



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE—Monday, October 7, 2013

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, Jr., a Senator from the State of Maine.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our stronghold and defense, Your judgments and will are perfect, so we place our trust in You.

Thank You for the privilege of speaking to You in daily prayer. Forgive us when our prayers are so other worldly they are no earthly good. Forgive us also when we put politics ahead of progress.

Lord, strengthen our Senators today, helping them to not throw away their confidence in You. Inspire them to persevere in seeking to do Your will, knowing that Your promises are sure and that the harvest is certain.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 7, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, Jr., a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KING thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following leader remarks the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 5 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

At 5 p.m. the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the Bruce and Ellis nominations, both to be U.S. district court judges in the State of Illinois.

At 5:30 p.m. there will be at least one roll call vote on confirmation of the nominations.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday the Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOHN BOEHNER, on national TV claimed there are not enough votes to pass the bill and bring an end to the dangerous government shutdown. I believe he is mistaken.

Two hundred Democratic Members of the House of Representatives said they would vote for the bill to reopen the government, and 22 Republicans in the House have said publicly they would vote for the bill. We have heard there are as many as 100 who wish to vote for it. No matter how we do the math, it adds up to a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

If there were only a mechanism for polling all Members of the House of Representatives to find out whether they support the Senate-passed bill, one surefire way to find out whether the bill would pass is to have a vote on it; that is, to vote on the legislation that has already been passed in the Senate.

There is a way; have a vote. That would settle the question for a long, long, time, wouldn't it.

What I say to the Speaker: Allow a vote on the resolution that would end the shutdown, legislation that you,

JOHN BOEHNER, proposed in the first place. The entire Federal Government could reopen for business by tomorrow morning.

I ask the Speaker, why are you afraid? Are you afraid this measure will pass, the government will reopen and America will realize you took the country hostage for no apparent reason?

Why is the Speaker opposed to these reasonable solutions?

Across the Nation people are suffering—not only Federal employees—because of his irresponsible action, the irresponsible tea party driven action. But it is not, I say, only Federal employees. US Air had a delivery last Friday of a \$180 million aircraft. They couldn't take delivery. Why? Because there weren't inspectors to do that for those aircraft.

We know that Lockheed has already announced today they are laying off 3,000 people, and there is more to come in the defense industry. It is happening all through the government.

There is an easy way out of this; the same escape hatch has been available as long as we have been a country. It is called a vote. But for the 7 days the Federal Government has been closed for business, the Speaker has refused to use that escape hatch.

It is so important when people wish to buy a home. One can't buy a home with an FHA loan today. Even if it is not FHA, they can't get them done because to confirm the amount of money that is on the application they need an IRS person to check it. They are not available.

The Senate-passed bill to reopen the government, while we work out our budget differences, wasn't my idea. It was his idea. The Speaker of the House of Representatives said: You do this CR at this number, and I will get it done.

We negotiated for a while. I agreed to his number. It was very hard to do for us in the Democratic Caucus. But it was his idea, not my idea. All this talk about not negotiating, that is what that was all about. He admits it was his intention all along to pass a clean resolution. But then he ran into the tea party, a minority within a majority

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a member of the Senate on the floor.

that runs the majority in the House of Representatives.

The bill before the House of Representatives is a compromise by us, a compromise that was difficult, I repeat, to get my caucus to accept. Now that we have compromised, the Speaker won't take yes for an answer. He has moved the goal line again.

Last week he said he wanted to go to conference to work out some differences. As we heard on national TV yesterday, he is not only concerned about ObamaCare, he is concerned about the budget deficit, as we all are. He keeps changing. He said he wanted to talk about that. Fine. We are happy to do that. If he wants to talk about ObamaCare, if he wants to talk about anything else, we will do it. I put that in writing and had it hand delivered to him. We said that we would talk about agriculture, we would talk about health care, we would talk about domestic discretionary spending, military spending, and anything he wishes to talk about. We have been asking to go to conference on a responsible budget for more than 6 months.

On national TV, the Speaker said Chairman RYAN and Chairman MURRAY have been working together for a long time. As I have indicated here previously, he said that in a meeting we had in the White House in the last few days. I said in front of everybody there: It is simply not factual.

Senator MURRAY issued a statement yesterday after she heard him saying this on national TV saying that is not true. They have had a couple of meetings but they haven't discussed anything substantive. I guess the meetings were only to say to the Speaker they met, but they talked about nothing in her budget or his budget.

We are saying simply, reopen the government. We have said we will go to your budget number. We don't like it. We have said we will go to conference and talk about anything you want.

He can't take yes for an answer.

Simply reopen the government. We will talk, I repeat, about anything you wish to talk about. We are not afraid to negotiate. We are not afraid to make reasonable compromises. Once again the football was moved, just like Lucy in the "Peanuts" cartoon.

As Judd Legum, editor-in-chief of ThinkProgress pointed out, Republicans have a strange definition of compromise. This is how he explains it:

Republicans ask: "Can I burn down your house?" We say: "No." Republicans ask: "Just the second floor?" We say: "No." Republicans ask: "[Just the] garage?" We say: "No." Republicans say: "Let's talk about what I can burn down." We say: "No." Then Republicans say: "You're not compromising!"

Republicans insist we must negotiate while the Federal Government remains closed. As The New York Times edi-

torial reported on Saturday, when 800,000 Federal employees are furloughed, government services are shut down and the economy is flagging, it is hardly time for talking.

Then they come up with all this: We will do an NIH bill. We will open NIH.

The problem is, it is really hard to pick and choose between that and the Park Service, especially when we consider they have cut spending this year for NIH by \$1.6 billion; the second year of their famous sequestration, \$2 billion. This is all a charade.

This is what the Times wrote after the brief introduction:

This is a moment for immediate action to reopen the government's doors, not the beginning of a conversation Republicans spurned when they lacked the leverage of a shutdown.

[Republicans] have refused to negotiate over the Senate's budget, they have refused to negotiate over the President's budget, and they have refused to negotiate to make the health law more efficient. . . . The two sides will eventually have to reach a reckoning on long-term economic issues, but the time to do so is not while dangling over an abyss.

Democrats are willing to negotiate but won't negotiate with a gun to our heads. We say to our Republican colleagues: End this irresponsible government shutdown. Stop your reckless threats of a default on the Nation's obligations. Then Democrats will negotiate over anything, anything our Republican colleagues wish to negotiate.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader in recognized.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. We are now in the second week of a government shutdown that nobody claims to want.

Democrats say it is unreasonable to ask for any changes or delays to ObamaCare. Republicans, we think the ObamaCare rollout has proven beyond a shadow of a doubt just how reasonable a delay is. If anybody had any doubts about the need to delay this thing, those doubts should have been allayed this weekend when the administration admitted its Web site wasn't working and took it offline for repairs.

Delay and basic fairness are what Republicans are asking for at this point, not exactly the Sun and the Moon.

Another thing Republicans have been saying is that if we can't agree on a bill to fund the entire government, let's at least pass the most urgent pieces of it. Let's at least pass the parts we can all agree on. That is exactly what the House has begun to do.

Over the past several days, the two parties in the House have responsibly come together and passed no fewer than eight bills to fund things such as

the Coast Guard, the Guard and Reserve, and programs for veterans. In other words, the House has quietly shown the two parties aren't completely at odds in this debate and that there is, in fact, some common ground here. Slowly but surely the House has approved funding for folks who shouldn't get caught in the middle of a political impasse such as this. They have done it on a bipartisan basis.

Over the weekend the House passed a bill that said a government shutdown doesn't affect the free exercise of religion on military bases, and 184 Democrats agreed. Another bill said government workers shouldn't have to wonder how they are going to pay their bills during a shutdown, and 189 Democrats agreed with that.

The bill to fund FEMA drew 23 Democrats. The one to fund NIH drew 25; national parks, 23.

Let's be clear here that the problem isn't the House. There is actually a fair amount of agreement among Republicans and Democrats over in the House, that Republicans and lawmakers have a duty and a responsibility that rises above the politics of the moment to fund things such as veterans, cancer trials, the National Guard, and reservists in every State.

The problem is the Senate.

I know Democrats don't like it, but the American people have given us divided government for two elections in a row. They gave us a Republican House, and they gave us a Democratic Senate.

This means negotiation isn't a luxury; it is a necessity. Until Senate Democrats accept reality, these crises will only be harder to resolve. So I would suggest they start thinking about how they might start playing a constructive role in the crisis and in the challenges that lie ahead. There is a time for politics, and there is a time for sitting down like adults and working things out. Republicans are ready and willing to negotiate. We invite Senate Democrats to join us.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Illinois.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me start off by acknowledging an article

which appeared in today's New York Times attributed to the Senate Chaplain, Dr. Barry Black, who led us in prayer to open the Senate's session. It is entitled "Give Us This Day, Our Daily Senate Scolding," and it goes on to talk about the prayers which Dr. Black, our Senate Chaplain, has offered during the course of the last week during the government shutdown. They say in the article the morning invocation has turned into a daily conscience check for the 100 men and women of the Senate.

The article points out that in the course of one of his prayers Dr. Black said:

Remove from them that stubborn pride which imagines itself to be above and beyond criticism. Forgive them the blunders they have committed.

I can't match his baritone voice and delivery when it comes to these prayers, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this article as a tribute to our Senate Chaplain who has been given the awesome responsibility to prove the power of prayer during the midst of a government shutdown.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 2013]

GIVE US THIS DAY, OUR DAILY SENATE
SCOLDING

(By Jeremy W. Peters)

WASHINGTON.—The disapproval comes from angry constituents, baffled party elders and colleagues on the other side of the Capitol. But nowhere have senators found criticism more personal or immediate than right inside their own chamber every morning when the chaplain delivers the opening prayer.

"Save us from the madness," the chaplain, a Seventh-day Adventist, former Navy rear admiral and collector of brightly colored bow ties named Barry C. Black, said one day late last week as he warmed up into what became an epic ministerial scolding.

"We acknowledge our transgressions, our shortcomings, our smugness, our selfishness and our pride," he went on, his baritone voice filling the room. "Deliver us from the hypocrisy of attempting to sound reasonable while being unreasonable."

So it has gone every day for the last week when Mr. Black, who has been the Senate's official man of the cloth for 10 years, has taken one of the more rote rituals on Capitol Hill—the morning invocation—and turned it into a daily conscience check for the 100 men and women of the United States Senate.

Inside the tempestuous Senate chamber, where debate has degenerated into daily name-calling—the Tea Party as a band of nihilists and extortionists, and Democrats as socialists who want to force their will on the American people—Mr. Black's words manage to cut through as powerful and persuasive.

During his prayer on Friday, the day after officers from the United States Capitol Police shot and killed a woman who had used her car as a battering ram, Mr. Black noted that the officers were not being paid because of the government shutdown.

Then he turned his attention back to the senators. "Remove from them that stubborn pride which imagines itself to be above and

beyond criticism," he said. "Forgive them the blunders they have committed."

Senator Harry Reid, the pugnacious majority leader who has called his Republican adversaries anarchists, rumps and hostage takers, took note. As Mr. Black spoke, Mr. Reid, whose head was bowed low in prayer, broke his concentration and looked straight up at the chaplain.

"Following the suggestion in the prayer of Admiral Black," the majority leader said after the invocation, seeming genuinely contrite, "I think we've all here in the Senate kind of lost the aura of Robert Byrd," one of the historical giants of the Senate, who prized gentility and compromise.

In many ways, Mr. Black, 65, is like any other employee of the federal government who is fed up with lawmakers' inability to resolve the political crisis that has kept the government closed for almost a week. He is not being paid. His Bible study classes, which he holds for senators and their staff members four times a week, have been canceled until further notice.

His is a nonpartisan position, one of just a few in the Senate, and he prefers to leave his political leanings vague. He was chosen in 2003 by Senator Bill Frist, a Tennessee Republican who was the majority leader at the time, from a group of finalists selected by a bipartisan committee. Before that he ministered in the Navy for nearly 30 years.

"I use a biblical perspective to decide my beliefs about various issues," Mr. Black said in an interview in his office suite on the third floor of the Capitol. "Let's just say I'm liberal on some and conservative on others. But it's obvious the Bible condemns some things in a very forceful and overt way, and I would go along with that condemnation."

Last year, he participated in the Hoodies on the Hill rally to draw attention to the shooting death of Trayvon Martin. In 2007, after objections from groups that did not like the idea of a Senate chaplain appearing alongside political figures, he canceled a speech he was scheduled to give at an evangelical event featuring, among others, Tony Perkins of the conservative Focus on the Family and the columnist and author Ann Coulter.

Mr. Black, who is the first black Senate chaplain as well as its first Seventh-day Adventist, grew up in public housing in Baltimore, an experience he draws on in his sermons and writings, including a 2006 autobiography, "From the Hood to the Hill."

In his role as chaplain, a position that has existed since 1789, he acts as a sounding board, spiritual adviser and ethical counselor to members of the Senate. When he prays each day, he said, he recites the names of all 100 senators and their spouses, reading them from a laminated index card.

It is not uncommon for him to have 125 people at his Bible study gatherings or 20 to 30 senators at his weekly prayer breakfast. He officiates weddings for Senate staff members. He performs hospital visitations. And he has been at the side of senators when they have died, most recently Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii in December.

He tries to use his proximity to the senators—and the fact that for at least one minute every morning, his is the only voice they hear—to break through on issues that he feels are especially urgent. Lately, he said, they seem to be paying attention.

"I remember once talking about self-inflicted wounds—that captured the imagination of some of our lawmakers," he said. "Remember, my prayer is the first thing they hear every day. I have the opportunity, really, to frame the day in a special way."

His words lately may be pointed, but his tone is always steady and calm.

"May they remember that all that is necessary for unintended catastrophic consequences is for good people to do nothing," he said the day of the shutdown deadline.

"Unless you empower our lawmakers," he prayed another day, "they can comprehend their duty but not perform it."

The House, which has its own chaplain, liked what it heard from Mr. Black so much that it invited him to give the invocation on Friday.

"I see us playing a very dangerous game," Mr. Black said as he sat in his office the other day. "It's like the showdown at the O.K. Corral. Who's going to blink first? So I can't help but have some of this spill over into my prayer. Because you're hoping that something will get through and that cooler heads will prevail."

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I picked up the newspaper, at least went online to look at the newspapers from Illinois this morning, and two stories jumped right off the page. One was in the Bloomington Pantagraph. What a great story it is and makes me so proud to be from the Midwest and to represent people who are, by their very nature, pretty darned extraordinary. It is a story that comes out of Lexington, IL, about an event that happened yesterday, and I will quote just a bit of it.

More than 60 area farmers, truckers and their families gathered north of Lexington on Sunday morning to pay back a friend who had helped them out at one time or another during his 71-year lifetime. Some 16 combines harvested more than 300 acres of corn as friends of Dave Thomas brought in Thomas' last harvest. Thomas died of a heart attack on July 22 and his wife Sharon and four sons decided to end the family's farm operations.

The article went on to say how it broke the family's heart to give up this family farm, but these neighbors pitched in. They wanted to harvest David Thomas' land and to make sure that last crop was brought in for his family. It is the kind of compassion and caring and family and community which we see in many States, but I see over and over in my home State of Illinois.

This is not unique. It happens often, and every time it does it is worthy of note because it is such a special comment on the people of this great Nation and their caring for their neighbors.

The area farmers in Chenoa, not too far from Lexington, are planning a similar harvest operation for another neighbor, David Harrison, this morning. Dave passed away last week.

Time and again these farm families put aside their own physical comfort, their own daily schedules, their own lives to help one another. It is such a wonderful comment on this great Nation that we call home and the area I am so proud to represent.

The second article that jumped off the page after I read this came out of Kansas—Wichita, KS—and it quotes Tim Peterson. He is a wheat farmer. I am not as familiar with wheat as I am

corn and soybeans, but he started talking about the problems he is running into. His problems are created by us because Tim doesn't have access to vital agricultural reports. They are casualties of the Federal Government shutdown. We stopped publishing this information, and farmers such as Tim Peterson and others are forced to make some very important family decisions, some important financial decisions without the necessary information.

These reports can alert them to shortfalls in overseas markets or if there is a wide swing in acres planted, both of which might prompt U.S. growers to plant extra crops to meet demand or hang on to a harvest a little longer to get a better price.

Here are these farmers across the Midwest who have worked hard to reach this point in the harvest where they can make enough money to live and to plant another year, to sustain their families and communities around them, and they have a problem. The problem is the politicians in Washington who want to shut down the government.

What a contrast: farmers who rallied in Lexington, IL, for the family of a fallen farmer, to show they would stand by him through thick and thin and help him out—at least his family out through this adversity—and then this article and story in Kansas, where the Congressmen and Senators sent to Washington to do their job and to provide the basic information for these farmers have failed and in failing have made it much more difficult for these farmers.

Two articles in the morning papers from the central part of the United States of America, which brings home to me the graphic human side of this government shutdown. Something else brought it home personally. When HARRY REID, our majority leader, announced we weren't going to have votes on Saturday or Sunday, I took the opportunity to get out of town and I raced off to be with my grandkids.

I have two twin grandchildren, 22 months old, and I just love them to pieces. I thought getting away with them is exactly what I need, to get out of this town and to get my mind straight after a tough political week. We had a ball. We did the normal things one would expect: going to the park and reading "Polar Bear, Polar Bear, What Do You Hear?" and all the things that are fun for a grandfather.

There were a couple moments, though—you see, they are almost 2 years old, and there were a couple moments during the weekend where one of them would lose it for just a little while and start crying and screaming uncontrollably and saying the word "no" over and over again and unable to express themselves because they just don't have the vocabulary to tell us what is on their minds. In those mo-

ments I felt as though I was back in Washington again.

The terrible twos temper tantrums sounded like Congress—people shouting no, screaming uncontrollably, and unable to express what they are doing and why they are doing it, and that is where we find ourselves today.

On the morning talk shows yesterday, on Sunday, a number of leaders came to speak, and of course everybody was focused on Speaker BOEHNER because he is the captain of the ship when it comes to the government shutdown, but it was interesting to me that what guided this government shutdown last week—ObamaCare, the health care reform bill—they were not talking about so much anymore. It has been launched, and 9 million people across America have visited the Web site because they are interested in finding health insurance maybe for the first time in their lives or health insurance they can afford—9 million.

Because so many have come to these Web sites, the Republican leader is right, we have had trouble getting them moving forward. It will take a few days to adjust to this volume of people coming on board to find out whether this insurance exchange can help them, their family or the business. The good news for my colleague Senator MCCONNELL, from Kentucky, is that his State has been a real success story, with 8,000 people having already signed up in Kentucky for health insurance on the insurance exchange of ObamaCare.

I hope Senator MCCONNELL and Senator RAND PAUL take some pride in the fact that now 8,000—at least 8,000—Kentuckians have health insurance they can afford and they can trust, some of them for the first time in their lives. When I hear this news, I wonder how these Senators from Kentucky and some other States can say we want to repeal this, we want to get rid of this.

What are they going to tell those 8,000 families who finally have health insurance for the first time? Big mistake. Sorry. Go back to the marketplace where you have no health insurance protection. That is hardly the response Americans want to hear in Kentucky, Illinois, in Maine or any other State.

What we are trying to do with ObamaCare, the health care reform act, is to open up an opportunity for 40 to 50 million Americans to have health insurance they can afford for the first time in their lives. What we have heard from the other side of the aisle is: Repeal it. Defund it. Delay it. Do anything you can to stop it. Stop it.

You know why they want to stop it? Because they understand that once people's appetites are whetted for health care insurance they can afford and insurance where they can protect their families, there is no turning back. We are at a point in history,

much as we were with the creation of Social Security and Medicare, where we are offering to families across America something they could not do by themselves and something they will value very much as part of their families and their future, and that is what is driving this fear on the other side of the aisle. That is what is driving the government shutdown.

What is worse is October 17, the next deadline, and it is not that far away. In another 9 or 10 days we are going to face a debt ceiling expiration. The debt ceiling is basically America's mortgage. We have to extend our mortgage. We borrow money to manage our government, to fight wars, to pay our military, to do the most basic things. When we borrow that money, we have to have authorization from the government. That is the debt ceiling.

Many of the same Senators and Congressmen who voted for this spending now will not vote to pay the bill. That is akin to eating the big meal at the restaurant and, when the waiter brings the check, saying: I ain't paying. How long would that last? That is what many are suggesting when they say we are not going to extend the debt ceiling. They have eaten the meal. They just don't want to pay the bill.

It would be the first time in the history of the United States we would default on our national debt. The first time we would basically violate the full faith and credit of the United States of America. It has its consequences. The last time the tea party did this, America's credit rating suffered. What happens when our credit rating suffers? The interest rates we pay go up. Taxpayers are paying more to China and countries that loan us money than they are paying to educate children, to build roads or do medical research.

Here we go again. Another threat by the Speaker that we are going to default on our national debt again. They threatened it 2 years ago, and they have come back again—the tea party. This is totally irresponsible.

I read the newspapers from different countries and they look at the United States and shake their head and they wonder how this country, which many say—and I can certainly see the reason for it—is one of the leaders in the world, can find itself in this manufactured political crisis again and again and again. It is like the temper tantrums of the terrible twos when we hear this. We think it is totally unnecessary. We have to help these kids grow up and get through it. America has to grow up and stand and say to Congress: It is time for you to grow up and stand and do the right thing for the future of this country.

I hope we can do this, and I hope we can do it together in a bipartisan fashion. This shutdown of the Federal Government should end today. The Speaker has before him a continuing resolution which he could pass, could pass in a heartbeat, and the government would be extended. The farmer out in Kansas would have the information he needs, the medical researcher would be back to work at the National Institutes of Health, and all of the agencies of the government would be functioning for the good of the American people. That is what we were sent to do. There are no excuses and no political reasons not to.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the distinguished majority whip, for bringing up Chaplain Barry Black's name and the article that appeared in the New York Times. I know Senator DURBIN and I do a lot of things together. One of those things is just about every Wednesday morning we attend the Senate Prayer Breakfast. Replete through all of Barry's prayers at that breakfast is always one word, and that is "humility." I think the message in that article in the New York Times and the message in the prayers in the last 7 or 8 days in the Senate and the message to all of us right now is that we need to grasp a little humility and find common ground among consternation and move this country forward.

To that end, I want to make my suggestion, for what it is worth, and I want to make mine as an inspiration with Senator COLLINS, the other Senator from the State of Maine who last week made her proposal. If we can't find common ground with the arguments we have today, let's proffer a new proposal to give us a chance to solve our problem.

SUSAN COLLINS made a great suggestion, to replace the medical device tax with other revenue so it doesn't cut the revenue and to get back to sequestration but only by cutting defense agencies, not by cutting across the board. That made a lot of sense. It provides a way to absorb those cuts but does so in a professional way.

So I come to the floor in a Robert Frost moment. You know the poem:

"Two roads diverged in a yellow wood. . . . I took the one less traveled by, and that has made all the difference."

We have been traveling down the wrong road for far too long. We are here today, in large measure, arguing over a CR we shouldn't have to be arguing over. Had we been doing our appropriations and doing our budgets over the last 4 years, the money would have been spent, the regular order would have been in place, the fiscal year moneys would have been appro-

priated, and there would be no need for a CR.

There is bipartisan responsibility for not having done a budget or an appropriations act. The leadership, obviously, controls the floor, so they can bring the appropriations act forward and that is their responsibility. But we have also cried out on our side for a budget. Year after year, let's have a budget. Now we have a budget, one approved by the House and one approved by the Senate, but an inability to go to conference because we can't get agreement on preconditions. Once again, this is another situation of not negotiating over something that is important to the American people.

So I have a suggestion, a suggestion that two-thirds of this Senate agreed to in the budget debate we had in March, a decision that 20 States have exercised in our country that has made them better, a decision the State of Israel made 2 or 3 years ago when they got into such dire financial conditions and went to the World Bank for suggestions; that is, let's force our CR and add to it a simple resolution that changes our way of doing business to a biennial budget and appropriations act, where we force ourselves to appropriate over 2 years and not 1, and make those appropriations in the odd-numbered years so that in the even-numbered years we do only oversight.

It would make a lot of difference for the American people if we were arguing over not how much bacon we were bringing home but how much money we were saving through oversight, savings, and fiscal accountability. I have introduced that legislation, along with Senator SHAHEEN—a Democrat from New Hampshire and a Governor who ran a State under a biennial budget. It makes sense, it is humble, it is the right way to do business, and it ends this necessity of having continuing resolutions at the last minute because we didn't do our job.

Let's face it. We are here today in the conundrum we are in because we did not do our job. We did not pass a budget and go to a conference committee, we didn't have appropriations acts, so we are doing a continuing resolution into a new fiscal year. That is no way to run the greatest country on the face of this Earth. Four years and running we have shirked our responsibility. It is time for a new day in the Senate. It is time for a biennial budget. It worked for Israel. If it worked for 20 States, it will work for us. It establishes priorities, it ends waste, fraud, and abuse, and it brings about good decisions.

Last night on "60 Minutes," Senator TOM COBURN from Oklahoma was featured, and the feature was about SSI disability and the fact that we now pay \$135 billion a year in SSI disability payments—a trebling of those costs in just a few years—and fully 25 to 40 per-

cent we know is fraudulent. Twenty-five to forty percent is \$40 billion to \$60 billion. You can do a lot with \$40 billion to \$60 billion. That is where transparency and oversight works.

There is nobody better than the Senator from Oklahoma in terms of oversight and nobody more humble than the Senator from Oklahoma, but when he knows he is right, he is going to work hard to do what is right, and that is what all of us should be doing.

Referring to the Senator from Oklahoma, I go back to the Workforce Investment Act, which Senator MURRAY and I are working very hard to bring to the floor. In that, Senator COBURN found forty-four duplicative job training programs in nine different agencies—over and over again. We are appropriating money forty-four different times to nine different agencies to do workforce training when we really only ought to be doing one. If we were budgeting on a 2-year basis and doing other oversight in even-numbered years, there would be no limit to the successes we could have, the transparency we could enforce, the agreements we could come to, and the lack of cliff management we are in today.

The debt ceiling we face in about 10 days is a debt ceiling we face because we are having to borrow more money to run our government. We are having to borrow more money to run our government because we are not doing fiscal accountability, we are not doing appropriating, and we are going to continue for that to grow and grow.

As a businessman and a saver, I know what the time value of money is. The time value of money means that if you put away a little bit of money every year and save for your kids' education, for your health care, or whatever it might be, when the time comes and you need it, you will have it. But I also know what the time cost of money is: when you are borrowing money to pay off borrowed money—and that is where we are in the United States of America today. So that is why this debt ceiling crisis is such a big issue.

I would submit, and humbly, that the Shaheen-Isakson legislation that forces us to do our regular order of business of appropriating, forces us to budget, and forces us to do it every year puts us back to the kind of discipline and job responsibility we really need around this place. Instead of arguing about what we can't agree upon, we ought to find common ground and run our country's household the way American families run their households. If we had to do here in Washington what every American family has to do year in and year out, this place would be a whole lot different.

It is time that we find humility, find common ground, do what 20 of the 50 States do, do what the State of Israel has done, and do what 67 Senators said we ought to do in the budget debate

back in March; that is, pass a biennial and appropriations act, end this foolishness, and gain back some of the humility we richly deserve.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 2 extra minutes to pay tribute to a physician in my county.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The further remarks of Mr. ISAKSON are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his call on this place to get back to regular order and to bridge our differences. I think it is an important one and a noble and hopefully easy request for us to ultimately follow.

I came down here this weekend to talk about a young woman in Bridgeport, CT, who is at the epicenter of the fallout of this shutdown, and I wanted to come back down on Monday to tell her story very briefly once again because the way a lot of trade papers cover this shutdown makes it seem as if this is just about politics. If you listen to some commentators and some members of the tea party crowd in the House of Representatives, they will tell you that what we are going to find in this shutdown is that everybody is going to learn that the government really doesn't do that much and it is not that big a deal if it goes away for a couple of months, a couple of weeks, a couple of days.

What we are finding as we enter week 2 of this shutdown is we have now moved past the point where the collapse of the government is just an inconvenience. It is now ruining lives. I wish Melanie Rhodes was the exception, but she is increasingly becoming the rule across the country. The Presiding Officer heard me tell her story this weekend, but I am going to do it again.

Melanie was homeless a couple years ago. She lives in the southwestern portion of Connecticut. She had hit really hard times, but she decided to pull her life together—not the least of the reasons being that she has a little boy. She has a son Malachi. Malachi was born about 2 months premature, so he was born with some developmental disabilities that luckily, because of a government program, were caught early on. The program is called Birth to Three. In Connecticut, it is our early intervention program. Most States have it. It is one of the programs that are going to run out of funds pretty soon if we don't start turning back on the faucet to State governments.

But even more important to Melanie was that through that early interven-

tion screening program that figured out Malachi needed a little bit of extra help, they got him into a Head Start Program. He wasn't even 1 year old when he started the Head Start Program. Today he is 3, and he is making incredible progress. He has some serious issues. He is just now learning how to communicate with some signs he has been taught. But he is doing better and doing better every single day.

On Monday night of last week Melanie stayed up all night watching to see whether the government was still going to be operating because she knew the Bridgeport Head Start Program works on a fiscal year that matches ours. So if the government shut down on October 1, the check wouldn't come to Bridgeport Head Start and they would have to send 1,000 kids home.

But she also knew her life was starting to get brighter in other ways as well. She had been looking for a job for a long time and she had done everything we asked of her. She had applied to everybody she could think of, from Walmart to Walgreens to McDonald's, and hadn't found anything until a bus company decided to hire her as a driver. She had gone through her training; she was just waiting for her background check to come back. It was going to be OK and she was going to start work. But, of course, the only way she could start work was if she had care for her child. As she has said so eloquently over the past week, she can't just leave Malachi with anybody because he is a kid with substantial difficulties and his caregivers need to know how to take care of him. So if there is no Head Start, there is no school for Malachi, he regresses in terms of the progress he has made, and she can't start her job. Her family essentially collapses around her simply because this place can't pass a budget. That is what is happening to Melanie, and she says simply this: We need our government and our businesses open. Why should we suffer and be held hostage while government can't do what they need to do?

Her story can be repeated thousands of times across Connecticut. I think I saw today that about 18,000 Head Start slots are going to be closed by the end of this week. Unfortunately, her story is not the exception; it is becoming the rule. This is what this shutdown means. It is not playacting. It is real.

As I watched some of the shows over the weekend, I heard a familiar refrain from our Republican colleagues. They said: Yeah, we have this demand that we want the health care law delayed or repealed or defunded in order to get the government up and operating, but really it is the Democrats. It is HARRY REID, it is President Obama who won't sit down and negotiate. If they would just sit down and negotiate, then we could end this whole thing.

I understand how some people might watch and think to themselves, why won't the Democrats just sit down and talk about this? So I would like to address this claim that the only thing stopping us from reopening the government is Democrats won't talk to Republicans. I want to address that in five simple ways.

First, I would make the point that every single one of my colleagues has made: We have already talked. What we thought we were talking about was a continuing resolution, a temporary budget that would keep the government operating for about 6 weeks. A lot of Democratic critics actually would argue that we didn't really negotiate that well over that particular issue because in the end the Senate passed a budget with a particular number for the continuing resolution, the House passed a budget with a particular number for the continuing resolution, and the difference was pretty substantial, but in the end the Senate just decided to go with the House number. We didn't settle in between. We didn't settle closer to ours or closer to theirs. We just took the House number. So we kind of feel, on the subject at hand, which is the continuing resolution, that the negotiation has already happened and we gave the House everything they wanted. There is not much more to negotiate after you give them everything when it comes to the bottom-line number in the continuing resolution.

Second, it is kind of hard to have a negotiation when only one side is making demands. We don't have any demands in this negotiation. All we want is for the things that normally happen to continue to happen—i.e., we want the government to stay open on the exact same terms the government was open last week and the week before. We want the country to pay our bills just as we have paid our bills for a generation. It is only Republicans—and, frankly, not all Republicans. Most Republicans in the Senate are not making these demands. It is mainly a small handful in the House and the Senate who say: In order to keep the government open, we want the health care law defunded or repealed or delayed.

It is difficult to have a negotiation when all we want is the status quo.

It is kind of like if two people lived in a house and one of them said: I am going to take the roof off the house if you don't do what I want. You wouldn't really negotiate that. That is an unreasonable demand. The roof just needs to be there. It is something that, for good reason, is normally not the subject of debate or negotiation. And you wouldn't settle for half. You wouldn't allow your roommate to take half the roof off. The roof just needs to be there, and if you are angry with me about something or you want to talk about something, let's do it while the roof is still on.

We can't negotiate over the government just operating. We can't negotiate over whether or not we are going to pay our bills. We don't want anything. We just want things to happen as they have happened in the past.

Third, this place just can't operate if in order to keep the government open for 6 weeks we have to satisfy everybody's personal political agenda.

I also said this weekend I have things I believe in very strongly. I represent Sandy Hook, CT. I submit I feel just as strongly about background checks as the Senator from Texas does about the repeal of the health care bill. But it would be unreasonable for me to say I am not going to vote for a budget because I don't get my way on background checks or immigration reform or tax fairness or whatever it may be that I care about outside the confines of the continuing resolution. If all 100 Senators had to get their particular nonbudgetary political points settled as a requirement of passing a continuing resolution, this place would absolutely collapse.

Maybe that is what some people want. Maybe some people want government to collapse and the government to shut down. But when I hear people talk on this floor, I take them at face value, that that is not what they want. Ultimately we all cannot get what we need all the time.

Fourth, you normally need to compromise when you do not have consensus, when you do not have agreement, when both the Senate and the House do not have the majority of their Members agreeing to the exact same thing. In that case you need to negotiate because clearly we do not have consensus, and so we have to get two sides together to find consensus.

We have consensus. We have a bill the majority of Senators supports, the majority of House Members supports, the President is ready to sign the minute it gets to his desk. That is what is referred to as a clean continuing resolution, a bill that would keep the government operating for the next 6 weeks on the same terms it was operating beforehand. The only reason why that is not law today is because Speaker BOEHNER will not bring that up for a vote in the House of Representatives. But it reportedly enjoys the support of more than 216 Members of the House, which is what you need today to get that bill passed. It has already passed the Senate.

Last, as Senator DURBIN talked about, what Republicans are demanding as their condition to keep the government up and operating is no less than the repeal of the signature achievement of President Obama's first term, the most important bill I have ever worked on, the most important vote I have ever cast. That is the health care law which is today saving millions of dollars for senior citizens in

their Medicare benefits and right now is providing a lifeline to millions of Americans who need cheaper insurance.

It is why poll after poll tells you that although people are still split on whether they agree with the exact prescription for our health care economy laid out in the bill we passed, they sure as heck do not want us to repeal the law. By about a 2-to-1 margin people say don't repeal the law, let it go into effect, give it a shot. It is also why by a 3-to-1 margin people do not agree with shutting down the government over the repeal of the health care law. It is why 9 million people have gone onto the Federal health care reform Web site to see what their options are. It is why, as Senator DURBIN said, even in States such as Kentucky, people are signing up by the thousands. In the first day of Connecticut's exchange we had more visits to the Web site than we had in the entire month previous. People are desperate for lower cost health care out there. Sick people and families with sick children have been waiting lifetimes to finally be able to get insurance for their loved ones.

People need this health care reform law to go into effect. It is simply not true, as the Senator from Texas and others have said, that people do not want this law. They have shown us how badly and desperately they need it by the flood of interest in the exchanges over the first week, and in poll after poll the American people say loudly they do not want this repealed.

It is hard to get major social change passed in this town. The Founding Fathers intentionally set up a process by which something such as health care reform seems nearly impossible. That is why it took 100 years since Teddy Roosevelt first proposed that we guarantee access to our health care system for all Americans for it to happen.

You have a lot of chances for that idea to crater. You need both Chambers to pass the exact same bill, you need a President willing to sign it, you need the courts to uphold it, and then you need the electorate to confirm it when everybody who voted for it stands for reelection again.

The reason why we are implementing the health care law today and the reason why most Americans want it to go forward is we passed every single one of those tests. For the first time in a hundred years the exact same proposal to reform our health care system passed with a majority of both the House and the Senate and was signed by our President. The Supreme Court reviewed the law and stamped that it was constitutional. Then this President and every Member of the Senate who voted for the health care bill went out to stand for reelection in 2012, based on the promise they would continue to implement the law. The President was reelected by a resounding margin and

every Senator in this Chamber who voted for the health care law won reelection. The bill passed, the courts upheld it, voters confirmed their original choices. People want this law.

We already compromised on the amount in the continuing resolution. It cannot be much of a negotiation when all we want is for the government to stay up and operating and for us to pay our bills. This place cannot work if, every time you negotiate a budget, everybody has to have their own political priorities taken care of.

We do not need to negotiate because we already have a bill that enjoys the support of both Chambers and will be signed by the President if only the House of Representatives will call it for a vote. The idea that people do not want the health care law simply is not borne out either by the polls or by people's conduct on the exchanges over the last 2 weeks.

Melanie Rhodes is waiting for an answer from us. Malachi needs to get back into preschool, ASAP. He is a little autistic boy who, every single day he sits home by himself, is marching a little bit more quickly backward off the progress gained through this program, funded not by government but by all of us, because we thought it was important that little boys with autism growing up in poor families with moms who used to be homeless should have a chance at success in life. Every day we continue to reverse our collective decision as a society that Malachi should get some help, he goes backward and backward. His mom, to whom we said: You know what. Pick yourself up by your bootstraps, do the right thing for yourself and your child—she did it. She got him into Head Start, she found a job, and now because that program is shut down, she likely will not be able to start her job. He moves backward. She moves backward.

It is not because Democrats will not negotiate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Connecticut for those eloquent and very powerful remarks, and I will take advantage of his presence here to perhaps engage in a colloquy, if he agrees to doing so, asking him, because he spoke so wonderfully about that one family, whether he has seen, as I have seen, that story of deprivation and setback duplicated on a bigger scale throughout our State?

Mr. MURPHY. I thank my colleague from Connecticut for the question. As he knows, there are a thousand different children in that one Head Start Program alone who have essentially lost access to childcare. This week I think the number is, as the Senator knows, about 18,000 kids across the country who will lose access to health

care. As we have seen, it has already had a big effect in our State because we have so many defense manufacturers. Some of the initial furloughs to civilians have caused a loss of work among families who could not afford it. We are seeing over and over how this shutdown trickles down.

Frankly, it is affecting the very families who cannot afford to miss a paycheck, the very families who cannot make quick arrangements to find somebody else to take care of their autistic child. As the Senator has seen and knows, this is affecting, in our small State, thousands and thousands of residents who did not have a lot of wiggle room when it came to the support that was standing around them due to programs run by the Federal Government.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. In fact, I think statistics show more than a thousand children and their families are directly affected by this shutdown in Head Start alone. Seniors, in terms of nutritional assistance—I do not know whether my good friend and very distinguished colleague from Connecticut has seen that phenomenon as well in Bridgeport and throughout our State of Connecticut and would care to remark on it?

Mr. MURPHY. I would say to the Senator, we have had this effort on behalf of Republicans to kind of pick and choose which parts of the government they are going to reopen. As I noted here on the floor in objecting to one of these piecemeal requests, that exact program my colleague referred to, the senior nutrition program which provides meals to very low-income and often very frail seniors who are getting them either at a senior center or delivered to them through the Meals On Wheels Program, was not initially one of the programs that Republicans chose to reopen.

That is why we object to this piecemeal approach. It is bad policy to allow for a wing of this House or the other House to pick and choose which people they help, leaving on the outside, as the Senator mentioned, some who are very deserving, such as very frail and often very hungry senior citizens.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. What is needed, I think my colleague would agree, is an end to the shutdown, reopening government—not for the sake of reopening the government but to provide these vital services and assurance that the United States of America, the greatest Nation in the history of the world, is going to continue paying its debts. Then and only then have a conference and a compromise and collaboration on what our overall budget should be with smart spending cuts and increases in revenue that close some loopholes and subsidies. I think that was the thrust, was it not, of what my colleague from Connecticut had to say?

Mr. MURPHY. I think the majority leader made it very clear he is willing

to sit down to talk about everything and anything the Republicans want to discuss but not with a gun to our heads. Let's reopen the government. Then, as we as a Chamber have been willing to do over and over, let's sit down in a budget conference with everything part of that budget on the table.

But this just cannot happen every time that one faction of one House does not get their way, they shut down the government until their particular demands are remediated.

As I was saying, Senator BLUMENTHAL and I care deeply about the issue of background checks. He worked his entire life on this issue. But given his life's work, he is still not coming to this Chamber and demanding until he gets his way on that issue, which is of such vital importance to his constituents and mine, that he will shut down the government.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. In fact, what is happening is a small fraction of one House of the Congress—in fact, in the House of Representatives, one small group of rightwing extremists, whatever they may characterize themselves as—is holding hostage the entire House of Representatives, the entire Congress, the entire government, even though it is only one branch and one part of a branch. I think Senator MURPHY has explained well our view—and our constituents in Connecticut need to know it—we are willing to compromise and collaborate but not with hostage-taking tactics that in effect say to everyone else in the country: It is our way or the highway.

I thank my colleague from Connecticut for speaking so clearly and persuasively on his topic, and for giving the impact of this government shutdown a human face and a human voice. The story he told from Bridgeport has indeed thousands of others just like it across the State of Connecticut, across the country, who are suffering the real hardship and harm of this shutdown.

We can talk in the abstract here. Our rhetoric may carry a little bit beyond these four walls. But the real-life consequences belong to them. Both Senator MURPHY and I have seen them in real life and that is why we are here to advocate and fight for those people of Connecticut, in Bridgeport, those families who depend on Head Start, those seniors who depend on nutritional assistance—he has told their story, and that of Sikorsky, so well today in this Chamber. These men and women, and their families, do great work for our Nation on their assembly lines.

Black Hawk helicopters are the best-made helicopters in the Nation. They perform rescue operations for our troops in Afghanistan. They medevac our Nation's warriors to places where they can be saved. They provide resupply and provisions. They are literally

lifesaving vehicles in our war to keep America safe.

Those workers in Sikorsky were told late last week: You are done. You are furloughed. Do not report to work next week because 45 inspectors—civilian employees of the U.S. Department of Defense—are going to be furloughed. The 45 inspectors and 1,500 or 2,000 or more workers at Sikorsky who work on the Black Hawk helicopter assembly line, and other product assembly as well, were told they were going to be furloughed.

Senator MURPHY and I, and other members of our delegation, spoke with officials of the Department of Defense. We made our interpretation of the recently passed law clear to them and told them that it applies to employees of the Defense Contract Management Agency whose services were vital to certify and inspect those helicopters. We needed to keep the assembly lines at Sikorsky open in order to make sure that Black Hawk helicopters were continuing to be available to our military men and women who depend on them so vitally.

Those conversations—and I am sure others had them as well—with officials at the Department of Defense, along with the action of the House over the weekend, will make sure that all of the furloughed employees who work for the U.S. Government will eventually be paid.

Secretary Hagel was persuaded to do the right thing. I commend and thank Secretary Hagel for bringing back those employees, such as the 45 DCMA inspectors, who have to be there for the Department of Defense in order to take delivery of those helicopters, which, in turn, is necessary to keep the assembly line open and keep Sikorsky workers employed and on the job with the countless other hard-working men and women defense contractors across the United States.

I thank Secretary Hagel, but at the same time we need to recognize that for every Sikorsky helicopter situation, for every Fortune 500 corporation, and for every one of those big defense contractors, there are literally thousands of suppliers and small businesses that are continuing in uncertainty, and sometimes confusion, about what is happening here in Washington.

There are thousands of other businesses that depend on those suppliers because they provide the raw materials for the parts for the Sikorsky helicopters. The ripple effect and the ramifications pervade our economy and our society. The uncertainty creates harm and hardship that is immeasurable and perhaps irreparable.

The harm is not only to those workers who rightly have whiplash from being furloughed one day and being called back another and then being uncertain as to what impact this shutdown will ultimately have; there are

suppliers and the countless other small businesses that cannot plan, cannot look ahead, cannot hire for the future, and sometimes they have to tell their workers: You are going to be furloughed. You cannot plan to buy a car or a new home or even the most minor things such as school supplies—or make other plans, for that matter.

Lives hang in the balance; lives are at stake. The real-life consequences are real and perhaps lasting for many Americans—not only the family who depends on Head Start or the senior nutrition assistance or the jobs in Sikorsky, but there are countless others whose lives also hang in the balance.

There is a solution to this impasse. Calmer minds, cooler heads, and common sense are beginning to reach a consensus that the House should be given a chance to vote, and that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOHN BOEHNER, should enable that vote. He should very simply provide an opportunity to Republicans and Democrats—not singling out one side or the other—to come together on a bipartisan basis.

Who cares who is in the minority of that vote as long as it reopens the government and provides Head Start, nutritional assistance, and enables some certainty that permits our economy to move forward rationally and sensibly so we can recover from the great recession? We need to grow jobs and enable the economy to reach some measure of prosperity. We all have an interest in that outcome. We should all be pulling for America. We should all be assured that the greatest nation in the history of the world will leave no doubt that it will pay its bills on time and that it will fulfill its obligations on time, just as we have for every year in the history of this great Nation.

There is a way to come together. I have heard from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that the time has come to end this impasse. Simply let the House vote.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, all over this country the American people are outraged by what is going on here in Washington. They have a hard time understanding why rightwing extremists in the Republican Party in the House are able to shut down the U.S. Government, while paychecks are being denied to millions of Federal em-

ployees and, at the same time, services—in some cases desperately needed services—are being threatened for tens of millions of Americans. People are hurting and they wonder what is going on.

Let me say a few words regarding what, in my view, has, in fact, happened. From the beginning, some of my Republican colleagues are saying: We just need to talk. Let's compromise. A key point they neglect to make is that a major compromise has already taken place. The Democrats in the Senate—and I am an independent, as is the Presiding Officer, affiliated with the Democratic Caucus—decided to send a budget for a continuing resolution to the House, which, in my view, was a very, very weak budget, one that I am totally dissatisfied with, and I think most Members of the caucus are. It continues the budget at sequestration levels which will have a devastating impact on this country. It is a bad budget. But the reason the majority leader sent it over to the House was that he was of the understanding that the Speaker of the House had requested that type of budget, and that once that budget came over—once that CR came over—the House would agree to it. In fact, let me read from an article in the Washington Post today commenting on an ABC interview that Speaker BOEHNER did. The Washington Post says:

In the ABC interview, Boehner tacitly acknowledged making a deal with Senate Democrats to avoid using the threat of a shutdown to attack ObamaCare in exchange for an agreement to maintain the deep cuts known as the sequester through the fall. He conceded that his rank and file forced him onto the path to shutdown by insisting on waging the fight over ObamaCare.

That was the Washington Post today. What does that mean? It means that an agreement had been reached by the Speaker and the majority leader that if the Democrats accepted the very low budget number the Republicans wanted, there would be a clean continuing resolution. What this article points out—and what I think the Speaker has virtually acknowledged—is that despite his agreement with the majority leader here in the Senate, he couldn't carry it out because his extreme rightwing said: Thanks. You got us the budget we wanted, the CR we wanted. That is not enough. Now we want to end ObamaCare.

That is where we are today.

So anyone who comes forward and says: Why don't you talk? Why don't you compromise? The fact is—and I think the majority leader has made this point—he compromised far more than many of us felt comfortable with.

A compromise has already been reached. The Democrats accepted, in my view, a very bad and weak Republican budget. But it was done with the hope and the understanding that there would be a clean continuing resolution and that the U.S. Government would not be shut down. That is point No. 1.

Point No. 2 is that the other day the Speaker said on TV that there are not the votes to pass a clean CR. What I have been hearing here on the floor of the Senate and in the House is that we have Republicans who are not sympathetic to ObamaCare, they don't like ObamaCare, and they would like to defund ObamaCare. But they understand we don't shut down the U.S. Government. We don't threaten that for the first time in the history of the United States we may not pay our bills, be a deadbeat Nation, and drive our economy and our financial system, and perhaps the entire world's financial system, into a catastrophic area by not paying our bills. We believe that there are enough Republicans in the House to join with Democrats and pass a clean CR.

The President and the majority leader have both made this point: Have the vote. Have the vote, Mr. Speaker. Maybe you are right or maybe you are not. But we don't know until you have the vote. I urge, as I have before, that the Speaker of the House function as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and not as the speaker of the Republican Party.

The last point I wish to make touches on an article that appeared in yesterday's New York Times. It is a very important article because it really tells us who is behind this shutdown and what their motives are. If anybody thinks this government shutdown or the threats about not paying our bills and driving the world's economy into catastrophic areas are ideas that just occurred the other day, that a Senator just had this bright idea, they would be very mistaken. The fact is we have a growing rightwing movement in this country funded by some of the wealthiest people in America, including the Koch brothers, a family that has made their money in fossil fuels and are worth over \$70 billion—\$70 billion is their worth. They are worth \$70 billion, and they have access to the best health care in the world. They have access to the best housing in the world. Their family members can go to the best colleges and universities in the world. Yet they are obsessed with, among other things, making sure 25 million Americans have no health insurance at all.

I am a strong supporter of a Medicare for all, a single-payer program. I don't think the Affordable Care Act went far enough. But to say the least, 20 million or 25 million Americans can finally have access to health insurance. They can go to the doctor when they need to go to the doctor. There are now no regulations that prevent them from getting care because of a preexisting condition. Can we imagine billionaires—billionaires—going to war against working people so they and their kids cannot get health insurance? I think that is just obscene. That is just obscene.

Let me quote from The New York Times article of yesterday. It is important that people understand that the fight against the Affordable Care Act is just the tip of the iceberg. We have families and billionaires such as the Koch brothers who not only want to see that we don't expand health insurance in this country, but they have a long list of issues they are going after. In fact, they want to repeal virtually every major piece of legislation passed in the last 80 years that protects the middle class, working families, women, children, the elderly, the sick, and the poor. That is their agenda. So it is not a question of opposing the extension of health insurance through ObamaCare; that is not enough for them. What they want to do is end Medicare as we know it right now, and transform it into a voucher system, that gives an elderly person who is dealing with cancer \$8,000 and says: Good luck to you.

They want to make massive cuts in Medicaid. They don't want to expand Medicaid. They want massive cuts. They are very clear about wanting to end Social Security. They don't believe the Federal Government should be involved in retirement issues and Social Security.

One of the more amazing things these guys want to do—and many of our Republican colleagues apparently drank the lemonade on this issue—is to abolish the concept of the minimum wage. The Federal minimum wage now is \$7.25 an hour. People can't live on that. But their idea is to get the Federal Government out of the minimum wage issue—no floor—so that if an employer in a hard-pressed area in Maine or in Vermont or in Michigan can pay people \$4 an hour, they think that is freedom: People have the freedom to work for \$4 an hour. We don't want a minimum wage.

So, in other words, these rightwing extremists and the big money behind them have a major agenda, of which repealing ObamaCare is just one small part.

Let me just quote, if I might, the New York Times article. I ask unanimous consent to have the entire New York Times article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 5, 2013]

A FEDERAL BUDGET CRISIS MONTHS IN THE PLANNING

(By Sheryl Gay Stolberg and Mike McIntire)

WASHINGTON.—Shortly after President Obama started his second term, a loose-knit coalition of conservative activists led by former Attorney General Edwin Meese III gathered in the capital to plot strategy. Their push to repeal Mr. Obama's health care law was going nowhere, and they desperately needed a new plan.

Out of that session, held one morning in a location the members insist on keeping secret, came a little-noticed "blueprint to

defunding Obamacare," signed by Mr. Meese and leaders of more than three dozen conservative groups.

It articulated a take-no-prisoners legislative strategy that had long percolated in conservative circles: that Republicans could derail the health care overhaul if conservative lawmakers were willing to push fellow Republicans—including their cautious leaders—into cutting off financing for the entire federal government.

"We felt very strongly at the start of this year that the House needed to use the power of the purse," said one coalition member, Michael A. Needham, who runs Heritage Action for America, the political arm of the Heritage Foundation. "At least at Heritage Action, we felt very strongly from the start that this was a fight that we were going to pick."

Last week the country witnessed the fallout from that strategy: a standoff that has shuttered much of the federal bureaucracy and unsettled the nation.

To many Americans, the shutdown came out of nowhere. But interviews with a wide array of conservatives show that the confrontation that precipitated the crisis was the outgrowth of a long-running effort to undo the law, the Affordable Care Act, since its passage in 2010—waged by a galaxy of conservative groups with more money, organized tactics and interconnections than is commonly known.

With polls showing Americans deeply divided over the law, conservatives believe that the public is behind them. Although the law's opponents say that shutting down the government was not their objective, the activists anticipated that a shutdown could occur—and worked with members of the Tea Party caucus in Congress who were excited about drawing a red line against a law they despise.

A defunding "tool kit" created in early September included talking points for the question, "What happens when you shut down the government and you are blamed for it?" The suggested answer was the one House Republicans give today: "We are simply calling to fund the entire government except for the Affordable Care Act/Obamacare."

The current budget brinkmanship is just the latest development in a well-financed, broad-based assault on the health law, Mr. Obama's signature legislative initiative. Groups like Tea Party Patriots, Americans for Prosperity and FreedomWorks are all immersed in the fight, as is Club for Growth, a business-backed nonprofit organization. Some, like Generation Opportunity and Young Americans for Liberty, both aimed at young adults, are upstarts. Heritage Action is new, too, founded in 2010 to advance the policy prescriptions of its sister group, the Heritage Foundation.

The billionaire Koch brothers, Charles and David, have been deeply involved with financing the overall effort. A group linked to the Kochs, Freedom Partners Chamber of Commerce, disbursed more than \$200 million last year to nonprofit organizations involved in the fight. Included was \$5 million to Generation Opportunity, which created a buzz last month with an Internet advertisement showing a menacing Uncle Sam figure popping up between a woman's legs during a gynecological exam.

The groups have also sought to pressure vulnerable Republican members of Congress with scorecards keeping track of their health care votes; have burned faux "Obamacare cards" on college campuses; and have distributed scripts for phone calls to Congress-

sional offices, sample letters to editors and Twitter and Facebook offerings for followers to present as their own.

One sample Twitter offering—"Obamacare is a train wreck"—is a common refrain for Speaker John A. Boehner.

As the defunding movement picked up steam among outside advocates, Republicans who sounded tepid became targets. The Senate Conservatives Fund, a political action committee dedicated to "electing true conservatives," ran radio advertisements against three Republican incumbents.

Heritage Action ran critical Internet advertisements in the districts of 100 Republican lawmakers who had failed to sign a letter by a North Carolina freshman, Representative Mark Meadows, urging Mr. Boehner to take up the defunding cause.

"They've been hugely influential," said David Wasserman, who tracks House races for the nonpartisan Cook Political Report. "When else in our history has a freshman member of Congress from North Carolina been able to round up a gang of 80 that's essentially ground the government to a halt?"

On Capitol Hill, the advocates found willing partners in Tea Party conservatives, who have repeatedly threatened to shut down the government if they do not get their way on spending issues. This time they said they were so alarmed by the health law that they were willing to risk a shutdown over it. ("This is exactly what the public wants," Representative Michele Bachmann of Minnesota, founder of the House Tea Party Caucus, said on the eve of the shutdown.)

Despite Mrs. Bachmann's comments, not all of the groups have been on board with the defunding campaign. Some, like the Koch-financed Americans for Prosperity, which spent \$5.5 million on health care television advertisements over the past three months, are more focused on sowing public doubts about the law. But all have a common goal, which is to cripple a measure that Senator Ted Cruz, a Texas Republican and leader of the defunding effort, has likened to a horror movie.

"We view this as a long-term effort," said Tim Phillips, the president of Americans for Prosperity. He said his group expected to spend "tens of millions" of dollars on a "multifront effort" that includes working to prevent states from expanding Medicaid under the law. The group's goal is not to defund the law.

"We want to see this law repealed," Mr. Phillips said.

A FAMILIAR TACTIC

The crowd was raucous at the Hilton Anatole, just north of downtown Dallas, when Mr. Needham's group, Heritage Action, arrived on a Tuesday in August for the second stop on a nine-city "Defund Obamacare Town Hall Tour." Nearly 1,000 people turned out to hear two stars of the Tea Party movement: Mr. Cruz, and Jim DeMint, a former South Carolina senator who runs the Heritage Foundation.

"You're here because now is the single best time we have to defund Obamacare," declared Mr. Cruz, who would go on to rail against the law on the Senate floor in September with a monologue that ran for 21 hours. "This is a fight we can win."

Although Mr. Cruz is new to the Senate, the tactic of defunding in Washington is not. For years, Congress has banned the use of certain federal money to pay for abortions, except in the case of incest and rape, by attaching the so-called Hyde Amendment to spending bills.

After the health law passed in 2010, Todd Tiahrt, then a Republican congressman from

Kansas, proposed defunding bits and pieces of it. He said he spoke to Mr. Boehner's staff about the idea while the Supreme Court, which upheld the central provision, was weighing the law's constitutionality.

"There just wasn't the appetite for it at the time," Mr. Tiahrt said in an interview. "They thought, we don't need to worry about it because the Supreme Court will strike it down."

But the idea of using the appropriations process to defund an entire federal program, particularly one as far-reaching as the health care overhaul, raised the stakes considerably. In an interview, Mr. DeMint, who left the Senate to join the Heritage Foundation in January, said he had been thinking about it since the law's passage, in part because Republican leaders were not more aggressive.

"They've been through a series of C.R.s and debt limits," Mr. DeMint said, referring to continuing resolutions on spending, "and all the time there was discussion of 'O.K., we're not going to fight the Obamacare fight, we'll do it next time.' The conservatives who ran in 2010 promising to repeal it kept hearing, 'This is not the right time to fight this battle.'"

Mr. DeMint is hardly alone in his distaste for the health law, or his willingness to do something about it. In the three years since Mr. Obama signed the health measure, Tea Party-inspired groups have mobilized, aided by a financing network that continues to grow, both in its complexity and the sheer amount of money that flows through it.

A review of tax records, campaign finance reports and corporate filings shows that hundreds of millions of dollars have been raised and spent since 2012 by organizations, many of them loosely connected, leading opposition to the measure.

One of the biggest sources of conservative money is Freedom Partners, a tax-exempt "business league" that claims more than 200 members, each of whom pays at least \$100,000 in dues. The group's board is headed by a longtime executive of Koch Industries, the conglomerate run by the Koch brothers, who were among the original financiers of the Tea Party movement. The Kochs declined to comment.

While Freedom Partners has financed organizations that are pushing to defund the law, like Heritage Action and Tea Party Patriots, Freedom Partners has not advocated that. A spokesman for the group, James Davis, said it was more focused on "educating Americans around the country on the negative impacts of Obamacare."

The largest recipient of Freedom Partners cash—about \$115 million—was the Center to Protect Patient Rights, according to the groups' latest tax filings. Run by a political consultant with ties to the Kochs and listing an Arizona post office box for its address, the center appears to be little more than a clearinghouse for donations to still more groups, including American Commitment and the 60 Plus Association, both ardent foes of the health care law.

American Commitment and 60 Plus were among a handful of groups calling themselves the "Repeal Coalition" that sent a letter in August urging Republican leaders in the House and the Senate to insist "at a minimum" in a one-year delay of carrying out the health care law as part of any budget deal. Another group, the Conservative 50 Plus Alliance, delivered a defunding petition with 68,700 signatures to the Senate.

In the fight to shape public opinion, conservatives face well-organized liberal foes.

Enroll America, a nonprofit group allied with the Obama White House, is waging a campaign to persuade millions of the uninsured to buy coverage. The law's supporters are also getting huge assistance from the insurance industry, which is expected to spend \$1 billion on advertising to help sell its plans on the exchanges.

"It is David versus Goliath," said Mr. Phillips of Americans for Prosperity.

But conservatives are finding that with relatively small advertising buys, they can make a splash. Generation Opportunity, the youth-oriented outfit behind the "Creepy Uncle Sam" ads, is spending \$750,000 on that effort, aimed at dissuading young people—a cohort critical to the success of the health care overhaul—from signing up for insurance under the new law.

The group receives substantial backing from Freedom Partners and appears ready to expand. Recently, Generation Opportunity moved into spacious new offices in Arlington, Va., where exposed ductwork, Ikea chairs and a Ping-Pong table give off the feel of a Silicon Valley start-up.

Its executive director, Evan Feinberg, a 29-year-old former Capitol Hill aide and one-time instructor for a leadership institute founded by Charles Koch, said there would be more Uncle Sam ads, coupled with college campus visits, this fall. Two other groups, FreedomWorks, with its "Burn Your Obamacare Card" protests, and Young Americans for Liberty, are also running campus events.

"A lot of folks have asked us, 'Are we trying to sabotage the law?'" Mr. Feinberg said in an interview last week. His answer echoes the Freedom Partners philosophy: "Our goal is to educate and empower young people."

CRITICAL TIMING

But many on the Republican right wanted to do more.

Mr. Meese's low-profile coalition, the Conservative Action Project, which seeks to find common ground among leaders of an array of fiscally and socially conservative groups, was looking ahead to last Tuesday, when the new online health insurance marketplaces, called exchanges, were set to open. If the law took full effect as planned, many conservatives feared, it would be nearly impossible to repeal—even if a Republican president were elected in 2016.

"I think people realized that with the imminent beginning of Obamacare, that this was a critical time to make every effort to stop something," Mr. Meese said in an interview. (He has since stepped down as the coalition's chairman and has been succeeded by David McIntosh, a former congressman from Indiana.)

The defunding idea, Mr. Meese said, was "a logical strategy." The idea drew broad support. Fiscal conservatives like Chris Chocoma, the president of the Club for Growth, signed on to the blueprint. So did social and religious conservatives, like the Rev. Lou Sheldon of the Traditional Values Coalition.

The document set a target date: March 27, when a continuing resolution allowing the government to function was to expire. Its message was direct: "Conservatives should not approve a C.R. unless it defunds Obamacare."

But the March date came and went without a defunding struggle. In the Senate, Mr. Cruz and Senator Mike Lee, a Utah Republican, talked up the defunding idea, but it went nowhere in the Democratic-controlled chamber. In the House, Mr. Boehner wanted to concentrate instead on locking in the

across-the-board budget cuts known as sequestration, and Tea Party lawmakers followed his lead. Outside advocates were unhappy but held their fire.

"We didn't cause any trouble," Mr. Chocoma said.

Yet by summer, with an August recess looming and another temporary spending bill expiring at the end of September, the groups were done waiting.

"I remember talking to reporters at the end of July, and they said, 'This didn't go anywhere,'" Mr. Needham recalled. "What all of us felt at the time was, this was never going to be a strategy that was going to win inside the Beltway. It was going to be a strategy where, during August, people would go home and hear from their constituents, saying: 'You pledged to do everything you could to stop Obamacare. Will you defund it?'"

Heritage Action, which has trained 6,000 people it calls sentinels around the country, sent them to open meetings and other events to confront their elected representatives. Its "Defund Obamacare Town Hall Tour," which began in Fayetteville, Ark., on Aug. 19 and ended 10 days later in Wilmington, Del., drew hundreds at every stop.

The Senate Conservatives Fund, led by Mr. DeMint when he was in the Senate, put up a Web site in July called dontfundobamacare.com and ran television ads featuring Mr. Cruz and Mr. Lee urging people to tell their representatives not to fund the law.

When Senator Richard M. Burr, a North Carolina Republican, told a reporter that defunding the law was "the dumbest idea I've ever heard," the fund bought a radio ad to attack him. Two other Republican senators up for re-election in 2014, Lamar Alexander of Tennessee and Lindsey Graham of South Carolina, were also targeted. Both face Tea Party challengers.

In Washington, Tea Party Patriots, which created the defunding tool kit, set up a Web site, exemptamerica.com, to promote a rally last month showcasing many of the Republicans in Congress whom Democrats—and a number of fellow Republicans—say are most responsible for the shutdown.

While conservatives believe that the public will back them on defunding, a recent poll by the Kaiser Family Foundation found that a majority—57 percent—disapproves of cutting off funding as a way to stop the law.

Last week, with the health care exchanges open for business and a number of prominent Republicans complaining that the "Defund Obamacare" strategy was politically damaging and pointless, Mr. Needham of Heritage Action said he felt good about what the groups had accomplished.

"It really was a groundswell," he said, "that changed Washington from the outside in."

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Let me quote from the yesterday's New York Times:

The current budget brinkmanship is just the latest development in a well-financed, broadbased assault on the health law, Mr. Obama's signature legislative initiative. Groups like Tea Party Patriots, Americans for Prosperity, and FreedomWorks are all immersed in the fight, as is Club for Growth, a business-backed nonprofit organization. Some, like Generation Opportunity and Young Americans for Liberty, both aimed at young adults, are upstarts. Heritage Action is new, too, founded in 2010 to advance the policy prescriptions of its sister group, the Heritage Foundation.

The billionaire Koch brothers, Charles and David, have been deeply involved with financing the overall effort.

Let me repeat that.

The billionaire Koch brothers, Charles and David, have been deeply involved with financing the overall effort.

Remember, these are the guys who are worth \$70 billion, who want to essentially repeal every major piece of legislation protecting working families over the last 80 years.

Let me go back to the article:

A group linked to the Kochs, Freedom Partners Chamber of Commerce, disbursed more than \$200 million last year—

\$200 million last year.

to nonprofit organizations involved in the fight.

Et cetera, et cetera.

Now I will go to another paragraph, which is really interesting and really important:

The groups have also sought to pressure vulnerable Republican members of Congress with scorecards keeping track of their health care votes; have burned faux “Obamacare cards” on college campuses; and have distributed scripts for phone calls to Congressional offices, sample letters to editors and Twitter and Facebook offerings for followers to present as their own.

What is going on here? What does that mean? This is what it means. As a result of the disastrous Supreme Court ruling called *Citizens United*, what billionaires such as the Koch brothers and others can do—and what they are doing today—is to say to Republicans in the House of Representatives: If you vote for a clean continuing resolution, if you vote to keep the government open, if you make it very clear that you will oppose any effort to see the U.S. default on its debts—if you do that, let me tell you what is going to happen to you, because we have the Koch brothers and people worth billions of dollars who are prepared to jump into your campaign, perhaps get a primary opponent to run against you, and to fund that opponent with as much money as he or she needs.

So now, what democracy in the House—as a result of *Citizens United*—is about is that a handful of billionaires can threaten any Member of the House with defeat by pouring in unlimited sums of money if they vote in a way that the Koch brothers do not like.

If that is how people think American democracy is supposed to function, it would surprise me very much. But that is not what American democracy is supposed to be about. That tells me again why we have to do everything we can to overturn this disastrous *Citizens United* Supreme Court decision so that a handful of billionaires cannot dictate public policy here in the United States of America and in the Congress.

Let me just conclude by saying this: The American people are angry and they are frustrated, and I think what they are seeing is that the middle class

of this country is disappearing. In fact, in the last 24 years median family income today is lower than it was. It has gone down. You have millions of people who are out there working for wages they just cannot raise a family on. You are seeing right now a growth in poverty among elderly people. In the midst of a disappearing middle class and the increase of poverty, you are seeing more income and wealth inequality in this country than we have seen since the 1920s. The gap between the very rich and everybody else grows wider. And now, as I mentioned a moment ago, what billionaires are doing with their money is continuing their war against the middle class by trying to repeal important pieces of legislation.

What the American people are saying is: What about us? What about us? Who is worried that my kid who graduated from high school cannot find a job? Who is worried that my other kid who graduated college is leaving school deeply in debt? Who is worried that in our country we are not being aggressive in dealing with the issue of global warming?

There are enormous issues facing the middle class in this country: the need to create millions of jobs, the need to raise the minimum wage, the need to make college affordable, the need to significantly improve childcare in this country and education in general.

There is an enormous amount of work to be done. What this Congress should not be doing is telling 2 million workers that you are not getting paid, furloughing what was then 800,000, now 400,000 workers. That is not what we should be doing.

I hope the American people stand and make it clear to our Republican friends that they cannot shut down the government because they are not getting their way. I hope the American people would do everything they can to demand that this Congress start doing its job, which is to represent working families.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise today with a pretty simple message for House leadership: You can end this Republican shutdown today. Just simply let the House vote.

On issue after issue after issue, when the House has acted, the Senate has responded with a vote, either with a vote for or against a tabling motion or a vote for or against legislation, but we have taken a vote. We simply ask the House to do the same.

By scheduling a vote on the Senate-passed plan—the continuing resolution—Speaker BOEHNER can ensure that more than 800,000 workers, including tens of thousands in my home State of Ohio, can get back to work.

By scheduling a vote on the Senate-passed bill, he can reopen the government without rehashing old political fights; then get down to business—deal with the debt limit—then get down to business and make decisions about immigration, make decisions about jobs, make decisions about what we are going to do with the budget.

I do not think we have ever, Mr. Speaker, seen one faction of one party of one chamber of one branch of government hold the entire country and economic recovery of our Nation hostage—a faction of one party of one house of one branch of government hold the country hostage.

Do not take my word for it. A Cleveland Plain Dealer headline said: “Republicans need to quit the attack on Obamacare and agree to a clean continuing resolution.” They called the actions of the far right attack on the 3-year-old health care law—the health care law that was passed overwhelmingly in both Houses, with 60 votes in the Senate and well over a majority in the House, affirmed in part by the Supreme Court—the Plain Dealer called the actions attacking the health care law “bordering on the un-American.”

The Toledo Blade called the actions of the far right in the House “GOP extortion,” challenging Speaker BOEHNER to put America’s economy over his own job, reminding him of his election night saying the 2012 election “changes that,” making the health law “the law of the land.”

Finally, the Washington Post—no stranger to criticizing Democrats—called out the “House of Embarrassment” and its “heedlessness” on the impact of its actions on ordinary Americans.

I was home this weekend, and I spoke with all kinds of people. I spoke with Federal employees, some of whom have been furloughed, some of whom have not. I spoke with others in Avon Lake, OH, other places. I listened to what they had to say. People are frustrated. They cannot believe that, again, one group of radicals in one House of one branch of government can, for all intents and purposes, shut the country down and move us towards the precipice of what happens if the Congress does not pay the bills that we as a Congress ran up. These are real people facing a real and devastating impact.

I did something else that I know the Acting President pro tempore, as a Senator from Maine, a former Governor, does also: get on the phone and just talk to people in your State about the impact this will have.

I spoke to one of the leaders of an institution in Ohio that has a large R&D

presence in the State. He talked about the irreparable damage to our infrastructure, similar to what happens in Senator NELSON's State—who just joined me on the floor—what could happen at NASA in South Florida, what happens at NASA in Cleveland, what happens at Batelle in Columbus, what happens at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton.

This leader at one of these institutions—I do not want to call him out by name—he talked about the irreparable damage to our infrastructure as a nation. This is not just highways and bridges. This is scientific researchers, this is engineers, this is people working on some of the most top secret issues in our country and our government.

He went on to say it is asymmetric: building and killing a scientific endeavor. Think about that. Killing a scientific endeavor you can do in a week or you can do in a month simply by stopping the research by an interruption like this, where many of the top scientists, the top engineers, at some point just say: I do not want to go through this again. I am not going to continue to do this important work for my country and then see it shut down because somebody has a political ax to grind, because somebody, on a continuing resolution, or one political party, as we approach the debt ceiling, wants to attach their political platform to one of these important pieces of legislation just to make the government run.

What is happening in places like that is some of these engineers say: I am not sure I want to work for NASA anymore. I am not sure I want to stay in the military. I am not sure I want to be at a major research institution like Batelle. I can go elsewhere where my work will not get interrupted and people will show their appreciation simply by continuing to fund my research.

When you think about this building and killing a scientific endeavor, it is a little bit like one old politician said, that it takes a carpenter a long time to build a barn, but any—I am not sure he used the word “mule”—but any mule can knock down that barn in a day or so.

I remember I was in a car accident years ago. I broke my back. I was in the hospital for a week. For 3 days I stayed in bed. I remember the first time I tried to walk how my muscles had atrophied. It took several weeks before I was back to full strength and could rebuild that muscle.

That is really the way it is with these research institutions in our country, which we have so many of, that are so important, whether it is NASA, whether it is Batelle, whether it is Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, whether it is the National Institutes of Health. We have assembled some of the greatest scientists and engineers and technicians in the world at these insti-

tutions, but building a scientific endeavor takes days and weeks and months and years; killing one is a matter of an interruption of 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 weeks.

That is why this is so dangerous, this shut down. That is why going up against the debt ceiling is potentially catastrophic for our country. It makes no sense. It is not good for our economy. It is not good for our people. It is not good for our Federal workforce that really can do the right kinds of things for our country.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would be glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. What the Senator said about NASA is so true. Would the Senator believe that 97 percent of the workforce at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is on furlough? A few of us had to intercede. The Mars mission that is supposed to go in a narrow window between mid-November and early December—if they miss that window, it would be another 2 years before they could launch that Mars mission and, therefore, you would have all the expense of keeping the scientists on, and so forth. We finally got them to bring them back so they could continue processing the mission so it can launch in that narrow 3-week window. But the rest of the people are gone.

Does that sound very intelligent to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BROWN. I would add, it is interesting: Three of the great NASA facilities are represented on the floor now by Senator CORNYN from Texas, Senator NELSON, and me. It is not just NASA employees at NASA Glenn in Cleveland.

Mr. NELSON. Correct.

Mr. BROWN. It is another 1,300 contractors who are doing work paid by taxpayers. They are actually private companies, as the Senator knows. It is the same in Florida, the same in Texas. And their work is important too.

I just think these kinds of interruptions are so senseless. What I heard more than anything from people when I was home was how senseless this is, how ludicrous this is.

I spoke to hospital administrators all over my State today. I was on the phone with a number of them from Williams County in the northwest corner of the State, to Columbus, to Cleveland, to all over, and it is senseless to them that they are in the midst of maybe a hospital expansion or maybe just doing the day-to-day work of the hospital, and they do not know what to think.

I have heard many of my colleagues here for years talk about the unpredictability of this economy and that it is partly because of Washington and ObamaCare or maybe Dodd-Frank: We do not know what is happening next.

The worst kind of unpredictability is shutting the government down or leading us right up to the debt ceiling. That is why it is so important that the House vote and then we get serious about doing the debt ceiling vote and then we move on to issues such as immigration and others that matter for our country.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I agree with our colleagues that a government shutdown is not the best way to do business around here. We should get together—the President, the House, and the Senate—and we should work this out, both the continuing resolution and the debt ceiling, of which Secretary of the Treasury Jack Lew has said he will basically run out of all of the extraordinary measures he can use to avoid us reaching the debt ceiling—which, colloquially speaking, I would say is the equivalent of maxing out your credit card, the Federal Government's credit card.

But it is worth remembering that as James Baker, former Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of State, with a distinguished record of public service going back many years—he recently noted in an article in the Wall Street Journal that since 1976 we have had 17 government shutdowns temporarily until differences between the parties, between the branches could be worked out. I hope we can do that sooner rather than later.

The truth is that there was a way out with regard to the shutdown, particularly when the House passed a piece of legislation that would maintain the spending limits at \$988 billion, which was the same level the Senate majority had chosen, but it also attached two other provisions to it, one of which would have eliminated the carve-out for Congress for ObamaCare—in other words, the carve-out that treats Congress differently than the rest of the country. Our Democratic friends unfortunately voted against that provision. All Republicans voted to eliminate that carve-out.

The second was the delay in the penalties that would be applied to individuals who do not buy government-approved health insurance under ObamaCare. The President has unilaterally delayed for 1 year the penalties for employers who do not meet the requirements of ObamaCare. All we were asking is that the same consideration be given to hard-working Americans. If our friends across the aisle—or at least enough of them—had joined with us to vote for both of those provisions that came over with the House bill, the government would not be shut down, it would be operating. But that was the decision they made. I think they made a mistake.

But we know the government shutdown debate is now quickly becoming a

debate over the broader subject of what we do about spending and debt, particularly what we do with regard to the debt ceiling I mentioned earlier. We have reached almost the top of our credit limit on the Nation's credit card, and President Obama is asking for another trillion dollars in spending, in debt limit. But the President differs from many of us in that he thinks this debt ceiling cap ought to be lifted by another trillion dollars without anything else attached to it. He thinks it ought to be automatic, even though we believe it is entirely appropriate—and the majority of times in the past, the debt ceiling increase has been accompanied by other long-term policy reforms. The President himself has agreed to these kinds of reforms in the past. But apparently this time he has drawn a line in the sand.

So now he believes, unlike the past, that Congress should act like a rubberstamp when it comes to raising the limit on America's credit card, our debt limit. Meanwhile, it seems our friends across the aisle also feel the House should be a rubberstamp for the Senate. All of this leads me to conclude that James Madison, the father of the Constitution, must be rolling over in his grave because he and others of the Founders were the geniuses who decided that it was the checks and balances from separated government—the executive and the legislative, the House and the Senate—that would best protect our freedoms and best prevent overreach by other branches.

But in a way I can understand why the President and the majority leader are refusing to negotiate and are saying “it is my way or the highway.” After all, the last time we had these kinds of major fiscal talks in advance of a debt ceiling deadline, the result was the Budget Control Act. That was 2011. That law produced, by default, real spending cuts and real deficit reduction. If you recall, that was where the supercommittee was created to try to negotiate a grand bargain. The supercommittee was unsuccessful, and the default was the Budget Control Act and the sequester, which automatically cut discretionary spending. Our friends across the aisle clearly think that was a big mistake. The President and the majority leader now are refusing to negotiate at all on the debt ceiling. They believe it ought to be rubberstamped.

Well, amidst all of the rhetoric and the finger-pointing, now Washington has erupted into something it does best, which is the blame game. I am afraid we have lost sight of our underlying debt problem.

Despite the short-term deficit reduction we have witnessed since 2011 due to the default position of the Budget Control Act, our long-term fiscal trajectory remains unsustainable. Last month the Congressional Budget Office projected that publicly held Federal

debt is on course to exceed the size of our entire economy. By that point, again, under current law, the interest we have to pay to China and other foreign creditors that hold more than half of our debt will be 2½ times greater than the 40-year average. We know interest rates are extraordinarily and abnormally low because of the policies of the Federal Reserve. But can you imagine, for that \$17 trillion in debt on which the U.S. Government would have to pay historic averages of interest to our creditors in order to get them to buy our debt, what impact that would have? Well, I will talk about that more in a moment.

If we continue down this road without adopting real reforms for our long-term fiscal challenges, we will condemn our children and our grandchildren to fewer jobs, slower economic growth, worse opportunity, and a much greater risk of a full-blown fiscal crisis.

In the event of a crisis, our safety net programs that we all care about for the most vulnerable in our country would be cut harshly and abruptly, as would our ability to fund national security and other priorities.

Nobody wants that kind of a future. Nobody has to accept that kind of a future if we just do our job—not the President trying to go it alone again, not the Senate saying “it is my way or the highway” to the House, but by the House and the Senate and the White House working together to try to work our way through it.

But if we continue to rack up debt—another trillion is what the President wants to raise the debt limit—and if we continue to postpone the hard choices and leave it to others, we will move closer and closer to an eventual disaster. By contrast, if we were to take the responsibility now to reform our safety net programs, we could reform them gradually so that people would barely feel it. That will make it much easier to protect the Americans who need these programs the most—our seniors and the most vulnerable in our society.

Of course, we cannot make any real progress as long as the President and the majority leader in the Senate refuse to negotiate. As I said earlier, Congress is not a rubberstamp. That is not the Constitution written by our Founders. The House of Representatives is not a rubberstamp for the Senate. We have been willing to compromise and negotiate. As a matter of fact, the House has sent over multiple bills. Every time a Member of the opposing party comes to the floor and talks about the National Institutes of Health's funding being cut off for children's cancer research, we have come down here and said: Well, let's pass the bill. Let's pass that appropriation.

When someone has said: Well, what about the veterans' disability claims

that are stacking up and are not being processed as a result of the shutdown, the House has passed legislation. We have come to the floor and offered legislation that would allow us to address that problem, but we have been told no time and time again.

I ask unanimous consent for 4 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we need to work together. That is the only way this is going to happen. We know it will happen. It is going to happen. The President cannot take the unsustainable position that “it is my way or the highway and I will not negotiate,” especially since he has done it before, especially since that is the only way our constitutional framework allows the resolution of problems. If we were to do—which we are not going to do—what the President and the majority leader have asked us to do, which is to raise the debt limit automatically without dealing with any of our long-term fiscal problems, we would simply be encouraging Congress and our policymakers to delay the tough choices and hard votes. We would be encouraging—indeed, we would be enabling—this type of fiscal profligacy that has left us with a gross national debt of \$17 trillion, which is about \$53,000 for every man, woman, and child in America.

More than \$6 trillion of debt has been added since President Obama became President of the United States. Yet the President seems to show absolutely no sense of urgency in dealing with it. That is despite his own fiscal commission, the Simpson-Bowles Commission, coming back in December 2010—that was a bipartisan commission he himself appointed—they came back with their own policy prescription to deal with this problem. Republicans, some of our most conservative Members, and some of the most liberal Members on the other side of the aisle came together and they voted for the Simpson-Bowles Commission report in December 2010, but the President simply walked away from it.

Back in March, he told ABC News:

We do not have an immediate crisis in terms of debt. In fact, for the next 10 years, it is going to be in a sustainable place.

That is what the President of the United States said last March. But that is not what his own bipartisan fiscal commission said in December 2010. That is not what the Congressional Budget Office says. As everybody around here knows, the Congressional Budget Office is the final authority on these matters. In their 2013 long-term budget outlook, on page 13, they have a couple of pages that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

It is entitled “Consequences of Large and Growing Federal Debt.” They did

not say: We do not have an immediate crisis in terms of debt, and we are pretty much in a sustainable place for 10 years.

They said:

The high and rising amounts of Federal debt held by the public that CBO projects for the coming decades under the extended baseline would have significant negative consequences for both the economy and the federal budget.

What were those? They said there would be less national savings and less future income. They said there would be pressure for larger tax increases and spending cuts to deal with this, particularly the phenomena of high interest payments that I mentioned a moment ago.

Again, because of the Federal Reserve's policies, it costs next to nothing for the Federal Government in terms of interest on our national debt, but when that goes back up to historic averages, to 4, 5 percent, it is going to cost trillions of dollars more for us to service the existing debt, not to mention the additional trillion the President wants to borrow.

What is that going to do? Well, that is going to crowd out other priorities such as NASA, which my colleague from Florida and I both think is an important national priority. I heard the Senator from Ohio say the same. But higher interest payments as a result of not dealing with this high debt are going to crowd out other important national priorities.

Finally, the Congressional Budget Office said there is a "greater chance of a fiscal crisis." Specifically, what they are talking about is that as we pay more and more for interest on our national debt, we lose more and more control over our fiscal future. As we all know on a bipartisan basis, we have been told time and time again by the experts that when our creditors lose confidence in our ability to repay debt, there can come a breaking moment when all of a sudden we lose control and all of these things happen, which we can avoid if we deal responsibly today.

In other words, the President seems content to let one of his successors deal with the problem of our rising national debt—that is only, I would add, if we get lucky enough to postpone the kinds of crises and problems CBO and Simpson-Bowles project that long. The President obviously has other priorities, but I want to remind him what his own former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ADM Mike Mullen, said when he was asked about the Nation's biggest threat to our national security.

He said it was the national debt. The President himself has echoed those comments, but the President is still sitting on the sidelines and still takes the untenable position that he is unwilling to negotiate. At a time when the country needs genuine leadership, he is nowhere to be found.

Until that changes, we are not going to get any closer to where we need to be sooner, rather than later, and that is a true bipartisan compromise.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article: "Consequences of Large and Growing Federal Debt."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the 2013 Long-Term Budget Outlook, Sept. 2013]

CONSEQUENCES OF LARGE AND GROWING FEDERAL DEBT

The high and rising amounts of federal debt held by the public that CBO projects for coming decades under the extended baseline would have significant negative consequences for both the economy and the federal budget. Those consequences include reducing the total amounts of national saving and income; increasing the government's interest payments, thereby putting more pressure on the rest of the budget; limiting lawmakers' flexibility to respond to unexpected events; and increasing the likelihood of a fiscal crisis.

LESS NATIONAL SAVING AND FUTURE INCOME

Large federal budget deficits over the long term would reduce investment, resulting in lower national income and higher interest rates than would otherwise occur. The reason is that increased government borrowing would cause a larger share of the savings potentially available for investment to be used for purchasing government securities, such as Treasury bonds. Those purchases would "crowd out" investment in capital goods, such as factories and computers, which make workers more productive. Because wages are determined mainly by workers' productivity, the reduction in investment would also reduce wages, lessening people's incentive to work. In addition, both private borrowers and the government would have to pay higher interest rates to compete for savings, and those higher rates would strengthen people's incentive to save. However, the rise in private saving would be a good deal smaller than the increase in federal borrowing represented by the change in the deficit, so national saving would decline, as would private investment. (For a detailed analysis of those economic effects, see Chapter 6.)

In the short run, though, large federal budget deficits would tend to boost demand, thus increasing output and employment relative to what they would be with smaller deficits. That is especially the case under conditions like those now prevailing in the United States—with substantial unemployment and underused factories, offices, and equipment—which have led the Federal Reserve to push short-term interest rates down almost to zero. The effects of the higher demand would be temporary because stabilizing forces in the economy tend to move output back toward its potential level. Those forces include the response of prices and interest rates to higher demand, as well as (in normal times) actions by the Federal Reserve.

PRESSURE FOR LARGER TAX INCREASES OR SPENDING CUTS IN THE FUTURE

Large amounts of federal debt ordinarily require the government to make large interest payments to its lenders, and growth in the debt causes those interest payments to increase. (Net interest payments are currently fairly small relative to the size of the

federal budget because interest rates are exceptionally low, but CBO projects that those payments will increase considerably as rates return to more normal levels.)

Higher interest payments would consume a larger portion of federal revenues, resulting in a larger gap between the remaining revenues and the amount that would be spent on federal programs under current law. Hence, if lawmakers wanted to maintain the benefits and services that the government is scheduled to provide under current law, while not allowing deficits to increase as interest payments grew, revenues would have to rise as well. Additional revenues could be raised in many different ways, but to the extent that they were generated by boosting marginal tax rates (the rates on an additional dollar of income), the higher tax rates would discourage people from working and saving, further reducing output and income. Alternatively, lawmakers could choose to offset rising interest costs, at least in part, by reducing benefits and services. Those reductions could be made in many ways, but to the extent that they came from cutting federal investments, future output and income would also be reduced. As another option, lawmakers could respond to higher interest payments by allowing deficits to increase for some time, but that approach would require greater deficit reduction later if lawmakers wanted to avoid a long-term increase in debt relative to GDP.

REDUCED ABILITY TO RESPOND TO DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

Having a relatively small amount of outstanding debt gives a government the ability to borrow funds to address significant unexpected events, such as recessions, financial crises, and wars. In contrast, having a large amount of debt leaves a government with less flexibility to address financial and economic crises, which in many countries have been very costly. A large amount of debt could also harm a country's national security by constraining military spending in times of crisis or limiting the country's ability to prepare for such a crisis.

A few years ago, the size of the U.S. federal debt gave the government the flexibility to respond to the financial crisis and severe recession by increasing spending and cutting taxes to stimulate economic activity, providing public funding to stabilize the financial sector, and continuing to pay for other programs even as tax revenues dropped sharply because of the decline in output and income. If federal debt stayed at its current percentage of GDP or grew further, the government would find it more difficult to undertake similar policies in the future. As a result, future recessions and financial crises could have larger negative effects on the economy and on people's well-being. Moreover, the reduced financial flexibility and increased dependence on foreign investors that would accompany a rise in debt could weaken the United States' international leadership.

GREATER CHANCE OF A FISCAL CRISIS

A large and continually growing federal debt would have another significant negative consequence: It would increase the probability of a fiscal crisis for the United States. In such a crisis, investors become unwilling to finance all of a government's borrowing needs unless they are compensated with very high interest rates; as a result, the interest rates on government debt rise suddenly and sharply relative to rates of return on other assets. That increase in interest rates reduces the market value of outstanding government bonds, causing losses

for investors who hold them. Such a decline can precipitate a broader financial crisis by creating losses for mutual funds, pension funds, insurance companies, banks, and other holders of government debt—losses that may be large enough to cause some financial institutions to fail.

Unfortunately, there is no way to predict with any confidence whether or when such a fiscal crisis might occur in the United States. In particular, there is no identifiable tipping point of debt relative to GDP that indicates that a crisis is likely or imminent. All else being equal, however, the larger a government's debt, the greater the risk of a fiscal crisis.

The likelihood of such a crisis also depends on the economic environment, both domestic and international. If investors expect continued economic growth, they are generally less concerned about debt burdens; conversely, high debt can reinforce more general concern about an economy. In many cases around the world, fiscal crises have begun during recessions and, in turn, have exacerbated them. In some instances, a crisis has been triggered by news that a government would, for any number of reasons, need to borrow an unexpectedly large amount of money. Then, as investors lost confidence and interest rates spiked, borrowing became more difficult and expensive for the government. That development forced policymakers to either cut spending and increase taxes immediately and substantially to reassure investors, or renege on the terms of the country's existing debt, or increase the supply of money and boost inflation. In some cases, a fiscal crisis also made borrowing more expensive for private-sector borrowers because uncertainty about the government's response to the crisis reduced confidence in the viability of private-sector enterprises. Higher private-sector interest rates, combined with reductions in government spending and increases in taxes, have tended to worsen economic conditions in the short term.

If a fiscal crisis occurred in the United States, policymakers would have only limited—and unattractive—options for responding to it. In particular, the government would need to undertake some combination of three approaches: restructuring its debt (that is, seeking to modify the contractual terms of its existing obligations), pursuing inflationary monetary policy, and adopting an austerity program of spending cuts and tax increases. Thus, such a crisis would confront policymakers with extremely difficult choices and probably have a very significant negative impact on the country.

Mr. CORNYN. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, before the Chair is yielded, I wish to say it is almost like *deja vu* all over again. The great Senator from Maine was sitting in the chair only a few days ago when this Senator had a chance to make comments. Here we are again.

I wish to say to the Senator from Texas, as he is leaving the Chamber, that I think the Senator is a good Senator who believes strongly in what he is saying, but if there is a will, there is a way. Reasonable people can come together and work through to a reasonable conclusion.

I was going to say, with the Senator from Texas on the floor, the Senator had a chance to express his opinion. In-

deed, the Senator did with his vote when we passed the appropriations bill, now called the continuing resolution, because we have not brought each of the appropriations bills to the floor.

We accepted it at the House number. The senior Senator from Texas expressed his opinion by means of his "no" vote, but "yes" votes won, and we sent it to the other body to keep the government open. Indeed, the government is not open.

I go back to 2 days ago when the Senator from Maine was the Presiding Officer and here we are again. If we would remember the Golden Rule put in the old English: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you or put into modern street language: Treat others as you want to be treated—in other words, recognize that the other fellow has a point of view and you have to respect his point of view—even though his point of view may be different from yours—the genius of American democracy is hammering out those differences and building consensus in a civil way and achieving a workable solution. What we have here is brinkmanship.

We hammered it out, we passed appropriations, a continuing resolution. We sent it to the House of Representatives, and they will not put it up for a vote because they are only—and this is operative—going to pass this with Republican votes.

What does that do? This takes an outsized minority of the Republican caucus being the tail that is wagging the Republican dog in the House of Representatives. If they only pass it with Republican votes instead of the will of the whole House then, in fact, we will have what we have now, a small out-of-the-mainstream political philosophy extremist group dictating what they want and only what they want. It is their way or no way. That is not treating others as they wish to be treated. This is an attitude of saying: I know better than you and my way is going to be the only way. That is not how we govern this country. That is not how we honor and respect other people's points of view that may be different from ours.

I do not wish to hold up the Senator from Maine, but I wanted to follow up on the conversation I had through the Chair 2 days ago. All of these high-minded, highfalutin ideas of all of us getting together and treating each other as we wish to be treated and hammering out this policy—lo and behold, maybe everything I am saying doesn't have a thing to do with this by virtue of an investigative piece having been done by the New York Times over the weekend. I wish to read the first three paragraphs of this investigative piece. It is entitled: "A Federal Budget Crisis Months in the Planning" by Sheryl Gay Stolberg and Mike McIntire.

Shortly after President Obama started his second term, a loose-knit coalition of conservative activists led by former Attorney General Edwin Meese III gathered in the capital to plot strategy. Their push to repeal Mr. Obama's health care law was going nowhere, and they desperately needed a new plan.

Out of that session, held one morning in a location the members insist on keeping secret, came a little-noticed "blueprint to defunding Obamacare," signed by Mr. Meese and leaders of more than three dozen conservative groups.

It articulated a take-no-prisoners legislative strategy that has long percolated in conservative circles: that Republicans could derail the health care overhaul if conservative lawmakers were willing to push fellow Republicans—including their cautious leaders—into cutting off financing for the entire federal government.

This is only the first three paragraphs. If that is true, then all of these high-minded ideas of the Golden Rule and treating each other with respect and working out your differences is all out the window.

If that is true—and it looks as if it is by virtue of what we see going on down in the other end of this Capitol Building, a small group of people are not going to do anything to open the government unless they get their way to defund the Affordable Care Act, the health care reform act—I would suggest that if that is the case, then the people who are suffering should sit up and take notice of what is happening to their government.

We have heard examples over and over. Senator BROWN and I were just talking about the 97 percent of people who are laid off in NASA. Then what do we do with all of the civilian workforce in NASA? Think of what this is doing to all of the contractors who work for NASA.

We have heard also the statistic out here that over 70 percent of the intelligence community has been furloughed. We have heard that Head Start, the federally funded program to get children ready to start the public schools, kindergarten and first grade, is shutting down.

We know last week, when we were in the middle of this shutdown, there was a storm brewing in the Gulf of Mexico. Thank the good Lord it fizzled out, but at one point it was expected to turn into a Category 1 hurricane hitting the gulf coast. Had that happened, FEMA had been laid off—although they reached back and started the National Guard, et cetera. Thank you to Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel for finding an unintended consequence in the law that was passed to pay the U.S. military while the government is shut down because he found a little hook in there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. He found a hook in there so he could then extend that to most of the civilian workforce, including some of the National Guard, but we didn't know that.

In my State of Florida, 156 employees were getting the notices just in the National Guard on Friday. There were already 1,000 military technicians that had been furloughed in the National Guard, and we had an inbound storm.

What about the programs in our State to help veterans find jobs? If we are not done with this shutdown at the end of October, that is gone. What about the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, a part of the State government. Ten percent of their funds are Federal funds. What about the Florida Department of Agriculture? Over 6 percent of their workforce is federally funded.

What about—and we have heard this in the Senate—Women, Infants, and Children? A society is supposed to take care of its very old and its very young. This is why we have programs for Women, Infants, and Children. Yet the supplemental nutrition program for women, for nursing mothers, for children up to the age of 5, for breast-feeding support, for nutrition education, and for health checkups is gone.

I could go on and on. Others have said it more articulately than I. This is ridiculous. This shouldn't go on. As the drumbeat of the crescendo continues, it will grow louder as we march toward October 17, when the debt ceiling has to be raised so we don't go into default.

It is a sad day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). The assistant majority leader.

BRUCE AND ELLIS NOMINATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. I rise to speak in support of two individuals whose nominations will be voted on at 5 p.m. We haven't set any records in the Senate in the last 5 weeks for productivity. We passed one major piece of legislation, which the Senator from Oregon brought before us relative to the issue of our helium reserve. It was great work. It is one of the few bipartisan actions we have accomplished in 5 weeks, maybe the only bipartisan one. At 5 p.m. we have a chance to improve our record.

These are two nominees for Federal district court judges in Illinois that I commend to the Members of the Senate.

I wish to say at the outset it isn't only this Senator on this side of the aisle making this recommendation, Senator MARK KIRK and I worked on a bipartisan basis to come up with these nominees and get them approved by our nomination committees. They are then approved by us, by the White

House, by the Judiciary Committee, and brought to the floor.

Since Senator KIRK has been elected, we have done this in lockstep, together every step of the way. By tradition, the President's party Senator, in this case myself, has three appointments. Senator KIRK has the fourth, but each of us has the veto power over the other's choices.

We have a working relationship and a good one. Senator KIRK has endorsed these two nominees: Colin Bruce, who has been nominated to serve in the Central District of Illinois, and Sara Ellis, nominated to serve in the Northern District of Illinois. They have the experience, qualifications, and integrity to be excellent Federal judges. Both appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee for a hearing on June 19, and both were reported out of the committee by a unanimous voice vote.

I would like briefly to discuss their backgrounds and qualifications.

Colin Bruce has been nominated to fill the judicial vacancy that opened in Urbana when Judge Michael McCuskey took senior status. Michael McCuskey is also one of my appointments, an outstanding Federal judge. I am sorry he is going into senior status, but he felt, and I did too, that Colin Bruce would be an excellent replacement to succeed him in that position.

Mr. Bruce has worked in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Central District of Illinois since 1989. He currently serves as the first assistant U.S. attorney, a position he has held since 2010.

Colin Bruce applied for the position of U.S. attorney. He didn't get it. But the man who did, the man I selected, Jim Lewis, hired him as his first assistant. So it was a few months ago that Jim Lewis, the U.S. District Attorney, came by my office with Colin Bruce. We talked about a number of things, and he said: Incidentally, I don't know what I would do without Colin Bruce. He is such an extraordinary first assistant. When he finished his presentation, I said: Jim, would you stick around for a minute; Colin, go outside, if you would. I said: Jim, I have an opening for a judgeship, and I know Colin is a person who would fill that bill. He has already gone through all the vetting. He would be an extraordinary judge, but you would lose him as your first assistant. He said: I can't stand in his way. I couldn't think of a better choice to be a judge in this district.

Colin Bruce was born in Urbana, IL. He got his undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Illinois and went straight to the U.S. Attorney's Office out of law school. He has handled criminal, civil cases, and bankruptcy and tort claims filed against the government. He then shifted to prosecuting complex criminal matters, drug fraud and cyber crime cases. In 2007, he was appointed branch

chief of the Urbana division of the U.S. Attorney's Office, and in 2010 he was named first assistant U.S. attorney, which is the No. 2 position, as I mentioned.

In his current capacity, he oversees the day-to-day operations of the U.S. Attorney's Office, supervises all the Federal criminal investigations, prosecutions, and appeals in the district, as well as civil defensive and affirmative litigation in the district in which the United States is a party.

He has received numerous recognitions, including certifications of appreciation from the Justice Department, the FBI, and the DEA, as well as awards from the Illinois State Police and the Metropolitan Enforcement Group and Task Force.

He has a record of giving back to the Urbana community through his association with charities, such as the Central Illinois Chapter of the American Red Cross and Imagine No Malaria, a charity that purchases mosquito nets for families in Africa.

He is an outstanding nominee for the Federal bench, and has a great family whom he brought to the hearing. I certainly urge my colleagues to join Senator KIRK and me in supporting his nomination.

The second nominee is Sara Ellis. She has been nominated for a Chicago-based judgeship that was formerly occupied by the distinguished Judge Joan Gottschall. Ms. Ellis currently works at the prestigious law firm of Schiff Hardin in Chicago, where her practice involves white-collar criminal matters, complex civil litigation, and corporate counseling.

She was born in Ontario, Canada, to parents who had emigrated from Jamaica. She moved to the United States and became a citizen at the age of 15. Her undergraduate degree is from Indiana University and her law degree is from the Loyola University Chicago School of Law.

After law school, Ms. Ellis joined the Federal Defender Program in Chicago, where she served for 6 years as a staff attorney. In this capacity she represented indigent criminal defendants in all aspects of criminal litigation, preliminary hearings, trials, sentencing hearings, and appeals. She then worked in private practice for several years before joining the City of Chicago Department of Law in 2004, where she served as assistant corporation counsel for 4 years, primarily handling section 1983 cases.

In 2008, Ms. Ellis joined Schiff Hardin, where she handles criminal and civil matters. She has served as an adjunct professor at Loyola University Chicago School of Law, teaching Federal criminal practice and legal writing.

She has a distinguished record of pro bono work and community service. Among her endeavors she has taught

reading and legal skills to children living in juvenile detention and she has provided legal advice and guidance to the Warren Park Youth Baseball League.

She is also actively involved with St. Gertrude Catholic Parish in Chicago and is on the board of the parish school, Northside Catholic Academy.

Ms. Ellis is an excellent nominee for a Federal judge. She too is a person with great family and children backing her up, and I am happy Senator KIRK and I can commend her as well to the Senate for this nomination.

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting to confirm these two nominees who have bipartisan support and will be outstanding Federal judges.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, I want to thank the Senator from Illinois for his kind words, and I certainly support the appointments, and I am glad we were able to get that legislation passed on a bipartisan basis to help American industry.

On Friday last, it was thrilling to read the United States is now No. 1 in the world when it comes to energy production—not Saudi Arabia, not Russia, but our country. It was a particular source of such satisfaction because, after all these years of the American people hearing about how we are dependent on foreign sources of energy, at the top of our papers Friday last the energy experts said the red, white, and blue was at the top in terms of energy production.

This good news story about the energy boom is, obviously, as the Presiding Officer knows, absolutely essential to creating more high-skilled, high-wage jobs. I saw it, along with my colleague, when I was in his State, and we see it all across the country. This energy boom, for example, has been key to triggering a manufacturing renaissance—the lower cost of natural gas in particular being a magnet to bringing companies that had gone overseas back to the United States again and employing our workers with good-paying jobs. It has been key to the falling imports of foreign oil. Of course, wind and solar farms are adding tremendously to the power mix. In our part of the country, Shepherds Flat in eastern Oregon is our country's biggest wind farm, and we are especially proud of it.

The current senseless government shutdown is putting this good news story at risk. When it comes to causing problems, unfortunately, this shutdown has something for everybody. If you care about oil and natural gas development, Federal agencies now cannot approve drilling permits either on

Federal land or offshore. If you care about renewable energy, wind and wave energy permitting is now at a standstill. It is at a standstill because of the shutdown. Environmental reviews for solar farms on Federal land have stopped. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has canceled a meeting about implementing two hydropower bills that passed this Congress on overwhelming votes.

In my part of the country we are especially proud of this legislation. Hydropower is responsible. It is actually the biggest source of clean power in the United States. Industry estimates it could generate perhaps as much as 60,000 megawatts of additional clean power. These hydropower bills—there were two of them—were the first stand-alone energy bills to become law since 2009. Now they languish because of the shutdown.

All of these developments—the developments I have described with respect to natural gas development, solar and wind energy, the hydropower laws that passed overwhelmingly in both the Senate and the House—are now, in effect, languishing. What it means is less new energy, fewer new jobs, and less revenue—less revenue that we are going to need in both the public and the private sector.

I might also add this shutdown harms the important safety work that needs to be done by blocking work that is going to speed up the response to oil spills and accidents offshore. Of particular concern to me, and I know to so many others in the Senate—I see my colleague from Alaska is here—are the people who get hammered, who get hit hardest by these consequences who live in our rural communities, the ones who depend upon producing energy, timber, and recreation. They are the ones who feel the biggest hit from the shutdown.

I am going to talk about what this means in terms of recreation and hunting and fishing. The hunting season starts at different times in different parts of the country, but between recreation and hunting and fishing we are talking about something in the vicinity of \$646 billion a year which goes just to the recreation sector, and another \$140-billion-plus in terms of hunting. I am going to describe the consequences there, but we are talking about policies with enormous impact for our rural communities.

I mentioned the thrilling news of last Friday, about how we were tops in terms of energy production, but I got some additional news that wasn't exactly thrilling last Friday when I was called by the Chief of the Forest Service, Tom Tidwell, who called to report the Forest Service had canceled 450 timber sales on 120 national forests across the country. What that means is loggers, such as the hardworking folks I represent in Oregon, who want to do a hard day's work, are being benched because of this shutdown.

The shutdown comes at a particularly ominous time because winter is at hand, in effect putting an end to logging operations for the year in many parts of our country. That means workers won't be able to make up for this lost time and money this year. Those loggers will simply have to get by with less. So again, rural communities are the face of what this means. They are the ones that are going to get walloped because of a handful of Members of Congress—a handful of Members of Congress—who won't fund the government.

So logging, energy, recreation, I mentioned the hunting season, the sort of flip side of the coin with respect to recreation. While the hunting season for ducks and geese is starting in my home State and across the country, the government shutdown here is closing hundreds of wildlife refuges where those waterfowl are normally fair game. According to the Fish and Wildlife Service, hunting, fishing and wildlife-related activities generate about \$144 billion per year. Hunters contribute \$5.4 billion in State and local taxes each year. Because the waterfowl season is only 3 months long in Oregon, if you lose 1 week, every lost week is a huge bite out of the benefits that hunting brings to our local economy.

What Senators may also not be aware of is the shutdown also means our government is less prepared to respond to these fires, these rapidly developing dangerous infernos in our national forests. The fires have lessened in some parts of the West, but there are areas of high to extreme danger in California, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, South Dakota, and other States. While many firefighters are considered essential, others, such as our off-duty firefighters, have been furloughed. Public safety on Federal lands is also impacted by these furloughs. Although law enforcement continues, without rangers and other agency employees on hand, the conditions are ripe for visitors to find their way into severely understaffed forests and pose a safety risk. And, of course, thousands of hardworking employees at these key natural resource agencies are now out of work.

As we speak, there are 24,000 furloughed at the Forest Service, more than 10,000 furloughed at the Bureau of Land Management. If they are not working, Bureau of Land Management employees can't issue permits for grazing on Federal lands. Energy Department workers and contractors can't clean up nuclear waste sites, such as that at the Hanford Reservation that threatens the Columbia River and the million people who live downstream.

Our committee, recognizing the situation, recently had to cancel a hearing on the Columbia River Treaty, which is vital to the energy and environment of the Pacific Northwest. It is vital to our

relations with Canada. This treaty is about managing a river that is the lifeblood for the Pacific Northwest. It is our lifeblood for transportation, for electricity, for fish, and there isn't much time for our two nations to come together to decide the treaty's future.

I have tried to describe what the shutdown means in terms of our status as No. 1 in energy production, what it means with respect to logging and forest fires, hunting and recreation, and it is all happening because a small group of Members in the other Chamber is demanding negotiations with the American economy tied to the train tracks. It is especially ironic that in many cases the districts of those Members are the ones that are going to bear the brunt of the impasse, those rural communities. They are the ones that are going to bear the consequences of stalled energy production and stalled logging.

I hope we can quickly come together and pass this budget without all the various additions that have made it impossible for Congress to go forward. It is time to reopen the government. I have spent a lot of time working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle on these other issues, and I will continue to do so, and I know a lot of Senators will. Right now it is time to reopen the government and end the shutdown.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, if the Senator will stay on the floor for a moment, one of the bills mentioned by the Senator from Illinois was the helium bill. Within that there is an important Alaska priority. I know my colleagues worked with the Senator—important to my State—on cleaning up those legacy wells that have been on Federal land for years with oil literally seeping out of those wells. And now there is money for the first time in I don't know how many years to actually clean up these wells. But from what I just heard, and correct me if I am wrong, what the Senator just indicated is that the Bureau of Land Management doesn't have the capacity to do permitting and other staffing. So there is no work to be done even though we finally passed a bipartisan bill in both Houses, signed by the President—something that has been waiting for decades to be cleaned. Am I correct on this, that BLM now can't do the work we want them to do? And Alaskans have been desperately waiting for decades.

Mr. WYDEN. I say to the Senator, we know for certain that 10,000 individuals have been furloughed at the Bureau of Land Management. And I tried to describe particularly getting these new permits. I guess if we are already out there with something—and I talked to Chief Tidwell about how we would try to stabilize operations that have, in effect, been put in place now. But we are

not going to be able to go forward with new operations like the Senator from Alaska is describing.

Mr. BEGICH. I know the Senator came to Alaska a few months ago and had an opportunity to see some of the great ability of our energy companies and what we are trying to do. Today I got an important announcement from Exxon and ConocoPhillips about building an LNG plant in an area the Senator had a chance to see. I didn't want to tell them yet, but I wanted to say thank you for the announcement, the multibillion-dollar investment in our State, something we have been doing already for 40 years—exporting to Japan. But now if there are any Federal Government permits they will need, the odds of them getting them in a timely manner are now delayed. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. WYDEN. Again, the Senator is right, because in Alaska, like Oregon, there is an extraordinary level of Federal ownership. In my State the Federal Government owns more than half of the land. The Senator is absolutely correct. With the shutdown, Federal agencies cannot approve drilling permits either on Federal land or offshore, and I saw both when I was in Alaska.

The point is that these are issues we can work on in a bipartisan way. As soon as the government gets reopened, we will go about the task of getting those permits out and coming together on a bipartisan basis, as we have done on so many issues. But we can't do it if the government is shut down. We can't do it if we can't pay our bills. That is what we are going to have to deal with.

Mr. BEGICH. I think this is more of a question/comment. One of the statements at the end talked about how this was held up. We passed a bill out of here—a continuing resolution—in which we cut, on an annualized basis, \$70 billion. We didn't compromise. We took their number. Let's make sure we are clear. We negotiated starting back in July, reduced and reduced, and then we went with their number, a \$70 billion annualized reduction. The body passed it, and nothing passes out of this body unless we get a motion to proceed with some sort of unanimous consent or bipartisan, and that was 99 to 0—people forget that—to move us to the bill. Then we moved it and sent it over to the House, where it has sat since the day we sent it over there. That would have kept this budget operating. Again, it had a \$70 billion annualized reduction.

I think that was the point toward the end of the Senator's comment, that a simple vote over there would put everyone back to work—these permits we just talked about, cleaning up the legacy wells.

The timber we have in southeastern Alaska is now in jeopardy because our Federal lands are now at risk. Is that a fair assessment?

Mr. WYDEN. It is. And I am sure the Senator was involved in this as well, where, after all these years about hearing that the Senate hadn't passed a budget, we stayed up one night until the wee hours and passed a budget. We had scores of votes. Then a lot of us simply wanted to have a conference with the other body. After hearing that there hadn't been a budget, we thought we would be able to get that conference going, and we haven't been able to do that either.

Mr. BEGICH. And they have passed their budget too. So we have two budgets ready to go to conference; is that fair?

Mr. WYDEN. It was there for the doing. I remember coming to the floor and asking unanimous consent to go to conference. I knew there had been some conferencing. But there was an immediate objection. At that time I pointed out that Republican and Democratic economists were saying look to the long term. I talked about it that day, saying that Senator ISAKSON of Georgia—a very able Member of the Finance Committee—and I have some new ideas on Medicare that we think can protect the Medicare guarantee and hold costs down. But we can't get at those kinds of issues unless, as the Senator says, we first reopen the government with that simple vote.

Mr. BEGICH. I appreciate the comments, and I thank the Senator for answering these questions. I think it is important again to point out that budget was passed back in April-May. We did ours, and they did theirs. We have tried 18 times to bring the two parties together. We have tried unanimous consent, as the Senator noted, here on the floor 18 times.

Then we went to this continuing resolution. That debate and negotiation started in July. The House had one number, and we had one number. As time progressed, we took their number—a \$70 billion annualized reduction. Some would not call that a compromise, but we will call it a negotiated compromise because we wanted to get it done. We again sent it over there. It has sat idle. One person—the Speaker—could put it on the floor. I heard him on the radio or TV this weekend explaining how the votes aren't there. Well, if the votes aren't there, put it on the floor and it will fail. But the reality is that the votes are there.

Just as we have taken every one of their items, brought it to the floor—we have voted on every single item over here. They haven't prevailed, but we voted because that is the process. But for whatever reason, it has gone over there and sat idle.

So if the Speaker doesn't think the votes are there, put it up. His side will win then. But there are clearly Republicans and Democrats over on the

House side who want to put the government back in operation so we can get on to these bigger issues.

Is that a fair chronology of events?

Mr. WYDEN. It is. And what I was struck by over the weekend with respect to those comments is, why not at least try that? If we add up all the Members on both sides of the aisle who said they would vote, for whatever—

Mr. BEGICH. House Members.

Mr. WYDEN. Yes, the House Members who said they would vote for it, it sure looks as though the votes are there. And if they are trying to break the gridlock, why not try?

So I hope that kind of thinking will set in here in the next few hours because that would be the fastest way, as the Senator from Alaska has made clear, to get the government open.

Mr. BEGICH. I thank the Senator for allowing me to ask some questions.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, we are in day number 7 of this government shutdown. As was pointed out by the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon, we started with a continuing resolution of \$1.058 billion. That was compromised down, with the expectation that there would be a clean CR, to \$986 billion—over a \$70 billion reduction. That wasn't good enough because there were some who wanted to add different amendments to deal with the affordable health care act. The bottom line is that we are in the throes of a governmental shutdown.

It is interesting that since the government was shut down—midnight tonight will be a solid week—we have seen bills come over from the House that would fund the VA and the National Park Service. The Senator from Alaska is on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. We both work very hard for rural veterans in this country, but we both know the VA can't do their job unless the IRS has funding and CMS has funding. So it is great to put that political gesture out there, but the truth is that they can't do their job until we have more than just the VA funded.

Then there was a story of childhood cancer, so the House came across and said: Maybe we ought to fund the National Institutes of Health.

Then there was the terrible scene last week where Capitol police officers—who are actually working without pay—had to address a lady who drove up here by the Hart Building. Since those officers responded, maybe we should pay them. So they came across with a bill for them. They should be paid all the time, I might add.

Then there is the issue of Hurricane Karen, so we need to fund FEMA. So they came across to fund FEMA.

Then they thought, all these furloughed Federal employees, we should pay them. And I agree, we should. The fact is that they do a great job and they should be back here working, and every one of them wants to be back here working to get that backpay.

Then they decided to fund things such as food inspectors because they understand our food security is at risk.

These guys can't see past their political noses. The bottom line is, as the previous speakers talked about, if the Speaker of the House put the clean resolution up with \$986 billion, it would pass the House. He said it wouldn't this weekend. OK. So if it doesn't, put it up anyway. Prove us wrong. The bottom line is that it would pass and this senseless shutdown would be over.

There are plenty of things out there that continue to hamper this country's moving forward economically due to this economic shutdown. We have talked about Head Start. We have talked about the Forest Service suspending logging contracts. The Senator from Alaska talked about drilling permits. Montana is an outdoor State, and people live for this time of year. It is called hunting season. Access to a lot of the hunting, camping, and fishing sites has been severely restricted. This weekend the National Guard furloughed its drill for 3,500 guardsmen. Communities around our national parks are being severely impacted, losing literally millions of dollars, which is real money.

So how do we get out of this? It is pretty simple: If the Speaker would put the bill on the floor, it would pass. He refuses to do that. I think he refuses to do it for another reason, and that reason is that I think a lot of his Members want to cater to the tea party movement but go back home and want to appear as if they are moderates. If they had that vote, it would certainly point out who stands for what in that body. That is why he needs to have the vote.

As was said by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska, we have had votes on everything they sent over here, just about. The fact is they need to do the same. We sent a clean CR to them. Unless they want this shutdown to go on and on for some unknown reason, they would vote on that clean CR.

Then we are rapidly approaching the debt ceiling, which puts the full faith and credit of this country at risk if we do not increase it. I might add this is not money that is yet to be spent, this is money that has been spent. It is not unlike the mortgage on your house or your credit card bill. If you do not pay them, interest rates will go up. If we do not increase the debt limit, interest rates and our national debt will go up. Those who are concerned about the debt and the deficit, as I am, and others on both sides of the aisle, we will see our national debt increase, not de-

crease, by doing something as silly as not increasing the debt ceiling.

I know there are some in this body who would love to put issues on the debt ceiling, and they are playing with fire. We saw what happened in 2011 when our credit rating was downgraded because some were just talking about not increasing the debt ceiling.

The truth is I will be the first to work with anybody in this body to try to reduce the debt and deficit by reducing spending, by removing tax loopholes in the code. We need to do that at the front end, not the back end. The debt limit is dealing with the issue at the back end. If we do not do it, if we do not increase the debt ceiling, we will see the economy spiral down out of control, potentially even putting us into a depression.

I don't say that to scare people. I say that to make the point that we should not be fooling around with this issue. We are adults here. We need to get together and realize that the debt ceiling is too important to play politics with. I know since I have been here—and this government shutdown issue is a prime example—politics has trumped policy nearly every time. It is time to endorse the right policy and get a long-term comprehensive deal that is not a patch, that doesn't add to the uncertainty, yet gets us by the continuing resolution, gets us out on the debt ceiling so we do not have to deal with this every 45 or 90 days and do not have to deal with the debt ceiling just about every year.

I think if we were to do that and cooler minds prevailed, we could see this country start to grow economically. We would see unemployment drop even more than we have seen previously. We would see this country go on to have an opportunity to pay down our debt and deficit in a way that makes sense for our kids and grandkids.

I do not know where this is going to end. I can tell you the folks back home see it for what it is, and they are tired of foolishness and they want to see it stopped. I can tell you what makes it particularly frustrating for me is that as I see businesses start to expand, as I see entrepreneurs ready to take chances, they look at what goes on in Washington, DC, and: Whoa, this is not worth it. We don't know what the future is to bring because of the uncertainty of not only the continuing resolution, keeping the government open, but also the talk that has been revolving now around the debt ceiling talks.

I hope this body will do the right thing, and that it would push the House to do the right thing; that is, put the clean resolution on the floor in the House. Let's get the debt ceiling behind us. Let's talk about debt and deficit reduction in a meaningful way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Could the Senator from Montana stay for a second so I can ask for a clarification of one of his beginning statements?

Mr. TESTER. Yes.

Mr. BEGICH. The Senator had at the beginning some good numbers there. If I do the math right, when the Senator from Oregon was here and from what I saw, we hear over and over there are not negotiations or compromise going on. But if I hear my colleague's numbers right, there were negotiations, there was compromise. As a matter of fact, there was so much compromise we went to the House number—not our number, we went to their number. We actually reduced the budget on an annualized basis \$70 billion. Isn't that what the Senator's numbers are? He is on the Appropriations Committee, I am on the Appropriations Committee. There is one thing we do know a lot about and that is numbers.

Mr. TESTER. It is. It is a much lower number. I will tell the good Senator from Alaska this: That is what happened in the negotiations. The upshot of all that is that we would get a clean CR coming back if we would negotiate it back down to that figure; there would not be a bunch of games being played.

Mr. BEGICH. Not a lot of stuff added on later that wasn't necessary. We would debate that later but—

Mr. TESTER. Absolutely. And we should debate them later. But the bottom line is it is important that we keep our government open. Why? Because we are wasting a ton of money the way it is being done now, and this piecemeal funding, trying to get a political advantage, is crazy. People see it for what it is: Political gamesmanship.

Mr. BEGICH. Isn't it odd they pass "let's pay everybody," 435 to 0, they pass it but they only want to have some of them come back to work? If you are a fiscal conservative—I think I am; we are from Montana, Alaska, you know, conservative States—I want them working if we are paying them. Doesn't that make sense?

Instead, it seems as though we are given a couple of agencies, but they still want to pay everybody. I don't know what the logic is there.

Mr. TESTER. Why don't we have them come back? We know the value of work to their self-esteem.

Mr. BEGICH. Absolutely.

Mr. TESTER. We know those folks are important to my office. If they were not important to my office, they would not be working for me. They tell folks what is going on, help constituents when they have problems with some of the agencies around.

But the bottom line is they are sitting at home. These are not rich folks. A lot of them are hand to mouth. They don't know how long this government shutdown is going to go on and they want to go back to work.

Mr. BEGICH. I guess I have one more. The Senator said something I thought was very interesting on the budget deficit. The Senator is older than I am. I came here 2 years after the Senator. When we came in, we dealt with the debt ceiling, which is about paying the bills. We have to pay the bills that were racked up for a period of time before we got here.

In 2009, I think the deficit per year was \$1.4 trillion. This year—which just closed out because we are still not done—it was about \$630 billion. That is almost a 60-percent reduction in the deficit. We are headed the right way. But this is not helping.

Mr. TESTER. My last point would be this. If we are going to get the debt and deficit under control, one of the things we have to do is grow the economy. By stopping government with this continuing resolution, by talking, simply talking about increasing the debt limit, it does not do good things for our economy. In fact, it takes it in the wrong direction. We see businesses contract when they see what is going on here in Washington.

It is time to start using some common sense. There are folks who claim to be business representatives out there. I talked to a bunch of businesses this afternoon.

Mr. BEGICH. The Senator runs a business. He is a farmer.

Mr. TESTER. I am. Every one of them said they ought to quit messing around, get to an agreement, have the debates on debt and deficit we need to have, because they are important, but don't hold up the debt limit and don't hold up the government funding in the process.

I thank my friend from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. I thank my good friend for allowing me to take a few minutes and ask a couple of points.

Mr. President, I am here to say that is what this debate is about, a simple question, allowing a vote on the House side. If they do not have the votes, because obviously the Speaker there believes he doesn't have the votes and he doesn't support it being voted on, let it be on the floor, it will fail, and we will go back to the drawing board.

But the reality is he knows the votes are there. We would be out of this shutdown. The result would be people would be back to work, services will be provided, and businesses will not be losing the confidence they are losing every day or like the market once again. Since this debate started, the threats of shutdown, of actual shutdown, the stock market over the last 15, 16 days has lost almost 600 points. Most people do not pay a lot of attention to that. But if you have an education account, a 401(k) account, a retirement account, an IRA, or you have a little money set aside, it has a direct impact to your livelihood over the long haul.

I encourage the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Speaker BOEHNER,

to allow a simple vote. We have, on every bill that has come over here. They have not prevailed, but we allowed a vote. That is the process.

But over there they refuse to do it. They keep sending back gimmicks. It is hard for me to understand this logic. They want to pay every single Federal employee, but they are only going to have some of them come back to work. It makes no sense. If you are paying your employees, have them come back and work.

I run a small business, my wife runs a small business, I know the Senator from Montana, who just left here, runs a small business. You don't pay your people not to come to work. When you pay them to work, you pay them to work.

The Presiding Officer was a Governor. He would not say one day: Oh, by the way, I am going to pay everyone, stay home for a month. No, he would have them come to work when he is paying them unless they have leave or vacation time. This is crazy. It passes unanimously on the House side.

Then they say: But we don't want you to work.

The taxpayers should be outraged about that. I want to vote on that bill. I want to vote on that furlough bill here. I want to make sure everyone gets paid, and then I went to follow it up with the CR and put everyone back to work. That is what we should be doing here, not these games where they bring over political statements with the items they are bringing over.

Do we want to vote against veterans? I have a higher per capita number of veterans in my State than any other State. Veterans are important to our economy. They have served our country. They deserve every benefit. But to play this game of leveraging—the American people see right through this. These guys who keep bringing these little schemes over here are thinking they are one step ahead of the American people. They are absolutely wrong. The American people are two or three steps ahead of us. They see the show-and-tell that is going on and it doesn't make sense.

Again, if you are going to fund all the employees—again, 435 to 0 they voted to fund all the employees who get paid, but then they only want some of them to go to work. It makes no sense to me at all.

I appreciate the time of the Presiding Officer allowing me the opportunity to engage with a couple of my colleagues here, but every time they spoke I wanted to explain and show kind of the farce that is going on over there and what is happening over there with a small group of the tea party—very small, 30, 40 Members over there, who decided they are going to run the government here.

The government is not run by one group, it is run by compromise and negotiation. We have negotiated all the

way down to their number, we have put every one of their bills on the floor and voted on them. Now all we ask is one simple vote, a clean CR that sits in the Speaker's office, ready to be put on the floor.

He even says it will fail. OK. Let's see. Let's see where his votes are. Let's see where it all is. If it fails, we will be right back to where we are today, no difference. What does he fear? He fears the fact it will pass.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEGICH. I thank the Chair.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF COLIN STIRLING BRUCE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

NOMINATION OF SARA LEE ELLIS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Colin Stirling Bruce, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois and Sara Lee Ellis, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. BEGICH. I ask consent the time be equally charged to both sides during the quorum call, and I suggest an absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering judicial nominations from a previous order.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today we are going to vote on two of the district court nominations pending before the Senate. I am glad we are getting to these important nominations, as we should have weeks ago. They should have been done in a routine fashion in the normal course of events, but there has been this concerted effort to slow down President Obama's judges—something we have never seen with other Presidents, but we do with him. I am glad that these are at least going through.

In the same vein, we see a needless government shutdown. I hope it comes to an end so the Senate can tend to the business of the country, including, as I said on the floor the other day, ensuring that the courts have the judges they need. In fact, speaking of judges, they are both from Illinois and have the support of Senator DURBIN and Senator KIRK.

I ask that my full statement regarding the judges be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOMINATIONS OF COLIN BRUCE AND SARA ELLIS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, we will vote on two of the district court nominations pending before the Senate. While I am glad we are considering these important nominations today, I hope that this needless government shutdown soon comes to an end so the Senate can tend to the business of the country, including ensuring that our courts have the judges they need.

Colin Bruce is nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Central District of Illinois. Mr. Bruce is a lifelong Federal prosecutor who has served in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Central District of Illinois for nearly 25 years. He has served as the first assistant U.S. attorney since 2010. He has extensive experience in Federal court and has handled over 600 cases, including 60 jury trials, 3 bench trials, and 80 appeals involving a broad range of issues such as drugs, fraud, national security, and cyber crime.

Sara Ellis is nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. Ms. Ellis works in private practice in Chicago and also serves as an adjunct professor at Loyola University Chicago School of Law. She has substantial experience litigating in the civil and criminal context, having previously worked as a staff attorney for the Federal Defender Program and as an attorney for the city of Chicago Department of Law. Over her 18-year legal career, she has tried 11 cases to verdict.

Both of the nominees have the bipartisan support of their home State Senators, Mr. Durbin and Mr. Kirk. They were reported by the Judiciary Committee by voice vote more than 2 months ago. While I am pleased that we are finally getting to vote on these nominees, voting on just 2 of the 13 judicial nominees currently pending on the floor is not enough to make real progress in reducing the vacancies on our Federal courts. Our Federal judicial vacancies currently number more than 90, including 39 that have been des-

ignated as emergency vacancies due to high caseloads by the nonpartisan Administrative Office of the Courts. There is no good reason for us to not get back to what used to be the regular order in the Senate of taking up and confirming consensus nominees within days of being reported out of committee. We need to get these talented men and women off the Senate calendar and into the courtroom so they can get to work on behalf of the American people.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I think I have spoken on the floor every day since this happened. In what has become an all-too-familiar scene around the Capitol over the past few years as we again find ourselves in a stalemate over providing funding to keep the Federal Government running. I share the frustration of most Americans—Republicans and Democrats—that what was once the regular business of Congress, funding the government, has been replaced by political theater and another artificial made-in-Congress crisis that might get a number of people on television, but while doing it, they imperil the economy, and in ways large and small, every single family in America. It makes no difference what their politics are, they are in peril.

Of course, there is an easy way to resolve this fabricated crisis. The House of Representatives could simply vote on the Senate bill. It is a clean continuing resolution. It has no partisan ideological riders on the right or the left. It would provide the funding necessary to keep the Federal Government open through November 15, and Speaker BOEHNER could accept the offer Leader REID made to get on with the business of negotiating and passing this year's appropriations bills that should have been passed by the end of last month.

Over the past week, the House has had ample opportunity to end this shutdown. They could have passed the Senate's legislation to fund all of the Federal agencies and provide Congress with the time it needs to find a path forward.

Yet a faction—not the whole House by any means—of extreme House members, supported by their leadership, have prevented the full body from voting on the Senate bill. Extreme Republican members—they certainly don't represent the kind of Republicans we have in Vermont—have prevented the full body from voting on the Senate bill.

Instead, what do they do? They are all collecting their salaries, but they closed the government all because they want to erode access to affordable, private health care options for millions of uninsured Americans. It is unconscionable, and they have not come up with an alternative.

They said: We will get rid of a family's option to keep their college-aged children on their health insurance, but we have no alternative. We are going to

get rid of the ability of spouses who may have had a preexisting condition, such as cancer or diabetes or a heart condition, from having insurance. We are going to get rid of that, but we have nothing as an alternative. We are going to eliminate those options, for those—who might be low-income persons—to get insurance, but we have no alternative. We just want to get rid of it.

There is no question that this is a crisis driven by a handful of partisans on the other side of the aisle for whom there is no path to compromise on just about anything. Well, there is one exception. They do find every possible opportunity to get in front of a television camera and talk about what they have done. The American people ought to know what they are doing; they are hurting them terribly.

Their demands are both constantly shifting and breathtakingly unreasonable.

While the Senate has voted on one flawed House proposal after another, the House refuses to vote on anything from the Senate. Incredibly, these same extremists—and they are extremists—are now threatening to employ this same harmful tactic when the Federal Government reaches its statutory borrowing limit in a couple of weeks.

It is interesting that the Speaker says: We are not going to be able to do anything on the debt limit. We saw the stock market, which was projected to be up by 150-to-200 points suddenly go down 150 points. There was a 300-point swing. In other words, we will continue our sloganeering and our stalling no matter what that might do to people's savings for retirement, or their pension, or to their kids in college or to the small businesses that are trying to make money so they can stay in business. We don't care what happens to them because we have to be on the evening news and talk about how we are standing up for America.

No, they are not standing up for America.

In fact, the Treasury Department reported last week that a failure to raise the debt limit could cause credit markets to freeze, the dollar to plummet, and interest rates to rise precipitously. The report goes on to say a government default on its debts might prove so catastrophic that it could potentially result "in a financial crisis and recession that could echo the events of 2008 or worse." They don't seem to care so long as they get on television.

We have all heard a lot of talk and seen a lot of crocodile tears about getting our fiscal House in order. Oh, what a great campaign slogan. But too many who got elected with such bumper sticker sloganeering are not following through on their constitutional responsibility to the government.

Look at their list of ransom demands for reopening the government: The

first one blows a \$100 billion hole in the national debt by repealing the Affordable Care Act. The second one adds \$30 billion more to the debt without offering any suggestion for making up the revenue. The third still keeps important government functions closed, such as providing food assistance to young children, expectant mothers, seniors, continuing health trials that could cure cancer or childhood diseases; and the list goes on and on.

It is truly unfortunate that a relative few Republicans in Congress, who are obviously enjoying the limelight, are willing to play politics and brinkmanship at a time when the public demands statesmanship. Their reckless actions are hurting families all across America. I would remind them they are hurting Democratic families, Republican families, Independent families; they are hurting Americans. For this small, extreme faction, it seems "compromise" is a dirty word and "distrust" is a political tactic. That may explain why we have heard excuse after excuse for blocking the budget discipline they so desperately pled for just a short time ago. They said: Why don't we pass a budget? Why didn't the Senate pass a budget? I was in the chair at 5 o'clock in the morning on a Saturday morning when we were voting on that budget. We voted all day and all night and we finished it. That was back in March.

So what happens when we want to go to a conference on the budget and work out the differences with the House? In a conference, if we counted the number of people, there would be more Republicans than Democrats. It was a Republican Senator who stood on the floor and said: I object to going to conference—the same one who was giving speeches asking why we don't have a budget.

Then, when we pass a budget, we have to go to the next step to work it out with the House: Oh, no, I object to that. Probably because he was surprised we had actually done our work. The chairwoman of the committee, the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY, who did such a brilliant job of getting together a budget that saves the taxpayers money—they then act terrified that it might actually pass.

They have objected 19 times to go to that budget conference. They have shut down the government. They are preparing to cause the government's first ever debt default in our Nation's history. That is right. The Speaker of the House is now holding the government's credit hostage, threatening this weekend to let the Nation default come October 17 when the debt limit is reached unless even more draconian spending cuts are made. Is there any reason markets all over the world are dropping? Is there any reason the rest of the world looks at America and says: What are you doing? Why are you letting the children in the sandbox take over?

We have caught just a preview of the chaos such a move could create. Stock futures, as I mentioned, dropped sharply and European stocks dropped dramatically in the wake of House Republicans' newest ultimatum. This is no way to govern.

It is also not an example to set for the rest of the world when we have to go to the rest of the world and say: Help us, work with us, to stop the terrorists who threaten the United States. Help us, work with us, so we can export our goods to your country. Help us, work with us to bring about stability around the world. They say: You will not do a thing to even help yourself. Why should we help you?

I talked to some of these countries. I talked to the people in those countries. They are shaking their heads and saying: What has happened to America?

So it is far past time for reason and sanity to return to Congress, on this government shutdown, on setting our budget priorities, and a whole host of other issues. Let's let the grownups come back and start running things around here.

I remain ready to work with people on both sides of the aisle. I am proud of my record, as the senior-most Member of this body, that year after year after year legislation I have written with both Republicans and Democrats as cosponsors has passed. The distinguished Presiding Officer was Governor of one of the great Commonwealths of this country, the Commonwealth of Virginia. He brought Republicans and Democrats together. It was a model for the rest of the country. It can be done, but it takes grownups to do it. We are always going to have a few loud voices saying: Oh, we can't possibly do this.

The American public expects the people who truly lead to be leaders. So let's work with people on both sides of the aisle. Let's find a solution that ends this needless shutdown and gets us and hundreds of thousands of Federal employees back to doing our work on behalf of the American people. That starts with the House voting on the Senate bill to reopen the American people's government.

That bill is sitting over there right now. Bring it to a vote. Vote to put Americans back to work and to reopen those trials to find cures for childhood diseases, or vote no if some wish to continue to be children in the sandbox.

I am blessed with grandchildren. I like to think none of my grandchildren would act as childish as a small group of ultra-rightwing Republicans have in the House. They don't reflect the great tradition of the Republican Party in my State or in this country. They reflect an atmosphere of people who care only for themselves. No matter what they say, they care only for their own egos and their own political future. It is time they started caring for the United States of America.

I see nobody else seeking recognition. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and if time is being charged, I ask unanimous consent that it be charged on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, with nobody else seeking recognition, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question occurs on the Bruce nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Colin Stirling Bruce, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Are there any other senators in the chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 213 Ex.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Durbin	Lee
Ayotte	Enzi	Levin
Baldwin	Feinstein	Manchin
Barrasso	Fischer	Markey
Baucus	Flake	McCain
Begich	Franken	McCaskill
Bennet	Gillibrand	McConnell
Blumenthal	Graham	Menendez
Blunt	Grassley	Merkley
Boozman	Hagan	Mikulski
Boxer	Harkin	Moran
Brown	Hatch	Murkowski
Burr	Heinrich	Murphy
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Murray
Cardin	Heller	Nelson
Carper	Hirono	Paul
Chambliss	Hoeben	Portman
Chiesa	Isakson	Pryor
Coats	Johanns	Reed
Cochran	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Risch
Coons	Kaine	Roberts
Corker	King	Rockefeller
Cornyn	Kirk	Sanders
Crapo	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cruz	Landrieu	Schumer
Donnelly	Leahy	Scott

Sessions	Thune	Warner
Shaheen	Toomey	Warren
Shelby	Udall (CO)	Whitehouse
Stabenow	Udall (NM)	Wicker
Tester	Vitter	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Casey	Inhofe
Coburn	Rubio

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON ELLIS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Sarah Lee Ellis, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table.

The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from California.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business for debate only be extended to 7:30 p.m. and that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for such time as I might consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I think we are all in a state of shock that we are entering the fourth day of a government shutdown with no movement in sight.

I wanted to go home to California to see how the Affordable Care Act is going in California since that is the reason the Republicans have shut down the government. I want to report that people there cannot understand why on Earth the Republicans want to stop the Affordable Care Act. They can't believe that just as Californians are on the brink of getting millions of our citizens insured and small businesses are getting affordable health insurance under the Affordable Care Act, Republicans not only have shut down the government, but they are threatening default. And they understand that default would lead to economic chaos. It has never happened before in American history. I tried to explain to my constituents exactly what has been going on

here, and I did it in the best way I could, and I think I was fair.

The first thing: In order to keep the government open for 6 weeks, they wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They tried 43 times. That never worked, so then they said they would defund it, which everybody understands that if you don't fund it, it is the same thing. But we told them they couldn't defund most of it because most of it is not appropriated funds. They didn't care. They put that forward. That went nowhere.

Then they said: We won't repeal it or defund it. We will delay the Affordable Care Act.

We all said: If you think we are going to delay further the chance for millions of Americans to get affordable insurance, we are not going to do it. This bill passed 3½ years ago and was upheld by the Supreme Court. It is not going to happen.

Then they said: We will just take part of it and stop part of it. We won't allow women to get preventive services.

That went over like a lead balloon, their war on women again. They were saying women won't be able to get tested for cervical cancer, for STDs, for pregnancy-related diabetes. They were just going to shut that part of the Affordable Care Act down. Women here in the Senate held a press conference, and they dropped that.

Then they said: OK, we are going to repeal one of the revenue streams that is going to cost \$30 billion, but we have no way to replace it.

So then they actually sent us a provision that would have added \$30 billion to the deficit—from the Republican Party. They say they are so fiscally conservative, and they actually sent us a provision that would cost \$30 billion with no way to pay for it. So that didn't go down to well.

This one is really beautiful. They say our staff and the staff of anyone working in the White House—all these people who believe so much in giving back to their great country will no longer get the employer contribution that all Americans get who work for large employers. That is their great "thank you" to their staff. That is their great show of appreciation—besides shutting down the government where their staff is working without pay.

So I explained this to my constituents who are trying to sign up for health care.

I went to a really good community health care center where people are lining up and getting information and they will be signing up for health care.

They said: Well, why would they do this?

I said: Well, there is more bad news. We thought they would extend the debt ceiling, which is the way you pay for the debts you have already incurred. It is already on the credit card. We need

to pay for that, and now they are threatening not to pay the bills of the United States of America. They are threatening to take this country into default.

Now they are saying: Well, maybe we won't do it if we can cut Medicare and Medicaid.

So now they have put the Affordable Care Act on the line, they have put Medicare on the line, Medicaid on the line, Social Security is out there, and they may cause a default if we don't deal with these programs that are so critical to our people.

I have been around here a long time, and I know we have differences. But the President is right when he says we the Congress have two things we have to do. One of them is that we have to keep the doors open because we have passed laws and they need to be carried out. Keep the government open. And the second thing we have to do is pay our bills that we incurred. Raise the debt ceiling. So far, the Republicans refuse.

We sent a clean continuing resolution over there without all this cutting health care, Medicare, and Social Security that they are interested in. We said: Let's just keep the government open and going for 6 weeks, raise the debt ceiling, and then of course we will talk about all of this. That is what we do. We negotiate. We talk. And the President is more than willing. He offered the Republicans a \$4 trillion deficit-reduction deal. They walked away. He is willing to talk about everything and anything. But you have to keep the government going and you have to pay your bills. That is the fundamental work we have to do. The irony, of course, is we get our checks. But our staff, they do not get their checks. The workers who come back because they are deemed essential, they are working without getting their pay.

This is an outrage. Speaker BOEHNER, all you have to do is put the continuing resolution on the floor for an up-or-down vote. Every Democrat will vote for it and, at last count, the newspapers say at least 21 Republicans. Open up the government. We are knocking on the door. Open it up. Guess what you will find behind the door? People who want to work, people who need a paycheck.

I have to tell you, they passed a bill that says they are going to pay Federal workers after the shutdown, and that is good. They should have done that. But right now we hear Republicans over here who say they don't really think that is a great idea. I have a better idea than even that: Open up the government and pay people for doing the jobs they were hired to do.

I have a ranking member who has asked for a big hearing on climate change, and he wants all the administration officials to show up. We were planning on that. But most of them

have absolutely no staff, and they are responding to emergencies. If there is a chemical explosion, the chemical safety board has to respond. If there is a horrible coal ash spill, the EPA will have to respond. If there is a disastrous cancer hot spot, the EPA will have to respond. Open up the government. Don't just say to people you will get paid so you don't have to bother coming to work. Open up the government. Let people work for the pay they are supposed to get. This is an outrage.

I have to say when they passed over there "pay the workers," we know why they did it. It was political. Because the heat in Virginia is so hot in this gubernatorial race, even the far right Republicans over there said to open up the government and fight about health care later.

I have to say when I went home and I saw people waiting to sign up for coveredCA.com, I learned that on the first day coveredCA.com had 5 million hits and 500,000 distinct users. Some 17,000 people called Covered California service centers and over 6,000 Californians began to sign up on the first day. On the second day they had 200,000 distinct users.

They are training thousands of enrollment counselors there. Many of them are already insurance agents. Many of them are going to work for big providers like Kaiser Permanente. Many of them are going to be in the community health care centers. Why do the Republicans want to shut down the government and threaten the default of this Nation when we are on the brink of getting millions of people the health insurance they need and deserve? The small business community is going to have an opportunity to get better rates and better tax breaks.

I want to talk a little bit about this threat of default because the threat of default is real. Let's start off and go through a couple of charts. First of all, we have a new thing going on. The junior Senator from Oklahoma today said: Oh, you don't default if you don't pay people what they are owed, only if you default on interest payments.

All of a sudden there is a new definition. But if you don't pay Social Security, he doesn't consider it a default. If you don't pay for Medicare, he doesn't consider it a default. If you don't pay contractors, he doesn't consider it a default.

Why don't we go to Black's Law Dictionary:

Default: The failure to make a payment when due.

Let's be clear, there is not one bill that is coming due that Congress did not pass. Let's be clear. Congress makes the decisions on spending. We default when we fail to make a payment when due. They are playing, as Jack Lew, the Treasury Secretary, said, with fire—playing with fire.

Let's see what has been said about default. Default means you fail to raise

the debt ceiling in order to accommodate the bills you have already incurred. Ronald Reagan, the hero of the Republican Party:

The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of a default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar.

Ronald Reagan said that in 1983. Why don't the Republicans listen to their hero? He said even the thought of a default was dangerous for this Nation. The last time they played these games it cost billions of dollars because we were downgraded. Let's look at Douglas Holtz-Eakin, CBO Director under George W. Bush, talking about default:

It's a bad idea, little defaults, big defaults; defaults, a bad idea, period, and there should be no one who believes otherwise.

If they don't listen to Ronald Reagan, why don't they listen to the CBO Director under George W. Bush? I tell you, these guys are in the fringes. They are in the fringe lane. They are in the far right, and they are going to go off the road, and if it were just them, it would be one thing, but they are taking America with them. We have to stand up and be counted around here and not let this go without comment.

Mark Zandi, he was JOHN MCCAIN's economic adviser. Here is what said:

The dark scenario is so dark I can't imagine it.

He is talking about a default. Speaker BOEHNER is standing there saying: Well, despite the fact that you read that I didn't want a default, I can't contemplate approving this without figuring out how to cut entitlement programs like Medicare and Social Security.

I have to tell you, they are playing with fire. I think they have lit the match. Anyone who knows anything about economics—I happened to have majored in it in college, and I was a stockbroker for a period of time and know that uncertainty is the worst thing. The last time the Republicans tried this—and eventually they decided to back up and back off—it cost us, as I was saying, almost \$19 billion over 10 years in taxpayer costs. America's credit rating was downgraded. Standard & Poor downgraded the U.S. credit rating for the first time in American history and the stock market sank. It dropped 2,000 points in July and August of 2011.

That is a wonderful policy, Republicans. Just keep it up. Who do you think you are helping? People who have 401(k)s? Everyone in America who is counting on the certainty of a government opening up every day in the greatest nation of the world? What are they accomplishing? The President had to cancel a trip to Asia that was so anticipated, giving China the upper hand

there. You have to be kidding. Who are you helping?

Here is the deal. We have a health care program now called the Affordable Care Act. I will tell you the story of Leslie Foster, a 28-year-old freelance filmmaker in Hollywood. He told the *Wall Street Journal*—Leslie Foster—that he found a plan on Covered California that will cost him only \$62 a month. Because Leslie earns \$20,000 a year, federal assistance will pick up nearly three-quarters of the cost of his premium. Leslie says he hasn't had comprehensive health insurance since 2006.

I went home to be with the real people, to see the good that we can do. Is the Affordable Care Act perfect? No. Can we fix it? Yes. Let's talk about it. But don't try to scuttle a law that is so important for the people of my State and for this country—48 million people who are uninsured in America today. They have a shot at getting insurance for the first time. Don't take it away. Don't threaten default, and don't shut down this government—which you already did. Open it up.

The more I think about it, they pass a law to pay Federal employees who are sitting home. Tell me how that makes sense. They want to come to work and do their jobs. They are not happy sitting at home, whether they get a check or they don't. Open up the government. If you don't like certain functions, fight it out during the regular order. PATTY MURRAY, the chair of our Budget Committee, she has asked—I think it is now 18 times, I could be wrong and I'll correct the record if I am wrong—she has asked them to go to conference and strike a deal. Let's sit down and talk.

Senator CRUZ objected every time, and when he was not here Senator LEE objected. The far right wing does not want to solve this problem because they like the chaos. I don't know why. They ought to say it to Andrew Stryker. He is 34 years old. He lives in Los Angeles. He does freelance work. He pays a monthly premium of around \$600 to stay on the plan from the job he left 4 years ago. He has high blood pressure and says he has been denied coverage in the past due to a preexisting condition. Last Tuesday Andrew told the *Washington Post* he picked out a silver plan on the Covered California exchange. It took him a while to sign up for coverage due to traffic and high demand on day 1. He said, “. . . it will save me over \$6,000. For that I would have waited all day.”

I think the Republicans should call up Mr. Stryker and say: Too bad. Too bad. You don't mind if we delay this another few years, do you?

And he would say: I sure would. I have a chance.

Last week San Franciscan Paul Cello told KQED that he selected a plan on the California exchange that will save

him more than \$300 a month compared to what he pays now in the high risk pool. “It's like a whole ‘nother world,” he said. “The coverage is better, no preexisting condition exclusions, I will get mental health coverage, so there's way more coverage than I had and I am going to be saving.”

Why doesn't JOHN BOEHNER, who is known to shed tears, call up Paul Cello and say: Gee, Mr. Cello, we are really sorry. We want to delay your insurance for a year or 2 or forever. Where is the emotion Speaker BOEHNER has shown in many other cases. Where is the emotion for workers here who cannot get a paycheck, who are just praying to God the Republicans will vote on that clean CR and open up this government?

We know we have disagreements. That is fine. We are proud of the values that we bring. But it is not right to shut down the government and cause so much pain. It is not right to threaten default and havoc in the markets, and havoc all across the nation. It is not right. They are trying to shut down the government, and they might default because they don't like Medicare, ObamaCare, Social Security, and Medicaid, and they are stamping their feet and they are throwing a tantrum. Why are they inflicting so much suffering on our workers and on our families, but none on themselves?

Note to the Republicans: You are protecting your pay. Give it up during the shutdown.

Here in the Capitol last week we had a very frightening incident. It happened right outside my office. We are so thankful to the Capitol Police for rushing to save the day. A vehicle was being used as a weapon. They ran right to the trouble. A couple of them wound up in the hospital. They are not getting paid. What do you think that does to the ego of people, to their feeling of self-worth? And these Republicans can get all the protection they want, and so do we. This is the way we value people: Shut down the government and don't give them their pay? And by the way, they tried to take away their employer contribution to their health care which is equivalent to a huge pay cut. Talk about values, Speaker BOEHNER, why don't you get a little bit of a dose of Tip O'Neill? Tip O'Neill knew the magic of 218. He didn't care whether it was Republicans or Democrats who voted. He got things done. They have done nothing. Just because they control one-half of one-third of the government doesn't mean they get to decide everything. It doesn't work that way. We have to work together.

They don't get to pick and choose what laws to enforce. If they don't like them, then repeal them. Try to repeal the Clean Air Act. Bring it on. Try to repeal the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Super Fund Act, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform law, and the Consumer Protection Agency. Be honest.

They don't even like Social Security, they don't like Medicare, and they don't like Medicaid. If they want to battle that out, bring it on. We will battle it out. But don't hold this whole country hostage and don't hurt millions of workers.

They did pass these little mini bills. We stand on the floor and talk about the horror stories. Oh, they passed a mini bill. I guess eventually they will send enough bills over here to open the whole government. Why don't they just open the government?

We cry for those people who can't get into NIH trials. They have a mini bill, but they didn't open the CDC and people are not working to catch the next epidemic. They didn't do anything to restart food inspections, and Lord knows we lose thousands of people a year from eating poisoned food. They will not open the EPA, and we have kids in Los Angeles, as we speak, who are very sick and ill with bloody noses.

There is a picture in the paper I can show everyone. The red over here is the result of bloody noses from little children who are living near an oil and gas operation. The day I read about it, I called up the EPA. They said they would be on it in 5 minutes, and then the government shut down. They don't care over there. Even though 75 percent of the people strongly support the EPA, they want to get rid of it. Bring it on but don't hold this country hostage.

There are 110 FAA safety inspectors in southern California who were furloughed, 830 Bureau of Land Management employees were sent home, and small businesses are not getting paid. We don't even know what our unemployment rate is in the greatest country in the world because the Labor Department had to send home the people who calculate that number.

In Santa Monica a plane crashed on Sunday evening and four people were killed. The NTSB cannot investigate—that is the National Transportation Safety Board—because the investigators are off the job. They took what they learned, put it in a vault, and when the government reopens, they will take it out. In the meantime, who knows why it happened. Maybe it is a defect in the plane that we could fix for all planes. Maybe it is something on the runway. We don't know. Maybe it was pilot error. All of this needs to be discussed and looked at.

What they are doing is disgraceful, and it is unprecedented. I have looked back, and there have been shutdowns, but most lasted 1 or 2 or 3 days, but none of them were about repealing a law, let alone a signature law of a President—Democratic or Republican.

The Republicans have to wake up and smell reality. They had an election and a lot of it was about the Affordable Care Act. They lost. Amazingly, the Affordable Care Act—they dubbed it

ObamaCare—is based on a Republican idea of individual responsibility. We actually got the idea from Republicans and from a Republican Governor named Mitt Romney. They ran away from it because they don't care for this President. Get over it. You lost. There are people in this Senate who ran on saying they would make the Affordable Care Act better, but they weren't going to repeal it.

The Commodity Futures Trading Commission furloughed 600 employees. The government can't regulate the markets for contracts in oil, corn, and metals. Commissioner Bart Chilton said:

Taking our cops off the beat for even a few days could have disastrous impacts on these markets that consumers depend upon.

We talked about the CDC. They furloughed 9,000 workers who respond to outbreaks such as salmonella. This is happening at a time when an outbreak of hepatitis A has affected 79 people in California.

We are dealing with a self-inflicted wound upon this Nation, a government shutdown that is unnecessary. We cannot allow this to continue. So I say to Speaker BOEHNER, who is the architect of this shutdown, stop playing games with the lives of Americans—our workers, our families, and our children. Do your job. Open the government. Let the House vote. It is pretty simple.

We have sent a bill over there which funds the government. We have made a commitment to them that after they pass that and the debt ceiling, every single thing is on the table.

I was thinking the other day that if you are a teacher and you get hired in a school and the school opens for work at 9 a.m. every morning, you have to be in the classroom at 9 a.m. in the morning in order to keep your job. If you weren't in your classroom at 9 a.m. in the morning and decided that you wanted to do something different such as come in at 11 a.m., you would be fired.

Our job is to keep the government running and pay the bills we have incurred. We don't get to pick and choose or decide that all of a sudden in the middle of everything we are going to cancel out a law that passed 3½ years ago.

This is so bad that the Republican candidate for Governor in Virginia has said: Stop it. Open the government and then debate health care.

The good news is Speaker BOEHNER could change his mind, bring up our bill in a few minutes' time. I know how it works. I spent 10 years in the House. It is real easy. They take the bill, go to the rules committee, talk about how they are going to allow one or two amendments or none, and they could then actually take it up, pass it, and send it to the President. What would that do? It would reopen the government tomorrow. It would keep the gov-

ernment open for 6 weeks while we debate the bigger issues, and then we should raise the debt ceiling so we can pay the bills we have already incurred.

It is so good to go home to your State and talk to people who are looking at us and thinking: Why would anyone want to close down this country because they don't like the fact that our families can get health insurance? They don't understand it. They are pondering it, and they are coming up with a tilt.

So, Speaker BOEHNER, you are a man; obviously, you have deep emotions. Your policies and that of your party are hurting people, hurting children, hurting families, hurting the economy, hurting the country, and all you have to do is bring up a clean continuing resolution that we passed over here, thanks to Republicans who allowed us to bring it up and pass it, and pass it over there. Let's get through this. Let's restore some faith that this country can function once again.

I thank the Presiding Officer. I yield the floor.

RETIREMENT OF DR. CLEM DOXEY

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, we had a discussion at the Prayer Breakfast 2 weeks ago about skin cancer, and we have shared a common experience in that we have confronted a melanoma at one time in our lives.

On this Friday night Dr. Clem Doxey of Marietta, GA, is retiring after 43 years as a leading dermatologist in the Southeast, chief of staff at Kennestone Hospital, and also a leading dermatologist around the United States of America. He is a real inspiration to me, a man who led me to help pass the TAN Act, along with Senator REID, JOHN MCCAIN, and others, who came together to bring about awareness for skin cancer, awareness for melanoma, and awareness for early detection; a citizen who contributed to us an idea that is now the law of the land in the United States of America and one I am sure will help save lives.

Clem is retiring after many years in Marietta, GA, and 43 years of practice. He has been a leader in Rotary, a leader in organizations in our community, a leader in our hospital, a friend to me, and my dermatologist.

He graduated from the Pensacola School of Medicine and went straight, as a flight surgeon, to Vietnam in the U.S. Marine Corps. He returned to be a physician and get his residency training at Tulane University Medical Center in New Orleans, LA, and then came to Marietta, GA, and founded Marietta Dermatology, now the leading dermatology practice in the State of Georgia. He will retire this Friday night.

I walk around on these two feet in part because Clem taught me early awareness, early identification, and the right practices to deal with skin can-

cer. I thank him for what he did for me and what he has done for countless patients over countless years in the great city of Marietta in the great county of Cobb.

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE AT FARMINGTON

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, on October 9, 1863, the Maine legislature signed a charter establishing the State's first public institution of higher education. I rise today to celebrate 150 years of remarkable accomplishments by the University of Maine at Farmington.

Also, 2013 marks another significant anniversary: this is the 16th consecutive year that the University of Maine at Farmington has been named to the U.S. News and World Report "Best College" list. That same publication has named UMF, as it is known throughout Maine, a "Best Value" school for its quality programs and affordable cost. In addition, the Institute of International Education and the U.S. State Department have recognized UMF as a "Top Producer" of Fulbright Scholars, with 11 faculty members having received that prestigious award.

Such recognition is but one measure of UMF's success. Another is the deep affection alumni and people throughout Maine have for this remarkable institution. In 2005, I had the privilege to serve as honorary chairman of UMF's campaign for a new Education Center to integrate technology with teaching and learning. The support from countless individuals, businesses, and organizations was overwhelming and enabled a small school of just 2,000 students to keep pace with the top colleges and universities in the country.

Responding to the needs of an ever-changing society is one of the richest traditions a college can have. The UMF tradition of service began in 1857, 6 years before the charter was granted, when a convention of teachers from Franklin County, in the mountains of western Maine, urged the establishment of an institution dedicated to educating educators for the benefit of their region and of the entire State. When the first class of 31 students matriculated at the new Farmington Normal School the summer after the charter, they did so in a setting that was described by a UMF historian as "rough, crude, and plenty humble." Over the years, UMF has become known for its outstanding liberal arts programs, which attract students not only from Maine but also from all over the nation.

Through the years, UMF has established another noble tradition—that of contributing to the entire region by adding to its cultural life, teaching in local classrooms, coaching youth athletics, and helping youngsters learn everything from swimming to foreign

languages. From the Health and Fitness Center to the Mantor Library, the doors of UMF are open to the community.

The combination of quality and value results in graduation and freshman retention rates that are significantly higher than the national averages for both public universities and private colleges. UMF's dedication to educating educators continues today, with graduates receiving the Maine Teacher of the Year Award in four of the last 6 years.

On that "rough, crude, and plenty humble" foundation laid 150 years ago, something magnificent has been built—an ongoing commitment to excellence and a spirit of service. On behalf of the people of Maine, I congratulate the University of Maine at Farmington for 150 years of outstanding contributions to our State.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ELIJAH EVANS

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor an exemplary young man who has persevered through life's challenges and devoted himself to bettering the lives of children in foster care. As a young boy, Elijah Evans was abused by his family, forcing him to be removed from their care and placed into a foster care program. Quickly winning the love of the nurse assigned to attend to his wounds, Elijah was adopted by Lynore Harding when he was 4 years old. But after being adopted, Elijah did not forget what it was like to live in foster care, or about the more than 400,000 children who are in foster care today.

In 2011, when Elijah was 13 years old, he began raising money to give Christmas gifts to foster children, knowing that the Christmas season often leaves these children with the longing feeling of not being a part of a family. In that year, he was able to raise \$5,000 and give Christmas gifts to 72 children. Since then, Elijah has established his own organization, No Use for Abuse, and has continued Christmas of Hope, which is going into its third year. He hopes that he will be able to expand his organization in the future to offer college scholarships to foster children after they graduate from high school.

As a father, I know that every life is incredibly precious. There is always more we can do to increase adoptions, but I'm deeply grateful for everything the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute and the Angels in Adoption do for children. Thankfully, with their help over 50,000 foster children were adopted into loving families last year and given a chance to make a positive difference like Elijah has. Elijah's actions are an extraordinary example of what can be achieved through

love and respect for all mankind and a passionate desire to serve others.

Elijah's noble and thoughtful efforts have not gone unnoticed. Aside from positively affecting the lives of so many foster children, Elijah will be recognized for his service by the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute at its annual Angels in Adoption awards gala on October 9, 2013. This award honors groups and individuals who have made extraordinary contributions on behalf of children still in need of families, and honorees include such individuals as First Lady Laura Bush, Sean and Leigh Anne Tuohy, and Muhammad Ali.

Lastly, I would like to express my appreciation to Lynore Harding for welcoming Elijah to be a part of her loving family and to offer my sincere congratulations and appreciation to Elijah for remembering the experience of being a foster child and for being a positive role model for the children who have not yet been as fortunate.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY) announced that on today, October 7, 2013, he had signed the following enrolled bill, previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 3095. An act to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rule-making proceeding, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill and joint resolutions were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3223. An act to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees.

H.J. Res. 75. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emer-

gency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CARPER for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Beth F. Cobert, of California, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1568. A bill to make technical corrections to the Pay Our Military Act to include midshipmen at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, who are appointed as midshipmen in the Navy Reserve; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 539

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes and diabetes.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 862, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1300, a bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to provide for the conduct of stewardship end result contracting projects.

S. 1332

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms.

MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1413

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1413, a bill to exempt from sequestration certain fees of the Food and Drug Administration.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public, that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, October 8, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the business meeting is to consider the nominations of Mr. Michael L. Connor to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior, and Dr. Elizabeth M. Robinson to be Under Secretary of Energy.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by email to Abigail_Campbell@energy.senate.gov. For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224-7571 or Abigail Campbell at (202) 224-4905.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 7, 2013 at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Social Security Disability Benefits: Did a Group of Judges, Doctors and Lawyers Abuse Programs for the Country's Most Vulnerable?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 7, 2013, at 5:50 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT REFERRAL

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as if in executive session, the nomination of Arun Madhavan Kumar, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service, received in the Senate on October 7, 2013, be jointly referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 3223, H.J. RES. 75, AND H.J. RES. 85

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I understand there are three measures at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for a second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3223) to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children for fiscal year 2014, and other purposes.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 85) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mrs. BOXER. I object to any further proceedings with respect to these measures en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bills will be placed on the calendar under rule XIV.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2013

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, October 8, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only until 12:30 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10

minutes each; and that the Senate recess from 12:30 until 2:15 to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:13 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 8, 2013, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

KELLY R. WELSH, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, VICE CAMERON F. KERRY.

ARUN MADHAVAN KUMAR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE, VICE SURESH KUMAR, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ARNOLD A. CHACON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE, VICE LINDA THOMAS-GREENFIELD, RESIGNED.

DANIEL BENNETT SMITH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (INTELLIGENCE AND RESEARCH), VICE PHILIP S. GOLDBERG.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

HELEN TIERNEY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN R. LANZA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBERT F. PLECKOWSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MILTON L. SHIPMAN
ROBERT W. STEWART

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOHN C. ANDERSON
SCOTT K. BENNER
KENNETH M. BUCK
SAMUEL R. COOK
JOHN H. DAVENPORT
ROBERT S. DAVIDSON
DAVID W. DINENNA
KRISTEN E. DIXON
KELLEY L. DONHAM
SAMUEL F. DRIVER
PAUL S. DRURY
RAYMOND M. DUNNING II
CHRISTOPHER J. ELLIS
TONEY E. FILOSTRAT
MATTHEW D. FISHER
JAMES H. FITZGERALD
ERIC P. FLOWERS
WILFREDO GARCIA
JAMES J. GROARK
GEORGE J. HANHAUSER IV
LARRY D. HEARN
KIM J. HODGES
NELSON IRIZARRY
GEORGE D. JOHNSON
MARTIN F. KLEIN

CATHERINE L. LASSITER
CARL E. LINK, JR.
ALVARO W. LOFSTROM
EARL MACK III
GARY J. MANN
SEAN P. McDONALD
DELWYN S. MERKERSON
EUGENE L. MONTAGUE
TAMARA L. MORRIS
ISOLDE K. OPPHILE
KURT D. OROURKE
REGAL L. PERRY
TODD M. PETERSON
CHERYL D. PHILLIPS
DAVID J. PINTER
ELIZABETH W. PREKKER
RANDY K. RIEDY
ERIC ROBINSON
KEVIN M. SANDERS
WILLIAM S. SCHAPER
GREGORY A. SCHEIDHAUER
SCOTT R. SHRADER
DOUGLAS D. SMITH
MICHAEL E. STEWART
MARK D. STIMER
ERIC P. TAUCH
KEVIN J. VINK
STEPHEN VROOMAN
KATTIRIA M. WALKER
ALEXIS M. WELLS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND
3064:

To be colonel

JAMES L. BRISSON, JR.
MARK E. FAIRBROTHER
KEITH N. GOODE
WILLIAM GREEN, JR.
SCOTT A. HAMMOND
JEFFREY D. HAWKINS
SCOTT F. JONES
ROBERT P. LASLEY
TIMOTHY S. MALLARD
JAMES PALMER, JR.
MARK A. PENFOLD
ROBERT E. PHILLIPS, SR.
MARK E. THOMPSON
DAVID A. VANDERJAGT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JAMES D. BROWN
ERIK W. FEIG
JAMES D. GRAY
JAMES J. KRISCHE
LESLIE D. MALONEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF
THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO
THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

LAURENCE J. BAZER
RUSSEL L. BETTS
DAVID D. COLDREN
DANIEL H. DENT
ROBERT J. DESOUSA
EDDIE M. FRIZELL
JORGE H. GALOFFINLOPEZ
MICHAEL J. GILLET
STEPHANIE K. HORVATH
TODD H. HUBBARD
NATHAN F. LORD
KENNETH J. MARKWELL
KEVIN D. MCMAHAN
DAVID J. MIKOLATTIES
STEPHANIE A. PURGERSON
COLLIN D. ROSE
COREY L. SEATS
RANDY R. SIKOWSKI
JOHN E. TRUNZO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

BRIAN M. ADELSON
DON C. AHSHAPANEK, JR.
CALVIN AMOS
TODD M. ANDERSON
LISA T. ANGLESON
PETER A. ARCANO
RICHARD P. ATCHISON
TERRY A. AYERS
BETTY J. BANKS
KEVIN D. BANTA
MATTHEW C. BECKMANN
KRIS A. BELANGER
CHRISTOPHER M. BENTCH
ROBERT L. BERRY
CRAIG B. BEST
JOHN A. BIVONA
THERESE J. BLAKE
BRADLY M. BOGANOWSKI
RUSSELL J. BONACCORSO, JR.
ERIC D. BOWERS

KIMBERLY R. BOYD
JEFFREY A. BREWSTER
KENNETH B. BROWN
ERIC B. BRYSON
MICHAEL L. BUTLER
THOMAS J. BYANSKI
DENISE M. CALISE
JOHN F. CAMPBELL, JR.
ROBERT L. CAPECE
THOMAS A. CARLSON, JR.
STEPHEN M. CARROLL
BRIAN T. CASHMAN
ROBERT J. CENTENO
JOHN R. CICCARELLI
KEVIN E. CLARK
WILLIAM J. CLARK
KIRK M. CLAUNCH
JOHN J. COLLINS
ROBERT S. COOLEY, JR.
CHARLES W. CROWDER
LUIS CRUZ
STEPHEN F. DALE
TRACY L. DAWKINS
GARY W. DETTLING
JORGE I. DIAZ
MATTHEW R. DOSMANN
ERIN M. DOWD
KATRINA K. DOWIS
THOMAS J. DOWNEY
DENNIS R. DUFFY
THOMAS A. DUNCAN
PETER J. DUSICK
PETER DYKMAN
DOUGLAS J. EISENSCHENK
DANIEL L. ELLIS, JR.
WILLIAM E. ELLISON
STEVEN K. ESPLIN
CHERYN L. FASANO
MICHAEL G. FLORU
SANDRA L. FORREST
ANGELA D. FORTUNE
STEPHAN J. FRANK
BRYAN S. FRANKLIN
CLARK D. FREDERICK
MICHELE B. FRIEDRICH
JOHN G. GANINO
MICHAEL F. GARCIA
NORA M. GARONO
STACY L. GARRITY
KATY M. GARZABAIR
MARK E. GIARDINA
GLENN A. GIBBS
STEPHEN E. GIBSON
STEVEN M. GRADY
DONALD G. GREENWOOD
ROBERT A. GRIERSON
RICHARD G. GULLEY
JAMES D. HAGAN
JOHN R. M. HAHN
ROBYN R. HAMASAKI
LISA A. HARBACH
JOEL C. HARDIN
JOHN S. HARRIS
JEAN E. HENDERSON
ROBERT J. HENDERSON
SUSAN E. HENDERSON
MICHAEL HENRY
JON K. HOLLAND
LAWANDA J. HOLLIMAN
JAMES G. HOLLINGSWORTH
DAVID M. HOLLIS
GEORGE E. HOOVER
JOHN K. HOFF
JEFFREY A. HOPKINS
MICHAEL J. HOWARD
SHELIA R. HOWELL
HOPE M. HUBBARD
STEPHEN IACOVELLI
JIMMY IBANEZ
GARRETT L. IDE
JOHN C. JACOBI
ALEXANDER JAROTZKY
ISAAC JOHNSON, JR.
CHARLES A. JONES
DOUGLAS E. JONES
JOHN F. K. JONES
DONALD L. JOYNER
DAVID J. JUNGQUIST
MICHAEL J. JUNOD
RONALD J. KASTELEIN
ALAN D. KATZ
MATTHEW A. KEUREJIAN
KENNETH D. KIRK
STEPHEN E. KREBS
CHRISTOPHER R. KUDUK
RAYMOND J. LAGEMANN, JR.
RUSSELL M. LARAWAY
ERIC J. LARSON
DAVID E. LEE
LAWRENCE D. LEON
JEFFREY H. LEROY
SARAH E. LETTSSMITH
STEPHANIE A. LEWIS
JOHN K. LIM
ROBERT K. LIPUT II
ERNEST LITYNSKI
EARNESTRHEINOLD R. LLOYD
JEFFERY E. LONG
DEWEY S. LOWERY, JR.
WYATT A. LOWERY
JOSE LUCENA
WILLIAM F. LYONS, JR.

ERNEST J. MALDONADO
PATRICIA A. MANCE
MARK W. MARTIN
TIMOTHY F. MCCONVERY
JESSE D. MCCURLEY
ELAINE K. MCGARRY
MICHAEL J. MCINERNEY
CHARLES J. MCCLAUGHLIN IV
RAFAEL MEDINAVAZQUEZ
KEVIN F. MEISLER
EDWARD H. MERRIGAN, JR.
MASAYO M. MESLER
MICHAEL H. MIDKIFF
KRISTO S. MIETTINEN
BRIAN E. MILLER
ERIC MILLER, JR.
WARREN L. MILLER
WILLIAM E. MILLER
JAMES C. MITCHELL
BYRON G. MOBLEY
WILLIAM D. MONTGOMERY
STEPHEN S. MORRIS
NORMAN D. NELSON
RANDALL D. NEWTON
DAVID L. NICHOLS
THOMAS A. NILES
RICHARD NORL, JR.
WILLIAM P. OBYRNE
DINAH F. OLAGBEGI
HEBER OLGUIN
RICHARD D. PANZARELLA
REINALDO PARAVISINI
GREGORY L. PARKER
BRIAN L. PATTERSON
JOHN D. PATTERSON
PHILLIP K. PATTERSON
FRANK W. PECJAK, JR.
MARISA K. PELOQUIN
WILLIAM PELT
EDGAR L. PEREZ
JOHN M. PERRY
ERIC R. PERRYMAN
LANCE S. PETERSON
CURTIS PHELPS
BRUCE PROTESTO
JAY M. PULLIAM
CARL D. RAMSEY
KEITH W. RAMSEY
TONY M. RATLIFF
TANYA M. RAWLINS
SCOTT A. REED
TODD L. RESSEL
DARWIN F. RICE
DALE A. RIDEN
JEFFERY P. RISNER
WILLIAM A. ROBERTSON
TERRY J. ROBEY
MARTHA D. ROBINS
MICHAEL A. RODRIGUEZ
MICHAEL E. ROERK
JOHN F. ROSNOW
CURTIS A. SAUBERAN
BRENDEN M. SCHERR
MITCHELL A. SCHMIDTKE
MICHAEL J. SEGUIN
SEAN E. SEIBERT
BRENT R. SELNAU
JAMES K. SHEARER
NATHANIEL SHROPSHIRE, JR.
ROBERT F. SILE
JONATHAN R. SIMMONS
TIMOTHY L. SIMPSON
JOHN C. SMALL, JR.
BRUCE M. SMITH
JOEL L. SOENKSEN
LOREN P. SOMMERFIELD
STEIN L. SORENSON
GARY R. SPEAR
KARL V. STAHLERCKER
JOHN N. STIBBARD
RODNEY D. STOVALL
JOSEF W. SUJET
BRADLEY J. SUMMERS
CYNTHIA K. SUMMERS
DAVID N. TATE
DANIEL L. TAYLOR
HERMAN E. TERMEER
LESLIE R. THOMASON
JONATHAN D. THOMPSON
THOMAS P. THOMPSON
TIMOTHY L. THRASHER
HARRY R. TIDESWELL
CHARLES E. TIPTON
REDUS V. TITTLE
JIMMEY W. TODD, JR.
MARCI D. TOLER
DERRICK E. TOMPKINS
STEPHEN TORRES
JANET J. TSAO
PAUL K. TSATSOS
JOSEPH S. TURLINGTON
ANDREW UDZIELAK
DAVID J. UYEMATSO
KENNETH J. VALCOURT
EMILIO VARGAS II
CHRISTOPHER H. VARHOLA
WILLIAM A. VAUGHN
JOHN G. VERNICK
MITCHELL R. WAITE
GEORGE B. WALSH
JANICE M. WALTMAN
ANGELA M. WANNAMAKER

October 7, 2013

MATTHEW S. WARNE
GAYLENE K. WEBER
KEVIN R. WILEY
ANTHONY L. WILKERSON
MARTHA S. WILKINS
JAMES O. WILLIAMS
AARON C. WILSON
WILLIAM WILSON II
MICHELLE M. WOOD
SIDNEY C. WRIGHT
DAVID A. YASENCHOCK
BRIAN G. YOUNG

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 159, Pt. 11

15335

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

SENNAY M. STEFANOS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER IN THE GRADE INDICATED
IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C.,
SECTIONS 531 AND 5582:

To be lieutenant commander

JESSICA Y. LIN

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by
the Senate October 7, 2013:

THE JUDICIARY

COLIN STIRLING BRUCE, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED
STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT
OF ILLINOIS.

SARA LEE ELLIS, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES
DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLI-
NOIS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, October 7, 2013

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

October 7, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

WHY WE FIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the "Band of Brothers" episode, "Why We Fight," reminds me of an experience my father, Jack Brooks, shared with me. At age 23, dad was a combat engineer in General Patton's army. Near war's end, dad was ordered to help at a German concentration camp. Dad and his fellow soldiers saw human bodies decomposing and stacked like cordwood, 5- and 6-feet high, with lime sprinkled on them to retard the spread of disease. Those concentration camps helped my dad, and America, understand why we fought in Europe.

Today, Washington is in an epic political battle that will affect America's future for decades and centuries to come. Some see a fight between Republicans and Democrats. I see a fight between those who are financially responsible and those who are not, between those who have the understanding and backbone needed to prevent an American bankruptcy and those who do not.

Why do I fight? I fight for America's children and grandchildren. I fight for America's future.

President Obama's five deficits have averaged \$1 trillion per year, the worst in history. America soon will blow through the \$17 trillion debt mark, the worst in history.

Mr. Speaker, it is challenging to grasp trillion-dollar deficits and a \$17 trillion debt. Let me simplify. In each of the last 5 years, the Federal Government borrowed 20 to 30 percent of its operational costs. How many American families or businesses could avoid bankruptcy if, year after year, 20 to 30 percent of what they spent was borrowed money? Not many, and not for long.

Economic principles don't care if you are a family, a business, or a country. If you borrow more than you can pay back, you go bankrupt. America has been warned of the consequences of financial irresponsibility. Greece is further down the debt path than America. Greece's unemployment rate is 27 percent, worse than any year in America's Great Depression.

Earlier this year, Cyprus confiscated as much as 60 percent of their citizens' savings and checking accounts. The Detroit and Stockton municipal bankruptcies risk retirees losing their pensions.

President Obama's former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Michael Mullen, warned Congress that America's greatest national security threat is not Iran, not al Qaeda, not China, not Russia; it is our debt. Admiral Mullen is prophetic. In recent history, no enemy has done as much damage to America's military and national security as have debt and sequestration.

President Obama's Comptroller General, Gene Dodaro, warned Congress and the White House earlier this year that America's deficits and debt are unsustainable, which brings us to today's fight involving a government shutdown, debt ceilings, and socialized medicine. No question, a government shutdown hampers the economy. Between 1976 and 1995, there were 17 government shutdowns. Yet, America's economy boomed in the 1980s and 1990s. Shutdowns can be overcome.

No question, not raising the debt ceiling poses economic risk. No one knows for sure how much risk, because America has never crossed this threshold before. Whatever it is, it can be overcome.

Knowing these risks, why do I fight over funding bills, the debt ceiling, and socialized medicine? Because too many Washington politicians pander to the

next election's voters without caring one whit about America's future—because appropriations bills, continuing resolutions, the debt ceiling, and the like are the only leverage I have to cajole financially irresponsible Washington politicians into doing what must be done to prevent an American bankruptcy.

It is because, as bad as government shutdown and debt ceiling risks may be, they are relatively inconsequential compared to the economic devastation resulting from an American bankruptcy. Think about the chaos and hardship that will ensue if America has no national defense, no FBI, CIA, or DEA, no Social Security, Medicaid, or Medicare, no NASA, no justice system because an American bankruptcy has deprived us of the money needed to pay for them.

Why do I fight? I fight to minimize the risk of America suffering a debilitating bankruptcy that can destroy the America it took our ancestors centuries to build.

Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to use any tools I can to win that fight, because this is one fight America cannot afford to lose. That is why I fight.

LET US VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this will be a short 5-minute, indeed a short 1-minute, because it all can be said in a very few words.

Yesterday, the Speaker said "there are not enough votes in the House to pass" a clean bill to fund the government and end the shutdown.

There is one clear way to find out, Mr. Speaker: let us vote on the floor of the House.

On Saturday, 195 of us Democrats sent a letter to the Speaker, saying we are willing to vote "yes." And the reports are also 22 Republicans at least are ready to vote "yes." That's a majority. There are enough votes to end the shutdown.

And Mr. Speaker, if you don't believe it, let us vote.

HEALTH CARE EXCHANGES WORKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today marks day 7 since the rollout of the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

health care exchanges under the Affordable Care Act. Listening to the hysterical rhetoric from the majority party in the House, you would think that America's basic freedoms and economy would be in ruins after day 7. And in fact, there have been some problems in terms of some of the accessing through the database that was set up.

Part of the problem was the fact that millions of Americans, far more than anyone expected, even the most ardent supporters of the law, have swamped the system, which, if you think about it, I think speaks volumes about the fact that there is a tremendous need out there for this affordable care—which, again, the law I think made an historic step in terms of advancing it.

I am proud of the fact that coming from the State of Connecticut, which, again, is one of the States that did not stonewall the legislation, Governor Malloy moved forward as quickly as possible and set up a system that was actually ready last week to deal with the onslaught of emails and calls into the call centers. As of Friday, they tallied over 100,000 contacts that came into the system. Again, they enrolled actually over a thousand people even though, again, coverage doesn't even begin until January.

So for a lot of people, again, the need to enroll right away doesn't exist right now because you have to actually write a check if you are going to enroll this early. But nonetheless, still, a thousand people have already signed up. And as I said, 100,000 were able to contact the system and interacted with it with little or no problem.

First of all, I would just like to again congratulate Lieutenant Governor Nancy Wyman, who has been sort of shepherding and quarterbacking this process over the last few months or so, again, to make sure that Connecticut's system was ready.

And I wanted to share, again, a couple of the stories of individuals who contacted the Connecticut Health Exchange over the last week or so to describe their experiences. There was 48-year-old Elly Baros, who said that she was pleased to be one step closer to enrolling in health insurance. The New Britain woman, who spent the entire afternoon at the health center going through her options, has been without coverage for a year and a half due to a layoff.

She said that she has been holding her breath, thanking God every day "I don't get sick or get into a car accident." She was excited to learn that she could get good individual coverage for about \$70 to \$200 a month or possibly even qualify for expanded Medicaid coverage.

I had a conversation and an email with a woman from Norwich, who is a 50-year-old, self-employed individual, who said to me:

I currently pay \$980 a month for coverage for myself. I have a rare preexisting condi-

tion known as trigeminal neuralgia, which is treated by medication in four annual visits to my doctor. For this, I am considered a "heavy utilizer." My condition interferes with my ability to earn.

Right now, what she is paying is on par with her mortgage payment.

After speaking with my insurance agent, I found out that my premiums under the Affordable Care Act will be cut to \$440 a month.

When I spoke to her on the phone the other day, she said when her agent called her and gave her this news she did a happy dance in her office, knowing that her health insurance premiums were going to be cut in half. Again, a 50-year-old, working individual who is now paying \$980 a month is seeing her health insurance bill cut in half because of the health care exchange.

She is one of these people who has contacted the system, but she hasn't enrolled yet, but she will. Believe me. She cannot believe that we are at a point right now where there is a concerted, intentional effort to shut the government down in an effort to deny her—somebody who, again, has a pre-existing condition—access to a smarter, more rational marketplace than the one that exists today.

The stories go on and on.

I have a letter from an individual who actually wrote to The New York Times, talking about the fact that on day 1 there were reports about how terrible the system is. She said:

I tried to sign up. I had absolutely no difficulty getting all the answers I needed and all the forms to fill out on the very first try. The entire process was simple, direct, and easy to follow. Please don't forget all of us who, while maybe not newsworthy, are a large part of the equation.

Her name is Hu Lindsay from Norwalk, Connecticut.

So, again, the folks at the health care exchange who have been planning and preparing for months have demonstrated that that demand can be met if you have the right planning in place and that, when people actually have a chance to get past all the nonsense that is thrown around out there about the end of American freedom and actually see that they can buy private health insurance plans—again, Connecticut offers three private health insurance plans, Anthem Blue Cross, ConnectiCare, and Healthy Connecticut—the system will work. That's why we must keep this government open and not buckle to the folks who want to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act.

SHUTDOWN'S IMPACT IN MY DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Good morning. I thought it was important to come as

soon as I arrived after 24 hours in my district. After voting to restore the payment compensation to our Federal employees—some 800,000-plus who are now laid off, which means that Americans are not receiving vital services—I wanted to go home for a moment to be able to interact with my constituents.

In that period of time, I met doctors; I met carpenters and millwrights; I spoke to those in the arts community. I commemorated the 70th anniversary of Catholic Charities at a mass at Sacred Heart Cathedral. I listened to our cardinal talk with great faith, the cardinal of our community in the Houston-Galveston Diocese, and the cardinal that is named by the previous Pope, who now resides in our community, who gave us the words the just live by faith.

I indicated that I would come back to let this body know that the people who are being affected are not Republicans or Democrats or Green Party or Independents, or any other definition other than Americans. And I was overwhelmed by those who came up to me and indicated—from airline pilots—that negotiation and interaction is important, but don't break on the issue of the Affordable Care Act and getting this government open.

They understand it. These are people who are being impacted, like the workers today of an aircraft company in Connecticut that is laying off 2,000 people, the Pentagon contractor that will soon be laying off thousands of people, the tax deadline for those who haven't filed coming up on October 15, needing IRS workers to help them with issues that they have in terms of filing their tax forms, or even the Federal courts, which will be assessing on October 15 whether or not they can keep their doors open for the moving of justice in this Nation.

So I think it is extremely important that whatever is tying you up, whatever is keeping you from looking at the common good—and I would offer to say to the American people everyone knows that we are not Greece. We wish the best for the people of Greece. But America is the richest country in the world, \$4 trillion in economy, and a country that is looked to from all around the world.

Our economy is bigger than the European Union. That means countries like Spain, Germany, France, England, all those members who as well are our allies, but look to America—how shameful it is for someone to be held, and if you will, tied up by their own individual personal interests.

One would ask if the Founding Fathers, as imperfect as America was as she began, had come from the 13 Colonies and various districts, and probably interests, and had held to those specialized interests, would we have created a Nation that started out by saying we organize to create a more perfect Union? Albeit that there were

groups of populations that did not have dignity and justice and citizenship at that time, something that I could look back at in bitterness, but I do not, because this is the greatest Nation in the world. But we are not showing ourselves that way.

It is not the truth to suggest that there are not enough voters, Members of Congress, that would vote right now today to open this government. It is something called a continuing resolution, but it's a bill that you put on the floor that has been passed already by Republicans and Democrats in the United States Senate.

This is not an idea of anyone over another person. Republican and Democratic Senators have already voted for this clean bill that we could vote on today. We have martial law. What that means—and my colleagues know what it means—is that you can put a bill on in just minutes.

So, rather than deciding amongst your children which ones to feed, which is the approach that my Republican friends in leadership are doing—squeezing out one little skinny bill versus another, squeezing out bills that leave out the FAA inspectors, leaving out ICE that deals with immigration, leaving out those who are dealing with young people who are undocumented, leaving out those who are helping young couples who want to get a home with mortgage processing. Who knows whose homes are going to be impacted by the heavy rains that are up and down the east coast who may need Federal assistance? All of that is being dumbed down—lost—because we have not opened the government.

I come today, Mr. Speaker, to ask all of us to turn to our American card, and hold up the American card—I am an American—and vote to open this government right now.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Andrew Walton, Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God of light and life, our prayer today is simple.

May the eternal Spirit that embraces all good deliver us from fear.

May the hearts, minds, and souls of the women and men of this House of Representatives elected to serve the people be released from fear into freedom.

In freedom, may they discover and rediscover what is already deep within themselves as humans created in divine image.

May every conversation and deliberation of this day and days to follow be filled with compassion for the millions of people whose lives and livelihoods are affected by these decisions, courage to compromise when necessary to sustain and provide for the well-being of all people, humility to let go of the ideological convictions when those convictions hinder the common good, and clear vision to see beyond narrow agendas toward a Nation filled with promise to be a beacon of light for all people.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BURGESS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

TWO WEEKS, NO NEGOTIATIONS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago Friday, the President called Speaker BOEHNER out of the blue to announce he would not negotiate to avoid a shutdown. Since then, the President has made no plans to negotiate and has hosted one White House meeting to restate his position to not negotiate.

Clearly, this confirms the American people should look at the actions of all officials, not just words. Sadly, the President says he "has bent over backwards to work with the Republicans," but this is not accurate. This continues his actions different from his words. In February 2009, the President announced the deficit was unsustainable, but then he tripled it.

House Republicans voted four times to avoid a shutdown. House Republicans were sincere in their actions and now vote repeatedly to save jobs and help families.

It is my hope there will be good-faith negotiations and we can come together to avoid the upcoming unsustainable fiscal crisis by ending the shutdown and addressing the debt limit.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

IT IS NOT TIME TO FIGHT

(Ms. BONAMICI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, today is day 7 of an unnecessary and harmful government shutdown that is hurting millions of Americans. Speaker BOEHNER called it an "epic battle."

Hundreds of thousands are out of work, Federal contractors aren't getting paid, small businesses aren't getting loans, home purchases are on hold, nutrition programs are at risk, and Speaker BOEHNER has said, "It is time for us to stand and fight."

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, this is the U.S. House of Representatives; it is not a battlefield. It is not time for us to fight; it is time for us to vote. Our constituents sent us here to get things done, to work together.

It is not time to fight; it is time to reopen the Federal Government. It is not time to fight; it is time to raise the debt ceiling and pay our bills. It is not time to fight; it is time to get the budget conference committee to work, something we have been asking for for months.

We can do it today, Mr. Speaker. It is not time to fight; it is time to vote. It is not a surrender; it is a solution. It is not time to fight; it is time to vote.

THE PRESIDENT'S REFUSAL TO NEGOTIATE IS HURTING OUR ECONOMY AND PUTTING OUR COUNTRY AT RISK

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues over the last 10 days have been through quite a bit. We sent four bills to the United States Senate to keep our government open and to protect the American people from the harmful effects of ObamaCare. Each of these requests was denied by the United States Senate.

After the fourth effort, we asked to go to conference and sit down and resolve our differences to keep the government open and to provide fairness to the American people under ObamaCare. The Senate Democrats once again said no.

The President had us all down to the White House last week, only to remind me that he was not going to negotiate over keeping the government open or over the looming need to increase the debt limit.

The President's refusal to negotiate is hurting our economy and putting our country at risk.

This morning, a senior White House official said that the President would rather default than to sit down and negotiate. Really? I am going to say this again: a senior White House staffer this morning said that the President would rather default on our debt than sit down and negotiate.

Now, the American people expect when their leaders have differences and we are in a time of crisis that we will sit down and at least have a conversation. Really, Mr. President, it is time to have that conversation before our economy is put further at risk.

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, today, as Congress focuses on the government shutdown, our Nation quietly marks the close of our 12th year at war in Afghanistan.

While the country talks about a Federal Government shutdown and the divisive partisan politics that are standing in the way of progress, the harsh reality and hell that is war seem a distant memory for most. Meanwhile, we have over 54,000 troops serving in Afghanistan today. To all of our troops, thank you for your service and the sacrifices that you and your families have endured.

Two thousand one hundred and forty-three U.S. servicemen have been killed in Afghanistan to date, leaving behind families who will never again feel their warm embrace. Let us honor those who have served and who continue to put their lives on the line and do our best to bring them home. Let us remember their great sacrifices and set aside the pettiness in our own lives that divides us, and let us remember their great service and ask ourselves constantly how best can we be of service.

A PREVENTABLE TRAIN WRECK: WHITE HOUSE BUILT SLOPPY IT ARCHITECTURE

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the administration finally began to acknowledge what many have been saying for some time: healthcare.gov is having major problems.

The administration spent most of last week boasting about the high number of visitors to the Federal site, but it conveniently left out a very important statistic: how many people actually were able to purchase insurance.

Unlike the initial claims that the sites were crashing because demand was so high, it is clear now that the exchanges were failing because they appear to have major structural flaws. According to technicians and people at The Wall Street Journal, the site appears to be built on a "sloppy software foundation."

To make matters worse, even the information the Web site collected may be useless thanks to a security problem that corrupted a lot of the data. According to one estimate, 99 percent of the applications submitted may be facing data problems that will stop these applications.

Members of the administration need to come to the Energy and Commerce Committee and start telling us the truth about this information architecture. Taxpayers have spent money, a lot of money, to build these sites. If they have been sold a pig in a poke, they need to know.

PAY OUR MILITARY ACT

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, my office continues to be flooded with calls from North Carolinians who are frustrated with the government shutdown. The House and Senate clearly disagree on how to proceed, but one thing we can all agree on is supporting our men and women in the military.

Last Monday, Congress passed, and President Obama signed, the Pay Our Military Act. This bill ensures that our servicemen and -women and their civilian counterparts are paid during the shutdown.

Unfortunately, the administration delayed using this authority to pay all members of the military and DOD civilians, meaning many civilian workers who should be working were furloughed.

Our servicemen and -women deserve our deepest respect and gratitude. These men and women bravely serve their country and their paychecks should not be jeopardized. After pressure from the House, the administration quit delaying the implementation of this law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the administration to also adopt the other common-sense funding bills passed by the House last week. Americans want to get back to work and don't want to see the government play politics with their paycheck.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1745

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 77) making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

H.J. RES. 77

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the heading "Department of Health and Human Services—Food and Drug Administration".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of the Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Food and Drug Safety Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Food and Drug Administration Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 77, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 77, which would continue the funding for the Food and Drug Administration. I think everyone here in the House agrees that funding for the FDA is necessary to this critical operation in order to support our Nation's public health and the millions of jobs associated with FDA activities. Most Members of this body may not realize it, but FDA-regulated industries account for almost 25 percent of the consumer spending in the United States of America.

Fiscal year 2013 agency appropriation included total funding of \$4.2 billion; \$2.5 billion came from discretionary funds and \$1.7 billion from user fees. Of greatest importance is the need to ensure that our constituents continue to consume safe foods and use safe and effective drugs and medical devices. Despite

reduced funding levels overall for FY 2013, we were able to provide a strategic increase of \$12.5 million for food safety activities and \$10 million for food and drug safety inspections in China. These funding increases will continue under a CR.

In addition to the funds appropriated for the FDA, this resolution that we are debating this afternoon would allow FDA to collect and spend drug and medical product user fees. Of course, the fees are charged to the industry to support such lifesaving activities for the review and approval of new and generic drugs as well as medical devices.

This House has already passed a resolution to fund the public health activities at the NIH, and it awaits the Senate's approval. Also, USDA meat and poultry inspectors were deemed critical to our Nation's food supply and have stayed on duty during this temporary delay in funding. It is now time for this body to continue funding one more critical component of our public health infrastructure.

The Food and Drug Administration touches every Member of this House, either directly or indirectly, and we need the entire Agency back at work. We need to also limit any damage to the millions of jobs impacted by FDA's work in the food and bioscience industries.

Now is the chance for my colleagues here in the House to join me in keeping this important program fully operational. I would ask that my colleagues support this resolution that we're debating this afternoon. It will ensure that all critical elements of our Nation's food and drug supply will be protected.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleague and chair, Mr. ADERHOLT, just said that this bill is necessary because funding for the FDA is necessary. He's absolutely right, but this bill doesn't do all that. You cannot just fund one component of government and not have the rest of government. FDA is the Food and Drug Administration. It relies heavily on the Centers for Disease Control. You do nothing to fund the Centers for Disease Control. So as just one critical component of the Federal Government, it isn't the Federal Government, and that's what has been shut down, and so I adamantly oppose this legislation.

We have been here a number of days now with the government shut down because people are trying to use the appropriations process, which is, as every schoolchild knows, the process where the President asks and then the Congress disposes, and we use the Appropriations Committee to dispose; that is, we make the decisions on how much is going to be spent by each agency.

The President came to Congress asking for \$1.2 trillion in expenditures.

The Republicans rejected that in their budget and came up with a much less budgeted number of \$967 billion. This bill on the floor, the big bill, has the Democrats agreeing to \$986 billion. That's a \$200 billion reduction. That's just amazing. I don't think this has ever been done before where that big of a cut has been made to the Federal Government, and yet we can't pass it.

The Senate has passed it because, as everyone knows, it's a bicameral process, and whatever the President signs has to be passed by both Houses. The Senate has passed over here a clean bill, as we say, which means without all kinds of conditionality. That would go to the President if this House had voted for it. It could go forward tonight. This whole thing—this charade of shutting down government—could be over tonight. All we would have to do is pass what the Senate sent over.

But no, here we go again. Now we're going to take it in piecemeal fashion. Tonight, we bring up the FDA; it's a wonderful organization. I want to point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that, since I've been here, in 20 years, we've passed 111 CRs—enacted. In fact, under President Bush, we passed 56. And I'm sure every one of the Republicans passed those; 56, without conditionality. Democrats didn't try to bring down the House. And even under President Obama, so far, we've passed 19 CRs. So why can't we do that now? Why can't we do what we've been doing, this House has been doing for decades, passing a CR to keep government open?

It's certainly not the responsible thing for our committee, and we're very proud of our committee, but a CR is giving up because we haven't passed the appropriation bills that are really the mechanics of how we ought to be spending money. In fact, my distinguished colleague, Mr. ADERHOLT, has, 94 times, voted for a CR. So I cannot support this piecemeal specialty of the day, just voting for one segment of the Federal Government and ignoring all the rest.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this bill makes sure that, even during this shutdown, the Food and Drug Administration's critical safeguards remain in place to protect our food and drug supply. The health of our people should not be jeopardized. This legislation provides funding for the FDA at the current post-sequestration annual rate of \$2.3 billion. This will provide funding to maintain protections for food, drugs, and medical devices, and allow the FDA to collect and spend user fees.

The length of this authority will last until December 15 or until we enact

year-long appropriations that address the funding of the Federal Government in full.

As with each of the other individual bills we have considered this week, the language in H.J. Res. 77 is nearly identical to what was included in my clean continuing resolution filed back in September. This bill moves us a step closer to the finish line, but we've got to remember that we can get there much faster if we find a way to fund the entire Federal Government. This will require cooperation and conversation from both the Senate and the House.

This will be the ninth bill the House has sent to the Senate to reopen the Federal Government. The ninth bill, Mr. Speaker. The House has voted to provide nearly one-third of the funding to reopen the government; but, unfortunately, the Senate won't even consider these bills, and so the government is still shut down. Our colleagues in the Senate say they want a clean CR, but when we've sent them these bills—pieces of a clean CR with clean funding mechanisms, nonetheless—they won't even bring them up for a vote.

This is not my first choice of how to fund the Federal Government. My preference would be to have passed full-year appropriations bills for all the government before September 30. The House made great strides toward that goal with our committee approving nearly all of our annual bills and with the full House passing four of them, yet the Senate would not even pass a single bill off the floor of the Senate. But I still hope and believe that we can find a path forward. It will require both parties, both bodies, to find ways we can work together to end this shutdown.

As we work toward that end, we can pass this bill to ensure that nearly all of the Federal Government's food safety activities are funded during the shutdown. I urge support of the bill.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member on the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the reckless Republican shutdown. I wish my colleagues had shown this same level of concern for the Food and Drug Administration over the last 3 years. Since Democrats passed the landmark Food Safety and Modernization Act, Republicans have done nothing but stand in the way of its implementation by underfunding the critical needs in the FDA bill.

This bill is nothing more than a Republican ploy, and the claim that Democrats are not negotiating is absolutely false. House Republicans wrote a bill and sent it to the Senate. The Senate adopted the most important part of it, the funding level, and the President

agreed to sign it even though the Democrats want greater investment to support economic growth. The only thing Democrats say "no" to are irresponsible efforts to put health care decisions back in the hands of insurance companies, which has nothing to do with keeping the government open. That is democracy. That is negotiation. We have done more than meet in the middle, but the Republicans now say "no" to their own bill. We could end the shutdown today if the majority would only support a reasonable solution to allow a vote on the Republican-written, Senate-passed bill.

Vote "no," and demand a House vote to immediately end the reckless Republican shutdown.

□ 1800

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), who chairs the full committee of Energy and Commerce.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in strong support of the Food and Drug Safety Act.

As we try to work out our fiscal differences, it is imperative that the Food and Drug Administration does have the resources that it needs to ensure the safety and quality of our Nation's food and drug supplies and medical devices. This bill will help ensure that the FDA can focus on that very important mission.

Over the past week, the House has acted to reopen major parts of other government. The legislation before us is yet another piece of that important effort to continue critical programs for the American people.

From food inspections to approvals of breakthrough new drugs and devices, Members on both sides of the aisle indeed understand and appreciate the important role of the FDA. This essential work should continue as we wait at the negotiating table for the President to join in a conversation to resolve our differences.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to ensure that the FDA has the resources to get the job done. Let's stand together in support of food safety and drug approvals.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman LEVIN, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, we should not be debating a bill that's going nowhere. We should be debating a bill that will end this shutdown.

Yesterday, the Speaker said this: There are not enough votes in the House to pass a clean bill to fund the government and end the shutdown. The truth of the matter is, if the bill will come up, it will pass.

On Saturday, 195 Democrats wrote to the Speaker and said, Bring up the bill. Informed reports say there are 22 Re-

publicans who will also vote "yes." That is a majority of the House.

I say to the Speaker: Let all of us speak.

The President today said this:

The truth of the matter is there are enough Republican and Democratic votes in the House of Representatives right now to end this shutdown immediately, with no partisan strings attached. The House should hold that vote today. If Republicans and Speaker Boehner are saying there are not enough votes, then they should prove it. Let the bill go to the floor, and let's see what happens. Just vote.

Then he continued:

There's no reason that there has to be a shutdown in order for the kind of negotiations Speaker Boehner says he wants to proceed. Hold a vote. Call a vote right now, and let's see what happens.

We say to the Speaker: Let democracy prevail. Bring the Senate bill up for a vote now.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), the chairman of the Health Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Food and Drug Safety Act.

Since the Senate will not negotiate with us about opening up the entire government, we will continue proposing commonsense bills to reopen critical functions as soon as possible.

This bill funds the FDA and ensures that it performs important duties, including inspections of food, medical devices, and pharmaceutical facilities. It makes sure that reviews of lifesaving new devices and drugs continue and that the government doesn't stand in the way of innovation.

We have the most dynamic and productive medical research firms in the world. American companies and universities are paving the way to incredible new cures. In fact, three American scientists were just honored with this year's Nobel Prize in medicine for their research into how our cells function. Americans can continue leading the world in this field, but we have to make sure that the FDA conducts reviews promptly.

Let's get the FDA back open and performing their important work. Patients, young and old, are counting on it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the former ranking member of the Agriculture Committee and now the ranking member of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we are almost a full week into this self-inflicted government shutdown because the Speaker refuses to stand up to a vocal minority in his own party. There is no end in sight. Instead, we sit here watching the Republican majority talk out of both sides of their mouths and

pretend to hold positions they have been voting against from the first day that they took power.

This bill is today's daily exercise in cynicism. I served as chairwoman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, the body that oversees funding for the Food and Drug Administration. We worked hard to increase the resources at FDA so that more food could be inspected, more outbreaks prevented.

We also passed the Food Safety Modernization Act in 2010 to improve FDA's ability to respond quickly and efficiently in a proactive, science-based fashion to contaminated food outbreaks.

Since taking office in 2011, this Republican majority has tried to undercut and hamstring the FDA at every step. In 2011, the first bill this majority passed included a \$241 million cut to the FDA. In 2012, they tried to slash salaries by 21 percent, hampering the agency's ability to implement the Food Safety Modernization Act. In 2013, they tried to cut FDA by another \$16 million. They rejected an amendment that I offered to increase funding by \$50 million for monitoring foodborne pathogens and implementing the new food safety law.

For years, we've been trying to get the Republican majority to be serious about the FDA and food safety funding. Food illnesses account for 48 million illnesses, 128,000 hospitalizations, and 3,000 deaths each year, and particularly affect children, pregnant women, and older adults.

Meanwhile, over 80 percent of the seafood and 30 percent of the fruit and nuts consumed in the United States are produced elsewhere, yet less than 1 percent of imported food is inspected by the FDA.

The Republican majority has refused to fund these food safety initiatives. Now they are bringing up this disingenuous bill for political show. The health of American families is not a game. These are people's lives.

Over 13 Federal agencies have important food safety responsibilities. The Centers for Disease Control identifies food safety pathogens in sources, and they are not funded in this bill. The Department of Justice prosecutes food contaminants, but they are not funded in this bill. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration carries out seafood inspections for the FDA, but they are not funded in this bill. USDA is responsible for a whole host of critical safety measures, but they are not funded in this bill.

Now, if you think there should be only one food safety agency, that's something that we can talk about.

This bill does not protect our families from contaminated food. It doesn't adequately fund the FDA. It's another in a series of purely political bills put forward by the Republican majority.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), who sits on the Homeland Security Committee.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Food and Drug Safety Act.

Right now, moms and dads across this country have too many worries. They worry about whether or not they'll have enough money to pay their rent, their mortgage, and even fill up their gas tanks. They worry about whether or not their hours are going to be cut at work next month. Why should we add to their worry the list of the safety of the food that they're feeding their children at dinner tonight?

One of my constituents from Fishers, Indiana, Elizabeth Armstrong, has experienced firsthand a child becoming ill due to contaminated food. Several years ago, Elizabeth's young daughter fell very ill after eating spinach contaminated with E. coli. This brave little girl luckily survived, but she now lives with kidney disease.

Isn't food safety a core function of our government? Is it responsible to stop routine inspections of food processors and place our constituents at risk of developing foodborne illness.

Mr. Speaker, our parents are worried, but this is one worry they should not have. FDA needs to keep food inspectors on the job. I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, how much time do both sides have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Alabama has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), who currently chairs the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of the Food and Drug Safety Act. The bill we are debating this afternoon would provide immediate funding for the Food and Drug Administration, which is, of course, the agency in charge of the safety and stability of our Nation's food supply and our medicine supply as well.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve an answer to a couple of simple questions. First of all, will Congress actually take action now to secure and to inspect our Nation's food supply? Secondly, will Congress take action now to secure our Nation's medicine supply?

I know that many on the other side of the aisle will once again oppose this legislation because they say they need to have an entire government funding bill or else nothing will be funded. Yet, they call Republicans "absolutists."

However, many on the other side of the aisle will recognize these legitimate concerns and will help us pass this important funding. It's time for the Senate to act on this and the other important funding bills that have passed with broad bipartisan majorities.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate majority leader and the President cannot continue to say that they will not negotiate on ending this government shutdown. They must stop holding so many important issues hostage to their absolutist demands. I say let's go to a conference committee now, let's negotiate in a bipartisan way, and let's stop this government shutdown.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Congresswoman from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, the ranking member on the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California, and I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, what baffles me is that our Republican friends are seemingly acting like there's business as usual, that we are quietly on the floor of the House, just passing a food safety initiative.

Our House is on fire, and there's nobody here to put the fire out. We're in the middle of a government shutdown. Of course I'm committed to the principles of this legislation, as my colleagues, as the ranking member, as the ranking member of the full committee, as Ms. DELAUNO and Mr. WAXMAN are. We are all committed to this.

May I remind my friends that 45 percent of the FDA employees, they are on furlough. Just today, four people in Texas were arrested because of FDA criminal investigators. They were trying to sell stem cell packages to sick people, devastated people, that were fraudulent and diseased and inappropriate to terminally ill people. It was the FDA criminal investigators that were able to make this case and the U.S. Attorney in my district said "thank you." But right now there are U.S. Attorneys across the Nation getting ready to lay off their attorneys.

The House is on fire, and my friends don't seem to understand.

□ 1815

Let me just share with you that there are usually 80 inspections on food facilities a day. They're not going on right now. Up to October 17, there will be some 960 facilities not inspected, and the only reason is that we will not come to the floor, put the clean CR on the floor, and have 195 plus 21 people vote in the majority to open the doors of this government.

But more importantly, have you heard the stories of families whose husbands or wives are laid off, struggling to make ends meet, calling on relatives to be able to help them? You've heard

of the young woman who came to my attention who had to be carried away to a shelter because she was suffering domestic abuse because of the financial crisis; or maybe you haven't heard that 70 percent of Americans and 51 percent of Republicans are saying, We don't like what you're doing, Republicans. We want this government to open.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. FARR. I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Or maybe you haven't heard from the Democratic Governor of Kentucky, Governor Beshear, who says that right now 7,000 are already enrolled in the Affordable Care Act. He is saying that he has a report that says that if this Affordable Care Act works, he'll have 17,000 more jobs, \$15 billion in the economy.

Let's stop this foolishness with ObamaCare. It's working. Let's get back to work and pass a clean CR. Too many people are hurting. Enough is enough. We need to do what is right for America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.J. Res. 77, a piece-meal "mini-CR," which woefully underfunds the Food and Drug Administration, FDA.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would be unnecessary if only the House majority would allow a vote on the clean Continuing Resolution, passed by the Senate. The House would easily pass the measure and the President will sign it, as he reaffirmed today.

H.J. Res. 77 is the latest attempt by the House Republicans to extricate themselves from the mess they created by shutting down the government. But they should have learned by now that it would not work. It is inefficient, unfair, and costly. The shutdown needlessly disrupts the lives of Americans who provide benefits and services and those who depend upon them. These reckless mini-CRs will have the effect, intended or not, of sowing division when unity is needed. It is not surprising, therefore, that responsible leaders of organizations that would benefit from these mini-CRs are united in opposing this piece-meal approach to appropriating.

Veterans groups opposed the 'Republican mini-CR for veterans' affairs. Similarly, leading research and consumer protection organizations oppose the FDA mini-CR before us.

For example, the Center for Science in the Public Interest, CSPI, opposes H.J. Res. 77. Although the organization is a health advocacy nonprofit that promotes food safety, the CSPI does not support the piecemeal approach by government that would make funding the FDA a partisan issue because "the irresponsible shutting down of government and particularly public health agencies like FDA and Center for Disease Control places families at risk from food borne diseases. But opening FDA alone would not solve the problem. Food safety is a joint governmental effort involving 13 different agencies often working collaboratively?"

The FDA is an essential federal agency with the life-saving mission of protecting all Americans from unsafe drugs, devices, biologics, and food.

For example in Texas, three men were arrested and a fourth is being sought by the FBI in connection with what investigators say was a \$1.5-million Texas-based scheme to illegally market and sell stem cell treatments to patients with terminal diseases. "Protecting the public from unproven and potentially dangerous drug and medical procedures is very important," said Kenneth Magidson, U.S. attorney for the Houston-based southern district of Texas. "This office will continue to prosecute violations involving threats to the public health."

"This indictment demonstrates the commitment of the FDA to protect the American public from the harms inherent in being exposed to unapproved new drugs," said Patrick J. Holland, special agent in charge of the FDA Office of Criminal Investigations, according to the statement. Due to the shutdown, the FDA is now unable to continue to aggressively pursue perpetrators of such acts and ensure that they are punished to the full extent of the law.

It is important that the FDA is funded as it plays a vital role in protecting consumers from contaminated and misbranded food.

But it is even more important that the entire government be reopened to serve all the needs of the American people.

Due to the shutdown, the FDA will have to cease most of its food-safety operations. That includes "routine establishment inspections, some compliance and enforcement activities, monitoring of imports, notification programs (e.g., food contact substances, infant formula), and the majority of the laboratory research necessary to inform public health decision-making."

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food Safety Inspection Service will continue manning every meat facility with full-time inspectors, even as many government programs are halted. But the FDA also oversees the safety of the vast majority of the country's food industry. According to a memo released by the Department of Health and Human Services, the bulk of FDA food inspectors have been deemed non-essential, so few, if any, food facilities will be inspected until the shutdown is over.

This past December, the FDA shut down a nut processor in New Mexico after records showed that the facility was shipping products infected with salmonella. This sort of monitoring and enforcement could become much harder because of the shutdown.

In fiscal 2011, the FDA coordinated or conducted inspections of about 20,000 food facilities for compliance with safety regulations. The number of past inspections suggests FDA officials normally inspect about 80 facilities per business day. So, for every day the government doesn't work, approximately 80 food facilities will go without federal inspections. If the shutdown lasts until October 17, 960 facilities may go without U.S. inspections.

A spokesman from the FDA contacted The Huffington Post on Wednesday to note that a portion of these inspections would be conducted by the agency's partners in state agriculture and public health departments. But he couldn't say how big a portion, or whether the FDA would continue, during the shutdown, to pay state agencies their normal fee for inspections conducted on the FDA's behalf.

To get a sense of what this means, we must understand that the FDA sends letters to food facilities that failed inspections. They reveal gnarly conditions at major food manufacturing facilities, including cooking implements covered in mold and stored in brown, soiled water at a Detroit donut facility; high levels of illegal drug residues in veal were found from a farm in upstate New York; and flies infesting a tortilla factory in Hagerstown, Maryland.

The warning letters give the facilities in question a chance to correct sanitation mistakes before they cause serious outbreaks of food borne illness. If the commands in a warning letter are not obeyed, the FDA has the authority to punish, or even shutdown, the facility in question.

These warning letters are sent to just a small fraction of all facilities that are inspected, and not all of these facilities have infractions that lead directly to illness. That means, it is impossible to say whether cancelled food safety inspections will directly lead to food consumers getting sick. However, fewer inspections can have a direct correlation to more contamination in the marketplace.

For these reasons, we must end the government shutdown as soon as possible, or, barring that, to fund food safety programs with a separate bill.

The following leading research and consumer groups have urged Congress to end the shutdown completely since they cannot support a legislative approach that shuts down some essential public health agencies while temporarily funding others: American Medical Student Association, Breast Cancer Action, Community Access National Network, Connecticut Center for Patient Safety, Jacobs Institute of Women's Health, National Consumers League, National Research Center for Women & Families, National Women's Health Network, Our Bodies Ourselves, The TMJ Association, WomenHeart: The National Coalition for Women with Heart Disease, WoodyMatters.

It is not responsible to fund the FDA at the same time that the Center for Disease Control and Prevention is unable to fully function to examine the cause of epidemics caused by unsafe food or defective medical products.

Mr. Speaker, if Congress fails to pass a "clean" continuing resolution before month's end, FDA inspections will continue to decrease across the nation and the likelihood of consumers becoming ill will increase.

This would be unconscionable.

Normally I would be pleased to be here today to talk about the funding for this program, but this is different. What the majority is doing is playing games with safety of the food supply and the lives of real people—the lives of our families, our friends, and our constituents.

For these reasons, we should be working to pass H.J. Res. 59 as amended by the Senate. That is the best way to keep faith with all persons who serve the American people as employees of the federal government, and the people who depend upon the FDA program.

OCTOBER 4, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: We are writing as public health, patient, consumer, and scientific nonprofit organizations to oppose H.J. Res 77 and any other efforts to single out the Food and Drug Administration for funding. Our organizations represent millions of patients, consumers, health professionals, and scientists who strongly support the work of the FDA and urge Congress to provide the level of appropriations the agency needs throughout FY 2014.

We appreciate the recognition that the FDA is an essential federal agency with the life-saving mission of protecting all Americans from unsafe drugs, devices, biologics, and food. We are very concerned that the current shutdown is curtailing the agency's work, which will inevitably delay the approval of new medical products and the inspection of medical products and food. The shutdown also harms scientists and other employees who have dedicated their careers to public service, and will make it even more difficult for the agency to attract the scientific expertise it needs now and in the future. And, the shutdown will also have a devastating impact on some of the companies that rely on FDA reviews to get their new products to market, and their workers.

Nevertheless, we cannot support a legislative approach that shuts down some essential public health agencies while temporarily funding others. For example, it is not responsible to fund the FDA at the same time that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is unable to fully function to examine the cause of epidemics caused by unsafe food or defective medical products.

We strongly urge Congress to do its job: immediately open up all federal agencies and then quickly work together to get the FY 2014 appropriations bills enacted into law, based on the funding levels needed to do their jobs well. These appropriations bills should not include a sequester or arbitrary across the board cuts, but rather should give agencies the authority to cut ineffective programs and adequately fund those that are essential.

American Medical Student Association; Breast Cancer Action; Community Access National Network; Connecticut Center for Patient Safety; Jacobs Institute of Women's Health; National Consumers League; National Research Center for Women & Families; National Women's Health Network; Our Bodies Ourselves; The TMJ Association; WomenHeart: The National Coalition for Women with Heart Disease; WoodyMatters.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), one of our physicians here in the House.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration historically has been one of the bipartisan efforts that this House has enjoyed. In fact, a little over a year ago, the Food and Drug User Fee Reauthorization Act passed both the House and the Senate, went to a conference committee, was signed by the President of the United States on July 9, 2012, in the middle of an election

year when partisanship was at its fever pitch, and yet this House came together and passed that reauthorization bill.

You've heard the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee say that he hoped this bill would pass today to allow the Food and Drug Administration to utilize those user fees that have been remitted by the companies that are actually looking to have their products approved by the FDA. I support him in that, and I hope he's correct.

One of the most important missions of the government, one of the premier agencies of the Federal Government is the Food and Drug Administration. Its job is to ensure that medical drugs and medical devices are safe and effective. The FDA is also a gateway for patients who are suffering disease and disability with the hope of one day getting past that disease and disability. The FDA is the gateway for those patients.

We've taken legislative steps to fix some of the issues with the FDA. They aren't always functioning in a perfect manner, but I know one thing for sure: keeping FDA employees away from their jobs is not the way to accomplish those goals.

This is a good bill today, the Food and Drug Safety Act. I hope the Senate will take this up. The House is going to pass it in a bipartisan manner in just a very short period of time. We will send it over to the Senate, as we have many other bills last week, and we'll continue to send bills. This is the way the process should work. Appropriations shouldn't be done in one large lump. They should be done in the individual departments.

I support this bill today. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has voted for CRs 19 times since President Obama has been in office, with the whole enchilada, passing them without rancor, without asking the President to negotiate. So there's no reason we can't do that tonight.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, HENRY WAXMAN, the distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, we're on the seventh day of a government shutdown caused by the reckless actions of House Republicans; and we are now considering the sixth piecemeal bill that reopens a few government activities, but still continues the shutdown for everybody else.

Now, I support the FDA. Who doesn't support the FDA? It's very important that they do their job. But you know what's also important? What's also important is the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, which responds to disease outbreaks and works to prevent the spread of seasonal flu. They're not going to be reopened. There's no funding for the Substance Abuse and Men-

tal Health Services Administration, which limits its ability to improve mental health across the country.

There are things this government does—and I'm pleased my Republican colleagues are starting to understand why government is so important. And that's why we shouldn't have this closing down of government and then reopening it piece by piece.

This is an effort to hold the government hostage until the unreasonable demand to deny health insurance for American families is met, and that is a demand that we will not give in to. Let the House vote on a clean bill to fund the whole government, not the piecemeal approach we're considering today. It's a gimmick, and it's also poor policy.

And you should understand something else, Mr. Speaker, they're not giving FDA the full funding. What they're doing is still continuing the draconian sequestration cut which took over \$200 million out of FDA's budget. If they love FDA so much, fund it where it should be funded, not with \$200 million less.

Mr. Speaker, there is no funding for hundreds of the Nation's tribes. There is no funding for meals for millions of seniors. There is no assistance to more than 1 million families in need.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FARR. I yield the gentleman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WAXMAN. I think we're all supporters of the FDA; but if the Republicans were truly interested in FDA, they would work with Democrats. We would have a conversation about it to lift the sequester and restore funding for FDA and all other critical programs as well.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, our distinguished leader.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the congressional district that is home to the Food and Drug Administration. Those individuals do great work for our country; and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, nobody—and I mean nobody—is being fooled by this ridiculous stunt that the Republicans in this House are pulling, trying to cherry-pick little pieces of government to fund when they know they're not going anywhere, when the American people know that this House is in possession of a piece of legislation that, if we were allowed to vote on it, would go to the President's desk tonight; he would sign it; and we would open up all of government immediately—FDA, NIH, the VA, everything.

The position Republicans are taking is made even more ridiculous by what we did on Saturday. On Saturday, we said, We're going to pay all Federal employees—not just employees at FDA, not just at NIH—all Federal Government employees. That was the right thing to do.

Now you're saying you only want to keep some of those agencies open, not all of them open. So what our Republican colleagues are telling the American people is, we want to pay all the employees in the Federal Government; but we don't want to allow a lot of them to go to work. We want to pay for everybody in the Federal Government, but we don't want to allow everybody to go to work. What kind of policy is that?

Now, Mr. Speaker, just this weekend, the Speaker of this House admitted on national television that he had reached an agreement with the Democratic leader in the United States Senate, Senator HARRY REID, where HARRY REID and the Senate Democrats said, We will agree on a temporary basis to the lower funding levels in the sequester in exchange for making sure we have a clean continuing resolution, that we keep the government open. That's what the Speaker agreed to.

But then he came back to this House, and he couldn't hold his caucus. Why? Because Senator CRUZ and a radical reckless faction said, No, we can't do that. We have to close the government unless we shut down the Affordable Care Act. And that position hasn't changed. That's why today we can't open the government, because our Republican colleagues want to continue to shut down the Affordable Care Act.

Let's vote today to open the whole government. Let's have a vote, Mr. Speaker, on the bill that's in our possession.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. I yield to the distinguished Congressman from Arizona, RON BARBER, for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, while Congress recessed this weekend, I stayed here in Washington to work with my colleagues to end this shutdown. I talked with southern Arizonans to hear from them about the shutdown and how it's impacting their families. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the people I talked with don't care who is to blame. They want us to reopen their government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. BARBER. On behalf of my constituents in southern Arizona, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to the continuing appropriations resolution, H.J. Res. 59. We must come together, and we must put the American people first. We cannot allow this stalemate to continue for one more day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is out of order for the gentleman to make a speech when seeking recognition for a unanimous consent request.

Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. FARR. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this piecemeal bill to nowhere that continues to delay and shut down government when we could be passing a bill right now that would keep government open, and it would open it up tomorrow morning; but the Speaker refuses to allow that legislation to come to the floor. He tells the press there aren't the votes.

Let's try it. I dare you. I dare you. Bring it to the floor. Let's see if there are enough votes. I think there are because I think the majority of this body wants to keep the government open and not play these games.

These are games. Never done before. Never done before. Congress has never shut down the government. Yes, it was shut down under Clinton, but it was by a veto. It wasn't for a failure to get them a bill. They're saying, Well, the President has to negotiate. He doesn't have to negotiate.

Under President Bush, we passed 56 CRs with no negotiation. Under President Obama, so far, 19. Almost every Member here voted for those. So you've been voting for CRs continuously for years and years without rancor. What's the difference now? You don't like a bill that passed 3 years ago, and you have to come and break the rules here by getting a waiver so you can bring up these issues on the appropriations bill because you don't want to do it in regular order? This is just insane.

This is insane. We've never done it like this. And the country is wondering what the heck is going on. Well, what's going on is we've just become children in this fight. This is nuts. This is not the way to run a government.

By God, let's get government open. We can do it tonight. Let's bring the bill to the floor and vote on it. Vote against this bill to nowhere.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that all of my colleagues would join me tonight in supporting House Joint Resolution 77 that has been discussed here over the last hour.

I understand that many of my friends across the aisle would disagree with the majority's decision to immediately fund the most critical function of government during the delay that we have in current funding.

I recognize your preferences for a vote on all the government at one

time; but you must recognize the truth of the matter is we don't have consensus in the House. Until the White House and the Senate are willing to sit down and negotiate a quick solution to this stalemate, I ask that my friends across the aisle join me in supporting the Food and Drug Administration, an agency that is on the front lines for our public health on a day-to-day basis.

There are a number of us who would question why nearly half of the FDA is furloughed when nearly all of their work impacts the safety and protection of human life. However, the administration has chosen to cease activities related to food, to medical devices, and to human drug establishment inspections, infant formula notifications, and to laboratory research that are tied to public health decision-making.

□ 1830

Most importantly, I would want to think that the administration is not playing politics with the safety of our Nation's food supply; but why is it that 87 percent of the Food Safety and Inspection Service is on the job while only about half of FDA's food safety staff are actually working, especially when FDA is responsible for 80 percent of the food supply?

As I noted in my opening remarks a few minutes ago, I would speculate that many of our colleagues don't realize how the FDA impacts every single one of our constituents in one way or the other. From formula fed to babies, to blood transfusions needed during emergencies and routine surgeries, to drugs that extend the lives of the sick, to the domestic or imported foods we feed to our families, on every occasion, the FDA is there.

Just 2 days ago, this body voted 407-0 to approve a measure that will provide backpay to furloughed Federal workers. This vote did not impact the critical needs of public health, yet an important vote, nonetheless. I would ask that each of the 407 Members who voted on Saturday for the backpay for Federal workers to now vote in favor of a bill that provides for urgent needs for our public safety and our welfare across the United States of America.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support this joint resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. FARR. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Farr moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 77 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Mr. FARR (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, this is the eighth time we've made this motion to bring the clean CR to the floor. And what could be simpler than a clean appropriations bill? No riders, no earmarks, no policy changes. I know it's something that my friends on the other side of the aisle have done over and over and over again. In this case, it's even with no increase in spending. It's clean; it's simple; it's the right thing to do.

So why are we here today, day after day, tinkering at the margins? Today we fund one agency; tomorrow it's something else; last Friday it was several others. This isn't any way to run a government, and no one who votes for this bill should think that it is. All this bill does is play favorites, pitting one agency against another for meager government funding.

So I offer this motion to recommit with the hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join me in funding, not part of government, not piecemeal government, all of government. Why? Because all Americans deserve a complete government at their service, a full-time government, not a partial government or a sometimes government.

This motion will allow us to pass the Senate version, which is a clean, what we call, continuing resolution, and it would reopen government within 24 hours. Very simple. Just bring it to the floor. Let the vote be what it is.

We've had, as I said earlier, 111 CRs since President Clinton was elected to

office. In fact, I have the breakdown right here. We had 36 CRs, continuing resolutions, passed without this kind of conditionality, without the government shutting down—36. Under President Bush, we had 56 CRs passed without shutting down the government. With President Obama, in the years that he has been here, we've already passed 19 CRs without shutting down the government, without rancor, without conditions.

So why are we doing it now? It doesn't make any sense. Nobody can explain this. All Americans want all of their government back, and we can do that. Voting on this motion to recommit, we can get government open.

So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this motion to recommit. Support our ability to get government back, working for all the people for all the time, not part-time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions that are contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires that an amendment be germane to the bill under consideration at the time.

As the Chair recently ruled on October 2, 3, and 4 of 2013, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and, therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I request to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, doesn't this bill before us fund a portion of the Federal Government?

My motion to recommit would open the entire Federal Government so that all the consumer protections that our Nation provides are guaranteed. We need to open up not just food safety, but we also need to open up the Centers for Disease Control. We need to open up consumer hotlines. Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to open up all the Nation's consumer protections?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman have argument confined to the point of order?

Mr. FARR. Last Saturday, we agreed to pay our workers furloughed during the shutdown. I supported that bill. But what sense does it make to have workers paid to sit at home and not be able to do their jobs? What kind of strange House is this that would force this situation on our fellow workers? You've got to sit at home, but don't worry, you'll get paid?

Mr. Speaker, if you rule this motion out of order, does that mean we will not have a chance to keep the entire Federal Government open today? Can the Chair please explain why we can't keep the entire Federal Government open tonight, now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order raised by the gentleman from Alabama.

The gentleman from Alabama makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from California are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to the Food and Drug Administration. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

On October 2, October 3, and October 4, 2013, the Chair ruled that a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House was not germane to various measures on the basis that the motion failed the committee jurisdiction test of germaneness.

Here, the joint resolution falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. The instructions in the motion fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules.

The instructions, therefore, propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 182, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

YEAS—217

Aderholt	Boustany	Carter
Amash	Brady (TX)	Cassidy
Amodei	Bridenstine	Chabot
Bachmann	Brooks (AL)	Chaffetz
Bachus	Brooks (IN)	Coble
Barletta	Broun (GA)	Coffman
Barr	Bucshon	Cole
Barton	Burgess	Collins (GA)
Benishek	Calvert	Collins (NY)
Bentivolio	Camp	Conaway
Bilirakis	Campbell	Cook
Bishop (UT)	Cantor	Cotton
Black	Capito	Cramer

Meng	Rahall	Takano
Michaud	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Miller, George	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)
Moran	Ryan (OH)	Tierney
Nadler	Sánchez, Linda	Titus
Napolitano	T.	Tonko
Neal	Sarbanes	Tsongas
Negrete McLeod	Schakowsky	Van Hollen
Nolan	Schiff	Vargas
O'Rourke	Schrader	Veasey
Owens	Schwartz	Vela
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Pascrell	Scott, David	Visclosky
Pastor (AZ)	Serrano	Walz
Payne	Sewell (AL)	Wasserman
Pelosi	Shea-Porter	Schultz
Perlmutter	Sherman	Waters
Peterson	Sires	Watt
Pingree (ME)	Slaughter	Waxman
Pocan	Smith (WA)	Wilson (FL)
Price (NC)	Speler	Yarmuth
Quigley	Swalwell (CA)	

NOT VOTING—34

Bass	Herrera Beutler	Rangel
Blackburn	Higgins	Ribble
Buchanan	Hoyer	Richmond
Castro (TX)	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Clay	Lipinski	Rush
Davis, Danny	Lucas	Sanchez, Loretta
DesJarlais	McCarthy (NY)	Sanford
Ellison	McKeon	Simpson
Forbes	Meeks	Welch
Gallego	Moore	Young (FL)
Gosar	Poe (TX)	
Gutiérrez	Polis	

□ 1914

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 139

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 139, a bill originally introduced by Representative MARKEY of Massachusetts, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting re-printings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

POLITICS: THE "ART OF COMPROMISE"

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Senate leader HARRY REID has been the most ardent proponent of his party's no-compromise, no-negotiation stance. The leader has even been unwilling to discuss a compromise to prevent a prolonged government shutdown.

We are moving into the second week of this shutdown. In an effort to avoid being labeled as an "obstructionist," the Senate leader has ordered a stance—at least rhetorically—and now claims there has already been compromise.

I would say to the Senate leader that there has been some compromise, but not in the Senate Chamber. The compromise has come from 57 Democrats who joined with the majority in the House to pass targeted appropriations bills that will fund key departments and programs.

Mr. Speaker, politics is often referred to as the "art of compromise." It is essential to the legislative process and surely vital to a functioning democracy. I commend my 57 Democratic colleagues in the House who understand this, and I encourage more to join them as we continue to pass targeted appropriations this week.

Unfortunately, not until both Chambers start compromising will we be able to end this shutdown.

END THE REPUBLICAN SHUTDOWN IMMEDIATELY

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call once again for this House to end this shutdown now by passing the Senate-passed bill that the President will sign to reopen the government.

Speaker JOHN BOEHNER refuses to bring up this bill. This weekend, he claimed it doesn't have the votes to pass. While I am no mathematician, basic math shows that the Senate-passed bill to end the shutdown would pass the House; 217 votes are needed for a bill to pass.

Look at these numbers. With the votes of 198 Democrats and the 23 Republicans who have said publicly that they would support the bill, the bill would pass with 221 votes.

Mr. Speaker, bring up the bill to end the Republican shutdown immediately.

DEBT CEILING

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad truth that our jaw-dropping \$16.7 trillion national debt pales in comparison to the totality of future spending obligations the Congressional Budget Office forecasts. A change in spending habits and a reform to mandatory spending obligations isn't just advisable in this moment; it is absolutely essential for America's long-term financial health.

But meaningful reform is impossible without leadership from the White House. Is President Obama willing to lead and enact reforms to make our country stronger? It appears not.

The President has made it no secret that he is loathe to engage in bipartisan negotiations regardless of what is at stake—whether it be reopening the Federal Government for the American

people, or containing our debt crisis so our children and grandchildren aren't left to pay for previous generations' irresponsibility.

Refusing to negotiate on the debt ceiling is code for refusing to make any changes to reduce future debt.

Mr. Speaker, as this body knows, it is foolish to take aim at the symptom without also treating the disease.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I received an email from a woman who runs a small business in my district. I will read it to you now:

Morgan, As you know, I'm a small business with 36 employees, have been paying 75 percent of my employees' health care for over 20 years.

Get a call from health care provider agent that although my renewal date is March 1, the companies are offering to renew on December 1 this year with a 9.8 percent increase. This is to beat what is anticipated as a 30 to 60 percent increase after all the effects of ObamaCare.

Needless to say, this has reignited my frustration with the so-called Affordable Health Care Act. Please stick to your principles, continue the fight. Let me know what, if anything, I can do.

Yes, ma'am, I will.

WE NEED A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days, this House has actually come together on two different measures here that would seek to ease a lot of the pain from the government slowdown. The sad thing is we can agree on everything the Republicans have been trying to pass out of here. The only thing we don't really agree on is what we are going to do with that portion of ObamaCare. We have even moved towards you in that we are going to limit it to simply giving the rest of the American people a 1-year delay in the mandate as the President has called for Big Business and has been given waivers to certain individuals.

We can agree on this. We can get this thing done on what we agree on right away. It is imperative what we do, because we've got three things going on that the American people don't like: they don't like this government slowdown; they don't like what they are seeing with ObamaCare; and they don't like the impending things we are going to have to do with the debt ceiling. All these things work together—the cost of ObamaCare, the government regulatory system that is killing jobs, and the inability for us to get things done around here.

The debt ceiling is a conversation we are going to hear a lot about in the very near future. If we are not doing the things to work on a truly balanced budget, then there is no reason the debt ceiling doesn't keep going up year after year after year.

We need to balance our budget, folks. We need to get the job done for fiscal responsibility. I am not seeing that plan come from the White House or from the Senate.

LET'S DO WHAT IS RIGHT FOR THE PEOPLE

(Mr. MCHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, tonight I had a wonderful tele-townhall meeting with my constituents from across the 10th District of western North Carolina.

We had a lot of discussions tonight about the government shutdown and about the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare. My constituents gave me great feedback. They said, Keep fighting because we want to see a repeal of ObamaCare. But they said, We want the President to come to the table and negotiate; we want Washington to work.

I also asked my constituents if they had seen their health insurance rates go up as a result of ObamaCare. Fifty-eight percent said they had seen rates go up; 9 percent said they had seen them go down; and the balance said they had seen no change.

Clearly, it is harming families with increased health insurance rates. My constituents want a repeal, but they want Washington to work. So I call on the President, and I ask our friends over in the Senate to come to the table with House Republicans and try to come to consensus so we can move our Nation forward and do what's right for the people.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus comes to the floor now entering the second week of the House Republican-led government shutdown. Instead of allowing a

simple "yes" or "no" vote on a bill that funds the government, Republicans continue to play irresponsible games that are hurting our country. The shutdown's impact on our already fragile economy, as previously predicted, is already beginning to take shape and is negatively affecting millions of Americans.

There is a simple solution to this, however, and that is to bring a clean continuing resolution to the House floor for a vote. The Senate has passed it; and if Speaker BOEHNER scheduled a vote, it would pass the House as well. But the House GOP is more concerned with catering to a fringe group of their caucus than leading for the American people.

There are serious costs to that inaction for my constituents and constituents throughout our country. In Nevada, an estimated 11,000 Nevadans may be furloughed or directly impacted by the furloughs. At one of our Air Force bases in my congressional district, 1,100 Nevadans are affected by furloughs, processing of claims at the VA and Social Security have slowed for new applicants, and the Head Start program is feeling the pinch of the shutdown.

Tonight, we come to this floor to raise these issues and others to call on our colleagues on the other side and the Speaker to allow a clean continuing resolution to be brought to the floor.

At this time, I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio, Congresswoman FUDGE, the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, a leader who has been fighting for equality and fairness for all Americans.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank my colleague for yielding, and I thank you, as always, for continuing to lead this Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could stand on this House floor today and say that Republicans are playing with fire when they refuse to fund the government, but I can't do that because what they are doing is much worse. They are playing with people's very lives. They have made it abundantly clear that they care more about scoring political points and embarrassing this administration than addressing the needs of the American people.

□ 1930

A government shutdown has had an immediate impact on many people across this Nation: furloughing more than 800,000 Federal workers; stopping nutritional and clinical support for women, infants and children; and delaying lifesaving research at NIH.

My office continues to receive calls from distressed constituents about the status of Medicaid, Social Security, and SNAP. While we can reassure them that such programs will continue to operate, their concern and anxiety

demonstrates the price every day Americans must pay when Congress fails.

Over the past few years, no issue has consumed more of the public's attention than health care reform; but, unfortunately for the American people, much of what has been said bears no relation to reality.

Republicans have tried to make the case that health care reform will raise health care costs catastrophically and drive up the cost of Medicare or increase the deficit. These claims are simply not true. The truth is the Affordable Care Act will slow overall health care spending, decrease Medicare spending, and decrease our deficit. All this will be accomplished while expanding health care coverage, cutting costs for seniors, and eliminating health disparities for communities of color.

Unfortunately, Republicans are so focused on preventing the expansion of health care that they are willing to hurt individuals in communities that are still struggling to rebound from our economic downturn. Already, as many as 19,000 children in 11 States have been left out of Head Start programs because grant money ran out on September 30. Several large defense contractors have started placing workers on notice that they may be furloughed. The 9 million mothers and children who rely on the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, better known as WIC, are facing the possibility that they may lose their benefits. And our local Federal courts may be crippled by furloughs as soon as next week.

The growing economic impact of this shutdown is extremely difficult to measure. The human and social impacts like the loss of money for food, housing, or educational opportunities are impossible to quantify. The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, passed by both Chambers of Congress, signed by the President, and confirmed as constitutional by the Supreme Court. Until Republicans accept this fact, the government will be shut down and the American people will have been let down by the majority party of this body.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), the vice chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HORSFORD for yielding me this time, and I thank him for all the work he does here in the House of Representatives and say he represents his district well.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight, quite frankly, very frustrated. I am frustrated as I stand here right now. Our Federal Government is shut down. This is the seventh day of a shutdown that did not have to happen. This

is political theater at its best—or at its worst. And who's paying the price? It's the American people who are feeling the pain.

This shutdown has been engineered and manufactured by House Republicans. Anyone paying close attention to what's happening here in the House will come to the quick conclusion that it is not the Democrats who have manufactured this crisis; it is the Republican majority that has done so.

There are votes on the floor tonight that could pass a continuing resolution to get this behind us. I can tell you that most, if not all, Democrats will vote for a clean CR, and many, many of my Republican friends would do the same. I dare not call my Republican friends by name, but there are many of them. I had two visit with me tonight on the House floor to say they are willing to do it.

Yet Republicans feel that somehow they can use the budget crisis as a means for defunding the Affordable Care Act. It will not happen. It is the law of the land. It is fully implemented. It has been approved by Congress, signed by the President, tested by the U.S. Supreme Court, and it is now fully operational as of October 1.

Open season for the health insurance marketplace began several days ago, and nearly 3 million people have visited healthcare.gov on the first day alone. Americans who before lived with the constant fear of financial ruin if they got sick because they never had health insurance flooded the Web site in huge numbers to sign up for coverage.

Right now, there are more than 600,000 Americans living in a household forced to file bankruptcy because of unpaid medical bills. More than 60 percent of all bankruptcies filed last year were because of medical bills that could not be paid. Many people forced to file for bankruptcy because of medical expenses actually had insurance but were hung out to dry by insurance companies that dropped them from coverage simply because they had that power. ObamaCare makes that a thing of the past.

Beginning on January 1 of next year, Americans can no longer be denied coverage or dropped from coverage for having a preexisting condition. All plans must include coverage for outpatient and emergency services and maternity and newborn care, mental health, and prescription drugs. I am very proud of this plan. There will no longer be a yearly or lifetime limit on how much insurance companies will pay out for care.

That the House Republicans would hold the Federal Government and its more than 4 million employees hostage over a law that, on all counts, seems to provide a great benefit to Americans defies logic.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a game, though my Republican colleagues seem

to think that it is. They are not working with any sense of urgency and don't seem to comprehend the seriousness of the Nation's fiscal crisis.

Just yesterday, on national television, the Secretary of the Treasury, Jack Lew, warned us of what the consequences could be. This isn't about who wins or loses. We aren't keeping score, but the American people are keeping score, and they can't figure out Republicans' outright obsession with ObamaCare while the Federal Government isn't open for business. It makes no sense.

Democrats have come to the floor for the past week asking and begging for House Republicans to permit a vote on the Senate's clean continuing resolution. I will repeat for the last time: It would pass this House tonight if the Speaker of the House, Mr. BOEHNER, will put it up for votes. The votes are here right now to pass the Senate version of the continuing resolution.

I urge the Speaker of the House, who is a decent individual whom I have gotten to know over the years since I've been here, I hope that he will finally say to the extreme right in his caucus that he has done all that he could to lift up the issues that they care about, but now it's the future of the country that we must all care about. Speaker BOEHNER, this week, sir, please bring the continuing resolution to the floor and see if the votes are here. They will be here, and we can reopen the government, and then we can sit down and reconcile our differences.

I thank all who are standing strong in this debate.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the vice chairman, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, for his constructive remarks and calling once again for the Speaker to bring a clean resolution to the floor. We know that the votes are here to pass a clean continuing resolution, one that would reopen government, one that would be supported by Republicans and Democrats; and so the Congressional Black Caucus comes to this floor at this hour to ask the Speaker of this House to do the will of the people and the will of this body.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), a civil rights icon, a man who speaks truth to power.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame and a disgrace. Furthermore, it is really, really sad that the government of the most powerful country in the world is closed. It is closed. It is unbelievable. It is unreal. It is downright embarrassing.

I wonder—I wonder what the rest of the world thinks of us. We go all around the world preaching democracy—one person, one vote—and we will not even give the Members, all of the Members of the House of Rep-

resentatives, an opportunity to vote on a clean effort, a continuing resolution, to end the shutdown.

Give the Members—please, give the Members, all of the Members, Democrats and Republicans—an opportunity to cast a vote, a free and open vote. That's what our Founding Fathers struggled for. People died for the right to participate. And in the House of Representatives, in this House, the people's House, we will not be provided an opportunity for all of the people to vote.

We must end the shutdown and put our people back to work and keep our economy growing and moving. We don't want to go back, my friends, or stand still. We want to go forward. Let's come together, all of us, Democrats and Republicans, come together and end this shutdown for good. We can do it. We made hard and tough decisions before and we can do it again, and we must do it because it's the right thing to do.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman very much for his comments and for pricking the conscience of this body for doing what's right at a time when the country expects that of our elected leadership.

I would like to yield, at this time, to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nevada for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end this shutdown. The absurdity of it begins with the fact that we are now going to pay people for not working. We need to bring them back to work to provide the services and do the work that they are being paid to do.

Mr. Speaker, this shutdown is really not based on reality. Some have said, some apparently believe, if they just stay the course and keep the government shut down, they will be able to repeal or substantially undermine ObamaCare. That's not going to happen, and so we are not based in reality.

Now they are blaming Democrats for not negotiating, but there's nothing to negotiate. We are talking about the budget. The Republicans came in with one number; the Democrats had a higher number. The Senate decided not to negotiate but, rather, accept the Republican number, so we're in agreement. There's nothing to negotiate.

Now, in the 1990s when they had a disagreement on the budget, there were profound differences on spending levels and tax and revenue levels. They couldn't agree on the budget. But we, at this point, at least for a short-term, 6-week continuing resolution, to keep the government open for at least 6 more weeks while we can negotiate, we have already agreed on the number.

Now, the problem we're in right now is we just cannot reward people who have a tantrum and say we voted 40

times to repeal ObamaCare and we haven't done it, so we're just going to shut the government down. You cannot reward that behavior because it will become an expectation that every time it's the end of the fiscal year and you need a continuing resolution or the debt ceiling, there will be an expectation of reward. No, this is not the end of the process. This is just the beginning. We are just talking about a 6-week continuing resolution. Two weeks from now, we'll have the debt ceiling. Four weeks after that, we'll be at the end of the 6-week period if we can reopen the government. They will be asking for things.

Now, the fact is, the problem that we have, as stated in a recent article in *Nation* magazine, they revealed the strategy of the Republicans. They made a list of the kinds of things they will be looking for in the continuing resolution, the debt ceiling, every time there's an opportunity to shut down the government, and here's the list:

They want to undermine ObamaCare, Keystone pipeline, offshore drilling, corporate tax cuts, business-oriented tort reform, sabotage Social Security and Medicare, undermine clean air EPA regulations, cut back on consumer protections, and end net neutrality on the Internet.

Now, I suppose that after they've gotten their list, they'll say: We'll be reasonable. We'll negotiate. We will only take half of the things that we don't have the votes to pass. We'll just take half.

No. If you get to the point where there is an expectation of reward, then we will be in that. Suppose Democrats had thrown in maybe gun safety, marriage equality, immigration reform, and a jobs bill, and we're sitting up here trying to do the budget and have to do all of that and all of those and think we're ever going to come to a resolution. We have to have a clean CR so we can reopen the government without all those complications.

□ 1945

Back to ObamaCare, which seems to be provoking this problem. The fact is our health care system was in trouble. The rates were skyrocketing year after year after year. The problems with our health care system were not caused by ObamaCare; ObamaCare is trying to cure the problems.

We had a gentleman earlier today who said people have looked at the rates and some are paying a little more, some are paying a little less, and some about the same. If that's the case, that is a miracle, because after the last 50 years, rates have been skyrocketing and going up much faster than inflation. If they had been anywhere close to even, that would have been a lot less than it would have been had we not had ObamaCare.

Now we have the situation where it's affordable, it treats those with pre-

existing conditions, people under 26 can stay on their parents' policies, insurance reforms, preventive care provided without copays and deductibles, the doughnut hole. It goes on and on. This is a good deal. It will be better than before.

Another gentleman earlier today said just eliminate the individual mandate. The individual mandate is in every policy because if you're going to cover preexisting conditions, you cannot allow people to wait until they get sick before they buy insurance. If that's the case, everybody will wait until they get sick to buy insurance. Everybody with insurance would be sick, and the average rates would go through the roof. If you look at what happened in New York and the rates there, you can reasonably estimate that if you provided that exemption, the cost of insurance would double on the spot. We can't have that. So we need to just proceed.

If you want to improve ObamaCare, let's talk about improving it. In the meanwhile, it is not going to be repealed. It's not going to be undermined. This idea that you can keep the government open piecemeal by funding one agency at a time is absolutely absurd. Passing those bills would only serve one purpose, and that is to perpetuate and extend the shutdown.

The fact is that they don't have the votes to repeal ObamaCare. They don't even have the votes to keep the government shut. If they called a vote, we'd reopen the government. We just want an up-or-down vote on reopening government. We've had several procedural votes so far where we could have reopened the government. At least have an up-or-down vote on reopening government. And as the gentlelady from New York pointed out, there are enough Republicans who are on public record saying they would vote "yes" to give a clear indication that more than a majority of the House would be voting in favor.

I want to thank the gentleman from Nevada for bringing us together. ObamaCare is a very important advance in health care. It will cure all of the problems they're talking about. We don't need to reward anyone for shutting down the government or threatening the debt ceiling or shutting down the government in 4 weeks. We need to just reopen the government, and then we can have intelligent discussions about what to do about the budget.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his comments and for bringing up a number of key points. The main one that, I think, gets lost is the fact that the President and Democrats in both the House and the Senate have compromised. They've compromised on the lower budget number to get to a 6-week agreement on funding the budget in order for us to

have a longer term negotiation for the budget in subsequent years. That is a major point that I think the Speaker and those on the other side tend to forget. That was a number that the Speaker himself offered up in July and said that he would bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor in July at the very number that Democrats are prepared to say "yes" to.

What we're here to say, Mr. Speaker, and Members on the other side, is take "yes" for an answer. We're ready. There are 195 Democrats who are ready in this House, some 20 Republicans who publicly said that they're ready to support a clean continuing resolution, and there are probably more that would vote for it once it's brought to the floor.

I now yield to the gentlelady from Maryland, Congresswoman EDWARDS.

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman from Nevada for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo what my colleagues have said: it is time for us to bring a clean funding resolution to the floor of the House that would get a majority of Democratic support, and it would get strong Republican support to reopen the government. Not to reopen it in pieces, but to reopen all of government for all Americans. It's time for us to do that now.

We've had several funding bills that have come to the floor to fund bits and snippets of the Federal Government, but that's really not the way to do it. In fact, as the gentleman knows, the government was shut down by Republicans, and it wasn't shut down piecemeal. So it should not be reopened piecemeal; it should be opened in full.

I represent a district in Maryland that has a lot of Federal workers, workers who work at virtually every agency of the Federal Government. And I would note that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have brought forward piecemeal funding bills that fund a handful of agencies. There are 486 Federal agencies, and we haven't brought 486 funding bills to this floor. So it's rather silly to propose funding the government in these little snippets.

These three workers were in my office. One of them works for the Environmental Protection Agency. The other works for the Department of Health and Human Services and, in fact, at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid services, and the other one works at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. As I talked to the workers, I cannot even begin to explain to you how devastated they felt being tagged nonessential, knowing that their work is vital, but not really feeling validated as workers. That was kind of one thing.

The other thing is that they're doing their jobs because they believe in their jobs. They believe in the work that they're doing for the government. They

believe in the work that they're doing for taxpayers.

Lastly, they're worried about all of the work that goes undone. They're worried at EPA about letting the public know that inspections about conditions of water and other things in the environment in communities across this country are not happening because the EPA is not in business.

The worker who was in my office, Julia, who works at the Department of Health and Human Services, Mr. Speaker, is worried because in the work that she does, her specific job is to train Medicare providers so that they indicate the right codes when they submit for payment so that there's not fraud. The other part of her job is that she's supposed to look through those claims and make sure that if there is any indication of a problem or fraud, that it gets referred to the inspector general and gets referred to the Department of Justice. At a time when we're both implementing health care, but also when Medicare is being used, it's really important that Julia's job actually saves taxpayers money, and yet she's at home.

The worker who came to my office today, Emma, from NASA, is very concerned because part of her job is working on systems that would help deliver us our next generation of weather satellites because we have a gap in our satellite coverage. The farther we get behind in developing that new weather satellite, it means that it puts all of us in jeopardy in terms of receiving the information that we need. Mr. Speaker, as Americans know, we don't get our weather from The Weather Channel; we get our weather from the National Weather Service, from the folks at NOAA, from the people at NASA, and yet they are at home.

The other thing that these workers explained to me is the great personal cost to them. Seconda, who works at the Environmental Protection Agency, told me today that she takes care of her mother, in addition to herself and other family members, on her salary, and that she has been worried and up nights and unable to sleep because she's not really clear how she's going to be able to meet those expenses.

Julia, who works at CMS and HHS, has an 11-year-old child who had brain damage when he was born, and he's a special-needs child. Aiden has a wonderful smile and a beautiful face and voice, and he needs his mom, but they've also been able to take care of services for him with the salary that she makes at HHS.

Emma at NASA said to me that her 12-year-old and 14-year-old really don't understand why she's at home instead of going to work.

These workers aren't just a faceless bureaucracy. They have lives and they have responsibilities. With the Federal Government shut down, we're not ena-

bling them to meet those responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that they said to me is if you open up the government piecemeal, it doesn't really help them out. Take the example of Julia at HHS. If her job is to make referrals to the Department of Justice and to the Office of the Inspector General, and she's at her job, if by some fortuitous chance our Republican colleagues decide to restart HHS, what that means is that she doesn't have anybody to refer that fraud to because they're not on the job at the Department of Justice. If NASA is working and NOAA is not, then that joint work that takes place between agencies can't.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, what we do know is that every week that the Federal Government is shut down, it costs taxpayers \$10 billion. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has been shut down now for a week. Chalk up \$10 billion to the taxpayers. So you can see that the entire purpose of the strategy to shut down government is, in fact, costing taxpayers money.

Finally, I will share with you what I read in the paper today, Mr. Speaker. Three scientists and researchers won the Nobel Prize for medicine. They won the prize for developing a way to track cell traffic so that it could make determinations about when appropriate packages of cells in the body are being delivered for certain purposes. In doing that, it would help us make discoveries for immunological diseases, for neurological diseases, for things like diabetes. Some of these scientists had been working under a grant from the National Institutes of Health for about the last 30 years. It made me think that if we are not funding the National Institutes of Health and other government agencies that do research right now, that the work that they've been doing for the last 30 years is work, if you think forward 30 years, we're going to be missing because we've failed to fund the kind of research that we need. So there are ripple effects to the cost of shutting down the Federal Government.

Finally, in my district, I plan every year to have a college fair for the students in my district. Usually about 2,500 to 3,000 students show up. Our college fair is supposed to come up this weekend. We usually get assistance from NASA. They bring all kinds of projects and experiments to the science fair to get young people engaged in the science, technology, engineering, and math fields so that we can get them invested in tackling these jobs for the 21st century. We usually get assistance from the Department of Education to educate young people about loan and grant opportunities that might be available to them as they decide to make their college selections.

I just got an email, even as I was sitting here on the floor, that none of

these agencies will be able to participate in a college fair for our young people who are preparing to go to college next year, and they're going to miss out on those opportunities about learning of what's available to them and the challenges that they face because the Federal Government has shut down.

This is a really sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, on the impact of the shutdown and the ripple effect that that has both throughout our economy and in our local communities. So I will close by urging Speaker BOEHNER, Mr. Speaker, to please bring a clean funding bill to the floor of the House of Representatives, let it come up for a vote. You know what? If it fails, it does. But I know that in this body Republicans and Democrats like me will support that bill, and we'll do it, even though I don't agree with the number, I never supported the number. But I know that even though it is a Republican number, I'm going to agree with it because it will restart government. It is time, Mr. Speaker, for us to open up all of the Federal Government for all Americans.

□ 2000

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentlelady for her remarks and for bringing the real-life names and stories about who this furlough impacts and how government shutdown is really affecting them. Those are the individuals, the public servants who provide critical services each and every day, who deserve to go back to work.

Again, we're asking that the Speaker bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor so the government can be reopened; and like the gentlewoman from Maryland, I, myself, have heard from my constituents who are affected by this. Many have sent emails and called my office. There is one by the name of Alex, a Department of Defense employee, who got married a week before the shutdown and was furloughed a week ago today. Now, is that the Republican Party's idea of a honeymoon gift? This has to end, and it has to end now.

I got some letters today from a fifth grade class of students from Sandy Miller Elementary School in Nevada. They wrote to me because they're planning a trip to the Grand Canyon, but now it looks like that trip may be in jeopardy because the government shutdown is threatening access to the Grand Canyon. They wrote to provide me with some advice on how to solve these problems and to suggest that if Congress could start acting a little more like fifth graders, maybe we could get something done around here.

I would like to share some of the remarks from the letters that they wrote. Stefany writes:

You should be respectful of each other. Be communicators. But most of all, be balanced and open-minded.

Rossie said:

You should be reflective about how you are affecting other people, not just yourselves. If my class can compromise and get along, you and your colleagues in Congress should too.

George wrote:

Congress should start cooperating and working as a team, like we do here in school.

"The message is pretty clear," as one of the writers, Bailen, put it, "if fifth graders can get along, you can too."

Well, I sure hope that's the case, Mr. Speaker. Because if we can't work together to do the people's business, then we shouldn't be here; and maybe we should turn the gavel over to them.

I yield the floor to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to thank the gentleman from Nevada for chairing this hour tonight.

And just as I reflect, Mr. Speaker, on the comments made by those fifth graders, well, I'm glad I'm in tune with them because, you see, through this whole ordeal, I have spoken about people who have narrow agendas, where they're only thinking of themselves and not the totality of the common good in the United States. Because, you see, it's disingenuous and hypocritical to one day vote for a shutdown of the government and the next day show up at the World War II Memorial and stand with the veterans saying this is horrendous what has happened. You can't have it both ways.

I did not vote for a shutdown of the government, so maybe I should have been there at the World War II Memorial, saying the things that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been saying as they voted to shut down the memorial.

I want to share a story with you from a young lady in my district just a day or two ago. She's a young mother in Newark, New Jersey. I represent the people of that town. She went to the young fathers program at Rutgers University with her 2-year-old daughter. Due to the government shutdown, this young mother no longer is receiving her WIC benefits. And in desperation, she is reaching out to anyone and everyone for help, as her child literally starves from lack of nutrition assistance. She doesn't know where to go or who to turn to. She feels totally alone. She doesn't know how she'll feed her child or how she'll make ends meet.

This story breaks my heart, and, unfortunately, she is not alone. There are millions of pregnant women and new mothers just like her across the country who don't know how they'll feed their child. And what breaks my heart even more is knowing that Congress has the power to open this government tonight. The votes are here, Mr. Speaker. Let's pass a clean CR.

Make no mistake, this is a Republican government shutdown. The extreme faction got exactly what they

wanted. Well, I ask you, did the American people get exactly what they wanted? The people I represent didn't. Families across New Jersey's Tenth Congressional District who won't get the Hurricane Sandy relief that they were counting on didn't. Veterans who put their lives on the line for this country didn't. Low-income children kicked off of Head Start didn't. The 31,000 furloughed Federal workers in New Jersey didn't. The 9 million women, infants, and youngsters who rely on the WIC program certainly didn't.

So I ask, Who are my Republican colleagues listening to? Whose interests are they representing? Instead of reopening the entire government for everyone, House Republicans hold the country hostage with their piecemeal approach, picking winners and losers, choosing which parts of the government are worthy of opening. We must open the entire government and do what we can to do it today.

Mr. Speaker, 200 Democrats have signed a petition to bring a bill to the floor that would open the government today, and more than 20 Republicans have said they would also vote for the bill. So we have the votes. The question is, why won't Speaker BOEHNER bring the bill to the floor, one that he knows will pass, one that would reopen the government today? Because it's not too much to ask Members of Congress to do their job. It's not too much to ask to reopen the government and pay our bills on time. The people I represent have to do their jobs and pay their bills on time every single day. Why can't the leaders of this Nation do the same?

With every day that goes by, the more we drive up the costs for the American people, the more we threaten the stability of our Nation's economy. We cannot keep the government closed, and we cannot default on our debt. So I strongly urge my Republican colleagues to stand up for the American people, bring a bill to the floor that would reopen the government today, and let's start doing the job expected of us and continue to move our country forward, not punish the American people by moving it backwards.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman.

May I inquire as to the time I have remaining, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nevada has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At this time, I yield to my good friend from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

Mr. VEASEY. I thank the gentleman from Nevada for recognizing me to talk about something that is very important, and that is what is going on with America's future as it relates to this Republican government shutdown, the Affordable Care Act, and jobs.

While Republicans refuse to bring a clean CR to a vote on the House floor to end this Republican shutdown, our Nation, our cities, our States continue to suffer. Every single day, we are losing millions of dollars, wasting time and resources by furloughing government workers and limiting the public's access to government. And as we approach day eight of this reprehensible Republican shutdown, Republicans continue to bring bills to the House floor that will only fund pieces of the Federal Government.

This cynical effort to make headlines and cover themselves for causing such shameful dysfunction is resulting in a historical loss of confidence in Congress and causing undue economic uncertainty for families and businesses all across our country.

To my Republican friends, please understand this is not a game. These political gimmicks are not a responsible approach to governing. Each problem resulting from the Republican government shutdown can be taken care of if we simply pass the Senate's clean continuing resolution.

In north Texas, in the area that I represent, the 33rd Congressional District, families may miss out on over 300,000 meals because the USDA may have to cancel food truck shipments to the North Texas Food Bank. It's ridiculous. And millions of Americans may be affected by the flu this year due to the closing of the CDC's flu tracking program. These are only two examples of the widespread direct effects of the Republican shutdown.

And here's what Republicans need to know: they should go in their districts and talk to people, talk to workers who work in the defense industry, that work at our military bases, that are government employees. Talk to people that have been furloughed. Talk to the people that, because of the sequester problems that we've been unable to solve here because of the lack of Republican leadership, have already been laid off, including the over 400 at Bell Helicopter in Tarrant County in Fort Worth.

And if they talk to people and they go into their districts and speak with everyday common people that are out there working hard every day, what they'll find out is that it hurts to lose your job. And when you lose that job—particularly at this time of the year, as we get closer and closer to the Christmas season—and when you lose that job, then something happens to your car, some medical emergency pops up that ends up costing you a lot of money, then you really start to struggle as a family, and it really starts to hurt. That is what is so shameful about this Republican government shutdown. It doesn't take into consideration the real people that are out there struggling every day.

Speaker BOEHNER claims there aren't enough votes to reopen the government, but we know that's not true: 200 Democrats, including myself, have signed a letter to Speaker BOEHNER, making it clear that there are enough votes to pass the bill and reopen our government now.

Republicans claim they started this shutdown to defund, delay, and deny health care insurance to millions of Americans. Such a move would work to deny health care coverage in my home State of Texas to 6 million uninsured residents. We have the highest uninsured rate in the Union. In the district that I represent, alone, over 265,000 are uninsured. That's over a third in the 33rd Congressional District, in Dallas and in Fort Worth.

To Members wishing to deny health coverage through the Affordable Care Act, I want them to explain to those constituents in the district that I represent and in their own districts. It's a myth that it is only happening in our districts. They have people in their districts that are uninsured also, and they need to start representing them.

The most ridiculous reality of this political stunt is that the ACA is the law of the land, which means that this shutdown will be fruitless in repealing the law. And in the end, Republicans will have to behave like adults and stop simply saying "no" and come to the table with solutions for matters we can address in good faith.

□ 2015

Until then, House Democrats have a clear message: We demand a vote to reopen our government so Americans can move on with their lives, get back to work, provide for their families.

I ask my Republican colleagues to let reason overtake ideology, and let's get our government open again. Let's get it running. Enough is enough. Let's do the right thing. Let's stop with these games, stop the obstruction, and let's get back to work. These families are depending on us.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for his very constructive remarks. And as he said, the fact that some on the other side want to close down government and keep it closed and now potentially threaten our ability to meet our obligations on October 17 with the debt ceiling over the Affordable Care Act, something that is now the law of the land that's been passed by this Congress, signed by the President, upheld by the Supreme Court, and that's simply not going to happen, it's time for them to come to the table to negotiate without holding the Affordable Care Act as a precondition. And that is what we are here to say, to ask the Speaker to bring to the floor a clean funding bill that's supported by an overwhelming number of Democrats and Republicans, to reopen government and

to allow our American workers to go back to work.

I'd like to now yield to the cochair of this Special Order hour, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), my good friend.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from the Silver State, my good friend, Representative HORSFORD, for his tremendous leadership for anchoring this CBC Special Order. And it's my honor and my privilege to join him today, during this Congressional Black Caucus Hour of Power, where, for 60 minutes we have the opportunity to speak directly to the American people. It's always an honor and a privilege to do so, but it's tragic and sad that we're here today under such circumstances. This is a manufactured crisis, a government shutdown engineered as a result of mean-spirited, reckless, and unreasonable behavior by our friends from the other side of the aisle.

And in order to mask the obstructionism and the behavior that has resulted in more than 800,000 hard-working civil servants being kicked out of their jobs temporarily—we hope—there's been a series of myths, of factual misrepresentations that have been brought to the American people from our good friends on the other side of the aisle. I just want to spend a minute or two exploring some of the most significant ones courtesy of the House GOP.

The first thing that led us down this road is this idea that the Affordable Care Act is a train wreck, repeated over and over and over again. The Affordable Care Act is a train wreck.

It's not a train wreck. The train hasn't even left the station. Enrollment just began a few days ago on October 1. The coverage period for the American people doesn't even begin until January 1 of 2014. How can it be a train wreck when the train hasn't even left the station?

This is behavior that is designed to create an accident because of some obsession that folks have on the other side of the aisle with providing tens of millions of Americans who are otherwise uninsured with health care coverage. It's an obsession that, quite frankly, I can't understand.

What are you so angry about? Are you upset about the fact that the Affordable Care Act prohibits preexisting conditions from denying health care coverage to Americans, including children?

Do you dislike the fact that young people going out into a very difficult job market can now stay on the insurance of their parents until the age of 26?

Does it really bother you that small businesses will be eligible for a tax credit up to 35 percent to help provide health insurance coverage for their employees in a manner that will allow

these small businesses to grow and prosper?

Enough with this myth the Affordable Care Act is a train wreck. But that was the basis of the shutdown and the ransom notes that were sent over to the Senate majority that courageously stamped each one: Rejected; return to sender.

Defund, delay, destroy the Affordable Care Act, that was the genesis of this conflict. And then we shifted, once it was clear that that strategy was not going to work, into the second great myth of this debacle that we find ourselves in. The second myth: Democrats refuse to negotiate.

Negotiate over what? Negotiate over a law that my colleagues have clearly indicated is the law of the land, passed by a duly-elected Congress in 2010, signed by the President, declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States of America in a decision issued by Chief Justice John Roberts, a Bush appointee, and then affirmed by the reelection of President Barack Obama in the electoral college landslide? Why do you want us to negotiate over settled law?

There are three ways in the American democratic system for you to change law, Mr. Speaker:

The first is through the legislative process. In 2010, you lost. Forty-three or 44 additional times subsequent to that, you've lost, unable to do it legislatively.

You can try and change the law in America through our democratic system jurisprudentially, through the court system. In 2012, the Supreme Court rejected that. You lost.

Then you can try and change things as a result of an election, and you lost with the reelection of the President by more than 5 million votes in 2012.

Those are the three legitimate ways—legislative, jurisprudential, electoral—that you change laws in American democracy. You do not extort concessions and threaten to shut down the government.

So this notion that we've refused to compromise is a great myth, particularly when, as my good friend from Nevada pointed out, the fact is that we've already compromised as it relates to the underlying number connected to funding the government.

The Democrats believe the appropriate number is \$1.058 trillion. That number is right here. The Republicans believe the appropriate number is \$986 billion. That number is right here. We've agreed to drop our number all the way down to \$986 billion, representing a \$70 billion compromise, yet you continue to put forth this myth, as if we're the ones behaving unreasonably. The American people see through this factual misrepresentation.

Lastly, let me just say, we had another great myth put forth this week-end by none other than the Speaker of

the House of Representatives. No, not the junior Senator from Texas; the other one from Ohio. He said there are not the votes in the House to pass a clean CR. Not the votes? I'm no mathematician, Mr. Speaker, but it's clear, 198 Democrats have indicated they're willing to reopen the government if you put the bill on the floor. And if you add that to the 23 Republicans who have gone on record back at home in their districts, that gets us to 221, the magic number being 217 to reopen the government.

Stop peddling factual misrepresentations to the American people to cover your legislative malpractice. Let's get back to doing the business of the American people.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I know we are coming down to the end of our time. I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much. Let me first thank you both for continuing to sound the alarm and to really conduct these Special Orders so the American people can know the truth about what's really going on here in Washington, D.C. So thank you, Mr. HORSFORD, thank you, Mr. JEFFRIES, for your remarkable leadership and for what you're doing tonight once again.

As I'm listening to what we've been talking about, there are two things that I want to drive home.

One is many of us did not want to and will continue to oppose sequester. What sequester has done is really gutted many of our safety net programs, such as Head Start, where 21,000 young people cannot have access now to Head Start in many of our districts. Senior citizens, Meals on Wheels, they won't be able to really get their Meals on Wheels, which is what they need to have a nutritious diet.

We see over and over again the impacts of sequester in people's daily lives, and it's wrong; and, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, the subcommittee that really works on all of our domestic programs, we've been fighting so hard to end the sequester so that people do not have to live through this pain, given what they're going through now as a result of sequester. So for us to support a bill that would open the government up at that level causes us a lot of pain and grief.

And what we're hoping is that, by our support of that \$986 billion bill to open the government up, we can open the government up so that people can get back to work, so that we have a functioning government, and so that we can begin to negotiate what makes sense for the American people in terms of the type of programs and the type of resources and services they need until we can get the Republican Tea Party Members of this House to understand that we need to create jobs and support

a jobs bill. But until we do that, we have to minimally ensure that the Federal Government provides for the basics for the American people, and so many of us would support that level of funding just to get the government open.

I think, and as you said, the Speaker, I think they know that they have enough votes to put up with our Democratic votes to open the government up; and so, for the life of me, I don't know why they don't just bring that bill to the floor. Let's see. Let's have an up-or-down vote. I think the American people deserve that.

A government shutdown is wrong. People deserve to have health care. Millions of people now are accessing the Affordable Care Act. They didn't have health insurance before. Now they'll be covered.

So, once again, we have to see why in the world, or ask the question: Why in the world would people who need health care, why would they be held hostage to people who want to work in a government shutdown?

So I hope that more people are listening, more people understand that we know how to open the government up and we know how to begin to negotiate on a real budget that makes sense for not only our domestic programs, but for the Pentagon and for our foreign assistance, State Department, all of those necessary programs that make for a functioning government.

So thank you again for your leadership, and thank you for giving me the time tonight to speak.

Mr. Speaker, here we are day seven of the hurtful devastating Republican government shutdown.

We all know that Tea Party extremists came to Congress—not to govern—but to achieve the goal of shutting down the government.

Well, congratulations to them for achieving a dream come true.

Now, millions of families, children, seniors, federal employees and our economy are paying the price.

In my congressional district, and throughout the state of California, families are already feeling the impact of the Republican government shutdown.

The California Women Infant and Children program is on the brink of turning away low-income pregnant women and new moms if this shutdown continues.

And schools throughout the state of California are cancelling field trips to national parks and monuments which are closed to visitors due to this Republican shutdown.

Across the country our vital national interests are also taking the hit.

The shutdown threatens to derail the already unacceptable Veterans Administration disability backlog.

There are no new business loans or assistance for small businesses or for our farmers.

Without the CDC conducting disease surveillance and taking calls about infectious diseases—our public health is at serious risk.

If the Republican shutdown continues—13 million children will lose access to school

breakfast and 31 million will lose access to school lunches.

8.7 million women and their young children will not receive nutrition assistance through the WIC program.

And 47.5 million people who rely on SNAP will go hungry.

Yes, the Tea Party is getting exactly what they wanted—and millions of children and families will go hungry because of it.

To add insult to injury, Republicans have shut down the government because they are obsessed—obsessed mind you—with destroying the Affordable Care Act.

The vast majority of Americans—who, by the way, continue to blame Republicans for the shutdown—see how senseless it is to shutdown the government because you want to deny health care to millions of Americans.

Despite the Republican government shutdown, health care exchanges established under the Affordable Care Act have successfully opened for enrollment.

Now millions of uninsured Americans are less than just three months away from having the health care coverage they so desperately need.

For the nearly 7 million uninsured African Americans, October 1st marked the opportunity to have fewer health inequities, and increased access to quality and affordable health care and preventive medicine.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, 500,000 young, African American adults have already gained coverage from a parent's health care plan.

And for the 7.3 million African Americans who have private insurance and the 4.5 million who have Medicare coverage, the Affordable Care Act now means access to key preventive health services, including vital screenings, at no extra cost.

With health disparities continuing to have a huge financial burden on the health care system, these key changes as provided through the Affordable Care Act will not only save money—but they will save lives.

California—the first state to commit to establishing its own exchange—launched the Covered California exchange.

In my Congressional District alone there are nearly 100,000 uninsured constituents and the opening of the exchanges means they are one step closer to health care coverage that can literally mean the difference between life and death.

"MAKING GOOD HEALTH MY REALITY" TOUR

Mr. Speaker, this summer I, and many of my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus, co-hosted the "Making Good Health MY Reality" tour health care town halls to help educate our constituents about the Affordable Care Act.

Two hundred constituents attended my town hall, and while there were many many questions, people were undeniably excited and looked forward to the open enrollment period.

There were many who already had private insurance, but attended in order to learn more so that they could tell their friends and family members about the Affordable Care Act.

Some attended just to speak about the good health care reform has already done in their lives, like the mother whose daughter became very ill while away at college and had to rely on her health insurance to seek treatment.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, her daughter was able to stay in college, graduate, and now has her own health care insurance.

But that isn't enough for Tea Party Republicans.

It isn't enough that websites across the country are crashing because of the interest millions of Americans have in getting affordable health care coverage.

As one constituent, after working for 3 hours to successfully enroll in a health care plan, put it: "Do I now have doubts about the Affordable Care Act? Absolutely not."

"I would go through much more to get affordable health insurance. I experience more stress every day worrying about getting . . . a disease like cancer and having to face a hospital bill I can't afford on my own." (Janice Worthen wrote of her experience in The Alamedan.)

That is what is driving Americans to the health care exchanges. That is what the Tea Party Republicans are holding this country hostage for.

Mr. Speaker, while all of us believe it is important to keep the government functioning, hostage taking is no way to run federal departments and agencies.

Members of Congress are elected to make sure our government functions.

Yet, instead of working together to do our jobs, Republicans continue to double down on the tea-party plan to destroy and decimate our government.

Instead of working on a serious option to reopen the government, Republicans latest strategy is to exploit our veterans, cancer patients, pregnant women, and young children, by voting on piecemeal bills that will not end impacts of a shut down that extend across our country.

WIC

It is simply outrageous to sit here and play politics with pregnant mothers, their babies, and their young children.

In the past year alone the WIC program has been cut by \$500 million—simply unacceptable to the more than 21,000 WIC participants in my congressional district alone.

As a Member of the Appropriations Committee, I witnessed Republicans vote over and over and over again to cut funding to this vital program.

Despite committee Democrats' best efforts to stand against these ridiculous attacks and to convince them of the importance of this program, they have refused to listen to reason and insisted on massive cuts.

HEAD START

And that's not all.

Because of the Tea Party imposed sequestration, more than 57,000 at-risk students have lost their Head Start slots, and my district alone lost \$1.5 million in federal contributions to the Head Start program.

Yet there is now a Republican proposal circulating to restore funding to Head Start.

The hypocrisy is truly appalling.

VA

We saw them do the same for the Veterans Affairs department.

Even if we do fund the VA, their employees still need to work with their counterparts at the Department of Defense and the Social Security Administration in order to process claims.

Mr. Speaker, of course we support our veterans, of course we support our national parks, and of course we support full funding for the NIH, the WIC program, and the Head Start program.

Yet, some people in this chamber who have been leading the charge to cut these very same programs are taking their fundamental responsibility and holding it hostage, hoping that by doing so they will get their way.

If my colleagues would really like to help our nation's most vulnerable, the people who will suffer the most due to their intransigence—rather than trying to score political points—they need to not only fund the entire federal government, they also need to roll back sequestration and other cuts to vital programs that they've made over the last three years.

But they aren't going to do that.

Instead they will continue to posture, to attempt to score political points, and in the end push to achieve the goal they set years ago: to dismantle this government.

Mr. Speaker, this is not what the American people deserve.

This anarchy must end.

We must bring a clean CR to the Floor, and we must pass it.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you to the gentledady from California.

I will just conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we demand a vote. We demand a vote on a clean funding resolution, one that's supported by 198 Democrats, 23 Republicans, 221 Members. A majority of the Members of this body are prepared to vote on a clean resolution, and we're asking—demanding—the Speaker bring that clean resolution to the floor so that we can reopen government and allow all of our American workers, those in government and those in the private sector, to get back to work and to meet our obligations as a country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which has already significantly improved health care for Americans. The six month enrollment period for Americans to sign up for affordable health care coverage in the state-based Health Insurance Marketplaces has begun. Important decisions on government finding and the debt ceiling await votes while politics take center stage and the soundness of our economy remains in question.

House Republicans have caused a government shutdown in order to advance a delusional political agenda spearheaded by disdain for the Affordable Care Act. In a demonstration of hollow leadership, politics are being placed before people. Instead of approving the Senate-passed funding bill, House Republicans have cast yet another vote to undermine the Affordable Care Act for the forty-third time since its passage.

However, the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land and many have already benefited from its implementation. In Texas, families have saved \$46.3 million in insurance company refunds. Medicare beneficiaries in the "donut hole" have saved \$420.7 million in pre-

scription drugs. More than 40,000 Americans and 17 million American children with pre-existing conditions gained insurance coverage through the Affordable Care Act. The Congressional Budget Office released a study showing that the Affordable Care Act will provide coverage for an additional 32 million people while reducing overall health care costs.

The new health care law will only grow stronger and expand access to quality coverage with the state-based Health Insurance Marketplaces for those who cannot receive coverage through an employer. The Affordable Care Act not only provides increased access to quality care but it marks the beginning of fewer health disparities across the nation and more investment in preventative health care. I am proud to stand with the President and my colleagues in support of the Affordable Care Act.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank my colleagues, Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. JEFFRIES, for leading the CBC's important discussion on Republicans' refusal to bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor and the resulting government shutdown.

The Republican course is a partisan path to nowhere, and it simply leaves our workers with fewer jobs, our families with less security, and our country with less certainty and stability.

The government shut down has left hundreds of thousands of Federal employees immediately and indefinitely furloughed.

Recruiting and hiring for Veteran jobs have ceased. Federal assistance to school districts, colleges and universities, and vocational rehabilitation agencies have been severely curtailed.

Important government research into life-threatening diseases, environmental protection, and other areas has halted.

This has all occurred because some Republicans do not like a law already enacted, that a majority of Americans support. A law that already has helped millions of American families, individuals, and businesses.

Reforming our nation's health care system is a historic opportunity to make health care more affordable and bring the kind of change we were all elected to achieve for the American people.

It's called the Affordable Care Act (ACA) and it secures affordable, high quality and accessible health care. It is about establishing healthcare as a right, not a privilege, for every American.

It is about wellness and prevention, economic security and entrepreneurship, and strengthening the middle class. This historic law is about creating a healthier America.

October 1st marked the first day the public could enroll in the Health Insurance Marketplace created by the ACA.

For many African-Americans, this date marked the beginning of fewer health inequities, increased access to quality care, more affordable health coverage, and greater investments in prevention.

African-Americans and other underserved populations often have higher rates of disease, fewer treatment options, and reduced access to healthcare.

The ACA addresses these overwhelming health inequities through several initiatives including data collection, prevention, workforce

development, and quality improvement strategies.

Thanks to the ACA, 7.3 million African-Americans with private health insurance can now receive preventive services, like wellness visits, and diabetes and cancer screenings, at no extra cost, 4.5 million African-Americans who have Medicare coverage can now receive preventive services, like flu shots and blood pressure and cholesterol screenings, at no extra cost, 6.8 million uninsured African-Americans may be eligible for coverage through the new Health Insurance Marketplace.

The new Health Insurance Marketplace is healthcare, made simple. It builds on the last three years, during which many Americans have already seen lower costs and better coverage.

Because of the ACA, 105 million Americans have already received access to free preventive services, 6.6 million Seniors have saved more than \$7 billion on their prescription drugs.

More than 100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on their insurance coverage.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about saving lives. In Ohio, according to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, there will be lower than expected premiums in the new Health Insurance Marketplace.

Ohio consumers will be able to choose from an average of 46 health plans in the Marketplace.

For every 10 individuals who are uninsured in Ohio, 6 will be able to find coverage for \$100 or less per month, taking into account premium tax credits and Medicaid coverage. As a lifelong healthcare advocate, as a stroke survivor, and as an African-American woman, I know the importance of protecting access to affordable healthcare coverage for all Americans, particularly those who are the most in need.

The new Marketplaces across the country will mean brand-new health and economic security for millions of Americans. It means a healthier, more prosperous nation.

I look forward to helping educate the American people about the benefits of the ACA and continuing to move forward with its implementation. But, with all of the benefits the ACA brings to our country, there are some who still refuse to see how the law helps the American people.

The ACA is the law of the land, which has been upheld by the Supreme Court and which is currently being implemented to the benefit of millions of Americans.

I urge Speaker BOEHNER and the other House Republican leaders to follow the will of the American people—end their politically-manufactured government shutdown, and pass the clean Senate CR, so that the government can get back to helping the American people.

I thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important issue.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and October 8 on account of a family illness.

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 8, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3241. A letter from the Director, Division of Coal Mine Workers' Compensation, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations Implementing the Byrd Amendments to the Black Lung Benefits Act: Determining Coal Miners' and Survivors' Entitlement to Benefits (RIN: 1240-AA04) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3242. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R01-OAR-2013-0028; A-1-FRL-9797-3] received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3243. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Fort Collins [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-0708; FRL-9900-86-Region 8] received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3244. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; West Virginia's Redesignation for the Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Associated Maintenance Plan [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0386; FRL-9900-71-Region 3] received September 57, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3245. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Procedures

for Stringency Determinations and Minor Permit Revisions for Federal Operating Permits [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-0355; FRL-9900-82-Region 6] received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3246. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment for the Chico Nonattainment Area for the 2006 Fine Particle Standard; California; Determination Regarding Applicability of Clean Air Act Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0800; FRL-9900-69-Region 9] received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3247. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Interim Rule to List the Southern White Rhino as Threatened [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-ES-2013-0055] (RIN: 1018-AY76) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3248. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Wagner, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0004; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-1] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3249. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Walker, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0266; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-11] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3250. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Brigham City, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0414; Airspace Docket No. 13-ANM-14] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Supplemental report on H.R. 1804. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress semi-annual reports on the cost of foreign travel made by employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs (Rept. 113-227, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LAMBOURN:

H.R. 3271. A bill making continuing appropriations for the compensation of Federal employees and certain military personnel in

the event of a Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3272. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain tax incentives for investment in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 3271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power

of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 15: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 233: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 350: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 565: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 685: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 688: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 721: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 830: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 855: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 940: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 997: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1070: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1094: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1250: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1318: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1339: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1462: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 1507: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1518: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Il-

linois, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1633: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1666: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1726: Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 1731: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1796: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1915: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2029: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2064: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2459: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2663: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2760: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2766: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 2797: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2887: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 3005: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3040: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3061: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3111: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MICA, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. DENT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. LABRADOR, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 3121: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 3143: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 3179: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 3232: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 3236: Mr. KIND.

H.J. Res. 43: Mr. HONDA.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H. Res. 61: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. SIRE.

H. Res. 131: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H. Res. 153: Mr. YOHIO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 254: Mr. HOLT.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMEMBERING RAYMOND F.
BARRY, SR.

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the remarkable life of Raymond F. "Rambo" Barry, Sr., who passed away on July 15th, 2013 at the age of 75. He was born on February 7, 1938 to the late Marjorie Barry of Altoona, Pennsylvania. Raymond happily spent his days traveling, watching his beloved Bengals, keeping up with politics, playing cards and engaging in lively conversations with his longtime friends.

Raymond felt an uncanny closeness to his fellow man, serving as a vital member of his community and church. He loved to support his friends and family, especially in their athletic endeavors. As Raymond was the recipient of a lung transplant, we were extremely fortunate that he was able to spend five and a half additional years with us. Every day, Raymond provided an example of friendliness and warmth, much to the benefit to those he met.

I would like to extend my deepest sympathy to Raymond's family, particularly his wife of 24 years, Teri Barry, as well as his sister Edna Hoskins, sister-in-law Ruth Reed, children Pamela Lucero, Warren Barry, Jerimie J. McKinley, and Jamie McKinley-Taylor, grandchildren Brian Hammer, Raymond Barry III, A.J. Hammer, Xzandria McKinley, Jonathon McKinley, Kat Taylor and Aleutian Taylor, 6 great-grandchildren, and numerous other family members and friends.

RECOGNIZING THE 102ND NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to recognize the Republic of China (Taiwan) as they celebrate their 102nd National Day on October 10, 2013.

The Republic of China, commonly known as Taiwan, maintains a robust economic and cultural relationship with the United States and serves as a strong trade partner. In my home state of North Carolina, Taiwan is among our top ten export markets in Asia.

As an ally in the Asia Pacific region and an important trade partner of the United States, Taiwan should be included in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House to further this goal.

As we continue to nurture bilateral relations with Taiwan, I invite our friends from Taiwan to visit the United States.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, 2013, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 519 through 524.

Had I been present for rollcall vote 519, on ordering the previous question regarding H. Res. 371, providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and for other purposes, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 520, on agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 371, providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and for other purposes, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 521, on the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair regarding H.J. Res. 85, making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 522, on passage of H.J. Res. 85, making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 523, to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair regarding H.J. Res. 75, making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 524, on passage of H.J. Res. 75, making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted "no."

REMEMBERING THOMAS GILLEN

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable life of my friend Thomas Joseph Gillen, who tragically passed away on March 9, 2013 at the age of thirty-eight. Tom was born on November 19, 1974 in Warren, Ohio, to his proud and caring parents, John and Gloria Gillen. He enjoyed hunting, fishing and spending time with his loved ones.

Tom led an exemplary life of service and dedication; he graduated from John F. Kennedy High School where he helped his football team win a State Championship in 1991 and place runner-up the following year. Afterwards, he went on to graduate from Youngstown State University and work for the State of Ohio Department of Corrections for the past fifteen years. Tom's life, although all too brief, was highlighted by success, commitment and loyalty.

I extend my deepest condolences to Tom's family. He is survived by his parents, as well as his sister Annie Needs, brothers John Gillen, Brian Gillen and James Gillen, niece Maggie Needs, nephews Matthew and Ian Needs, as well as several aunts, uncles and cousins. Although Tom is no longer with us, his memory will endure in the hearts of his family and friends.

Thomas was a successful and caring man, and I am deeply saddened by his premature passing. He knew how to be a team player and how to make difficult sacrifices. Thomas left an impression in the minds of everyone he met and will be greatly missed. The state of Ohio lost an outstanding citizen and his community will miss him dearly.

DAN THOEMKE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Dan Thoenke for receiving the 2013 Golden Mayor's Award for Excellence.

This award recognizes extraordinary contributions to the Golden community and is presented to Dan Thoenke for building community and making Golden a better place for all. Dan's contributions in Golden can be seen in many venues including his leadership with the Together Church of Golden, a voluntary group of pastors from all denominations, his work with the Golden Backpack program, Neighborhood Rehab project, City Unite, and as Chaplain for the Golden Police department. Dan is

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

a quiet but powerful leadership force and a role model of excellence in our community.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Dan Thoemke for this well deserved recognition by Mayor Marjorie Sloan and the City of Golden. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

HONORING ROBBIE BRONNER

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, reaching the age of 80 years is a remarkable milestone; and

Whereas, Mrs. Robbie Bronner was born eighty years ago and is celebrating that milestone today; and

Whereas, Mrs. Bronner has been blessed with a long, happy life, devoted to God and credits it all to the Will of God; and

Whereas, Mrs. Bronner is celebrating her 80th birthday with her family members, church members, and friends here in Atlanta, Georgia on September 29, 2013; and

Whereas, the Lord has been her Shepherd throughout her life and she prays daily and is leading by example a blessed life; and

Whereas, we are honored that she is celebrating the milestone of her 80th birthday with church members from the 4th District of Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Robbie Bronner for an exemplary life which is an inspiration to all:

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim September 29, 2013 as Mrs. Robbie Bronner Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 29th day of September, 2013.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCENTIVES FOR BUSINESS AND INDIVIDUAL INVESTMENT ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a slightly amended version of the District of Columbia Incentives for Business and Individual Investment Act (H.R. 2890), which I introduced on July 31, 2013. The prior version of the bill had a couple of drafting errors. This version of the bill corrects those errors by extending all of the D.C. tax incentives through 2015.

RECOGNIZING SAFEWAY FOR SERVING OUR TROOPS

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Safeway Inc., headquartered in Pleasanton, California, for receiving the Secretary of Defense Employer Support Freedom Award from the Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (ESGR) organization.

The Employer Support Freedom Award recognizes employers who show a commitment to hiring and supporting service members from the National Guard and Reserve. Safeway was one of only 15 employers to receive this prestigious award, chosen from over 2,900 nominations.

More than ten years ago, Safeway was one of the first companies to extend full benefits and cover the pay differential for Reserve and National Guard employees called to active duty.

Additionally, in 2012, Safeway launched its Retail Military Recruiting project, which seeks to hire veterans from a variety of backgrounds. In 2012, Safeway hired 1,500 veterans, and it plans to hire another 1,500 veterans in 2013. Also, Safeway has instituted a special program to hire junior military officers and non-commissioned officers for managerial positions in the company.

As a nation we must pledge that when our troops return home we leave no service member behind. Safeway has shown our troops and veterans more than words of appreciation; it has provided meaningful support to our brave service members.

I applaud Safeway's continued service to our National Guard, Reserves, and veterans through these hiring and benefits programs. Congratulations again to Safeway for achieving this great honor.

REMEMBERING MARTHA M. MURANSKY

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of an outstanding and charitable woman, Ms. Martha M. Muransky. Martha was born on May 28, 1923, to Joseph and Martha Kukara and spent her 89 years as a resident of the Youngstown, Ohio area. She witnessed almost a century of change and was always filled with humor, wit and kindness. She enjoyed cooking, baking, sports, and, most of all, spending time with her family.

Martha graduated from Campbell High School in 1940 and was an active member of the SS. Cyril & Methodius Church. Martha possessed a keen intelligence, a love for reading, and understood the value of commitment. She worked as a precinct committee woman during elections, belonged to the First Catholic Slovak Union and without a doubt was her son

Ed's number one fan as he pursued an outstanding football career. A hard worker, Martha was employed by G.E. Mazda Lamp Company, operated her family's produce store until 1957, and worked for both Union Bank and the Home Savings and Loan Company.

I extend my most sincere condolences to Martha's family. Her long and productive life set an example to all of us and all who knew her. Her life and the values she embodied greatly influenced her relatives, including her two brothers, Larry and Ray Kukara, daughter Elaine Mulichak, son Ed Muransky, grandchildren Brian Mulichak, Melissa Kellgren, Eddie Muransky, Deloran Muransky and Donielle Muransky, and great grandchildren, Luke, Paige and Karter. Martha was preceded in death by her sister, Ethel DeNicholas, and two brothers, Frank and Joseph Kukara. Martha was a very special woman and will be long remembered.

HONORING FRANK LEAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Frank Leal Elementary School for being named a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School. This is a remarkable honor that deserves our recognition and praise.

Frank Leal Elementary School is in Cerritos, California and was among three Los Angeles County schools named as a National Blue Ribbon School.

This prestigious award is given in recognition to schools where students perform at remarkably high levels or where significant improvements are being made in students' academic achievement.

Leal Elementary School was recognized as a "blue ribbon" honoree because it ranked among the highest-performing schools on state assessments in language arts and mathematics, achieving an Academic Performance Index score of 972. That's nearly 200 points higher than the state average of 789.

This award would not have been possible without the tireless dedication of teachers, counselors, parents, and, of course, the brilliant students at Leal Elementary School. Countless Leal parents will one day see their children attend and graduate from college, fostering future generations of service-oriented, civically engaged Cerritos residents.

The National Blue Ribbon recognition is just one of many more milestones to be achieved by these bright young scholars. The community pride they have created through their exemplary achievement encourages students in our communities to strive for even greater academic success. For that reason, I would like to recognize Frank Leal Elementary School for being named a National Blue Ribbon School.

TRIBUTE TO GREENFOREST
COMMUNITY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, Greenforest Community Baptist Church has been and continues to be a beacon of light to our district for the past fifty-five years; and

Whereas, Pastor Dennis Mitchell and the members of the Greenforest Community Baptist Church family today continue to uplift and inspire those in our district; and

Whereas, the Greenforest Community Baptist Church family has been and continues to be a place where citizens are touched spiritually, mentally and physically through outreach ministries and community partnership to aid in building up our district; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious Church of God has given hope to the homeless, fed the needy and empowered our community for the past fifty-five (55) years; and

Whereas, this Church has produced many spiritual warriors, people of compassion, people of great courage, fearless leaders and servants to all, but most of all visionaries who have shared not only with their Church, but with DeKalb County their passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Greenforest Community Baptist Church family for their leadership and service to our District on this the 55th Anniversary of their founding;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim October 20, 2013 as Greenforest Community Baptist Church Day In the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 20th day of October, 2013.

IRWIN JOSEPH KRAMER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Irwin Joseph (Jim) Kramer on his 80th birthday. There are many ways to serve your fellow man, whether it be through service to one's country, advancing knowledge in a scientific field or by becoming a community leader, and I applaud Mr. Kramer for his great achievements in all of these areas.

Originally from Brooklyn, and a graduate of Brooklyn College, Mr. Kramer joined the United States Air Force and served in the Korean War. His military career eventually brought him to Newfoundland, Canada where he served as a meteorologist.

Mr. Kramer also demonstrated great dedication to the Aurora community after moving and settling down in Colorado. In addition to serving on the board of the Danbury Park Homeowners Association, he served on the board of

Aurora Mental Health Center and volunteered many hours of this time to the Aurora Mental Health Center. Improving the lives of his friends, family, and even strangers is the cornerstone to his legacy.

Mr. Kramer currently resides happily in Aurora, Colorado with his wife Barbara. He has 3 sons, 3 step sons, 5 daughters in law and 11 grandchildren.

CONGRATULATING GREENE EARLY
COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL FOR
BEING RECOGNIZED AS A
NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Greene Early College High School located in Snow Hill, North Carolina for being recognized by the U.S. Department of Education as a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School.

Since 1982, the Department of Education has recognized elementary, middle, and high schools whose students excelled or showed significant academic improvement on state or national assessments with the prestigious National Blue Ribbon School designation. This year, Greene Early College High School is being recognized, along with 285 other schools nationwide, for its academic performance.

Students from Greene Early College High School have demonstrated academic excellence by achieving 100 percent proficiency on North Carolina's End-of-Grade Tests, and by achieving a 100 percent graduation rate. These achievements have distinguished Greene Early College High School as one of the highest performing schools in eastern North Carolina. As a result, the North Carolina State Board of Education and the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction named Greene Early College High School an Honor School of Excellence this year.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the students, faculty, and parents of Greene Early College High School for their commitment to academic excellence. A solid educational foundation and high school diploma are essential for achievement and success in today's competitive global economy. The Blue Ribbon School designation is a great testament to the Snow Hill community's commitment to prepare their children for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring and celebrating Greene Early College High School's great achievement by being recognized as a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School.

IN RECOGNITION OF COUNTY LINE
FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150 years of fellowship and

service Pilot Point's County Line First Baptist Church has provided to its members and community.

Originally founded in 1863, the County Line Baptist Church, then named Colored Missionary Baptist Church, quickly became the center of the African American community. Early members met under a brush arbor before building a chapel near the Cooke and Denton county line in 1874. In 1882, the church moved to Pilot Point. It was there the church served as the first school in the area for African Americans, working to educate people of all ages to strengthen the community as a whole.

County Line Baptist Church has become an iconic and central part of the African American community in northeast Denton County. The congregation has been active in the community and state. Through a variety of programs, including the establishment of adult literacy classes and serving as the host for associational conventions. Today, County Line remains a place of solace, worship, study, social events, weddings and funerals where both members and non-members are always welcome.

It is my honor to recognize the County Line Baptist Church and their continued dedication to their community, and to represent Denton County and the City of Pilot Point in the House of Representatives.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,747,458,528,953.05. We've added \$6,120,581,480,039.97 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

FRANK LAY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and applaud Frank Lay for his outstanding service over the years to our community.

Frank's career spans over 57 years in diverse business and political environments. Some of his accomplishments include teaching for seven years at Utah Technical College, 10 years as vice president of the Utah Building Trades and president of the Western Apprenticeship Coordinators Association. Frank's leadership and guidance during his tenure as president of the Utah AFL-CIO had an enormous positive impact on working families. Frank continues to bring the same diligence

and compassion to the senior citizens of our community. Frank is a tireless advocate for the issues facing senior citizens and makes sure Colorado legislators, state and federal, are aware of the issues they face.

Though Frank Lay is resigning as president of the Colorado Alliance for Retired Americans, I know he will remain a champion for the community. I am honored to recognize him for his devotion to the middle class, protection of seniors and dedication to the public good. I am sure he will have the same unwavering commitment and enthusiasm to future endeavors. Thank you for your service, Frank.

TRIBUTE TO SPRINGFIELD
MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, Springfield Missionary Baptist Church has been and continues to be a beacon of light to our district for the past one hundred forty-one years; and

Whereas, Pastor Charles W. Levy and the members of the Springfield Missionary Baptist Church family today continues to uplift and inspire those in our district; and

Whereas, the Springfield Missionary Baptist Church family has been and continues to be a place where citizens are touched spiritually, mentally and physically through outreach ministries and community partnership to aid in building up our district; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious Church of God has given hope to the hopeless, fed the needy and empowered our community for the past one hundred forty-one (141) years; and

Whereas, this Church has produced many spiritual warriors, people of compassion, people of great courage, fearless leaders and servants to all, but most of all visionaries who have shared not only with their Church, but with Newton County their passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Springfield Missionary Baptist Church family for their leadership and service to our District on this the 141st Anniversary of their founding;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim October 6, 2013 as Springfield Missionary Baptist Church Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 6th day of October, 2013.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcalls No. 519 and 520, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING GLADYS LATTIMORE

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, there are many individuals who are called to contribute to the needs of our community through leadership and service; and

Whereas, Mrs. Gladys Lattimore has answered that call by giving of herself as an educator at Salem Middle School, and as a beloved wife, mentor and friend; and

Whereas, Mrs. Lattimore has been chosen as the 2013 Teacher of the Year, representing Salem Middle School; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents for the betterment of our community and our nation through her tireless works, motivational speeches and words of wisdom; and

Whereas, Mrs. Lattimore is a virtuous woman, a courageous woman and a fearless leader who has shared her vision, talents and passion to help ensure that our children receive an education that is relevant not only for today, but well into the future, as she truly understands that our children are the future; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Gladys Lattimore for her leadership and service for our District and in recognition of this singular honor as 2013 Teacher of the Year at Salem Middle School;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim September 27, 2013 as Mrs. Gladys Lattimore Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 27th day of September, 2013.

HUGH KING

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Hugh King for receiving the 2013 Golden Mayor's Award for Excellence.

This award recognizes extraordinary contributions to the Golden community and is presented to Hugh King, M.D., Ph.D., for his fourteen-year humanitarian career as co-founder of Namlo International, an organization that enables education and a better quality of life to citizens of Nepal, Nicaragua, the USA, and Spain through five programs—school construction, school improvement, scholarships, sister schools, and sustainable development. Hugh, a full professor of Chemical and Biological Engineering at the Colorado School of Mines, and his co-founder and wife Magda, the first woman from Spain to reach the summit of an 8000 meter peak, founded Namlo with the belief that the key to success is a

focus on helping communities take responsibility for their schools.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Hugh King for this well deserved recognition by Mayor Marjorie Sloan and the City of Golden. Thank you for your dedication to our community.

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY 2013

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, October 10, 2013, marks the 102nd anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of China, Taiwan. I wish to congratulate the people of Taiwan on their National Day, also known as the Double Ten Day, as they celebrate the birth of their country and the great strides they have since made.

The United States and Taiwan have always enjoyed a mutually beneficial relationship that stems from our shared values: democracy, the rule of law and free enterprise. Taiwan's strong democracy serves as a beacon and model for East Asia. Through their ingenuity and hard work, Taiwan has become a vital player in the world economy. In 2012, bilateral trade between our two countries reached \$63 billion, making Taiwan our 11th largest trading partner. Last year, South Carolina's exports to Taiwan reached \$225 million. Taiwanese companies are also heavily invested in manufacturing plants and distribution centers, creating jobs in my home state.

On the occasion of its National Day, I would like to reflect on how we can improve on our already strong partnership with Taiwan. As a fellow democratic ally of the United States, we must further support and encourage Taiwan's international participation. Both houses of Congress voted overwhelmingly to support Taiwan's observer status in the International Civil Aviation Organization earlier this year, and consequently, Taiwan has been invited as a guest to its assembly. The United States should also ensure that Taiwan is not excluded from the Trans-Pacific Partnership or other regional trade agreements for any political reasons.

Again, I would like to join my colleagues and the people of Taiwan in commemoration of its 102nd National Day and wish Taiwan even greater success in the future and the continued friendship of our two nations.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT PITTENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2013

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall votes No. 517–526, I am not recorded because I was absent from the U.S. House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

On rollcall No. 517, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 518, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 519, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 520, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 521, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 522, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 523, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 524, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 525, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 526, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, October 8, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 9

10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine housing finance reform, focusing on essential elements of the multifamily housing finance system.

SD-538

OCTOBER 10

8:30 a.m.
Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine the debt limit.

SD-215

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael D. Lumpkin, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, Jamie Michael Morin, of Michigan, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, and Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, all of the Department of Defense.

SD-G50

10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the impact of a default on financial stability and economic growth.

SD-538

2:30 p.m.
Select Committee on Intelligence
Closed business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SH-219

OCTOBER 11

Time to be announced
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine the impacts of the Government shutdown on economic security.

SR-253

OCTOBER 23

2:15 p.m.
Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine the future of long-term care policy.

SD-562

CANCELLATIONS

OCTOBER 10

10 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Federal Programs and the Federal Workforce
To hold hearings to examine the government shutdown, focusing on its impact on government efficiency and the Federal workforce.

SD-342

POSTPONEMENTS

OCTOBER 9

10 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.

SD-226

2 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on European Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the Eastern Partnership, focusing on the outlook for Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, Belarus, Armenia, and Azerbaijan.

SD-419

Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the Department of Veterans' Affairs claims transformation efforts.

SR-418

OCTOBER 10

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the draft regional recommendation regarding the Columbia River Treaty.

SD-366

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine women-owned small business, focusing on strengthening the Small Business Administration's counseling and procurement programs.

TBA

SENATE—Tuesday, October 8, 2013

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious God, we praise You that although we have merely a feeble hold on You, You have a mighty grasp on us. Use Your mighty hands to lead our lawmakers to Your desired destination, making them instruments of truth and justice. May the tirades of majorities and minorities be equally impotent to sway our lawmakers from doing what is best for America. May our Senators' daily choice be characterized by ethical congruence as they strive to match their words with deeds.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 12:30 today. During that period of time Senators will be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each. The Senate will then recess from 12:30 until 2:15 p.m. to allow for our weekly caucus meetings.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are now entering the second week of a Republican government shutdown. The Speaker of the House of Representatives is still sitting on the one bill that can reopen the government. Speaker BOEHNER insists the Senate-passed bill to end the shutdown can't pass the House. Well, I am not the first to issue this challenge—it has been issued all weekend and yesterday—and that is, prove it. Bring it up for a vote. If the Speaker really believes the bill will not pass, he shouldn't be worried about bringing it up.

The House, though, if we look at what has happened, has wasted weeks voting—and I have really lost track of the number of times, but I think it is 44 times—the House alone has acted to repeal ObamaCare 44 times. What is the result every time they vote? The same. Truly what Einstein said: The real definition of "insanity" is someone who keeps doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results. If, in fact, Einstein is right, then that is insanity, what is going on over there—to vote more than 40 times on the same thing and lose every time. So let's talk about wasting time. Has that been a waste of time? Maybe after 5 or 6 times they should have maybe gotten the message, but how about 44 times? Talk about wasting time.

Could it be that the Speaker is really worried that reasonable Republicans will join Democrats to pass legislation to open the government? Sensible Republicans have grown increasingly fed up with the shutdown, and they are looking for a way out. Just yesterday PETER KING of New York, a Republican, said:

Republicans should not have started this. Closing the government down was the wrong thing to do.

Republican Congressman KING called Speaker BOEHNER's unreasonable strategy to shut down the government unless Democrats agree to defund or end ObamaCare—a law that will help 25 million uninsured Americans gain access to affordable care—doomed to failure. That is what PETER KING said.

Again quoting Congressman KING:

If we want to defund something, we should repeal it, and do it the same way the President got it signed—elect Republicans to both Houses of Congress, repeal it, and have a Republican President sign it.

Mr. President, it is pretty obvious what is going on. I have known it all the time. We have all known it all the time. When I say "all the time," at least in these last many months. But it was made very clear to the world on Sunday in a front-page story in the New York Times. They worked a while on that story, but basically what the story said is that very rich people in America who don't believe in government have used ObamaCare as a conduit to shut down the government. That is what they wanted to do. That is what they have done, with huge amounts of money. We know this has been led by, according to the news article, a former Attorney General of the United States, Ed Meese, and the Koch brothers, who have been raising and spending hundreds of millions of dollars to get us where we are right now.

But what PETER KING suggested is that we follow the democratic process. That has been turned on its head. I know Republicans don't like ObamaCare, but the Affordable Care Act has been the law of the land for 4 years, been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, and millions of Americans—multimillions of Americans—are already benefiting from this law.

There are rumors floating around. One of my rich friends from Nevada called me on Friday. He said: HARRY, I am down here in southern California getting a little cosmetic surgery. My anesthesiologist told me one of his friends, who is a general surgeon, took somebody's gallbladder out. Do you know how much money he got back for that?

I don't know if it was a he or a she. I said: No, I don't know.

He said: Fifty-eight dollars. That is what ObamaCare is all about.

I said: That is not possible because ObamaCare, that aspect of it, doesn't kick in until January 1.

He said: Are you sure you are right?

I said: Yes. All this signing up for exchanges and all that will take 3 months.

These are the rumors floating around out there about ObamaCare.

If Republicans want to propose a legislative way to make the law work better or more efficiently, PETER KING is right. We are willing to do that and do it the way our democratic process provides.

(Mr. MARKEY assumed the Chair.)

I see the Senator from Massachusetts has taken the Chair, and he served many years with PETER KING. I personally have watched his voting record. I don't like most of it, but at least he is speaking out, and I admire the man for doing that. By shutting down the government—and that is what has happened—we are satisfying the Koch brothers and Ed Meese, but millions of people in America are suffering.

ObamaCare is not going to disappear. It is here. The senior Senator from Arizona gave a speech here within the last week or so, and he said: I don't like ObamaCare. I campaigned against ObamaCare when I ran for President. I campaigned against it when Obama ran the next time. But, he said, we lost. It passed. He is President. Elections have consequences.

That is what the senior Senator from Arizona said, and he is right.

ObamaCare is not going to magically disappear.

Tom Friedman, a renowned journalist—his bipartisanship has been legendary. He is a brilliant writer. He was

chief correspondent for the New York Times for many years in the Middle East. He has covered all parts of the world. He has won three Pulitzer prizes—maybe four—and he has had five or six best-selling books. But even Tom Friedman has given up trying to be bipartisan. He wrote in the New York Times, where he writes a column 3 days a week, that ObamaCare is not really at stake in this shutdown, it is democracy that is at stake.

Here is exactly what he said:

When extremists feel that insulated from playing by the traditional rules of our system, if we do not defend those rules—namely majority rule and the fact that if you don't like a policy passed by Congress, signed by the president and affirmed by the Supreme Court, then you have to go out and win an election to overturn it; you can't just put a fiscal gun to the country's head—then our democracy is imperiled.

He went on to say more:

President Obama is not defending health care. He's defending the health of our democracy. Every American who cherishes that should stand with him.

Mr. President, that is as true as anything could be. We stand with our President. We stand with a President who is President of everyone in America.

We believe deeply that ObamaCare is already saving lives and will save many more in the future, but we are willing to work with Republicans to change it if they think they can make it better. We want to do that.

I wrote a letter 1 week ago today to the Speaker of the House of Representatives—and he knows this—where I said: You know, we are in this position because you asked me to put you in this position to do this.

He said, going back as far as July and confirmed in the early part of September, I—the Speaker of the House of Representatives—want to have a clean CR, and the way we can do that is you agree to our number. He said this in July and early September.

I said: I hate your number. It is unfair. We passed a budget here—\$70 billion more than that.

He said: But we have to avoid problems here. We can't have a government shutdown. Work with me, take that number, and we will have a clean CR and go on to other things.

I did that. It was hard. Senator MIKULSKI, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, hated it, and Senator MURRAY, chairman of the Budget Committee, hated it, but then they said: OK, we will go ahead and do it. We will work with you to help talk to the caucus.

We did that based on the assurances of the Speaker of the House of Representatives that we would get this out of the way in order to fund the government for 1 year. Well, he didn't live up to what he committed to doing. In our business that is not good.

In addition to that I said in the letter: OK, you have sent us a little piece

of legislation over here saying you want to have a conference. We agree. We will talk to you about anything you want to talk about. You want to talk about discretionary spending, you want to talk about the farm bill, you want to talk about postal reform, you want to talk about health care, we will talk, but open the government and extend the debt ceiling.

He read the letter. I called him 45 minutes later. He said: No, can't do that.

He can't take yes for an answer on the number in the CR or what he wants to talk about. I don't know what else is left to talk about.

All we are asking is that government be reopened. Stop threatening a catastrophic default on the Nation's bills. We have to pay our bills. What kind of a country do we want?

As I do every 2 weeks, I met yesterday with someone who briefs me on what is going on around the world with our intelligence services. This person told me his counterpart from a relatively small European country is making fun of our country because of what is going on here. In today's press China is complaining. They are doing pretty well economically. They buy our securities and they need a place to invest their money that is secure. China is now complaining about the fiscal integrity of the United States of America because we are arriving at a point in a few days where we are not going to pay our bills.

This is America. We are not asking the Speaker to do something that is unreasonable. We want him to pass a bill that has his number in it, not ours. Ours is \$70 billion higher than that. We are also not asking him to do anything unreasonable. He asked us to go to conference. We say let's do it. All we want is the government open first, and we will agree to conference.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I would be happy to yield to my friend, the distinguished President pro tempore.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I was there, and I saw how hard the Senator worked to pass a continuing resolution—as a number of the Republican leadership of the House had asked and based on their assurances that we would use it.

I would ask my friend, the majority leader, is that sort of a classic bait-and-switch operation? If it is, I can think of another one where they asked us to pass a budget. Senator MURRAY led us in passing one where we finished the last vote at 5:30 or 6:00 on a Saturday morning, having gone around the clock. Then we wanted to go to conference after the Republicans demanded we pass one, and they then refused to let us go to conference with the Republican-led House. Is this bait and switch?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, through the Chair to my friend, the senior Senator from Vermont: We have a law in place. The Presiding Officer voted for it when he was a Member of the House of Representatives. We voted for it. There is a law that set spending levels for multiyear. We did that. It was part of a deal. It was a law that was passed. But in spite of us having passed a law that set the standards for 2 years, the Republicans kept coming to the floor many times saying Democrats need to pass a budget.

We didn't need to pass a budget. We already had those numbers in place. But after this haranguing that went on for so long, we said, OK, we want to get along. We don't want any problems. So Senator MURRAY, the chairman of the Budget Committee, worked very hard to pass a budget, and we did that. Lo and behold, after the Republicans kept talking about regular order, we wanted to go to regular order, and they said: No, thanks. And she has been waiting 6 months. So the President pro tempore's description is absolutely true.

Let me close by saying all we ask is for the Speaker to be reasonable. If he brings his bill, his resolution, to the floor, it will pass. And then everyone has my commitment: Open the government, raise the debt ceiling, and we will talk about anything you want to talk about. We are not afraid to go to conference. We are happy to go to conference. That is what we used to do here all the time. But we have a little problem: The Republicans won't let us go to conference. Maybe they will in this instance because that is what he said he wants.

So open the government and get back to the so-called conversation, as he talks about it. We will get back to the negotiating table and work out our budget disagreements. We can even start talking about ways to make the Affordable Care Act better—not worse, but better. We can get back to the business of legislating. That is what our job has always been and should be.

I would ask the Chair to announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Vermont.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of our distinguished

majority leader. He has probably the most frustrating job there is because he has continuously brought up and passed bills to get us out of this and reopen the government, and he is blocked by the Republican leadership in the other body.

Today marks the 8th day of this unnecessary government shutdown, more than 192 hours since the world saw the doors to the United States Government closed for this embarrassing and needless shutdown. While the Republicans in the House have the ability to end this shutdown right now—before noon today—they refuse to pass the clean continuing resolution approved by the Senate.

I have joined other Senators in coming to the floor to speak about the pervasive impact of the shutdown, and there isn't a single family in Vermont or in America—Republican, Democratic, or Independent—that this shutdown hasn't affected. All these families have been affected, but now we face cascading worsening effects to come the longer this senseless shutdown continues. I have joined the chorus of voices urging the relatively few in the House of Representatives holding up this process to put an end to this political act of destruction. It might allow them to send out bumper stickers and raise money from their supporters, but it is not helping the country.

If the human toll of the impact—if a Vermonter is not able to buy a home, or children turned away from potentially life-saving clinical trials, or the parents of our fallen soldiers who won't receive death benefits to pay for their funerals—and that is not an exaggeration. We have always had a program, when one of our soldiers dies overseas in combat, there are benefits established so the family can at least be there when the casket returns at Dover Air Force Base and to provide for the funeral. Even that is cut out. We send our soldiers to war. We tell them we are there to take care of their families if something happens. Now, because of a small group of tea party Republicans, we say we can't even take care of their families when they die in the service of the country. For shame if that happens.

If all of these examples don't motivate them to do the right thing, maybe I can speak their language for a moment and point to the fiscal cost of this Republican shutdown. The estimated cost per hour of the Republican shutdown—that the government remains shut down—is \$12.5 million. That is \$300 million a day wasted or nearly \$1.6 billion per week. And what do the American people get for that? They get to watch fake budget conferences, staged photo ops, and the very Members shutting down the government and running to every single TV camera they can find. Over the last 8 days we have spent more than \$2 billion for the

government to not work, not function, and not serve the American people.

Can you imagine the actual good that could have been done with that \$2 billion that was just wasted? And that figure only covers the cost of work and services the government can't perform because 800,000 Federal workers are furloughed. It doesn't take into account the ripple effects throughout our overall economy.

Where are the deficit hawks who claim we don't have enough money to provide SNAP benefits to hungry Americans in the farm bill? Where are the Members who shamefully held up disaster relief after Tropical Storm Irene and Hurricane Sandy, while insisting that spending be offset? Surely, they would want to put a stop to the shutdown to end this wasteful government spending. Yet here we are, waiting for the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives to pass the clean continuing resolution and put an end to this shutdown.

Instead of passing a clean Senate-passed continuing resolution pending in the House—based on budget levels that, as the leader pointed out, Republicans themselves wanted—the proposals being offered by House Republicans would actually expand the deficit.

First, the House proposed we repeal the Affordable Care Act because of claims it is harmful to our economy. But if we repeal it, we would actually accelerate the health care cost spiral and boost the Federal deficit by \$109 billion. They don't tell people they are voting to add another \$109 billion to our deficit. Then they suggest we repeal just a portion of the Affordable Care Act, but add \$30 billion to the deficit for which they don't want any offsets. Where were the Members in the House who attacked appropriations bills and insisted on cuts to funding for law enforcement officers, disaster preparedness, and medical research? Where were the Members who insisted the devastating costs of sequestration must remain in place because we simply can't afford to spend and must reduce the deficit, no matter what it does to law enforcement or medical research or disaster preparedness?

They ditched their principles, and now they have forced a government shutdown which is costing more than if we had stayed open because of the money wasted. It appears the only time the House is willing to compromise is when it comes to adding to the deficit in order to prevent access to affordable health insurance for millions of Americans.

We are here right now because the Republican leadership in the House refuses to act. They could end the shutdown right now and make this the last day we spend \$300 million on nothing. Yet there is this faction within the majority of the House that has now

brought the government of the United States to a halt, wasting hundreds of millions of dollars each day, day after day, and they will not relent. They talk about the Affordable Care Act, which, if we have children in college, allows them to be on our insurance policy. They want to do away with that, but they don't have any alternative. The Affordable Care Act allows a member of your family with a preexisting health condition—heart, cancer, whatever—to get insurance. They want to do away with that. They have no plan of their own.

I want to get back to work for Vermonters. I want help for the Vermont company who can't start their new business because the certificate is sitting on a desk at the Department of Treasury's Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau but nobody is there to sign it—I want pregnant Vermonters and new moms going without meals and whose babies are going to go hungry because they are unable to get healthy food and baby formula without the WIC benefits they are supposed to have access to—I want to see them fed. I want to see our farmers have the ability to continue to work as they do every single day and know the farm bill has been passed.

Let's stop the sloganeering here. Let's stop rushing to the TV cameras. Let's actually do what is best for America. Wouldn't that be a wonderful step in the right direction?

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and I be allowed to speak for up to 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator is recognized.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we are in the eighth day of a completely unnecessary partial government shutdown. Last week there was an official at the White House who said they were winning the shutdown debate and they were not concerned about how long the shutdown lasts. Well, there may be Democrats and folks at the White House who are content with the current situation, but Republicans remain focused on finding a solution to reopen the government.

The Republicans have offered multiple solutions to fund the government and will continue to work to find common ground while providing ObamaCare relief for middle-class Americans. Middle-class Americans deserve the same relief from ObamaCare the Democrats have already given themselves and big business. Senate Democrats even had the opportunity to give the same 1-year relief from

ObamaCare to their constituents that President Obama has already given to big business.

We believe this is an issue of basic fairness. We believe this law should be delayed—not just for big businesses and not just for the favored constituencies but for all Americans because of the harmful impact it is having.

In fact, there is bipartisan support for giving individuals and families relief. A colleague of ours on the other side of the aisle—a Senate Democrat—recently said a delay for individuals would be very reasonable and sensible. There have been a number of votes in the House where Democrats have voted with Republicans in support of providing that delay to middle-class Americans.

With regard to where we are right now, we have a near-term issue and we have a slightly longer term issue. The near-term issue has an awful lot of folks increasingly concerned about the impact the government shutdown is having on people across this country. The House of Representatives has passed nine bills that have been sent to the Senate which are sitting here at the desk that would provide funding for some of these programs and services which impact people across this country that could be picked up today and passed by unanimous consent. And, by the way, many of those have passed with bipartisan support.

As recently as Saturday the House passed a bill that would provide back pay for Federal workers. There were 189 Democrats in the House of Representatives who voted in support of that bill. There have been up to 57 Democrats in the House of Representatives who have voted to give pay to our National Guard and Reserve, the same thing we have done for our active-duty military. They have also voted to provide relief to our national parks so they can open again. They have voted to provide funding for the National Institutes of Health so that those life-saving medicines can continue to be provided. They have voted to provide funding for FEMA so FEMA can respond to the natural disasters that are occurring across the country.

There are nine bills sitting at the desk of the Senate that could be picked up and passed today by unanimous consent. There wouldn't be a single Republican that I know of who would object to any of those measures being passed that would provide funding and relief in support of the services and programs which impact people across the country.

The House will pick up a couple of more bills today. They will do one that funds Head Start and will then send it over here, so that will be the tenth bill that will be sitting at the Senate. They will pass a bill that funds Impact Aid, something which is very important to the people I represent in South Dakota.

That will be the 11th bill that will be sitting at the desk in the Senate awaiting action. As I said, they could all be passed by unanimous consent. There would not be a single Republican that I know of who would be opposed to any of those being moved forward.

It is not a question of addressing the funding concerns and making sure the programs and services which impact people across this country are being funded; that can be done. It has been done by the House, and those items have moved over here to the Senate. All that is necessary is for the majority leader to come over, pick them up, ask for unanimous consent to pass them, and those items would pass.

I see the near-term issue as being one that is very easy to solve, and all that it entails is for the leadership in the Senate to pick up those bills and pass them.

The other issue I mentioned that is a little bit longer term, but not much, because it is about 9 days away, is we are going to hit the debt limit, which means the United States of America will no longer have borrowing authority. We will hit up against the amount we are able to borrow on our credit card to fund the services of our government. There is a request obviously to increase the debt limit to allow the Federal Government to borrow more money. I have had private conversations with members of the administration's team. They said they would like to see a debt limit increase that would take us through the next election—through November of 2014. To do that we would be looking somewhere in the trillion-dollar range. It strikes me that—and I think it is something supported by the American people—if we are going to have a debate about increasing the debt limit, we ought to do something about the debt. I think that is a sensible position to take. By a 2-to-1 margin, polls show the American people believe if we are going to raise the debt limit, we ought to do something to fix and address the debt.

What we are simply saying is: Let's sit down and have a discussion about things we can do that will put us on a different and sustainable fiscal trajectory for this country that won't saddle future generations of Americans with massive amounts—trillions and trillions of dollars—of additional debt. That issue is looming out there and it is not very far away. We don't have a lot of time to deal with that. It is not, as I said, as immediate as the government shutdown, which can be addressed by the majority of the Senate. I think the debt limit is going to require both parties here in Congress and the President and his team to get together and figure out what it is we can do that would not only raise the debt limit—the amount we can borrow—but address the underlying fundamental problem, and that is the fact that we have a \$17 trillion debt.

There has been a lot said about things that various Senators have said in the past on the floor and in the course of these various debates we have had about debt limit increases, and I wanted to point out that the President of the United States, President Obama, when he was here in 2006, said raising the debt limit is a failure of leadership. He said it is a failure of leadership and described it as unpatriotic. Unpatriotic—failure of leadership to raise the debt limit.

Now he is saying he wants a clean debt limit increase—no negotiation, period. No negotiation on the debt limit. Well, at the time when he said that raising the debt limit was a leadership failure, the total Federal debt was \$8.3 trillion. Today it is \$16.8 trillion, \$16.9 trillion. So the Federal debt, literally, is double what it was when the current President said back in 2006, as a Member of this Chamber in the Senate, that raising the debt limit would be a failure of leadership. Now it is twice that amount. It was \$8.3 trillion in 2006, and now we are going on \$17 trillion.

It seems to me the President of the United States—who described raising the debt limit in 2006 when the debt was half of what it is today as a leadership failure—ought to be willing to exercise some leadership and engage himself in a process that would allow us to sit down and talk about what we can do to get this debt under control.

There is a series of spending reforms that have been put forward by many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle that would deal with the out-of-control spending, particularly on what we call the mandatory spending part of the budget, those entitlement programs that currently are on an unsustainable path. We would like to try and get that spending under control. There are a number of other things that have been proposed that, frankly, would be good for the economy.

One of the best ways to get our fiscal house in order is to get the economy growing and expanding at a faster rate. When the economy is growing and expanding, more people are working, more people are investing, more people are paying taxes, and government revenues go up. When we have an economy growing at 3 to 4 percent instead of an economy growing at 1 to 2 percent, which is what we have today, the result is a dramatic increase in the amount of tax revenue that comes into the Federal Treasury.

When they are talking about raising the debt limit, we should look at what we can do in association with that discussion to actually reduce the debt. One would be to put spending reforms in place, and the other would be growing and expanding the economy.

One of the things that has been proposed that would grow the economy is tax reform. I happen to believe, and I

think a lot of us do, that the best thing we can do to get the economy growing at a faster rate is to reform our Tax Code in a way that makes us more competitive in the global marketplace. That would mean reducing the tax on business, which is the highest in the world. The United States has the highest corporate tax rate in the entire world.

Lowering marginal income tax rates, broadening the tax base, doing away with many of the loopholes, deductions, exemptions, and preferences that are in the Tax Code today that benefit particular constituencies and going to a broader based tax base, but one that has marginal rates that are significantly lower than where they are today—I think that would dramatically unleash economic growth in this country and get people back to work so they can pay taxes and get government revenues up.

In the context of raising the debt limit, we ought to do something about the debt, and as I said, that is fairly straightforward.

One of the ideas that has been put forward here is that we need a clean debt limit increase; we can't have any discussion or negotiation about this. If we look at history, it has been the case that many of the big accomplishments, if you will, when it comes to deficit reduction, when it comes to fiscal plans being put into place, occurred in the context of increasing the debt limit. In fact, throughout our history, going back to 1978, the debt limit has been raised 53 times in those 35 years. Of those 53 debt limit increases, 27, or more than half, were done around other policy considerations and policy discussions and legislation that was put forward to address issues—in many cases to address the out-of-control spending and debt we have in this country.

For 35 years now, with 53 debt limit increases, more than half have involved discussion of other matters. In fact, some of the biggest accomplishments we can point to in the history of the last 30 years occurred at a time when we had both sides trying to figure out a path forward for dealing with fiscal imbalances our country faced.

The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation passed in 1985, the Budget Acts in 1990 and 1993 and 1997, and more recently in 2011. All occurred in the context of a debt limit increase. So there is ample precedent in history for doing big things that are good for the country and good for future generations around the debt limit increase. It defies history to suggest we cannot come to the table and cannot negotiate in the context of a debt limit increase.

As I look at these issues that are converging on us now and what they mean for our children and our grandchildren and for future generations, it seems to me that taking a position of

we will not negotiate, period—which is essentially what the President has said and what has been echoed here by the Senate majority—is not only wrong in terms of what we need to do to fix the debt and to get our country on a more sustainable fiscal path, but it is also completely at odds with what we know to be the case throughout our history. We can do better by the American people. We should do better by the American people. It requires leadership.

The President of the United States, President Obama, as Senator Obama back in 2006, said at that time that raising the debt limit would be a leadership failure and described it as unpatriotic. Here we are these many years later, with double—double—the amount of debt we had back when he made that statement.

This situation we are in today cries out for leadership. It cries out for leadership from the President and from those of us in Congress. I hope we can find our way to get together, to sit down, to negotiate, to come up with solutions that are good for the future of this country that would deal not just with raising the borrowing limit so we can borrow more money to fund government, but to address the underlying problem, and that is the fact that we have a \$17 trillion debt that continues to grow at \$600 billion, \$700 billion a year.

We continue to have a chronically high unemployment rate. We continue to have a labor force, a workforce that is at historically low levels; in other words, the number of people who are working today as a percentage of those who could work is at the lowest level it has been in 35 years. We have a sluggish economy that is growing in the 1- to 2-percent range. Take-home pay for most Americans has gone down since the President took office by about \$3,700.

We need to get middle-class Americans back to work, middle-class Americans earning more, being able to provide for their families, increasing family household income and take-home pay in this country, and the way to do that is to get the economy growing and expanding.

The other way to do that, I would argue, is to get spending here in Washington under control so we are not out there borrowing more and more money all the time, so that more and more of our country's assets and resources can be deployed toward things that will yield a return, that will put more people to work, that will grow the economy, and expand the standard of living and the quality of life for people across this country. Time is short. The clock is running. Time is a-wasting. We need to get this done.

In the near term we need to bring up the nine bills sitting here in the Senate that were passed by the House. That would put funding for a lot of these

services and programs that impact people—which has been expressed so many times by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—back in place.

Secondly, let's get together—the President, Democrats, and Republicans here in Washington, DC—to talk about not only raising the debt limit but what we are going to do to address the underlying debt.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. HAGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I rise to address the negative impact this government shutdown is having on my home State of North Carolina. It is a shame that some in Congress are playing political games with the most basic function of keeping our government open. I did not get elected to shut down the government. With each minute that goes by, more and more North Carolinians are feeling the impact of this irresponsible shutdown.

North Carolina is proud to be home to almost 1 million veterans. But as of this spring, we are also home to one of the worst VA disability claims backlogs in the country. We have pushed to have senior VA personnel dispatched to North Carolina. More caseworkers have been added. After a lot of attention and work, we were finally beginning to see the needle move in the right direction.

Claims were being processed faster, which means veterans were getting the benefits they deserved faster. But as of today, the Winston-Salem regional office is closed to the public. With claim processors furloughed and just a skeleton staff operation inside, this government shutdown threatens to reverse the progress we have made in addressing that backlog. So I ask, is it worth shutting down the government over a political game when veterans get caught in this crossfire? No.

In my home State we are also proud of the 11 national parks that are not simply just beautiful places in our country and in our State but also important drivers of our tourism economy.

As families flock to enjoy these affordable destinations, they stop at our local small businesses, they eat at our restaurants, and they stay in our hotels. In 2011, out-of-State tourists to national parks in North Carolina spent \$720 million during these trips, which supported nearly 12,000 jobs.

I do not know how many of my colleagues have been fortunate enough to visit western North Carolina at this time of the year. But right now the fall leaves are turning and western North Carolina is opening its arms to welcome tourists from around the country and from around the world who come to see this beautiful landscape.

On the other side of the State, in the east, we have Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Cape Lookout. They are both closed. October is the most popular surf-fishing month of the year. But with beach access closed our fishermen cannot get to the fishing areas.

With parks from out west all the way to down east closed, we fear too many families will decide to cancel their vacations. So I ask, is it worth shutting down the government over political games when our small business owners who support our economy will be the ones to shoulder this burden? No.

In my home State we are proud that our university system includes a number of distinguished research institutions that are on the cutting edge of new technologies and therapies that will make our world better. NIH supports roughly 20,000 jobs in North Carolina. But the NIH will not take any action on grant applications or awards or admit new patients to clinical trials while our government is shut down.

So I ask, is it worth putting medical advances and thousands of jobs at risk just to play a tired political game? No. I could go on and on. While new vaccines are still being delivered, the CDC is not able to track flu cases as usual. They cannot support State and local partners who help monitor infectious diseases.

The FDA is not able to support the majority of its food safety activities. Pell grants and direct student loans could be delayed for 14 million American students. School districts, colleges, and job training centers could face major cashflow problems without money for Federal programs and grants coming in the door.

Our research universities, in addition to doing this cutting-edge research that benefits our entire country, are huge employers. Some of them receive tens of millions of dollars a month in reimbursement for work already performed for the Federal Government. Without those funds coming in the door, these universities can be put in an incredibly difficult position with respect to managing their expenses—not to mention the time lost in Congress when we should be talking about how to continue repairing our economy; we should be talking about how to improve job training programs; we should be talking about growing manufacturing in our country. But instead, we are just manufacturing crisis after crisis after another. There is no reason we cannot end this shutdown.

Fortunately, there is a simple solution. The Senate has passed a respon-

sible bill that keeps the government running at currently reduced spending levels. The House of Representatives could pass that bill today. This shutdown could end within a matter of hours. Then we could have the time and space to come together on a long-term, balanced, and bipartisan plan to finally put our fiscal house in order. Instead, the other side of the Capitol insists on sending us bills that they know have zero chance of passing or becoming law over here just to stage a political stunt.

But political stunts will not process VA claims. Political stunts will not help restaurant owners in western North Carolina make payroll while the national parks are closed. Political stunts will not get this government reopened for business. I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to stop playing this partisan game, take up the Senate-passed bill, end this government shutdown.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to extend the period of morning business for debate only until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the majority leader be recognized following morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPACT OF DEFAULT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I rise today with just 9 days left until the United States hits the debt ceiling. Never before in our history have we failed to pay our bills, but in 9 days that possibility will reach our doorstep.

Even though defaulting on our debt could send our economy into a tailspin, even possibly another Great Depression, there are already those who are denying the impacts of default. The debt ceiling deniers try to claim that this won't be a big deal and that middle-class families won't be hurt. Well, these debt-ceiling deniers need a dose of debt-ceiling reality.

The truth is that failing to pay our bills on time would most probably be worse than in 2008 when Lehman Brothers and AIG went under and the econ-

omy went into a tailspin. We still haven't recovered from that debacle. To this day there are people out of work. There are middle-class families whose income is lower than it was then because of what happened in 2008.

Why could it be worse—in all likelihood would be worse? Because just as housing securities had to be marked down because of the Lehman crisis, if government bonds, which are much more widely held, have to be marked down in lower value, we could have a freeze where banks are not able to lend money.

What happened in 2008 was simple. Banks and other financial institutions had all these mortgage securities on their balance sheets. All of a sudden their value seemed to be a lot less, so the banks' balance sheets were in the red. That meant they couldn't lend money, and not just for long-term mortgages and car loans but also for overnight lines of credit. Businesses were shaken. Many businesses couldn't function. Wire transfers weren't allowed to be made, and the whole financial system came to a startling and devastating halt.

Now the effects would be worse, in all likelihood, and for this reason: Mortgage securities were widely held but not close to as widely held as U.S. Treasuries are. Imagine on the day of default or, God forbid, even a day or two before default, all of a sudden the markets determine—and they are mystical in some ways—that Treasuries should be written down significantly. There is a very real possibility that could—and not 5 percent but significantly higher than that; I would estimate a 30-, 40-, 50-percent chance—send us into a tailspin that might make the 2008 recession look like child's play.

How would that affect the average family? Well, if the United States defaults, middle-class family paychecks would be raided by higher interest rates on everyday expenses. Already interest rates on short-term Treasury bonds are creeping upward as the possibility of default looms over us. If we default, investors who always considered U.S. debt risk free will demand higher interest rates due to the heightened risk that they might not be paid. For the first time ever investors question whether the U.S. Government would honor its commitments.

The domino effect on interest rates that affect family budgets would be endless and cataclysmic. Credit card interest rates would go up, adding hundreds of dollars to monthly bills. Young families seeking to take out a mortgage on a new home would be faced with thousands of dollars in higher payments over the life of the mortgage. Many might not even buy that home, putting a crimp in one of the bright spots of our economy—the housing market. Someone wanting to take out a loan to buy a new car should prepare to pay hundreds or thousands of

dollars more in higher interest rates. That means car sales would decline and automobile manufacturers could lay off people. Do you have privately held student loans? Prepare for monthly payments to shoot upward. Innocent families, millions of them—tens of millions—would be hit with thousands of dollars in additional bills through no fault of their own if U.S. Treasuries were devalued.

The damage doesn't stop there. If we default on our debt, the dollar loses value, and a trip to the gas station or the grocery store gets more expensive. The dollar won't go as far. Americans will have to shell out more for gas and for milk to feed their kids.

Think of the effect of a default on 10,000 baby boomers who are retiring each day. In 2011 the stock market lost 2,000 points. How much more might it lose now? We gained that back by the beginning of 2012, but that is no comfort to the thousands of people retiring every day. And when you are dealing with U.S. Treasuries—and these are not certainties, but these are possibilities—it could be a lot worse. You can check your 401(k) and see that political brinkmanship took a huge bite out of your retirement savings. Imagine the pain of saving wisely, making smart choices, only to have your retirement account and family budget wrecked by dangerous brinkmanship from tea party Republicans in Washington. If there were ever a governmental action that merited the words “playing with fire,” this is it.

The devastation doesn't end there. If we don't raise the debt ceiling, the Federal Government will be faced with impossible choices. Do we pay foreign debts—because if we don't, those countries won't lend to us anymore—or do we pay veterans' benefits? Do we make sure Social Security benefits go out or Medicare? Do we pay our troops? Do we fund border security? What do we pay for education? These are all tough choices.

Make no mistake about it. If the debt ceiling is not lifted, we can't meet all our obligations.

So the chances of this are not 80 percent, but they are close enough to 50 percent that anyone who risks this, particularly for this forlorn goal: we won't raise the debt ceiling unless we repeal ObamaCare—which we know isn't happening—it is madness. Risk the economy of the United States, the possibility of going through worse than what we went through in 2008 because you demand ObamaCare be repealed when we know it won't happen? Wow. I have rarely seen such madness coming out of legislators, but it is coming out of a few.

So the consequences of failing to raise the debt ceiling are crystal clear: interest rates on the middle-class expenses such as home mortgages, car loans, and student loans will shoot up.

Housing markets, automobile markets, and others decline as many are laid off, and then others are laid off in a cyclical cycle. The dollar will lose its value, making everyday purchases more expensive, and the Federal Government faces terrible choices about who we pay—seniors, veterans, military, creditors. To risk these consequences would be a terrible mistake.

In conclusion, I come here with a simple plea—not to our tea party activist colleagues but to mainstream conservative Republican friends. Please help us avoid the default crash. Please help us avoid an economic apocalypse. We are ready to talk. We are ready to negotiate on anything. But first open the government and pay our bills. Then we can sit down and debate our differences. The future of our financial system, the future of millions of Americans, is at stake. We don't play around with that. We don't hold that hostage.

To my mainstream conservative Republican colleagues, please do the right thing. Let us pay our bills and take the threat of severe economic collapse off the table now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise to speak as the chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who would like to reopen government and have our committee get back to regular order to be able to move our appropriations bills, to be able to debate them on the floor, amend them on the floor, and go to conference to resolve either fiscal or other issues we might have with the House. But we can't do it because we are in lockdown politics.

There is much about where we find ourselves that is very frustrating to me. One of the main ones is the fact that the tea party Republicans are out there saying things that simply are not accurate. Tea party Republicans say President Obama won't negotiate. That is not true. Tea party Republicans are saying Democrats in the Senate won't negotiate. That is not true. Tea party Republicans say the Senate has not moved appropriations bills. That is not true. The Appropriation Committee has. Tea party Republicans say the House doesn't have the votes to reopen the government. That is not true. And tea party Republicans say the debt limit is not a big deal. That is not true. So let me elaborate on these point by point.

Tea party Republicans say President Obama won't negotiate. The President has negotiated time and time again. He had a framework for a grand bargain in his 2014 budget. Read it. Let the print speak for itself. He had \$1.8 trillion of deficit reduction over 10 years, including \$400 billion in health care savings,

\$200 billion in savings from mandatory programs, \$200 billion in further discretionary cuts in strategic funding and discretionary spending. And, yes, he would even change the cost-of-living calculation for Social Security. But the Republicans couldn't take yes for an answer. Here was Obama, here was his budget, here is what he was offering—to reduce debt, to take on mandatory spending, to take on discretionary spending. They couldn't take yes for an answer. It included items in there I didn't agree with, but they were to be negotiated, to be discussed. Since he became President, the deficit has gone down by 50 percent, from \$1.4 trillion in 2009 to an estimated \$700 billion in 2013. High? Yes. But cut in half.

Now let's go to this President who they say won't negotiate. He negotiated in December of 2012 on a fiscal cliff deal. He wanted a 2-year delay in sequester, but we got 2 months. He wanted tax cuts for the wealthy to be eliminated above \$250,000. He agreed to an estate tax exemption. He wanted a \$3.5 million exemption, the Republicans wanted \$5 million. He said OK. The 2-percent Social Security payroll tax was ending without offsetting stimulus provisions. He gave and we supported him. Now they say he won't negotiate.

Speaker BOEHNER says, we just want to have a conversation. That is what the President did. What were those summits at Andrews Air Force Base? I thought that was going to be kumbaya. The President has had private one-on-one meetings, and nothing has come from that. Then he did a larger charm offensive—he had dinner with Republicans both at the White House and at different restaurants around town. Nobody seems to be able to take yes for an answer. This is the President who has invited people to the White House, invited leadership to play golf with him to build relationships, he has had dinner there. But instead of having lunch with the President, they want to have his lunch—over and over again.

The President has expressed a willingness continually to negotiate. And where are we now? We need to reopen the government. The House needs to pass the Senate clean short-term CR and raise the debt limit. Once it is open for business, we can talk about other matters.

Now let's go to tea party Republicans saying Democrats won't negotiate. Senate Democrats have tried to negotiate on the budget since we passed it on March 23. We were here for a marathon session led by Senator MURRAY—vote after vote, amendment after amendment—and we passed a budget resolution.

The rules of engagement and the rules for dispute resolution in the Congress are, take what one body passes, like the Senate, and meet with the

House in a conference. Senator MURRAY was ready to go. She asked permission—which she has to do under the rules of the Senate—to have her budget conference to hammer out the budget with PAUL RYAN and other House Members.

Nineteen times since March 23 Senator MURRAY has stood on this floor and asked for the ability to negotiate with the House. Nineteen times she was blocked by six tea party Republicans. Nineteen times, using the rules to protect the voice of the minority—which I understand they used not only their voice but what was used to protect them to prohibit the Senate from meeting with their House counterparts.

So Senate Democrats want to negotiate. There is PAUL RYAN. There is PATTY MURRAY. Let's have the budget conference and hammer it out. The Democrats have been ready to negotiate on a budget since March 23, 2013.

Let's have a conversation? We have been trying to have that conversation since March. Who has stopped us? HARRY REID didn't stop PATTY MURRAY. CHUCK SCHUMER didn't stop the Budget Committee. BARBARA MIKULSKI is not stopping it. Six tea party Republicans have stopped the ability of the Senate from going to the House to negotiate a budget.

Free the Budget Committee. Why is that so important? Because they not only come up with an overall budget in discretionary spending, mandatory spending, and revenues, but they put a cap on us appropriators. One of the outcomes of a budget agreement is they set the total amount of money the Appropriations Committee can spend on discretionary spending. To the shock of everybody, there is actually a cap on discretionary spending established by the Budget Committee. That has been the rule of the Budget Act going back to the 1970s. I would accept a cap agreed upon in a duly constituted process established by the rules of the House and the Senate—which is, we pass a budget, we meet in conference, we come back and give the appropriators what they call the 302(a)—the total cap we can spend—we take a look at it, and we meet and we follow the law. It also says what revenue should be and then total mandatory spending.

So when we hear Democrats won't negotiate—the Democrats have negotiated.

Going to this situation where we know the fiscal year expires October 1, the Senate put forth a bill. It came out of the Appropriations Committee. It was really, as the Chair, at my suggestion we would have a short-term funding resolution so we could deal with issues such as debt limit, canceling sequester for 2 years, and what our funding as a cap should be for 2014—short term, no new money, but a goal of getting us to canceling the sequester, following what the Budget Committee would set as the cap on us.

In order to get there, I was willing to compromise. I didn't want to. I felt it was too harsh, too rough on important discretionary spending. But sometimes you have to negotiate and compromise. So I was willing to compromise in order to get to negotiations. What was the compromise? The House has a level of \$986 billion. It follows fiscal 2013 at the sequester level, meaning reduced by over \$100 billion. I thought that \$986 billion was too low. The Senate bill was \$1.058 trillion. That is over a \$70 billion difference.

But that is what a conference is. That is what negotiation is. So in order to get us across the dome into negotiations, I was willing to compromise, particularly on very important domestic spending.

The liberals who want to fund Head Start, who want to fund NIH—well, maybe we are not liberals. Maybe we are just Americans and, I believe, friends on the other side of the aisle—we were ready to go. So in my mind, as an appropriator, I have already compromised just to get us into the room. But they won't even take up that bill. They won't take up the bill that Speaker BOEHNER said he would pass if we agreed to their number—\$986 billion—to get us into the room to talk. If you tell the Senate: If you agree with us on this, just to get a short-term negotiation going, we will pass it, and then you don't, why should we believe it will be any different?

But as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I am ready to negotiate. I am ready to compromise. I have reached out to my House counterpart, the chair of Appropriations. We have a marvelous, civil, candid relationship. We are ready to go to work.

We differ on money. There is no doubt. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Congressman HAL ROGERS, is a wonderful gentleman, but I will tell you he is a rock-ribbed, no-nonsense fiscal conservative. But that is OK by Senator BARB because that is what compromise is. That is doing what Colin Powell asked us to do: Let's talk things over. Let's find some sensible center. Let's make sure we run the U.S. Government in a smart, frugal, effective way. That is what it would take.

We are ready to do it, but we need—I need Speaker BOEHNER to pass the short-term CR so we can even get into the room to do this. So when you say Senate Democrats will not negotiate or will not compromise, it is not true.

Also, I heard the junior Senator from Kentucky say that the Senate has not approved appropriations bills. The Appropriations Committee, despite being hamstrung by not having a budget, reported 11 appropriations bills. Eight of them were supported by Republicans. By August 1, our Appropriations Committee had marked up every single bill except one, Interior. We had marked

them up with bipartisan support. Eight of them had bipartisan support; three did not: Labor-HHS, Financial Services, and Legislative Branch.

Why did we not get that? Because the Labor-HHS bill and Financial Services play a role in funding ObamaCare. There we go again. Don't do anything that would fund ObamaCare. There we go again.

I am so fed up with those riders, those poison-pen riders. We could have done that to them. We chose not to. I would like to see the comprehensive immigration bill passed. I didn't put any riders on the appropriations bills coming out of the Senate. I would have liked to have seen a farm bill. That has been worked on so hard by Senator STABENOW, the Senator from Michigan, and Senator ROBERTS, the Senator from Kansas—they worked wonderfully on a bipartisan farm bill. It was something to be proud of in the Senate. I would have liked to have attached that to the continuing. But we decided no riders, nothing cute, nothing clever, no earmarks, nothing like that—straight-forward money bills ready to go to conference.

We could not get it, but they are passed. They are passed in the Appropriations Committee and we are waiting to get to work.

The Republicans, the tea party Republicans say they do not have the votes in the House to reopen government. Give it a chance. Put the vote to the floor. If we win, government is reopened. If we lose, at least we offered a suggestion and we can go back to the drawing board. But the solution to reopening the government lies on Speaker BOEHNER's desk. He says he wants to have a conversation. We say pick it up, have the vote. That puts the conversation to work for a short-term funding resolution.

We say to our six Republican Senators who have blocked the Budget Committee, let the Budget Committee go to conference. Let Senator PATTY MURRAY and Congressman PAUL RYAN meet to resolve these issues. Let's follow the regular order. Let's get back to the way this government and this country should function.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:26 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

QUORUM CALL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 3]

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Murphy
Baucus	Johnson (SD)	Murray
Begich	Kaine	Pryor
Blumenthal	King	Reed
Boxer	Landrieu	Reid
Brown	Leahy	Schatz
Cantwell	Levin	Tester
Cardin	Markey	Udall (CO)
Casey	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Wyden
Heinrich	Menendez	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the presence of all absent Senators, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 214 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Ayotte	Feinstein	McCain
Baldwin	Fischer	McCaskill
Barrasso	Flake	McConnell
Baucus	Franken	Menendez
Begich	Gillibrand	Merkley
Bennet	Graham	Mikulski
Blumenthal	Grassley	Moran
Blunt	Hagan	Murkowski
Boozman	Harkin	Murphy
Boxer	Hatch	Murray
Brown	Heinrich	Nelson
Burr	Heitkamp	Portman
Cantwell	Hirono	Pryor
Cardin	Hoeven	Reed
Carper	Isakson	Reid
Casey	Johanns	Rockefeller
Chambliss	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Chiesa	Kaine	Schatz
Coats	King	Schumer
Cochran	Kirk	Sessions
Collins	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Coons	Landrieu	Shelby
Corker	Leahy	Stabenow
Donnelly	Levin	Tester
Durbin	Manchin	Thune
Enzi	Markey	Toomey

Udall (CO)
Warner

Warren
Whitehouse

Wicker
Wyden

NAYS—14

Alexander
Coburn
Cornyn
Crapo
Cruz

Heller
Johnson (WI)
Lee
Paul
Risch

Roberts
Rubio
Scott
Vitter

NOT VOTING—2

Inhofe

Udall (NM)

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. As soon as I finish my remarks, we will enter into an agreement on how the speakers will go forward.

The shutdown of the Federal Government is now affecting some families more than others. It is affecting families who are the most vulnerable, denying them the benefits to help with the funeral expenses of loved ones killed while serving our country.

This part of my presentation is not something I got from my staff; this is in the press right now:

The families of five U.S. servicemembers who were killed over the weekend in Afghanistan have been notified that they won't be receiving their benefit, normally wired to relatives within 36 hours of the death. The death gratuity is extended to help cover funeral costs and help with immediate living expenses until survivor benefits typically begin. The money also helps cover costs to fly families to Dover Air Force Base to witness a return of their loved ones in a flag-draped coffin.

"Washington may be shut down, but it's still asking people to go to war," says the head of the Council on Foreign Relations, Gayle Lemmon. "When people realize that they can serve and fight for their country, but that their families will get an I.O.U. until the shutdown is over, I think they're just shocked."

I know I am.

For example, LCpl Jeremiah Collins, 19 years old, was a marine who died Saturday while supporting combat operations in Afghanistan. He was one of the five killed, including four troop members who died Sunday by an improvised explosive device.

A law passed last week to continue paying civilian members of the military during the shutdown, but does not allow for payouts of the death benefit to the families of the fallen, officials told Andrea Mitchell of NBC.

One senior official said he was disgusted by the predicament.

That is where we are.

I have asked each Senator to come to the floor today because it is important that we have an opportunity to talk about the crisis facing this great Nation. This government shutdown is an embarrassment to our Nation—not only to the people of America but around the world. An economic conference in the Far East that President Obama was to attend—he couldn't be-

cause of the government shutdown. So who is there pontificating about how bad things are in America? The President of China. And that is what he is talking about—America can't pay its bills.

The families who lost five loved ones—it is an unbearable loss, but now they are being denied death benefits because of this senseless shutdown. It is shameful and embarrassing. There are no words to describe this situation that at least I am capable of expressing, that America could fail the families of our fallen heroes. Appalling, frightening—everyone can come up with their own description.

It is time for us, Members of this august body, to stand before the American people and publicly discuss the path forward. Democrats stand unified, asking the Speaker to reopen the government—the whole government, not bits and pieces of the government. It is bad enough with all of the sequestration that has cut, for example, the National Institutes of Health this year by \$1.6 billion, and add to that the government shutdown, add to that the second year of sequestration, which will be another \$2 billion for the National Institutes of Health. This premier search we have in America for cures for disease, there has never been anything like it in the world; the Library of Congress, there has never been anyplace like it in the world. The great library in Egypt didn't compare to the Library of Congress. But there has been nothing ever in the history of the world like the National Institutes of Health. We are mindlessly going forward and cutting these scientists by billions of dollars.

We need to reopen the whole government—not in some piecemeal fashion that further demonstrates to the world that we are unable to find real solutions. Open the whole government so we can get back to work. Allow the government to do its duty by our military families and by every American family.

Quickly—I have said it before—in July of this year the Speaker of the House of Representatives and I sat down in his office. I was there, my chief of staff was there, and his chief of staff was there—the four of us. The Speaker wanted to figure out a way to go forward. We talked about a number of things. The one thing he was firm in, he said, it has to be at 2013 levels. I said: I can't do that; it is \$70 billion less than the budget we passed just a short time ago. So the conversation continued. In September we talked and talked.

I spoke to Chairman MURRAY and to Chairman MIKULSKI. It was really hard. They had worked so hard to get regular order back in the Senate. But, like the good soldiers they are, we decided to try to talk to the rest of the caucus and swallow really hard because we had the assurance—I had the assurance

that we would have a clean CR now, in September. That didn't work. The Speaker didn't deliver on what he said he would deliver.

So the government closes and we have one thing after another coming over here and we send it right back. The last thing they sent over a week ago was to say let's go to conference. So last Tuesday I sent him a letter, and in the first letter I talked about a very decisive time in my life when I voted for the Iraq war. Within weeks of that I felt I had been misled. But regardless of that, that is how I felt. So I became an opponent of that war, and I did everything I could to focus on that war, which was having our military subjected to violence, and that is an understatement. Thousands were being killed, tens of thousands wounded. The number of Iraqis who were being killed is really hard to demonstrate adequately.

There was a time that came in my life when we had an opportunity, under my direction, to shut the government down. How? By not funding the war. I made a decision—and that is in my letter to the Speaker—not to do that.

(Ms. BALDWIN assumed the Chair.)

I, frankly, received a lot of help from around the country. But that is what I did. And I do not look back at all. So I was trying to tell the Speaker: Do not do this. However, I said: You have done it, and you have asked for a conference. We will go to conference on anything you want to go to conference on. We don't care. But first you have to open the government and allow us to pay our bills. That is in the letter of last Tuesday.

Forty-five minutes after he got the letter, I called him. He said: No, I can't do that. So for someone to suggest we have not negotiated is just absolutely wrong.

Madam President, \$70 billion—it is the biggest compromise I have ever made in my career as a Member of Congress—some 31 years. It may not sound like much to some people, but it was really big. My caucus remembers what I asked them to do. So for someone to suggest to any of my Senators that we have not negotiated is simply unfair, and to say that we will not negotiate is unfair. I put it in writing. We are happy to go to conference. But you have to open the government. This is unfair—just like these five soldiers killed. So open the government, let us pay our bills, and we will negotiate on anything you want to negotiate.

I have spoken to the President. I am certainly not name-dropping. I have told my caucus this several times over the last 2 days. He cannot, as President of the United States, negotiate on paying the bills of the country, the debt ceiling. I think there are Senators over here who he has sat down with and talked to individually and as groups to talk about a budget deal. There were

many conversations in the Oval Office that I attended to talk about a budget deal. He has put in writing things that he would be willing to do that, quite frankly, our base is not excited about. But he put it in writing. He is still waiting for the first sentence from the people he invited to dinner and met with—the first sentence—as to what they were willing to do.

As said late last week by Haley Barbour and Ed Gillespie, former chairs of the national Republican Party, Republicans—now, they said this, not me—there is a time now when Republicans have to start being for something, not against everything.

So I do not come here to argue and badger people. I am happy to talk about anything. Senator MURRAY will deliver a presentation in just a little bit. We know how hard she has worked. She has the respect of both Democrats and Republicans. But I repeat, when the Speaker said he wanted to go to conference last week, we said: Good. We will do that. I am not a one-man show over here. I clear everything with my caucus, with rare exception, before I go marching off into the blue.

So I repeat, we are ready to go to conference as soon as the Speaker reopens the government and removes the threat of default. He has to take yes for an answer. You folks have to take yes for an answer. We are just as willing to sit down and talk today as we were in the spring and as we were this summer. In the meantime, let's open the government and live up to our obligations as a country.

To that end, I will introduce a bill to allow the United States to pay it bills with no preconditions or strings attached. I will do that later today and start the so-called rule XIV process.

We may have our differences, Democrats and Republicans, but we should not hold the full faith and credit of this great country hostage while we resolve it. At a later time Senator BAUCUS will talk, and I hope he repeats here on this Senate floor what he told us in our caucus that we just completed: Great nations are not guaranteed greatness. There have been books written about it, and he will talk about one author, a famous author, who recently wrote a book about how great nations have to meet expectations. We are great today. That does not mean we will be forever. How is this country going to look to the world community if we no longer have the full faith and credit of the United States meaning anything?

I hope we can get Republican co-operation to move this bill quickly; that is, the debt ceiling bill. If not, the process could take us right up to the deadline—one day before.

I am optimistic, however, that my Republican colleagues here in the Senate will not filibuster this bill. I am cynical by nature. That way I am not disappointed as much as those who are

optimistic. My friend, Senator SCHUMER, and I have ongoing issues. He is optimistic about everything. I am cynical about everything. But I am optimistic, even though that is against my nature, that Republicans are not going to hold the full faith and credit of the United States hostage. I hope I am right.

We need to reopen the Federal Government now—not 10 minutes before the debt ceiling is gone. We need to get back to the business of protecting American families, back to the job of legislating. We are not doing anything in this body anymore. It is our job to legislate. That has always been our job; it always will be our job. Open the government, pay our bills, and let's negotiate.

It is my understanding that this consent request has been cleared. We will hear from the Republican leader. Then we will hear at that time from Senator MCCAIN for 15 minutes, followed by Senators DURBIN, SCHUMER, and MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that be the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCONNELL be recognized, which we really do not need consent for him. He has time under his leader time. Following his statement I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCAIN be recognized for 15 minutes, then Senator DURBIN for 10, Senator SCHUMER for 10, Senator MURRAY for 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I would ask the distinguished majority leader if he would consider modifying his consent request so that we could alternate back and forth across the aisle. With that modification, I have no objection.

Mr. REID. Well, after we get this out of the way, you mean?

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, the majority leader asked for a number of Democratic Senators to speak without any intervening speeches or remarks by Republicans. All I am suggesting is, after he and the Republican leader speak—

Mr. REID. Madam President, I say to my friend from Texas—

Mr. CORNYN. And after Senator MCCAIN speaks and a Democrat speaks, that a Republican gets to speak and so forth. That is all I am asking.

Mr. REID. I say, Madam President, through the Chair to my friend: three Democrats, two Republicans. It does not sound too outrageous to me. So would the Senator object to that?

Mr. CORNYN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. OK. So following Senator MCCONNELL, I will call upon Senator DURBIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of my good friend, the majority leader. I might say, however, that as much as I appreciate his comments to all of us, the real challenge is his relationship with the House and whether or not we can begin the discussion process to get to an outcome.

Nobody is happy with the government shutdown, certainly not anybody on this side, and not anybody on the other side. But I would remind everybody on both sides of the aisle that Democratic Senators have said repeatedly ObamaCare is the law of the land and, basically, we should get used to it.

We have suggested various modifications, some of which enjoy bipartisan support. But, obviously, so far that is not something our friends on the other side are willing to do.

But let me also point out to all of you that the Budget Control Act is also the law of the land. It was negotiated on a bipartisan basis, signed by the President of the United States, and the Budget Control Act is the law of the land.

When my good friend the majority leader says he was negotiating with the House over the CR level, my view was that was not a negotiation, that was current law, in place, passed on a bipartisan basis, signed by the President of the United States—current law.

So I think I can pretty safely say that nobody on this side believes that we ought to revisit a law that has reduced government spending for 2 years in a row for the first time since the Korean war, at a time when we have a debt the size of our economy which makes it look a lot like a Western European country.

So as we go into whatever discussions we end up having to solve the shutdown problem, I would say to my friends on the other side, revisiting a law negotiated by the President, passed on a bipartisan basis, that is actually reducing government spending ought not to be a part of the final outcome.

But talk we should. The American people have given us divided government. And when you have divided government, it means you have to talk to each other. This is not 2009 and 2010 when our friends on the other side had a total hammerlock on all the government. We now have divided government. It means we have to talk to each other and get to an outcome.

I think it is far past time to get that done. I hope, given where we are today, there is adequate incentive to get those talks started, principally between the majority leader and the Speaker, to get us to the outcome we all want, and to get us there soon.

But let me just conclude by saying the Budget Control Act is the law of the land. If you believe in reducing

government spending, it is working. My Members and the American people think reducing government spending is a good idea. So we have a law in place that is achieving those kinds of results. That is not something at a time when we have a debt the size of our economy that we ought to lightly walk away from.

So I hope my good friend, the majority leader, will, in addition to talking to us, which we appreciate, talk to the Speaker because that is how we resolve this crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, since the beginning of this great Nation, 1,948 men and women have served in the U.S. Senate. That service is a singular honor and carries with it an important responsibility. James Madison said the “use of the Senate is to consist in its proceeding with more coolness, with more system, and with more wisdom, than the popular branch.”

Throughout our history it was this Senate, many times in this very room, that took on the most difficult challenges facing America: the creation of the Federal judiciary, the abolition of slavery, decisions to go to war, and the advancement of civil rights.

At each of those moments, skeptics questioned whether there were Senators capable of resisting political pressure and whether there were Senators prepared to lead a divided nation.

My colleagues, this is our moment. This is our chance—our chance—to bring this Nation back from the precipice. We should agree to restore the functions of government, not in a piecemeal fashion but in an orderly process befitting a great nation. We should spare America's workers and businesses the tragic consequences of a first-ever default on our Nation's debt. And we should restore the time-honored process of legislating—legislating—by adopting a bipartisan budget with the House, by considering spending bills on the floor of this Chamber, and passing appropriations bills in an orderly process.

We can vote today, this afternoon, to go to conference on the budget and begin to resolve our differences with the House. If we fail, we know we will have diminished this great body and our great Nation—a nation which we have all taken a solemn oath to serve and protect.

So let's agree to restore the functions of government—all of it. I have spoken with many of my colleagues and friends—and they are my friends—on the Republican side of the aisle. We have shared our frustrations at the current situation. To a person, each one of you has said to me: We have to bring this impasse to an end.

Waiting for the House of Representatives to save us is beneath the U.S. Senate.

We have our own responsibility and our own opportunity. We can come up with bipartisan Senate solutions. We can show the House of Representatives the path to end this crisis. Why are we waiting for them to show us? Let's begin to restore the confidence of the American people in this institution, in the Senate. We can fund the government, we can go to conference on a budget, and we can extend our debt authority.

I see my friend Senator MCCAIN on the floor. I know he is going to speak in just a moment. Over the last year I have seen moments in the Senate where we have defied our cynics and our critics: our successful bipartisan effort to pass a comprehensive immigration bill, a historic farm bill with far-reaching reforms, and a bipartisan extension of the Student Loan Program.

We came together and we found common ground. We led as the Senate. Now we need to summon the political courage and purpose to find a bipartisan way to meet this challenge. I know it will not be easy, but I know we are up to the job. I know we have an opportunity that comes once perhaps in a political lifetime.

But I wish to say this: What we are dealing with in the Senate is not just another political dustup. This confrontation is of historic proportion. Let's not wait on the House to find a solution. It is our responsibility as elected Members of the Senate to find that solution.

The solution I think is clear. Summon the political courage and the sense of purpose that comes down to us in the Senate, and throughout our Nation's history it always has.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the order now before the Senate is Senators be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each. I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCAIN be recognized for 15 minutes. Everyone else will continue on the other order of 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent to return to the normal one side and then the other side as far as speakers are concerned.

Mr. REID. That is fine. That is our plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I say to my colleagues, I bring to your attention two events today that I think deserve our attention. The first one is a story entitled, “Grand Canyon food shortage turns dire.” The St. Mary's Food Bank is set to deliver food boxes to Grand Canyon National Park today

as a Federal shutdown strands thousands of employees inside the park without work and pay.

The Grand Canyon, thousands of people inside the park without food or pay. This great Nation, we are having to have charities deliver food to people who are trapped in the Grand Canyon.

Also today, "Shutdown outrage: Military death benefits denied to families of fallen troops."

At least five families of U.S. military members killed . . . in Afghanistan over the weekend were given a double-whammy by federal officials. Not only have your loved ones died, but due to the government shutdown, you won't receive a death benefit.

The approval rating of Congress we joke about, about being 12 percent or 11 percent. I have a line I use all of the time: We are down to blood relatives and paid staffers. But should not we as a body, Republicans, Democrats, no matter who we are, should we not be embarrassed about this? Should we not be ashamed?

What do the American people think when they see that for those who served and sacrificed in the most honorable way, their families are not even eligible for death benefits? I am ashamed. I am embarrassed. All of us should be. The list goes on and on of people, of innocent Americans who have fallen victim to the reality that we cannot sit down and talk as grownups and address this issue.

I am not going to take the full 15 minutes because I frankly get a little bit emotional. But we started with a false premise on this side of the aisle that somehow we were going to repeal ObamaCare. That is after 25 days of debate, including up until Christmas Eve morning fighting against ObamaCare, and that is after a 2012 election where I traveled this country with passion, the first thing saying that the first thing we are going to do when Mitt Romney is President of the United States is repeal and replace ObamaCare. The American people spoke.

So somehow to think we were going to repeal ObamaCare, which would have required 67 Republican votes, of course, was a false premise and I think did the American people a grave disservice by convincing them that somehow we could.

Now, 70 percent of the American people, according to a Washington Post poll this morning, disapprove of Republicans, but they disapprove of Democrats as well. They disapprove of the President of the United States as well. Meanwhile, the Chinese, great role models of democracy, are now criticizing us because of a looming failure by the American Government to pay its debts, both domestic and abroad.

I say to my friend the majority leader, and he is my friend—we use that word with great abandon around here, but he and I have known each other

now for 30 years—let's find a way to allow the adversary—I ask my good friend from Utah who is a history major, the words of Abraham Lincoln, "Charity toward all, malice toward none."

Let's find a way out of this. Let's find a way that we can sit down. I do not care if it is appointing people. I do not care if it is the informal conversations that we have been having back and forth. But there should be a way out of both of these dead ends that we are in.

How is this going to end? We know how it is going to end. We know how it is going to end. Sooner or later the government will resume its functions. Sooner or later we will raise the debt limit.

The question is, How do we get there? If there is anybody who disagrees that we are not going to reach that point, I would like to hear from them. So why don't we do this sooner rather than later? Why doesn't the Senate lead? I have great respect for the other side of the Capitol, but I understand the contradictions that are there and the difficulties the Speaker has. I am in great sympathy there.

So why don't we get together? Why don't we sit down and—look, this body voted 70 to 29, I think it was, to repeal the medical device tax. Do my colleagues want to renounce that vote they took on the budget? Why don't we use that as one of the areas where we could reach agreement? What about the issue out there the American people believe that we are under a different health care system than they are and ours is a better deal than theirs?

There are a number of issues that we could sit down and negotiate within an hour if we will stop—stop attacking each other and impugning people's integrity and honor. So all I can say is let's start this afternoon. I do not care who it is or how it is shaped, but let's sit down and get out of this, so that these families whose loved ones just died—just died—will receive the benefits at least that would give them some comfort and solace in this terrible hour of tragedy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those on the Democratic side be in this order: SCHUMER, MURRAY, BAUCUS, MIKULSKI, WARNER, CARDIN, KLOBUCHAR, WHITEHOUSE, STABENOW.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise because we are getting very close to a time of crisis, perhaps one of the greatest economic crises this country has known. I have many good friends on the other side of the aisle. I do not

doubt for a moment their motivation, their desire, and their love of country. It is every bit as strong as those of us on this side of the aisle.

So I make a heartfelt plea: We must come together and avoid a default of the United States. Many have said, I heard some even say on the other side, that default does not matter or it does not mean much. Let me explain the danger. There is a very real chance that if we default, there will be a recession greater than what occurred in 2008 and all too real a possibility it could put us into a depression.

Let me explain why. What happened in 2008 was simple. Mortgage securities declined in value immediately—dramatically they declined in value after Lehman and AIG went down. Banks' balance sheets instantly flipped from black to red. Loans were frozen, not only long-term loans but even overnight loans, lines of credit. The economy came to a screeching halt. We had to offer huge rescues or bailouts to overcome that. But even so, interest rates climbed.

If that happened with mortgage securities, the likelihood of it happening with Treasuries is all the more frightening because Treasuries are more widely held, more internationally held, the currency of the land, of the world. If Treasuries were to dramatically drop in value the day we defaulted or, make no mistake about it, it could happen a day or two before, here is what would happen: The economy would decline dramatically. Things would freeze. Interest rates would go way up. The cost of a mortgage, the cost of a car loan, dramatically increasing, hurting every middle-class family. Home sales would decline. Auto sales would decline. Hundreds of thousands, millions would be laid off.

Why risk that? We all have political goals. They differ. That is reasonable. There is a time and a place, as the Scriptures say, "A season for everything." There is a time and a place to debate these things. It is not while our government is shut down and while our debt hangs in the balance, risking default. There is a simple and logical solution which good men and good women on both sides of the aisle can come to.

Let's open the government. Let's pay our bills. Then let's debate every issue you wish to debate. Nothing should be off the table. We are happy to go to a committee, a conference committee. The Senator from Washington has asked, I believe it is 18 times—will ask again in a few minutes. Of course we want a conference committee where we can discuss things but not at the price of keeping the government closed, hurting millions of families in every way, not at the price, even worse, of defaulting on our debt.

I would say, with all due respect to my colleagues in the House, they have

it backward: First, go to conference and then decide whether to open the government or default. No one—liberal, conservative, Democrat, Republican—could say that is a rational strategy if you care about the country and worry about the risk of doing these things.

I understand the frustration with ObamaCare. We would argue there was an election in 2012. We would argue that every Democratic incumbent had to debate that issue over and over, as did President Obama when Governor Romney made it a major issue. The electorate decided they didn't want to get rid of ObamaCare. But we understand how passionately people feel, and we understand you will continue to try and do that. But again, there is a time and a season, and now is not the time and it is not the season when the government is shut down or default hangs in the balance.

I plead with my colleagues to allow us to come together. We want to negotiate. We want to sit down and talk to you. We are eager to do it. But first let's open the government, pay our bills, and then let's negotiate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, my understanding is we were going to go back and forth, and if the Senator from Texas wishes to go, I will yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his impassioned remarks today, and all of us weep for those service men and women who have lost their lives in defense of this great Nation.

I would note this Senate can right now, today, move to correct the problem the majority leader described. The House of Representatives has passed eight separate bills funding vital priorities of the government. All eight of those bills now sit on the majority leader's desk. This Senate has not voted on those bills. To date, the majority leader has not allowed the Senate to have even one vote on the bills that would fund vital government functions. One of those bills is a bill that funds the VA—funds the Department of Veterans Affairs.

It seems to me we are going to have political differences, and those political differences are not going away anytime soon, but we ought to be able to say, regardless of what happens in the battle over the shutdown, that our veterans should be beyond politics. We should have bipartisan agreement on standing for our veterans.

Right now veterans disability payments are not funded. The House has passed legislation to fund that. That was bipartisan legislation, with a number of Democrats in the House, and yet the majority leader has not allowed the Senate to vote on it. The only thing in

the way of funding the VA today is the Senate voting to do so—is the objection the majority leader has raised to funding the VA.

Let me note that the bill the House passed funding the VA is a clean CR on the VA. It doesn't mention ObamaCare. It doesn't say a word about ObamaCare. It simply says our veterans should be beyond partisan politics, regardless of the shutdown.

Let me also note this body has already engaged in bipartisan cooperation. Earlier in the course of this debate, the House of Representatives passed a bill to fund the men and women of the military—to pay their paychecks. For weeks there had been politicians suggesting if there were a government shutdown the men and women of the military would not be paid. The House passed a bill, a clean CR, that said we will fund the men and women in the military. I commend my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, and I commend the majority leader, because the 54 Democrats in this body made the right decision to act in a bipartisan way and cooperate with the Republicans in this body and with the House of Representatives, and in 24 hours the bill funding the men and women of our military became law, went to the President and was signed into law. That is the way we are supposed to operate.

So I would ask: If we could work together in a bipartisan manner to say we are not going to hold the men and women of the military hostage, why can't we work together in a bipartisan manner to say we are not going to hold our veterans hostage; that regardless of what happens in the shutdown, let's fund the VA now?

Likewise, the House of Representatives has passed a bill funding our parks and national memorials. We have seen day after day our World War II veterans coming to the World War II Memorial and facing barricades the administration has put up. The administration has expended money to keep them out. The House has passed a bill to fund our parks and our memorials. Let me suggest if the Senate would only vote, we could open every park and memorial in the country.

The House has passed a bill to fund FEMA. If the Senate would only vote, FEMA could be funded.

The House has passed a bill to fund the National Institutes of Health so we can provide vital cancer research. The majority leader spoke quite passionately just moments ago about the need to fund the National Institutes of Health. I agree with the majority leader, and I would ask the majority leader to withdraw the objection he has raised to funding the NIH.

Let me note, some have disparaged the House's approach as a piecemeal approach. Yet that is the traditional means of appropriating and legislating

that for centuries this body has done. The VA is usually funded—just the VA—not connected to anything else. Why would the Senate want to hold veterans hostage because of disagreements over ObamaCare? I don't think we should. I think we should fund the VA right now.

Why would the Senate want to hold our parks and memorials hostage?

Why would the Senate want to hold the National Institutes of Health hostage?

Why would the Senate want to hold Federal workers hostage?

On Saturday, the House of Representatives unanimously passed a bill to provide back pay for Federal workers who had been furloughed. Every House Democrat who voted voted in favor of that. Yet the majority leader has not allowed this body to vote. I am going to say right now I agree with those House Democrats, and I urge that Senate Democrats stand with House Democrats who voted unanimously in favor of back pay for Federal workers.

We can work together with bipartisan compromise, but we can only do so if both sides come to the table. Right now the House of Representatives is working constructively to fund vital priorities and, unfortunately, President Obama, the majority leader, and Senate Democrats are refusing to negotiate, refusing to compromise. That is not a reasonable approach. It is not a path that will lead to resolving this.

I hope we come together, resolve this, fund our vital priorities and, at the same time, respond to the millions of people who are hurting because of ObamaCare—who are losing their jobs, who are pushed into part-time work, who are facing skyrocketing insurance premiums and who are losing their health insurance.

We need to answer the call of our constituents. We need to answer the call of Teamsters president James Hoffa who put in writing that ObamaCare right now is destroying the health care of millions of working men and women. "Destroying" is the word Mr. Hoffa used. I think the Senate should respond to the concern Mr. Hoffa raised, and we should stand with millions of working men and women and we should protect their health care so the hundreds of millions of Americans who have health care right now don't lose it.

People all across this country are getting letters in the mail telling them they are losing their health care because of ObamaCare. We need to listen to them. So let's fund our government, let's fund our vital priorities, and let's listen to the American people and stop the No. 1 job killer in this country that is ObamaCare.

I urge this body to work together in a bipartisan manner to listen to the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think there is one thing every one of us can agree on: There are innumerable problems across our country—families who have been challenged, sad stories that should be taken care of in every part of our country, in each of our States, with families we know who are hurting because of this government shutdown. There is one answer to that, and it is an easy one. It is for the House of Representatives to simply take up the bill that is in the House today and pass it. We know there are enough Members of Congress who can pass that today and every problem we have heard about or haven't heard about yet will be solved. Republicans simply need to end this government shutdown so Americans stop hurting.

Our families also need to know they are not going to be threatened by a catastrophic default. And when that happens, we will be waiting at the table, as we are today, to negotiate a long-term deal in the budget conference that the other side has spent months blocking.

We have been trying to work with Republicans toward a fair, long-term budget deal for years. Since 2011, Democrats from the Senate to the House to the administration have sat in rooms, we have negotiated, we have talked, we have discussed, and we have offered compromise after compromise. We have tried regular committees, we have tried supercommittees. If there was a room where Democrats and Republicans could sit and talk, we found it and we got to work. But no matter what we did, no matter how much we offered, we were unable to come to a place that we could agree was a fair and balanced approach that the American people deserved.

So this year, our Republican friends on the other side of the aisle asked us to return to regular order. That was the most important thing they said—for us to get to a place where we could find a budget deal that could be agreeable and we could move forward. That is exactly what we did. In the Senate we passed our budget more than 6 months ago. The House of Representatives did the same. Since that time we have asked 19 times to go to conference to work out our differences. Nineteen times we have come to the floor to say let's have regular order, let's work out our differences in a conference committee.

We wanted to get in a room with the House Republicans to sit at a table and do everything possible to bridge the divide between our two budgets. We knew it would not be easy. There are significant differences between the House and Senate budget. But the American people expected us to try and we were committed to doing that. Importantly,

we wanted to make sure we had enough time to bridge that divide and get to this difficult deal so we would not be here today where we have lurched into another manufactured crisis.

Republicans rejected our attempts to sit down and negotiate. Every time we asked to go to a budget conference, we were shot down. Democrats came to the floor again and again, along with, I would add, a number of responsible Republicans who agreed. Even though they did not support the budget that was passed here, they agreed we should go to conference with the House Republicans and work out our deals. But each time we asked, a handful of Republicans objected and said: No discussions. They refused to allow us to go to a table. They had no interest in any discussions or negotiations or talk, and they pushed us until they got exactly what those few Republicans here wanted, and that was an avoidable—completely avoidable—government shutdown.

After spending 6 months rejecting talks, causing this crisis, now all of a sudden some of our Republican friends seem desperate to make it look as though they are the ones interested in negotiating. They know it is clear to families across the country the only reason this crisis continues is the House Republicans' refusal to take up the bill and pass it right now—a bill that will get our government open and running again.

And, by the way, they are now trying to do everything they can to distract their constituents from that simple fact. But the American people are smarter than that. They know the world did not begin the day of the government shutdown. They know it is not possible for Republicans to have just discovered negotiations 20 minutes before a shutdown, when all they need to do is take up the bill and vote.

The latest gimmick the House seems to be considering is to start another supercommittee to debate this issue. Instead of simply taking a vote to end this crisis, they want a repeat of 2011. They want another supercommittee. Well, as everyone here knows, I co-chaired that supercommittee, the Senator from Montana worked for hours and hours and days on end with me on that committee, and it failed. For reasons that we believe in and they believe in, which could be debated, the supercommittee did not come up with a resolution. I think House Republicans are going to have a lot of trouble explaining to those families who haven't seen a paycheck since this shutdown started that they should wait for another supercommittee to go to work.

Here is what should happen. House Republicans should end this crisis. They should simply allow a vote on our bill to end the shutdown, which would pass with bipartisan support.

They should stop threatening an economic catastrophe if they don't get

their way, and we are happy to sit down and negotiate. We know on our side that negotiation on a budget deal is not going to make us happy. We know the House Republicans won't be happy. But that is how a democracy works—by working out our differences. Democrats are here today to say we are willing to negotiate and we are willing to work with our Republican counterparts to find a path forward. Of course we want to negotiate. We have tried to start a budget conference for 6 months.

I know the vast majority of my Republican colleagues came here to help our families and to help our communities. I know they came here to solve problems. The vast majority came here to work across the aisle to make the country better. So I urge our Republican colleagues here in the Senate today to support the unanimous consent we are about to offer to end this crisis, take the threats off the table, and sit down and work with us toward a balanced and bipartisan budget deal that I know so many of us in this room want.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—H. CON. RES. 25

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives a message from the House that they have passed H.J. Res. 59, as amended by the Senate, the Senate then proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment at the desk, which is the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate proceed to vote on a motion to insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think we should all note that this unanimous consent agreement essentially asks the Senate to direct the House on what to pass and to pass the CR the Senate desires. There won't be any need to, in effect, deal in that fashion. That won't work.

I would also note in response that there is a unanimous consent request agreement I could agree to and I think Members of this side would agree to, and that is that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment at the desk, which is the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made

and laid upon the table; that the Senate proceed to a vote on a motion to insist on its amendment, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate. I further ask consent that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes reconciliation instructions to raise the debt limit.

That is the reason there has been an objection over here—because, under the way we believe we should proceed, raising the debt limit is a legislative act that should be subject to 60 votes. The concern from Members of our conference who have objected is that if we put the debt limit on the budget, then we would only have to have 51 votes. They have insisted they would approve going to the House and having conference on the budget, but they want an agreement that they are not going to attempt to slip that through. And if it is not a problem, why won't they agree?

So for these reasons, we are not able to agree, and I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, responding to the unanimous consent request the Senator from Alabama propounded, I reserve the right to object. We may have just reached the heart of the matter. While we hear day after day that our House Republican friends want to negotiate on the debt limit, the Senator from Alabama asked us now to specifically preclude ourselves from talking about that very subject. I respectfully suggest that perhaps the real problem here isn't that Democrats aren't talking to Republicans; it is that Republicans aren't even talking to each other.

I also would note that this modification the Senator from Alabama is asking would leave us in a shutdown facing hundreds of thousands of families who would wonder when their next paycheck would come while we do our work.

So I object to the Senator's request, and I renew my unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama objected to the request from the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SESSIONS. And I believe I understood she has renewed it, and so I would renew my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to all requests.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, just briefly, I appreciate Senator MURRAY having passed a budget this year in the Senate for the first time in 4 years. It is a budget that is far from the kind of budget we should have, but it was one they stood up and voted for. That is something of value to begin our process around here.

I would note that the reason it is such an unacceptable proposal from my Democratic colleagues—very similar to what President Obama asked for—is that it raises taxes \$1 trillion over 10 years and raises spending \$1 trillion over 10 years. That is above the lawful Budget Control Act levels we agreed to on a bipartisan basis in August of 2011.

If we remember, the President insisted we have a debt ceiling increase then. He said that we couldn't negotiate on it, that the country would sink into oblivion if we even got close to the debt limit, and we all had to back down and just agree to raise the debt limit without any limits.

Polling data showed the American people did not believe we should raise the debt limit of America without at least cutting spending and reducing our deficits; the credit card Congress was on was going to be pulled back. So Republicans stood firm. An agreement was reached, and the President approved it. It had no tax increases and raised the debt ceiling \$2.1 trillion over 10 years. How much is that? We were projected to increase spending over 10 years by \$10 trillion. This would reduce the increase in spending from \$10 trillion to \$8 trillion—not enough to throw the government into default, disaster, and confusion if properly executed. And it certainly wasn't the best way it was done. So that was the agreement. Before the ink is dry, with a year or so under it, now our colleagues have already abandoned ship, thrown in the towel, and want to raise spending by \$1 trillion over what they agreed and raise taxes by another \$1 trillion. That is why we have a big disagreement.

What do our colleagues want? They want to tax more, spend more, with more debt. It is not the way to run America, and the American people know it. So somehow, in this debt crisis, we all have to work together. And I respect my colleagues, but I cannot agree to doing something in this process that violates the solemn agreement. We told the American people: OK, we have raised the debt ceiling \$2 trillion, but we reduced spending by \$2 trillion. The debt ceiling has already eased up by \$2.1 trillion, but we still made a promise we have to honor—that we will save \$2.1 trillion of growth over the next 10 years. That is our responsibility and duty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next two Republican Senators to be recognized would be Senator COLLINS from Maine followed by Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska and that we would continue to alternate between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that Senator COLLINS be recognized at this time.

Mr. BAUCUS. Reserving the right to object, would the Senator repeat his request.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the two Republican speakers on this side be Senator COLLINS from Maine and Senator MURKOWSKI and that we continue to alternate between both sides. Since I just butted in as part of our budget debate, I did not intend or desire to take Senator COLLINS' time. She has been patiently waiting next in line.

Mr. BAUCUS. I certainly will not object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I wish to underline the gravity of the financial condition our country is headed to at this point. I think in the back-and-forth we tend to overlook just how serious this matter is. Here in the Capitol we walk in the footprints of our forefathers. Walking through these halls, their presence is felt at every turn. Just outside this Chamber are the likenesses of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and dozens of statesmen cast in bronze and marble.

At the end of this month a new leader will be added to the halls of Congress—Winston Churchill. A bust of the late Prime Minister will be added to the Capitol collection in the National Statutory Hall later this month.

Churchill once said, "The price of greatness is responsibility." We here in Congress have a great responsibility—a responsibility to conduct the business of this Nation, to represent and do what is right for our people and help the people we represent. That is our responsibility here. However, the inaction of a small group of Members in the House has crippled Congress and is now threatening to impede the ability of the United States to fulfill one of its greatest responsibilities—to pay the government's bills. It is completely irresponsible to threaten to default on the Nation's debt. Since 1789 this country has always honored its obligations. Even when the White House and Capitol were burned to the ground right here in 1814, America still honored its debts.

America is the greatest country on Earth. We are the leaders of the free world. Nations look to us as examples in democracy. We are supposed to be "the shining city upon a hill," but unfortunately the shine risks being tarnished by a debt default.

I agree with many of my colleagues that more could be done to reduce the deficit and promote economic growth, but, as the President said, we cannot negotiate under the threat of default of the Nation's debt. It reminds me of what President Franklin Delano Roosevelt once said: Never fear to negotiate, but do not negotiate out of fear. Failing to raise the debt limit and shutting down the government are two fearful actions that should not be on the table as we attempt to negotiate

other matters in our Nation's fiscal policy.

The path is clear. We need to open the government and raise the Nation's borrowing limit. Take away those two guns to our head as a country. Then and only then can we responsibly address the Nation's long-term budget challenges.

Right now we need to come together to ensure that we do not permit another self-inflicted wound to our Nation's economy, and that is what defaulting of the debt is—a self-inflicted wound with global consequences.

When is the X date? When is the date on which the U.S. Government can no longer pay its bills? We don't know exactly. It is uncertain, and that is part of the problem. Uncertainty creates unpredictability. Nobody knows for sure. The Treasury Secretary says it is October 17. That is as good a date as any. At that time we will have exhausted all "extraordinary measures" to stay under the debt limit. I reminded my colleagues that we have been over the debt limit since I think it is May. But we have been taking extraordinary measures; that is, not fulfilling other obligations; that is, not making the government contribution to, say, the government retirement system, for example—we are not doing that anymore. That is an extraordinary measure. We are not making that contribution so we can make other payments such as Medicare payments and other payments the government is obligated to make.

After October 17, after all extraordinary measures are exhausted, we would risk defaulting on payments. This is dangerous territory. As of next Thursday it is expected the Treasury Department will have only about \$30 billion cash on hand, barely enough to support the government for 1 or 2 weeks. After that the government's wallet is empty. We are in uncharted waters.

Again, this country has never in its history defaulted on the national debt. If the debt ceiling is reached, government would immediately have to slash its spending by 20 or 30 percent, driving the Nation back into recession.

Make no mistake about it. Social Security payments and Medicare would have to be slashed, veterans' benefits hit, farm payments, farm funding, Department of Defense, payments to the disabled—every program this government runs will be devastated by cuts.

The default would also have global consequences, not just here in America but worldwide. Christine Lagarde, the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, warned that a failure of the United States to raise the debt ceiling could damage the entire global economy. She is right. Look at how precarious the European economy is right now, and the great effort the European countries have been under-

taking to try to stabilize the southern countries in Europe, along with the creditors of the northern nations of Europe. She said it is "mission critical" that the debt limit be resolved as soon as possible. Mission critical, says Christine Lagarde, Managing Director of the IMF.

We are the most important economy in the world. We are the reserve currency for the world. Our Treasury bonds are the very foundation of the global financial system. Default would put the global economy in chaos. The New York Times has an article today entitled "Default Threat Generates Fear Around the Globe."

Five years after the financial crisis in the United States helped spread a deep global recession—

Don't forget, Lehman Brothers collapsed 5 years ago in December.

—policy makers around the world again fear collateral damage, this time with their nations becoming victims not of Wall Street's excesses but of a political system in Washington that to many foreign eyes no longer seems to be able to function efficiently.

We have read the article. We know it is true. The plug has been pulled on negotiations between the United States and Europe on their trade agreements. Why? Because of the government shutdown, not so much the debt limit but the shutdown.

We also read articles, I am sure it is true, that President Obama had to cancel his trip to Southeast Asia because he had to stay here and try to work out this crisis. The United States is losing influence in Southeast Asia because he is not there. Who is there? President Xi, the President of China. President Xi is there, explaining to the Southeast Asian countries that China is their friend and he is making loans, an international development bank sponsored by China, tens and twenties of billions of dollars—not by the United States but China.

Those countries are trying to escape the gravitational pull of mainland China. President Xi's presence there helps increase their gravitational pull. The President of the United States is not there, not there to show to those other Southeast Asian countries that we care. He is not there because we are not doing our work. That is why he is not there.

His absence creates another almost deeper concern among countries, let's say in Southeast Asia. Where is the United States going to be militarily if there is some military difficulty in Southeast Asia? Where is the United States going to be? Can the United States be counted on? Can the United States be trusted?

It seems as though there is a question there because the President is not in Southeast Asia and the other question is there because there is a question whether the United States is going to pay its debts, going to pay its bills.

I think we eventually will, as the Senator from Arizona Senator McCain said. I think most Members of this body think we eventually will. But let's get there now, not later.

There is a real danger here, a big danger here. The danger is we are going to get close to the cliff and get so close to it that we will go over it. We know the cliff is out there. The cliff is default. We know it is not too far away. We know we do not want to go over the cliff. We do not know exactly where that cliff is. We don't know. It may be closer than we think. We do not know what payments we have to make, when they are due. We do not know what the revenue is going to be. That is why the X date is so uncertain.

In addition to that, something might happen that triggers a catastrophic economic global response. I don't want to overstate this point, but back in 1914, the Archduke of Austria was assassinated—Serbia. That spark started World War I, that spark caused it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BAUCUS. Very briefly, in addition, there have been other instances when pressure was being built up, people did not heed warnings, they let fate tempt them, and the result was collapse. There have been financial bubbles. The tulip bubble, for example. Lehman Brothers is another example. We knew with the mortgages being written that a bubble was building in that market, but we let it. We would say, oh, nothing is going to happen, but it eventually did.

I plead with my colleagues here. Remember, we cannot control fate. We can't control it. We can do our best. We all know that we are going to raise the debt ceiling, we all know we are going to open the government, so let's do it early rather than late.

I know it was exceeding my time a little bit, but I think it is important to remind ourselves.

I know we are the greatest country in the world.

The leader asked me to refer to a book I mentioned a couple of hours ago in the Democratic luncheon by Paul Kennedy, a Princeton historian. He pointed out in the sweep of history, civilizations and countries rise and fall. There is no guarantee that any country or civilization continues forever—Greeks, Romans, Persians, Genghis Khan, the United Kingdom—they rise and they fall. We are No. 1 right now. How long can we continue to be No. 1?

He also pointed out, Paul Kennedy, in the sweep of history, countries are defeated not by external armies but by internal decay. So I am saying let's not decay here. Let's resolve this as adults and let's be responsible in the spirit of Winston Churchill.

I apologize to my good friend from Maine for speaking on her time.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the government shutdown represents a failure to govern and must be brought to an end. Disabled veterans who have sacrificed so much for our country are waiting for their claims to be handled. Pregnant women and small children are at risk of their WIC benefits not being funded. Crucial biomedical research is being disrupted and the sickest of children are being turned away from clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health.

The impact goes far beyond the direct consequences for Federal employees and the programs they administer. One has only to look at the impact of the closure of Acadia National Park in my State of Maine to see the ripple effects on shopkeepers, servers at restaurants, inn owners and others who depend on revenue from these disappointed tourists.

That is why I have worked hard to put together a three-point plan to bring this impasse to a speedy end. I am very delighted that my friend and colleague from Alaska Senator MURKOWSKI has joined me in shaping and supporting this plan. Let me quickly describe it and let me give credit to those who have talked about concepts that have been incorporated into this plan—people such as my colleagues Senator HATCH and Senator TOOMEY, and on the House side, Representative KIND and Representative DENT.

The first point of the plan would fund government for the next 6 months at the level of \$986 billion, so that would allow government to immediately reopen.

Second, it would repeal the tax on medical devices and equipment such as x-ray machines and pacemakers. This tax will only serve to drive up the cost of health care because it will be inevitably passed on to the consumer, it will stifle innovation, and industry estimates that it will lead to the loss of some 43,000 jobs. It is a tax that does not make sense.

The administration has pointed to the \$30 billion that would be raised by this tax over the next 10 years. Fair enough. There is a way to replace that revenue and it is a way that has beneficial consequences to many employers who are struggling to make pension contributions in this difficult economy. It would do so without in any way weakening the pension obligation to their workers. It is a complicated issue. It is called pension smoothing. But it is one that this body has dealt with before in the transportation bill known as MAP 21. We would extend that pension smoothing on the contributions which have been produced by the fact that the Federal Reserve has held interest rates at a very low level.

I will describe this in more detail in a written statement. It is in the statement that I made on the Senate floor

on Saturday. But suffice it to say that by smoothing these pension contributions, we can replace the lost revenue that would result from the repeal of the 2.3-percent tax on medical devices and equipment.

The third point of our plan, the Collins-Murkowski plan, includes a bill that Senator MARK UDALL and I introduced earlier this year that would provide flexibility to Federal managers in dealing with sequestration, but it does so in a way that preserves the important congressional oversight. Sequestration is a flawed policy because it does not discriminate between essential programs and those that are duplicative and wasteful. But if we are to have sequestration, surely we should give Federal managers the ability to set priorities and apply common sense in its administration instead of having across-the-board, equal meat axe cuts for every line item in their budgets.

But to ensure that this flexibility is not abused, we would have the Appropriations Committee oversee this process and have the right to reject the plans. It is very similar to the reprogramming requests that the Appropriations Committee receives now and either accepts or rejects when agencies want to move money from one account to another.

This would represent a modest proposal that could bring this impasse to an end, allow government to reopen, give those on both sides of the aisle who have voted during the course of the budget resolution by 79 votes to 20-something votes to repeal this harmful tax on medical equipment and devices and yet replace the revenue. I don't see how the administration could object to that because the revenue would be replaced. Yet this harmful tax would be repealed and we would give Federal agencies the flexibility to deal with sequestration.

There is something in the Collins-Murkowski plan that everyone on both sides of the aisle can point to. Yet it would get us out of this impasse that is increasingly harmful to our country and its image in the world.

It is past time for us to come out of our partisan corners, it is past time for us to stop fighting, and it is past time for us to reopen government. We have all made crystal clear what our positions are on ObamaCare at this point. Let's proceed with governing rather than continuing to embrace a strategy that will lead us only to a dead-end and whose consequences will be increasingly felt by our economy and by the American people. We can do this.

I ask my Democratic colleagues to take a close look at the plan we are putting forward. It is a reasonable approach. I ask my Democratic and Republican colleagues to come together. Let's get this done. We can do it. We can legislate responsibly and in good faith.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to respectfully say that we in the Senate and we in the Congress have to do what our constituents elected us to do and what the Constitution requires us to do: keep the United States Government open and make sure the United States of America pays its bills. To do that, we are open to negotiation and examining a variety of ideas, but the main idea is to go through the regular order in the committee process.

We can keep the government open and we can meet our responsibility on the public debt if we embark upon two solutions and they are in the hands of the other party. We call upon the House to pass the Senate continuing funding resolution that would reopen government and keep it going until November 15. It is not a long-term solution. If we get to it right now, we will fund it at 2013 levels, acknowledging the sequester level. That was a big compromise. I compromised, as the chair of the Appropriations Committee, to move that continuing funding resolution. It was \$70 billion less than what I wanted, but in order to get us in a room and get the conversation going and the negotiations going, I was willing to compromise.

I call upon the House to pass that. I call upon the Senate Republicans who have objected to going to the Budget Committee to lift their objection so we can take the Senate-passed budget and go to conference so we can get a budget.

Why is this important? For those who say we have to control spending, there is nobody who disputes that, but the way we control spending is to go through the regular budget process. I say to many of my colleagues who might not understand the Budget Control Act and I say to the American people who are listening, the way to control discretionary spending is to pass a budget that sets a cap on what the appropriators can spend in domestic spending.

I heard the wonderful Senator and distinguished war hero from Arizona JOHN MCCAIN ask us to get to it today. I agree. Let's get to it today and lift the objection for Senator MURRAY, the chair of the Budget Committee, to take appointed conferees so they can negotiate on the budget.

I say to my colleagues—again, to explain the Budget Control Act—we appropriators are not wild spenders. We appropriators can't go rogue in terms of wild runaway spending. We have a budget cap imposed upon us through a budget process and something called a 302(a), but we can't get the cap on spending unless the Budget Committee is able to move. This is very serious.

I have the high honor of representing the State of Maryland, and I see my

colleague from Maryland, Senator CARDIN, on the floor. We represent 5½ million people and a lot of civilian agencies. I note also on the floor are the distinguished Senators from Virginia, both of whom are former Governors of Virginia.

Between the four of us, we represent the largest concentration of Federal employees in the world. We represent Federal employees from the Department of Defense to the National Institutes of Health, to the National Institute of Standards and Technology. There is a rollcall of honor in service and duty that makes the United States a stronger country, a stronger economy, and so on.

When we speak about government, we know what we are talking about, and we know what is going on. Many have spoken about opening NIH. I want to open NIH. NIH, which is a clinical hospital, is not accepting new patients. This week 200 people have been turned away. Children in the United States of America were turned away. It is not just BARB MIKULSKI talking, the Washington Post reported on a lady who has cancer and wants to come to NIH, but she can't get into a clinical trial because it is closed down. They say: Senator BARB, open NIH. But we have to open the rest of the government.

Right now the Centers for Disease Control has a substantial number of its workforce furloughed. Having the CDC closed constitutes a danger to public health. Right this minute in 18 States, 278 people have been sickened by salmonella. Thank God there have been no deaths, but it is making people very sick. We don't have CDC on the job to track diseases and alert the public health departments around the United States of America so they can stand sentry to protect people against salmonella. Open the CDC. Open the whole government.

Just this week, in our own metropolitan area, a worker was killed trying to service the Metro. This should be under investigation. There was one death and several injuries. There was a bus crash in Tennessee, but right this very minute the National Transportation Safety Board has the majority of their people furloughed. They can't investigate the Metro accident, and they can't investigate the bus crash in Tennessee.

A few weeks ago Senator CARDIN and I were informed that a person had a terrible accident on the Bay Bridge in which a car went over the side of the bridge. We asked for an investigation to make sure our bridge is safe. That was under way, but now it is going to be delayed.

Let's take our FBI. Our FBI agents are on the job. They are being paid with IOUs. A group of FBI agents, called Voices from the Field, said to us, their U.S. Government: Guess what. We don't have gas for our cars. The FBI

does not have gas for its cars. The agents' gas allowance is limited to 200 miles per week, and they can't even buy gas out of their own pocket.

Not only is the FBI running out of gas, I think we are running out of gas here. The way we fuel our tanks and get America running and rolling again is to reopen government. The way we reopen government is for Mr. BOEHNER, the Speaker of the House, in his job as Speaker, to bring up the vote on reopening the government and vote on the Senate-passed resolution.

We say to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to lift their objection to the Budget Committee going to conference so the Budget Committee can come up with a budget with their caps on domestic discretionary spending. We will cap all discretionary spending. We appropriators will abide by the cap. We will not have runaway spending, and we will not go rogue. We will follow the rules, but I think we all need to follow the rules. Under the statutory requirement of the Budget Control Act, they were supposed to bring the budget back April 15. We passed one on March 23 and we have been waiting and waiting.

I wish to join with my colleague from Arizona. Let's get to it. Let's get the job done. Let's reopen government. Let's pay our bills. I am willing to negotiate. I am willing to compromise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, from what I heard from those who have just spoken prior to me, it sounds as if we ought to be able to get something done. We listened to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, with her commitment to advancing issues through the budget process. I think we too need to go to conference and get that moving.

We are sitting here in a kind of a rarefied world in the Senate Chamber. Some would suggest we live in a little bit of a bubble. Let me tell everyone about the folks who are not living in a bubble: the furloughed Federal employees and those who have been shut out of whatever it is that they had hoped they were going to be doing this past week and those in my State, for instance, who are looking to fill the family freezer.

It is moose season in my State, but now they were told they cannot access any of the refuge lands because Fish and Wildlife has said they cannot access the land regardless of what ANILCA provides and regardless of the full public access to these Federal lands. Those folks who are feeling the real impact of a government shutdown are not living in a bubble.

We just heard the chairman of the Finance Committee talk about the looming threat we are facing as we approach the debt limit, and he refers to a fiscal cliff. In fact, as a nation, we could lose

our financial footing. We could go over that fiscal cliff.

For a lot of folks, they are already looking at their own fiscal cliff. They are not waiting for us to figure out what we are going to do or not do when it comes to dealing with the debt limit. They are not getting paid. They are perhaps a small business, such as Seong's Sushi Bar & Chinese, which is located across the street from the Federal Building in Juneau. They are sitting there losing revenues on a daily basis because they don't have the customers they anticipate every day. The folks who frequent Capital Brew, which is a drive-through coffee shop that is also in Juneau across from the Federal Building, Bill's Mini Cache, which is a snack shop inside the Anchorage Federal building, these are folks who are looking at it, and they are feeling their own fiscal cliff right now, with or without the threat of the debt limit.

So they are looking at us and they are saying: Wait a minute. You told us a couple weeks ago that we were going to avert this shutdown, that we would figure out how we were going to pass a continuing resolution.

We didn't pass a continuing resolution. Somehow, that all gets wrapped up in ObamaCare. They are trying to figure out where the nexus is here between funding the government and what is going on with the Affordable Care Act. They then find out: We are in a government shutdown. What does that mean for me? I am sitting here in Alaska, 4,000 miles from Washington, DC. But then they learn Fish and Wildlife is saying: No, you can't go out and get the moose to put in your freezer to make it through the winter. Or you are the crab fisherman who is waiting at the crab grounds beginning October 15, but the quotas have not yet been determined from within the National Marine Fisheries Service center yet, so you can't go out. The revenues the industry might be able to derive, about \$7 million from the sale of great king crab that we would all love—a great market out there—but they are not going to be able to get out in the water because some Federal agency 4,000 miles from home hasn't delivered to them the quota.

So when we talk about these fiscal cliffs, it is not just waiting for us to hit a debt limit. It is what is happening with this government shutdown.

So what they are asking me—and I know each and every one of us is hearing from our constituents—is: So what is your plan? And oh, by the way, you better get on it pretty quick, because you have my attention now. What is the plan? So they see some of the things coming out of the House. The House has these mini efforts to fund a specific section, and it doesn't go anywhere here. We are told: Well, we want to open the whole thing. So if we can't open the whole thing and we can't open

a portion of it, nothing happens. Nothing happens. So where is the plan? What are we going to do?

So I am pleased to stand with my friend from Maine Senator COLLINS as she has described a plan which I think is pretty reasonable. I think it is pretty sensible. When we think about those small, rational, reasonable steps that might get us to a place where we can stop the madness, if you will, break this impasse—a proposal that would pull back on the medical device tax, with an offset, so that we are not eroding, we are not undercutting the revenues that would come in for the Affordable Care Act, a 6-month extension of the continuing resolution, as well as a sequestration with a little bit of flexibility and, oh, let's add in some oversight, it sounds pretty rational.

Some suggest maybe the President doesn't want to do this because it is a small incursion in his signature bill. Do my colleagues know what. Right now, what we need to be thinking about is who we work for, whether it is the crab fisherman who wants to get out in the water and who is waiting for NMFS to step it up, whether it is the family out in Galena who is hoping they are going to be able to get their moose before moose season closes, whether it is the guy at Seong's Sushi Bar and Chinese there in Juneau, or whether it is the Alaska family. I got an e-mail a couple of days ago. This family has been planning for a year to bring all the kids together, including boyfriends and girlfriends. They are going to do a great hike out in the Moab National Park for a week, and they are stuck. Nothing is going on, and their family vacation is ruined.

What about what is going on—this is an amazing one—in the Kenai River, which happens to proceed through some refuge areas. People can still go fishing now, and there is good rainbow fishing out there. But when you move down river through that refuge park, you better bring your lines in because we are going to have enforcement action on the river.

There are so many stories we can all attest to, and some of them are horrible. Some of them, as Senator McCAIN has indicated, are about families who are grieving the loss of their loved one—someone who has served this country with honor—being denied death benefits.

The country expects us to get our act together, and they expect us to do it without delay. They are not interested in knowing which side is going to gain more leverage the further we delay. Nobody is winning. I tell my friends the Democrats: You are not winning. And I tell my friends the Republicans: We are not winning. The administration is not winning. Everybody is losing when we cannot come together with a plan, with the resolve to do the job we are tasked to do, which is basic

governing, and keeping the government open is basic governing.

So whether it is Senator COLLINS' plan, whether it is an effort that is yet to be created, as the Senator from Arizona challenged us, let's start this now. Let's not delay any further because real people—the people we care for, the people we are charged to help—are hurting right now. This goes beyond mere inconvenience. This is hurt.

So let's do what we have pledged to do. Let's do what we have signed up to do, which is to work together. At the end of the day, this is not going to be a Republican plan or a Democratic plan or a Senate plan or a House plan. It is going to be a plan that allows us to govern.

With that, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend the period of morning business for debate only until 7 p.m., and that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to follow up on the remarks of my colleagues and the Senators who have spoken before me.

It seems as though we have accepted this new normal, that shutting down the operations of the largest enterprise in America is acceptable. I concur with my colleague, the Senator from Alaska, about the real stories and real pain that is taking place because of this government shutdown. I commend some of my colleagues for their comments. When we read these tragic stories, whether it concerns NIH or it concerns our veterans or concerns our National Park Service, they say: Oh, but that part of the government we want to reopen. Does that mean that every other aspect of government remains closed until we can find that story?

I point out stories to my colleagues that were in both *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* today—stories we should be celebrating about—three American Nobel Prize winners. Does that mean we should now reopen the NSF, because if the National Science Foundation isn't funded, there may not be a next generation of American Nobel Prize winners? Do we have to bring in a story about some child being hurt because their food or their meat or their fish wasn't inspected correctly?

I have to tell my colleagues, I spent a lot longer in business than I have in

politics, and I have been involved in a lot of business negotiations. But I have never been involved in a negotiation that says during the negotiation we have to shut down the operations of our business and inflict pain not only upon our employees but upon the general economy across the board.

That is not the way to govern.

We have talked about stories about Federal workers. But I agree with the Senator from Alaska. It also hurts the hotel owners along the Skyline Drive in our State of Virginia and the government contractors who start and stop because they don't understand how government is going to operate. I heard a story this morning about a small business outside a government facility in St. Louis that is hurting as well.

This piecemeal approach to reopening government makes no sense. What might be better—as we hear from some folks who want to have this piecemeal effect—is to ask: What parts of the government should stay closed. This is not the way to operate. We ought to reopen this government, put our people back to work, get this economy going again, and continue the very real conversations we have to have about getting our fiscal house in order.

What makes this different to me, in the 4½ years I have been in the Senate, than previous discussions and debates is that we have this—the first in my tenure in the Senate—government shutdown which disproportionately is hurting Virginia and Maryland. But it is literally hurting every community across America. But we have this tragedy, this catastrophe merging now into a deadline that is going to hit us next week where there are certain Members of Congress who say: It is OK if America defaults.

I find that stunning.

When we look back, we find there has never been a major industrial country in modern history that has defaulted. As a matter of fact, the last major country to default was Argentina, back in December of 2001. In the aftermath of that default, they had over 100 percent per annum inflation. Every family in Argentina saw literally 60 percent of their net worth disappear within a few weeks. America is not Argentina, but why would we even get close to that kind of potential economic catastrophe?

It has been mentioned already that America holds a record as the reserve currency for the world. When crises happen, as have happened around the world recently in many countries, people and capital flow into the dollar. That is because the dollar and the full faith and credit of the United States has never been suspect. There has never been a question of whether we are going to honor our commitments. Next week, or very shortly after, that history is going to be put potentially in jeopardy.

I have heard those who say we can prioritize payments. There is no business group in America or no economist that I know of, from left to right, who believes that somehow America can partially default and prioritize payments. Are we going to pay interest? Are we going to pay our troops?

Those of us who served at State levels realize that sometimes our budgets are close to 50 percent pass-throughs from the Federal Government.

The Presiding Officer was the governor of the great State of West Virginia. How long before West Virginia defaults if America starts prioritizing its payments? How many other Detroit's will there be all across America if we were to take this type of irresponsible action? Even if there were some possibility that there might be some chance of some logic behind this partial payment scheme, it has never been tried before. No industrial country has ever gotten this close to a default. Why would we take the chance? Why would we play Russian roulette with only one bullet in two chambers? It is something that at this moment, for our national economy and the world economy, can be devastating.

I know we seem to all be repeating ourselves on both sides, but to me it seems very easy in a negotiation; we have differences. I would say to my colleagues I probably make folks on my side more angry than almost anyone else on these issues around getting our country's balance sheet in order. I am anxious to continue those discussions about tax reform, about entitlement reform, about bringing our debt-to-GDP ratio down. But that kind of negotiation hasn't happened while we have this government shutdown and the full faith and credit of the United States potentially in jeopardy.

So let's open the government, not just because we hear some tragic story about one component of the government, not just because we need to make the case about food inspectors, about the National Science Foundation, about NASA Langley where we do aeronautics research—3,500 people and 7 people were at work last week. China, India, other nations around the world are not stopping their research, not stopping their investments because we can't get our act together. Open this government. Take off the table the idea that America will default. Then I am anxious to join with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get our country's balance sheet in order. But to continue to hold this economy and these stories of these Americans lives in this limbo is irresponsible beyond words.

So I hope we will go ahead and—agreeing with my colleagues who have spoken already, let's get this government open. Let's take and make sure we are going to honor and pay our debts, and let's get to the very real,

important questions of how we get our Nation's balance sheet right.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 72

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I want to again thank the majority leader for bringing the attention of this body to the tragedy of those servicemen who lost their lives and the fact that, unfortunately, their families had been notified improperly, I believe, that they will not be paid the tax-free death gratuity they are entitled to under law. This is wrong. Every Member of this body agrees this is wrong. Every Republican agrees this is wrong, and I am confident every Democrat agrees it is wrong as well.

Indeed, the way this announcement that was made was highly troubling. The Department of Defense notified our military families via Twitter that those servicemembers who die in battle will not be paid their tax-free death gratuities due to the partial Federal Government shutdown.

I think this is yet another pattern that we have seen distressingly from the Obama administration of politicizing this shutdown and playing partisan games to maximize the pain that is inflicted on Americans. It is part and parcel of the pattern we have seen, barricading the World War II memorial, barricading the parking lot at Mount Vernon, George Washington's home, even though Mount Vernon is privately operated, barricading the roads leaving Mount Rushmore, even though they are State roads and not Federal roads.

The actions by the Department of Defense are also contrary to the statute that this body just passed. The military death gratuity is by statute a pay and personnel benefit. Accordingly, it is clearly funded by Public Law 113-39, the Pay Our Military Act that was passed in a bipartisan manner this week. We already acted to prevent this and, unfortunately, the Defense Department is declining to follow that law that we passed.

The legislation this body already passed would immediately act to take the families of those soldiers and sailors and airmen and marines whose lives are tragically taken—to take them off the table and say: Regardless of what happens in a government shutdown, we are going to stand by the men and women fighting for America.

Indeed, the House of Representatives has introduced a bipartisan bill to immediately fund death gratuity payments. When that bill is passed, the Senate should pass that bill immediately. Indeed, the Pentagon should abandon this policy to begin with and simply follow the law that was already passed. But if they do not, I call upon all 100 Senators to come together, to listen to the majority leader, who spoke powerfully about the need to

stand by our service men and women whose lives are tragically taken. When the House passes that bill, which I am confident it will do so with considerable speed, I would call upon every Senator to listen to the majority leader's call and to stand with our service men and women.

But there is something else we can do right here today to demonstrate that this body does not have to be locked in partisan gridlock, to demonstrate that bipartisan cooperation is possible, and to demonstrate that our veterans are truly not the subject of partisan dispute but are separate and deserve to be treated fairly, deserve to have the commitments, the promises we made to our veterans honored; that is, this body can stop blocking the legislation that the House of Representatives has already passed—bipartisan legislation to fund the VA, to fund disability payments—so we do not hold them hostage to what is happening in Washington.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 72, making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014; that the measure be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas has stated again what has already been talked about here a lot, and that is a piecemeal approach to funding our government.

As do most Americans, we Democrats support the purpose of this bill to fund the Veterans' Administration. But there is no reason for us to have to choose between this important government function and disease control, NIH, highway safety, FBI, poor children, workplace safety, or protecting the environment.

We could do all these things if the House Republican leadership would just allow the House to vote on the Senate-passed measure to end the shutdown. Everyone knows the votes are there.

Our position is simple: Open the government, pay our bills, and then we will be happy to negotiate about anything.

We need to end this government shutdown.

First of all, my friend talks about these five families who are in bereavement, and that is an understatement. Five sons, husbands, friends were killed over the weekend.

Providing the funding that my friend requests would not enable DOD to pay a death gratuity to the families of 17

servicemembers—five over the weekend. We have had others die who have given their lives to protect the Nation since the shutdown began on October 1. Seventeen.

This is but one example of how the efforts of the Senator from Texas to fund the government on a piecemeal basis does not work.

If the Speaker would allow the House to pass the Senate continuing resolution, the Department of Defense would have the authority it needs to bring families to Dover, DE, to receive the remains of their family members and to pay the death gratuity benefits.

The junior Senator from Texas expresses concern for America's veterans. But his consent request addresses only some of the ways in which the American people, through their government, have committed to help our veterans.

Let me quote from the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY. He gave these remarks on October 3. Here is exactly what he said:

I would note also that I believe the resolution the Senator is offering and suggested be passed provides only partial funding for the VA. There is no funding here to operate the national cemeteries. There is no funding for the Board of Veterans' Appeals. There is no funding for constructing VA hospitals and their clinics. There is no funding, actually, to operate the IT system that the entire VA needs in order to continue going forward.

So there could not be a better example of: Why we are involved in this? Why could not we just open the government? Let our former colleague, the former Senator from Georgia, Max Cleland, a decorated, disabled American veteran who runs the cemeteries, do his job. He cannot do that. Let's get it all over with. Let's have the NIH go forward, the Centers for Disease Control, the Park Service. We cannot have this piecemeal approach, because you wind up with the same situation in which we now find ourselves. We want to do something for the veterans, but it does not take care of much of what the veterans need.

So I ask unanimous consent that my friend's request be modified as follows: That an amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, then be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate. This amendment is the text that passed the Senate and is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government—everything; veterans, there are cemeteries, there are benefits, everything—and it is something that is already over in the House and reportedly has the support of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

So I would ask my friend to really surprise the world, surprise the country, and say: I agree. Modify it. Let's fund the government.

And then, as we have said, as I have said—and everyone listen: We are

happy, when the government is open, when we can pay our bills, to sit down and talk about anything they want to talk about. It does not matter. No restrictions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader and I be able to engage in a colloquy so that we may perhaps be able to, as the majority leader said, surprise the world by finding some avenues of bipartisan cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am happy to sit down and talk to the Senator—his office or my office. The point we have right here today is that we need the government open. With all due respect to my friend, the junior Senator from Texas—I want to say this in a most respectful way—he and I, with the dialog here on the Senate floor, we are not going to work this out. I have asked that the government be open so that everyone can have benefits. The veterans measure he proposes leaves many veterans out in the cold—out in the cold—including the families of 17 of our servicemen who were killed since this came into effect, this shutdown.

So we will go as we have. I object to his proposal. I assume he will object to mine. And then we will go through the 10 minutes per person and see what happens later today. But I do—I am happy to sit down and talk to the Senator in my office, his office, any place he suggests, privately or publicly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, was there—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, just a clarification: Was there objection to the request that we be able to engage in a colloquy? I was not clear as to what the majority leader was objecting to.

Mr. REID. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will note with regret that the majority leader objected to engaging in a discussion, to engaging in negotiations here on the Senate floor. I think that is unfortunate.

So I will promulgate the questions I would have asked him directly, and he may choose whether he may wish to answer.

The majority leader read from comments that Senator MURPHY made on the Senate floor, suggesting that the House bill funding the VA was not broad enough. I would note, in my of-

fice we have drafted legislation that would fund the VA in its entirety. And if his objection is that it is not broad enough, I will readily offer that I would happily work with the majority leader to fund every bit of the VA as it is right now today, and we could introduce that bill. Indeed, I would be happy to have it labeled the Reid-Cruz bill and to give lead authorship to the majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I would be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator be willing to take care of the 560,000 veterans who are Federal employees, many of whom have now been furloughed?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Illinois for that question. Indeed, I enthusiastically support the proposal that the House unanimously passed to give backpay to Federal workers. Indeed, I would ask a question of the assistant majority leader: whether the Senate will even vote on that proposal because there are eight bills funding the Federal Government that are sitting on the majority leader's desk. We have not been allowed to vote on any of them.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator from Texas is asking me a question, I would respond through the Chair that we have given the Senator from Texas ample opportunity to completely fund the government, including all of the veterans who work for the Federal Government, and all of the functions of the Federal Government so we do not run into the embarrassment of these poor families in their bereavement being denied the most basic benefits that our government gives.

He has had a chance to do that over and over. I believe he has declined that opportunity. So he bears some responsibility for the unfortunate circumstances we face.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I would note the fact that there are some issues on which we have partisan disagreements does not mean there are not other issues on which we can come together.

Ms. STABENOW. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield to my friend for a question.

Ms. STABENOW. Through the Chair to the Senator from Texas, I am wondering if his motion includes the full funding of the VA medical system, which is a completely government-run, government-controlled health care system?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend for that question. As I said, I would readily support legislation fully funding the VA, because the VA is a vital government system. It is a promise we have made. It is unrelated to ObamaCare. My principal complaint this past week has

been that the Democratic majority in this body is holding programs unrelated to ObamaCare hostage in order to force ObamaCare on everyone. We agreed for active-duty military.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, if I might, just to clarify so that I understand, because the Senator from Texas has, in fact, made the ending of a private sector competitive health care system for up to 30 million Americans part of what he wants to stop, I wanted to be clear that the fully government-funded, government-run, with government doctors system through the Veterans Administration is something the Senator is advocating that we continue to fund through the Federal Government?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Michigan for that question. Yet again, the answer is yes. I believe we should fully fund the VA. The two questions I would promulgate—

Mr. REID. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. REID. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. CRUZ. I would note the majority leader seems not to want to engage in debate. So I object. I hope the majority leader will start negotiating.

Mr. REID. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the modified request.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. REID. Yes, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, using leadership time, we have a number of people who are wishing to speak. They should be able to do that. But I say as nicely as I can, the problem we have here is what people are saying, like my friend from Texas, little bits and pieces of government. It will not work. We have to open the government. So until that happens—we have to open the government. We have to make sure we can pay our debts. Then we will negotiate.

I know he is fixed on ObamaCare. We know that. But the problem is that is not going to change. So I would hope we can do what needs to be done, open the government, make sure we pay our bills, and then we negotiate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I want to join with most of my colleagues who have talked about the urgency of us getting the government open. It is causing great harm to our country. Make no mistake about it, it is hurting our economy. I could talk about my own State of Maryland. Our Governor has estimated that we are losing \$15 million every day. So every day is precious.

I could talk about over 100,000 Federal workers in Maryland who are furloughed out of the 800,000 nationally, having a huge impact on our economy.

This morning Senator BOXER held a news briefing where we talked about the impact on the Environmental Protection Agency where 93 percent of its employees have been furloughed. We can talk about the direct impact of those employees not being there.

There was a representative from the Ding Darling Refuge in Florida saying not only did it hurt the local economy directly, but she talked about one of the contract services that provided the touring service to the refuge had to lay off 20-some employees.

There are private sector jobs that are directly being lost as a result of this furlough. It is going to be very difficult to get back that loss in our economy the longer the government shutdown lasts. It is wasteful to the taxpayer. The last shutdown cost the taxpayers \$2 billion. Here we talk about conservatives who want to do something about the national debt and they are wasting taxpayer dollars by keeping government closed.

Yes, it is hurting our Federal workforce. I joined with Senator MIKULSKI in the comments she made a little bit earlier. Our Federal workforce has had to endure freezes in salaries, furloughs as a result of sequestration, freezes in the number of employees who can be hired, doing more work with less, and now furloughs again under a government shutdown. Those who are working do not know when they are going to get paid. It is not what we should be doing to our Federal workforce. They have suffered. This is wrong. It is totally avoidable.

The furloughs at the Environmental Protection Agency are jeopardizing our public health. We had experts come in today and talk about the fact that we do not have the people on guard to protect our waters, to protect our air, to protect our environment. It is jeopardizing public health. It is jeopardizing our environment.

I mentioned this morning, and let me mention again, the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge located on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, in Cambridge. This is a community in which that refuge is a huge part of their economy. This is a popular month for visitors to visit Blackwater. Well, the local businesses are hurting. The restaurants have less customers; the hotels, less rooms are being rented. It goes on and on and on, the damage to our economy.

Harbor Point is one of the most important economic developments in downtown Baltimore. It is an RCRA site, which means it is under court order requiring the Environmental Protection Agency to sign off on the development plan. Well, we have a development plan. The city council is

acting. We are ready to move forward. But guess what. We cannot get EPA to sign off on it because the people responsible are now on furlough. That is holding up economic growth and economic development in Baltimore. That is what this is doing. It is harming us.

Maryland farmers on the Chesapeake Bay are doing what is right to try to help our bay. They depend upon the protections of the programs that are out there on soil conservation. The Senator from Michigan knows through how hard she has been working on the agriculture bill to provide the tools that are necessary to help our farmers be responsible farmers on land conservation.

I received a call from a farmer near Centerville, MD, on Monday that sums up pretty well how important the Natural Resources Conservation Service is to their work. This person is enrolled in the Conservation Stewardship Program, the CSP. That means he is planting bumper crops in an effort to help us deal with the runoff issues of pesticides and insecticides into the bay, helping us in helping the bay.

He receives certain payments as a result of participation in the program. He is no longer getting those payments. We are asking him to make sacrifices, but we are not giving him the Federal partnership. That is not right. He is hurt. He said: What am I supposed to do? Am I supposed to continue to do this? He told me he has a son with a medical condition that requires regular clinical eye treatment. He does not know whether he can afford that this month. He was helping us with the environment. Now what do we do? We back off of what is necessary.

I could give you many more examples. There is no piecemeal way you can correct each one of those.

On our foreign policy issues, I have the honor of chairing the East Asia and Pacific Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. President Obama was supposed to be the headliner at the East Asia Economic Summit this past week. Guess who stole the headline. President Xi of China rather than our President. Asia is wondering whether America is open for business. We were missing at the table. That is no way for America to be conducting its business. We need to be open. We need to get government open.

I hear my colleagues who want to negotiate budget deals. I am all for that. I think I have a reputation around here and people know I am interested in getting Democrats and Republicans together and getting a budget that makes sense for our country. But let me quote from the Baltimore Sun from this morning, because I think they say it better than I could say it. This is an exact quote from the Baltimore Sun about negotiations and how we have to go through negotiations.

Passing a “clean” continuing resolution keeping government fully operating at funding levels that GOP has already endorsed is no compromise. It’s status quo. Raising the debt ceiling isn’t a concession either—it allows the nation to pay the bills Congress has already incurred and prevents the possibility of a government default, which would hurt the economy, raise borrowing costs and increase the Federal deficit.

So when Speaker Boehner lashes out at President Obama for failing to negotiate, one has to ask, what is this thing he describes as negotiation? House Republicans are not merely leveraging their political position—as some dryly claim—they are threatening to do grievous harm to the global economy and the American public.

The gun isn’t raised to Mr. Obama’s head or to the Senate’s. The Democrats have no particular stake in passing a continuing resolution or in raising the debt ceiling other than keeping public order and doing what any reasonable person expects Congress to do. No, the gun is raised at the nation as a whole. That’s why descriptions like “ransom” and “hostage” are not mere hyperbole, they are as close as the English language gets to accurately describing the GOP strategy.

The editorial ends by saying:

It’s time for Mr. Boehner to put down the gun and put more faith in the democratic process.

We need to negotiate a budget for next year. We absolutely need to do it. We tried to go to budget conference many times. The majority leader has repeated that request today. The formula of what is right for this country to do—and it is not one side getting advantage over another—the right thing to do is open government, pay our bills, and, yes, let’s negotiate a budget that will not be what the Democrats want, will not be what the Republicans want. We are going to have to compromise as the Framers of our Constitution envisioned that we would do. That is what we should have done months ago. We passed our budget in March. We should have been negotiating months ago.

But what we need to do right now is open government, pay our bills, and, yes, then it is ripe for us to sit down and negotiate. I can tell you, we are ready to do that. But it is up to Speaker BOEHNER now to vote, to vote on the resolution that will keep government open, to vote on a way we can make sure that we will continue to pay our bills, and then accept our offer to sit down and negotiate a budget for the coming year. That would be the best thing we can do for the American people.

I urge my colleagues with a sense of urgency that we move this immediately because of the damage we are causing to our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, there can be no doubt that no one wants to be here. Not one Member of this body wants to be in shutdown. We all may have different reasons, different explanations

as to why we are here. We might differ with regard to our own beliefs as to how best we should get out of this. But not one of us wants to be here. Every one of us recognizes how awful it is to be in a shutdown posture.

I would like to take a few moments and explain my thoughts on both of those two points. I believe perhaps the single most important reason, single most undisputable reason why we are in a shutdown posture has to do with the fact that for a variety of reasons we have been operating on the basis of continuing resolutions for several years in a row. A continuing resolution, of course, is a bill, a legislative vehicle through which Congress may choose to keep government programs funded at current levels. It is kind of a reset button. It propels us forward on the basis of our current spending pattern, rather than on the basis of an independently, freshly negotiated set of priorities.

This is a different way of running government. Normally this is reserved for unusual circumstances. It usually does not last as long as we have been going this time around, for about 4½ years this way. But this causes us to do things in a way that is different than one would otherwise choose to do them. It is certainly very different than the manner in which we would operate in any other aspect of our lives.

To use one familiar example, let’s analogize Congress’s spending pattern, its spending decisions, to a consumer going to the grocery store. Suppose you went to the grocery store having been informed by your spouse that you need to bring home bread, milk, and eggs. So you went to that grocery store, you put bread and milk and eggs in your basket. You go to the checkout counter. You place the bread, the milk, and the eggs on the counter. The cashier rings you up. The cashier at that point says: Okay, here is what you will owe us for these items, but we will not allow you to buy just bread, milk, and eggs. In order to buy these items at this store, we will also require you to purchase a half ton of iron ore, a bucket of nails, a book about cowboy poetry, and a Barry Manilow album.

Of course, anyone being told that would be a little surprised. Anyone being told that would be reluctant to shop at that same store in the future. And if another store existed, another alternative, very few, if any, consumers would continue shopping at that institution.

Yet that in some ways is the way we are asked to spend money here in Congress when we are operating on the basis of back-to-back continuing resolutions, just pushing reset on our spending button, keeping a Federal Government that spends about \$3.7 trillion a year operating sort of on economic autopilot.

It would actually be a little bit closer analogy if we changed the hypothetical

to a circumstance in which the cashier said not just that you have to buy half a ton of iron ore, a bucket of nails, a book about cowboy poetry, and a Barry Manilow album, but you also have to buy one of every single item in the entire grocery store in order to buy anything—no bread, no milk, no eggs, nothing unless you buy one of everything in the entire store. That would bring us a little closer to the analogy we are dealing with here where we have to choose to fund everything or alternatively to fund nothing. Neither one of those, it seems to me, is a terribly good solution. Neither one of those fairly represents good decisionmaking practices.

We ought to be able to proceed, as past Congresses have historically, passing a dozen or so—sometimes more—appropriations bills and going through our Federal Government category by category debating and discussing each appropriations measure, discussing the contents of that measure to make sure there is sufficient agreement within this body and within the House of Representatives to continue funding the government function in question.

We have a new item in the store, so to speak, as we are shopping this year. This new item in the store is called ObamaCare, one that is about to take full effect on January 1, 2014. Yes, it is the law of the land, but we do have the final choice, the final option, the final authority to choose whether to fund that moving forward or, alternatively, to defund it. We can take that out of the grocery cart.

It is a new item that has caused a lot of people a lot of concern. A lot of people are fearing and experiencing job losses, cuts to their wages, having their hours slashed and losing their health care benefits as a result of this law, and they see more of these disturbing trends coming in the near future. So they are asking for Congress to help. They are asking for Congress to defund the implementation of this law.

A lot of people and many of my colleagues in this body have responded by saying: Yes, but it is the law. That is true. It was passed by Congress 3½ years ago and signed into law by President Obama. It is important to remember two facts about this, however.

First of all, the President himself has announced that he is not following the law. He himself says the law is not ready to implement as it is written. He himself has refused to follow it as it is written.

Secondly, it is not unusual, it is not unheard of by any means to have a law that puts in place one standard, one program, and then have a subsequent appropriations decision made by Congress that results in the defunding of that very program. Let me cite one of many examples I could point to. Under Federal law, currently there is designated something known as the Yucca

Mountain nuclear waste repository. That is our official nuclear waste repository. Yet for many years it has been defunded by the Congress. That is Congress's prerogative. Congress holds the power of the purse. Congress may decide to do that.

It is also important to remember that this was by design that it would work this way. Our Founding Fathers understood and set up the system so that it would work this way, and they put the power of the purse in the hands of the House of Representatives, understanding the House of Representatives would act first when exercising the power of the purse.

James Madison acknowledged this fact in *Federalist* No. 58, and if I can quote from that in pertinent part, James Madison wrote:

The House of Representatives can not only refuse, but they alone can propose the supplies requisite for the support of Government. They, in a word, hold the purse; that powerful instrument by which we behold, in the history of the British Constitution, an infant and humble representation of the People gradually enlarging the sphere of its activity and importance, and finally reducing, as far as it seems to have wished, all the overgrown prerogatives of the other branches of the Government. This power over the purse may, in fact, be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon with which any Constitution can arm the immediate Representatives of the People, for obtaining a redress of every grievance, and for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure.

So we find ourselves now in a position in which the House of Representatives is wanting to get the government funded again and is acting to keep the government funded on a step-by-step basis, starting with those areas as to which there is the most broad-based bipartisan support, those areas of government that have nothing to do with the implementation and enforcement of ObamaCare. Moving step by step in this fashion, we can get the government funded again. We should be getting the government funded again.

In many respects, what we have seen over the last week—the conduct of the Obama administration during the first week of this shutdown—may well serve as the single best argument against ObamaCare. What we have seen is a willingness of this President and his administration to utilize the already vast resources of the Federal Government to make it hurt—to hurt families, to hurt businesses, to hurt those who depend on their access to Federal lands, to national monuments, national parks, and other Federal installations. This itself is evidence of the fact that when we give government too much power, that power may, and ultimately will, be abused.

I want to be clear that this is not a problem that is distinctively Democratic. It is not something that belongs uniquely to liberals. This is equally a Republican problem. Republican and

Democratic administrations in the past and in the future will have chosen at times to abuse power when it suits their interests in order to get their way politically. We need to not give yet another source of power to the Federal Government—a source of power that intrudes into one of the most personal aspects of human existence.

When we give the Federal Government control of our health care system, we give them control of aspects of our lives that are intensely personal, very intimate, and, frankly, not the business of the Federal Government. We don't want to give that power to a government that may one day be used against us for someone's partisan political gain. It is for that reason we are having this discussion. It is for that reason we need to keep the government funded.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, we are now in day 8 of the government shutdown, and the pain has been felt by all across the country—by the cancer patients being denied access to new clinical trials at NIH, by the mom whose son has muscular dystrophy. His name is Jackson. She told me that every day those researchers aren't working on a cure for her son's disease is a day lost. She said every day counts. Small businesses can't get affordable loans through the SBA. Farmers write me about not being able to get their conservation loans.

I have here a letter I read on the floor on Saturday:

Please do whatever you can to stop the government shutdown. We have 14 acres of land enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program. Our rental payment is made to us this first week of October. We depend on this money. It is not a small amount for our family.

Kathy, from Minnesota:

I am an employee of the Social Security Administration, Office of Disability . . . I have seen you intervene on matters for claimants who have disability hearings pending. I am furloughed as part of the government shutdown. If you want your constituents' hearings addressed, I need to be at work in my office.

Alicia, from Hastings, MN:

I am writing to express my extreme concern over the federal government shutdown. I am a teacher, a mother of three boys, and the wife of a furloughed veteran who works for the Minnesota Air National Guard. I have never before written a letter to my representatives, but feel so utterly helpless and frustrated at this time; I needed to voice my concern. . . . At this point in time, my husband, who is a veteran . . . is out of work because he is a federal employee not deemed essential. I am afraid that not only are the other 800,000 laid-off federal employees deemed non-essential, but the rest of the American citizens are non-essential as well.

She goes on to say:

Our struggles are real-life struggles; not a game, not philosophical, not in theory, not

distant, and not imaginary. My hope is that these struggles and hardships matter to you . . . That is your duty. That is your charge. That is your enormous task. Shutting down the government is not one of those responsible actions.

That is what we are hearing from the people in my State, the people all over the country.

It is time to end the shutdown, and I will continue to urge my colleagues in the House to do the right thing and pass the straightforward bill the Senate passed on September 27 that would get the government back to work and get those employees back to their jobs.

It is great that the House passed a bill to pay them. That is a good thing. But now they are paying them to stay home. They are paying them to not do their job. They want to come back to work.

As you know, Madam President, we are now facing another critical deadline—the deadline for paying our bills or facing default. Next Thursday, on October 17, our country will hit its legal borrowing limit, and when that happens we will be asked to do what Congress has routinely done 70 times over the past 50 years; that is, pay our country's bills.

Let me be clear. This is about making good on commitments we have already made. This is about doing what regular Americans do every month when they pay their credit card bills. Yet lately we have heard voices from the other side from a number of people who seem to think this is just no big deal.

Just the other day Republican Congressman JOE BARTON of Texas said:

Some bills have to be paid and some bills we can defer and only pay partially, but that doesn't mean that we have to pay every bill the day it comes in.

Then there was Dan Mitchell, a senior fellow at the conservative Cato Institute, who said:

There's no need to fret.

No need to fret? That is not what history teaches us.

As chair on the Senate side of the Joint Economic Committee, I had a hearing a few weeks ago about the cost of this brinkmanship, about what happens if we go over that cliff, if we let our bills go, if we don't pay them.

Let's turn back to 2011. We have a very clear lesson of what happens when the mere prospect of a default sent shock waves through our economy. I recently released a report examining the fallout of that brinkmanship. The results were ugly. The Dow Jones plummeted more than 2,000 points, our credit rating was downgraded, and \$2.4 trillion in American household wealth was wiped away.

I think it is important for everyone to remember that in 2011 all of this happened before we averted default. The Treasury Secretary sent a letter to Congress about the looming debt ceiling starting on January 6, 2011. On May

2 he announced that the debt limit would be reached on August 2. That was the magic day. We now have people saying maybe it is not October 17. They were saying that back then. But do you know what happened in the lead-up to August 2? On July 14 Standard & Poor's warned that it may downgrade the U.S. credit rating. They followed through on that. They downgraded it after the magic day of August 2, but it was 2 weeks before that they warned they might do it. What happened then? Well, over late July and early August, leading up to the date, the Dow Jones dropped more than 2,000 points.

So the next time someone says there is no need to fret over playing games with the debt ceiling, tell them to talk to the families whose retirement plans took a hit.

Make no mistake. This brinkmanship has very real consequences for our economy. We can't afford to go down this path again because this time around the fall could be so much harder. Our Joint Economic Committee analysis indicates that rates could rise on everything from credit cards and home mortgages to borrowing costs for businesses. At a time when our economy is finally turning a corner, this would put a real strain on families and small business owners.

But don't take my word for it. Secretary Lew has said extraordinary measures will be exhausted by mid-October. Already our government is not matching the retirement fund that Federal workers put in. Already they are not issuing some of the municipal bonds. Already they are not making some of the typical investments they would normally make. The business community and my friends on the other side of the aisle know businesses are overwhelmingly opposed to the idea of America not paying its bills, including key leaders such as Randall Stephenson, CEO of AT&T, who said:

It is unthinkable that the US could default, and it would be the height of irresponsibility for a public official to consider such a course.

Our country cannot afford to keep lurching from crisis to crisis. It is time for both parties to focus on real solutions and get the government back to work in the short term so we can focus on responsibly reducing our deficit in the long term. I supported the work of the Gang of 6, the work of the Gang of 8, the work that was being done by the Domenici-Rivlin Commission, the work that was being done by the debt commission. I was one of 14 Senators who pushed for that work to be done, and I think it is a great basis. I don't agree with everything in it, but it is a good start for how we can negotiate a major deal. We cannot do that in the next few days. We need time to do it, and that is why the Senate proposal is 6 weeks—6 weeks to allow the government to open again so we can truly negotiate the

kind of long-term debt reduction deal that we should.

We need to be forward-looking. We need to be forward-looking enough to recognize the decisions we make today go far beyond the next election cycle; they will be felt by generations to come. We have a responsibility to get things right. We can't allow our country to go over the brink. It is not the American way.

In a 1987 address to the American people when he was talking about the debt ceiling and the need to pay our country's bills, President Ronald Reagan said:

The United States has a special responsibility to itself and the world to meet its obligations. It means we have a well-earned reputation for reliability and credibility—two things that set us apart from much of the world.

I urge my colleagues to take these words seriously and to join me in ensuring that Congress acts responsibly and in the best interest of this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes be divided between myself and the senior Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, not to object, I wish to clarify and ask if we might expand that to indicate the order which I believe we agreed to on the floor; that I be allowed to speak after my two distinguished colleagues, then Senator WHITEHOUSE, and then Senator COBURN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator modify her request?

Ms. AYOTTE. Absolutely, I modify the request to reflect what the senior the Senator from Michigan said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I think it is time for us to end this government shutdown. I said on the floor twice last week, and prior to that, that I didn't think the strategy of defunding ObamaCare was a strategy which would be successful. While I support repealing and replacing ObamaCare, because I have seen the negative impact in my own State of New Hampshire, we have already seen the government is shut down and yet the ObamaCare exchanges have opened—showing already many of the problems with those exchanges, with the computer system, what are called glitches but are major flaws at this point. So it is time for both sides to come together and resolve this on behalf of the American people.

Let me say it is appalling that we have soldiers who have been killed in the line of duty and their families aren't receiving death benefits. It is wrong. It is outrageous. We need to

solve this right away and we need to solve this overall government shutdown.

In New Hampshire, we have private campgrounds which contract with the White Mountain National Forest which are closed, despite the fact that they actually bring revenue into the Treasury. They are run privately and actually make money for the Federal Government. I think the administration is playing games with things like that, and they should open those campgrounds. But ultimately we have to get this government open.

I wish to praise my colleague, the senior Senator from Maine Senator COLLINS, who came to the floor earlier today with an idea she has drawn not only from Members in this Chamber but in the House of Representatives of a way we could resolve this impasse, and that is taking something we have already voted on in this Chamber on the budget resolution. There was a vote in this Chamber on the medical device tax repeal, and that vote got on the budget resolution 79 to 20. We voted on a bipartisan basis to repeal this tax. I have been against this tax since I campaigned, because in New Hampshire we see the impact on our companies. It is going to increase health care costs. Many companies in New Hampshire, such as Smiths Medical and Corflex, are negatively impacted by this tax. Their workers are put in a difficult place when these companies can't expand or they have to reduce their workforce because of this onerous tax—which, by the way, is a 2.3-percent tax on revenue, a tax on innovation and new ideas in health care, rather than a tax on profit. But ultimately we should repeal this tax. It is wrong.

I wish to support what my colleague from Maine came to the floor on today as something we should take up and discuss in this Chamber; that is, a repeal of the medical device tax with a pay-for, a CR proposed for a longer period of time within the Budget Control Act numbers. She has proposed 6 months, and flexibility for the agencies to address the sequester in a way that is best and most sensible for the American people.

I thank my colleague from Maine. We can come together and resolve this. I hope that along with Members on the other side of the aisle who voted for the repeal, we can work together with Members of the House of Representatives, we can work this out, get the government open, and also address concerns that we have with ObamaCare which is impacting an important industry, the medical device industry that provides innovation and important life-saving devices for people in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, four times the House of Representatives has

sent over continuing resolutions with various additions for consideration by the Senate. Each time Senator REID and the majority party have tabled those provisions, essentially shutting them down without giving them an opportunity for a vote on the merits.

The last time, though, I believe Senator REID led his colleagues down a very treacherous path, because the provisions of this otherwise clean CR would have repealed the provision that carves out Congress and members of our staff and gives us preferential treatment under ObamaCare. The second part of it has to do with delaying penalties on individuals, just as the President has unilaterally done in delaying penalties on employers.

There is no good reason for us not to pass both of those provisions. But instead of trying to deal constructively with the House of Representatives—which has sent four separate bills over here on the continuing resolution—the majority leader has chosen to stiff-arm each of those efforts.

So when the majority leader comes to the floor and bemoans the government shutdown—something we all agree we should try our best to avoid—he claims they are willing to negotiate and the President is willing to negotiate a change in the outcome. But we know that is not true. We know each time they have shut out Republican proposals from the House of Representatives which would open the Federal Government with reasonable bipartisan agreements.

But what really is beyond belief is when I hear our colleagues come to the floor and they say, Why can't we have cancer research for children at NIH continue? Yet we come to the floor and offer bills which would open funding at the National Institutes of Health, that very same cancer research, and they are objected to by the Democratic side of the aisle. I don't know any other word to describe it than hypocrisy.

This morning, the Washington Post talks about the case of Michelle Langbehn from California, who was diagnosed with sarcoma and is unable to have an opportunity to participate in a clinical trial at NIH. This is the very same sort of program which would have been funded by the bill we offered on this side of the aisle and was objected to by the majority leader and the Democratic side.

There is one bright spot of agreement, and that is we were able to agree unanimously to pass the House bill that funded our troops which passed the House 423 to 0. That is the good news. But the bad news is this has now all morphed into a debate not only on the continuing resolution but on the debt ceiling. What the majority leader and his side of the aisle are apparently proposing is that without making any arrangements whatsoever to pay for the \$17 trillion in debt that has already

been accumulated, they want another clean debt ceiling increase, and the President says he won't negotiate, but in all likelihood we will be voting later this week on another \$1 trillion added to our maxed-out credit card without doing anything whatsoever to take care of the debt which has already been incurred.

That is fundamentally irresponsible. That is not me saying it. The American people have said this. The Congressional Budget Office has said this. The President's own bipartisan fiscal commission has said that.

In a recent poll from NBC-Wall Street Journal, when people were given the choice between raising the debt ceiling or not raising the debt ceiling, 44 percent said don't raise the debt ceiling, 22 percent said raise the debt ceiling. I realize we have more choices than that. There could be, coupled together with the raising of the debt ceiling, some real reforms of our broken entitlement programs to shore up Social Security and Medicare. But our colleagues and the President himself have said, No, I am not going to negotiate. No, I want a clean debt ceiling. No, I want the freedom to max out the credit card another \$1 trillion, without doing anything to pay off the debt that threatens not only our future prosperity, but our national security.

I remember very clearly when ADM Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was asked what the greatest national security threat to the United States was, and he said the national debt.

Why would our colleagues and the President of the United States ignore what the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff called the most significant national security threat to our country by saying, We are not interested in any reforms, we are not interested in anything that would actually pay down the debt and remove that threat to our national security and our future prosperity? Why would they say, No, we want to keep on spending money—money we don't actually have—and continue to borrow from our creditors like China and other foreign countries that hold a majority of our national debt? And when interest rates start to tick back up again as the Federal Reserve begins to taper its purchase of our own debt, we are going to see more and more of our national expenditures go to pay interest on that debt, crowding out not only national security but the safety net programs for the most vulnerable people in our country.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, first I apologize for the hoarse voice. I have been recovering from a cold. But it is important for me to have the opportunity to speak on behalf of the people from Michigan about what is

happening, as everyone at home is scratching their head trying to figure out why, in the greatest country in the world, we have seen government services now shut down and why there are those who think it is all right for us not to pay our bills and default on the full faith and credit of the United States of America, and why folks aren't willing to just open the government, pay our bills, and then negotiate.

In fact, we have been negotiating. We have negotiated on a lot. I am proud to say we negotiated a successful bipartisan farm bill not that long ago, a real deficit reduction proposal which actually passed the Senate with over a two-thirds vote. So we certainly are willing to negotiate.

Our leader Senator REID was willing to negotiate and in fact did negotiate with the Speaker of the House. As we all know, the Speaker called him in September and indicated he would like to see a 6-week extension of the current funding levels for the government while we were negotiating something more broadly on a budget. It was at a funding level which we don't believe is the right one in terms of investing in education, innovation, and creating jobs, but it was 6 weeks. After talking with us, our leader said that in the interest of negotiating and compromising, we would be willing to do that.

As we know now from Republican colleagues in the House who said that was the intent, unfortunately the Speaker could not follow through on the agreement he had negotiated.

That is because a minority of the minority in the House that is extremely intent on—and in fact has successfully achieved one of the goals they ran on—shutting down the government. But we have negotiated.

We also have negotiated on the big picture. We know that a few years ago with the Bowles-Simpson Commission, with others, that \$4 trillion in deficit reduction over 10 years was picked as an important goal to be able to rightsize and bring down our long-term debt. The good news is that not only have we cut the annual deficit in half, but of that \$4 trillion we have already agreed to \$2.5 trillion of that in deficit reduction over the next 10 years. So over half of that has already been achieved.

When my friends on the other side of the aisle act as if nothing is happening, I have to say the deficit has been cut in half and, second, over half of a long-term goal on the debt has been achieved. We need to keep going. We don't need to shut down the government to do that. We do not need to default on our debts as the greatest country in the world to do that. We just need to work together to do that. That is why we would say we need to open the government, pay our bills, and continue to negotiate. Let's negotiate, but it is a continuation of negotiating.

In fact, weakening the full faith and credit of the United States of America—think of that, the greatest country in the world, the full faith and credit of the United States of America, that has been the highest standard in the world, when you say the full faith and credit of the United States of America—right now there are folks playing Russian roulette with that who are willing to weaken that and undermine our recovery, if not take us over another horrible economic cliff and cost billions of dollars for American consumers.

Given the seriousness of it and the fact that we are very close to having that happen and the fact that we are the world's leader, 30 years ago President Ronald Reagan warned about the consequences of the richest, most powerful nation in the world suddenly running out of money to pay its bills. He said:

The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of a default—

As people are flippantly discussing these days—

by the United States of America are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate.

Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States of America [would cause] incalculable damage.

This is President Ronald Reagan.

President Reagan reminded Congress:

Never before in our history has the Federal Government failed to honor its financial obligations. To fail to do so now would be an outrage.

His words.

The Congress must understand this and bear full responsibility.

We know if the United States defaults on its obligations, if we don't pay our bills, the result will be a financial crisis worse than what we went through in 2008. Frankly, I don't want any part of that. I know what happened in Michigan in 2008, 2009. I know our Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, understands that as well, what happened to families and businesses all across America. To even come close to that is irresponsible.

If that were to happen, 57.5 million Americans could very well not get their Social Security checks on time.

My mom called me the other night. She is 87 years old, doing great. She said I was at church on Sunday and my friends were asking: That couldn't really happen, could it?

I didn't know what to tell her. No, Mom, it should not happen. It has not happened before. But I can't promise, given the words of people on the other side of the aisle who believe it is no big deal or of what is being said by the Speaker and by the tea party Republicans in the House—I couldn't absolutely say to her don't worry about that.

Madam President, 3.4 million veterans might not get their disability

benefits on time. We have just been debating whether we should make sure, as we must, that the VA is fully funded. Yet next week if we do not back up the full faith and credit of the United States of America, veterans could very easily be in a situation of not getting disability checks or seniors' Social Security, Medicare. Children, families, communities, businesses, farmers, that is who will pay the cost of this default. Middle-class families will pay the cost of this.

It will be catastrophic in terms of interest rate increases and loss of jobs if we do not stand together as Republicans and Democrats in the Congress of the United States and back up the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

According to Goldman Sachs, if we adopt the "China first" model of only paying the interest on our debt, which has been proposed by the House, where we pay some of our debts but not others, the drag on our economy would be massive. They estimate we would lose 4.2 percent of our gross domestic product. To put that in perspective, when the recession hit bottom in 2009 we lost 4.1 percent of GDP, from the peak in 2007. That was the worst recession in our lifetime.

This is not a game. This is serious.

Even more concerning to me is that this would drive up borrowing costs for families, for small businesses, for our manufacturers who are back on their feet now and roaring and bringing back our economy. For every 1-percent increase in interest rates, we are told Americans will pay \$75 billion—\$75 billion lost to the economy. When Republicans in the House took us to the brink of default 2 years ago, which resulted in the lowering of America's credit rating for the first time in history—even though we didn't default, just talk of default ended up lowering our credit rating for the first time in America's history—it cost the average family buying a home at the time about \$100 every month for the life of their mortgage in higher interest rates; \$100 a month for the life of the mortgage. That is outrageous and irresponsible.

That same default crisis in 2011 cost taxpayers \$19 billion in additional interest when our credit rating fell and interest rates went up. Where did that \$19 billion go? Right back on top of the national debt, not only adding to the national debt, it threatens to erase America's retirement savings. In 2011, over \$800 billion was lost in retirement accounts after the House Republicans played politics with the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

If I might just take 1 more minute, I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. This time, if we actually default, the fall could be even

worse and the damage could be permanent. This is the greatest, wealthiest, most powerful country in the world and it is outrageous that this would even be considered.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the National Association of Manufacturers, expressing their deep concern about the possibility of default.

I will share, finally, remarks of the chairman of AT&T.

It is unthinkable that the United States could default on its financial commitments and it would be the height of irresponsibility for any public official to consider such a course.

Our country deserves better. The people of this country deserve better. We have to do better for them.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
MANUFACTURERS,

October 8, 2013.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT, SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADERS PELOSI, REID AND MCCONNELL: On behalf of the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)—the largest manufacturing association in the United States, representing small and large manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states—I write to strongly urge you to act as soon as possible to raise the statutory debt limit.

The failure of policymakers to address this critical issue is injecting uncertainty in the U.S. economy, hampering the ability of manufacturers and the broader business community to compete, invest and create new jobs. In a recent survey of NAM members, almost two-thirds of respondents said it is extremely important for the President and Congress to make progress on funding the government for fiscal year 2014 and extending the nation's debt ceiling. More than 90 percent said that addressing the nation's fiscal challenges was important for their company.

Manufacturers believe the United States must meet our financial obligations to ensure global investors' continuing confidence in the nation's creditworthiness. Our nation has never defaulted in the past, and failing to raise the debt limit in a timely fashion will seriously disrupt our fragile economy and have a ripple effect throughout the world. In particular, a default would put upward pressure on interest rates, raising both the short- and long-term cost of capital and discouraging business investment and job creation. In addition, a default would create an uncertain fiscal environment that will discourage foreign direct investment in the United States that could harm our economy for years to come.

Our nation's economic future depends on your actions. Now is the time to rise above

partisan differences and put the nation's best interests first by addressing the debt limit. Thank you in advance for the leadership that will be necessary to appropriately resolve this critical issue.

Sincerely,

JAY TIMMONS.

Ms. STABENOW. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am glad to join this debate, which throughout the afternoon has been peppered with the assertion that either Majority Leader REID or the President or Democrats in general will not negotiate—that we will not negotiate. I remember when I was younger there was a radio commentator, a man named Paul Harvey, and his little motto in his radio bits was to surprise you with “the rest of the story.”

On “will not negotiate,” we don't even have to go to the rest of the story. Go to the rest of the sentence. The rest of the sentence is that the President and the majority leader will not negotiate—while the other side is holding hostages, while the tea party is holding hostages.

Here is what our former colleague, my former ranking member on the Budget Committee, Senator Judd Gregg, has said about this:

A small group of Republican legislators led by the junior Senator from Texas, decided to take as hostages government operations and the raising of the debt ceiling.

Those are exactly the hostages, Federal employees who cannot work, people and businesses that want or need Federal services, those families we have heard so much about today who lost loved ones on the field of battle and cannot get their death benefits.

There is an even bigger hostage out there, which is the threat of a catastrophic default which would be the result of a failure to lift the debt limit. Our country has been through a lot, through Civil Wars and world wars, through depressions and calamities of various kinds. Through all of that we have never defaulted on our debt. But there is a group in Congress so desperate that they are willing to use that, that threat as a hostage for leverage in negotiations.

When colleagues on the other side invite us in the old phrase, “Come, let us reason together,” let us negotiate, they do not mean come let us reason together, let us negotiate; they mean let us negotiate, but we want a black-jack in our pocket. If the negotiations don't go just the way we want, we want to keep hundreds of thousands of Americans out of their jobs and we want to threaten the economic security of this country.

There is a difference that every American understands between negotiating and negotiating while threatening the hostages. I will say that sanctimoniously offering to release a hostage here or a hostage there when a

program becomes too popular or there is too much scrutiny on the damage that one thing is doing, to say, oh, we will give up that hostage, we will let us vote on that hostage, doesn't change the principle. There is a difference between negotiating in good faith, negotiating on the merits, and negotiating with threats to hostages. That is no road to go down. That is a very dangerous threat.

As President Reagan warned us:

Congress must realize that by failing to act they are entering very dangerous territory if we don't raise the debt limit. Never before in our history has the Federal Government failed to honor its financial obligations. Too fail to do so now would be an outrage.

Ronald Reagan:

The Congress must understand this and bear full responsibility.

We have to address these problems in the traditional order of government with real negotiations because if we don't, if we yield to hostage-taking as the new way of governance in this country, where does it end? The continuing resolution that we proposed that the Speaker has refused to have a vote on—in all this time he has never had a vote on the continuing resolution that we passed that would open the government—it would only extend the operations of government for 6 weeks. We would be back at it again. What would the price be next time? After we defunded ObamaCare, would they want to privatize Social Security? They tried that before. Over and over, the popular will has to rule. That we do through our American procedures. The vaunted procedures of our American system of government would be lost in a devil's game of threats and hostage-taking on both sides because two can play at this game if those are the new rules. We don't want to go there.

America is a great country and in part we are a great country because our democracy is an example to the world. We are no example to anyone when we legislate by threats of default, disaster, and confusion, to use the felicitous phrase of our colleague from Alabama.

There is a condition that sometimes befalls pilots called target fixation. It happens when a pilot diving on a target becomes so fixated on hitting that target that they become disoriented with their surroundings. The worst thing that befalls somebody who has target fixation is that they crash the plane.

Right now we have Republican target fixation on repeal ObamaCare. Imagine passing it 40-some times in the House, which they have done. If that is not a sign of target fixation, I don't know what is. Not seeing the damage that is being done by closing down the government, not seeing the damage to families, not seeing the damage to employees, not seeing the damage to people who depend on government services

and licenses and safety checks seems to me to be a sign of target fixation.

If they have target fixation this badly, they may not even see President Ronald Reagan's warnings of how dire and dangerous it is to play around with our debt limit. On the House side, they are already talking about playing around with our debt limit. They want to go into the danger zone, and who knows how close to the flame they are willing to fly. When they have target fixation, their judgment is not very good.

They are certainly not seeing the damage to American values and American procedure that an insistence on legislating by holding hostages and threatening them does. It does damage to our values, and it does damage to our procedures.

A great observer of the American system of government once described procedure as its bone structure. We can throw it all out, the Constitution, the bicameralism, and we can go back to the basic animal state that whoever can make the worst threat wins the argument. That is not the American way. The American way isn't to win the argument by seeing how many people you can put at risk and how badly you can threaten them, but that is the stage we are in right now.

Let's negotiate, indeed, but let's negotiate as Americans. Let's negotiate under our proper procedures. Let's open the government. There is no reason for it to be closed other than bargaining leverage and hostage-taking. There is no other reason. That is exactly why the tea party has shut down the government, just for that purpose. They say it. They use nicer words. I think the word that was used earlier in debate today was to create adequate incentive. When somebody else is holding hostages, we have incentive, but it is not an appropriate incentive.

So open the government and stop threatening the debt limit. That is wildly irresponsible. If they don't believe us, believe Ronald Reagan, believe the Secretary of the Treasury, believe the National Association of Manufacturers, believe the CEO of AT&T, believe virtually every responsible, knowledgeable adult who has observed what the dangers are of blowing the debt limit and default.

Open the government, stop threatening the debt limit and, by all means, let's negotiate. We could set a date tomorrow. I am sure the President would have a meeting at the White House the next day. Anything people wanted could be on the table, but they would have to come in and negotiate like Americans. They would have to negotiate on the merits fairly and not with a blackjack in their back pocket, with threats that if they don't get what they want, they are going to start wrecking things such as our economy and our government. That is not the

right way to proceed. If we go down that road, who knows what evil lurks at the end.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I have listened very carefully to the two previous speakers on the floor, and I understand a lot of their frustration. We are where we are.

I think we have two big problems. Actually, we have two major problems. One is our country is bankrupt. People don't like to hear that, but let me give the facts. The total unfunded liability of the United States of America is \$126 trillion. If we add all the net worth of everybody in the country and all the assets of the Federal Government and all the assets of the States and combine them, we have \$94 trillion worth of assets. We are already in the hole \$30 trillion. That doesn't include the \$17 trillion in debt we have.

So I would like to correct a couple of things. One, the Senator from Michigan mentioned that we were downgraded because of the impasse in Congress. No, we were downgraded because Congress has failed to address the real problems of our debt and deficits. Go read their statements. It had nothing to do with action here. It had to do with the fact that we will not address the biggest problems in front of us.

I ask unanimous consent to have some scissors on the floor because I wish to make a point in a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. We have a credit card. I want you to think about your own personal life that if, in fact, you have a limit on your credit card and your financial situation worsens, you are still paying the payments, but you are not bringing down the principal on your credit cards and you are not earning significantly more money and you go to Citibank or American Express or Chase and say: I want you to raise my limit. The first thing they are going to ask you is: What have you done to improve your financial situation so we might consider raising your credit limit? That is what happens to every other American.

We have this big talk about a debt limit. There is no debt limit in this country. We have increased it every time it has come up. There is no limit right now in this country on the debt we have.

We hear all of these speeches about the risk. You know what the real risk is? The risk is continuing to do nothing to address the underlying problems of our country. The risk is continuing to add entitlement programs that have no way to pay for themselves and no reform of the entitlements we have today. That is the risk.

How does that play out? We have heard all of these dire warnings of what

will happen. What is going to happen to your children and grandchildren is what has happened over the last 15 years in this country. Do you realize that the average median income in real dollars now is at the same level it was in 1989? We are going backward right now. We are not addressing the real problems.

Since I am a doctor, I will put it in medical terms. If, in fact, you treat symptoms of disease by raising the debt limit rather than treating the real disease, which is reforming the problems, reforming our spending, quit having 100 percent involvement by the Federal Government in everything Americans do, if you continue to borrow the money and treat that as the symptom, when there is a lack of oversight by Congress and lack of real work by the Members of this body to actually eliminate waste, which is over \$250 billion a year as outlined by the Government Accountability Office, we ignore that for the political arena we have seen over the last couple of weeks in Washington.

The real disease is not fixing the real problem. All of the politicians—Republicans and Democrats alike—want to give you a soft answer. Here is the answer: If you are \$30 trillion in debt that you cannot pay for, what you have to do is have everybody have some pain, but we refuse to do that. There is no leadership in Congress to address the real disease we are facing. This is a government that has totally ignored the enumerated powers, totally ignored the 10th Amendment. We have a Justice Department that ignores the rule of law in terms of how they decide what they will enforce and what they will not enforce on a political basis rather than on what the law says. Those are the real problems in front of us.

We have heard all the dire warnings about how we cannot raise the debt limit. What does default mean? They always say we can't raise the debt limit, but they will not talk about what default means. Default in the international financial community means you will not pay the interest and you will not pay back the principal on your bonds. That will never happen to us. It would require less than 6 percent of the cash we are taking in now to manage the debt we have right now—less than 6 percent.

So only somebody who wants to hurt us further would play the political game if we ever got there. I am not saying we should get there, but if we got there, it would only be to play the political game to not pay Social Security or not to pay Medicare. We have more than enough money to do that. But what we have is a bloated, oversized, inefficient, ineffective Federal Government that nobody wants to hold accountable except the American people.

So the question is, Who gets to decide? Congress obviously is not deciding very well. The President has not shown any leadership. Maybe it is time for the American people to decide. Maybe it is time to take some of the power away from Washington and restore it to where our Founders thought it should reside: by respecting the enumerated powers very specifically listed by our Founders with great commentary so it would not be distorted, but we have distorted it anyway. We need to reembrace the 10th Amendment which says: Everything that is not specifically enumerated in these powers is left to the power of the people and the States.

We find ourselves with a credit card. This happens to be our debt. The number I chose to put on here was our debt this morning: \$16,747,458,528.90. We need to cut this up just like we would do for an adolescent or young adult kid when you are responsible for their credit card. If they are not responsible, you cut up the credit card. You fix the real problem. You don't continue to ask for an increase in their propagate spending.

Members of Congress who will not do oversight and get rid of \$250 trillion of fraud, waste, and abuse every year should not be rewarded, but that is what we will end up doing because we don't have the courage, nor the leadership, to address the real problem in front of our country. The real problem is cowardice. The real problem is to not recognize where we are and not act on making decisive decisions.

We heard how bad it will be if we don't raise the debt limit. I agree, it will be tough. There will be ramifications. How bad will it be if we do? What happens to your children? What happens to the declining family income in this country if we continue to let the Federal Government run uncontrolled and out of control? What happens if we continue to not hold Congress accountable for forcing efficiencies on the Federal Government.

I know what could be done. There was an agreement called the Budget Control Act, and what it did is it forced sequester. Sequester is a stupid way to cut funding in the Federal Government, but it is far better than not cutting it at all.

What has the sequester done? The sequester has forced agencies—because Congress will not force them because we are afraid we might offend somebody—to start making choices. They are still making tons of bad choices. For instance, on the last day of the State Department's budget, they spent all the remaining money. They just spent \$5 million for new crystalware for all of our embassies. Do we have \$5 million? What is wrong with the crystalware we have now? They had to spend the money because they couldn't come back to Congress and say we saved \$5 million.

We are addressing the wrong problems. We are not holding people accountable. Consequently, maybe it is time for the States and the people to exert some common sense on us. I dare say there is not one Member of this body who would let their adolescent child run up a bill and then not eventually try to intercede on a credit card but just let them continue to run it up.

Congress and the U.S. Government is that adolescent child. We are the adolescents and the people and the States are the grownups. We are at an impasse, and it does kind of sound like a kid. I am not going to talk to you. I don't like the way you did that.

We had the majority leader the other day claim that the House was out of bounds because they got to pick and choose what we pay for. It just so happens that in the Constitution, that is what it says. The House of Representatives gets to pick and choose. All spending bills start in the House. They have to start in the House. They get to pick and choose. We don't have to accept it, but they get to pick and choose. So there is a lack of understanding on the basic concepts our Founders set up.

We know the history and they know the history of republics. Republics always die. There isn't one that has survived as long as we have. They decline and die over the same thing: They get in trouble financially.

We are in trouble financially. We are \$30 trillion in the hole, plus another \$17 trillion in debt. Wouldn't it be smart if we started addressing that problem before we blankly allow an increase in the level of the credit card? Actually, what we should do is cut this credit card up, which is what I am going to do because that is the way I vote. I think it is time we quit borrowing money—actually, I think I better tear it up—it is time we quit borrowing money for the future of our kids. It is time we quit mortgaging their future. It is time we start taking responsibility for the actions of the Federal Government rather than giving excuses on why we can't get together and address the real problems of this country. Congress fails to do the oversight.

We just had a hearing yesterday where we showed one of the problems inside the Social Security and disability system. It was a bipartisan hearing, with lots of work done. There are real problems. The trust fund for those people who are truly disabled in this country will run out of money within 18 to 24 months. The Finance Committee hasn't offered any bill to fix it. The House Committee on Ways and Means hasn't offered any programs to fix it. Yet it is going to be bankrupt. What does that mean for somebody who is truly disabled? It means their check is going to get cut. Now tell me whether we would rather spend \$5 million on new glassware for our embas-

sies—crystal—or \$5 million for someone who is truly disabled. That is where the real decisions need to be made, but we won't make them.

If we talk about our national debt—when I came to the Senate in 2005 every American owed \$24,000 on the national debt. It is now almost \$53,000—in a little over 8½ years. So we now owe 2½ times what we used to owe. How did we get there? Why did we let that happen? Why don't we learn to live within our means? Is there always a political reason? Is there always a reason where we can game somebody and say they don't care if they don't want to do this? They certainly couldn't care about Americans if they want to spend money we don't have on things we don't need.

If we look at the \$125.8 trillion, that works out to \$1.1 million per family. Think about that. That is our unfunded liabilities, and that is going to come due over the next 50 years. If a person has children or grandchildren, as I do, I really don't want their opportunities to be totally limited by this debt load we have.

So we have all of this politicking and posturing and political expediency going on in both bodies, and nobody is talking about what the real problem is. The real problem is we are spending a lot of money we don't have, and we are borrowing from other countries for things we don't absolutely need.

The second part of the problem is we have programs that are designed to benefit people which are riddled with waste and fraud—\$100 million in Medicaid and Medicare. Nobody really questions that number. It has been authenticated by four separate studies outside of the government, and inside the government we say it is \$80 million. Why would we continue to let a system run that has that kind of fraud in it?

We are getting ready to crank up the Affordable Care Act—we are cranking it up—and we have now said we are not going to authenticate somebody's reliability as to their income? What do we think the fraud rate on that is going to be? We know what the fraud rate is with the child tax credit. It is well over 20 percent. In the earned-income tax credit, we know it is well over 20 percent. So \$1 out of every \$5 we pay out is to people who don't deserve it. We are going to see the same thing with this. Why would we do that when we have this kind of problem in front of us?

In the last 2 years our debt limit has increased twice what our economy has grown. For every dollar of new debt we take in, we are getting about 2 or 3 cents of economic growth out of that new debt. It used to be that when America borrowed a dollar, it would get 35 or 40 cents of growth out of that debt. So in the last 2 years we have increased the debt limit \$2.405 trillion

and the economy has grown less than \$1.2 trillion over the last 2 years.

We are adding \$26,000 to our national debt every second—every second. There is no question that our economy is growing some—some—far less than marginal. Why isn't it growing? It isn't growing because the American people don't have confidence in the future. How do we restore confidence in the future? We restore confidence by modeling a behavior that says we are going to act responsibly with our future, which means we are going to make the hard choices, even if it costs us our political career, to solve the problems in Washington so the generations that follow us will not suffer a lower standard of living but also so we can instill confidence in the American economy.

There is \$3 trillion in cash sitting in this country right now—not Federal Government money, private money—\$3 trillion. Why is it sitting there and why is it not being invested? That \$3 trillion would create 700,000 or 800,000 new jobs a year—that \$3 trillion. Why is it not being used? Because people don't have confidence in the future.

I want to tell a story about Virgil Jurgensmeyer. Virgil grows mushrooms and other vegetables in a business. This past August he told me he was thinking about expanding his business, a \$5 million expansion, adding a couple hundred jobs in a very small town in northeastern Oklahoma. He was afraid to do that. He has plenty of business. He is buying \$50,000 to \$100,000 of product from his competitor every month because he can't produce it. He says: I don't think it is worth the risk right now given where our country is. That is happening all across this country. There is no confidence.

It brings me to another point I wish to speak about. We are not just bankrupt as a nation. Our leadership is bankrupt. Leadership is about creating a vision and bringing people together, not creating controversy and dividing people. It is not about pointing out the worst flaws of somebody. It is about reinforcing the best flaws. It is about selling the confidence that we can do this together.

Do my colleagues realize we can do this together as a nation? There isn't a problem in front of us that we can't solve if we choose to solve it. Do my colleagues remember the debt commission? I was a member of that committee. We voted on some big plans that would have solved a lot of the problems we are facing this very week in this body. I didn't like every bit of it, but it was a chance to try to solve—bring together both sides and solve it. Not once was it taken up on the floor by the majority leader. The President never embraced it—his own commission, his own fiscal commission—never embraced it. It was the greatest failure of leadership I have ever seen. We had conservatives and liberals agreeing

that here is a plan we can work out. Yet it was thrown away.

With the politics we see in Washington today, the only time we are going to solve these big problems is when both political parties take the pain evenly. Nobody wants to do that. Everybody wants to win. It is all short-term political expediency.

In the words of my friend Erskine Bowles, where we are today is the most easily predictable problem we ever would have seen. All we have to do is look at the path of the numbers. It is true that our deficits are down a little bit, that we raised \$70 billion in taxes last year, and the economy is growing. It just shows what potential there is if we would put the economy on steam, where we had confidence. We could have had \$500 billion, \$600 billion a year in revenues to the Federal Government. But we won't do that.

Today we find ourselves in worse condition than we were in 2011, and in 2011 we were told we can't do big things. We have to wait.

So we had a debt limit increase. So tell me how we have gotten better since then. We have unfunded liabilities that are growing faster every year. Our true debt-to-GDP ratio is now over 100 percent, counting all debt, internal and external. We have not done it.

Hundreds of thousands of Federal workers right now are furloughed because Congress—not Republicans, Congress—has failed to do its job, has failed to compromise, has failed to reach a meaningful agreement that gives both groups something they can claim they actually worked on the real disease.

Madam President, how much time have I consumed?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 23 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. I will finish. Would the Chair let me know in about 28 minutes?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. Let me describe also what is going to happen in about 20 years, maybe 10. If we don't address these problems, it won't matter what the debt rating agencies say; we will have developed a pattern that says we think we can continue to borrow and continue to raise the debt limit and not make the structural changes that put us on a path to solvency. So what does that look like? What that looks like is borrowing costs going up.

My friends all say—and the President said today—maybe our borrowing costs will go up if we don't, in fact, raise the debt limit. Guess what. Our borrowing costs are going up every day we don't address these problems whether we address the debt limit or not because eventually the rest of the world is going to say: We don't think they are willing to cut up the credit card. They are not willing to make the sacrifices

necessary to put their country on a path of prosperity.

We have all the capabilities in the world to address our problems. We do not have the leadership that will get us there. I am not just directing that at the President; I am directing that at my own party.

So what is the solution?

I am going to spend the next couple days outlining waste in the Federal Government, fraud in the Federal Government, duplication in the Federal Government. But the solution is called sacrificial leadership. It means modeling the behavior that says you are willing to give up something—maybe the prestige of being in office—to actually fix the long-term problems of our country. It is leadership that calls out the best in us instead of pointing out the worst in us. You do not see that very often here. You did when I first came. You certainly do not now, and that is a function of leadership in the Senate.

Majority Leader REID and I do not agree on much. That is obvious. But in a previous discussion on the Senate floor, Leader REID said: "Meaningful deficit reduction requires shared sacrifice." We are never going to get there unless everybody shares in it.

The other point I would make is that we are living off the next generation right now. We are going to borrow \$2,000 against the future of every man, woman, and child in this country this year alone. They are going to have to pay it back. Another way of putting it is that 1 out of every 4 hours you work, the Federal Government right now is confiscating—of everybody in our economy. It is soon going to be 2 out of every 4 hours you work.

Our country was founded on the idea of liberty and freedom. When the confiscatory rates that will have to be there to pay back our debt or to at least borrow more money come, half of your work is going to be for the Federal Government—not your State or local governments; it is going to be to pay the bills of the Federal Government. So money that is going to go for interest is money that is not going to be invested. It is money that is not going to improve education. It is not going to invent the new technology.

So I believe we can solve our problems, but I think it requires an informed public. Do you realize the Federal Government is twice the size it was in 1999? It is twice that size. It is two times as big as it was in 1999. Think about that for a minute. If you extrapolate that, that means in another 12, 13 years, it is going to be four times as big as it was in 1999. The question comes: Are you getting value? Is it efficient? It is productive? Is it what we want to do?

I think we can cheat history as a republic. As a constitutional republic, I think we can cheat history. I do not

think we have to go down the path every other republic has gone down, but it is going to require real leadership and shared sacrifice on the part of everybody in this country. It is going to require that we take the spending out of the Tax Code for the well-heeled who have placed special benefits in the Tax Code for themselves. It is going to require that we reform Medicare.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 28 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

It is going to require that we reform Medicare, that we fix Medicaid, that we control how the Federal Government buys and uses things. It is going to require us to eliminate multitudes of duplicative programs that have no real benefit other than to benefit the politicians. It is going to require shared sacrifice.

So we can go down that path, unite our country, bring us together with a vision that through this, together we can all accomplish what is needed for our children and grandchildren or we can continue this petty little kindergarten game that is going on in Washington right now where everybody's nose gets bent out of shape, saying they are right or they are right, and playing off the American people.

None of us in Washington are right. The Founders were right. The enumerated powers were right. The 10th Amendment was right. We are dead wrong. It is time we grow up and start understanding the vision of our Founders that secures our liberty and preserves our future.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, before he leaves the floor, I want to thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his commitment to this issue, for his candor. We do not necessarily agree on every single thing, but I do know he is a man of great conviction and we are lucky to have him in the Senate. It is my hope we can get to a place where we actually are together addressing these budget issues in a way that is not management by crisis or one across-the-board cut after another but actually is a thoughtful plan to relieve our children and our grandchildren of this burden we are threatening them with.

So, through the Chair, I thank my colleague.

Madam President, I come to the floor today, after the Senator from Oklahoma described today as a day of petty kindergarten political games, to talk about a place where they are not playing any of those right now, and that is a town in Colorado that I represent called Estes Park, which has been a beacon of resilience. It is in the mountains just northwest of Boulder. It is the gateway to Rocky Mountain National Park.

I can see from the Presiding Officer's reaction that she may have been there.

The town has several thousand residents and hosts close to 3 million visitors a year, including an average of over half a million visitors in the month of September.

This time of year is peak tourist season. The weather is beautiful. The aspens' leaves are even more beautiful than the weather, and the elk famously wander through the park and through the town. Whether you are coming to rest or recreate, Estes Park welcomes you, and it always has.

In 2011 visitors generated \$196 million in tourism spending and supported more than 2,700 jobs. By some estimates tourism accounts for 43 percent of local employment. But when the floods hit in Colorado, Estes Park was almost entirely cut off from the outside world.

As shown in this picture, here is Route 34 going to Estes Park.

Two of the major roads into town were wiped out for miles at a stretch, leaving only one road into town. Many homes and businesses were destroyed. But the residents of Estes Park picked themselves up and began the recovery process. Limited access to the town has been restored. Folks had just started opening their businesses again. Visitors had just started to return to Rocky Mountain National Park. And then Congress stepped in and dealt an unbelievably cruel blow by shutting down this government.

Let me quote what Estes Park resident Tom Johnson said on the Tuesday of the shutdown:

I think politicians are playing around, like they do, and it's the people who wind up—

“And it's the people who wind up”—with all the problems for it. Man, they did it to Estes Park, when they shut down that park.

Rocky Mountain National Park closed with the shutdown. Hundreds of campers have had to cancel their reservations, and likely thousands more canceled their plans to visit.

The Denver Post reported that if visitors to Estes Park decline by 70 percent, it could mean the loss of 1,100 jobs, \$90 million in spending, \$5.8 million in State sales tax revenue, and \$4.4 million in local taxes. This is one community in Colorado, one community in the United States of America tonight, as we horse around here in the Congress.

The shutdown is a kick in the teeth to our local governments and small businesses in their efforts to recover from these floods.

One of the area's more famous businesses is the Stanley Hotel. John Cullen, the hotel's owner, told us that while it is booking visitors for long weekend trips, it has been slow to bring in the usual number of guests during the week. He says it is because locals cannot come to Rocky Mountain

National Park for the fall foliage. He tells us they have done everything they can to keep the hotel open because it is a major employer in Estes Park, but he is losing money on a daily basis.

Diane Muno is a local business owner in Estes Park, with four retail shops. The Spruce House and the Christmas Shop are two local Christmas and holiday stores; the White Orchid and the White Orchid Bridal Shop sell clothing and other apparel.

Some of these businesses have been serving customers in Estes Park since 1969. They are institutions in this Colorado community.

The flooding damaged three of four of her businesses. One was seriously damaged and has not yet reopened. The other two rushed to reopen to recover, and they would have been fine except we closed Rocky Mountain National Park, and that has slowed foot traffic in a significant way. Diane's October revenue for these four stores is down 67 percent—two-thirds down—from this point in October last year. She typically has 12 to 15 employees, but she is working a skeleton crew of 6.

Another business damaged by the floods was Kind Coffee. Its owner, Amy Hamrick, has been relying on Internet sales while she is working to reopen the store. The community has rallied around the store, as our communities that have been struck by the floods have done. It bought coffee beans and mugs and T-shirts online and helped clean up floodwaters. But the same story holds: She took a huge hit when the government shut down. Making horrible things worse, Amy's husband David Hamrick, a firefighter with the U.S. Forest Service, has been furloughed.

This is what this inability of Washington's politicians to get done the most basic function we have—to keep the government running—has wrought in this one Colorado community.

Amy told National Public Radio:

We carry on through the middle of October with tourism dollars and locals coming to see the elk rut and to go into the park and see the color. . . . And the national park is also our largest employer in town. So our community now has lost a lot of jobs in the interim.

This is exactly why it is the wrong moment for Colorado, for Estes Park, to have Washington's dysfunction come crashing down. They do not deserve it. They do not deserve it. But, as they are now saying in Estes Park, they are mountain strong and they will get through it. And I know they will.

Amy Hamrick took the time to remind us that 90 percent of the town is open, dry, and ready for customers. She said:

The town . . . is beautiful and the golf courses have elk on them 24 hours a day.

Estes Park, like much of Colorado, has taken a hit, but it will not stay down. The community continues to

pull together and recover. As expected, its neighbors are going the extra mile to help everybody out.

This quote from Jeannie Bier captures the spirit of Colorado. She said:

We live down in Loveland and it is difficult for the people down there right now—

I know it is difficult down there because I was there last week with the mayor and county commissioners and others looking at devastation in Loveland—

but we also knew it is just as difficult up here in Estes and they are our neighbors, so we took the roundabout way to get up here to support Estes as well.

The floods will not deter them, and neither will the outrageous stupidity of this shutdown.

Rocky Mountain National Park is closed, but there are still plenty of other reasons to come and enjoy Estes Park.

Earlier today somebody who works with me named James Thompson spoke with the town's mayor Bill Pinkham and asked him what is the one thing he would want me to say on this floor. The message was plain and simple. He said:

Michael, tell them it's spectacularly beautiful up here. It's still a great experience. We're open for business!

This town has been through a lot and has risen to its challenges.

So I say to everybody, come to Estes Park. Enjoy the beauty. Shop at our businesses. Dine at our restaurants. And meet the folks who would not let a natural disaster or a manmade disaster stop them from succeeding. You can learn more about a trip to Estes Park at visitestespark.com.

To my colleagues, I urge you to come to Colorado for a different reason. Maybe we could all learn something from these incredible people about what it means to pull together in the face of a crisis.

For those of us playing politics with this shutdown and playing politics with this fiscal cliff, I would really encourage you to spend a single moment in one of our flood-ravaged towns. That might bring some welcome clarity to the debate.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, most of us here in the Senate have read at least something about our Nation's founding. Although it is striking, what is almost always overlooked is the Founders' use of the language of “the republic.”

Asked by a citizen on the street which was being created behind closed

doors in Philadelphia, “a Republic or a monarchy,” Benjamin Franklin famously said: “A republic, if you can keep it.”

As with most foundational decisions, the Founders made this choice deliberately. The idea of democracy frightened Hamilton, Adams, and others, because they equated it with mobs in the street. They worried that mob rule would overcome rights bestowed not by their government but by their Creator. They studied the classics and their models were the Greek and Roman republics.

They set out to do something never done before, to create a republic of the scope and scale never before attempted, and one that could expand as the country grew.

Today we are the world’s oldest and greatest democracy. During the last century, America has expanded the constitutional rights of women and people of color well beyond landowning White men, originally privileged. In our time, we have come to understand that democracies are about the rights of citizens, but a republic, the Founders understood, is about the duties of citizens, the obligations a citizen has to a society whose constitution guarantees his or her rights.

Basic duties are to pay taxes levied by a representative government, to defend our country when called upon, and to obey the law. Our Founders had something even greater in mind, qualities that would make a republic endure. Like republics from ancient Athens forward, they believed in popular sovereignty, based on citizen participation in government. They believed in the commonwealth, all those things we hold and value in common, such as our defense and our shared infrastructure, and the welfare of the next generation of Americans.

They believed in putting the common interest above personal or narrow interests, a sense of the national interest. How else could committed slave-owners and abolitionists form a country and a government?

They believed in resistance to corruption, those who would turn the national interest to personal gain. We were founded as a republic and we have become more democratic across time. We are democratic and republican. Interestingly enough, what came to be the semblance of the first political party in America called itself the Democratic Republicans. It was founded in 1791. Sounds pretty weird today, I know, but it simply meant those who believed in democratic equality and freedom, working to uphold the ideals of the Republic. One of our bedrock American principles is that we must protect our rights through performance of our duties. That is not some abstract political theory. This is a definition of who we are and how we must govern ourselves.

We have rights and responsibilities as citizens and as Senators. We have the right to free speech but the responsibility not to shout “fire” in a crowded theater. We have the right to assemble but the responsibility to do so peacefully. In this body we have the right to filibuster but the responsibility to govern on behalf of the American people.

But the fewer the Americans who exercise the most fundamental right, I would say duty, of voting, the more political influence extreme groups in our society have. This is where we find ourselves at the dawn of the 21st century, with a Senate that at times is dominated by a small faction that does not represent the mainstream of American political thought, and a House that is gerrymandered into dysfunction. This institutional paralysis has created a vacuum into which a million special interests happily roam.

Actually, I should call them narrow, not special, interests. From ancient Athens onward, narrow interests have been the enemy of every republic. That has never been truer than it is today. Keeping the Republic created by our Founders should concern every generation of Americans, including our own. The sovereign power belongs to all the people, not just a vocal few. It is our responsibility, it is our duty, as elected officials when that ideal is tested, to work together to restore a sense of the commonwealth and the common good that enabled us to prevail in world wars and to overcome depressions.

This is our cause, but we are stuck. We are stuck because we are fighting over yesterday’s battles instead of seeking to anticipate, as our Founders did, how we will manage change. To one degree or another, all Senators and possibly all Americans are conservative. If conservative means to protect our Nation’s principles and ideals, I am a conservative. If conservative means to preserve a culture of tolerance, justice, and equality, I am a conservative. If conservative means to respect the unique cultural heritage of America, I am a conservative. If conservative means to protect our natural heritage, I am very much a conservative.

But while we protect and preserve the best of what makes us who we are, we must adapt to change. Scarcely one of us in the Senate has ever sought office without advocating some kind of change: change of officeholder, change of party, change of policy. That is good, because the future is arriving faster and faster and we have gotten no better at anticipating it.

Even with the seemingly endless crawls of the words “breaking news” at the bottom of our screens, no one predicted the Arab spring before it sprung. That is the most closely watched region in the world.

There are great historic tides that demand that we change and adapt to them in order to preserve and protect

and conserve our central values. We do not live in a stagnant world. Indeed, we are living in the midst of great revolution that makes the 21st century as different from the 20th as the 18th century was from the 17th. We are living through what may be the peak years of change on the scale of the Industrial Revolution. But even though we may come here oriented to change, the institutions of government, Congress included, are oriented to the past. Our committee structure and our regulatory agencies imagine an economy that existed deep in the last century. We are designed to support incumbent interests, not the innovators that will drive job growth and wage growth in the 21st century. This is a fatal flaw, if we are ever going to tackle the growing income inequality that our Nation faces, an inequality that has been unmatched since 1928.

We are regulating the telegraph when the world is wireless. Just one example: Almost a year ago I visited Apple out in Silicon Valley to learn something about their work in education. A little over 4 years ago, when I was superintendent of Denver Public Schools, I did not spend one second thinking about how to apply a tablet to the education of our kids, because there was no such thing as a tablet—a little over 4 years ago.

Today the tablet, combined with platforms such as the iTunes platform, presents an unbelievable opportunity for our children and children all over the world to learn and to teach each other. It was amazing to see.

In any case, Apple presented a slide showing that 75 percent of their last 12 months of revenue was derived from products they did not sell 5 years before—75 percent of their revenue came from things they did not sell 5 years before.

We have not updated our Tax Code since 1986. I was in college in 1986. What are the chances that our Tax Code is helping drive job and wage growth in 2013, 27 years later, more than a quarter of a century later?

In this Congress and in this government, we are desperately out of sync with the world as it is. It is, in fact, an irony that we must change and adapt to preserve the principles that we treasure. But we must.

Today, many flying the tea party banner resist all change. Indeed, they want to go back, often to a past that never existed, or to a time that has no relation to our time. Too often, their politics embrace old interests that will not drive us forward to an economy that is creating jobs and raising wages.

Our founding principles should not change. I agree with that. But our practices and methods must change to become relevant. These two parties, or three with the tea party, have to escape their orthodoxies for this to be possible. Efforts to maintain the status

quo or to return to some mythical past are doomed to fail. That is simply because time and the tides of human affairs will not stand still. We do not control history and cannot dictate to it. Change is the one constant. How we attempt to shape it to our purposes, by creative, imaginative public policies will determine whether we can preserve the best of our past, our principles, our heritage, and our values.

Those who seek to protect our Nation against change by sitting on the beach before a massive incoming tide with shovel in hand will be swept away as surely as King Canute. As I mentioned earlier, anyone who believes their orthodoxy or their ideological orientation prepared them for the Arab spring or made us safer is deluded. Our job must be to create a shared understanding of the facts when we work in a town that is arranged to obscure them.

Despite the desires of nostalgia, we are not going back to the *laissez faire* world of Herbert Hoover. Social safety nets are here to stay to protect children, the elderly, the poor, the disabled, and to protect our ability to call ourselves a civilized nation. But even they will have to be changed if they are going to survive for the next generation of Americans.

The revolution of globalization and information has transformed the world's economy and cultures and societies all across the globe, including here in the United States. These revolutions, like the Industrial Revolution before them, cannot be stopped. It is up to us to decide whether we can accept this new reality and position our country to lead, as it has since our founding, or whether we shrink into an imaginary conception of what the world once was and what the United States once was.

With all of this change and pace of globalization comes fear of the future and a sense of loss of what once was. That is human nature. I do not exempt myself from that. At a time of uncertainty, it has become fashionable in some political circles to capitalize on it politically. This kind of demagoguery is not unknown in American history. Anytime Americans become fearful or worried, there have always been those who saw personal advantage in fanning those flames. But they do not join an honor roll of history, an assembly of our greatest leaders. Media attention, which is easy and cheap, is not a measure of leadership. Division does not require moral authority.

If we are at another of history's turning points, as many believe, as I believe, one road leads to the worst of our past. The other leads to a new definition of our freedoms. We treasure the freedoms incorporated in the First Amendment to our Constitution.

We remember at the height of the Great Depression that Franklin Roo-

sevelt declared four new freedoms: Freedom of speech and worship and freedom from want and fear. Today, in the middle of what one might characterize as a political depression, let's consider some new freedoms for the 21st century: Freedom from foreign oil; freedom from false patriotism; freedom from the politics of division; freedom to create a constructive future; and, yes, freedom from unconstitutional government surveillance.

We have duties to perform far greater than merely funding the government. Just ask any poor child or her teacher in a typical American school. The good news is that fear has never and will not now dictate the fate of our Republic. History's dustbin is filled with failed demagogues. And we are not going back. But we need to hurry. The world is not waiting for us.

Americans want us to move forward into the 21st century with the imagination, creativity, adaptability, and values that have made this country so great from its founding. The stakes are simply too high in our time to allow our institutions to be crippled by politicians who color far outside the lines of conventional American political thought and who react with angry and mock surprise when their policy objectives are not achieved.

It is time to close this sorry chapter in the history of the Congress, reopen our government, preserve the full faith and credit of the United States, and work together as Senators from the various States on the people's business. I suspect that is why most of us wanted to serve to begin with.

Madam President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each during that period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONORING DR. PAUL R. RAO

• Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, today I wish to honor an outstanding gentleman and friend, the man who guided me through years of speech recovery. Dr. Paul R. Rao, a recognized leader in his field of

speech-language pathology, will retire from his work as vice president of Inpatient Operations at the National Rehabilitation Hospital, NRH, on October 17, 2013, his 67th birthday and 43rd wedding anniversary.

Dr. Rao began his professional career more than 32 years ago at MedStar Health and skillfully guided the development of the new speech and language department when MedStar opened the National Rehabilitation Hospital in Washington, DC, 27 years ago.

I met Dr. Rao when I entered NRH in February 2007, following an AVM and a month in intensive care. Over the months he became more than a therapist for me, he was a friend and a coach. When I returned to South Dakota in August of that year, Dr. Rao took his own time to join me as I greeted the people of South Dakota for the first time since the AVM. I continued to work with Dr. Rao in outpatient therapy, despite his demanding schedule as a vice-president for NRH, for another 3 years. I have been told that we were truly the odd couple, he the ebullient, loquacious Italian and I the stoic, reticent Norwegian.

He is widely recognized for his professional skills and is a sought after public speaker. Among his honors is the Clinical Achievement Award by the American Speech-Language Hearing Foundation that he received not once but twice, in 1989 and 2001. The DC Association for Healthcare Quality conferred on Dr. Rao the Janis Willis Annual Award for Educational Excellence in 2001 and the Beth Lang Award for Outstanding Leadership in 2003.

In addition, he is a national leader in medical rehabilitation, serving as president of the American Speech and Hearing Association, and as fellow of the American College of Healthcare Executives.

Dr. Rao is the editor of *Managing Stroke: A Guide to Living Well After Stroke* published in 2000 and the lead editor for the second edition of this text in 2009.

He has made invaluable contributions to MedStar's National Rehabilitation Network and was recognized for his leadership as steward of the patient safety journey when he was awarded the National Rehabilitation Hospital's John W. Goldschmidt Award for Excellence in Rehabilitation.

I am pleased to take this opportunity to thank Paul for sharing his talents with me. I wish him and Martina a wonderful retirement.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1569. A bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

The following joint resolution was read the first time:

H.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WYDEN for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Michael L. Connor, of New Mexico, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

*Elizabeth M. Robinson, of Washington, to be Under Secretary of Energy.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 1569. A bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014; read the first time.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 55

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 55, a bill to prohibit Members of Congress and the President from receiving pay during Government shutdowns.

S. 153

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend section 520J of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for mental health first aid training programs.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health

threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 554

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 554, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit.

S. 1318

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1318, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1530

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1530, a bill to realign structures and reallocate resources in the Federal Government, in keeping with the core American belief that families are the best protection for children and the bedrock of any society, to bolster United States diplomacy and assistance targeted at ensuring that every child can grow up in a permanent, safe, nurturing, and loving family, and to strengthen intercountry adoption to the United States and around the world and ensure that it becomes a viable and fully developed option for providing families for children in need, and for other purposes.

S. 1551

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1551, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap

and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 1557

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1557, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. RES. 254

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 254, a resolution designating November 2, 2013, as "National Bison Day".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 1569. A bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014; read the first time.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1569

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Default Prevention Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. ENSURING TIMELY PAYMENT.

Section 2 of the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013 (31 U.S.C. 3101 note) is amended—

(1) by striking "date of the enactment of this Act" each place it appears and inserting "date of enactment of the Default Prevention Act of 2013";

(2) in subsection (a), by striking "May 18, 2013" and inserting "December 31, 2014"; and

(3) in subsection (b), by striking "May 19, 2013" each place it appears and inserting "January 1, 2015".

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 8,

2013, at 10 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on October 8, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 8, 2013, at 3 p.m., to hold an African Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, "Security And Governance In Somalia: Consolidating Gains, Confronting Challenges, And Charting The Path Forward."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST
TIME—S. 1569 AND H.J. RES. 77

Mr. REID. Madam President, I understand there are two measures at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the measures by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1569) to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 77) making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading en bloc and ask that my objection appear in the RECORD on both measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The measures will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY,
OCTOBER 9, 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 9, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of

morning business for debate only until 2 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:55 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 9, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 7, 2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*SCOTT S. DAHL, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 8, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 8, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS MASSIE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

SHUTDOWN AND AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we begin the second week of the Republican government shutdown. The proximate cause was the Republican effort to delay money that the government needs to fund the Affordable Care Act, to stop the Affordable Care Act. Well, it is also now the second week of the Affordable Care Act, which clearly now will not be repealed, defunded, or delayed.

Just this last weekend, we all approved legislation that would pay all of the Federal workers on furlough the salaries they lost by being sent home making them whole. This is important because they had nothing to do with this travesty. But now, we're paying them not to work. One wonders why we're still in the middle of this exercise. Is there any way out of this cul-de-sac?

I find it encouraging that some of my Republican friends are talking about negotiating. We've been waiting for 6

months for negotiations to begin on the budget. Hopefully, Republicans will appoint conferees, and we can get down to talking about what level of spending we want, need, and can afford.

But maybe we can help things along in dealing with another area—to come together on the looming deficit of infrastructure. America's civil engineers tell us that more than \$2 trillion is needed over the next 5 years for roads, bridges, transit, sewer, and water. These deficiencies create uncertainty, congestion, safety, and health problems, and undercut America's long-term productivity. Why don't we come together to address this problem? Ronald Reagan supported a nickel-a-gallon gas tax increase in 1982, when that was real money. The Clinton plan that led to our only balanced budgets in 40 years included our last gas tax increase. And remember the Simpson-Bowles deficit plan that called for a phased-in gas tax increase of 15 cents?

Since the last increase in the gas tax, the purchasing power of the highway trust fund has dropped by two-thirds due to inflation and greater vehicle efficiency. If we want to bring Americans together, let's work with the huge coalition that stands ready to work with Congress in taking this action. It includes people in the construction industry, obviously, but also local governments and professions like architects and engineers, truckers, and bicyclists. Everyone from the AFL-CIO to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce acknowledges that it is past time for Congress to act, and they will work with us if we take action.

The failure to address this loss of purchasing power is also a source of the budget deficit. Since the last big transportation bill expired in 2005, we have had to make four major general fund transfers of approximately \$50 billion just to prop it up at its current inadequate level, and it's going to get worse when the transportation bill expires in 51 weeks.

I urge my colleagues to join me in averting another fiscal cliff, this one with the highway trust fund. Let's work with the vast array of interests that want to rebuild and renew America. Don't ignore this deficit. Instead, let's act responsibly in fixing the trust fund, putting hundreds of thousands of Americans to work at family wage jobs, in rebuilding and renewing America's infrastructure—making us safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

DOING THE PEOPLE'S WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, just because the President and Senate refuse to talk to the House of Representatives doesn't mean we're going to stop doing the people's work. We will continue to make the case that there is no rational or acceptable reason for the President and Senate to deny working families fair treatment under ObamaCare.

Just as the President decided to give big businesses 1 year to ready themselves for all of the ObamaCare's drastic changes, the American people should have that same year. It is basic fairness.

And while the Senate refuses to work with us to work through our policy differences to reopen government fully, the House of Representatives will continue building common ground with House Democrats to restore as many services as we possibly can. The Senate should consider these proposals—opening parks, funding the NIH, ending veteran benefits application delays, funding FEMA and the FDA, and restoring WIC. They are things we can agree on. Let's not squander these opportunities for common ground. Let's pass policies we can agree on and work through our differences together. Regardless of the Senate's non-negotiation policies, North Carolinians still deserve to have their voices heard at their Capitol.

My constituent Jeremiah from Rural Hall just received a letter from his insurance provider. He tells me:

It appears that due to the health care reform, my insurance premium will double for the upcoming year. It also appears that there's nothing I can change with my current insurance provider to make it more affordable. I have been attempting to log onto the President's Web site, healthcare.gov, without success. I understand that I may be able to get a tax credit if I'm eligible. To my understanding, this will not help me in making my month-to-month bills. If this change goes through next year, I'll not be able to afford to feed my children, much less purchase health insurance. This needs to stop now.

Angie from Clemmons contacted me to say:

ObamaCare is already adversely affecting my family in several ways. My son and daughter-in-law's family health policies are rising dramatically. They both are already working full-time jobs, and each one has part-time work also.

Robert from Lewisville wrote:

My 27-year-old son, David, buys health care insurance through Blue Cross/Blue

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Shield of North Carolina. His current cost is \$111 per month. He received a letter from Blue Cross saying his current policy is being canceled due to the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare. David's new cost is going to be \$288 per month. He works hard and does not take handouts from government. How is ObamaCare helping people like him?

Jeffrey from Boonville told me his story, too:

I went onto the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Web site this morning. If I buy health insurance today, the cost would be \$256 a month, but come the first of the year, the same plan will be \$556 a month. How is that affordable? This new law was supposed to make it more affordable. I've not checked yet to see if I can get a subsidy. Even if I was eligible for one, it's not the responsibility of other Americans to subsidize my family's health insurance.

Susan from Mocksville wrote to me to say:

I had affordable health care. I paid Blue Cross/Blue Shield of North Carolina \$181 per month. Now they sent a letter saying that if I keep this insurance, it will now be \$464 per month. This is insane. ObamaCare is affordable for who? Please, who can I contact to have some kind of influence?

Mr. Speaker, we share Susan's concerns in the House of Representatives. We want Susan to be treated fairly and to have the same 1-year break from ObamaCare that President Obama chose to give to Big Business. And on Susan's behalf, House Republicans are trying to contact a body with some influence, the United States Senate, to find a way to reopen government and ensure ObamaCare is implemented fairly. But the Senate isn't willing to budge. They won't sit down to talk. They are not interested in making sure the President's unworkable law is at least applied fairly.

GETTING BACK TO WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, just days before the United States Government reaches its statutory borrowing limit, let's be clear: this is not new spending. This is agreeing to pay the bills we've already accrued. Senator Alan Simpson said it best:

If you're a real conservative, an honest conservative without hypocrisy, you'd want to pay your debt.

Eight days ago, a minority faction of the Congress chose to shut down the Federal Government. This was touching the fire. To refuse to lift the debt ceiling is to place our entire hand into the fire. A Reagan economist called this debate "playing with matches around gasoline." Yes, that's the same President Ronald Reagan who raised the debt ceiling 18 times without the accompanying brinksmanship. And let's remember, during the 2011 debt ceiling debate, the mere threat of a default scared the markets and drove up interest rates. Retirees lost \$800 billion

in assets as markets tumbled. Home buyers lost \$100 a month as rates spiked. The harm this time could be much worse.

We need to pay our bills so we can start solving the real problems facing this country rather than fixing ones we caused ourselves. And, Mr. Speaker, what is most extraordinary about this fiasco is this: I thought budget negotiations were supposed to be about funding levels, but this Nation's most contentious budget fight in nearly 20 years isn't about funding levels at all; it's about using the budget as leverage to repeal or delay an existing law.

Despite the destructive effects of sequestration, in an effort to compromise, we gave in to the demands to the majority and accepted their \$986 billion spending limit. Just put this into context. The \$986 billion level is 17 percent below fiscal year 2010 spending and 10 percent less than the original Ryan budget. It is below Simpson-Bowles. If that's not compromise, I don't know what is. Those on the other side of this aisle don't know how to take "yes" for an answer. We agreed to deeply slash government spending. Please accept a victory and restart the government so we can get back to the real work of this body.

THE SHIELD ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again this morning to thank the men and women of the Federal law enforcement community, as well as those brave soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines, for what they do to protect this great Nation both abroad and here at home.

Certainly, we are thankful for them each and every day for protecting us in our Nation, but recent events again remind us of their importance.

After the Capitol was thrown into lock-down last week, Capitol Police and other Federal officers sprang into action to protect the building and those inside. In their rush to service, I'm sure none of them thought about the fact that as we continue in a partial government shutdown that they may not be paid even though, for some, that may have been the case.

While there is uncertainty about the Nation's fiscal path in Washington, that uncertainty should never be passed along to our servicemembers and Federal law enforcement officers. The Strengthening Homeland Security, Intelligence, and Essential Law Enforcement Departments Act, or SHIELD Act, of 2013 would alleviate that doubt. This simple, bipartisan legislation that I have introduced prioritizes and protects pay for soldiers and law enforcement personnel if bor-

rowing limits are reached or if there is an interruption in appropriations like there is right now.

In our most difficult hours, we rely on our law enforcement officers and our military for the protection of our lives, liberty, and freedom. No servicemember or critical officer protecting the United States at home or abroad should have to worry about their paychecks in the event of a government shutdown, nor should they be used as a bargaining chip during partisan budget debates. Thankfully, during this current budget impasse, pay for our troops was secured early through a bipartisan vote, and I applaud the President for agreeing to it. However, the SHIELD Act would codify the measure into law, meaning paychecks would never again be threatened, and action would never have to be taken to protect this very basic principle.

□ 1015

This bill already has the strong support of organizations like the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, which represents dedicated first responders. Just as important, it is commonsense legislation that everyday Americans understand and expect from a Congress that often stumbles in its responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to the brave men and women who protect us—both abroad and in your communities—to make sure their pay doesn't become a political pawn at the whim of battling ideologies.

No members of our Federal law enforcement community or armed services should have to worry about the financial situation of their family back home while they are on the job; nor should we let our financial problems rest on the backs of those who selflessly serve the American people.

By ensuring funding for critical Federal officers and our troops, we are allowing agencies and departments to sustain a strong law enforcement and military presence at all times, regardless of fiscal conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this commonsense, bipartisan legislation, and I call for leadership in both parties to consider the SHIELD Act for quick passage.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, it is day 7 in a bizarre, new twist on the Republican Tea Party trip down the rabbit hole. On Saturday, the House of Representatives voted unanimously to pay retroactively every Federal employee, those who are working, Capitol Hill Police, those who are being kept from working, like the aviation safety inspector I talked with yesterday. He was

quite concerned about what might happen with a long lapse in aviation safety nonpartisans, but he's not allowed to work. That's a bit bizarre. He's thankful that he will someday be paid for not working, but he would rather be working, actually.

How is it in this weird world that the Mad Hatter Tea Party explains to their people back home, Well, we've shut down government sort of. We've shut down the services, but we're going to pay people for the work they're not doing. We're going to let the Social Security applications pile up and not be processed. We're going to lock people out of the national wildlife refuges during hunting season. We're going to keep the crabbing fleet grounded in Alaska because we can't issue their permits, and we're not going to continue to do the surveys for the fishing season off the northwest coast.

We've withdrawn all of that. All of those people are sitting around at home, frustrated by law, can't even access their official email, but they're going to be paid. And the Republicans say, We made it good. We're going to pay them.

What about the American people getting the services?

It reminds me of Wimpy J. Wellington from Popeye, who says, I'll gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today. Somehow, Tuesday never came, and repayment was never made. In this case, perhaps someday, when they stop their games, we will repay people. But what about the people who have automatic withdrawals, and they're living paycheck to paycheck, and their mortgage is coming due today or next week? What are they going to do? I see the credit unions offering zero percent loans. That's very nice of them. Wouldn't it be better if we actually put those people back to work and we paid them, and you declared victory?

You have victory within your grasp, and you're refusing it. Is it about ObamaCare? You know that was an impossible goal. That victory is not within your grasp. If it's about the deficit, which is what Gingrich put the government out of work for, then you have victory within your grasp, because Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader REID agreed weeks ago to a 6-week continuing resolution, which is what has customarily been done around here for the 27 years I've been here when the two bodies can't agree on a budget. We don't shut down the government every year. Out of 27 years, twice have we got it done in time. So in 23 of those cases, we've continued. In this case, Senator REID agreed to continue running the government at lower levels of spending, a major reduction back below the 2010 levels. All Speaker BOEHNER has to do is bring that bill to the floor of the House, and it will pass.

There are enough Republicans who told the press that they would vote for

that. They can declare victory. They cut the budget yet again. They're not off on this fruitless errand of trying to stop ObamaCare from going into effect, which went into effect last week. By the way, 234,000 Oregonians have accessed our Oregon Web site, which is working quite well, thank you very much. In the States that are cooperating, it's working well. In those bone-head States that said they wouldn't cooperate and wouldn't help their people and are actually prohibiting people from being helped like, Florida, no, it's not working so well. I wonder why. Go figure.

Let's not continue this, and let's begin to deal very quickly with the issues before us because we have looming a deadline that you can't make good later. You can't make it good later. You can't tell the people of the world, all those to whom we owe hundreds of billions of dollars and the Social Security trust fund and others, Oh, we'll make it good later after we default on the debt someday. Interest rates will jump up; houses become more expensive; the housing market probably crashes again; auto sales grind to a halt; credit card interest rates go to even more extortion levels. The damage you will do by credibly threatening to default on the debt of the United States of America for some clearly undefined goal will not be undone for generations. You can't go there.

Declare victory temporarily. You got your lower levels. Bring a bill to the floor today. Let us vote on it. The Speaker said on the weekend he doesn't have the votes. Let's check that out, because we really think he does have the votes; and it's making him not look too good that he actually accepted the deal before he rejected it and now says he doesn't have the votes. That's an interesting kind of conundrum, and we can prove it very easily.

Bring the bill up today. Fund the government. Pay people to actually work.

WORDS HAVE MEANING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, words have meaning, and we are coming to the floor regularly to talk about the fiscal issues of our great Nation and to talk about how we should approach these.

I'd appreciate that we have everyone in the body involved in this debate, Mr. Speaker, but I want to drill down just a little bit and take a look at what we have going on out in the media and what we continue to hear from so many who are beginning to participate in this debate.

The President and some of our friends across the aisle love saying

they want a clean CR. That sounds really nice. For them, they feel as if it implies that what we want is a dirty or an unclean or an evil CR, and I find their choice of words so very interesting, Mr. Speaker.

What we want is an accountable CR because, when they're saying they want a clean CR, I would encourage my colleagues to realize what they're wanting is the no-obligation loan. They want no strings attached. A "clean CR" means give us the money, but don't you dare expect us to be accountable for that money.

Words have meaning. When our colleagues hear that, I would encourage them to just realize that what they're really telling you is that they don't want the accountability, that they don't want the transparency. They do not want the responsibility. As we would say when I was in the State Senate in Tennessee, they don't want outcome-based budgeting; they just want to be able to spin what they can spin.

What we continue to push for is accountability, transparency, being responsible to the taxpayer and being responsible to future generations. We have to do that because the spending is out of control.

We talk a lot about the CR and the lower spending levels that are in that. Those came about because of the Budget Control Act. The fact is that we worked and got a 2 percent across-the-board spending reduction; and for the last 2 years we've been able to get the deficit, the annual spending overage, down a little bit. We were in 2010 and 2011 borrowing \$3 billion a day to keep the doors open around here. Today, we're borrowing \$2 billion per day to keep the doors open. We need to get to the point that we're not borrowing a single cent. We need to get to that point. Our goal, for those on the other side who can't figure out what a goal is, our goal is fiscal responsibility, fiscal endurance and sovereignty, preserving freedom, free people and free markets. That is our goal for this Nation and doing it in a responsible way.

I've got a great niece who is due this month, and when Georgia Kati Graham arrives, I don't want her to be looking at a mess of a Federal Government. Right now, her share of the national debt is \$53,000. Every newborn who is going to arrive: welcome. With your citizenship, here is what you owe.

That is not responsible. It is why we come to this floor day after day. It is why we continue to say to the Senate, Negotiate with us. Work with us. Sure, let's look at the short-term funding issues, let's look at the long run. How do we preserve this great Nation? How do we get this spending under control? I would offer, Mr. Speaker, we don't do it by going out and borrowing \$2 billion a day. We don't do it by having the Fed monetize \$75 billion worth of debt each and every month. We do it by saying

we don't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem. And it is time that we put the components of that problem on the table and negotiate our way through it so that we're looking at long-term fiscal health and fiscal solvency, not just for this year or next year, not just for the next decade, but for the next century. Let's put our focus on how we return to certainty, how we return to predictability with our Federal regulatory agencies and our Tax Code.

The time to tackle the problem is now.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

AMERICAN NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the three recipients of the Nobel Prize in medicine for 2013. All three work at American universities.

Dr. James E. Rothman chairs the cell biology department at Yale University. Dr. Randy W. Schekman works at the University of California at Berkeley. Their German counterpart, Dr. Thomas C. Sudhof, is on the faculty of Stanford.

The Nobel committee has recognized the importance of their lifesaving work. The question is: Why don't the House Republicans?

On the very day that three researchers at American universities won the Nobel Prize in medicine, the House Republicans continue their siege against the Government of the United States, and their siege includes the National Institutes of Health, where the American people through their Federal Government support medical research and path-breaking, basic research in the difficult search for cures.

Mr. Speaker, I should note that Dr. Rothman of Yale received two grants under the Obama Recovery Act for his work in developing a better way to study cells. Of course, he would have received none if the Republicans in Congress had had their way. More to the point, the Republican shutdown has jeopardized hundreds of research projects like Dr. Rothman's, Dr. Schekman's and Dr. Sudhof's. The Republicans have essentially shut down the National Institutes of Health, which has told researchers that they cannot process their grant applications, which eventually will bring federally supported research to a halt.

I count more than 30 research projects underway just in Ohio at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland and at least a dozen more at the Cleveland Clinic and at the University of Toledo Medical University—cutting-edge research, peer-reviewed research, research that could save lives.

Thanks to the Republican Congress, these are "dark days for medical research." So says the Atlantic Magazine.

Between the sequester and the shutdown, repeated hits to research funding may have serious consequences for scientific advancement.

That's not something you see in the flash of but one day. But it erodes America's real strength over time.

□ 1030

Almost three out of four employees at the National Institutes of Health are sitting at home, thanks to the Republican Congress. They're not allowed to do their work of finding cures and stamping out disease. The Republican Congress locked them out. Two hundred patients at the National Institutes of Health Clinical Center were turned away due to the Republican Congress' throwing its little temper tantrum over losing the Presidential election again. Many of those 200 people are cancer patients, and 30 of them are children, paying a heavy, heavy price for Republican intransigence. The Republicans told them, Go away.

Mr. Speaker, even if the Republicans lack any empathy whatsoever, at least you would think they would care about jobs in America. Research and development, including research and development in biotechnology, provides a competitive advantage for the United States. It's a very promising sector for economic development and job growth. Just come to Cleveland to see the new Health Innovation Center, or look at the neuropsychiatric research being conducted at Case and the University of Toledo Medical Center. Look at what it draws around it. Yet The Atlantic magazine says the sequester is killing 20,500 jobs this year in the life sciences field, and the government shutdown threatens to ground medical research into cancer, Alzheimer's, diabetes, and disabling neuropsychiatric disorders.

The Nobel committee gets it. The American people get it. A recent poll showed that 83 percent of the public believes investing in medical research is important for our economy.

So why don't the Republicans get it? As NIH Director Collins told The Atlantic last week:

We will not know what grant that was going to lead to the next breakthrough in cancer research didn't quite make the cut. We will not know what brilliant scientists, who were going to win a Nobel Prize, basically gave up because of the failure to get support from the current system and decided to do something else or move to another

country, which some of them are doing already. We won't know. That is the sad tale that is wrapped up in all of this.

The good news is that three scientists working on the frontier of scientific research—three scientists at American universities—did not give up, and they have captured the Nobel Prize in Medicine for 2013.

The bad news is that House Republicans apparently have given up. They apparently don't care whether the U.S. keeps distinguishing itself by winning such prestigious awards. They apparently don't care whether we support the research that will help humankind and eliminate diseases and save lives. They don't care if the United States remains the global leader in medical and scientific research and enjoys the millions of jobs that it will create in the future—what a shame—and how easy it would be to bring up a clean continuing resolution and put the government of the people of this country back to work.

ATF CENSORS FREE SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to talk and discuss and debate the issues of the debt ceiling, of the continuing resolution, there are still things taking place in government. Some of them aren't so good.

Just to give a little background, which you are certainly aware of, we have our Constitution with the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights is a section in the Constitution that protects citizens from government abuses.

The First Amendment is first because it contains the most important rights. If those rights are abridged, the rest of the Bill of Rights—to me—is meaningless, and we all know that two of those provisions have to do with the freedom of speech and the freedom of press. We traditionally honor those because they are so important.

Historically, the most controversial of all speech and press was political speech and religious speech. Those are especially protected in the First Amendment, and there are historical reasons for that. The colonists, our forefathers, they were an ornery bunch, and they were constantly hammering, through the press and through speech, King George III, Great Britain, and their abuses on individuals in the Colonies—and rightfully so.

Therefore, when our Constitution was written and the Bill of Rights was written, we wanted to ensure that, under our philosophy and under our democracy in the United States, freedom of speech, and freedom of press were protected.

Over the years, the Supreme Court has ruled on free speech and press cases; but they have gradually limited

speech, which is another issue. The prevailing rule is that, if there's a compelling State interest—whatever that means—and we'll talk about that some other time—then speech can be prohibited. Never mind, Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment doesn't say anything about limiting speech when there's a compelling State interest.

But the Supreme Court said, if there's a compelling State interest, speech can be limited, and, of course, the Supreme Court decides what that compelling State interest is.

There are also two types of punishment for speech. One is censorship, which is the most egregious. That is to prevent someone from saying something or publishing something. Then there's the other type of punishment for speech, after the speech is made. Then there is punishment sometimes for what is said, such as a threat or yelling "fire" in a crowded theater. But the most egregious is preventing someone from saying something or printing something or publishing something. That is censorship.

So that brings us to what is taking place. We've all heard of Fast and Furious. That's the situation where our government sent guns to Mexico under the theory that they're going to track the guns. Americans were killed; Mexican nationals were killed. We're over in court because Eric Holder won't give us information about Fast and Furious. Now one of the ATF agents wants to publish a book, called, "The Unarmed Truth," and it's about Fast and Furious. He is an agent in the ATF and whistleblower.

The ATF has a policy that says, Well, we, the ATF, decide whether someone in our organization is allowed to publish or have some type of outside employment, and we use our own discretion. It's just up to us. We don't have any policy rules. We just arbitrarily decide. And they have decided that because Dodson wants to publish this on his own time, not on company time, or government time—he went and tried to get permission—they said, You can't publish that book. Here's the reason he was given, Mr. Speaker. The reason given to him was, well, it might hurt the morale in the ATF.

Now, do you think that's a compelling State interest to prevent a person from printing something and violating his right of free speech because the government says it might hurt the morale in the ATF?

Absolutely not. You've got somebody that wants to tell the truth about the ATF, and it's a violation of his constitutional right not to be able to discuss openly what took place. It's a denial of the First Amendment freedom of speech. It is a denial of freedom of press.

These individuals of the ATF, censor police, ought to be furloughed. They ought to be sequestered, specifically

those that are denying the freedom of press, the freedom of speech to someone who just wants to talk about what took place in the ATF. This ought not to be, but that's what has taken place by the ATF coverup squad. Unchain the freedom of speech and press.

And that's just the way it is.

DEBT CEILING INCREASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the irresponsibility of the Republican Party in holding hostage the full faith and credit of the United States.

As hundreds of thousands of Federal workers go without pay, as home buying slows to an eventual halt, and as Federal agencies remain unable to complete the important work of implementing the Wall Street Reform Act, Republicans are threatening another crisis that could have significant impacts on our financial markets and the economic security of all Americans. They do this in pursuit of an ideological agenda. The result is continued instability and uncertainty for our economy and fragile recovery.

We should not default on our obligations. The ramifications of doing so would be serious. The underpinnings of the entire financial system could be affected, with the possibility of triggering a financial crisis reminiscent of the days following the failure of Lehman Brothers—only this time, it would be far worse.

If the U.S. defaults on its debt, lending—the lifeblood of our economy—would dry up. The dollar's value could drop, and we could see dramatic increases in interest rates on everything from mortgages and auto loans to credit cards. Not only that, but every U.S. corporation and municipality would likely see their borrowing costs climb as well. Unemployment rates would rise precipitously just as we're beginning to recover.

If Congress cannot do its job in a timely manner, in the future, the government's ability to pay its debts will be looked upon with uncertainty by investors and markets, leading to higher borrowing costs in the future and, in turn, an increase in our Nation's deficit. Worst of all, we could see another dramatic loss of wealth for working Americans.

History tells us that even the threat of default can send shock waves through our financial system. In 2011, just the prospect of defaulting on our debt caused a drop in consumer and business confidence, a 17 percent decline in the S&P 500 index of equity prices, and increased volatility in the stock market; and, of course, we received a downgrade in the U.S. Government debt.

The drop in equity caused by the 2011 debt ceiling fight had serious consequences for American families. The months following saw a \$2.4 trillion decline in household wealth and an \$800 billion drop in retirement assets. The cost of homeownership also increased, as risk-averse lenders increased the cost of borrowing to purchase a home. The 2011 debate showed us the very serious consequences of even debating whether we should pay bills already incurred.

But no one knows with certainty the full extent of the damage to the economy should the U.S. actually default on its debts. We have heard speculation ranging from bad to the catastrophic. I, for one, do not want to find out.

What I do know is that everyone from Wall Street CEOs, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, to small business owners, and prominent conservative economists are concerned with the significant damage that could result from a debt ceiling standoff. Warren Buffett, Ben Bernanke, Hank Paulson, and the heads of the Nation's largest financial institutions have been outspoken about the need to end this hostage crisis now.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have been through enough. We remain in the midst of a government shutdown with no end in sight. It is hurting real people and damaging our economic recovery. At this tenuous time, defaulting on our Nation's debt could create the perfect storm that may roil financial markets and undermine the credibility of the United States; but, most importantly, it could be devastating for American families who are already suffering in the aftermath of a major recession, foreclosure crisis, and now a government shutdown.

So I urge my colleagues to stop using the debt ceiling to push extremist ideology and vote now on a clean debt limit increase.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee said she doesn't know what we mean when we talk about a "clean debt limit increase." I think she knows. She knows that they should not try to do away with the ACA—that is, the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare—and hold us hostage because they don't like it.

The ObamaCare legislation was passed. It is in law. President Obama was absolutely supported by the citizens of this country when they voted the President to be reelected once again. The Supreme Court supported it. If they wish to do away with ObamaCare, they should go through the legislative process and repeal it; but no, they are holding us hostage on the budget.

BLIZZARD IN SOUTH DAKOTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, a record blizzard hit my State of South Dakota. Some places in the Black Hills saw almost 4 feet of snow in just 2 days. Thousands were without power. Thousands are still without power. Emergency vehicles were stranded along with the people that they were trying to rescue.

The damage from the downed trees, the downed power lines covered with heavy, wet snow is monumental. On top of that, with warm weather expected this week, we expect to see massive flooding that could bring even more damage.

On the plains in western South Dakota, ranchers are still trying to recover from losing cattle in the drought last summer, which was the worst drought that we had seen since the Great Depression.

□ 1045

We've heard now that they've lost tens of thousands of cattle in this fall blizzard. We've heard that tens of thousands of cattle have been lost in the snow. They're being found frozen, smothered by the high drifts and injured from wandering in zero visibility in 70-mile-per-hour winds.

We talked with one rancher near White River, South Dakota, who found over 50 cattle who had died in one spot near a dam.

Another rancher north of New Underwood was finally able to locate his entire herd of 63 cows who'd taken refuge in a shed for protection, but none of them survived.

Another story is from a rancher near Union Center who said, "It's bad. It's really bad. I'm the eternal optimist, but this is really bad. The livestock loss is catastrophic. It's pretty unbelievable."

He said cattle were soaked by 12 hours of rain early in the storm, so many were unable to survive an additional 48 hours of snow and winds up to 60 miles per hour.

See, this blizzard came so early, cattle hadn't even had time to grow their winter coats. "It's the worst early season snowstorm I've seen in my lifetime," he said, and he's 60 years old.

Another rancher said, "This is absolutely, totally devastating." He's 52 years old. He's from Caputa, South Dakota. "This is horrendous. I mean the death loss of these cows in this country is unbelievable."

This man said he estimated he had lost half of his herd, but it could be far more. He was still struggling to find snow-buried cattle and those that had been pushed miles by winds that gusted over 70 miles per hour on Friday night.

An emergency management director in Butte County said that the trail of carcasses is a gruesome sight across the region. They're in the fence line. They're laying along the roads. It's really sickening.

And none of the ranchers that I have talked to can remember anything like it. Not only will this be devastating for this year's business, but also it will take years to rebuild what has been lost.

Yet another rancher, near Scenic, couldn't find his cattle over the weekend, and said he nearly killed a horse trying to get through the snow while searching for his cattle. He turned back, and yesterday, with the help of a pilot friend, flew over land south of the Badlands.

He found what he called the "trail of death." About 200 of his 600 cows were dead, leading up to and throughout a draw. The calves that were still alive were standing by their mothers. The rest of his cows and calves are alive, but he can't get to them.

Those are just many of the tragic stories that we've heard. Our lack of a comprehensive farm bill leaves these ranchers without the protection of a livestock disaster program that would come in in these situations and blunt just a small portion of the loss.

I fought hard to include livestock disaster programs in the farm bill, which would cover these producers retroactively.

It's time we finish our work on the farm bill. It's time we go to conference, have a negotiation on the most reform-minded farm bill that has been put together for decades. Getting the farm bill done could give those in western South Dakota more certainty during this very, very difficult time.

THE ISSUE THAT WILL NOT GO AWAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALÉOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALÉOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to detract our attention from the current national debate on the government shutdown and the debt ceiling issue, but I do want to share with my colleagues an issue that will not go away.

What is it that the National Football League, the 32 football club owners, and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell have yet to understand why the word "redskin" is considered a very offensive racial and derogatory term that describes Native American Indians?

My apologies, Mr. Speaker, for I have yet to master the English language. But I want to share again and again with my colleagues and some 181 million football fans all over America why our Native American Indian community considers the word "redskin" as very offensive, and clearly, the National Football League and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell cannot and should not disclaim responsibility.

Again, let's review the history. The origin of the term "redskin" is com-

monly attributed to the colonial practice of trading Native American Indian scalps and body parts as bounties and trophies. For example, in 1755, settlers of the Massachusetts Bay Province were paid out of the public treasury for the killing and scalping of people of the Penobscot tribe. The bounty for a male Penobscot Indian above the age of 12 was 50 pounds, and his scalp was worth 40 pounds. The bounty for a female Penobscot Indian of any age and for males under the age of 12 was 25 pounds while their scalps were worth 20 pounds. These scalps, I submit, Mr. Speaker, were called "redskins."

The current chairman and chief of the Penobscot Nation, Chief Kirk Francis, recently declared that the word "redskin" is "not just a racial slur or a derogatory term," but a painful "reminder of one of the most gruesome acts of . . . ethnic cleansing ever committed against the Penobscot people."

Mr. Speaker, again, I ask my colleagues and the 181 million football fans throughout this great Nation of ours—suppose that that redskins scalp that was brought in for payment was the scalp of your mother, your daughter, or your wife or your son? Again, Mr. Speaker, Native American Indians are also human beings and God's children. They are not animals.

Our colleague, TOM COLE, from Oklahoma, the cochair of our Congressional Native American Indian Caucus and a member of the Chickasaw Nation, states:

This is the 21st century. This is the capital of political correctness on the planet. It is very, very, very offensive. This isn't like warriors or chiefs. It's not a term of respect, and it's needlessly offensive to a large part of our population. They just don't happen to live around Washington, D.C.

Also, our colleague BETTY MCCOLLUM from Minnesota, as cochair of the Congressional Native American Indian Caucus, says this "is another attempt to justify a racial slur on behalf of Mr. Dan Snyder," the owner of the Washington franchise, "and other NFL owners who appear to be only concerned with earning even larger profits, even if it means exploiting a racist stereotype of Native Americans. For the head of a multibillion dollar sports league to embrace the twisted logic that 'redskin' actually 'stands for strength, courage, pride, and respect,' is a statement of absurdity."

My dear friend and colleague, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, representing the District of Columbia, states that the owner of the Washington football franchise, Mr. Dan Snyder, "is a man who has shown sensibilities based on his own ethnic identity, yet who refuses to recognize the sensibilities of American Indians."

Ms. NORTON also said:

As an African American woman and third-generation Washingtonian, I want to say to

Redskin fans, no one blames you for using a name that has always been used . . . but I can think of no argument for retaining a name that degrades our first Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the game of American football has become one of the most treasured sports among American Polynesian athletes. Polynesian youth learn to play the sport at a young age, with dreams of playing in the National Football League. Football offers opportunities for higher education and economic opportunity.

Many of our Polynesian NFL players have realized their dreams, like Troy Polumalu, and Chris Kemoeatu of the Pittsburgh Steelers, the late Junior Seau, and now Manti Te'o of the San Diego Chargers, and the former player, Joe Salave'a, and Roy Helu, with the Washington Redskins.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, let's do the right thing, and I appeal to the NFL, do the right thing. Change the name of the Washington football franchise.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to detract our attention from the current national debate on the government shutdown and the debt ceiling issue, but I want to share with my colleagues an issue that just will not go away. What is it that the National Football League, the 32 football club owners, and the NFL Commissioner Mr. Roger Goodell have yet to understand why the word "redskin" is considered a very offensive, racial and derogatory term that describes Native American Indians?

My apologies, Mr. Speaker, for I have not yet mastered the English language—but I want to share again, and again with my colleagues and some 181 million football fans around the country—why our Native American Indian community considers the word "redskin" as very offensive, and clearly the National Football League, and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell cannot and should not disclaim responsibility.

Again, let's review the history. The origin of the term "redskin" is commonly attributed to the colonial practice of trading Native American Indian scalps and body parts as bounties and trophies. For example, in 1755, settlers of the Massachusetts Bay Province were paid out of the public treasury for killing and scalping people of the Penobscot tribe. The bounty for a male Penobscot Indian above the age of 12 was 50 pounds, and his scalp was worth 40 pounds. The bounty for a female Penobscot Indian of any age and for males under the age of 12 was 25 pounds, while their scalps were worth 20 pounds. These scalps were called "redskins."

The current chairman and chief of the Penobscot Nation, Chief Kirk Francis, recently declared that "redskins" is "not just a racial slur or a derogatory term," but a painful "reminder of one of the most gruesome acts of . . . ethnic cleansing ever committed against the Penobscot people."

Mr. Speaker, again I ask my colleagues and the 181 million football fans throughout this great Nation of ours—suppose that the "redskin" scalp that was brought in for payment was the scalp of your mother, your daughter, or your wife or son? Again, Mr. Speaker, Native American Indians are also human beings and God's children—they are not animals!

Our colleague TOM COLE from Oklahoma, Co-Chair of the Congressional Native American Indian Caucus, and a member of the Chickasaw Nation, states: "This is the 21st century. This is the capital of political correctness on the planet. It is very, very, very offensive. This isn't like warriors or chiefs. It's not a term of respect, and it's needlessly offensive to a large part of our population. They just don't happen to live around Washington, DC."

Also, our colleague BETTY MCCOLLUM from Minnesota and Co-Chair of the Congressional Native American Indian Caucus, states that Mr. Goodell's letter "is another attempt to justify a racial slur on behalf of [Mr.] Dan Snyder," owner of the Washington franchise, "and other NFL owners who appear to be only concerned with earning even larger profits, even if it means exploiting a racist stereotype of Native Americans. For the head of a multi-billion dollar sports league to embrace the twisted logic that '[r]edskin' actually 'stands for strength, courage pride, and respect' is a statement of absurdity."

My dear friend and colleague, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, representing the District of Columbia, states that the owner of the Washington football franchise Mr. Daniel Snyder "is a man who has shown sensibilities based on his own ethnic identity, [yet] who refuses to recognize the sensibilities of American Indians." Ms. Norton also said, "As an African American woman and third-generation Washingtonian, I want to say to Redskins fans—no one blames you for using a name that has always been used . . . but I can think of no argument for retaining a name that degrades our first Americans."

Mr. Speaker, the game of American football has become one of the most treasured sports among American Polynesian athletes. Polynesian youth learn to play the sport at a young age with dreams of playing in the National Football League. Football offers an opportunity to enter the realm of higher education and economic opportunity. Many of our Polynesian NFL players have realized their dreams—like Troy Polumalu and former player Chris Kemoeatu of the Pittsburgh Steelers, the late Junior Seau and now Manti Te'o of the San Diego Chargers, former player Joe Salave'a and now Roy Helu, Jr. with the Washington "Redskins," Haloti Ngata and former player Ma'ake Kemoeatu with the Baltimore Ravens, Isaac Sopoaga and former player Vai Sikaheima with the Philadelphia Eagles, Tyson Alualu with the Jacksonville Jaguars, Samson Satele and Fill Moala with the Indianapolis Colts, Mike Iupati with the San Francisco 49ers, Ropati Pitoitua with the Tennessee Titans, Paul Soliai with the Miami Dolphins, and Domato Peko, Ray Mauluga, and former player Jonathan Fanene with the Cincinnati Bengals, and the list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I love the game of football. I played all four years in high school. I love the NFL. But there is absolutely no excuse for the Washington professional football franchise to continue the shameful use of the word "redskins."

Just last week, another island boy weighed in on the name of the Washington, DC football franchise. He is none other than our own President Barack Obama, born in Hawaii and

who played basketball for Punahou High School in Honolulu, Hawaii, and he said: "If I were the owner of the team and I knew that the name of my team—even if they've had a storied history—was offending a sizable group of people, I'd think about changing it." President Obama further said: "Native Americans feel pretty strongly about it . . . I don't know whether our attachment to a particular name should override the real, legitimate concerns that people have about these things."

While race-based killing of Native Americans is a thing of the past, the tradition of mockery and insult—whether intentional or not—lives on through the Washington "Redskins," a name that American Indian rights activist Ms. Suzan Harjo calls "the worst thing in the English language you can be called if you are a native person." This is not a popularity contest. You don't take polls on issues with deep moral implications. That is just absolute nonsense.

For those who question whether this racist or derogatory word is offensive to Native Americans, I want to share with my colleagues an excerpt from a letter sent by the leaders and members of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI)—the oldest, largest, and most representative American Indian and Alaska Native organization serving the broad interests of the majority of some 5 million Native Americans with well over 500 tribal governments and communities across the nation. In the letter, NCAI President Jefferson Keel of the Chickasaw Nation from Oklahoma states that Congressional efforts on this issue "will accomplish what Native American people, nations, and organizations have tried to do in the courts for almost twenty years—end the racist epithet that has served as the [name] of Washington's pro football franchise for far too long."

Mr. Speaker, the term "redskin" does not, as NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell suggests, offend just one person. And the responsibility for perpetuating this racial slur, as Mr. Goodell implies, lies not just with Mr. Dan Snyder, the owner of the Washington football franchise. The responsibility rests squarely on the National Football League and the 32 owners of their football teams, and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell.

As for the "Redskins" sponsors—such as FedEx, Virginia Lottery, Sprint Nextel, Coca-Cola, Bank of America, Anheuser-Busch, and others—they are equally accountable for the continued use of this disparaging term. Their silence on the issue given their direct contribution to this racist and derogatory word is deafening.

Again, I ask NFL Commissioner Goodell and the 32 club owners—do the right thing—change the name of the Washington football franchise.

I submit for the record a letter from the National Congress of American Indians; and today's commentary from two articles in the Washington Post authored by Mr. Dana Milbank, Ms. Theresa Vargas and Mr. Mark Maske.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF
AMERICAN INDIANS,
March 21, 2013.

Hon. ENI FALEOMAVAEGA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FALEOMAVAEGA: On behalf of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), the nation's oldest and largest tribal government advocacy organization in the country, we applaud you for sponsoring the "Non-Disparagement of Native American Persons or People in Trademark Registration Act of 2013". This legislation will accomplish what Native American people, nations, and organizations have tried to do in the courts for almost twenty years—end the racist epithet that has served as the mascot of Washington's pro football franchise for far too long.

The NCAI membership has been an active part of ending these types of derogatory stereotypes for several decades. The NCAI was one of many native and non-native organizations in support of the original court cases on this matter, *Harjo et al v. Pro Football, Inc.*, and we support the current case, *Blackhorse et al v. Pro Football, Inc.*, to cancel existing trademarks.

We are proud of all our people who struggle for dignity and fight against stereotypes, including Native and non-Native students, families, teachers, and others who have worked together to retire over 2,000 "Indian" names, logos, mascots, and behaviors in schools across the land. The use of Native Peoples as mascots is offensive and unjustifiable. We will continue to call for an end to this practice until the remaining stereotypes are gone from the American landscape.

Thank you and your co-sponsors for your leadership and courage in introducing this important legislation. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me or the NCAI Deputy Director, Robert Holden, at the National Congress of American Indians.

Respectfully,

JEFFERSON KEEL,
President.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 2013]

FOR THE REDSKINS, WHAT'S IN A NAME?
PLENTY

(By Dana Milbank)

You know a guy is in trouble when he hires Lanny Davis as his lawyer.

Davis has developed a specialty representing Third World dictators and questionable businesses since his days as a spokesman for Bill Clinton during the Monica Lewinsky scandal. So when Davis's name appeared on a statement from the Washington Redskins on Saturday afternoon declaring that President Obama was wrong to question the team's name, it was a sure sign that Dan Snyder is worried.

Davis, brought in this summer to help with the team-name controversy, expressed his disappointment "as a supporter of President Obama" that Obama was not aware of a decade-old poll finding that only one in 10 Native Americans were offended by the name. "We love our team and its name," he wrote, and "we do not intend to disparage or disrespect a racial or ethnic group."

I like Davis and admire his creativity, but, to borrow a Clinton-era phrase, let's parse this statement. Are the Redskins really defending the name with an out-of-date survey that allowed anybody—even somebody with less native blood than Elizabeth Warren—to identify as a Native American? And even if those results were accurate, are Davis and

Snyder suggesting that racism is okay if it polls well?

To see whether it's right to use "Redskins" as a mascot, NFL owners gathering in Georgetown on Tuesday for their Fall meeting should substitute some other common racial epithets and see how they would sound: The Washington Wetbacks? The Houston Hymies? The Chicago Chinks? Or perhaps the New York Niggers? That would be enough to send anybody to the shotgun formation.

"This word is an insult. It's mean, it's rude, it's impolite," Kevin Gover, who is Native American and director of the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian, said Monday at a news conference on the eve of the NFL meeting. "We've noticed that other racial insults are out of bounds. . . . We wonder why it is that the word that is directed at us, that refers to us, is not similarly off-limits."

Gover was part of a gathering arranged by the Oneida Nation at the Ritz-Carlton, the site of the owners meeting. The tribe has been running radio ads calling for a name change, and the cause got a boost when Obama said in an interview with the Associated Press on Saturday that he'd think about changing the name if he were in Snyder's shoes. Snyder is on record telling USA Today: "We'll never change the name. It's that simple. Never—you can use caps."

Actually, forget the Caps; let's use the Bullets, who became the Washington Wizards to avoid using what was a less offensive word than Redskins. Davis decries the "selective" outrage against the Redskins but not the Atlanta Braves or the Cleveland Indians or the Chicago Blackhawks. The Braves' Tomahawk Chop and Cleveland's Chief Wahoo are indeed appalling, but the team names aren't epithets.

"We're asking the NFL to stop using a racial slur," said Ray Halbritter, representing the Oneida Nation.

The best argument was made not by a Native American but by an African American, the District of Columbia's delegate to Congress, Eleanor Holmes Norton. "My great-grandfather was a runaway slave," she said. "I went to segregated schools, just like many Native Americans. . . . I don't see how anyone who has gone through our historic experience can fail to identify with Native Americans who are raising this issue. Need I remind them of the terms that have been attached to us in history and how the moment we hear one of those terms, you've got an uprising?"

That makes Davis's defense sound all the more trivial. "The name 'Washington Redskins' is 80 years old—it's our history and legacy and tradition," his statement said—as though that trumps the Native Americans' history and legacy and tradition.

Norton predicted that the offensive name won't last much longer. "The name is going to go in the dustbin of history," she said. "My only regret is that Dan Snyder, the owner of the team, had to be pushed this far."

If Snyder feels otherwise, perhaps he can start making his way to history's dustbin, and a new owner can change the name. Maybe then we'd win some football games.

Make your case: Should the Washington Redskins change their name?

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 2013]

INDIAN TRIBE PUSHES FOR WASHINGTON REDSKINS NAME CHANGE AS NFL OWNERS GATHER

(By Theresa Vargas and Mark Maske)

NFL officials will meet with the Native American group that is campaigning against

the name of the Washington Redskins and hosted a symposium Monday on the issue a mile away from where league owners began gathering for a fall meeting.

"They know we're not going away," said Ray Halbritter, a representative for the Oneida Indian Nation. He called the meeting with the National Football League "a move in the right direction."

The symposium comes three days after President Obama took a stance in the long-standing debate, saying that if he were the team's owner, he would think about changing the name.

The Oneida Nation launched the "Change the Mascot" campaign a few months ago, drawing inspiration from a high school in its back yard that dropped the "Redskins" moniker. Since then, the New York tribe has emerged as one of the strongest forces behind the growing push to scrap the Washington team's 80-year-old name, scheduling radio ads to run in every city the Redskins visit this season.

Its conference, held at the Ritz-Carlton in Georgetown, featured a panel of speakers that included the head of the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian, a psychologist who spoke about the public health consequences of the word, student activists and politicians—Rep. Betty McCollum (D-Minn.) and Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-D.C.).

"I can think of no argument for retaining a name that directly insults Americans and especially our first Americans," said Holmes Norton, speaking as a third-generation Washingtonian.

She said NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell showed leadership last month when he stepped back from his earlier defense of the team's name and said, "If one person's offended, we have to listen."

Nevertheless, no formal discussion of the Washington Redskins' name is expected among NFL owners who are gathering at another Ritz-Carlton in Washington for a one-day meeting Tuesday, according to two people familiar with the situation, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the topic.

They said they sense little or no sentiment within the league to urge Redskins owner Daniel Snyder to make a change.

NFL officials were invited to the Native American symposium, but none attended the event, Halbritter said. But he said he was encouraged that Goodell had instructed Adolpho Birch, the NFL's senior vice president for labor policy and government affairs, to schedule a meeting. The sit-down is scheduled for Nov. 22 at the league's offices, but two sources said it could be held sooner.

On Monday, as NFL franchise owners began arriving for their Tuesday gathering, several declined comment on the name-change issue.

Green Bay Packers President Mark Murphy, who once played for the Redskins, was the athletic director at Colgate when the school changed the name of its athletic teams from Red Raiders to Raiders in 2001. But he declined to speak Monday on the controversy.

"I'd rather not get into it," Murphy said. Philadelphia Eagles owner Jeffrey Lurie also declined to comment.

In May, Redskins owner Daniel Snyder told USA Today, "We'll never change the name. It's that simple. NEVER—you can use caps."

In the months since, a string of prominent sports writers has stop penning the word. A group led by a former Federal Communications Commission chairman announced an

effort to persuade broadcasters to stop saying the name on the airwaves. And a decision is expected soon in a lawsuit aimed at revoking the federal trademark protection of the team's name.

Kevin Gover, who heads the American Indian museum and whose son is a plaintiff in the trademark case, said the Oneida Nation has long been a powerful force in the American Indian community and that the tribe's involvement in the name-change issue has only elevated the conversation. He said he has little doubt that NFL officials, even if none attended the symposium, were listening to what was said.

"Like all major industries, the NFL is very interested in its public image," Gover said, "and when there is a challenge to that public image, the NFL is inclined to respond."

During Monday's event, Gover—who wrote a letter to *The Washington Post* about the offensiveness of the name when he was a high school senior in 1973—spoke about how as a child he was called "redskin" and doesn't understand why, unlike other racial slurs, the word has not become off limits.

Michael Friedman, a clinical psychologist who has researched the effects of stigma and discrimination, said the word amounts to harassment and causes mental and physical harm to a population that already faces higher rates of depression, alcoholism, suicide, diabetes and infant mortality.

"This is a public health issue," he said. "This is not a political correctness issue."

Also on the panel were two students from Cooperstown High School and the school board's president, who earlier this year were behind the decision to change the school's team from the Redskins to the Hawkeyes. The Oneida Nation later paid for the school's new uniforms.

The tribe, which has about 1,000 members, has prospered in the casino and resort business and has pledged \$10 million over 10 years to the American Indian museum.

The tribe also sponsors the Buffalo Bills and has a "vested interest in the league being a unifying force," Habritter said.

"As an Indian nation that values the idea of mutual respect, we only have one simple objective in all of this," Habritter said. "We no longer want to be treated as targets of racial slurs. We don't want our children to be treated as targets of racial slurs. We want to be treated as what we are: Americans."

[From the *Washington Post*, Oct. 8, 2013]

TACKLING THE OFFENSIVE

(By Dana Milbank)

You know a guy is in trouble when he hires Lanny Davis as his lawyer.

Davis has developed a specialty representing Third World dictators and questionable businesses since his days as a spokesman for Bill Clinton during the Monica Lewinsky scandal. So when Davis's name appeared on a statement from the Washington Redskins on Saturday afternoon declaring that President Obama was wrong to question the team's name, it was a sure sign that Dan Snyder is worried.

Davis, brought in this summer to help with the team-name controversy, expressed his disappointment "as a supporter of President Obama" that Obama was not aware of a decade-old poll finding that only one in 10 Native Americans were offended by the name. "We love our team and its name," he wrote, and "we do not intend to disparage or disrespect a racial or ethnic group."

I like Davis and admire his creativity, but, to borrow a Clinton-era phrase, let's parse this statement. Are the Redskins really de-

fending the name with an out-of-date survey that allowed anybody—even somebody with less native blood than Elizabeth Warren—to identify as a Native American? And even if those results were accurate, are Davis and Snyder suggesting that racism is okay if it polls well?

To see whether it's right to use "Redskins" as a mascot, NFL owners gathering in Georgetown on Tuesday for their fall meeting should substitute some other common racial epithets for Hispanics, African Americans, Asians and Jews and see how they would sound. That would be enough to send anybody to the shotgun formation.

"This word is an insult. It's mean, it's rude, it's impolite," Kevin Gover, who is Native American and director of the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian, said Monday at a news conference on the eve of the NFL meeting. "We've noticed that other racial insults are out of bounds. . . . We wonder why it is that the word that is directed at us, that refers to us, is not similarly off-limits."

Gover was part of a gathering arranged by the Oneida Nation at the Ritz-Carlton, the site of the owners meeting. The tribe has been running radio ads calling for a name change, and the cause got a boost when Obama said in an interview with the Associated Press on Saturday that he'd think about changing the name if he were in Snyder's shoes. Snyder is on record telling *USA Today*: "We'll never change the name. It's that simple. Never—you can use caps."

Actually, forget the Caps; let's use the Bullets, who became the Washington Wizards to avoid using what was a less offensive word than Redskins. Davis decries the "selective" outrage against the Redskins but not the Atlanta Braves or the Cleveland Indians or the Chicago Blackhawks. The Braves' Tomahawk Chop and Cleveland Chief Wahoo are indeed appalling, but the team names aren't epithets.

"We're asking the NFL to stop using a racial slur," said Ray Halbritter, representing the Oneida Nation.

The best argument was made not by a Native American but by an African American, the District of Columbia's delegate to Congress, Eleanor Holmes Norton. "My grandfather was a runaway slave," she said. "I went to segregated schools, just like many Native Americans. . . . I don't see how anyone who has gone through our historic experience can fail to identify with Native Americans who are raising this issue. Need I remind them of the terms that have been attached to us in history and how the moment we hear one of those terms, you've got an uprising?"

That makes Davis's defense sound all the more trivial. "The name 'Washington Redskins' is 80 years old—it's our history and legacy and tradition," his statement said—as though that trumps the Native Americans' history and legacy and tradition.

Norton predicted that the offensive name won't last much longer. "The name is going to go in the dustbin of history," she said. "My only regret is that Dan Snyder, the owner of the team, had to be pushed this far."

If Snyder feels otherwise, perhaps he can start making his way to history's dustbin, and a new owner can change the name. Maybe then we'd win some football games.

NFL TO MEET TRIBE OVER REDSKINS NAME

(By Theresa Vargas and Mark Maske)

NFL officials will meet with the Native American group that is campaigning against

the name of the Washington Redskins and hosted a symposium Monday on the issue a mile away from where league owners began gathering for a fall meeting.

"They know we're not going away," said Ray Halbritter, a representative for the Oneida Indian Nation. He called the meeting with the National Football League "a move in the right direction."

The symposium comes three days after President Obama took a stance in the long-standing debate, saying that if he were the team's owner, he would think about changing the name.

The Oneida Nation launched the "Change the Mascot" campaign a few months ago, drawing inspiration from a high school in its back yard that dropped the "Redskins" moniker. Since then, the New York tribe has emerged as one of the strongest forces behind the growing push to scrap the Washington team's 80-year-old name, scheduling radio ads to run in every city the Redskins visit this season.

Its conference, held at the Ritz-Carlton in Georgetown, featured a panel of speakers that included the head of the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian, a psychologist who spoke about the public health consequences of the word, student activists and politicians—Rep. Betty McCollum (D-Minn.) and Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-D.C.).

"I can think of no argument for retaining a name that directly insults Americans and especially our first Americans," said Holmes Norton, speaking as a third-generation Washingtonian.

She said NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell showed leadership last month when he stepped back from his earlier defense of the team's name and said, "If one person's offended, we have to listen."

Nevertheless, no formal discussion of the Washington Redskins' name is expected among NFL owners who are gathering at another Ritz-Carlton in Washington for a one-day meeting Tuesday, according to two people familiar with the situation, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the topic.

They said they sense little or no sentiment within the league to urge Redskins owner Daniel Snyder to make a change.

NFL officials were invited to the Native American symposium, but none attended the event, Halbritter said. But he said he was encouraged that Goodell had instructed Adolpho Birch, the NFL's senior vice president for labor policy and government affairs, to schedule a meeting. The sit-down is scheduled for Nov. 22 at the league's offices, but two sources said it could be held sooner.

On Monday, as NFL franchise owners began arriving for their Tuesday gathering, several declined to comment on the name-change issue.

Green Bay Packers President Mark Murphy, who once played for the Redskins, was the athletic director at Colgate when the school changed the name of its athletic teams from Red Raiders to Raiders in 2001. But he declined to speak Monday on the controversy.

"I'd rather not get into it," Murphy said. Philadelphia Eagles owner Jeffrey Lurie also declined to comment.

In May, Redskins owner Daniel Snyder told *USA Today*, "We'll never change the name. It's that simple. NEVER—you can use caps."

In the months since, a string of prominent sports writers has stopped penning the name. A group led by a former Federal Communications Commission chairman announced an

effort to persuade broadcasters to stop saying the name on the airwaves. And a decision is expected soon in a lawsuit aimed at revoking the federal trademark protection of the team's name.

Kevin Gover, who heads the American Indian museum and whose son is a plaintiff in the trademark case, said the Oneida Nation has long been a powerful force in the American Indian community and that the tribe's involvement in the name-change issue has only elevated the conversation. He said he has little doubt that NFL officials, even if none attended the symposium, were listening to what was said.

"Like all major industries, the NFL is very interested in its public image," Gover said, "and when there is a challenge to that public image, the NFL is inclined to respond."

During Monday's event, Gover—who wrote a letter to *The Washington Post* about the offensiveness of the name when he was a high school senior in 1973—spoke about how as a child he was called "redskin" and doesn't understand why, unlike other racial slurs, the word has not become off limits.

Michael Friedman, a clinical psychologist who has researched the effects of stigma and discrimination, said the word amounts to harassment and causes mental and physical harm to a population that already faces higher rates of depression, alcoholism, suicide, diabetes and infant mortality.

"This is a public health issue," he said. "This is not a political correctness issue."

Also on the panel were two students from Cooperstown High School and the school board's president, who earlier this year were behind the decision to change the school's team from the Redskins to the Hawkeyes. The Oneida Nation later paid for the school's new uniforms.

The tribe, which has about 1,000 members, has prospered in the casino and resort business and has pledged \$10 million over 10 years to the American Indian museum.

The tribe also sponsors the Buffalo Bills and has a "vested interest in the league being a unifying force," Halbritter said.

"As an Indian nation that values the idea of mutual respect, we only have one simple objective in all of this," Halbritter said. "We no longer want to be treated as targets of racial slurs. We don't want our children to be treated as targets of racial slurs. We want to be treated as what we are: Americans."

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARVIN COGHILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to pay tribute to my friend Marvin Coghill, a great North Carolinian who passed away on August 18. Marvin was an international leader in the tobacco industry, but much more than this, he loved the Old North State, and his many acts of kindness and generosity exemplify the good and humble man that he was.

Marvin was born and raised in a farming community in Vance County. Always the diplomat, Marvin studied at NC State University for a year, then went up the road to rival UNC-Chapel Hill. His college days were cut short in 1952, though, when he joined the U.S.

Navy and honorably served our country in the Korean war.

The end of Marvin's military service marked the beginning of his career with Standard Commercial Tobacco Company in London in 1957. He traveled thousands of miles from eastern North Carolina on behalf of Standard Commercial, eventually settling in Thailand in 1963, where he married his first wife, Tomoe.

Rising through the ranks, Marvin was named president and CEO of Standard Commercial in 1980. A year later, his adventure came full circle when he returned to North Carolina. For the rest of his life, he called Wilson his home. A man of great talents, he continued to lead Standard Commercial until his retirement in 2000.

In his later years, Marvin would be honored with countless local awards and recognitions, and many organizations, including Wilson Medical Center Foundation, the Salvation Army Boys and Girls Club, and the Tobacco Farm Life Museum benefited from Marvin's generosity.

Marvin also became deeply involved as a cofounder of Wilson Youth United, an organization dedicated to improving the prospects of at-risk youths.

But that was just like Marvin. He had personally helped pay for many young folks to attend college, and after retirement, he redirected his considerable talents towards improving his community.

It was also in retirement that he married fellow Henderson native, Anne Coghill.

One of Marvin's great contributions to the world was his love of people. With his impeccable manners and gift of storytelling, any conversation with Marvin was a real delight. He saw what men and women were capable of, and throughout his life, he always brought out the best in people. Always outwardly focused, Marvin looked for ways to enrich the lives of people around him.

Through the years, you'd often find Marvin enjoying breakfast at the Country Restaurant in Wilson. He was very modest, and you would never expect, when you first met him, that you were talking to one of the true titans of the tobacco industry worldwide.

But you were always touched by his big heart and bigger personality, and each and every one of us is a better person for having met and known my friend Marvin Coghill. He will be greatly missed by me and many others throughout the world.

END THE TRAVESTY AND DO WHAT'S RIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to start this morning with some-

thing that we, as Democrats and Republicans, can immediately address.

Coming from a State that has sent probably one of the largest percentages of men and women to our faraway shores as members of the United States military and, in particular, Afghanistan, I stand here today to reach out to the Pentagon and to others to be able to embrace the five families that are now facing the most devastating news: that their loved one was lost in Afghanistan in a war over the weekend.

Yes, as we bring our troops home, as I've advocated for a very, very long time, as well in Iraq, our soldiers are still dying in a place of war.

I want immediately for the \$100,000 death benefit and the flight to Dover to be given to these families. I'm reaching out to the Pentagon, writing a letter, and asking that this be immediately resolved.

Last week, we passed legislation to indicate that the United States military would continue to be paid. I, as a lawyer, not in military law, could make the argument and make it today on the floor of the House that that gives authority to provide those death benefits and, as well, the transportation cost to Dover Air Force Base.

If we can do anything, if we cannot do much, we certainly can come together around the brave men and women in the United States military.

This shutdown is shameful. It is indicative of the worst of not appreciating the institution of this place and the priority of the American people.

But I know that there is a great love and affection and recognition that, but for those who leave this place, the United States of America, willingly, to sacrifice their lives on behalf of the great freedom that this country promotes, the constitutional government that this country supports, and is valued through the Constitution—there is no way that I will continue to stand here on this floor in the midst of a shutdown and allow this travesty to occur.

So I am asking that we immediately respond to these individuals and these families, and we let them know that God loves them and so does this Nation, which appreciates and is grateful for the sacrifices of their loved ones.

It is a grateful Nation, and we will not stand for this outrage that impacts these innocent families who now, not only are mourning the tragedy of the loss of a young life, but also the devastation of a response.

I don't know why we continue in this shutdown that is, frankly, a situation that is, in essence, not following the parliamentary procedures.

□ 1100

We know that the process of budgeting is a separate process from opening the doors of the government, and I just cited the tragedy that I want to

have a solution to. But as I say that, I want us to have a solution to turning the tide on opening the government.

We know that there are enough Republicans and Democrats who would vote for a clean bill to open this House right now. I say this because it pains me to hear of the tragedy that I just spoke of, which I look to be resolved within hours, and I say that broadly to the military families around America and around the world.

But in addition to solving that crisis, we need to be able to open the government for veterans. In the next couple of days, they will see those veterans centers shut down. Those are the centers where veterans go for employment and benefit issues they have.

A couple of weeks ago, I stood before the DeGeorge Hotel in Houston, Texas, which is now a veterans center and a home for homeless veterans. I was there with people who said, My life has not been the best. I served my country, but this is my home now. I don't want to move. I want to get on my feet and live in the DeGeorge Hotel.

These are men and women who were willing to put on the Nation's uniform and offer themselves in Vietnam and many places around the world and now have come to a point where they're homeless and being served by veterans resources, and now we're telling them that they cannot have the services that they need.

In a couple of days, the Federal courts are looking at possibly shutting down Federal courts.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to hear from one of our Republican friends saying, This is exactly what I wanted; I'm excited the government is shut down.

Think of our military and our veterans. Let's come together to make a difference in this world.

COME TO THE BARGAINING TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, why are we here today in the middle of the government shutdown? The answer, frankly, is that the Senate refuses to come to the table to negotiate.

The House has passed four different measures that would have kept the government open. The Senate has ignored them all.

Before the government shut down, the House passed a bill which would keep the government open and defund the President's health care law. Well, it is probable that the Senate wasn't going to support that, but I was thinking at least we would be able to get documentation as to whether there would be some Democrat support for that.

That having failed, we passed a second measure to keep the government open and simply delay the President's

health care law by 1 year. After all, the President himself had delayed portions of the law.

Obviously, that didn't play with the Senate.

So then we passed another piece of legislation which would have funded the government and would have funded the President's health care law, but simply would have made the law fairer for all Americans.

The President changed the law by executive order—a procedure of questionable legality—but he changed the law, giving large employers a 1-year delay in the employer mandate. In other words, employers were required to offer insurance or face a fine. The President, by executive order, changed the law to delay that for 1 year. We asked simply to give the individual the same prerogative that the President gave large employers: delay the requirement to buy insurance for 1 year without having to pay a fine.

We also asked that Congress, the President, and the Vice President be treated the same as all other Americans. The President changed the law by executive order—a procedure of questionable legality—saying that Congress would get a different deal in the exchanges than the average individual. When I went home to my district in August and did 12 town hall meetings, there was universal disgust for that rule.

So in our proposal to the Senate, we said, We'll fund the government, but simply change the rule concerning Congress so that Congress is treated the same as every American. Let's change the law so that the individual is treated the same as a large employer. I don't see how that's holding a gun to anyone's head. That is simply fairness for the American people.

And that was rejected by the Senate.

Then we simply asked the Senate to come to the table. Well, if this proposal, which just makes the law equitable for every American, is unacceptable to you, would you please come to the table and let's talk about what is acceptable to you. Let's sit down and negotiate.

Mr. Reagan presided over his terms in office with a Democrat-controlled House, and yet he worked with Mr. O'Neill and got significant legislation done. Mr. Clinton worked with a Republican House and got significant legislation done and made real progress with welfare reform and many other issues in the Clinton Presidency, but they worked across the aisle. They worked with a House of different parties and got things done.

Now we have a President who says, I'm not going to negotiate. We have a leader in the Senate who says, I'm not going to negotiate.

Each part of our government has a role to play—the executive, the Senate, the House. Frankly, in the whole his-

tory of the Republic, we've never had a situation where the President says, I'm not going to negotiate, or where one House says to the other House, We're not going to negotiate. This is, frankly, unbelievable. It's a step in our government which I don't think the American people want.

This is not about the President's health care law. This is about the function of our government and how each section of the government deals with each other. I think the American people want it to go in the traditional fashion, where the House, the Senate and the President work together to find a solution.

When the Senate refuses to pass legislation and won't even consider talking to us, that's not right. We in the House have passed legislation to fund FEMA, to fund our national parks, to fund WIC, to fund our veterans, to fund the National Institutes of Health, the FDA, and the National Guard. By the end of tomorrow, we'll have funded more than half the government in this House, and yet the Senate won't take any of that up and won't even negotiate with us. We even made sure that furloughed employees will be paid.

The Obama administration has given exceptions to their allies, Big Business, and some unions. Why shouldn't the American people be given the same kind of treatment?

The administration and the Senate should come to the bargaining table today and end this shutdown.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it is now day 8 of House Republicans' reckless, irresponsible government shutdown. In that time, America has been demanding to hear one reasonable, responsible proposal from House Republicans about how they plan to reopen the U.S. Government.

While House Republicans refuse to capitulate, New Mexicans are still hurting. They're hurting because one radical faction of one party in the House stands in the way, holding the entire Congress and the entire country hostage.

First, this band of radicals forced a government shutdown just to get its way. They have caused significant economic harm and are wasting hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars every day. These are the same Republicans who promised fiscal responsibility.

Now they're dangerously close to forcing an economic shutdown by threatening a catastrophic debt default if they don't get what they want. The problem? They don't even know what they want. As my Republican colleague from Indiana said last week:

We have to get something out of this, and I don't know what that even is.

As Speaker BOEHNER admitted the other day, he committed to Senate leadership that he would support the very same bill—a clean continuing resolution—for which he now refuses a vote on the floor.

On Sunday, I was back in Albuquerque, meeting with Federal employees who have been furloughed. I heard heartbreaking stories of families who say that because of the shutdown, they're worried about paying their mortgages and utility payments and car loans and credit card bills. That's what they're concerned about. That's what keeps them up at night.

I heard from a civilian air traffic controller at Kirtland Air Force Base who was worried about the safety of the airmen because he's not allowed to work. Federal employees are demoralized and feel abandoned. They don't understand why they are being blamed for House Republicans' failure to pass a clean funding compromise.

But in a 2½-hour meeting, not one of the furloughed New Mexicans told me he wants to see the Affordable Care Act repealed. Not one. I think that shows how far removed from reality House Republicans are. They're willing to continue harming hardworking, innocent Americans because of their obsession with destroying the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is reckless behavior.

As this shutdown carries on into week 2, we keep learning of more negative impacts. Sandia National Labs, one of the largest employers in my district, has started notifying its more than 10,000 employees that they are likely to experience furloughs if the government doesn't reopen soon. That will have an absolutely devastating ripple effect on our local economy that we may never recover from.

Instead of voting to end the shutdown, House Republicans have wasted time with false and misleading attempts to reopen the government bit by bit. After all, they didn't shut down the government piece by piece, so we shouldn't open it that way either.

The one bill that House Republican leadership should be bringing to the House floor today is the Senate-passed, clean funding compromise, which would go directly to the President and immediately open up the entire government for all New Mexicans and Americans.

We know that there are enough votes right now to pass a clean funding compromise. So why won't the Republican leadership allow a vote on it?

I understand that some of my Republican colleagues say part of the reason they got elected was because they pledged to dismantle the Affordable Care Act. We were all sent here to represent our constituents. I know that.

I'm here to represent constituents who are being hammered by the sequester. I've said many times in this Chamber that we need to immediately replace the sequester with a balanced approach to deficit reduction, but I'm not prepared to keep the government shut down because of it, inflicting further harm on people, not only in my district, but around the country.

In spite of the damaging effect the sequestration continues to have on my State, I am prepared to vote right now for a temporary compromise bill that funds the government at sequester levels. I am prepared to vote for it as is virtually every Democrat in the House. The Senate has already passed it. The President says he'll sign it immediately.

We want to get rid of the sequester, but we're willing to vote for a compromised funding bill at sequester levels, and I'll tell you why—because, at this time, it's a reasonable path forward.

So to my Republican friends who don't like the Affordable Care Act, here's a proposal for you: let's reopen the government now with a clean funding bill. Let's put all the furloughed Federal employees back to work. Then we can work together to determine what parts of the Affordable Care Act work well and which parts need to be addressed. After a reasonable amount of time, we can make the necessary adjustments to the law.

That's how you effectively represent your constituents who still have serious concerns about the Affordable Care Act. That's a reasonable path forward.

Mr. Speaker, let's reopen government right now. Then let's work together on a long-term solution that addresses the serious and significant fiscal issues facing our Nation today.

TIME TO SHOW LEADERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, Irish leader Henry Boyle once said:

The most important trip you can make in life is meeting people halfway.

Unfortunately, in this debate, the President and HARRY REID's latest offers are way short of halfway. They won't even come to the negotiating table.

During this shutdown, the Republicans in the House have passed nine bills to fund and reopen vital functions of government. Let me go through some of them for you:

Twenty-five of my Democratic colleagues voted with House Republicans to fund pediatric cancer research. Twenty-three of my Democrats colleagues voted with Republicans to reopen national parks, memorials, and monuments;

□ 1115

Thirty-five of my Democratic colleagues voted with Republicans, honoring our promise to give veterans the benefits they have earned;

Thirty-six of my Democratic colleagues voted with Republicans to pay our National Guard and Army Reserve personnel;

Twenty-three of my Democratic colleagues voted with Republicans to make sure funds are available to provide disaster relief; and

One hundred eighty-nine of my Democratic colleagues voted with House Republicans to provide backpay for furloughed Federal employees.

Each of these are reasonable proposals, yet HARRY REID insists that virtually all of them will not be considered in the Senate, and the President has threatened a veto.

Let me repeat. House Republicans have passed bills to fund pediatric cancer research, reopen national parks, provide benefits to veterans, pay salaries for our National Guard, fund disaster relief programs and other vital services. Dozens of my Democratic colleagues have voted for each of these bills, yet the President and HARRY REID won't budge.

The American people are disappointed in this shutdown—after all, this is not the way government is supposed to work—but the American people are also figuring this out. This shutdown can end if HARRY REID and President Obama meet House Republicans at the negotiating table—but their chairs sit empty.

The American people don't want the President's health care law, but they are ready for this shutdown to end. It's time for both parties to listen to the American people, work out our differences, and find a commonsense way forward.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday, while referencing how long the government shutdown lasts, a senior Obama administration official told *The Wall Street Journal*:

It really doesn't matter how long the government shutdown lasts because we are winning.

But, Mr. Speaker, as you know and I know, this government shutdown isn't a game. There are no winners when Washington fails the most basic test of governing. That is why this body passed four bipartisan proposals to keep the government open while shielding Americans from the disastrous effects of President Obama's health care law.

Once a shutdown was triggered by Senate Democrats, we worked to minimize its harmful effects with the passage of bills to reopen our national

parks and museums, to restore critical funding for children's cancer research, fund the Veterans Administration, and to continue providing nutritional assistance through the Women, Infants, and Children program, among other measures. Now we're waiting on President Obama and the Senate Democrats to do their part.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents can't wait too much longer. Across my district, Tennesseans are feeling the very real impact of President Obama and the Senate Democrats' continued refusal to negotiate.

Larry, in Jamestown, is a park concessionaire at Big South Fork Recreation Area. Fall is his busiest season. He estimates that he lost \$7,500 on an engagement he had planned for 11 months—canceled because of the government shutdown.

Following the Veterans Administration's warning that they could run out of funding as early as late October, Charles in Crossville emailed my office pleading for help: "I am a disabled veteran who depends on my compensation check to have some quality of life," he wrote. "This is unacceptable."

Bobby, in Fentress County, is a craftsman, who was supposed to have his work displayed in the Smithsonian American Art Gallery last Thursday—a proud moment stolen from him because of an unnecessary gridlock here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, our Senate colleagues have the power to end this arbitrary and unnecessary pain today by taking up the House-passed measures to reopen our parks and museums, to restore veterans' benefits and fund other important functions of government. What we need now is for them to act.

Our constituents expect us to listen to them, to work out our differences, and to find a commonsense way forward. Why can't we at least give them that? HARRY REID and President Obama need to listen to the people of this country and come to the table and negotiate. Let's get our work done.

SHUTDOWN DUE TO LACK OF LEADERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, why are we here?

We are here because of a failure of leadership. The fact is the President of the United States has failed to negotiate. The fact is the Majority Leader of the Senate, the head of the Senate, has failed and refuses to negotiate.

It's interesting how time changes one's perspective. Let me quote Barack Obama before he became President. These are the words of Barack Obama. He said:

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership

means "the buck stops here." Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

Barack Obama said it very well before he became President. Now he needs to serve and act as President and provide the leadership.

The fact is October 1 is the beginning of the financial year, and we should responsibly fund the government. The fact is, in just a few more days, we will reach \$17 trillion in indebtedness—nearly half of that incurred since Barack Obama has become President. Think about that. They're going to come and ask for another \$1.9 trillion to keep us going for 1 more year. That means in 6 years we will double the debt that's racking up the greatest debt in the history of mankind for any government.

Republicans might like to think that we won the House of Representatives back in 2010 and '95, but it was the same issues: spending, taxes, and health care. Remember HillaryCare and the taxes and other things imposed by President Clinton. The difference is President Clinton negotiated with us. We balanced the budget within 2 years. We can do that if good people of good faith will come together and negotiate, but we can't negotiate by ourselves.

The Constitution empowered the House of Representatives to be in charge of and responsible for levying taxes—because we're closest to the people—and spending. We have that responsibility. They sent us here. They elected us, rejecting the spending that went on. They saw what went on—\$1 trillion more than you took in, spending, the first year of this Presidency, and \$1 trillion since. So we must act responsibly, but we must have leadership starting from the White House, starting from the Senate.

Republicans in the House are ready to negotiate. We were here when the Senate didn't show up on Sunday. They didn't show up to work the day before the 1st of October to fund this current year. We must be here to meet, responsibly, our debt. We can't put that debt, as the President has said before he was President, on the backs of our children and grandchildren; but we can't do that without the system working. We need leadership—leadership from the President to negotiate, leadership from the Senate to negotiate.

Our leadership has said they will negotiate. We've been here—we'll stay here—but we need to responsibly fund all the activities of government even if it's piece by piece, as we have responsibly done, and sent them over to the other body, and they sit there.

But again, I urge all of the leaders to come together, and my colleagues, particularly the Senate and the President of the United States. We can do responsibly what we need to do, as designated

by the Constitution of the United States, and provide that leadership.

MILITARY FAMILY BENEFITS DURING SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with this body and the American people a great injustice. A few moments ago, one of my colleagues from Texas, from across the aisle, spoke of this as well. So as you can see, there are many times that we all can come together and agree upon certain items and move the American people forward in a better way; however, this particular situation is unthinkable.

A great injustice is being done to our servicemembers and their families. We learned last night that five brave American servicemembers were killed over the weekend in Afghanistan while selflessly protecting our country. Normally, Mr. Speaker, the loved ones of these fallen warriors receive assistance in the form of benefits to help them make those final arrangements for burial and other necessary preparations. Yet, as a direct result of the political gridlock here in Washington and despite legislation passed in this House last week with great bipartisan support, servicemembers and their families are no longer receiving their benefits.

Mr. Speaker, despite the government shutdown, our servicemembers are still expected to go to war, knowing full well that they may pay the ultimate sacrifice for this great Nation, and we should be expected to keep our promises to their family members. I am working, as we speak, to right this wrong, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress to help people, not to hurt people, and this shutdown is hurting innocent Americans.

This past Sunday, I flew back home because Congress was not in session. We were not voting on Sunday, so I took a flight home to California to meet with my constituents in my congressional district.

I held a town hall. I held it at Dublin City Hall. Dublin City Hall is where I served as a city council member. Dublin is also home to many Federal employers. In my congressional district, we have 4,000 Federal employees, plus a number of government contractors who work at Lawrence Livermore and

Sandia National Laboratories. I also held it there because, for 2 years as a city council member, I worked in that chamber day in and day out to make sure that we provided a balanced budget. We provided a 2-year budget.

It is so frustrating for me here in the Congress that we provide budgets that are only 45 or 60 days at a time, and across America our city councils are thinking big and thinking forward and balancing their budgets while taking measured investments in the future.

So we gathered the community of California's 15th Congressional District at Dublin City Hall, and we had over 150 people attend. The room was filled with fear and anxiety. Federal workers were in the room, worried about what this was going to mean for the personal incomes, for their families, for their household bills. Even though Federal workers in my district have been furloughed, their bills have not been furloughed. The home lenders are still calling, asking where the mortgages are. Their auto loans are still going to be due. Their credit card statements will still arrive. If they have kids in college, they're still going to have to pay tuition.

The Federal employees told me about the stress that they're living under either by not being able to work or, even worse, by being told that they have to work, but they're not going to receive their paychecks right now. In fact, we were reminded in this very Chamber just last week how stressful that can be, when the Capitol Hill Police, who stand guard here at democracy's door, who protect the people's House, rushed to aid the Members of Congress and the employees who work in this building as an erratic driver drove into a barricaded area just outside the Capitol grounds. Those Capitol Hill police are working to protect us, but they're doing so without pay.

So I heard stories just like that in my congressional district from the employees in our district, who are very scared about what's going to happen next. We learned that this is affecting people who work not just inside government, but also outside government.

□ 1130

Inside government, we have employees at Camp Parks Reserve Forces Training Area, the NASA facility in Dublin. We also have a women's Federal prison.

Outside government, we have government contract employees—about 6,500 of them—at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and about 1,500 of them at Sandia National Laboratories.

They told us, if the government shutdown continues, they may be furloughed within the next 10 days.

Most strikingly, the Republicans who attended expressed their concern, as we have heard in this Chamber, about the Affordable Care Act. I understand that,

but not a single Republican who attended told me or told our other constituents that they believe their concerns over the Affordable Care Act were worth prolonging this government shutdown.

There are also concerns about, well, why don't we just get some of the government up and running like some of the bills that we passed last week but that the Senate won't take up? I told my constituents I will not support any bill that pits any constituency against each other. We saw bills that pitted veterans against seniors, sick children against the poor. It is time to get the government up and running for everybody. Veterans who attended our town hall agreed. They served this country to make sure that the government works for everybody, not just for the veterans who served it.

I am inspired by, and I told my constituents that I have hope in, a freshman group that continues to gather a couple times each week and that was here during the shutdown crisis, called the United Solutions Caucus. It has about 15 Members on the Republican side and 15 on the Democratic side. They are freshman Members of Congress who are meeting and talking about what we can do to work together.

Finally, to my colleagues across the aisle, I ask you this respectfully: Did you come to Congress to help people or did you come to Congress to hurt people? If you came here to help, just like I did, then I think you know what to do next. Turn on the lights of the government that runs the greatest democracy in the world, and let's get America working again.

IT IS TIME TO PUT THE INTERESTS OF AMERICANS FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA of California. Day No. 8, Mr. Speaker.

Today is day No. 8 of a government shutdown. Enough of the gamesmanship. Enough with the name-calling. Enough with the blame game. It is time we opened up the government.

Real Americans are getting hurt, like Brian from Carmichael. Brian has been out of work for 2 years. He recently got a job offer that requires him to get a class B driver's license. Well, he went to the DMV. He was told he needed a Social Security card, which he lost a couple years ago. He went to the Social Security office to get a card. Do you know what he was told: the office is closed. They have been furloughed.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to open up the government. Real Americans like Brian are getting hurt. Let's get Brian his job, and let's open up the government.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 33 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Lord, You know there are many Americans who look to the people's House as uncertainty about the future of the economy and their livelihoods hang in the balance.

Bless the Members of the people's House with the understanding that it is their work to develop the strategies and the plans to assuage the fears of their fellow countrymen and -women.

We again ask You to impel those who possess power here in the Capitol to be mindful of those whom they represent who possess little or no power and whose lives are made all the more difficult by a failure to work out serious differences.

May all that is done today be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) come

forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it has been 1 week since the government shutdown. For 1 week, the President and Senate Democrats have refused to negotiate to reopen the government's doors.

House Republicans know the hardships American families are facing due to Washington Democrats' failure to negotiate. We have worked over the past week, passing bills to have the government functioning.

House Republicans have voted to fund pediatric cancer research, reopen national parks, memorials and monuments, give veterans the benefits they have earned and deserve. On Saturday, House Republicans voted to pay 800,000 furloughed employees who are at risk of losing a paycheck due to the President's government shutdown.

With the debt ceiling limit looming, the American people are waiting for the President and Senate Democrats to negotiate a solution for fiscal responsibility.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today we find our Nation in the midst of a government shutdown and in the shadows of a debt default.

A week into the shutdown, the partisan gridlock in Congress is as bad as ever; but across the country, millions of Americans are finding new hope in the affordable health coverage on the online exchanges.

Despite the more than 40 Republican attempts to repeal, defund, or derail this law, the Affordable Care Act is finally fulfilling the promise of dependable, affordable health coverage for millions of our fellow Americans.

On opening day, the exchanges were inundated with millions of users—Americans excited to learn more about

their new coverage options. It was a little bumpy, as expected, but no fleeting Web page glitches can distract us from the fact that for the first time millions of uninsured Americans who have lived in dread that an illness or an accident could plunge them into financial ruin will finally have access to good coverage that they can afford.

Today is a dark day here in D.C., but for the thousands of people I represent, a long night is ending. And that's worth celebrating.

ANGELS IN ADOPTION

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 2013 Angels in Adoption, Jessie and Kayci Prince, from my hometown, Plano, Texas.

As children, both Jessie and Kayci were touched by adoption. Having experienced the powerful impact adoption has on families, they decided to adopt one of their own. In 2012, Ezekiel—Zeke for short—from the Democratic Republic of Congo, became part of the Prince family.

As the Princes helped Zeke learn how to read, they quickly learned how challenging it was to find books that depict transracial families.

They decided as a family to write, illustrate, and publish "That's a Yummy Color," a children's book celebrating adoption. This book is now helping other families form special bonds with their own adopted children.

I am grateful for the compassionate families like the Princes.

Jessie and Kayci, you are truly an inspiration. God bless you.

OBAMACARE

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week the health insurance marketplace opened, giving millions access to quality health care. Since then, there has been too much focus on the small hiccups that are to be expected when any large program is implemented.

Yesterday, I received a letter from a North Carolina woman who lives over 600 miles from my home district in Illinois. Like many Illinoisans, she believes the positives of the Affordable Care Act are being overlooked. She said:

My family has already benefited from the Affordable Care Act as I have two children just finishing college. I am relieved I can keep them on my medical coverage at no cost. This saves them money and gives me peace of mind. The cost of our health care plan has decreased by \$400.

Like many, she wants to ask Congress: Is this why you shut down the

government, to keep me and my children from getting affordable health care?

Citizens are sick and tired of the misinformation being spread about the ACA. The ACA didn't cause the shutdown. The shutdown is a symptom of what really ails America—cynicism that allows a few to take hollow ideological stances at the expense of many.

Like me, she wants us to pass a clean CR and end this shutdown today.

MR. PRESIDENT: THIS IS OUR LAND

(Mr. SMITH of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, President Obama must stop playing politics with our National Park System. The parks belong to every American and should not be held hostage in President Obama's political game.

In the 1960s, the Federal Government established the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in south central Missouri under the guise of protecting the rivers and forests for all Missourians. Some 50 years later, President Obama is taking away our access. The riverways do not belong to President Obama. They belong to my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama is working to make his shutdown as painful as possible. The President has barricaded parks and monuments across the country, including the open-air World War II Memorial in Washington. It costs more money to barricade the monuments than it would to leave them open.

The national parks do not belong to President Obama. The parks belong to every American. It's time for President Obama to open our national parks. It's time for President Obama to stop playing politics with our parks.

MONEY AND POLITICS

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this government shutdown has clearly demonstrated our democracy is not working the way it was designed. Unfortunately, this is largely due to the oversized influence and obscene amount of money in politics which continue to fuel our distorted political process, and it could get worse.

Today, the Supreme Court is hearing arguments in the McCutcheon case, the second-coming of Citizens United. This case could open the door to even more money flooding our political process. Money and politics have paralyzed Washington and have paralyzed my Republican colleagues' will to compromise. They would be more apt to compromise if they were not absolutely

petrified of the Koch brothers spending millions of dollars to unseat them.

We cannot afford to have a system of government fueled by money that rewards confrontation and condemns compromise. If we don't fix this underlying problem, money and politics, we will continue to lurch from crisis to crisis, and the American people ultimately lose.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, back home, Hoosiers know that we only solve problems by sitting down and talking. Unfortunately, President Obama and Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID refuse to join Republicans in the constructive, respectful dialogue that Washington desperately needs. Eight days ago, Senate Democrats shut down the government by refusing four separate House-passed bills to fund the government.

It's clear that the American people don't want this shutdown, and it's exactly why the House has passed nine bipartisan, commonsense bills to fund and reopen parts of government that we all agree on.

Together, House Republicans and House Democrats have passed bills to ensure that the National Guard is paid, veterans' benefits are funded, and our national parks are reopened. Unfortunately, these common-ground solutions are gathering dust in the Senate as HARRY REID refuses to come to the table and talk.

The American people don't expect Republicans and Democrats to agree on everything, but they do expect us to talk. It's time for Senate Democrats to put aside their obstructionism and come to the table.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the truth is out. Republican leaders and their big donors have been planning this shutdown for over 2 years. Why? They claim it's because of ObamaCare, but it's now clear to everyone that it is plainly and simply about Obama.

He won re-election, and they still can't deal with it, so they're willing to hurt their own constituents and the entire country just to try to keep our President from doing the job he was overwhelmingly elected to do.

The American people should be outraged and demand that this shutdown end now and that Congress lift the debt ceiling, pay our bills, and protect the good faith and credit of our Nation.

The good news is that even some Republicans are sick and tired of these childish, destructive tactics. They, like us Democrats, want to put our Federal workers back to work, to make sure they and those depending on Social Security will be paid, that all veterans receive the services we owe them, that vulnerable women and children can get the care they need, and that our Nation will continue to remain strong.

So the American people must demand that Speaker BOEHNER bring the clean CR to the floor for a vote today. If he doesn't, then they must insist that their Representatives stand up for this country and our fellow Americans by stepping up and signing a discharge petition to end the madness.

□ 1215

NEGOTIATION

(Mr. KLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves 1 week into a government shutdown. That's something I hoped I would never have to say on the floor of this House. I did not want this; House Republicans did not want this; and the American people surely did not want this.

So why are we here? We're here because Democrats in the United States Senate and the President of the United States refuse to negotiate with the people's elected Representatives here in the House.

How long can their refusal to negotiate go on? All we are asking for is a conversation, Mr. Speaker. That's it. House Republicans want to sit down in good faith and work to get this government open again and to make sure that all Americans are treated fairly under the President's health care law.

My colleague from Indiana, just moments ago, pointed out that we pass bills in this House with overwhelming majorities—margins of over 100 votes, bipartisan votes—to keep important, essential services up and running. There are grounds for agreement. We just have to negotiate.

Leader REID, Mr. President, let's talk.

IMPACTING AMERICA'S YOUNGEST LEARNERS

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the government shutdown and its detrimental impact on Federal programs like Head Start and Impact Aid for school districts.

Instead of punishing our youngest learners through this government shut-

down, our Nation needs a responsible, forward-looking fiscal policy that repairs the damage done by sequestration and the government shutdown and that allows programs like Head Start to provide the highest quality early learning opportunities to our most vulnerable children. A piecemeal approach to funding Head Start is not a real solution to this government shutdown.

This GOP majority has slashed funding for education, including Impact Aid. Impact Aid school districts have been harder hit than any other school districts as they struggle to provide quality education for the children of active military and Native American students. Due to the GOP sequester, many of these school districts have been reduced to 4-day school weeks.

This is a reckless and irresponsible way to govern. Our Nation's children and families deserve more, not less.

AMERICA'S VETERANS AND THE SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to continue speaking out about the human consequences of this ridiculous government shutdown. We are now one full week into this shameful display of irresponsibility.

Yesterday, I spoke with a man in my district named Joe Burton, who lives in Monmouth, Illinois. He is a decorated war hero, serving 21 years in the military. As a retired Army sergeant, Joe received the Bronze Star for his brave service in the gulf war.

But after honorably serving our Nation for so long, Joe is now worried sick about how this reckless government shutdown is going to impact him and his family. This tough guy is literally frightened about the shutdown and how it is affecting his VA disability payments. If his benefits aren't there and don't arrive, he has no idea how he will pay his bills or even how he will pay for his next meal. More than anything, he just wants to know how veterans like him across the country are going to make ends meet if we don't get this solved.

Let's stop this nonsense now and do right by Joe and the others who have served our country.

NO WAY TO RUN THE GOVERNMENT

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here at a time we should be celebrating the many freedoms bestowed upon us, but I am here in the midst of some Republicans crippling us.

It is fatal for the Congress to overlook the urgency of the moment and to

underestimate the desires of the American people who want the doors of government open, ending the whirlwinds of piecemeal, cherry-picking funding.

Paraphrasing Martin Luther King: When the architects of our Republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir.

Instead, citizens are sitting at home, waiting for Congress to open the doors of government because bills are due, mortgage payments, rent, car loans, services are needed. So I request the Republican leadership to end this debate, because the American people are asking Congress to let them get back to work so they can cash their checks.

Mr. Speaker, this is no way to run the government.

ACCESS TO QUALITY CARE FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Instead of approving the Senate-passed funding bill, House Republicans have placed politics before people while important decisions on government funding and the debt ceiling await votes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with excitement to express my support for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which has already significantly improved health care for Americans. In my State of Texas, families have saved \$46.3 million in insurance company refunds. Medicare beneficiaries in the doughnut hole have saved \$420.7 million in prescription drugs. More than 40,000 Americans and 17 million American children with preexisting conditions gained insurance coverage through the Affordable Care Act. Because of the health insurance marketplaces, in my district, about 204,000 individuals will have access to quality, affordable health care coverage.

The Affordable Care Act will grow stronger and expand access to quality care for all Americans.

UNDERMINING CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, the last thing Congress needs is more special interest candidates who don't answer to the American people; and yet this morning, the Senate minority leader and his big money allies in the Republican Party once again asked the Supreme Court to give billionaires more influence on public policy through our elections. If this effort succeeds, individuals would be per-

mitted to give as much as \$3.5 million each to candidates and parties next year in addition to the already unlimited amounts they can spend independently.

It should go without saying that the number of people who are able to contribute on this scale is minuscule, but the ranks of those who would be affected by this deluge of money cannot be overstated. It is simply not possible to turn up the volume on the already amplified voices of a few wealthy donors without drowning out the millions of Americans already struggling to be heard.

The fact is we will never have a fair and balanced budget or a more equitable tax system while the well off and well connected are allowed to control Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the Republic the Framers intended. When they created Congress and when the people approved the 17th Amendment, appointing themselves the electors of the Senate, they wanted to ensure government was accountable to the people it serves. The more we undermine campaign finance laws, the further we get from that fundamental principle.

EVEN ONE MORE DAY IS TOO LONG

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, this shutdown has affected more than just the government. We all need to understand that.

Yesterday, I learned that a veteran-owned small business in my district that contracts with the Navy has had to furlough its workers; but because they are not Federal employees, they won't be receiving backpay when the government resumes full operations. The lost pay will have a terrible impact on these employees and their families, but their absence is also seriously affecting the financial well-being of the small business that employs them.

Let's think about this: How often is this happening throughout the country? And you begin to see how San Diego, alone, is losing \$7 million a week during the shutdown. How much longer are we going to play political games when everyone is guaranteed to lose?

For our communities, for our economy, and, most of all, for those who are out of work, even one more day is too long. Let's fund the whole government and end this shutdown.

"CRUZ CONTROL"

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the Republicans

have shut down the government. They have shut the whole thing down. Their 2-year-old plan to shut down the government over the Affordable Care Act is as harmful as it is fruitless.

However, all is not lost. The Republican shutdown can end today if the Speaker would simply disengage the "Cruz control" and hold a vote on a clean bill. This is day 8 of the government shutdown. With the debt ceiling vote looming, this is the time for action, not talk.

You can't negotiate with a Republican Party stuck on "Cruz control" on something so basic as a clean bill to reopen our government. Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues have determined that fealty to extreme Tea Party groups is more important than the needs of the people they represent.

It's time to end the stubborn, unreasonable, and mean-spirited obsession with killing the Affordable Care Act. The Republican shutdown can end today if only the Speaker would allow a vote.

FALLEN HEROES AND FAMILIES ASSISTANCE ACT

(Mr. BARBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, our Nation lost five brave servicemembers in Afghanistan. Shortly after they were killed, their families were notified that our government would not pay their survivor benefits due to the shutdown. This is disgraceful and an outrage.

These servicemembers gave their lives in defense of our country. When they stepped up to defend our Nation, we promised that they and their families would be cared for. Now, due to the shutdown, we have broken and abandoned that sacred commitment.

Today, I am introducing the Fallen Heroes and Families Assistance Act, which will ensure that the promises we made to our fallen servicemembers are fulfilled. I urge its immediate consideration by the House. We must honor our commitments to our fallen heroes and their families.

ECONOMIC HARM OF THE SHUTDOWN

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this Republican shutdown and their threats not to pay America's bills are not only reckless, but they're playing with economic fire. Their irresponsibility is burning the American people.

There are currently more than 800,000 Federal employees out of work, with thousands already filing for unemployment benefits because they've been furloughed by the GOP shutdown. These

are working men and women who have to pay their bills, their mortgages, their car loans.

The Republican shutdown is harming the whole economy. The Dow Jones Industrial Average went down another 136 points yesterday and has been down nearly 200 points during the course of this Republican shutdown. It is currently at its lowest levels in a month.

Global markets continue to slide due to the uncertainty that the Republican shutdown has caused. According to news reports, it has already cost us over \$2 billion because of the shutdown, and it is hurting U.S. trade because inspections of imports and applications for exports can't be cleared by agencies like the EPA due to the fact that the staff in charge has been furloughed.

Mr. Speaker, it is well over time to bring up a clean continuing resolution for a vote. End this needless Republican shutdown, which is not only hurting the American people, but the entire economy.

SBA GRINDS TO A HALT

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the economic disruption caused by the Republican-orchestrated shutdown continues to mount. The negative impact on the lives of the American people and the loss of jobs and opportunities continues to rise.

As one example, in my home district of New York, the shutdown is hitting some small business owners really hard because it brought to an absolute halt any work of the Small Business Administration. On average, the Small Business Administration approves over 9 million loans in my district alone for small businesses each month, but because of this shutdown, zero. Zero are being approved—small business loans, real estate or equipment loans, and this has a terrible ripple effect on our economy.

It was bad enough that the majority would not bring a single meaningful jobs bill, infrastructure or transportation bill to the floor for a vote to create jobs; but now, this reckless, long-planned action to bring the work of the government to a halt, it is actively killing jobs, killing opportunity, killing hope.

Let's bring a clean budget up for a vote today and put people over politics.

□ 1230

DAY 8 OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, day 8 of the shutdown of the Federal Government.

What do we know, Mr. Speaker?

We know, 1, you and your majority wanted the shutdown, so you win. You have no plan to end this shutdown—that's obvious—and it's no longer about ObamaCare.

But what we don't know is, who do you want to punish?

It must only be the people of this great Nation. You pass bills for show only. You know that the Senate and the President will not cherry-pick among the departments, yet you continue to pass these bills. Yet, you won't let the House vote on a clean CR to open government.

Mr. Speaker, you tell us when you've made the people of this country suffer enough. You tell us when you're satisfied with the level of anxiety and pain that you have caused. At that time, maybe you'll let us vote the clean CR and let the people see where we all stand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Members will remember to address their remarks to the Chair.

HEAD START CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 84) making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 84

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing all projects or activities under the Head Start Act (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the heading "Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families, Children and Families Services Programs".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each project or activity shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Head Start for Low-Income Children Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Head Start Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 84, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to present H.J. Res. 84, the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act. This bill provides Federal funding at the current, post-sequester rate for the Head Start program, which millions of children across the country rely on to fulfill their educational and health needs.

As we work our way out of this government shutdown mess, we shouldn't let some of our most vulnerable citizens—low-income children with no recourse—suffer. In my home State of Kentucky, 20,715 kids rely on Head Start to provide a helping hand. If we don't do anything about this today, 2,800 kids in Kentucky will lose access to Head Start programs starting November 1.

This bill provides funding for Head Start at an annual rate of \$7.586 billion. This funding will help reopen the doors to the more than 1,600 Head Start programs across the country. As before, the funding will last until December 15 or until we enact full-year appropriations.

This is another step the House is taking to alleviate the burden of this current fiscal dilemma and move us closer to ending the government shutdown.

The nine bills the House has passed since October 1 to reopen the government—this will be the 10th—constitute nearly one-third of the Federal Government's discretionary budget. These 10 bills fund very critical programs, cleanly, as the Senate has demanded, and have been supported on a bipartisan basis in this House.

So why are these bills still sitting on HARRY REID's desk?

Why is the Senate not making every stride it can to help our Nation's disadvantaged children, hungry families, and our veterans?

This method of funding the government is not my preferred way, Mr. Speaker, nor is it the standard, but while we work to find an end to the shutdown, we should fund those programs we can as soon as we can.

I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will take this opportunity to meet us at the negotiating table. We've got a great deal to work out, but this can't be done if we are not willing to talk and listen to each other.

It is the time-honored way, Mr. Speaker. When the two bodies disagree on something, each body passes a bill, and we send it to conference with the other body. That's what should be done here.

In fact, this body, several days ago now, appointed conferees on this topic and sent it over to the Senate, only to be met by a loud snore.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want us to get together and talk about ending this shutdown. Though I wish we were able to end the shutdown in its entirety, this bill will at least reopen one indispensable government program and lessen the toll that the shutdown is taking on the American people.

This Congress is facing a great deal of difficult choices in the near future, but taking care of our children should be a top priority. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to the reckless Republican shutdown. I wish my Republican colleagues had shown this same level of concern for Head Start earlier in the year when the majority proposed to slash the Labor-HHS spending bill by 22 percent. The majority did not have the courage of their convictions to stand behind their cuts and even release a copy of their bill.

Today's bill does nothing to help families afford child care or to invest in other pre-K services that are so important for children's development.

Even if House Republicans' piecemeal bills were enacted, at the rate they're going, it will take until after Christmas before the government is fully up and running. The Republican plan is completely irresponsible.

We could end the shutdown today if the Speaker allowed a vote. Democrats have negotiated, and we didn't just meet in the middle. We agreed to the Republican spending level in the stop-gap bill, but Republicans insist on repealing the Affordable Care Act, including allowing insurance companies to deny care to children.

Vote "no" on this bill. Demand the House vote to immediately end the reckless Republican shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), who is the chair of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly thank the chairman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I strongly support the Head Start program, and I am so hopeful that the House will pass this bill today and, certainly, that the United States Senate will take it up as well.

Head Start is a program that helps American children get the extra help that they need at an early age. I'll tell you, you can talk to any mother or grandmother. You don't need some scientific study to tell you that this program, an early intervention, is absolutely critical to making sure that every child can optimize their individual potential and to achieve their own opportunities.

During this shutdown, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about ObamaCare, but this bill has nothing to do with ObamaCare, absolutely zero to do with ObamaCare. This bill is about America's children, about Head Start. There are no strings attached. It just funds Head Start.

Now, I know that many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that they can't support any funding bill unless they get exactly what they want, which is an entire continuing resolution to finance the entire government. They want exactly what they want, otherwise they can't do this kind of a thing. And yet, it is interesting to note that they call Republicans "absolutists."

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, many others on the other side of the aisle will support this funding bill for Head Start, as they have supported these other funding bills that we have been passing since the beginning of the shutdown, in a bipartisan way.

President Obama and the Senate majority leader keep saying that they will not negotiate, but I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker that they will negotiate and that we can go to a conference committee, that we can work out our differences, that we can stop the shutdown, because to just keep saying, as the President keeps saying and the Senate Majority Leader keeps saying, that they will not negotiate on funding the government and they will not negotiate on raising the debt ceiling, I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is a proper way forward. Certainly, on issues like American children, we can put politics aside.

□ 1245

Mrs. LOWEY. Before I yield to my next speaker, I would like to make it clear that we negotiated a spending bill. We took the Republican number. Let us pass that spending bill. Speaker BOEHNER should bring it to the floor at your number and then raise the debt ceiling. Then there is plenty of time to negotiate on all the outstanding issues.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I join the National Head Start Association in opposing this bill.

At a time when our Nation's at-risk families are suffering on multiple levels due to sequestration and the Republican government shutdown, a piecemeal approach like this one is not in anyone's best interest. This disingenuous Republican effort would selectively fund some education programs while failing to provide funding for others that poor children and their families rely on.

The National School Lunch Program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Title I, after-school, special education, and rural education programs, among others, are all left out of

this bill. It's unconscionable that our Nation's most vulnerable children are being denied Head Start services because of Speaker BOEHNER's refusal to bring to the floor a clean bill to open the government.

Let's stop this charade of pitting seniors against children, veterans against families, one group of Americans against another. Let's open the government and serve all our countrymen.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. YODER. I thank the chairman from Kentucky for his work on this legislation to help provide funding for Head Start kids to have an opportunity to realize all the opportunities that life presents.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask us to work together and set aside our differences for the good of the American people.

We are divided. We have an ongoing dispute about whether Congress should receive special treatment and whether individuals should be given the same exemptions that businesses have been given under the Affordable Care Act. That is in dispute.

Why can't we go forward with legislation and policies and things that we all agree on? The Senate has a position and the House has a position, and we can go on and on with this debate about whether we should fund special treatment for Congress, businesses, and labor unions under ObamaCare; but there are unnecessary casualties to that debate.

Today, we have an opportunity to take Head Start off the table—a program that serves 1,146,468 kids nationwide; and 1,436 of these young students are in Kansas' Third District. These vulnerable students need our help. These are kids with little opportunity, disadvantaged by poverty and circumstances that put them behind from day one. Head Start for low-income children is a ray of hope, coming at a critical time when these young learners are developing their young minds.

Head Start works for students, Head Start works for families, and Head Start works for the American taxpayer. So why can't we come to an agreement as to the funding for this portion of government? We can't come to it for every portion—we get that—but we are in agreement that this shutdown is unnecessary and that we can fund Head Start today.

For some, this is a philosophical debate, but for the young learners at Head Start of Shawnee Mission, Kansas; Olathe, Kansas; or the Children's Campus in Kansas City, these are real lives and real futures at stake. They are counting on us. Surely we can take our partisan hats off for a moment and fund a bill to get each of these kids a chance to succeed.

Let's pass a clean bill that funds Head Start today. Let's put aside our differences. Let's find common ground. We have the power today to take Head Start kids out of this debate and ensure their funding.

Let's show the American people that today, on this issue, on these kids, there is no disagreement.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) control the remainder of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentlewoman from New York, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States of America has now been closed for a full week. People are out of work. Some are even going hungry. Our economy is poised on the brink of a disastrous default, and yet this Republican majority continues to play political games with the future of our country and the lives and health of American families.

The hostage being negotiated today is Head Start, one of the true American success stories. Unquestionably, it is the most effective early childhood development program ever developed, and I've heard so often from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about how unsuccessful the program is and what a terrible program it is and that we ought to cut it.

For almost 50 years now, Head Start has provided comprehensive childhood development, literacy, and family services to nearly 30 million preschoolers from low-income and working families. It now serves nearly 1 million children every year. It's an example of how dedicated teachers, with the help of a smart Federal investment, can enrich the lives of our citizens—the cornerstone of our efforts to close the achievement gap—combat poverty, and provide all kids with the opportunity to thrive.

It is another important Federal program that Republicans are claiming to support today in full defiance of their previous voting record. It is as if the majority expects that we have all forgotten the positions they have been promoting for years—up to this point. We have not forgotten.

I am the ranking member of the subcommittee that oversees Head Start funding, and I have had to continually fight tooth and nail to see this program adequately funded and to protect it from the deep cuts put forward by the majority.

In 2011, the very first bill the Republican majority passed tried to cut Head Start by over a billion dollars; and 218,000 kids would have been cut from the rolls, 16,000 classrooms closed, and

55,000 teachers, assistants, and staff would have lost their jobs.

That was the majority's opening offer, and they didn't blink an eye. Parent, teachers, and advocates stood up and said "no" to these cuts, and the majority had to back down.

Instead, what they're doing now would be automatic cuts, the across-the-board cuts known as sequestration, which was never meant to become law. They're using that to do their work for them. Because of those cuts, this majority has voted to make permanent that 57,000 students all across America have already lost access to Head Start. Even the children who are able to remain in Head Start can expect shortened school days, elimination of home visits, and teacher layoffs. In total, 78,000 children have lost access to this early learning since this House majority took office, and those sequester cuts will grow worse over time.

This is a self-inflicted government shutdown. Head Start centers are being forced to close. The longer the majority perpetuates this shutdown, the more kids are being denied an opportunity to learn.

I'm happy to see my colleagues on the other side of the aisle embrace the importance of early childhood education. President Obama has called for universal preschool, which would make a profound and positive difference for children and their families across the country; but this Republican majority turned its back on that proposal, walked away from it, and didn't even consider it.

Let's stop playing games with people's lives, their health, and our children's future. It is little wonder that, according to the latest polls, a full 70 percent of the country opposes this hostage-taking and wants us to get back to work.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe what I just heard. The gentlelady was describing the importance of the Head Start program in glowing terms, and yet she turns around and tells us she's going to vote against funding for the Head Start program. That's a puzzle to me.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all, we all know that we're 8 days into this Tea Party Republican government shutdown with \$2.4 billion in lost economic activity. This hostage-taking continues.

The Tea Party Republicans continue to want to deny millions of Americans health care. That's why this shutdown continues, and the public knows this.

Because of the devastating sequester, already more than 57,000 students have

lost their Head Start spots. At the same time, the Tea Party Republicans insisted on cutting food stamps by \$40 billion for these same children.

So you can't tell me that today they care about these kids when they fight to cut Head Start and every other program for young people in the Appropriations Committee.

The National Head Start Association doesn't buy this very sinister approach, which will not reopen the government. They know that there are enough votes to open the government up if Speaker BOEHNER brings the Senate budget bill to the floor.

Also, let me just say many Democrats did not want the funding level of the Senate budget bill, but compromised just to get the government open.

Let's shut down this shutdown.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the chairman of the full committee, the National Head Start Association has said—I'm commenting on this sham of a bill before the House today—that they are opposed to this effort because they realize that it is a charade. I think it's important to note that. They are certainly committed—and have been for years—in terms of early-learning education and education for our children, but they, too, understand what is happening here today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is now the second week of the Republican shutdown of our government—shut down because they want to put insurance companies back in charge of America's health care.

Republicans in the House think they can get out of this horrible mess they created by partially opening one part of the government or another. Today, it's Head Start—a program I strongly support and one that used to be supported on a bipartisan basis to provide education, health and nutrition services to at-risk children.

When Republicans voted to shut down the government, they closed the doors on thousands of these children and their families. After several bad news articles about the Republicans shutting down Head Start, they now want to partially open it.

Keep in mind, restoring funding to Head Start only serves a small percentage of at-risk children who need preschool and are eligible for it. It is not enough to restore one set of early-learning services for at-risk children but to not fund the Child Care and Development Block Grant, special edu-

cation services, and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, which provides early childhood services for children from low-income families as well.

If the Republicans are serious about supporting early childhood education, we should vote on the clean, Senate-passed budget to reopen the government so that services for those kids and their families can be fully restored.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. We should have that vote today.

It's time to stop the Republican shutdown. I call on the Speaker to let us vote. Let us vote. Let us vote on a bill to open the whole government.

As of today, enough Republicans have publicly stated that they're ready to join all of the Democrats to vote to open the government. Republicans should allow the House to vote on the Senate bill—a bill that was negotiated by the Speaker of the House, Mr. BOEHNER, and the leader of the Senate, Mr. REID, but was rejected by the Republican caucus.

Bring that bill to the floor. Let us vote, and let these children get these services.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, a quote from the National Head Start Association:

The proposed Head Start for Low-Income Children Act, while attempting to provide a funding extension for Head Start, does not put forward a true solution to the government shutdown.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

□ 1300

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the definition of "farce" is: a foolish show, mockery, a ridiculous sham.

Now, this Head Start funding bill and cry for providing a head start for our low-income children is indeed a false start at this 22 percent sequestration level. The politicians' mantra that education is the key does not pass the laugh test where our babies are locked out and out of luck—no LIHEAP, immunizations, disability education assistance. This is a key to what—a key to a government careening toward default? It is a government that has defaulted on the future of our children.

Let's shut down the shutdown.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to read a headline from Connecticut's Hartford Courant: "Head Start Memo: Nearly 1,000 Children Shut Out."

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

You will find no stronger supporter of the Head Start program than I. For years, I worked first as a teacher in Head Start, and later I was a supervisor for Parent Involvement and Volunteer Services.

I know Head Start. The experience was life changing—inspiring me to join the war on poverty and dedicate myself to improving the lives of low-income children and families. Thanks to Head Start, thousands of children have been put on a solid path to a well-rounded education.

Head Start teaches children to feel good about themselves, to have a positive self-image. Head Start introduced children to books and reading and to how to resolve conflicts. We gave full examination and discovered educational disabilities, and we gave them the path to good health services.

The opposite side of the aisle claims they support Head Start and early childhood education, but they supported sequestration that has robbed 57,000 children of the opportunity to be in the Head Start program.

This Republican destructive strategy—picking winners and losers, who will survive and who will not—is not the right way to go.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. WATERS. Put a clean CR on the floor so that we can vote for all of government to be protected. Don't pit children against veterans, et cetera.

I will not be bullied into supporting this measure. I urge my colleagues to stand with me. Despite my love for this program, I must vote against this measure.

I ask my colleagues to stand up to these Republican tricks and vote "no."

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am really puzzled. We hear speaker after speaker on the other side tell us how committed they are to these poor children in the Head Start program, and yet here's the chance, Mr. Speaker, to continue this program. Yes, it does not include the entire government, but are we going to hold hostage these kids from poor families who are desperate for this program. Are we going to hold them hostage, or are we going to go ahead and approve this short-term funding for the Head Start program?

If you believe in Head Start, it seems to me you would stand in the well and say: I support this bill because it continues the Head Start program.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just comment for a moment in that I think that it is not a question of holding these children hostage. You are holding the entire Nation hostage for an effort that is not

going to change, and that is: the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land.

Let's have a vote on this floor of the House of Representatives. We can reopen this government and not hold anyone hostage any longer.

If my memory serves me well, in 2011, the gentleman, whom I do have great respect for, voted for H.R. 1—and maybe it was his bill that he passed—which would have cut Head Start by over \$1 billion.

It is puzzling to me that all of a sudden my Republican colleagues have gotten religion on the Head Start program. It is so inconsistent with where this majority has been with regard to Head Start and so disingenuous and duplicitous that we know it is a political ploy.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Republican shutdown is a disaster for families across America and this great country, and we are not fooled by this political gimmick on the floor today. It is a gimmick; it is a gimmick; it is a gimmick.

The Republican position in this Congress, as demonstrated in their budget, has been to slash support for Head Start students. I know this; Head Start parents know this; Head Start teachers know this; and our communities back home know it all too well. In fact, in the House Budget Committee just this past March, Democrats offered an amendment to eliminate the severe Republican cuts to education and Head Start students and to stop the layoffs of teachers. Republicans scoffed, just like they are scoffing at their basic responsibility to negotiate and pass a budget and keep government working.

Mr. Speaker, when you shut down Head Start classrooms, did you know that the parents of these students may not be able to go to work or keep their jobs? That is not smart. Head Start keeps parents working or studying for their own degree so they can move out of poverty into the middle class.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the gentlewoman 10 seconds.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. So I urge Speaker BOEHNER to bring a clean bill to the floor that funds the U.S. Government, not these political gimmicks.

Enough of the gimmicks. We know we have 200 Democrats ready to support a clean CR and at least 20 or so Republicans. End these political gimmicks. Fund the government. End this calamity for American families.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I think the best way to resolve

this debate is to ask a simple factual question.

There are two approaches here. The majority approach wants to pass this piecemeal bill. We want—"we," meaning the entire Democratic Caucus and enough Republicans to pass it—we want to take up the Senate clean bill and vote on it now.

Which of these two approaches would provide the most help most quickly to the Head Start centers across the country? Which would really help the program?

If this bill passes, it will languish in the current political turmoil and go nowhere. If the Speaker puts on the floor the clean Senate continuing resolution, it will pass this afternoon, and the Head Start centers that are afflicted by this problem all over the country will open tomorrow morning.

If you care about helping the Head Start program, you will vote in favor of the Senate bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill because I actually think Head Start is an important program, and I've supported it. I've seen and I've gone to Head Starts throughout my district and have read to the kids who are there. The reforms that were done that made it more of an educational preschool type of atmosphere—that was done, gee, I don't know, probably about 7 or 8 years ago—I think actually helped improve Head Start, making sure that children are ready when they start regular K-12. So I support this.

This is important, and in this atmosphere where it is all or nothing and no negotiations—we're not going to talk to you—we are left doing these micro or minivan-type bills in which we take the most important, essential programs and say, you know, we agree with you that Head Start is a worthwhile program and that it's worth funding. So why don't we just work together and agree that we will fund Head Start at the budget level.

I heard comments earlier about some Republicans wanted to cut it, and yes, there are going to be some that do. So if you think that it's that cynical, call us on it. Vote for it. You want Head Start to continue, and you think we're being cynical with this? Call us on it. Vote for it.

Let's send a bipartisan measure over to the Senate, and force them to vote for it. What's the worst thing that's going to happen? Oh, Head Start gets funded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleague who just spoke, vote for it.

Let's take the bill that was passed in the Senate, bring it here. There are apparently enough votes to reopen this government. Vote for it.

Why be afraid of the process? That's what we do here—we vote. Bring the bill here. Let's open it up and take our chances. What are we afraid of? What are we afraid of? Are we afraid that, in fact, some Republicans will join all of the Democrats to pass a bill that reopens the Federal Government and protects these children, protects our veterans, protects our workers, protects everyone? There is just a fear and a loathing here which I truly do not understand.

With regard to Head Start and other early childhood education programs, we know what those economic dividends are. It's about productivity; it's about prosperity; but it's about the quality of their lives and their futures. That's what "Head Start" means.

Given the record of this majority and its past actions in cutting funding over and over and over again for Head Start, it just proves how disingenuous this gimmick is here today. They're playing to the crowd, but the crowd isn't listening. No one will forget what you have done.

In fact, Head Start graduates are less likely to need special education services, to be left back a grade, or to get into trouble with the law. They're more likely to go on to college and to have a professional career. It is a program, yes, that works wonders, which is why we've all been surprised and dismayed by our Republicans and their attempts to slash this funding in the past.

May I ask the gentleman if he has any additional speakers or if he is going to close?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I am dismayed, but we are all dismayed. We have fought these battles on Head Start in the committee. As to the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, who sits on the Labor-HHS Subcommittee, we fought over and over and over again in talking about how important this program is; and day after day after day after day, we have been told that the facts belie themselves, that this is not a successful program, that kids aren't learning. They have dug up studies from 20 years ago to tell us that this program doesn't work. All of a sudden, today, they think that there is merit in Head Start?

I hope this extends to what the President has asked for in universal early

childhood education. Do you know that the Labor-HHS Subcommittee never even saw a markup, nor did they ever mention, with their draft proposal, early childhood education? They dismissed the President's view of early childhood education and providing universal early education for kids; and now, today, they stand before this body and this Nation and say they support this effort.

Let me just tell you, this is more of the reason why the hostage-taking by the majority has to end. Every day, we waste time with these gimmicks mortgages our kids' futures and our future as a Nation. It's not responsible governing, and it's time for it to end.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

□ 1315

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard here today what we have heard in the last several days from the other side—that they will not vote for any of these individual bills because we are not bringing the entire continuing resolution before the House.

But let me point out: with this bill—the 10th in this series that we brought out in a so-called piecemeal fashion—it will take us to about a third of the CR, the original continuing resolution. So we are passing the continuing resolution one piece at a time, but nevertheless we are passing a continuing resolution.

To say that I am not going to vote for this bill because you don't have all of the bills before us doesn't have much logic to it. It means that every bill that comes before the House could be argued the same way: I won't vote for that bill because it doesn't fund whatever or enact whatever piece of legislation that is waiting in the wings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is about Head Start. It is not about health care; it is not about procedure; it is not about whether or not this is piecemeal or full, or what have you. It is about Head Start. If you believe in the Head Start program and the hundreds of thousands of young children in this country—and families—that are depending on this program, it seems to me you would lay everything else aside and vote for that program, which I am asking our Members to do as I close.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for Head Start and my opposition to this legislation, which locks in the automatic cuts to funding for this critical program.

A high-quality early education puts children on a path to succeed academically and in life. Decades of research and data show that investments in high-quality early education help close the achievement gap, increase high school graduation rates, and reduce the need for special education. These investments also

lower the rates of criminal activity and dependence on public assistance. In fact, one study found that for every dollar invested in high-quality early education, taxpayers saved \$7 in other costs.

When first entering school, a child's health, emotional well-being, and social surroundings are all factors in their ability to succeed academically. Head Start recognizes this and, in turn, merges literacy and math activities with access to vision screenings and other basic health care services.

Additionally, the program brings parents into the development process by providing them with support services in and out of the home, such as access to social workers, peer counseling, and parenting programs.

In my state of Pennsylvania, Head Start centers serve more than 37,000 children, but now, this unnecessary government shutdown threatens this important program. Already, Head Start programs in six states have been shuttered as a result of the federal government shutdown. This is unacceptable.

Instead of playing games, House Republicans should join Democrats in finding a solution to this shutdown. It is time pass a clean CR, reopen the government, and allow all children access to early education.

Our nation deserves better. Our children deserve better.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.J. Res 84, Head Start for Low-Income Children Act. Head Start represents an innovative idea from a Democratic led Congress that was created for the education of our smallest citizens who come from poor or low income households.

We know that if these children have an early start in education it levels the playing field of life and they can have an equal opportunity to succeed.

Families in my district who rely on Federal Government programs like Head Start are hurting. The pain did not start with the shutdown, but with sequestration which hit Head Start programs for 3 to 4 year olds in the Houston Area hard: \$5,341 million dollar cut, 109 employees cut, 699 slots for children cut.

On October 2, I joined hundreds of Head Start supporters from across the country and many of my colleagues to protest the closing of Head Start programs due to the Federal Government shutdown.

I picked up one of the tiny blue chairs that represented the thousands of Head Start children from around the nation and said that an empty Head Start chair represents a future doctor, engineer, president, or teacher who is at risk because of the Federal Government shutdown.

My support of Head Start and Early Head Start is based on what I have seen and heard about programs like the AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start program serving parents and children in the 18th Congressional District.

The AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start is a program serving low income families in my Houston Texas District.

I visited with AVANCE-Houston administrators earlier this month because I wanted to get an update on how low-income families with infants and toddlers and pregnant women served by the program were doing.

The AVANCE-Houston Early Head Start's mission is simple. AVANCE-Houston works for

healthy prenatal outcomes for pregnant women, enhance the development of very young children, and promote healthy family functioning.

AVANCE-Houston serves nearly 1,800 children city wide. Each of these families and their children are suffering the effect of the legislative malpractice of the House majority.

The sequestration has cost Head Start and Early Head Start: AVANCE-Houston lost \$842,518.

The impact to the AVANCE-Houston Head Start employees, teachers and administrators of the first wave of lost funds were: Furlough days, hiring freeze, extra workloads, morale level, outsourcing of custodial services.

In Houston, Head Start families and their children saw a reduction of days of operation; increase concerns about loss of services for their children and Hardy Center closure

AVANCE-Houston absorbed the sequestration reduction in federal funds by:

Reducing enrollment by 3.3% which ended access to the program for 72 children; Eliminating 11 Early Head Start and 9 Head Start Teachers and Support staff, and 12 custodial positions; and

AVANCE-Houston facing a Federal Government shutdown now must consider what it might mean to their future:

Possible loss of services for an already underserved population;

Increased costs of operation—Lease cost, building maintenance, medical insurance rates, unemployment, and worker's comp;

Maintenance of competitive salaries;

High staff turnover;

Limited dollars for new initiatives/curriculum.

I know many of my colleagues on the other side of aisle speak about reforming malpractice lawsuit rights of victims, but what the public is seeing in the legislative malpractice of my colleagues in the majority.

When there are no perceived consequences for bad behavior or harm caused to another there are no incentives to stop the bad behavior.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is legislative malpractice because it does not address the earlier cuts to Federal Government employees and programs caused by sequestration and makes worse an already bad financial situation for our government's most important assets—Federal workers.

The importance of Federal workers and the critical programs or services they administer like Head Start in our Congressional Districts cannot be understated.

The Houston Chronicle reported that due to sequestration it had already caused Head Start children and their parents pain.

This school year, a parent Marlen Rosas hoped her 3-year-old son, Hector, would be attending Head Start so that he might learn English.

Her modest hopes for her son were that he would eventually earn the high school diploma she never had the opportunity to earn.

But when Ms. Rosas went to enroll Hector—even though he met all the qualifications for the federal Head Start program—Hector was turned down.

Ms. Rosas said, "I'm sad because he wanted to go to school," Rosas said through an interpreter. "He only speaks Spanish, and that

would be one of the advantages: for him to socialize with those who speak English, while learning the names of colors and numbers—just to be learning.

A couple made a contribution of \$10 million to open Head Start Programs in 11 states for 7,000 kids from low-income families could continue to receive educational services. I commend this couple for their generosity of heart to assist some of the Head Start Children impacted by this cur majority led Federal Government shutdown.

The legislative malpractice of representing to the American public that the Federal Government is comprised of dismembered parts that can be funded without regard for what one part does or how one agency contributes to the work of other agencies.

It is like building a car with no regard for what a part does and how it would function when installed—because the purpose of car is transportation.

The purpose of the House of Representatives is to fund the Federal Government—what we are doing will not accomplish the outcome.

Those who control the House of Representatives is making a cruel tragedy out of the budget process by teasing Federal employees who watch while the House majority toy with their lives by passing one funding bill at a time.

Mr. Speaker, the majority should stop playing games with the American public and pass the clean funding bill from the Senate that would fund the entire Federal Government including all programs immediately.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 84, the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act.

Since its inception in 1965, Head Start has served over 30 million children and their families. The program's purpose has always been to serve children and pregnant women in centers, family homes, and in family child care homes in urban, suburban, and rural communities throughout our nation.

Last year, California Head Start received over \$900 million in federal funding and taught over 111,000 children. In California, there are almost 23,000 Head Start employees serving children and their families.

My rural, low-income district relies heavily on the Head Start Program. Without it, families across the Central Valley would be unable to ensure proper care and early education of their young children.

Just last week, two of my constituents flew across the country to appeal to me and my California colleagues on the devastating impacts of this drawn-out shutdown on the Head Start Program.

After passage, this bill would provide immediate funding for the nation's Head Start program at the same rate and under the same conditions as were in effect last year ensuring that Head Start programs across the country will be able to keep providing education, health, nutrition and additional services to our 1 million enrolled children and their families.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to H.J. Res. 84, the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act. While I appreciate the concern for the harmful effects of the shutdown on Head Start and am deeply troubled by the children

cut off from Head Start services, I am unable to support this funding bill. A far better approach to undoing the damage caused by this shutdown is to pass a clean continuing resolution, CR, that funds the entire government.

On the heels of devastating sequester cuts which caused more than 57,000 children to lose their Head Start slots—over 4,000 of whom live in Texas—this shutdown continues to harm even more of America's most vulnerable families. Already, thousands of children have been affected by Head Start program closures and reduced services due to a lack of federal support from this crisis and thousands more children are at risk of losing their seats in classrooms as the shutdown continues.

However, this piecemeal approach to funding Head Start fails to provide America's children with the same support as a fully operational government through a clean CR. The populations served by Head Start often rely on many other vital programs that provide critical assistance to students who are most in need, such as the National School Lunch Program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), special education programs, and Title I programs, none of which are included in this funding bill.

The implication of students losing vital classroom time, nutrition, and instruction is severe and only makes the mission of improving student achievement and closing achievement gaps that much more difficult.

I urge my colleagues to immediately pass a clean CR and reopen the full government so we can put an end to the current political stalemate and bring the focus back on undoing the harmful effects of the sequester.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, after months of refusing Democratic calls to negotiate a replacement to the sequester that slashed over \$400 million from the Head Start budget this year and eliminated slots for 50,000 children, I'm pleased to see some of my Republican colleagues acknowledging the importance of this early education program. However, to truly serve these kids and their families, we should pass a clean CR that will immediately send funding to those centers that did not receive their payments last week and then we should work together to replace the damaging sequester cuts.

A clean CR would reopen all programs for vulnerable children and their families. It would provide funding for the Community Action Agencies that represent one-third of all Head Start grantees. It would fund child care programs that help parents find affordable and safe places for their children when the Head Start day ends. And it would fund the Social Services Block Grant that helps fill gaps in services to help low-income families get back on their feet.

All of these vital programs are ignored in the resolution on the Floor today. I urge the Speaker to let the House vote on the Senate-passed CR and reopen the government now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mrs. CAPPS. Yes, I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 84 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlelady's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to speak on this topic.

I worked for decades in our Nation's public schools as a school nurse, and I saw firsthand in my community the tremendous effects that Head Start programs have for so many of our most vulnerable children.

No one is a stronger supporter of this program, but today is really not about the children of Head Start or their families. Today is about ending the childish behavior of those of the Republican leadership, who continue to stand in the way of reopening our government.

Let me be clear: we are here today because one faction of one party in one House of Congress has shut down the United States Government because they don't like one law—the Affordable Care Act. This is a law that was passed by this Congress; it was affirmed by the Supreme Court; and it was a focal point of the last election in which the candidate for president who supported the law won.

But none of this matters to our Republican colleagues. Instead, they have let their obsession with repealing the Affordable Care Act bring our entire Federal Government to a screeching halt.

Mr. Speaker, this piecemeal approach pushed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reopen certain parts of the government is merely a facade. It is a "gimmick," as my colleague referred to it, giving the illusion that they are trying to fix the problem, but they are not.

Instead, we find ourselves here picking and choosing and waiting for them to decide whose lucky day it is to be funded by the Republican leadership. This is not the way to run a great Nation.

Even if we reopen Head Start programs, what about the millions of other students that benefit from programs administered by the Department of Education? What about the families who cannot get their childcare vouchers? What about the job-training programs to help the unemployed parents get back on their feet? How long do they have to wait, Mr. Speaker, until we get around to funding their programs? When is their lucky day?

We cannot continue government funding by picking programs out of a hat. If the House leadership really wanted to fix the problem, they could do so today if they would just bring a clean continuing resolution to the House floor for a straight up or down vote.

At least 25 of our Republican colleagues have publicly supported a vote for a clean continuing resolution. That is enough votes to end the shutdown today—we know it, the Speaker knows it, and the American people know it—but we are still waiting.

Now, let me say it again: This government shutdown does not have to continue. We can end it right now.

My amendment today is the ninth time that Democrats have provided a solution to end the government shutdown. It is the only way to get a vote on the clean negotiated continuing resolution today.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take this opportunity to stop wasting time. We must reopen the government, and we must get back to our work, which is to rebuild our economy, to support our veterans, to pass a farm bill, and to address the many other challenges that this great Nation of ours faces. To do so, we need to stop playing these games.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues, including my many Republican colleagues who have called for a vote on a clean CR, to join me today and to end this charade. I urge a “yes” vote on this motion.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI which requires that an amendment be germane to the bill under consideration.

As the Chair recently ruled on October 2, 3, 4, and 7, 2013, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and, therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us fund only a portion of the Federal Government?

My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so that all of our education programs are there for all of our children and families. Can the Chair explain, please, why it is not germane to open all of the Nation's education programs?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Kentucky makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from California are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to Head Start. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair ruled on October 2, October 3, October 4, and October 7, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds on committee jurisdiction grounds.

Therefore, the instructions propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 191, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 529]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr

Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn

Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan

Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzer
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)

Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey

Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohy
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—191

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa

Hastings (FL)	Matheson	Sánchez, Linda	Carter	Jenkins	Rahall	Hanabusa	Maloney,	Sanchez, Loretta
Heck (WA)	Matsui	T.	Cassidy	Johnson (OH)	Reed	Hastings (FL)	Carolyn	Sarbanes
Himes	McCollum	Sánchez, Loretta	Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Reichert	Heck (WA)	Matsui	Schakowsky
Hinojosa	McDermott	Sarbanes	Chaffetz	Jones	Renacci	Himes	McCollum	Schiff
Holt	McGovern	Schakowsky	Coble	Jordan	Ribble	Hinojosa	McDermott	Schwartz
Horsford	McIntyre	Schiff	Coffman	Joyce	Rice (SC)	Holt	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Hoyer	McNerney	Schneider	Cole	Kelly (PA)	Rigell	Horsford	McNerney	Scott, David
Huffman	Meeks	Schrader	Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Roby	Hoyer	Meeks	Serrano
Israel	Meng	Schwartz	Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Roe (TN)	Huelskamp	Meng	Sewell (AL)
Jackson Lee	Michaud	Scott (VA)	Conaway	Kingston	Rogers (KY)	Huffman	Michaud	Shea-Porter
Jeffries	Miller, George	Scott, David	Cook	Kinzing (IL)	Rogers (MI)	Israel	Miller, George	Sherman
Johnson (GA)	Moore	Serrano	Cotton	Kline	Rohrabacher	Jackson Lee	Moore	Sires
Johnson, E. B.	Moran	Sewell (AL)	Cramer	Labrador	Rokita	Jeffries	Moran	Slaughter
Kaptur	Murphy (FL)	Shea-Porter	Crawford	LaMalfa	Rooney	Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Keating	Nadler	Sherman	Crenshaw	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen	Kaptur	Napolitano	Speier
Kelly (IL)	Napolitano	Sinema	Culberson	Lance	Roskam	Keating	Neal	Swalwell (CA)
Kennedy	Neal	Sires	Daines	Lankford	Ross	Kelly (IL)	Negrete McLeod	Takano
Kildee	Negrete McLeod	Slaughter	Davis, Rodney	Latham	Rothfus	Kennedy	Nolan	Thompson (CA)
Kilmer	Nolan	Smith (WA)	DeBene	Latita	Royce	Kildee	O'Rourke	Tierney
Kind	O'Rourke	Speier	Denham	Lipinski	Ruiz	Kilmer	Owens	Titus
Kirkpatrick	Owens	Swalwell (CA)	Dent	LoBiondo	Runyan	Kind	Pallone	Tonko
Kuster	Pallone	Takano	DeSantis	Loeb sack	Ryan (WI)	Kirkpatrick	Pascarell	Tsongas
Langevin	Pascarell	Thompson (CA)	DesJarlais	Long	Salmon	Kuster	Pastor (AZ)	Van Hollen
Larsen (WA)	Pastor (AZ)	Tierney	Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Sanford	Langevin	Payne	Vargas
Larson (CT)	Payne	Titus	Duffy	Lummis	Scalise	Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Veasey
Lee (CA)	Pelosi	Tonko	Duncan (SC)	Lynch	Schneider	Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Vela
Levin	Perlmutter	Tsongas	Elmiers	Maloney, Sean	Schock	Lee (CA)	Pingree (ME)	Velázquez
Lewis	Peters (CA)	Van Hollen	Farenthold	Marchant	Schrader	Levin	Pocan	Walz
Lipinski	Peters (MI)	Vargas	Fincher	Marino	Schweikert	Lewis	Polis	Wasserman
Loeb sack	Peterson	Veasey	Fitzpatrick	Massie	Scott, Austin	Lofgren	Price (NC)	Quigley
Lofgren	Pingree (ME)	Vela	Fleischmann	Matheson	Sensenbrenner	Lowenthal	Rangel	Waters
Lowenthal	Pocan	Velázquez	Fleming	McCarthy (CA)	Sessions	Lowe	Roybal-Allard	Watt
Lujan	Polis	Walz	Flores	McCaul	Shimkus	Lujan Grisham	Ruppersberger	Waxman
(NM)	Price (NC)	Wasserman	Forbes	McClintock	Shuster	(NM)	Ryan (OH)	Welch
Luján, Ben Ray	Quigley	Schultz	Fortenberry	McHenry	Simpson	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (FL)
(NM)	Rahall	Waters	Foster	McIntyre	Sinema	(NM)	T.	Yarmuth
Lynch	Rangel	Watt	Fox	McKeon	Smith (MO)	Maffei		
Maffei	Roybal-Allard	Waxman	Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Smith (NE)			
Maloney,	Ruiz	Welch	Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Smith (NJ)			
Carolyn	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)	Garcia	Rodgers	Smith (TX)	Clay	Honda	Rogers (AL)
Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth	Gardner	Meadows	Southerland	Galleo	Johnson (GA)	Rush
			Garrett	Meehan	Stewart	Gutiérrez	Lucas	Thompson (MS)
			Gerlach	Messer	Stivers	Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
			Gibbs	Mica	Stockman	Higgins	Richmond	Young (FL)
			Gibson	Miller (FL)	Stutzman			
			Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)	Terry			
			Gohmert	Miller, Gary	Thompson (PA)			
			Goodlatte	Mullin	Thornberry			
			Gosar	Mulvaney	Tiberi			
			Gowdy	Murphy (FL)	Tipton			
			Granger	Murphy (PA)	Turner			
			Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Upton			
			Graves (MO)	Noem	Valadao			
			Griffin (AR)	Nugent	Wagner			
			Griffith (VA)	Nunes	Walberg			
			Grimm	Nunnelee	Walden			
			Guthrie	Olson	Walorski			
			Hall	Palazzo	Weber (TX)			
			Hanna	Paulsen	Webster (FL)			
			Harper	Pearce	Wenstrup			
			Harris	Perry	Westmoreland			
			Hartzler	Peters (CA)	Whitfield			
			Hastings (WA)	Peters (MI)	Williams			
			Heck (NV)	Peterson	Wilson (SC)			
			Hensarling	Petri	Wittman			
			Holding	Pittenger	Wolf			
			Hudson	Pitts	Womack			
			Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)	Woodall			
			Hultgren	Pompeo	Yoder			
			Hunter	Posey	Yoho			
			Hurt	Price (GA)	Young (AK)			
			Issa	Radel	Young (IN)			

NOT VOTING—14

Clay	Lucas	Thompson (MS)
Galleo	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Herrera Beutler	Richmond	Whitfield
Higgins	Rogers (AL)	Young (FL)
Honda	Rush	

□ 1349

Messrs. CAPUANO and SMITH of Washington changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. YODER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 168, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 530]

AYES—248

Aderholt	Bentivolio	Brooks (IN)
Amash	Bera (CA)	Broun (GA)
Amodei	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Bachmann	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
Bachus	Black	Burgess
Barber	Blackburn	Bustos
Barletta	Boustany	Calvert
Barr	Brady (TX)	Camp
Barrow (GA)	Braley (IA)	Campbell
Barton	Bridenstine	Cantor
Benishkek	Brooks (AL)	Capito

Andrews	Cicilline	Doggett
Bass	Clarke	Doyle
Beatty	Cleaver	Duckworth
Becerra	Clyburn	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Edwards
Bishop (NY)	Connolly	Ellison
Blumenauer	Conyers	Engel
Bonamici	Cooper	Enyart
Brady (PA)	Costa	Eshoo
Brown (FL)	Courtney	Esty
Brownley (CA)	Crowley	Farr
Butterfield	Cuellar	Fattah
Capps	Cummings	Frankel (FL)
Capuano	Davis (CA)	Fudge
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny	Gabbard
Carney	DeFazio	Garamendi
Carson (IN)	DeGette	Grayson
Cartwright	Delaney	Green, Al
Castor (FL)	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Castro (TX)	Deutch	Grijalva
Chu	Dingell	Hahn

NOES—168

NOT VOTING—15

Clay	Honda	Rogers (AL)
Galleo	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Gutiérrez	Lucas	Thompson (MS)
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Higgins	Richmond	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1356

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 529—Motion to Table Ruling of the Chair; and 530—Passage of H.J. Res. 84, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1520

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 89, EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3273, DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WORKING GROUP ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 90, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-243) on the resolution (H. Res. 373) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth; and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 89, EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3273, DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WORKING GROUP ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 90, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 373 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 373

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the

bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. (a) In the engrossment of H.J. Res. 89, the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 3273, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.J. Res. 89;

(2) conform the title of H.J. Res. 89 to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 3273, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 3273, as passed by the House, to the engrossment of H.J. Res. 89, H.R. 3273 shall be laid on the table.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. House Resolution 373 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 3273, the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013; H.J. Res. 89, the Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act of 2013; and H.J. Res. 90, the Flight Safety Act of 2013.

Mr. Speaker, today this body will consider three important pieces of legislation designed to address the current

government shutdown and the looming debt limit. The first of these bills would appropriate the funds necessary to pay essential Federal employees who have been continuing to work during the shutdown. These men and women have earned their paychecks and deserve for us to act on their legislation to ensure that they are paid on time.

Secondly, we will consider legislation to fully fund the FAA in order to ensure that our Nation's commerce and air travel continues uninterrupted and safely. There are many, many workers of the FAA who need to come back to work to ensure the safety and to ensure that millions of American passengers in the air are not put at risk due to a continued government shutdown.

Finally, we will consider legislation to establish a bicameral, bipartisan Working Group on Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth. This working group would consist of 10 Members of the House and 10 Members of the Senate, representing six from the majority and four from the minority of both Chambers. These Members would be appointed no less than one day after the enactment of this legislation, and would each meet on the subsequent calendar day until an agreement is reached on the overall discretionary levels for fiscal year 2014; changes to the discretionary debt limit; and reforms to direct spending programs.

For nearly a month now, Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have asked Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID and Senate Democrats to sit down and negotiate with House Republicans. Bill after bill from House Republicans and this body have gone to the United States Senate only to be batted down or to be revised and to come back without addressing the significant problems that our country faces today.

So what we are trying to do is to find another avenue, and that is to have the House of Representatives and the United States Senate and their appointees be able to meet together in a working group to resolve these issues. What do I envision? I envision a TV would be in the room. The American people could take part in these discussions and see how much progress can be made between Senate Republicans and Senate Democrats and House Republicans and House Democrats on these important issues, and hold those Members accountable for exactly the same thing that we're trying to do, and that is to get this government back opened up with an agreement about how we are going to fund this government.

So, today, we ask once again if the Senate is willing to join us not only as we work towards ending this government shutdown but on how we are going to address our government's debt and put our Nation back to work on the pathway to prosperity. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my good friend, for granting me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends are devolving into self-parody. The solution to this unnecessary and manufactured crisis is simple, and it hasn't changed for months:

Step one, pass a clean, short-term continuing resolution at Republican sequester levels to reopen the government;

Step two, pass a clean debt ceiling bill so that the United States will not default for the first time in history and so we don't send the economy into a tailspin;

Step three, finally agree to go to conference on the budget so we can sit down and talk about our priorities.

Let me go over that once more just in case there's any confusion on the other side of the aisle: reopen the government; raise the debt ceiling; and negotiate on the budget.

That has been what the White House and Democrats in Congress have been asking for over and over and over and over again. It's what we're asking for today, and it's what we will ask for tomorrow.

By contrast, the list of House Republican demands changes every 10 minutes: repeal ObamaCare, defund ObamaCare, delay ObamaCare, stage a non-filibuster filibuster, ask for the entire Romney economic platform in order to raise the debt ceiling, yell at park rangers, fund this part of the government, fund that part of the government, pay furloughed employees, pay essential employees, hold a conference meeting, hold a press conference, rinse and repeat.

Enough, Mr. Speaker. Enough.

Here we are again with yet another convoluted, cockamamie legislative effort that is going absolutely nowhere. We have yet another "message bill" that is designed to win today's news cycle but that gets us no closer to resolving this crisis.

Today's effort is particularly pathetic, Mr. Speaker. Instead of actually solving the problem and letting the American people get on with their lives, the bill before us today would create that most cherished and beloved Washington institution, a committee—not just any committee, no, but another supercommittee. It's Supercommittee 2: The Wrath of Cruz.

We have before us a bill that was dreamed up—Lord knows when—float- ed in the press at 10 o'clock this morning, distributed as legislative language at 11:30 this morning, in the Rules Committee at 12:30, and on the floor at 3:20. Forget the 3-day rule, Mr. Speak-

er. This contraption barely even followed the 3-hour rule.

And the Superdupercommittee Part 2—pardon me, the "bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth"—that is created by this bill doesn't come with any instructions. There is no time line. There is no deadline. It doesn't reopen the government. It doesn't prevent a default. It doesn't do much of anything.

It's unclear whether coffee and pastries will be provided at the Superdupercommittee Part 2 working group. Maybe we need another bill to do that.

This is just another press release. Mr. Speaker, we do not need another committee to do the job that we were elected to do. Let me remind my colleagues that we have this thing called the Budget Committee, and the Republicans made a big deal about the fact that we passed a budget in the House and the Senate didn't pass a budget in the Senate. Then the Senate did pass a budget. What you're supposed to do is then go to conference and work out your differences and come up with a final product. For 6 months we have been pleading with the Speaker of the House and the Republican leadership to appoint conferees to negotiate a budget agreement. That's the way it's supposed to work. The Senate does something, we do something, and we negotiate the differences. For 6 months the Republicans have refused to appoint conferees, and now they're saying we need this kind of vague committee that has no instructions, that has no time line. It doesn't do anything to stop the government shutdown. It doesn't do anything to stop the government default on our financial obligations.

This is no way to run a railroad, let alone the United States House of Representatives. So I would urge the Republican leadership to start caring a little less about winning today's news cycle and a little more about the American people, who sent us here and who expect us to do our jobs.

Open the government. Raise the debt ceiling. Negotiate on the budget. It is really not that complicated.

In the meantime, I urge all of my colleagues to reject this closed rule, reject the underlying legislation, and reject the politics of manufactured crises.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, hot off the press this afternoon from Politico, which is not exactly a right-wing newspaper, it says:

Obama calls Boehner. Reiterates he won't negotiate.

So the President evidently today, as reported by Politico, called Mr. BOEHNER to repeat: I'm not going to negotiate on bills to reopen the government or to raise the debt ceiling. That's what's being reported.

Mr. Speaker, this is, I think, a bad precedent. Where I'm from in Dallas, Texas, leaders lead. Leaders lead by trying to do what's in the best interest of everybody, not running to crisis after crisis after crisis, not negotiating, not agreeing to meet with people, not agreeing to do things to help resolution. Leaders present ideas, opportunities, options. They're the ones that stay at the table, and they're the last ones to leave when everybody else gets frustrated.

I think what's important to note is this President is simply different than every other President we've ever had. What he is doing is giving up not only his legitimate moral authority to lead, but what he's doing is saying, I recognize what could happen if we're unsuccessful. I think, as Speaker BOEHNER said yesterday, the President's senior adviser said he would sooner see the government go into default than to meet with and negotiate with the Republicans. That is not what leaders should be doing, and I would suggest to you that this President stands on the shoulders of other Presidents for 230-plus years who have given their very best to the benefit of others. They have looked at Republicans, they have looked at Democrats, they've looked at House Members, they've looked at Senate Members, and realized they had to negotiate. That was one of the key things I remember as a young man about Ronald Reagan's negotiating with Tip O'Neill, inviting Tip O'Neill down to the White House, their being good with each other, talking about how they could make progress with each other.

We are evidently past that. This President even has the audacity to call the Speaker and say, I'm not going to negotiate with you. That is not good leadership, and the American people are seeing it.

The House of Representatives, we're not going to get our nose out of joint. We're going to stay at work. It is true that we bring this bill up, and we'll probably be here tomorrow and the next day with new ways to negotiate. Today, we're here on the floor just as we were yesterday, just as we were on Saturday, talking about constructive, creative, bipartisan issues to fund this government and to make sure we can get moving.

The NIH should have been open already. We should have had lots of government agencies as a result of what we are doing, including Head Start. We should have these activities, even if it's one by one, to open up. Today, we're on the floor to say, We ought to pay those government employees who have been working when Tuesday rolls around. They should get paid. We should have people at the FAA come back to work and open that agency back up. That's what House Republicans are doing. We recognize this President will not negotiate, but we're going to offer ourselves

up. I think the American people see what House Republicans are attempting to do.

I am very proud of not only what our Speaker is doing but of our majority leader, ERIC CANTOR, and our whip, KEVIN MCCARTHY. They are attempting to move forward ideas that sustain this body to where we can look people straight in the eye and where we can accomplish things on behalf of the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume

Mr. Speaker, we are in this predicament because the Republicans shut the government down. It is that simple.

You own this shutdown whether you like it or not.

The gentleman quoted Politico. Let me read from Politico. It says:

President Barack Obama opened the door to a short-term debt ceiling increase in order to avoid going over the fiscal cliff and allowed negotiations between the White House and Congress on a long-term deal.

That doesn't sound like someone who doesn't want to negotiate. I'd prefer a long-term deal because I'm tired of this crisis by crisis by crisis, but this President has gone out of his way to negotiate over and over and over again.

I will just point out another thing for my colleagues. Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID and Speaker BOEHNER negotiated a deal on this short-term continuing resolution to keep the government going. Speaker BOEHNER admitted that this week with George Stephanopoulos on Sunday, that they negotiated a short-term spending deal to keep the government open at the Republican sequester levels. The deal was that, in return for the Republican numbers, the Speaker wouldn't attach any extraneous materials to that short-term continuing resolution.

Obviously, that is a deal that the Speaker did not keep in large part because of a group in his conference who kind of represents, I guess, the Ted Cruz wing of the party who said that wasn't enough. They wanted to shut the government down, and they're willing to default on paying our bills for the first time in history. That is, in my opinion, unconscionable.

Let's not talk about who wants to negotiate here. Democrats have negotiated going to your level on the short-term continuing resolution. The President has been willing to negotiate time and time again. Every time he gets close to an agreement, the Speaker can't deliver. He's going to continue to try, but don't say he's not trying to negotiate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to address all remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distin-

guished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is really getting more and more difficult for us to get out here and act as though we're really having a serious debate about something, and I just want to start off by saying that I don't want anybody in the country to forget—as they're trying to do things with a Federal Government that's shut down as the VA service centers did, and their phones are now inoperative as we've all learned to our great dismay—the deceased soldiers and their families have not been able to be compensated in any way to make it possible for them to pay for funerals or even go to them. I'm sure that will be something we're going to come up and deal with as they're doing with this part-time “let's build ourselves a new government.”

Don't forget that this was about health care. That's all there is to it. Service people can't get the benefits that they need. Nobody can get anything from the government. Mortgages are on hold because Republicans didn't like health care.

If you would have asked them why in the world do you object to 30 million Americans who have not been able to afford health insurance having an opportunity to get it, they don't give you any answer. It's more obfuscation. If we talk about negotiations, let me tell you the negotiation that is really critical that is not taking place at all, and we're doing an example of that right now.

There is no negotiation in the committee process. The only committee that has been putting anything up to the floor of the House has been the Rules Committee. Somebody writes a bill in the afternoon, and either that evening or early the next day, the Rules Committee goes in, and it goes right to the floor. There is no amendment chance, there's no discussion chance, and we don't know what they're doing. The discussion and the amendments and the negotiation, yes, that's supposed to go on between the two parties in the committees, and it is nowhere to be seen and hasn't been for ages.

We've been down this road before, again with the supercommittee idea, which was such a glaring disaster and only ended up in sequestration, and the whole idea of sequestration was so, with all of that, none of us ever thought we'd get there, but now we're pretending that's what it is. Now it's, Let's have another supercommittee. I will tell you that was so awful, and it set us back so much in this country not only with scientific research and national security and public safety being compromised, but now they want to do it again.

I think it's just another delaying tactic because I'm persuaded today, as I

stand here, that the Republican Party in this House does not want to open the government. The opportunities they've had over and over again have been absolutely quashed. There's a lot of talk in the media about, Oh, if only I had a chance to vote for a clean resolution, I would do it in just a moment. Well, let me tell you that it has been turned down twice before in the House of Representatives on the rule when we got to the part about the previous question. We always say just vote “no” and you will then have your opportunity to vote on the clean bill from the Senate, which already passed there, and would go directly to the President. We never got a single Republican vote. Draw your own conclusions about the 25 Republicans who stated if only they were given that opportunity.

□ 1545

Now the sequestration, as my colleague has pointed out, we accepted as part of a deal on our behalf between Speaker BOEHNER and Senator REID. As awful as it is—and most of us did not like that—nonetheless, for the short-term CR, we were willing to take it, but now the majority, again, refuses to let us vote on a CR which was agreed on.

This irresponsible governance has continued in the days since the majority shut the government down; and over this last week—or last several weeks, actually—the majority has abandoned any semblance of regular order and just turned the Rules Committee, as I've said, into the committee of jurisdiction.

Now, where does all this come from? I think most Americans were surprised. Let me express my concern.

I recall that, just after Senator Obama was elected President in 2008, we all heard about the great dinner that took place on inaugural night, declaring, among Republican elected officials, that they would not allow Senator Obama—now President Obama—to get anything done. Well, we thought after 4 years, maybe that was over with, and we did get the health care bill passed.

Now we learned on Sunday morning that that is taking place again, which again says, you know, I'm not sure that this party could put the government back into business or not because they would have to get the permission, apparently, from the Heritage Foundation's Heritage Action for America, former Attorney General Edwin Meese, and David Koch, because they wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and they engineered this whole thing. That appeared on Sunday. This is Tuesday. Not a single refutation has taken place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlelady an additional 1 minute.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. So it's time for this game to come to an end, but it won't because it's not part of the plan. I am really tired, on behalf of the American people, of watching them being fooled; and I think that we are more than disgusted and tired with the process by which this legislation comes to us. The four of us on the Rules Committee are calling for you to open up this process so that the other members of our party—as well as yours who, I am confident, know nothing more about these bills than we do—have an opportunity to really do our jobs as we were sent here to do.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentlewoman from New York, the ranking member of the committee. Just before we came down to the floor, we had a very, very nice committee meeting where she was able to not only articulate that, but was joined by her other colleagues. I did offer words of assurance to them about not only how we need to move forward but also how the committee needed to get slightly better in our time frames, and we're going to attempt to do that.

The gentlewoman recognizes that what we are doing is bringing bills as quickly as we can, including the FAA, opening up the FAA again, and how important that is. So she recognized the importance of what we are attempting to do.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. President, can we talk? The government is partially shut down. The Nation's debt ceiling is looming.

President Obama and HARRY REID have drawn a hard line. They have proclaimed over and over again, no negotiation. They insist the debt limit must be raised at current levels of spending. No negotiation. They're adamant that the status quo must be preserved. And why not?

Here is the status quo: 7.3 percent unemployment 4 years after the recession has ended; 15 percent unemployment for those under 25; 50 percent of recent college graduates unemployed or underemployed; household income down 10 percent in the last 5 years. It has fallen every year since the President has been in office, and it continues to decline. Continued economic stagnation 4 years after the recession has ended; continued record deficit spending; Social Security and Medicare on a path to insolvency.

Why would the Republicans want to discuss these fundamental problems? Why would we want to alter that course?

By any measure, the President's policies are failing miserably:

He is failing our seniors. Their safety nets, Social Security and Medicare, are

headed for bankruptcy, but he won't negotiate.

He is failing our middle class through higher taxes, higher energy costs, higher insurance bills on one hand, and on the other hand, a continued decline in household income. They're getting squeezed from both sides, but he won't negotiate.

He is failing our youth, the millennial generation, by piling mountains of debt on our children and our grandchildren, but he won't negotiate. He is failing our youth and millennial generation through his job-killing policies of more regulation, more taxes, and more government.

Mr. President, our youth wants to work, and they're counting on us, but the President won't negotiate. Remember, my friends, that the Democrats held the House, the Senate, and the Presidency for only 2 years; but out of that came ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank, the two biggest expansions of government and killers of jobs to come out of Washington in 50 years.

I didn't want the government to shut down—nobody did—but we cannot continue to run head-on into failure. If we are to change course, the Republicans can't do it on their own. The President and HARRY REID in the Senate will have to participate.

Mr. REID, we are asking once again for a conference.

Mr. President, it's way past time to soften your hard-line stance on no negotiation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to direct all remarks to the Chair and not to another in the second person.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman from South Carolina, who just spoke, I don't know what he is talking about.

We have been negotiating. This temporary spending measure that we're talking about, HARRY REID negotiated it with Speaker BOEHNER. It's at your levels, your sequester levels. Do you think I like that? I can't stand it, but I don't want to shut the government down.

The bottom line was the Speaker said that, in exchange for that, there would be no extraneous materials attached to that CR. He wasn't able to deliver on his promise because of some people in your conference. It's that simple.

The gentleman is on the Budget Committee. I would think that, in being on the Budget Committee, you would want to go to conference—you worked on a budget; the Senate worked on a budget—to work out those spending differences. We have tried 19 times to get you to go to conference, and you refused to negotiate with the Senate on each of those occasions.

Every time the President negotiates, unfortunately, your leadership can't

deliver on the deals. So we have been negotiating, negotiating, negotiating. We still want to negotiate, but, please, the gentleman gave no reason why we should shut down this government, why the Republicans should have shut down this government, and he has given no reason why we should default on our financial obligations. We ought to pass a short-term spending bill to reopen the government, and we ought to pass a clean debt ceiling bill so we don't default on our financial obligations and ruin our economy.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members of an essential rule of decorum in the House. Under clause 1 of rule XVII, Members are to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person. Directing remarks through the Chair helps to reduce personal confrontation between Members and fosters an atmosphere of mutual and institutional respect.

The Chair appreciates the attention of the Members to this matter.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I associate myself with his remarks. I thank him for his extraordinary leadership in trying to keep the government open.

Mr. Speaker, this is—what?—the eighth day of the Republican shutdown of government. Small businesses cannot get loans to expand; veterans face uncertainty about their benefits; tuition assistance and the rest. Millions of women and children will go without the nutrition programs that they desperately need.

The shutdown could be over in hours if Republicans would stop being the party of “no” and just take “yes” for an answer.

So in case you don't know, I have some very good news for you: Democrats have not only been willing to negotiate; Democrats have already stated that they are ready to cooperate.

For example, I have good news. Perhaps you missed the fact that 200 Democratic Members of the House have signed a letter saying that they're willing to accept the Republican number of \$986 billion even though, as the gentleman said, we don't like this number—we don't think it's adequate—but the fact is we don't like shutting down the government more.

So, in order to open up government, 200 Members have signed the letter, and five additional Members have made public statements of their willingness to support the Republican number. There's space in this letter for the signatures of maybe just 17 Republicans to sign, but they don't have to sign a letter. Many of them have made public statements, which we respect and

honor as their public statements, that they would vote for the Republican number of \$986 billion.

The Speaker negotiated with Senator REID. Senator REID accepted the Republican House number. The President of the United States accepted the Republican House number. The Democrats in the House accepted the Republican House number. The only people not accepting the Republican House number are the Republicans in the House.

So, when the leadership of the Republican Party—Speaker BOEHNER, in particular—go around saying it can't pass, that the votes are not there, does that mean he does not trust the word of his own Members who have said that they will vote for the \$986 billion? Let's find out. Let's bring the bill to the floor.

That is what we are saying: just bring it to the floor. It has passed the Senate. The President stands ready to sign a number we don't like, but prefer it over shutting down government. We don't like it. We want to open the doors of government, and we are willing to use the key of the Republican number to do so.

Last week, Democrats went a step further. In both public and private discussions, Speaker BOEHNER said that he doesn't want to go to conference on the budget even though he asked for regular order in March. In early March, Senator MCCONNELL and Speaker BOEHNER said they wanted regular order. That's a message to the President that Congress should work its will. That was good news to us. That means: you pass a bill in the House; you pass a bill in the Senate; you go to conference to reconcile your differences. Perhaps the Speaker didn't think that the Senate would pass a budget, but they did in a matter of days—practically hours—after the House passed its budget.

But what happened to regular order? It blew out the window. After saying, We want regular order, no longer did the Republicans want to take "yes" for an answer. And why? Well, some of this is explained under the Speaker's own statement. Speaker BOEHNER said, Under rules—listen to that word "rules." Under rules, if you appoint conferees and after 20 legislative days there is no agreement, the minority has the right to offer motions to instruct, which become politically motivated bombs to throw up on the House floor.

So to be frank with you, we are following what I would describe as regular order. What I would describe as regular order is not "under rules." "Under rules" are the rules of the House.

The Speaker—as awesome as the power of the Speaker is, and I understand that—does not have the power to just decide what regular order is, and if you don't want to honor regular order, just say you're not going to honor it, but don't redefine it in order to keep government shut down.

So, in listening to the Speaker's not wanting to shut government down at first and then after it was shut down wanting to open it, the House Democrats took a step unprecedented by any minority party in the Congress of the United States. The House Democratic minority said, We will surrender. We will relinquish our right to motions to instruct—an insider term, actually—placing conditions on how it would go to the conference table.

□ 1600

So we said to the Speaker, don't worry about that. If that's important to you, if you want to shut down government because you're afraid of a motion to instruct, we'll allay your fears. Fear no more, Mr. Speaker. We will not offer these motions.

As an example, we didn't offer the motion on the first night, which was our right to do, when this bill was introduced as all of you will agree.

So we have said, we have made that claim. This, as I said, is unprecedented, but is a necessary move to end the Tea Party stranglehold on our government and restore basic services on which millions of people rely.

They didn't take "yes" for an answer. Two hundred signatures.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit this letter for the RECORD—200 signatures. It's a beautiful sight, because I want to tell you something: it's about cooperation.

None of us likes this number. All of us want to open up government. That's why we signed it. I want to thank Congressman TIM BISHOP, Congressman PATRICK and Congressman KEITH ELLISON for producing this result.

So we've said, yes, we're giving you the votes on something we don't like. We've said we won't do motions to instruct. Please take "yes" for an answer.

If you insist on being the party of "no," then don't hide behind something and say who won't negotiate. We cooperated. We gave you what you wanted.

Now here we are today. Republicans are offering yet another motion to keep the government shut down. Some people call it, in the press, the "super-committee." Others call it the "Ted Cruz committee." Whatever you call it, I'd like to know who writes this stuff. This is so ridiculous a proposal. It's so ridiculous a proposal.

How about we go to the budget table and see how we can reduce the deficit? produce growth for our country?

But all we're going to do is cut our investments in education, investments in making the future better. We're going to make seniors suffer more while we do not touch revenue, and we will not allow any discussion of closing special interest loopholes. That's how they want us to go to the table.

You must be kidding.

As I said, who writes this stuff?

Sometimes there is an expression that people use. Flippantly, they'll say, "Who do you think you are?" when you say something. Remember that from your childhood when somebody said, "Who do you think you are?"

I think we have to take that sentence very seriously, with an emphasis on "think." That would be interesting.

Who do we think we are?

Do we think that we are a party that is responsible, all of us—a Congress that is responsible—that wants to do the right thing for the American people, that knows that we have to come here to cooperate with each other to get something done in a bipartisan way?

To my fellow colleagues on the Republican side—I hope that's allowed, Mr. Speaker. They are Members of the body—do you think you have come here to make sure that people know that you can do this just because you're doing it?

It's just a waste, a total waste of time, and we don't have time to waste. In fact, we could be spending our time in such a more important way—working in a bipartisan way on entrepreneurship, on creating growth for our country, on investing in the education of our people, which, by the way, brings more money to the Treasury than any other initiative you can name.

Early childhood, K-12, higher education, lifetime learning. You want to reduce the deficit?

Invest in education.

You want to increase the deficit?

Cut education.

But let's sit down and talk about that. The path to get there is one that says, say yes to 986. We did, your number. It says accept our offer. We won't offer any instruction to the committee, but don't continue to be the Tea Party of "no."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Speaker—is that allowed, Mr. Speaker? I hope the Speaker will give us a vote so we can see where this Congress stands on the serious responsibility that we have and that the Republicans will even accept what they are asking us to accept.

This rule should be voted down. This commission is a joke whether you call it the Ted Cruz commission or the super—super in what way? Certainly not super in meeting the needs of the American people.

To recap, A, we are giving you 200 votes for your number. Take "yes" for an answer.

B, the Speaker doesn't want any conditions or discussion or anything else on the floor about the budget. We are willing to accept that.

Take "yes" for an answer.

I ask for a "no" vote on the rule.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Enough is enough.

Today marks the fifth day that the federal government has been shutdown. Please consider how deeply unfair this is to the citizens we represent.

The solution to this crisis is a simple piece of legislation that funds the government at levels that have already passed both chambers of Congress.

At this point, to attach defunding or delaying the Affordable Care Act to legislation needed to reopen the government is to put our economy at risk in order to advance a political agenda.

We demand a vote on a clean continuing resolution immediately so that government functioning can resume and Americans can move on with their lives.

The games have to stop.

Best Regards,

Tim Bishop; Patrick E. Murphy; Nancy Pelosi, Democratic Leader; Steny H. Hoyer, Democratic Whip; James E. Clyburn, Assistant Democratic Leader; Xavier Becerra, Chair, Democratic Caucus; Joseph Crowley, Vice Chair, Democratic Caucus; Nita M. Lowey, Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations; Chris Van Hollen, Ranking Member, Committee on the Budget; Robert E. Andrews; Karen Bass; Joyce Beatty; Ami Bera, Jr.; Sanford Bishop, Jr.; Earl Blumenauer; Suzanne Bonamici; Madeleine Z. Bordallo; Robert A. Brady; Bruce L. Braley; Corrine Brown; Julia Brownley; Cheri Bustos; G.K. Butterfield; Lois Capps; Tony Cardenas; André Carson.

Joaquin Castro; Judy N. Chu; David N. Cicilline; Yvette D. Clarke; Wm. Lacy Clay; Emanuel Cleaver; Steve Cohen; Gerald E. Connolly; John Conyers, Jr.; Jim Costa; Joe Courtney; Henry Cuellar; Elijah E. Cummings; Susan A. Davis; Danny K. Davis; Peter A. DeFazio; Diana DeGette; John K. Delaney; Susan DelBene; Theodore E. Deutch; John Dingell; Lloyd Doggett; Keith Ellison; Eliot L. Engel.

William Enyart; Anna Eshoo; Elizabeth Esty; Sam Farr; Chaka Fattah; Bill Foster; Lois Frankel; Marcia L. Fudge; Tulsi Gabbard; Pete Gallego; John Garamendi; Joe Garcia; Alan Grayson; Gene Green; Al Green; Raúl Grijalva; Luis Gutiérrez; Janice Hahn; Colleen Hanabusa; Alcee Hastings; Denny Heck; Brian Higgins; James A. Himes; Rubén Hinojosa; Rush Holt; Mike Honda; Steve Horsford.

Jared Huffman; Steve Israel; Sheila Jackson Lee; Hakeem Jeffries; Henry C. "Hank" Johnson; Marcy Kaptur; Bill Keating; Robin Kelly; Joseph P. Kennedy, III; Dan Kildee; Derek Kilmer; Ann Kirkpatrick; Ann McLane Kuster; James Langevin; Rick Larsen; John Larson; Barbara Lee; Sander M. Levin; John Lewis; Daniel Lipinski; David Loebsack; Alan S. Lowenthal; Michelle Lujan Grisham; Stephen Lynch; Daniel Maffei; Carolyn B. Maloney; Sean Patrick Maloney.

Doris O. Matsui; Carolyn McCarthy; Betty McCollum; Jim McDermott; James P. McGovern; Jerry McNerney; Gregory Meeks; Grace Meng; Michael

H. Michaud; George Miller; Gwen Moore; James P. Moran; Jerrold Nadler; Grace Napolitano; Richard Neal; Gloria Negrete McLeod; Richard Nolan; Eleanor Holmes Norton; Beto O'Rourke; William L. Owens; Frank Pallone; Bill Pascrell; Ed Pastor; Donald Payne; Ed Perlmutter; Gary Peters; Pedro R. Pierluisi.

Mark Pocan; Jared Polis; David Price; Mike Quigley; Nick J. Rahall; Charles Rangel; Cedric Richmond; C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger; Bobby L. Rush; Tim Ryan; Linda T. Sánchez; John P. Sarbanes; Janice Schakowsky; Adam Schiff; Brad Schneider; Allyson Y. Schwartz; Robert C. Scott; José Serrano; Terri Sewell; Carol Shea-Porter; Brad Sherman; Albio Sires; Louise Slaughter; Adam Smith; Jackie Speier; Eric Swalwell; Mark Takano.

Dina Titus; Paul Tonko; Niki Tsongas; Juan Vargas; Marc Veasey; Filemon Vela; Tim Walz; Debbie Wasserman Schultz; Maxine Waters; Mel Watt; Henry Waxman; Peter Welch; Frederica Wilson; John Yarmuth; Pete Visclosky; Matthew Cartwright; David Scott; Zoe Lofgren; Nydia M. Velázquez; John Carney; Ben Ray Lujan; Michael F. Doyle; Donna F. Edwards; Eddie Bernice Johnson.

Scott H. Peters; Chellie Pingree; Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan; Kurt Schrader; Rosa L. DeLauro; Bennie G. Thompson; Mike Thompson; John Tierney; Kyrsten Sinema; Lucille Roybal-Allard; Kathy Castor; Tammy Duckworth; Collin C. Peterson; Donna M. Christensen; Ron Barber; Michael E. Capuano; Raul Ruiz; Loretta Sanchez.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the minority leader for her comments today and thank her for coming to the floor.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado Springs, Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman for his work on the Rules Committee and for bringing H.J. Res. 89, the Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act, and I rise in support of this act.

Mr. Speaker, this will ensure that Federal employees who have been deemed essential will have no disruption in their pay. That's an excellent step in the right direction, and I wholeheartedly support that concept.

Just on Saturday, the House unanimously—every single Republican and every single Democrat—supported H.R. 3223, and that said that everyone who is a Federal employee will get paid eventually, at the end of this slowdown that we're in right now. So this is a step in the right direction.

But I want to urge that we take up a bill that I introduced yesterday, H.R. 3271, which goes a step further and says there is no distinction between the essential and non-essential Federal worker. All Federal workers are to be brought back immediately and given back pay and put on a regular pay schedule.

We are going to be reimbursing these people for back pay sooner or later

anyway. That's what the bill Saturday accomplished that we all supported here in the House, but this would reassure everyone that they can go to work immediately.

There are people who are going to be having a tough time making house and car payments, and these are people with important jobs.

In my district, in Colorado Springs, there are a lot of defense civil workers, and they are supporting the warfighters. The Pentagon is supposed to be bringing all of them back, and many of them are coming back, but not every single one. So I want them to have the assurance that they will get paid immediately on being reinstated and that they will come back to work immediately.

So I think that it would be in the interest of our Federal workforce to take up the bill that I've introduced, H.R. 3271, and bring all civilian furloughed and Federal workers back immediately, with back pay.

But this is a great bill. I do support it, H.J. Res. 89. I thank the Rules Committee for bringing it out.

There has been, unfortunately, some gamesmanship we've seen with the National Park Service. I think that that's unfortunate. Shutting down the World War II Memorial when veterans are in their eighties and nineties, coming to Washington, maybe for the last visit that they can, and they're being told they can't enter the memorial.

So let's don't have any gamesmanship. Let's bring everyone back to work.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to end the games, I have a better idea. Just open up the government. End the Republican shutdown.

It's really simple. We could have an up-or-down vote to open up government today, and all the Federal workers would be taken care of, and all the monuments would be reopened. We wouldn't be having all this controversy. We can get serious about negotiating a long-term spending bill. It's a better way.

So join with us and support a clean continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the Dean of the House.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my dear friend from Massachusetts.

As I begin, I express my great affection and respect for my colleague from Texas, who is my dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are here to be ashamed of ourselves. We're wasting the taxpayers' time, the taxpayers' money, and we're wasting the business and the time of the House.

We are taking up a bill to require that Members of Congress sit down and talk about deficit reduction and raising

the debt limit. The last time I checked, we didn't need a law to do that. It's already our job. We have a conference that we can call at any time between the House and the Senate, which would enable us then to get to the serious business in handling this matter under the regular order. We don't do it. I don't know why.

The President says he is not going to negotiate with a gun at his head. Frankly, I wouldn't either, and I don't think anybody else in this place would. Beyond that, he also is not going to negotiate the full faith and credit of the United States, which is one of the questions at issue.

So one of the problems we seem to have with our Republican friends is that their Tea Party fringe is so ideologically hell-bent in getting their way that they're finding that they're too extreme to get it.

Now, we Democrats have shown a willingness to cooperate and to compromise. In fact, as the minority leader observed, we have asked Speaker BOEHNER to convene a budget conference all year, but to no avail.

Two hundred Democrats, including myself, sent a letter to Speaker BOEHNER on Saturday, saying we'd support an extension of sequester-level spending through November 15. Democrats don't want the sequester to begin with, but the interest of compromise and keeping government open says that we're going to show good faith to my Republican colleagues.

And what is my Republican colleagues' response?

No. Resurrect the failed supercommittee. They have apparently read the Peter Principle, which says, when you can't think of anything else to do, appoint a committee, and they will obfuscate the matter further.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to put an end to these asinine antics and maneuverings. It's time to pass the Senate continuing resolution. It's time to show the Americans and the rest of the world that a great institution, created by an enormously wise group of men who made the United States Constitution, is an institution that is not beyond hope of redemption and that it can work together.

We offered to work together with my Republican friends and colleagues. We hope that they will do this.

I would simply observe that we are engaged here in another curious practice also. We're going to have it so that we're going to pay Federal workers for doing nothing. Imagine that.

My Republican colleagues, over the years, during my career here, have always been complaining about "welfare queens" who would ride to the welfare office to get their pension checks. Well, here we are going to convert a bunch of Federal employees to "welfare queens" by paying them while they do not work. The whole thing is silly, and the American people feel so.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Dean of the House has spoken. I gather, from his comments, that he would not like to be appointed on the committee, and I'm disappointed. I was rather hopeful that the minority leader would see that he would be exactly the kind of commonsense person that could represent the party, and so I'd hope that the gentleman would reconsider that.

At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Grandfather Community, North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairman of the Rules Committee.

Ms. FOXX. I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

We've heard from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle they only need us to take up one bill. Well, what about all those bills we've sent over to the Senate, including four appropriations bills that the Senate won't take up to vote on?

It seems to me that they ought to be doing that if they want to show some good faith effort.

Today, as we have every day since October 1, the House of Representatives is taking yet another bipartisan step forward to resolve our differences with the United States Senate and reopen the Federal Government for the American people.

Even prior to October 1, House Republicans took numerous reasonable steps toward compromise. We voted four times on separate proposals to fund the entire government. With each vote, we sought to lay the groundwork for bipartisan compromise.

Our final two full-funding proposals simply addressed the fundamental unfairness in ObamaCare, the fact that American families won't get the same year to prepare for ObamaCare that the President decided to give to businesses and the fact that Members of Congress will get a subsidy to pay ObamaCare premiums that the rest of America will not.

Every vote from the House of Representatives has had at least some Democrat support. Not one Senate vote has been bipartisan.

While we've moved to the middle, Senate Democrats still refuse to budge. They won't even send any Senators to sit down and talk with House Republicans about a bipartisan solution to reopen government.

□ 1615

One noteworthy area, though, where there seems to be great opportunity for us to move forward with our Democrat colleagues is on the matter of Federal employee pay. One of this rule's underlying bills will ensure timely pay for Federal employees who have continued to work through this shutdown. Those who are defending our borders, our food supply, and our Capitol, should be paid

on time. It's my hope that both sides will come together and support this rule and the underlying Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act.

Mr. Speaker, we don't expect to agree on everything with our Democrat colleagues. The House appointed a team on September 30 to meet with the Senate and find common ground to fund the government. When our team gathered on the morning of October 1, no one from the Senate showed up. Every day since, the Senate has refused to be part of any discussions with the House on how to move forward. That refusal is inexcusable.

That's why the House will be considering another bill today, the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act, to bring Senate Democrats to the table. Once the Senators have come to the table, we can start building on areas where we should have common ground and reach a solution that benefits all of the American people. But it starts with a talk.

Both the rule and the underlying bills have my support, and I urge the same from my colleagues.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just remind my colleagues there's an easy way to solve all of this—reopen the government, raise the debt ceiling, and negotiate a new budget. Our minority leader has already said it on the floor. It's our willingness to cooperate.

It's not that complicated. You can save all this misery that Federal workers are now enduring by reopening the government right now. This is not that hard to do, and it's at your number. It's at Republican levels. That is a compromise on our part. We loathe those sequester numbers that Republicans insisted on enshrining—those are horrible for our economy—but to keep the government open, we're going to swallow that so we have time to work out a longer-term deal.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his time.

I am glad that the minority leader got on the floor of the House and spoke common sense and indicated two things. Right now, there are 200 Members who would be willing to vote for a clean CR that would open this House, right now. We believe a number of Republicans would make it a bipartisan vote, and we'd be able to open the government.

The Republicans are playing a game of Legos. They are taking that big red box and opening it up and throwing the Legos on the ground and are trying to construct a government. Well, that's a kids' game—and it's a good game—but we cannot play with the lives of the American people.

Just a few minutes ago, we talked about restoring Head Start. We know

that that bill is going nowhere. We know that the sequester is continuing to undermine Head Start seats across America—57,000 of them. In fact, it's an empty chair across America, where little babies cannot go to a Head Start program. That's what the Republicans are trying to do. They're trying to tell Marlen Rosa that her 3-year-old son, Hector, couldn't go to Head Start.

And what is their answer? Another supercommittee—a committee that maybe will be playing Legos itself because the last supercommittee—of course, we respect all of our Members—are trying to do. They're trying to tell the solution to our problem.

I tell you what the solution is, Mr. Speaker. It is to vote on the clean bill, open the government, let the FAA be in operation, let the Justice Department be in operation.

In the meeting that I just came from, I learned 90 courts are vacant. Issues dealing with rape and domestic violence are not being attended to. Public defenders are not being resourced and are being laid off. Hundreds of lawyers are not in the Department of Justice. The American Bar Association says there is no justice.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, all we have to do is not get a supercommittee, but get a supercommitment to America.

Vote for a clean bill, and vote for the debt ceiling.

Mr. Speaker, I again rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation.

I oppose this rule because it is not a serious effort to end the government shutdown engineered by House Republicans by cherry-picking some programs and now adding a smoke and mirrors effort to replace the negotiation of the Budget bills passed by both the House and the Senate.

Both President Obama and Senate Majority Leader REID have made it crystal clear that they will not accept this game-playing and now the American people are saying the same thing.

A piecemeal strategy now being pursued by House Republicans is not an honest or serious option to reopen the government and will not end the impacts of this shutdown that extend across our country.

A consequence of partial funding of the entire Federal government one piece at a time instead of through a clean CR is the denial of burial assistance to the families of four troops who were killed by an IED in southern Afghanistan.

The majority leadership of the House has America facing a government at war and a government shutdown at the same time.

The majority of the House has found a way to intentionally inflict wounds on the American public—not by accident, but as a political strategy to get what they cannot do through the regular legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, today the Washington Post Editorial Board said it best:

What have House Republicans managed to accomplish in a week of government shutdown? Damage the livelihood of millions of Americans? Check. Government secretaries, food-truck operators, cleaners who work in

motels near national parks: They're all hurting. Waste billions of taxpayer dollars? Check. It costs a lot to shut agencies, Web sites and parks, and it will cost a lot to reopen them. Meanwhile, the House has voted to pay the salaries, eventually, of hundreds of thousands of employees whom it has ordered not to work. That's an odd way to manage an enterprise. Interfere with key government operations? Check. Rattle the markets, slow an economy in recovery, interrupt potentially lifesaving research at the National Institutes of Health? Check, check and check. Derailed the hated Obamacare? Ch—Oh, no, wait a minute. That was the GOP's ostensible purpose for this travesty of misgovernment, but the online insurance markets created by that law opened on schedule last week and continue to operate.

The House Republicans' continued refusal to take up and vote on the clean CR passed by the Senate over a week ago, and which the President has stated publicly on several occasions he would sign is ignoring the easy solution to this impasse.

Now faced with strong public backlash—more than 70% of Americans disapproving of the government shutdown engineered by the House Republicans, the majority is trying to extricate themselves from this debacle by bringing to the floor and passing "mini-CRs."

The House majority should know that the American public knows and very well understands what is happening. This is legislative theater at its worst—noise and thunder signifying nothing.

Mr. Speaker, these ploys are a cynical waste of time giving false hope to innocent Americans who depend on the services provided by these programs. But House Republicans know they have no chance whatsoever of becoming law. The Senate will not pass them and the President would veto these piece-meal measures if they made it to his desk.

All we are doing is wasting time when we should be helping people.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can keep our promises to our veterans, to our elderly, to our children, parents and young people as well as the 800,000 Federal workers that our government is needed, compassionate, strong and effective.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can fund our engineers and technicians who maintain all of our critical military equipment to keep our troops safe and take care of national security infrastructure.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can fund the services needed by those who rely upon our full faith and credit as well as our word that this nation will not forget its fallen heroes.

For these reasons and more, I oppose this rule and urge my Republican colleagues to rescue the American people from this situation and end the disruption in the lives of 800,000 dedicated workers who take pride in the greatest jobs in the world: serving the American people.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, we heard from one of the brightest voices of the Republican Party, a member of our Republican leadership, VIRGINIA FOXX.

At this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr.

WOODALL), a member of the Budget Committee and the Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say I saw my chairman get on his feet when the gentleman from Michigan began to speak. It's not often that the dean of the House comes down to speak. It's a treat for me, too. I've been here 2½ years, but I've been watching the process a lot longer than that. I do think there's a lot that we can learn from history and a lot that we can learn, as Chris Matthews put it on his show the other day, from when politics worked.

There is no shortage of shrill voices in Washington, D.C., and when I get back home to the folks in the suburbs of metro Atlanta, rarely do I hear somebody say, ROB, I wish there were more angry people in Washington. I wish there were more folks pounding their fists and yelling and screaming, because I really think that's how solutions can be brought about.

That's not how solutions are brought about anywhere. It's not how they're brought about in business. It's not how they're brought about in politics. It's not how they're brought about in kindergartens around the country.

I have a chart here, Mr. Speaker, that says that the Democrat Speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill, who presided over some of the most trying times in our Nation and some of the biggest deals in our Nation, was often in conflict with the President of a different party. While Tip O'Neill was Speaker of the House, the government shut down 12 times.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, not to say that a government shutdown is okay. It's not. I didn't want it to happen. It doesn't need to happen. I'm glad we're bringing more bills to the floor to reopen the government—we are already more than 50 percent of the way there with the bills that have come to the floor. But it is happening, and it's not happening because Republican this and Republican that.

I commented earlier to some of my Democratic friends about what great party discipline they have displayed in never talking about a government shutdown but in always making sure it's a "Republican government shutdown." I suppose you get points for that in terms of party unity, but it's just not true; nor has it ever been true in the history of our Republic that when legitimate policy differences come about, driven by our constituents back home, that the best way forward to solve those is to make sure you demonize the other guy and make sure folks know who to blame for it.

In these 12 times that the Democratic Speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill, was leading this institution—the people's House—and the government shut down, it wasn't because Tip O'Neill was a bad man. It wasn't because he lost control of some liberal

faction within his party. It was because the House of Representatives, the closest voice to the American people in our Republic, had legitimate policy differences with the President of the United States, and that's where we sit today.

What's surprising is not that we have legitimate policy differences with the President of the United States. What's surprising is that we bring a bill to the floor to fund Head Start, and that becomes complicated. What's surprising is that we bring a bill to the floor to make sure that our men and women are getting paid, and that creates the controversy. What's surprising is we bring a bill to the floor to fund nuclear security across the country, and that's what brings controversy.

There is so much that we agree on, and I am certain we're going to find the pathway forward; but I am equally certain that that pathway forward is not going to be found more quickly in depending on how much we can embarrass and marginalize our political opponents. It's going to be found when we agree that there is more that unites us than divides us, and it's okay that we have some serious policy differences.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman is actually the one who appointed me as the rules designee to the Budget Committee, and I'm grateful to him for that because it really gives me an opportunity to express what, for my constituents, is commonsense budget reform, Mr. Speaker. They know you just can't keep spending and spending and spending and never have to pay the bills. The bills have to get paid.

But I would say that the funding level that the United States Senate has agreed on is absolutely in no way a compromise. It's the law of the land. The law of the land, if this Congress were to dissolve itself tomorrow, is that for fiscal year 2014 we're only going to be able to spend \$967 billion. The Senate wants to spend \$986 billion. The law of the land is not going to let them spend that much. That's just the law of the land.

Now, we don't have to like it. We can try to change that, but to characterize that as somehow moving to the middle is to misrepresent, Mr. Speaker, what the facts of our budget are.

As my colleague from North Carolina said so well, the House has adopted a position, and the Senate rejected it. So we moved to the middle and adopted a position, and the Senate rejected it. So we moved further to the middle, adopted a position, and the Senate rejected it. Then we said, Let's just sit down and talk about it to find that pathway forward.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, are talking a lot about a budget conference. I suspect we'll continue to hear that. I even read about it in the *National Journal*—apparently, that message is being sold well—but as my friends on both sides of the aisle know, a budget conference has absolutely no force of law whatsoever. Zero. We can conference a budget until we're blue in the face, Mr. Speaker, and we will never change one penny of Federal spending.

Now that's different from the conference that this House moved to go to with the Senate. The conference that this House moved to have with the Senate—where we could actually change the law, where we could fund the government, where we could deal with the debt ceiling, where we could focus on priorities that each one of us has for our families back home—the conference this House moved to create, Mr. Speaker, can change the law.

Let's do something that matters. Let's do it today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I served as an aide here on Capitol Hill when Tip O'Neill was Speaker of the House. I think he is one of the greatest Speakers that ever served in the United States House of Representatives. He was a friend of mine as well.

I will tell you that Speaker O'Neill would never go on national TV and threaten to default on the debt to this Nation. He would never, ever act in a way that might bring this economy to ruin. He put country before political party.

I would also say that Speaker O'Neill understood the importance of working in a bipartisan way. He would be disgusted with the way this House is being run today. The bottom line is he'd be scratching his head right now, wondering why we just don't resolve this in a very simple way.

There were 200 Democrats who have signed a letter saying, We will cooperate with the Republicans to pass a clean continuing resolution at Republican levels, and we know that there are 20 Republicans in the House who publicly said they would support such a move. That's the majority. We could open up the government in a matter of minutes. In the Senate, over a dozen Republican Senators voted for cloture on a clean continuing resolution. That is bipartisanship. Accept it. This is the way this House should be run.

So I would just point that out to my colleagues that we're going through all this rigamarole for I don't know what when we could end this Republican shutdown right now by bringing a clean continuing resolution at Republican levels to the House floor. It would pass in a bipartisan way, and I predict that there will even be more than 20 Republicans that would support it. They want a way out of this.

Let's open the government. Let us not use the debt ceiling in the threatening manner in which it's being used by the Republican leadership here. We should never—I don't care what your political ideology is—default on our financial obligations. That is economic ruin for this country, and I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that. We should never use that in such a political way.

Let's work together and appoint budget conferees and go to negotiate a budget conference so we can have some parameters in terms of numbers we can work with.

I listened to some of my colleagues talking on the other side—even those who serve on the Budget Committee—and you wonder why we should have a Budget Committee if the Budget Committee doesn't mean anything. I have a lot more respect for the people that serve on that committee.

As this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

□ 1630

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Also, let me just associate myself with the gentleman from Massachusetts' comments with regard to Speaker O'Neill. I, too, was a staffer during that period when the great Speaker, Mr. O'Neill, was Speaker, and there is no way that he would have allowed this hostage-taking to occur.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. Again, I just have to say, we've seen this 8 days, unfortunately, and it is a Tea Party Republican government shutdown. We've seen \$2.4 billion in lost economic activity; and so, yes, this hostage-taking, it continues.

Hostage-taking really is a deplorable tactic. The Tea Party Republicans continue to want to deny millions of Americans health care—and, yes, the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, which the Supreme Court has upheld. That's why the shutdown continues, and the public knows it.

Yet, instead of bringing up a budget bill to open up the government or pass a debt limit increase to pay our bills, the House has taken up two more last-minute bills to distract from their Tea Party Republican shutdown. This most recent bill establishes a supercommittee to make recommendations on spending and changes.

I want to remind my colleagues, this is the same proposal—or very similar—that got us into this devastating sequester in the first place. We've been there; we've done that. Thanks, but no thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Now, as a member of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, I can tell you that both the House and Senate have passed budget resolutions. Democrats have been trying to work out our

budget differences for 6 months, but Republicans continue to block these efforts. The American people deserve a functioning government.

The public understands that we can open up the government. And I have to say, the Democrats did not want the funding level of the Senate budget bill, but we are compromising to get this government open.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentle-lady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. It's also important to recognize, again, as an appropriator and as a member of the Budget Committee, I hear and see each and every day, whenever we're in committee, the tactics and the discussion with regard to cuts to Head Start and the women and children nutrition assistance program—all of those programs that just very recently the Republican Tea Party Members have started to say that they support. So let's see what happens. I hope that they do support this when we get to these budget negotiations.

It's time that we shut down this shutdown. We need to reject this rule. Let's have an up-or-down vote to open up this government and let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that there is a lot of dialogue on the floor today about opening up the government. Yet this body has passed bill after bill after bill—whether it's the intelligence community, whether it's Head Start, whether it's NIH—making sure that we are going through a deliberative process. Repeatedly, you are seeing where our friends on the other side vote “no,” and when it gets to the other body, even though it's a passed piece of legislation, the Senate, our friends over there, ignore the bills. I kind of wonder what we're really trying to aim at, whether we're really just trying to score political points or whether we can begin working together. That's what House Republicans are here to do: to set aside our differences, to try and fund these issues, to try and deal with the President.

Earlier in the week, our great young Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, went to the White House. He was asked to come to the White House, and really all he was there to be told by the President was: I won't negotiate. I won't negotiate. I won't negotiate. Then, as Mr. BOEHNER tells the story, he got that message, so he came back to work. Here we are, trying to send ideas out about working together.

The working group intentionally was an open-ended opportunity for Members of Congress—10 on the House side, 10 on the Senate side—to work together with an opportunity, as a work-

ing group, to try and overcome this by-pass. That's what we're trying to do. I think we're going to be faithful to it. I think we're going to pass this here today, and then we're going to see what the Senate will do again—I'm sure, once again, just another piece of log over in their fireplace for the Senate majority leader to burn down. I am hopeful here today that we have common sense, and I think we will pass this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I ask the gentleman how many more speakers he has?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would advise the gentleman, at this time, I do not have any further speakers. I thank the gentleman for asking.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to vote on the clean Senate continuing resolution so that we can send it to the President for his signature today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as we bring this debate to a close, I have the dueling emotions of being angry and being very sad—angry that we are putting the American people through this trauma. This is totally unnecessary. This is a manufactured crisis.

When my colleagues talk about the fact that Democrats aren't willing to negotiate, let me just refer to some of the recent headlines: “Nineteen Times Democrats Tried to Negotiate with Republicans”; that's according to the National Journal. “Republicans Spent Year Blocking Budget Conference”; that was in the Huffington Post. “Boehner Tells GOP He is Through Negotiating with Obama”; that was in The Hill newspaper. I mean, those are the headlines about my friends' actions during these recent weeks.

The bottom line is that what we're doing today really is sad because I think it diminishes this institution. We ought to be solving problems. We ought to be finding ways to lift people up. We ought to be trying to debate ways to create more jobs and opportunity in this country. We ought to get the government running. We ought to deal

with the debt ceiling, not politicize it, and we ought to work on a long-term negotiation so we have a long-term spending bill that makes sense for this country, and we're not doing that.

We're coming up with a committee today that does nothing. You pass this bill, the government still shuts down. You pass this bill, we're still headed for a default on our obligations on October 17. This does nothing. It does nothing. It is sad because it is beneath this great House of Representatives. So many incredible things have happened on this floor, and yet this is so trivial. It is so meaningless at a time of such a great crisis.

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that this is a crisis that my friends have brought on themselves. There is nothing that says that we should be in shutdown today other than the fact that my friends on the other side of the aisle decided to shut the government down.

Now they're saying they care about the monuments and they care about our senior citizens and our veterans, but they're the ones who shut the government down. They say they don't want to default on our financial obligations, yet we heard on “This Week” with George Stephanopoulos that the Speaker of the House is prepared to basically see this country default on our debt. That's what he said.

I mean, I am shocked by that kind of talk. I don't care what party you're in, where you come from ideologically. We all should at least agree that we ought to pay our bills, that if we don't, it will do great damage to our economy, and it will hurt your constituents just as much as mine. We could do so much better. We could do so much better than this.

I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who say they want a vote on a clean continuing resolution to vote with us on some of these procedural motions. Start giving us some votes on these procedural motions, because it appears that your leadership will not give you the right to an up-or-down vote. Notwithstanding all of the talk about a transparent process, an open process, you're not going to get that vote unless you force it.

Here is the other sad thing. My friends on the other side of the aisle began this Congress by talking about regular order and a transparent, open process. Of all the stuff we've been voting on these last few days, nobody has seen it. Even the committee chairman who oversees these bills doesn't even come to the Rules Committee to testify. We don't know what we're voting on here.

We can do better. Reject this rule. Vote “no” on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate my dear friend, my colleague, from Worcester, Massachusetts. I will describe it to him real fast.

Mr. Speaker, what we're trying to do is open up all the employees that are home at the FAA. That's it. We're going to bring them back to work; pay them; get it done, all the employees at the FAA.

Secondly, we're trying to form a working group. We're trying to work around the process that has gotten bogged up today, with an idea from our Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, and our Majority Leader, ERIC CANTOR, and our whip, KEVIN MCCARTHY, and a couple of people who are in the Republican leadership who are saying let's find another way around the logjam that we've got. So we came up with a good idea and said let's go to a working group. Let's actually get 10 Members of the Senate and 10 Members of the House. Let's meet. Let's meet very quickly. As a matter of fact, the resolution says that, within 1 day, they've got to be selected; within 1 day after that, they have to meet. Let's put them to work. Let's put the Members to work on this on a bipartisan, bicameral basis. That is what this is about. It is really pretty simple.

Mr. Speaker, this is not really rocket science right now. We're engaged in how we put one foot in front of the other, and Republicans have been doing this for 3 weeks. We're meeting at the Rules Committee. We're taking testimony. We are listening to the people who come to the committee.

We have very vigorous, detailed debates where Members, Republicans and Democrats, come to the Rules Committee from the Appropriations Committee. As a matter of fact, we've seen some star witnesses in this House—stars, good people, great ideas—trying to push that we're going to work together. We're going to do this together. We can do this together. Not all the bills were agreed to, but a bunch of them have been on a bipartisan basis.

So you never know when you throw up a good idea whether somebody is going to take you up on it or not. We have had a couple where that has worked; and we, as Republicans, are going to stay after it. We're the ones willing to negotiate.

Now, there was a discussion about us showing up at the World War II Memorial. Yup, sure did. I did that myself, too. The reason we went down there is that there are men and women who served in the military during World War II who, at the last years of their lives, are coming up in what are called Honor Flights, where they come up here and meet together as people who were comrades in arms for the United States of America, who fought the Axis of Evil, the Germans, the Japanese, and others. They wanted to come just about 2 miles from here down to the World War II Memorial, and it was

locked. It was bolted up and locked. So a couple of colleagues, my fellow Texans, went down there last week and found out—the park ranger was there. Well, who's allowed to get in? First Amendment protesters. First Amendment protesters are the only ones allowed in—well, and Members of Congress. So these two colleagues of mine took bolt cutters, opened it up, and it has been open ever since.

That's what Republicans are trying to do. We are trying to do that not just for the World War II Memorial; we are trying to do that for this government. We are trying to work on commonsense ideas. We are asking for this House of Representatives to be with us today.

I support this rule. I support the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 373 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, shall be taken from the Speaker's table and the pending question shall be, without intervention of any point of order, whether the House shall recede from its amendment and concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The question shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the question of receding from the House amendment and concurring in the Senate amendment without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

Sec. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 59 as specified in section 5 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused,

the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the BBC News, on October 1, 2013 in England, published the following: “For

most of the world, a government shutdown is very bad news—the result of revolution, invasion or disaster. Even in the middle of its ongoing civil war, the Syrian government has continued to pay its bills and workers' wages. That leaders of one of the most powerful nations on earth willingly provoked a crisis that suspends public services and decreases economic growth is astonishing to many.”;

Whereas the state-run Xinhua news service, on October 2, 2013 in China, published the following: “With no political unity to redress its policy mistake, a dysfunctional Washington is now overspending the confidence in its leadership.”;

Whereas The News of Mexico, on September 25, 2013 in Mexico, published the following: “They squabble over the inconsequential accomplishment of a 10-week funding extension. It isn't serious, but it certainly isn't funny.”;

Whereas the Australian, on October 1, 2013 in Australia, published the following: “The irresponsible way in which Congress . . . played the politics of partisan petulance and obstruction . . . does them little credit. Neither does it say much for the budgetary processes in the world's largest economy.”;

Whereas the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, on October 2, 2013 in Germany, published the following: “The main actors in this dispute, which brings together many factors, both ideological and political, took a huge risk and, unhindered, proceeded to validate everyone who ever accused the political establishment in Washington of being rotten to the core . . . The public is left wondering how things could have been allowed to get to this point and why there is so much poison in the system.”;

Whereas the Süddeutsche Zeitung, on October 2, 2013 in Germany, published the following: “What has already been apparent in America for a few years now is the self-destruction of one of the world's oldest democracies. And the great tragedy here is that this work of destruction isn't being wrought by enemies of democracy, greedy lobbyists or sinister major party donors. America's democracy is being broken by the very people who are supposed to carry and preserve it . . . the politicians . . . At the moment, Washington is fighting over the budget and nobody knows if the country will still be solvent in three weeks . . . What is clear, though, is that America is already politically bankrupt.”;

Whereas the Washington Post, on September 30, 2013, quoted Justice Malala, a political commentator in South Africa as saying the following: “They tell us, ‘You guys are not being fiscally responsible’ . . . And now we see that they are running their country a little like a banana republic . . . there is a lot of sniggering going on.”;

Whereas the headline of the New York Daily News, the fourth most widely circulated daily newspaper in the United States, on October 1, 2013, read: “House of Turds”, and the bylines stated: “D.C. cess-pools shut down government” and “They get paid while nation suffers”;

Whereas these reports call into question the dignity of the House; and

Whereas the resulting reduction in the public's perception of the House's dignity has culminated in a 7% Congressional approval rating in the most recent Economist/YouGov poll: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House—

(1) without seeking to effect a change in the rules or standing orders of the House or their interpretation; and

(2) without prescribing a special order of business for the House—

that a government shutdown is a mark upon the dignity of the House and that the House would be willing to pass a “clean” continuing appropriations resolution to end it.

□ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Florida wish to present argument on why the resolution is privileged under rule IX to take precedence over other questions?

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the dignity of the House has been called into question. You have heard the text of the resolution, but I think that some points bear highlighting.

The BBC News has reported that “leaders of one of the most powerful nations on Earth”—by the way, that is still us—“willingly provoked a crisis that suspends public services.”

A leading Chinese news service stated:

A dysfunctional Washington is now overspending the confidence in its leadership.

A German newspaper stated:

The main actors in this dispute took a huge risk and proceeded to validate everyone who ever accused the political establishment in Washington of being rotten to the core. The public is left wondering how things could have been allowed to get to this point and why there is so much poison in the system.

Another German newspaper said:

What has already been apparent in America for a few years now is the self-destruction of one of the world's oldest democracies. And the great tragedy here is that this work of destruction isn't being wrought by enemies of democracy, greedy lobbyists, or sinister major party donors. America's democracy is being broken by the very people who are supposed to carry and preserve it—the politicians. What is clear, though, is that America is already politically bankrupt.

The headline of the New York Daily News, the fourth most widely circulated daily newspaper in the United States, on the first day of the government shutdown read this way—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair has heard the reading of the resolution.

Does the gentleman have an argument to present as to why it qualifies as a matter of privilege under rule IX?

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes, I do, and I was about to get to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you.

As I just indicated, the headline of the New York Daily News, the fourth most widely circulated daily newspaper in the United States, on the first day of the government shutdown read this way: “House of Turds.”

The bylines stated: “D.C. cess-pools shut down government,” and “They get paid while the Nation suffers.”

Just today, a new poll came out that demonstrated as follows:

A national poll asked the following questions:

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or witches? Congress, 32 percent; witches, 46 percent.

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or hemorrhoids? Congress, 31 percent; hemorrhoids, 53 percent.

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or dog poop? Congress, 40 percent; dog poop, 47 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair would again ask the gentleman from Florida to address whether or not this resolution is privileged under rule IX.

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes, I am explaining why it is privileged under rule IX.

May I continue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed so long as the gentleman confines his remarks to whether or not the resolution is privileged under rule IX. Should the gentleman fail to continue along that path, pursuant to the Chair's guidance, the gentleman will no longer be recognized, and the Chair will be prepared to rule on the question.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, one of the questions before the House on this resolution is whether the dignity of the House has been offended. I am demonstrating vividly that the dignity of the House has been offended in support of this resolution.

May I continue without interruption?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may continue under the previous guidance issued by the Chair.

Proceed.

Mr. GRAYSON. Good.

The current polling indicates:

What do you have a higher opinion of, Americans: Congress or toenail fungus? Congress, 41 percent; toenail fungus, 44 percent.

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or cockroaches? Congress, 42 percent; cockroaches, 44 percent.

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or potholes? Congress, 36 percent; potholes, 47 percent.

And finally—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Once again, the Chair requests the gentleman from Florida to confine his remarks to whether or not the matter is privileged under rule IX. Should the gentleman proceed in any other manner, the Chair will be prepared to rule on the question.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, that is exactly what I have been doing. I would ask the Chair to allow me to continue without further interruption.

May I continue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed so long as his comments are confined to the procedural issue of whether or not the issue is privileged under rule IX.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, I want to repeat: one of the questions to make

that determination is whether the dignity of the House has been offended.

As I indicated, there is one final point to make here before I get into further argument, which is this: the American public is now of the following opinion:

What do you have a higher opinion of, Congress or zombies? Congress, 37 percent; zombies, 43 percent.

Now, clearly, statements such as these and others cited in the resolution call into question the dignity of the House. These statements are not from a single editorial or merely one passerby. These statements are being expressed around the Nation and across the globe.

They have contributed to a Congressional approval rating plummeting to 7 percent—that is 7 percent—in the latest Economist/YouGov poll, and they must be addressed by this body.

Thankfully, rule IX of the rules of the House of Representatives provides Members a mechanism through which to address those times when the dignity of the House has been harmed and called into question. It allows for questions of privilege.

Specifically, rule IX reads as follows:

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and integrity of its proceedings.

I submit to you, Mr. Chair, that these are questions squarely within the dignity of the House of Representatives.

Further, rule IX provides that:

A resolution reported as a question of the privileges of the House, shall have precedence of all other questions except motions to adjourn.

I have offered a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House, and I am here today to secure a vote on that resolution.

Mr. Speaker, you should find the obvious, which is that the dignity of the House has been called into question and that no part of the resolution that I have offered goes beyond the scope of a question of privilege—such as attempting to legislate—so that a vote must be allowed on this measure.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, the vote that should be allowed would be on the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House—

(1) without seeking to effect a change in the rules or standing orders of the House or their interpretation; and

(2) without prescribing a special order of business for the House—that a government shutdown is

—and this is obvious at this point—

a mark upon the dignity of the House and that the House would be willing to pass a “clean” continuing appropriations resolution to end it.

That is right—“a mark upon the dignity of the House and that the House would be willing to pass a ‘clean’ continuing appropriations resolution to end it.”

What then is a satisfactory question of privilege?

Well, from the plain text of rule IX, and from existing precedent, a satisfactory resolution must demonstrate that the dignity of the House has been called into question. It has been called into question to such a degree that I wanted to show you the cover from the Daily News, that I was prevented from doing so, because to show it to you—just to show it to you—would somehow be considered to be offensive to the dignity of this House.

And the resolved clause of the resolution may not diverge into affecting the legislative actions of this body.

I argue, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution satisfies both accounts.

I have found no precedent in the annotated House Rules and Manual or Hind’s or Cannon’s or Deschler’s Precedents that would allow the Chair to rule against the resolution before us today. In fact, one would question whether this entire body—including the Parliamentarian—has been politicized unnecessarily if you do rule against that today.

Not once do the precedents address a resolution that outlines a litany of condemnations against Congress from media sources around the world and here at home, as opposed to responding to a single source of criticism. Not once do the precedents rule on a resolution citing Congressional approval ratings below 10 percent in conjunction with persistent reporting against the dignity of the House.

If the first hurdle to be crossed today is that the dignity of the House has to be called into question, then, Mr. Speaker, you are required to rule in favor of this resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

If “dignity” means what the dictionary says it means—“the state or quality of being worthy of honor or respect”—then surely the honor and respect of this House has been called into question.

When only 7 out of 100 Americans approve of what we do—the lowest approval rating ever—then surely our dignity has been diminished and is actively being called into question.

If we are to be called “obstructionists” and practitioners of “partisan petulance,” if we are to be called an establishment that is “rotten to the core,” and if we are leaving Americans wondering why there is “so much poison in the system,” then surely our dignity as a body has been diminished.

If we are accused of “willingly provoking crises that suspend public services and decrease economic growth,” then surely our dignity as a body has been diminished.

If we cause international media outlets to refer to us as “politically bankrupt” and responsible for “breaking America’s democracy,” then our dignity as a body, as a House, is being called into question.

□ 1700

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The Chair has heard enough and is prepared to rule.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, the Chair has not heard my arguments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman from Florida that he is not recognized and that the Chair is prepared to rule on the question.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, excuse me, but I have a point of parliamentary order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Hearing argument on a question of order is within the Chair’s discretion. The Chair will once again advise the gentleman from Florida that the Chair is ready to rule on the question.

Mr. GRAYSON. I would remind the Chair that the Chair actually agreed to hear my argument. Having done so, the Chair needs to hear my full argument.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule on the question of whether the resolution offered by the gentleman from Florida constitutes a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, I have to say, Mr. Chair, that in doing so, you, yourself, at this point—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized.

The resolution alleges that a lapse in appropriations impairs the dignity of the House. It further expresses a sense of the House concerning action it might take on an appropriation measure. The gentleman from Florida casts this proposal as a statement.

As the Chair ruled on recent occasions such as October 2 and October 3, 2002; March 11, 2008; and December 13, 2011—in each case consistent with a principle enunciated by Speaker Gillett in his landmark ruling of May 6, 1921—a resolution expressing a legislative sentiment ordinarily does not give rise to a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

The precedent of March 11, 2008, is particularly illustrative. On that occasion, a resolution alleged that legislative inaction had brought discredit upon the House, and declared that the House should consider a motion to concur in a specified Senate amendment. The Chair held that the resolution did not present a question affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, its dignity or the integrity of its proceedings as required under rule IX.

These precedents are annotated in sections 702 and 706 of the House Rules and Manual. The principle upon which they stand was articulated by the Chair on January 24, 1996, as follows:

To rule that a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX may be raised by allegations of perceived discredit brought upon the House by legislative action or inaction, would permit any Member to allege an impact on the dignity of the House based upon virtually any legislative action or inaction.

The Chair would not distinguish between those precedents addressing resolutions that called for specific legislative action and a resolution that merely provided a statement about such action. Both express a legislative sentiment and are properly initiated through the introduction of a resolution via the hopper.

For these reasons, the resolution offered by the gentleman from Florida does not constitute a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to explain why the Chair is wrong and to finish my argument.

Mr. SESSIONS. Objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 373, by the yeas and nays; and

Adopting House Resolution 373, if ordered.

The first vote will be conducted as a 15 minute vote. The second vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 89, EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3273, DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WORKING GROUP ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 90, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 373) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth; and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 186, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 531]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Petri
Amash	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Amodei	Griffin (AR)	Pitts
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Poe (TX)
Bachus	Grimm	Pompeo
Barletta	Guthrie	Posey
Barr	Hall	Price (GA)
Barton	Hanna	Radel
Benishek	Harper	Reed
Bentivolio	Harris	Reichert
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Ribble
Black	Heck (NV)	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Hensarling	Rigell
Boustany	Holding	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Brown (GA)	Hunter	Rokita
Buchanan	Hurt	Rooney
Bucshon	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Jenkins	Ross
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Campbell	Jones	Runyan
Capito	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Joyce	Salmon
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Sanford
Chabot	King (IA)	Scalise
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Schock
Coble	Kingston	Schweikert
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Scott, Austin
Cole	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Sessions
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Conaway	Lamborn	Shuster
Cook	Lance	Simpson
Cotton	Lankford	Smith (MO)
Cramer	Latham	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Long	Southerland
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Lummis	Stivers
Denham	Marchant	Stockman
Dent	Marino	Stutzman
DeSantis	Massie	Terry
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Thornberry
Duffy	McClintock	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Turner
Ellmers	McKinley	Upton
Farenthold	McMorris	Valadao
Fincher	Rodgers	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Walberg
Fleischmann	Meehan	Walden
Fleming	Messer	Walorski
Flores	Mica	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Fox	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Garrett	Neugebauer	Wolf
Gerlach	Noem	Womack
Gibbs	Nugent	Woodall
Gibson	Nunes	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Yoho
Gohmert	Olson	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Gosar	Paulsen	
Gowdy	Pearce	
Granger	Perry	

NAYS—186

Andrews	Bonamici	Carney
Barber	Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)
Barrow (GA)	Braley (IA)	Cartwright
Bass	Brown (FL)	Castor (FL)
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Castro (TX)
Becerra	Bustos	Chu
Bera (CA)	Butterfield	Ciциlline
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Clarke
Bishop (NY)	Capuano	Cleaver
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Clyburn

Cohen	Kennedy	Peterson
Connolly	Kildee	Pingree (ME)
Conyers	Kilmer	Pocan
Cooper	Kind	Polis
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Price (NC)
Courtney	Kuster	Quigley
Cuellar	Langevin	Rahall
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Danny	Lee (CA)	Ruiz
DeFazio	Levin	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Delaney	Loeback	Sánchez, Linda
DeLauro	Lofgren	T.
DelBene	Lowenthal	Sanchez, Loretta
Deutch	Lowey	Sarbanes
Dingell	Lujan Grisham	Schiff
Doggett	(NM)	Schneider
Doyle	Luján, Ben Ray	Schrader
Duckworth	(NM)	Schwartz
Edwards	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Engel	Maffei	Serrano
Enyart	Maloney,	Sewell (AL)
Eshoo	Carolyn	Shea-Porter
Esty	Maloney, Sean	Sherman
Farr	Matheson	Sinema
Fattah	Matsui	Sires
Foster	McCollum	Slaughter
Frankel (FL)	McDermott	Smith (WA)
Fudge	McGovern	Speier
Gabbard	McIntyre	Swalwell (CA)
Garamendi	McNerney	Takano
Garcia	Meeks	Thompson (CA)
Grayson	Meng	Thompson (MS)
Green, Gene	Michaud	Tierney
Hahn	Miller, George	Titus
Hanabusa	Moore	Tonko
Hastings (FL)	Moran	Tsongas
Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)	Van Hollen
Himes	Nadler	Vargas
Hinojosa	Napolitano	Veasey
Holt	Neal	Vela
Honda	Negrete McLeod	Velázquez
Horsford	Nolan	Visclosky
Hoyer	O'Rourke	Walz
Huffman	Owens	Wasserman
Israel	Pallone	Schultz
Jackson Lee	Pascrell	Waters
Jeffries	Pastor (AZ)	Watt
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Waxman
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Welch
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Wilson (FL)
Keating	Peters (CA)	Yarmuth
Kelly (IL)	Peters (MI)	

NOT VOTING—19

Cantor	Gutiérrez	Rogers (AL)
Clay	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Crowley	Higgins	Schakowsky
Ellison	Lewis	Scott, David
Gallego	Lucas	Young (FL)
Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)	
Grijalva	Rangel	

□ 1727

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 186, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 532]

AYES—227

Aderholt	Barletta	Bilirakis
Amash	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Amodei	Barton	Black
Bachmann	Benishek	Blackburn
Bachus	Bentivolio	Boustany

Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culbertson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foss
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper

Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)

Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn

Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmuter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Neal
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 373, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN). Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 89

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. Such amounts as may be necessary for paying salaries and related expenses of Federal employees excepted from the provisions of the Antideficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1341 et seq.) who work during the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending December 15, 2013, when there is otherwise no funding authority for such salaries and related expenses: *Provided*, That not later than December 20, 2013, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report specifying the use of funds made available to the Executive Branch by this joint resolution.

SEC. 102. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 103. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Excepted Employees' Pay Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 89, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

NOT VOTING—18

Clay
Crowley
Ellison
Higgins
Galleo
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Lucas
McCarthy (NY)
Rangel
Rogers (AL)
Rush
Schakowsky
Westmoreland
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1735

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was detained and missed the following votes:

1. Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 89, H.R. 3273 and H.J. Res. 90—Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

2. H. Res. 373—Rule providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 89—Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act, H.R. 3273 Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act, and H.J. Res. 90—Federal Aviation Administration Continuing Appropriations Resolution. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

NOES—186

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)

Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro

DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Gene
Hahn

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, the legislation that I bring before the House today is very simple. It's very straightforward. It's very clear, very understandable, and, quite frankly, I think it should be noncontroversial; because what this bill does is simply say that the Federal employees who have been working during this shutdown are going to be paid, and they are going to be paid on time.

Now, a lot of people during this shutdown have been coming to work every day. They've worked for countless hours for the citizens of our Nation, and they deserve to be paid. As I said, it's very simple. If you work, you get paid.

For instance, the Capitol Police, they're on the job. They're working every day. You might remember last week, they rushed into harm's way in the line of duty. Now, those Federal employees deserve to take home a paycheck because they're on the job.

There are other Federal workers that are working every day during this shutdown. Some of them are working to make sure that our safety and well-being is in place. Some are working to make sure that the critical needs of our citizens are met. Some are working to make sure that businesses aren't unduly harmed during this shutdown, and some are working to make sure that the Federal Government extends a helping hand to those people that are the most vulnerable and are truly in need.

So what this bill does is simply say, as long as this shutdown is going on, until it ends, the people that come to work every day deserve to be paid. They deserve to be paid on time. Remember, the people who come to work every day, they're just like everybody else. They've got bills to pay. They've got mortgage payments they've got to make. They've got to pay their rent. They've got to make car payments. They've got to pay their utility bills. They've got mouths to feed back home. There is no reason that they should be punished because the Democrats and the Republicans and the White House can't agree how to move forward on funding the Federal Government.

Now, it's the goal of this Congress, as always, to make sure that Federal employees are paid and they're paid on time, and we usually do that by passing appropriations bills, and we do that. We fund the programs, and the salaries are paid on a continuing basis. We usually do that by the end of the fiscal year. It didn't happen this year, and I hope we don't find ourselves in this position ever again. But right now,

it's time to come together. This is a logical, commonsense step to take—to make sure the people that go to work every day get paid on time.

We came together on Saturday, this weekend, on a unanimous vote, and said that those Federal employees who have been furloughed would be paid on a retroactive basis. It's my hope that we can come together today on a unanimous vote and say the people that go to work are going to get paid on time.

So I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution; and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me start by saying that I wish we were here on the floor today in order to consider a bill that would reopen the entire Federal Government.

This bill would pay all excepted Federal employees across the Federal Government as they would normally be paid irrespective of the shutdown. This is the right thing to do for all of our excepted Federal employees who have continued to work during the shutdown.

□ 1745

While this bill will provide some certainty to those individuals, we all know that there is a much easier and better method of accomplishing this goal, and that is to consider and pass the clean Senate continuing resolution which would reopen our Federal Government immediately.

I'm still unclear as to why Republicans are refusing to allow a vote on the most basic solution to this reckless shutdown.

While this bill guarantees timely pay for our employees, it does not reopen the Federal Government. That means it does nothing to solve the many problems the American people are facing as a result of the Republican decision to shut down the government.

Within the subcommittee that I am the ranking member of, the Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee, the shutdown has required the Small Business Administration, for instance, to furlough almost two-thirds of its workforce. The agency has had to shutter almost all of its loan programs for our Nation's small businesses, including loan programs for veterans, women-owned small businesses, and small businesses located in underserved areas.

Within the Federal judiciary, the Federal defenders currently have enough funding to continue operations for a couple of weeks. However, once that time is up, they may be unable to fulfill their constitutional duty to uphold the Sixth Amendment rights of criminal defendants.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission has been cut from 540 employees to 22, making it near impossible for

the agency to perform its duty of fully reviewing thousands of different kinds of products. This will clearly increase the risk to the public.

The IRS has been forced to furlough most of its workforce, preventing the agency from providing taxpayer assistance to those who have questions, to examine questionable tax returns, or even to accept paper tax filings.

The IRS brings in the vast majority of our Nation's revenue, and the Republican shutdown is harming our ability to pay our bills.

The American people need a full continuing resolution so that their government can perform the many duties that remain essential to American consumers, investors, taxpayers, and small businesses. A clean CR would do just that.

I realize that the majority wants to do this piecemeal, one at a time. I think I'm doing some math, and at this rate, the full government would be open by 2025, so I'm hoping we can do it before that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. This bill addresses a critical issue facing the Congress right now. It ensures that the essential personnel who've been working throughout this shutdown receive their hard-earned pay on time.

These diligent men and women are protecting our homeland; they're ensuring our safety and well-being; they're providing critical services for our people and shielding our economy. They've been by our sides as we have worked to find a way out of the mess that we find ourselves in. They've been guarding this very building, putting themselves in harm's way. It's our responsibility to these dedicated professionals that they receive due compensation for their service to this Nation.

In addition, the House will consider a second piece of legislation this afternoon which will be combined with this bill and sent to the Senate. The second bill will provide a path forward to bring all parties to the table to end the government shutdown.

For a week, this House has been toiling, working, trying to find a way to end the impasse or at least mitigate its effects as we work toward a solution to this very serious problem.

We've provided bills that would fund the entire government and avenues to reopening certain critical government functions. We even proposed a conference committee, hoping the Senate would finally agree to talk to the House. We heard nothing.

But a week later, we're still no closer to a resolution. The Senate has turned down nearly every bill we've sent them and rejected every compromise we've offered. They've flatly refused a conference committee to attempt to find some sort of solution. After 8 days of a shutdown, it's high time that we all start having real, adult conversations about how to get out of this mess.

This second bill will establish a working group, Madam Speaker, that will provide a framework to get the House and Senate together to hash out our differences on the myriad fiscal crises that we are currently facing. If enacted, it will require, by law, Members from both Houses to meet and work our way toward a final agreement. There is far too much at stake now to be stuck in our ways. We must work together in a productive fashion if we wish to get anything accomplished.

It's imperative that we get our fiscal house in order and put our budgets on an attainable and sustainable path. We must have a common, agreed-upon, top-line discretionary spending level with the Senate, which will allow our annual appropriations work to be completed this year.

To do this, we must enact meaningful, commonsense entitlement program reforms that will slow the monstrous growth of these auto-pilot programs. We need to ensure that they're sustainable in the future—stop them from devouring the entirety of our Federal budgets—including funding for our domestic programs and our national defense, and prevent them from plunging our Nation further into debt.

I believe that the Members of this House and of the Senate are reasonable people, people of goodwill, people who wish to do right by this country. That's why I hope that this House will approve both of these bills today.

This is the right thing to do, to help find an end to this government shutdown, to tackle our spending problems and our debt limit, and to show the people of the United States that we are here to legislate, not to pontificate. They expect and deserve no less.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill and this path forward.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), my dear friend, the low-key Mr. MORAN.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my good friend from New York, and I trust that my very good friend from Kentucky wasn't referring to anybody on this side of the aisle when he used the word "pontificate."

Obviously, Madam Speaker, on this side of the aisle we are going to vote for this bill. The Democrats never wanted to shut down any of the government in the first place.

But I want to remind my colleagues that the vast majority of Federal em-

ployees in their districts are considered nonessential. I would like for my colleagues to reflect on what that means within each individual family when a breadwinner, who has been working hard at a job—making his family proud or her family proud—comes home and has to announce that they're furloughed because they were considered to be nonessential.

Imagine if that happened in the House and, if we had to divide up between essential and nonessential, how we would feel. I know it brings smiles as it did in the caucus just a few minutes ago, but think about it.

It's wrong to have this arbitrary distinction. Ninety percent of the IRS is considered nonessential; 90 percent of the Department of Energy, 90 percent of the Environmental Protection Agency, 81 percent of the Interior Department, 70 percent of the intelligence agencies are considered nonessential. They're not nonessential. They're working hard. They ought to be able to get back to their jobs. We need them to be back to their jobs.

It's very disappointing that the Senate has held up the bill that we voted for unanimously on Saturday—I hope they'll let that loose—but the reality is, when we vote to pay people, we recognize they deserve to be paid, and if they're being paid, all of them want to be working for that pay.

So that's what we need to do. We need to open the entire government. Let everyone work for their pay as they want to do.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), an outstanding member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill because people do need a paycheck. They need to be able to plan their expenses based on their income, and we have disrupted that income flow, so it makes sense to say, let's get the pay schedule back on track.

But I want to say something in a broader context that, after offering the Senate three different compromises on keeping the government open—three different compromises that were rejected—and then a fourth offer to let's immediately, last Sunday, go to a conference and start negotiating our differences, all of those were rejected; but even in that context, we have found a few things that we can agree on: the military pay bill, which not only included the men and women in uniform but the civilian support staff that they had.

As Mr. MORAN has pointed out, recently we came together again for the furloughed employees to be able to get back pay for the time in which they're out of work. Then we tried the other day to pass—and did from the House—

the NIH, the National Institutes of Health, which passed the House floor on an overwhelming bipartisan basis; and we're looking at other programs that have passed, again, on a bipartisan basis, such as WIC—the Women, Infants and Children nutrition program—Head Start, Impact Aid, and we have a number of others.

Why, Madam Speaker, are those important?

Because many of us have actually chaired and participated in conference committees where House and Senate Members come together to iron out their differences. Frequently, the gap is huge, and frequently, the differences are numerous.

We know from experience that if you can start chopping those big differences into small steps, eventually you close the gap, and that is what the House Appropriations Committee, under Chairman ROGERS, is doing, and much of it with the support of Democrat House Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. But if we can get some of these things off the table—if we can agree on military pay, if we can agree on the civilian support staff for military, if we can agree on furloughed employees, and if we can agree with NIH, that science and public health should be off the table—then, Madam Speaker, that big gap that stands between us and the Senate right now, it begins to narrow, and we create a little bit of momentum for a solution.

There are still going to be great differences that aren't going to be easy, but I think it is very important for us to come together and find the things on which we do agree, and at least move in a positive direction on them.

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), one of the great gentlemen, and I mean that.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I rise in strong support of paying our Federal workers, but I oppose the parliamentary gimmicks being used by the majority to consider H.J. Res. 89, which is why I voted "no" on the rule.

This resolution would ensure that the more than 1.2 million dedicated Federal employees who have been required by their agencies to work during the government shutdown will receive their paychecks on time.

So far, these committed men and women have been at their duty stations without pay for 8 days since Republican extremists took our government hostage as part of their crusade to take health care from tens of millions of our fellow citizens.

It is only fair and right that we pay them in a timely manner for the services they have rendered. These employees have mortgages, student loans, and children in college. They have to provide for their families, and they need their paychecks.

Three days ago, the House unanimously passed H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act, which would give back pay to 800,000 Federal employees furloughed as a result of this government shutdown. I understand, however, that a Republican Senator is blocking the consideration of that bill in the Senate.

Our Federal workers have endured relentless assaults over the past 3 years and have sacrificed much already. They have suffered through a 3-year pay freeze, reductions in their retirement benefits, and sequester-imposed furloughs.

It is time to stop the assault on our Federal workers. I urge the Senate to pass H.R. 3223 by unanimous consent immediately.

I support our Federal workers, and I support H.J. Res. 89, but I oppose the measure to which it will be attached upon passage, and note that by simply bringing to the floor a clean measure to fund the entire government, this bill would not be necessary.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time both sides have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 9¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 13 minutes remaining.

□ 1800

Mr. CRENSHAW. At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. I want to thank Chairman CRENSHAW for yielding. I want to also thank him and Chairman ROGERS for their help today and on Saturday. I also want to thank their staffs. The staffs and leadership have been incredibly helpful in bringing this legislation to this floor.

Madam Speaker, I think if you look at the vote on Saturday, I and all Members believe that Federal employees should be paid, period. Too many Federal employees and their families don't know when their next paychecks will arrive and are worried about paying their next mortgage payments, paying utilities bills, filling up their cars with gas, or paying for their children's tuitions, which are coming up very soon. We need to fix this.

That is why I joined last week with Mr. MORAN and others in our delegation—colleagues on both sides of the aisle—to bring bipartisan legislation to the floor last Saturday to ensure that all Federal employees, whether exempt or furloughed by no fault of their own, are paid once this shutdown ends. I'm

pleased that this bill passed the House 407–0.

I heard that both a Republican and a Democrat Senator had this bill on hold. I don't understand, Madam Speaker, the Senate's ways of going about this, but I think, if any Senators have a hold, they ought to feel strongly enough that they ought to do it publicly so we know who they are, but I understand it's both a Republican and a Democrat. On behalf of the people who are having a very difficult time, I would ask them to lift that hold.

Additionally, this House acted to ensure that members of the military and Defense Department civilians exempt from furloughs would be paid on time. I am pleased that the Pay Our Military Act, which the House passed by 423–0, was quickly approved by the Senate and signed into law by the President.

Today's legislation builds on these efforts by ensuring that other exempt Federal employees like the FBI team in Nairobi investigating the attack by Al-Shabaab; the CIA, which is looking at things coming in with regard to al Qaeda; the DEA, which is stopping drugs from coming into this country; the Border Patrol agents; doctors and nurses at VA hospitals; Federal firefighters; air traffic controllers; and prison guards will be paid as soon as possible. I hope the House today will follow the bipartisan precedent we have set over and over and vote for this legislation.

In closing, I know my colleagues recognize that Federal employees aren't just nameless faces behind desks. They are real people, out in the field, who work day in and day out to keep our country safe.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to clarify that it is a gentleman of the minority party that has objected and is holding up the pay bill in the Senate.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), a great leader and the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend from New York.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely the right thing to do to make sure we pay Federal workers on time whether they're the Capitol Police or any other public servant doing the work of our country right now.

It was also the right thing to do on a bipartisan basis to make sure that Federal employees are not punished through no fault of their own. We did that unanimously by the vote on Saturday to make sure that Federal employees do not have to bear that burden when they're not the ones making the bad decisions.

What is very puzzling, Mr. Speaker, is, in having voted unanimously to say that we're going to make sure we pay those Federal employees who are being furloughed, we would at the same time

block them from going back to work for the American people.

I just don't understand, Mr. Speaker, how the Speaker of the House can explain that to the American people when we have in our possession here in the people's House a piece of legislation that, if we were allowed to vote on it, could reopen the entire government right now, without preconditions.

Now, we've heard from our Republican colleagues that they want to open one little piece—let's open the national parks. Let's open another little piece—but on Saturday, what we did was vote to make sure that every Federal employee, whether they work for the national parks or any other Federal agency—everyone—would get paid for yesterday, for today, for tomorrow.

So why would our colleagues want to let one more day go by when we're compensating Federal employees and making them stay at home? Why wouldn't we open the Federal Government today so that they can do the work that we're paying them to do on behalf of the American people? It is absolutely mind-boggling, Mr. Speaker, that our Republican colleagues would take that position.

In the Senate right now you've got a Senator from Texas, Senator CORNYN, who is blocking that particular provision that we passed unanimously. I hope that he will let it go. But over here in the House, we have a bill that the President's waiting to sign right now. All we need to do is pass it, and the votes are here in the House to do it. If the Speaker doubts that fact, there's an easy way to figure it out. We all know that. Put it up for a vote. What's the Speaker afraid of—a little democracy in this House?

So we're going to be paying all the Federal employees, as we should, because they absolutely should not be penalized—not for one day that we're forcing them to be out of work. These are men and women who are dedicated to providing service to our country. They want to get back to work, and what this House is saying is, We're going to keep paying you, but we're not going to let you go to work for the American people. That is an astounding position to take.

Let's vote to open the entire government right now. Let's take up the Senate bill. Let's get it done.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I don't have any further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we keep saying it, and the folks who keep watching us wonder why we keep saying it—or maybe they know why we keep saying it. Little by little, you are reopening the government, but it may take until 2025 to accomplish it at this level. So our hope would be that we just pass the resolution that was passed in the Senate and open the government.

Now, this one is an easy one. Everyone is going to vote for this bill. In fact, this bill should pass on a voice vote so that we can get folks and pay them properly for the services they're rendering, but there are other people who need to come to work. There are other people who need to service the American people. There are Americans who need to be serviced, and this is not the way for us to behave.

A little bit of history—and I know that some people in the last couple of days have either refused to mention it or gave up on it—and that is that this all started not because there were differences in economic reasoning or behavior. It started because a group of people on your side wanted to attach killing ObamaCare—the Affordable Care Act—and they were willing to do whatever they needed to do to accomplish that.

That's not going to happen. How many times do we have to say that bill was passed by the House, passed by the Senate, signed by the President, and upheld by the Supreme Court? I don't know how many laws you can say that about in this country that we don't go after, and yet some folks just won't give up.

The time is now for us to open up the government. The time is now for us to pass this bill, to respect our Federal workers, but also to respect the American people in general by making sure that the government is open.

Take up the resolution. It will pass in 2 seconds, I assure you. In fact, I predict that if you bring that resolution to the floor, you may be shocked to get a unanimous vote, because that's what we want to do—to open up the government and then move on to deal with the issues that we have to deal with.

So let's do it, and let's do it quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody in this Chamber wanted to see the government shut down. Nobody wanted to see it down.

As has been pointed out, we passed a continuing resolution, funded the government, sent it to the United States Senate, and they said "no." So we sent another resolution that kept the government open. The Senate said "no." A third time we sent a resolution to the United States Senate to keep the government open. The Senate said "no."

Then we said, Why don't we just sit down and talk? Why don't we have a conference committee—one of those committees that we have all the time in this body when the House and the Senate disagree. We call it a conference committee. We appoint a group from the House. They appoint a group from the Senate. We work out the differences. That's the way you resolve conflict. That's the way you move ahead.

So the House appointed eight conferees. We went to a meeting, ready to meet with the Senate. They didn't show up. So we decided they don't really want to have any negotiations about how we continue to fund the Federal Government.

Then we said, If they won't pass a continuing resolution to fund the entire Federal Government, maybe we should just take certain parts of the Federal Government and see if the United States Senate or our friends on the other side would vote in favor of doing that. Of course, everyone has voted to say we ought to keep the government running as it relates to the military—both the defense and civilian employees. So our friends on the other side decided that was a good idea, and they voted for that.

Then we said, Since the District of Columbia is being penalized by our inaction, why don't we pass a bill that says we'll appropriate the money—it's their own money—and let them spend it the way they want to spend it. We had that on a suspension vote, and our friends on the other side didn't want to do that, so they voted "no."

Then we had a bill on Saturday that talked about folks that are on furlough, and our friends on the other side said, That's a good idea. We ought to pay them retroactively.

So they've been picking and choosing, picking and choosing, and some of these bills passed. In fact, if you add up all the bills we've passed, there have been 10 bills now that keep the government running in different ways shapes, and forms—that's almost one-third of all the discretionary spending—and we passed all that.

Where are those bills? They're sitting down in the Senate, waiting for the Senate to do something.

So we find ourselves in a situation that we didn't want to be in. We're all frustrated—people are angry—but we'll keep going. We're going to try to get the government running again. We're going to try to keep things open.

But for goodness sake, this bill before us today simply says the folks that are coming to work are doing the things that are important to our Federal Government, and they ought to get paid. If you work, you get paid, and you get paid on time. I think everybody agrees with that.

So let's not penalize them. A lot of people are being penalized because of our inaction, but let's not penalize the people who come to work every day to meet the critical needs of our country. Let's make sure that they get paid. Sooner or later, Mr. Speaker, we'll open this government back up. We've tried to do almost a third of it now. Still, people say no. We'll move ahead.

With that, I simply urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation to make sure that the people who are working get paid on time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.J. Res. 89, the Federal Worker Pay Fairness Act.

Last week the House passed support of H.R. 3223, the "Federal Employees Retroactive Pay Fairness Act," which provided for retroactive pay for nearly 800,000 federal workers who have been furloughed as a result of the government shutdown engineered by the Tea Party faction of House Republicans.

The 1.3 million "essential" civilian employees as well as those who are on Furlough share the same financial fate neither will get a paycheck if the shutdown extends beyond October 15, 2013.

Federal employees whether they are working or waiting be called back to work are all waiting on the House to honor a promissory note for agreeing to give their best in serving the people of the United States.

We promise to pay Federal employees what is owed to them. We owe them dignity and respect as well as a debt of gratitude for electing to enter into public service.

The reason we are considering another Federal employee pay bill is that the earlier bill forgot something important that the majority is trying to fix—and I agree they should fix with passage of this bill.

We have not started the debate on the Debt Ceiling, but it is time to start considering the consequences should this method of legislating continue.

The world has a promissory note that is written on every dollar bill, "This note is Legal Tender for All Debts, Public and Private."

That promissory note means that people around the world highly value our nation's currency—not having that reputation will hurt everyone in this country.

In other words our money is only as valuable as its reputation, which is why threatening not to honor our debts is more than just a light matter to be down played by PR talking points.

But to my dear friends on the other side of the aisle this is another example of why this piece-mill process to attempt to fund the Federal government is a problem and why the American public can see that this process makes no sense.

The House has members who are specialists in appropriations they serve on the House Committee on Appropriations.

According to the Rules on the House of Representatives the House Committee on Appropriations' function is the appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

The Appropriations Committee would not have forgotten to include Hill staff, which this bill will address. Hill employees include Capitol Police officers, custodial staff, and the staff of the Library of Congress.

This gesture is appreciated by these Federal government employees, but neither they nor the other federal employees promised back pay will see anything until this body passes a clean CR offered by the Senate.

The United States House of Representatives has Rules that govern how we as the people's representatives are to conduct the business of the Federal government.

The House of Representatives have been trying to put on a show for the American public by bringing bills to the floor—fast and varied though they may be they are half baked and ineffective means of funding the Federal government.

My colleagues on the other side aisle are only human—and they are going to forget something, but one of the things they should not forget is how their decisions are impacting the lives of people.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.J. Res. 89.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1815

DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WORKING GROUP ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 373, I call up the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3273

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. BICAMERAL WORKING GROUP ON DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a bicameral working group to be known as the “Bicameral Working Group on Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth” (hereinafter referred to as the “working group”).

(b) PURPOSE.—The working group shall recommend to the House of Representatives and the Senate—

(1) overall levels of discretionary spending, including for the fiscal year ending on September 30, 2014;

(2) changes in the statutory limit on the public debt; and

(3) reforms in direct spending programs.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) The working group shall be comprised of 20 members to be appointed as follows:

(A) The Speaker shall appoint 10 Members of the House of Representatives, of which one shall be designated as House co-chair and 4 shall be on the recommendation of the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(B) The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint 10 Senators, of which one shall be designated as Senate co-chair and 4 shall be on the recommendation of the minority leader of the Senate.

(2) Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the working group shall be filled in the same manner as the original designation was made.

(3) Each appointment under this subsection shall be made not later than one calendar day after enactment of this Act.

(d) MEETINGS.—The members of the working group shall meet not later than one calendar day after their appointment pursuant to subsection (c) and shall meet on each calendar day thereafter unless both co-chairs jointly determine that there is good cause to dispense with such meeting.

(e) ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—The working group may not report any recommendation unless it receives the support of a majority of the members appointed by both the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate.

(f) REPORT.—

(1) The working group shall report its recommendations, including any legislative language required to implement those recommendations, to the House of Representatives and the Senate within 3 calendar days after their adoption.

(2) The report shall be referred in the House of Representatives by the Speaker in accordance with clause 2 of rule XIV.

(3) The report shall include any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted to the co-chairs prior to its transmission pursuant to paragraph (1).

(g) TERMINATION.—The working group shall terminate immediately after transmission of the report under subsection (f).

(h) RULEMAKING.—The provisions of this section are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legisla-

tive days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3273.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It has been 1 week since the Federal Government shut down. In that time, House Republicans have passed several appropriations bills designed to provide funding for numerous parts of the government's most important functions. Additionally, we've invited Senate Democrats to join us at the negotiating table to find a commonsense solution to our Nation's fiscal problems.

Unfortunately, no one over these 3 weeks has been able to reach a compromise, and Senate Democrats have simply returned our volley every time without a value-added proposition. So what we are here to do today is to stand up once again and say we believe we are trying to appropriately fund the Federal Government.

As a result, we are here today. House Republicans are going to offer to sit down at the negotiation table with Senate Democrats in an effort to reach the meaningful solutions our constituents expect from us.

H.R. 3273, the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013, would establish a bicameral, bipartisan working group consisting of six Members of the majority and four Members of the minority from both the House and the Senate. These 20 Members would be appointed no less than 1 day after enactment of the legislation and would meet each subsequent calendar day to provide recommendations to overall discretionary spending levels for fiscal year 2014, changes to the discretionary debt limit, and reforms to direct spending programs.

Mr. Speaker, being from Texas, I am used to a lot of people trying to work for the good—the common good—of its people. I will tell you that I fully expect that the reason I came to Washington was to work for the good and not for just the people of Texas, but to accept the responsibility. It was important that I come to work for all people in Texas and the American people to make their lives better. I believe that some of those ideas include sitting down, talking, negotiating, finding common ground, leading—not obstructing, not saying “no,” not being the first one to walk out or not agreeing to meet, but, rather, to sit down and be constructive.

That is what we in the House of Representatives are trying to do once again today with a common set of principles. We believe constitutionally, as the House of Representatives, we have the authority and the responsibility to be leaders in the process that will allow the American people to effectively see who is here, who is working,

and expect us to get our job done. Unfortunately, it's a rough world, and we're having a tough time, so a new idea today is to gather our colleagues together from each side and see if we can make progress.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman, my good friend from Texas, who yielded the time.

I rise today obviously in strong opposition to this measure. I would say to my friend, I just heard him just a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, say that the people from Texas sent him here to do things. Well, the people from Florida sent me here to do things just like him. There are 435 Members in this institution, in addition to delegates from around our territories, and each one of them has an unequivocal and clear understanding about how to go about budgeting in this particular matter.

Forming a working group is forming another group up above that group. I don't need that, and I don't believe he needs that. I don't need it. Evidently, we haven't done very well when we've had it. From the newspapers today, I gathered that we had a Simpson-Bowles Commission, which people forget was the legacy of the 2010 debt ceiling increase. We had the Domenici-Rivlin commission. We had the Cantor-Biden talks. We had the Obama-Boehner debt ceiling negotiation, the Gang of Six talks, the supercommittee, and then the Obama-Boehner fiscal cliff talks. Not one of them worked, and this mess isn't going to work either.

It's sort of like, Mr. Speaker, moving the hostages, since they're taking them one by one here with this rifle-shot approach to legislating, when, in fact, all they have to do is put a clean CR on the floor and we could pass it, and they know that. But basically what they're doing is saying, Okay, we're going to take some hostages over here; then we're going to put them in another room with some more people so that they can talk to them.

I said in the Rules Committee, and I repeat: this is a gimmick wrapped in a con inside a scam, and nothing tells me anything different about my friends across the aisle who've offered gimmick after gimmick instead of doing what they know is right.

We can open the government, and that's easy to do. We can put Americans back to work, and that's easy to do. We can keep our country from defaulting on its obligations. This measure will do none of those things, not one of them.

In all that talk about the President, the President made it very clear today that he's willing to negotiate. Evidently—and I picked up on this—my

friends on the other side must have poll-tested conversation. Well, conversation allows, among other things, that you have an exploratory understanding with people in an informal setting.

What have we been talking about around here for 2 years? We've been talking about this mess. This didn't just come up last night or the day before yesterday. Democrats have already offered seven times to take up the Senate-passed continuing resolution. The House GOP has blocked a vote on the measure each and every time. For 6 months, we've been asking these people to conference.

To the House Republican leadership I say, Mr. Speaker, let us vote on a clean CR. Let us raise the debt ceiling. Why prolong this shutdown when you know that the votes are here in the House of Representatives?

My friends across the aisle know they've made a mistake. The goalposts have not only moved; they have vanished completely from the field. First, they want to defund ObamaCare. Then they only want to delay ObamaCare. Then when that didn't work, they said, well, we don't want to shut the government down, so let's open it up piece by piece. Evidently, that isn't working either, so they're now down here, moaning and groaning about the fact that the Senate isn't going to take up something that's foolish because they've made it clear that they want this to be a measure that's not a part of any negotiations or conversation; and the President made it clear that he will converse with anybody about anything but not with a gun at his head and not with the kind of undertaking that you are going forward here.

So now it's a working group, another supercommittee. How did that work out for you the last time, I ask my friends, if you would, Mr. Speaker?

So tell me, where does it all end? In all seriousness, what do my friends across the aisle hope to achieve?

Speaker BOEHNER has said: "My goal here is to have a serious conversation"—he said it 27 times "conversation" on Sunday; I was looking at him when he said it—"about those things that are driving the deficit and driving the debt up, and the President's refusal to sit down and have a conversation about this is putting our Nation at risk of default."

At 11:38 today, the President's office issued a statement wherein they had a conversation today with JOHN BOEHNER, in essence, telling him virtually that we can do this with a clean CR.

What have we been talking about? Why are we even here? What are we talking about now? Are we having a conversation, or are we just talking past each other here in the House of Representatives? Republicans have shut down the Federal Government and taken us to the brink of a global eco-

nomic catastrophe because, evidently, they want to have a conversation that we are already in the middle of.

Guess what? The Senate CR is at the levels you wanted—\$986 billion. That's what they voted on. Sequestration is the law, as my friend from Georgia is fond of saying, "the law of the land." You've already gotten what you wanted. Let's just vote on a clean CR. Let us raise the debt ceiling. This shutdown and looming debt ceiling breach are failures of the majority's leadership to stand up against the extremists within their own party, elected on a platform of obstructionism that borders on insurrection.

Leaders, you say on the other side, must be strong. Leaders must be courageous. This has become not a democracy that was intended by Jefferson and Madison and Adams and all of those that were our Founders, the Franklins and the Washingtons. They founded a democracy in spite of their divisions. They did not want to have mobocracy. That's what you've allowed to stand up in your part of this institution, a mob.

Mr. Speaker, let us end these games with a strong bipartisan message. We can show the rest of the world that the United States is ready to end its political brinksmanship.

When I was a child and I would speak out of turn, my dad and my grandmother would say: Sit down and shut up. We don't need a shutdown. We don't need people being shut out. What we need to do is shut up and let the American people cause us to listen to them and go about the business of bringing a clean CR down here. That's what I'm hearing from the American people, both Republican and Democrat, liberal and conservative, that they want us to sit down and shut up and open up this government with a clean CR.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party hears the gentleman. We are also listening to the American people. The American people are sick and worried about their future. They see a government that spends too much money and listens too little. They tax too much and leave too little for the American people. They are very aware that this Big Government ploy and play by not just this administration, but the prior administration that ran this House of Representatives, placed America in a detrimental position, in a position where we have health care that is a government-run health care plan, that is causing not just uncertainty, but unemployment. Republicans got into this whole mess of the debate with ObamaCare because it got closer and closer and closer to implementation.

Let's look at what this bill tactically does. It tactically puts rules and regulations on business. That means that

business arbitrarily will make decisions literally to cut not only the amount of people that they have, but the work hours associated with that. Many unions across the United States are concerned about the loss of the 40-hour workweek because that's the threshold that Democrats have placed the American worker in.

So the Republican Party, in listening not just to business, but workers, made a determination that the closer we got to this implementation, we were going to continue discussing how bad this was for not just business, but for individuals.

Then the President came and unilaterally decided he would let businesses be deferred for a year, but kept the rules and regulations on individuals. That was done over Fourth of July, just in a tweet that went out. They weren't even brave enough to put the full announcement out.

So now the Republicans have focused since the Fourth of July on the unfairness about how individuals will be expected to apply all of these laws directly on them as individuals. See, what the American people understand is, it is almost impossible to fight as an individual against a big government, against the IRS, and it's the IRS who will be making sure that the American people follow this tax law.

□ 1830

That is what the Supreme Court said it is. It is a tax law.

That is where lots of groups around the country continue to speak, not only clearly, but with effectiveness, about how it is unfair for the President to give 1,200 waivers and a waiver to certain people who were included in the bill—business—and now he is going to waive that but put it off on individuals.

These are small business owners. They are men and women who are not just our neighbors. They are men and women who produce the goods and services, who put their name on their businesses, who have their children become teachers and firefighters and members of our military.

They see where this is harming their ability to have health care. It is harming their ability to have the opportunity for their small business to be successful because it is putting them at a disadvantage. Perhaps worst of all, there are lots of businesses who understand that this will cost an incredible amount of money, and that is why businesses will not offer the exact same health care plan that they had previously—UPS, all the way to Delta Air Lines, and lots of other companies.

That is why it is very timely—it is very timely—that Republicans have been doing this all year, but we focused on this directly at the implementation.

We are here for a good reason. We are trying to now change the dynamics with a working group. We are trying to

say we believe that some of our colleagues would have a better opportunity to negotiate with some good ideas. Trust me, there are good ideas that float back and forth between Republicans and Democrats all the time. We are trying to say that a successful "rain dance" has a lot to do with timing.

That success can be accepting this working group, getting our Members together on a bipartisan basis—House and Senate—immediately within a day or so, and then start working together. Do you know what? Even if they weren't the final answer, what a great opportunity to empower our Members to talk and work together and see if they can make headway.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to tell both sides how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the Speaker.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. NITA LOWEY, my good friend and an appropriator supreme.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, a quick review of the facts makes clear that Republicans are revising history when they claim Democrats refuse to negotiate.

A headline yesterday from National Journal sums it up:

Nineteen Times Democrats Tried to Negotiate With Republicans: The GOP's biggest talking point of the shutdown is only true if you ignore everything that has happened before last weekend.

House Republicans' failure to negotiate includes: their leadership walking out of negotiations last December; ignoring the President's \$4 trillion deficit reduction plan; refusing for months to negotiate on the budget with the Senate; and now denying the House a vote to end the shutdown after Democrats agreed to their spending levels.

Of course we will work with you, my friends, on honest efforts. President Obama signed a bipartisan \$2.5 trillion deficit reduction law, and the deficit today is half of what it was in 2009. We are willing partners who will compromise.

But to suggest that we need a special committee to tell us what we already know is just not sincere. This bill is an attempt to shift blame for this shutdown. Speaker BOEHNER should stop trying to find somebody else to do his job. He can end the shutdown today by allowing a vote on the Republican-written and Senate-passed CR, which would get a majority vote in the House and be signed by the President.

Reopen the government. Do not jeopardize the full faith and credit of the

United States. Stop wasting time on political stunts like this bill while Americans suffer. Vote "no."

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would thankfully acknowledge the floor of the House of Representatives here for voting on several very, very important items that allow those employees that today might not be at work. We have asked that they come back to work, and it was passed here—those in food and drug security, those in Head Start, those in national emergency disaster recovery, those in the NIH, and those in national parks.

These are an example of the ideas that have come forth from votes on this floor. And soon to come—intelligence, border security, Native Americans, and Alaskan health care, national weather monitoring, nuclear weapons security, and nutrition assistance for women and children.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I put to you most sincerely: Do you not feel that by cherry-picking what it is that you want to do with these rifle shots, that it is causing a morale problem in the rest of the government?

Let's assume that you have 150 that you are going to do, and the group that would be going back to work the latest would be sometime the week after next or sometime 2 weeks from there.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman for asking. My dear friend, very respectfully, has asked a good question.

As a matter of fact, we would like to move forward with all 150 as quickly as possible. What we would like to do is move through these. We've got them now. They are lined up to go to our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol. But they don't want to do that.

Why would I move forward if they don't want to do that? Why would we move forward if they do not actually really want to open up the government except under their terms?

We believe that they have not addressed the underlying problems:

Number one, what is happening with this thing called ObamaCare, and secondly, with the debt? We are adding debt as we speak. We have gone from \$9- to \$17 trillion in just a few short years.

We have been working with the President. We have been doing things in the 3 years that Republicans have been back in the majority. We are trying to correct the errors of the past. That is why we are here today.

The gentleman asked a good question: Wouldn't it be a good thing to get through our list of 150? I would say to the gentleman, we have already done some and we will keep doing them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. In the vernacular, they just say “bring it.” Put all 150 of them down here and we would have a clean CR.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), one of the most distinguished Members that has served in the House of Representatives, my good friend, the minority whip of my party, who may very well answer that question that I asked about morale.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman pointed out, the morale is low for approximately 315 million people who call America home; low because they see a dysfunctional board of directors of their country; low because they are anguished about the inability to come to grips with reality.

I want to tell my friend, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee, we said “yes.” You sent us a bill to the United States Senate, which we control, and you said, Let us open government, and we will open it on the condition that we cap spending at \$986 billion.

Now, you also put another piece on that bill which said we ought to defund ObamaCare—the Affordable Care Act, as we call it. I venture to say that close to 90, maybe even 100 percent, on your side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman—I say to him, Mr. Speaker—didn’t think that was going to happen. They said it because they feel strongly, Mr. Speaker, about that. I understand that. I have strong feelings myself.

Now, the gentleman, my colleague from Maryland, I hope is going to use the analogy about “vetoing” the debt limit because it is a good one. But I will tell my friend the Senate said “yes” and sent it back here.

We could open the government this evening if only you would accept what you suggested, if only you would say, “Yes, you agreed with our number.”

There was no negotiation, there was no compromise on our side. There was a saying to you: We want to keep the government open, so yes. Our Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives and the Senate said, Mr. Speaker, we will take your number. America needs to know that we have said “yes” to the number that you suggested.

I don’t like your number. I think it is not good for America, Mr. Speaker. I think it is not good for our national security, for our economy, or for the morale of the American people long term.

Having said that, I want government open, so we have said “yes” to your number. We didn’t negotiate. We said, “We will take what you propose.”

Mr. Speaker, I hope every American understands that when one side says, “We’ll take your number,” that there ought to be an agreement.

Now, I rise in opposition to this bill that has been put on the floor, which is another way to distract from the business at hand—opening up our government. Eight days from now our government will be in a position for the first time in history where we won’t be able to pay our bills. The wealthiest Nation on the face of the Earth, the most creditworthy Nation on the face of the Earth, will be in a position not that we don’t have the resources, not that we don’t have the credit to borrow to make sure that we continue to be able to pay our bills—that won’t be the case. It will be the case that we don’t have the authority to do so because this Congress has not acted.

I tell my friend, Mr. Speaker, who chairs the Rules Committee and whose father served with such distinction as the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. The present head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. Comey, says that this sequester and budget number will deeply hurt law enforcement in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I talked to my colleagues, let’s defeat this bill, and let’s move to the business that is real, that will make a difference, not make a political point. Let us move to doing the business of America and put the people’s government back to work, not pretend that we are going to do it by some supercommittee. We tried that. It didn’t work very well. I am sorry about that. I urged them to stay in business and do their job.

I ask my colleagues, defeat this, move to the business of America, put the people’s government back to work.

Mr. Speaker, this House has a responsibility to reopen government.

We can vote on a bill within the hour that would reopen the entire government—and we know the votes are there to pass it.

Two hundred Democrats are on record that we will vote to reopen the government, and there are media reports that twenty-five Republicans will do so as well.

So let’s find out: put a bill on the floor to reopen government, and let the House work its will.

Democrats are also ready to work with republicans to prevent a default.

Once we end the shutdown and remove the threat of default, Democrats want to sit down and talk in a bipartisan way—as we have asked to do for months—and work out a long-term solution to our nation’s fiscal challenges.

But the plan on the floor today won’t do that.

It is a pretense, not a substantive action.

It does not reopen government, nor does it ensure America pays its bills.

And it is not a real mechanism to reach a broader agreement on fiscal issues.

It does not have a deadline for action—nor does it require a vote on any recommendations the committee would produce.

And, it is not a balanced approach, as it precludes the consideration of any new revenue whatsoever.

This is just more of the same from the Tea Party-driven Republican conference that isn’t serious about reducing the deficit in a balanced and sustainable way.

Instead of wasting more time on these reckless and irresponsible gimmicks, we ought to be taking responsible steps to end the shutdown, prevent a default, and then work together to achieve real, long-term fiscal solutions.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the gentleman knows, there are few people in this House who I have a better relationship than I do with the gentleman from Maryland. With great respect, I listened to him and his words.

I would say back to him there is a little bit more that really comes to us from people who speak about their lives also. I am concerned about people who are not only working for our great government and people who receive services, but we are also trying—without to make a point—we are trying to make changes in the Affordable Care Act, which is also known as ObamaCare.

□ 1845

There are several things about the Affordable Care Act that render that title difficult to understand, because the Affordable Care Act, within a year the Congressional Budget Office said they believed it would be at least twice as expensive as it was originally thought it would be.

Secondly, some 70 percent more people will be in the system because they provided a figure that did not match what they expect now for people to be in it from people who moved off of their worker plans, their insurance plans.

Third, the President stood right here one State of the Union and said there won’t be a dime of taxpayer money.

And lastly, the President of the United States said:

And if you like your insurance, I guarantee you, you can keep it.

But, Mr. Speaker, what has happened since then is this administration was incapable of providing information about how this would work. And even to today, after the announcement was made, people are going onto the Web site and learning more about these exchanges.

The largest cardiology group in America, cardiologists—heart doctors—were not even included or asked to be in the exchange. Not even given a chance to say no, thank you, the largest cardiology group in America.

So now the American people are looking at it and saying, my doctor’s not even included, so who is included because my doctor is not, and now I am

looking at this plan that is very expensive. Granted, New York City, the State of New York was less because they had a very expensive plan, and it's true in some places it is less. But the best doctors or the doctors that people went to are not even included in those plans now. As an example, as I said, the largest cardiology group, the most experienced cardiologists, the ones you want to go to for Medicare, for Medicaid, and for your health insurance, are not even going to be included in the government plan.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is just one example about the disappointment that the American people have because they were told one thing, and they're going to get something else. Because you're fighting the government, we have to do it in such a public way. If we simply followed the law, and the contract or the express contract did not equal what came out the other end, you could go to court and sue for it. But you can't sue the government over this. So we are litigating this actually, Mr. Speaker, right before your eyes in a very public way, saying that we believe this health care, known as ObamaCare, should not be entered into lightly.

We better understand what we're doing, and we're asking for a lot of changes. Those changes are: we think we ought to delay it; we think we ought to defer it; we think we ought to wait on it. We have, in essence, backed up every single time from our demand, and now we've gotten to a point where we, as Republicans in our discussion through legislation with the Senate, have now gotten to the point where we've said, We are where we're going to be. Now we're going to try and open up the government and we're going to try and make it work. That's the facts of the case, and that's just the way it is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thought we were here about the working group, but it does come out in the wash: we really are here about ObamaCare.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member on the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida. As the gentleman said, we discovered right now that the government is still shut down because our Republican colleagues want to repeal the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, when in fact we could open the government right now by passing the bill that's in our possession.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about negotiation because the President and the Democrats in Congress have been trying to have a budget negotiation with our Republican colleagues all year long. In fact, in March, the House passed its budget, and in March, the Senate passed its budget.

And just like the textbook says, you're then supposed to have a negotiation between the House and the Senate to negotiate your differences to reach a compromise. What happened? The Speaker of the House refused to appoint negotiators from the House. We tried three times to get a vote; each time the Speaker said "no."

In the United States Senate, on 18 occasions, in fact 19 now, the Democratic leader and Senator MURRAY tried to get consent to have a budget negotiation between the House and Senate. On 18 occasions, Senate Republicans said "no." They didn't want to talk. They didn't want to negotiate. So the clock ticked until we got down to government shutdown. And then what happened?

The Speaker of the House and the Senate Democratic leader had a negotiation. On Sunday on national television, the Speaker of the House told the country that he had a negotiation with Senator REID. They had gotten a deal. But guess what? The Speaker reneged on the agreement. Why? He told us that, too. He couldn't sell it to a reckless faction of his own party. He wanted to allow that faction of the party to run the country and shut down the government.

Now what are our Republican colleagues saying? That they're not going to let us pay our bills on time unless we adopt the Republican budget agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleagues—and I think this is an important question for the country—if the President of the United States said that he would veto a debt ceiling bill, that he would veto legislation to pay the country's bills on time unless Republicans adopted the President's budget and the President's agenda, our Republican colleagues would say he'd lost his mind. Our Republican colleagues would probably start impeachment proceedings. And yet, that's exactly what they're doing. They're saying that they won't take responsibility in joining us to pay our country's bills on time unless we adopt the Republican budget agenda unless we say let's get rid of the Affordable Care Act, unless we do everything their way.

Again, if the President was to take that position, you would say he was off his rocker. So now, our Republican colleagues are coming up with a fake committee where it actually sets the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the gentleman.

So after all this refusal to negotiate, you now want to set up a fake committee on deficit reduction where you refuse to even include the idea of reducing the deficit in part by shutting down tax breaks for big oil companies

because you don't want to use one penny of revenue, even from closing tax loopholes, to reduce the debt and deficit. I hear from my colleagues how important it is to reduce the debt—and it absolutely is—but apparently it's not important enough to shut down one tax loophole for special interests.

End this sham. Vote on the Senate bill. Open the government.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, there is some truth to this. I and the Speaker and the majority leader and the whip and our conference do not want to have anything that would empower somebody to raise taxes. But we did want to empower that we would allow maybe Mr. DINGELL, the Dean of the House, maybe Mr. VAN HOLLEN, maybe Mr. HASTINGS, to be part of a committee, a working group that would sit down with their colleagues and speak honestly—and maybe Mrs. LOWEY—speak honestly about how we get out of this mess that we all have.

And as a working group, as a working group with no dictates but how you've got to do what you're going to do, no timeframe except you have to go meet, and you've got to be successful, and it's going to be about these items. In other words, make "the big deal" the big deal. And the big deal right now is spending, debt, and how we do something to get this government back to work. That's what I think the legislation does.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Well, for a week now, the Republicans said no to a CR funding the entire government unless there was defunding of health care reform. That was the bludgeon. It did not work.

So the Republicans shut down the government. It turns out that tactic was in the works for a year, as described in The New York Times yesterday:

One morning in a location the Members insist on keeping secret, came a little-noticed "blueprint to defund ObamaCare" signed by leaders of more than three dozen conservative groups. It articulated a take-no-prisoners legislative strategy that had long percolated in conservative circles: that Republicans could derail the health care overhaul if conservative lawmakers were willing to push fellow Republicans—including their cautious leaders—into cutting off financing for the entire government.

So now we have a shift. Keep the government shut down, let government not pay its bills. Why? Because the Speaker said it would be "unconditional surrender." That isn't what's needed. We don't need another supercommittee. What we need is to be allowed to vote.

This poster shows 195 Democrats willing to reopen the government; 22

Republicans on record. That's a majority of the House. Mr. Speaker, let democracy prevail. Let us vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 1¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the balance of my time to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this debate is a bizarre experience for those of us who have been urging negotiation on the budget for a year. "Take the President up on his overture of last December," we've said to our Republican friends. "Let's go to a conference with the Senate and work out a budget." But the Republicans have steadfastly refused. They have run out the clock. And why did they do that? So that in a crisis atmosphere, they could demand a ransom for doing our basic duty—keeping the government open and paying our bills.

Well, that's extortion, and it's way over the line. We can't do that. In fact, we need to open the government. We could do it tonight. The votes are here if the Speaker would simply permit a vote. We could reopen the government immediately.

I promise you once we do our basic duty, we will be happy immediately to do what we should have been doing all along, and that is to negotiate a budget plan, a budget plan that puts everything on the table: revenues, entitlement, all categories of spending, a budget plan that secures this country's economic future and ends this charade that the Republicans have put us through here as the new fiscal year begins.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, we're here because Republicans want us to move forward with a process that is very important. We've had a number of times that the gentlewoman, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Mrs. LOWEY, we've had the great young chairman from Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS, chairman of Appropriations, come up to the committee and talk very clearly about their ideas about moving forward to get things done.

□ 1900

I don't know that they would be the representatives of this body, but I bet they would be and I bet you that they could make real progress, along with, perhaps, Mr. VAN HOLLEN and others who are awesome Members on their side, Members who are committed to getting the work done.

But this is a fight, and it's a fight that goes all the way to our friends in the Senate and all the way to the President. As best I can tell you, just as I started, I will end today. I will say that today's stalemate is the making of the President. This is his making. He places his own political power, I believe, above the Constitution, wanting to dictate policies instead of negotiating them with a duly elected branch of government, and that's the House of Representatives.

I hope that the American people take note of what's happening. The President is different from his predecessors not in terms of greatness, but rather to the degree to which he's willing to sacrifice this Nation's greatness. He's willing to take us to the brink, rather than offering his negotiating skill-set and getting people together. That is what we should be about.

The Speaker of the House has literally instructed us to get a working group together, gather it on a bipartisan basis, and see if we can make progress not with the President, not with the Speaker, not with the Senate Majority Leader, but among Members of this body who we know and who we respect. Let's gather us together, and let's get together, and let's make a difference. That's what we're trying to suggest today. I will tell you that my colleagues that have been here on the floor, including the great minority whip, I believe have the ability to make this success happen if we will work together. That's what I'm for.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3273, the so-called "Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013," which establishes another supercommittee to make recommendations on spending and changes in the statutory limit on the public debt, the latest gimmick of the Tea Party dominated Republican majority to extricate themselves from the fiasco they created when they voted to shut down the government.

The bill before us is a bad idea brought up at the worst possible time. The bill seeks to recreate the 'super-committee' Frankenstein monster that failed its assigned task and ended up giving us the Frankenstein monster called sequestration.

We have been there and done that. We are not going down that road again.

Additionally, this bill is not a genuine effort to reach an agreement on budget and fiscal priorities. If that were the case, House Republicans would not have rejected the numerous requests of House and Senate Democrats over the past six months to go to conference to reach an agreement.

Let us review the record leading up to the Republican shutdown and the cost of the recklessness course of action:

\$150 million a day—The price-tag for closing down the government. In 1995, the record three-week closing cost \$1.9 billion in today's dollars.

800,000-plus—Federal employees expected to be furloughed as a result of the GOP's irresponsible shutdown.

192—The number of days House Republicans have refused to negotiate on a federal budget, setting the stage for a GOP government shutdown.

128—The number of points the Dow Jones Industrial Average dropped on Monday in reaction to the GOP shutdown.

72—Percent of American voters opposed to Congress shutting down the federal government to block implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

68—Percent of Americans who say shutting down the federal government even for a few days is a bad thing for the country.

49—Republicans who say shutting down the government over Obamacare is a big MIS-TAKE.

45—The number of times GOP have unsuccessfully tried to repeal or undermine Affordable Care Act.

18—The number of times Senate Republicans have blocked Senate Democrats' efforts to go to conference and negotiate on the budget to avoid a government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats are and have been willing to negotiate over honest differences—but not before House Republican vote to open the government and remove the threat of government default.

And there is an easy and verifiable way for them to demonstrate their good faith, and that is by bringing to the floor for an immediate vote on the clean CR already passed by the Senate.

The President has stated repeatedly that he will sign a clean CR. Our constituents are waiting. It is time to end the madness.

Mr. Speaker, let the House vote on H.J. Res. 59, as passed by the Senate today.

That is the best way to keep faith with all persons who serve the American people as employees of the federal government, and those who depend upon the services they provide.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, October 8, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the three million members of the National Education Association (NEA) and the students they serve, we urge you to VOTE NO on The Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act of 2013 (H.R. 3273), a misguided strategy to ending this political stalemate, and instead pass a clean Continuing Resolution (CR) immediately. Votes associated with this issue may be included in the NEA Legislative Report Card for the 113th Congress.

The shutdown of the federal government has already affected countless children, working families, and seniors across the country; the longer this crisis drags on the more pain will be inflicted upon those who least deserve it. Meanwhile, H.R. 3273 seeks to create a 'working group' of Senators and Representatives to discuss FY 2014 funding by attempting to achieve deficit reduction without accompanying revenue increases. Students in America's schools are bearing the brunt of this shutdown every day and require solutions now.

Instead of seeking deficit reduction on the backs of those students and working families, Congress should take a responsible, balanced approach that reflects the values that

make our nation strong: investing in people, jobs, and education as the path to prosperity. By eliminating wasteful corporate tax breaks and loopholes and ensuring the wealthy are paying their fair share we can appropriately reduce our deficit. As just one example, as many as two out of three U.S. corporations paid zero in federal income taxes over much of the previous decade, according to the Government Accountability Office (GAO). The share of federal revenues coming from corporate taxes has shrunk by two-thirds in the last 50 years. This is undermining our ability to make the necessary investments in education that are sorely needed in order to return our nation to prosperity. It is time to put politics aside, do what is right for our nation, and take the balanced approach to deficit reduction widely supported by voters by calling on corporations and the very wealthy to pay their fair share.

Meanwhile, the current approach to deficit reduction without revenue increases has left us with the indiscriminate, across the board cuts of the sequester. It is long past time for Congress to reverse course from the austerity approach that included slashing education across-the-board by 5 percent this year—the equivalent of cutting nearly all education programs and Head Start by roughly \$3 billion. The level of cuts imposed by sequestration have already taken federal funding back to pre-2004 levels while our nation's schools are serving nearly 6 million more students since that time.

There are millions of children being affected every day this shutdown continues. That is why we urge you to think of every single individual when making these funding decisions to ensure continued debates on Capitol Hill are not hurting everyday Americans and their families. We urge you to immediately pass a clean CR to ensure that the most vulnerable among us are no longer the victims of the government shutdown and we can focus back on undoing the harmful effects of the sequester.

Sincerely,

MARY KUSLER,
Director, Government Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Work Group Act of 2013, I note that Sec 2(b) implicitly calls for reductions in direct spending programs, but does not authorize the working group to consider additional revenue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am opposed.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3273 to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 3273. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment is a simple, straightforward improvement that I believe both sides can agree is absolutely necessary, and it is also supported by the majority of the American people. If my amendment passes, it will end this reckless and irresponsible government shutdown.

The majority claims that the bill before us right now will force the House and Senate to negotiate; but as written, this bill will do nothing of the sort. It will simply prolong the government shutdown. It will prolong the pain being done to our veterans, to the National Guard and Reserves, and to women, infants, and children; and, most importantly, this bill will prolong the pain being inflicted on our economy.

Let's be clear, this bill is a bill to nowhere. In my view, there is no one in this room right now who thinks this bill will reopen the government.

Since April, the Senate has tried 19 times to request a conference with the House; but each time, the request was blocked by Senate Republicans.

After months of stalling and preventing a budget conference, I am amazed that my friends on the other side of the aisle want us to believe that they are ready to negotiate a budget. We have had months to produce a budget that the House and Senate could agree on.

If my colleagues truly want to negotiate a budget that will move our country forward, they must vote "yes" on my amendment.

Once we have reopened the government, we can then sit down and work

out a budget for the long term. We can do this in a bipartisan manner, without our economy sinking, without our constituents being hurt, and we can do it in a manner that is becoming to this House.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that Congress must get its fiscal house in order, and I believe both sides must come together to find solutions that better reflect the values of the American people; but instead of ending the shutdown, we continue to consider bills that play games.

We cannot open the entire Federal Government one bill at a time. If we continue down this path, the government will remain closed for the next 3 months.

How much damage would that do to the economy?

How many veterans would go without their benefits?

How many kids would lose Head Start funding?

How many families would go without nutritional assistance?

We cannot continue to play these games for 3 more months. The American people and the residents of my great county, Ventura County, deserve better.

We can end this insanity right now. Reopen the government. Spare the American people the effects of this shutdown, and then come together to resolve our differences.

To put bills on the floor that pretend to take care of our Nation's critical needs, when they do not, is shameful.

I came to Congress to move our country forward, to help the families, the veterans, the small and large employers in Ventura County, to create jobs, and to invest in our future. We need to end this shutdown today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the amendment contained in the motion violates clause 7 of rule XVI, commonly referred to as the germaneness rule.

The objective of the bill under consideration is to establish a working group on deficit reduction. The amendment proposes to consider a Senate amendment to a House bill; therefore, the amendment fails the fundamental purpose test of germaneness described on page 547 of House Practice:

If the purpose or objective of an amendment is unrelated to that of the bill to which it is offered, the amendment may be held not germane.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed in the motion is not germane to the bill, and I respectfully request a ruling from the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I request to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized on the point of order.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us set up a commission to examine deficit reduction?

My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so that our taxpayers can receive the benefits they have already paid for. The recommit deals with government expenditures, and right now we are running a deficit. So isn't the amount the government is spending a relevant topic to deficit reduction?

Can the Chair explain why it's not germane to open up the entire Federal Government while we discuss deficit reduction?

Mr. Speaker, if you rule this motion out of order, does that mean we will not have a chance to keep the entire Federal Government open today? Can the Chair please explain why we can't keep the entire Federal Government open today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from California are not germane.

As recorded in section 932 of the House Rules and Manual, a general principle of germaneness is that an amendment must relate to the subject matter under consideration.

The instant bill proposes to establish a working group composed of Members and Senators. As such, it proposes a bicameral order in the form of a joint rule.

In contrast, the instructions in the motion to recommit provide for the disposition of an extant legislative measure. As such, it proposes a special order of business of the House.

By addressing a different exercise in rulemaking than the pending bill, the instructions propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to

table will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment; passage of House Joint Resolution 89; and the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 194, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Granger	Perry
Amash	Graves (GA)	Petri
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Pitts
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Grimm	Pompeo
Barr	Guthrie	Posey
Barton	Hall	Price (GA)
Benishek	Hanna	Radel
Bentivolio	Harper	Reed
Bilirakis	Harris	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Renaeci
Black	Hastings (WA)	Ribble
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Hensarling	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Holding	Roby
Bridenstine	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hunter	Rokita
Bucshon	Hurt	Rooney
Burgess	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Jenkins	Roskam
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Cantor	Jones	Royce
Capito	Jordan	Runyan
Carter	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Chabot	King (IA)	Sanford
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Scalise
Coble	Kingston	Schock
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Cole	Kline	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Sessions
Conaway	Lamborn	Shimkus
Cook	Lance	Shuster
Cotton	Lankford	Simpson
Cramer	Latham	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Latta	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Long	Smith (TX)
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Lummis	Stewart
Denham	Marchant	Stivers
Dent	Marino	Stockman
DeSantis	Massie	Stutzman
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	McClintock	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Tipton
Ellmers	McKinley	Turner
Farenthold	McMorris	Upton
Fincher	Rodgers	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Wagner
Fleischmann	Meehan	Walberg
Fleming	Messer	Walden
Flores	Mica	Walorski
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Fox	Miller, Gary	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Garrett	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Gerlach	Noem	Wittman
Gibbs	Nugent	Wolf
Gibson	Nunes	Womack
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Woodall
Gohmert	Olson	Yoder
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Yoho
Gosar	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Pearce	Young (IN)

NAYS—194

Andrews	Green, Gene	Owens
Barber	Grijalva	Pallone
Barrow (GA)	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Bass	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Beatty	Hanabusa	Payne
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bera (CA)	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Peters (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Peters (MI)
Blumenauer	Honda	Peterson
Bonamici	Horsford	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Pocan
Braley (IA)	Huffman	Polis
Brown (FL)	Israel	Price (NC)
Brownlee (CA)	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Bustos	Jeffries	Rahall
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Capuano	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Keating	Ruiz
Carney	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda T.
Castor (FL)	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Kind	Sarbanes
Chu	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Kuster	Schiff
Clarke	Langevin	Schneider
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Levin	Scott, David
Conyers	Lewis	Serrano
Cooper	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Loeb sack	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lofgren	Sherman
Crowley	Lowenthal	Sinema
Cuellar	Lowe	Sires
Cummings	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lynch	Speier
DeFazio	Maffei	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Maloney	Takano
Delaney	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Matheson	Tierney
Deutch	Matsui	Titus
Dingell	McCollum	Tonko
Doggett	McDermott	Tsongas
Doyle	McGovern	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McIntyre	Vargas
Edwards	McNerney	Veasey
Ellison	Meeks	Vela
Engel	Meng	Velázquez
Enyart	Michaud	Visclosky
Eshoo	Miller, George	Walz
Esty	Moore	Wasserman
Farr	Moran	Schultz
Fattah	Murphy (FL)	Waters
Foster	Nadler	Watt
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Waxman
Fudge	Neal	Welch
Gabbard	Negrete McLeod	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Nolan	Yarmuth
Garcia	O'Rourke	
Grayson		
Green, Al		

NOT VOTING—10

Clay	Hinojosa	Rush
Gallego	Lucas	Young (FL)
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	
Higgins	Rogers (AL)	

□ 1933

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Messrs. KEATING, CONYERS, Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. COHEN and RYAN of Ohio changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 197, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Gowdy	Pearce
Amash	Granger	Perry
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Petri
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Bachus	Griffin (AR)	Pitts
Barletta	Griffith (VA)	Pompeo
Barr	Grimm	Posey
Barrow (GA)	Guthrie	Price (GA)
Barton	Hall	Radel
Benishek	Hanna	Reed
Bentivolio	Harper	Reichert
Bilirakis	Harris	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Ribble
Black	Hastings (WA)	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Rigell
Boustany	Hensarling	Roby
Brady (TX)	Holding	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hultgren	Rokita
Bucshon	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Hurt	Roskam
Calvert	Issa	Ross
Camp	Jenkins	Rothfus
Campbell	Johnson (OH)	Royce
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Runyan
Capito	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Joyce	Salmon
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Sanford
Chabot	King (IA)	Scalise
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Schock
Coble	Kingston	Schweikert
Coffman	Kinzing (IL)	Scott, Austin
Cole	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Sessions
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Conaway	Lamborn	Shuster
Cook	Lance	Simpson
Cotton	Lankford	Smith (MO)
Cramer	Latham	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Long	Southerland
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Lummis	Stivers
Denham	Marchant	Stockman
Dent	Marino	Stutzman
DeSantis	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
DesJarlais	McCauley	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	McClintock	Thornberry
Duffy	McHenry	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McIntyre	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Turner
Ellmers	McKinley	Upton
Farenthold	McMorris	Valadao
Fincher	Rodgers	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Walberg
Fleischmann	Meehan	Walden
Fleming	Messer	Walorski
Flores	Mica	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup
Fox	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Williams
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Neugebauer	Wittman
Gerlach	Noem	Wolf
Gibbs	Nugent	Womack
Gibson	Nunes	Woodall
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Yoder
Gohmert	Olson	Yoho
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Gosar	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NAYS—197

Andrews	Becerra	Blumenauer
Barber	Bera (CA)	Bonamici
Bass	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)
Beatty	Bishop (NY)	Braley (IA)

Bridenstine	Honda	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Peters (CA)
Bustos	Huffman	Peters (MI)
Butterfield	Israel	Peterson
Capps	Jackson Lee	Pingree (ME)
Capuano	Jeffries	Pocan
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Poe (TX)
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Carson (IN)	Jones	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Kaptur	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Keating	Rahall
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Rangel
Chu	Kennedy	Richmond
Cicilline	Kildee	Rooney
Clarke	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Cleaver	Kind	Ruiz
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
Cohen	Kuster	Ryan (OH)
Connolly	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	T.
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
Costa	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
Costa	Levin	Schakowsky
Courtney	Lewis	Schiff
Crowley	Lipinski	Schneider
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Schrader
Cummings	Lofgren	Schwartz
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
Davis, Danny	Lowe	Scott, David
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
DeGette	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Shea-Porter
DeLauro	(NM)	Sherman
DeBene	Lynch	Sinema
Deutch	Maffei	Sires
Dingell	Maloney,	Slaughter
Doggett	Carolyn	Smith (WA)
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Duckworth	Massie	Swalwell (CA)
Edwards	Matheson	Takano
Ellison	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Engel	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Enyart	McDermott	Tierney
Eshoo	McGovern	Titus
Esty	McNerney	Tonko
Farr	Meeks	Tsongas
Fattah	Meng	Van Hollen
Foster	Michaud	Vargas
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Veasey
Fudge	Moore	Vela
Gabbard	Moran	Velázquez
Garamendi	Mathes	Walt
García	Murphy (FL)	Waxman
Grayson	Nadler	Welch
Green, Al	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Green, Gene	Neal	Yarmuth
Grijalva	Negrete McLeod	
Gutiérrez	Nolan	
Hahn	O'Rourke	
Hanabusa	Owens	
Hastings (FL)	Pallone	
Heck (WA)	Pascarell	
Himes	Pastor (AZ)	
Holt	Payne	

NOT VOTING—10

Clay	Hinojosa	Rush
Gallego	Lucas	Young (FL)
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	
Higgins	Rogers (AL)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1940

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES' PAY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries

and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]

YEAS—420

Aderholt	Cotton	Griffith (VA)
Amash	Courtney	Grijalva
Amodei	Cramer	Grimm
Andrews	Crawford	Guthrie
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Gutiérrez
Bachus	Crowley	Hahn
Barber	Cuellar	Hall
Barletta	Culberson	Hanabusa
Barr	Cummings	Hanna
Barrow (GA)	Daines	Harper
Barton	Davis (CA)	Harris
Bass	Davis, Danny	Hartzler
Beatty	Davis, Rodney	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	DeFazio	Hastings (WA)
Benishek	DeGette	Heck (NV)
Bentivolio	Delaney	Heck (WA)
Bera (CA)	DeLauro	Hensarling
Bilirakis	DeBene	Himes
Bishop (GA)	Denham	Holding
Bishop (NY)	Dent	Holt
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Honda
Black	DesJarlais	Horsford
Blackburn	Deutch	Hoyer
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Bonamici	Dingell	Huelskamp
Boustany	Doggett	Huffman
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Huizenga (MI)
Brady (TX)	Duckworth	Hultgren
Braley (IA)	Duffy	Hunter
Bridenstine	Duncan (SC)	Hurt
Brooks (AL)	Duncan (TN)	Israel
Brooks (IN)	Edwards	Issa
Broun (GA)	Ellison	Jackson Lee
Brown (FL)	Ellmers	Jeffries
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Jenkins
Buchanan	Enyart	Johnson (GA)
Bucshon	Eshoo	Johnson (OH)
Burgess	Esty	Johnson, E. B.
Bustos	Farenthold	Johnson, Sam
Butterfield	Farr	Jones
Calvert	Fattah	Jordan
Camp	Fincher	Joyce
Campbell	Fitzpatrick	Kaptur
Cantor	Fleischmann	Keating
Capito	Fleming	Kelly (IL)
Capps	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Capuano	Forbes	Kennedy
Cárdenas	Fortenberry	Kildee
Carney	Foster	Kilmer
Carson (IN)	Fox	Kind
Carter	Frankel (FL)	King (IA)
Cartwright	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Cassidy	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Kinzing (IL)
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Kirkpatrick
Chabot	Garamendi	Kline
Chaffetz	Garcia	Kuster
Chu	Gardner	Labrador
Cicilline	Garrett	LaMalfa
Clarke	Gerlach	Lamborn
Cleaver	Gibbs	Lance
Clyburn	Gibson	Langevin
Coble	Gingrey (GA)	Lankford
Coffman	Gohmert	Larsen (WA)
Cohen	Goodlatte	Larson (CT)
Cole	Gosar	Latham
Collins (GA)	Gowdy	Latta
Collins (NY)	Granger	Lee (CA)
Conaway	Graves (GA)	Levin
Connolly	Graves (MO)	Lewis
Conyers	Grayson	Lipinski
Cook	Green, Al	LoBiondo
Cooper	Green, Gene	Loeb sack
Costa	Griffin (AR)	Lofgren

Long	Pearce	Sherman
Lowenthal	Pelosi	Shimkus
Lowey	Perlmutter	Shuster
Luetkemeyer	Perry	Simpson
Lujan Grisham	Peters (CA)	Sinema
(NM)	Peters (MI)	Sires
Luján, Ben Ray	Peterson	Slaughter
(NM)	Petri	Smith (MO)
Lummis	Pingree (ME)	Smith (NE)
Lynch	Pittenger	Smith (NJ)
Maffei	Pitts	Smith (TX)
Maloney,	Pocan	Smith (WA)
Carolyn	Poe (TX)	Southerland
Maloney, Sean	Polis	Speier
Marchant	Pompeo	Stewart
Marino	Posey	Stivers
Massie	Price (GA)	Stockman
Matheson	Price (NC)	Stutzman
Matsui	Quigley	Swalwell (CA)
McCarthy (CA)	Radel	Takano
McCaul	Rahall	Terry
McClintock	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
McCollum	Reed	Thompson (MS)
McDermott	Reichert	Thompson (PA)
McGovern	Renacci	Thornberry
McHenry	Ribble	Tiberi
McIntyre	Rice (SC)	Tierney
McKeon	Richmond	Tipton
McKinley	Rigell	Titus
McMorris	Roby	Tonko
Rodgers	Roe (TN)	Tsongas
McNerney	Rogers (KY)	Turner
Meadows	Rogers (MI)	Upton
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Valadao
Meeks	Rokita	Van Hollen
Meng	Rooney	Vargas
Messer	Ros-Lehtinen	Veasey
Mica	Roskam	Vela
Michaud	Ross	Velázquez
Miller (FL)	Rothfus	Visclosky
Miller (MI)	Roybal-Allard	Wagner
Miller, Gary	Royce	Walberg
Miller, George	Ruiz	Walden
Moore	Runyan	Walorski
Moran	Ruppersberger	Walz
Mullin	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
Mulvaney	Ryan (WI)	Schultz
Murphy (FL)	Salmon	Waters
Murphy (PA)	Sánchez, Linda	Watt
Nadler	T.	Waxman
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Weber (TX)
Neal	Sanford	Webster (FL)
Negrete McLeod	Sarbanes	Welch
Neugebauer	Scalise	Wenstrup
Noem	Schakowsky	Westmoreland
Nolan	Schiff	Whitfield
Nugent	Schneider	Williams
Nunes	Schock	Wilson (FL)
Nunnelee	Schrader	Wilson (SC)
O'Rourke	Schwartz	Wittman
Olson	Scott (VA)	Wolf
Owens	Scott, Austin	Womack
Palazzo	Scott, David	Woodall
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Yarmuth
Pascrell	Serrano	Yoder
Pastor (AZ)	Sessions	Yoho
Paulsen	Sewell (AL)	Young (AK)
Payne	Shea-Porter	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Clay	Hinojosa	Rush
Gallo	Lucas	Schweikert
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Higgins	Rogers (AL)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1948

Mrs. CAPPS changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(b) of House Resolution 373, H.R. 3273 is laid on the table.

HOUSE PASSES 10TH BIPARTISAN FUNDING BILL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, weeks ago, the administration reached out to Capitol Hill to continue budget negotiations. According to the National Journal:

Majority Leader Reid's office had a message for them: don't do it. The White House listened. The summit was nixed. And no serious talks have occurred since.

As the government shutdown stretches into its second week, the White House has embraced Reid's hard-line, no-negotiations stance—at least so far.

Unfortunately, hard-liner, non-negotiable posturing seems to be all the Senate Majority Leader knows.

Today, the House passed the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act, the 10th bipartisan stopgap funding bill to pass the House since the Federal shutdown began. The program remains a priority of the President; yet the White House just announced a veto threat on the bill—without a doubt, at the Senate Majority Leader's request. If this isn't a purely political move, I don't know what is.

I urge the Senate and the President to join 57 of my Democrat colleagues who are supporting the solutions being put forth by the House. The American people deserve as much.

LOCAL SHUTDOWN EFFECTS

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to highlight just one of the stories that comes in here each and every day from my congressional district highlighting the unnecessary hardship the Republican government shutdown has brought upon the American people.

One of my constituents, who works in business aviation, contacted my office just this week to tell me about the bur-

den the shutdown has had on his business and his family's bottom line.

During the government shutdown, aviation components cannot be produced, financed, bought, sold, inspected, or registered without the Federal workers that are currently furloughed. Today, large parts of this industry—and our economy at large—simply cannot function. Stories like this will continue until the House brings up the Senate CR, which funds our government at the level House Republicans fought for.

Stories like these are not isolated to upstate New York. This is happening in countless corners of our Nation and across all regions and all of our districts back home.

A piecemeal approach that picks winners and losers in our Federal agencies is no way to run the country. Bring up the Senate CR. Take “yes” for an answer. Let's get this Nation back to work.

EQUAL JUSTICE FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. POSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, there are just two issues stopping the Obama shutdown from ending: number one, make Congress and the White House obey the same ObamaCare rules as everyone else; number two, the President let business off the hook for a year. We want workers to be let off the hook for a year, too.

That's what Republicans, Democrats, and Independents in my district all want, and that's what the Republicans ask—equal justice for all Americans. What is so hard to understand about all that? It's really that simple.

They will negotiate with Putin, Assad, and even Iran, but not with House Republicans. That's not fair. That's not right. And it's not good for the United States of America.

BRING UP THE IMMIGRATION BILL

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I have enjoyed in this House is sincerity. There's not a Member of this House that thinks the President of the United States is going to delay, repeal, or tear apart the Affordable Care Act; but if there's politics involved, I understand that. I'm a politician.

It just seems to me that if you have a plan, a strategy, and the whole world is saying that a handful of people are destroying the credibility of the Republican Party and therefore taking down the Democrats and the Congress with them—even the President of the

United States—then I think it's safe to say it's time to look for some credibility so that we can regain being a two-party system.

So I didn't come here this morning to get arrested, but I did, because there are tens of thousands and millions of people that want to become Americans. They don't want to knock Republicans. They don't want to knock Democrats. They want to be Americans.

Bring up the immigration bill. Let's vote these new, wonderful citizens in, and maybe they can bring some sense to the parties.

SENATE SHOULD PASS HOUSE VERSION OF CR

(Mr. CASSIDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat what my colleague from Florida said. My Democratic colleagues have suggested that if the House only passes the clean Senate CR, we can move on with business. I will point out if the Senate will only consider the House CR, we can also move on.

But the problem is that there's two provisions. One provision takes away a sweetheart deal that only Members of Congress and their staff get. Secondly, since the President delayed the mandate on employers to provide insurance for a year, we would similarly delay the mandate on the employee to have that insurance.

If she is relying upon her employer to provide the policy, what is she to do if he is given a break on not providing that policy?

We can quickly reopen the government. The House Republicans have voted a budget which would completely fund the government, but it has those provisions which Senator REID will not even negotiate over. He will not come together to discuss these two things.

So, as a favor to both our country and the American taxpayer, I ask Senator REID to address it.

A LONG JOURNEY STARTS WITH SMALL STEPS

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, over my years in Congress, I've had the honor of chairing several conference committees. Conference committees are set up when there's a disagreement between a House-passed bill and a Senate-passed bill. You sit down with your list of differences and you start sawing away at them, if you will.

That's, in fact, what the House has been doing the past 2 weeks in the midst of this shutdown. We've been

finding some things, such as military pay, science, civilian furlough issues, and health-related issues—things that are less controversial and on which we can agree—so we can get some momentum to come up with a big agreement.

Indeed, the gap is large. We have disagreement on ObamaCare because it's one-sixth of the American economy. It's very big.

Secondly, we have a disagreement on the debt ceiling. Do we continue along the path of spending that we are on or do we make corrections?

Thirdly, we have a \$90 billion gap between our spending level between the House and the Senate.

These are big issues. Sometimes, a long journey starts with small steps. That's why I urge our friends in the Senate to pass the legislation which the House has sent over to them, and then we can start focusing on the larger issues.

□ 2000

OPEN THE GOVERNMENT

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we in Texas know that when the cattle starts stampeding, you're really in trouble; so my friends on the other side of the aisle haven't realized that the cattle in the United States is stampeding: 57,000 seats of Head Start are going; veterans centers will be closed in a couple of days; Federal courts are looking at whether or not they can stay open past October 15; U.S. attorneys are laying off various U.S. attorneys across America, up to 4,000.

We actually have rules in this House, the rules that brought about the agreement in the beginning of the year where we actually agreed to the 986 number that the Republicans had. We agreed to the tax reform that the Republicans had and Democrats agreed. But now they want to throw on us another supercommittee—fool's folly—talking about discretionary spending, the debt ceiling, and entitlement reform—all decent ideas, but open the government first.

Get the bill on the floor that is clean. Open the government. Raise the debt ceiling to pay our bills. Let the American people get back to work. Let our veterans get services. Stop throwing down another committee. We don't catch cattle. We don't go after cattle in Texas by throwing down a committee. We get it done.

Let's get the job done. Let's stop the stampede.

SPEAKER BOEHNER, LET YOUR PEOPLE GO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, October 8. October 8. We are now 8 days into the shutdown of the government of the United States of America, presumed to be the strongest Nation on this Earth, presumed to be the greatest economic power, presumed to be the world's oldest democracy—perhaps oldest, but not functioning.

Why? Why are we in this situation? Eight days without a functioning government. What in the world is the Republican Party doing to this Nation? And why? Why? It's hard to say why because every day the goalpost changes. Every day a different demand. And today yet a new demand.

But what's the result of all of this? What does all of this mean? It means that this Nation is humiliated by this shutdown.

Speaker BOEHNER, let your people go. Speaker BOEHNER, let your people go and vote. Why not? We think there's a majority. Let's see here. There's 198 Democrats that will vote for the reopening of this government tonight. Call us back into session, Mr. BOEHNER, 198 Democrats. And by the public record, there are 23 or more Republicans that have said they would vote for a clean CR. Mr. Speaker, let your people go and vote.

What does it mean that the government shut down? What does it mean to Americans? I'll tell you what it means in my district. It means that the day care centers, the early childhood education programs, the levee improvements, indeed, even today we've learned that the burials of those brave men and women—men, in this case—that have recently been killed in the war in Afghanistan, their families will not receive \$100,000 that's been set aside for them.

Oh, I know we have a vote here. This is the eighth day of the shutdown, and we have, in this House, passed eight bills to appropriate pieces of this government.

These are the 12 appropriation bills. These are the 12 appropriation bills that fund every function of government, whether it's the military, whether it's the farm programs, the day care programs, the health care programs, the Centers for Disease Control. Here they are, more than 1,000 specific items. And in 8 days, our Republican colleagues have put before us eight bills to fund eight of the more than 1,000. At this rate, it will be 2020 before this government fully is functional. How foolish. How stupid. How humiliating for this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, let your people vote. Let us vote. Let us vote on reopening this government. The votes are there. A simple blackboard will tell

you the votes are there. Tonight, call us back to session, and tomorrow morning the people of America, the people across this world will see the strongest Nation in the world, the government of that Nation functioning once again.

How do I go back to my district and tell the people at the Dixon National Cemetery that those burials aren't going to take place? How do I go back to my district and tell them—yeah, maybe we ought to see this.

In California, northern California, it's hunting season, opened on Saturday, but the refuges across this great Nation are closed to hunters, the duck hunters, the men and women that want to recreate in those areas. And if you're not a hunter, maybe you're a fisherman, but don't go to a refuge. Don't go to the Bureau of Land Management fishing areas. Don't try to put your boat in the water at the national parks. You can't do it because this government is shut down.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, let your people vote. Let us all vote. Let us reopen this government.

We have several of my colleagues with me tonight. We're going to cover this issue. How much I would prefer to be here with my colleagues from New York and other States to talk about putting Americans back to work. And I guess we are, in a way, putting the Federal employees back to work.

Mr. PAUL TONKO from the great State of New York, thanks for joining us once again.

Mr. TONKO. My pleasure. I appreciate the gentleman from California bringing us together tonight in thoughtful discussion about what is chaos here in the Nation's Capitol. So, Representative GARAMENDI, thank you for bringing us together with Representatives from New Jersey and from Connecticut and from Pennsylvania, and others who will probably join us that will speak to the unnecessary pain that has trickled into the lives of far too many working families across this country and impacting so many small businesses from coast to coast with the ill effects of a government shutdown—a Republican government shutdown simply because, as you just heard the gentleman from California indicate, we need to vote on a CR, a continuing resolution, a bill that allows for the budget to continue into a date certain as mentioned in that bill, most likely 2 months—8 weeks—as an extender into perhaps mid-December.

Why do we need to do that? So that we can bring stability into the process, allow government to be funded, allow for the doors to be opened, allow for the lights to go on and reopen government. That's the first step in the sequence.

Secondly, another cornerstone bit of legislation coming quickly upon us, giving the green light to America to

pay her bills. America's working families understand what that's about. They know that they play by the rules. They roll up their sleeves. They work hard. They expect to taste success. They pay their bills on time, and they expect their beloved country to do the same thing. Our second step in the process.

Then thirdly, buying this 8 weeks of time allows us to immediately name those individuals who will be the representatives for the majority and minority parties in each of the Houses of Congress to sit down and nail down a budget in those ensuing 8 weeks to make certain that stability again is the outcome. That's what we're asking for.

Mr. Speaker, you are the Speaker not only to the Tea Party, not only to the Republican Conference, but to the entire House, the United States House of Representatives. Let all of us vote on what is a clean CR, which has been approved by the United States Senate—and, by the way, in negotiations to date, accepts your number, the lowest number in the process. We're not happy with that number, but we're going to cave to your request to allow for government to be refunded, to be reopened, and for us to move forward. That's what it's about.

We're asking for dignity to be expressed for America's working families. We're allowing for certainty to be the outcome for our small business community so that we can grow our economy, allow for the climate that produces both public and private sector job growth that allows us to move forward with a sense of hope. That's what the request is here.

Why don't you let us vote on a clean CR? Are you fearful that it might pass? Are you fearful that you don't get your way? Because you know, in the 45 votes that have been taken on a debt ceiling limit vote since the days of President Ronald Reagan, those 45 measures have been approved 38 times without any bells and whistles—and certainly unprecedented to have attached to the vote some sort of clutter that deals with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Never have we reached to that sort of negotiated outcome where we are repealing the law of the land—in this case, the law of the land that is 3 years old, was approved by a majority in the House of Representatives, was approved by a supermajority in the United States Senate, was tested, because of your concern, before the highest Court of the land, and the Supreme Court gave it thumbs-up in meeting the constitutionality test. What more do we need to do to convince you?

Let me just say this, Representative GARAMENDI, quickly so we can get to our colleagues. I want to share with you some of the results in these few 8 days already—but painful 8 days for far too many.

By the end of this month, food pantries like the one in my district in Cohoes, New York, may not have the money to stay open. That is the situation with many of our food pantries. This is a facility that helps feed 215 hungry families in the capital region of New York State.

Projections are that one of the providers of electronics for our fighter jets, our submarines, and our helicopters in Saratoga Springs, New York, in the 20th Congressional District that I represent, have grinded to a halt as inspectors can't complete contracts and new orders cannot come in.

We also have impacting us a forensic meteorology business in Niskayuna, New York—again, in the 20th Congressional District of New York—that works each and every day with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, that helps bring benefits to all of us from the devastation of Mother Nature. These are jobs that are meaningful—meaningful to the quality of life of people across this country, that are meaningful to working families who are now without jobs, people who are not getting paid and showing up to work. These are devastating consequences to the economy.

We implore the leadership of this House, we implore the Speaker to call for a vote on a clean continuing resolution that embraces your number, the lowest number in negotiations that we will settle upon. We will offer our votes for that kind of measure, only give us that chance so that America can have her government funded, we can move forward to advance the debt ceiling limit bill vote that will allow for America to pay her bills, and then finally move to that conference table, where representation from both parties in each of the Houses will nail down a budget in the ensuing 8 weeks.

□ 2015

That will bring stability to the economy and will bring economic and social justice to the people of this great country. Let's move forward with that sense of fairness.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. TONKO, the gentleman from New York.

I would like now to bring to the microphone our friend from the great State of Connecticut, JOHN LARSON.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman from California for organizing this hour, and I appreciate the eloquence of our colleague from New York, both of whom have addressed the most important issue of the day, in fact, the last 8 days, as Mr. GARAMENDI has articulated.

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves dealing with the issue “de jure.” Each day the goalposts move, each day the American public sits in utter amazement and disgust with its elective representatives. It is astounding to them to see the greatest Nation in the world brought to its knees.

Our forefathers were very prescient—and certainly George Washington, who Daniel Webster, the Senator from Massachusetts in this Chamber—well, actually, it would have been down the hall—got up on the 100th anniversary of George Washington's birth and talked about the President's admonitions. Amongst his keenest admonitions was about that of "excessive" party spirit.

Now, in Washington's day, there weren't political parties, as we know them. It wasn't Democrat or Republic; it was Federalist or anti-Federalist. He knew very well and was concerned deeply about what factions could do. He warned about the outside influence of party. But what he was most concerned about is what happens within a government if people in that very government are at war with their own existence, are working against the interest of the government and therefore the people.

So we find ourselves this evening as Members of the minority coming to this floor and asking for one simple thing from the majority, and that is a vote. Now, we understand that we have asked for votes on this floor—we have asked for votes to put the country back to work. As the gentleman from California has articulated on many occasions to come here and talk about making things in America and allowing a vote to put us back to work, we have been denied that opportunity. We have been denied the opportunity here to vote on nutrition and funding and making sure that important bills like the agriculture bill, that the very poor amongst us and the very needy are fed. We have been denied an opportunity to vote on immigration, as you heard CHARLIE RANGEL talk about so nobly earlier this evening. We have also, most importantly, been denied a vote here that is fundamental to our democracy.

The most fundamental thing and the most patriotic thing that we do in a society is vote. Yet here, because of the tyranny of the majority, 200-plus Democrats are not allowed a vote. More importantly, the American people are not allowed a vote on the continuing of its government. As the gentleman from New York pointed out, not only is it the continuation and shutdown of government, but on the near horizon defaulting on the full faith and credit of the American people. This is unconscionable.

But Washington was prescient when a few, dangerously are at war with their own government, who seek to bring that government down through a shutdown; and then by not paying the bills that this body and the other body have racked up, the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth. We need to be able to express the will of the people. All we ask of the majority party is for

a vote, a simple vote, as the gentleman from New York said, on a continuing resolution unencumbered that does nothing more, and at the levels that they have requested, but put the Nation back to work and then respond quickly to the need to pay our debts without being held hostage.

You are not holding Barack Obama hostage, Mr. Speaker. You are not holding the Democrats in Congress hostage, Mr. Speaker. You are holding the people of the United States hostage. For the sake of fairness and being responsible, bring the bill to the floor for a vote. Allow the minority the opportunity to vote.

If you don't have the votes, let it be so, and let the world know, and let every American citizen know, where their Members stand on this issue. Stand with your country. Do not let it be shut down. Do not let it default. At least give us a vote.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. LARSON.

Mr. Speaker, a vote—that is what democracy is all about. We are asking for a simple thing: the opportunity to vote on extending the operations of the American government.

Now I would like to turn to the gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. DOYLE. I thank my colleague from California and my colleagues from New York and Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, many of us that you will see on the floor tonight, we are not regulars, we are not people that come to the floor often to speak. But I think many of us feel it is important for the American people to understand the nature of this task, this battle, that we face on their behalf.

We hear a lot from Republicans about the President not wanting to negotiate, not wanting to talk. The Democrats don't want to negotiate. They have been pretty good at saying that over and over and over again, Mr. Speaker. But what they are not telling the American people is the nature of the negotiation that they want to have. I think it is important that that be revealed.

What makes me so angry—and the reason I am here tonight—is what we face in the country right now is completely a manufactured crisis. There is no structural economic reason that our country should be facing default come the 17th of this month. There is no reason that 800,000 Federal employees aren't working. There is no reason for this to happen.

This is being manufactured by a party because they are trying to get something that they have not been able to get at the ballot box. We have divided government. The Republicans control the House of Representatives, the Senate is controlled by the Democratic party, we have a Democratic President.

The Republicans had two goals going into this manufactured crisis. One was to destroy the health care bill. Now, this is a bill that passed the House of Representatives, it passed the Senate, it was signed by the President, it was upheld by the Supreme Court. We had a Presidential election and their candidate said on day one of his new administration the first thing he would do if elected was to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That gentleman lost by 5 million votes.

What they can't accomplish at the ballot box they now were looking for a way to accomplish here. But it couldn't be done through the regular process, Mr. Speaker. It couldn't be done through the regular order.

So now comes this ingenious idea, hatched by the Tea Party wing of the Republican Party, to say: Here is what we will do. We will wait until the end of the fiscal year to come, and we will say we are going to shut the government down unless you repeal ObamaCare.

I was on this floor a couple of days ago and read something on the floor that I saw on the Internet by a young man by the name of Judd Legum. I hope I have said his last name correctly. He put an analogy about what we were actually facing. He said it is sort of like if someone comes up to you and says, I want to burn down your house, and you look at the guy and you say, no. And he says, well, I just want to burn down the second floor, and you tell him, no. And he goes, well, what about your garage, can I burn your garage down? And you say, no. And the guy says, well, let's just sit down and talk about what part of your house I can burn down, and you look at the guy and you say, no. And he goes, you see, you're not compromising.

This is what we are facing in this so-called "rigged" negotiation. What Republicans are saying is, defund ObamaCare, we will open up the government. We said, no. Then they said, we will delay ObamaCare for a year and we will open up the government, and we said, no. Then they said, well, just get rid of that individual mandate—which effectively kills the health care bill—and we said, no. Then they said, well, will you just sit down and negotiate with us and tell us what part of the Affordable Care Act we can get rid of, and we said, there are 20 million Americans that are counting on this bill, it is the law of the land, the answer is no.

And they look at us and say, the Democrats don't want to negotiate; the President doesn't want to negotiate.

Well, I got news for my friends over there: we are not going to negotiate the rights of 20 million uninsured Americans because they can't get this done at the ballot box.

So now, Mr. Speaker, what is the new strategy? They have shifted off of the

health care bill now because the American public, by margins of over 70 percent, have said we don't want you to shut the government down to try to get rid of the Affordable Care Act.

So now where have they moved? To the Ryan budget. What is the Ryan budget? It is a budget that keeps us in sequester, it is a budget that does not invest in our infrastructure, it is a budget that does not invest in the education of our children, it is a budget that makes it impossible for this economy to grow, and it is a budget that threatens the social safety net that many of our senior citizens depend on.

They couldn't get it passed in the regular order. They couldn't get it passed in their own House of Representatives for a long time. They were afraid to put the bill on the floor. They certainly couldn't get it passed in the Senate, and they knew the President wouldn't sign it.

So what is the strategy now? This new rigged negotiation that we are being asked to have with our friends is: Give us pieces of the Ryan budget, and in return we will open up the government and we will raise the debt ceiling, but only if you give us what we want in the Ryan budget.

Mr. Speaker, we want to have a budget negotiation with our friends on the Republican side. The House has passed a budget, the Senate has passed a budget. The numbers—there is a great disparity in the numbers. Democrats believe in investing in America. We want to rebuild our roads and bridges and sewer systems. We want to invest in the education of our children. We want to protect our seniors and our veterans. It costs money to do that, Mr. Speaker, so there is a difference.

But we are ready and we are willing to appoint conferees tomorrow to sit down and have a negotiation. I want the American public to understand that we have asked 18 times to appoint conferees to negotiate the differences in the Senate budget and the House budget, and all 18 times the Republicans in the House have said no.

□ 2030

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just say if there's someone in this House that's not willing to negotiate, it's our friends on the Republican side of the aisle. The American people deserve a budget negotiation where we sit down and settle our differences. We're not going to get everything we want, Mr. Speaker; it's divided government. The Republicans are going to get something in this budget negotiation, the Democrats are going to get something in the budget negotiation. But the country moves forward, we pay our bills, and we live to pay another day.

In closing, let me say to the American people, we will not be part of a rigged negotiation where Democratic priorities and principles aren't allowed

to be discussed, only that which the Republicans couldn't get in the ballot box that they're trying to get now by holding a gun to our head. That's not how you do business in the United States of America. That kind of behavior has to be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of the American people, I hope Republicans will come to their senses, pass a clean CR, and let's sit down and negotiate a budget agreement for the American people and move this country forward. I thank you for yielding me this time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. DOYLE, thank you so very much. The Republican shutdown has to end. It has to end, and how correct you were about the negotiations just this evening. They put a proposal on the floor to create some sort of a negotiating committee that did not have all of the issues before them, as you so correctly pointed out, only their set of issues were to be allowed to be discussed by that negotiating committee, none of the issues that we care about on the Democratic side. That's hardly a negotiating opportunity.

I now yield to the gentleman from the great State of New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GARAMENDI for bringing us all together tonight. I couldn't stand with better Americans than I am standing with tonight. I mean that.

Mr. Speaker, the latest supercommittee plan that folks on the other side of the aisle gave us today is really absurd. In fact, as a member of the Budget Committee, this new-found Republican insistence on negotiations, referred to by Mr. DOYLE from Pennsylvania, is mind boggling, since my colleagues have spent the last 6 months avoiding negotiations. And I didn't come here tonight to water the wine, so we're going to say it like it is.

My fellow Americans, this House of Representatives passed its budget over 200 days ago on March 21. Then the Senate passed its budget 2 days later. Now, think about what I just said. What happened to it? Well, the usual protocol is the two sides name conferees, they come together in conference, and they work out a budget. That didn't happen. That's 6 months ago. We've been asking to go to conference so we can resolve our differences, and there are always differences within parties, between parties, you name it. We want to fund the government. We want to get rid of sequestration, like Chairman ROGERS said on July 31, 2013:

I believe the House has made its choice. Sequestration—and its unrealistic, ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.

Mr. ROGERS is the chairman, a Republican, he said it. He said that; I didn't say that. He said it better than I could ever imagine saying it.

So what happened? Democrats attempted to go to conference 20 times. The Republicans objected every single time. Fact check this: over here in the House, we have almost 200 Members who signed the discharge petition calling for a conference on the budget. We tried four times to bring the resolution to the floor. Leader PELOSI even went so far as to name conferees. Some of them are in this room. Some of us are conferees. She did that on June 27. What's the date today—October 8? June 27. So why, after this stalling, have the Republicans finally found religion and now they want to negotiate?

I'll tell you why: we've just discovered we have a phantom government in the United States. Every Congressman, every House Member, every Senate Member should be concerned that they're elected by the people of this country, be they Democrat, Republican, Independent, Libertarian, it doesn't matter, they've been elected. They stood for election. We respect that, regardless of denomination, because we know that neither party is ever perfect. Come on, we all share in the pluses, we share in the minuses. There's never one party that has all of the answers. We know that. But why?

Well, just this past Saturday, October 5, we had a front page story in The New York Times. It was mind boggling—mind boggling—that article. Here's the title of that article, "The Federal budget crisis months in planning." Well, I don't remember planning this. I don't know if any Republicans were out planning this. Who in God's name are they talking about? And this is what it says in the article in the second paragraph, which refers to a manifesto—a manifesto—put together by non-elected people in this country. Hear me, America, hear me.

They sat down one morning in a location the members insist on keeping secret. Wow. And came—little noticed—a blueprint. This is what they said, Mr. Speaker. A blueprint to defunding ObamaCare signed by—oh, you're going to love this, Ed Meese. Boy there's a name that pops up. I can't believe it. Ed Meese. It's not funny, it's serious; a phantom government. Leaders of more than three-dozen conservative groups, and I will put in the RECORD tonight who those groups are, and I got part of their manifesto. Listen to this. This is what they put together. And I'm sure there are only a few Congressmen on the other side who even knew about this. It says this:

Conservatives should not approve a CR unless it defunds ObamaCare. This includes ObamaCare's unworkable exchanges, unsustainable Medicaid expansion, and attack on life and religious liberty.

They said that February 14, 2013. This did not just happen, Mr. Speaker. It didn't just happen. It wasn't an accident; it was planned. That is the lowest thing you could ever read about a government that wasn't even elected. Who

the heck are these people to decide what we're going to do?

Now we know why Mr. RYAN did not want to go to conference. Now we know why Mr. BOEHNER did not want to go to conference, because that was not the plan. Read it. Judge for yourself. Judge for yourself.

It also said that these 30 groups, and the names of each group besides Mr. Meese's, are right here. You've got every right-wing group in the universe. They go into this manifesto on Medicaid expansion, permanent appropriations, implementation. They want to run the government. These people actually wanted to run the government.

My friends, the Republicans don't want to negotiate. They want to use this shutdown and the threat of default to invalidate the results of—oh, an election last November. These people weren't elected, we were elected. And I love debating people from the other side who are elected. That's their God-given right. That's what liberty is all right. Why don't they come in here, this shadow government, this phantom group, why don't they stand there and tell us who they talked to within the Republican Party. Tell us. America has a right to know.

Don't you talk to me, Mr. Speaker, about let's have transparency in government when you have this vagabond group out here funded by—guess. I'll give you three guesses. No, I'll only give you one guess: the Koch brothers. They think they're running this government. The Supreme Court heard another case today—isn't that interesting. This is mild compared to what would happen if they were able to do and spend as much money as they want.

I did not come here to water the wine. You better listen to it, and every member of the staff better listen because they tried every trick in the book, putting your own health care in jeopardy, saying that you get a subsidy from the government when it's just like any company that in some way contributes to your health care. Somebody gets hired by the Federal Government to be a secretary, making \$20,000, \$25,000 a year, the cost of their health care will go up between \$5,200 and \$12,000. How are you going to live on that being a staff member here on the floor or back in your districts. They will stop at nothing, nothing, to bring the government down at any cost. At any cost.

The November election apparently did not occur in their minds. We are dealing with dangerous people. Either they are on hallucinogenic drugs or they just lost their minds. This is what we're dealing with. To bring us to this precipice only a few days away, something's wrong. This is not how we debate things in the United States of America. This is not in any manner, shape, or form. As President Obama

said, Democrats are willing to negotiate, but not with a gun to our heads. Never. I'm from Paterson, New Jersey; you never put a gun to my head, I've got news for you.

Let's end this irresponsible shutdown and default threat, and let's get back to work. That's what we were sent here for.

I thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI for your patience.

Signed:

Edwin Meese III, Former Attorney General, President Ronald Reagan; Chris Chocola, President, Club for Growth; Jenny Beth Martin, Co-Founder, Tea Party Patriots; Penny Nance, President, Concerned Women for America; The Honorable J. Kenneth Blackwell, President, Constitutional Congress, Inc.; William Wilson, President, Americans for Limited Government; Duane Parde, President, National Taxpayers Union; Susan Carleson, President, American Civil Rights Union; Andrea Lafferty, President, Traditional Values Coalition; Alfred S. Regnery, President, The Paul Revere Project; Lewis Uhler, President, National Tax Limitation Committee; Brent Bozell, President, ForAmerica; Matt Kibbe, President, FreedomWorks; Marjorie Dannenfelser, President, Susan B. Anthony List; David Williams, President, Taxpayers Protection Alliance.

The Honorable David McIntosh, Former U.S. Representative, Indiana; David Bozell, Executive Director, ForAmerica; Colin Hanna, President, Let Freedom Ring; Stuart Epperson, President, Council for National Policy; Heather Higgins, President, Independent Women's Forum; Cindy Chafian, President, The Mommy Lobby; Gary Bauer, President, American Values; Mike Needham, CEO, Heritage Action for America; David Bossie, President, Citizens United; Mathew D. Staver, Chairman, Liberty Counsel Action; James Martin, Chairman, 60 Plus Association; Erick Erickson, Editor, RedState.com; T. Kenneth Cribb, Former Domestic Advisor, President Ronald Reagan; Becky Norton Dunlop, Former White House Advisor, President Ronald Reagan; Grace-Marie Turner, President, The Galen Institute.

Myron Ebell, President, Freedom Action; Craig Shirley, Reagan Campaign Biographer; Rev. Lou Sheldon, Chairman, Traditional Values Coalition; Richard Rahn, President, Inst. for Global Economic Growth; Lee Beaman, Businessman, Nashville, TN; Bob Reccord, Executive Director, Council for National Policy; Angelo M. Codevilla, Professor, Emeritus, Boston University; Tom Donelson, Chairman, America's PAC; Brian Baker, President, Ending Spending; Kay R. Daly, President, Coalition for a Fair Judiciary; Don Devine, Senior Scholar, The Fund for American Studies; Gary Aldrich, President, Patrick Henry Center for Individual Liberty; Ralph Benko, President, Center for Civic Virtue; Andresen Blom, Senior Strategist, Center for Civic Virtue; Joe Gregory, CEO, Gregory Management Co.; Rebecca Hagelin.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. PASCRELL, thank you very much. Whether you're from New Jersey or wherever, I'm not about to threaten you. But I would like to welcome to this microphone our friend from the State of Massachusetts, who is probably just as tough as the gentleman from New Jersey, and that's Mr. CAPUANO.

Mr. CAPUANO. For the first time in my life, I have no intention of being as passionate as the gentleman from New Jersey, and I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I was going to walk people through this because to me, good people can disagree. Reasonable people can disagree. Even people I disagree with vehemently, that's what politics, that's what government, that's what life is all about. But you're not entitled to forget history or to ignore facts. And for me, there have been lots of misrepresentations in the last week or two because there's a lot of passion, a lot of emotion. But I need to back up a little bit, educational value.

When I'm told that the Democrats have to come to the table and compromise, my answer is: We have, repeatedly. And we will do it again, if necessary.

And people say, Well, no, you haven't. The President is saying no, you won't negotiate.

Well, no, we won't negotiate on this issue at this point in time because we have already gone far enough, and here's why. 2011, the last supercommittee, where did it come from? It came from the budget impasse. We couldn't come to an agreement. We couldn't make a deal. We had taken our corners. What did we do? We created a supercommittee and it was said if the supercommittee doesn't work, do something like Simpson-Bowles or whatever they would come up with, then we would institute a sequester. And a sequester, for all intents and purposes, is an across-the-board cut of roughly 8 percent per year every year for 10 years in a row. That's what it is. At the end of that 10th year if you don't do anything, you would be spending approximately 48 cents of every dollar you were spending when you started.

Now I understand that some people want a government that does that and the programs that would pay for. I don't agree with that, but that's a reasonable position to take. "I don't want senior housing. I don't want childhood nutrition." I don't agree with it, but it's a reasonable position to take, and we should argue about that and we should debate about that, and the American people should have an opportunity to elect people that agree or disagree with them on those types of issues.

□ 2045

We couldn't come to an agreement, so the sequester took place; and the sequester set out numbers each year for 10 years. This is as much as you can spend unless you come up with some sort of agreement to get around it. We haven't been able to do it. We've had the first year of sequester and are about to enter the second year of sequester.

Pursuant to the law that was passed in 2011, a law, by the way, I voted against—I don't like the concept of sequester—but the majority ruled and it passed. Pursuant to that law in this coming fiscal year, we would have been allowed to spend a little over a trillion dollars. Remember, that number is based on an 8 percent cut from the prior year. So this already represents a cut, and, by the way, it represents a massive compromise between Democrats and Republicans to pass that sequester. So it was a Democratic compromise with Republicans to cut the budget for 10 years in a row. That's where we start.

This year, Republicans passed a budget of \$967 billion, \$100 billion below what the sequester allows. They're entitled to do that. Again, I can disagree, but I respect their viewpoint. If you really think the government can operate and provide the services the American people want on that number, fine. I will disagree, we will vote, pass it, and we'll move on. Of course, the Senate didn't agree with that number. The Senate passed another number. Here we are today.

What's happened? The last week or so, you have heard pretty much every Democrat, pretty much every Democrat say we want to vote on the clean CR, the continuing resolution, that the Senate passed. The average American has no clue what we're talking about. Here's what they passed. They passed a budget that would allow the spending of \$986 billion. To me, if you're going to talk about a compromise—sequester allows a little over a trillion. Republicans want \$967 billion. The compromise is here, a little over a trillion dollars. That would be a compromise on a compromise. But, no, the Senate says not \$986 billion. That's a compromise on a compromise on a compromise. What did the Republican House leaders say? No. \$967 billion, our number. By the way, no health care.

For those of you who thought Democrats haven't been compromising, I'm here to tell you, in my opinion, not only have we compromised; I think we have compromised too much from my philosophical viewpoint. I know that I'm the minority view in this House. So be it. I think the sequester was too much. I certainly think \$967 billion is too much, and I think \$986 billion is too much. You know why? My constituents want senior housing, they want children fed, they want young people educated, and on and on and on. They want veterans benefits. They want all the things that we do. Of course no one wants to pay for that. I get that. I don't either. I pay taxes. I wish everything was free. I'm going out to dinner in a little while, hopefully to watch the Red Sox win the series, and I don't want to pay for dinner, but I guess I'll have to.

Reasonable differences of opinion, no matter how dramatic they may be, a

\$100 billion difference, are realistic, they're honest, and the American people have a right to take sides. They don't have a right to say Democrats haven't compromised. This was a compromise. This would have been a compromise. This is a compromise. This is not. This is uncompromising. That's why I wanted to come up here.

By the way, there's one little point of historic note. I've been in the House 14½ years. This is my first Special Order. And, as I said, I probably missed the first inning of the Red Sox game, which in my district is close to a cardinal sin. But this is more important.

I'm not trying to convince anyone that my side is right or the other side is wrong. People have their opinions. I know that. You're probably not going to change them. I am here to say that there is a difference between compromise and capitulation. We have compromised one, two, three times to get where we are. To get to this number would be the fourth. To get rid of health care would be fifth; and not just fifth, it would be the ending. As far as I'm concerned, this Democrat will not compromise further on these issues. It's time for the other side to compromise off of what they think the world should be.

Thank you for yielding, Mr. GARAMENDI.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. CAPUANO, thank you so very much. I think it's a tragedy you've waited 14½ years to be so eloquent in explaining how we got to where we are and the fact that the Democrats have consistently cooperated, compromised, and watched those critical programs that we care so very much about being consistently hacked away at and reduced and, in many cases, all but eliminated.

Now, we are in the eighth day of the shutdown of the United States Government that used to be thought of as the most powerful democracy in the world. At the moment, it's a democracy that's not working. As pointed out by my colleagues, there was an election last November in which these issues were all fundamental in that debate, and the American people voted to fully enforce the Affordable Care Act and to provide the services, whether they're education, transportation, health care, and the rest. Here we are, the minority party in this House and actually a minority of that minority party, driving an agenda that is anathema to those things that I believe we need to do and completely contrary to last November's election.

I would like now to call upon Mr. RYAN of Ohio, a gentleman who often joins us on these evening discussions. We'd like to talk about jobs, and we'd like to talk about rebuilding the American manufacturing sector. We know that can only be done when the United States Government is operating.

I yield to Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate my colleagues' words here tonight. There's not a whole lot left to cover, whether it was the gentleman from Pittsburgh or the gentleman from Paterson or the gentleman from East Hartford or the gentleman from Somerville in the Boston area, and also the gentleman from upstate New York. We've seen them cover many of the issues here. They've been broken down. I would just like to maybe touch on a point or two.

A lot of Members have come to this floor. On all the TV shows they talk a lot about, We've got to pay our bills, we've got to pay our bills. I think everybody here agrees that we've got to pay our bills. It's important for us to remember the bills that were racked up that we have to go out and pay, those appropriation bills, off-budget many times, were to fund two wars. They went right on Uncle Sam's credit card, both of them. They were not paid for, and many of our colleagues on the other side never came to this floor and said, Oh my, God, how are we going to pay for all of this?

Economist after economist would come back and say this is going to be maybe \$100 billion, \$200 billion, \$300 billion, \$400 billion, \$500 billion today. If we factor in all the veterans that are coming back, these wars are going to be \$2 trillion to \$3 trillion to \$4 trillion when it's all said and done. I don't remember being here watching a Member come up on the other side of the aisle, get in the well, and make an argument that we need to pay for these wars if we are going to go. There was not one.

Today, they want to talk about being responsible. They want to talk about us meeting our obligation. Now they want to say, Oh, yeah, we ran up those credit cards. We swiped them, and we kept swiping them. Then we doubled down. We need a surge. Let's double down. Let's run that credit card one more time. Now today they're saying, We're not going to pay the bills. We're going to default unless you repeal the Affordable Care Act, and then we'll have a conversation.

It's the height of irresponsibility.

Another thing that I find humorous is how over the past few years we've been lectured to by many members of the Tea Party about the Constitution of the United States and how they're the only Americans, this 20 percent, 25 percent, maybe 30 percent, are the only Americans who have read the Constitution, and they're the only ones who adhere to the Constitution. Yet when we talk about the political process that we need to work through, and as Mr. CAPUANO was just saying, you can have a reasonable position. If you don't like it, go to the ballot box and win the election. Yet those very same Members are now thumbing their noses at the political process that the Founding Fathers set up for us to adhere to.

We were here during the Iraq war. I was. I wasn't for it. I campaigned against it in my first campaign. Guess what? I didn't win. I didn't win the argument in 2002 and 2003. I didn't win it in 2004 or 2005. I came to this floor night after night after night. We finally won the House and Senate in 2006. We tried to stop the war. We didn't do it, but we took it to the people and we won the House and the Senate back. In 2007 and 2008, we took it back to the street, won the Presidency. Then, longer than any of us wanted, we finally started winding things down. We went through the political process. We didn't shut the government down. We didn't say we're going to default on the credit card bills that previous Congresses ran up, even though we disagreed with how they spent the money.

What's happening is radical. These are radical acts here in the House Chamber. To say we are here to negotiate, if you get rid of the Affordable Care Act, is ludicrous. It doesn't make any sense. Have the guts to go to the American people and make the argument. For the life of me, I can't figure out why you wouldn't let the Affordable Care Act get set up. If it's so awful, if it's so bad, set it up, and let it go. President Obama has his fingerprints all over it. The Democrats have their fingerprints all over it. If it fails, you'll win the Senate in 2014; and if it's so bad, you'll win the Presidency in 2016. You can then defund it, dismantle it, and put 30 million or 40 million people out of the health care system, make sure you can get denied health care for having a preexisting condition and put the insurance companies between the doctor and the patient. Fine, you won the elections. You're perfectly capable of doing that.

Have the guts to go to the street and make the argument. Seventy percent of Americans are saying do not shut the government down to try to end the Affordable Care Act.

I will say what I think's happening here. I think the House leadership on the Republican side has Stockholm syndrome. I think they have started to identify themselves with their captors. The Tea Party has now convinced the leadership in the House of Representatives that they should have sympathy and empathy towards their captors, so the whole country at this point is being shut down because of this.

Lastly, let me say that the only successful moments in politics that our friends on the other side have had is when they divide the American people. Who's in a union; who's not in a union. Who's in a public sector union versus who's in a private sector union. Who's black; who's white. Who's gay; who's straight. Divide, divide, divide, divide; and here we are in 2013 a divided Nation that is ungovernable at this point because of the power that is held by the Tea Party in the United States House of Representatives.

I just want to say that there is a future waiting to be taken for this country, investments back in the United States into our infrastructure, into our research, into renewable energies, into expanding the grid and making it smarter, and into making sure everyone has access to the latest technologies such as three dimensional printers in schools, robotics, Legos. Get kids excited about learning.

We only have 313 million people in the United States. We're competing against 1.4 billion people in China, and we're sitting on our hands. We're not making the investments we need to be making, and there are colleges and universities and schools that need the investment. Every day that goes by, Mr. GARAMENDI, we see one more, two more, five more, 10 more situations where investments were made collectively by the public to benefit our country.

We need to end this lockout that's happening right now.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

□ 2100

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. RYAN, thank you so much for bringing us just some sense of reality of what is actually happening here.

We're in the eighth day of the lockout. We're in the eighth day of the shutdown of the government of the United States of America. And it appears, from all that we hear from the Republican side, that this may go right up to the debt limit. What a tragedy it would be if we hit that and took down the entire economy.

I think it's time for me to close. I want to thank my colleagues. I would ask the American people to pay attention.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, let us vote. Speaker BOEHNER, let us vote on a clean continuing resolution so that we can, once again, start this government. The votes are here. And if you don't believe the votes are here, put us up on the board. Let's see if there are 217 votes to reopen the American Government. We can only find out, Mr. Speaker, if you let us vote.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by saying that I am exceptionally privileged to be here on the House floor of the United States Congress this evening to speak on behalf of my constituents and in front of the Nation. It is an honor that few people realize, and it's worthy of mention.

I just want to also thank the fine gentlemen and ladies from the other side that were here this evening. I appreciate your impassioned pleas. That's what this place is all about. I might disagree with many of them, but I appreciate your passion and your willingness to serve.

I just want to talk about a couple of things and, at least from my side, Mr. Speaker, set the record, or at least kind of balance the record—maybe not set it straight in some people's minds because I'm sure some folks will disagree. But when the one gentleman said that he opposed the Iraq war and folks were here paying for it with a credit card and he was opposed to that, well, I wasn't here. So I can't really atone for the sins of the past, and there's a good chance that I would disagree with many of them, but one of the reasons I wasn't here was because I was in Iraq at that time.

And even though I think it is morally wrong to have spent this Nation into such debt over those conflicts, when you are attacked, you must respond, number one; and, number two, I think it kind of belies the fact that the current administration has nearly doubled that spending in half the time. So with all due respect, I think it's fair just to point that out.

And regarding another gentleman who talked about the interest of the other side to negotiate and agree to a compromise and to compromise, in looking at the numbers, the sequester came from the President of the United States out of another supercommittee that was created, and the President demanded the sequester, demanded the number. So this Congress has given it to him, and this Congress has held that number. It was demanded out of that negotiation. So by saying that they've compromised, they haven't compromised on anything. That's where we all agreed to be at the end of that negotiation.

Now, there's been a lot of impassioned talk and yelling and wailing, and I don't really think that's helpful to the narrative here. We're all going to have to work together at some point and figure this thing out, and blaming one side or the other side, I just don't know where that really gets us.

I want to just talk a little bit about some of the facts. And these aren't my facts; they're not SCOTT PERRY's facts. I've got The Washington Post here, because some people say this is unprecedented, it's never happened before, and only one party does this.

Well, there was a shutdown in 1976. Gerald Ford was the President. The Democrats held both Houses. It was ended by all sides coming together and working towards a continuing resolution.

The next one was in 1977. Jimmy Carter was the President. Democrats held

both Houses. Amazingly, it was resolved by both sides coming together and working on a Medicaid ban.

Then there was the shutdown of 1977. Jimmy Carter was the President. Democrats were in charge of both Houses. They signed a temporary bill because they came together and worked something out. The 1977 shutdown under Jimmy Carter, Democrats were in charge, and they were doing what they thought they needed to do. They're elected by their people to do the work of this House, but they came together after 8 days and they resolved it.

The next one, 1978. Jimmy Carter was the President. The Democrats controlled both Houses. Eighteen days—eighteen days—but they resolved it after they got together. The President, the Senate, and the House, they got together.

1979, Jimmy Carter was the President. The Democrats were in charge of both Houses. Eleven days. What resolved it? They got together and they talked. Nothing happens here, and nothing will happen here, if we're not going to be willing to be civil with one another and get together and talk.

1981, Ronald Reagan was the President. The Republicans had the Senate. The House was controlled by the Democrats. After 2 days, they resolved it. Again, Reagan came down and signed a bill extending the current spending limit.

And then again, in September of '82, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans held the Senate. Democrats held the House. Tip O'Neill was the Speaker. But they resolved it in just 1 day because they got together. Both of them were out that evening having fundraisers, both parties. They let the government shut down, but they got together and moved beyond it.

1982, Tip O'Neill again the Speaker. Republicans were in charge of the Senate. Ronald Reagan was President. Over the MX missile, they shut it down, but they figured out a way to get past it because they negotiated.

And for 3 days in 1983, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans were in charge of the Senate. The House was controlled by Democrats, with Tip O'Neill Speaker. And they resolved it, again, over about a \$100 million discrepancy.

1984, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans had the Senate. The House was controlled by the Democrats. Over a Supreme Court ruling, they shut it down, but they resolved it after all sides came together and negotiated.

This is from not a right-wing paper in town here. These are not my facts.

1984, Ronald Reagan was the President. Republicans had the Senate. The House was controlled by Democrats. Tip O'Neill was the Speaker. And they shut it down again, but they opened it back up.

The 13th one happened in 1986 under President Reagan. Republicans controlled the Senate, Bob Dole. Democrats in the House by Tip O'Neill. And they resolved it by getting together—each side gave up some of their demands—and they expanded welfare in return for the appropriations necessary to reopen the government.

Ronald Reagan, in 1987, was the President. Democrats were in control of both Houses. And again, they found a way to get together on the fairness doctrine.

In 1990, George H.W. Bush was the President. Democrats controlled both Houses. They figured it out and signed a continuing resolution and reduced the deficit.

And then the 16th time, Clinton was the President and Gingrich was the Speaker of the House. The Senate was controlled by Republicans and so was the House. But even then, they worked it out. Even then, they worked it out. When both Houses of Congress were against the President, Mr. Speaker, they found a way to work it out.

And then for 21 days in 1995, with Clinton as the President and the House was controlled by Republicans and the Senate was controlled by Republicans, again, what resolved it? They worked it out. They got together, and they worked it out.

So let's go to the debt limit, because we've also heard this is a historic time, it's unprecedented, it's never happened before, Mr. Speaker.

So 1970 is where we found out the practice of attaching nongermane provisions to the debt limit began in earnest. In 1971, Social Security changes; 1972, the spending cap and impoundment of powers on the proposal to increase the debt limit.

And I'm just skipping because there's a pile of them here.

In 1980, Congress repealed an oil import fee. President Carter vetoed the bill. Both Houses of Congress were Democrat and President Carter was a Democrat. But he vetoed it, and they overrode the veto by wide majorities, but they worked it out. They worked it out.

1985, 1990, 1993, 1996, 1997, 2010, 2011, 2012. The debt limit is the appropriate place in this divided government to find some fiscal sanity, and that's what's happening here right now in this town.

Now, of course, like I said, I don't want to get into the blame game here. I'm really going to try to stay out of it. Whether we agree with ObamaCare or not is not the issue. It might be a great law. And there are other laws that some people think are great laws or are not great laws. The question really should be and really is: Can we afford it? Can we afford it?

We are running a trillion-dollar deficit every single year. We take in \$1 trillion less than we spend. So if you

are a household that brings in \$100,000, you are spending \$25,000 more every single year as a ratio more than you bring in. I ask the American people, Mr. Speaker, how long can this be sustained?

So even if we agree that it's a good law—and many of us don't. That's fair. But even if we agree that it's a good law, how are we going to pay for it? That's the question.

Now Congress' job in this House and this Senate is to craft legislation and to determine our spending priorities and our spending levels. That's our job. The other gentleman said, We haven't read the Constitution or—it's in the Constitution. It's very simple. That is our job.

With all due respect to the President, I've got to tell you, it does not help. Again, we are going to have to work together. It's for the sake of our Nation. It does not help to be lectured to about what we must do here, according to the President, when it's exactly what he would not do and did not do when he served in this building. It does not help.

Now, our constituents elected us. The citizens of our districts elected us. They elected us to come here and do something, to do something. And we keep on hearing from the other side, Just pass a clean CR. Just pass it and everything will be fine.

I came here to do something. We are spending \$1 trillion more than we bring in every single year. We are \$17 trillion in debt. The bill that's being implemented, the law that's being implemented right now is going to cost us \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion. We don't know. And the President, I understand—I'm not sure of the number—is going to ask in a week to raise the debt ceiling another \$900 billion. So that is \$100 billion short of \$1 trillion, which are still all numbers that are staggering to my mind.

So if we add that up, okay, so at the minimum, we're at \$20 trillion, and that doesn't include Social Security and all the other obligations that we have. And the clean CR that we're being beseeched to just vote on so everything will be fine says, That's okay, just keep going. Don't change a thing. Everything's fine. Nothing to see here.

Everything's not fine. The constituents that elected me had three concerns when I ran, and I hear about them every single day at the grocery store, at the gas station, on my telephones, in email, and in the letters they send to me. Do something about this debt. Do something about this deficit. Do something about this spending. Do something about ObamaCare. That's what they send to me. That's what they tell me.

Maybe the world doesn't understand where this is going to end, but a lot of us do. When our dollar isn't worth anything, when we have to take a wheelbarrow of dollars to the grocery store

to buy just what we need to survive, that's where it will end. We don't have to go there. We are choosing to go there. And it doesn't have to be that way.

Another one of the gentlemen said, Well, we need to move on so we can make investments, investments in education, investments in infrastructure. And he's right. The world is leaving us behind. He's right. But we only have so much money. So we have to prioritize, Mr. Speaker. We must prioritize. And that's what this is about. We said, We've only got so much; and if you want to spend a bunch more on education and on infrastructure so we can compete, then you are not going to have as much money to spend on some other things.

□ 2115

But nobody wants to make that distinction. Nobody wants to choose in this place.

Some of us, reluctantly, because it's unpleasant, but reluctantly we know it is your duty and so we are forced to choose, and we are ready to choose. I say it's doing nothing because passing a clean CR will do nothing to fix our \$17 trillion debt and our \$1 trillion annual deficits. It will do nothing.

So I will go home to my constituents, to the people that elected me, and they'll say, What did you get accomplished? And I will say nothing?

I won't say nothing. No, I will say I tried. I might fail. I might fail, but I'm not going down on my knees, Mr. Speaker. I'm going down, if I go down, I'll go down fighting, because I can't do nothing.

I don't want to see a government shutdown. Nobody in this place wants to see it. It's not good for this side, it's not good for that side, it's not good for the American people. It is not good. We acknowledge that.

But why should anyone believe the concerns about debt and deficit will be discussed when they haven't been discussed in the 5 years?

And to be clear and to be honest, they haven't been discussed really ever. Republicans, Democrats, nobody wants to touch it.

I've got a mother on Social Security, Medicare. I don't want to see her out on the street. I will take care of my mother. That's what we do in our family. We will not let that happen.

But some people don't have that option. I don't want to see it go bankrupt. But right now, Social Security Disability, that portion of Social Security, the last report I saw, will be bankrupt in a year and a half. In a year and a half.

Social Security, 10, 15 years behind it. Medicare, Medicaid, bankrupting our Nation. And we're doing nothing. We're doing nothing.

We can't do nothing. And so we must discuss it. We must get to the issue.

So we can't agree to this thing where the other side says, just pass it. Let us spend as much as we want to, and we promise you that we'll come to the negotiation table and talk to you about the things that are important to you.

With all due respect, they haven't been important enough in the last 5 years or the last 20 years; and so we have no reason to believe, I have no reason to believe that they will.

And those who say that one side is doing this for partisan reasons, for political gain, I ask, what political gain?

What is the upside?

What is the upside for me, any of us?

There is none. The Representatives in this body who disagree with passing a clean CR are putting themselves at peril for love of country and love of the future.

I've got two little girls, two little girls that I'm desperate to have the same opportunities that I had. When I grew up, our house didn't have electricity. We didn't have running water. My parents were often unemployed. Me and my brother ate some strange things just to eat because we didn't know any better. We did okay. And we made a life for ourselves, but we had an opportunity in America.

But that opportunity is going to slip away from us because of the way we are handling our fiscal house.

Look at what will happen if we continue without adjusting course. I would argue that the first people that would lose their jobs under this situation are government workers.

When we can no longer borrow from the Chinese, when we can no longer borrow from ourselves, Social Security, the Social Security trust fund, part of that \$900 billion that they're going to ask us to raise the debt ceiling so we continue to borrow is coming out of the Social Security trust fund. Who agrees with that?

I don't know one American that says that's okay. And somehow this is the only place in the world where it would be okay.

But government employees, just like in Greece, when they ran out of money, when they ran out finally, the first ones to go—not for a week, not for a couple of days, gone. The job is gone. You are no longer working. You have no job. There's nothing to come back to.

We don't have to do it. We don't have to. We can make a choice now. We're saying turn the ship around on a dime. We're saying turn the wheel a little bit, just a little bit, and let's start heading to the course of correction.

But voting for a clean CR says just keep going, just keep going. Don't worry about the torpedos, don't worry about the iceberg, just keep going.

So just like in Cyprus, we'll come home to find out the banks under Federal control and Federal order will have removed the money from our sav-

ings account. They'll just do it. That's what they did in that country because they ended up where we're going.

Why would we do it?

Now, those who say they want a clean CR, they are patriots. I know that. They are hearing from their constituents. I've had constituents come in, crying, literally crying in my office, and we talked about the situation.

Those folks that want a vote on a clean CR, they are patriots too. They want to fix it; they just want to do it now.

But I would say that it is time to do the hard right because for too long the easy wrong has been done. I don't know when they want to do something, but I want to do it now because I don't think we can wait.

Now, we have offered our ideas and we have asked for their ideas. We have offered them. We understand and respect the other side disagrees with our solution.

We had four votes in this House before this government shut down, four bipartisan votes. People on both sides of the aisle voted four times for something.

But the Senate disagrees. The President disagrees. I respect they disagree. I respect that they don't like our solution. It is their prerogative, and maybe it's their duty.

All we're saying is okay, fine. You disagree. I get it.

What's your idea?

What's your solution?

The solution should not be nothing. The solution from them has been no. Now go about your business and come up with what we want.

It just seems like not negotiating—if I had a fight with my wife, if I had a dispute with my daughter, I never want to go to bed angry at my family, and I never want my family to go to bed angry with me. Before the day's done, we're going to sit down at the table, and we're going to talk about it.

We might go to bed a little sore with each other, but we love each other and we love this country, and so it's imperative that we stay with each other to work through it.

We understand and respect the other side. We understand that they don't want to do anything with ObamaCare, but ObamaCare adds \$2 trillion to \$3 trillion to our national debt. So if you don't want to do anything about that, fine. What do you want to do?

That's all I'm asking. That's all we're asking. What do you want to do?

Some say, well, you need to raise taxes. ObamaCare raised taxes; I think it was the largest tax increase in history.

Okay. So we did that. And that wasn't enough, so just last December, when I wasn't here, another \$650 billion in taxes on an economy that's struggling to get through, 1 to 2 percent growth.

We're choosing this, and I don't think we have to.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that we're taking in more tax revenue right now, right now, than ever before in history?

There's more money coming in now than ever before, and we're \$1 trillion apart every year. I mean, how much more can we take?

Should we just take it all?

I mean, that's another form of government. It's been done. It doesn't work out real well.

Well, some will say, well, cut the military. Well, this place cut the military about \$1.2 trillion over the last year and a half. And for me, the Constitution says provide, it uses that word, provide for the common defense, Mr. Speaker.

The line below it is promote the general welfare. Words mean things. We have a duty to provide for it.

Certainly, there are inefficiencies. I've been in the military. I've served, and I know they're there. And it's right to take a look. Everything needs to be on the table.

But how much more, and how much do we enfeeble ourselves and disable our ability to do our constitutional requirement, which is to protect the citizenry?

It is our requirement.

Now, we passed a bunch of bills in the House here; and, to tell you the truth, I kind of like it. We're moving towards the CR one piece at a time, so I don't have to vote for things that I don't think we should spend money on for the sake of the things that we must spend money on.

Mr. Speaker, it's not optimal, but it's a way to get there. But, like, for cancer research for kids, we passed that out of the House, and the leader of the Senate says, when asked, well, why won't you pass it? He says, well, why would we want to do that?

My goodness, why wouldn't we want to do that?

That's where we have consensus. We have some consensus.

And another gentleman questioned why Congress has the right to pick and choose what gets funded. Isn't it astounding that someone in the Senate doesn't understand that not only is it the right of Congress to do that, but it's our duty. That's what we're here to do. That's what we're supposed to do.

We have offered numerous ideas. The Senate says no. They don't say no—but. They just say no.

Refusing to negotiate is, to my mind, irresponsible. I mean, I don't know if they're here for themselves or the greater good of Nation when I hear reports—I don't know if they're true—but they're reported in the newspapers that the park rangers are told make it as difficult as possible.

And when I see the World War II Memorial, when I went out on the Mall

this morning, the World War II Memorial barricaded up. It costs more money to close it than it does to leave it open.

I saw a cone out on one the streets with barricades all around the cone in the middle of the street. I mean, why are we renting barricades?

And on the Mall adjacent to the street that's closed because it's a Federal park area, there's an immigration rally that's being supported by the Park Police.

What's happening, Mr. Speaker?

The Grand Canyon, closed. I guess you can't walk up to the rim and look over. The State offered to pay the bill, and the Federal Government said, no, we don't want your money. We want to close it.

Is that reasonable?

I don't know. It's not reasonable to me.

It was The Washington Post that reported employees were to make it as inconvenient as possible.

Now, some are characterized around here as being extreme, an extreme faction. The four bills that we passed to avert the shutdown were passed by this side and that side together, four bipartisan bills.

And they say the House is being held hostage by a few Members. I don't know. Bipartisan votes on both sides seems less than extreme to me.

And I've got to ask, since when are Americans who want to see the government act within the constitutional bounds, that is, the House and the Senate, the Congress figuring out our spending level and our spending priority, when is that extreme?

Why is that extreme?

That's our job. That's the division of powers. That's the checks and balances. That's what we do. That's why we're here.

How is that extreme?

How is spending trillions of dollars more than you have now viewed as responsible?

How is talking about trying to save some money and be responsible with the taxpayers' money on our future, how is that seen as extreme?

Why is it okay to think that spending that money is okay and acceptable to most Americans?

Who gets away with that kind of behavior in their own households?

Well, you do, but not for very long, I guess.

With that I'd like to yield some time, if I could, to the fine gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. I appreciate my friend from Pennsylvania.

You were mentioning some of the things that the prior speakers, the Democrats, were saying. And one of the things that was said was, give us a vote, when, as my friend from Pennsylvania pointed out, there have been plenty of votes.

They also were saying that, talking about budget conferees. We're past the

end of the fiscal year. The way it's supposed to work, we're supposed to have a budget very early in the year, and then after that, do the appropriations bills.

Well, the Senate has not been doing budgets in the past. This is the first time in years. They haven't done what the law required. They seem to ignore the law anytime they wish.

They have not been passing any appropriations bills. And that's a political game that allows Majority Leader HARRY REID to avoid following the law so that any potential vulnerable Democratic Senators will not have to take tough votes like people do in the House constantly, because we've appropriations bills and we continue to do that.

And so we know, since we passed the military pay bill that required that the military get paid, we treat military pay somewhat like we do Social Security pay, so that if the government were shut down, the military still gets paid. People in harm's way don't have to worry about family members getting their check.

So since my friend across the aisle was so upset about not having a vote, and I realize we get busy here and some people forget the things we've been voting on the last 10 days.

So I'd just like to remind my friends across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, that actually, we voted, after we passed a bill to pay our military; and as my friend, Mr. PERRY knows, the Democrats voted for it. The Senate voted for it. The President signed it.

And in the bill, as we spelled out, civilians were supposed to continue employment that were assisting the military. Contractors were supposed to continue working that were supporting the military; and yet this administration had chosen to try to make as many people suffer as possible, even though the law didn't require it.

So the Secretary of Defense sat on his hands for about a week, had civilian personnel not working that could have been working all this time; decides, after a week, to follow the advice, he says, of his people that had been looking at the bill.

And we made clear from the very beginning, before the shutdown even started, you don't have to send all these people home, but he did it anyway.

□ 2130

It was consistent with what has been mentioned that one of the park rangers said, though it was disgusting to the ranger, We were told make things as difficult for people as we can.

And people keep saying we were demanding the total repeal of ObamaCare. Well, we know that would be best for America because a lot of people are already suffering. We've already seen ObamaCare is not being followed as law because the President has

had hundreds of exemptions that he has waved his hand, waved his magic wand and said, You don't have to follow this law; you don't have to follow this law. You don't have to follow what's here in this provision; you don't have to follow what's in this provision. And by the way, the business mandate in the law makes no exceptions. Business folks, my party still wants to get your contributions, so I will wave my wand and you don't follow the law.

So when my friends across the aisle say, Just let ObamaCare go, I would say the same thing. You let ObamaCare go, if the President will, if HARRY REID will. If you just let it be enforced exactly the way it is, it won't last a month.

But he has had to do so many waivers, and it will continue. So it's not going into law. In fact, the Supreme Court had to rewrite it just to uphold it. Because they already said that the basis for the law that was given, the interstate commerce clause, was not a basis to take over health care in America. So they struck it down under the law as written; and the law, as written, said there was a penalty.

Well, the Supreme Court said at page 15 that it's a penalty, and therefore the anti-injunction act does not apply. Therefore, we do have jurisdiction, and so now that we have jurisdiction, we'll go ahead and decide it's not constitutional the way it's written as a penalty, but we will rewrite it, the five of us in the majority, and call it a tax. And then we'll uphold it as a tax, even though clearly that's not the way it was written.

It's not what the President promised the American people. So much for the Democrats wanting ObamaCare to be followed as it was written. We're way beyond that with all the waivers and exemptions.

But then we had a vote that said, Okay, let's just suspend it for a year because everybody knows ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. Clearly. That's why the President had to give business a 1-year exemption, where we just won't follow the law as it's applied to business.

But then, after the Senate refused to even take that up, we did the most reasonable thing that some said they could imagine and that is, Okay, you just waved off the mandatory requirements for business. So if you're going to magically wave off part of the law that's mandatory, then let's agree to do that for everyone, like the person that's making \$15,000, or 133 percent of the poverty level. A year or so ago, we were told that was \$14,000 something. Now it's \$15,000. But even with subsidies, you're probably going to end up paying a few thousand dollars. Somebody making \$15,000 is going to have a few thousands over their subsidies? And if you don't do that, you're going to pay the \$95, or 1 percent of your income, as an extra tax?

People do not have that extra money. People have been sent from full time to part time. When the union members figured out what the union leaders had done to them, causing many of them to lose full time and going to part-time employment, many of them losing their great health insurance and now they'll have to go under the ObamaCare exchanges, like Members of Congress, they got upset. All of a sudden, the leaders of the unions said, Gee, look at all the unintended consequences.

We knew there were intended consequences. We talked about them at the time.

So that was something that was passed. Just waive the individual mandate for a year. That was not taken up by the Senate. So then we passed what, to me, seemed like a capitulation. We appointed negotiators and said, Okay, you don't like any of those proposals, Mr. Majority Leader HARRY REID, then this is what adults do: we appoint negotiators, and we can probably have a deal done by morning before anybody realizes there's even been a shutdown at midnight.

But Majority Leader REID, following the lead of our President, made clear that they were going to follow the conventional wisdom of the last few years that if there's a shutdown, the mainstream media will clearly blame Republicans, and maybe that will help us politically. So he even refused to negotiate.

So once we saw that HARRY REID had completely refused to even negotiate, pretty reasonable folks that were appointed by Speaker BOEHNER, the majority leader says, We're not going to do that.

It's possible they could have slept through it. Maybe I was given a speech and my Democratic friends dozed off and didn't know we had all these votes. So if they happened to be sleeping while we had these votes, I would like to remind people that then we had a bill that we voted on to provide local funding for the District of Columbia. We know the District of Columbia has a lot of money of its own that comes in.

Frankly, I was shocked that our friends across the aisle—most of them—voted against allowing the District of Columbia to just move forward with its own money so that it could run the operations of the city. Apparently, they wanted to inflict as much harm as possible so that people would continue to blame the Republicans.

We know the mainstream media has long since quit being objective. Twenty-one stories from the mainstream media at first all unanimously blamed Republicans failing to report that HARRY REID would not even appoint negotiators to work something out quickly.

And then we passed the Open Our National Parks and Museums Act. It

would have made sure that all of these places that have been shut down by this administration in the most hurtful, harmful, punitive way possible, trying to get everybody in America they can to hurt some way so that they can blame Republicans, when it's simply the decision of the President.

We answered by saying, Okay, Democrats across the aisle, you want a vote? Let's vote. There's no need to do this, and the response across the aisle was to have most of the Democrats vote to leave them shut. They weren't going to vote with us to fund our national parks.

And then we had a vote on Research for Lifesaving Cures Act, H.J. Res. 73, to provide funding for the National Institutes of Health, which is responsible for lifesaving medical innovation and cancer research. Most, except for about 20 or so Democrats, all voted not to fund the National Institutes of Health.

Our friends across the aisle say, Give us a vote. They got a vote. You want to fund the NIH, then vote to do it. We'll send it down. But even though we passed it and sent it down the Hall, HARRY REID was not going to do it because, as my friend pointed out, when he was asked if you could save one child with cancer, why wouldn't you do that, he said, Why would we do that? And then he chastised the reporter for asking a question which in his mind he thought was a silly question. I thought it was an excellent question.

And then many of us believed there was enough latitude to pay some of our Reservists on Active Duty. But the Defense Department took a narrow interpretation so they could punish more people and blame the Republicans.

So to counter that, we passed a Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act on October 3 that ensured during the shutdown that it would not affect the pay for our National Guard and Reserves. Again, 160 Democrats voted against that. They asked for a vote, we give them a vote. Most of them voted against it. Then our friend, HARRY REID, down the hall said, No way, we're not funding them.

Again, maybe our friends were asleep. Sometimes when I talk, I put people to sleep. It happens. I'm a very restless speaker.

We passed the National Emergency Disaster Recovery Act. That provided immediate funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and 164 of our Democratic friends voted against that, and HARRY REID refuses to bring it up.

We actually brought up a bill to pay our veterans and make sure our wounded warriors were taken care of. The way the rules of the House have been—and are—you can bypass the committee of jurisdiction and go straight to the floor without the committee bringing the bill to the floor, without it being voted out of committee, under what is called a suspension. But to bypass the

committee of jurisdiction, it requires a two-thirds vote in the House.

I, like Speaker BOEHNER, thought that surely you could bring the veterans bill to the floor under a suspension because surely they would vote to fund our wounded warriors. Most of us were totally shocked that the vast majority of Democrats voted against funding our veterans, our wounded warriors.

So we had to go back, have the committee of jurisdiction pass it, bring it to the floor under a rule so a simple majority would pass it. And that's what we did with H.J. Res. 72; and when 157 of our friends across the aisle who wanted a vote, they got a vote. And they voted against funding our wounded warriors.

We also took up the Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act that provided immediate funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for women, infants, and children. It serves nearly 9 million mothers and young children and provides vital nutrition that poor families might otherwise be unable to afford.

Then 164 of our Democratic friends voted against that bill, but it passed the House nonetheless. We sent it down to HARRY REID. They have been wanting a vote. We gave them a vote.

On October 5, we voted for the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. It provided for compensation for Federal employees furloughed due to the Senate Democrats' government shutdown. It's similar to the bipartisan legislation enacted during previous shutdowns. We did pass that, but HARRY REID thus far has refused to take that up.

Mr. PERRY. I yield back the balance of my time.

VOTING TO END THE SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 18 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate so much my friend, Mr. PERRY from Pennsylvania, bringing this whole issue forward.

There are a number of more votes that we did take. We took up the Head Start for Low-Income Children Act, providing official education funding to support Head Start programs across the country, and 168 of the Democrats across the aisle voted against that. HARRY REID is refusing to take that up.

My friends across the aisle wanted a vote. So we voted for the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act. It seemed like if HARRY REID would not appoint negotiators before the shutdown really had a chance to take hold, I wasn't sure this was

really necessary, but there's a Chinese proverb having to do with allowing your opponent a graceful way out.

□ 2145

So this bill was proposed as a graceful way out so that HARRY REID could come back and say, Okay, well, now we will, under this new bill, we'll go ahead and appoint negotiators and act like it was some new bill when the truth is it's just us trying to have a bicameral discussion. Yet we had 197 Democrats vote against—well, there were 197 that voted against the bill, basically Democrats, saying we don't want to sit down and work this out with negotiators.

I thought about voting against it because it seemed pretty needless since we already voted to appoint negotiators, conferees. HARRY REID wouldn't do that. But I was persuaded, look, this is a way for HARRY REID to get out gracefully, go ahead and appoint negotiators. Now maybe we can get something worked out.

We also passed the Federal Workers Pay Fairness Act, which ensured all Federal employees who are still on the job during the shutdown will be paid on time. Again, we have not seen that the Democrats in the House have any interest in bringing that to the floor to get a vote.

So my friends across the aisle here in the House who kept screaming, Give us a vote, I hope that will be directed toward their friend, HARRY REID, down the hall, Give a vote to the Senate on these bills. I just can't imagine a majority of the Senate not being willing to fund the things that we have passed.

So, let's see, the term that was used in the prior discussion was "burning the house down," "rigging negotiation." Rigging negotiation? We appointed negotiators. It's not rigged.

Now, it is interesting that the President wishes to have the authority—takes the authority even though he doesn't have it—to just rewrite the entire ObamaCare law. Any part that he decides to wave his hand and dismiss, he's done that. But there are consequences for doing that.

We've also seen in this shutdown something that's just not normally been seen in America. We've seen Franklin Roosevelt say, We have nothing to fear but fear itself. But it's a rare thing—an extremely rare thing—to say that the market needs to be afraid and needs to start getting concerned, trying to gin up a panic to drive down the market. And the market, after a week's time of Republicans having negotiators sitting out there for over a week, waiting to sit down and negotiate with Senators, and the Senators thinking they're winning a political battle, so being unwilling to send negotiators to sit down and work out a deal. Today, between the concerns expressed by the President that the market needs to be concerned, basically

saying it needs to start dropping so Republicans will get scared and they will give me everything I want.

So it's interesting they talk across the aisle about holding a gun to the head, burning the house down. The thing is, this is not our House. It's not the Democrats' House; it's the people's House. That's why I try to take people through tours at least once a week when we're in session. This is the people's House, and it breaks my heart that it's so hard to get in here nowadays. It wasn't when I was in high school, and I would like for it to be more accessible to people.

But burning the house down, the references are so misplaced because it's the Democratic President that says, Give me everything I want. Do not stand in my way when I legislate and rewrite the laws to suit me. We already saw that happen with the GM and Chrysler bailout. The government became socialists for a while here and decided to take up nationalist interests in things—did so with Wall Street.

With the car dealers, it should have scared most Americans. It should have scared Americans enough that they would never, ever have wanted the government to be in control of their health care, because what we saw is mainly Republican dealers were the ones that lost their dealerships. There was no due process. They violated bankruptcy law right and left. And the Supreme Court, Ruth Bader Ginsburg put a 24-hour hold, but then let it lapse. The Supreme Court hung their heads, let illegal actions, unconstitutional actions, takings without due process all take place. And Republican dealers, many of them were punished, had their dealerships taken away even though they still owed money on them. That should have been enough to scare everybody, but we didn't learn a lesson.

Then we find out that after the Citizens United case that the President got upset, stood up here in this Chamber, misrepresented—I know he didn't do it knowingly, but he was not familiar with the law regarding the Citizens United case and misrepresented the law as borne out by the Supreme Court Justice Alito sitting there shaking his head saying "not true." And the President, I'm sure, is just taking advice that's given to him by those around him, not knowing that those who gave him advice were as ignorant as they are.

But when people keep clamoring, Give us a clean CR, when people hear the term "give us a clean CR," they need to understand that this is people demanding that Congress reject the responsibility it has under the Constitution and help crown a monarchy. Let's make it official. We don't want the Congress to do its job and to appropriate as article I requires. We want Congress just to say, Here's the massive sacks of money, Mr. President; go

do what you want. Go find all the Solyndras you want. Go find all the cronies that you can help in a capitalist way so that they can overtake their competitors. Go do what you wish. Maybe you can even find some more dealerships to take away without due process.

We hear friends across the aisle say they love to debate elected officials when the fact is during the 4 years the Democrats had the House as a majority and had the Senate, it was the most partisan, closed Congress in the history of this country. There were more closed rules, bills where no amendments were allowed whatsoever. Even on ObamaCare, we were not allowed input. There was some discussion, but it was made clear our input was not allowed, so nearly half of the country was not misrepresented when had it came to ObamaCare.

And it's really amazing to hear people say that the ObamaCare law was passed by Congress, by both Houses; the President signed it into law; and then of course they misrepresent—I know they don't do it intentionally—but saying the Supreme Court upheld it. Now, the Supreme Court rewrote it and then upheld what they wrote—or at least five out of the nine did. Then the President has completely rewritten anything he doesn't like, given waivers, exemptions. So it's not the law that got passed.

And it's amazing to hear people say, gee, once a law is passed and the President has signed it, you can't change it. It's the law; get over it. And almost in the same breath come back and say, now the debt ceiling—parenthetically, which was passed by both Houses, signed by President Obama and is upheld by the Supreme Court—we want to change that immediately, do that now; don't use it as a gun to our head. What do you mean a gun to your head? It's the law. You just told us if it's passed by Congress, signed by the President—the President himself said it bears my signature, we're not changing it. So why would that be a gun to the head when I thought the President said we weren't supposed to talk metaphorically like that. We weren't supposed to use violent metaphors. Why are we talking like that? Why are we calling people arsonists when we're just trying to follow the Constitution? But again, that's consistent with Homeland Security saying that those who believe in the Constitution are extremists, and they must be watched at all cost.

I think my friends are right when they say go to the American people. The trouble is the mainstream media has not done that. They have actually stood in the way of the truth getting to the American people. They're not asking questions as my friend had asked Andrea Mitchell today, Why are you not asking why the President is not

under ObamaCare? She says, well, why aren't you under it? Well, we are on it.

There was an issue about subsidies. I'm not going to take them, not when other Americans don't get them the way they used to. But, gee, let's be honest about things. Well, The Wall Street Journal says that Maryland has 326 enrollees in their health exchange—got an article here talking about there. “ObamaCare's Winners and Losers in Bay Area,” an article from Mercury News that talks about:

Cindy Vinson and Tom Waschura are big believers in the Affordable Care Act. They vote independent and are proud to say they helped elect and re-elect President Barack Obama. Yet, like many other Bay residents who pay for their own medical insurance, they were floored last week when they opened their bills: their policies were being replaced with pricier plans that conform to all the requirements of the new health care law.

Vinson, of San Jose, will pay \$1,800 more a year for an individual policy, while Waschura, of Portola Valley, will cough up almost \$10,000 more for insurance for his family of four.

“Welcome to the club”, said Robert Laszewski, a prominent health care consultant and president of Health Policy and Strategy Associates in Virginia.

For years, the Nation has been embroiled in the political rhetoric of “ObamaCare,” but this past week the reality of the new law sank in as millions of Americans had their first good look at how the 3½-year-old legislation will affect their pocketbooks.

It's a disaster. So when my friends on the other side of the aisle say, well, let's just let it fully take effect, we've already seen what happens, this President and HARRY REID are not going to let the full thing take effect.

We've seen the way the IRS, with instructions from somebody around the White House—if not in it, we're still trying to get to the bottom of it—was instructed to go after conservative groups. And they did. The IRS was weaponized.

We've seen what's happened with other groups. They're paying a price. And you want these people to control your health care? You want them to decide whether you get a knee replacement or a hip replacement?

“Beyond the glitches: Will young and healthy Americans pick up ObamaCare?” is an article, October 7, that talks about one of the most heated arguments among health care policy writers has revolved around the issue of rate shock, which is a term for the premium increases many Americans—especially younger, healthier ones—will experience once the law kicks in. It's just going to get worse.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say they want a vote. They've been getting votes. They will continue to get votes. We just ask them to join us in demanding that HARRY REID bring these bills to the floor for a vote. And let's get them passed so these things will be taken care of.

And in answer to his question: Why would we do that? The answer is: To

help America. It's that simple. Mr. REID needs to bring these bills to the floor in the Senate; and if you're not going to bring the bills to the floor, for heavens sakes appoint negotiators so we can get America moving before any more punitive shutdowns by this administration occur just to punish the American people because of the temper tantrum being thrown by those who want their way or nobody gets to play.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 3, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3233. To extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, also reported that on October 7, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3095. To ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rule-making proceeding, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 9, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3251. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-0941; FRL-9398-7] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3252. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Styrene, Copolymers with Acrylic Acid and/or Methacrylic Acid; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0381; FRL-9396-9] received September 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3253. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tuba City, AZ

[Docket FAA No.: FAA-2013-0147; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-1] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3254. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Waco, TX, and Establishment of Class D Airspace; Waco, TSTC-Waco Airport, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0136; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASW-4] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3255. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Columbus, Rickenbacker International Airport, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0270; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-4] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3256. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Grand Forks AFB, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0261; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-14] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3257. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Spata, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0165; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AGL-6] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3258. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; San Marcos, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0273; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASW-9] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3259. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Bedford, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0359; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AEA-7] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3260. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Factoryville, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0345; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AEA-6] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: House Committee on Rules. House Resolution 373. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain

Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3273) to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-243). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 3273. A bill to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth; to the Committee on Rules; considered and passed.

By Mr. BARBER (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LONG, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 3274. A bill to amend the Pay Our Military Act to make appropriations available to continue the payment of a death gratuity and certain other death-related compensation in the event of the death of members of the Armed Forces and certain other persons who pass away during a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.R. 3275. A bill to amend the Pay Our Military Act to ensure that the allowances of members of the Armed Forces covered by such Act include military tuition assistance programs of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 3276. A bill to prohibit the operation of an exercise facility for Members of the House of Representatives during a Government shutdown; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3277. A bill to prohibit United States voluntary contributions to the regular budget of the United Nations or any United Nations agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3278. A bill to amend chapter 77 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify certain due process rights of Federal employees serving in sensitive positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 89. A joint resolution making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations; considered and passed.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 90. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal

Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. BARBER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. LONG, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.J. Res. 91. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. BARR):

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Environmental Protection Agency should hold public listening sessions on regulations targeting carbon dioxide emissions from existing power plants in those States most directly impacted by the potential regulations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FALCONA, and Mr. SABLAN):

H. Res. 374. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to file, sign, and call up discharge petitions; to the Committee on Rules.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 3273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2, Section 5, Article I of the Constitution (Permitting each House to determine the Rules of its Proceedings).

By Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 3274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, To raise and support armies

Article 1, Section 8, To provide and maintain a navy

By Mrs. BLACKBURN

H.R. 3275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 3276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I: All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 89.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 90.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 91.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Con-

gress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. LOEBACK.

H.R. 75: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 269: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 366: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 580: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 647: Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. HAHN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 713: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 724: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. PETERS of California, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 725: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 784: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 846: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 920: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1000: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1005: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1010: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 1024: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1039: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1074: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 1179: Mr. HIGGINS and Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 1293: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1295: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1553: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1652: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1726: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1734: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1750: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1755: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1830: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1971: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2020: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2199: Ms. DELAURIO.

H.R. 2208: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2213: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 2224: Mr. HIMES and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2305: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2315: Mr. LANCE and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2328: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2376: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2429: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2500: Mr. KILDER.

H.R. 2510: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2547: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 2643: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2682: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2697: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2725: Mr. BERA of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. NEGRETTE MCLEOD.

H.R. 2734: Mr. TONKO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2767: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 2856: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2870: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2901: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2920: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2974: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2999: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3043: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 3077: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. SIRE.

H.R. 3108: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3111: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PERRY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 3112: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 3116: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 3121: Mr. HARPER and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 3133: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3134: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 3142: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3160: Mr. DAINES and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 3207: Mrs. NEGRETTE MCLEOD and Mr. FOSTER.

H.J. Res. 64: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H. Res. 147: Mr. POSEY.

H. Res. 153: Mr. RADEL.

H. Res. 227: Ms. TSONGAS.

H. Res. 231: Mr. HIMES and Mr. COFFMAN.

H. Res. 281: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. RADEL.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Rules in H.R. 3273 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 89, the Excepted Employees' Pay Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 90, the Flight Safety Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 91, the Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING DAN McMICHAEL

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an esteemed American, R. Daniel McMichael, who passed away recently at the age of 87, having dedicated his life to the advancement of sound, conservative policies and principles.

I knew Dan for many years as a fellow member of the Free Congress Foundation Board, where his expertise and advice were invaluable. An Air Force veteran of World War II, Dan became an expert on international strategic issues and was particularly sought after for his knowledge and guidance about ballistic missile defense. He was a member of the advisory board of the National Strategy Information Center, the International Security Studies Program of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, the Institute for Strategic and International Studies of Lisbon, Portugal, the Center for Strategic & International Studies at Georgetown University, the National Defense University Foundation, and the East-West Center.

Dan served for 6 years as vice-chairman of the National Strategic Materials and Minerals Program Advisory Committee of the Department of the Interior and in 1980 was named chairman of President Reagan's Strategic Minerals Task Force, which completed its work during the transition. For the next decade, he served as an advisor to both the Administration and Congress on strategic resources and continued, until his passing, to provide strategic advice and strategy to numerous organizations as an independent consultant and defense and security analyst.

Dan played a pivotal role for many years as Secretary and advisor for both the Sarah Scaife Foundation and the Carthage Foundation, foundations that support conservative organizations and public policy programs. Groups supported by these foundations include the Heritage Foundation, American Enterprise Institute, Center for Security Policy, Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Free Congress Research and Education Foundation, and the Hoover Institution, among many others. Dan also served as director and past president of the World Affairs Council of Pittsburgh, which recognized his efforts to further international understanding and education.

Dan leaves a distinguished legacy of service and commitment to conservative values that will be long remembered, and his influence will be felt for many years to come. I ask my colleagues to join me today in paying tribute to this great American and patriot, R. Daniel McMichael.

CONGRATULATING JELLY BELLY'S
NORTH CHICAGO PLANT ON 100
YEARS IN THE COMMUNITY

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate 100 years of Jelly Belly Candy Company production in North Chicago. For more than a century, Jelly Belly has been making in our Illinois Tenth District some of our favorite candies, including candy corn, mint wafers, and of course, the Jelly Belly gourmet jelly beans that are a worldwide institution and a local treasure.

Since its inception in the late 19th century, the confectioner now known as Jelly Belly has remained family-owned and committed to producing the highest-quality products for its consumers. This singular dedication to excellence and customer service serves as Jelly Belly's sole business philosophy.

Now for 100 years, Jelly Belly has made its home in North Chicago, enriching the community and building strong, deep roots.

Extending the values of the family-owned business, Jelly Belly has maintained a continuous level of commitment to its employees and treated the community like family as well.

Among the oldest Jelly Belly locations, the North Chicago plant is not only an important employer, with more than 140 staff, but it is also a community landmark and institution. We take great pride seeing millions of Jelly Belly jelly beans and other candies produced each year in North Chicago.

Jelly Belly's decision to remain in North Chicago for a century speaks to the innovative and dynamic spirit of the Tenth District's business community, as well as the loyalty of the firm and its respect for its workforce.

Jelly Belly has achieved remarkable success in its 100 years in North Chicago, and it has done it the right way and with integrity. I want to personally congratulate them on 100 years in the community, and I look forward to another Jelly Belly century in the Tenth District.

RECOGNIZING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF WESTMINSTER AT LAKE RIDGE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 20th anniversary of Westminster at Lake Ridge, a continuing-care retirement community in Lake Ridge, Virginia.

Founded in 1906, the Westminster Ingleside Family of Communities was established in the

District of Columbia by the Washington City Presbytery. This group of continuing-care retirement communities currently comprises Ingleside at King Farm, Ingleside at Rock Creek, and Westminster at Lake Ridge.

The Westminster Ingleside Foundation supports charitable activities in these communities and advances initiatives aimed at improving senior health and well-being. The three communities and foundation are managed by the Westminster Ingleside Service Corporation.

The planning for Westminster at Lake Ridge (WLR) began in 1978. Myles Golbranson took the lead in organizing the effort to build the community. Mr. Golbranson and his group of Presbyterians envisioned a continuing-care community that would provide a nurturing and stimulating living environment for seniors and retirees. It was established as a not-for-profit in 1989, and just four years later, the first residents moved into their new homes in Lake Ridge.

Today, Westminster at Lake Ridge is a community of civically engaged and well-informed seniors. Residents donate thousands of volunteer hours to the surrounding community. They participate in literacy, citizenship, education, political advocacy, and various other charitable programs. Many of the residents are active in informative monthly speaking organizations as well as fitness and hobby groups. I am honored to host an annual Senior Issues Forum in the community where I can always expect a thoughtful exchange with my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the 20th Anniversary of Westminster at Lake Ridge. A vision that began 35 years ago is now a vibrant continuing-care retirement community and a welcoming place where anyone can feel at home.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for votes on Monday, October 7, 2013, due to Flight #4205 being delayed in leaving Hilton Head Island Airport and arriving late into Charlotte Douglas International Airport, such that I missed my connecting Flight #2896 to Washington, DC. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

Motion to Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair—Vote: "yes."

H.J. Res 77—Food and Drug Safety Act—Vote: "yes."

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

TRIBUTE TO HENRY "HANK"
HAROLD ADAMS

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute a remarkable Hoosier, Henry "Hank" Harold Adams, who passed away on October 6, 2013. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for his leadership and service to our community, state, and country.

Mr. Adams was a Tennessee native, who moved to my home county, Lake County, to run appliance stores in Gary and Hammond. Although not born one, Hank was someone we were proud to claim as a Hoosier. His first foray into politics started because of a strip mall that was approved in his town in 1991.

Mr. Adams served as the St. John Township Assessor for 16 years where he fought for fairness in the property tax assessments across Lake County. In 2010, he did what many thought was impossible—he became the first Republican in several decades to be elected to a countywide position. As Lake County Assessor, Hank worked tirelessly to ensure property tax assessments were fair, accurate, and completed on time. Hank served in this capacity until last week, when he resigned while battling cancer.

As an elected official, Mr. Adams was well known for being a tough but fair man. For nearly two decades it was through this tough demeanor that he delivered essential leadership for Lake County. But, those of us who had the privilege of knowing him as a man, not merely as a politician, saw much more.

Hank was a kind and caring man who gave his best effort every day to his family, friends and to Lake County. He was someone who would do whatever he could to help a friend, or stranger, in need. Hank was a mentor of mine, a coach of sorts when I ran for Indiana Secretary of State in 2001. His advice was invaluable in my early years, and something I still do my best to adhere to even today. He was instrumental in my efforts to improve election security with Indiana's photo ID law.

Mr. Adams left his loving wife, Jean, and his extended Lake County Republican family. His legacy is one that will be remembered and honored by those who knew and loved him. His electoral victories prove that most in Lake County, Republican and Democrat, shared my belief in Hank Adams, the man and leader. Rest in peace my friend, and thank you for your leadership.

COMMEMORATION OF NATIONAL
DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. ALBIO SIRE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. SIRE. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of China (Taiwan) has had no stronger supporter than the United States Congress and today I rise in commemoration of the upcoming Na-

tional Day of the Republic of China on October 10, 2013.

The United States and Taiwan share many basic principles such as democracy, human rights and trade. In particular, Taiwan is very important to the U.S. economy. In 2012, Taiwan was the 11th largest trading partner with the U.S. Additionally, Taiwan was the 7th largest destination for U.S. agricultural exports. Furthermore, bilateral trade between the United States and Taiwan is over \$63 billion annually.

For Taiwan to remain competitive, it is important that they are able to participate in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). This 12-nation trade agreement is currently being discussed among Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, and Singapore. The TPP is open to all APEC [Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation] economies, of which Taiwan is a member, and therefore would be incomplete without Taiwan's inclusion.

As the Administration follows through on its Rebalancing of Asia policy, Taiwan will play an integral role. Since Taiwan is one of our strongest allies in Asia, we need to continue to support their inclusion in the TPP; otherwise they will fail to remain competitive, which may result in a decrease of purchases for American products. This in turn, could negatively impact American farmers and manufacturers that count on Taiwan to buy their products.

Once again, I congratulate Taiwan on the upcoming National Day of the Republic of China, and look forward to continuing our working partnership.

COMMEMORATING THE 25TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF THE HUMAN SER-
VICES COUNCIL OF FAIRFAX
COUNTY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 25th Anniversary of the Human Services Council of Fairfax County and to thank the many citizens who have spent countless hours ensuring that the county meets the needs of its citizens.

In response to the challenges brought about by the dramatic growth of Fairfax County in the 1970s and 80s, the Board of Supervisors recognized the need to assess the county's ability to meet the diverse needs of its citizens. In June 1988, The Board chartered the Human Services Council to develop a comprehensive human services plan to establish and coordinate service needs, resource requirements, funding allocations, and priorities across all human service agencies.

The Council is comprised of twenty citizens who are appointed by the Board of Supervisors. It is charged with analyzing the needs and effectiveness of the human services system; advising the system on annual and strategic goals, objectives, and priorities; enhancing the coordination of services among human service providers both public and private; overseeing key aspects of change in the sys-

tem; and serving as a liaison to governing and advisory boards of existing human services organizations as well as to the community.

In 1989, the Human Services Council's first report, *Toward a Long-Range Plan for Human Services in Fairfax County*, provided a comprehensive review of human services programs in the county and set the foundation for improvements in needs assessment and service delivery that continue to this day. The Council's contributions proved invaluable in 1992 when due to a severe recession, devastating reductions for human services were proposed. The Council worked with other stakeholders to examine the impact of the cuts, prioritize services and analyze service delivery systems, thereby providing information that resulted in the preservation of funding vital to the well-being of vulnerable residents. In 1996, the Council adopted three primary objectives that have provided a clear focus for the human services system in Fairfax County: ensure the protection of children and other vulnerable members of the community; maximize prevention opportunities in order to strengthen the well-being and stability of families and communities; and promote self-sufficiency and help families achieve maximum independence from long-term public supports.

Over the past 25 years, the Council has not only worked within the county government, it has partnered with community-based organizations, schools, nonprofit organizations, and state and local government agencies to develop a regional human services safety net that promotes independence, ensures the availability of safe affordable housing, supports families and individuals in crisis, prevents abuse and neglect, responds to threats to public health, responds to crime in the community, addresses alcohol, drug, physical health, and mental health issues, prevents social isolation, and prevents neighborhood deterioration.

As Providence District Supervisor and later as Chairman of the Board, I had the great honor of working with the Human Services Council in many areas of critical need in the County, most notably on creation of the stand-alone Office to Prevent and End Homelessness, and the Penny for Affordable Housing initiative. I personally extend by deepest appreciation to Kevin Bell and the other members of the Council for their untiring efforts on behalf of the most vulnerable in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the crucial role the Human Services Council members have played over the last 25 years in making sure all of Fairfax County's residents have the safeguards and support they need to live up to their fullest potential.

RECOGNIZING MARIA GOMEZ

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Maria Gomez, president and CEO of Mary's

Center, for her outstanding contributions to health care, education and other social services in the District of Columbia and for being awarded the 2012 Presidential Citizens Medal.

A nurse by training, Maria Gomez holds a nursing degree from Georgetown University and a Master of Public Health degree from the University California at Berkley. Mary's Center's services often are comprehensive, but Maria Gomez has never strayed far from health care. Maria Gomez founded Mary's Center in 1988, initially to provide bilingual prenatal and maternity care to vulnerable immigrant women in the District of Columbia. The small, basement-level facility, which served 200 women yearly in 1988, quickly expanded and today there are six locations in the District of Columbia and Maryland, and two mobile units, which serve over 50,000 men, women, and children of every background yearly. Maria Gomez molded the mission of Mary's Center into a model wrap-around non-profit to improve the futures of our Hispanic residents through the delivery of health care, education and social services.

Maria Gomez's has received numerous awards for work at Mary's Center. Among her awards are recognition in Washingtonian Magazine as one of the 45 individuals who shaped Washington, D.C. between 1965 and 2010, a Washington Post Award for Excellence in Nonprofit Management, and a Champions of Choice Award from Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington. She also has been singled out by the federal Health Resources and Services Administration for her excellent leadership in providing access to care for Latino women and children.

Mr. Speaker, in this first month of the D.C. Health Benefit Exchange, it is appropriate to note that Mary's Center is a neighborhood Health Exchange Assister, a natural role for a leadership organization and for a leader whose career exemplifies offering health care to D.C. residents. I ask my colleagues to join me honoring Maria Gomez for her work in health care and her excellence in providing other services to the people of the District of Columbia.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes yesterday. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote 527 and "nay" on rollcall vote 528, final passage of H.J. Res. 77, the Food and Drug Safety Act.

The Republican piecemeal bills to fund only select governmental entities leave the American public without the critical services in food safety, public health, and consumer protections. This bill fails to fund the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission, which work alongside the Food and Drug Administration to ensure food safety and public health. However, I stand ready to vote for a clean continuing resolution

to end the Republican Shutdown and fund the entire federal government.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PRS, INC.

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate PRS, Inc. on its 50th anniversary and to recognize PRS for assisting thousands of individuals with mental illness, substance use disorders, mild intellectual disabilities, and autism spectrum disorders achieve personal wellness and play productive roles in the community.

PRS provides critical services to people living with severe mental illnesses such as schizophrenia, bi-polar disorder, major depression, intellectual disabilities, substance use disorders, or pervasive developmental disorders. Through innovative service delivery and programs, PRS can quickly assess the needs of an individual and implement services such as counseling, interpersonal skills training, vocational assistance, substance abuse services, and community housing. Thanks to the support offered by PRS, clients can and do increase their independence and self-sufficiency, allowing them to take critical steps toward leading strong and fulfilling lives.

Originally known as The Social Center, this institution began in 1963 in the basement of a church as a social program to assist recently discharged patients from Western State Hospital in Staunton, VA. Formally incorporated in 1970, by 1974 the Social Center had grown to serve more than 300 individuals at three locations with a staff of 18. By 1989, the agency was providing a range of rehabilitative skill training and support services including vocational, educational, case management, recreational and other services. In 1992, PRS opened the Reston-Faraday Clubhouse and between 1994 and 2002, opened five residential facilities for clients who need full-time, intensive support.

PRS Community Support Services helps people develop skills necessary to remain in their homes and out of the psychiatric hospital. In FY2013, 100% of the clients in that program maintained their homes and avoided eviction. The PRS Recovery Academy provides a curriculum-based day program that helps clients in the early stages of recovery master the essential skills of daily living and begin working toward their recovery and community integration goals. Over the years, PRS Employment Services has grown from serving just over 200 clients in 2000 to 502 in 2013, 89% of whom retained employment for 12 months or longer.

In 2011, PRS expanded the populations served to include persons with emotional and/or behavioral disorders irrespective of a diagnosis of mental illness. Thus, PRS began providing services to individuals with mild intellectual disabilities, substance use disorders and pervasive developmental disorders, including autism. All told, PRS served 920 individuals in FY2013 and 98% of them stayed out of the hospital.

PRS reached some other very significant milestones in 2013 by earning an Honorable Mention in the 2013 Washington Post Award for Excellence in Non-Profit Management, by being named one of the 50 Best Nonprofits to Work For in the United States by The Non-Profit Times for a third year in a row, and by opening its doors for the first time in the District of Columbia with the DC Recovery Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing PRS for 50 years of service and for its commitment to ensuring that every person has the right to live in dignity.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,747,429,285,635.12. We've added \$6,120,552,236,722.04 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.1 trillion in debt our Nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 528, Making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Fairfax County Planning Commission.

The mission of the Fairfax County Planning Commission is to advise the Board of Supervisors on all matters related to the orderly growth and development of Fairfax County. This includes stewarding of the comprehensive plan for the physical development of the County, amending zoning and subdivision ordinances, and reviewing specific project proposals. The Planning Commission also provides citizens with an opportunity to provide input and contribute to matters involving development in and around their communities.

When the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors unanimously voted to establish a Planning Commission in July 1938, the County had

a population of about 40,000 people. The original five members were appointed based on the land-use interest they would represent, such as farmers, townspeople, commercial, and industrial interests. Commissioners met in closed sessions and did not record minutes until 1941. Today, Fairfax County has a population of approximately 1.1 million and the Planning Commission consists of twelve volunteer members—one for each of the nine supervisory districts and three who serve the County at large. They meet weekly in public sessions that can be viewed online anywhere in the world. Additionally, commissioners form subcommittees as needed to focus on specific topics such as parks, transportation, housing, and the environment.

For much of its first 75 years, the Planning Commission shepherded the County's transformation from a predominantly rural area to one dominated by sprawling suburbs and job centers. The transportation patterns were indicative of this; people travelled into Washington, D.C., for their jobs and back home to Fairfax County. This landscape began changing as more and more corporations, especially technology companies, relocated their corporate headquarters or opened large offices in Fairfax County, primarily in the Dulles Corridor and Tysons areas. The expansion of professional opportunities continued to fuel the population growth of the County, irrevocably changing commuting patterns and posing new challenges and opportunities. In this century, as the County continues to redefine itself, emphasis has been placed on smart-growth, multi-use development easily accessible to public transit. Through the natural cycle of growth and redevelopment, new activity centers have been established throughout the County in communities like Reston, Laurel Hill, Springfield, and the Mosaic District in Merrifield.

In May 2010, the Planning Commission presented the most ambitious redevelopment plan in the County's history to Board of Supervisors—The Tysons Plan. The Tysons Plan was a culmination of years of planning and analysis, much of which I had the honor of working on while serving as the Providence District Supervisor and then as Chairman of the Board of Supervisors. Under the Tysons Plan the area known as the "downtown of Fairfax County" will be transformed from a district filled with a patchwork of unconnected development and businesses into a vibrant, walkable, sustainable, transit-oriented mixed-use community. When completed, Tysons will be an urban center where people live, work, and play, and it will be home to up to 100,000 residents and 200,000 jobs. This plan received the American Planning Association's 2011 Daniel Burnham Award, which recognizes one urban plan in the nation each year, for advancing the science and art of planning.

Looking forward, the Planning Commission and staff will continue to seek a balance between this phenomenal growth and the need to maintain open space, manage traffic, and provide affordable housing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Fairfax County Planning Commission on the occasion of its 75th Anniversary and in thanking the volunteer Commissioners and the staff of the Fairfax County

Planning Commission for their efforts, expertise, and dedication toward making Fairfax County one of the best places in the country to live, work and raise a family.

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. DENNIS A. ROSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, Taiwan, our dearest friend and closest ally in East Asia, is celebrating their 102nd birthday on October 10 of this year, known as "Double Ten" day given it is the tenth day of the tenth month.

Taiwan and the United States' strong relationship is based on the common standard that human rights, democracy and the rule of law are critical to maintaining a flourishing society. Both nations do not just speak of these as theories, but create environments for which they can be attained.

Because of this friendship, there are a few areas that I would like to shine a light in the hopes of strengthening Taiwan's global standing.

First of all, I would like to see a Bilateral Investment Agreement, BIA, between the United States and Taiwan as soon as possible. The protections afforded in a BIA are greater than what currently exists. This BIA will give investors of both countries greater confidence investing in each other and provides a platform for sustained economic growth.

I would also like my colleagues to join me in supporting Taiwan's participation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership, TPP. As a Member of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, APEC, Taiwan is rightfully allowed to be a part of TPP. The absence of their membership could create an unfair disadvantage for Taiwan and will be a hardship for our good friends in this global economy.

Taiwan is a beacon of democracy in East Asia. The United States should do all that it possibly can to ensure that Taiwan is in position to prosper and is on a firm foundation for sustained economic growth.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH SEPTEMBER 15–OCTOBER 15, 2013

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, since 1968, America has annually celebrated the National Hispanic Heritage Month to recognize the contributions of those whose ancestors came from South and Central America, Mexico, Spain, and the Caribbean. The start day of National Hispanic Heritage Month, September 15th, is significant because it is also the anniversary of independence for some Latin American countries such as: Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and El Salvador. Additionally, Mexico and Chile celebrate their independence days on September 16th and September 18th.

This year's theme, "Hispanics: Serving and Leading our Nation with Pride and Honor," highlights the tremendous impact Hispanics have made in all sectors of our society. It is individuals like Thomas Pérez, the country's first Cabinet Secretary of Dominican descent, who reminds us that willingness to work hard can help achieve great success. Secretary Pérez is not only a role model for youths in our congressional district, but also an inspirational example of the American Dream.

I am proud to represent a congressional district with one of the largest and diverse Hispanic populations in the country. Our District is blessed to have great organizations that provide very useful services to my Hispanic constituents such as: Casa de la Herencia Cultural Puertorriquena, Institute for the Puerto Rican and Hispanic Elderly, Hispanic Federation, El Museo del Barrio, Julia de Burgos Cultural Center, Casabe House Development Fund, Inc., the Dominican Women's Development Center, El Centro Civico Cultural Dominicano, Inc., the PR Dream, Boriken Neighborhood Health Center, Dominican Sunday, Inc., The Dominican Bar Association, the Hispanic Community Organization for Life, El Asociacion Tepeyac de New York, New York City Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, the New York State Federation of Hispanic Chambers of Commerce, MASA, Acacia Network, Casita Maria, and Comunilife. I am grateful for their continuous efforts to improve the lives of people in our district.

I will tirelessly continue to fight for various issues that are most important to our Hispanic community, such as comprehensive immigration reform which can create a path to citizenship, and provide more opportunities for Hispanics to achieve the American Dream.

TO CONGRATULATE BARBARA LIPPA ON HER RETIREMENT

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Barbara Lipa on her retirement as Executive Director of the Fairfax County Planning Commission and to thank her for 35 years of service to the community.

Ms. Lipa began her career with the Planning Commission in 1978 as a Planning Aide. In 1979, she was promoted to Deputy Director and was promoted to Executive Director in 1999. In December 1999, Ms. Lipa earned designation as a Virginia Certified Planning Commissioner.

During her 35 year tenure with the Planning Commission, Ms. Lipa witnessed an explosion of growth. In 1978, the County population was less than 579,000. There were approximately 192,776 residential housing units, nearly 60% of which were single family detached homes. Ethnic diversity was virtually non-existent; 91.6% of the residents were white, 5.4% were African-American, and all other minorities combined comprised only 3% of the population. The median household income was \$15,707, and 62% of housing was owner occupied with the median home value of

\$35,400. And while Metrorail operated in Washington, D.C., and a few close in suburbs, it would be nearly another decade before Metro would be an option to Fairfax County residents.

By the end of 2012, the population of Fairfax County had nearly doubled to more than 1.1 million residents. There are more than 408,000 residential housing units and the percentage of single family detached homes has decreased to approximately 47%. Fairfax County is now an ethnic tapestry; nearly 40% of its residents are minorities with Asian/Pacific Islanders comprising the largest single ethnic group. The 2012 median household income was \$105,797 and the median home value was nearly \$431,000. Metro is a daily part of life, and the Silver Line through Tysons and the Dulles Corridor will extend this service through Fairfax and into Loudoun County.

In 1978 there were fewer than 159,000 jobs in Fairfax County, today there are nearly 600,000. With 10 Fortune 500 Companies headquartered here, Fairfax County is home to more Fortune 500 companies than 33 states and is tied with 3 others; this exponential job growth has fueled the need for additional facilities, infrastructure, development, and services.

Ms. Lippa has excelled in leading Fairfax County's planning efforts during 35 years in an ever-changing climate. Her management and guidance has contributed greatly to the evolution of Fairfax County from a suburban enclave to a 21st century metropolis. In 2010, she was honored with a Team Excellence Award for her work with the Commission's Tysons Committee and in October 2012, Ms. Lippa received the Marge Bleiweis Peace Builder Award. In addition, under her leadership, the Fairfax County Planning Commission was recognized with the American Planning Association's 2011 Daniel Burnham Award for its work on the Tysons Plan.

Despite the demands of serving on the Planning Commission, Ms. Lippa still found the time to remain involved and active in the community. For 28 years, she has been a member of Zonta International, holding numerous leadership positions and in 2012 was named as the Zonta Club of Fairfax 2011 Volunteer of the Year and honored by the Inter-Service Club Council of the City of Fairfax. From 1994 to 2008, Ms. Lippa continued her work to improve educational opportunities while serving as a member of the Northern Virginia Community College Business Advisory Curriculum Committee.

For generations to come, the benefits of Ms. Lippa's dedication, expertise, and commitment will be felt by millions of residents and will pave the way for the continued prosperity of the entire region. On behalf of the residents, businesses, and visitors to Fairfax County, I thank and commend her for a job exceedingly well done.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ms. Lippa on her retirement and thanking her for 35 years of service to Fairfax County and our community.

CELEBRATING THE NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, since World War II, the United States and the Republic of China, commonly referred to as Taiwan, have shared a close friendship. I'm pleased to recognize the upcoming National Day of the Republic of China on October 10, 2013.

Taiwan is a shining example of democracy in the Asia Pacific region and promotes shared values with the United States, including respect for human rights, a market-based economy, and freedom. Taiwan is a very important trading partner and our economies are closely linked. Last year, Taiwan was our eleventh largest trading partner overall, was our seventh largest agricultural export market, and shared more than 63 billion dollars in bilateral trade.

Taiwan's economy is a dynamic force in the Asia Pacific region and it is in both of our interests to continue strengthening our trade and investment ties. We should continue to expand trade through a Bilateral Investment Agreement, a Free Trade Agreement, and an expanded Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). Taiwan is a member of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation and if admitted to the TPP, a great U.S. ally such as Taiwan would be an even more important economic player.

Taiwan has recognized that joining the TPP would be the best way to diversify its market and improve competitiveness in the region. I encourage my colleagues to support Taiwan's inclusion into TPP, which would further strengthen U.S.-Taiwan trade and investment dialogues and would likely increase other TPP member countries' willingness in engaging Taiwan in vigorous and ambitious trade negotiations. The United States should actively seek ways with its TPP member nations to include Taiwan in the partnership, allowing Taiwan to play an even more important role in the regional economic integration in the years to come.

Finally, I encourage more high-level diplomatic visits between our two countries to increase bilateral interaction on matters such as security, trade, investment, cultural exchange, and education. Just as our economic partnership continues to improve, Taiwan is one of our most valuable allies and is a nation we can truly depend on. That is why I introduced the Taiwan Policy Act with my colleagues, the co-chairs of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, Representatives MARIO DIAZ-BALART, ALBIO SIREs, JOHN CARTER, and GERALD CONNOLLY, to strengthen our political, security, economic, and trade relations. I was proud to see this legislation pass in the Foreign Affairs Committee in August and am looking forward to its swift passage here in the House soon.

I wish a very happy Double Ten Day to the people of Taiwan. While we are already close partners, it is my firm belief that our best days are still ahead.

CONGRATULATING OTSEGO COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Otsego County Chamber of Commerce for being named the winner of The Business Council of New York State's Chamber of the Year award. As the Representative of New York's 19th Congressional District, I have the great honor of working with the Otsego County Chamber and know first-hand the good work they do for Upstate New York.

Each year, The Business Council Chamber of the Year Award is given to a Chamber of Commerce that displays a positive commitment to pro-business activities within their community and state. In awarding this honor to the Otsego County Chamber of Commerce, The Business Council of New York has recognized Executive Director Barbara Ann Heegan's leadership and the entire Otsego County Chamber's work on behalf of the business community. Their commitment to quality programs and services, fiscal responsibility and membership growth makes them an example for Chambers of Commerce across New York and across the Nation.

In these tough economic times, it is more important than ever that we have strong organizations dedicated to economic growth. Located in Oneonta, N.Y., the Otsego County Chamber of Commerce works to improve the overall business climate in Otsego County and create an atmosphere which attracts investment by building a positive, forward-thinking business community through partnerships with government, individuals and private institutions.

Of particular interest to me was the Otsego County Chamber's partnership with local education institutions. These efforts included coordinating with the SUNY Cooperative Ed Initiative to create a college intern program, developing a partnership with Broome Community College to provide courses to county residents, expanding networking opportunities for community members, and providing seminars and educational programs. At a time where unemployment is hovering around 8 percent but around 4 million jobs remain unfilled in the United States, it is more vital that job creators and educators work together to build the workforce our country needs to remain competitive on the international front.

It is an honor to represent Otsego County in the United States Congress and I am proud to stand today in recognition of the Otsego County Chamber of Commerce. I look forward to continuing to work with Executive Director Heegan and her award-winning membership at the Otsego County Chamber to grow the economy and bring jobs to Upstate New York.

RECOGNIZING THE APPOINTMENT OF WILLIAM WON KYUN HWANG AS PRESIDENT OF THE WASHINGTON CHAPTER OF THE NATIONAL UNIFICATION ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate Mr. William Won-Kyun Hwang for his appointment as President of the Washington Chapter of the 16th Session of the National Unification Advisory Council (NUAC) for the Republic of Korea. The Council was established in 1980 under the Constitution of the Republic of South Korea to advise the Korean President on policies that promote a democratic peaceful reunification of Korea, including the views of Koreans living domestically and abroad.

A successful Northern Virginia businessman, Mr. Hwang is a resident of Oakton in the 11th Congressional District, and he has been an active member of the Fairfax County community. He is the president of three companies involved in trade and property development, and he serves on the Fairfax County Park Foundation Board.

He served from 2008 to 2010 as President of the Korean-American Association of Virginia, which provides a multitude of services to help Korean immigrants adjust to life in America. In addition to being a past chairman of the Board of Directors for the KAAV, Mr. Hwang also has chaired the 14th San Francisco Korean American Olympics Washington Team in 2007, the Vocational School of the Korean American Association of Northern Virginia, the Korean American Business Association, and the Korean American Sports Association of Greater Washington. He was the 2006 delegate for the Washington, D.C., and Seoul City Sisterhood, and Seoul City, along with Dan Kook University of Korea, recognized him as an honorary ambassador in 2008.

As co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Korea, I am pleased to have worked with KAAV and other Korean-American organizations on promoting cultural awareness and addressing issues within the community, and I am pleased to join them in celebrating Mr. Hwang's appointment. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Hwang for his service to the local Korean-American community and in commending the NUAC for its efforts to promote peace and unity on the Korean peninsula.

HONORING THE CAREER OF CLARA THOMPSON

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Clara Delle Thompson of Rock Island, Illinois.

Clara Thompson will be retiring at the end of this month after almost 45 years serving Rock Island as a court reporter. Her friendliness, unmatched style and love of her "bling" will be greatly missed in the Rock Island County Courthouse by the many judges, bailiffs, attorneys and others who love and respect her. Thompson is a legend in the 14th Judicial Circuit in Illinois where she has continued to use her notebook and shorthand to take notes on court proceedings, even while the rest of her colleagues turned to electronic steno-machines. She jokes that if the power goes out, her pen still works.

Thompson has lived in the Quad Cities since her family moved to Rock Island when she was nine. She worked for Deere and Co. and Dohrn Transfer before becoming a court reporter in her late 30s. Along with her work, she is very involved in her community, supporting the Figge and the Putnam museums and the Quad City Botanical Center among other organizations.

While the Rock Island County Courthouse will not be the same without Clara Delle Thompson, I wish her the best as she continues to serve the people in her community, play bridge and I hope she will be able to keep travelling the world.

FIREFIGHTER BRAD LUCZAK

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Brad Luczak from my district. I ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating him on his nomination for the Saginaw Firefighter of the Year Award. This award speaks highly of his consistent dedication and commitment to excellence. Mr. Luczak has worked hard to earn this opportunity, and I am proud to have him protecting the people of Saginaw.

As a demonstrated leader, among not only his fellow firefighters, but also his city, Mr. Luczak exhibits what a true hero looks like. His drive and determination are truly inspiring, and he is a role model for the town. It is a true honor, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Luczak represents Michigan and I thank him for his service to our country.

I applaud Mr. Luczak's efforts, and I look forward to following his progress in the future.

IN HONOR OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ZION MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. PAUL C. BROWN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the rich heritage of Zion Missionary Baptist Church whose members are celebrating its 150th anniversary. In 1863, shortly after President Abraham Lincoln gave the Emancipation Proclamation, thirty-six

freedmen founded a church at the Pepperton Community in Jasper, Georgia. Since then, Zion Missionary Baptist Church has become a thriving fellowship, dedicated to ministry and service in the African-American community.

It is worth noting that before there were African-American mayors, governors, or even a president, Black churches, like Zion, thrived with leadership from African-American Sunday school teachers, deacons, and pastors. As with many churches, over the years the members of Zion were seen as community leaders, who helped mentor, educate, and counsel many in the Black community. Today, Zion serves not only as a place of worship, but as a people with a mission to serve as a source of encouragement, inspiration, and pride for members of the community for more than a century.

The 150-year history of Zion Missionary Baptist Church includes many pastors, challenges, and changes, but its unwavering commitment to being a place where the community gathers to help and support one another is to be commended. No matter the cause, event, or activity, God has used Zion to influence its community. Therefore, I close by asking you to support and pray for what God is doing at Zion Missionary Baptist Church. May it continue as a pillar of strength for the residents of Butts County for generations to come.

RECOGNIZING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hispanic Heritage Month and the countless contributions of Hispanic individuals and organizations to the outstanding quality of life enjoyed by Northern Virginians. In 1968, Hispanic Heritage Week was established by President Lyndon Johnson; 20 years later in 1988, it was expanded by President Ronald Reagan to cover the 30-day period between September 15 and October 15 of each year.

This period includes several dates of great significance to the Hispanic community. September 15 is the anniversary of independence for the Latin American countries of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. Mexico and Chile celebrate their independence days on September 16 and September 18, respectively. October 12 is Columbus Day or Día de la Raza, and is celebrated in the United States as well as in many Latin American countries.

Each year since 1994, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors has recognized Hispanic Heritage Month. Prince William County also celebrates Hispanic Heritage Month with events in schools and libraries. Of course, Hispanic individuals and organizations remain active year round to improve our community. Both the Dulles Regional Chamber of Commerce and the Prince William Chamber of Commerce support active Hispanic Business Councils that promote and improve the Hispanic business community and forge strategic partnerships with local businesses, community

organizations, governments, and elected officials. The annual Dulles Regional Chamber Council's Hispanic Business Reception welcomes hundreds of guests from the Greater Washington Metropolitan Region and attracts corporate executives, diplomats, elected officials and non-profit partners, who meet and develop working partnerships while enjoying Hispanic culture.

Northern Virginia is blessed by its diversity and is enriched by our vibrant Hispanic community. Approximately 16% of Fairfax County residents and 21% of Prince William County residents are Hispanic or Latino. In the 11th District of Virginia more than 130,000 of my constituents identify as Hispanic or Latino.

A growing number of small businesses are Latino-owned; and MicroTech, one of the 10 Fastest Growing Hispanic-Owned Businesses in the nation is located here in the 11th Congressional District. The Fairfax Hispanic Firefighters Association, FHFA was established in the spring of 2003, to assist the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department in the delivery of bilingual Life Safety Education programs. In Prince William, the "Panorama Latino TV Show" serves as a vital link between local governments, first responders, service providers, non-profits, and the Hispanic members of our community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and thanking the Hispanic-American community for their contributions to our community.

IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 3230 AND
H.J. RES 72

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to both H.R. 3230 and H.J. Res. 72, two bills which claim to fund our veterans and our National Guard and Reserve but are nothing but a political ploy and a piecemeal approach that do nothing to address many of the crucial services relied on by our military and veterans.

Let me be clear. Every member of Congress fully supports our National Guard and Reserve and our veterans. Yet neither of the two bills we considered today actually accomplish this objective.

Although H.R. 3230 does provide for the pay and allowances of military personnel in the reserve component who are in inactive status, it does not fund other essential programs and services to support our military, like equipment needed for readiness; military maintenance and procurement; and research and development for technological superiority of U.S. forces.

H.J. Res. 72 also neglects to fund several critical programs for veterans, including the delivery of veterans' health care services, grants to state veterans homes, and funding for the VA's Office of Inspector General. In fact, this bill represents a \$6.2 billion reduction in funding for the VA compared to the bipartisan MilCon/VA appropriations bill passed overwhelmingly earlier this year.

So H.J. Res. 72 is not a vote to fund our veterans; it is a vote to cut veterans funding. In addition, it would leave their children and grandchildren behind without funding for programs like Head Start or medical research to cure the diseases that harm our veterans and every other citizen. Taken together, these two bills fail to equip and train our troops or build housing for their families.

The fact is that we do have a way to solve this issue today. If we take up the Senate's clean continuing resolution, we can send it to the President for his signature tonight. The clean CR also provides \$6 billion more in funding for the VA and veteran's programs compared to the piecemeal bill offered today. That is why I call on my colleagues to bring up the clean CR so we can end this shut down and pave the way for full and immediate funding for our National Guard, our military reserves, and our veterans.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETE P. GALLEGO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 527 on the Motion to Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair, I am not recorded because I was absent due to attendance at the funeral of Deputy Sheriff Billy "Bubba" Kennedy from Upton County who was killed in the line of duty after 14 years as a committed peace officer. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 528 on H.J. Res. 77, the Food and Drug Safety Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to attendance at the funeral of Deputy Sheriff Billy "Bubba" Kennedy from Upton County who was killed in the line of duty after 14 years as a committed peace officer. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CLARIFY CERTAIN DUE PROCESS RIGHTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SERVING IN SENSITIVE POSITIONS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, as hundreds of thousands of our federal workers face furloughs and a third year of pay freezes, I introduce a bill to clarify certain due process rights of federal employees serving in sensitive positions. The bill would overturn a recent, unprecedented federal court decision, *Kaplan v. Conyers* and MSPB, that strips many federal employees of the right to independent review of an agency decision removing them from a job on grounds of ineligibility. The case was brought by two Department of Defense (DOD) employees, Rhonda Conyers, an accounting technician, and Devon Northover, commissary management spe-

cialist, who were permanently demoted and suspended from their jobs after they were found to no longer be eligible to serve in non-critical sensitive positions.

Specifically, the decision prevents federal workers who are designated as "noncritical sensitive" from appealing to the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) if they are removed from their jobs. Noncritical sensitive jobs include those that do not have access to classified information. The decision would affect at least 200,000 DOD employees who are designated as noncritical sensitive. Even more seriously, most federal employees could potentially lose the same right to an independent review of an agency's decision because of a pending rule by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) that would permit agency heads to designate most jobs in the federal government as noncritical sensitive.

The Kaplan decision undercuts Title 5, section 7701 of the Civil Service Act, which ensures due process rights for federal workers required by the United States Constitution. Stripping employees whose work does not involve classified matters of the right of review of an agency decision that removes them from their jobs opens entirely new avenues for unreviewable, arbitrary action or retaliation by an agency head and, in addition, makes a mockery of whistleblower protections enacted in the 112th Congress. My bill would stop the use of "national security" to repeal a vital component of civil service protection and of due process.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

COMMEMORATING AUGUST 2013 AS THE 110TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST KOREAN IMMIGRANTS ARRIVING IN AMERICA

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with Korean-American immigrants in my district and through the nation in celebrating August as the 110th anniversary of the first Korean immigrants arriving here in the United States. The Institute for Korean-American Studies (ICAS) is hosting its summer symposium on this very topic: The Korean Diaspora: Challenges Facing the Korean-American Community.

The first Korean immigrants—102 men, women, and children—arrived in Honolulu, Hawaii, in 1903 to work as laborers on sugar plantations. Since then, Korean Americans have settled across America, which is now home to the second largest Korean population outside of Korea itself. More than 80,000 Korean-Americans live in the National Capital Region, making this the third largest Korean community in the United States. In the 11th Congressional District of Virginia, which I represent, is home to a thriving Korean-American community. Asian-Americans comprise the largest ethnic group in our District, which is more than 40% minority and in which more than 1-in-4 is foreign born.

Earlier this spring, I was pleased to join my colleagues in welcoming President Park Geun-hye of the Republic of Korea, who addressed a joint session of Congress. She spoke eloquently about her long-term hope for restoring trust across the Korean peninsula and fostering a shared sense of economic vitality across Asia. As a co-chair of the Congressional Korea Caucus, I and my colleagues are committed to preserving and further growing the strong relationship we have enjoyed with South Korea for the past 60 years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the countless contributions of Korean-Americans and in commemorating the 110th anniversary of the arrival of the first Korean immigrants here in America. I wish ICAS success with its upcoming symposium.

KEVIN O'DONNELL, CAN DO, INC.

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Kevin O'Donnell for 40 years of service with CAN DO, Inc. in Hazleton, Pennsylvania.

Mr. O'Donnell joined CAN DO in 1973 as assistant director. CAN DO, Inc. is a private, non-profit industrial/economic development corporation serving Greater Hazleton in Northeastern, Pennsylvania. Mr. O'Donnell quickly rose through the ranks of this organization, becoming a project manager for the area's first synthetic fuels plant in 1974 and in 1984, becoming director of the organization. In 1995, that title changed to president, the position he has held since that day. Under Mr. O'Donnell's leadership, CAN DO received the Arthur D. Little Environmental Excellence in Economic Development Award in 1993, the U.S. Green Building Council's Energy and Environmental Design Award in 2006, and the Pennsylvania Economic Development Association's "Large Agency of the Year" title in 2007.

A native of Greater Hazleton, Mr. O'Donnell's success extends beyond his work with CAN DO. In 1984, he was selected by the Pennsylvania Economic Development Association (PEDA) as the first-ever "Developer of the Year." In 2006, he was awarded the Ben Franklin Innovation Award "Special Achievement" for his contribution to the creation of the Great Valley Technology Alliance (GVTA). In 2009, Mr. O'Donnell was inducted into Northeast Pennsylvania's Business Hall of Fame for his numerous achievements and contributions to Greater Hazleton and Northeast Pennsylvania. Locally, he has received numerous awards for his work as a former officer and member of several educational institutions and community and civic groups.

Mr. Speaker, for 40 years Kevin O'Donnell has served as an integral member of CAN DO, Inc., bringing thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars to the Greater Hazleton economy. Therefore, I commend him for his service to the economic development of Pennsylvania's 11th District.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF
JOYCE BLACK

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend Joyce Black, who passed away on Friday, October 4, 2013. I wish I could be at the funeral today to be with her husband Stanley and the rest of her family, but my congressional responsibilities keep me in Washington.

Joyce lived a truly remarkable life. She was involved with numerous charitable and civic organizations, including the American Diabetes Association, City of Hope, Stop Cancer, Vista Del Mar, Israel Bonds, the Jewish Federation, the L.A. Jewish Home, the L.A. Opera, Cedars Sinai Medical Center, and the Temple of the Arts. In fact, earlier this month, Joyce and Stanley made a special donation to Children's Hospital Los Angeles that will fund research and clinical care programs at the hospital. Joyce was devoted to providing the best medical care to our children.

I extend my sincerest condolences to Stanley, her son Jack, and daughters Jill and Janis. Married for 57 years, Stanley and Joyce's partnership was truly inspirational. Joyce leaves behind a remarkable legacy of kindness and generosity that will impact not only those who were lucky enough to meet her, but future generations to come.

RECOGNIZING MARTY WHITE FOR
HIS FORTY YEARS OF RADIO EXCELLENCE

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Northwest Florida's Marty White for having spent 40 years on the radio, over thirty of which have been spent waking up the people of the greater Pensacola area. I am pleased to acknowledge his success and great achievement.

Mr. White grew up in Northwest Florida and attended J.M. Tate High School in Cantonment. After graduation, he joined the United States Air Force where he served our Nation before he ever thought about a career on morning radio. Following his military service, Mr. White used his connections to secure an interview at a local radio station in 1973. He landed the job and has been on the radio ever since, entertaining the people of the Gulf Coast.

The radio industry has changed drastically over the years that Mr. White has been on the air. Many radio personalities have come and gone in the wake of advancing technology and station buyouts. Mr. White, however, has adapted to these changes and remained a local radio mainstay due to his massive popularity.

Over twenty of his years on the radio have been spent on 102.7 WXBM. What once start-

ed as a small station in Chumuckla has moved to Pensacola under the umbrella of the second largest radio station operator in the country, Cumulus Media. Whereas this change could have resulted in the hiring of a new staff altogether, Mr. White has remained as the voice that the people of Northwest Florida enjoy waking up to in the morning or listening to during their drive to work.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I congratulate Marty White for reaching forty years on the radio. My wife Vicki joins me in offering our best wishes to Mr. White, his wife Donna, and their son Cody. We look forward to many more mornings listening to Marty on "Your Hometown Morning Show" in the years to come.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF
LILLIAN BERNICE VARNADO
WATKINS

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of educator and homemaker, Mrs. Lillian Watkins, a beloved educator and homemaker.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins passed away on Sunday, October 6 at the age of 96. While I am deeply saddened by her passing, I am comforted in knowing that her legacy is one that will live on through her involvement in public education, the values she instilled in her children and the foundation of her husband's success.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins was born on March 13, 1917 in Canton, Mississippi as the fourth of Reverend Willie L. Varnado and Mrs. Etta Pearl Varnado's five children. She attended elementary, primary and secondary schools in Canton and Jackson, Mississippi. Mrs. Watkins earned her bachelor's degree from Lane College in Jackson, Tennessee where she graduated cum laude.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins taught civics and home economics at Burt High School in Clarksville, Tennessee following graduation. She later married one of her fellow teachers, Mr. Levi Watkins Sr. After marrying in 1940 the couple moved to Parsons, Kansas where she gave birth to five of their six children. In 1948, the family moved to Montgomery, Alabama where the sixth child was born.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins raised six children, all of which have broken racial barriers in the South by holding leadership positions in the arts, business, education, government and medicine.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins' husband is known for his transformational leadership as the president of Alabama State University. He took the university from a small teacher's college to a destination university accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools upon his departure in 1981. Although her husband is highly respected for his legacy at Alabama State University, Mrs. Watkins' children give her the credit for their successes in life. She was the personality of the family giving her

children the rock-solid confidence they would need to achieve their goals.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins' son, Dr. Levi Watkins, Jr., was the first African-American graduate of Vanderbilt University and the first cardiac surgeon in the country to perform a human implantation of the automatic implantable defibrillator. Another son of Mrs. Watkins' is a retired surgeon while one of her daughters is a concert pianist.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins' son Donald Watkins, Sr., Esq., was Montgomery's first black city attorney and one of the first African-Americans on the City Council. Watkins describes his mother as the "rock" of the family. He said that because of the love and respect she provided to all of her children they never had to look outside of the home for validation.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins' daughter Doristine Minott was the principal of Southlawn Middle School until her retirement in 2007. Mrs. Minott remembers her mother for teaching her children to be humble and "to see beauty in the simplest things." She remembers, "My mom was the quiet giant behind my dad's success . . . It was she who quieted the storms during the difficult times."

Mrs. Lillian Watkins is remembered as one who fully embraced her roles of wife, mother and homemaker and later, as aunt, grandmother and great-grandmother.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins had a passion for music, sewing, art, decorating and traveling. In her later years, she developed a gift for writing poetry. She participated in poetry readings at Art Festivals in her community and at church while living in Ohio with her daughter. Several of her poems were later published in two books.

Mrs. Lillian Watkins' legacy will live on through the lives of her six children. All six of her children have broken tremendous racial barriers not only in Alabama but across the country. The success of her children is only a reflection of the integrity and humility that she instilled in each of them.

Saying thank you to Mrs. Lillian Watkins seems woefully inadequate. But, we are truly grateful for the life of this extraordinary public servant, educator, mother and homemaker. On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this Nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Mrs. Lillian Watkins.

HONORING SMITHSONIAN SECRETARY WAYNE CLOUGH

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Smithsonian Secretary Wayne Clough for his long and distinguished career in Academia, and as caretaker of the Smithsonian legacy since 2008.

Secretary Clough announced this month that he would retire in October, 2014 after what will be six unforgettable years at the helm of this historic institution.

Since Clough's tenure began, his unprecedented leadership has taken the Smithsonian

in new directions—setting bold new educational goals that built on the institution's core strengths. As a part of this process, the Smithsonian has now become a world leader in new digital communications and imaging technology. To reach new audiences, Clough oversaw the first-ever online branding and advertisement campaign across all 50 states, and has put renewed emphasis on collaborations with universities and outside organizations. More than 400 exhibitions have been opened across the system under Clough's name, many of which are permanent.

Before coming to the Smithsonian, Clough was a valuable leader on the staffs of many commendable institutions of higher education across the country. In particular, he served as the president of my own alma mater—Georgia Tech—for 14 years.

During his time at these universities, he's been recognized with many formal academic awards. Among them, are his induction into Georgia's Technology Hall of Fame, Georgia Tech's Joseph M. Pettit Alumni Distinguished Service Award, election to the National Academy of Engineering, the 2008 NAE Bueche Award in public policy, and nine national awards from the American Society of Civil Engineers—including the 2004 OPAL lifetime award and 2012 President's award for his efforts in education.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest thanks for his lifelong devotion to education and his procurement of one of America's longest standing protectors of its history. I wish him a joyous—and well-deserved—retirement.

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT D. YOUNG

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to former State Senator Robert D. Young in honor of his dedicated service to our country and the people of the State of Michigan in light of his recent passing. Senator Young's devotion to his community and this nation is something that is to truly be admired.

Senator Young's career began in Spaulding Township where he built homes and managed a large farm. In 1974, Young won the election to the State Senate where he served for the next eight years.

Upon leaving his successful career in State politics, Young took a position as the Executive Vice President of the Great Lakes Sugar Beet Growers Association. From this position, he advocated agricultural policies in Michigan, and Washington, DC, for thirteen years.

Senator Young's career was dedicated to public service and the betterment of the state of Michigan. I stand here today to honor Senator Robert Young for his many accomplishments. On behalf of Michigan's Fourth Congressional District, I offer my appreciation for his years of service and extend my heartfelt condolences to his family upon their loss.

HONORING THE BALL STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishment of the Ball State University football team.

Ball State's football team recently traveled to Charlottesville, Virginia where they defeated the University of Virginia Cavaliers by a score of 48–27.

A day before the game I had the privilege of meeting the team and coaching staff when I led them on a tour of the Capitol. In the short time we spent together, it was obvious that the team is full of great young men who are learning lessons that will not only make them successful on the field, but also in life.

The Cardinals victory over Virginia was unquestionably one of the biggest wins in the history of the program. It also marked another in a long line of major upset victories for Mid-American Conference teams in recent decades.

Ball State quarterback Keith Wenning completed 23-of-41 passes for 346 yards and two touchdowns in the victory. He also became the Cardinals' career passing leader with 9,250 yards. Running back Jahwan Edwards ran for three touchdowns, marking the sixth game in his career with three rushing scores and setting the Ball State career touchdowns rushing record at 35. Late in the game Wenning completed a 72 yard touchdown pass to Jordan Williams. The reception was the longest of Williams' career and gave the Cardinals a 41–27 lead. The Cardinals also finished the game with no turnovers.

I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in congratulating the Ball State Cardinals, their head coach Pete Lembo, Ball State President Jo Ann Gora and the entire Ball State University community for their impressive victory.

RECOGNIZING THE PRIDGEN FAMILY AS THE 2013 WALTON COUNTY FARM FAMILY OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Pridgen family for being selected as the 2013 Walton County, Florida, Farm Family of the Year.

Steve Pridgen, a born-and-bred third generation farmer, takes to heart the value of hard work, stewardship of land, and the love and support of his family. If you ask Steve how he feels about farming, he will tell you it has been a dream come true, and it has grown to become his life's passion. Ever since he was a young boy, Steve dreamed of farming just like his father and grandfather. In 1983, while only a high school junior, he took over operations for his father's 430-plus acre farm, which is located in the Liberty Community.

The Pridgen family farm boasts 65 head of beef cattle, 120 acres of pasture land, as well as 300-plus acres of pine trees. In addition to Steve, his wife, Ronda, and their children, Stephanie, Chase, and Madison, along with Steve's mother, Martha, all contribute to the overall success of the farm. The Pridgen children are especially willing to help out on the family farm; Chase can often be found driving around a tractor, while Stephanie gladly gives up her free time when home from school to assist her father and brother.

The recognition bestowed upon the Pridgen family is not the only accolade they have been given with regards to their efforts in agriculture. In 2007, the Pridgen family was named Florida's Outstanding Tree Farmers of the Year by the Florida Forestry Association.

Steve Pridgen is extremely grateful for the opportunity he and his family have been given to devote their lives to cultivating God's earth. His gratitude goes out to the Walton County farming community, of which he is thankful to be a part, as well as, the Walton County Extension Service.

Mr. Speaker, our great Nation was built by farmers and their families. The Walton County Farm Family of the Year Award is a reflection of the Pridgen's tireless work and their dedication to family, faith, and farming. On behalf of the United States Congress, I would like to offer my congratulations to the Pridgen family for being outstanding in their field. My wife Vicki and I extend our best wishes for their continued success.

CELEBRATING THE 90TH
BIRTHDAY OF AGAR JAICKS

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an extraordinary progressive leader in San Francisco, Agar Jaicks, who celebrates his 90th birthday today. Jaicks is a central figure in the founding and growth of progressive organizations and neighborhood groups that greatly influenced San Francisco's political life from the 1950s to the present day. He is one of the most beloved and admired figures in our City's great history, and I join my constituents in honoring five decades of his tireless service to the people of San Francisco. Agar Jaicks has been a relentless advocate for social, economic and environmental economic justice. Above all, he is a loyal friend, with a gentle grace and modesty so rarely seen in the world of politics.

Agar Jaicks was born in Chicago in 1923 and raised in the exclusive North Shore suburb of Lake Forest, Illinois, an affluent, upper-class, conservative community. At the age of 20, Jaicks joined the U.S. Marines and fought valiantly in the South Pacific during World War II. After the war ended, he attended George Washington University under the newly implemented Veteran's GI Bill, where he met Diana Roosevelt, the niece of First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt, who would become his wife. Their first date was a Senate hearing on Capitol Hill, portending a life together in political and public service.

After graduation in 1950, Agar and Diana Jaicks moved to San Francisco to build a life and raise their family. Jaicks' first job in San Francisco was pumping gas for Chevron, but his interest in news and politics led him to a longtime career working for the next forty years as a director for KGO TV.

Agar's political life began with the 1951 campaign of Helen Gahagan Douglas for the United States Senate against Richard Nixon. In 1953, he and his wife joined the San Francisco Young Democrats, a group of progressive activists, where he befriended many future political leaders, including U.S. Representatives Phillip Burton and John Burton, Mayors George Moscone and Willie Brown, all whom he would staunchly support.

Jaicks was elected to the San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee in 1962 where he would serve as Chair and be a stabilizing force for sixteen years. In this position, he ran the United Democratic Campaign that led voter registration efforts and 'get out the vote' mobilizations.

Jaicks' greatest friendships were with San Francisco Supervisor Jack Morrison and U.S. Representative Philip Burton.

Agar and Diana and their Haight Ashbury neighbors, Jack and Jane Morrison and Sue Bierman, stood on the progressive front of important San Francisco battles, from stopping the central freeway that would destroy San Francisco neighborhoods and Golden Gate Park neighborhoods to fighting unrestricted downtown development.

Agar was a devoted husband to his late beloved wife of 64 years, Diana, and remains a loving father to his children, Lisa and Scott, and his grandchildren.

I am proud to call Agar Jaicks my friend and thank him for his leadership, his devoted friendship, and his wise counsel.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF EVELYN LOWERY

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of Civil Rights Activist Evelyn Gibson Lowery, a beloved civil servant remembered for her remarkable display of leadership and civil rights activism.

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery passed away on Thursday, September 26 at the age of 88. While I am deeply saddened by her passing, I am comforted in knowing that her legacy is one that will live on through her involvement in the Civil Rights Movement at local, regional, national, and international levels.

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery was born in 1925 in Memphis, Tennessee to activists Rev. Dr. Harry and Evelyn Gibson. She attended Clark College and Youngstown University. In 1948, she married Rev. Joseph Lowery. Evelyn dedicated her life to the cause of justice.

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery and Rev. Lowery participated in the 1965 Selma-to-Montgomery march in Alabama and stand as an inspirational couple as pioneers in the Civil Rights

Movement. Upon the death of his wife, Rev. Lowery was quoted, "My beloved Evelyn was a special woman, whose life was committed to service, especially around the issues of empowering women. She was a wonderful mother and wife and I thank God . . . that I was blessed having her as my partner, my confidante and my best friend for almost 70 years."

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery founded the SCLC/Women's Organization Movement for Equality Now Inc. in 1979 as the sister organization of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference which was founded by Rev. Lowery and other Civil Rights Activists. Her decision to found this organization was prompted by her weariness of seeing the rights of women, children and families ignored. Through Evelyn's inspiring leadership and guidance, the SCLC/W.O.M.E.N Inc. has more than accomplished its mission of reacting and responding to the plight of marginalized people. The organization has grown into an international association with programs offering education and mentoring in addition to HIV/AIDS awareness campaigns throughout the world.

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery not only participated in the Selma-to-Montgomery march in 1965 but she and Rev. Lowery have been instrumental in the commemoration of Bloody Sunday nearly every year since. She also contributed to the erection of the Civil Rights Freedom Wall at the Brown Chapel AME Church in Selma, Alabama.

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery founded several prominent programs including the Drum Major for Justice Awards Dinner in 1980 honoring those who contribute to social justice in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and the Evelyn G. Lowery Civil Rights Heritage Tour honoring civil rights movement icons. In 1988, she founded the Women's Empowerment Training Center for GED/computer training. In 1995, Evelyn founded a mentoring program for young girls.

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery has been described by several in the civil rights community as a champion in the civil rights movement and a "drum major for justice in her own right." Her legacy will live on in the hearts and minds of all of those who benefitted from her contributions to justice and equality.

Mrs. Evelyn Lowery received many awards and recognitions for her tremendous contributions to the cause of justice. Evelyn was appointed by Atlanta's former Mayor Maynard Jackson to arrange clothes for missing or murdered children for burial. She was the recipient of the Rosa Parks Award, the APEX Museum's Tribute Award, and the YWCA Academy of Women Achievers Award. Evelyn was recognized as one of the 100 most influential women in Atlanta by the Atlanta Business League's Women of Vision. She was honored in 2004 at the International Civil Rights Walk of Fame at the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site in Atlanta, Georgia.

Evelyn's instrumental role in the Civil Rights Movement has made an indelible mark on this nation. Today we honor her for her role in the story of the Civil Rights Movement. As the first black woman elected to Congress from Alabama I am humbled to stand before the nation and share her story of strength, compassion and courage.

Saying thank you to Mrs. Evelyn Lowery seems woefully inadequate. But, we are truly

grateful for the life of this extraordinary public servant. On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Mrs. Evelyn Lowery.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 2, 2013, I attended the funeral of a good friend and constituent, Mrs. Evelyn Lowery, in my congressional district. Consequently, I was unable to make votes for a portion of the day.

Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes: on rollcall No. 509, I would have voted "no"; on rollcall 510, I would have voted "no"; on rollcall 511, I would have voted "yes"; on rollcall 512, I would have voted "no."

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, it is an honor for me to recognize the National Day of the Republic of China, which is celebrated every year on October 10, also referred to as Double Tenth. The Republic of China, more commonly known as Taiwan, continues to be an anchor for peace and security in the Asia Pacific region and one of the United States' most trusted allies.

Taiwan's National Day is a time for celebrating and commemorating its establishment on January 1, 1912. Since its establishment, Taiwan has established itself as a stable democracy; one whose leaders are democratically elected and where civil and human rights of the citizenry are respected. These shared values serve as the foundation for the U.S.-Taiwan alliance. I have had the pleasure to meet with Taiwan's Representative serving in Washington, DC, Ambassador Pu-tsung King and his family. I have witnessed firsthand their kindness, grace and dedication to their home country. Ambassador King and his family are eloquent representatives for the people of Taiwan.

The friendship between Taiwan and the U.S. is long-lasting and all facets of the U.S.-Taiwan bilateral relationship—cultural, economic, and strategic—have expanded and grown stronger since the signing into law of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) in 1979. A strong, prosperous Taiwan serves both our nations' interests. In 2012, Taiwan was the United States' 11th largest trading partner, and the 7th largest export market for U.S. agriculture. For my home state of Indiana, Taiwan is one of its top export markets in Asia. Hoosier farmers and my state's economy have

benefitted greatly from trade agreements with Taiwan.

There is no denying that Taiwan's contributions to the global community are immeasurable. It is a membership of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC). On July 12, 2013, President Obama signed into law legislation that calls for the Secretary of State to endorse Taiwan's entry into the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). This will help strengthen the safety of air travel between the United States and Taiwan.

I congratulate Taiwan on its National Day and I look forward to many years of continued cooperation between our two countries.

HONORING LT. COL. JAMES DABNEY

HON. GARY G. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate a true American hero, Lt. Col. James Dabney, retired, for his induction into the Ranger Hall of Fame for his service to this great Nation during the Vietnam War.

In the Spring of 1968, James Dabney was 25 and an Army captain; he was the officer in charge of the 123 men of Delta Company, 4th Battalion, 12th Infantry, 199th Infantry Brigade and medics, forward observers and soldiers with the 17th Armored Cavalry.

His men were teenagers and had been drafted to serve. They were stationed about 15 miles outside of Saigon to block the enemy's entry into the city.

Lt. Col. Dabney describes the conditions: It was hot and humid and there were torrential downpours. One night, he says, it rained so hard that the men were in foxholes sitting in water up to their chest. The soldiers were eating rations left over from Korea. They were spent. They were hungry. They were tired from being constantly on alert. Most of the guys had just been through the Tet Offensive.

On May 5, 1968, the company of 123 men engaged 2,000 North Vietnamese soldiers. Over the next four days a fierce battle ensued. But the crew of young Americans held their ground and, in the end, the enemy retreated. For their bravery, the company would later be awarded the Presidential Unit Citation.

Forty-five years later, Lt. Col. Dabney doesn't reflect on his own accomplishment; he remembers the six young men of his company that didn't return home.

He says he got the recognition, but they were the real heroes.

In addition to his induction into the Ranger Hall of Fame this summer, Lt. Col. Dabney has also been awarded the Presidential Unit Citation, Distinguished Service Cross, a Silver Star, two Bronze Stars, three Purple Hearts and the Legion of Merit for his actions in Vietnam.

But his greatest award, he says, is an eagle figurine with an inscription from the men in his company thanking him for his leadership.

In 1984, Lt. Col. Dabney retired from the Army. He and his wife, Jeanne Marie, cele-

brated their 25th anniversary last year and have five children, Jill LeWallen, Lynn Raper, Jeannie Pilgrim, James Winch and Marianne Mazurowski.

IN HONOR OF TAIWAN'S 102ND NATIONAL BIRTHDAY

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, Taiwan, a dear friend and close ally in Southeast Asia, is celebrating their 102nd birthday on October 10, 2013.

Taiwan and the United States have a good relationship because we have so much in common. We both believe that human rights, democracy and the rule of law are critical to maintaining stability. Both nations do not just speak of these as theories but create environments in which they can be fulfilled. It is a shame that Taiwan is not given the recognition they deserve in the international community, as they have attempted to uphold the same values that the United States holds dear. This commitment to similar ideals should bring our two countries closer together.

There are a few areas that I would like to address that could further this friendship and enhance our cooperation and understanding.

I would like to see an expanded trade relationship with Taiwan. Taiwan is one of our largest trading partners, and my own state of Michigan exported nearly \$200 million worth of goods to Taiwan in 2012. An expanded trade relationship with Taiwan would certainly be beneficial to the United States, and also to the state of Michigan. A bilateral trade agreement is something that should be explored.

It is also hard to understand just how much Taiwan has advanced over the previous decades. Their shift to democracy in the 1990s was truly an amazing event, especially given their location and external pressures, but this event is hard to understand without actually visiting the island. Many Members of Congress have visited Taiwan, but it can be hard to convey the importance of such travels to other parts of our government. I have encouraged high-level visits from the United States, and also have encouraged allowing high-level Taiwanese officials to visit with executive departments. In this way, we can more accurately assess our relationship with Taiwan, their importance to stability in the Asia-Pacific region, and the power of democracy in Asia.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ARLAM CARR, JR.

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of Montgomery Civil Rights pioneer Arlam Carr, Jr., a beloved Alabamian remembered for his role in the desegregation of Montgomery public schools.

Arlam passed away on Thursday, September 26 at the age of 62. While I am deeply saddened by his passing, I am comforted in knowing that his legacy is one that will live on through his contributions to the desegregation of Montgomery's public schools and the Civil Rights Movement in Alabama.

At the age of 13 Arlam was the plaintiff in the 1964 lawsuit before the Supreme Court against the Montgomery County Board of Education. He played an instrumental role in desegregating Montgomery's public schools. In 1965, he became one of the first African-American students to enroll at Sidney Lanier High School.

Arlam has been remembered by his colleagues and friends as having "a quiet courage that was reflective of his character." Others remember Arlam as "gentle, yet tough."

Arlam believed in the human decency of all people claiming that once white students were

given the chance to interact with black kids, they would realize all are human, all the same. When asked to recall the days before integration, he focused on the positive side, recalling those who supported him and reminded his audience of the progress that has since been made.

Arlam didn't ignore the work that remained and the injustices that persisted however. One colleague evokes, "When it came to discussing injustices in the community, you could hear and feel the steel in (his) voice."

Arlam was a lifelong Montgomery resident working for almost forty years at WSFA-12, where he served many roles, ultimately as Director of Newscasts. He helped launch Today in Alabama. He was the longest tenured member of the WSFA News Team.

Arlam was active in many community and civic groups, including the Laubach Literacy Council and Leadership Montgomery. He was

devoted to his family and his community. Arlam served as a deacon in his church. This was a position he wore with the utmost pride as a servant of God.

Arlam's instrumental role in the Civil Rights Movement and the integration of Montgomery Public Schools has made an indelible mark on the City of Montgomery and the State of Alabama. Today we honor him for his role in the story of Alabama. As the first black woman elected to congress from Alabama I am humbled to stand before the nation and share his story of strength, compassion and courage.

Saying thank you to Arlam seems woefully inadequate. But, we are truly grateful for the life of this extraordinary public servant. On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Arlam Carr, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, October 9, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 9, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

LEAVING THIS WORLD A LITTLE BETTER THAN YOU FOUND IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, "Try and leave this world a little better than you found it." Those were the parting words of Robert Baden Powell, a soldier, writer, and founder of the world scouting movement. This was a message to all Scouts that was found among his papers after Powell's passing in 1941.

I am a scouter, Mr. Speaker. It is part of who I am, both as an American and an elected official proudly representing Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. Scouter Powell's words today are part of scouting's principles, to always leave the campsite cleaner than when you found it. It is into service, serving others, and making the world a better place. They also ring true in the debate taking place now in Washington.

Today we are saddling future generations with mountains of debt. We have made promises we cannot keep. We are leaving the next generation worse off

than our own. We face a Nation with grave challenges, challenges that aren't being addressed. The fact of the matter is that Congress has yet to deal with the real drivers of our debt, a large portion of which is health care costs.

Mr. Speaker, I don't care who won the White House or which party holds the majority in Congress. Why? Because not until we actually tackle the tough issues, the tough challenges, can we honestly say that Congress or the White House is doing what is right for the country. Right now we aren't making necessary progress, not on our budget and deficits, not on our long-term debt, not on bringing down the cost of health care. Though we have made some progress on spending, we are nowhere near where we need to be.

We are also leaving the health system worse than where we found it. Here are just two letters from my constituents that my office has received.

Tina, from Jefferson County, Pennsylvania, writes:

Please do not vote in any way to continue funding the Affordable Care Act. It in no way improves the situation of the average American. Yes, it provides another option for health insurance, but the rates are no more affordable than the private insurances; and therefore, if a person cannot afford the private insurance, there is no way they will be able to afford the government plan. In addition, the act places further strain on the system and will cause the shutdown of more hospitals, cause more physicians to leave the system, and further crowd our Nation's emergency departments.

Catherine from DuBois wrote:

I am fortunate to have good insurance through my employer. However, I found out from them that they may provide a lesser form of health care due to the no-Cadillac plan. They understandably want to avoid a penalty for providing a good plan. This seems unfair to me, as if we are being penalized for working and having a good employer. If they are willing to provide a good health plan, why should they be penalized and why should they have to lessen our coverage? I am very distraught about many layers of the health care plan that are starting to come to light. I don't know if anything can be done.

I cannot stand idle as Congress acts like it is solving problems when, in fact, it is failing to tackle the tough issues, health being one of them. Let me be clear that a government shutdown is unacceptable. However, each day we stall and fail to deal with these challenges, the worse it gets for the next generation.

The real debate needs to be about how we get our fiscal house in order and set a course of long-term job

growth. Not until then will I be satisfied. It should be about addressing the challenges the people elected us to solve. Again, not until then will I be satisfied. It is about trying to "leave this world a little better than you found it."

GETTING TO A BIG DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker said that the shutdown should be unacceptable. I agree with that. We could all, within the next half an hour, vote to make the unacceptable not the policy that we are pursuing.

Mr. Speaker, our government has now been shut down for over a week and the American people are looking to Congress for solutions, not spin. Thousands of dedicated Federal employees here, but more profusely around this country, continue to be furloughed without pay, all because a faction of Republicans insist on keeping government closed until we repeal the Affordable Care Act, a demand that has nothing to do with keeping our government open.

Debate about the Affordable Care Act is legitimate. There are people who disagree with it and people who agree with it. But holding ransom the people's government is and should be, as the previous speaker said, unacceptable.

Americans are tired, I am tired, I think most Members are tired of hearing the same rhetoric from politicians over and over. Instead, they want real solutions that can restore fiscal sanity, end the irrational sequester which HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a conservative Republican from Kentucky, says does not work and cannot work, and break the cycle of manufactured crises that do nothing to help our economy and, in fact, are doing it great harm. So the question, Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves is: How do we reach a solution? How can this Congress achieve the big, balanced deal that our constituents expect from us?

First and foremost we must end the shutdown. Mr. Speaker, 200 Democrats—we have a vacancy—200 Democrats will vote this very day, this very hour, to open the government. That means, Mr. Speaker, we only need 18 Republicans. The previous speaker said it is unacceptable where we are. We can

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

change it, and we can change it within the hour, with only 18 Republicans joining 200 Democrats to say let the people's government be open; let the people's government be serving them.

First and foremost, Mr. Speaker, we must end this shutdown and take action to prevent the United States from defaulting on its bills for the first time in history. A solvent nation should not be taken hostage to accomplish an objective. Once these immediate threats are removed, Congress should then vote to go to conference on the differences which are legitimate between our two budgets. Republicans have refused, for the last six months in the House and in the Senate, to go to conference.

The Speaker talks about negotiation. That is where you do it. That is the mechanism that is set up under our democracy to resolve differences. Go to conference. There we can have the opportunity to agree on a comprehensive, balanced plan to put our country on a fiscally sustainable path, not for the next week, the next month, the next 180 days, but for decades to come; and if we do that, our economy will explode, jobs will be created, and Americans will again feel good, not only about their country, but about their Congress.

The shutdown and the threat of default are standing in the way of a real negotiation process for a long-term solution. Democrats, I say, Mr. Speaker, are ready to sit down and talk with our Republican colleagues about a long-term agreement. We know that will require tough decisions, but Republicans should not demand their own policies as ransom required to reopen the government and make sure America pays its bills.

Democrats have already made the difficult choice to accept the Republican's preferred budget level for the short-term funding bill. How do I know it is their preferred funding bill? Because they voted on it and sent it to the Senate, Mr. Speaker, and the Senate said, We will accept your number, and they sent it back here; and my Republican colleagues will not say "yes" to their own number.

A big and balanced agreement on a budget. After we take the Republican number to open up government, go to conference, have discussions, a big and balanced agreement on the budget and on getting our debt under control will require real compromise and difficult decisions. My colleagues, we should have the wisdom and, yes, the courage to make them; and if we do, future generations will thank us.

I continue to believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a bipartisan majority of Members in this House who are ready to work in good faith towards achieving such an agreement. My observation, however, is, after 33 years in this body, that there is a small faction on the Republican side of the aisle—that

may be 50, it may be 60—that is holding captive the 170 of their colleagues who want to make sense and move forward.

I hope that Speaker BOEHNER will take the important steps necessary to enable those negotiations to begin by allowing a vote on the Senate's bill at the House number to reopen government and another one on a clean measure to prevent an unthinkable and economically catastrophic default. Once those occur, Mr. Speaker, we will be able to resume work on achieving real and lasting results for the American people when it comes to our long-term fiscal health.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, would bring the bill to open our government, the people's government, to the floor this day.

THREE CRISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, this October fiscal crisis is punctuated by three developments that are becoming increasingly obvious and disturbing. The first is the refusal of the Senate and the President to resolve their differences with the House through negotiation and compromise on the bill that would actually fund the government and end this shutdown. In recent days, senior administration officials have said they don't care how long the shutdown lasts because they are winning politically and the President would rather the Nation default than negotiate with the House.

Our form of government cannot operate in such a manner. Congress is a bicameral legislature. That means two Houses that are specifically designed to have a different perspective on issues. The two Houses of Congress were designed to disagree. The only way a bicameral legislature can possibly function is through each House exercising its own best judgment on a given issue and then coming together and meeting to isolate their differences and resolve them through negotiation and compromise.

The conference process of Congress has evolved over centuries. It is very effective at resolving the differences between the two Houses; but it takes two Houses to operate it, and the Senate is refusing to do so. This malfunction is at the very heart of our stalemate.

The second development is the deliberate decision by the administration to amplify the public's suffering and inconvenience during this stalemate. This government has gone through 18 shutdowns now in the past 37 years, but never has a President barricaded open-air venues like national memorials. In fact, he has gone so far as to forbid the

use of turnouts on public roads that offer passersby distant views of Mt. Rushmore and Yosemite. He has ordered people out of their own homes and ordered businesses to close just because they lease land from the Federal Government. He has even tried to close the Atlantic Ocean to Florida fishermen.

In the past, Presidents have done everything they could to minimize the impacts of shutdowns. This President is going to ridiculous extremes to maximize the suffering that people must endure. One park ranger told a reporter, "We've been told to make life as difficult for people as we can." And then he added, "It's disgusting." And when this House has passed stopgap measures to minimize these impacts, the President and the Senate have summarily rejected them.

The third development is the rapid unraveling of ObamaCare. As it has rolled out, millions of Americans have discovered that their health insurance rates have skyrocketed or they are losing their health plans entirely or that they are having their hours cut back at work. It is very clear that the public isn't buying these new government-brokered policies. One hundred and seventy thousand people visited the Maryland exchange looking for affordable insurance since it opened more than a week ago, but only 326 have actually bought these plans, less than 0.2 percent.

Now, imagine, you have got the biggest store in town. People are required by law to purchase your product. You open for business, and 99.8 percent of the customers who walk into your store walk out again without buying your product. Do you think you have a problem? We can't pretend this isn't happening. Millions of Americans right now are losing their health plans and not finding affordable replacements. This matter must be resolved, and it must be resolved now.

This government only exists with the consent of the governed. When it deliberately goes out of its way to maximize the pain and suffering of the American people in this crisis, it jeopardizes that consent. This matter must be resolved, and it must be resolved now. And this government is simply not designed to function with one party refusing to talk to the other, with one House refusing to resolve the differences that divide it from the other. This simple failure is at the heart of our Nation's distress, and it, too, must be resolved, and it must be resolved now.

We are now 5 years into this administration. They have not been happy ones for our Nation. But now we have arrived at a crisis—or more precisely, at three crises: one that is costing millions of Americans the health plans they liked and were told they could keep, a second in the relationship of this government to the people, and a

third in the basic function of our fundamental institutions.

Happily, the Constitution's Framers gave us all of the tools that are necessary to resolve these crises except for one, and that one is what Lincoln called the better angels of our nature. Only we can appeal to those angels, and we must do so before more harm befalls our country.

HOUSE GYM REMAINS OPEN FOR MEMBERS DURING SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today is the ninth day of the Republican shutdown, what started as a tantrum against the Affordable Care Act to defund it, then morphed into a demand to delay it for a year, but now is really an open assault on our system of government.

Unless a fanatic minority holding JOHN BOEHNER and the American people hostage get their way, they will continue to inflict unnecessary pain on hundreds of thousands of our employees and on the American public. Now they are poised to wreck the global economy by threatening that America will not pay its bills. If it works, they will do it all over again.

Make no mistake, this is an assault on our system of government unlike anything we have seen before. We must stop them now, united in the belief that there are some lines we are not going to cross. There will be no weapons on the floor of the House and no willful damage to the American people.

What if these fanatics had their tactics used against them? What if Democrats and Speaker PELOSI demanded that the disastrous war in Iraq stop and, if it didn't, we would wreck the American economy? That our deeply felt concerns about preparing for climate change and global warming were nonnegotiable? What if Senator CHRIS MURPHY, who had 26 innocent children and their teachers massacred in his district, what if he said, Enough. Unless we get background checks for purchasers of guns to make sure that unfit people can't get them, something that 90 percent of the American people agree with, unless I get that, I am going to shut down the government? Can you imagine the howls of outrage?

There is a tremendous disconnect here. One glaring symbol of the disconnect can be found in the sub-basement of the Rayburn office building, the House gym. Now, make no mistake, everywhere I have worked I have started fitness programs for our employees. They save money; they improve productivity; they can even save lives. I helped start a fitness program for our employees here on Capitol Hill. If anything, it may be more important

for people in Congress who are leading a crazy, unhealthy lifestyle and can seldom get together and interact like human beings. For 17 years, this is where I have tried to start every single day, to exercise, to enjoy bipartisan camaraderie, an island in the storm of Capitol Hill. It is convenient to be able to shower there instead of at home. It is important. It is very important, but it is not essential.

I had somebody argue with me yesterday that it doesn't cost that much because we pay dues. We have an access key that lets us in and there aren't any staff members there now. Well, that is true. It doesn't cost very much, but it costs. The electricity, the hot water, the towels, they are not provided by gym fairies. They are provided by taxpayers. And the same is true for countless facilities across America, closed by the senseless Republican shutdown.

In fact, since we have decided that we are going to pay all the employees when it is over, we are paying them not to work. And it is costly not to collect fees. You can make a better argument for restoring those services than you can for the House gym. Some of the most fanatic about inflicting unnecessary pain on the American public are regulars, enjoying our House gym while the staff gym is closed.

Mr. Speaker, if you and the House Republicans are serious and not cynical about the shutdown, then shut down the House gym until this madness ends.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS PASSING BILLS TO REOPEN GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, like myself and many Americans, I am very frustrated over the inaction of Congress to get its work done; but let's look back at what has happened over the last week or so.

The House Republicans, we have sent bills over to the Democratically-controlled Senate to open the government, to run the government, to fund the government. We have sent, starting from delaying ObamaCare, which most Americans have serious problems with, to other bills, and I want to talk about the latter two that we sent.

One was to fund the government completely until December 15, but also with two exceptions. The one exception is that Members of Congress and the President would live by the same rules under ObamaCare that all Americans have to. The other exception is ObamaCare. We need to delay those rules, and let's move on.

The people that talk about the status quo in American history here, the status quo, if you vote for a clean CR, you want the status quo to remain the same. That means unemployment stays

where it is, forcing Americans into part-time work. We need structural changes to the underlying problems. We need to address why our debt keeps going up.

The President, yesterday, in his news conference, talked about raising the debt ceiling doesn't increase the debt ceiling, doesn't increase spending. Well, I wish the President would answer to me: When he took office, the debt was \$10 trillion; now it is approaching \$17 trillion. How does raising the debt ceiling not increase the debt?

The President talks about it is unprecedented, talking about the debt ceiling and having negotiations would be unprecedented if we do that. Well, Ronald Reagan and Speaker Tip O'Neill did it. Bill Clinton did it. President Obama did it in 2011 under the Budget Control Act. It is not unprecedented. And, interestingly, the times the President has been forced to negotiate are times when we have had crises that we have had to address, and the President did that in 2011.

If ObamaCare is so good and it is the President's signature piece of legislation, he ought to be the first one to sign up for it. I believe the First Family ought to be the first in line to sign up for ObamaCare. But, you know what? The President of the United States is exempt from ObamaCare. It doesn't make sense. He ought to have to live by his own bills that he supported and pressed through.

We talk about compromise. I am sure the President doesn't watch FOX News, but I think Bill O'Reilly has a compromise that maybe makes some sense. The individual mandate—that was one of the things we put in there, in one of those bills—we said delay the individual mandate for 1 year. The President delayed the employer mandate for 1 year. It only makes sense, especially when you see so many people having trouble signing up, getting on and all the uncertainty. We are getting reports now of premiums going through the roof, higher deductibles, higher copays, and we need to delay it.

One of the items we said in the bill was to delay the individual mandate for 1 year. That was rejected by the Senate. Also, we sent a bill over there to say, Okay, if you don't take that, let's just go to conference. Let's sit down and talk. Let's negotiate.

But I think the compromise Bill O'Reilly put out on FOX News the other night makes some sense. Make the individual mandate voluntary, but don't force people to go on this. Delay it for 1 year. Don't force people to go on this and risk their privacy concerns, force them to pay higher insurance premiums for insurance they may not need. Let's see what happens.

As ObamaCare moves through, I think that is a compromise that makes some sense, and the President ought to look at that and talk about that; but in

order to do that, he needs to come to the table. He needs to sit down with House Republicans and negotiate and work through the problems. That is how our system of government was set up, and that is how it is supposed to work. The Founders had that right, especially in divided government. So I encourage the President.

Now, this morning there are some reports that the President is inviting the House and Senate Democrats to the White House later today, and supposedly we are going to get an invitation here soon. That is encouraging. I hope he is serious about sitting down and working out the differences, because we have to get back to the work the American people expect us to do.

So I look forward to sitting down with the President and our leadership and working through these problems and getting the government going; but we can't do it without sitting down and talking and making sense and representing the American people, because we were elected to do that.

CREATING JOBS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 1,000 days since I arrived in Congress, and Republican leaders have still not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our jobs crisis. Instead, this House has voted 46 times to defund or delay health care for people who desperately need it, wasting precious time.

Wake up, Republicans. ObamaCare is not only the law of the land; it is not only a safeguard to save the millions of people with preexisting conditions; it is an essential tool to give people the economic security and purchasing power they need to revive our economy.

People need ObamaCare. President Obama cares about the American people, and we should, too. Even a Tea Party member of my freshman class of 2010 understood this when he stood and expressed his hopes of being able to receive federally subsidized health coverage immediately upon taking office. He was incensed. He couldn't wait 30 days, but he acts as if he wants his constituents to wait forever.

People all over the world are amazed that we do not have universal health care like they do. We are a world power, and they are saying, You don't have universal health care in America?

Mr. Speaker, people want health care; people deserve health care; and, Mr. Speaker, people want jobs. No one wants to revive the Great Recession by playing dangerous games with our economy. But do you know what? This is precisely what this House is doing.

This is scary. I am nervous. I am stunned by the insensitivity. The whole world economy rests on Amer-

ica's Treasury bonds. Let me repeat: The whole world economy rests on America's Treasury bonds.

Mr. Speaker, when we play with fire on the debt ceiling, you threaten to burn down the buttress on which Americans' 401(k)s, mutual funds, small businesses, and stock portfolios rest. Just consider what happened the last time Republicans simply threatened to breach the debt ceiling in 2011. Government bonds were downgraded, retirement assets plummeted, and homeowners saw big hikes in their monthly payments. That was just for talking about breaching the debt ceiling.

Independent analysts have concluded that a debt default would be as bad as the global financial crisis of 2008. After that crisis, American savers lost decades' worth of wealth in their homes and 401(k)s. We are still living with massive unemployment from that crisis to this date.

While some Members of Congress may like to behave as though we have moved past our unemployment crisis, it is a different story when you look at African Americans—13 percent unemployment; the Hispanic community, 9.3 percent unemployment; and the youngest workers, 22 percent unemployment.

Across America there are nearly 12 million people officially out of work and tens of millions more who are underemployed or who have simply given up looking. America's public sector workers—our teachers, firefighters, construction workers, public health workers, medical researchers, public defenders, bus drivers, social workers, and police—have already suffered so painfully, first under the sequester, and now under the shutdown.

But a default would devastate every worker and every retiree. It would hit every 401(k), every mutual fund, every stock portfolio, every mortgage payment, every student loan, and every business loan. It is impossible to be fiscally conservative or probusiness and simultaneously try to use this financial weapon of mass destruction against American businesses and American taxpayers. It is time for Congress to pass a clean debt ceiling bill.

Mr. Speaker, open the government. Mr. Speaker, raise the debt ceiling. Mr. Speaker, let's begin to address our real crisis: jobs, jobs, jobs.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to both sides in this very important debate: the future of America and where we are going and how we are going to pay for the future of this country. What is amazing to me is that President Karzai of Afghanistan, I don't believe he has furloughed one person.

We are furloughing U.S. Government workers all across this Nation, but Mr. Karzai continues to get his millions and millions of dollars. Mr. Speaker, this is unnecessary. I don't know why we in Congress continue to fund a war where we can't even get an accountability from the inspectors. It makes no sense.

I want to read three paragraphs from an article I read this weekend, called, "The Forgotten War." One of the paragraphs:

But even when the war "ends" and Americans have forgotten it altogether, it won't be over in Afghanistan. Obama and Karzai continue negotiating towards a bilateral strategic agreement to allow the United States to keep at least nine of the biggest bases it built and several thousand trainers, and undoubtedly Special Operations Forces in Afghanistan, seemingly forever.

Another of the paragraphs:

It won't be over in the United States either. For American soldiers who took part in it and returned with catastrophic physical and mental injuries and for their families, the battles are just beginning. For American taxpayers, the war will continue at least until mid-century. Think of all the families of the dead soldiers to be compensated for their losses, all the wounded with their health care bills, all the brain-damaged veterans at the VA hospitals. Think of the outgoing costs of their drugs and prosthetics and benefits. Medical and disability costs alone are projected to reach \$754 billion, not to mention the hefty retirement pay of all those generals who issued all those reports of progress as they so ambitiously fought more than one war leading nowhere.

Mr. Speaker, just this past weekend, we had five Americans brought back in flag-draped coffins. I doubt sincerely if many people in this country read that report, that five Americans came back in a flag-draped coffin.

I do not understand why this Congress continues to have these difficulties of trying to fix our own problems in this country, but don't worry about the waste, fraud, and abuse—and, more important, the loss of limb and body and heart that our kids have been giving in Afghanistan.

I will close by reading one more paragraph from the article, called, "The Forgotten War":

Will the United States still be meddling in Afghanistan 30 years from now? If history is any guide, the answer is "yes"; and if history is any guide, three decades from now, most Americans will have only the haziest idea why.

I can only say to the families of those five patriots who came back in a flag-draped coffin, may we never forget. May we never forget that the war in Afghanistan continues to go on and on and probably will for the next 30 years. Come on, Congress, let's get together. Let's stop spending money in Afghanistan. More important, let's stop sending our young men and women to give their limbs and their life.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, as I always do, I ask God to please bless our men

and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God, in His loving arms, to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I ask God to bless us in the House and Senate, bless the President, and, please, God, three times, God, please, God, please, God, please, continue to bless America.

PROVIDING RELIEF FOR AMERICANS AFFECTED BY SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again speak out about the human consequences and the reckless and irresponsible government shutdown. Today it is day 9 into this needless swirl of frustration and madness.

Yesterday I spent time on the telephone talking with a woman whom I am here to represent. She lives in a small town called Roseville, Illinois. It is in the southern part of my congressional district. Her name is Sherri Leath.

Sherri is a decades-long employee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and she serves as a food inspector. She spent the first 4 years of her employment in a slaughterhouse, a beef slaughterhouse. The last 6 years, she is in the inspection area of a poultry and a pork processing plant. This is not a glamorous job, she is the first to admit that, but she works very hard every day, and she takes great pride in the fact that she is making sure that our food is safe and wholesome.

She has four children and six grandchildren, and she says she keeps them in mind and she keeps all the children in mind throughout this country as she is inspecting in these plants and makes sure, again, that this meat goes out safe and wholesome.

So today she will drive. She has a very long commute. She will spend most of that time in a cooler that is at most 45 degrees. And I would call someone like Sherri Leath an unsung hero, because without people like Sherri, who, again, are not receiving their pay right now, our food supply would be in jeopardy.

So she is going into work every day, not taking home a paycheck, and she is worried at a deep level about her family's future. She has a husband named Thomas, who is a school bus driver and brings home \$800 a month. This is not enough for Sherri and Thomas Leath to pay their bills.

So they have already discussed what this government shutdown means to their family. Step one for them, if the paycheck doesn't come, is they will tap into their reserves, into their savings. Step two, if it leads to that, they will have to go into further credit card

debt. This is not what we should be doing to people like Sherri and Thomas Leath. This is not what we should be doing to the hardworking Federal employees who want nothing more than to do a good job, go to work, and receive fair pay. But this is the way it has been for 9 days now.

We heard Congressman STENY HOYER speak half an hour ago now, talking about that we have an answer to this right now. We have enough Republican votes and we have enough Democratic votes today, within the hour, as he explained it, to get the government up and running again. We could immediately—immediately, today—provide relief for people like Sherri and Thomas Leath by reopening the government right here and right now. We have a bipartisan path to do that.

I would say let's do it. Let's get at it today and put these good, hardworking people back to work and receiving fair pay.

THE INCONVENIENT INCONSISTENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATION—DEBT LIMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker:

The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the United States Government cannot pay its debts. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our government's reckless fiscal policies.

That was a statement by Senator Barack Obama in 2006.

Driving up our national debt from \$5 trillion to \$9 trillion is irresponsible. It is unpatriotic.

Once again, Senator Barack Obama in 2008:

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices on to the backs of our children and our grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better. I, therefore intend to oppose the effort to increase America's debt limit.

Senator Barack Obama, 2006.

But that was then; this is now. The President, last week, said, without an increase in the borrowing limit, "the whole world will have problems." In other words, we are all going to die. The sky is going to fall unless the United States raises the debt limit.

He seems to be a little bit inconsistent on positions regarding the debt limit. Of course, now the debt limit is up to \$17 trillion, double what he talked about several years ago of not raising.

So we find ourselves in a situation where the President's attitude seems to be: I will not negotiate, except with the Russians, the Syrians, the Iranians

about what is going on overseas. But I will not negotiate, I will not talk to the House of Representatives about American issues.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that things that are happening in the United States are really just as important as what is happening in Russia, Syria, and Iran—but maybe not to the administration.

The administration would rather be in shutdown and lockdown for political reasons than to talk, to negotiate, to compromise, to even listen.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they say that Nero fiddled while Rome burned. It seems that the administration is in bunker mentality while the United States is in economic turmoil. And where are we? We are in a situation where there is no talking. And it seems to me, the administration says it is our fault. The President won't talk to us. The President has the habit, it seems, to blame others on bad things that happen and takes credit for things that are always good.

But, in any event, I reemphasize the President's own words about why we should not raise the debt limit: it is reckless; it is irresponsible; it is unpatriotic; it hurts us domestically and internationally; it is a failure of leadership, and Americans deserve better.

I agree with that.

So since the President seems to be somewhat inconsistent about his positions, why doesn't he just talk to us? Talk to us about the debt limit, the continuing resolution, about America's issues, America's policies, America's problems, and at least acknowledge that the House of Representatives exists.

So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, when you get to talk to the President—because I don't get to talk to him—and suggest that he come out of the White House and meet with the people's House and quit fiddling around and start talking to us so we can solve this problem together.

And that's just the way it is.

ECONOMIC HARM OF THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the majority party's latest idea is to create a supercommittee to figure out how to reverse their Republican shutdown of government. Frankly, Congress doesn't need another committee. It only needs the Speaker to unlock the Tea Party chains put on regular committee order and their function in this House. Let the Appropriations Committee do its job as mandated by our Constitution. It can and will get the job done.

Though it is not my first preference, we can begin by allowing a vote on a clean continuing resolution, that is, allowing the Senate bill which contains

the Republican budget mark of \$986 billion to move forward. Though the Democrats have expressed deep dismay at that number as it is not what Democrats had sought in discretionary accounts, it speaks loudly to which party is willing to compromise. And then if the majority party does not like the Affordable Care Act, use your real power in the regular committee structure that you control to change it. But closing down the entire government is a sledgehammer when what you need is merely a needle and thread.

Meanwhile, the Republican shutdown is wreaking havoc on our economy. More and more working Americans and businesses are getting singed. How can this be good? The Republican shutdown costs the American people \$12.5 million each hour and \$300 million a day. As of today, the GOP shutdown has already cost the American taxpayers over \$2 billion. Is that responsible government?

The Republican shutdown has caused rising uncertainty about our economy. It has already placed a downdraft on our economic markets and job creation. Yesterday the Dow Jones Industrial Average fell another 160 points. This is part of a recent precipitous slide which has seen the financial market lose nearly 400 points this month alone. Overall, the trend is strongly in the wrong direction—down.

The International Monetary Fund, as a result of the Republican shutdown, cut its growth forecast for our economy by 0.3 percentage points to 2.9 percent for this year and 3.6 percent for next year. This surely will cost the American economy more jobs going forward.

The sapping of U.S. growth will be felt globally, as U.S. economic sluggishness impacts other nations. Global markets continue to fall as well, wondering what will happen to the value of our Treasury bonds. Chaos and uncertainty trigger poor markets. We sure don't need any more of that medicine.

There are over 800,000 Federal workers who have been furloughed as a direct result of the shutdown. They are worrying about whether they can pay their bills, pay their mortgage. NASA, for example, had to furlough 97 percent of its more than 18,000-person workforce due to the closing of the government.

At NASA's Johnson Space Center in Houston, only 100 of 3,150 civil servants have not been furloughed. An additional 10,000 contractors with the Johnson Space Center will face being furloughed.

According to a local FOX affiliate, the NASA Glenn Research Center in Brook Park, Ohio, near Cleveland, which I represent, has essentially furloughed nearly all its 3,000 employees at NASA's key propulsion center. This absolutely punches down the local economy as well as the national.

The Republican shutdown has also caused many more contractors who do detailed work for our government to lose their jobs. Defense contractors like Boeing and Lockheed Martin have had to furlough thousands of employees because the shutdown has halted awards and payments to those companies.

The Republican shutdown hurts government agencies and weakens our national security. There are currently no death benefits given to families of soldiers killed in action; medical treatment for those in the military has been scaled back; and furloughs are creating backlogs for VA disability claims.

Mr. Speaker, just bring the clean continuing resolution that has the Republican budget number in it to a vote. Reopen our government. Use the regular committees to work out any difficulties you have with the Affordable Care Act. And, please, put America's economy back on an even keel.

LIVING WITHIN OUR MEANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, words are very powerful and words are important. I hear the words from our President and realize that he understands the importance of words, also. In the past, he has talked about debt, borrowing, and spending, but now he talks about obligations, because he understands that "debt," to the American public, is a four-letter word. He doesn't want to be tagged with the fact that he is asking for more debt, so now it is "obligations." That is a word that has cleaned up the concept that we are simply borrowing against our future.

But even the word "borrowing" needs to be looked at, because that assumes that we have the credit to borrow with; and the truth is no nation can lend us the kind of deficits that we are running right now, so we are actually printing the money.

But even the word "printing" has been changed in Washington. Now it is "quantitative easing." It just sounds so much better. "Printing" sounds so crass to the American public who might be worried about what is happening to their savings accounts while Washington is printing money.

The word "negotiation" is a word that the President is familiar with. He did it 2 years ago when we reached this exact same point. Both sides came to the table and negotiated, and we wound up with a budget that was not as extremely overdrawn as we had faced before. That is the power of negotiation.

But now the word "negotiation" is taken out of the President's vocabulary, and he declares that he is being held hostage. Oh, really? This thing he calls being held hostage is actually the

American way. It is what our Founding Fathers wanted. They came here and set up a system with a President and two Houses of Congress and two different parties; and those parties would sometimes have all the power, and sometimes they would share the power.

This President says he is being held hostage by the system. That means he doesn't believe in the balance of powers that the electorate cast in the last election. He declares over and over that the election is done—I was elected. The same people that elected him chose to put Republicans in power in the House of Representatives. I think they did that because they were afraid of this debt, deficit, borrowing, and spending.

We are told that we should have a clean CR. There is nothing clean about sacrificing the future of our children and grandchildren. That is what the President wants: a CR where he can spend what he wants to spend without negotiations on anything. We actually, in the House, submitted four different plans before this shutdown occurred. Those plans were just summarily rejected by the Senate, waved off, not really even considered; and yet we find our friends declaring this to be the Republican shutdown, not that both Houses failed to come to an agreement and the White House failed to sit down and negotiate. They just weren't going to be held hostage. So now, then, we need a clean CR, according to some, and we need to stop this Republican shutdown.

Words are very powerful. No longer do we talk about spending in Washington. We talk about investing. We are investing the American public's money. We are investing it in things like studies of the sexual habits of the fruit fly in Tijuana or wherever. "Debt" is, indeed, a four-letter word.

We are finally led to believe that default will occur immediately, that we somehow won't pay our obligations, that the American people need to understand that they are still paying their taxes every day and those taxes come to Washington. That is about \$2.5 trillion a year. If we do not extend the debt ceiling any higher, then what Washington is going to have to do is it is going to have to prioritize. It is going to decide which of its expenses to pay.

The Constitution demands that we pay our obligations. It says we can't default on those. Washington would have to do the same thing every American family does: it will have to prioritize its expenses if we do not extend the debt ceiling so chaos will not reign. We simply have to live within our means. That is what every American family has to do.

INVESTING IN AMERICA'S PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me, first of all, say good morning to my colleagues and start with a thank-you to President Obama for his invitation to the White House to all Members of Congress in quite a contrast to the representation of the President's lack of involvement.

In fact, over the last 4 or 5 years, this Congress has failed to pass a budget with a Republican majority in the House. That has constantly raised the question of how can we start growth in America.

So I thank the President, first of all, for his negotiating at the beginning of January 2013, in the tax negotiations, along with the acceptance of the very structured and restrictive and non-growth number of 986 for the budgeting of this particular Nation.

We are a growing Nation, we are a thriving Nation, we are the most powerful Nation in the world, and the way to go forward is to invest in America's people. So I thank the President. I thank the President for recognizing, as devastating as the sequester was, that he was willing to cede to a supercommittee that did not fulfill its responsibilities.

So we are here. And this is not about individual Members of Congress. It is about the American people. It is about the 29-year employee in the Dallas-Fort Worth area that spoke eloquently to the fact that, combined with military service, she desired to be at work. She enjoyed working with her young child and being at his school, but she wanted to help Americans. But she is not able to go to work.

It speaks to this question of the willy-nilly structure that the Republicans have constructed. I use the term "martial law." For those who want to understand it better, we were speaking of martial rule. So it is martial law on this floor. But a martial rule we are using means that whatever is thrown down on the floor, what Legos are thrown down on the floor to be picked up, that is how we are running this government.

So the word "clean bill" is not a naughty word. It means that we want to fulfill the ability to fund the entire government, not to leave out the SNAP and WIC programs or school food programs that are suffering, not to leave out rural development or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Centers for Disease Control that announced today there is a salmonella epidemic and because we don't have those staff persons, America suffers.

□ 1100

I understand Senator MCCAIN's frustration on the floor of the United States Senate because I went to the

floor yesterday in the early morning hours to express my pain for the families who have lost their loved ones in Afghanistan. These are young men and young women; and because of our government shutdown, their memorial services benefits could not be had.

I planned the introduction of a bill, ceded to the bill that is now going to be on the floor, that now we are going to pick to be able to help them. I indicated yesterday in a letter to the Secretary that he should immediately provide them with their funds, that it was eligible under a particular law. We all come together around that issue, and we are pained because of the loss of those loved ones of those family members.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is not about us. I continue to say that we are not doing it the right way.

A Vietnam veteran in Houston, Mr. Richard Simon, who came to a veterans center, was turned away yesterday. Homeless veterans in Houston, who need the veterans service centers, were turned away as of Wednesday because all of these veterans centers are being closed down. A farmer in Iowa, John Gilbert, has 770 acres. He is working every day, but he can't get his agricultural resources because the Department of Agriculture has shut down. A family resource center that is dealing with domestic violence is no more because it cannot get its Federal dollars. Then, of course, the U.S. Attorney's Office has seen 4,000 U.S. Attorneys shut down. There have been 3,000 Lockheed employees laid off and 3,000 NASA employees laid off.

So I believe that it is important that we recognize that we are not here for ourselves, rather, that we are here for the families whose loved ones lay down their lives in Afghanistan. Whether we call it a clean bill—however we call it—it needs to be put on the floor of the House because we cannot run the government by playing Legos. We can't throw sticks on the ground. We can't be out on the corner playing those games, throwing things on the ground, and saying, Whatever happens, it will happen.

We have got to help Richard Simon. We have got to help the veterans who are going to these closed centers. We have got to make sure that we understand that a President should be judged for his leadership in this country and not on where he came from or what he looks like. We have to be able to work with all people in America—and all of the people are being harmed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this one question as I go to my seat: Are we going to leave homeless veterans on the street, Mr. Speaker? I hope that we will answer that question and also pay the veterans or their families for the memorial services.

THE PRESIDENT'S REFUSAL TO NEGOTIATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, politics is full of irony, and I believe that that is a vast understatement compared to what is exhibited on this floor almost every day. Sometimes that irony bleeds over into the absurd, and that's what we are facing today when it comes to our President, who absolutely refuses to even sit down and negotiate over the debt ceiling limit or over the implementation of ObamaCare or over the continuing resolution or, frankly, over anything else.

Think about that.

The President of the United States is unwilling to even sit down to have any negotiations—to have even a conversation—with the Speaker of the House.

The President likes to say, I won the election, and he likes to remind us that elections have consequences; but I would remind the President that I won my election as well and so did 233 other House Republicans. I represent more than 700,000 people. Those 233 House Republicans represent more than 150 million people. They expect certain things of us. They expect us to represent them. They expect us to fight for those values that we promised that we would. I can't abandon those values. I owe it to my constituents. I owe it to my family. I owe it to my Nation. I owe it to myself to continue to fight for those values that, I think, help to make this Nation the great Nation that it is.

The President is the President of the United States. He is not just the President of the Democratic Party. He is not just the President of those States in which he won. He is the President of the United States, and he owes it to the Americans to be willing to sit down and to try to negotiate when we come into a conflict such as we have now.

Yes, we've got great challenges before us, but we can work through these. We always have before. We can find a way to work together. Republicans and Democrats have been working through their differences for generations, but we can only do that if we are willing to sit down and talk with each other. We can only do that if we are willing to be respectful of the deeply held positions that each of us holds. We can only do that if we are willing to work together for the betterment of this Nation, which brings me to the debt limit.

It is like a dark, looming cloud that hangs over us now. We can't ignore it. We can't pretend that it doesn't matter. We can't pretend that it's not important. So, like others, I would like to quote from one who is considered to be a great political leader of this century:

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. "Leadership" means that the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of

bad choices today onto the backs of our children and our grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, of course I'm not quoting TED CRUZ or MITCH MCCONNELL or the Speaker of the House. I am quoting a young freshman Senator who is now the President of the United States, who at least at one point in his career recognized the serious and the longstanding threat to this Nation that our rising debt is.

We have the opportunity to work together now to fix this problem; and if we can't fix it, at least we can take a meaningful step forward. I hope the President will work with us to address what he used to believe was a serious problem, but I believe it starts with one thing: sitting down together and talking in order to work it out.

The American citizens—all of us—deserve a President who is willing to lead. The American people deserve a President who is willing to talk. Yes, we live in a day in which there are policy and political differences, but that has always been the case. From the birth of our Nation, it has always been such. We are a Nation in which ideas and principles sometimes conflict, but the American people deserve a President who understands that negotiating is part of the process.

I pray that the President will sit down and talk with us now.

MR. SPEAKER, LET YOUR PEOPLE GO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I have a very simple message: let your people go.

The American people are very frustrated by what we are doing here. They want us to end this shutdown. In fact, some 70 percent of them do not like the way you or the Republican majority is handling this crisis. So, Mr. Speaker, if you will just let your people go and allow us to bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor, we can end this. Despite your claims to the contrary, it is clear to everyone that we have at least 17 votes required from your side of the aisle to pass the continuing resolution. So, Mr. Speaker, why don't you just let your people go?

I have a simple question for you: If you think to the contrary that their votes are not there, then why not put your cards on the table and allow a vote?

The American people cannot afford more rounds of betting their economic futures on politicians' betting on a pair and thinking they have a full house. The American people think it's time to call your bluff. Mr. Speaker, let your people go.

We can reopen the World War II Memorial and the VA today. We can en-

sure that all military families receive death benefits and can travel to Dover Air Force Base to receive their loved ones' remains. We can end what Senators on the other side of the aisle have declared "shameful and embarrassing."

We can end this today, Mr. Speaker, if you let your people go.

Holding back on a vote prevents the opening of lifesaving clinical trials at the NIH. It prevents the opening of national parks and museums for use by families everywhere. The shutdown is costing taxpayers \$12.5 million each and every hour you refuse to vote, and it is costing the American people already \$2.5 billion.

Don't listen to me. Listen to your own caucus Members: Enough is enough, said one Republican in the House. Let's get on with the business we were sent to do.

Another Republican agreed with him: The politics should be over, he said. It's time to legislate.

Another said: I'd vote for a clean CR because I don't think this strategy is working.

Many more echo these sentiments, Mr. Speaker: let your people go. Instead, you seem to be listening to a small faction in your caucus that says they want to "win at any cost." They say they won't be disrespected and that they need to get something out of this, but they don't know what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will see what is clear to everyone around the world who is watching this spectacle: there are no winners. Mr. Speaker, let your people go.

It's blackmail to shut down the government because you don't like the Affordable Care Act. Mr. Speaker, listen to those blunt assessments from your own caucus who call the followers of this strategy "lemmings with suicide vests."

Traditional allies of the GOP, like the Chamber of Commerce, have said this is "not in the best interest of the U.S. business community."

The Wall Street Journal has called it a kamikaze mission, and in fact, in their editorial headline, they said: Are the Republicans nuts?

Another Republican Senator said: This strategy isn't good for America.

This last comment really says it best, that this is not good for America. Mr. Speaker, let your people go, and bring a clean CR to a vote.

THE DEFINITION OF "FAIR"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, I was elected—and so were a lot of my classmates—in what we termed a very fair election. I think the issue that we all need to be concerned about right now is that it is

truly unique in America that everybody is treated fairly. It doesn't matter what the color of your skin is; it doesn't matter how you worship; it doesn't matter if you even worship or don't worship—you are treated fairly. The President has said many times that this is a country in which everybody deserves a fair shot, in which everybody deserves a fair opportunity to rise to whatever level he can. Every single American deserves to be treated fairly. I hear that term. I hear it battered back and forth.

So what is the real definition of "fair"?

I went to Webster's Dictionary. It says "fair" is treating people in a way that does not favor some over others. It does not treat one person in a favorable way over somebody else.

That is truly, uniquely American because there are very few places in the world where everybody does get treated fairly.

When I look at the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, I ask myself: Is this really fair?

If you look at this definition, it goes farther down and gives the antonym, or the opposite meaning. I would say that, if you were to look at what is not fair, the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, would be one of those things that would be the direct opposite of what fair is.

Is it fair to give 1,200 waivers to some and not to others? Is it fair to say to employers, do you know what, this is a very complicated law, and it has grown so complicated that you need another year to give you a fair chance to understand what's in it, so we're going to give you a year's delay. Now, if you're an individual, no, you're not given that.

So my question is: Is it fair? Is it fair to give one group something and the individual not?

I don't know. I don't know that that meets anybody's definition of what fair is.

Also, I heard Secretary of Health and Human Services Sebelius asked that very same question by a journalist:

So, Secretary Sebelius, is it fair to go ahead and give employers 1 year to figure it out because it's so hard to understand that it's not really fair to put that kind of pressure on them; yet, with the individuals, they have to do it today?

She says: No, no, no. They can opt out if they're not ready to do that. Now, you have to pay a fine if you want to opt out. You have to pay a fine if you don't want to participate at all.

You are held to a different set of standards than another group, so I don't know how that fits under the definition of fair.

We can talk about this and go back and forth all day long, but this is a gift. This Affordable Care Act—this ObamaCare—is a gift that keeps giving.

It's a law that, while it's giving, it's also taking. It is driving our debt to an unbelievable level. The President says it's going to reduce our debt over the long run. The truth of the matter is in 10 years it adds \$1.8 trillion, and that's a pretty fairly heavy debt for the people to absorb.

Now, back home—and I don't know if this lady is a Republican or a Democrat—Melissa had written to me from Hermitage, Pennsylvania. I want you to understand how this is. This is an individual. She has two degrees, one in criminal justice and one in teaching, but she couldn't get a job, so she started her own business.

She says:

No government loans, no bank loans, no investors, and I have grown the business over the past handful of years. I received a letter from my insurance provider, Aetna, and according to my letter, no longer am I going to be covered after November 25. I operate a small business, a successful business in this economy.

Now she talks about her daughter, Riley:

Riley is a young girl who is working her way through school as a part-time cashier at a local grocery store. She makes minimum wage, and she is paying for her own health care benefits. She got a letter, saying, Do you know what, your policy that you have now is going to go from \$70 a month, and it's going to triple. It is going to put a heavy weight on her in order for her to stay covered.

So we talk about fair, and we talk about what's fair to everybody—not just to a few but to everybody. My friends get up, and they rail about what we are not doing, about how we are not treating the law fairly. The law is not treating us fairly. Sadly, we are in a time when Americans don't expect an awful lot out of Washington. In fact, it's fair to say they don't expect hardly anything out of Washington, but they do expect to be treated fairly.

So I would say to everybody: Please, let's treat everybody the same. This is America. That's what makes us unique, and that's what makes us special.

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY'S 100TH-YEAR ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Concordia University of Chicago is an American private Lutheran liberal arts university, located in the village of River Forest, Illinois, 10 miles west of downtown Chicago.

In 1855, Lutheran ministers Friedrich Johann, Carl Lochner, and Philipp Fleischmann established a private teachers seminary in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, to train day school teachers for Lutheran schools. In 1857, the responsibility for the operation of the school

was taken over by the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. The synod moved the school to Fort Wayne, Indiana, uniting it with a theological seminary which had been founded there by followers of Johann Konrad and Wilhelm Lohe. In 1861, the theological seminary was moved to St. Louis, Missouri, later to Springfield, Illinois, and then back to Fort Wayne, Indiana, in 1864. The teachers seminary was moved to Addison, Illinois. Concordia University makes its foundation with the 1864 move to Addison, Illinois.

Originally called Concordia Teachers Seminary, then Concordia Teachers College, the institution is the oldest in the Concordia University system. The original building is gone, but a monument still stands on the site of the seminary in Addison, Illinois.

In 1913, the college moved to its present campus in River Forest, Illinois. In 1979, the institution expanded its education-centered program to become a full liberal arts institution, and it changed its name to Concordia College. In 1990, having experienced a tremendous growth in its graduate offerings, the school recognized and changed its name to Concordia University. The university was officially known as Concordia University, River Forest until 2006, when the current name was adopted.

In 2006, CURF was the only university in the 10-school system to achieve the rank of top tier on U.S. News & World Report's "best college" list. They were also awarded this ranking in 2010.

Concordia University Chicago has a prominent and a prestigious music department among schools of a similar size. However, education is still Concordia's largest academic program. Other programs include business, communications, theology, and many other undergraduate degree programs. Concordia University's enrollment for the 2012–2013 academic year is 5,454 students, and many of these students plan to become church workers.

I am inspired when I read the university's mission statement, which is:

As a distinct, comprehensive university of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, centered in the gospel of Jesus Christ and based in the liberal arts, Concordia University equips men and women to serve and lead with integrity, creativity and compassion in a diverse, interconnected and increasingly urbanized church and world.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate and salute Concordia University on its 100 years of teaching and service in the Chicagoland community.

DEATH BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a fallen soldier from my

district, and I urge the passage of a bill later today to ensure that death benefits still flow to the families of our military heroes despite the government shutdown.

Army Ranger Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins, from Carlisle, Pennsylvania, was killed this past Sunday by an IED.

Sergeant Hawkins was on his fourth tour in Afghanistan and was serving as a rifleman, a gun team leader, and a Ranger team leader when he was killed. Fittingly, he was tending to another wounded Ranger when he was killed. Sergeant Hawkins was clearly following part of the Army Ranger creed, which says:

I will never leave a fallen comrade.

Mr. Speaker, we should take that advice as well here in this body and not leave behind Sergeant Hawkins' wife, Brittanie, of Lansing, Kansas, or his parents, Roy and Sheila Hawkins, of Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

Here in the House, we thought we had taken care of this problem by passing our Pay Our Military Act soon after the shutdown occurred; but, apparently, the Pentagon wants to have more explicit guidance on their ability to provide the death benefits to military families. So let it be said loudly and clearly here in the House of Representatives: we will never leave a fallen comrade.

I urge my colleagues to pass the bill to make sure that the \$100,000 gratuity is paid to cover final costs for Sergeant Hawkins and for all of our other brave men and women in service and that loved ones left behind receive what they are entitled to. I hope that the Senate follows suit and that the President signs it into law so that there is no further delay.

May God bless Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins and all others like him who defend our freedoms every day.

OBAMA REFUSES TO PAY MILITARY DEATH BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am gravely disappointed at the lengths the White House has gone in order to manipulate American lives as they seek to coerce America's elected House of Representatives into spending money America does not have on a dysfunctional, socialized medicine program that does not work, that threatens American lives, and that a majority of Americans do not want.

Congress and the White House agree on, roughly, 99 percent of Federal Government spending. We should fund that 99 percent, reopen the Federal Government, and debate our disagreements on the remaining 1 percent, but the White

House and Senate refuse to do that. Instead, President Obama, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID and their Democrat allies force a Federal Government shutdown. They hold 99 percent of the Federal Government hostage to support their all-or-nothing demands.

The lengths the Democrats and the White House will go in order to manipulate American lives and public opinion is most disheartening.

The Obama administration ordered the closings of all Washington, D.C., monuments, thereby denying World War II veterans access to their memorial. Never mind that, in the history of all Federal Government shutdowns, no President has ever ordered and spent taxpayer money to barricade and close Washington's open-air memorials.

The Obama administration disregarded the Pay Our Military Act and illegally ordered furloughs of, roughly, 400,000 Department of Defense civilian personnel for a week, thereby disrupting their lives and, more importantly, jeopardizing America's national security. The Obama administration followed that up with illegally ordering furloughs for who-knows-how-many thousands of defense contractors and their employees.

Never mind that, in doing so, the Obama administration violated the Pay Our Military Act that President Obama, himself, signed—an act that fully funds all defense workers and contractors who “are providing support to members of the Armed Forces,” which, by the way, is all of them.

Yesterday, America woke up to yet another political manipulation by the Obama administration. America's Commander in Chief denied death gratuities to the families of four soldiers and a marine who were killed in Afghanistan. Adding insult to injury, America's Commander in Chief refuses to pay the cost of the burial expenses of our men and women in uniform who have given their lives for their country.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage. It must stand.

The Obama administration claims:

As a result of the shutdown, we do not have the legal authority to make death gratuity payments at this time.

I respectfully disagree.

The Pay Our Military Act expressly states:

There are hereby appropriated sums for fiscal year 2014, such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces.

Death benefits and burial expenses are part of our military's compensation package, a part of the “pay and allowances” the Pay Our Military Act says the Obama administration must pay. Congress should not have to pass yet another bill today to force the President to do what the law already says he should do.

Instead of punishing America's military by illegally furloughing defense

workers and contractors, instead of dishonoring our World War II veterans, our Korean war veterans, our Vietnam veterans by spending taxpayer money to barricade their memorials and by denying them access to their memorials, I yearn for a Commander in Chief who supports our veterans and our men and women in uniform rather than using them as pawns to be sacrificed in partisan, political games. I cannot help but think of the contrast between our current Commander in Chief and our first one.

During the Revolutionary War, George Washington lived with his troops, fought with his troops, and sacrificed for his troops. When the Continental Army was faced with hardship, inadequate food and clothing, George Washington reached into his own pocket and sacrificed his wealth to help the men who fought under his command.

Mr. Speaker, I pray our current Commander in Chief will study and understand the graciousness, the leadership, and the sacrifices of George Washington as he makes decisions on whether to treat our veterans, our troops, and our defense workers with the respect they have earned and deserve.

DENYING MILITARY DEATH BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the legislation that will be considered on the floor of the House today, legislation that would address the unacceptable wrong of denying death benefits to the families of fallen soldiers during the budget impasse.

While I, no doubt, expect our Chamber to pass this critical funding bill that the American people have a right to expect—I hope it's passed not just in a bipartisan fashion, but I hope it's passed unanimously in the House—we must consider what has led us to even have to legislatively fix such an obvious injustice.

The Department of Defense, even during the current impasse, is spending sums in the billions of dollars.

How is the debt payment for members of the military not considered essential, Mr. President? What was the decision-making process to deem the death benefits nonessential, Mr. President? Who made the final call in this decision, and why are you not firing that person?

This follows the same pattern that we saw earlier this year when the President cut military tuition assistance. We were able to restore those needless cuts and have introduced a bill to ensure the President does not continue to play games with the tuition assistance as early reports indi-

cate that military tuition is again being held back from families. Simply put, we made promises to our fighting men and women and their families.

Mr. Speaker, the House is ready to keep those promises, but the President is demonstrating, at best, a failure to lead and, at worst, bare knuckle partisanship.

AN ADULT CONVERSATION ABOUT FIXING OUR ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President and his allies claim that the shutdown of government is about one thing—a Republican obsession with ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, they are missing the point completely.

For the past 3 years, the House has been working to improve our economy, to create private sector jobs, and to address barriers that inhibit economic growth. ObamaCare, unfortunately, has emerged as one of the largest challenges standing in the way of job creation: workers are having their hours cut; families and businesses are facing higher premiums; employers aren't expanding because of the uncertainty.

Fixing the health care law would have the quickest impact on the economy; but, in fairness, we can't do that unless the other side sits down and talks to us. Thus far, the Senate and the President have rejected all efforts of the House and refuse to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, this debate should be about caring for the American people, their futures, and the liberties we share in America. We want to reopen the government and help families find jobs, but that requires that the House and the Senate and the President sit down together and have an adult conversation about fixing our economy.

TIME TO PAY THE PIPER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, as the clock ticks, the country gets closer to a time when it will run out of money.

People probably couldn't understand all of the debate leading up to the implementation of ObamaCare just a few days ago, and some of the questions and debate became blurred. That was one of the biggest government programs—largest spending programs—probably in the history of our Nation; but it did have consequences, because you are spending more trillions of dollars, and if we are going to provide health care, we want it right. There are many Americans who don't have health care, and we should assist them in a responsible fashion. The roll-out has been

a disaster. We are holding a hearing on that in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

All that being said, it's about time to pay the piper here. I think the American people will understand, and can understand, that the country is close to default. The country is close to default because we have incurred an indebtedness that will soon exceed \$17 trillion, an indebtedness which, again, will reach the current limit next week. They are asking for another \$1 trillion or \$900 billion to get us one more year. We are going to have to pay the piper.

When you spend \$1.5 trillion more a year in the first year with the Obama administration and, in each succeeding year, over \$1 trillion more than you took in, you acquire an indebtedness. It was \$9 trillion when President Bush left office, and it will soon be \$18 trillion in some 6 years, the most indebtedness of any nation. We can't become a Greece. This is not that difficult to understand.

When the government can't pay its bills, if folks think there is a temporary shutdown now, think of a permanent shutdown. Think of going to the bank and not being able to withdraw money or, as you've heard, not being able to obtain a mortgage. The full faith and credit of the United States of America will collapse. Just like when an individual spends more than he earns, he must pay the piper. Hopefully now, everyone can understand we are in that situation and that we must act responsibly.

Republicans are not standing in the way. Republicans are trying to save the day because this is coming due. The bill is due. We must find a way to cut spending, reduce the amount of Federal spending and keep the debt down. It's that simple. If the President of the United States will not negotiate and if the Senate will not negotiate, you cannot achieve what we need to do to be responsible as stewards of the American people. We are one half of one-third of the government, so this isn't all our responsibility.

We are trying to act responsibly, and we are asking people to come together and find a way to reduce spending in a responsible manner. If we have got problems with some programs like ObamaCare, let's fix them. Let's get this spending down. Again, this is the time we are going to have to pay for all of these government programs, for the spending that has gone on unchecked and for the indebtedness the United States has incurred.

Just a final lesson: the Constitution and the Founders put all spending—the appropriations, the funding of programs—and also the responsibility for raising taxes with this body, the House of Representatives. They did so because we are closest to the people. We get elected every 2 years. They chose to have the Republicans in the majority

in order to control the spending that went out of control and the government programs that went out of control.

So that is what we are doing, what they sent us here to do; and we must do it in a responsible fashion. We are here. We were here before the shutdown. We have asked to negotiate. We will continue to do that. Our leaders are committed to doing that, to working in a responsible fashion. We have to get this right. We must pay the piper. The piper is calling our bills and our credit due, so let's join together and act responsibly.

THEIR WAY OR THE HIGHWAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 3 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, members of the Republican Women's Policy Committee sent an earnest letter to Senator HARRY REID, asking him to please put aside the partisanship for a second and to take the opportunity to enact commonsense legislation to help our kids; take up bipartisan House legislation to restore WIC; to open NIH; and to fund Head Start.

Senator REID has done nothing, though, and President Obama said that it's their way or the highway, to give them everything they want or get lost.

In North Carolina, our WIC program doesn't have sufficient funds to issue new vouchers until the Senate acts. It's the Senate's choice. They should do the right thing. At this point, however, the Senate is rejecting common ground.

Senate Democrats are refusing to make government work for the American people because they won't even agree to having a conversation about whether all Americans should be treated equally under ObamaCare. Health care is a matter of security to many Americans; and health care, as we all know, is changing drastically next year. For many in North Carolina, it is becoming more expensive; and for others, their plans are being canceled.

When asked why American families are being denied a 1-year delay of the individual mandate so they can figure out ObamaCare without having the threat of government penalties, the Secretary of Health and Human Services suggested that the way to "opt out" of the mandate was to simply allow government to levy a fine against you. That sounds like a fair choice, doesn't it? Individual Americans do what we want or pay an unprecedented tax on your behavior. Mr. Speaker, the refusal even to acknowledge the specter of unfairness in ObamaCare's implementation is shocking.

Consider the great lengths Senate Democrats are going in order to prove

a point about not negotiating: Senate Democrats won't call a vote on legislation to fund the National Institutes of Health, to ensure pay for Guardsmen and Reservists, to stop veteran benefit application delays, to fully fund WIC, to restore Head Start, to restore FEMA or FDA funding. Senate Democrats won't call a vote to reopen the national parks.

Throwing all of this common ground by the wayside—common ground that will help people—is inexcusable. The President and the Senate need to start explaining why their way or the highway is more important than doing their jobs and finding a compromise to end this shutdown.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Rod MacIlvaine, Grace Community Church, Bartlesville, Oklahoma, offered the following prayer:

Father, I thank You for the heroic leadership that this House of Representatives has exemplified in the past week during this present crisis. I thank You for their late nights. I thank You for their efforts to seek compromise. And I thank You for the creative solutions they have proposed.

Yet, Lord, at present, there is no solution. So today, Father, we confess our desperate need for You. We joyfully concur that You are the source of wisdom, and all strength resides with You. You are the author of unity even when parties are in conflict. So we ask that You would grant supernatural breakthrough.

Where there is no way forward, we pray that You would forge a way. When negotiations break down, please grant fresh ideas for debate.

We ask this, Lord, for Your glory and for the good of the American people.

We pray this in Jesus' name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. ROD MACILVAINE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of our guest chaplain, Dr. Rod MacIlvaine. Rod MacIlvaine is the founding senior pastor of Grace Community Church in Bartlesville, Oklahoma, a community just north of Tulsa.

He also serves as a fellow with the Veritas Center for Faith, Freedom, and Justice at Oklahoma Wesleyan University, and he is an adjunct professor in the doctor of ministry department at Dallas Theological Seminary.

His ministry at Grace Community Church concentrates not only on worshipping the risen Christ, but also on equipping people to serve the city, especially helping people recover from substance abuse and painful pasts.

For the past 10 years, he has also worked through a missions organization he cofounded called "Grace Missions International."

He and his wife, Cindy, have been married for 34 years, and they have four children: Sarah, Kristin, Caleb, and Jared, and six grandchildren, including one adopted from Uganda.

I want to thank Dr. MacIlvaine for serving as our guest chaplain today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, when the hallmark of "Presidential leadership" becomes the refusal to have a conversation, we all should be concerned.

Our country is facing some very real challenges right now. To name a few:

Government is shut down because the Democrat Senate won't fund operations unless the House allows ObamaCare to be implemented unfairly;

Families in my district will be forced to spend thousands more next year on health insurance because of the President's partisan health care overhaul;

The country is days away from exhausting its \$16.7 trillion debt limit.

These challenges are bigger than any one party, and our solutions must be, too.

Not negotiating when such pivotal matters are at stake is wrong. It betrays years of precedent, and it contradicts the bipartisan reality of divided government.

House Republicans want to reopen government as soon as possible, but we can't shape a fair bipartisan solution when we're the only ones willing to sit down, talk to the other side, and negotiate.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican mantra of the day is that the President won't negotiate. Give me and the American people a break.

The President sat down with Republicans many times, and I think he tried harder and longer than he should have to reach bipartisan agreements. The cuts they produced hurt my and many other communities.

A popular definition of "insanity" is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result.

The Biden task force, the Simpson-Bowles, and the Domenici-Rivlin Commissions were bipartisan and produced nothing. I recall the Speaker walking out on one of the talks.

In the temporary CRs, Budget Control Act and lifting the debt ceiling in the last Congress, Democrats compromised on important programs, and, frankly, there's no place left to cut.

As the President said yesterday, "I don't know why Democrats right now would agree to a format that takes off the table all the things they care about and is confined only to the things the Republicans care about."

To go to the table with a gun to our heads in a decidedly one-sided negotiation would really be insanity.

We need to, as Chaplain Black prayed last week, "stop the madness" and restore sanity in this House. Mr. Speaker, you can do that today by bringing a clean CR for a vote and lifting the debt ceiling so that the United States can pay its debts.

IRAN SANCTIONS

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, a nuclear-armed Iran is simply unaccept-

able and would pose a grave national security threat to our Nation and our allies.

Sanctions against the Iranian regime are having an effect on their nation's economy and remain a key tool for U.S. policymakers. Unfortunately, the Obama administration is asking to delay new sanctions following all the talk about historic, high-level meetings, and phone calls.

Mr. Speaker, now is not the time to be fooled by the rhetoric coming out of Tehran, especially as they push harder every day to develop a nuclear bomb. Before we even begin to discuss any deal with Tehran, we need to increase the pressure that has been working. It's time for the Senate to pass the House's new round of sanctions, which recently passed on this very floor with 400 votes.

Each day the Iranian regime is able to further drag out the promise of talks is another day that centrifuges will keep spinning. Once they're done spinning, they won't have any need to talk again.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, we are now in day 9 of the Republican government shutdown.

Let's keep it real. Come on. This could end tonight if Republicans vote "yes" on a clean CR. The problem is that the Republicans only want to pass partisan bills with no attempts to reach across the aisle. Instead, Republicans are bringing bills up for votes that claim to fund the VA, feed children, and cure deadly diseases when, in fact, they actually reduce funding for these very important programs. The appeasement of the far right, the Tea Party, is the opposite of good governing and bipartisanship, and it needs to stop today.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I am disheartened by my Republican colleagues' inability to compromise for the benefit of the American people. It's not fair to the constituents that I represent in places like Grand Prairie, people who work at the old Carswell Air Force Base and the Naval Air Station Fort Worth who were recently furloughed as nonessential employees. It's unfair to punish the 62,000 Federal workers in the Dallas-Fort Worth area who have faced uncertain work status as a result of these partisan games.

I urge Republican leadership to stop the parlor tricks. Everything doesn't have to be a partisan battle. It is time for House Republicans to take "yes" for an answer and end the government shutdown today.

DEATH BENEFITS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, last week before the shutdown, this House overwhelmingly passed legislation to provide for our military in case of a government shutdown. We voted to provide them not only pay, but benefits for themselves and their families. Now the President's lawyers at the Department of Defense are blocking death gratuities to the families of those who've made the ultimate sacrifice.

Families of soldiers killed in battle are being victimized by the Department of Defense. It's outrageous. Today, Congress will act again to make our wishes even more clear. The President is the Commander in Chief. He should not be using troops and their families as pawns in this political bickering. He should be doing everything he can to stand up for the men and women of our military. Instead, he is refusing to negotiate until he gets his way. He is violating the trust between himself as Commander in Chief and the troops and destroying their morale.

Divided government is hard, but it's what the people have given us. It requires negotiation and compromise. Let's provide for our troops and their families. Let's sit down and talk, and let's get the whole government reopened.

IN MEMORY OF NICHOLAS ORESKO, MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT

(Mr. SIRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in memory of Master Sergeant Nicholas Oresko, the oldest living Medal of Honor recipient and Bayonne, New Jersey, native, who passed away on October 4, 2013, at the age of 96.

In the final stages of World War II, on January 23, 1945, Master Sergeant Oresko's unit was pinned down by deadly enemy gunfire as the Battle of the Bulge drew to a close.

As platoon leader with Company C, he made a final, solitary attempt to eliminate the German position in nearby bunkers. Master Sergeant Oresko charged the hill, weathering enemy fire, to throw a grenade into the German bunkers.

Refusing to withdraw from the battle, despite being wounded and weak with blood loss, he continued the assault until he was assured the mission was successfully accomplished. His lone assault wiped out two machine gun positions and enabled his unit to take the hill with minimal casualties.

The true impact of his unselfish actions can never be measured as it extends beyond the lives of the men he saved.

Master Sergeant Oresko was awarded the Medal of Honor by President Harry

Truman on October 30, 1945, for his quick thinking, courage, and unswerving devotion to his country and fellow soldiers.

I rise today in memory of Master Sergeant Nicholas Oresko, to honor his courage and to ensure that those who will sacrifice their own safety for the benefit of the Nation are never forgotten.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, our message in the House has been pretty clear. We want to reopen our government and provide fairness to all Americans under the President's health care law.

This law had a big rollout last week. It has been called an "inexcusable mess," a "rolling calamity," "consumers will face dramatically higher rates," "many remain locked out," "surprise, premiums just went up," "instead of making it easier for people to get health insurance, it will be a lot tougher." What a train wreck.

How can we tax people for not buying a product from a Web site that doesn't work? How can you give big businesses a tax break and leave hardworking families out in the cold?

This is why we need to sit down and have a conversation about the big challenges that face our country.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS WEEK

(Mr. LOEBSACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark Mental Health Awareness Week.

I was raised by a mother who struggled with mental illness her entire adult life. I personally know firsthand how important timely and proper intervention and care are for those who are struggling and how important that care can be.

I want to thank the mental health advocates who have contacted me or whom I have met at Iowa events to raise awareness in my district, events such as the walks hosted by the National Alliance on Mental Illness.

Hearing from those at home in Iowa who are personally affected by mental illness on a daily basis has strengthened my resolve to continue to fight to make improving access to mental health care for all Americans a top priority.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end this shutdown of government and get back to work on the critical issues that face our Nation, including a mental health system that will work for all those who are struggling, as my mom did for so long.

RESPECTING SERVICEMEMBERS AND MILITARY FAMILIES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, two Army Rangers, a nurse, and an Army criminal investigator were killed in action while defending our freedoms on Sunday. Because of a devastating decision made by the administration, the grieving families of American heroes Sergeant Patrick Hawkins, PFC Cody Patterson, 1st Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno, and Special Agent Joseph Peters are not receiving their loved ones' death gratuities.

Over a dozen more military families are also suffering due to the administration's actions and failure to negotiate. When Congress passed the Pay Our Troops Act last week, it was our intent to pay the pay and benefits our brave men and women have earned and deserve without question.

On Friday, I sent a letter to Secretary of Defense Hagel, demanding answers. Our brave men and women serving in uniform risk their lives to keep American families safe. I appreciate today, as a grateful military dad, that Congress will pass a bill restating benefits to our military families who have earned everlasting respect.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

□ 1215

HONORING THE FAMILIES OF FALLEN SOLDIERS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Standard and Poor's, Mr. Speaker, indicates that the wealth of American families has grown three times since President Obama has taken office. But here comes the government shutdown, the Republican government shutdown.

Yesterday I rose to the floor of the House to mourn the fact that we lost five brave young men and a young woman over the weekend in Afghanistan doing their duty. I wrote to the Secretary of Defense to direct him and ask him to immediately pay those moneys for the memorial services and other dollars to their families.

We all are concerned, but there comes the government shutdown, a shutdown because of something totally unrelated, the Affordable Care Act. Never during the time of Speaker PELOSI did we have a government shutdown. So, today, we will come together, as Republicans and Democrats, mourning the loss of those soldiers and having H.J. Res. 91.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that every single Member be

counted as an original cosponsor of this bill to pay those families that are now mourning and that we never, ever again, never, ever again say "no" to our families who have seen their young men and women fall on the battle-ground.

We don't have to do this but here comes a government shutdown. Let us all join on this bill. Let us be cosponsors. I ask the leaders of this bill to put every single Member on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain that unanimous-consent request. Cosponsors may be added by the sponsor in the normal, proper format.

RIISING HEALTH CARE COSTS

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to hear the real-world impacts of the implementation and cost of ObamaCare in my congressional district. Just last week, I received an email from CyrusOne, a small business located in my district. Due to ObamaCare, they anticipate paying over \$36,000 more for their current level of health insurance for their employees once ObamaCare is implemented.

For a small business, these significant new costs inhibit their ability to hire new workers or to simply keep the workers they have on the payroll. Consumers will begin to see the impact of these costs in the form of higher prices passed on to them.

Higher prices and fewer jobs, this is not the health care reform that Americans want or deserve. We must repeal or at least delay the individual mandate before it does even more damage to our economic recovery.

DAY 9 OF THE REPUBLICAN SHUTDOWN

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the ninth day of the Republican government shutdown. There are only 8 more days until we hit the debt ceiling.

I was back home in Rhode Island this past weekend, and heard from many of my constituents who are disgusted with what they are seeing here in Washington. The American people expect their elected leaders to work together to get things done for our country, but there has been absolutely no cooperation since this shutdown began from our friends on the other side of the aisle who are committed to ending ObamaCare.

If the House voted right now on a clean funding bill, it would pass with support from both parties, and the government would reopen immediately; but instead, we are spending another

day trading political rhetoric instead of working on the serious challenges facing our country.

Just yesterday, the U.S. Department of Education released a study of 23 industrialized nations that found Americans fall below international averages in basic problem-solving and reading and math skills. This problem demands a solution, but Congress can't work on this and so many other important issues until the partisan games end.

Let's open the government, raise the debt ceiling, commit to addressing the long-term budget challenges facing our country, and get back to work for the men and women who sent us here.

BLIZZARD OF 2013

(Mrs. NOEM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday, a storm struck western South Dakota and dumped up to 4 feet of snow throughout the region. This has left thousands without power and devastating livestock losses in the area. Some estimate that hundreds of thousands of livestock have been killed, many of which are still buried in the melting snow.

The weekend's blizzard is expected to cost local governments millions of dollars. Those counties and the Governor are expected to petition the President for disaster status and for FEMA funds so they can clear the fallen trees and help ranchers remove all the cattle that died during that storm.

Some in South Dakota are wondering if this partial government shutdown will affect the timing of potential assistance. It certainly does not have to. There may be disagreement over certain parts of the Federal budget, but not on FEMA.

Last week, the House passed a bill to fund FEMA. It passed with Democrat support because there is bipartisan recognition that we should fund non-controversial aspects of our government and stop the attempts of some to make this partial shutdown as painful as possible. It does not have to be this way.

I call on our Senate colleagues to act immediately on the funding measures that we have sent them. It's time to negotiate, to work together, so that we can end this shutdown.

WE'VE GOT TO OPEN UP GOVERNMENT

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Day No. 9, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today is day No. 9 of the government shutdown.

Enough with the games, the name calling, the finger-pointing. It's time we come together, open the govern-

ment, pay our bills, and then begin negotiating a real budget. Yes, let's negotiate a real budget that begins to address our debt and the deficit. But first, we've got to open up government.

In my district, in Rancho Cordova, they've shown us what working together looks like. I spoke with Darcy Brewer, the executive director of the California Capital Airshow. They faced some challenges—high winds, bad weather—but they came together, worked into the night, and didn't shut down. They put on a spectacular airshow.

Mr. Speaker, that's what we do as Americans. When times get tough, we pull together, and we show up. We don't shut down.

THE TWILIGHT ZONE

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask if we've entered the twilight zone.

Last Friday, a bipartisan coalition in the House of Representatives passed House Joint Resolution 75, which ensures the proper funding for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, better known as WIC. Senate Democrats have refused to take action on this legislation, choosing to play political games instead of providing nutritional assistance to low-income pregnant women, new mothers, infants, and young children.

Here's where it gets stranger. President Obama has actually threatened to veto the legislation. The President of the United States is threatening to veto nutritional assistance for little babies and preschoolers?

This isn't a game. Yesterday, North Carolina stopped using WIC benefits because of this unfortunate shutdown.

America elected a divided government, but they expect us to work together. Mr. Speaker, the President needs to convey to the Senate Democrats that they must come to the negotiating table. Senate Democrats must rejoin the normal legislative process. Let's talk.

FURLOUGHED FEDERAL CONTRACTORS

(Ms. TSONGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had a heart-wrenching conversation with a nurse employed at a military installation in my district. She has been furloughed because of the Republican government shutdown. As a Federal contract employee, she is terrified that she won't be able to recover

her lost pay, putting her family at financial risk. "We are the ones suffering," she told me. "We are hard-working Americans working paycheck to paycheck. Something like this can destroy us."

No piecemeal approach, no temporary fix here or there is going to put an end to this reckless shutdown. Only one bill is guaranteed to reopen all of the government—or even any part of it today—and put this nurse and hundreds of thousands of Americans like her back to work.

It is time for the House to vote on the straightforward, Senate-passed funding bill. Mr. Speaker, let us vote.

PUTTING OUR TROOPS BEFORE POLITICS

(Mr. SMITH of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday people across this country were shocked to learn that families of troops who died in combat are being denied death benefits, including a fellow Missourian. Like so many in my district, I was appalled to see news reports showing so little respect or care for the families of troops who made the ultimate sacrifice.

Many issues divide us in this body, but surely Democrats and Republicans can come together to support our troops and to support their families. This issue should rise above any political divide. Troops who lay down their lives in battle should never be forgotten or forsaken by their government.

Today, the House will vote on H.J. Res. 91, Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers. I am hopeful this legislation will then be taken up immediately by the Senate and then quickly signed into law by President Obama. We must correct this wrong.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask every American to join me in prayer for the troops we have lost and for their families who were forgotten by our government.

STOP THE RECKLESSNESS

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER says he doesn't have the votes to pass a clean bill that would keep government open. Yet 198 Democrats would vote for it; another 21 Republicans say they would, too. That's more than the 217 votes needed to pass a bill. That's basic math. The votes are there.

And yet so many people are suffering in this ninth day of the GOP shutdown, people like Leo Finn, who had been scheduled to start a clinical trial at a cancer institute in Boston to battle his liver cancer, but last week, he was told he couldn't because of the shutdown.

The National Institutes of Health has furloughed 73 percent of its staff. Leo, a father of three, says:

Everyone talks about national parks, but the shutdown of the NIH is starting to affect people's lives and whether someone will survive a disease.

Now Leo's life is on hold.

It is time for Speaker BOEHNER to stop this recklessness. It is wrong. It is shameful. Bring a clean bill up for a vote.

PLAN FOR PAYING DOWN THE DEBT

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, the American people understand the importance of making tough decisions and balancing their budgets.

According to the Federal Reserve, over the past 3 months, Americans have worked to pay down their credit card debts by more than \$6 billion; yet the United States Government continues to operate in the red, as it has operated in the red 55 of the last 60 years. Our national debt now stands at \$17 trillion. Now the administration is asking Congress to increase our debt by trillions more.

Mr. Speaker, Americans do not want to raise the debt ceiling again unless they see a path towards paying down the national debt and balancing the Federal budget. American citizens cannot take out a loan without a plan to pay it back. How can our Nation continue to borrow money without any plan to pay it back?

Mr. Speaker, let's stop the culture of debt and despair in Washington, D.C. Let's put a plan in place to pay down our debt, and let's get our country back on solid financial footing.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN EFFECTS ON CONSTITUENTS

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as I awoke this morning and read my local newspaper, I realized that my dear friend Greg Taylor is lying in a medical bed, mostly paralyzed and barely able to breathe, as he copes with ALS, or Lou Gehrig's disease.

This past December, Greg lost his business. If this is not bad enough, Greg's long-time partner of 28 years, Albert Sanchez, was just furloughed, a member of the Department of Defense. Although he may now return back to work, this stress is unbearable as they both struggle to make house payments. I failed to mention, they also have a 19-year-old son.

Today is the ninth day of this government shutdown. We still must do something to stop this shutdown.

Speaker BOEHNER, the Democrats have compromised by agreeing to your budget numbers. Now it is time for you to compromise by giving us a clean bill to vote for.

Let's stop this nightmare. I urge us to move forward.

□ 1230

IT'S TIME TO STOP PLAYING GAMES

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, over 1 week ago, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID shut down the government rather than have an honest conversation about the problems facing this country.

The House has passed not one, not two, not three, but four separate bills that would have kept the government running, while ensuring basic fairness for all Americans under the President's health care law.

And even after the United States Senate rejected every single one of these bills, still House Republicans asked to simply have a conversation, and the Senate said no.

So here we are. House Republicans are working and will continue to work to fund important government functions like medical research and benefits for our veterans. We hope the Senate and the President will join us in these efforts.

It's time for the President and the Senate to stop playing games at the expense of the American people.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF JOHN DOLAN

(Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, often people overlook the treasures in their own backyards; and in Vermont, one of our treasures is the Vermont Institute of Natural Science, an institution that has provided environmental education for young Vermonters since the early 1970s. It has provided help through education, research, avian wildlife, and rehabilitation programs.

Thousands of children in New England have grown up with VINS and taken the lessons they've learned about environmental responsibility and sustainability with them into their adult lives.

Sustaining such a mission over the long term requires persistent work and agile leadership. Dolan has succeeded. He served as VINS president for 8 years and retired on October 1.

John led VINS through a transformation that made it more resilient.

He brought renewed focus to the environmental mission of VINS by enhancing the visitors center, expanding the nature camps, and hosting regional events focused on the environment. He created new partnerships, including an expansive research and education program with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Dolan's leadership helped VINS sustain its inspiring mission, and he leaves the institute stronger than when he came. On behalf of all who have benefited from VINS and who continue to enjoy it, I offer John my thanks and best wishes for his future.

Vermonters are proud of this backyard treasure and heartened that VINS is here to stay.

LET'S TONE DOWN THE RHETORIC

(Mr. WEBER of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans continue to call on Senate Democrats and the President to come to the table and negotiate.

Here's one way to start: let's tone down the rhetoric.

Is it proper to refer to someone you don't agree with as a "hostage taker" or as a "legislative arsonist"?

I don't think so. We may disagree on policy, but this kind of rancor will not solve anything.

Let's work together. It can be done. The House just passed a bill which was not just bipartisan but unanimous that guaranteed back pay for Federal workers, and the bill has the support of the Senate and the President. That's encouraging.

Now the Senate should take up the other bipartisan funding bills we passed here in the House to fund things like medical research and veterans benefits.

Let's negotiate. The American people deserve for us to get this government reopened.

I'm RANDY WEBER and I am proud to be an American.

LET'S MAKE D.C. LISTEN

(Mr. HIMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, when Senator CRUZ took to the Senate floor for 21 hours to explain to the American public why the Congress had to shut down the government and breach the debt ceiling in order to repeal the Affordable Care Act, I listened carefully. One of the themes was, make D.C. listen. Make D.C. listen.

We know, from polling, that 70 percent of Americans oppose shutting down the government to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

But I went, on Monday, to listen to a couple of my constituents, Tamika

Younger and Carla Carey, of Bridgeport. These are two young mothers who drop their children at Head Start in Bridgeport every single day so that they can go off to their jobs to make the money to give those children some quality of life.

Thanks to the Republican government shutdown, there is no Head Start in Bridgeport now, and they are scrambling and putting their jobs at risk to find something to do with those children they love.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's make D.C. listen to 70 percent of Americans and to Tamika and to Carla, who have very real problems today.

RECOGNIZING NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS PETER HIGGS AND FRANCOIS ENGLERT

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the scientists at Fermilab in my district for their work to find the Higgs particle.

Yesterday, Peter Higgs and Francois Englert were awarded the Nobel Prize in physics for independently proposing a theory for the Higgs boson. That theory, initially rejected in the 1960s, led the high-energy physics community on a decades-long quest to find the particle that gives mass to matter.

While this discovery has been largely credited to CERN in Europe, America has been a leading force in the fundamental science that made identifying the Higgs possible.

Hundreds of scientists from my district are working actively on experiments at CERN. They played a leadership role building the Large Hadron Collider. We should all congratulate these scientists for advancing the basic understanding of our universe necessary for forging ahead into the next great frontier.

America is made great by our leadership in discovery sciences, so let's show them the support necessary to continue and expand our own science ecosystem.

IT IS TIME TO END THIS DESTRUCTIVE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. CARNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is time to end this destructive government shutdown. It just doesn't make any sense, and it's hurting people, and it's hurting the economy.

While Congress is wasting time on the shutdown, we have important work to do. We need to reform our housing finance system.

Right now, the Federal Government backs over 90 percent of all mortgages being made. That's just not sustainable. We have to bring private capital back into the markets, and we have to reduce the government's role, but we have to do it in a smart way.

For generations, owning a home has been part of the American Dream. The 30-year fixed-rate mortgage has made that dream possible for many of us, and so our number one priority in reforming our housing finance system should be preserving the 30-year fixed-rate mortgage.

But the legislation currently moving through the House doesn't do that. That's why we need to work together on both sides of the aisle to fix that problem.

We need to reform our housing finance system and protect taxpayers, but we also must preserve home ownership for millions of American families.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER TO ADDRESS OUR DIFFERENCES

(Mr. STIVERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues in the House and the Senate today to work together to address our differences to fix this government shutdown.

The House has started by unanimously passing a bill that will pay furloughed Federal workers back pay. We've also passed bills that will fund lifesaving research, Head Start, veterans, and many other important parts of the government.

While some people have called this a piecemeal approach, those people ignore the fact that that's how our appropriations process has worked for over 230 years, with multiple appropriations bills every year. That is the real normal.

Mr. Speaker, let's tone down the rhetoric and work together and get our government funded and pay our debts.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN STOPS MILITARY DEATH BENEFIT

(Ms. CASTOR of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the harsh impacts of the Republican government shutdown is the fact that military families of our fallen heroes will no longer receive survivor benefits. They have been suspended.

Meanwhile, on Sunday, 8,000 miles away in Afghanistan, four Army Rangers were killed and 30 others were wounded by a suicide bomber and an IED. That's why I urge the approval today of legislation on the floor to provide the death benefits to our fallen soldiers.

But I'd also like to salute a Tampa, Florida, foundation, the Special Operations Warrior Foundation, that has stepped forward to fill the void and will provide four very generous grants to the families of our brave soldiers killed in action.

They typically provide scholarships and financial aid and counseling to the families of Special Operations soldiers, and I'd like to thank them: Retired Air Force Major Steve McLeary, Retired General Doug Brown, Retired Vice Admiral Joe Maguire, Melinda Scofield and Dahlia Munoz, and the entire board of directors, and the greater community of the Tampa Bay area that supports Special Operations Command and all of our brave heroes.

STOP EXAGGERATING AND FEARMONGERING

(Mr. MULVANEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, while we disagree from time to time, in fact, we agree more often than we probably disagree in this House. I think everybody can agree that one of the things we'd like to try and preserve is the concept of a reasoned debate. We want to have reasoned debate about the issues.

It is impossible to do that if folks start exaggerating and fearmongering, and that is exactly what is happening right now on the discussion of the debt ceiling. We hear that if we don't raise the debt ceiling, the world is going to end.

We've been trying to convince people for the last several weeks that the debt ceiling and the default are not linked in any fashion. Thankfully, just 15 minutes ago, somebody else came and agreed with me on this. It's Moody's, who says:

We believe the government would continue to pay interest and principal on its debt even in the event that the debt limit is not raised, leaving its creditworthiness intact. The debt limit restricts government expenditures to the amount of its incoming revenues; it does not prohibit the government from servicing its debt.

It goes on to say these two things are not linked. Let's have a reasonable discussion about the debt ceiling and the import of raising it and the import of running the government.

But let's stop trying to scare people and the markets into thinking that if we don't raise the debt ceiling that the Nation will default on its debt.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM IS LONG OVERDUE

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, comprehensive immigration reform is long

overdue. The leadership the President, the Senate, and the Democrats in this body have shown has been tremendous.

Yes, we must provide a pathway to citizenship for the 11 million living in the shadows. Yes, we must provide the promise of the American Dream for the millions of youngsters brought here through no fault of their own; and, yes, we must ensure that this immigration bill is a comprehensive immigration bill, open and accessible to all.

Diversity visas are one of the few ways and paths that those from Africa and the Caribbean have to become American citizens.

In many African countries, whole cities gather to hear the results of the diversity visa lottery. What's more, immigrants from Africa and the Caribbean typically are more educated, with the ability to contribute to our economy right away.

If we are going to have true comprehensive immigration reform, then we must keep the diversity visa lottery intact at its current levels because our diversity is what makes this Nation great.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SURVIVOR BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 91) making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military servicemembers of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 91

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for death gratuities and related benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided for fiscal year 2013 in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013 (division C of

Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for "Operation and Maintenance" and "Military Personnel" accounts for continuing the following projects and activities that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution or the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113-39), and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013:

(1) The payment of a death gratuity under sections 1475-1477 and 1489 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The payment or reimbursement for funeral and burial expenses authorized under sections 1481 and 1482 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The payment or reimbursement of authorized funeral travel and travel related to the dignified transfer of remains and unit memorial services under section 481f of title 37, United States Code.

(4) The temporary continuation of a basic allowance of housing for dependents of members dying on active duty, as authorized by section 403(l) of title 37, United States Code.

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each program or activity shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Department of Defense Survivor Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 91, the Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act.

Our government has no greater responsibility, Mr. Speaker, than to take care of the families of our brave men and women who have fought and died for our country. This bipartisan legislation provides continuing appropriations to ensure that, if troops are killed serving our country, our government will honor its obligations to them and their families without delay.

Specifically, the bill would provide for the payment of death gratuities and other benefits, such as military housing allowances, to the families of our fallen soldiers. It would provide for authorized funeral and burial services for servicemembers and their families.

This measure would also pay for families to travel to meet the remains of their loved ones returning home. This bill provides appropriations to pay benefits upon the deaths of military servicemembers.

My colleagues, while this bill is written as a "continuing appropriations act," I want to be very clear. The intent of this legislation is to fully fund the specific benefits for all authorized recipients.

Mr. Speaker, we have a solemn duty to take care of our troops and their families, especially as we remain a Nation at war.

Our men and women serving in uniform, serving in dangerous places all over the globe, deserve the peace of mind of knowing that during the worst of times their families will receive the benefits they deserve immediately. This bill removes any ambiguity on this point.

This is a bipartisan bill with Democratic and Republican cosponsors that, I believe, should pass with overwhelming support.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, we are all looking for legislation upon which we can reach consensus. I am hopeful this bill will bring us together, and I urge support for it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, first of all, to thank Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN for bringing this legislation to the floor. I want to thank Chairman YOUNG of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and the subcommittee members for their work, and I certainly support the gentleman's legislation.

Unfortunately, the Department of Defense had to report that since October 1 of this year, 17 servicemembers have perished whose survivors would be entitled to a death gratuity payment. So the gentleman's legislation is correct in that it is timely, and it should pass.

The only other observation I would make at the beginning of the debate is the House passed the Pay Our Troops Act, H.R. 3210. I would hope that none of our colleagues are under the misimpression that we have solved all of our problems relative to our national defense because, in a comprehensive fashion, essentially, it deals with about 40 percent of the Department's budget.

The problem that Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN is attempting to address today is but a slice of that 60 percent that, unfortunately, the Government of the United States has not dealt with since the beginning of the fiscal year. But, again, I strongly support and thank the gentleman for his efforts.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, the Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act. This bill, as has been said, will ensure that the families of U.S. military members who have given the ultimate sacrifice will receive the benefits they were promised in spite of this unfortunate government shutdown.

The House has voted to take care of our warfighters by ensuring that they will be paid during the fiscal crisis, but our responsibility to our soldiers doesn't end there by any means.

As they put their lives on the line on behalf of this Nation, our brave soldiers shouldn't be concerned about who will take care of their families. That's part of our Nation's agreement with our men and women in uniform: You take care of the United States, and we will take care of you and your beloved family.

To this end, the bill allows continued funding to guarantee that the government honors its commitments to our military families without delay. It allows funding to provide a death gratuity to families of fallen soldiers. This is a lump payment to assist them in one of their greatest times of need.

The bill also allows for the customary financial assistance for funeral costs, family travel and housing, back salary payments, and living expenses. It's certainly the least we can do for those who make the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

The reality is we are a Nation at war. Wars don't stop just because our government is not functioning properly, nor do our obligations to our soldiers get put on pause while we work to clean things up.

To the families who have lost a son, a daughter, a sister, a brother, a husband, or a wife to war, this bill is our

commitment to you that you should not have to suffer even more heartache after such a significant loss.

This legislation is the right thing to do. It should be passed without delay. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER).

Mr. BARBER. I thank the gentleman.

First of all, I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY for taking up this critical legislation and for moving it so quickly to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, our Nation lost five patriots in Afghanistan. We need to remember who they were:

First Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno, U.S. Army;

Sergeant Joseph Peters, U.S. Army;

Sergeant Patrick Hawkins, U.S. Army;

Private First Class Cody Patterson, U.S. Army;

Lance Corporal Jeremiah Collins, U.S. Marine Corps.

Thirty-six hours after they were killed, their families were notified that our government would not pay death benefits because of the government shutdown.

When I heard about this yesterday morning, I simply could not believe it was true. I asked my staff to look into the matter and find out if it could possibly be true. Unfortunately, they confirmed that indeed we had denied these benefits. We took immediate action, and along with a bipartisan group of Members representing the districts where these fallen heroes lived, we moved forward and introduced this legislation.

As has been said, the bill will provide funding to pay survivor benefits and cover the funeral costs for these military families and all servicemembers who may give the ultimate sacrifice during this shutdown of our government services.

God forbid that any other family should be put in this situation again. It is absolutely abhorrent that we would leave our military families without assistance when they are at their most vulnerable time of trying to deal with their loss and grief.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.J. Res. 91, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY),

a distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey in all matters related to national security, as well as the leadership of the gentleman from Indiana.

I also appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey's bringing this measure to the floor. It's rather unfortunate and somewhat amazing to me, actually, that he has to.

The Pay Our Military Act passed the House on September 29, passed the Senate, and was signed by the President the next day. It says clearly that there are hereby appropriated such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces.

Who would have ever thought that some lawyer in the Pentagon would say that the death and other benefits we are talking about today would not be included in that? Rather than spend more time in squabbles with lawyers, I think the gentleman from New Jersey wisely has brought this measure to the floor just to make it clear so everybody understands that all of these allowances should be paid.

I think it's also, Mr. Speaker, very important for all of us to say that our hearts grieve with the families for whom this benefit is immediately relevant. Money alone, of course, cannot express our gratitude for the sacrifice and the service that their loved ones have given to this country. But it is important, even in these times when we have differences on fiscal and other issues, that the House come together and everybody unites, regardless of our opinions about other targeted funding issues, to say that we will stand with those families who have given so much to our Nation.

So, again, I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing this, and I hope that all of my colleagues will vote in support of this measure.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans made a purely political choice to shut down our government to advance their agenda.

Unbelievably, House Republicans decided to shut down our government with thousands of American servicemen and -women on the battlefields in Afghanistan. We are here today because brave Americans who gave their lives on the battlefield were being denied funeral benefits because of this shutdown. Their families were being denied payments of survivor benefits.

This is a disgrace and a shameful consequence of the irresponsible Republican majority. This is an outrage.

The fact that we are here today to pass this bill is a clear admission that America's fallen heroes have been abandoned in this shameless political game being played.

Passing this bill is absolutely needed, but this bill requires us to recognize the willful failure of the Republican leadership in this House to fund our Federal Government and to provide our servicemen and -women all that they need.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and all of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee who are bringing this up so quickly and for fast-tracking it.

Mr. Speaker, I was in the Marine Corps. I did three tours: two in Iraq, one in Afghanistan. I served with these men and women. I have met their wives, their husbands, their kids, their families. I sat down with them. I've had dinner with them. I want to say from the bottom of my heart, I apologize for the shameful act of the administration's lawyers in determining that what we passed last month does not count for paying this death benefit.

When the lawyers in the administration made the decision to not count the death benefit, they broke a sacred trust with our U.S. military men and women and those on the front lines. It is up to us in this Congress to restore that trust for the American people and for our military that we have sent to war for whom we have a responsibility.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER).

Mr. BARBER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say the denial of this benefit is absolutely outrageous, and it is a disgrace. We've broken our fundamental promise to fallen heroes, and we must fix it. This bill will do just that.

We must also ensure that it never happens again. That's why, later today, I will be introducing a bill that makes sure we never forsake our fallen servicemembers or any member of our uniformed services ever again under these circumstances.

I am very pleased that we came together today in a bipartisan fashion. I thank my colleagues for coming together and for putting their differences aside in order to honor these commitments to those who have fallen and in order to take care of their families in this time of need. I hope we will see a unanimous vote in approving this bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN. I am very grateful that my oldest son's in-laws are ably served in New Jersey by Congressman RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today to express my shock at the administration's absolutely disgusting failure to keep faith with those who paid the ultimate price in the service of our country.

Today, four of our fallen have arrived at Dover Air Force Base, and the families in attendance will have had to pay their own way to be there for the arrival of their loved ones. This is a disgrace and an intentional policy to cause pain by this administration, whose actions are disrespectful of those who have made our freedoms possible.

Soon, we will vote to restate the critical death gratuities that we owe in no uncertain terms to the families of our fallen servicemembers to correct the injustice that has been thrust upon them.

I am particularly disappointed in the administration, as the son of a veteran, as a 31-year veteran myself, and as a grateful father of four sons currently serving in the military.

This Congress, in a bipartisan way, passed the Pay Our Military Act. It was signed into law for the express purpose of making sure that those who served in our Armed Forces in the defense of our freedom are paid all that they are owed. The administration already has the authority to pay this gratuity.

Every effort should be made to respect our servicemembers and military families. The administration is playing politics on the backs of the families of our fallen. This is unconscionable.

Today's vote will give us an opportunity to do our duty to take care of the families of our fallen servicemembers. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this bill.

□ 1300

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I rise in enthusiastic support of H.J. Res. 91, and I thank the ranking member and the chairman for recognizing that all Members—all Members—had a pain in their heart regarding those mothers and fathers who are now suffering the loss of their children, four young men and one young woman, to my recollection, names that we should never forget because we are a Nation at war. For that reason, I believe that this was of great concern to the administration and Secretary Hagel. They're in a dilemma, a conflict, if you will, on the present shutdown of the government.

But I would say to the chairman and ranking member, this is what Congress is all about, fixing the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I will place into the RECORD my letter to Secretary Hagel asking for relief for these families. Now we have it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. If I might just inquire, a question of the Chair on H.J. Res. 91: Would you accept a unanimous consent request to ask that every Member of the House be considered an original sponsor or cosponsor of this legislation, H.J. Res. 91?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's request cannot be entertained. There is a proper procedure for adding cosponsors.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I make that request now.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 8, 2013.

Hon. CHUCK HAGEL,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY HAGEL: Let me express my appreciation for your service to our nation and for the sacrifices being made by men and women in uniform serving far from home to keep America safe.

As you may be aware, this past weekend five members of the Armed Forces fell in battle while serving in Afghanistan. All Americans mourn their loss and extend our condolences to their families.

I am particularly disturbed to learn that death benefits have been withheld from the families of the fallen due to the government shutdown.

I am therefore requesting that you review H.R. 3210, the "Pay Our Military Act," which the President signed into law as Pub. L. 113-039 on September 30, 2013, and direct that death benefits be paid to the families immediately so that they can travel to Dover Air Force Base and defray the cost of funeral expenses for these fallen heroes.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I know how important the work done by our men and women in uniform serving abroad is to the mission of keeping the homeland secure. I know also that your commitment to our men and women in uniform is unparalleled.

Thank you for your reconsideration. Please contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Very Truly Yours,
SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, four brave United States servicemembers died in service to our Nation. Like too many before, Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno, Sergeant Hawkins, Sergeant Joseph Peters, and Private First Class Cody Patterson were killed—far from home—by an improvised explosive device in the remote Kandahar province of Afghanistan.

Now, due to the government shutdown, their families have not been disbursed the standard survivor benefits from the United States military that they are rightfully owed. These bene-

fits include reimbursement to the family for funeral expenses, payment of survivor housing, reimbursement for funeral travel, travel associated with dignified transfer of the remains, and other expenses.

This is, beyond a doubt, an outrage. Two of the fallen, Sergeant Hawkins and Private Patterson, were based in my district at Fort Benning, Georgia. Both soldiers were members of the Army's prestigious 75th Ranger Regiment. Sergeant Hawkins was serving his fourth deployment to Afghanistan and Private Patterson his second.

Imagine the pain these families are going through in coping with the death of a loved one. Now imagine being greeted with the cold shoulder of a shuttered government, their country turning on them all because of an unnecessary shutdown.

How dare we not provide these grieving families with the necessary support in their time of need. I am truly embarrassed that these shutdown shenanigans have impacted these brave soldiers' families in this way.

To those people who say the government shutdown is only of minimal impact, remember these families. This is not minimal. These are our sons and daughters we have sent to combat in faraway lands, and they should never have to question our Nation's resolve in taking care of their families. We must reopen our government so that such inconveniences do not continue to plague our Nation.

In the meantime, let's pass this bill, H.J. Res. 91, for our Nation's military families.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, without question, every Member of the House should support providing a death gratuity for family members following the death of service personnel.

The majority is once again proposing an approach that addresses today's problem but leaves the overarching crisis before us unresolved. Major gaps in capabilities remain with neither a fully functioning national defense nor a fully functioning Federal Government.

The Republican shutdown and piecemeal plan is damaging to the Department of Defense: it hurts our credibility with our allies; reports from the Asian-Pacific Economic Forum suggest that the shutdown raises questions about U.S. political stability and plays into Chinese and Russian foreign policy objectives; and the Army Chief of Staff has said the shutdown is harming readiness.

Even if Republicans' irresponsible piecemeal bills were enacted, at the rate they are going, it would take until after Christmas before the government is fully up and running.

We could end the shutdown today if Republican leadership would allow a vote. Democrats have negotiated. We didn't just meet in the middle; in fact, we agreed to the Republican spending level in the stopgap bill.

How many more times will the majority discover an unintended consequence before they come to their senses and allow a vote to end the reckless Republican shutdown?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. If I could ask my friend how many more speakers he has on his side.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We anticipate, through the Chair, several more speakers; but I assume we are both waiting, perhaps, for some additional.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. That is what both of us are doing, and we can continue talking to each other.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be happy to.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say to the gentleman that I want to salute you and Chairman YOUNG for sponsoring this legislation, which is truly bipartisan, for bringing it to the floor and for giving Members of both parties an opportunity to join together. At a time when there is a lot of disjointment around here and lack of consensus, on this there is no argument at all; and I am highly appreciative of all that you have done to assist in this process.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I appreciate the gentleman's remark about our chairman, Mr. YOUNG, who has announced his retirement at the end of this Congress. You could find no finer person in the world—a kinder heart or wanting to leave the world better—than our chairman.

I would use this time while we are waiting to simply follow on Chairman ROGERS' remark in reminding all of our colleagues that we do continue to be a Nation at war, and while we have lost 17 individuals since October 1, in fact, this Nation has lost 117 people since the beginning of this year.

I do hope, as we proceed with the United States Congress and the administration, people understand that we ought to fully fund not just the Department of Defense for their important job, but the other agencies of this government, and certainly through the regular appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, our government has no greater responsibility than to take care of the families of our brave men and women who have fought and died for our country. This legislation will ensure, as we've said earlier in this discussion, without question and any ambiguity, that the Department of Defense should provide payment of death

gratuities and other benefits to families of our fallen men and women in uniform.

I urge support for this bipartisan legislation, and I thank Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their leadership in making sure this bill gets to the President as quickly as possible.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 91. Yesterday the Department of Defense issued a press release saying the Pentagon does not have the authority to pay death gratuities for the survivors of service members killed in action. This is beyond unacceptable.

Prior to the end of the fiscal year this body passed the Pay Our Military Act, giving the Secretary of Defense plenty of latitude on prioritizing military pay and allowances to Service Members.

This act was understood to provide for death benefits to families of fallen troops during the government shutdown.

I add my voice to the cacophony of frustrated colleagues in disbelief. We are flabbergasted that the Death Gratuity, which provides surviving family members \$100,000 in death benefits, was not brought to our attention sooner.

Our office received a phone call from a constituent yesterday who was enraged that military families were no longer receiving these benefits.

Having deployed as a chaplain in the Air Force Reserves, I have been in those life altering situations where the loss of life uproots a family's sense of normalcy.

The immediate days after learning of a service member's death are critical for a bereaving family. Knowing the cost of burial and other after life care is provided for makes the situation a little more bearable.

I plead with this Congress to not turn this issue into one of our normal political footballs where we punt the issue from one body to the next. Let us decide now to take care of our citizens who have offered up their sons and daughters, husbands and wives to the defense of our Nation.

Today this body will choose the moral imperative and tell the families who have lost it all, your cries are being heard and your broken hearts have moved our Chamber into action.

I implore the House with the strongest conviction I possess to move on this legislation and return military families back to focus on rebuilding their lives.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in strong support of H.J. Res. 91 the Department of Defense Survivor Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution for 2014.

The Federal Government functions as a cohesive unit, not as dismembered parts. The Federal Departments, subagencies, independent agencies, commissions, and offices interact with each other much like a military unit serving in the field.

They have relationships that are not apparent until they are revealed most often when a critical need for the Federal Government function is not present when another agency or most important when someone needs that service.

I along with fellow members of the United States House of Representatives stand together to honor and recognize the sacrifice of Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins, First Lieutenant Jennifer M. Moreno, Sergeant Joseph M. Peters, Private First Class Cody J. Patterson, and Lance Corporal Jeremiah Collins who lost their lives in defense of this nation and pray for their families that they find solace, grace and mercy.

We made a promise to them and to their families to support them when deployed, and take care of their families at home so they can serve without fear or concern for the wellbeing of their loved ones.

We also promised all of our men and women in the armed services that should the unthinkable happen and their lives are lost in the service of this nation we will step in and be there for their families.

This promise is one that the House and the President take very seriously, but the business of politics is intervening in our discharge of the most basic function of Congress to fund the entire Federal Government.

Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins, First Lieutenant Jennifer M. Moreno, Sergeant Joseph M. Peters, Private First Class Cody J. Patterson, and Lance Corporal Jeremiah Collins did not forget their duty nor ignore the obligations to keep the oath they took to protect this nation from all enemies both foreign and domestic.

The majority has to put the nation's interest ahead of their political interest—the ideological, social or cultural values that you embrace cannot supersede the needs of our nation. Congress' insistence on funding some parts of the Federal government, while intentionally not funding others is causing confusion and doubt about what can and cannot be funded.

This is understandable since the Federal funding process has never occurred in this way.

Members of the House of Representatives know how serious Congress takes Federal employees coloring outside of the lines when it comes to Congressional legislative intent when they carry out their work. We do not ask Federal employees to be creative with the purse strings of the government, but the mini-CR process is creating confusion and uncertainty on how Federal employees working with a mini-CR, reduced staff and under Sequestration determine how to proceed within the law.

Appropriations bills can be hundreds of pages long depending on the size of the agency. When the House of Representatives insisted on closing the entire Federal government, then decides to engage in this absurd process of mini-continuing resolution, they knew we were moving Federal employees into uncharted waters.

There will be other surprises regarding what agency is needed to provide a service to a group or another part of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the House majority has this Nation stumbling around a dark room looking for a way out, but we know how to escape this drama. The flashlight that can lead us out of this darkness is the passage of the Senate's clean CR.

I pay tribute to these American heroes:

Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins, 25, of Carlisle, Pennsylvania, assigned to the 3rd Battalion,

75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, Georgia. In 2010, he enlisted into the Army following his high school graduation.

He has been posthumously awarded the Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Service Medal and Purple Heart. Sergeant Hawkins has been awarded the Joint Service Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with two Campaign Stars, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, the NATO Medal, and the Presidential Unit Citation.

Sergeant Hawkins was described by fellow service persons as "a brave and incredibly talented Ranger." It is reported that he was killed while going to the aid of a fallen fellow soldier. The Ranger Creed: I will never leave a fallen comrade, is part of the values held by soldiers—they put others before themselves and in doing so assure success of their missions.

First Lieutenant Jennifer M. Moreno, 25, of San Diego, California, assigned to Madigan Army Medical Center, Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Washington. First Lieutenant Moreno volunteered to be a member of a cultural support team that joined efforts with a special operations task force serving in Afghanistan.

She grew up in Logan Heights with her mother, two sisters and a brother who is also in the Army.

Sergeant Joseph M. Peters, 24, of Springfield, Missouri, assigned to the 5th Military Police Battalion, Vicenza, Italy. It is reported that the Army's Criminal Investigation Command (CID) said that Sergeant Joseph M. Peters was assigned to one of their Special Operations units. Sergeant Peters investigated felony level crimes involving the Army. Peters was the first special agent for CID to be killed in Iraq or Afghanistan.

Private First Class Cody J. Patterson, 24, of Philomath, Oregon, assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, at Fort Benning, Georgia. This was his second deployment to Afghanistan. He was described as:

... courageous and dedicated and lost his life while fighting tenaciously against our nation's enemies alongside his fellow Rangers. Our thoughts and prayers are with the Patterson family.

Lance Corporal Jeremiah Collins, 19, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, assigned to Combat Logistics Regiment 2, 2nd Marine Logistics Group, II Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

We offer our heartfelt sympathy to the families and fellow soldiers of those who died.

Mr. Speaker I ask that my Colleagues work together to end this impasse so that we can have a whole and completely functioning Federal government.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.J. Res. 91.

This past Sunday four of our brave soldiers were killed in Afghanistan by a roadside bomb. Those four included an Army nurse from Joint Base Lewis-McChord, an Army criminal investigator from the 5th Military Police Battalion in Vicenza, Italy, and two Army Rangers from Company B, 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, at Fort Benning, Georgia, which borders my Congressional District, and which I feel a deep commitment to.

And earlier this week I was shocked and angered to learn that the Secretary of Defense and the President were withholding the Death Gratuity for the families of these fallen heroes.

For those of you who do not know what that is, the Death Gratuity is a benefit payable to a designated beneficiary, in a lump sum of \$100,000, for a death on active duty or inactive duty training, and Burial Benefits which provide up to \$10,500 to survivors to cover expenses related to the burial of the service member.

In order to prevent these kinds of delays in benefits, on September 29th, with my full support, the House passed H.R. 3210, the Pay Our Military Act. On September 30th the bill was passed by the Senate and signed into law by President Obama.

Among other things, that bill was to ensure that during the shut down there would be funds available to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components, who are performing active service.

The Congressional intent of the legislation was clear: to give the Department of Defense the authority to pay these very types benefits to the men and women of this great Nation who have sacrificed to preserve our freedoms. It is a shame that the President and Secretary of Defense are playing politics and not honoring the Congressional intent of the bill already signed into law.

What is even more shameful is that as the Commander in Chief, President Obama is not honoring that role. As the head of our Nation's military, I find it incomprehensible that he has not ordered these benefits to be paid out no matter what. Congress has already approved these funds, but the buck stops with the President, literally. How can the leader of our military turn his back on those he swore to lead?

It is for that reason I speak in support of H.J. Res. 91. This bill will ensure death gratuities and related survivor benefits will be paid out to those families who have given the ultimate sacrifice for our nation.

I hope both sides of the aisle show the president today that he cannot play politics at the expense of our fallen service men and women, and their families, and give these brave soldiers the respect they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 91.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 373, I call up the

joint resolution (H.J. Res 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 90

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the heading "Department of Transportation—Federal Aviation Administration".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for

operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Flight Safety Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Federal Aviation Administration Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.J. Res. 90, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I present H.J. Res. 90, a bill providing the FAA with critical funding to ensure safe air travel for the American public and providing critical support for the aviation industry, our Nation's leading exporter.

This bill funds the FAA at the current fiscal year 2013 sequester level through December 15 or until enactment of a full-year appropriation for the Transportation-HUD bill, whichever comes first.

The bill would bring back over 6,000 aviation safety inspectors who are currently not working due to the shutdown. These safety inspectors perform critical aircraft certifications that support American jobs by certifying new aircraft for sale in the U.S. and abroad.

The FAA's aviation safety workforce is also essential to ensuring safety in the national airspace by reinspecting and recertifying the operation aircraft fleets that transport millions of Americans every day.

The bill would also reopen the aircraft registry service, assuring that American-made aircraft can move off the production lines and onto the markets in the U.S. and around the world.

The bill would reopen the FAA Academy to resume the training of new air traffic controllers and ensure that our air traffic controller workforce is fully staffed.

The bill will ensure that air traffic control modernization investments resume, ensuring that our NextGen development and deployment continues on schedule.

This is not a comprehensive FY 2014 bill but, rather, a CR to continue funding the FAA at the current fiscal year 2013 sequester levels. This brings the FAA back to work to ensure the safety of the flying public until we can come to an overall resolution on the FY 2014 funding levels.

I urge the quick passage of this important legislation so that we can send it on to the Senate. Let's get the FAA back to work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1315

Here we go again. This week, the House has considered bill after bill to fund pieces of the Federal Government. We can open the entire government if the House would simply pass the clean continuing resolution passed by the Senate nearly 2 weeks ago. Instead, we are considering a bill to fund the Federal Aviation Administration, but we are leaving many other agencies within the Department of Transportation in shutdown status.

I strongly support the mission of the FAA. The controllers, technicians, and safety inspectors are highly skilled and dedicated public servants. However, I cannot support this piecemeal approach to funding our transportation system.

For example, 94 percent of the Federal Transit Administration's employees are furloughed. More than 1,300 transit agencies across the country are not receiving grants for capital and operating assistance. No funds are provided for the Capital Investment Grant Program, which helps create construction jobs and relieves congestion in our major cities.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's vehicle safety program is shut down. Defects in cars and trucks are not being investigated. Crash tests and safety rulemakings have been suspended.

What about assistance for Amtrak? Operating and capital assistance is discontinued at a time when more than 30 million passengers rely on Amtrak to get to destinations all over this country.

The Maritime Security Program gets no relief in this piecemeal approach. This program provides vital support by helping move the cargo that is necessary to support our national defense efforts overseas.

Finally, the National Transportation Safety Board has furloughed most of its employees. Investigations into last week's tragic bus crash in Tennessee will go undone. Today, we reported a

gas explosion in Oklahoma, which would be the responsibility of this agency to investigate. Will it be investigated? Probably not—only because of the shutdown.

The reckless and irresponsible shutdown that has been masterminded by a small faction of the House is disruptive for our Nation's transportation system and for the programs that support our most vulnerable citizens.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for opposition to this piecemeal approach to this piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard from the other side of the aisle on all of these bills that attempt to reopen many aspects of the Federal Government. We hear them say, well, I am in favor of that program, but I want to vote against it until they bring the entire government funding bill before us.

I would love to do that. I would love to bring the entire budget here. In fact, we did, and we can't get the Senate to act on it. But in the meantime, the other side is saying, I will vote against this because I want to save and vote for the entire Federal Government.

That may work in some of the agencies, but this is safety. This is the safety of people flying the skies of this country and the world. You don't want to delay safety until you can vote on a bigger bill. I think it is irresponsible not to support the safety of our people in the skies.

This bill provides funding to resume operations within FAA that are critical to the safety of our skies and our aircraft fleet. It would bring back 7,000 aviation safety inspectors currently not working, restart aircraft certification activities, resume training for air traffic controllers, reopen the aircraft registry service, and continue air traffic control modernization.

Mr. Speaker, you don't want to mess around with the safety of our people. This bill cures that problem. I can't imagine anyone wanting to oppose this bill.

The sum total of these efforts will help guarantee safe, efficient, and reliable air travel for the American public.

This funding is provided at an annual rate of \$12 billion and will last until December 15, or until the Congress enacts and the President signs full-year appropriations bills.

The language in this bill is yet again nearly identical to what was included in the CR I offered back in September—nearly a month ago.

Once again, we are calling on the Senate to consider and pass this bill. Our colleagues on the other side of the

Capitol continue to call for a clean CR; yet they continue to act on these "clean" mini-CRs.

The House has put forward a plethora of options to fund the Federal Government: first, the four annual appropriations bills to fund the government in regular order; then three different continuing resolutions prior to September 30; and now the short-term CRs to reopen parts of the Federal Government—in fact, more than a third of it so far.

But the Senate is committed to inaction. They didn't pass any regular appropriations bills; they will not pass our clean, short-term funding bills; and they so far have refused to join us at the negotiating table.

Mr. Speaker, that completely puzzles me. It goes against the grain of what has gone on in this country since we have been a country. When the two bodies differ, the Founding Fathers said, if you can't agree, appoint conference members from either body—both bodies—and let them go out and recommend a solution to the problem. It has always worked, except now the Senate refuses to do their duty.

I hope they will consider this bill as a steppingstone toward ending the shutdown. We need to come together in a productive way with open ears and open minds to find a way to clean up this mess.

I urge my colleagues to preserve the safety of American skies. Vote for this bill.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting in that I believe many months ago the Senate, which no one thought would pass a budget, we persuaded them through our votes here in the House to pass a budget, and the House leadership refused to have a conference to appoint conferees so that we could have had regular order, had done the appropriations bills—and I know the chairman of Appropriations wanted to do that—and today here we are talking about safety when most of the air traffic controllers are already on the job.

I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this reckless Republican shutdown.

As if we need any more proof of a broken Republican government funding strategy, today we are considering a fix to a sequester Band-Aid. This is déjà vu, Mr. Speaker, and further admission that the Republican budget strategy just is not working. While this bill puts furloughed FAA workers back on the job, it does nothing for the rest of our transportation system. This shutdown affects our transit, vehicle safety, railroad, pipeline and hazardous materials, and maritime programs, too.

For example, at the Federal Transit Administration, 94 percent of the employees have been furloughed. No grants are being issued to more than 1,300 transit agencies around the country. Additionally, at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, vehicle safety activities, like consumer testing of new vehicles and investigations to identify defects in automobiles, have been suspended.

Now, all of these points aren't to say that Democrats have no desire to avoid flight delays and cancellations because of furloughed controllers. Earlier this year, despite our opposition to the broader FY '14 T-HUD bill, we supported the inclusion of language to prevent controller furloughs. Unfortunately, that effort never advanced because the allocation for the T-HUD bill under the Republican budget forced cuts so deep to very important popular initiatives like the Community Development Block Grant and Amtrak programs that not even Republicans could support the broader bill, and it was Republicans that pulled the bill from the House floor.

We could end FAA furloughs and all other furloughs if the Speaker allowed a vote on the clean CR to end the shutdown. Democrats have negotiated. Let's remember that. We didn't just meet in the middle; we agreed to the Republican spending level in the stop-gap bill. Look no further than a recent headline from the National Journal yesterday: "Nineteen times Democrats tried to negotiate with Republicans. The GOP's biggest talking point of the shutdown is only true if you ignore everything that has happened before last week."

I want to make one other point. I woke up this morning listening to the voice of a furloughed worker with two kids in college who was talking about how in the world he is going to pay his expenses and put food on the table without the dollars that he and his wife count on in their accounts.

Let's look at the facts. Let's listen to these stories in our districts. It is fine to be so cavalier here in Washington and shut down the government, talking about getting rid of our important obligation to pay our debts, but let's look at the impact of this. Let's look at what is happening back home in our districts and think of how critical these workers are, these programs are.

Let's get the bill on the floor that would fund the entire government. This piecemeal effort may sound good. I don't know if it sounds good to your constituents. I don't know if you can fool them that way, but let's put the entire bill on the floor that was at your level that passed the Senate and let's move forward.

Vote "no" on this irresponsible bill, and demand a House vote to immediately end the reckless Republican shutdown.

Mr. LATHAM. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this bill to fully fund the FAA, the Federal Aviation Administration. It is so absolutely critical, both to our economy as well as to our security in the airways, not only on commercial flights but general aviation as well.

Mr. Speaker, during this shutdown, we keep hearing a lot about ObamaCare, but this bill has nothing to do with ObamaCare. It has no strings attached. It just funds the FAA.

I know that many of our colleagues on the other side will say, well, they can't vote for this unless they have an entire clean CR funding the entire government, because they want exactly what they want, and nothing else will do. Yet, they call Republicans "absolutists."

Fortunately, many on the other side will support this bill. In fact, I think it is of note that with all the various CRs, clean CRs, that we have been passing since this shutdown began, all with no strings attached, all that have nothing to do with ObamaCare, we actually now have funded a large part—if not more than half—of the entire discretionary Federal budget.

Unfortunately, the President and the Senate Majority Leader keep saying that they will not negotiate; they won't consider any of these things.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important funding bill.

□ 1330

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), the ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee, I know how important it is to end the shutdown of the FAA, but I do have to ask the question, if safety were so important, why wasn't this the first bill brought to the floor in this piecemeal approach that the Republican side has taken?

Now, look. A safe and efficient aviation system isn't just good for travelers; it's the lifeblood of the economy where I come from. In our State, 131,000 people across over 1,200 companies work in the aerospace industry, but these folks don't just depend on the FAA. Is it safety to say that police departments that need Federal grants to put cops on the beat should have to wait? Is it safety to say that our functioning transit systems have to wait for grants to make the transit systems more safe? Is it safety to say that the

EPA can't issue grants in my district or around the country to make sure that we have safe and clean drinking water? This bill funds none of these priorities.

We should not be opening just parts of the government to serve just some of the people. We should open the entire government for all Americans. The Republican solution to the Republican shutdown, this piecemeal approach picking winners and picking losers, is no solution at all.

It's great that this House wants to make sure that air travel is safe, but why should we stop there? What about safety on our highways?

In the last 10 days, there have been three major, fatal transportation accidents across this country. A plane crashed in Santa Monica, California, killing four; a bus crashed in Tennessee, killing eight and injuring another 14; and less than a mile from this building, one person died and two others were injured during a Metro repair accident this week. But the National Transportation Safety Board can't investigate because this Congress sent the investigators home on furlough.

Let's end this piecemeal approach and move on to a vote on a Senate bill that opens all of the government for all Americans. If it's about safety, let's do it that way. This continued unwillingness to allow one vote—just one vote—to open the government for all Americans and not just some needs to stop. One bill, one vote for all Americans.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. I thank the chairman for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it troubles me that the administration is once again going out of its way to cause pain for the American people and at great risk to America's safety. We see this up close and personal in my district with this incomprehensible closure of the FAA registry office. That is the office that allows air flights to be transferred, to be sold and bought and purchased and entered into service. In previous shutdowns, this office was deemed essential. It was kept open and for good reason. It is the equivalent of DMV for aircraft; you have to keep this pipeline moving. It is important for safety and for workers. It is affecting thousands of families all across the country who build these airplanes—engineers and workers and manufacturers and sheet metal benders—especially in the Fourth District, the air capital of the world.

There are thousands of families, many of them hardworking union families folks across the aisle tell me they care deeply about, and I know that I do, too. I would urge these folks on the other side of the aisle to recognize the importance to our labor force, to keep

America safe, to get the aircraft registry back open, and to pass this legislation on the floor today.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today in support of H.J. Res. 90, the Flight Safety Act. This commonsense bill will restore critical funding to the FAA and help protect airports in northern Michigan and throughout our Nation.

Like so many people in our country, I am deeply frustrated by this government shutdown. I don't want to see air travelers in northern Michigan hurt because the Senate and the President refuse to negotiate on a spending plan. All that needs to be done is for both sides to come to the negotiating table, but the Senate refuses to talk to us. It's ridiculous.

We've already seen this mess in Washington impact airports in my district, like the Cherry Capital Airport in Traverse City. Just this past weekend, dozens of flights were canceled because of this government shutdown. Families shouldn't be stranded at the airport for hours just because Washington can't get its act together. But it doesn't have to be this way. We could fix this problem at our airports right now with this simple piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Flight Safety Act today. I also urge our colleagues in the Senate to take action and pass this measure as soon as possible.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleague that we could fund the entire government if my colleague could persuade his leadership to bring H.J. Res. 59 to the floor. We could have a straight up-or-down vote. It would probably pass in a bipartisan manner, and we could stop the shutdown, and people could go back to work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that we've talked about bringing our employees back from the shutdown. We were told by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that this is very important because here we are dealing with safety, and the reality is that probably the majority of the air traffic controllers and safety personnel, as required by FAA, are working. I can't imagine that the administrator, Mr. Huerta, would put the American public in any kind of danger.

Again, if we would have had a budget conference several months ago, we

could have done the appropriations process and probably funded the entire government using regular order, but I keep hearing that if this vote were to come to the floor that it would pass in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take H.J. Res. 59 from the table and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Well, Mr. Speaker, next time I bring it up, I will try to clear it since there is such enthusiasm to bring the Federal Government back to work.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about H.J. Res. 90, the so-called "Flight Safety Act," which provides limited and insufficient funding for the Federal Aviation Administration, and is test gimmick of the Tea Party dominated Republican majority to extricate themselves from the fiasco they created when they voted to shut down the government.

I am a senior member of the Homeland Security. I chaired the Transportation Security Subcommittee in the 111th Congress and was its Ranking Member in the last Congress. I represent Houston, which is home to one of the nation's busiest and most important airports. So I know the importance of the air transit industry to our economy. And I know that the health of the air transit industry depends upon security of air travel. I support robust funding for the FAA. I support robust funding for TSA. I support and worked to secure increased funding to modernize airport runways, reduce noise, increase the number of air marshals, and to develop NextGen.

NextGen is the name given to the new airspace system to be phased in between 2012 and 2025. NextGen will transform America's air traffic control system from an aging ground-based system to a satellite-based system that shortened routes, save time and fuel, reduce traffic delays, increase capacity, and permit controllers to monitor and manage aircraft with greater safety margins. So while I take a back seat to no one in my support for a modern and secure air transportation system, the bill before us is the wrong way for this House to deal with the pressing budgetary priorities of the nation.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon our Republican colleagues to abandon their current strategy of wasting valuable floor time bring miniCRs to the floor. They know the Senate will not accept them and the President will veto them. This strategy will not reopen the government they voted to shut down.

There are the votes in this House to pass the clean CR from the Senate and send it to the President today. That will reopen the gov-

ernment today. And that is what we should do. Every day we delay passing a clean CR is another day of unnecessary pain and hardship and burden inflicted on the American people.

People like Ramon Encarnacion of Texas, whose 11-year-old son doesn't understand why his father, an FAA aviation safety inspector, was able to greet him when he got home from school this week. "When he came home and saw me here and not working, Mr. Encarnacion said 'But you're always at work.'" Mr. Encarnacion worked for 25 years at American Airlines without ever being furloughed and he never thought he would be out of work when he took a job at the Federal Aviation Administration as a safety inspector last year. But with the government shutdown, Mr. Encarnacion and hundreds of other Texas employees who work for the FAA are getting an unplanned and unpaid leave of absence.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more to the nation's transportation system and infrastructure than the small portion of FAA safety inspectors funded by this piece-meal mini-CR.

The shutdown of the government has crippled many of the safety enforcement and grant-making functions of the Federal Transit Administration, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and the National Transportation Safety Board.

This mini-CR does not end the adverse effects that the government shutdown has had on other transportation safety and infrastructure investments. As long as House Republicans abandon their shutdown strategy: The Federal Transit Administration cannot process or award operating and capital grants to roughly 1,300 transit agencies.

The FTA cannot fund or review major transit capital projects which create construction jobs and relieve congested areas. And FTA cannot implement its authorized safety oversight responsibilities provided in MAP-21. FTA cannot perform these critical functions because more than 9 in 10 (94 percent) of its employees have been furloughed.

There are no funds in this mini-CR for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration so the agency has had to: Suspend investigations into safety defects in vehicles; halt all vehicle safety enforcement, research, data analysis, and consumer testing programs; Delay compliance testing of vehicles and equipment; and Defer safety research on crash avoidance technologies, occupant protection and alcohol detection.

Since there are no funds for the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration in this bill, the agency lacks funds to conduct pipeline and hazardous materials safety inspections or to award pipeline safety grants to state and local governments.

The National Transportation Safety Board has had to furlough 95 percent of employees and suspend investigations into new crashes and incidents.

The same is true for the Federal Railroad Administration, which has no funds for FRA safety inspectors and has furloughed more than half of its employees.

Mr. Speaker, the lack of funding for the Maritime Administration has resulted in the shutdown of the United States Merchant Marine

Academy and a suspension of the Maritime Security Program, which ships cargo to support our national defense efforts overseas.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this mini-CR claims funds portions of the Transportation Security Administration but it provides no funds for commercial aviation screening or Federal Flight Deck Officer Training or Federal Air Marshals travel and training.

Democrats are and have been willing to negotiate over honest differences—but not before House Republican vote to open the government and remove the threat of government default.

Mr. Speaker, people are hurting. Our economy is suffering. The shutdown has cost our economy \$8.5 billion in lost productivity already and that number increases by \$1.5 billion everyday.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end the madness. Let the House vote today on H.J. Res. 59, as passed by the Senate and reopen our government and put our people back to work.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, once again we are considering a piecemeal bill to fund just one part of the federal government while ignoring every other priority. Speaker BOEHNER continues to prevent this House from working its will and passing a clean CR that would open the FAA and every other agency in our government. That is undemocratic and, in the face of increasing negative impacts from this government shutdown, unsustainable.

Of course we all want the Federal Aviation Administration to open. But there are many more transportation safety programs that the House Republican leadership is ignoring by failing to bring a clean CR to the Floor. Just this weekend, there was a terrible accident during track work on the DC metro system. But 95 percent of the National Transportation Safety Board's employees are furloughed, so they can't investigate. 94 percent of the Federal Transit Administration's employees are furloughed, preventing them from fully implementing the new safety oversight responsibilities that so many of us worked hard to include in MAP-21. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has had to suspend investigations into safety defects in cars.

We need all of our transportation systems to be safe. Let's vote on a clean CR today and put all federal employees back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Ms. ESTY. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Esty moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 90 to the Committee on Ap-

propriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Ms. ESTY (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this is the ninth day of the unnecessary government shutdown and the 12th time we've made a motion to bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor—12 times to allow this House to vote on a measure that has passed the Senate, 12 times to allow the House to vote on a budget figure that the Republicans asked for and that has already passed this House—a measure that, based on public statements by Members of this body, would pass and reopen the government immediately.

Across my district and across the country, workers have been furloughed, and veterans and seniors are seeing their earned benefits delayed. People in Connecticut and across America are suffering the consequences of this reckless, unnecessary shutdown in very real ways.

For months, groups in Connecticut that partner with NIH to conduct research that we need to find breakthrough treatments for children and adults with cancer have been asking that we end the budget sequester. Last week, university hospitals and researchers like those in my State came together to oppose the piecemeal approach, and they asked this House to end the government shutdown.

The shutdown means that loans for small businesses to help them grow and create jobs are being delayed. In fact, the average loans for small businesses approved per day in my district are \$188,000, and those businesses put those loans to work in creating jobs, ordering new equipment, exporting their goods, but they can't when the SBA is shut down.

Business travelers need the entire Federal budget reopened, not a gimmick piecemeal bill limited to parts of the FAA. Piecemeal gimmicks are not

a solution for families and children who need the entire Federal Government reopened so that Head Start classrooms aren't closed. Piecemeal gimmicks are not a solution for our veterans who need the entire Federal Government reopened so that they don't face even more unnecessary, harmful delays for the benefits they have earned.

Tax-paying Americans are right to expect their hard-earned tax dollars are used responsibly. What sense does it make for taxpayers to be footing the bill for furloughed workers who are prohibited from working when we can vote today for this motion which would lead to the entire Federal Government's reopening?

Yesterday, I received a report that 801 unemployment claims have been filed in Connecticut from furloughed workers. Taxpayers will be paying unemployment instead of paying people to work. One vote is all it would take, and this motion could be that vote.

It's time to end the shutdown. It's time to send a short-term funding bill to the President. It's time to reopen the entire Federal Government. It is time to be responsible. This is what I hear from folks across my district: Reopen the entire government. A manufacturer in my district let me know that the shutdown is causing uncertainty in its business and its customers' businesses. The shutdown has put a chilling effect on its customers and is harming confidence.

Piecemeal gimmicks are not the solution to this problem, and this disingenuous, piecemeal approach is not acceptable to the Chamber of Commerce or to a coalition of over 250 associations representing multiple private sector job-creating industries. They sent a letter to us even before the shutdown, urging this body to promptly pass a continuing resolution to fund the government and raise the debt ceiling. We need to reopen the Federal Government for all of the American people.

Make no mistake: I want the FAA reopened. I have contract towers in my district. I want the FAA reopened. I want the VA reopened. I want the entire Federal Government reopened. I ask my colleagues to be reasonable and to vote to pass this motion to reopen the entire Federal Government.

I will remind my colleagues who claim that we won't meet part way, we have. Mr. Speaker, the budget figure in this temporary spending bill is your proposal. The Republican budget number is much, much lower, frankly, than what Democrats prefer, but we want to end the shutdown and stop the pain for all of the American people. So we come before this House with the Republicans' own budget figure and ask all House Members to do the right thing. Join us. Join us in reopening the Federal Government. I urge all House Members to vote "aye" on this motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1345

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires that an amendment be germane to the bill under consideration.

As the Chair recently ruled on October 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8, 2013, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and, therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from Connecticut wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us fund a portion of the Federal Government?

My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so that all of the benefits taxpayers have paid for with their hard-earned dollars are available.

Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to open all of the Federal Government instead of just one portion of the government?

We have voted to pay workers furloughed during a shutdown—I supported that bill—but what sense does it make to have workers paid to sit at home and not able to do their jobs? What kind of a strange House is this that would force that situation on our workers and taxpayers?

Mr. Speaker, if you rule this motion out of order, does that mean we will not be opening the entire Federal Government today? Can the Chair please explain why we can't open the entire Federal Government today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Iowa makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to the Federal Aviation Administration. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair ruled on October 2, October 3, October 4, October 7, and October 8, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds because such a motion addresses a matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the underlying measure.

Therefore, the instructions propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of Rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommittal, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 91.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 194, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

YEAS—228

Aderholt	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Amash	Fleischmann	Lance
Amodei	Fleming	Lankford
Bachmann	Flores	Latham
Bachus	Forbes	Latta
Barletta	Portenberry	LoBiondo
Barr	Fox	Long
Barton	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Benishek	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Bentivolio	Gardner	Lummis
Bilirakis	Garrett	Marchant
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Marino
Black	Gibbs	Massie
Blackburn	Gibson	McCarthy (CA)
Boustany	Gingrey (GA)	McCauley
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	McClintock
Bridenstine	Goodlatte	McHenry
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	McKeon
Brooks (IN)	Gowdy	McKinley
Broun (GA)	Granger	McMorris
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	Rodgers
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	Meadows
Burgess	Griffin (AR)	Meehan
Calvert	Griffith (VA)	Messer
Camp	Grimm	Mica
Campbell	Guthrie	Miller (FL)
Cantor	Hall	Miller (MI)
Capito	Hanna	Miller, Gary
Carter	Harper	Mullin
Cassidy	Harris	Mulvaney
Chabot	Hartzler	Murphy (PA)
Chaffetz	Hastings (WA)	Neugebauer
Coble	Heck (NV)	Noem
Coffman	Hensarling	Nugent
Cole	Holding	Nunes
Collins (GA)	Hudson	Nunnelee
Collins (NY)	Huelskamp	Olson
Conaway	Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo
Cook	Hultgren	Paulsen
Cotton	Hunter	Pearce
Cramer	Hurt	Perry
Crawford	Issa	Petri
Crenshaw	Jenkins	Pittenger
Culberson	Johnson (OH)	Pitts
Daines	Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Jones	Pompeo
Denham	Jordan	Posey
Dent	Joyce	Price (GA)
DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Radel
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Reed
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Reichert
Duffy	Kingston	Renacci
Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger (IL)	Ribble
Duncan (TN)	Kline	Rice (SC)
Farenthold	Labrador	Rigell
Fincher	LaMalfa	Roby

Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner

Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao

Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—194

Andrews	Green, Al	Owens
Barber	Green, Gene	Pallone
Barrow (GA)	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Bass	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Beatty	Hanabusa	Payne
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bera (CA)	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Peters (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Blumenauer	Holt	Peterson
Bonamici	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Horsford	Pocan
Braley (IA)	Hoyer	Polis
Brown (FL)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Israel	Quigley
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Butterfield	Jeffries	Rangel
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Ruiz
Carney	Keating	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Kildee	T.
Castro (TX)	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Kind	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Clarke	Kuster	Schiff
Clay	Langevin	Schneider
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Levin	Scott, David
Conyers	Lewis	Serrano
Cooper	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Loeb	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Loeb	Sherman
Crowley	Lofgren	Sinema
Cuellar	Lowenthal	Sires
Cummings	Lowe	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Speier
DeFazio	Lujan, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	(NM)	Takano
Delaney	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Maffei	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Maloney,	Tierney
Deutch	Carolyn	Titus
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Doggett	Matheson	Van Hollen
Doyle	Matsui	Vargas
Duckworth	McCollum	Veasey
Edwards	McDermott	Vela
Ellison	McGovern	Velázquez
Engel	McIntyre	Visclosky
Enyart	McNerney	Walz
Eshoo	Meng	Wasserman
Esty	Michaud	Schultz
Farr	Miller, George	Waters
Fattah	Moore	Watt
Foster	Moran	Waxman
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Fudge	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Galleo	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Neal	
Garcia	Negrete McLeod	
Grayson	Nolan	
	O'Rourke	

NOT VOTING—9

Ellmers	Herrera Beutler	Meeks
Gabbard	Higgins	Rush
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)

□ 1412

Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. SINEMA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 536, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 172, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

AYES—252

Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Jordan
Amash	Duffy	Joyce
Amodel	Duncan (SC)	Keating
Bachmann	Duncan (TN)	Kelly (PA)
Bachus	Ellmers	King (IA)
Barber	Farenthold	King (NY)
Barletta	Fincher	Kingston
Barr	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger (IL)
Barrow (GA)	Fleischmann	Kline
Barton	Fleming	Labrador
Benishke	Flores	LaMalfa
Bentivolio	Forbes	Lamborn
Bera (CA)	Fortenberry	Lance
Bilirakis	Foster	Lankford
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Latham
Black	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Boustany	Galleo	LoBiondo
Brady (TX)	Garcia	Loebsack
Braley (IA)	Gardner	Long
Bridenstine	Garrett	Lucas
Brooks (AL)	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Brooks (IN)	Gibbs	Lummis
Broun (GA)	Gibson	Lynch
Buchanan	Gingrey (GA)	Maloney, Sean
Bucshon	Gohmert	Marchant
Burgess	Goodlatte	Marino
Bustos	Gosar	Massie
Calvert	Gowdy	Matheson
Camp	Granger	McCarthy (CA)
Campbell	Graves (GA)	McCaul
Cantor	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Capito	Griffin (AR)	McHenry
Carter	Griffith (VA)	McIntyre
Cassidy	Grimm	McKeon
Chabot	Guthrie	McKinley
Chaffetz	Hall	McMorris
Coble	Hanna	Rodgers
Coffman	Harper	Meadows
Cole	Harris	Meehan
Collins (GA)	Hartzler	Messer
Collins (NY)	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Conaway	Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)
Cook	Hensarling	Miller (MI)
Cotton	Holding	Miller, Gary
Cramer	Hudson	Mullin
Crawford	Huelskamp	Mulvaney
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (FL)
Culberson	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)
Daines	Hunter	Neugebauer
Davis, Rodney	Hurt	Noem
DeBene	Issa	Nugent
Denham	Jenkins	Nunes
Dent	Johnson (OH)	Nunnelee
DeSantis	Johnson, Sam	Olson
DesJarlais	Jones	Palazzo

Paulsen	Roskam
Pearce	Ross
Perry	Rothfus
Peters (CA)	Royce
Peters (MI)	Ruiz
Petri	Runyan
Pittenger	Ryan (WI)
Pitts	Salmon
Poe (TX)	Sanford
Pompeo	Scalise
Posey	Schneider
Price (GA)	Schock
Radel	Schweikert
Rahall	Scott, Austin
Reed	Sensenbrenner
Reichert	Sessions
Renacci	Shimkus
Ribble	Shuster
Rice (SC)	Simpson
Rigell	Sinema
Roby	Smith (MO)
Roe (TN)	Smith (NE)
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)
Rogers (MI)	Southerland
Rohrabacher	Stewart
Rokita	Stivers
Rooney	Stockman
Ros-Lehtinen	Stutzman

NOES—172

Andrews	Grijalva	Owens
Bass	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Beatty	Hahn	Pascarell
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Himes	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Brown (FL)	Honda	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Polis
Butterfield	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Capps	Huffman	Quigley
Capuano	Israel	Rangel
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carney	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	T.
Chu	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Clyburn	Kuster	Schwartz
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Levin	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lewis	Sherman
Crowley	Lofgren	Sires
Cuellar	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Cummings	Lowe	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lujan Grisham	Speier
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
DeGette	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Maffei	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Maloney,	Tierney
Deutch	Carolyn	Titus
Dingell	Matsui	Tonko
Doggett	McCollum	Tsongas
Doyle	McDermott	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McGovern	Vargas
Edwards	McNerney	Veasey
Ellison	Meeke	Vela
Engel	Meng	Velázquez
Enyart	Michaud	Visclosky
Eshoo	Miller, George	Walz
Esty	Moore	Wasserman
Farr	Moran	Schultz
Fattah	Nader	Waters
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Watt
Fudge	Neal	Waxman
Grayson	Negrete McLeod	Welch
Green, Al	Nolan	Wilson (FL)
Green, Gene	O'Rourke	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Gabbard	Higgins	Young (FL)
Garamendi	McCarthy (NY)	
Herrera Beutler	Rush	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1419

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SURVIVOR BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 91) making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 425, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 538]

YEAS—425

Aderholt	Camp	Culberson
Amash	Campbell	Cummings
Amodel	Cantor	Daines
Andrews	Capito	Davis (CA)
Bachmann	Capps	Davis, Danny
Bachus	Capuano	Davis, Rodney
Barber	Cárdenas	DeFazio
Barletta	Carney	DeGette
Barr	Carson (IN)	Delaney
Barrow (GA)	Carter	DeLauro
Barton	Cartwright	DeBene
Bass	Cassidy	Denham
Beatty	Castor (FL)	Dent
Becerra	Castro (TX)	DeSantis
Benishke	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bentivolio	Chaffetz	Deutch
Bera (CA)	Chu	Diaz-Balart
Bilirakis	Cicilline	Dingell
Bishop (GA)	Clarke	Doggett
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Doyle
Bishop (UT)	Cleaver	Duckworth
Black	Clyburn	Duffy
Blackburn	Coble	Duncan (SC)
Blumenauer	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Bonamici	Cohen	Edwards
Boustany	Cole	Ellison
Brady (PA)	Collins (GA)	Ellmers
Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)	Engel
Braley (IA)	Conaway	Enyart
Bridenstine	Connolly	Eshoo
Brooks (AL)	Conyers	Esty
Brooks (IN)	Cook	Farenthold
Broun (GA)	Cooper	Farr
Brown (FL)	Costa	Fattah
Brownley (CA)	Cotton	Fincher
Buchanan	Courtney	Fitzpatrick
Bucshon	Cramer	Fleischmann
Burgess	Crawford	Fleming
Bustos	Crenshaw	Flores
Butterfield	Crowley	Forbes
Calvert	Cuellar	Fortenberry

Foster
 Foxx
 Frankel (FL)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hall
 Hanabusa
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzer
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Hensarling
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holding
 Holt
 Honda
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huffman
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Kuster
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Latta
 Lee (CA)

Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loebach
 Lofgren
 Long
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnlee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Radel
 Rahall

Rangel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruiz
 Runyan
 Ruppersberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Speier
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters

Watt
 Waxman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland

Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack

Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Herrera Beutler
 Higgins

McCarthy (NY)
 Rush

Turner
 Young (FL)

□ 1433

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 538, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

SHUTDOWN ISSUES

(Mr. POSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, most people are surprised and actually stunned and amazed to discover that the Senate and the House have agreed—at least for the next 5 weeks—on a level of funding.

This is not an argument about money. This shutdown is not about money. There are only two issues stopping the shutdown from coming to an end right this second. The President was on television yesterday, for over an hour, and never mentioned those two issues.

We've agreed on the money. Here are the issues:

Make Congress and the White House obey the same ObamaCare rules as everybody else in the United States of America.

The President gave Big Business and special interests a 1-year break from being a part of ObamaCare.

We want America's workers and families who work hard and play by the rules to have the same advantage. That's what Republicans, Democrats, and Independents in my district say they want.

To give special benefits only to Big Business and special interests is not fair, it's not right, and it's not good for the United States of America.

VOTE ON A CLEAN CR

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I stand here on behalf of my Arizona district to once again make a simple request: allow a vote on a clean funding bill to reopen the government.

In the past week, House GOP leaders only allowed piecemeal votes on bills

that went nowhere. Yesterday, they did it again. This time, they did it with Head Start funding, which is important for the 12 Native American tribes in my district. Schools on tribal lands have already taken a massive hit with sequestration cuts.

The shutdown is continuing this pain, not just with cuts to Head Start and impact aid, but with furloughs from the Indian Health Service and with cuts in funding for programs that protect women from violence.

These piecemeal games are a dead end. They only prolong the shutdown. If House leadership were genuinely concerned about programs like Head Start or Impact Aid, they would allow a vote to reopen the government.

Congress should stop picking winners and losers. This is not a game. We demand a vote on the budget.

LET'S GET OUR ACT TOGETHER

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reiterate again that the bodies have agreed on the general numbers that we have to look at to deal with our budget. We need to do it. We need to get it done, and we need to get people back to work here in the United States of America.

The one thing that shocked me, Mr. Speaker, is last Saturday, I went with my colleague STEVE KING to The Mall because we wanted to open up the World War II Memorial, the Korean Memorial, and the Vietnam Memorial so that our veterans and the American people could visit them.

We were absolutely shocked to find the level of intimidation that was going on. Police dogs were held by park rangers, and mounted police were in front of the barriers in front of these monuments. That's shameful.

What was even more shameful is that there were 90-year-old people in 90-degree weather, and the park system had shut down not only the water fountain but also the bathrooms. We had 10 Honor Flights coming in to visit the World War II Memorial, and in one of the most undignified acts I've ever seen, the Greatest Generation was denied access to a public bathroom in the national park.

That's terrible. We wouldn't do that to anyone. That's why we need to get our act together and get this taken care of.

SHUTDOWN CONSEQUENCES FOR NEVADA

(Mr. HORSFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to give credit where

credit is due and to commend a Republican who understands the negative consequences of this shutdown, and he is the Governor from my home State of Nevada, Governor Brian Sandoval.

Yesterday, he told the Las Vegas Sun that Nevada is struggling because of this ongoing shutdown. He said that Nevadans are going to “see some catastrophic issues going on for the State” if the shutdown continues.

The Sun reported that 362,000 food stamp recipients will see benefits end on November 1 as State employees who administer the program face potential furloughs. In addition, 425,000 women, infants, and children would be cut from food assistance rolls. Rape crisis call centers may be closed. Unemployment claims will not be processed.

Republicans in Congress need to recognize what’s happening in their States. Listen to your constituents. Listen to your State legislators and Governors.

This shutdown needs to end, and it needs to end now.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Las Vegas, NV, October 8, 2013.

Hon. HARRY REID,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.
Hon. DEAN HELLER,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JOE HECK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. DINA TITUS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MARK AMODEI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. STEVEN HORSFORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN: Your service to our state is vitally important, and I want to thank you for your work and dedication. I know we all put Nevada first and understand how special and unique our great state is. We have all worked together to move our state forward, and I will always be grateful for your willingness to put partisanship aside when it comes to Nevada.

I feel compelled to write all of you to express my deep concern with the shutdown of the federal government and its potential impacts on our state. This shutdown impacts how the state operates, the services we are able to provide, and has the potential to set our state back when it comes to economic recovery. In the most basic of terms, this is about ensuring people are fed, houses are kept, and jobs are available.

As you are aware, Nevada was the last state to emerge from the great recession. While we have made much progress since the height of the recession, our unemployment rate still remains above the national average, and our housing market has not fully recovered. And while Nevada’s economy is once again expanding, a prolonged federal shutdown undermines consumer confidence and threatens economic growth nationally. Either of these outcomes endangers the tourism industry that is so important to our state.

Job creation and getting Nevadans working again has been my greatest priority since

coming to office, and I know, as members of the federal delegation, it has been a priority of yours as well. However, I am concerned that we may be forced to take steps backwards as the impacts of this shutdown unfold on the economy. While we do not know the extent of the impact, we know even in the best of times the economic impact of a government shutdown is felt.

I am also deeply concerned about the possibility of a disruption in services to our state’s neediest. Whether it is child nutrition programs, SNAP benefits, unemployment insurance, or dozens of other programs, this disruption in service undermines the economic and nutritional security of Nevadans. Those who are struggling may go hungry or be unable to pay their rent or mortgage. These services are designed to help those who have fallen on the hardest of times. A disruption to these services will be devastating for some.

The state has the ability to cover the cost of some federally funded programs during the shutdown by temporarily allocating money that has been set aside for other purposes. However, we have no assurances that the federal government will reimburse Nevada for any costs that it assumes during the shutdown. It is difficult to make informed choices on how to proceed absent swift action from the federal government to provide clear directions regarding which programs will be made whole and which will not. At a very minimum, the federal government needs to address this uncertainty so the state can plan financially and manage its affairs responsibly.

The State of Nevada cannot be expected to assume the costs of federal programs. We built our budget in good faith with reasonable assurances regarding federal funding levels. To that end, I have included a summary of the shutdown’s impact on the people of Nevada. I implore each of you to work together to resolve the issues in Washington and to honor the federal commitment to Nevada.

Thank you for your attention to this most important matter. As always, I am available to each of you should the need arise to discuss this further.

Sincere regards,

BRIAN SANDOVAL,
Governor.

RESPECT FOR OUR FALLEN HEROES

(Mr. HUDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been 8 days since the government shut down. The postal service is still running. Social Security and unemployment checks are being processed. Citizens can get passports and food stamps, and certain groups that have the right ideology are even given permits to protest on our National Mall; but for some reason, our military families, including those at Fort Bragg in North Carolina, cannot receive emergency death benefits.

This is worse than excusable. It’s shameful.

Last week, Congress unanimously passed the Pay Our Military Act, with the intent that all military pay and al-

lowances will be disbursed during the government shutdown. Unfortunately, this administration has been playing political theater with the families of our war heroes who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

To make our intent crystal clear, today the House passed the Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act. Certain things should transcend politics, and it is up to the Senate and the administration. In fact, they have a moral obligation to join the efforts of the House to fix this problem and to express our deepest gratitude to the families of our heroes.

CONSTITUTIONAL DUTIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue of increasing relevance to our national affairs and to constitutional government properly understood—and that is the requirement that the President faithfully enforce the laws of the land and the failure of the current incumbent to satisfy that obligation.

The Constitution sets out a simple yet effective structure: the major powers of government—legislative, executive, and judicial—are divided into three separate branches of government. The legislative branch—the Congress—passes laws, makes law; the executive branch—the President—enforces law; and the judicial branch—the Supreme Court and inferior courts—interprets laws.

Article II, section 3 of the Constitution imposes upon the President the duty to “take care that the laws be faithfully executed.” This duty has roots in Anglo American law dating back to the Glorious Revolution of 17th century Britain. In fact, the English Bill of Rights of 1689 provided that:

The pretended power of suspending laws, or the execution of laws, by regal authority, without the consent of parliament, is illegal.

For his part, the Founder of our country, George Washington, saw the faithful execution of the law to be one of the President’s core responsibilities. In a letter to Alexander Hamilton, then-President Washington explained that the Constitution’s “take care” clause meant:

It is my duty to see the laws executed: to permit them to be trampled with impunity would be repugnant to that duty.

The duty of the President to “take care that the laws be faithfully executed” is a central component not simply of the executive branch of government, but to the entire constitutional system.

□ 1445

Yet the conduct of the current incumbent has evinced a disregard for

this core constitutional duty. By picking and choosing which laws to enforce, the President has undermined the constitutional order and has failed to keep faith with the basic idea that ours is a government of laws, not of men.

Now the most conspicuous vehicle for the President's disregard of the Take Care duty has been the implementation of the law that bears his name—the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, aka ObamaCare.

Now, it is interesting that of all the arguments that have been put forward to counter those who seek to defund, delay, or repeal this law, the one that ObamaCare supporters have embraced most frequently as of late goes like this: ObamaCare is the law of the land and has been upheld by the Supreme Court; therefore, it cannot be repealed, defunded, or delayed.

Now, this is a nonsensical argument on its face. Congress has the authority to legislate, per article I of the Constitution, and can amend, supercede, or repeal ordinary legislation as it sees fit. But this argument is particularly rich regarding ObamaCare. Because if this law is somehow sacrosanct, then why is the President not enforcing it as written? It is untenable to assert that Congress cannot change the law through legislation but that the President can delay or waive provisions of the law by executive fiat. Exhibit A for this, as it relates to ObamaCare, is the President's unilateral decision for 1 year to delay the enforcement of the so-called employer mandate, a central provision of ObamaCare requiring most businesses to provide government-sanctioned insurance to their employees.

Now, section 1513(d) of that law states that the employer mandate “shall apply to the months beginning after December 31, 2013.” Note the statutory command of “shall.” This is not discretionary, and there is no provision of the law permitting the Executive to delay it.

Incredibly, the President has not offered any coherent rationale for his actions. He was asked in an interview with *The New York Times* whether his critics were justified in asserting that he lacked authority to delay the mandate. He responded by saying:

If Congress thinks that what I've done is inappropriate or wrong in some fashion, they're free to make that case. But there's not an action that I take that you don't have some folks in Congress who say that I'm usurping my authority. Some of those folks think I usurped my authority by having the gall to win the Presidency. And I don't think that's a secret. But ultimately, I'm not concerned about their opinions—very few of them, by the way, are lawyers, much less constitutional lawyers.

In other words, the President doesn't care what Congress thinks, as elected Representatives of the people, and feels no need to justify his official conduct.

Now, a couple weeks later he was asked again about this decision to uni-

laterally delay the mandate, and he said, look, he “didn't simply choose to delay this on my own” because the decision was made “in consultation with businesses all across the country.”

Now, I have searched the Constitution in vain for the provision allowing the President to suspend article II, section 3 of the Constitution so long as he consults with business, but I have not found it.

What is even worse, though is that the President further justified his conduct by stating:

In a normal political environment, it would have been easier for me to simply call up the Speaker and say, you know what, this is a tweak that doesn't go to the essence of the law. Let's make a technical change of the law. That would be the normal thing that I would prefer to do, but we're not in a normal atmosphere around here when it comes to ObamaCare.

That's the end of the President's quote.

Now, this is absurd. The Constitution doesn't relieve the President of his duty to faithfully enforce the law simply because the political environment is difficult. Second, the President didn't, in fact, need to call the Speaker, because a couple weeks before his comment, this House voted 264–161—with 35 Members of the other party voting “yes”—to delay the mandate by law for 1 year. Most of us in the House actually think that, as a matter of policy, the employer mandate is bad for the economy. The President responded to our request to delay the employer mandate by threatening to veto the bill.

Now, with respect to the employer mandate, the emperor truly has no clothes. The unilateral delay of this mandate is not consistent with the Constitution's Take Care clause and is an abridgement of Congress' constitutional duty to make the law. The separation of powers is designed to ensure a government of laws, not of men. This President is content to be a law unto himself.

Now, the employer mandate delay is not an exception that proves the rule, unfortunately. Far from it. The entire enterprise of ObamaCare implementation has been an exercise in the administration picking and choosing which provisions to enforce and which provisions to delay or waive. Rather than implement the law as written, the President is rewriting the law as he goes along.

The following list represents a pretty impressive display of this lawlessness:

ObamaCare contains a statutory cap on out-of-pocket health costs, yet the President suspended this provision, most likely because he feared it would lead to health insurance premiums rising even more than they already are.

Second, the law requires the State-based ObamaCare health insurance exchanges to verify whether applicants for exchange subsidies qualify for sub-

sidies based on their income level. Yet the President suspended this requirement, thereby allowing taxpayer money to be handed out based on the “honor system”; and we know that it's going to hit the taxpayer more than if you actually enforce the regulations.

The plain text of ObamaCare also provides that subsidies can only flow through State-based exchanges, yet the President's IRS is disregarding this requirement and is allowing subsidies to flow to Federal exchanges.

So this is creating, I think, a patently unjust scenario: The law imposes substantial burdens on society as a whole, but those with political connections—employers, insurance companies, what have you—are granted delays and/or waivers from the law's burdens. This is precisely contrary to James Madison's admonition in the *Federalist* No. 57 that there should be “no law which will not have its full operation on the political class and their friends, as well as on the great mass of society.”

The most egregious example, though, of political favoritism via executive branch lawlessness has got to be the illicit bailout for Members of Congress with respect to congressional health plans. Now, when the bill was being debated several years ago, the American people were told we have to pass the bill to find out what is in the bill. And sure enough, the law contained all sorts of surprises, including an interesting provision regarding health care for Members of Congress.

Now there is broad agreement among analysts who have looked at the effects of ObamaCare that the law's structures and incentives will cause millions of Americans to lose their employer-provided coverage and get pushed into these health care exchanges. The only dispute really is how many millions of Americans will suffer this fate. The Congressional Budget Office said 7 million. Other analysts have said it's going to be tens of millions of Americans.

Perhaps recognizing this possibility, one section of ObamaCare makes Congress eat its own cooking. The idea behind the provision is that, because ObamaCare will upend the health care arrangements of other Americans, Members of Congress and other political insiders should be placed in exactly the same position as their fellow citizens whom they have burdened, and thus Members of Congress must go and get insurance through these ObamaCare exchanges. No more gold-plated plans for Washington, given Washington is having a negative effect on other Americans.

Now, one can search the health care law in vain for any provision providing Members of Congress taxpayer-financed subsidies for use on these ObamaCare exchanges. It's just not there. In fact, as *Politico* reported, the

Office of Personnel Management initially said that lawmakers and staffers couldn't receive subsidies once they went into the exchange because there was no authority to give them subsidies. This is probably also because any other American who loses their health coverage and goes into the exchanges is prohibited from getting a tax-excludable employer contribution.

This state of play didn't sit well with a lot of Members of Congress. So after being lobbied by Members of both the House and Senate, the President pledged to "fix the issue." He ordered OPM to reverse course and grant unique taxpayer subsidies to Members of Congress and other Washington insiders—again, without having a statutory authority to do so.

So this is a lawlessness in service of liberating Members of Congress from having to live under the terms of the laws that they impose on others. And this is creating all sorts of problems of fairness and equity.

I think the Founding Fathers had it right when they said that the President did have a duty to take care that the laws would be faithfully executed. And that word "faithfulness" means something. Yes, you have discretion as an executive to enforce laws to a certain degree or not, depending on the situation. That is a natural aspect of prosecutorial discretion. But the idea that you can just supercede or delay laws by executive fiat is something that's foreign to our constitutional tradition.

I'm going to yield in a second to the gentleman from Oklahoma, but think about this: Had Mitt Romney won the 2012 election and he came in and started delaying or waiving parts of ObamaCare with impunity and with no congressional authorization, can you imagine the uproar that we would be hearing from the press and from our friends on the other side of the aisle? I think it would be very loud in here if that were the case.

At this time, I thank my friend from Oklahoma for coming, and I yield to him.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Well, I really appreciate it.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), who has been such a great leader on constitutional issues in this body. And I'd like to say that, here you have a gentleman who went to Yale undergraduate and he played baseball. He got a law degree from Harvard, and then he decided to join the United States Navy. He has served bravely in the United States Navy as a JAG officer, and now he's serving in the United States Congress. So if there is anybody in this body who has the credibility to discuss these constitutional issues, it is my good friend from Florida, RON DESANTIS. And I appreciate your leadership on these issues.

When you think about the constitutional process, Mr. Speaker, there is one particular issue that is near and dear to me, that is near and dear to my constituents, that we have seen this body go through earlier this year, and that is the issue of gun control. I think it was back in April. The President had an agenda and HARRY REID had an agenda, and their agenda was to outlaw certain types of guns. These guns didn't operate any differently than other types of guns; they just looked scary, so they wanted to ban them.

Interestingly, that effort died in the Senate and it never came to the House of Representatives. So then they started another effort, and that effort was for what would eventually be a national gun registry. They called it "universal background checks," but ultimately it would be a national gun registry, and that effort died in the Senate.

Now, the constitutional process, if the President wants his agenda enacted, he needs to go to the United States Senate or the House of Representatives and pass a law, in a bicameral process, and eventually it needs to go to his White House for signing. Ultimately, this bill did not have the will of the American people. This bill did not have the desire of the Members in this body to pass that bill. So what the President did recently—which I believe is egregious—is he decided to enter the United States of America into an international treaty to accomplish the very objectives that the House of Representatives and the Senate had rejected, and that's the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

Under this treaty, anybody who purchases a gun internationally—if a gun comes from another country, maybe a Glock from Austria—well, then you have to enter into an international database. You have to enter your name and your address and your phone number. There will be an international database of anybody who buys a gun that was ultimately produced in a country other than the United States.

And let me be clear about this, because I've talked to a lot of gun manufacturers. Many parts of many guns are not made in the United States. You could have a handle that's made in China. You could have a trigger that's made in Mexico. If you look at most of the guns that are made in the United States, major parts of them are made elsewhere, which means that we are going to have a national gun registry that will have an international body overseeing our national gun registry per the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

Now, for the President of the United States to have an agenda item that doesn't get through the Senate, that doesn't get through the House of Representatives, that never comes to his desk for signing, that he is ideologi-

cally committed to this—which is a violation of the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution—for him to then enter into a treaty, an international treaty where there will be an international body responsible for overseeing this treaty, to me, is an egregious lack of leadership and certainly violates the intention of the Constitution. The President knows full well that the Senate will never ratify this treaty.

And this is another important point, I think. The President has had other agenda items. He wanted to sign us up for other treaties—the United Nations Convention for the Rights of Children, the United Nations Convention for the Rights of Women, the United Nations Convention for the Rights of the Disabled. There are all these conventions, and they're all seemingly very good conventions; but what I would say is this: The United States of America has laws, and those laws are far more stringent than these treaties.

□ 1500

For what purpose would we sign on to a treaty when our laws themselves are stronger at adhering to the principles that these treaties are trying to promote? Why would we sign on? Why would we turn over our sovereignty to an international body? I personally don't understand it.

The United States is a leader in the world. We can lead the world by example, but signing over our sovereignty so that there will be an international body that comes in and inspects our country because the President has an ideology that he couldn't get through the House, that he couldn't get through the Senate, that ultimately these treaties were not going to be ratified by the Senate, I think it is egregious.

Certainly the Second Amendment of the United States is, quite frankly, not up to debate by foreigners, and it is not up to debate by foreign bodies. Foreign governments cannot come into the United States and force us to overturn our own constitutional amendment—the Second Amendment.

That is, I think, another example of where this President has overreached beyond his constitutional authority in certainly passing laws—not actually passing laws, but creating treaties because he can't get his laws passed—that would violate our Constitution.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. Thank you for those comments, and thank you for the service that you have given to the country, here in the Congress, but particularly as a naval aviator flying more than one platform—the E-2D Hawkeye and then also the F-18 Super Hornet.

You have been deployed in harm's way numerous times, and you speak with a great deal of authority, not only on these issues, but on issues related to national security. I think it has been

great that the gentleman and I have had a mutual pact to be supporting our blue-water Navy because there is no other weapon in the world like it when you can move a carrier 90 miles off somebody's coast and project power.

With that, I would like to recognize another one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SALMON), a guy who has been here before, he has walked the walk, and one of the few guys who will tell you what his principles are and will come here and will actually put those principles into action. He did it in the '90s and he is doing it again.

Mr. SALMON. Thank you very much.

First of all, I want to say what an honor it is to be sharing the dais with two such distinguished gentlemen who have given up their careers and sacrificed countless hours with their families to come to this body and not, as has been done before, be willing to "kick the can down the road"; coming to make real change; coming to try to get our arms around the real problems that are confronting our society and us as a Nation.

I would like to say that it is just a debt crisis, that it is just funding for our government. But I think we all know it is much more than that. It is about the freedoms that we hold. It is about everything that we hold dear—everything that every military person for the last 240 years has fought to defend—and that is the freedoms that our Founding Fathers envisioned when they started this great experiment. We don't want to let that experiment die.

I am so honored to be able to serve with two gentlemen that take this seriously and are willing to do more than be politicians and risk those political careers to actually do what is right. What a novel idea for Washington, D.C.

I would like to talk just a little bit about the genesis of the President's health care law when we talk about the constitutionality. They cooked this thing up at a time when they knew that time was running short. A new Senator had just been elected from Massachusetts, so they had to act very, very quickly, or they wouldn't be able to get by the cloture vote. That is why NANCY PELOSI ended up saying, we have to pass it before we know what is in it and then we can read it afterwards, because virtually none of those Senators actually read it.

That is why I understand Wolf Blitzer just came on today and said: Mr. President, why don't you postpone ObamaCare for a year?

Why? Because we have seen over the last week it is a failure. Its roll-out has been catastrophic. We want to stop the hemorrhage and help the American people.

How did the bill eventually become a law? It happened because they did a "strike all" on a bill that was originated in the House. But they did a

"strike all" with language that had nothing to do with the original language.

Why is that important? Because in the Constitution there is a provision called the origination clause. That stipulates that any revenue bill has to originate in the House of Representatives. It has to. That is a requirement for the Constitution, but this bill actually started in the Senate—ObamaCare started in the Senate. So constitutionally from day one it started out on shaky footing. They violated the Constitution right out of the shoot.

Now, let's fast-forward to where we are today. Congressman DESANTIS, you have done a marvelous job describing some of the inconsistencies and the breaches of the Constitution that this President has done in actually changing his own law. We say it is his own law—it is Congress' law. It is a law that a President can't enact in and of itself and he can't change in and of himself. We don't have a line-item veto anywhere. The President can only change the law if it goes through Congress first. So like you said, Congressman DESANTIS, he arbitrarily changed the date in the law from one year to the next, and you can't do that.

I have heard from the Democratic Party time and time again—the folks on the other side—that they can't support this pathway that we have been going through in the last week of putting bills up on funding various aspects of government, like funding for NIH and kids with cancer or funding our veterans or funding our national parks. They say that that is a process of creating winners and losers, and they can't have any part of that.

Well, what is President Obama doing when he is giving breaks to Big Business and to Congress, but he is not giving them to every other American when it comes to ObamaCare? Isn't that creating winners and losers? I think it is a tad hypocritical of them to even raise that specter.

But I want to talk for a little bit about what has happened in the last week and a half. Because while the President is very willing to exceed his constitutional authority to do certain things, when he does have the constitutional authority to do something, he doesn't do it.

What am I talking about? I am talking about what has happened over the last few days with the bill that we passed last Saturday before the shutdown funding our military, the Pay Our Military Act. It was clear in that bill, that very succinct bill, that they had the power to pay all of our military folks, including all of our civilians, and that they could go ahead and take care of the death benefits for these widows who have lost their loved ones in war. That was very, very clear. They had that ability all along.

So what does the President do? He wants to use this for political leverage

and make this as painful as he possibly can. So what do they do? They furlough several hundred thousand civilian workers within the military, just so they could ratchet up the pain and make it a little bit tougher on the Republicans.

Then what happens? About a week later Chuck Hagel, the Secretary of Defense, comes out and says, Oops, my bad. I guess we had the power all along.

Wasn't that what we have been telling them all along? You have the power to go ahead and keep these people at work and not disrupt, but they did that for political gain so that he could make it as painful as possible.

One other example: in my own State, in Arizona, we have one of the greatest national parks, the Grand Canyon. It is not only a wonder for the entire world, but it is also a wonder for our economy. We have folks that are doing river raft trips, folks that do excursions and hikes down through the Grand Canyon; but they run into a closed park.

Well, let me tell you something: I was here during 1995 when we had that last government shutdown. And guess what? We had a Democratic President. His name was Bill Clinton. We had a Republican Governor, just like we do in Arizona right now. His name was Fife Symington. What happened with the government shutdown? President Clinton worked with our Republican Governor, Fife Symington, to allow them to use private and State resources to keep the park open.

So our Governor, Governor Brewer, writes a letter to President Obama thinking that he might be somewhat similar in nature to President Clinton as far as being willing to negotiate. I mean, these are people's lives on the line. What did they get? A big fat zero—no way, you can't open it.

We have seen that time and time again. We have seen it on the National Mall that when certain groups of people want to come and take a look at the monuments or go into the National Mall that, no, the government is shut down, you can't come in, everything is shut.

But yesterday, what happened in the National Mall? Fifteen thousand people came for a protest on immigration reform, and they opened up the National Mall.

It is a disturbing pattern. If you agree with the President and his policies, we are going to do everything within our power to use government to help you get where you need to be. If you disagree with me, we are going to use our government to bludgeon you and use it as a tool to further our political agenda.

That has happened with the IRS when it comes to the nonprofit status of various organizations. It happened with our Capital Mall and our Capital monuments.

All I am saying is that I find it so incredulous that the President is willing to overstep his boundaries and unconstitutionally do things through executive order, and yet when he has the power and we have given him the power he is not willing to do it. I find those inconsistencies extremely disturbing and a little bit Machiavellian.

I would hope that the President would look at what we are trying to do through this process. We have a responsibility to the people that elected us to make the laws as good as we possibly can.

The last proposal that we put on the table was that we would delay the individual mandate so that every American—as you said, Mr. DESANTIS—every American could get the same deal that Big Business with their great lobbyists here in Washington, D.C., got and that Members of Congress got. They would get the same consideration.

The other part was that we would make sure that Congress lived under the same laws everybody else has to. A pretty commonsense approach, so much so that multiple Democrats agreed with us and voted with us to pass that and send it to the President. But what did HARRY REID do? He shoved it in his draw at the behest of President Obama.

It is time to stop these reckless games. Mr. President, you have already shown that you are very willing to use your executive powers far beyond your scope of authority given you in the Constitution. Is it unreasonable for us to ask you to use your powers when you are given them to do the right thing?

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for those great comments.

I think he brings up a great point about the funding bill that was sent the day before the fiscal year ended was not demanding that the President fully repeal the health care law; it basically had two very reasonable policy asks:

One, that Members of Congress live under the exact terms of the law that they passed and not get any type of special unauthorized treatment; and then

Two, that individuals be given the same courtesy that the President gave to Big Business.

That was very reasonable. The press hasn't really reported that. That is not really the way they framed it. I am not surprised at that. But that is a vote—by standing beside the Senate majority leader, all those Senators who did that—that is going to be a vote that is going to reverberate into the future.

I think it is interesting because when we are talking about the proper constitutional authority of the President, our primary means to check the President is the power of the purse. That is basically what we are doing in terms of

we are sending the funding bill, but we are saying, look, we cannot afford to continue going with this disparate treatment throughout society. You have got to treat everybody the same.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DESANTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I just wanted to ask you a quick question, which is, when you consider the fact that the media reporting is very different from what I have perceived in this body as a Member of Congress, I am more astonished every day at how the media reports the story. But the very last ask that we made before the government shutdown was about 1 o'clock in the morning, so I guess technically the government had been shut down for about an hour. That very last ask was simply a meeting. It was simply a conference so that people on their side and people on our side could come together and discuss ObamaCare and some of the problems that we have with it.

Now, when you talk about the Constitution and the constitutional process that we have and you have divided government—I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida—is that not a perfectly reasonable adult way of handling disputes?

□ 1515

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman for the question. That is not only an adult way, that is exactly the way that the Founding Fathers envisioned it. James Madison, when he wrote about the different branches of separation of power, checks and balances, he said:

Ambition must be made to counteract ambition.

So you have an executive that gets beyond their scope, he expected the legislature to check that. So in this instance, we are saying, Wait a minute, you can't unilaterally delay the law for business, but then leave the rest of the American people holding the bag. You can't let Congress, the people who are imposing this law upon others, get out from under the exact text of the law. So in that sense, that's exactly the way the system is supposed to work.

Now he has a different view of, basically, the Congress needs to do what he decrees, and then he will grant Congress the courtesy of actually discussing issues with them. That would probably not have gone over very well with the Founding Fathers.

I want to just make another point because the gentleman from Arizona brought up how ObamaCare was passed and kind of the genesis of it. Some of our friends on the other side of the aisle that say, How can you guys be talking about this, it's the law, move on, not giving any credence to the 50 to 55 percent of Americans who are being negatively affected by it. But if you

compare how that law was passed compared to any other major piece of legislation, I pulled some interesting numbers. Social Security in 1935, in the House of Representatives, 96 percent of the Democrats voted for it, 81 percent of the Republicans voted for it. The interstate highway system under Eisenhower, 93 percent in this body voted for it, 98 percent of the Republicans in this body voted for it. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, maybe the most important piece of legislation in the 20th century, 61 percent of the Democrats in the House voted for that piece of legislation, 80 percent of the Republicans in the House voted for that piece of legislation.

Even 1981, the Reagan economic program, in the Senate, 78 percent of the Democrats voted for Reaganomics, and 98 percent of Republicans voted for Reaganomics. When the gentleman from Arizona was here when they did welfare reform, you had a unified Republican Party joining with a number of Democrats and a Democratic President. So when you have this bill that never received any support from the other party and that rests on all these broken promises about your health care is going to decline by \$2,500 a family, you can keep your plan, keep your doctor, we know none of that is going to be true.

I just want to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma, yield to him because he and I had been discussing the idea of the President's responsibility to enforce border security and enforce laws related to immigration. I yield so you can discuss that.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I appreciate that, and it is perfectly appropriate that we have the gentleman from Arizona here as well. The gentleman from Arizona, and when you serve in this body, you get to meet a lot of very interesting people that have done amazing things in their lives. The gentleman from Arizona who we heard from earlier had an opportunity to serve in this body back in the 1990s, and then he left. He had a term limit pledge. He honored his term limit pledge. And then he came back recently as a newly elected freshman with the rest of us, and it is an honor to serve with him. But in that hiatus when he was back in Arizona, he ran for the governorship of Arizona, and he darn near won. Interestingly, he ran against the person who won, who was Janet Napolitano, who became the Secretary of Homeland Security here in the Obama administration.

I would like to discuss some things about why it is so important for me personally. I am a Navy pilot, as the gentleman from Florida said, and I have flown combat. But interestingly, I have also flown counterdrug missions in Central and South America. And I can tell you without a doubt that the drug cartels that we fight down in Central and South America, they don't try

to get the drugs into the United States of America anymore. Their only objective is to get the drugs to northern Mexico, where they are vertically integrated with gangs and other cartels who bring the drugs across the border without a hitch. Now, because we have these drug wars in northern Mexico—and, by the way, there are over 100,000 people who have been killed in the last 7 years in these drug wars in northern Mexico, but that exists because we have an open border policy on the south side of the United States.

So if you were to hand a 16-year-old kid a backpack with \$1 million worth of cocaine and you say to him, Hey, go across this border and get to that point, you're going to be very well rewarded. A 16-year-old kid will do that in many cases in these impoverished areas in northern Mexico. Interestingly, another 16-year-old kid will see that backpack and want it for himself, and the next thing you know, you've got one killing the other, and then you get a third killing the second. And then you have these gangs form, and this is how you get to a point where you have cartels and gangs that are killing not only each other, 100,000 people, but they are also killing judges. They are killing police officers. They are killing politicians. And on top of it all, they are not just transporting cocaine, they are transporting young girls in the slave trade. And they are transporting weapons. This is happening in northern Mexico just south of our border. Mexico is on the brink of a failed state because of this, and it is the direct result of an open border policy.

Now the Secretary of Homeland Security, former Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano has been on record. What does she say? She says that the border is secure. That's what she says. I have just got to tell you that I know firsthand that it's not. And the people who live in Arizona know that it's not. The people who live in Texas know that it's not. The border is not secure.

But here's what we have done in this body. We have passed laws to secure the border. Has the border become secure? No. Have thousands of people died since those laws have been passed because we haven't secured the border? Yes.

The President's job per the Constitution is to faithfully execute the laws, not pick and choose which laws he wants to follow based on political preference, which is what he has been doing.

So if it is all right, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Arizona. You have been near and dear to this for a very long time. If you have some comments, I would love to have you share them.

Mr. SALMON. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. Yes, it has been something that we have been dealing with in a very up close and personal way.

As a matter of fact, about a month and a half ago, I had the good fortune to meet with Arizona's adjunct general. He's over the National Guard for Arizona. He was finishing up his term in office, and I said, Sir, what is your biggest concern when it comes to possible terrorist activity here in Arizona? We don't have a lot of the national weather pattern problems like they do in other parts of the country, like hurricanes and tornadoes. We have some dust storms every now and then, and we have had some terrible fires. But I was truly interested, and I wasn't trying to lead him in any direction. But he said, without a doubt, the thing that keeps me up at night, the thing that worries me more than anything is the porousness of our border, and the fact that about 15 percent of the people that we apprehended last year were not from Mexico. Many of those people were from the Middle East. What I worry about is because it is so lax and so easy to get across our border, that some terrorist is going to be able to get across the border with a suitcase bomb and detonate it and a lot of people will be injured or killed. That was his big concern.

So then I had an opportunity to sit down with some of our ICE people that are stationed in Arizona. They are the ones responsible for interior enforcement. I had a long conversation with them. You know what they told me? They said, You know, we don't need a lot more assets to get the border secured; what we need is for this administration to enforce the law. We need them to let us do our jobs. We are law enforcement people. We see the law very, very clearly. We know what the laws state, but our hands have been tied by this administration. They won't let us do our jobs.

He then proceeded to tell me that we have done these surveys on a regular basis to try to determine where employee morale is at, and they said it's at an all-time low ever since they've been doing these surveys right now within ICE, especially in Arizona because they feel they are not empowered to do their jobs, and they wonder, what am I doing here. Many of them want to be transferred out or just kind of, you know, march in place and do their time and get out as soon as they can, but the morale is terrible. These are honorable, decent people who want to do their jobs.

The other side would have you believe that no, this is just about some honest people who want to come across the border and get jobs in the United States and take care of their families. It's not just about that. As we saw with Brian Terry, with the gun smuggling, Fast and Furious, guns are being smuggled across the border, drugs are being smuggled across the border, and unsavory characters who have bad ideas on what they want in the United States

are coming across the border, and one day the piper is going to have to be paid. So the border is far from being secure. We have the ability to do it, but this administration will not let them do their jobs.

Mr. DESANTIS. Thank you for that. It's interesting. As you bring up former Secretary Napolitano, that brings up the Presidential appointment and confirmation process. The Constitution provides for Cabinet officers and judges, that the President will nominate, the Senate votes to advise and consent to confirm, and then at that point they can become appointed and fill the office.

There is also another provision in article II of the Constitution, in section 2, involving what are called recess appointments, and it says:

The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

This made a lot of sense at the time, especially because you'd be in session, people lived all over the country. They'd take a horse-drawn carriage to get to Washington and back, so the Senate may be out for months and months. The Founders didn't want government ground to a halt. It's been used more recently if the Senate is on a recess, the President can kind of strategically figure that out and appoint somebody who might not otherwise be confirmed. Well, what this President did was a step further than that. He actually said that if the Senate says that it's not in recess, if they are just adjourned for say a day, a couple days and they are having pro forma session, that that doesn't actually count as a recess in his judgment and he can go ahead and do recess appointments, people to the National Labor Relations Board and the Consumer Financial Protection Board that would not otherwise be able to be confirmed. A lot of people cried foul about this, and it actually got tied up in the courts. Normally, we have to check some of these things, but there was somebody who had standing to bring a lawsuit. It has gone to two different Circuit Courts of Appeal and they both said, Look, the President can't just unilaterally determine when the Senate is in recess. The Senate is either in recess or they are not. If it is just that they go to sleep at night and come back the next morning, the President can't wait until midnight and just thrust somebody into office. So both of those courts have said that the President has overstepped his authority by shoving these recess appointments in office while the Senate was not in a formal recess; they were just adjourned within that term of service. And so I think the Supreme Court is going to hear that this time. I think they are definitely very likely to agree with

those courts and say if the President can determine when it is a recess, then the whole idea of advise and consent gets swallowed up by the exception, and that's just not something that's going to work.

The gentleman from Arizona is interesting with his history because I listed some major pieces of legislation and how they all got broad bipartisan support. And the last one I mentioned was the 1996 Welfare Reform Act which Congress basically passed. It got vetoed and passed again, and finally President Clinton signed it. And the core of that, as I understand it, was that you would actually try and incentivize work instead of dependency, and so it had work requirements for able-bodied folks. I think the results of that were very, very positive. It essentially changed the incentive structure and actually gave people hope to get off dependency and into a productive life.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona because the President has basically watered down those work requirements unilaterally, and I think that will have a negative effect.

Mr. SALMON. I thank the gentleman from Florida. Yes, I was right in the middle of all those debates. As a matter of fact, before I came to Congress, the Arizona Legislature, which I was part of, actually passed a bill called Workfare, which was very similar to what we passed in 1996. It recognizes the idea, I think the truth, and there is an old Chinese proverb: If I catch a fish for you, you'll have food for a day. If I teach you to fish, you'll have food for your life.

That was the model we tried to employ, and that was that people have to work. They have to give something back for the welfare payments that they are given. It was called Workfare, and that is what we decided to do here in the Congress.

And it did one other thing, Congressman, that no government program can or normally does really do, and that is help instill dignity in people. I think one of the things that has really broken our country is that we have become this welfare state, a bunch of dependents across the country. I think that giving somebody the opportunity to be able to give something back actually helps preserve, I think, the human spirit. We all want to feel like we have some worth, that we have some relevance to society. And the old traditional welfare program is almost like we'll pay you to stay out of society. We'll give you just barely enough to subsist, but you stay out of society. And that's the message, subliminally or otherwise, that it gives to those people.

□ 1530

We don't really have much to offer you. You don't offer much value to society, so we will pay you to stay home.

We thought of a different idea, I think a vastly more compassionate idea, and that is to have people be able to give something back so they didn't get something for nothing. Also, along the way, they actually got skills and abilities that they didn't otherwise have so that they could learn how to work, they could learn how to hold down a job.

That was one of the key components of the welfare reform that we passed in 1996, that while we send that money out to the States, that there are work requirements. I think that's reasonable. You don't get something for nothing. You have got to get out and help pull the wagon instead of having everybody cart you around. That's reasonable.

What did this President do the moment he got in office? He started through executive orders granting waivers to each of the States, getting rid of those work requirements. Again, that was a law that was passed in 1996, signed by President Clinton, and the President coming after changes the terms of those laws. To me, as far as I am concerned, not only is that lawless, it is foolish, because it is hurting the very people he purports to help. I believe that rather than helping them, it is keeping them down.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for that.

You mentioned just as the President came into office, and I remember the first thing, and I wasn't here. None of us were in Congress at the time. Just as a citizen, I was Active Duty Navy. You were probably too, Mr. BRIDENSTINE. But we had this stimulus bill that had been passed. This was a huge thing. Part of that, as I've learned more about it, is that there were actually requirements that the executive branch was supposed to submit timely reports that would document the different spending and what was going on. I think even the Vice President said, Hey, I am going to be the watchdog on this. It is, in fact, the case that most of those deadlines have just been completely disregarded, that you haven't seen the type of reporting that was envisioned by the law, and that's perhaps because the law wasn't successful at engineering an economic recovery.

Shortly after that, though, one of the biggest issues that happened in 2009 was the auto bankruptcy. This was something that was unusual because the White House actually got very involved on the ground in terms of refereeing the rights of the various parties, including the creditors.

I now yield some time to the gentleman from Arizona to discuss that because you had mentioned that was something that had bothered you at the time. The floor is yours.

Mr. SALMON. I appreciate that.

When we talk about the rule of law, the rule of law means that it applies

equally to everyone. Of course, today, we have talked a lot about how within ObamaCare the rule of law does not apply equally to everyone. Some people get waivers. Depending on what kind of company you work for, some companies get waivers. Some unions get waivers. When it comes to individual health care policies, some people get grandfathered and they get to keep their policy, and other people get letters saying their policy is canceled.

We have exchanged, in this country, at this point under ObamaCare, the rule of law for the rule of man, where you have nameless, faceless bureaucrats that don't represent anybody and make decisions that change the law for individuals. That's not what was intended by the Founding Fathers.

As the gentleman from Florida said, when you think about creditor rights and you think about the bailout for Chrysler, you have different classes of creditors. In the case of the Chrysler bailout, you had secured creditors. That means that in the hierarchy structure, they were superior to the shareholders. They were superior because they were lending the money. They weren't the owners of the company. They had rights that were above the shareholders.

In the case of Chrysler, what happened is the President came in, like you said, and they got very involved. In fact, they changed the rule of law for the rule of man, where you had bureaucrats coming in and making a decision that the secured creditors would be wiped out. In fact, they were bullied. I think they received 30 cents on a dollar for investment, if I remember correctly. But the secured creditors would be bullied to give up their investment, and the people who actually came out ahead were the unions, who were not secured creditors. This is a violation of bankruptcy law.

Again, the President's job is to faithfully execute the law, not change the law for political preference and not replace the rule of law with the rule of man, which is what they did in this case. Politically, they made a decision that the secured creditors would be wiped out, the unions would be made whole, and at the end of the day—here is the fallout from that: in the United States of America, all across this country, and in the world, people are making decisions about where they're going to invest money. If you look at the investment opportunities in the United States of America right now, if you're going to invest in Big Business, the whole too-big-to-fail mantra that we have heard over and over again, if you are going to invest in Big Business, you are going to have to take a risk, and that risk has nothing to do with the return on investment or whether or not the company is sound. That risk is now political risk. Because as an investor, politically you could be wiped out,

even if you have a secured debt instrument.

When you replace the rule of law with the rule of man, especially as it relates to business, people make decisions to invest elsewhere. And if you look at our country right now and you look at the capital investment in our country, we could be doing much better. Of course, if we had a President that adhered to the law, rather than changing the law based on political preference, we might see more investment in our country. Of course, investment is how businesses grow. It is how they raise money to open up a new plant or open up a new store, and capital investment is how new firms get created and it is how jobs get created and grow. So what we have right now is the replacement of the rule of law for the rule of man, and it has been detrimental for our economy as it relates to the securities industry.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank both the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Arizona for coming here today to offer their views. Their comments are much appreciated. The great thing about these two guys is they will stand up to people, regardless of party. They will stand up to people in their own party. They will stand up to people in the other party if what they're trying to do is not the right thing because these guys want to do the right thing.

I just want to conclude by invoking two giants in American history in terms of some of the issues that we discussed today and kind of what they mean.

The first is the Father of the Country, George Washington. When he took the reins as the first President of the United States, he made the comment "I walk on untrodden ground." So he had a great sense that it wasn't just about him. He was already the biggest hero in the country. He could have taken over the country after defeating the British. He could have been king, but he surrendered his sword and retired to Mount Vernon until he was called back to further service. He was very sensitive to the idea that he was trying to establish a framework for freedom that could last generations, and it wasn't just about his own personal glory. What he tried to establish was the proper role of an executive in a constitutional system. There's a lot of people that said you either have a strong executive and it is a monarchy, or you just can't have a strong executive. I think he laid the foundation to say, actually, you can have a constitutionally circumscribed executive power that was nevertheless a force of good for the country.

The other gentleman that I would like to mention is Abraham Lincoln, who's obviously one of the greatest Presidents we have ever had. His earliest recorded speech was a speech be-

fore the Young Men's Lyceum of Springfield, Illinois. This was in the 1830s, so he still had decades before he was President. I don't think he had been elected to anything even locally at the time. He was really concerned about the future of the country because he said you had this great Revolution, you had this great Constitution, you had these wonderful decades where people were actually living and breathing that. Obviously, he felt that there was a lot of work to do because he spoke out against things like slavery, but he thought that the ball was moving in the right direction in terms of individual freedom. But he feared that as the Founding Fathers and their generation passed away, that people really wouldn't have something that they could all have to organize around and be faithful to in terms of our country. So what he told people to do was to really embrace constitutional principles and the rule of law.

In his speech, he said:

As the patriots of '76 did to support the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and laws let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor. Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty.

He went on to say:

And, in short, let it become the political religion of the Nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues and colors and conditions sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.

I think what Lincoln was getting at was this idea of American exceptionalism. It is not because we as Americans are anything special. I am certainly not anything special. It is not that we are so much better than anybody as people. The exceptional part of the country is the origins of the country and the principles that the country is designed to further. That, I think, is what Lincoln was talking about; that when you embrace the Declaration, when you embarrass the Constitution, when you embracing a framework in which individual liberty is the paramount objective of society, and that is why things like the separation of powers and proper lawfulness from the legislature and executive are so important. It is not just because this is all a game and we want to try to blow the whistle on people who are in the other party. It is because ultimately this constitutional structure and these protections are what make us different from all the countries that have come before and all the countries that have been founded since.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

INSIDE THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUDSON). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, for a government that shuts down, there sure seems to be a great deal going on. Down here on the Mall, somehow the National Park Service, which has been, parenthetically speaking here, presiding over a park service, beginning with the Franklin D. Roosevelt memorial, has not had God mentioned in any memorial since that time. We don't have time or a place for mentioning God, as our memorials have in some way in the past, but, by golly, we have got time during a shutdown to approve a permit to allow people who want to demand that—though they are here in this country illegally—they have a right to demand rights. This administration, just as it did with the Occupy Washington movement, facilitates that.

We know with the Occupy Washington movement there was all kinds of lewd, lascivious stuff going on in public. The Park Service didn't seem to be bothered by that. But let veterans show up to the World War II memorial, and they have got barricades. Let World War II veterans, who fought their way to the top of Mt. Suribachi, try to get to the monument that commemorates climbing to the top of Suribachi, they put up big obstacles to our veterans getting there.

So the message from this administration very clearly is that if you are illegally in the country, we will bend over backwards to let you commit all kinds of acts on the Mall; we will send Capitol Police down to pick up your garbage; and if you just want to illegally occupy a public area, we will let you do that. We will let you use the basest services in public. All kinds of lewd and lascivious things were going on there with the Occupy Washington movement, and that was allowed to continue on and on and on.

□ 1545

However, if you have served your country in the United States military, then we're going to try to make life miserable for you. It just might be those people that have hung on to their God and their guns and love America and love the Constitution, so this Homeland Security thing is sure a threat. Which is quite interesting.

You know, with all the things that are going on, we have seen that this administration has not had a problem with some things that some of us felt were a problem, such as, like I've mentioned in the last couple of years, one of the members of what was originally the Countering Violent Extremism Working Group named Elibiary from Texas, who was placed on there. And then he got a promotion from Secretary Janet Napolitano up to the Homeland Security Advisory Council,

and, gee, now we're finding out that he's continuing to defend one of the principals of the Holy Land Foundation.

We're finding out that he is still defending, he still considers them to be unjustly prosecuted even though Federal courts have found that crimes were committed and that terrorism was supported by the Holy Land Foundation. The Dallas Federal court, along with the U.S. Court of Appeals in New Orleans, found that groups like CAIR, which has now changed its name to WTF, and ISNA, groups like that were the largest front group for the Muslim Brotherhood in America.

So it's rather interesting, because this administration has made life so difficult for our veterans just trying to get here and enjoy the memorials. I've been down to the memorials I think every day until today, and it's amazing. I've been down there different days, all hours of the day and night. You're lucky if you see one park ranger in the area of the World War II Memorial, and yet now they've got them very strategically placed.

They will stand there with the barricades closed most of the time. If some group comes up and explains that they're a World War II veterans group, then they'll open and let them through, but they stand there intimidating. Sometimes an officer comes by with a canine, which is a bit more intimidating to most people. So unless Members of Congress are standing there, we see people come up and get intimidated and walk away, unless a Member of Congress goes up and says, Please, come in. You are welcome.

Fortunately, veterans of Vietnam and Korea are just going around the barricades and fortunately are not being stopped. At the Lincoln Memorial, though, when a couple of Members of Congress encouraged people to come on up, like they do at the World War II Memorial, they said that it appeared that the park SWAT team—I mean, officers came in from all over, threatening arrests. Get out of here.

It's just amazing how far this administration will go to hurt Americans that love America, that have served this country.

And then we find out about Americans killed in Afghanistan. There should have been no problem whatsoever with the Defense Department cutting the \$100,000 checks to these families. There should not have been. And if there was any doubt, then the bill we passed before the shutdown began should have taken care of that. There was plenty of prerogative to do that. But we had to come back today and pass another bill just to say get a check to the families of those who lost a loved one serving this country, because the administration is playing hardball and has gotten policies in place that are hurting as many Ameri-

cans as possible. But when you look at who's advising this country's top leaders, is it any surprise?

Here's a story from October 6 from The Daily Caller:

Senior adviser to the Department of Homeland Security is an old friend of an activist who was convicted in 2008 of financing the terrorist organization Hamas.

In an interview with The Daily Caller, Mohamed Elibary, a member of the Homeland Security Advisory Council, reiterated claims he made this summer that former Holy Land Foundation President and CEO Shukri Abu Baker is innocent and a victim of political persecution.

Elibary, who in his position on the council also has regular access to classified information, said the United States insults Muslim dignity and compared the Muslim Brotherhood to American evangelicals.

Elibary confirmed to journalist Ryan Mauro of the Clarion Project in August that he is a longtime friend of Baker. The Mauro interview can be read at the Center for Security Policy.

Baker and four other officials of the closed Holy Land Foundation for Relief and Development were convicted of using the charity to finance Hamas in 2008. It was the largest terrorism financing trial in U.S. history. Federal prosecutors described the foundation, which was closed by the U.S. Government in 2001, as an entity of the U.S. Muslim Brotherhood.

Elibary first disclosed the relationship in a 2007 article in The Dallas Morning News. He met Baker as a teenager and was so moved by the terrorist funder's explanation of alleged Israeli persecution of Palestinians that he says he began donating monthly to Baker's foundation until it closed in 2001. The friendship continued, with Elibary meeting with Baker for coffee the day before he was convicted.

Elibary maintains that Baker is innocent. And in 2010, he wrote that the U.S. Government was "using the law to force compliance with unjust foreign policies." He reiterated his belief that the U.S. should not have prosecuted the Holy Land Foundation.

The Muslim activist has never disguised his support for Muslim Brotherhood extremism. In a 2006 letter to the Morning News, he defended the fanatically anti-American early Brotherhood leader and theorist Sayyid Qutb stating, "I'd recommend everyone read Qutb, but read him with an eye to improving America not just to be jealous with malice in our hearts."

Let me insert here, Qutb wrote, in Egypt, a book called "Milestones," where a guy named Osama bin Laden gives a great deal of credit for radicalizing him. And here we have someone that Janet Napolitano hand-picked to be at the highest advisory council level, have access to classified material, somebody that thinks the guy that radicalized Osama bin Laden is somebody we all should read with an eye toward improving America.

"Elibary has been honored by the FBI's Society of Former Special Agents," the article says. And again, parenthetically here—it's not in the article, but we also know that the FBI continued a relationship with CAIR, even knowing that they had gathered evidence that showed that CAIR was a large Muslim Brotherhood front orga-

nization which was supportive of the Holy Land Foundation. Even knowing those things, even knowing that it was implicated as a named coconspirator in that trial, amazingly, it took until 2008 and 2009 for the FBI to suspend their partnership with CAIR. And we know that CAIR continued until they changed their name here recently in the last few weeks to WTF.

They continued to complain. They have instant access to anyone in this administration. They helped get the FBI material, training materials purged of anything that might be offensive to someone who was a radical Islamist.

The article says:

In September, Elibary was promoted to senior adviser at the advisory council, a title held only by select members. Other council members include William Bratton, the revered former New York police commissioner and Los Angeles chief of police; former CIA Director Bill Webster; and L.A. County Sheriff Lee Baca.

And we have this, which has been tweeted out:

I'm honored to be reappointed to the Secretary of Homeland Security's Advisory Council and promoted to senior fellow position.

That's Mohamed Elibary. This article says:

"If you've ever wondered why the Obama administration believes that the Muslim Brotherhood is a moderate force for good and partners with known U.S. Muslim Brotherhood entities, this interview with Mr. Elibary helps us find an answer," Mauro said.

Elibary received national attention in June 2012 when Minnesota Republican MICHELE BACHMANN and four other Members of Congress—one including me—wrote a letter to the Department of Homeland Security, naming him as one of three advisers with extensive ties to the Muslim Brotherhood and other Islamist organizations and causes.

Anyway, it's just amazing. And it is also amazing, when I confronted Secretary Napolitano in a hearing about the fact that Mr. Elibary had accessed classified material and I was told by the director of the Department of Public Safety, Steve McCraw, in Texas, he had spoken with her chief of staff. He had confirmed that he had briefed her totally on what Mr. Elibary had done, and they would be looking into it. When I asked her about it the next day after her chief of staff had said she had been totally briefed, she looked me in the eye and said she didn't know anything about it. But she did say she would investigate.

We now know from a Freedom of Information answer from the Department of Homeland Security, they never investigated. Even when you had a writer, a journalist, Patrick Poole, wrote a story stating that Mr. Elibary had actually shot two documents that they knew he had downloaded from the classified Web site, he had shopped it to a

national media, and Mr. Poole confirmed to me that they have never once asked him about his sources. And we then had it confirmed from the FOIA request that actually they never did an investigation. Instead, they just promoted him. It is incredible. But then again, when you look at what this administration is doing to those who don't necessarily worship Allah but worship God and believe in God and have served the country, this administration is making it tough.

One of our most revered monuments, Mount Rushmore. Well, I was quoted accurately in the media over a week ago saying, After shutting down these open-air monuments, just sidewalks where you can roll around in disabled veterans' wheelchairs, what are they going to do next, put drapery over Mount Rushmore? Well, it turned out what they did—I guess I shouldn't have said anything because maybe it was the power of suggestion.

Oh, there's a way we can make people miserable. Even though it's a State road, built by the State of South Dakota, maintained by the State of South Dakota, patrolled by the State of South Dakota, we had Federal authorities go put cones and barricades to prevent people from being able to pull off to the side of the road to even take pictures of Mount Rushmore. Somebody, while the government was shut down, sent enough park rangers out to put up massive numbers of cones to try to make life as difficult as possible simply for people who loved America, who just wanted to pull over and get a view of Mount Rushmore.

□ 1600

They weren't going to patrol it. South Dakota does that.

When South Dakota, our dear friend, KRISTI NOEM, she said when South Dakota had pointed out, hey, this is State road, the Federal authority said, oh, no, but this is on Federal land, and we're not letting anybody pull over.

So this is what you get. This is the way Americans are treated unless you're going to be illegally in the country and have a protest, then we will give you permits, whatever you want.

I was gratified to hear our friend, Representative NOEM, point out to us that, though sad that South Dakota had 4 feet of snow in some places, unfortunately, that covered all the barricades and cones, strictly in the interest of safety, South Dakota had to send their snowplows and wipe all the snow, and there was no way to sort out the cones and barricades, so apparently they were in some ditch somewhere.

But for safety purposes, because they were just trying to help those South Dakotans and Americans that wanted to see Mount Rushmore get through that road, that State-built road.

So, anyway, another chance to make Americans miserable, but Mother Na-

ture came through, followed by South Dakota, making things safer.

Here is one. This is out by the Moore Farm that hasn't gotten a dime of Federal money since 1980. Former Park Director, National Park Service employee as director, been a director for 32 years, they barely make it, but they have lost \$15,000 to \$20,000 just by being closed down.

They rented barricades to take out there and close down a colonial farm from the 1700s and, as a result of this mean-spirited action by an administration, this farm may close down for good. They are running out of money.

But I have a dear friend that has arrived on the floor, and I would certainly yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for such time as he may consume.

Mr. LAMALFA. I appreciate my colleague, Mr. GOHMERT, here on pointing out really the hypocrisy of what's going on with the public's lands, the public's parks, the way this is being used as leverage by the folks higher up in this administration to try and extract from the American people, from those of us in this House, perhaps, what they want.

He mentioned the thing in South Dakota there. Now, there is a lot of suffering going on in South Dakota where a lot of ranchers have lost a lot of livestock. And if anything, if your government has the ability to do something, it should be finding ways to help people, instead of putting up cones where they aren't supposed to be on a State highway they claim is on Federal land.

So if all those cones are in the bottom of the canyon that they may have had to rent or what have you, similar to the barricades they are putting up around the monuments and memorials here in this town, where they have to go out and rent barricades on company time with furloughed employees even to set them up and put sandbags in place, this an insult to the American people. It is an insult to all of our Honor Flight folks that have been coming in to town, anybody that would use what would normally be 24-hour memorials, 24-hour monuments.

So what gives? I don't understand.

You know, getting to the bottom of this here, we have this impasse in the Congress here in Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is about time this is ended because we are hurting the American people by the actions of this White House, by the impasse, the Senate.

We have sent over various, either all-inclusive CRs, or the bits and pieces we are doing to try and fund things as a priority, one at a time, that are very important to the American people. Funding our veterans, funding the basic ability when we have had fallen soldiers come home here in this recent news story, that their families can't even go pick them up because of an unyielding-ness by this administration,

by those in the various bureaucracies to instead work to help American people in a time of fiscal straits that we are in, to help as much as possible, they are looking for ways to instead hurt them as much as possible.

What is with this?

We can even go back to previous impasses where, at least, President Clinton would sit down with the Republican House or Republican Senate or, after a while, it was a Republican House and Democrat-controlled Senate. There has been a mixture, over time, of putting aside the bitter partisanship and figuring out how we are going to hammer this out.

If we can do it with President Clinton, we can do it in previous Presidencies. This isn't the first time there has been this kind of impasse or this type of slowdown or shutdown. Yet this time seems to be unique in the meanness and the bitterness that's coming down from the intractability at the White House level and over on the Senate side as we have put forward solution after solution.

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time just momentarily, it is also worth noting that here in the House we have actually had numerous Democrats vote with us. So the only really bipartisan thing that has been going on in this whole Capitol are our bills to fund certain parts of the government.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. LAMALFA. Yes, thank you. Yes, we have had unanimous votes go off this floor with nearly 200 Democrats joining us on two of the pieces of legislation, and anywhere from 25 to 35 to 40 on many of the other pieces that have gone out. So it has been a bipartisan effort. I think both sides of the aisle see this is really a nonpartisan issue on these issues we are working on.

And so why do they have to rest on Senator REID's desk over on the Senate side?

Why do we get threats of vetoes from the White House when we find agreement?

We would find agreement on almost the entire CR if we got that one provision there, where even some of the Senators themselves, and now we are seeing it in the press where, I think you mentioned Wolf Blitzer has now joined with Senator MANCHIN as well as Senator BAUCUS in thinking the Obama health care take over is a train wreck, that we are seeing a pretty diverse group of people saying, you know, a 1-year delay would not be an unreasonable thing.

As we have seen the exchanges rolling out, they are not working very well. And people, when they are looking finally to find out what the prices are, what it is going to cost them, maybe people thought they were going to get it for free. They were going to get a rebate; they were going to get a

lower price. A lot of Americans, especially the youth, are going to see higher prices. They are not going to see the savings.

And if you look at the track record of the government operating things, government generally doesn't do things cheaper, and we are going to learn this in a very detrimental way to our economy, to the health care for the people of this country as this Obama health care takeover continues to roll out.

Mr. GOHMERT. And I am sure that Mr. LAMALFA has had people ask, as I have had, now, why in the world is ObamaCare costing so dramatically much more than the health insurance we had before?

And then we get notified we are actually getting less health care.

And my friend mentioned Wolf Blitzer, this article in National Review online quoted him as saying if they weren't fully ready, talking about the Web sites, ObamaCare Web sites, they should accept the advice that a lot of Republicans are giving them, delay it another year, get it ready, make sure it works.

They know how to do it; but if they didn't get it ready on time, then maybe fix the problem and make sure people don't have to worry about it.

But we come back, it is a disaster. It is more expensive than people's health care was before. They are getting less health care; they are not keeping their doctor. And most—it sounds like an awful lot of Americans are not keeping the policy they have. So why is it costing so much more?

And what people that don't know need to understand, when you hire thousands and thousands of people who don't provide health care to be navigators through the health care system, and you hire 18,000-or-so more IRS officers to go through every detail of people's personal financial and personal life, and they don't provide any health care, they may cause some health problems, but they don't provide any health care—you add all this bureaucracy—it is going to cost more and you are going to get less treatment, and it is not going to be as good a treatment.

I yield back to Mr. LAMALFA.

Mr. LAMALFA. Exactly. Now, who are the navigators?

Weren't they supposed to be vetted as to who they are, go through security?

And as well, look at the track record of the IRS. Do the American people really want 18,000 or so IRS individuals helping with their important personal health data?

I mean, there have been laws passed to make sure that that is a very secure thing. Sometimes even inconvenient to the patient, where you might be at the doctor and say, well, don't you already have this information from my other doctor?

There are very strict guidelines in how your information is traded around.

Now it is going to be in the hands of navigators that are unvetted and with IRS agents that have some very huge security issues already with the way that is being used against certain organizations.

Mr. GOHMERT. And there is a story today from the Daily Caller about the White House IRS exchanged confidential taxpayer information by Patrick Howley. So if you think your personal information is secure with the IRS, or with the Federal Government, it is already showing you should not be comfortable with it happening.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. LAMALFA. The most outrageous thing for most folks, though, is that the waivers, many individuals in this country are asked for and got to be outside of this as it was coming together; and more and more are asking for it, some are being turned down.

But especially, I guess, buying off Members of Congress through the OPM, allowing Congress and Capitol Hill to be exempt from this. If it is such a great program, if it is going to work so well, why would we be subject to a waiver?

Why are they talking about there would be a brain drain on Capitol Hill because everybody would be leaving because they can't afford the health insurance?

How does that work?

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, apparently, our time is expiring. I appreciate so much my friend, Mr. LAMALFA, helping me. And we should not be treated any differently. The President and his family need to sign up.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth noting that when I went out to the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial, the Iwo Jima Memorial, this administration had tried to prevent World War II veterans from getting to the symbol of Mount Suribachi, and there were three busloads of World War II vets up there at the memorial, and the barricade was in pieces.

God bless our World War II veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 10, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3261. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0209; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-127-AD; Amendment 39-17514; AD 2013-14-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3262. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BRP-Powertrain GmbH & Co KG Rotax Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0263; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-17535; AD 2013-15-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3263. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0197; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-09-AD; Amendment 39-17524; AD 2013-15-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3264. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1285; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-073-AD; Amendment 39-17544; AD 2013-16-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3265. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1033; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-266-AD; Amendment 39-17504; AD 2013-13-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3266. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0669; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-117-AD; Amendment 39-17540; AD 2013-16-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3267. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0447; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-17-AD; Amendment 39-17536; AD 2013-15-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3268. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace LP (Type Certificate Previously Held by Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0093; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-17515; AD 2013-14-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3269. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1156; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-205-AD; Amendment 39-17500; AD 2013-13-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3270. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0564; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-013-AD; Amendment 39-17494; AD 2013-13-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HUELSEKAMP, Mr. BOUTSTANY, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LONG, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RADEL, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HALL, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 3279. A bill to amend section 1303(b)(3) of Public Law 111-148 concerning the notice requirements regarding the extent of health plan coverage of abortion and abortion premium surcharges; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLEMING (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3280. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to limit the application of such Act to certain imported plants and finished plant products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3281. A bill to transfer criminal enforcement and investigative authority and functions of certain agencies to the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.J. Res. 92. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Centers for

Disease Control and Prevention for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill is based is Congress's power under the Commerce Clause in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 3280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which states The Congress shall have Power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.J. Res. 92.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 25: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 262: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 455: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 460: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 565: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 666: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 669: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 685: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 719: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 732: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 794: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 831: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 855: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 961: Mr. COSTA and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 964: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 997: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 1100: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1150: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 1226: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1276: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1339: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1385: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1389: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1428: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1429: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1507: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1690: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1705: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1907: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1921: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1992: Mr. COOK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1998: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2016: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 2023: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2027: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 2296: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2330: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 2502: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 2509: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2542: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2560: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2575: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 2654: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2738: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2780: Mr. HIMES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2794: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2839: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2902: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 3040: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 3080: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 3118: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 3163: Ms. BASS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 3178: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 3183: Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3188: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 3212: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 3232: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 3274: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3275: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.J. Res. 64: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. JONES.

H.J. Res. 91: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

October 9, 2013

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE, Vol. 159, Pt. 11

15523

H. Res. 30: Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 208: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H. Res. 247: Mr. KEATING.

H. Res. 254: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Res. 353: Mr. DELANEY.

H. Res. 360: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H. Res. 365: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WHITFIELD,
Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr.
CLAY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr.
QUIGLEY.

SENATE—Wednesday, October 9, 2013

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable HEIDI HEITKAMP, a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.
O God, in whose presence our souls take delight, to whom in affliction we call, forgive us for continuing to sow to the wind even when hearing the sounds of the approaching whirlwind.

Lord, when our Federal shutdown delays payments of death benefits to the families of children dying on far-away battlefields, it is time for our lawmakers to say "enough is enough." Cover our shame with the robe of Your righteousness. Forgive us, reform us, and make us whole.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 9, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable HEIDI HEITKAMP, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. HEITKAMP thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following leader remarks the Senate will be in a period of morn-

ing business for debate only until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

MEASURES READ THE SECOND TIME

Mr. REID. There are two measures at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1569) to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 77) making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I would object to any further proceedings with respect to these measures en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bills will be placed on the calendar under rule XIV.

DEBT DEFAULT

Mr. REID. Madam President, it is very hard to find, on occasion, common ground in Washington. Of late, it has been hard all the time.

There is one thing on which Republicans and Democrats should be able to agree: there is no more important issue before Congress than to prevent a catastrophic default on our debt. Default would put our economy in grave danger, and that is a gross understatement. I have said it, so many of my Republican colleagues have said it, and the business community is shouting it from the rooftops.

Goldman Sachs CEO Lloyd Blankfein said this about averting default—he is not known as a great liberal or outstanding Democrat, but he is known as a great businessman. He said:

While the current government shutdown is unfortunate, the impacts of a debt default would be magnitudes worse and should not even be considered a viable option. The economic damage associated with default or near default would be severe and have serious consequences for the recovery of the U.S. and global economy.

That was amplified the last couple of days by Christine Lagarde, head of IMF, who says this is just awful for the world economy.

The world economy affects us. We affect it. No country in the world affects the world economy more than we do. We are going to affect it in a very negative fashion, which will have tremendous negative consequences for us.

There are some Republicans in Congress threatening default, even elated that we are going to have one, saying it doesn't really matter.

Warren Buffett said that using the threat of default to extract political payment "ought to be banned as a weapon. . . . It should be like nuclear bombs, basically too horrible to use." Warren Buffett said this, and his father was a Republican Member of Congress.

Business leaders are begging us to do the right thing and to do it now, quickly. In addition to America's reputation in the world, the bedrock of the global economy is at stake, as I have already stated.

Yesterday a bill was introduced that would remove the specter of default and allow the United States to pay its bills with no preconditions or strings attached. Republicans and Democrats may have our differences, but neither side should hold the full faith and credit of the United States hostage while we resolve them.

Let's reopen the government. Speaker BOEHNER could end this government shutdown today, an hour from now, by letting the House—the entire House—vote on the Senate's clean bill and reopen the government. When the Speaker is on national TV and other places saying: We don't have the votes, he will never know that because he won't let the measure come to the floor. Of course it has enough votes.

Let's reopen the government and pay our bills. There is no reason for Republicans to drag out this process and force the Nation's economy ever closer to an economically catastrophic default. Then let's negotiate. Two hundred days ago to the day, Senate Democrats passed a budget, led by Senator MURRAY, that reflects our priorities. Since then we have asked 20 times to negotiate a compromise within our budget and the one passed by Republicans in the House. We are not afraid to negotiate, but we need someone to negotiate with. We need a dancing partner. If Republicans end this irresponsible, as it appears now, government shutdown, remove the threat of a cataclysmic default, and stop objecting to a budget conference, we could start negotiating now.

Republicans have already been so harsh on rhetoric. Republicans have already done enough harm to our economy with a reckless shutdown designed to undermine the law of the land, ObamaCare. But the consequences of a first-in-history default on the debt would be far worse—even worse than the 2008 financial crisis from which we are still recovering. Two years ago, the

last time the Republicans flirted with this terrible idea, America's credit rating was downgraded for the first time in the history of our great country. The stock market dropped 2,000 points. It has already dropped 7 or 8 percent over the last few weeks.

Raising the debt limit doesn't cost taxpayers a single dime, and Republicans shouldn't claim it does because it doesn't. That is certainly not what they claimed when George W. Bush raised the debt ceiling seven times. Congress has raised the debt limit more than 90 times since it was created in 1939, the majority of those times with Republican Presidents. Ronald Reagan asked Congress to raise the limit 18 times—twice as many as any other President. He, being the great orator he was, said that to do what is being done now, to use an example of why someone should never do that, he called it "outrageous."

Raising the debt ceiling simply allows payment of bills we have already incurred—bills for wars and tax breaks paid for with borrowed money—and basically the simple operation of our government.

I heard one Republican Senator today—I read about it—he said: Well, we have enough money coming in to pay the interest.

Social Security payments would not go forward, and that is only the beginning.

To even consider defaulting on these obligations or to use the threat of default to extract concessions is terribly irresponsible in a negative fashion.

Republican Governor Jon Huntsman, Governor of Utah, an extremely liberal State, said this about the current Republican brinkmanship over default:

It's pretty sad, pretty pathetic for the greatest economy on Earth to be experiencing this . . . Russian roulette with our . . . economy.

He continued:

We have to see it as an economic issue. . . . If you think the government shutdown is a big deal, that's a hand grenade compared to a thermonuclear weapon that would be hitting the debt ceiling.

Yesterday the minority leader suggested that the only way to disarm this weapon is for me to engage in one-on-one talks with the Speaker of the House. I am happy to talk to JOHN BOEHNER anytime. We have talked. But it is obvious to me that no amount of talking will make Speaker BOEHNER either willing or able to end this shutdown and prevent a catastrophic default.

In fact, as my friend the senior Senator from Arizona said yesterday, it is time for the Senate to deal and to lead. He is right. We have an issue coming before us momentarily—the debt ceiling. We have to be the Senate, lead, get that passed, and send it over to the House of Representatives. We have already passed a bill to reopen the gov-

ernment. We have already done that. We are going to go a step further. Senate Democrats have introduced legislation to avert a default on this Nation's obligations.

I say to my Republican colleagues in the Senate, the time for misleading rhetoric is through, and the time for responsible leadership is here. We are happy to work with our Republican colleagues, open the government, pay our bills, and negotiate anything—anything they wish to talk about.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The assistant majority leader.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Each morning, the Senate opens with the customary prayer by our Chaplain and the Pledge of Allegiance. This is an opportunity for Members of the Senate to reflect on two important things: first, our mission on Earth not only as elected officials but as human beings and, second, our devotion and loyalty to this great country.

I have listened to most of the prayers that have been offered over the past 9 days of the government shutdown by Dr. Barry Black. He is a retired admiral from the U.S. Navy and came again before us this morning to offer a prayer. This prayer had a very important message. It was short and direct. He talked about this government shutdown. He reflected on the fact that we literally have families who in the last few days had that awful knock on the door where they were told their son or daughter had died in service to his country in the U.S. military. There were 5 over the weekend and I understand 17 over the course of this government shutdown.

Sadly, the support we always give to these families is not there. It is not there. Customarily, within 24 to 36 hours they are given a sum of money in advance on the benefits that soldier earned so they can take care of funeral expenses and the obvious needs of their family. We can't do that because the government is shut down. That awful knock on the door was not followed by the consolation of this government helping these families. We offered to

many of these families an opportunity to come and to be there to welcome, at Dover Air Force Base in Delaware, the return of their fallen hero. We can't offer them that benefit because the government is shut down.

Dr. Black said to all of us this morning, all of those who believe a government shutdown is just another political gambit—what he said, we should remember, and his words were direct and simple: Enough is enough. Enough is enough.

It isn't only a matter of these families losing that loving son, daughter, husband, wife, brother, or sister; it is a matter that our government that asked them to risk their lives for this great Nation will not stand by them in this moment of grief.

Yesterday, the junior Senator from Texas came in and said: Oh, I think we have already voted to take care of that. It is not true. What is happening now is the House of Representatives—the House of Representatives, which refuses to reopen the government—is scurrying to pass a little bill that will take care of these families. Let's get that bill in, they said. We don't want to face the embarrassment of another headline like this.

That isn't enough. It isn't nearly enough because the embarrassment of this government shutdown goes beyond this grievous situation with these bereaving families. It goes to so many different levels.

Think about this for a moment: In the United States of America, when it comes to infant formula for babies, 60 percent of the infant formula is sold through one government program called WIC—Women, Infants, and Children Program. It is a program that brings in pregnant mothers and moms with new babies and does its level best to make sure those babies are healthy and off to a good start in life.

In my State of Illinois, in the largest county, Cook County, 50,000 mothers depend on WIC—the WIC Program that provides the basics for healthy moms and healthy babies. The WIC Program runs out of money this month. When it does, the support for these families, for these moms, and for these babies is in danger.

Why are we doing this? Is this part of the Republican strategy—sick babies, mothers unprepared to deliver? Is that part of their strategy? Is that their leverage for what they want to achieve? If it is, I have three words for them: Enough is enough.

I just left my office where I had a group of people from my State visiting for whom I have a special affection. They are with what is known as the Primary Health Care Association, and I will bet the Chair has a similar association of some type in her State of North Dakota. These are the folks who open the clinics in the neighborhoods and small towns so that people who

aren't wealthy have access to a doctor and a nurse. I love them, I just love them to pieces because they have invested their whole lives in helping folks who are often ignored. They told me that despite the sadness they feel, and even the anger over this government shutdown, there is a feeling of elation now that the insurance exchanges are open under the Affordable Care Act. They say people are coming in and saying: You won't believe it, but I qualify for health insurance for the first time in my life. These are the clients, these are the people they help every day, and now these people have the peace of mind of health insurance.

That drives some on the other side crazy—to think ObamaCare will go forward and provide this kind of help. In my State, over 250,000 people have already visited the Web sites. They are signing up now for health insurance, many of them for the first time. Ours isn't the most successful State. It appears that per capita the State of Kentucky is one of the most successful, with some 10,000 people already signing up for health insurance—health insurance they otherwise can't afford or don't have.

This is part of the debate in Washington. The Republicans, many of them, are arguing we have to shut down the government, we have to shut down ObamaCare, we have to stop these people from signing up for health insurance. It is not going to work. They cannot reverse history. This is a law that has been on the books almost 4 years, enacted by Congress, signed by the President, judged constitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court—a law on which we have had a referendum in a Presidential election. When President Obama stood up and said: I am going to fight for affordable health care and health care reform, and the Republican candidate said: I will abolish it, President Obama won that reelection by 5 million votes. That is the verdict of history. That is the judgment of the American people. That is how we guide a democracy.

There are some very wealthy, very extreme who will never accept the results of an election. They think with enough money they can overcome the voice of democracy. They are wrong, and that is why what we are setting about to do here is to reopen this government, pay our debts, and then work out whatever remains in terms of issues.

I ask my staff each morning to give me a list of what is happening because of this government shutdown. I can't keep up with it—I mean, page after page, issue after issue. Here is one. There is a major salmonella outbreak affecting hundreds of people in many States right now. The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food Safety and Inspection Service has announced an estimated 278 people across 18 States,

mostly in California, have been reported ill. They are working with the Centers for Disease Control, along with State and local officials, to track that. But that said, we have to understand that with a government shutdown these agencies are not fully staffed.

Families and children across America are vulnerable because of this Republican shutdown strategy. For some, it will mean an illness they will get over in a few days. For others, it could be more serious. The words of the chaplain ring in my ears: Enough is enough.

We keep hearing about this piecemeal approach of the House of Representatives, where when they see these ghastly headlines of bereaving families who are denied the basic benefits that we offer families of those who have fallen in service to America—when they face that embarrassment—they quickly manufacture a little spending bill to cover it, saying: Oh, we will take care of that one. Chuck E. Cheese's calls it Whac-A-Mole. And that is what they are doing. Each time a story pops up, they try to knock it back down.

The Center for American Progress has done a review of the 14 bills passed by the House. They find approximately \$83 billion in funding—just about \$6 billion a bill. The total amount of non-defense funding in the original House-passed continuing resolution was \$469 billion. Therefore, the House bills that already have passed and are currently under consideration make up less than 18 percent of the total. So for all the efforts of the House of Representatives, sending over these bills to react to embarrassments from their government shutdown, they can't keep up with it.

The simple honest answer is to open the government. We have passed the bill and sent it to Speaker BOEHNER. He is living in political fear of calling that bill because he knows it will pass. The Democrats overwhelmingly will support it, and enough moderate Republicans will step up to reopen this government, and Speaker BOEHNER cannot accept that reality. He is afraid to call a vote.

How many more embarrassing moments will we have, reporting on situations such as these poor families who have given their all, who have lost their loved ones, and now they are asked to suffer because of the Republican shutdown? It has to come to an end.

Yesterday on the floor I appealed to moderate Republicans in the Senate to step up—step up and join us. We are going to have a bill before us in a short time—I hope sooner rather than later—that is going to avoid a default on America's debt. If we default on October 17, it will be the first time in the history of the United States that will have occurred. It will have a devastating impact on businesses, on jobs, and on the savings of Americans.

If you have a savings account, if you have a retirement account, have you been watching it over the last several days? Have you seen what the Republican shutdown has done for your plans, for your future and your family? This is unacceptable, and it will get dramatically worse unless we pass, in a bipartisan fashion, this extension of the debt limit for the United States of America. This will be a chance for moderate Republicans in the Senate to speak up and stand up.

Before I close, I want to say a special word about my colleague, my Republican Senate colleague MARK KIRK, who announced this week he would vote for a clean debt ceiling. I have said it back home, and I will say it here on the floor. It is the right thing to do for my colleague. It is the right thing to do for America. But I want to express my appreciation for his leadership. I hope his example of stepping up and saying he is going to put the country first before his party is one that will be followed by other Members on his side of the aisle.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

HEALTH CARE EXCHANGES

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Illinois, and I have heard him make reference to the insurance exchanges that opened last week. It was 1 week ago President Obama's health insurance exchanges opened, and by all accounts it was a complete disaster.

The administration had 3½ years to prepare for the big launch. It spent months and millions of dollars advertising the start date. Yet on October 1, the American people had their first chance to sign up, and the exchanges flopped. It was a complete fiasco.

The administration tried to say it was caught off guard. They said they were caught off guard by too many people going to the Web site on the first day. Even Saturday Night Live ridiculed the excuse. They said: That is like 1-800-Flowers getting caught off guard on Valentine's Day.

There were glitches the first day, but they lasted the whole week—the entire first week. The question is, Did the administration finally get its act together? Well, actually, no, it didn't. The past weekend they had to pull down the Web site to try to fix some of the worst problems. USA TODAY, a newspaper whose editorials have actually in the past supported the health care law, had as yesterday's headline: "Health sites generate more error messages than coverage." That was the headline. The subheadline: "Exchange launch turns into an inexcusable mess."

An inexcusable mess. And they go on:

... the administration managed to turn the experience for most of those visitors into a nightmare. Websites crashed, refused to load, or offered bizarre and incomprehensible choices. Even though the system was shut down for repairs over the weekend, Monday's early reports continued to suggest an epic screw-up.

The front page of the Wall Street Journal on Monday read: "Software, Design Defects Cripple Health-Care Website."

One does not take down a Web site for minor glitches. These are signs of major trouble. Some of us have been warning that the administration has failed to prepare properly. We said there would be security holes that would expose people to fraud and identity theft. It turns out the administration didn't even get to the point where the security flaws would actually matter early on because people couldn't even start entering their personal information. The exchanges were failing to launch. People got repeated error messages, and they couldn't fill out forms or applications. They couldn't create an account to start looking at the most basic of information to even make comparisons. When they tried to telephone to get help, they found long wait times and they got disconnected entirely. Even the administration's biggest cheerleaders admitted defeat. One reporter at MSNBC spent so much time trying to show viewers how to sign up for the exchange Web site online that she actually gave up. They were playing this on television. She finally threw in the towel saying:

If I were signing up for myself, this is where my patience would be exhausted.

The Wall Street Journal tried to find out what went wrong. It talked to computer experts, who looked at the healthcare.gov Web site, and what the computer experts said is, "The site appeared to be built on a sloppy software foundation." According to those experts, "such a hastily constructed website"—and, of course, they had 3½ years—"may not have been able to withstand the online demand last week."

Even the far-left Wonkblog at the Washington Post couldn't believe how badly the administration had failed. One of its columnists wrote:

The Obama administration did itself—and the millions of people who wanted to explore signing up—a terrible disservice by building a Web site that, four days into launch, is still unusable for most Americans.

It wasn't supposed to happen this way. President Obama promised using the exchanges would be like, in his words, shopping on amazon.com. Well, Amazon can handle 13 or 14 million transactions every day with no problem. There are over 5,000 Web sites generating more traffic than healthcare.gov.

So how many people were able to successfully enroll in the health care exchanges on the first day? We have no

idea. The administration doesn't want to talk about it. First, they said: We are thrilled so many people were checking out the Web site. By Sunday, Treasury Secretary Jack Lew was on multiple television shows refusing to answer questions about how many people had enrolled and just repeating the White House talking points. He claimed 4.7 million people had visited.

If they are willing to tell us how many people have visited the Web site, why won't they tell us how many people actually got coverage?

The administration says they won't provide any data to back up its claims until at least November.

Remember, California claimed 5 million people visited their Web site for its own State exchange for the first day. They later had to back up and say that wasn't true. It turns out they had 645,000 visitors—less than 1 million, not the 5 million they claimed. That is a State that spent \$313 million on their site and it couldn't handle even that many people, because they had trouble.

President Obama said he was going to have the most transparent administration in history. The health care law is this administration's signature accomplishment. October 1 was the day they had been working toward for more than 3 years, and now the President won't tell the American people—won't tell any of us how many people have even signed up for health insurance. Why not? What is the President trying to hide?

CNN looked into the 24 States that set up their own insurance exchanges under the law. They found that as of last Friday, about 52,000 applications had been started. That is not how many people have actually completed their application successfully; it is just they have started. It is not how many people have gotten insurance; that is just how many people get to the point of starting their application.

Even if the Obama administration fixes the technical problems with its health insurance Web site, it will not have fixed the many problems with its health care law. The law will still not give people the lower cost, high-quality care they wanted—which is the reason we needed health care reform in the first place. But I think the American people will hold the President to his promises and hold the Washington Democrats who voted for this law to their promises.

The President, right before the exchanges opened, said coverage in the exchanges should cost less than your cell phone bill. He said you should be able to keep your doctor. And he said it would be as easy and secure as amazon.com. So far, the President's health care law has failed on all of these. That was exactly what many of us warned would happen.

It doesn't matter if the ObamaCare exchange system failures happened be-

cause of heavy traffic or because of design flaws. The administration officials should be embarrassed, but they should not be surprised. Republicans warned the exchanges were not ready for prime time, but the President and Democrats ignored calls for a delay.

Why is the administration insisting now on fining people—fining people who don't have insurance, even though they can't sign up on the Web site successfully? The President unilaterally gave big businesses a 1-year delay in the employer mandate. Workers should get the same break that bosses get. If bosses get a 1-year delay in penalties, why shouldn't hard-working men and women all across the country get a 1-year delay of the individual mandate?

President Obama should have delayed the launch of his insurance exchange until it was ready. That would have been the fair thing to do. It is still the right thing to do. It is also the fair and right thing to give individual Americans the same delay of the mandate that the President has unilaterally—without the action of Congress—given to businesses all around this country.

Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, yesterday the Veterans Affairs Administration announced it would furlough 7,000 Veterans Benefits Administration employees, and as a result activities and services in the following areas would be suspended: The education call center, personal interviews and hearings at regional offices, education and vocational counseling, outreach programs including at military facilities, the VetSuccess Program on campuses.

But this announcement is only the beginning of the contraction in the services and activities of the VA. In fact, VA also announced that at the end of the month it will run out of funding for compensation, pension, educational and vocational rehabilitation, and employment benefits.

What does that mean for America? What are the consequences of the VA saying this shutdown means we are shutting our doors to processing and paying the claims of men and women who have served this country, who have been disabled as a consequence of that service, who have earned educational benefits so they can come back and continue to contribute to this

country? What that means to America is we are in effect defaulting and failing on a core obligation this country has to men and women who serve and sacrifice. America is failing to keep faith with its veterans, and America is failing on one of its most essential obligations.

We ought to be ashamed and embarrassed that 7,000 men and women, who want nothing more than to help their fellow veterans—in fact, half of those 7,000 men and women at the VA are themselves veterans—have been told: Go home. In fact, at the end of the month the benefits, pensions, and educational benefits that are received by veterans will have to be suspended because the VA is running out of money. Right now it is in effect continuing on the leftover money, which will last only through the end of this month.

I spoke this morning to a veteran named Jordan Massa, a native of Bridgeport, who served for 6 years in the U.S. Army as an infantryman, including two tours in Iraq. Jordan Massa was injured in an IED explosion, a roadside bomb, that left him severely disabled with ear and back wounds as well as posttraumatic stress. Jordan Massa waited for 2 years after he applied for the benefits he needs and deserves, until October 1—just days ago—when he heard the good news that he would be receiving the disability benefits to which he is entitled—not as an act of charity or beneficence; he is entitled to those disability benefits. Now Jordan Massa is on the verge of being denied the benefits he needs and deserves because of this shutdown. A Connecticut native, awarded the Purple Heart, he has been a student at Tunxis, and has sought to help other veterans as a counselor—giving back to this country even after his service in uniform.

I spoke also to Aaron Jones, who works at the South Park Inn Shelter, which serves homeless veterans in Hartford. That shelter is full.

There are thousands of homeless veterans in Connecticut and millions across the country who also are a mark of shame and embarrassment for this country. The greatest Nation in the history of the world is failing to provide for men and women who have worn the uniform and now are homeless.

He is telling me the government shutdown has created an additional obstacle to those veterans who want to leave that shelter to find permanent housing. Some are there for emergency, about 7; some are there in transitional housing, about 10; and they want to resume productive and constructive lives. This shutdown has created an additional obstacle to their doing so. In fact, for Aaron himself, who is a veteran and served in the National Guard, a tour in Bosnia, a tour in Iraq, this shutdown is a horrendous obstacle.

At this moment as I speak on the floor there is a House hearing. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has, as its principal witness, the head of the VA, General Shinseki, who has served this Nation with distinction and dedication and has sought valiantly to reduce the backlog in disability claims and to provide benefits more efficiently and effectively to our veterans.

Rather than using General Shinseki as a political punching bag, the House should simply have a vote. They should vote on a simple, straightforward, no-strings-attached funding resolution that would enable those 7,000 VA employees to come back to work and serve the people they love. It would provide for other essential services, whether at NIH serving cancer victims or the other agencies that work with the VA to help serve our veterans, such as the Department of Labor and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The piecemeal approach the House is taking, a "cause du jour" approach to governing, is simply inadequate and irresponsible. The bill they have sent to us, while it deals with the VA, would not provide for those other agencies that are essential to the VA's work, whether in training or housing or processing claims.

This Nation should be embarrassed and ashamed. This legislature ought to be embarrassed and ashamed that it is failing to keep faith with Jordan Massa, with the folks who live at the South Park Inn Shelter, and countless other veterans in Connecticut and across this country who are entitled to benefits, pensions, and processing of their disability claims so they can receive what they deserve and need. If the House votes it will pass a simple, straightforward funding resolution, if the House is permitted to simply say yea or nay to that very straightforward, simple measure, this Nation will keep faith with Jordan Massa, with Aaron Jones, and with the countless millions of other veterans who at the end of this month will lose the benefits and pensions they are entitled to receive as a result of their service and sacrifice to this Nation.

I ask the Speaker of the House to simply allow a vote. Let the House vote so we can open government, pay our debts, and then reach a budget that is comprehensive and responsible and meets the needs of those veterans and many other Americans who are harmed and handicapped, enduring hardship as a result of the failure of that body. It is a small minority in one branch of the legislature, one branch of our government that is failing our Nation.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. I understand we are in morning business. I ask consent to speak for 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I wish to talk a little bit about the government shutdown—what else. It is my understanding that my colleagues across the aisle, I understand I will not have the opportunity to speak to any one of them, but should they come out on the floor—they are out on the Senate Capitol steps exhorting the House to send something they prefer over or to simply end the shutdown with a clean bill. I however would have suggested they would go over to the House steps as a gesture of good will. I am not sure any Member of the House—I know when I was in the House, I am not sure I would have appreciated either party getting on the Capitol steps and urging me to doing something when I was in the House. But be that as it may, perhaps it is a good will effort as opposed to further demands.

I want to make sure everybody in Kansas is aware—and I know I speak for everybody on our side—the Republican side of the aisle did not want to shut down the government. As everybody knows, we have the current continuing resolution. I am sorry we have to continue to go through continuing resolutions. This is where we bundle up everything from appropriations bills, some of which have already been worked through, and then simply meld them together into a continuing resolution. We do not do appropriations bills anymore. That would be called regular order. I truly resent this. I find this most unfortunate.

So here we are, trying to consider how to fund the government. Many of us believe this funding measure should do everything possible to also control spending. That seems to be the real issue. Chief among these proposals would be to defund or at least delay the health care reform law. My colleagues and I have supported multiple measures to try to avoid a shutdown.

In the past few weeks Republicans have offered no fewer than three solutions to avoid the government shutdown, and I voted to keep the government open every single time. Most recently, the House is passing mini-CRs to open the government piece by piece because we cannot come to an agreement on a continuing resolution. Most people, if they pay attention to the media—or if the media even covers this—understand what the House is trying to do, which is to open the government piece by piece. The first item

of business would be to certainly fund the Veterans Administration. We have all seen what is going on down at the World War II Memorial and, unfortunately, at the Marine Corps War Memorial as well, where we have yet to break the barrier. Being the senior marine in the Congress, I may lead a charge at the memorial sometime later this week. I have not made up my mind yet.

At any rate, that is just not reasonable. There are a lot of things being done, including no death benefits for people who have paid the ultimate sacrifice recently in the current wars that continue to go on. That is abhorrent. Why that decision was made by the Department of Defense I do not know.

At any rate, the House is trying to target these particular items, most of which have been identified by the President. So these mini-CRs by the House mirror what the President says in regards to the hurt that is being caused by the shutdown. What the President identifies, the House is trying to fix and then send over to the Senate. It is very unclear whether the majority leader will even allow a vote in regard to these measures. Senator CRUZ spoke to this in regards to a plan A, when we were discussing this in the Republican conference.

At any rate, the majority leader has refused to consider a single one. So this debate is not about shutting down the government, it is actually in part to protect Americans from what I call the disastrous health care law that is damaging our economy, raising taxes, and costing people their jobs. It is about a President who is unwilling to lead, unwilling to even come to the table to negotiate.

The President is now indicating he might want to negotiate on a short-term continuing resolution, but we do not have an agenda. We have had quite a few people offer plans. The distinguished Senator from Maine, SUSAN COLLINS, has a plan—it should be a bipartisan plan—that calls for a short continuing resolution, repeal of the medical device tax, and then fixing the sequester so the different agencies would have the authority to pick and choose how to meet the guidelines with regard to the Budget Control Act. Then it allows oversight responsibility to the Appropriations Committee to take a look at what the various Secretaries would do and make sure that is all right. This would be plan B.

We have a plan C by PAUL RYAN that I just read about in the Wall Street Journal. So we are not lacking in plans. What we are lacking is a room. We don't have a room, we don't have a table, we don't have chairs, and we don't have anybody in the chairs, they don't want anybody in the chairs. By the way, I would just as soon not have another supercommittee that turned out to be not very super, selected by

leadership. We could have the Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction, and the Ways and Means Committee in the House, which has jurisdiction, and I will bet we could come up with something that would be reasonable. At any rate, it is still about the majority leader insisting, no, he is not going to consider something like this. Unless, of course, the President would change his mind—and I hope he does.

My colleagues across the aisle have refused to consider even the most moderate proposals such as repealing the medical device tax as recommended by Senator COLLINS and ensuring that Members of Congress and their staff are treated the same as the average American in the ObamaCare exchanges.

Let me repeat that: that Members of Congress and their staff are treated the same as average Americans in the ObamaCare exchanges. When that came up in the Finance Committee, long before ObamaCare was passed or, for that matter, before it left the Finance Committee to go behind closed doors, in the majority leader's office—where I think he was singing with Mr. Rich, in terms of singing behind closed doors, but that is another story—at any rate, that first time I think it was Senator GRASSLEY who said he thinks it is only right that Members of Congress and their staff live under the same rules. He proposed that amendment. I voted for it then and I would again. It did pass then and, of course, now it is defeated by those across the aisle.

After failing to pass a budget last year and the 3 years prior to that or to pass a single funding measure this year, the Federal Government has been operating under a stopgap measure, as I mentioned before, called a continuing resolution. This is not what the people of Kansas expect from their government.

Despite multiple disruptions and critical delays, the exchanges became active as of October 1, about a week ago. However, since then we have heard feedback that the exchanges are off to a rocky start, are unusable or totally disappointing, fraught with frequent error and messages from a failure of a major software component. That is also not what people expected from any government program, and certainly not what has been sold as the President's signature domestic achievement.

Unfortunately, this was not unexpected for those of us who have opposed the law since the beginning, but it does bring up an issue. If you watch the news media—and for that matter, the comedy shows that follow later in the evening—there is always somebody who is trying to sign up on a computer and following the instructions given by the Department of Health and Human Services.

After you log on, the first page shows a smiling face, and then you get maybe three questions. I was interested in one

of the questions I heard had been asked: What do you eat? What is your favorite food?

If that's true what on Earth does that have to do with signing up for ObamaCare? Maybe they are concerned with somebody they feel might be obese or something like that, and maybe that is the person who ought to be signing up. I just don't know.

I know when I went through the first 16 pages—when I was reviewing as a member of the Finance Committee—of the draft on how you sign up, I got to page 3, and must say I would not give any database that kind of personal information. I think part of the delay is probably caught up on that. But you can't even get past page 3, and then it says you must wait.

I don't know how long we are going to wait. I know the President has called it simply glitches and bumps in the road. I think the front page of the Washington Post saying that many people had warned the administration that this was not going to work is certainly pertinent with regards to this discussion. I would offer up that these are system failures as opposed to bumps and glitches. I don't know when this is going to be worked out.

Despite a government shutdown, my colleagues across the aisle will not even consider solutions which acknowledge the widespread concerns expressed by the American people have with ObamaCare.

Let me also point out something else. The nominee to be the new head of the IRS—I asked him first why on Earth he would want to take on that job. He said, I am Mr. Fix-it, and that is what his resume says. I asked him a couple of questions, and I wished him well. I said: How are you going to implement and enforce this fine that is going to be on everybody if they don't sign up? I understand, from the administration, that nobody has to submit their eligibility requirements with regards to income. This is going to lead to fraud, abuse, and scamming. Second, you can't even sign up to begin with, and third, how on Earth is the IRS going to find anybody when they do not have the information or capability to do that?

I asked the distinguished nominee, who will come before the Finance Committee, where I will ask him again: How are you going to do that? He said: I need 8,000 more people. I said: What do you think the chances of that happening are around here? They would have to be trained, right? He said: Right.

They don't even have the people to enforce this if, in fact, they are going to enforce the fine. So why not just tell the American people: I am sorry, but we are not ready to fine people. We are not ready to have people declare their eligibility with regards to income, and we are not ready to sign people up yet

because of the glitches, bumps, or failures in the system. So just delay it. Maybe they could delay it—as one prominent newscaster has proposed—and just say: Look, if you want it, sign up for it, do. If you don't, you don't have to. You won't have to anyway because you are not going to get fined because the IRS has no capability to fine people. How are they going to do that? Are they going to cut your rebate check? Most of the people don't even get rebate checks. This is a mess that is just falling apart.

I, for one, am going to do everything I can to not let this stalemate stand. I am a senior member on the Finance Committee. I would encourage my colleagues basically that we meet, and that we discuss a continuing resolution that would extend funding out and allow us to try to work together on the systemic problems that face us with regards to the national debt.

I want to work toward a solution. I am going to do everything in my power to bring my colleagues to the table. I think they want to come to the table. We have a lot of responsible and good people interested who want this to end just like this side wants it to end. But we race headlong into another debt ceiling debate with the President in the exact same position as he is in the shutdown—unwilling to lead, unwilling to even come to the table, and we still have the majority leader saying no. We have White House officials running to the media declaring that we will default on our debt, the sky will fall, and this will be the fault of Republicans. These claims of inevitable default are false given the operation of the government and the cash flowing into the Treasury each month. They are clearly posturing—and dangerously posturing at that. No one wants a default or a shutdown by shotgun. Nobody wants a default—least of all me. It is the height of irresponsibility to make these claims and all along the way refuse to negotiate.

What we are asking for, and what we must do, is very simple: Consider a debt limit extension and budget changes at the same time, which would allow us to address our debt problem. Contrary to what Secretary Lew and other administration officials say, this is how these issues are handled. This is regular order. The debt limit, for at least the last 27 years, except for one small extension, has been attached to larger spending cuts and budget reforms. This is not unprecedented. This is how we do business. This is regular order.

The President's position is at odds with the stance taken by his predecessors from both parties. They saw the common sense of coupling deficit reduction with the extension of the debt limit. It is hard to figure out the President's thinking on this. Maybe now that a huge portion of Federal

spending is on autopilot, he simply wants a blank check to fund the government with automatic increases in the debt limit. I want to mention something else that bothers me. I would like to go into negotiations with at least certain things that are guarantees, things which have been guaranteed before. I am talking about guarantees in the Budget Control Act, and I am talking about the so-called fiscal cliff. The fiscal cliff protected 99 percent of Americans from a tax increase and had an estate tax reform that made sense and some real progress on capital gains.

The Budget Control Act, as we all know, led to the sequester. Again, Senator COLLINS has a plan that would fix the sequester and would give people more flexibility on how to do it, but also with oversight by the appropriations committees to make sure it is done right.

In meeting with the President—and he indicated in a press conference the other day that maybe he would invite more people to the White House. I appreciated being invited to the White House about 6 months ago. The subject came to a grand bargain. We were asking how this would work out.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I ask for an additional 5 minutes if I may have it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Thank you, Madam President. I will try to wrap up. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator who wishes to speak. I will try to get this done.

We were meeting with the President. I was bringing up the issue of regulations, but the rest of the people were talking about a grand bargain and what could happen. The President said on tax reform: Why can't we start with a clean page? Basically everybody agreed. And then he said we could also take mortgage interest, charitable giving, retirement, and we can means-test those and start from there. I thought, oh boy, here we go again—income redistribution. That is not the answer.

I would just say that before we enter into any negotiations, we ought to make sure that the Budget Control Act and the fiscal cliff bill, which were negotiated in good faith with the Vice President and which have resulted in lower spending, in the first actual decreases in spending by the Federal Government since the Korean War. That is unbelievable.

So in going to negotiate, I don't want to give up in regards to those decreases, and I don't want a situation where the President has said: I gave to you on CPI so I need \$800 billion in revenue. The distinguished majority leader has said it is \$1 trillion. So if we are

going to raise \$1 trillion in revenue, then here we go again and whatever negotiations come down the pike are going to be more spending and more taxes. People are just figuring out what their tax bill is going to be with ObamaCare. We don't need a situation where we sit down and negotiate simply for more taxes and spending. Without going into the constitutional implications of granting any authority on autopilot to the President, I would say I am adamantly opposed to giving any President that much control over the budget.

Why does all of this matter? Why am I making this speech? Why is my friend across the aisle going to make her speech? The debt limit is currently \$16.7 trillion. The debt has increased about \$6 trillion since the President took office—more than any other President in our history. The main source of this tremendous growth in our debt is entitlement spending, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid. PAUL RYAN has a plan to fix that. It ought to at least be on the table, and that way we can see a path for where we can go with it.

Without changes, spending on these programs is expected to grow by 79 percent over the next 10 years. In fact, by law, there is no upper limit on how much we spend on these programs. This spending—added to interest payments on the debt—will make up close to 65 percent of the budget in 10 years. By then we won't have any discretionary spending.

The Congressional Budget Office reports that we remain on an unsustainable path. All we are asking—prudently, I hope—is that any increase in the Federal debt limit needs to be coupled with real, tangible cuts in discretionary spending and meaningful, structural reform to entitlement spending. We need to get this done to rein in our unsustainable debt and to ensure that these programs are there for our children and our grandchildren.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Thomas Sowell, a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution from Stanford University be printed in the RECORD at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[From the Standard Times, Oct. 6, 2013]

WHO SHUT DOWN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

(By Thomas Sowell)

SAN ANGELO, TX.—Even when it comes to something as basic, and apparently as simple and straightforward, as the question of who shut down the federal government, there are diametrically opposite answers, depending on whether you talk to Democrats or to Republicans.

There is really nothing complicated about the facts. The Republican-controlled House of Representatives voted all the money required to keep all government activities going—except for Obamacare. This is not a matter of opinion. You can check the Congressional Record.

As for the House of Representatives' right to grant or withhold money, that is not a matter of opinion either. You can check the Constitution of the United States. All spending bills must originate in the House of Representatives, which means that congressmen there have a right to decide whether or not they want to spend money on a particular government activity.

Whether Obamacare is good, bad or indifferent is a matter of opinion. But it is a matter of fact that members of the House of Representatives have a right to make spending decisions based on their opinion.

Obamacare is indeed "the law of the land," as its supporters keep saying, and the Supreme Court has upheld its constitutionality. But the whole point of having a division of powers within the federal government is that each branch can decide independently what it wants to do or not do, regardless of what the other branches do, when exercising the powers specifically granted to that branch by the Constitution.

The hundreds of thousands of government workers who have been laid off are not idle because the House of Representatives did not vote enough money to pay their salaries or the other expenses of their agencies—unless they are in an agency that would administer Obamacare.

Since we cannot read minds, we cannot say who—if anybody—"wants to shut down the government." But we do know who had the option to keep the government running and chose not to.

The money voted by the House of Representatives covered everything that the government does, except for Obamacare. The Senate chose not to vote to authorize that money to be spent, because it did not include money for Obamacare.

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid says that he wants a "clean" bill from the House of Representatives, and some in the media keep repeating the word "clean" like a mantra. But what is unclear about not giving Reid everything he wants?

If Reid and President Barack Obama refuse to accept the money required to run the government, because it leaves out the money they want to run Obamacare, that is their right. But that is also their responsibility. You cannot blame other people for not giving you everything you want. And it is a fraud to blame them when you refuse to use the money they did vote, even when it is ample to pay for everything else in the government.

When Obama keeps claiming that it is some new outrage for those who control the money to try to change government policy by granting or withholding money, that is simply a bald-faced lie. You can check the history of other examples of "legislation by appropriation," as it used to be called.

Whether legislation by appropriation is a good idea or a bad idea is a matter of opinion. But whether it is both legal and not unprecedented is a matter of fact.

Perhaps the biggest of the big lies is that the government will not be able to pay what it owes on the national debt, creating a danger of default. Tax money keeps coming into the treasury during the shutdown, and it vastly exceeds the interest that has to be paid on the national debt.

Even if the debt ceiling is not lifted, that only means that government is not allowed to run up new debt. But that does not mean that it is unable to pay the interest on existing debt.

None of this is rocket science. But unless the Republicans get their side of the story

out—and articulation has never been their strong suit—the lies will win. More important, the whole country will lose.

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield back any time I may have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, as my colleague from Kansas said, I also came to the floor today to talk about the unnecessary government shutdown that is continuing and is having widespread ramifications in New Hampshire and across the country.

I would like to respond to some of what he said about the Budget Control Act and about the current state of the deficit. The fact is the deficit, under this President, has been reduced by more than 50 percent since he took office. It is on course to reach a little over 4 percent of GDP by the end of 2015, I believe. By 2023 it is expected to get even lower—down to a little over 2 percent. There is no doubt that we need a plan to deal with the long-term debt and deficits of this country.

Most of us who supported the Budget Control Act thought that was what we had done. We put a committee in place that was actually going to come up with an agreement on how we could get to a long-term plan to deal with this country's debt and deficits. It is really unfortunate that some of the people who were appointed to that committee didn't share in that commitment.

I think it is important to remind us all where we are. We have made significant improvements on reducing the deficit in this country. We have been willing to look at a long-term agreement to deal with the debt and deficit, and I think that is what we ought to do. I would hope that as the result of this government shutdown, we can get some agreement from both sides of the aisle to actually do this.

My main purpose in coming to the floor today is to talk again about the impact of the shutdown on too many people who were caught in the middle between this unnecessary inflicted crisis that we are seeing in Washington and the impact that it is having on families, small businesses, the economy of New Hampshire, and the country.

We are now in the ninth day of the shutdown. In New Hampshire we have seen hundreds of Federal workers who have been furloughed. Some of those workers are back to work. Fortunately, at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard most of those people are back to work, and that is very good news. We still have people at the Forest Service, and we have people who work for the Federal Government in other capacities all over the State who have not been fortunate enough to be called back to work.

I would just remind everybody that even for those people who are back at

work, they are not being paid. They are working without pay.

In New Hampshire Small Business Administration loans have been halted, and that is true across the country. The Federal Housing Administration and VA loans have been slowed down. At the White Mountain National Forest, which is a Federal forest that hosts more visitors than Yosemite and Yellowstone National Parks combined, people who are traveling through our beautiful White Mountain National Forest at this time of the year so they can look at the foliage are not even able to use the restrooms because of the shutdown.

This morning I wanted to speak about some of those businesses I have heard from who are being hurt by the shutdown. New Hampshire is truly a small business State. Ninety-six percent of employers in the Granite State are considered small businesses and they are the backbone of our economy. They are also where most of the new jobs are going to come from.

Two out of every three new jobs in the United States is created by a small business, but the shutdown is hitting them hard. I heard this morning from two of our businesses that have been established in the State for a long time. They have national reputations.

Titeflex, which is an aerospace company in the lakes region, does a lot of business for the Department of Defense and they also provide supplies to larger companies. They told me their inventory is piling up on their docks now because they don't have anybody to inspect it, because those Federal officials who do that are not working. They are furloughed. They said it is really going to be a problem in 10 days if they don't get this resolved, when they have to report to the corporation their bottom line numbers, which will show on their reports, and that will affect their company.

Then I also heard from some representatives of Smith Tubular, which is a medical device equipment company that does business with the VA and with the military, and they also do a lot of work with the FDA. They said they are seeing their contracts affected, and they have heard from FDA that they couldn't provide the payments they normally provide to them because there is nobody at FDA to process those payments. So that is having an effect on the ability of businesses to innovate, to provide the products that are needed.

We have seen an impact on lending in New Hampshire. The Small Business Administration has reported that loans are not being originated. One does not need a Ph.D. in economics to understand that if small businesses can't access capital and credit, there are real economic consequences. One of our largest SBA lenders in New Hampshire is a company called the Granite State

Development Corporation. Twenty of their loans are on hold already because of the shutdown.

Then this morning I heard from a community bank in New Hampshire called Provident Bank that it has about half a dozen SBA loans being held up right now. One of those loans is for a newly starting up entrepreneur who wants to open an Orange Leaf Frozen Yogurt franchise in New Hampshire. All the paperwork is ready to go, but Provident Bank can't get the final approval for the loan until the SBA is up and running again. So if the shutdown continues, Provident Bank is concerned that interest rates are going to rise, and if interest rates rise, the cost of borrowing for small businesses is going to go up.

As the Presiding Officer knows, because her State is much like New Hampshire with a lot of small businesses, access to credit is the lifeblood of those small businesses. Right now, we are preventing them from getting the help they need.

Then we have small businesses in New Hampshire that rely on consumer demand. I heard from Charles Moulton, who is the owner of a New Hampshire maple syrup company called New Hampshire Gold. This is the time of year when people are coming to see the foliage and sample our maple syrup in New Hampshire. He has four employees and his maple syrup company has a storefront in New Hampshire, but it also sells one of their signature products, their maple syrup, to Zion National Park in Utah—kind of an unlikely location for a New Hampshire maple syrup, but New Hampshire Gold sells to tourists who come there from all over the world during the summer and early fall. But now, because Zion National Park is shut down, as are all of our national parks, New Hampshire Gold sales have dried up. While they continue to sell in Concord, NH, in their retail store, much of the cushion they needed to get through the winter into next year comes from that location at Zion. They can't afford to lose those dollars as they are thinking about how to get through the rest of this year.

New Hampshire Gold is just one of the thousands of small businesses that have been hurt by the shutdown of our national parks. Visitors to the parks spend nearly \$13 billion a year in regions within 60 miles of the parks. This shutdown is hurting not just visitors to those parks; it is hurting small businesses such as New Hampshire Gold and all of the other small businesses around our parks who depend on that tourism business.

There is no doubt this shutdown is hurting our economy. Economist Mark Zandi projected that a 3-to-4-week shutdown would reduce gross domestic product by 1.4 percent during the fourth quarter. He noted that the pro-

jection likely underestimates the economic fallout, since it doesn't fully account for the impact of such a lengthy shutdown on consumers, businesses, and investor psychology.

The bottom line is clear: The shutdown is bad for our economy, it is bad for middle-class families, and it is bad for the country.

As we look at the looming deadline for when we need to raise the debt ceiling so we can pay the bills this country has incurred, there is potentially even greater fallout for America. Holding the economy and critical services hostage to score political points is irresponsible. We need to open the government. We need to raise the debt ceiling so we can pay our bills. With the economy finally showing signs of improvement, the last thing we should be doing is what is happening right now.

I am hopeful the House will do what is right. I am hopeful they will pass a short-term funding bill. That action will get our government running again, and then we can continue to negotiate on what we need to do to address the long-term debt and deficits in the country, as well as talk about where we need to invest to make sure this country stays competitive in the future.

I yield the floor.

QUORUM CALL

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 4]

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Nelson
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Casey	Klobuchar	Schatz
Coons	Leahy	Schumer
Durbin	Merkley	Stabenow
Franken	Murphy	Warner
Heinrich	Murray	Warren

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the presence of absent Senators, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 215 Leg.]

YEAS—78

Ayotte	Graham	Mikulski
Baldwin	Grassley	Murkowski
Baucus	Hagan	Murphy
Bennet	Harkin	Murray
Blumenthal	Hatch	Nelson
Boozman	Heinrich	Portman
Boxer	Heitkamp	Pryor
Brown	Hirono	Reed
Cantwell	Hoeven	Reid
Cardin	Isakson	Rockefeller
Carper	Johanns	Rubio
Casey	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Chambliss	Kaine	Schatz
Chiesa	King	Schumer
Coats	Kirk	Shaheen
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shelby
Collins	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Corker	Levin	Toomey
Donnelly	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Durbin	Markey	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	McCaín	Warner
Fischer	McCaskill	Warren
Flake	McConnell	Whitehouse
Franken	Menendez	Wicker
Gillibrand	Merkley	Wyden

NAYS—18

Alexander	Crapo	Moran
Barrasso	Cruz	Risch
Blunt	Enzi	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Scott
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Cornyn	Lee	Thune

NOT VOTING—4

Begich	Paul
Inhofe	Vitter

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The senior Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, when a house is on fire, the reasonable thing to do is put it out and then figure out what happened to prevent the next one.

When a ship is headed toward rocks, the reasonable thing is to steer away and then work on charting a better course.

When a government is shut down and is headed toward a default that economists would say is catastrophic, the reasonable thing to do is end the crisis, steer away from the next one, and work together on a long-term plan to avoid these crises in the future.

We are now in the second week of this absolutely unnecessary government shutdown. Every day we are hearing more and more about the tremendous impact this is having on our families and our communities across the country. It is only going to get worse.

We can end this today. It does not have to continue. We are holding the door open for our Republican colleagues to join us in putting a stop to this madness. All they need to do is come in. Senate Democrats have spent the past 6 months trying to get Republicans to join us at the table in a budget conference. We knew there were two options: conference or crisis—working together toward a bipartisan budget deal or lurching separately into a completely avoidable government shutdown.

A number of Republicans joined us in a push for negotiations, but no matter how many times we tried, we were blocked. We were pushed to this point by a refusal to negotiate, and now the only path forward is for the House to end the crisis and then join us at the table at which we have been waiting to sit for 6 months.

Democrats want to negotiate. We want to have this conversation. We think the only way out of this cycle of constant crisis is for the two sides to work together, to make some compromises and get to a fair and responsible long-term deal. But it does not make sense to do that while our families and our communities are being hurt by this government shutdown and while the threat of a default hangs over their heads.

I served on the supercommittee. I worked with my colleagues to write and pass our budget here in the Senate. I know Democrats and Republicans have some serious differences when it comes to our budget values and our priorities, and I absolutely believe we owe it to the American people to try to bridge that divide and to find common ground. But are we really going to ask them to wait patiently, continue suffering through this shutdown, keep watching as we cruise toward an economic calamity while another supercommittee gets together and has a conversation? That does not make sense. Let's have those conversations, let's have those negotiations, but let's end this crisis and get to work.

Yesterday I heard something from the Speaker. He said he didn't want to end the shutdown or address the debt limit now because that would be "unconditional surrender to the President." Have we really come to the point where simply allowing the government to open is considered by one party to be a political loss? Are we really in a place where the majority of one Chamber in one branch of government believes allowing the United States of America to pay its bills is a major concession?

I say to my Republican friends who are here today, imagine if our roles were reversed. For example, I have been working very hard this year to write an early childhood education bill that I am passionate about, and I believe it will really help our children and our families. I suspect there are a few people in this Chamber today, including several on the Republican side, who could one day see themselves in the White House. If that day were to come, what would my Republican colleagues do if I said to them that if they did not pass my bill to expand pre-K, I would get all the Democrats together and we would refuse to pass any spending bills until we got what we wanted? And if that led to a government shutdown because they refused to let my bill pass, what would they do if I de-

manded a supercommittee to discuss ways to invest in our children before I allowed a vote to open the government again? I would humbly suggest that my Republican colleagues would say exactly what Democrats are saying now: This is not a legitimate way to negotiate, and the only path forward is to end this crisis and then have a conversation.

The great American system we hold so dear—our democracy that is the envy of the world—simply cannot work if a minority of Members can threaten to shut down the government or devastate the economy if they do not get their way on an issue—any issue. That is not what Democrats did when we were in the minority, and it is not what we should do should that day come again. Our system was designed to push both sides toward negotiations in a divided government, to encourage negotiation and movement toward common ground. It breaks down when one side refuses to negotiate in advance of a crisis, and it falls apart when a minority refuses to allow the basic functions of our government to perform unless their demands are met.

I know all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, came here to fight for their constituents, to solve problems, to make this country work better. I know there is nobody here today—not a single Senator—who was sent here to shut the government down or to push this country toward an unprecedented default on our loans. And I know so many of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, are sick of the constant crises. They hate seeing their constituents get hurt.

As my friend the Senator from Arizona said yesterday, I think we should find a way to sit down and find a way out of these dead ends. That is what I am here today to offer—a way out, a path forward. It is not a defeat of one side or the other, it is certainly not any kind of surrender, but it would allow us to get out of this mess that has been created and open a path to negotiations so we can avoid the next one. I am going to ask consent once again to start a budget conference as soon as the current crisis has ended. Democrats have made it clear we want to negotiate. We couldn't have made it more clear. We will sit down and negotiate over anything the Republicans want, and we pledge to work as hard as we can for as long as it takes until we get a fair long-term budget deal to end these constant crises. But first this current crisis needs to end and the threat of the next one needs to be lifted.

Republicans don't need a hostage. There are plenty of things Democrats want out of a long-term deal for which we are very interested in making some compromises. So I urge my Republican colleagues to please consider taking us up on this offer. We can end this today.

We can do the right thing for our families and the communities we represent, and we can get back to work helping people, solving problems, and working together.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 25

I respectfully ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives a message from the House that they have receded from their amendment and concurred in the amendment of the Senate with respect to H.J. Res. 59, the Senate then proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment at the desk, which is the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate proceed to vote on a motion to insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate; with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Is there objection?

The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, on this side of the aisle we agree it is good to negotiate, and we should. I would only hope the President of the United States would be a part of that negotiation in order to make it successful.

But I would ask my friend why the request is contingent on passage of the House continuing resolution. The Democrats have already rejected the House's request to go to conference on the CR, seemingly in contrast to what they are now asking for, which is a negotiation.

Hopefully, we will pass H.R. 3273, the Deficit Reduction and Economic Growth Working Group Act, which will create a bicameral, bipartisan group to address the CR and the debt limit situation.

But on the Republican side, again I would say to our friends that we have a longstanding request to make sure reconciliation instructions are not in order in a budget conference so that the debt limit can be increased on a strictly party-line vote.

We happen to think it is a problem if the debt ceiling is raised as the Democrats are requesting, that we would see the debt go up by 68 percent under this President—more than all other Presidents in American history who preceded him. We think that is a bad idea.

So I would ask the distinguished Senator from Washington whether she would consider an amended unanimous consent request, and we would ask that the Senate, by way of amendment to her request, proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment at the desk,

which is the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25 be amended, be agreed to; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate proceed to a vote on the motion to insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate; with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate; and I would further ask unanimous consent that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes reconciliation instructions to raise the debt limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Washington so modify her request?

Mrs. MURRAY. Reserving the right to object, let me make one observation, which is that sometimes I think those who have been objecting now 21 times to our request to go to conference have forgotten whom I would be conferencing with, which is the Republican House majority. What they fight so adamantly and strongly for here in the Senate will be well and ably represented in a conference committee. That is the point of a conference committee. That is what our democracy was set up to do in a divided government, where we have the opportunity to do that.

Having a conference committee to work out our budget agreement is exactly what I have asked for, but I will object because what the Senator's request does is simply say: We are going to keep our government closed. We are not going to allow people to do the functions that are so desperately needed. We are going to stay closed, and we are going to hold that hostage.

As I said so clearly when I spoke before, we need to open the government, we need to pay our bills, and we need to negotiate. That is what our request does, that is what the Republican request does not do, and so I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the modified request.

Is there objection to the original unanimous consent request?

Mr. CORNYN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Washington for her 21st time in coming to the floor of the Senate and asking the Republicans to join us in a conference committee to resolve budget differences between the House and the Senate. Twenty-one times Senator MURRAY has come to this floor simply asking to negotiate, and the Republicans, who have been arguing that we don't negotiate, turned her down 21 times—the latest by the senior Senator from Texas. The

junior Senator from Texas shut down the government over the notion of defunding ObamaCare, and now the senior Senator from Texas has said he objects to going to a conference committee to resolve our differences, Republicans and Democrats, between the House and the Senate.

If we are going to restore this Senate to the orderly process, what the Senator from Washington has asked for is very basic—open the government.

This morning the Chaplain of the Senate started by acknowledging the five families who were notified, after they had lost a military member—a son, a husband, a brother in Afghanistan over the weekend—he noted that in their bereavement they were being denied the basic benefits this government gives to these grieving families after they have lost someone in uniform. The Chaplain of the Senate said it this morning: Enough is enough.

This notion that closing down our government and keeping it closed is somehow acceptable political conduct is outrageous. We just left a press conference where Maryland Senators MIKULSKI and CARDIN, and Senator KAINE and Senator WARNER of Virginia, spoke about the impact to their local economies and the loss of these jobs with this government shutdown. I can tell stories of Illinois, with 50,000 Federal workers who have either been furloughed or their checks are being withheld for the most part. This is unnecessary, and it is unacceptable.

We were in the midst of a terrible accident last week, right before October 1. A train ran into one of our Metro trains coming back from the airport, and 30 people were sent to the hospital. The National Transportation Safety Board went out to investigate the accident to find out what led to this terrible thing. They had to leave at midnight on October 1, after having collected what evidence they could, because the government was shut down. The investigation was suspended. That is one small example. There are the five families who are grieving. And it goes on and on.

What we hear from the Republicans is we will take care of each of these as it arises. We will pick out the vital functions of government. So far, all of the bills passed by the House of Representatives combined represent only 18 percent of the domestic discretionary budget of the United States.

So each day, as another tragedy occurs, as another embarrassment to this Republican strategy emerges, they will try to find a way to fix that story, to fix that problem. It is time for us to fix our sights on a solution that is befitting the great Nation of America: Open the government and pay our bills while we negotiate.

That is the only responsible way to approach it. I am sorry that for the 21st time the Republicans have come to

the floor and denied the request by the Senate Budget Committee chair, Senator MURRAY of Washington, to sit down and negotiate. Twenty-one times Republicans have refused to allow us to enter into a bipartisan negotiation. That is why we face the problems we do today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, it is a good thing that Democrats for the first time in 4 years passed a budget—at least brought one to the floor and passed it on a strictly partisan basis. Before that, they not only didn't pass one, they didn't bring one to the floor for 4 years and refused to do so, even though a specific provision of the United States Code actually required them to do so. It was a stunning development.

Senator Conrad, then the Democratic chair of the Budget Committee, wanted to bring up budgets, fought to bring up budgets, and one time said he was going to bring up a budget. But Senator DURBIN and others in the leadership apparently had a vote, and they voted against him. Senator MURRAY, to her credit, has gotten a budget through. The Presiding Officer is a member of that committee, and they got a budget through this year, which was a good thing. I am not sure, but I suspect Senator MURRAY was one of those who blocked Senator Conrad from even bringing up a budget for 4 years. So I think it is a bit aggressive to say Republicans are blocking a budget when the history is they haven't even voted on one.

Secondly, there are Members on this side of the aisle who simply say the legislation necessary to raise the debt ceiling again should be passed—like legislation should be passed—on the floor of the Senate, and it would require a 60-vote point of order where you have to have 60 votes to pass.

In conference, a raising of the debt ceiling would be put on the budget which only requires 51 votes for passage. We have simply said we would allow the budget to go to conference and agree to conference, but we want a commitment that our Democratic colleagues will not try to sneak through raising the debt ceiling on the budget—which doesn't require but 51 votes. Our colleagues have flatly refused. If they would make that agreement, we would go to conference.

I think our Democratic majority should agree to that. They have indicated they don't intend to put it on the budget. One time Senator DURBIN said he didn't think it was appropriate to put it on the budget. If so, let's make clear we are not going to gimmick it up and add that to it.

The reason we have had such contention at this point in history is that we are facing fundamental challenges relevant to the whole future of America

financially. It is a time of great importance. The American people understand this. The American people want us to take action to place this country on a sound financial path.

So we are heading to the debt ceiling. By law we limit the amount of money Congress can borrow and how much money we can spend above our current level. We are now spending about \$3,500 billion a year and we are taking in about \$2,800 billion a year. Think about it. That is what we are doing every year, and it is unsustainable.

In August of 2011 we faced a debt ceiling, and the American people told Congress: We want to clip back on your credit card. You are not going to continue to borrow this much money every year. Before you raise the debt ceiling, we want you to show that you are going to be more frugal and are going to manage our money better.

Republicans dug their heels in and said, Mr. President, we are not going to raise the debt ceiling until you agree to some financial constraints and that you are not going to keep spending recklessly every year.

After a tense time, a committee was formed and an agreement was reached, and this is what we agreed to: First, we would raise the debt ceiling \$2.1 trillion. Then, over the next 10 years we would reduce the projected growth of spending by \$2.1 trillion—one for one, as Speaker BOEHNER said.

So it gave Congress 10 years to find cuts. But in a little over 2 years, we have already borrowed another \$2 trillion. We have hit the debt ceiling cap again, and we have not yet come close to saving the \$2 trillion we promised to save.

And by the way, these are not really cuts. When you look at the U.S. budget, the budget was projected to increase spending from \$37 trillion over 10 years to \$47 trillion over 10 years. With the Budget Control Act, spending would increase from \$37 trillion to \$45 trillion over 10 years. That is not really a cut in spending, is it?

Yes, the way it has been carried out hits some departments more than others—particularly the Defense Department—and we need to adjust that. But fundamentally, the reduction in the growth of spending that was part of the BCA last year was not extreme, not irresponsible, and should and must be preserved.

But colleagues, the President of the United States, after signing that agreement in August—the sequester is part of the BCA. It was all part of the same deal that created the \$2.1 trillion in savings. In January, after that August, he proposed a budget that would increase spending another \$1 trillion and would raise taxes \$1 trillion. That is basically what our colleagues passed in their budget this year: to spend \$1 trillion more than the Budget Control Act said we should spend and raise taxes another \$1 trillion over 10 years.

This is a total abdication of the promise we made to the American people. We said, OK, American people, we are going to vote to raise the debt ceiling. A lot of people didn't like any raising of the debt ceiling. Phone calls to my office were against any raising. People said, It is time for you guys to live within your means like I have to do in my house.

So we raised it. But we promised we wouldn't spend so much. We promised we would reduce spending by \$2.1 trillion, but over 10 years. Do you know what a lot of cynics around here said? They said, Congress won't adhere to that. That is just a bunch of baloney. They promise that all the time, and then they breach their promises all the time. That is why the country is going broke.

That is exactly what the President did in January of 2012, 6 months after the agreement—he proposed to spend another \$1 trillion above the amount of money we agreed to spend 6 months before. Why?

I didn't really want to sign that agreement. I didn't really want to cut that much money. So I am not bound by it. I didn't make a promise to the American people. I forgot all about that. That was 6 months ago. Oh, a 10-year promise, that we are going to contain the growth of spending for 10 years? Forget that. I don't want to do that. I want to spend more. I have investments I want to make. I have taxes I want to increase.

This is fundamentally what is occurring here. So we have got to stand firm and adhere at least to the containment of growth in spending in the Budget Control Act. We have to. Failure to do that is a capitulation in our promises to the American people, a total abandonment of any pretension that we will be fiscally responsible in this body. It is just unthinkable that we would abandon the limits we had in the Budget Control Act.

The sad truth is the Budget Control Act reductions in the growth of spending do not come close to putting us on a firm financial footing. We are still on an unsustainable debt course, as our Congressional Budget Office has told us.

Yes, we have seen a reduction in the deficits this year of \$600 billion. People say that is great.

George Bush has been called profligate, and sometimes he was. The highest deficit he ever had was \$470 billion. The year before his last year in office was \$167 billion.

President Obama in his 6 years will have averaged almost \$1 trillion a year in deficits. We have never, ever come close to that kind of deficit before in the history of the Republic.

So what does a budget say that says we want to tax people \$1 trillion more and spend more money under these circumstances? I will tell you what it says.

From the President and the majority here in the Senate, it says: It is not our problem. We can't find any more ways to reduce the growth of spending. We can't save another dime. You people just don't understand. There is no way we can save any more money. We have a problem, though. And do you know who is responsible for it? You, the American people. It is your fault. You won't give us enough money. If you would just send more money, another \$1 trillion, another \$2 trillion, another \$600 billion which was passed in January, just another few hundred billion more or a trillion here and a trillion there in taxes, why, we could solve all of the problems. Send us more money. And by the way, we will use that money to create government programs and government bureaucracies that impose great costs on the American economy and have in fact resulted in the declining wages of American workers to a degree that is not acceptable.

We need a growth-oriented, lean government—a lean government that serves the people for the least possible cost and reduces these deficits. Deficits themselves are pulling down the economic growth in our country. The size of our debt is so large, we have never had anything like it, it is already beginning to diminish the prospects for growth in our economy and reduces job creation and reduces wages.

I know we are in a tough time now. We certainly need to work our way out of this. But the President negotiated over the debt ceiling in August of 2011, and we made at least a step forward. In fact, it was the most significant fiscal step this country has taken, maybe in decades, and for the last 2 years we have actually spent less money than the year before. Think about it. To hear people talk, they would think the country is going to collapse.

But we have had a modest reduction in spending, and that has been good. It has been good. But it is not nearly enough to put us on a sustained path.

We need to save Social Security, we need to strengthen and save Medicare, we cannot afford the Affordable Care Act. We have witnessed a total misrepresentation on the Affordable Care Act with regard to its cost. The Government Accounting Office, an independent auditor, has told us it is going to add at least \$6 trillion to the debt of the United States over the long term under its likely set of assumptions. It does not pay for itself—nowhere close. It is as unstable financially as Social Security is over the long term.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Let's keep working. Maybe we can develop some ways to confront our financial problems. It is absolutely critical that we do that. We have a moral responsibility to do that and we have to start working together to achieve it. I think the President

needs to back off his statements that he will not negotiate on the continuing resolution or the debt ceiling.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask my colleague from Alabama, if he has a moment or two more, after I read an official consent request, if he might stay for a moment and answer a question about how that budget conference committee works?

Mr. SESSIONS. I have a moment.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, through the Chair, I want to pose a question about the budget conference committee. I think it is something that has puzzled a lot of people across America.

We hear some folks standing and giving speeches saying for 6 months we have been trying to get a conference committee and we have other folks who are standing and saying we will be glad to go to conference as long as there is a deal beforehand on exactly what is done in the conference committee.

In that regard, I thought it would be useful to have a little bit of perspective here. My understanding is that anything that comes out of the budget conference committee would have to have agreement of both the team of delegates from the House side and the team of delegates from the Senate side. That is a question I ask of the ranking member of the Budget Committee, to clarify that process?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator. Of course that is correct. I understand the Speaker has indicated there is no guarantee that the increase in the debt ceiling would not be a part of a conference report that came out of conference committee. We have independent Senators in this body who simply said we do not think we should be subjected to having the debt ceiling increase without a full debate and the normal processes of 60 votes in the Senate. That is where the disagreement lies. People can have disagreements about the validity of their concern, but it is a legitimate concern. If there is no intention to move a debt ceiling increase at 51 votes, why wouldn't my colleagues agree not to do it? That is the disagreement I think that now exists.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, might I ask about a couple of other pieces to this puzzle. Why not, with that concern—I pass this question through the Chair to my colleague—why not, with that concern, simply ask the House delegates to carry that concern, rather than blocking the start of the conference committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I say to my colleague, through the

Chair, it is very simple. Senators have rights. They have a right to assert those privileges on the floor of the Senate. We have Senators who say you should not do this, you should not raise the debt ceiling on the budget and we do not want to go to conference unless you do agree not to sneak that through without a full debate and 60-vote threshold on the floor of the Senate. Attaching it to a bill that is a budget deal that is huge and would have a lot of interest in it would make it even more difficult to separate that question out. Rightly or wrongly, that is their view.

I say I don't see any problem and I am amazed at the intransigence of the majority of not just accepting that. I don't think it is likely, as the Senator indicated, that the House would add that to it, frankly. I am not too worried about it. But some are and that is causing the disagreement right now. I think it would be great to go to conference. I would like to see a conference occur, frankly. I think it is an unusual and positive development that after 4 years of not even bringing a budget to the floor, that we now have the majority here passing a budget so we can try to do something with it in conference—although I have to tell you, all of our colleagues, there is a big difference in the budgets. The budget passed out of the Senate with our majority that every Republican opposed completely busted the Budget Control Act. It is nowhere close to what was agreed to in that Act 2 years ago.

I think we have a huge gap to cover in conference. It is not impossible and it would probably be a healthy thing to start that process. I wish my colleagues would relent and commit not to try to sneak the debt ceiling increase in on the budget.

I thank the Chair. I appreciate my colleague, a member of the Budget Committee, who contributes ably and works hard to try to do the right thing around here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, the thing that puzzles me, if my colleague would still consider responding, is that there is a process on the floor of giving instructions to a conference committee.

My colleague has left the floor, but the question I would have followed up with is, given that there is a specific process in the Senate for doing budget instructions to a conference committee, why not utilize that specific process, hold a vote on the conference committee instructions, rather than blockading the conference committee from starting?

I guess I will have to rhetorically answer the question, that there is no good explanation for why not go through the normal process and propose a Budget Committee instruction for our conferees.

Then the question becomes, couldn't we resolve this today? Couldn't we resolve this today, have a proposal put forward to instruct the conferees, vote on it on the floor of this Senate, and it either passes or it does not? Isn't the whole budget process designed specifically to be a simple majority process under the Budget Act so we can indeed get the job done and not be paralyzed?

I think—I believe the story—and I would have liked to have had the perspective of my colleague—but I think the story is a determination to not allow a majority determination of the budget instructions, to, instead, allow a minority to do so. I believe also that is an absolutely unprecedented situation, but I wanted to clarify that and understand whether there was in fact precedent for this type of determination that in a simple majority budget process, a minority would blockade a budget conference.

It is very strange that this should become such a central issue. But I want Americans to understand that essentially it boils down to this: For 6 months we have been trying to start a budget conference committee. A small group, a couple of individuals have wanted to instruct that Budget Committee but to do so without going through the normal process on the floor so they could do it as a minority rather than as a discussion and decision of the Senate as a whole. It is that precedent that seems unacceptable. I think if the tables were turned it would be felt strongly on the other side.

I hope to keep exploring these questions, because this 6-month obstruction of being able to get the budget that provides a framework for spending is deeply damaging. This body absolutely has to be able to do its fundamental work in determining the budget, getting a budget conference, getting a budget number, doing the spending bills, all appropriations bills—because otherwise we are careening from crisis to crisis.

I am going to shift gears here. I am going to step back from what is going on immediately with the shutdown and ask where did the seeds of this come from? If we turn back to about April of 2009, shortly after I first came to the Senate, there was a memo put out by an individual named Frank Luntz. Frank Luntz was providing a roadmap on how to block any sort of improvement in our health care system. Frank Luntz said, and he was specifically instructing my colleagues across the aisle—he said it doesn't matter what is in the health care bill. It doesn't matter what good it does. Whatever it is, let's attack it and call it a government takeover.

This was long before anyone even knew what was going to be in the bill. So this strategy of poisonous partisanship rather than problem solving has been with us since at least April of

2009. Therefore, a series of myths were generated. As the process proceeded, those who were behind the myths kind of doubled down on them. For example, we have in the health care reform a process by which small businesses can join together and get the marketing clout of a large group to negotiate lower rates and get a better deal. But under the Frank Luntz “let’s demonize and deceive” strategy, instead of honoring the fact that the small businesses will be able to get a better rate, there has been an assertion this would hurt small businesses.

In the health care reform bill we have a process by which individuals who have no market clout can band together and get a much better deal. We are seeing significant drops in rates for individuals across this country under the marketplaces that are just now opening for signup. But indeed, under the Frank Luntz “deceive and demonize” strategy, it became: Let’s tell people insurance rates will go up instead of down.

We have a bill before us—not a bill but a health care reform law coming into effect—that ends abuses in the insurance industry. There was a situation where you could not get a policy if you had a preexisting condition; the sort of situation where if you had insurance and you got sick you would be thrown off the policy; the fact that your children were not able to stay on your policy until they were able to get health care insurance of their own.

These bills of rights are reforms that are deeply sought by Americans across this country, urban and rural. But under the Frank Luntz “deceive and demonize” strategy, there was simply an assertion, unfounded, that this would destroy the insurance system.

You have a process whereby, under the marketplaces, insurance companies will have to compete, private insurance companies. Yet under the Frank Luntz strategy adopted by some of my colleagues across the aisle, they decided to say this would hurt competition even though it strengthens competition. It puts before people, apples to apples, companies having to lay out their rates and benefits under these different levels of insurance. We are seeing that competition from private companies proceed to lower rates.

Let’s fast forward. We had that phase of the “demonize the plan” even though we have to mischaracterize it and deceive and delude Americans about what is in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I will wrap up with a sentence or two and yield to my colleagues. Thank you for coming to the floor to continue the conversation.

I think it is so important that we proceed to put our government back on track and quit careening from crisis to

crisis, doing damage to communities and families across our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the period for morning business for debate only be extended until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and the majority leader be recognized following morning business; further, that the Republican side have the time from 2 p.m. to 2:45 p.m., and the majority have the time from 2:45 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today is day 9 of the government shutdown. House Republicans piously blame everyone except themselves, but there is no mystery about what is happening.

It is very simple: They continue to refuse to permit a vote on a continuing resolution to keep the government operating for one reason—they disagree with one law, the Affordable Care Act.

That law, debated for months, voted on dozens of times, signed into law by the President, and ruled constitutional by the Supreme Court, will finally make it possible for tens of millions of uninsured Americans to obtain affordable health insurance, including those with preexisting conditions.

House Republicans and a handful of tea party Senators don’t like it, and they have used all kinds of scare tactics to try to derail it. Yet, millions of Americans who know better, who want to protect their families, have already shown that they want to sign up.

Unyielding in their opposition, tea party members of Congress, for whom “compromise” is a dirty word, are on a crusade to hold the Federal government hostage until the Affordable Care Act is repealed. It is a form of extortion that has no place in a democracy.

Then, after a couple of days of angry phone calls from outraged constituents, in an attempt to blunt the criticism, the House Republican leadership abruptly changed course and decided to pick and choose which government agencies and programs to fund.

This latest ploy is revealing for what it says about tea party Republicans. It is as if they suddenly learned for the first time that the Federal Government is comprised of millions of hard-working Americans, in every State, who perform countless tasks the rest of the country depends on.

Did they not realize that many of the people who sent them to Washington depend on the Federal Government for

their monthly pay checks? That every American depends on the Federal Government to inspect the safety of the food they eat, the water they drink, and the air they breathe? That America’s students and farmers depend on loans from the Federal Government?

That countless needy families depend on Federally funded Head Start programs? That the Department of Health and Human Services pays for the vaccines that protect American children from polio, measles, and other diseases?

It has been interesting to hear the Speaker of the House. He wants the President to, “sit down and have a conversation.”

President Obama has shown time and again he is willing to compromise, sometimes more than some would like. He sat down with the Speaker last week. But no President should negotiate the terms of keeping the Federal government operating. And no Member of Congress should recklessly toy with the United States defaulting on its debt payments for the first time in history, and when the world is finally recovering from a devastating global recession.

The Senior Senator from Maryland, the Chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, has done an excellent job of explaining what is at stake—not only for American families but for the reputation of the United States, the world’s oldest democracy. Senators should be aware of the impact of the shutdown on thousands of American companies that depend on financing from the Federal Government to export their products and invest overseas.

During this shutdown, the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation cannot provide new loans or insurance to U.S. companies. This means that every month those companies—U.S. companies—lose \$2 billion to \$4 billion in revenues, jeopardizing some 30,000 American jobs.

If the shutdown continues, the Department of State, which conducts all kinds of services for Americans and programs overseas, will be severely affected. In fiscal year 2011, when the Federal Government came close to shutting down, the Department estimated that 70 percent of its Washington staff would be furloughed.

Do our Tea Party friends think these Federal workers just sit idly at their desks doing nothing? That they are some kind of luxury we cannot afford? Wait until one of their constituents is falsely arrested and imprisoned overseas, or robbed, or badly injured, and there is no one at the State Department to help them. Almost 800,000 children under the age of 5 die of diarrhea annually, mostly due to unsafe drinking water and poor sanitation. Those deaths are entirely preventable. A prolonged government shutdown would mean curtailing water and sanitation

programs for millions of people in the world's poorest countries—programs that have always had strong bipartisan support.

Malaria causes half a billion deaths a year, 90 percent of them children. A continued shutdown would force the U.S. Agency for International Development to stop funding malaria prevention programs, putting tens of thousands of lives at risk.

Speaker BOEHNER is right. Shutting down the Federal Government is “not a damned game.” But what the House is doing is playing Russian roulette with the U.S. economy and people's lives. There is no excuse for it, and the Speaker has two choices: stop it, or continue to roll the dice with the U.S. economy and the lives of millions of American families and programs that protect our Nation's security.

At the State Department, the shutdown has already forced the cancelation of International visitors programs that enable future foreign leaders to experience this country first hand. Instead of seeing what a great country this is, they see our political system in disarray. It is embarrassing for our embassies and should be embarrassing to all of us.

Despite the shutdown, the State Department still must ensure the health, safety, and welfare of nearly 10,000 academic exchange participants in the United States and abroad. Either those students and scholars will have to return home, or the organizations and universities that are responsible for implementing the exchanges continue operating without knowing if, or when, their costs will be paid.

We have heard about the impact of the shutdown on the U.S. national security establishment, including the Department of Defense and the intelligence community. But the shutdown may also affect the State Department's anti-terrorism programs that support law enforcement and border controls in countries highly vulnerable to terrorist threats, such as Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, Kenya, and Niger.

The shutdown has halted trade talks between the EU and the United States on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Plan. This deal would harmonize U.S. and EU regulatory standards, and eliminate trade barriers. It would bring real benefits to the U.S. economy. Yet the Tea Party shutdown has prevented U.S. trade officials from traveling to Brussels to negotiate with their EU counterparts. Instead, EU diplomats remain at the ready to talk to nobody.

Because of the shutdown, President Obama had to cancel his trip to Asia this week. We hear quite a bit about the Administration's “pivot to Asia,” but it is hard to pivot in another direction if you can't even get one foot out of your own country.

Who made it to the Summit instead? China's President Xi filled President

Obama's seat next to Vladimir Putin. Is this who the tea party wants to lead in the lower income Asian countries? For the sake of our economy and national security, we need our President to have a seat at the table.

The list goes on and on, but these are just a few of the impacts of the shutdown that are only beginning to be felt. As this needless work stoppage drags on and more people are furloughed and programs are cancelled, our diplomats, our international development programs, our leadership in international organizations, and our national security will suffer.

It is as foolhardy as it is wasteful.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I am pleased to be here on the Senate floor this afternoon. I am saddened by the circumstances we find ourselves in and look for a solid, responsible, and quick resolution to our differences in regard to continuing resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California Mrs. BOXER follow me upon the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, again, under the circumstances we find ourselves in, I look forward to a quick and responsible resolution to the differences we have and that we move forward with the funding of our Federal Government.

I would point out that a reason we are at this point is we need a continuing resolution because the Senate failed to do its work in the first place. While, for the first time in 4 years, the Senate passed a budget, it was never reconciled in conference with the House. I am certainly a Republican who would be supportive of that reconciliation of the conference committee to work out the differences between a House-passed budget and the Senate-passed budget.

The reality is that there are 12 appropriations bills—and I am a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I take that responsibility very seriously. I was excited to become a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee when I arrived here at the Senate. I saw it as an opportunity for us to establish our priorities and determine what we should be spending money on. Yet not 1 of the 12 bills that are required for us to pass across the Senate floor has been passed this year; therefore, on September 30 we ended up with no funding in place, and it creates this opportunity for us to have this debate and discussion about a continuing resolution at a time in which there is great leverage on that issue.

What I lament and what I wish would have happened is we would have passed 12 appropriations bills and then worked

out the differences with the appropriations process in the House.

Today I want to speak about a particular issue related to the shutdown of the Federal Government—the lack of funding. Prior to that occurring—prior to September 30—both the House and Senate and the President signed legislation called Pay Our Military Act. It was designed to make certain that our military men and women had compensation should there be a shutdown. I appreciate that legislation passing and am pleased it is in place now we are in the circumstance we are in. There were rumors and concerns about how that bill would be implemented by the Department of Defense. The Senator from West Virginia Mr. MANCHIN and I led an effort in which we had 50 Senators in a highly bipartisan way ask the Secretary of Defense to interpret that legislation in a broad way that would make certain our furloughed civilian employees who support our military men and women, as well as our Reserve component—those who serve in the National Guard and Reserve—would be put back to work for the benefit of the Nation's security.

I thank Secretary of Defense Hagel for his decision to implement that legislation in a broad way that did exactly that—returned furloughed civilian workers at DOD, the Department of Defense, back to work, and gave the ability for our National Guard and Reserve members to continue in their responsibilities for defending our country. Again, I thank Secretary Hagel.

I am here today to point out that we have an additional problem, in fact, one that is equally, if not more, serious than that, and that is that we have read and heard that those who die in the active service of our country are not now able to receive the death benefits that come to their families upon their death. I can't imagine that there is a Senator of any political party or persuasion who thinks that is a desirable outcome.

With Senator MANCHIN and others, we worked at bringing this issue to the attention of the Department of Defense, asking Secretary Hagel, in a letter that was led by Senator COONS and Senator BLUNT, to use every opportunity, full authority, wide flexibility—whatever circumstances the Department of Defense could find—to provide the benefits to those who died in service to our country.

There is a special tax-free payment of \$100,000 to eligible survivors of members of the armed forces who are killed in action. Those benefits usually arrive within the first 3 days following the death of a service man or woman. This helps the family—certainly not overcome their loss—to have the necessary funds for funeral services, to travel in this case to Dover Air Force Base to meet their loved one as he or she returns home, and to overcome the lack

of a regular paycheck. This death gratuity is such a small price to pay to honor and recognize someone's family who has lost a member of their family in service to our country.

At least the stories are, the reports are that this situation is due to the inability of us to resolve—to work with the President, Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate—the continuing resolution, and so work is being done so that the death benefit will be available. My understanding is that the House of Representatives is poised to pass legislation to make certain that the Department of Defense has the authority to immediately pay those benefits. I hope that is a piece of legislation that is met with unanimity of support here in the Senate.

We have asked Secretary of Defense Hagel if he has the ability to do that within his current legal jurisdiction, within the law—if he has the ability to do that within the law that he does have—and we anxiously await and hope the Secretary can do that. But, if not, I hope this Senate will unanimously confirm that legislation that would allow the Secretary to pay those benefits immediately.

Again, I just can't imagine any of my colleagues ever thinking that under any circumstance, we ought not step forward to resolve this issue. Just because we can't resolve everything—it seems to me there is a method of operation too often here in the Senate that if we can't solve every problem, we are unwilling to solve any problem. On those things on which there is such significant agreement, we ought not let anything stand in the way of coming to the aid and rescue of a family who now so desperately grieves the loss of their loved one.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES
SERGEANT PATRICK HAWKINS

We know over the weekend there were five soldiers killed in Afghanistan. There are five families as of today who would be in this circumstance. I would like to pay tribute to one of those five: SGT Patrick Hawkins. He was born October 1, 1988. He graduated from high school and enlisted in the Army in his hometown of Carlisle, PA.

SGT Patrick Hawkins, according to his Italian commander, was described as a brave and incredibly talented Ranger. The description of his death revolved around the fact that he was moving to aid another wounded Ranger when he was killed. His actions, according to, again, his commander, were in keeping with the epitome of the Ranger creed, which is, "I will never leave a fallen comrade."

Sergeant Hawkins dedicated himself to serving us—to serving our families, to serving all Americans—and he ultimately paid for that service with the loss of his life. I pay tribute to this soldier as an example of many who have

sacrificed in similar ways over a long period of time, but especially for those five who this weekend lost their lives in Afghanistan.

Sergeant Hawkins was awarded the Bronze Star and the Meritorious Service Medal. He was awarded a Purple Heart. None of that replaces the loss of life. He is survived by his wife, who is a resident of Lansing, KS, and her parents, who are residents of my hometown of Plainville, KS.

So today, on behalf of my colleagues in the Senate, I pay tribute to a soldier who in serving his country lost his life, who leaves behind grieving family members and friends, and who epitomizes what we all should know in service here in the Senate, which is what I spoke about earlier on the Senate floor this week. That is, if we need a reminder about how this place should work, we should look to our service men and women who, for no partisan reason—no Republican or Democratic reason—volunteered to serve their country. They concluded there were things much more important than life itself, and that being the ability to have a country that we know and enjoy as the United States of America, that has the freedom and liberties guaranteed to us by our Constitution, and creates the opportunity for every American to pursue what we all call the American dream.

Today, I pay tribute to one more hero, one more soldier, one more American who, through service to others, was willing to sacrifice his life for the betterment of his family back home and for the future of a country that we all love and call home, the United States of America.

I yield to the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, would it be possible—because Senator CASEY and I were each thinking we would get 10 minutes and we are willing to cut that to 15 minutes between the two of us—could we ask unanimous consent, if the Republicans don't mind, just slipping a little bit, because people took extra time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you. So we will each have about 7½ minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, we are going to fix the injustice my colleague spoke about—the injustice to the families who lost their loved ones. Let me be clear about one of those five families who were denied the benefit and someone important to me a constituent of mine—Army 1LT Jennifer Moreno from San Diego, who was killed this weekend in Afghanistan by a roadside bomb. Jennifer was 25 years old. Because of this shutdown brought to us by the Republicans, those families have

to suffer even more than they are already suffering.

Let's be clear. This never had to happen. This government has been shut down by the Republicans for one reason, and JOHN BOEHNER was honest about it. He said:

The American people don't want to shut down the government, but the American people don't want ObamaCare. They don't want the Affordable Care Act.

Let me say that to close down the government because a person doesn't like a law that was passed almost 4 years ago, to shut down the government because a presidential election was lost and which was based, in large part, on this—to shut down the government, to keep our people—millions of them—from getting affordable care for the first time, it is a disgrace. It is. There is no other way to say it, except maybe it was said beautifully here. It was said beautifully here by the chaplain: "Enough is enough."

We are going to fix this problem; of course we are, this indignity our military families had to face. But let's be clear: It never would have happened if the government had been open.

We have two things that are in our job description. I know the Presiding Officer knows that quite well. One is to keep the doors of government open officially. We do our best, but we don't always succeed. There are problems here and there. Keep the doors open. Just as a pilot has to fly a plane, just like a teacher has to teach a class, just like a nurse has to give a vaccination, we have a basic responsibility to keep this government open, and we know how to do it. They pass a budget over in the House, we pass it in the Senate, the conference is called, they hammer it out, and we have a budget plan, and none of this would be happening. Let's be clear. The Republicans have objected now 21 times—21 times—to Senator MURRAY, the chairman of our Budget Committee, so she can sit and confer with her counterpart, PAUL RYAN, and hammer out the details of a long-term budget. But, no. The Republicans don't want to do that. They want to hold the country hostage. They want to put our backs up against the wall, or the backs of the American people. Why? They don't like the health care law.

If a person doesn't like a law, that person tries to repeal it. They tried to repeal it 43 times. It went nowhere. If you don't like a law, try to replace the people who support the law. Oh, they tried. They tried and they failed. I served with five Presidents, three of them Republican. I didn't like everything they did; believe me. But after they won and they had an agenda, I did what I could, and so did my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to carry it out the best I could, to fix it where I could.

Let me just say this: We are in a shutdown because they are throwing a

temper tantrum about the health care law, the Affordable Care Act. I wish to share some news with them, because I went home to see how the health care law is working in my State. I want to say what I know. I know it is working. By now we have had more than a million distinct visitors to our site, coveredCA.com. We have tens of thousands of applications. We have completed more than 20,000. Small businesses by the hundreds are coming on to the site.

In the time I have remaining, let me read to my colleagues about one woman the Republicans want to stop from getting health care by shutting down the government. According to the Associated Press, nothing could dissuade Rachel Mansfield of La Quinta, who sent in an application to Covered California last week. Rachel has been waiting for the exchange to start so she and her husband could get health insurance. Rachel is self-employed. Her parents currently pay a \$530 monthly premium for her coverage. Her husband has been rejected for health coverage because he was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder. Rachel's new premium, instead of it being \$530 for just her, will be \$400 for both of them, with higher quality coverage than she currently has.

That is why the Republicans are having a temper tantrum, to stop my constituent from, for the first time, having peace of mind and having good insurance? Come on. If you don't like the law, work with us. We can make it better.

Then there is Melissa Harris. According to the Fresno Bee, Melissa stopped at a CoveredCA tent on campus. She is paying \$600 a month with help from her family for insurance through her former employer. She has diabetes and hypertension and, under the Affordable Care Act—which prevents insurance companies from denying coverage for preexisting conditions—she can now afford health insurance on her own. And the quote from her, from my constituent is, "It's a Godsend for me—a blessing."

It is a blessing. And that is why the Republicans are shutting down the government, to stop my constituent from getting a blessing of health insurance.

There was another story of a man who waited on the phone for 40 minutes, and he finally got on. He signed up and he said: You know what, I have been waiting for years. Forty minutes was nothing.

So I say to my friends, the law is the law. Open the government, pay our bills, and we will negotiate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator's time is expired.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I yield the rest of the time to Senator CASEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, thank you very much. I know our time is limited.

I want to start on an issue that I think all of us are coming together on no matter what party we are in, and that is what has been happening to our military families.

On Sunday, as noted by the Senator from Kansas a few moments ago, SGT Patrick Hawkins from Carlisle, PA, was killed in action in Afghanistan when his unit was hit with an IED, an improvised explosive device. Sergeant Hawkins was moving to the aid of a wounded Ranger when he was killed. Due to the shutdown, Sergeant Hawkins' family cannot receive the death benefit provided to soldiers to cover the funeral and burial expenses for that family.

Today I am joining an effort with a number of Senators writing to urge Secretary Hagel to use whatever discretion he has to provide the death benefits to the Hawkins family as well as the other families so we can meet the promise we made to those families. I know the President is working on this issue, is working with the Office of Management and Budget and the Defense Department on a solution to this problem.

Mr. President, I will move to the question of where we are now. This is a shutdown brought about by the tea party. We know that if Speaker BOEHNER would simply hold a vote on the bill that is before him, which would fund the government, this crisis would be over.

So we should continue to take steps, No. 1, to open our government; No. 2, to pay our bills and make sure we do not miss a bill and default; and No. 3, to negotiate—or I would argue to continue to negotiate because we already negotiated a budget number which was much lower than our side of the aisle wanted. We agreed to \$70 billion less from the other side. If that is not a compromise and a negotiation, I do not know what is.

We know this sentiment and this position to make sure the government opens is a point of view that is shared by Democrats, Republicans, and Independents across the country. By way of example, nine Members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation—four Republicans and five Democrats—are supportive of a so-called clean bill that does not have attachments to it, to open the government, to make sure we can have a functioning government, to pay our bills, and then work together on longer term solutions. Just a couple of examples—and I know our time is limited.

As this tea party shutdown moves into its second week, the Women, Infants and Children Program—we know it by the acronym WIC—will no longer be able to be funded in many States across the country. We know this pro-

gram provides nutritional services to more than 8.9 million participants per month, including 4.7 million children and 2.1 million infants. A quarter of a million of my constituents in Pennsylvania depend upon this program. For now—for now—the State government is using carryover funds to keep the WIC Program running in Pennsylvania. If the government shutdown continues to stretch on, this may put the program in jeopardy.

We know the impact this shutdown is having on older citizens across Pennsylvania and across the country. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services is no longer able to provide health care provider oversight. While Medicare claims are still being paid, the shutdown has caused a reduction in the number of initial surveys and recertifications for Medicare and Medicaid providers. If providers are unable to be certified, then they cannot serve beneficiaries.

Home- and community-based services are adversely impacted. We know that even though Social Security checks are going out, at the same time those who are hoping to be enrolled in Social Security do not have that opportunity.

Let me read from a letter we got from a constituent in northeastern Pennsylvania talking about this individual's parents.

Besides our personal difficulties due to the Budget Impasse, my elderly parents live with the worry of when and if they will receive their Social Security checks. At 85 and 83, they should not have this uncertainty. These should be their golden years. It breaks my heart to hear my Mother saying she can't sleep and has a stomach ache from the worry about where our country is heading. Middle and low income families cannot afford another economic downturn, we are just barely recovering from the last one.

That entire passage came from one individual in northeastern Pennsylvania writing about her parents, and I think that is the best summation I have read about what this is doing to people. The worry and the anxiety, in addition to the harsh impact, are things we should not accept.

Finally, I will conclude with some comments about national security.

I support—and I know this is widely shared—the passage of the Pay Our Military Act and welcome the Defense Department's decision to bring the majority of furloughed staff back. We mentioned the death benefits for families. We are all together on that. But all the while—all the while—that the Speaker does not put a bill on the floor that will open the government, we see the impacts on our national security. Seventy percent of the intel community's workforce has been furloughed. These are people who work every day to keep us safe from terrorists, and they are not able to work. The Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Asset Control has a skeletal crew, and they are not able to do their work, which is part of our national security.

So if we are doing the right thing, and if the Speaker and his party in the House are doing the right thing, they would vote today to open the government, to ensure that we pay our bills, and to continue to negotiate. It is very simple. What they have in front of them is a 16-page bill. I think they could pass it this afternoon and reopen our government and give that family in northeastern Pennsylvania some measure of peace of mind instead of the worry and the anxiety and the fear that are caused by both the government shutdown and efforts made to even contemplate defaulting on the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 58

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, last Saturday the House voted 400 to 1 to express the view that a government shutdown should not interfere with the ability of military chaplains to provide services for our servicemembers. The House took that vote amid reports that chaplains were limited in their ability to minister to those who sought their services even if ministers were doing so on a volunteer basis.

We have heard reports that those who have scheduled baptisms might not be able to have them. Obviously, this is not a tolerable situation. We have a very large military presence in Kentucky. The folks at Fort Campbell and Fort Knox do not need this. We need to remedy the situation immediately and care for the troops who have volunteered to defend us.

The House has already taken a stand, in an overwhelming, bipartisan basis—only one vote against it. It is time for the Senate to do the same. So I would call on the majority to allow a vote to express the Senate's views that servicemembers in my State and every other State or overseas should be able to receive religious services. This is one vote we should have today. Some of my colleagues will talk this afternoon about some of the other votes we should also have. The government may be shut down, but our service men and women should not be caught in the middle of this impasse.

I had indicated to my colleague, the majority leader, that I would ask unanimous consent after my remarks, which I will proceed to do now. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 58, which was received from the House; I further ask

unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, there is no question when we look across the Senate or across the House, people of different political parties, people of different faiths all support any kind of religious service for members of the armed services. There is no question about that. Our budgets indicate that every year. That is a widely held point of view.

Unfortunately, what we are seeing is a continuation of an effort to pick and choose what areas of our government should be funded. We should not have an exercise where we choose between our soldiers and our kids or between one priority versus the other. We should vote and work together to open the government. It is as simple as that. Open every service that is part of the Federal Government.

Open the government, pay our bills, and continue negotiations which started a long time ago on the current budget. I come from a State which has well more than 1 million veterans. No State in the country has contributed more to the armed services of the United States than Pennsylvania. I will take a backseat to no one when it comes to supporting our troops and supporting their families.

That is why we are all coming together to make sure the death benefit is paid for those who recently lost their lives, including Sergeant Hawkins from Pennsylvania. But this process we are going through today is just another attempt to not deal directly with the question of how we are going to operate the Federal Government.

We should urge our colleagues in the House to have a vote today. It would take a matter of minutes for the House to vote on a bill that will open the government, allow us to make sure we are paying our bills, and do everything we can to continue to work together on a longer term budget agreement.

So I would first offer a modification and ask unanimous consent as follows: that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, expressing the sense of the Congress that the House should vote on the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the continuing resolution passed by the Senate; that the concurrent resolution, as amended, be agreed to; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Republican leader so modify his request?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. CASEY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Republican whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 91

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, there are obviously differences in this Chamber over the fiscal direction of our country, but we should be united in our efforts to do right by our uniformed military and their families and certainly their survivors. The way they have been treated is simply unacceptable—indeed, it is outrageous. The President's spokesman today said he is looking for a solution. We are here to offer one to him. Washington has not gotten a lot right lately but now is our chance. The legislation I will be offering a unanimous consent request on would right this wrong by ensuring that the families of the fallen receive four essential benefits: the death gratuity benefit, the coverage of funeral and burial expenses, coverage of travel to both the funeral and the dignified transfer of their loved one's remains and the temporary continuation of their housing allowance.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives H.J. Res. 91, making continuing appropriations for survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military servicemembers for fiscal year 2014, the measure be read three times and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, would my friend agree that we have just learned that the President said he would solve this in the next hour. Would my friend be willing to wait until 4 o'clock today and renew his request at that time if it has not been done?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, responding to the distinguished majority leader, if that will help facilitate this getting done, we would be glad to work with him. Hopefully, we can find another area, as we did for military pay for our uniformed military, where we can begin to mitigate the hardship caused by this shutdown.

Mr. REID. I think on this issue it would be the best way to proceed; that we can do something together, and hopefully the White House will be in on what we are trying to do. So I ask my friend to renew this at 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 70

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, if businesses ran their operations the same way the government is running this shutdown, they would be bankrupt. Oh,

that is right. That is kind of where we are, isn't it.

Our national parks, particularly the ones that are revenue producers, are shut down. Yellowstone Park is a revenue producer. You pay to go into the park. You pay to travel through the park. The roads connect Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming. It is a thoroughfare. You have to pay to be able to do that. But right now you cannot do that, which means you probably have to travel an extra 300 miles to get to your destination.

The park does not get the revenue, and not only that, there are people in the park who are visiting there and they have been made to leave. They were made to leave in a very ungracious way. One of the tours was from Japan, Australia, Canada, and some people from the United States. They had reservations at Old Faithful. That is one of the historic places in the park, one place that everybody goes because they like to see the geyser go off. It is probably the most famous geyser in the world.

But they were told they had to leave. They had 2 days of reservations. They said: OK. You can stay for the 2 days. But an armed guard was outside of their room and they could not leave their room to go watch the geyser go off, which they do not have any control over, nor can they harm. It has been written up as Gestapo tactics that met senior citizens in Yellowstone Park.

So we are giving up the revenue and we are creating a bad impression. We should not be doing that. We ought to be taking revenue. The revenue is a little more difficult than that because we have concessionaires in the park, people who run the hotels and the stores and the filling stations and the other services in there. They pay a fee for doing that and a percentage of what they take in. So we are not getting that percentage now either.

They are losing about \$4.9 million a week by not being able to be open. There are a lot of other things I could say about the way the parks are being treated here and around the country, but the ones that are revenue-producing are particularly egregious.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 203, H.J. Res. 70, making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations; I ask further that the measure be read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I appreciate the motion of my colleague, as someone who comes from a State where tourism is

the No. 3—and we have 38 million people—it is the No. 3 business in our State. We have national parks. But guess what. You fellows over there, you did not take care of all of my recreation land under the Army Corps. You did not take care of all of the BLM land.

This whole notion of funding the government piecemeal is absurd. This is the greatest Nation on Earth. All you can do is come with these little, mini, piecemeal bills. Let's face it. We would not be going through any of this angst, and my friend would not have to have any of that emotion if the Republicans had not shut down the government.

I wish to state the rest of my reservation. We certainly support the notion that our parks should open, but we also support the notion that this government should open. If the Senators don't like certain functions, let's duke it out and find out which ones we have the votes to do away with. I know a lot of you don't like the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act. Fine, let's fight that out.

I see my colleague from Wyoming is here. He and I are constantly debating the issue of what should be a priority, but we don't do it this way. We need the entire Federal Government open. People need to get paid. The communities around the parks, around the BLM land, around the Corps recreational lands, around our NASA Ames facility, and I could go on and on—they need to be paid because the mom-and-pop shops are suffering. We don't do government by piecemeal, not in the greatest Nation on Earth.

This reminds me of a woman who is drowning and someone goes to rescue her, but he only takes her halfway to the shore and leaves her to drown. This is what this is about. We don't say: I will save this child, but this one I don't have to save. I will save this community because I kind of like it, but this community, sorry. No one party has a right to do it, not the Republican Party, not the Democratic Party. We don't have the right to decide which kids live and which kids die, which families thrive and which sink, and which communities suffer and which communities don't. None should suffer, not in this Nation.

Open the government, pay our bills, and let's negotiate. Let's negotiate on everything.

I have a modification to suggest to the unanimous consent request, if I might.

I ask unanimous consent that the consent be modified as follows: That an amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, then be read a third time and passed, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate. This amendment is the text that passed the Senate and is a clean con-

tinuing resolution for the entire government and is something that is already over in the House and reportedly has the support of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Wyoming so modify his request?

Mr. ENZI. Reserving the right to object, the reason we are in this mess right now is because we didn't do the budgets piecemeal. We are supposed to do them piecemeal. We are supposed to do 12 separate spending bills. We are supposed to do them one at a time. We are supposed to have the right to amend them. This way we can get into the details of what we are spending, instead of an Omnibus bill, which is what is being suggested by this amendment.

Had we gone through each of those, we could have had all of these discussions. This is how we should do it, which is our second most important task. Our most important one, of course, is the defense of our country, but the second most important one is the spending bills, and we are not doing the spending bills. I know the other side will say: Well, we brought out one, it was filibustered, and we didn't get cloture on it. We only did that one time. There should have been every one of these bills brought up with the right to amend and then they wouldn't have been filibustered. Then they could have been passed when the House sent their companion bill. Since we didn't do the process right, we are stuck with the continuing resolution.

Piecemeal is one way we can get it through. There was a request for a conference between the two sides. That was turned down by the Democrats. It would have been a chance to raise all of these things at once. That was turned down.

I object to the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object to the original request.

I feel I must respond. Senator MURRAY and I looked at each other and said: It feels as though it is "Alice in Wonderland."

Where were my colleagues 21 times when the chairman of the Budget Committee or her representatives asked to go to conference on the budget resolution, in which the conferees would negotiate how to fund the various parts of government, and that instruction would be sent to the appropriators? I do not understand what is happening here.

All we hear on the other side is negotiate, negotiate. They won't remember—selective memory, perhaps—that they objected 21 times to going to negotiations on the budget.

I have to say, this is the saddest display coming from the Republicans, who

serve in the greatest legislative body in the world, to try to fund this government on a piecemeal basis, leaving some of our families winners and some of our families losers. It is pathetic, and they have caused this Republican shutdown. They can end it.

Because I feel my friend's narrow, piecemeal approach to running this country is very wrong for this country, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Does the Senator from Wyoming still have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

Mr. ENZI. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HARKIN. My friend from Wyoming mentioned the fact that we should bring up appropriations bills. As someone who has been a member of the Appropriations Committee for quite a long time, I would remind my friend from Wyoming that earlier this year, on the first appropriations bill that we passed out of committee under the leadership of Senator MIKULSKI—it was the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill—if I am not mistaken, it had a number of Republican votes in committee. It was brought out onto the floor. An extraneous amendment was offered by the Senator from Kentucky, whereupon I believe Senator MIKULSKI, our leader, filed cloture on the bill so we could vote on the appropriations bill.

I say to my friend from Wyoming that all the Republicans on that side voted against cloture, voted against taking up that one appropriations bill—I am sorry, I am reminded that we had one Republican, the Republican from the State of Maine who did vote to go to cloture on that bill, one Republican out of all those on the other side.

I say to my friend from Wyoming, we tried to bring up the appropriations bill. It was Republicans who objected to even dealing with that appropriations bill. I would ask my friend from Wyoming if he had looked at that history and understood what had happened on the bill that came up at the time.

I thank my friend from Wyoming for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I have looked at both of the histories that have been discussed. One of them is the budget. The failure of the budget to not have a conference committee did not stop the Appropriations Committee from going through and doing 12 appropriations bills. I think that is what I count on the calendar that could have been brought up. There was only the one brought up.

The Senator has said, appropriately, that in committee there ought to be

some amendments, but on the floor there were none.

What we have spent a lot of time on around the body this year is try to negotiate how few amendments would be brought up. That has taken longer than it would have taken to vote on the whole issue.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from the Eagle Tribune.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Eagle Tribune, Oct. 8, 2013]

'GESTAPO' TACTICS MEET SENIOR CITIZENS AT YELLOWSTONE

(By John Maccone)

NEWBURYPORT.—Pat Vaillancourt went on a trip last week that was intended to showcase some of America's greatest treasures.

Instead, the Salisbury resident said she and others on her tour bus witnessed an ugly spectacle that made her embarrassed, angry and heartbroken for her country.

Vaillancourt was one of thousands of people who found themselves in a national park as the federal government shutdown went into effect on Oct. 1. For many hours her tour group, which included senior citizen visitors from Japan, Australia, Canada and the United States, were locked in a Yellowstone National Park hotel under armed guard.

The tourists were treated harshly by armed park employees, she said, so much so that some of the foreign tourists with limited English skills thought they were under arrest.

When finally allowed to leave, the bus was not allowed to halt at all along the 2.5-hour trip out of the park, not even to stop at private bathrooms that were open along the route.

"We've become a country of fear, guns and control," said Vaillancourt, who grew up in Lawrence. "It was like they brought out the armed forces. Nobody was saying, 'we're sorry,' it was all like—" as she clenched her fist and banged it against her forearm.

Vaillancourt took part in a nine-day tour of western parks and sites along with about four dozen senior citizen tourists. One of the highlights of the tour was to be Yellowstone, where they arrived just as the shutdown went into effect.

Rangers systematically sent visitors out of the park, though some groups that had hotel reservations—such as Vaillancourt's—were allowed to stay for two days. Those two days started out on a sour note, she said.

The bus stopped along a road when a large herd of bison passed nearby, and seniors filed out to take photos. Almost immediately, an armed ranger came by and ordered them to get back in, saying they couldn't "recreate." The tour guide, who had paid a \$300 fee the day before to bring the group into the park, argued that the seniors weren't "recreating," just taking photos.

"She responded and said, 'Sir, you are recreating,' and her tone became very aggressive," Vaillancourt said.

The seniors quickly filed back onboard and the bus went to the Old Faithful Inn, the park's premier lodge located adjacent to the park's most famous site, Old Faithful geyser. That was as close as they could get to the famous site—barricades were erected around Old Faithful, and the seniors were locked inside the hotel, where armed rangers stayed at the door.

"They looked like Hulk Hogans, armed. They told us you can't go outside," she said. "Some of the Asians who were on the tour said, 'Oh my God, are we under arrest?' They felt like they were criminals."

By Oct. 3 the park, which sees an average of 4,500 visitors a day, was nearly empty. The remaining hotel visitors were required to leave.

As the bus made its 2.5-hour journey out of Yellowstone, the tour guide made arrangements to stop at a full-service bathroom at an in-park dude ranch he had done business with in the past. Though the bus had its own small bathroom, Vaillancourt said seniors were looking for a more comfortable place to stop. But no stop was made—Vaillancourt said the dude ranch had been warned that its license to operate would be revoked if it allowed the bus to stop. So the bus continued on to Livingston, Mont., a gateway city to the park.

The bus trip made headlines in Livingston, where the local newspaper Livingston Enterprise interviewed the tour guide, Gordon Hodgson, who accused the park service of "Gestapo tactics."

"The national parks belong to the people," he told the Enterprise. "This isn't right."

Calls to Yellowstone's communications office were not returned, as most of the personnel have been furloughed.

Many of the foreign visitors were shocked and dismayed by what had happened and how they were treated, Vaillancourt said.

"A lot of people who were foreign said they wouldn't come back (to America)," she said.

The National Parks' aggressive actions have spawned significant criticism in western states. Governors in park-rich states such as Arizona have been thwarted in their efforts to fund partial reopenings of parks. The Washington Times quoted an unnamed Park Service official who said park law enforcement personnel were instructed to "make life as difficult for people as we can. It's disgusting."

The experience brought up many feelings in Vaillancourt. What struck her most was a widely circulated story about a group of World War II veterans who were on a trip to Washington, D.C., to see the World War II memorial when the shutdown began. The memorial was barricaded and guards were posted, but the vets pushed their way in.

That reminded her of her father, a World War II veteran who spent three years in a Japanese prisoner of war camp.

"My father took a lot of crap from the Japanese," she recalled, her eyes welling with tears. "Every day they made him bow to the Japanese flag. But he stood up to them."

"He always said to stand up for what you believe in, and don't let them push you around," she said, adding she was sad to see "fear, guns and control" turned on citizens in her own country.

Mr. ENZI. I object, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. For the benefit of those on the other side of the aisle, I am not going to end my remarks with the issue of a unanimous consent, but I still have things I wish to say.

No one supports a government shutdown, not my side of the aisle or the other side of the aisle. Could we have avoided this situation? Sure. The government could be open and fully operating today but for the majority. There

was an unwillingness to engage in a legitimate debate over proposals to amend ObamaCare or any other issues that have come before us, not even having a debate on those pieces that have come over from the other body. Hiding behind a motion to table is a way of avoiding debate.

As we know, the House passed and the Senate defeated three different continuing resolutions. Each one of those would have kept the government open and prevented a shutdown, but they were rejected by the Senate majority.

We are in this position because the majority refused to give the American people relief from the individual mandate and treat President Obama and his political appointees the same as all other Americans or as we now in Congress will be treated when it comes to health insurance.

We could have considered each of the 12 individual appropriations bills and passed them into law. But the Senate Democratic leadership has been derelict in that responsibility.

The Senate did not get into debate on a single one of those bills prior to the end of the fiscal year. I heard what my colleague from Iowa said, that one was brought up, then amendments were filed, and there wasn't a motion to move ahead. The point is the Senate is a deliberative body. Every Senator has a right to offer an amendment. We were denied that right by the majority or at least weren't assured of that right by the majority, and that is why cloture was not granted.

Of course, what the American people deserve is fair consideration of all the money we appropriate. We don't get that consideration on a continuing resolution, we get it lumped into one piece of legislation. We should, as the Senator from Wyoming said, be considering separate appropriations bills.

I remember not too long ago that a chairman of an Appropriations Committee on the other side of the aisle, when they were in the majority, was bragging to the Senate that for the first time in a long time the Senate passed every single appropriations bill before the end of the fiscal year. If it could be done then, why can't it be done now? But it isn't going to be done if we aren't willing to debate the bills.

It seems to me the American people, the taxpayers, deserve a thoughtful and good-faith effort to find common ground on our spending matters. It is a duty to pass spending bills.

Passing a continuing resolution has become a new normal around here. That is not right. It is not acceptable. While we wait for the Senate majority and the President of the United States to come to the negotiating table and end their government shutdown, we should be working to fund or reopen areas of government where there is agreement.

This is what we did when we passed the Pay Our Military Act, where we all agreed to pay those both in and out of uniform who defend our freedom. We made a commitment to them because of their commitment to our country. The military people deserve that piece of legislation.

This is what we should be doing to open our national parks and monuments. That is what we should be doing to ensure the critically important work of the National Institutes of Health.

Why hold these widely supported and critically necessary areas hostage? Why is the majority insisting on an all-or-nothing approach? Why can't we agree to fund these things we agree on and negotiate the rest?

At the very least, a little bit of common sense ought to prevail. It was common sense, for instance, when the minority leader made the point about chaplains. It is common sense that chaplains have an obedience not only to the government but to a higher authority, and they ought to be able to exercise that wherever they are.

We have a situation that the parks aren't open. We have a situation where the World War II Memorial was closed down. Open-air memorials have never been closed down when we had shutdowns in the past. A little common sense prevailing would avoid a lot of these situations we are bringing before the Senate for consideration.

Remember, the House of Representatives has passed legislation to keep the government open, and the Senate has refused it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 85

Mr. COATS. There is an interesting debate going on without achieving any results. Let me take a crack at trying to make a more persuasive argument to see if my colleagues across the aisle would agree.

We can disagree on what is an essential function of government, what is a constitutional function, what we ought to be funding and not funding. That is some of the debate we are in today.

I don't think anyone can disagree that an essential function of government is providing for our national defense, providing for homeland security, protecting Americans from terrorist threats, and responding to natural disasters. There is an organization in the government called the Federal Emergency Management Agency—FEMA is the common name—which is there to provide support to first responders whenever a natural disaster hits, whenever an intended disaster through an act of terrorism threatens this country or threatens Americans. These are functions that have to be immediately responded to, and FEMA has, over the years, improved significantly its abil-

ity to play a critical, crucial role in responding to these types of efforts that put Americans at risk.

What I am bringing forward, because we now know that while some functions of FEMA are being supported and funded and manned, many of those who would be essential should a disaster hit, whether it is natural or manmade, have been furloughed and are not available to assist in that first response. So I am simply asking that we consider seriously and gain support for the funding of FEMA to its full extent.

We have recently seen natural disasters in the United States. We had tornadoes roar through southern Indiana. FEMA was there just last year immediately. We are still in hurricane season, though we have been very fortunate this year and have not had a major hurricane land on the continental United States. Karen was in the gulf, but it dissipated. I might remind my colleagues hurricane season runs to November 30, so we are not out of the woods yet.

We have just seen a disaster in the Upper Midwest with an unprecedented amount of snow falling affecting ranchers, affecting communities; and some of our Northern States—South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado, and others—have seen massive flooding and wildfires throughout the West. All of these are disasters that need to be responded to and FEMA plays a major role in all of that.

Who knows what potential terrorist attacks or threats are out there where we may need to have an immediate response. So what I am asking is that we consider funding FEMA at its current annual funding rate of \$10.2 billion. This bill will extend funding for FEMA until December 15, but funding in the bill could end sooner if Congress, hopefully, reaches a larger budget agreement before that time. Hurricane season doesn't end until November 30, as I said. We can ensure this critical government function is not in any way limited by passing this bill, which was supported by 23 Democrats in the House of Representatives. So it does have bipartisan support.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 210, H.J. Res. 85, making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency; and I further ask unanimous consent that the measure be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, I wish to commend my colleague from Indiana for noting the important role the Federal Government plays when it comes to natural disasters. There is not a Senator on this

floor who hasn't seen this Federal response in his or her own home State because of a natural disaster. The Senator from Indiana is proposing we respond to these natural disasters with the government agencies that have been authorized, that are appropriated—usually appropriated—the funds to do so. He has picked one of them, FEMA, and he has picked it because of the possibility of a hurricane. That is a legitimate observation.

Unfortunately, the Senator from Indiana is not telling the whole story. FEMA plays an important role. Wouldn't the Senator like to have the National Weather Service fully funded so we could see the hurricane coming in advance? Sadly, it is a casualty of the Republican shutdown. Wouldn't the Senator like to have the Coast Guard available to have aerial observation of the oncoming hurricane and to provide that information to save lives? Sadly, it is not included in the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Indiana, and many of their functions are the victims of the Republican government shutdown.

I am sorry too that when it comes to the actual damage done by a disaster, FEMA plays an important role but not an exclusive role. The Senator from Indiana knows this, as I do from Illinois. Listen to the other agencies that are a critical part of responding to natural disasters: The Small Business Administration, they are usually the first on the scene with the Red Cross. Sadly, they are closed down because of the Republican shutdown of the government, and the Senator doesn't include them in his natural disaster request; DOT—Department of Transportation—and the need for emergency highways in the midst of hurricanes and tornadoes is not included in the request of the Senator from Indiana; the Corps of Engineers, the National Guard and Reserve, and the Public Health Service, none of these are included.

But the good news for the Senator from Indiana is we can take care of this together. I am going to suggest a modest modification to his request that covers all of the disaster agencies of the Federal Government that respond and keep us safe and do everything to put families back in their homes and businesses back in business. It is just a basic idea. Let's reopen the Federal Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the request of the Senator from Indiana be modified: that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, then be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate. It is a clean, no-strings-attached continuing resolution for the entire government and every

disaster agency of the Federal Government. It is something that is already in the House of Representatives and has, reportedly, the support of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

I hope the Senator from Indiana will stick with me. Let's get the job done and accept this modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will Senator from Indiana so modify his request?

Mr. COATS. Reserving the right to object, I think my colleague, the Senator from Illinois, has made an important point. There are agencies that relate to the role FEMA plays when a natural disaster or our homeland security is threatened. I don't disagree with that. Therefore, I would be willing to modify my amendment to include the Coast Guard, the National Weather Service, and those agencies listed by the Senator from Illinois as a part of this. So directing this toward applying to natural disasters and threats to our homeland security, I think we should include those agencies. I think we could go forward with that request.

But I don't think that is what the Senator has offered. He offered a total CR, which we know is not going to go forward under the current circumstances, even though all of us want to get to that point. But as was discussed earlier by my colleagues, the regular order is usually to take appropriations—pieces of appropriations—and pass them on an individual basis. That simply is what we are doing, given the constraints we have that prevent us from doing that and coming forward.

I would say this: Three times the House has sent over opportunities to take up the full CR that have been rejected by the other side and a fourth opportunity to sit down and negotiate how we would go forward, which has also been rejected. So it works both ways.

If the Senator would be able to acknowledge the addition of what was listed directly related in his statement, then we could give that consideration here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request, as modified?

Mr. COATS. It is sort of a Ping-Pong game.

Mr. DURBIN. Which request, my request?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. As modified by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me see if I can clarify.

Reserving the right to object, I understand the Senator from Indiana acknowledges that just appropriating money for FEMA does not respond to natural disasters in America. I have offered a continuing resolution which includes all of the disaster agencies. I think what he is asking me to do is to rewrite his original unanimous consent request.

I would just like a yes or no when it comes to my request to modify his original request. I am not certain what he has asked of me for further modification. So I would ask for clarification either from the Senator from Indiana or from the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from Indiana further modify his request?

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I am not able to modify the request that has been made, as I understand it, by the Senator from Illinois, because he goes beyond what he listed as being needed to just address natural disasters and threats to homeland security. He listed a number of agencies that play into that role.

My understanding—and he can clarify this if I am wrong—is that he wanted to expand my request that he consent to adding the limited portion of what he mentioned relating to the role of FEMA and our national security issues and homeland security issues that we are faced with, but he added to that the request for funding of the entire functions of government, and that I cannot consent to.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, this is why this approach is so awful. Coming to the floor with 11 requests for 11 agencies, we estimate there are another 79 requests that need to be made for us to fund our government.

Grow up, Senate. You can't do this one agency at a time. We will be here in December doing agency by agency. What we are offering is a continuing resolution to fund the government, including all of the disaster agencies.

I object to the original request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from North Dakota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 3230

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 206, H.R. 3230, making continuing appropriations during a government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces; I further ask unanimous consent that the measure be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Reserving the right to object, we are again seeing a request to fund a small part of our government. This request refers to our National Guard and Reserve. These are amazing members of our American family who

have given and sacrificed with great honor and who I find to a one are selfless. Not a one of them would say take care of me but do not take care of any of the other Americans who are home today or whose businesses have been hurt or who don't have the services they need because of this government shutdown. I would think the National Guard and Reserve would stand tall and say: Let's take care of every American. It is what I have sworn my own life to do, and it is what this Federal Government should do.

So instead of just taking a piecemeal approach—again, just asking to take care of the Guard and Reserve—I would say to the Senator that it is easy to do this. We can take up a unanimous consent request that has been offered a number of times on our side to simply open the government for all the functions and not those we pick and choose at the moment or by saying one American is more important than another American or one function is more important than another function. It would be like picking your children. We don't do that in our families and we shouldn't do it in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, then be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate—passed the Senate—and is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government. It is something that is already over in the House and reportedly has the support of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota so modify his request?

Mr. HOEVEN. Reserving the right to object, the good Senator is talking about a resolution that has already gone from the Senate to the House. That has already been done. Why do we keep going back to things we don't have agreement on, rather than advancing on the things where we can get agreement?

We have instances where our National Guard is not getting paid. We have instances where our Reserve members are not being paid. We have instances where death benefits are not being paid to members of the military who made the ultimate sacrifice.

We passed the Pay Our Military Act. It went through the House, and it went through the Senate. We passed the Pay Our Military Act. All of our military members and the civilians who support them should be paid. We passed legislation to do that, whether it is Active Forces, Guard, or Reserve. We have done that.

What we are simply asking for here is a measure that would make sure that gets done. That is what we are asking for. Let's make sure they all get paid. We passed the legislation in both Houses. Let's start working on the things we can agree on. That is why I have asked for consent to proceed with the measure, and I object to the request to modify it.

Again, I ask unanimous consent that my original measure, H.R. 3230, Pay Our Guard and Reserve Act, be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. Is there objection to the original request?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, because this request doesn't resupply the stocks for our Guard and Reserve, it doesn't buy the tools or spare parts, it doesn't provide the energy and support they need to keep their facilities open, their electric bills can't be paid, their base maintenance can't be paid, they can't get their GI education benefits or mental health programs they need to make the transition home, because I believe—and I think all of us here believe—we should open all of those functions, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST H.J. RES. 84

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, despite all the noise going on, despite the fight we are having, I think one thing we can all agree is the most important thing for our country is to restore and save the American dream.

With all this talk of an economic recovery, it would shock people around this country who are struggling to find a job or perhaps have a job but the job is a dead-end job and it doesn't pay enough that they can't live off of what they are making—there are a lot of reasons that is happening, but one of the reasons that is happening is because in the 21st century, the jobs we need in order to make it to the middle class require a higher level of skill and education than they did in the past. This is particularly chronic and is hurting people who are growing up disadvantaged, especially children growing up in dangerous neighborhoods, with little access to education and broken families. They are struggling to get ahead, and we are seeing the impact of the societal breakdown every day.

We have a program called Head Start. This program helps children 5 years of age and younger. There are about 1 million kids a year who benefit from this program. It helps them get meals, it helps them get access to medical screenings, physical therapy for children with disabilities, and access to quality prekindergarten education for these children. This is not a perfect program. I would like to see reforms. I would like to see this program become

portable so that children and their families can access the best provider possible. But now is not the time for this debate. Now is the time to do everything we can to protect this program in the short term because as we speak there are thousands of children around this country already being impacted. In my State of Florida, almost 400 children have already been cut off from these services.

The reason I think this issue is different from the other ones that have been debated here is because the one thing you can't get back is time. Every day that goes by is one less day of education these children get. You can never give them back the time. You can always go back and pay somebody the money you owe them, but you can't give them back time.

So I would like to make a request that I hope will be accepted. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 84, which makes continuing appropriations for the Head Start Program, which was received from the House; I further ask that the measure be read three times and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak before I object to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida, now wants to fund the Head Start Program. That is all well and good. We all recognize how invaluable the Head Start Program is. But I must say that listening to this request and the previous request and the other requests that have come up reminds me of an analogy.

The Republicans, quite frankly, have torn down the wall of government, and now they want to rebuild it brick by brick, but the way they want to rebuild it is by stacking the bricks. Here is a stack of bricks here, here is another stack of bricks, and here is another stack of bricks. Anyone will tell you that if you build a wall like that, it will be very weak. It won't hold together.

Our government is built from a wall of interconnected bricks. Look at a brick wall sometime. See how the bricks are interconnected. It provides strength. They all rely upon one another. They are interconnected. They provide a bulwark. If you stack those bricks one after the other, you will have a weak wall.

Now what the Republicans are saying is: Well, we have torn down that wall by shutting down the government. Now we want to build it brick by brick, but

we will just stack them. We will have a brick here and a brick there.

This is what I am getting at with that analogy. The Senator from Florida wants to fund the Head Start Program—all well and good—but the Head Start Program is not a separate brick in that wall, it is interconnected to so many others.

A variety of other Federal programs are used in the Head Start Program. For example, States use the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program. They use the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families—TANF—Program. They use the social services block grants to provide wraparound services. In this way, for example, they can use some of those funds to extend the Head Start day from half a day to a full day. They can extend it from a full day to later hours for parents who have different working hours and working conditions. Under a shutdown, we don't have these other programs. So you might have the Head Start Program, but these other ones are all shut down.

Head Start providers use funding from the Child and Adult Care Food Program, which is funded under a whole different auspices of the government, but this food program comes in to provide healthy meals and nutritious services. I say to the Senator from Florida, I have visited a lot of Head Start centers, and they have nutritious food for these kids. That doesn't come under the Head Start Program, that comes from the Child and Adult Care Food Program. That is also shut down right now.

So, again, you could fund the Head Start Program, but all these other programs interlock and provide the support necessary for a good Head Start Program.

I might also say that the Head Start Program is a need-based program. So if someone wants to get their child into a Head Start Program, sometimes documentation is used and needed—documentation such as last year's tax returns. What was your income? Well, as long as the IRS is closed right now—out of 94,000 active IRS employees, 87,000 are furloughed—the IRS is not processing those.

The point I make to all and to the Senator from Florida is that it is not enough just to say: I want to reopen the Head Start Program. All of these bricks are interlocked. That is why it is so important to get the government running again.

If the Senator from Florida wants to cut funding for some of these other programs, there is plenty of opportunity to do that through the legislative process and the appropriations process. But just to say we are going to fund the Head Start Program, I say, with all due respect, that is a cruel irony to hold out to all of the families who use the Head Start Program that

somehow, yes, we want to fund Head Start, but all the other things that go to support it and make it work, we are taking that away, and like a wall built of stacked bricks, it will fall over because it won't have the other supports that are needed.

So I respectfully object to the request from the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Kentucky.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 70

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, let's be very clear here today. Republicans have come to the floor to reopen the government. We have offered request after request to reopen the government. We have offered to negotiate. From the other side, we hear: We will not negotiate, we will not compromise, and we will not reopen the government.

We have offered 13 different compromises today to reopen the government. We are willing to open the government.

They say: You must agree to everything or we will open nothing. We will not compromise.

We say to them: Why don't we open the parts of government we agree on?

Can we not end this farce of putting security guards in front of the World War II Memorial? My goodness, it is an open park. They spent more money closing it than we spend keeping it open. We spend more money guarding the World War II monument than we do protecting our Ambassador in Libya. It has become a farce.

Eighty-five percent of your government is open. We have offered today to open another 10 percent. Compromise means coming together and voting on some of the things on which you agree.

Every program we have wanted to open today—the national parks, NIH, Veterans Affairs, allowing funerals, for goodness' sakes, for our military heroes who have died in action—they say: We agree to it, but we won't agree to it.

So let's be very clear. Republicans have offered today very specific proposals for opening the government. The Democrats have uniformly rejected every appeal to open the government. So when one of our heroes can't have a funeral, when one of our people cannot be buried in Arlington Cemetery, when a World War II veteran goes to the monument and is barricaded and kept from viewing the monument to celebrate their service, be very clear that Republicans have asked to open the government, and the Democrats have rejected opening it at every point. In fact, they are very explicit with their strategy. We will not negotiate, they say. The President says he will not negotiate under pressure. My question is, When will he negotiate?

We have had one good thing happen for the American taxpayer in the last 5 years. The bad thing is \$7 trillion has

been added to your kids' and your grandkids' tab. One good thing happened, and it happened under duress, and it happened with regard to the debt ceiling. The sequester actually cut the rate of growth of spending. It didn't cut spending, but it is cutting the rate of growth of spending. The sequester happened under duress. The other side loves debt, loves spending, and doesn't care how much your kids or grandkids will have. They don't care. They have rejected every compromise.

What we are saying is that \$7 trillion of debt under President Obama is too much. The country is struggling. Economists say 1 million people are out of work because of the economy and because of the debt and because of the burden. And what do they want to do? Heap more debt on your kids and grandkids. I say enough is enough.

Let's reopen the government. Republicans today have said we will open the government. Let's open the parts we can agree to.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 207 for H.J. Res. 70 to open the national parks, to make continuing appropriations for the year 2014; that the measure be read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it was my understanding that the Senator from Kentucky was going to make a request relative to the Veterans Administration. The request relative to the national parks has been made earlier today. Is the request for the National Park Service?

Mr. PAUL. Yes. And I can go on. I want it to be very clear that the Senator is objecting to funding the national parks, so when people go to the national parks, they know they can call his office. We want to open the national parks, and we want to make it very clear that the Democratic side is objecting to funding the national parks.

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to clarify a few points relative to statements made by the junior Senator from Kentucky.

The first statement: The Democrats will not negotiate. Well, let me remind the Senator from Kentucky—and I am sure he has not forgotten this—the spending level for the continuing resolution is the Republican's spending level which we agreed to in negotiation, \$978 billion on an annual basis.

Mr. PAUL. It is the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. It is the figure Republicans placed as part of the negotiations, which the majority leader agreed to. That was a negotiation which led to that number which Speaker BOEHNER agreed to.

Secondly, this argument by the Senator from Kentucky that the Republicans are here today to open the government—let me at least remind the Senator from Kentucky that it is their failure to pass the continuing resolution by the Republican majority in the House that has closed the government for 9 straight days. We passed the continuing resolution to keep the government open at Republican spending levels. The House has refused. This is a Republican shutdown.

Point No. 3.

Mr. PAUL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. Let me finish my statement. I reserved the right to object and I have the floor—I stand corrected. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor, but I can stand and speak reserving the right to object to his unanimous consent request. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The right is at the sufferance of the Senator who has the floor.

Mr. PAUL. I will suffer longer.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Kentucky because I went through a period of suffering a few moments ago.

The point I would like to make to the Senator from Kentucky about the national parks is one I hope he will understand. We want to open the entire government including the national parks and other lands, recreation facilities that are owned by the Federal Government beyond the national parks. When it comes to the World War II memorial the Senator made reference to, I was just there. We had a group of honored veterans from World War II who came from Illinois last week and I met them. They had access to the World War II Memorial. The reason there was any restriction was because the Republican shutdown took the employees away, which made it impossible for them to man their post.

Here is my offer to the Senator from Kentucky. It is not new, but it tells the story. Do the Republicans want to reopen the Government? Here is your chance.

I ask consent the Senator's request be modified as follows: That the amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate. This amendment is the text that has passed the Senate, it is a clean continuing, no-strings-attached resolution for the entire government including the national parks and many other important things. It is something that is

already over in the House. It could be called in a matter of minutes and passed by a bipartisan majority in the House.

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. I am not opposed to a clean CR. If we want to have a clean CR at a level at which we can balance the budget, I am all for it. If the Senator would accept a modification of a top-line number of \$940 billion to replace \$988 billion where appropriate throughout the continuing resolution, I can support his unanimous consent for a continuing resolution to go back over to the House.

Mr. DURBIN. Does the Senator object to my modification?

Mr. PAUL. I am offering a new modification to your modification and asking unanimous consent that the Senator accept as a new top-line number, where 988 appears, that \$988 billion appears throughout the continuing resolution, that if your objective is to have a clean CR, let's have a clean CR. I am happy to do it. But we need to do it and restrain the growth of spending in our government because your party has added so much our country is drowning in a sea of debt.

If you will agree to a top-line number of \$940 billion to replace \$988 billion throughout the continuing resolution where appropriate, I would agree to your consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois so modify his modification?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, holding the floor at the sufferance of the junior Senator from Kentucky, I would like to ask him to respond to a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. PAUL. Sure.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator tell us when was the last time our Federal Government had a surplus in the budget and who was the President at that time?

Mr. PAUL. Could I ask for a germane question?

Mr. DURBIN. Not really.

Mr. PAUL. Part of the answer is it was divided government. The interesting thing about divided government is divided government can work better, and with more conversation, I think we could get beyond this impasse. I think if we would negotiate—and here is the problem. I know now there are some in your party saying you will negotiate but the President said at least, oh, 20, maybe 30, maybe 40 times on national television he will not negotiate until he gets his way and that is still essentially what you guys are saying. You will negotiate after you get your way. The problem is, we think you will not negotiate unless there is a deadline, because the thing is, when you finally did

negotiate—and here is my question to the Senator from Illinois through the Presiding Officer—did you vote for the sequester?

The sequester was not a Republican bill, it was voted on by many Members of your party. The numbers are yours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired. Procedurally—

Mr. DURBIN. I object to the modification to reduce the top-line budget number. This was a number negotiated between Speaker BOEHNER and the majority leader. Speaker BOEHNER said this was a number he could pass. I believe since we took a \$70 billion cut in the budget resolution that has already passed in the Senate, I will not agree to further cuts in the programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection to the request?

Mr. DURBIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. PAUL. Is there objection to the original—the modification of my motion? I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DURBIN. I believe what is pending is the original unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original unanimous consent request?

Mr. DURBIN. For the record, the last time we had a surplus was under a Democratic President, President William Jefferson Clinton, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, what is the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield 1 minute of my time to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. While the junior Senator from Kentucky is on the floor, I want to make sure the American people know the answer to the question my friend from Illinois asked him—who was President the last time there was not only a balanced budget but a surplus? The answer is Bill Clinton. And I was here when we had that vote. So, I think, was the Senator from Illinois. We did not get one Republican to join us in that budget that actually worked so well that we had a surplus until the Republicans put a huge tax cut for billionaires on the credit card, and two wars.

Let's be clear here, what this is about. We have to open the government, we have to pay our bills, and then let the good Senator from Washington go negotiate with Congressman RYAN, the chairman of the Budget

Committee, and yes, we can see our way to a balanced budget. But let's not play these games of government by piecemeal spending.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as we now know, the government has been closed for business for more than a week. Across the country, newspapers are now filled with stories about how the shutdown is costing us jobs and slashing paychecks and interfering with everything from Head Start to the VA claims. This shutdown has already cost American workers and families a lot of pain and its impacts are only going to get worse. That is why what we heard this weekend from Speaker BOEHNER was so frustrating.

Speaker BOEHNER said:

The American people expect in Washington when we have a crisis like this, that the leaders will sit down and have a conversation.

Listening to Speaker BOEHNER, you would think a government shutdown fell out of the sky last week and caught everyone by surprise. The truth is it was completely avoidable. Senate Democrats tried to start negotiations to avoid this shutdown 18 times before October 1, and each time an extreme minority of Republicans stood up and said no. Speaker BOEHNER himself even spoke out in favor of delaying negotiations.

This shutdown did not happen by accident. We did not have to have this crisis. This shutdown happened because tea party Republicans and the Republicans who would not stand up to them chose brinkmanship over negotiations for 6 straight months. Now that we have reached this point, Republicans say they are ready to have a conversation—but only if we allow the government shutdown to continue.

Democrats are more than happy to talk about the budget, but Republican insistence on keeping the government closed during these negotiations makes no sense at all. It suggests that they are not thinking about how this shutdown is impacting our families and our businesses, which cannot afford talk at the expense of action.

I would like to talk about some of those impacts today. At a time when we should be focused on creating jobs and growing our economy, this shutdown is hurting workers and businesses and our recovery. From the sandwich shops that rely on Federal employees who come by for lunch every day to construction companies that cannot get contracts because of all the economic uncertainty to major corporations such as Boeing, that are considering furloughs, it is clear the shutdown is putting both public and private sector jobs at risk. Because Federal workers at agencies such as the IRS and Social Security Administration are

out of work, thousands of potential home buyers will be unable to get their mortgages approved, which could damage our housing recovery which has boosted our economy.

Our Nation's veterans deserve our gratitude and our respect and all the support we can offer. But this shutdown is creating uncertainty for these men and women who have heroically served our country.

Veterans make up nearly 30 percent of the Federal workforce—30 percent. They are feeling the effects of furloughs. The shutdown has worsened the backlog in disability claims at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and veterans across the country are now watching and waiting for an end to this shutdown because, if it goes long enough, their benefits could be threatened. Nearly 640,000 veterans in my home State of Washington alone are at risk of losing their VA benefits if this shutdown extends past October. It should not have to be said, but they deserve much better. So do the struggling families who are now wondering how much longer they will be able to put food on their table.

This shutdown will stop funding for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, known as WIC, which helps more than 8.9 million struggling moms and young children get healthy food. Many of our States are now scrambling to find money to keep those WIC operations going. The USDA now estimates that we will only be able to continue as usual until the end of October, until their funding runs out.

Other struggling parents wonder where they will send their children while they are at work. More than 7,000 children and their families have lost access to Head Start due to this shutdown. And, by the way, that is on top of the 57,000 slots as a result of the sequestration that has impacted so many.

As much as Republicans may not want to acknowledge it, the effects of this shutdown are far-reaching and severe and, should this government stay closed, it will only get harder for agencies to continue providing services that are so crucial to our families and communities. So when Speaker BOEHNER says the American people expect their leaders to sit down and have a conversation—you know what. That is what I have been saying for the last 6 months. But what I will not accept and what I strongly believe the American people will not accept is starting a conversation while we are in this shutdown, which is hurting our economy and some of our most vulnerable children and families, and does even more damage. Now is not the time to talk about avoiding a shutdown, it is the time to actually do it.

Speaker BOEHNER has said there are not votes in the House to pass a clean

continuing resolution that will simply keep our government open. If that is the case, I would like him to prove it. Speaker BOEHNER should bring up the Senate's clean continuing resolution and allow Democrats and Republicans to vote on it. Then he should join Democrats in preventing a default, without delay and without strings attached because, I want to be very clear, a default on U.S. debts would be unprecedented and devastating.

I held a hearing a few weeks ago in our Senate Budget Committee to talk about the impact of brinkmanship and uncertainty on our economy. The economists who joined us warned us that for families in my home State of Washington and across the country, default would mean mortgage rates and student loan costs would rise, making it harder to afford home ownership or even afford tuition; that home prices and stock prices would fall and businesses of all sizes would have trouble financing their activities, which would of course lead to layoffs and surging unemployment.

I am not going to let the tea party cause Washington State families that kind of hardship. But after we have reopened the government, prevented this default, and made sure our families and communities are no longer paying the price for tea party brinkmanship, I would be more than happy to begin the negotiations that Democrats have been out here requesting to have for months. It is clearer every day that there is bipartisan support for those responsible steps. Democrats and Republicans may not agree on much, but I think a lot of us on both sides of this aisle have had enough of tea party brinkmanship and seen enough of governing by crisis.

We are ready, together, to resolve our differences in a way that works for the American people and our economy, and I sincerely hope Speaker BOEHNER will not let the tea party stand in our way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, the U.S. Treasury says that in exactly 8 days it will not have enough money to pay the government's bills. We are not in this position because the Secretary of the Treasury or the President spent more than they were supposed to. The Constitution allows them to spend only what Congress tells them to spend, and that is exactly what they have done.

We are not in this position because investors refused to buy our bonds. Investors are lining up around the block to buy those. We are in this position for one reason and one reason only: Congress told the government to spend more money than we have. Congress told the Treasury to run up our debt to pay for it, but now Congress is threatening to run out on the bill.

If that strikes you as bizarre, you are not alone. The United States is the only democracy in the world where the legislature debates whether it should pay the bills it has already incurred. The United States is the only democracy that regularly considers whether to run out on its bills; that is, to voluntarily default on its debt.

Congress exercises direct control over the amount the Federal Government spends and the amount the Federal Government brings in through taxes and fees. Our national debt is simply a function of those two things—the money coming in and the money going out—and so Congress exercises direct control over the amount of debt we have. If Congress is unhappy with the size of the debt, it should change how much it spends or how much it brings in. There is no other option. The idea that we can somehow renege on our debts without paying a huge price is a fantasy, a dangerous fantasy.

Consider what happened in 2011, the last time the government came up to the edge of a voluntary default. Even the possibility that the government would not make good on its debts spooked investors and pushed up interest rates. According to the Bipartisan Policy Center, the interest rate increase from the last time the United States even talked about default will cost the government \$19 billion over 10 years. That is \$19 billion that could have brought back funding for Head Start, Meals On Wheels or our military. That is \$19 billion that could have eased the interest rates on student loans or been invested in medical research. That is \$19 billion that could have been used to pay down the debt. Instead, that is \$19 billion that was just flushed down the drain. Does anyone here care about wasteful government? Well, then, that is it.

The last time the government came to the edge of a voluntary default, consumers and businesses got spooked too. The S&P dropped by more than 17 percent, \$800 billion in retirement assets vanished, mortgage rates went up nearly three-quarters of a point, costing every new homeowner real money. The net result was less consumer spending, fewer business investments, lower home ownership rates, and slower job growth.

That is what happened the last time Congress came to the edge of a voluntary default. What happens if Congress actually defaults? If that happens, there is widespread concern among economists of every political persuasion that we would plunge into another recession.

Government debt may seem to be an abstract and complicated thing, but, in fact, it is pretty simple. The government owes money to two main groups of people. It owes payments on U.S. bonds, which are mostly owned by foreign governments, and it owes money

to the American people for things such as Social Security payments and Medicare reimbursements for hospitals and physicians. It owes paychecks to the military and retirement checks to veterans.

If the Treasury does not have enough money to make all of its payments, then it will likely try to minimize the damage to America's credit rating, and that means making payments on the bonds held by foreign investors, leaving others to absorb the losses.

Who will not get paid? Will it be seniors who rely on Social Security to live? Will it be hospitals that rely on Medicare to operate? Will it be our servicemembers who rely on paychecks to help their families back home? Will it be Federal contractors, large and small, who support millions of jobs nationwide?

The Treasury makes 80 million payments a month and many of them will be delayed. As more time passes, unpaid bills will pile up. From there, it just gets worse. The Federal Government's inability to pay its bills could set off a chain reaction of defaults, sending the financial system into turmoil. Millions of people who rely on Federal payments might not have the money they need to keep current on their student loans or their mortgages or their small business loans. That could cause interest rates to spike, leading to a wave of further defaults, while the financial markets would be faced with the very real possibility that the United States would not have enough money to make payments on its bonds.

American Treasury bonds are considered safe investments. They are considered so safe that they are used as collateral in millions of financial transactions around the world. If the United States does not have enough money to pay its bills, parties to these transactions will demand more collateral or different forms of collateral. That has a domino effect throughout the economy. The end result could be the kind of freeze of the credit markets that we saw after the failure of Lehman Brothers collapsed in 2008, the freeze that triggered the financial crisis.

The idea that we can renege on our debts and not pay a huge price is a dangerous fantasy. I have heard some extremists in Congress argue that even if the United States runs out of money to pay all its bills, it will not be so bad because the Treasury will be able to keep current on its bond payments and avoid a technical default.

That is a heck of a best case scenario, making bond payments to foreign governments, mostly China and Japan, while holding up Social Security payments, hospital payments, and military payments here at home. It is a terrible idea. People count on those payments to live.

It is also a terrible idea that would not work. Just ask top Wall Street ex-

ecutives, including the CEO of Goldman Sachs who said publicly and unequivocally that prioritizing bond payments would still create "insurmountable uncertainty for investors," causing a spike in interest rates that would immediately increase monthly payments on student loans, mortgages, other personal debt, and would cripple job growth. Like it or not, the threat of default will cause this country a lot of pain.

I want to make this absolutely clear: If we run out of money to pay our bills, the world will view this as the first default in the history of the United States. Wall Street and the global financial markets will view this as the first default in the history of the United States.

This fight is about financial responsibility. Financially responsible people don't charge thousands of dollars on their credit cards and then tear up the bill when it arrives. Financially responsible Nations don't do that either. When we put our name on the line saying that a debt is backed up by the full faith and credit of the United States, we follow through. We protect our good name. We protect our good credit.

For many things that we do in Congress, we can make a mistake and then back up and fix it. A default on our national debt is not one of those things. If we default and pay late, the damage could be irreversible.

The first time we flirted with default was the first time in history that America's credit rating fell. If we actually default, some economists estimate we will add \$75 billion a year to the debt in additional interest payments. That is three-quarters of \$1 trillion over the next 10 years. There are a lot of good things to do with that money. Flushing it down the drain is not one of them.

If we default on our debt, we could bring on a worldwide recession, a recession that would pummel hard-working middle-class people, people who lost their homes and jobs and retirement savings and who are barely getting back on their feet. Maybe we can escape a recession—maybe—but we are playing with the lives of every American, and it is not what the American people sent us to do. This is no time to act out dangerous fantasies.

We must raise the debt ceiling. We must raise it now. A bedrock financial principle of government is to tell the world that the United States always pays its debts in full and on time. That is who we are.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in taking the floor to stress the urgency of action. I agree with my colleague from Massachusetts and her comments about the devastating impact the failure to pay our

bills would have on our economy, on our Nation's reputation, and on the worldwide economy. That would make absolutely no sense at all and would put our Nation at great risk.

I thank the Senator for taking the time to explain the specific consequences if we were to allow the U.S. Treasury to be put in the position where it could not honor all of the obligations that have already been incurred.

This is not about increasing spending. This is about paying the bills we have already incurred. Whether it is for those who hold our bonds, those who are entitled to a payroll check or those who are entitled to a contractor's check, we have to honor our bills. That is what America's great reputation is all about.

I thank the Senator for bringing that up.

The combination of a government shutdown combined with not paying our bills will have an impact on our economy that will be very hard for us to overcome. We have already been harmed. This government shutdown has already hurt America. It has hurt us internationally.

This past week President Obama was supposed to be at the Asian economic summit. The Presiding Officer—the Senator from Delaware who serves on the Foreign Relations Committee—knows very well the importance of that particular conference.

The headliner of that conference should have been President Obama pointing out how important the rebalanced Asia is to America's economy and that we are open for business; instead, America was closed for business. The headliner at that economic summit was President Xi of China. That is not what this Nation needed. We were harmed by that government shutdown and the President's inability to travel to Asia. Make no mistake about it, it hurt America.

Our economy has already been hurt by the shutdown. Every day that the government is shut down, it hurts our economy. I can give a lot of specific examples. For instance, there was a report in this morning's paper about the State of Colorado and how it recently experienced one of the worst floods in its history which caused a devastating impact on its economy. They are now telling us that this shutdown is approaching the economic damage to Colorado that nature did to it a couple of weeks ago by the floods. However, there is a major difference: We can't stop what nature does—we can try to mitigate it—but we can stop this government shutdown. This is a government problem that we have imposed on the people of Colorado, the people of Maryland, the people of Delaware, and the people of our entire country.

This shutdown has hurt the taxpayers of this country. I have heard my

conservative friends say that we want to make sure we don't spend so much money. We want to help the taxpayers. In this short period of time already the shutdown has cost the taxpayers of this country a reported \$2 billion. That is just wasted taxpayer dollars. We have a responsibility to care for the public funds. The way to do that right now is to open government and stop wasting taxpayer dollars.

I have been on this floor many times to talk about the harm we are doing to the Federal workforce. Yes, we are harming the Federal workforce; there is no question about it. I am particularly sensitive because this region has more Federal workers—of the 800,000 who have been furloughed, over 300,000 come from this region. By the way, 30 percent are veterans. The people who have served our Nation are now being furloughed because of this government shutdown. Maryland's workforce is about 10 percent of Federal workers. So this has had a real impact on the State I have the honor of representing in the Senate. Each one of those 800,000 people whom we represent is real. They are not just numbers. These are real people who have been harmed by the closing of the Federal Government.

Let me speak about a couple of people whom I have heard about or who have called me. Kayla is a 15-year-old who I spoke to on the telephone. She told me about how her parents are worried. Both of her parents are Federal workers, and she, a 15-year-old, sensed the fear in her parents as to whether they will be able to pay their bills. We put that family at risk by failing to keep government open.

Melissa Ayres is a furloughed Federal worker at the Social Security Administration. Her husband was unemployed for 2½ years as a result of our economic downturn. Now his company is recovering, but Melissa was the principal wage earner. She stated:

I have always been the primary earner until Monday. Now I think: What do I do to support my family?

The government shutdown has hurt Melissa Ayres and her family.

I heard from a farmer on the eastern shore of Maryland's Cecil County. He is part of the conservation stewardship program. I know the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Delaware, is well aware of that. But what this person has done is taken some income away from his farming activities by planting buffer crops. Those buffer crops help with reducing the amount of pollutants that run off into the Chester River, in this case, which will flow into the Chesapeake Bay. So he is being a good steward of the environment, and he enrolled in the conservation stewardship program. As part of that, he gets a payment from that fund, because he is giving up some of the income of his farming activities in order to help us preserve the Chesapeake Bay. During this

shutdown, that payment is not being made.

He has put himself in a tough position. He did the right thing. He has put his family at risk. He told me he has a young child who is undergoing certain treatment for his eye. He doesn't know whether he has the money for his child to continue in that medical treatment. He needs the check for his participation in this program.

This government shutdown has had a real impact on real people.

Johnny Zuagar who works at the Census Bureau—I should say used to work at the Census Bureau because he has been furloughed. Of the 5,000 employees at the Census Bureau, less than 40 are currently working—forty out of 5,000. The budget he has for his family is based upon his paycheck. If he doesn't get his full paycheck, he can't pay his bills. So his question is which bills should he pay and which not pay.

That is the situation we are putting people in as a result of this government shutdown.

Marcelo Del Canto was here earlier this week. He works with helping in the fight against substance abuse. He has been a Federal worker for 8 years. He is in the unenviable position that he and his wife both work for the Federal Government, and they have both been furloughed. He is a Marylander and just recently bought a home in Maryland. He has a mortgage. If he doesn't get a paycheck, how does he pay his mortgage? The mortgage company is not going to say: Oh, government shutdown. You don't have to pay your mortgage payments.

This shutdown is having a real impact on real families in my State of Maryland and in every State in this Nation.

Then there are agencies that just can't do their work that will hurt our country. The Environmental Protection Agency currently has 93 percent of its workforce on furlough. That means we are at risk with our public health—clean air, clean water. Our environment is at risk. The Chesapeake Bay is at greater risk because the people out there doing the monitoring and doing the enforcement are not there. Scientists are not doing what they need to be doing in order to help us with public health and to deal with our environment.

Let me tell my colleagues that it is also directly hurting our economy. In Baltimore, one of the most important economic development sites, Harbor Point, in downtown Baltimore, which is being developed is a RCRA site, which requires the approval of the Environmental Protection Agency in order to move forward with the economic development plan. The people who would do that approval process are on furlough. That project is now on hold and the economic development that would help Baltimore and our State economy is now on hold.

The shutdown is having a real effect on real people.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, which is located in the State of Maryland, does work that is so important for innovation, for science, and technology. They do work to help us have a competitive edge internationally. Ninety-one percent of their workforce is on furlough. How do we expect to be competitive?

This year, the SAMMI Awards were recently given out. The SAMMI Awards are given to Federal workers who excel in public service. These are our frontliners. These are the people who are serving their nation, and we want to honor them. I want to recognize some of the people who were being honored at the SAMMI Awards this year. One is Daniel Madrzykowski. He works at NIST. I mention him because he has been there for 28 years. The work he does is to figure out how he can keep our first responders who fight fires safe. He does the research as to how they can go into a building in a safer way. Well, he is furloughed, and our first responders are at a little bit greater risk today as a result of the government shutdown.

The shutdown is having an effect on real people.

I read with interest how we celebrated the Nobel Prize in medicine going to James Rothman and Randy Schekman for the incredible work they did. I don't know if I can explain what they did, but I will tell my colleagues that it is incredible. They were able to reach that pinnacle in their careers and reach their accomplishments because during their career they were supported by the National Institutes of Health. NIH does basic research which is so important—the building blocks for discovery in America. It provides incentives for young people to go into science and to go into research.

Will we have the next group of Nobel laureates? Today it is less certain than it was a week ago. NIH cannot support those types of research grants today. Their people are on furlough. America is not open for business. Real people are being hurt by what is happening.

It is not just in government employment. I can talk about private sector employment.

It was just reported today that Lockheed will be laying off 400 Maryland workers as a result of the shutdown. I can give many more examples of private companies that are laying off people as a result of this shutdown.

The bottom line is this: We hear from some of our Republican colleagues in the House that we have to negotiate, we have to pick winners and losers; we have to wait for a crisis to occur in a particular agency before they will consider a special bill to open some of those agencies. So let me just conclude by the quote I cited once before on the floor of the Senate from the Baltimore

Sunpapers. It says, in regards to negotiations and what we should do:

The gun isn't raised to Mr. Obama's head or to the Senate's. The Democrats have no particular stake in passing a continuing resolution or in raising the debt ceiling other than keeping public order and doing what any reasonable person expects Congress to do. No, the gun is raised at the nation as a whole. That's why descriptions like "ransom" and "hostage" are not mere hyperbole, they are as close as the English language gets to accurately describing the GOP strategy.

It is time for Speaker BOEHNER to put down the gun. It is time for us to open government and to make sure we pay our bills, and then, yes, we want to negotiate. For 6 months, we have been trying to negotiate a budget. Open government, pay our bills, and then let's negotiate a responsible budget for this Nation.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

MR. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the twin manufactured crises that are facing the country: A hobbled government and the threat of default.

I have seen some describe this as a game, and I have heard others say it is just partisanship posturing. But this situation is neither. This is serious business. In fact, I am deeply troubled about this—not only as a Senator representing the State of Rhode Island, but as an American—about where my country is going.

I am dismayed that some on the other side have decided that for whatever reason—and those reasons seem to keep changing—the only way to achieve their goal—and their goals seem to keep changing—is to shut the government down and suggest that defaulting on our debt will have no consequences.

It would be a nice fiction if we could say: Well, America really didn't have to pay its bills. That we don't have to pay for the trillions we spent in Iraq and in Afghanistan, or for the significant tax cuts under President Bush that benefited the wealthiest Americans. I didn't support the operations in Iraq, and I didn't support those tax cuts. I think we could have invested the money much more wisely and helped America.

But the reality is all these bills are coming due, and the United States Treasury has to pay them.

Some of my colleagues on the other side are suggesting: Well, we can prioritize payments. No one will be upset. No one will be hurt if we don't pay the bills as they come due. We will just pick the ones we want to pay.

But these are not Democratic bills. They are not Republican bills. These are America's bills. They were approved by the Congress of the United States under Republican Presidents and Democrat Presidents, under Re-

publican Congresses and Democrat Congresses. And as they come due, they must be paid.

But we are here today in this manufactured crisis that essentially locks out and blocks the American people from accessing their government—from accessing basic government services. Women and children receiving food under the WIC program, Head Start—a whole panoply of Americans who are literally being denied benefits they earned, or benefits that are necessary not just for their health, but for the health and vitality of the fabric of America. Then, on top of that, is the added threat of a default on our obligations—already accrued, already authorized, already appropriated obligations—not new borrowing for new expenditures. These bills are coming due.

We have seen this ever-changing theme from the other side about why they have to do these things. At first it was an effort to repeal ObamaCare. Then it was a 1-year delay of health insurance under the Affordable Care Act. Then it was just a delay of part of the law. Then it was repealing a tax that was part of the law. Now, we have heard about Canadian oil pipelines, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and cutting Medicaid. The rationale keeps changing and suggesting that the reasons behind this lockout are not only unclear to the American public, they are unclear to the proponents. In fact, some are suggesting that this is also about cutting Social Security and Medicare and other programs that are central to every family in this country. Indeed, it seems as though they have transitioned from "let's take ObamaCare and repeal it" to "let's take the New Deal and repeal that." In fact, one of our colleagues in the House apparently suggested he didn't know what he wanted; he just knew he wanted something in exchange for an open government that is functioning and a government that pays its bills.

It is hard not to draw the conclusion that many of my colleagues on the other side have simply committed themselves to extracting major policy concessions, whatever they can get, by threatening to default on our debt and by continuing to lock out the American people from its government. They are sadly using potential economic chaos to get their way.

Now I don't think Republicans are debating seriously—and we have heard this argument from them for years going back—for decades, in fact—to the initial debate on Medicare, that it is evil socialized medicine. Now I am sure during the discussion of the New Deal, there were criticisms of growing central government, but to seriously take away these programs I think would cause the American people to stand up and say no, since most if not every American fundamentally depends on them. Particularly as they get to the

point where they are retired or they are approaching retirement.

So now the Republican story has shifted, as they have gotten closer and closer to what seems to be some of their real motivating factors: shrinking government dramatically, not just those parts that are popular. Now they are beginning to hint that this is about something more fundamental. This is about tearing up the basic social contract where people have worked all their lives, paid into Social Security, and will get Social Security benefits. For them, this is about tearing up the social contract that if you have worked, you have paid into the Medicare system, you will get Medicare benefits.

Of course now they have shifted their current story again, and now it is all about negotiation, that we have not negotiated. That is why they have to shut down the government and default on the debt of the United States. The irony, of course, is that Democrats have been, indeed, trying to go into serious and bipartisan negotiations about our budget for many months. Indeed, months ago, in March, as I recall, the Senate, after taking 47 rollcall votes, passed a solid, balanced, and sensible budget plan and asked to negotiate with the other body in a conference. Indeed, at the beginning of the year, the Speaker called for following the budget process, for following regular order.

At one point, the other side even demanded that Senators and Congresswomen and men should not be paid if there was no budget resolution. But, sadly, months later, after we had passed our budget, a handful of colleagues in this body, on the Republican side, have been blocking us from going to conference. They are insisting that as any precondition to a bipartisan conference we could not talk about raising revenue, or take actions that will ensure the government be able to pay its bills. They have essentially stopped regular order.

For his part, the Speaker of the House refused to appoint conferees for months, as well, apparently fearful that Republicans might have to actually vote on some of their proposals that have been incorporated over the years in various Republican budgets with respect to Medicare, Medicaid, and other programs.

But now as we approach default, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are saying: Oh, it is time to negotiate on the budget.

It was time months ago when we asked to go to conference. It was time weeks ago. Now it is time to ensure that we pay our bills and we open the government.

We have come to the Senate floor 21 times so far to seek to go to conference to negotiate with the House on the budget. What do we hear? When we ask to go to negotiate, no. But, when we

ask them to open the government, to pay our bills, they say no let's negotiate. That is not the way to conduct the business of this government. It is not the way to provide the confidence our economy needs to go forward. It is not the way to provide families the confidence they need to face the rigors of daily life—of educating children, of taking care of their health care, of contributing to their community.

We have had consistent and constant objections, which frustrate our ability to go to conference and negotiate, over many, many, many months. But after all their other rationales—defund ObamaCare, delay ObamaCare, delay the personal mandate—now it has come down to let's negotiate, when indeed, Republicans have rejected that approach 21 times on the floor of the Senate.

It is time for the other Chamber to reopen the government and agree to pay our bills. They can do that by bringing to the floor very quickly—and they can procedurally: a clean CR—a term of art that was Washington speak until a week or two ago, but now everyone knows. It simply sets for a few weeks the amount of money we can spend and allows us to open the government.

Americans are being hurt by the shutdown, and they will be hurt even more grievously if we default on our debt. It is continually amazing to me that the other side persists in shutting down the government and threatening to default on the debt.

But, you have a response by the other side, particularly, that is consistent with what we heard during their primary campaign for the Presidency: Let's shut down some government agencies. Now it is the other side of that coin: Republicans will just open a few government agencies, not the whole government, but the ones—and they change or they increase each day—that they think are important. Each day they seem to have another idea about: Well, we have to open this. It will be a good headline. It will be a good talking point.

For example, they have talked about opening the national parks, the Smithsonian, and other museums. But, let's remember that in the House, Republicans have proposed cutting the allocation for the Department of Interior Appropriations Bill by \$5.5 billion from last year.

So we have to go forward and we have to resolve this situation. We cannot allow this lockout to continue. We have to do what Leader REID has said quite succinctly: open the government, pay our bills, go to conference on the budget, and then negotiate everything that is within reason to negotiate. Let's do that for the American people. We are ready to do it. I hope our colleagues will agree to do it also.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I would like to start by reading a letter I received this week. So many of us in the Senate are operating with furloughed staff, and we are doing our best to read and respond to the letters we are getting from home, the calls that are coming into our offices. This one touched me in particular. It began:

My name is MSgt Corey P DiLuzio. I am an Air Reserve Technician at Dover AFB. I have served this great nation for 12 years without question or reservation. Every time I have been called upon, I have answered the call, left my family behind, and served proudly as maintainer for the C-17 aircraft. I know you understand the reach and the mission requirements for such an aircraft. I tell you this not for a thank you or any type of acknowledgement. I tell you this—

Master Sergeant DiLuzio writes—because I am also a husband to a woman who has stood by my side in support for every deployment. I tell you this because I am the father of a three-year-old boy who doesn't even question the answer Daddy's at work. I understand a man in your position has made . . . sacrifices as well, however, today I had to tell my family I am unable to work. Not because of anything I have control of, but because of decisions made by individuals who will not miss a paycheck; individuals who will always know when the next check is coming. I write this understanding that it will fall on deaf ears, and I am usually one that remains quiet and follows the orders for those appointed above me, however, enough is enough. Please do your part in resolving this issue so I can get back to serving my country and my family.

Sincerely yours, MSgt Corey DiLuzio.

It pains me that the master sergeant thought his letter would fall on deaf ears, that no one here—that neither I nor any of my colleagues—would hear or care about the concerns of a man—his wife, his family—who has served this country and who stands ready to continue serving this country but whose family is being harmed by the mindless, purposeless shutdown of the government that is now in day 9—this first government shutdown in 17 years, and by all indications one that will continue into another week.

I start by saying to Master Sergeant DiLuzio: I am sorry. I am sorry for the needless pain and difficulty this shutdown is imposing on your family and so many other families across this country. Roughly 800,000 Federal employees have been furloughed at different times in the last 9 days, and while some may be returning to Active service, they will be getting IOUs rather than regular paychecks. All over this country, private contractors, as we have heard from other colleagues today, are also laying off people because they cannot get the permits or work permission or the site access they need to move forward.

This shutdown is continuing to harm our country, our reputation, our economy, our families. It is a needless, manufactured, self-imposed wound.

I wrestle with this because we are facing twin manufactured crises, as Senator REED of Rhode Island just finished saying: hobbled government due to this shutdown on the one hand and the steadily increasing risk of default on the other—these twin manufactured crises seeking some purpose that is unclear from day-to-day. When this government shutdown started, it seemed to be aimed at what, repealing the Affordable Care Act, so-called ObamaCare, and then 1 day later it seemed to be aimed at delaying the Affordable Care Act, and then when that clearly was unsuccessful, it seemed to be aimed at seeking some partial repeal of the Affordable Care Act and now it is an ongoing crisis in search of a purpose. The menu of potential demands is growing, and the impact on our families and our communities is growing as well.

The House has been wasting its time on mini microappropriations bills in an attempt to give reporters and folks back home the sense that they are actually doing something, when it is just misdirection. They think all the activity will keep the American people from noticing that Speaker BOEHNER is not bringing up the one bill that could reopen this government in a matter of minutes—a so-called clean continuing resolution, a simple extension of current spending levels.

I know to all who watch—Master Sergeant DiLuzio and many others—we sometimes speak in language that is opaque, that is difficult to understand. We talk about sequester and continuing resolutions and so forth. So I am going to try and work through these issues in a way that is accessible and direct.

Let's be clear. This government is shut down right now because the House would not pass a 6-week extension—an extension to November 15—of what is required to keep us open. Today that would be just over 4 weeks. We are literally fighting over a 4-week funding bill. How absurd is it that all of this is over a measure that would have only funded the government in the first case for another 4 weeks from now. There is, frankly, nothing about this situation that is not absurd.

Every day the House Republicans show up with a new strategy, a new press conference, a new message, and, as I said, all the while not explaining exactly why the government is shut down. Initially, it was shut down to prevent the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, but that is moving forward, as it was always going to be because it is an enacted program.

So what is the current message from the House? They say they are the only ones ready to negotiate, that they are alone at the table, sitting there with jackets off, in their bright, starched, white shirts, waiting for Senate Democrats to meet them at the table and ne-

gotiate. Another farce, another fantasy.

I am, frankly, tired and frustrated with the games that seem to be played here. I would like to highlight, if I could, a few of our real efforts to work collaboratively, to answer the question, why won't you negotiate, by saying we have been negotiating.

Once the House votes to keep the lights on and to pay our bills, we will continue to negotiate. I have a simple question. Does the House want us to continue to be a closed-door nation, a nation where we have locked out hundreds of thousands of Federal workers? Does the House want to threaten that we will become a deadbeat nation, a nation that fails to meet its obligations built up over many administrations and many Congresses, Republican and Democratic, or are we going to reopen the government, become an open-door nation, and are we going to pay our bills and become a responsible nation, as we have been in the past?

How did we get here? As a member of the Budget Committee, let me first start, if I could, with the budget resolution. That is how our rules work. We are supposed to begin with a budget resolution that sets a framework for what we are going to spend in the next fiscal year.

For the last 3 years I have been serving here as a Senator, over and over on this floor the call was: Why won't the Senate pass a budget? Well, this year this Senate passed a budget resolution with significant Republican input. Between this floor, where we ultimately passed it, and the committee on which I serve, the Senate adopted more than 40 amendments offered by my Republican colleagues.

We compromised. We worked toward a shared goal. Week after week, as I said, Republicans had asked in past years: When is the Senate going to pass a budget? Yet we did, more than 6 months ago—200 days ago, to be precise, we passed a budget in this Senate.

Our chair, Senator MURRAY of Washington, has tried to take our budget to conference with the House to do as the rules provide, to reconcile and to responsibly negotiate over our fiscal differences—18 times. She has tried over and over and over to take us to conference and responsibly open formal talks with the House to resolve our fiscal differences. Every time that motion has been blocked, denied, barred, all by a very small group of tea party Republicans in this Chamber who have refused to let us go ahead and negotiate as the rules say we should.

I also serve on the Appropriations Committee. Once the budget is framed, once the budget is resolved, we are then supposed to move to appropriations and set our spending levels. As a member of that committee, I have been a part of the process in which we have, in fact, passed 11 spending bills out of

committee, 8 of them with bipartisan support.

In order to try to move that process forward, months after the budget was passed, we brought the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill to this floor. It passed out of committee by a vote of 22 to 8, with 6 Republican votes, a strong bipartisan bill to be passed out here on the floor.

What happened? It was blocked. Again, a small number of the other party came and objected and blocked the passage of that bill, a bill that would put Americans to work and strengthen our infrastructure and help support the housing recovery, a bill that would have moved us forward.

Despite every attempt to fund this government through what we call regular order, the budget process and the appropriations process, we, even after that, came to the table, ready to compromise on this continuing resolution.

The Senate budget calls for a top-line spending number of \$1.058 trillion, a balanced approach that reduces Federal spending in some areas, raises revenue in others, and makes progress by replacing the sequester. That is the budget we passed in the Senate. It would call for spending \$1.058 trillion. The House budget instead called for \$988 billion. As you have heard our leader Senator HARRY REID say on the floor this week, he compromised. He agreed to a short-term funding bill at \$988 billion, a \$70 billion cut for this fiscal year, a major and painful concession for Democrats, particularly those of us on the Budget Committee who had not voted for a \$988 billion number.

We have already slashed spending. People are already suffering through the sequester, another thing that was enacted due to comparable tactics the last time there was a near default in 2011. The sequester has resulted in across-the-board spending cuts. It has been dangerous and painful and which I have spoken about on this floor repeatedly, reading letters from Delawareans, such as the master sergeant, commenting on how it is not the smart way to make cuts, it is an across-the-board way, an irresponsible way to make cuts.

That same Air Force base, Dover Air Force Base, suffered furloughs for hundreds of airmen and their families because of the sequester cuts. We had worked out a budget that would have replaced it and would have avoided those sequester cuts in a balanced and responsible way. But instead, in order to compromise, our majority leader agreed to a \$70 billion cut for this fiscal year. It was tough for a lot of Democrats to swallow. So, frankly, when I see House Republican leaders go on TV and say Democrats will not negotiate, Democrats will not compromise, I have to say: That is not the case. That is not the facts I have before me. We have compromised. We have negotiated. In

fact, we have tried for months on this floor, more than 6 months, to get the compromise, to get the negotiation to move this forward. Instead, we find when we give an inch, they take a yard.

Today there are some, some in the other party, suggesting that if they are not granted a great big wish list, they will force us to default on our country's sovereign debt. We keep hearing from the other side about the need to compromise and negotiate. I could not agree more. The whole way this body is supposed to work is by following the rules, following the process, going to conference, negotiating and achieving a responsible result.

We have repeatedly solicited Republican input, accepted Republican amendments, and made painful compromises. Now my message is simple: We should be following the rules. We should be following the process of this body. We should turn on the lights. We should pay our bills. I would be happy, honored to continue working with Republican colleagues to find real solutions to our fiscal problems, the way we are supposed to, in a conference negotiating over the budget that was passed here more than 6 months ago.

To the colleagues with whom I share this Chamber but with whom we have some differences over why this government is shut down today, I hope you will listen to Master Sergeant DiLuzio and his family and to the thousands and thousands of other Americans who are writing in and calling our offices. They deserve better. This country deserves better. We need to show we can be the model of democracy that achieves responsible principled compromise.

To my colleagues and my friends in the other party: Stop blocking progress. Let's go to conference on the budget. Let's negotiate. But, first, let's get our folks back to work. Let's get the government open. Let's move forward in a way that honors the best of our traditions and our rules.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 7 p.m., and that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to add my remarks now for the third time about this shutdown. I want to say this is not the way we ought to be running our government, and enough ought to be enough.

For example, as you know, the Secretary of Defense has figured out a way he can bring back most of the furloughed civilian employees—there may be a quarter of them who are still on furlough but most of them—by a law that passed here that saw most unintended consequences. But there was a little part of the law where he was able to bring them back for the national security and defense of this country.

But there are still gaping holes. For example, although the active-duty National Guard is not furloughed, a lot of the civilian force and the Reserve force of the Guard is furloughed.

I just talked to an F-22 pilot of the Virginia National Guard. He is a long-time fighter pilot in the U.S. Air Force, flew F-15s, now F-22s. He has transitioned to the National Guard, went to a unit that has the F-22s, which is the Virginia National Guard. All of those Reserve National Guard pilots are still coming in and flying, because we still have to protect the air defense of this country. They are flying, but they are not getting paid. Some of their technicians are there, still supporting the maintenance of the aircraft. Some of them are not getting paid. All of the ancillary support staff is on furlough.

In this example of the protection of the national security, in this particular case providing for our air defense through an Air National Guard unit, is this the way an air guard unit ought to be run?

Instead, it is not being run according to how it should be because of a political tantrum by certain people trying to get their way, instead of allowing the government to be functioning through its appropriations.

There is now a salmonella outbreak, 278 cases in 18 States, including my State of Florida. The Centers for Disease Control, which monitors at one time 30 different diseases operating in this country—now 68 percent of the Centers for Disease Control employees have been furloughed. So because of the salmonella outbreak that has occurred—it may be in the Presiding Officer's State as well. I will look it up afterwards and tell the Presiding Officer. It is in my State. I know it started in California, where most of the cases are.

But had the CDC been there in full force, instead of 68 percent of them being laid off, maybe we would not have had this outbreak, or they may have been able to spot it and stem it quickly before it spread to 17 other States.

I will give you another example: NASA. This little agency is the one that has the most people furloughed as a percentage of the workforce. Now 97 percent of NASA employees are furloughed. Since most of NASA's work is done by contractors, without the NASA supervisors there now, the contractors

are being laid off. You take a place such as the Presiding Officer's State of Ohio, the NASA Glenn Research Center, look at the impact to the people in that community.

You take a major space center elsewhere, such as the Johnson Space Center in Houston, the Kennedy Space Center in my State, look at what it is doing to the lives of people. But remember that we have a mission that is going to Mars that has a unique, one-time-in-2-years launch window, starting the middle of November into the first part of December. If that narrow 3-week launch window is missed because of the lack of preparation of this spacecraft to launch, there is not another launch window for 2 years. Because of that, we were able to get NASA to recall that team. They are there continuing to prepare the spacecraft. They are not getting paid. But at least we are not going to cause all of the additional delay of 2 years and all of the additional expense of keeping that team of scientists together, along with the staging of the spacecraft for another 2 years.

There are three examples: the National Guard, and the defense of this country; the salmonella outbreak, because of the layoffs of the CDC, the Centers for Disease Control; and NASA.

This should not be. Enough is enough. The political tantrum ought to stop. Let us get back to the business of governing.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

SOUTH DAKOTA BLIZZARD

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the devastation that has been inflicted on many in my home State. An early season snowstorm has dumped 1 foot of snow and heavy winds on much of western South Dakota. The thoughts and prayers of Barbara and I are with those affected by this disastrous storm.

Communities and residents are wrestling with the damage caused by downed trees, and utility companies are facing power outages. County, community, and emergency officials have shared with my office numerous stories of volunteers stepping in to help to transport medicines and oxygen to residents stranded in their homes.

Neighbors are helping assist each other with cutting down tree limbs, snow removal, and getting essential food items and medical supplies to the elderly and disabled residents. There

are countless reports of people helping to move stuck drivers out of snowdrifts or helping to shovel the roofs and snow from the home of a senior citizen or disabled residents. When people are in need, South Dakotans step up.

One of the most significant impacts of the storm has been on my State's livestock producers. "Tens of thousands of cattle killed in Friday's blizzard . . ." proclaims the Rapid City Journal headline.

Silvia Christen, with the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association, has shared with me gut-wrenching stories of ranchers who have lost their herds. She said a man near Interior found his cows had pushed themselves and their calves over a Badlands wall and killed many of them. He estimates his loss at 50 percent of his total herd.

A young man east of Hermosa estimates he lost 30 percent of his 200 breeding cows. He found them all in one pile in a draw covered in snow. He saw the heads and hooves sticking out from the snow and can't bring himself to go closer or dig them out. He stated:

I'm young, but I always thought I was a good rancher. I thought I'd taken care of them but I guess I should have done more.

He hung up the phone with an apology as his voice broke.

Our cowboys are resilient people, but this blizzard comes on the heels of a devastating drought last year from which ranchers still haven't fully recovered.

I am very proud of our State and local officials who have taken immediate action to assist those in need. The National Guard is conducting life-saving safety operations to ensure folks without power are OK and to open roads. The State is working with a local rendering company to assist with finding, identifying, and dealing with livestock that have been killed. Our ag organizations in the State are providing help and guidance to ranchers who were hit.

The one place where help is lacking is from the Federal Government. Because of the government shutdown, producers can't rely on their FSA offices for assistance.

Since Congress hasn't finished the farm bill, West River ranchers may have to wait for disaster assistance. The 2008 farm bill included several critical disaster assistance programs, including the Livestock Indemnity Program, which provides help to producers affected by natural disasters. Unfortunately, that program expired in 2011, and because Congress hasn't yet completed a comprehensive farm bill, there continues to be no funding available for them.

We passed a good farm bill here in the Senate twice in the past 2 years. I worked to include funding for these livestock disaster programs, which are in both the Senate and House bills. The Senate is ready to negotiate the farm

bill, but the House hasn't appointed conferees. The longer they delay, the longer my constituents will suffer without disaster aid.

The House needs to pass a clean continuing resolution, and they need to appoint conferees so that we can finally finish the farm bill.

It will take many months for the Black Hills communities to clean up from the October blizzard. For ranchers who lost livestock, it may take years to recover. But whatever Mother Nature has to deliver, it cannot dampen the spirit of South Dakotans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to give voice to frustrated Nebraskans. I rise to testify to the simple truth that a government should not intentionally make life harder for its people. I rise to say: Enough. Enough press conferences. Enough brinkmanship. Enough dividing people of good will against one another.

I am still pretty new here, but I can say that in Nebraska and in so many other States across this Nation we actually work together—and not just on small bills but also on the big issues. I urge my colleagues to remember where we came from.

While I served in the Nebraska Legislature, we dealt with a major budget shortfall. We didn't go on TV or Twitter or fight; we legislated and we fixed the problem. That is the Nebraska way. We roll up our sleeves, we cut through the talking points, and we get to work.

Nebraskans are pragmatic. They are well informed, and they expect results. So when Nebraskans look at the dysfunction we have here in Washington, they are frustrated, and I am too. I am very frustrated. I am frustrated that this Congress can't pass appropriations bills that comply with the law. I am frustrated that this Congress cannot agree on a budget. I am frustrated with crisis management instead of responsible governance. I am frustrated with being told one thing only to learn it is just not true. I am frustrated with the willful ignorance that goes on in Washington when it comes to our debt. And I am frustrated with the lack of solutions.

The American people do not want us to just stand in opposition; they want us to put forth constructive ideas to solve problems. As a result of Congress's failure to agree on a spend-

ing plan, the government is shut down. The result? Well, in yesterday's Omaha World Herald there was a report that Nebraska farmers are unable to cash checks when they bring their grain in after harvest. The article noted:

State law requires elevators to include a lender's name on a check when a farmer has a loan against the grain. With no one at Farm Service Agency offices because of the shutdown, checks can't be cashed when the lender is the FSA.

"We've got millions of dollars of grain checks out there that farmers need," said Dan Poppe, president of the Archer (Neb.) Cooperative Credit Union, with locations in Archer, Dannebrog and Central City.

He said entire rural economies count on the money.

"It impacts not only our farmers, who are relying heavily on the money, but also the local grocery store, hardware store, the feed and seed," Poppe said.

It is not just farmers and ranchers, it is also our manufacturers and our investors. A constituent from Waco, NE, wrote:

I am a Dow employee living in your district. This impasse is beginning to threaten Dow's investment in new U.S. manufacturing. Not only will a continued delay push back Dow's plans to create thousands of new American jobs, it will harm Dow's competitiveness and directly impact me and my family. Greater economic certainty will help Dow, its employees, and our State thrive.

The wife of a Federal law enforcement officer from Gretna wrote:

We are a single income family. We have a 2 and 3 year old and one more on the way. I am due in November. This shutdown will leave us unable to pay our bills.

A 23-year-old Department of Agriculture employee emailed me saying:

My wife works two jobs to help make ends meet, but we still live paycheck to paycheck. If this shutdown is not resolved within the next few days, we will be devastated financially.

A U.S. Air Force veteran wrote to tell me:

I applied for Social Security disability assistance on the 15th of August and my claim had gone for medical review on the 26th of August. I have no money, and I just found out yesterday that because of the shutdown SSA claims are on hold.

A furloughed Federal worker from Omaha called my office to say: We are all tired. We are tired of not getting a budget until the last minute. We are all tired. You guys need to do your job.

I agree. I hear these same messages over and over. Nebraskans are tired of the name calling and the blame games. They want to see government work, and they want to see it work well. They are not fooled by the rhetoric, and they expect us to govern responsibly. I agree. That is why I am talking with my colleagues—not publicly in front of the cameras but privately—to see if we can forge a way forward. But I believe we have to do more than just open the government. That is just the

basics. We have to address our \$17 trillion debt. It is smothering this country, it is jeopardizing our national security, and it is a threat to our children's future.

Congress will soon vote on increasing the debt ceiling—the sixth debt limit increase in the past 5 years. Our national debt has almost doubled since 2006, and our debt limit has grown twice as much as our economy in the past 2 years. Shouldn't the opposite be true? Meanwhile, our economy's lethargic recovery continues sluggishly along at a rate of 1 to 2 percent. This is unacceptable.

Instead of growing our economy by reducing spending, cutting regulations, and overhauling an outdated tax code, Congress has continued to spend money we just don't have.

I didn't run for office to shut down the government. I ran for office to help hard-working Americans get back to work. I ran for this office to stand for middle-class families who aren't asking government for a hand up, they are just asking that the government stop holding them down. Nebraskans want to know they can provide for their families, and I don't think that is asking too much.

Make no mistake. High public debt depresses economic growth, which in turn dampens job creation. Ironically, our country's debt crisis comes as the Congressional Budget Office is predicting that tax revenues will be at an alltime high—\$2.7 trillion in tax revenues. The problem isn't that we have too little revenue, the problem is that we are spending too much.

Part of why Nebraskans are frustrated is that our problems are so clear. We know exactly what they are. There is no mystery here. The American people know you can't keep spending twice what you make. They live within a budget—a budget that must balance—and they expect government to do the same. Our government is a long way from a balanced budget, but we can work at a minimum to try to get there.

Despite these realities, we are not moving forward. For the past several weeks, Members of Congress, the President, and the press have been participants in a circus. After 9 days, there is still no end in sight. Let me repeat that. After 9 days of a government shutdown, there is still no end in sight.

That is not to say there aren't some good ideas out there. Several of my colleagues have offered a number of commonsense proposals that do have broad support. These ideas include repeal of the medical device tax, which was adopted by the Senate as an amendment to its budget resolution by an overwhelming vote of 79 to 20. And this happened in March. Other ideas include a commitment to reducing spending, as required by current law, but we would increase the flexibility for Federal

agencies to make smarter cuts. We all agree sequestration is a very clumsy way to cut spending.

That is why we need to provide program managers with the ability to determine which programs are wasteful or less efficient.

It is a matter of setting priorities so we can make wise decisions. That is the Nebraska way, and that is what we need to do in Washington as well.

Senator COLLINS' sequestration proposal would also allow Congress to continue to exercise oversight on all spending and related cuts. That is important. Even the President has put forth ideas to cut spending by \$400 billion over the next 10 years. These offers could give us the framework for a real discussion.

Yet we remain at an impasse, unable to move forward. A nation of movers, thinkers, innovators, and entrepreneurs should not be caught in neutral. We should move forward—always forward, and always building a better future. We are the single greatest nation the world has ever known. We have stood as a sentinel of liberty and economic prosperity for over 200 years, yet we find ourselves no longer able to perform even the most basic functions of government. That is not acceptable. Our forefathers, our constituents, and our children and our grandchildren deserve better.

I am ready to move forward. I am tired of waiting, and I am willing to work with any of my colleagues to find a reasonable solution. So let's get to work.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I am privileged to represent the State of Ohio, as I know the Presiding Officer is to represent Connecticut, and the previous speaker is to represent Nebraska.

We are home to several large research facilities—medical research facilities, aeronautics research facilities, military research facilities, some that are overwhelmingly represented to do research in pure science. All of them have a major impact in their communities in terms of employment with usually very good-paying jobs—scientists, engineers, physicians, chemists, and all kinds of people in the natural, medical, or aeronautic sciences and all of the support staff. These research facilities are always good for communities. And they not only provide employment, but they provide great wealth for our country. So much

of this research helps people in their daily lives and is commercialized into businesses, and entrepreneurs take much of this research and applied science and create more economic activity, prosperity, and good-paying jobs. And that is where this shutdown is particularly problematic.

There are 800,000 Federal employees that have lost jobs as a result of this ridiculous shutdown. I have spent much of the last several days on the phone talking to people running these institutions, talking to smalltown and big-city bankers, entrepreneurs, businesses, union officials, and people who represent or run many of these organizations. All of them think this shutdown is absolutely unnecessary.

Just a moment ago the Presiding Officer and I had a conversation, and we both shake our heads: Why do radicals in the House of Representatives want to inflict this kind of pain—not just on the 800,000 Federal workers, but on the contractors near these facilities, the restaurants, hardware stores and businesses, and the school districts that are affected because people aren't bringing home the income and aren't paying as much taxes—all that happens when this willful government shutdown, orchestrated because a group of people want to attach their political platform, ideas, gimmicks, or statements to legislation we need to pass?

It is pretty simple: Pass the continuing resolution. Keep the government open. That is not a Democratic or Republican platform. That is what we need to do. Don't go around attaching political statements in a political platform to a simple "keep the government open" resolution.

The same on the debt ceiling. Nobody is wild about increasing the debt ceiling. Nobody is wild about passing legislation so we don't default. It is not a part of the 2012 Democratic platform to raise the debt ceiling, nor is it a part of the 2012 Republican platform. So when we have a vote, it is not negotiated: Let's add a bunch of 2012 Republican party platform rhetoric to something to raise the debt ceiling so the government of the United States pays its bills. It is not a Democratic or a Republican value to pay the bills this Congress ran up. It is our duty.

We take an oath of office. I took the oath in January 2013. The Presiding Officer took his oath. We know running the government and paying our bills is what you do as an elected official. Those never used to be controversial, until some radicals in the House of Representatives decided that this is a political opportunity. We can accuse the President of not negotiating. We can tell the public the Democrats are willing to shut down the government. The Republican Governor of Nevada to the Democratic majority leader from Nevada this week called it a Republican shutdown. So it is clearly a group of radicals.

Back to what I was saying about these great research facilities. The Presiding Officer has them in Connecticut, I have them in Ohio, and the Senator from Hawaii has them in her State. An administrator of one said it is asymmetrical, killing and building a major scientific endeavor. It is a lot harder and takes a lot longer for a group of engineers, doctors or scientists to construct a very important scientific endeavor than it does to kill one.

Fifty years ago, Speaker of the House Rayburn from Texas at one time said—and I will clean this up: Any mule can kick down a barn. It takes a carpenter to build one.

I will make it more personal. A dozen years ago I was involved in a car accident and broke my back. I was in good health and exercised, but for 3 days I didn't get out of bed. I remember the first day I got out of bed and tried to walk. My leg muscles had atrophied. It takes a lot of time to build up those leg muscles, and it took 3 days for them to atrophy. I was in my late 40s then and in good shape.

That is also the way science is, in the same sense that it takes a long time and a lot of investment of public dollars and a lot of brain power and really high-quality, talented scientists, engineers, doctors, or medical researchers to do these projects. And then we are going to lay them off for 2 or 3 weeks because somebody has some political idea they want to attach to a continuing resolution. Somebody wants to take their political platform and put it on legislation that the government pay its bills for their political gain.

A leader of one of these major institutions in Ohio told me he had to bring in many of his managers and employees and tell them there were going to be layoffs and furloughs. In some cases, with no end in sight because of this government shutdown, what are they going to do? Their scientific endeavors get interrupted and in some cases may not be repaired or rebuilt. So many of the best scientists and engineers are going to say: I am not coming back and doing this.

So the radical Republicans in the House of Representatives say: OK, we can keep the government open if you repeal part of ObamaCare.

If the President had done that and said: OK, keep the government open, and we will repeal this section of ObamaCare, what would have happened next? Then there would have been another continuing resolution or another end of the fiscal year or another opportunity these politicians would have seized to again threaten to shut the government down and gut something else, some other law they don't like. In other words, if there is a law they don't like, and they are in the position, then they are going to say: I am going to shut the government down if you don't

change this law. If the President says yes to that, what happens the next time? Then, I am going to ask the President to get rid of two laws I don't like or I will shut the government down or I am going to block the government from paying its bills because I don't like a law passed back in 1993 or 2007. We can't operate the government like that.

NASA Glenn Research facilities, one of the great NASA facilities in the country; Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, a major research facility near Dayton, OH; Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus—thousands of employees, engineers, scientists, technicians, highly-skilled people, very educated, run eight of the national energy labs. Case Western Reserve University Medical School and Engineering School, Ohio State University, University of Cincinnati—I could name one after another. These places can't operate if every 6 months or 1 year they are subject to a potential government shutdown unless the President does what some radical Members of Congress want.

So when people say: First, open the government; second, pay our bills; and, third, let's negotiate—we have already negotiated the dollar figure on the continuing resolution. Every time the continuing resolution expires or the fiscal year ends, every time we have to pay our debts when the debt ceiling limit is reached—if we have to play this game, it is going to mean a potential government shutdown or disruption at Battelle, NASA Glenn, Ohio State's medical school funding and research funding, and Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. If that is the way this crowd believes we should run a government, they don't have much regard for government.

Every time they have had a chance, they tried to privatize Medicare, they tried to privatize Social Security. They don't like EPA, Head Start, or Meals On Wheels. They don't like these government programs. I understand that, but play it right. Don't threaten to close the government unless we change the law which Congress passed, the President signed, and the Supreme Court affirmed. But if it was my political platform in 2012—even though it was defeated in front of tens of millions of voters—and I don't like what you are doing, then I am going to threaten to shut down the government. Our country is too important and too big for that.

On an international scale, the President of the United States didn't go to China for a major economic conference because he had to be here because the government was shut down. Other countries—particularly China—made fun of us. Other countries basically were asking: Is the United States abdicating its leadership role? And the Peoples Republic of China is not slowing

down in their investment in scientific research or modernizing their infrastructure.

If we allow this kind of government shutdown and this kind of activity by radicals in the House of Representatives, this is not good for our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, amid all the rhetoric and the blame games and, yes, even theatrics, I want to make sure the American people actually understand what President Obama and the majority leader are asking us to do. Their position is that Congress should raise the debt limit—actually suspend the debt limit through the end of 2014 and increase our national debt by another \$1.1 trillion without doing anything to solve our underlying fiscal problems, including the \$17 trillion in debt we have already run up.

I cannot imagine there is anyone in this Chamber or within the sound of my voice who thinks that is a good idea. At some point, if we keep maxing out our credit card rather than dealing with our debt problem, our spending problem, we come back to the bank, so to speak, and ask for our debt limit to be increased another \$1.1 trillion, where will this end? I can tell you where I think it will end: It will end in disaster. Ultimately, at some point our creditors will lose confidence in our ability to repay that money. At some point interest rates are going to not be zero or next to zero, they will be up around the historic average, 4 percent or 5 percent, and we will have to pay China and our other creditors more and more of our Federal budget just to pay interest on the national debt.

At some point that becomes unsustainable. It will hurt our national security. It will hurt the safety net programs we all care about, to protect our most vulnerable. Unfortunately, the President and the majority leader remain dug in. Notwithstanding the charts we have seen on this floor that talk about negotiations, there have been no real negotiations. The President called Speaker BOEHNER last night to tell him: In case you missed the message, Mr. Speaker, from when we met at the White House last week, we are still not negotiating.

What is that all about? The President could have sent him a text message with as much information as that conveyed.

I am told the President has invited the Republican Members of Congress to the White House to meet with him tomorrow. I hope that meeting is more productive than the meetings he has already held or the phone conversations he has had with the Speaker. I can only hope the President has reconsidered his unsustainable position, that he is not willing to negotiate.

The Founders of this great country created a Constitution for us with co-equal branches of government. Congress is not better or worse than the executive branch. We are coequal. We cannot function without one another. We can pass a law, but it cannot become the law unless the President signs it. The President cannot pass a law without Congress. So we have to learn to work together.

In the context of the recent history I want to recount for everybody, the President's refusal to negotiate is simply unsustainable and quite remarkable. Over the last 30 years, virtually every major domestic policy reform has involved at least some kind of bipartisan compromise.

In 1983, a conservative Republican President worked with a liberal Speaker of the House and Senate leaders from both parties to save and preserve Social Security. That was in 1983. At the time those Social Security amendments were signed into law, Republicans had the same Senate majority the Democrats have today, 54 Republicans then, 46 Democrats. Meanwhile, the Democratic House majority was significantly larger than the Republican House majority today. Yet both sides did what so far we have been unable to do and that is come together, negotiate and reach an outcome. Ronald Reagan, back in 1983, then signed that negotiated outcome into law. In the end, the majority Senate Democrats voted for those Social Security amendments, as did a majority of Senate Republicans.

Three years later, in 1986, liberal Democrats and conservative Democrats joined together to enact another landmark reform bill. Once again the President's party controlled the Senate but not the House. Once again, there was not a refusal to negotiate; rather, there was a negotiation and a bipartisan outcome—notwithstanding the normal partisan rivalries that will always exist. In June 1986, 97 Members of this Chamber, a massive, overwhelming supermajority, voted in favor of the Tax Reform Act which lowered Federal income tax rates and broadened the base. The final version of that bill was supported by a majority of Senate Democrats and a majority of Senate Republicans as well. That was the kind of historic accomplishment that seems to be slipping through our fingers today by virtue of the refusal to negotiate. That was a historic accomplishment that dramatically simplified the U.S. Tax Code and made it more conducive to economic growth—a lesson we would do well to recall and emulate today.

Fast forward a decade to 1996. A Democratic President, Bill Clinton, joined together with the Republican House and Senate and, despite partisan pressure enough to go around and all sorts of heated rhetoric, Democrats

and Republicans joined together and reformed our welfare system, helping millions of disadvantaged people to get off welfare rolls and make the transition from dependency to work, dignity and self-reliance. That was a great accomplishment. In the end, 78 Senators, including most Senate Democrats and every single Senate Republican, voted for that.

One more prominent example. In 2001, a conservative Republican President worked with a prominent liberal Democrat to enact a major overhaul to our education laws. Indeed, the No Child Left Behind Act was a direct result of President Bush's negotiations and collaboration with the late Senator Ted Kennedy. The final legislation 87 Senators voted for, including a majority of Senate Democrats and a majority of Senate Republicans.

I am not necessarily saying every single one of those pieces of legislation was something that was perfect in every way. I think we have learned there are things that still needed to be done, particularly when it came to education reform, but the three Presidents I mentioned, two Republicans and one Democrat, worked together to make substantial compromises in order to pass Social Security reform, tax reform, welfare reform, and education reform. But they also understood that politics is the art of the possible and they did not treat the word negotiate as a dirty four-letter word.

I want to emphasize one more time that Republicans stand ready to work with President Obama in addressing our country's most serious fiscal and economic challenges. Yet rather than to pursue serious good-faith negotiations over things such as entitlement reform and tax reform, things that would actually be good for our economy and good for our country, President Obama decides to erect and then knock down strawmen.

For example, when Republicans talk about entitlement reform, he says we want to eliminate the safety net. When Republicans talk about tax reform, he says we want to give tax breaks to rich people. That is campaigning, that is not governing.

Here is the reality, though. Republicans do not want to eliminate the safety net, we want to improve the safety net, particularly Medicare and Social Security. We don't want to give special tax breaks just to the wealthy, we want to give all Americans a simpler, flatter, fairer Tax Code that is more conducive to economic growth. We want the type of Tax Code the President's own bipartisan fiscal commission, Simpson-Bowles—the recommendations they made in 2010. Yet the President ignored it, walked away, and has done nothing to contribute to that debate.

We understand, being elected officials ourselves, that all elected politi-

cians have to campaign for office. It goes with the territory. You cannot get here unless you run for office and you win an election. But at some point the campaign has to end. At some point we have to govern. At some point the partisan rhetoric has to give way to actually accomplishing things and solving problems. At some point America's elected leadership needs to demonstrate real leadership and a willingness to govern.

President Obama has now reached a critical point in his Presidency, in his second term. He will be remembered for one thing or another. He will be remembered either as a President who was willing to step up when America needed that kind of leadership, when Congress needed bipartisan cooperation in order to solve our Nation's biggest challenges, or he will leave a legacy, if he does not do that, of a President who refused to do his job in order to try to win the partisan battles.

We need something better and America deserves better. We need a President who will govern and not campaign perpetually.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, our distinguished Republican whip referred to negotiations that occurred regarding welfare reform, tax reform, education reform, No Child Left Behind. These negotiations occurred, yes, but they certainly occurred not in the context of a threat of a government shutdown or the threat of government defaulting on our obligations. There is a very big difference in the context in which these negotiations occurred. That is not what we have before us today.

This past Saturday I came to the floor to share some thoughts on the impact of this government shutdown on Hawaii's Federal employees. In those remarks, I tried to remind my colleagues that we have to think beyond the most recent news cycle. Shutting down government hurts the confidence of the American people in our institutions. It drives people away from public service and it undermines our national security and our economy. If we are going to live up to the legacy of our Nation as the world's indispensable Nation, we have to rise above zero sum politics. We have to show our allies and our adversaries that our political process can withstand grave disagreements. Our process is intended to allow for vigorous debate but to ultimately find common ground.

Over 6 months ago, the Senate passed a budget. So did the House. A little over 6 days ago the U.S. Government shut down. How did this happen? The reason is that Republicans have blocked now 21 attempts to negotiate a Federal budget agreement in a timely fashion. That is how negotiations are supposed to happen—not with the

threat of a government shutdown, not with the threat of defaulting on our obligations and debt.

Instead, after 6 months of failing to come to the table, tea party Republicans are holding the U.S. Government—and, if we default on our debts, the world economy—hostage.

Enough is enough. The Senate is prepared to negotiate on fiscal issues. The President is ready to negotiate on fiscal issues. We can find a way forward so we can all agree on the path. But first Congress needs to do its job. It needs to reopen the government and make sure the United States pays its bills. These are fundamental responsibilities.

Just to be clear, defaulting on our debt would be the most irresponsible action I can imagine. It is the most easily avoidable catastrophe in history. We are not talking about a natural disaster, we are talking about a totally avoidable catastrophe. Yet some Republicans in the House believe a default would not be a big deal. In fact, one Member of the House actually said that a default would “bring stability to world markets.”

That is an opinion that no one outside of the tea party bubble agrees with. In fact, economists, small businesses, bankers, big businesses, realtors, and nearly everyone in between have been clear: Default would be a catastrophe for our economy—and not just our economy either. Our currency, our bonds, and the full faith and credit they are backed by are the linchpin of the global economy. How a default from the world's most trusted Nation could possibly bring stability to world markets is incomprehensible.

We have to stop the ideological games and irresponsible rhetoric, and then we can negotiate on fiscal issues and other policies—mindful of the work we were elected to do and mindful of the people, families, and communities that elected us to serve them.

Today I would like to share some more stories from Hawaii families and businesses about how the government shutdown is impacting one of the key drivers of Hawaii's economy—tourism.

Each year millions of people from all over the world flock to Hawaii. Our State has so much to offer. They come to enjoy our blue oceans and sandy beaches. They come to visit our breathtaking national parks and wildlife refuges. They also come to learn and pay respect at our historical attractions, such as Pearl Harbor.

Last year Hawaii welcomed over 8 million visitors—a record number. Combined, these visitors spent \$42 million per day, of which \$5 million supports State and local government activities that benefit our communities. In 2012 about 20 percent of our State's gross domestic product was generated by tourism. That economic activity supports 175,000 jobs in Hawaii.

Due to our location in the center of the Pacific Ocean, Hawaii's tourism industry relies on critical government services to keep people moving and commerce flowing. These include the work done by our air traffic controllers, our customs and TSA personnel, and agricultural inspectors. Many of these workers are on the job, but they are not getting paid right now. Thanks to them, our transportation systems are operating safely and effectively. As a result, visitors are still flocking to our resorts, our beaches, and other attractions. Even with the tea party shutdown, 2013 is on track to be another strong year for tourism in Hawaii.

Unfortunately, at the same time, there are small businesses around the State that are being impacted by this shutdown. For the last 7 days our national parks, wildlife refuges, and historical sites have been closed to the public. These Federal sites are critical to many small businesses, particularly in our rural communities.

Over the past week I have heard from many people—especially small business owners—whose livelihoods are being impacted by the closure of these Federal sites. One tour operator wrote to me:

Our business is losing money, as do our tour guides who cannot perform the tours to the National Parks. We have to return the money to a lot of our clients because their tours have to be cancelled. Our tour guides are losing income as well, as they will not be able to do the tours.

National parks are some of the main attractions in Hawaii. People travel thousands of miles from all parts of the world, spend a lot of money to come and visit, and then the main things that attract them are closed and they are not able to see them. For a lot of people, these trips are once in a lifetime, and if they don't see them now, they will never be able to see them again.

A restaurant owner from Hawaii Island wrote:

Well, we are in a small town on the Big Island of Hawaii. Our economy is totally tourist driven. We are dependent on people going to the National Park and stopping at our place to eat. Since the shutdown, our revenue has dropped a lot and we have had to cut hours for employees to compensate for the lack of business.

I'm tired of all this Republican childish actions and wish all politicians would drop the partisan nonsense and do what is right for the American People.

Thank you for your concern.

One gentleman from Maui reminded me that private businesses don't get to pause on meeting their commitments when the government is closed. He wrote:

My daughter and son-in-law have a tourist based clientele for their bicycle crater tour business on Maui. When Haleakala National Park was closed down, they lost their income and are still having to pay office expenses, etc., etc., as well as their home ex-

penses, but nothing is coming in, as everything is going out.

They are losing hundreds to thousands of dollars a day, their employees who have families aren't able to work with the business closed, tourists who come to Maui to have a good time, part of which was the bike ride down from Haleakala, are angry and disappointed and some even think this is somehow Maui government's fault!

He goes on to say:

My daughter has six children, mortgage payments. Money is going out, but none is coming in. My family are diligent middle class people who work hard, pay their taxes, vote in every election—responsible citizens who do their part always.

If this ridiculous federal government shutdown continues for any length of time, my family will lose their business and be at poverty level in no time, as will all their employees. Everyone I know, on either side of the political spectrum, thinks the shutdown is ridiculous and unnecessary.

I also heard about the impact of the shutdown on the visitors themselves who go to Hawaii. One person from Hawaii whose family members traveled to Hawaii to visit wrote:

My family has travelled 6,000 miles on a once in a lifetime trip—sorry—no Pearl Harbor (Dad was a lifer Navy man) no Volcanoes National Park—no Puukohola—these sites are essential to our culture and tourism alike—many are without work—it is just ridiculous over a LAW that has been declared Constitutional—their antics change nothing—just hurt our country.

Another local bed-and-breakfast owner on the Big Island shared the perspective of some of her international guests:

Aloha, I have a bed and breakfast in Hilo and I feel sorry for my guests who have saved for a once in a lifetime vacation to Hawaii. They have come from all over the world to see our Beautiful Volcano National Park! These Guests do not understand how the government can CLOSE and deny them access to the Park.

This week I have guests from Montreal, Canada; Singapore, Germany, France and Japan! They may NEVER have the opportunity to visit here again. This is Shameful for our country. Not only is this behavior bad for our Country but bad for the world.

The tea party shutdown is also impacting Hawaiian visitors to our Nation's Capital. Yesterday I met with 81 students from Millilani Middle School on Oahu. They made the long trip from Hawaii to Washington, DC, in hopes of seeing historical sites, visiting museums, and learning about their country and our democracy. The trip was saved for and planned for months in advance. The sites and museums were scheduled. Their tickets and reservations were already paid for. They could not rebook their travel even though the shutdown has closed many of the sites they planned to visit. I took them on a tour of the Capitol myself because it was the only way they could see these halls of government. These students are here to learn about our democracy. Many of them asked me about the shutdown

and how we were going to get government back on track. What kind of message will they take home with them about how our government operates?

These are just some of the stories that illustrate the real impact of the tea party shutdown on communities, families, and people in Hawaii. So many of the folks whose letters I have shared work hard to earn an honest living. They go to work each day, striving to show our visitors aloha while building something for themselves and their families to be proud of. They play by the rules, meet their commitments, and do what they can to be good community members. Yet, through no fault of their own, many of these Hawaii small businesses are losing income and their livelihoods are being affected.

It is past time for the House to take the responsible action to pass the Senate bill to keep government running and services going. It is not fair to our veterans, our students, and their families when they can't visit our Nation's historical and national treasures just because a small minority in Congress has chosen recklessness over responsibility. It is not fair that this shutdown and these senseless default threats have gone on for a week. This behavior is harming our economy and undermining our credibility around the world. We need to stop the tea party temper tantrum, we need to open the government, we need to pay our bills, and then we can negotiate on other matters.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I appreciate the time to be on the floor. I want to continue talking about what I think are the real problems with where we are today.

What we are hearing in the press is that there is no agreement on a continuing resolution, that there is conflict and lack of discussion in Washington, that the debt limit is coming up, yet Washington is not capable of solving its problems.

I made some points yesterday about the reason we are not capable of solving our problems is that there is an absence of leadership. We are not only bankrupt financially, we are bankrupt when it comes to our leadership.

I want to dispel the rumor that our problems are not insolvable. They are imminently solvable. We have \$126 trillion worth of unfunded liabilities for which Americans are responsible. We have \$17 trillion worth of debt, and we have \$94 trillion of total assets in this

country if you add what the Federal Government and everybody else owns. So the difference between \$128 trillion and \$94 trillion is \$34 trillion, and then another \$17 trillion—that is \$51 trillion we are going to have to account for. What is in front of us—and by the way, the Affordable Care Act will add \$6.7 trillion to those outstanding liabilities net of any tax revenues and tax increases it collects.

So what are we to do? What are the American people to think? They see impasse, lack of conversation, lack of compromise, lack of resolution, and no reconciliation. So I wanted to take a few minutes today to kind of give a little history, first of all, and then outline what is possible—I am not saying we must do it—over the next 10 years that we could do that would put us on a pathway to where we would be solving the problems and not leaving our children an inheritance of debt.

I made the point yesterday that the median family income in this country today in terms of real dollars is exactly where it was in 1989. We are going backward. We are going to go backward this year. What that really means is that the standard of living is declining. The American public is getting further and further behind.

One of the quotes I use—and I don't know if it is accurate—has been attributed to Alexander Tytler, a Scottish historian. Let me read it:

A democracy—

In this case a constitutional Republic—

is always temporary in nature; it simply cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It will continue to exist until the time that voters discover that they can vote themselves generous gifts from the public treasury. From that moment on, the majority always votes with the candidates who promise the most benefits from the public treasury, with the result that every democracy will finally collapse due to loose fiscal policy, which is always followed by a dictatorship.

Where are we in that line? Is \$50 trillion in negative net worth not a sign that we are going there? Is declining median family income not a sign that we are going there?

What we have seen in this last so-called recovery is the wealthy have done very well but nobody else has. So what we are seeing is history repeat itself in terms of what has been outlined and observed in the past.

Alexander Tytler was also accredited with this, but nobody can prove it:

The average age of the world's greatest civilizations from the beginning of history has been about 200 years. During these 200 years, these nations always progressed through the following sequence: From bondage to spiritual faith; from spiritual faith to great courage; from courage to liberty; from liberty to abundance; from abundance to complacency; from complacency to apathy; from apathy to dependence; from dependence back into bondage.

I think we are somewhere in here, if history speaks accurately, or at least his observation of history.

So what we ought to be about is making sure we cheat history—all of us, together, liberals, conservatives, Democrats, Republicans, Independents—we ought to be about cheating history. How do we do that? Are the problems we have in front of us so big that we can't solve them? I don't think so. Are positions so hardened that we can't think in a long-term way about solving the problems that are in front of our country?

When we talk about the debt ceiling—I have been accosted a lot in the news media in the last 48 hours because I don't believe the debt ceiling equals default on our obligations in terms of our sovereign debt. It just so happens Moody's, the rating agency, agreed with me today; that, in fact, they are not the same thing and they say there should be no effect. That doesn't mean we should. I am not proposing we should. But the scare tactics of saying the Earth is going to collapse if we somehow fail on time to raise the debt limit is not true. The Earth will collapse for Americans if we don't address the underlying problems facing our country—this \$50 trillion in unfunded liability and negative net worth.

Here is what we know has happened in the last few years, and it proves the point. It is why median family income is going down. It is because our debt is growing twice as fast as our economy.

Here is our GDP increase over the last few years: \$1.199 trillion. Here is our debt: It went up \$2.405 trillion. To say that another way, that is 2.4 billion millions. These numbers are unfathomable, but the graph shows it all. Our GDP has increased. So what is happening is that for every \$1 in debt we go into, we are getting a deepening decrease in return in our economy, and it is continuing to go down. So the more we borrow, the less well off we are in terms of being able to grow our economy. So the problems in front of us and what we see is what I would say as careerists don't want to solve the problem because the thing that comes to the careerist's mind is how does that affect the next election.

I don't care what happens in the next election in this country; what I care about is whether we are going to address the real problems and secure the future for the country. Whether they be Democrats or Republicans, liberals or conservatives, I don't care. We are all in this together. When our living standard goes down, we all go down together.

So how do we solve this problem? The first thing in any addiction—and we have an addiction to spending—is to recognize we have an addiction. We have an addiction to spending. We have an addiction to not living within our means. We just passed \$600 billion in

January of increased taxes on the American economy, most of that coming from the people who are doing much better during this tepid recovery. Will that solve our problems? Can we tax our way out of this? Can we have confiscatory tax policies that will not hurt our economy and get us out of this? The answer is no, and everybody recognizes it.

What else does everybody recognize? They recognize that a big portion of the problem is entitlement spending, and no political party wants to be blamed for being the person who “fixed” entitlement spending unless we do it together. So we have a great opportunity to, together, modify our mandatory spending programs and make significant savings. But having spent the last 9 years with my colleague from Delaware who is on the floor oversighting the Federal Government, I can tell my colleagues there are more things we can do other than that.

So I thought I would spend a few minutes to go over a publication I put out a couple of summers ago, and it is called “Back in Black.” It is not perfect. I will be the first to admit it. I know we will not ever pass \$9 trillion worth of savings over 10 years. But here is \$9 trillion worth of options we could look at and take half of them and actually get on the road to health.

What would getting on the road to health look like? It would be rising personal incomes, not declining personal incomes as we are seeing today. It would be rising median family incomes. It would be faster economic growth.

Mr. President, am I out of time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 10 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. My request was for 30 minutes when I came to the floor. Evidently, that wasn't made. Is the order of the day 10 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. COBURN. I would ask for just a short period of additional time if my colleague from Delaware would allow it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. May I ask unanimous consent that the doctor be afforded another 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. I will spend some time tomorrow then going through what this is. But it is solving our problem in such a way that it doesn't kick the can down the road, which is what we are getting ready to do.

What I would say in conclusion is by increasing the debt limit, we let the politicians off the hook because then they don't have to make the hard choices required for us to live within our means.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware will state his inquiry.

Mr. CARPER. I have no objection; I can stay 10 minutes, 20 minutes. I would like for the Senator from Oklahoma Dr. COBURN to have a chance to explain what he wanted to say. I don't mean to interrupt.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I would just inquire if there are other speakers after Senator CARPER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no apparent order of speakers, and if there is no objection, the Senator from Oklahoma can take an additional 20 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. I thank the Chair. I truly thank my colleague. He is a great colleague to work with. People are always telling stories about how people don't work together. I can tell my colleagues that the Senator from Delaware Mr. CARPER and I work together. He is my chairman, and I am the ranking member on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, where most of this information came from, and he helped dig it up.

What I say is we have an opportunity to do that. We have an opportunity for Democrats and Republicans to come together, forge a compromise, make major changes that are necessary and absolutely required if we are going to have a secure future. I think we ought to look at it.

So we put together a plan that has \$3 trillion—that is \$300 billion over 10 years—in discretionary spending; that is nonmandatory. It has \$1 trillion in defense spending, which is about what we already have. Health care entitlements is \$2.7 trillion, and we can go into the details of that. Tax Code simplification, \$1 trillion to come back to the Federal Government. Interest payment savings of \$1.3 trillion, and Social Security reform that says it will be healthy for the next 75 years. That comes to \$9 trillion that our kids aren't going to have to pay back. That is \$9 trillion in money we are not going to borrow. So even if we just took half of that—\$4.5 trillion—and said we are going to get on the path to health, we are going to float that \$3 trillion that is sitting in cash in Americans' bank accounts and give them the confidence back to invest it in our country, it would make a massive difference in our country because what is going on right now is a crisis of confidence.

The American people don't trust Congress. I think we got a pretty low rating this week and deservedly so. The approval rating of President Obama is at his all-time low. So how do we fix that? We don't fix that individually. We don't fix that by pointing out what is wrong with the other person. We fix that by coming together and solving real problems that will give the American people confidence that we have their best interests at heart—not in

the short term, as Alexander Tytler was talking about, but in the long term; that, in fact, we want to secure the future for our kids and grandkids.

I think we ought to be about cutting up the credit card. I know I am in the minority in the Senate. I don't believe we should have another debt limit increase. I think the thing to force us to make these hard choices—because there is certainly not the political will to do it—is to put ourselves in the position where we are forced to make the hard choices.

We are going to make them eventually. Everybody agrees with that. We are basically going to make these changes because there will come a time when we will not be able to borrow money no matter what interest rate we pay. So we are not talking about defaulting on our sovereign debt. We are not talking about not paying interest on our sovereign debt. We are talking about forcing ourselves into a position where we have to prioritize what we spend.

What do the GAO reports tell us? In the last 3 years, the GAO has given Congress wonderful information which Congress has not acted on. What have they told us? They have told us we have 91 different health care workforce training programs—91. They have told us we have 679 renewable energy initiatives, none of which have a metric on them. They have told us we have 76 different drug abuse and prevention programs run by the Federal Government. They have told us the Department of Defense has 159 different contracting organizations, none of them being held accountable. They have told us that at Homeland Security, where Senator CARPER and I chair and vice chair the committee, they have six different R&D facilities, three of which are doing exactly the same thing. We have 209 science, technology, engineering, and math programs—209. We have 200 different crime prevention programs. We have 160 homeowners and renters assistance programs. We have 94 private sector green building assistance programs, none with a metric, and the agencies don't even know how much money they are spending on them. They told us we have 82 teacher quality programs run by the Federal Government, half of which are not in the Department of Education. I will not continue, but my colleagues get my point.

What have we done about those things? Nothing. Where is the oversight on them? There is none. So the whole idea for me—I am thinking about the future more than I am a political career—is I think we ought to be working on those things. I think the American public expects us to work on them.

I will finish by saying we have been running the credit card for a long time. Do we, in fact, have the right or the privilege or the ability to ask for an

extension and a raising of our debt when, in fact, we have not acted responsibly with our spending? Nobody else in the country gets their credit raised when they have not acted responsibly. They actually check your credit score. They know what kind of bills you are paying, whether you are getting further behind. So should we, in fact, tear up the credit card? Should we force some good old adult supervision on Congress, where we will actually be forced to make difficult decisions about priorities on how we spend America's money? When I say "America's money," I mean the people out there working hard every day. They may not be the highest tax payers, but it is unconscionable to me that when we spend their money, we are wasting 15 to 20 percent of it all the time.

So I think we ought to tear it up. The way we tear it up is we just tear it up. We tear the credit card up. We shred the credit card, and we say: You are going to live within your means. You are going to start making the hard choices. You are addicted to spending. You are addicted to not being responsible with the dollars you have.

Congress needs to be in a 12-step program, and it should start with us.

Mr. President, I thank my colleague the Senator from Delaware for his patience and his friendship.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, Dr. COBURN is a tough act to follow, and I am not going to try to do that. But I am happy to serve with him. We come from different parts of the country, different kinds of training, upbringing, and careers, but we have ended up here together in the Senate for the last 9 years and have had an opportunity to lead, first, the subcommittee on Federal financial management—it is a subcommittee of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee—and this year to be the Democratic and Republican leaders of the committee. I enjoy working with him. I find that we have the opportunity to do some really good for our country, and I thank him for letting me be his wingman.

I want to just follow on with what Dr. COBURN has said, by asking us to think of how we spend money and what we spend it for in this government of ours. Then I actually have an op-ed that I read recently in our local paper in Delaware that I would like to read into the RECORD from Dr. Bob Laskowski, who is the CEO and the president of Christiana Care Health System, one of the largest hospital systems not just in our State but one of the largest in our part of the country.

Before I do that, I want to follow on to some of Dr. COBURN's comments by talking about our spending in the Federal Government. I would like to think of it as a pie. It is a big pie. A little

more than half of the spending pie goes for something we call entitlements—things we are entitled to by virtue of our age, our station in life, or we might be entitled to Medicare if we are 65 or older, or Medicare if we are disabled and unable to work, or we may be entitled to early Social Security benefits at age 62, full retirement Medicare benefits 5 or so years after that. We may be entitled to benefits because we served in the military or we are a veteran or somebody with a disability. Those are all programs that are called entitlement programs. A lot of people say they are uncontrollable, we cannot do anything to control them, and they have grown like Topsy.

Today, if you think of the spending pie, over half of it is for entitlement. Roughly, closer to another 5 to 10 percent of spending today is for interest on the debt. If interest rates were not so low, it would be a lot more than 5 or 10 percent. Fortunately, we are blessed to have very low interest rates, but still our interest as a percentage of that pie is somewhere, I think, between 5 and 10 percent.

The whole rest of the Federal government is called discretionary spending, which means we actually have some discretion on how that money is spent. It is not an entitlement program, but we actually have to pass spending bills. We call them, usually, appropriations bills. There are about a dozen of them that cover everything from agriculture to defense, to housing, to the environment, to education, to transportation—you name it. That part of the budget—roughly, close to 40 percent, 35 to 40 percent—is called discretionary spending. More than half of that discretionary spending is for defense—I would say roughly 20 percent of the whole pie, maybe a little more than 20 percent. About 15 percent of the whole pie—a little less than half of the discretionary spending—is for nondefense matters.

So if you think about it, it goes something like this: For the spending pie, over half of it is entitlements. Allegedly, those are things we cannot reduce, control. I do not agree with that. Another 5 or 10 percent is for interest. Then we have roughly 40 percent for discretionary spending, the lion's share of which is for defense, and a little less than half of it is for nondefense spending. Think about that—entitlements, interest, defense spending. You set that aside, and for the whole rest of the government you have about 15 percent. That is domestic or nondefense discretionary spending.

We could actually eliminate domestic discretionary spending in its entirety—get rid of everything, everything we do in government other than entitlement programs, interest, and defense—and we would still have a deficit.

For people who say we can only focus on domestic discretionary spending or

squeeze that to reduce the deficit further, the deficit is down from about \$1.4 trillion about 4 years ago to about half that today. So we have made progress. It is still way too big, but we cannot get from here to where we want to go in terms of a balanced budget by just focusing on domestic discretionary spending.

I would like to say there are three things we need to do. Dr. COBURN has heard me say this more times than he wants to remember. The Presiding Officer has heard me say it a time or two as well.

There are three things we need to do if we are serious about deficit reduction, facing the reality of today.

No. 1, entitlement reform. These are the President's words: entitlement reform that saves money, entitlement reform that saves these programs for our kids and our grandchildren, and entitlement reform—these are my words—entitlement reform that does not savage old people or poor people, but it is sensitive to the least of these in our society.

The second thing we need to do is to focus on revenues. We need some more revenues. If you look at our country last year, when our deficit was about \$700 billion—the year we just finished—as I recall, revenue as a percentage of gross domestic product was somewhere in the area of 17 percent, maybe 18 percent—revenue as a percentage of GDP. Spending as a percentage of GDP was over 20 percent, maybe around 21, 22, 23 percent.

The difference between revenues as a percentage of GDP down here at 17, 18, 19 percent of GDP and spending at 21, 22, or 23 percent, that difference right there is about a \$700 billion deficit from the last year.

At the end of the day we need to make the revenues come closer to, actually, the spending. I suggest that we need to take a page out of the book they did in the second term of President Bill Clinton when we had run chronic deficits since 1968. President Clinton asked Erskine Bowles, who was then his Chief of Staff, to work with a Republican Senate and Republican House—a Republican Congress—to see if we could come up with a budget plan that included revenues, included spending, to actually balance the budget.

As we all know the story, famously it worked. A Democratic President, working with a Republican House and Senate, with the help of Erskine Bowles and Sylvia Mathews—now Sylvia Mathews Burwell, who was Erskine's Deputy Chief of Staff, later Deputy OMB Director—they got the job done. They reached across the aisle and worked it out. The deficit reduction plan was a 50-50 deal—50 percent on the revenue side and 50 percent on the spending side. They grew the heck out of the economy. As a result, we had four balanced budgets in a row—I think 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001.

Harry Truman used to say: The only thing that is new in the world is the history we forgot and never learned. I think as we try to figure out what to do with today's deficits and how to get on an even more fiscally responsible track, it would be smart to look back about 15 years and see how it worked then.

For folks who might be watching this around the country, we actually have a budget law. I think our budget law was adopted in 1974. There is an expectation in our Nation's budget law for the President to present us in the Congress with a budget—one budget, not a capital budget and an operating budget but one budget. It is different from the States. It is different from my State, where I was Governor of Delaware for 8 years, where we have a capital budget and an operating budget. But we have one budget.

The President usually submits a budget in January, maybe February. This year it was a little late. The expectation here in the Congress, under the law, is that by, say, the end of April—a couple months later—the House and the Senate would have passed something called a budget resolution.

A budget resolution—what is that? It is not a budget. A budget resolution is a framework for a budget. It includes not nitty-gritty line-item spending plans for everything—defense and non-defense—but it says, roughly, we will spend this much in these programs, and generally, we will raise this much money in these ways from these revenue sources. It is not very specific, but it is a framework for the budget. I like to think of it as the skeleton, and later on, when we pass appropriations bills, when we pass revenue measures, we put the meat on the bones. That is where the real specificity comes along.

For a number of years we have not been able to pass in the Senate, in the House, a budget resolution—they are usually different—and then go to conference, create a conference committee to create a compromise. We have found it difficult to actually come up with a compromise budget resolution—a compromise, a spending plan, a framework for the appropriations bills and revenue measures.

This year started more promising because in the Senate here, in April, under the leadership of our Senate Budget Committee chairman PATTY MURRAY of Washington, we actually passed a budget resolution—sadly, without Republican support. We passed one, and it was one of those like the Clinton years, a 50-50 deficit reduction deal. It did not eliminate the deficit, but it kept it going in the right track. Half of the deficit reduction was on the spending side, half on the revenue side.

Over in the House, they passed a different kind of budget resolution. The budget resolution they passed did a lit-

tle entitlement reform. But that 15 percent of the spending pie I was talking about—the 15 percent that is domestic discretionary spending—was reduced, as I recall, from 15 percent to like 5 percent. Think about that. We would be talking about—aside from entitlement spending, interest on the debt, and defense spending—having about the whole rest of the government be like 5 percent of our spending. That is not my vision of what our government should be about. That is not my vision. And I do not think that is the vision of a lot of people in this body and in this country.

So the three things we need to do: No. 1, entitlement reform. It saves money, saves the programs. It does not savage old people, poor people. The second thing, we need some additional revenues.

I remember Kent Conrad, when he was our Budget Committee chairman, gave a presentation at a meeting a year or so ago. He talked about revenues. He talked about tax expenditures. As to the tax expenditures that he talked about, he said over the next 10 years we will see about \$12 trillion to \$15 trillion go out of the Treasury because of tax breaks—tax credits, tax deductions, tax loopholes, the tax gap—\$12 trillion to \$15 trillion go out of the Treasury for those tax expenditures. He said more money will come out of the Treasury for those tax expenditures—tax breaks, tax credits, tax deductions, tax loopholes—than all the appropriations bills we are going to pass. Think about that.

He said we have a new way to appropriate money, we just do it through the Tax Code. I would say to our Republican and Democratic friends, this is where I think Senator Conrad was coming from. If we cannot figure out how out of \$12 trillion or \$15 trillion of tax expenditures a year, maybe 5 percent of those that could be reduced or could be eliminated because they serve no useful purpose, something is wrong with us. If we can do 5 percent of, say, just \$12 trillion in those tax expenditures, 5 percent would be about \$600 billion over the next 10 years. Match that with entitlement spending reductions, that is about \$1.2 trillion. That is a pretty good next step to take in narrowing our deficit on top of what we have already done.

The third piece, in addition to entitlement reform that saves money, saves the programs for the long haul, and does not savage old people or poor people, some additional revenue, generally from eliminating or reducing tax expenditures, the third piece—and Dr. COBURN was talking a little bit about this. He was talking about the way we spend money. We have a culture in the Federal Government. We have had it for a long time. Big companies have this culture too, and some States as well as counties and cities. I call it a

culture of spend thrifts as opposed to a culture of thrift. What Dr. COBURN and I attempt to do with the folks on our committee is look at everything we do in the Federal Government to the extent that one committee can. We like to work with the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, with the General Accountability Office, GAO, the Office of Personnel Management, with the General Services Administration, all of the inspector generals across the agencies, throughout the Federal Government. We like to work with nonprofit groups such as Citizens Against Government Waste and others.

We do this in order to figure out what we are doing. How are we spending the taxpayers' money? Are there ways we can do those things, realize the goals we are trying to achieve, by spending less money or getting better results for the same amount of money? We need to do that in everything.

One of my colleagues said to me, when I said I was coming over to speak tonight: What are you going to talk about?

I said I think I will talk about regular order. We talk a fair amount about regular order around this place. We do not always follow it. Regular order, for the people watching who are tuned in wondering what is regular order, means following the rules. In this case, we have a Budget Act that says the President submits a budget the early part of the calendar year. Congress adopts a budget resolution. We do that about the beginning of May. Then we do our work on preparing appropriations bills and revenue measures. In order to go to a conference on a budget resolution, we have to get agreement. The majority leader will come or the Budget Committee chair will come to the floor and say: I ask unanimous consent to go to conference with the House and to name conferees and begin working out a compromise between the House and the Senate.

For many years it was perfunctory. The unanimous consent request was made. We would go to conference with the House. We would go to work on a budget resolution between the two bodies. This year, every time that request has been made—and it has been made dozens of times by Democrats and by at least one Republican—dozens of times—there has always been an objection to keep us from going to conference to work out this compromise.

As much as anything, we need to create an environment where we can focus on doing the three things I talked about: entitlement reform, tax reform that raises some revenues through deficit reduction, and try to focus on everything we do and say how do we get a better result, how do we get a better result for less money or the same amount of money.

I would say to my Republican colleagues who continue to object: Stop.

Please stop. Let us actually have a chance to gather in a room in this building and see what we can hammer out to address, not a short-term continuing resolution but actually a thoughtful, comprehensive spending plan as we did 15, 16 years ago when the Republicans were in the majority here, House and Senate, and we had a Democratic President. We got the job done and helped to continue the longest running economic expansion in the history of this country.

I mentioned Bob Laskowski, president and CEO of Christiana Care Health System, a large regional health care system. He did a great job. We are very proud of him in our State. They provide care to a lot of people. He is a doctor and a health system leader. I thought his perspectives on health care reform and the Affordable Care Act were important enough to share on the floor.

This comes from an op-ed that appeared in one of our local statewide papers called the News Journal, a Gannett publication. His op-ed was in the News Journal this past week. I am going to read it. It is not that long. It goes like this:

With some in Washington promising to speak out against implementation of the Affordable Care Act until they "can no longer stand," it might be a useful reality check to visit an emergency room in any town or city across America.

He goes on to say:

There you will find thousands of Americans each day that really cannot stand. It is not just because an injury, illness or disease has put them on their backs.

Too often, it is because an eminently treatable ailment has been allowed to turn into something much worse—for the simple reason that the patient doesn't have health insurance and couldn't afford to see a doctor until things became so bad that the emergency room was their only option.

In the continuing cacophony of criticism around so-called ObamaCare, this crucial fact keeps being lost: Our health care system remains badly broken—and in the absence of reform, it will continue to get a lot worse.

I see this—as a physician and as a health care executive; but more importantly, I experience this as the friend of too many neighbors with no health insurance.

He goes on to say:

I think that might be the reason why 3 in 4 Americans surveyed in a recent Pew Research poll say they oppose efforts to sabotage the law: because they know that the people threatening to derail and defund the Affordable Care Act are not offering a better solution.

Ironically, the part of the Affordable Care Act that we are attempting to implement and stand up across the country right now, the health exchanges or marketplaces, is a Republican idea. It was first offered as an alternative to HillaryCare back in the first term of President Clinton. It is a Republican idea, a business idea.

But I do not care whether it is a Democratic or Republican idea. It is a

smart idea to use large purchasing pools, enable people who otherwise would buy health insurance for one person or five people or for a small business—it is a way for them to bring down the cost of their care, use competition to get better options. It is a smart idea.

The idea of another criticism, the individual mandates, people being individually mandated to get health care and if they did not they would maybe face some kind of fine—modest at first, it grows in time—that is not a Democratic idea. Ironically, that is an idea we got out of Massachusetts. The author, the Governor who signed it into law, was the Republican nominee for President last year, Mitt Romney.

So what we have tried to do is take some Republican ideas and some Democratic ideas and, frankly, some good ideas.

And over half of those who "oppose" the law today, say they want it fixed, not scrapped.

I agree with that—fixed, not scrapped.

They know that in the absence of reform, there are still too many people who use the emergency room as their only source of medical care; too many families and businesses who cannot keep up with the ever-rising cost of health care premiums; and too many Americans who find nothing but frustration when navigating our health care system—who still fill out too many forms, are prescribed too many tests that do not help them and get passed from office to office without anyone guiding them overall care.

Beginning [last week], millions of uninsured Americans began to shop for quality, affordable health care through the health insurance marketplaces. These marketplaces are a key element of the Affordable Care Act and represent an important step toward putting quality health care within reach of all Americans.

Just as Medicare has enabled seniors to get the care they need to live longer and healthier lives, increasing access to health insurance is vital to unlocking a healthier country, by ensuring something that millions of Americans do not have today: The opportunity to stay healthy through regular doctor visits rather than seeking help only when they get sick.

In some cases very sick.

It is worth remembering: Health care reform is not about special interests. It is about people like us, our families and our neighbors. It is about fellow parishioners and Little League coaches. It is about a neighbor who cuts himself making dinner and a spouse who finds a worrisome lump.

Everyone we know and everyone we love—will need our health care system at some point. Three years after America debated the need for health care reform, millions of Americans who work hard, pay taxes, and raise families still cannot afford to see a doctor. That is wrong.

And even though the resistance of some states to fully adopt the Affordable Care Act will tragically still leave some families in those states in the lurch, we now at long last have the unprecedented opportunity to create a system that will work better for us all.

We should also remember: Over time, the Affordable Care Act promises to improve the

system as much for the shrinking majority of Americans who have health insurance as for those who do not.

Access is just the first step. The act provides a blueprint for a new model of care, one that rewards doctors for more coordinated care. Here at Christiana Care [and throughout Delaware] we have seen what happens when we provide that kind of care through reengineered medical practices, known as "medical homes," where doctors are enabled to not only efficiently meet patients' needs but to anticipate them as well.

This coordinated approach makes getting care simpler and makes the lives of those getting care easier. It makes quality better; and, by making care simpler, better, and more accessible, it saves money.

No law as big or ambitious as the ACA can possibly get it all right on the first try. But let us not forget: When Medicare was signed into law, critics warned seniors would languish in long lines, and that we would all long for the good old days before reform took place.

Today, Medicare has helped hundreds of millions of Americans live longer, healthier lives—while reducing the poverty rate among seniors by 75 percent.

Dr. Laskowski goes on to write:

I believe if these historic changes are given a chance, we will collectively create a system that is defined not by volume, but by value. Over the next several years, I know we can make health care in America more "people focused" and less transactional by realizing the best way to provide better outcomes at lower cost is by partnering with patients.

As we in health care listen to our patients, we will learn what our patients truly value. Then we will be able to free up resources to help patients get healthy faster and stay well.

The Affordable Care Act is a map toward that future. History is being made.

I will close by saying: While many of our colleagues argue that the Affordable Care Act will lead to rising insurance costs and lost jobs, the truth is that in Delaware and throughout the rest of the country, millions of Americans are already learning they will be able to find quality health care, insurance plans for a more affordable price.

In Delaware and much of the country, millions of Americans will be able to find quality insurance plans for less than \$100 a month. I have told my constituents and my colleagues since this debate over health care reform began, this law is not written in stone. We want to make the law better wherever we can, just as we have made the Medicare prescription drug program better, which was largely supported by Republicans. But we actually made it better in the Affordable Care Act.

I would urge my Republican colleagues to enable us to reopen our government, to reassure Americans and our creditors in this country and around the world that we will honor our debts. Then let's get to work right away to improve the Affordable Care Act and these insurance marketplaces and come to a consensus on a bipartisan budget resolution that lays out a spending plan that will get us from where we are to where we need to be.

Last word. I spent some time in the Navy, and the Presiding Officer spent some time in the military. One of the Presiding Officer's sons may be on Active Duty today. Some of the time we used to fly in and out of Japan in Navy P-3 airplanes.

I learned not long ago that in Japan they spend about 8 percent of GDP for health care. In this country, we spend about 17 or 18 percent. Think about that. They spend 8 percent of GDP for health care. We spend 17 or 18 percent. They get better results. For the most part they have lower rates of infant mortality and higher rates of life expectancy than we do.

The other thing is they cover everybody. Tonight when folks go to bed in this country, this evening some 40 million will go to bed without health care coverage. The Japanese, smart as they are, cannot be that smart. We cannot be that dumb. We cannot be that dumb.

There are ways to get better results for less money, including in the provision of health care. We can work together. If we work together, we can make that a reality.

The last thing I will say is I think the Presiding Officer has heard me tell how I love to ask people who have been married a long time what the secret is for being married 40, 50, 60, 70 years. People give me very funny answers. Some are actually hysterical. But every now and then some of them are serious, almost poignant. And I will close with one of them tonight.

A couple of years ago I met a couple who had been married over 50 years.

I said to them: What is the secret for being married 55 years?

They said: The two Cs.

The two Cs.

I said: What is that?

They said: Communicate and compromise.

Think about that. Communicate and compromise. I said: That is pretty good advice.

I got to thinking about it later, and I thought that is also some pretty good advice and maybe the secret for a vibrant democracy—to communicate and to compromise. We think we were willing to compromise on the short-term spending resolution that is the continuing resolution by agreeing to the numbers set by the Republican House leaders. They do not regard that as a compromise, but I think it was an attempt to compromise.

We need to find compromises in a conference on the budget resolution. That is where we should put our money, that is where we should put our efforts in the weeks to come.

I would add one more C. Communicate and compromise, as important as they are, maybe a third C would be collaborate. That would be a good one to add. So three Cs: Communicate, compromise and collaborate. It is what the American people sent us here to do.

I know the Presiding Officer feels that way, and so do I, as does Dr. COBURN. There are a bunch of us who feel that way. So let's do that.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, pending before the Senate is a unanimous consent request on H. Con. Res. 58, a bill to urge the Department of Defense to allow military chaplains to perform duties during the shutdown.

Earlier today, I objected to this bill because I misunderstood its purpose, and I would like to withdraw that objection at this time.

The bill will urge the Department of Defense to allow military chaplains, including contract personnel, to perform religious services during the shutdown and permit services to take place on property owned by the Department of Defense.

Today, just as the Department of Defense and the administration solved the problem with military families and their death benefits upon the loss of one of their loved ones serving our country, I urge, and I know others will as well, the DOD to ensure that all active-duty members are able to exercise their First Amendment rights and participate in religious ceremonies while they are serving. So that is something I hope we can resolve.

I also want to raise some issues that relate to the shutdown. I raised some earlier, but these are additional concerns I have with regard to the shutdown.

The impact of this shutdown is being felt across the board, across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and, indeed, across the country. It is felt by small businesses, States and municipalities are feeling it already and anticipating much more of an impact as time goes by, and, of course, families are feeling it very acutely. Yesterday I sent a letter to Speaker BOEHNER emphasizing the detrimental impact the shutdown was having on my constituents in Pennsylvania.

Just by way of a couple of examples that apply to Pennsylvania and to the Nation, domestic violence programs across the country have been impacted directly by the shutdown. The offices that oversee grants under the Violence Against Women Act have had to shut down and are not able to issue grants or provide reimbursements to local programs.

I would say parenthetically that it took many months for the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization to go forward. There were a lot of problems along the way, a lot of objections.

Fortunately, we have the program reauthorized, but now, because of the shutdown, we are having problems with women who are victims of violence getting the services they are entitled to.

We are hearing as well from folks in our domestic violence shelters—shelters that rely upon Federal funds and that have already been impacted by the sequester—the across-the-board indiscriminate cuts that have been in effect since March. These shelters may have to further reduce services to vulnerable victims of domestic violence.

In the words of one State advocate: We are hanging on by our fingernails.

Meaning they are hanging on in terms of just being able to provide services, with funding either limited or funding being jeopardized.

Women trying to escape abusive relationships should not be hampered by the failures here in Washington to end this shutdown.

In terms of Social Security, we know Social Security checks are going out, fortunately, but in Pennsylvania, on average, 2,900 new claims are processed each week. That is the typical weekly total for new claims. This means Pennsylvanians who have reached retirement age and have paid into the system their entire careers are now forced to wait for benefits.

You have to ask yourself: Why should a domestic violence center, with people who work to help domestic violence victims, have to wait for a political dispute where one wing of one party engaged in an ideological exercise allows a government shutdown, and, therefore, that domestic violence center doesn't get the help it needs, and the women, mostly women who are impacted, don't get the help they need.

The same could be said of someone who reaches retirement age and expects, and has a right to expect, their Social Security eligibility will be processed. Why should they have to wait for Washington?

In Pennsylvania alone, when it comes to small businesses, 30 loans, on average, are made each week by the SBA, for a total of \$13 million each and every week. The loss of these loans is hindering entrepreneurs from growing their businesses and from obtaining much-needed capital. Again, why should a business owner—a small businessperson who gets help from the SBA and has an expectation of getting that help—and, remember, we average 30 of those loans every week in Pennsylvania amounting to \$13 million—why should that all be stopped because someone in Washington has an ideological point to make? It makes no sense, and it is an outrage.

The shutdown is also impacting infrastructure in public lands across the country. Until the government is open, the maintenance of our Nation's basic infrastructure is impacted. In Pennsylvania, a lot of that basic infrastructure

involves our waterways—the locks and dams. That whole system which is in place for Pennsylvania and many other States, the maintenance of those locks and dams, is deferred. We all know what happens when you defer maintenance on something as fundamental as infrastructure.

I have been informed that repairs that were scheduled to take place on locks along the Lower Monongahela River in western Pennsylvania are suspended. If you have a problem with those, with a lock—and locks and dams generally, but in particular focusing on the Monongahela River—you stop the flow of commerce or you slow it down substantially. When you slow down or stop the flow of commerce, that affects jobs and the economy of southwestern Pennsylvania. If just one of these locks were to fail, it could have a detrimental economic impact on the whole region.

How about national parks? We have heard a lot about that topic this week and last week. The closure of national parks is negatively impacting Pennsylvania's economy. According to the National Park Service, the communities and businesses surrounding Pennsylvania's national parks and memorials are losing up to \$5.7 million in spending by nonlocal visitors for each week the government remains closed. That is just national parks and just in Pennsylvania—almost \$6 million—and that is just the beginning of what could be a much more substantial and detrimental impact to the State's economy.

I would go back to the point I made several times—and all of us have made these arguments in different ways—and that is that we know for sure there is a very simple way out of this predicament for Washington but, more importantly, for the country, and that is for the Speaker to put on the floor a bill which both parties now agree will pass. It is a clean funding bill. All it does is fund the operations of the government, albeit at a much lower level—\$70 billion less—than our side wanted.

We compromised greatly at the beginning of this process, despite what some have said. So we have compromised to make sure we can fund the government. It is about time for the Speaker to put this bill on the floor. They can vote on it very quickly, and it would pass very quickly. It is only 16 pages long. And that is the key to resolving and ending this tea party shutdown.

I urge the Speaker to do that. I have urged him, as we all have in various ways, and we respectfully suggest that could happen tomorrow. Thursday would be a good day to end all of this so we can get people back to work, we can have the functions of government operating to such an extent the economy can grow, and we can have a lot of debate and discussion about how to fund the government long term or what

to do about our fiscal challenges—what to do about a whole range of issues. But it is time for the government to open, and it is time for the House to act to do that.

It is also time to make sure we pay our bills.

Thirdly, it is important we continue to negotiate, just as we negotiated a long time ago, many weeks ago, to reach the point where we can have a bill that would fund the operations of the government.

Some people in the House chose to take a different path which led to the shutdown. It is about time we get them back on the right path, which is to open the government, pay our bills, and then have negotiations and discussions and compromises to move the country forward.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DEATH GRATUITY PAYMENTS

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, today I wish to express my deep disappointment at our failure to adequately provide for our fallen heroes and their families.

Once again, we learn that we have suffered recent casualties. And since the government shut down last week, the Department of Defense has been unable to guarantee full benefits and honors to those servicemen and women who have been killed in the defense of our Nation.

Among those who have given their lives in service of our Nation in recent days are two Army Rangers assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, headquartered at Fort Benning in my home state of Georgia.

These elite soldiers were serving on the front lines in Afghanistan, fighting for democracy and our American way of life when they made the ultimate sacrifice.

I have since been informed that the Department of Defense believes it lacks the authority to make automatic Death Gratuity Payments, to transport the next of kin to Dover Air Force Base so they can receive their fallen warrior, and to provide funeral allowances for the appropriate military honors.

This is simply unacceptable, and it is incumbent upon us to fix this.

It has been my great privilege to visit Fort Benning and meet with the members of the 75th Ranger Regiment over the years.

They live by the motto that "Rangers Lead The Way," and they serve our country regardless of Federal funding, domestic politics, or government shutdowns.

That is exactly what these brave individuals did in Afghanistan, and unfortunately it is our lack of leadership in Washington that has created undue hardship and stress for their loved ones in their toughest time of need.

I understand that our colleagues in the House of Representatives are expe-

ding legislation to provide explicit authorization to the Department of Defense to correct this oversight.

The Senate must act immediately on receipt of that legislation.

We owe this much to these brave men and women, their families, and the thousands of military members who continue to serve in harm's way.

I regret that the President has not taken this issue seriously enough to take action on his own to resolve this problem.

I remain confident that the Senate will take proper actions, and I look forward to passing this legislation as soon as possible.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, and for other purposes.

At 5:31 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill and joint resolution were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1569. A bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

H.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following joint resolutions were read the first time:

H.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 267. A resolution relative to the death of Rod Grams, former United States Senator for the State of Minnesota.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 398

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 398, a bill to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum, and for other purposes.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 554

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 554, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 775

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 775, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax incentive for the installation and maintenance of mechanical insulation property.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1183

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 1358

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1358, a bill to establish an advisory office within the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission to prevent fraud targeting seniors, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S.J. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 10, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

S.J. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 267—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF ROD GRAMS, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN)

submitted the following resolution; which was:

S. RES. 267

Whereas Rod Grams faithfully served the people of Minnesota with distinction in the United States Congress;

Whereas Rod Grams was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1992 and served one term as a Representative from the State of Minnesota and later served as a chief of staff in the House of Representatives;

Whereas Rod Grams was elected to the United States Senate in 1994 and served one term as a Senator from the State of Minnesota;

Whereas as a Senator, Rod Grams served on the Senate Standing Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, Energy and Natural Resources, Foreign Relations, and the Budget and on the Joint Economic Committee;

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Rod Grams, former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Rod Grams.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 9, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Housing Finance Reform: Essential Elements of the Multifamily Housing Finance System."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF ROD GRAMS, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 267, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
A resolution (S. Res. 267) relative to the death of Rod Grams, former United States Senator for the State of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 267) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.
(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.J. RES. 84, H.J. RES. 89, H.J. RES. 90, AND H.J. RES. 91

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I understand there are four measures at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the joint resolutions by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 84) making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, and for other purposes.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for the fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 91) making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military servicemembers of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASEY. I now ask for a second reading en bloc, and I object to my own request en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The measures will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2013

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, October 10, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the time until 1 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; and that at 1 p.m. the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair to allow for a special caucus meeting with the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the provisions of S. Res. 267, as a further mark of respect for the memory of the late Senator Rod Grams of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:48 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 10, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

JANET L. YELLEN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE BEN S. BERNANKE, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KENNETH E. BRANDT
DAVID A. HALL
STEVEN C. HERMAN
DONALD R. MALIN
JOEL V. MILLER
DANIEL J. THOMPSON
JAMES A. TILLMAN
WILEY R. WILLIAMS

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING TAIWAN ON ITS 102ND NATIONAL DAY

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Taiwan on its 102nd National Day on October 10, 2013.

Taiwan is a model of success in Asia. Through hard work and ingenuity, Taiwan has become one of the strongest economies in the Pacific Rim. Taiwan also has strong democratic institutions that foster the values of freedom, diligence, and transparency. The accomplishments of Taiwan, whether economic or political, are impressive.

On the occasion of Republic of China's Centennial National Day, I wish for continued trade cooperation between the United States and Taiwan. I also look forward to furthering the common economic interests of the United States and Taiwan, and I would like to encourage my colleagues in our efforts to preserve and strengthen the friendship between our two countries. Taiwan has much to offer the rest of the world, and its innovation and expertise will continue to create new, mutually-beneficial trade avenues.

Congratulations to the Republic of China and I look forward to continuing our partnership with Taiwan.

HONORING KIMBERLY ROADS SCHLAPMAN

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to recognize the talent, hard work, and determination of Kimberly Roads Schlapman, a lifelong resident of Habersham County, Georgia. Millions of fans know Kimberly as one of the beautiful, strong voices behind the country group Little Big Town. But many folks in Northeast Georgia were touched by Kimberly's musical abilities, as well as her commitment to her community, long before her rise to stardom.

During high school, Kimberly contributed her time as a candy striper at the Habersham County Medical Center. She was a member of Youth Against Cancer, the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, the Student Advisory Board for Community Bank and Trust, the Key Club, the Y Club, and the Student Council. Kimberly also served as vice president of her senior class.

Kimberly was also actively developing her musical skills during this time. She was a member of the Habersham Central High

School Chorus. She was also part of the Habersham Central Concert Choir. She was selected to sing in the Georgia Allstate Choir for five consecutive years and was one of six sopranos selected to study vocal music in the Georgia Governor's Honors Program.

While performing in the Habersham Community Theater and other special events in the community, she was selected to represent her state and region in numerous talent competitions. Kimberly's hard work paid off with great success, as she won first place in the National Beta Club competition as well as the International Key Club Convention.

Kimberly continued pursuing music when she enrolled at Samford University in Birmingham, Alabama, where she was a member of the Samford Singers and the Lake Junaluska Singers. Through these groups, she found a friend in Karen Fairchild. That relationship helped lead to the formation of Little Big Town.

In its 14 years together, Little Big Town has played before more than 4 million people. Last year, they achieved its first #1 radio hit with the song "Pontoon." The song came from the band's fifth album, *Tornado*, which was recently received platinum certification with sales of over one million copies. Little Big Town was recently honored with two CMA awards, two ACM awards, a Grammy award, and an Emmy award.

Georgians are truly proud of all Kimberly's achievements, both on and off the stage. I join many others in wishing Kimberly and her family the very best.

HONORING THE WALTER BRACKEN STEAM ACADEMY

HON. DINA TITUS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to congratulate the Walter Bracken STEAM Academy in District One in Las Vegas for being named a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School of Excellence and for being designated as "exemplary high achieving."

The Blue Ribbon Schools award is the highest honor that the Department of Education can bestow on an American school. The administration, faculty, staff, and students of the Walter Bracken STEAM Academy should be very proud. You have developed a strong school community where students are encouraged and enabled to pursue their interests and develop their talents, skills, and intellect.

The most important investment we can make for the future of our nation is in the next generation. Walter Bracken STEAM Academy is a prime example of what we can accomplish both individually and as a society when we make access to a quality education a priority.

HONORING DR. CLEM MELTON DOXEY

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Clem Melton Doxey for his long and distinguished career in medicine, and as the founder of Marietta Dermatology and The Skin Cancer Center.

On September 30, Dr. Doxey retired from his practice after 43 years of service to his patients and his community.

Since he began Marietta Dermatology in 1970, Doxey's passion for helping people has shown through his dedication to continue expanding his practice and personally serving between 40 and 50 patients a day. Dr. Doxey was the first dermatologist in the Marietta area, and his practice has since grown to 80 employees—including 11 partner physicians—at three locations in Marietta, Canton, and West Cobb.

A native of Louisiana, Doxey received his undergraduate degree in chemical engineering as well as a medical degree from Louisiana State University. After completing an internship at Oakknoll Naval Hospital, he graduated from Pensacola School of Medicine as a flight surgeon in 1963. He served in the First Marine Brigade in Vietnam, and then completed his dermatology residency at Tulane Hospital in 1970. Thereafter, Doxey moved to Cobb County with his family where he would serve the community with his knowledge of medicine. He also taught residents at Emory University for 22 years.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest thanks to Dr. Doxey again for his lifelong devotion to the practice of medicine and dedication to the people of our Northwest Georgia community. I wish him a joyous—and well-deserved—retirement.

HONORING ROBERT GREENE AS HE RECEIVES THE BUFFALO CLUB MEDAL

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Mr. Robert Greene, as he is awarded the prestigious Buffalo Club Medal. Created in 1956, the Buffalo Club Medal is presented to individuals who represent the ideal, gracious, deeply perceptive, dedicated, self-effacing leader. An accomplished lawyer, humanitarian champion, and dedicated community servant, Bob epitomizes these qualities. Since 2001, Bob has been deeply involved in the creation

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

of a sustainable orphanage for young girls in Haiti, among countless other pursuits, locally and otherwise.

Bob's work in Haiti began with his first trip in November 2001, serving as a member of a medical team through the Catholic Health System of Western New York and the Sisters of Mercy.

Since his initial trip, Bob has traveled to Haiti on over twenty separate occasions, serving in various roles. Since the devastating earthquake in 2010, Bob has dedicated his efforts to planning of and fundraising for a sustainable orphanage for girls ages 4 through 9 on the outskirts of Port-au-Prince.

Upon completion, the orphanage will be a home for over 200 girls. Fifteen bungalows will host twelve to fifteen children each. The orphanage will include a multipurpose building and a primary school, which has future plans to expand to include a secondary school. Grounds will include a large vegetable garden and pond for fish, which will supply much of the food. Solar panels will power the orphanage complex.

Bob's generosity is boundless. Presently, he serves as the Director and Past President of the Notre Dame Law Association, Director and Chairman Emeritus of the Western New York Public Broadcasting Association, Director of the Global Health Ministry, and a trustee of the WNED Foundation and the Foundation of the Zoological Society of Buffalo. In the past, Bob has served as the Chairman of Canisius College, a trustee of the Albright Knox Art Gallery, Director of the Sisters of Charity Hospital, Director and Chairman of the Zoological Society of Buffalo, Chairman of Shea's Buffalo Center for the Performing Arts, the Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra, and Bishop's Council of the Laity.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor Bob Greene as he receives the Buffalo Club Medal. His personal contribution of time and effort towards the progress and enhancement of our community and those abroad is admirable, and I am grateful for his commitment to such noble causes. I wish him much continued success in all his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, 2013, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 529 and 530.

Had I been present for rollcall vote 529, on the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair regarding H.J. Res. 84, making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted "No."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 530, on passage of H.J. Res. 84, making continuing appropriations for Head Start and for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted "No."

HONORING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LA VISTA LIONS CLUB OF ATLANTA

HON. TOM PRICE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to honor the La Vista Lions Club of Atlanta for sixty years of outstanding service in the Atlanta community. Since 1953, the La Vista Lions Club has supported numerous organizations in Georgia that provide essential services to individuals with vision and hearing impairments.

In its most recent history, the La Vista Lions Club has dedicated its time and resources in support of the Georgia Lions Lighthouse Foundation, which provides hearing tests, hearing aids, vision tests, eye glasses, and eye surgeries for Georgia residents in need. Plus, the La Vista Lions Club sponsors activities for children with vision and hearing impairments including the Georgia Lions Camp for the Blind and the Mike Glenn Hearing Impaired Basketball Camp.

Over the past sixty years, the La Vista Lions Club has been a vital asset to our community by providing these services to fellow Georgians. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the La Vista Lions Club of Atlanta on sixty years of outstanding work in the Sixth District of Georgia.

HONORING THE WEST HAVEN FIRE DEPARTMENT AS THEY CELEBRATE THEIR 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to extend my sincere congratulations to the members of the West Haven Fire Department, past and present, as they celebrate their 125th anniversary. This is a milestone for this wonderful organization and I am proud to have this opportunity to honor their outstanding work on behalf of the West Haven community.

The men and women who serve as firefighters face risks that few of us can comprehend. Each day, they must be ready to perform under intense pressure—literally in life or death situations as we have all witnessed in recent days. Few things are more important than feeling safe in our homes and workplaces. Our firefighters provide us with that peace of mind. Their commitment and dedication cannot be questioned and our thanks can never repay those who put their lives on the line to ensure our safety. A combination of career and volunteer firefighters, the members of the West Haven Fire Department have demonstrated an extraordinary commitment to our community.

On November 6, 1888, a fire broke out at the Hinman Hotel on the Corner of Washington Avenue and Beach Street. Not having

a fire department of their own, the City of West Haven sent word to New Haven and asking for assistance. Unfortunately, by the time the New Haven Fire Department was able to respond, the Hinman Hotel had burned to the ground. This prompted the people of West Haven to form their own fire department and on November 18, 1888, Engine & Hose Company #1 was founded.

It was not until 1892 that two more companies were formed. In January of that year, the James Graham Hook & Ladder and the West Haven Hook & Ladder both came to be. In 1895 North End Hose #3 and Seaside Hose #4 (later to become Savin Rock Hose #4) both entered the department. Although the James Grahams would disband in 1902, Engine #1, Hook & Ladder, Engine #3 and Engine #4 all remain active companies to this day. During World War II, a group of firefighters would be formed and funded by the Federal Government for civil defense. At the end of the war these men founded Steven Heights Engine Company #5, bringing the total number of the volunteer companies back up to five.

In 1919, shortly after the passing of House Bill 177, West Haven's first official Board of Commissioners was seated and they continue to serve in the same capacity to this day. On January 24, 1933, the Commissioners appointed the first six permanent paid firemen, establishing the career department. Lloyd Cameron was appointed Chief of Department by the new board in 1919. In 1936 the board made Chief Cameron the first Permanent Paid Chief of the department. Over its 125 year history, the career department would expand from six men to its current compliment of 54. All in all 167 men have been hired by the career department including those who are currently employed.

In 1988, in conjunction with the 100th anniversary of the department, the Department began their Explorer Post program. Young boys and girls of high school age are able to join the Explorers, learn about firefighting and train alongside the members of the Department. Most go on to join the volunteer companies and a few have even become career firefighters.

Today, as they reflect on their history and look towards their future, I am honored to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to every member of the West Haven Fire Department, career or volunteer, past and present, for their outstanding service to our community. Happy 125th anniversary.

HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TWIN CITIES LOCAL INITIATIVES SUPPORT CORPORATION

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Twin Cities Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) and the celebration of its 25th anniversary. On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Minnesota, and the thousands of families, individuals,

businesses, and residents that Twin Cities LISC has supported throughout the years, I am proud to offer congratulations on this milestone.

During the past 25 years, Twin Cities LISC has served as an integral partner in creating safe, livable and sustainable communities. Their dedication to solving society's most pressing issues with collaborative, community-driven solutions has gone a long way toward increasing the health and wellness of thousands of Minnesota families.

As one of 30 urban and regional branches of the Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Twin Cities LISC has established a reputation as a national leader in rebuilding blighted neighborhoods and improving quality of life. Focusing early attention on improving the quality of low-income housing in Saint Paul, their vision and strategy has expanded to include health and wellness, improving education, increasing family net worth and creating better paying jobs. To date, Twin Cities LISC has invested more than \$350 million in grants and leveraged an additional \$1 billion in total development into building sustainable communities.

Twin Cities LISC has been a vital partner in developing the Central Corridor Light Rail Transit, Minnesota's largest to-date infrastructure project. By focusing on transit-oriented development, Twin Cities LISC has ensured that the project successfully connects neighborhoods. To address disruptions caused by construction, Twin Cities LISC provided support services to help with job and housing retention. Their efforts to promote diversity and jobs have helped to expand the opportunity created by this major infrastructure project.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of Twin Cities LISC and their record of accomplishment in promoting thriving, sustainable communities, I am pleased to submit this statement in recognition of the organization's 25th anniversary.

**HONORING THE UNIVERSITY OF
MAINE AT FARMINGTON ON ITS
SESQUICENTENNIAL**

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Maine at Farmington as it begins celebrating its sesquicentennial this academic year.

More than 150 years ago, teachers from Franklin County petitioned the Maine State Legislature to establish a State Normal School. In March 1863, after heated debate, the Legislature passed the Normal School Act. That fall, Farmington was chosen as the site for the Western State Normal School, the first public institution of higher learning in the State of Maine. Originally a teachers' college with an emphasis on liberal arts, the Western State Normal School first opened its doors on August 24, 1864 to 31 students who convened in the attic of a building in downtown Farmington. Over 100 years and several name changes later, the school merged into the University of Maine System in 1968 and became formally

known as the University of Maine at Farmington, or UMF, in 1971.

UMF currently enrolls over 2,000 students from across the country and the world. It continues to be a national leader in producing exceptional teaching professionals that have a direct impact on the state of Maine. Approximately seventeen percent of Maine's educators earned their degree from the University of Maine at Farmington, including four of the last six Maine "Teacher of the Year" recipients. In addition to maintaining its commitment to training quality educators, UMF has made efforts to strengthen other academic areas, such as the arts and sciences, health, and rehabilitation.

Today, October 9th, also known as Charter Day, marks 150 years to the day since the Maine Legislature signed the school's charter and is the highlight of the Sesquicentennial celebration. The day's events feature a ceremony honoring notable dignitaries, an array of cultural events, a ribbon cutting ceremony for the restoration of Abbot Park, and an evening of visual and performing art. The anniversary will continue to be observed throughout the academic year focusing on the six key academic disciplines of education, psychology, English, biology, mathematics and history. I am proud to have the opportunity to share the impressive accomplishments of the University of Maine at Farmington and look forward to watching the University continue its growth during the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in congratulating the students, alumni, faculty, staff, and friends of the University of Maine at Farmington as they celebrate their sesquicentennial.

**CELEBRATING TAIWAN'S
NATIONAL DAY**

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 102nd National Day of the Republic of China (Taiwan). Also known as "Double Ten Day," this important anniversary marks a special occasion for the good people of Taiwan.

Taiwan is a modern-day success story that exemplifies the prosperity and opportunity that comes from a strong commitment to the rule of law, democracy, and human rights. I know that the people of Taiwan are rightfully proud of these achievements, and I will stand with them to preserve the free and open society that exists there. Indeed, Taiwan has come a long way in a short time. This is why it is more important than ever to strengthen the United States' relationship with Taiwan.

The U.S.-Taiwan relationship is the cornerstone of American foreign policy in the Asia-Pacific region. Earlier this year, I led the successful bipartisan effort to end over four decades of isolation for Taiwan at the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), because safety in international air travel should not be held hostage to geopolitics. I commend the President for signing this impor-

tant legislation into law, and I am even more excited that as a direct result of our efforts in Congress, Taiwan has finally been invited to participate in ICAO this year. It is the first time since 1971 that this has happened.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. enjoys a very positive and productive economic relationship with Taiwan. It comes as no surprise that Taiwan is America's 11th largest trading partner. In fact, in my home State of California, the two-way trade with Taiwan is even more significant, particularly with so many Taiwanese visitors travelling to the U.S. under the Visa Waiver Program. Given the importance of our trading relationship, I urge the Administration to quickly finish the ongoing U.S.-Taiwan Trade and Investment Framework Agreement negotiations and move on to a broader, more comprehensive Bilateral Investment Agreement with Taiwan.

As we join with the people of Taiwan in celebration of Double Ten Day, it is important to remember that the bond between the U.S. and Taiwan remains vibrant and strong. As a longtime friend of Taiwan, I know that Taiwan's national day is a very special occasion for Taiwanese people living all over the world. So, as we mark the 102nd National Day of Taiwan, let us salute the strong friendship between the U.S. and Taiwan, and let us recognize the shared strengths that make this relationship one of the most important.

**HONORING THE BRANFORD
ITALIAN-AMERICAN CLUB ON
THE OCCASION OF THEIR 75TH
ANNIVERSARY**

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join the Branford community in extending my heartfelt congratulations to the Branford Italian-American Club as they gather in celebration of their 75th Anniversary. This is a remarkable milestone for this community treasure!

Today, as the Club members and their families gather to commemorate their 75th Anniversary, they also celebrate the many invaluable contributions the Club has made to our community. People across the country struggle to create a sense of community, a sense of belonging. Growing up in an Italian-American neighborhood, I know the feeling of heritage and kinship that organizations like the Branford Italian-American Club provide. Like so many others, the Club has played an important role in forging strong bonds of friendship throughout the community.

The Branford Italian-American Club's strength lies in the participation and commitment of its members. Over the seventy-five years, the Club's membership has worked hard to preserve and protect the rich history of our ancestors. Whether it through the Bocce League, Dart Club, the Club Cruise, or their participation in such local events as the Branford Festival, the activities offered through the Club allow families to connect with each other—celebrating our shared history and traditions. That sense of heritage and culture is

the special gift that the Club gives to their members, our community, and future generations.

Our communities would not be the same without the efforts of volunteers like you whose energy, compassion, and concern touches people's lives every day. Throughout its history, a commitment to community service has been at the center of the Branford Italian-American Club's mission. Its members have volunteered for countless community efforts, volunteering as mentors for children in the local school system, and adopting families in need during the holiday season.

Today, as they gather to celebrate the past 75 years, the members of the Branford Italian-American Club can be proud of the many ways in which they have helped to shape our community. I am proud to have this opportunity to extend my deepest thanks and appreciation to the Club's leadership and its members for all of their outstanding efforts to improve the quality of life for others and to make our community a better place. I am also honored to stand today to congratulate them on this very special anniversary and wish them a the best for many more years of success.

CONGRATULATING COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR WILLIAM T. BISSETTE, JR. FOR HIS YEARS OF SERVICE IN THE U.S. ARMY AND AS GARRISON COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR AT FORT MCCOY, WISCONSIN

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished service of Command Sergeant Major William T. Bissonette, whose tenure as Garrison Command Sergeant Major at Fort McCoy, Wisconsin, concludes October 10, 2013. CSM Bissonette's official retirement from the U.S. Army Reserves is January 31, 2014.

CSM Bissonette's 32 years of dedicated service in the U.S. Army is noteworthy in every respect. CSM Bissonette assumed his duties at Fort McCoy on June 26, 2009. Immediately prior to this assignment he served as the command sergeant major of the 378th Military Intelligence Battalion (Battlefield Surveillance Brigade).

CSM Bissonette, a native of Massena, N.Y., entered active duty March 16, 1982 and attended one-station unit training at Fort Benning, Ga., where he became an infantry anti-armor specialist. His overseas assignments include the Republic of Korea, the U.S. Territory of Guam and the Republic of Iraq. His stateside assignments include tours at Fort Campbell, Ky.; Fort Rucker, Ala.; Fort Bliss, Texas; the Pentagon; Fort McPherson, Ga.; and Fort Sheridan, Ill.

CSM Bissonette has served in a variety of duty positions to include anti-armor specialist, machine gunner, weapons team leader, drill sergeant, recruiter, training and evaluation noncommissioned officer (NCO), unit training NCO, advanced NCO Course instructor, first

sergeant, operations NCO, operations sergeant major, G7 sergeant major.

He has attended various military schools including the Air Assault School, Drill Sergeant School, Recruiting School, Master Fitness Trainer Course, Battle Focused Instructor Trainer Course, Emergency Preparedness Course, Force Integration Course, First Sergeant Course, Sergeants Major Course, Command Sergeants Major Course, and Garrison Command Sergeants Major Course. He holds an associate degree from Central Texas College.

CSM Bissonette has committed his life to serving our country and has received many deserving awards and decorations, including the Bronze Star, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Joint Service Achievement Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Humanitarian Service Medal, Korea Defense Service Medal, Expert Infantry Badge, Air Assault Badge, Joint Staff Identification Badge, Army Staff Identification Badge, Drill Sergeant Identification Badge, Basic Recruiter Badge with two Gold Stars, Joint Meritorious Unit Award, and the Army Superior Unit Award, as well as various campaign and service medals.

It has been an honor for me to serve as U.S. Representative for Wisconsin's Third Congressional District during CSM Bissonette's tenure at Fort McCoy. During his service at Fort McCoy, CSM Bissonette helped transform this vital national training center into one of the Army's best and most effective of the seven active Army Power Projection Platforms. I know his leadership will be greatly missed at the base and surrounding communities, but I am thankful for his leadership and contributions to ensuring that Fort McCoy remains a shining star in the nation's military training infrastructure.

On behalf of my constituents in Wisconsin and a grateful nation, I would like to thank and commend CSM Bissonette for his years of dedicated service in the U.S. Army and in particular as Garrison Command Sergeant Major at Fort McCoy. My best wishes to him, his wife Katherine and their children Michael and Samantha.

IN RECOGNITION OF MALALA YOUSAFZAI

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Malala Yousafzai. On October 9, 2012—one year ago today—Malala was the target of an assassination attempt by the Taliban because she chose to speak out against their efforts to ban girls from school in her Swat Valley neighborhood of Pakistan. Since then, Malala has emerged as a leading voice for underprivileged children, especially girls, in the fight for global education equality.

Along with former British Prime Minister Gordon Brown and the "A World at School" movement, Malala will work to raise \$500 million over the next three years to provide edu-

cation to the 300,000 Syrian school-aged children living in Lebanon. In addition to this and winning an International Children's Peace Prize for her overall efforts, Malala was recently honored at the opening dedication of Europe's largest public library. In a recent address given at the UN, she reiterated her mission, "They thought that the bullets would silence us, but they failed . . . and then, out of that silence, came thousands of voices."

For many, Malala Yousafzai, is a symbol of resilience and courage in her fight for global education equality. Please join me in supporting Malala and her efforts on the anniversary of the Taliban's heinous failed assassination attempt. I proudly acknowledge and encourage her to continue her efforts for education equality.

HONORING MYERS FLOWER SHOP AS THEY CELEBRATE THEIR CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to join the Branford community and the Myers family as they celebrate the 100th Anniversary of Myers Flower Shop—a remarkable milestone for this community institution.

Charles Myers had a unique passion for flowers. Following his studies at Yale University, he dedicated himself to the establishment of a premier flower shop, opening his first location at 936 Chapel Street in New Haven, Connecticut in 1913. In 1940 the shop moved to 28 Whitney Avenue and just seven years later, Charles, while doing what he loved best, suffered a fatal heart attack at the shop. His wife, who had been a long-time assistant at the shop, stepped in to fill the breach until 1950 when his son, Allan, returned home and took over the operation of the family business. Following Alan's passing in 1959, his wife, Sue took up the reins until the third generation of the Myers family, their son Chuck and his wife, Elsie, assumed the leadership role in 1971. Despite the many changes, the business flourished and a new branch was opened in Branford and then another in Guilford. Though the New Haven and Guilford shops have since closed, the Branford shop continues to be a staple of Branford's merchant center at its location at 1008 Main Street. Today, granddaughters Lee-Ellen and Elsie run the store with the same strong sense of hard work and passion that was the trademark of Charles Myers.

As it was recently described by one of his granddaughters, when Myers celebrated its grand-opening, life expectancy was about forty-seven years, few doctors went to college, most babies were born at home, and the speed limit was set at 15 mph to prevent Model T cars from spooking horses. So many things have changed over the course of its one hundred year history, but the one constant has been the company's commitment to outstanding customer service. Lee-Ellen and Elsie remain committed to ensuring that the

legacy of their grandfather thrives—bringing flowers from all over the world to its customers, offering great quality and excellent service to every client, and doing whatever they can to make the lives of others just a little bit brighter.

In a recent article about the centennial celebration, Albert Canosa wrote: "Every industry has its legacies. The Kennedys are synonymous with politics. The Fords are the kings of automobiles. And here in Branford, Connecticut, the legacy of Charles Myers is associated with flowers." Myers Flower Shop is a community treasure—a classic example of the American entrepreneurial spirit and the very essence of what we so often describe as the American Dream. I am proud to rise today to extend my heartfelt congratulations to Lee-Ellen, Elsie, and the entire Myers family as they mark this centennial celebration and wish them all the best for continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, Monday night I meant to vote against H.J. Res 77. This Resolution was just the latest bill to come to the floor as part of the Republicans' foolish strategy. Funding the federal government one program or agency at a time is a reckless approach, and one I strongly oppose.

To be clear, I support full funding for the Food and Drug Administration along with the entire federal government. Ensuring our food, medications, and medical devices are safe is important. Halting these critical activities is already impacting our communities and the effects will only continue as long as Republicans refuse to bring a clean Continuing Resolution to the floor.

It is time to end this manufactured shutdown, get our federal workers back on the job, and fund every federal program and agency at once.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF PARATRANSIT, INC.

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Paratransit, Inc. as they celebrate their 35th anniversary. As staff, passengers, and supporters of this vital transportation lifeline gather to celebrate, I ask all my colleagues to join me in recognizing them for their invaluable service to the Sacramento region.

For the past thirty-five years, Paratransit has served countless individuals with disabilities and the elderly by offering door-to-door transportation services, allowing them the mobility to lead quality lives. Since its inception in 1978, Paratransit, a private nonprofit corpora-

tion, has been innovative in providing a public transportation system with fully accessible options, as well as working with other local nonprofit agencies, assisting them in delivering much needed client-focused transportation. In 1981, Paratransit became the first designated Consolidated Transportation Services Agencies in the State of California. In 1992 with the passing of the Americans with Disabilities Act, The Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) and Paratransit partnered to implement the law in the most effective and efficient method to provide service to those with disabilities. That same year, the Community Transportation Association of America named Paratransit, Inc. as Transit System of the Year.

Paratransit's diverse services include a mobility training program that provides assistance to people to learn how to ride RT's buses and light rail cars, giving them independence to work, visit senior centers, go shopping or to doctor appointments, and visit friends and relatives. In 2012, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments honored Paratransit as the Regional Organization of the Year. Their successful Wheels to Work employment program, partners with Women's Empowerment, The Sacramento County Department of Human Services, The Sacramento Housing Alliance, Sacramento Steps Forward, and The California Department of Rehabilitation to help people get employment by providing low-income individuals with job counseling, interview preparation and other services. Also in 2012, Paratransit received the Innovative Transportation Program from the Women's Transportation Seminar for their forward thinking efforts.

Paratransit's maintenance division services its fleet of 150 vehicles, as well as the fleets of 20 other agencies, to ensure safe and reliable public transportation options. It also repairs accessibility equipment, such as lifts and ramps, and adapts vehicles for disabled drivers. As the 2002 United States EPA Energy Star Small Business award winner, Paratransit is committed to clean energy and a sustainable environment. Its Sacramento facility contains a storm water retention system. They have an expansive recycling program for all waste coolant, motor oil, transmission fluid, batteries, metals and tires. Committed to improving air quality, Paratransit joined with Hybrid Technologies in 2007 to produce the world's first full lithium-powered PT Cruisers.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby recognize and commend Paratransit for their outstanding commitment and service to our community. I ask all my colleagues to join me in wishing this fine organization continued success and support as they work to provide seamless transportation options and other important services for everyone in the Sacramento Region.

DEATH BENEFITS BILL H.J. RES.

91

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we lost five warriors on the battlefield of Afghanistan re-

cently. They were 25-year-old 1st Lt. Jennifer M. Moreno; 24-year-old Pfc. Cody J. Patterson; 24-year-old Special Agent Joseph M. Peters; 25-year-old Sgt. Patrick C. Hawkins; and 19-year-old Lance Cpl. Jeremiah M. Collins, Jr.

Unfortunately, their families were given the news not only that they had lost their loved ones, but they were also told that they would not be given the \$100,000 in death benefits that they were entitled to receive within three days of the death of their loved ones.

The \$100,000 payment is being withheld from the families—two of them Army Rangers—and one Marine and the bodies of the five warriors will be returned to Dover Air Force Base today. Congress needs to act NOW to rectify this absurd and disgraceful situation.

This money helps the families by giving them an immediate source of cash to help get through the tough times surrounding the funeral of their loved ones.

The Pentagon says it has specific instructions from its budget office not to make payments for deaths that occurred after 11:59 p.m. on Sept. 30, 2013—the date of the start of the government shutdown.

Congress passed a bill last week which should have made it clear that the Pentagon had the authority to make these kinds of payments, however this Administration continues to play politics with this shutdown and has apparently directed DOD not to make these payments.

In order to make it ABUNDANTLY clear that DOD has the authority to make these payments, I thank the Speaker for quickly bringing this bill up to the floor.

It is my hope that the Senate quickly passes this bill, and the President signs it. There is no excuse that any other American hero's family is told that they will not get the death benefit they deserve.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE NEW HAVEN MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join the many who have gathered to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the New Haven Manufacturers Association—a remarkable milestone for this outstanding organization. Their leadership, vision, and advocacy have not only served to promote and expand manufacturing opportunities in New Haven County, but have become integral to how our communities and policy makers address manufacturing needs across Connecticut.

As one of the oldest states in our great nation, Connecticut has a long and rich history. At the heart of our state's economic history is a strong manufacturing foundation. Connecticut is incredibly proud of that heritage and can boast of many firsts in manufacturing:

the first cotton gin, patented by Eli Whitney; the first factory town in America, planned and established in Seymour; the first movable parts mass production in use, making clocks; the first industrial training school, established by John Holbrook in Derby; as well as the production of the first revolver, portable typewriter, sewing machine, vacuum cleaner, Poloroid camera, color television, and helicopter. Our state's manufacturing industry has and continues to be an important part of our economic success.

For one hundred years the NHMA has been a strong voice on behalf of New Haven County manufacturers—ensuring that public officials and communities understand the importance of the industry to our economy, that manufacturing employees have access to ongoing training and development resources, and that those schools and programs responsible for training the next generation of these skilled workers are able to do so with the most up-to-date technology and machinery. Over the course of my tenure in Congress I have had many opportunities to work with the NHMA as well as to visit many of their member companies to see first-hand the innovative work they are undertaking. We worked together to bring funding to Platt Regional Vocational Technical High School which financed new machinery for the school's manufacturing program and I have been proud to support their idea of the creation of manufacturing reinvestment accounts which are aimed at reducing the financial burdens our smaller manufacturers face as they seek to expand their businesses.

Their dedication and good work has helped to preserve our state's rich manufacturing history, provide a forum for the exchange of ideas, issues and best practices among their members, and advocate for public policies that enhance manufacturing as a whole. Today, as they celebrate their centennial anniversary, I am proud to rise and join the many community and business leaders who have gathered in extending my heartfelt congratulations and very best wishes to the New Haven Manufacturers Association. Happy 100th Anniversary.

MOURNING THE PASSING OF FORMER MINNESOTA SENATOR ROD GRAMS

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my condolences to the family and friends of former U.S. Senator Rod Grams who represented Minnesota from 1995 to 2001. He had previously been elected to the U.S. House in 1992 where he served one term. Senator Grams passed away last night at home in Crown, MN. He was 65 years old.

Senator Grams was a Republican who fought hard for the issues he believed in and worked to find common ground on issues that concerned Minnesotans. Before entering politics Sen. Grams was a well known television newscaster in the Twin Cities. I remember watching him frequently.

While serving in the U.S. House and Senate I did not have contact with Sen. Grams, but following his time in elected office I had many interactions with him as he represented various private clients. I always found Rod Grams to be a kind and engaging man who cared deeply about Minnesota.

The public service provided by Senator Rod Grams is to be honored and respected. He was a conservative who cared about Minnesota and its people. Again, Mr. Speaker, I extend my condolences to his family, friends, and supporters.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048, 913.08.

Today, it is \$16,747,419,536,935.48. We've added \$6,120,542,488,022.40 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.1 trillion in debt our Nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING TAIWAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. KEVIN YODER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the National Day of the Republic of China. October 10 marks the beginning of the Wuchang Uprising which led to the creation of the Republic of China in 1912.

The Republic of China, or Taiwan as it is more commonly known, has worked tirelessly to become a global player both politically and economically. With a thriving economy, Taiwan already plays a critical role in the global supply chain and serves as a major innovator in the technology industry. I am proud to represent Garmin Ltd. in my district which is an exemplary company conducting business internationally based in both Kansas and Taiwan. The Taiwanese community is a strong contributor to Kansas's 3rd Congressional district.

In light of these contributions, it is my belief that Taiwan should be included in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP).

Taiwan currently plays a major role in ensuring U.S. interests in the Pacific. For decades we have enjoyed a mutually beneficial relationship based on trust. It is my hope that we can continue and strengthen this relationship going forward. To achieve this goal, I look forward to working with the Administration to see that a bilateral investment agreement is signed between our countries.

Lastly, as long standing allies, it is time for us as a Congress to reconsider our diplomatic relationship with Taiwan by welcoming high-

level officials from Taiwan to meet with their American equivalents in Cabinet level positions.

I commend Taiwan on its National Day, and look forward to a continued partnership.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LOUIS MAGNARELLI, PH.D.

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with the heaviest of hearts that I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend and outstanding community member, Dr. Louis Magnarelli, whose recent passing was all too soon. Internationally recognized scientist, mentor, and friend, Lou was a remarkable man whose kind heart and passion for science touched the lives of many.

Earning his B.S. in Biology at the State University New York at Oswego, an M.S. in Biology at the University of Michigan, and his Ph.D. in Medical Entomology at Cornell University, Lou began his career at the Connecticut Agriculture Experiment Station in 1975. He dedicated a lifetime to his research and his work earned him a distinguished reputation on his area of expertise, medical entomology. He began as Assistant Scientist, served as Associate Scientist, Scientist, and later Chief Scientist/State Entomologist and Vice Director. For the last nine years, Lou led the Station as its Director. His contributions to Connecticut and science were extensive and unparalleled, publishing in excess of two hundred scientific articles. His expertise was not only recognized here but internationally, particularly for his work on ticks, tick-associated diseases, serological testing for vector-borne pathogens.

His colleagues perhaps put it best when they wrote "Lou was not only our Director, he was our colleague and most of all, our friend. His door was always open, both literally and figuratively, for discussion of all matters from the scientific to the personal. His keen scientific and analytical mind was only exceeded by his desire to bring this institution's scientific knowledge and experience to the benefit of the citizens of Connecticut. He was a strong supporter of Connecticut agriculture, the state's trees and woodlands, and the green industry. Lou's wisdom and skillful stewardship as our leader will be sorely missed. Even through his illness, his thoughts were always of the Experiment Station. All Station staff, both present and future, will take tremendous pride in honoring and continuing Dr. Magnarelli's unwavering commitment for Putting Science to Work for Society."

I would be remiss if I did not extend a personal note of thanks and appreciation to Lou for his many years of friendship and service. I often sought his guidance and expertise. Lou's joy and dedication to his work was contagious and I could always count on him for outstanding research or an update on Station's recent work. I am proud of the work that we did together and the many accomplishments that were achieved on behalf of the Station and the residents of Connecticut.

Louis Magnarelli's presence, both at the Station and in the scientific community, will be deeply missed. He worked tirelessly for the people of Connecticut, our communities and the environment. He was an extraordinary individual whose passion for science, exceptional leadership, and compassion for others will long serve as an inspiration to others—that is his lasting legacy. I join so many others in extending my deepest sympathies to his wife, Sharon, family, friends, and colleagues as they mourn his loss.

**“CHANGE THE MASCOT”
CAMPAIGN**

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I was honored to participate in a symposium led by the Oneida Indian Nation in support of the “Change the Mascot” campaign. The discussion gave voice to many serious concerns with the continued use of the disparaging slur “Redskins” as the name of Washington’s National Football League (NFL) team. I commend and congratulate Ray Halbritter of the Oneida Indian Nation for his leadership and the tremendous effort put forth by his community to raise national awareness of this issue. Below are my remarks from the symposium for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Good morning. It is my honor to be here today to support the “Change the Mascot” campaign. The “Change the Mascot” campaign is advancing a national dialogue, which is important for Native Americans and all Americans to have.

There are more than 5 million Native Americans in the U.S. They are our neighbors and friends—children, elders, moms and dads, men and women—who care about their culture, their communities, and their country.

Native Americans are not mascots or caricatures to be exploited for profit—not by the NFL or any professional sports team owner. They should never be stereotyped in a dehumanizing, degrading, or demeaning manner.

In the year 2013, for the NFL and a team owner to be so driven by profit that this clearly racist mascot continues to be promoted and defended is truly outrageous. But it has not gone unnoticed. That is why we are here today as part of the “Change the Mascot” campaign. And change is coming.

Let me quote from the September 13, 2013 editorial by the Washington Post: “We hope, too, that Mr. Snyder finally understands that the team’s name . . . is a racial slur of Native Americans so offensive that it should no longer be tolerated.” They go on to say: “Mr. Snyder should be prepared for the controversy never to end.”

There is no dignity or respect in the exploitation perpetrated for profit by the NFL and Dan Snyder’s football business. They are promoting a racist slur that must change. And, this campaign is going to keep advancing until that name is changed.

It is my honor to represent Native American families in my Congressional District and

throughout Minnesota. In Minnesota, we have eleven Sioux and Ojibwe Nations that have a long and very proud history of contributing to the strength, diversity, and success of our State. In one month—on November 7th—my team, the Minnesota Vikings, will host Washington’s football team. That night I am sure the “Change the Mascot” campaign will have a big presence in the Twin Cities. I look forward to welcoming you, Ray!

I want to recognize one colleague who is not here today, but has been the leading voice in Congress on this issue—Delegate ENI FALEOMAVAEGA who represents American Samoa. He is the author of legislation that would end federal trademark protection for the term “Redskin”. I am proud to be a co-sponsor, along with Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. And this issue isn’t going away.

The hired PR folks, who are now defending Mr. Snyder’s football team, cite outdated polls of Native Americans and talk about history and tradition. It’s all rubbish and corporate spin to keep the profits flowing.

Mr. Snyder, change the mascot. End this ugly history and tradition of your team’s racist slur and pick a new mascot that offends no one—hurts no one—dehumanizes no one.

It’s time to put dignity and respect for Native people ahead of your profits.

**COMMEMORATING DOUBLE TEN
DAY, TAIWAN’S NATIONAL DAY**

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues that this Thursday, October 10 is Double Ten Day, Taiwan’s national day. I hope they will join me in congratulating the people of Taiwan on this momentous occasion.

Our great friend in Asia, Taiwan, will be celebrating its 102nd anniversary on October 10. Also known as Double Ten Day since it falls on the 10th day of the 10th month, this is Taiwan’s National Day and is revered and celebrated in the same fashion as we do the Fourth of July here in America.

Taiwan is today a multi-party democracy with a strong economy that is working to ease tensions with Mainland China, while preserving both its political existence and its vibrant national life. This Double Ten Day marks the 102nd anniversary of China’s Wuchang Uprising, a significant development in the Xinhai Revolution. This occasion is especially important given Taiwan’s aspirations to participate in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Taiwan has been a great friend and partner of the United States, and I have no doubt that this important relationship will continue to be a source of strength to our peoples as this new century continues to unfold. I congratulate the people of Taiwan as they commemorate Double Ten Day.

**HONORING XAVIER HIGH SCHOOL
ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR
50TH ANNIVERSARY**

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2013

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join the many who have gathered in celebration of Xavier High School’s 50th Anniversary. It is a remarkable milestone for this educational institution. “A Catholic community fostering excellence in scholarship, leadership and service,” over the course of the last five decades, Xavier has helped prepare hundreds of young men from communities across Connecticut for their future success—educating the whole person: spirit, mind and body within a Christian framework.

Founded in 1963 by The Most Rev. Vincent J. Hines, second bishop of the Diocese of Norwich, as a Catholic secondary school for young men, Xavier High School is sponsored jointly by the Roman Catholic Diocese of Norwich and the Congregation of the Brothers of Saint Francis Xavier. From its earliest days, Xavier has maintained an educational philosophy which seeks “to impress upon students the dignity of the human person created by God, to guide and counsel students in educational and vocational need and to help them prepare for college, for life work, and above all, for life itself.”

As the school year closed this past summer, Brother Brian Davis, Headmaster at Xavier, took a moment to reflect on the Xavier’s first fifty years in the school magazine’s summer edition, commenting on how some things had changed but many had stayed the same—particularly the commitment of the school, faculty, staff, and students to service. Giving back to their communities and working to benefit those less fortunate has always been a central tenant of a Xavier education. Just this past year, students not only spent countless hours working in their hometowns, but also on service trips sponsored by the school to Guatemala and Camden, New Jersey. And the lessons they learn about service stay with Xavier graduates throughout their adult lives, with many remaining actively involved in public and community service.

Xavier has created an educational environment which fosters the spiritual, academic, and physical growth of its students and challenges them to use their talents in service—an environment perhaps best described by their motto, “Be a man. A man like Jesus.” The school’s motto is central to their philosophy, and is reflected throughout their curriculum and in the day to day activities of the students, faculty, and staff. I am proud to stand today to extend my sincere congratulations to them as they celebrate their 50th Anniversary and wish them all the best for many more years of success.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all

meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 10, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 11

10 a.m.

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the way forward from government shutdown and debt ceiling confrontation toward long-term fiscal sustainability and economic growth.

LHOB-1100

11 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the impacts of the Government shutdown on economic security.

SR-253

OCTOBER 15

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine small businesses, focusing on the government shutdown.

SR-428A

OCTOBER 23

2:15 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine the future of long-term care policy.

SD-562

SENATE—Thursday, October 10, 2013

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Immortal and wise God, may the memory of Your past mercies sustain us during these challenging times. As we have reached the 10th day of this Federal shutdown, strengthen our Senators with Your might, preserving them with Your grace, and instructing them with Your wisdom. Inspire them to take a step back from partisanship and to take a step forward toward patriotism, striving to strengthen and not weaken this land we love. Lord, make them alive and alert to the spiritual values which underlie all the struggle of this challenging season. Direct their going out and coming in as You energize them with Your presence. We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 10, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, the debt limit bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion. The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following leader remarks the time until 1 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders and their designees.

At 1 p.m. the Senate will recess subject to the call of the Chair for a special caucus meeting with the Presiding Officer.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.J. RES. 84, H.J. RES. 89, H.J. RES. 90, H.J. RES. 91

Mr. REID. There are four measures at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the measures by title for a second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 84) making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, and for other purposes.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 91) making continuing appropriations for the death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military servicemembers of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would object to any further proceedings with respect to these measures en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The measures will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. REID. The President issued a warning to Congress:

The full consequences of a default by the United States—or even the prospect of a default by the United States—are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar in exchange markets.

The President went on to warn of “risks, the costs, the disruptions, and

the incalculable damage” of failing to avert such a default.

This is not Barack Obama; this was Ronald Reagan in 1983.

Four years later in 1987, Reagan again warned Congress about the impacts of a default on the economy. He said:

This brinkmanship threatens the holders of government bonds and those who rely on Social Security and veterans benefits. Interest rates would skyrocket, instability would occur in the financial markets, and the Federal deficit would soar.

Yet three decades later, an alarming number of Republicans have denied or downplayed the seriousness of a first-ever default on the full faith and credit of the United States.

To these default deniers, east is west, north is south, black is white, and right is wrong.

Let's talk about what raising the debt actually means. It simply means we are going to pay our bills. It is not a vote to spend more money to authorize new programs or to buy new things. It is a vote to pay the bills.

The Federal Government has already incurred these bills, bills for roads and bridges—we have already built them—the warships we have already commissioned, wars that have been waged and tax breaks that have been charged on a national credit card.

A vote to avert default is a vote to pay the bills for all these and more.

Many Republicans are in the press today, and have been for the past week or 10 days, arguing. Why worry about it? It will all work out.

These same Republicans who argue that we should default on the Nation's bills voted time and time again to spend borrowed money, and a lot of it, without any regard for the long-term effect it would have. These Republicans voted to sell government bonds to China, Saudi Arabia, and Japan to pay for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Republican Senators have come to this floor and lamented raising the debt. We have to raise this debt because of two unpaid wars costing trillions of dollars; tax breaks for the wealthy costing trillions of dollars, all given to the rich with borrowed money; wars fought with borrowed money.

During the Bush administration, these same Republicans were happy to run up America's credit cards to the tune of trillions of dollars. Their theory was lower the taxes; it will be great for the economy. They are now howling about the debts they created, the debts they voted for. Never mind that with little help from Republicans in Congress, President Barack Obama

has reduced the ratio of deficit to gross domestic product from 9 percent to 4 percent. This is very good, in spite of the debt he has been trying to get charge of; it wasn't his.

Now that the bill for the Republicans' excesses has come due, the bills for wars they supported and the tax cuts they have received, they are not willing to pay them. They want to walk out on that check.

Many of these same Republicans also say we can avoid default by prioritizing whom to pay and when we pay them. They say we should pay foreign debt-holders first. They all agree with that. China would be first, then Saudi Arabia, and maybe Japan.

We shouldn't and couldn't pay Social Security recipients under that scenario, veterans or Medicare. No matter how much we would want to, we couldn't do it. There would be no money to do it. In addition to having shockingly skewed priorities, Republicans are also using very flawed logic.

Here is a real-world example. Let us say the Presiding Officer has a mortgage, car payment, and a cell phone bill. The Presiding Officer has to decide: Which one should I pay? I can't pay them all. Which one should I pay?

It doesn't matter if the Presiding Officer picks one of them because he has defaulted anyway. He can't pay his bills. He likely would never be able to buy another car, cell phone, certainly not a house. His credit would be ruined for the foreseeable future.

The same thing would happen to our country. One week from today—and that is not a definite time, it could be a couple days before or a couple of days after, but we are there; let's say a week from now and use that as a point of reference—the United States has no money. It can't borrow any money. The Federal Government paid China but failed to pay Social Security recipients, unemployment benefits or the salaries of our brave men and women fighting in uniform.

The damage not only to our credit rating, world credit rating, but also to our global reputation would be profound and irreversible. The risks, the costs, the disruptions and the damage would be incalculable. This is what President Ronald Reagan said.

Why don't they listen to this man they say is such a great leader—and was. I agree. He was a tremendous President. I didn't agree with him all the time, but he was a real leader. He, more than anyone else, is responsible for ending the Cold War. There are many who say he couldn't fit in the Republican Party of today.

Robert Dole, who was the majority leader of the Senate from the State of Kansas, a patriotic American, said himself he doesn't fit in the Republican Party today.

The stakes couldn't be higher. A global economic recession, and possibly

even depression, face this great country. This is why President Obama reached out to House Republicans, inviting them to the White House yesterday afternoon for a serious discussion. Guess what they said. We are too busy. We will send a few of us, but we are too busy. Remember, the House is led by this same man who said he wanted to have a conversation, but they are unwilling to have one with him.

I was disappointed to hear that the same intractable Republican leaders who caused the current government shutdown were unwilling to even allow their Members to meet with the President for a constructive conversation. Again, they will send—I think they picked 17 out of the 232 they have. This great conversation is one they don't want.

They want to talk, but their actions tell another story. They have caused enough economic turmoil with the reckless shutdown of the Federal Government. If that is not enough, now we have the debt ceiling coming in about 1 week. If Republicans force default on the Nation's debt, it would be magnitudes worse than the damage they have already caused our great country with this senselessly created government shutdown.

Yesterday, Fidelity, the Nation's largest mutual fund manager, with \$500 billion in assets, announced it would sell all of its short-term government bonds because of the threat of default. Today there will be more.

Yesterday, government bonds were considered the safest investment in the world. Will they be so tomorrow? Time will only tell. If the United States fails to pay its bills, that safe haven will disappear very quickly.

We are going to vote Saturday on the ability to proceed to a clean debt ceiling. We will find out how Senate Republicans wish to proceed. Economists say the consequences of not paying our bills, not extending the debt ceiling, would be immediate and catastrophic. This isn't a bunch of Harvard left-wingers.

Even Republican economist Douglas Holtz-Eakin said debt deniers are dead wrong. He said a failure to raise the debt ceiling leads to very bad economic outcomes and chaos in financial markets.

Fidelity's move is only the first sign of economic chaos and will continue to spread the closer America comes to defaulting on its bills. With every day that passes, it is more and more important for Republicans to stop denying the reality of default and start working with us to find common ground.

All we have said is open the government. Let us pay our bills. We will negotiate with them on anything. We will have a conversation with them about anything. Open the government. Let us pay our bills. Then we will negotiate.

RECOGNITION OF MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to start this morning by quoting something my good friend the majority leader said back in 2007—back when Congress was weighing whether to raise the debt ceiling. Here is what the majority leader said back then:

Until we change the policies that led down this path, we will be back year after year, digging the hole ever deeper.

And, of course, that is essentially what so many Americans are saying today: If we are going to address the debt ceiling, then let's also address the root causes of the debt. It just makes good sense.

One would think our friend the majority leader would continue to agree with this logic as well, but that is not what he has been saying lately. He is basically saying that it would be irresponsible for Congress to address the most pressing problem we face in the country, that it would be reckless to raise the debt ceiling if that also meant doing something about the debt. In other words, he now seems to think the best thing to do about our crushing Federal debt is to do nothing at all. That is why my friend the majority leader introduced legislation this week to now allow another \$1 trillion to be added to the debt with no strings attached at all; none, just a \$1 trillion debt ceiling increase: Just keep raising the credit card limit and letting someone else deal with it later on.

We now have a debt close to \$17 trillion—nearly double what it was in 2007. We are borrowing nearly \$2 billion a day—\$2 billion a day—and apparently our friends on the other side are fine with that. They want us to give Washington a free pass to borrow and spend \$1 trillion more. He is so comfortable with all of this, my friend the majority leader rejected the President's own proposal this week to do a short-term increase followed by a negotiation on reforms.

Well, in my view, we were sent here to solve problems, not to defer them. We were sent here to confront the challenges of the moment, not ignore them. That is why the majority leader's proposal just won't fly, because it is completely at odds with the wishes of most Americans. And that is something the President and a lot of other Senate Democrats agreed with when a Republican President was asking for a debt limit increase. Of course, the problem is a lot more serious now than it was back then.

Here is something else. Neither side wants to default on our debts. Neither side will allow it. That is certainly the case, and people should know that. It is irresponsible to do nothing about the debt, and it is irresponsible to be stirring up anxiety about default, but that

doesn't mean the American people are wrong to ask that a debt limit increase include reforms aimed at actually tackling the problems that got us in this position in the first place, especially since what our country has routinely done in the past is just that.

Going back to the Eisenhower administration, requests to raise the debt ceiling have often been tied to important fiscal reforms—nearly two dozen times going back to the Eisenhower administration. That is how we got the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings reforms in the 1980s. That is how we achieved balanced budgets in the 1990s. That is how we secured significant spending reductions in President Obama's first term—spending reductions on which he later campaigned.

Now President Obama seems to think Congress should just increase the borrowing limit on his already maxed-out credit card without a single negotiation. He seems to think the representatives of the American people should just do what he says when he says it and because he says it, no questions asked—no questions asked. You know, that is not just irresponsible, it is not the way Presidents of both parties have dealt with this problem in the past. Reagan negotiated, Clinton negotiated, and if President Obama wants America to increase the credit limit, he will negotiate too.

I would also like to address one of the President's favorite talking points these days. He says he won't negotiate over "the bills Congress has already racked up." Look, if the President actually believed his own talking point, he wouldn't threaten to veto virtually every Republican attempt to get spending under control. We have tried endlessly. The only times we can even get him to discuss sensible budget reforms is when he is absolutely forced to—when Washington has to deal with things like the debt ceiling. So let's drop the tired talking points and just get about negotiating.

I know the President doesn't like the fact that Americans elected a divided government, but they did. We have a divided government, and no matter how much he tries to divide us, at the end of the day he is going to have to deal with a Congress he doesn't entirely control.

The American people can be persuaded to raise the debt ceiling, but they are not in any mood to simply hand over a blank check. They are looking for sensible reforms. So if the President wants to increase his credit limit, let's get to the table and negotiate. He has been inviting Members of Congress to the White House this week. In fact, we were told earlier today that Senate Republicans have been invited to meet with the President tomorrow morning. That is a good start but only if it means he has decided to drop his refusal to negotiate on solutions. But if

this is just a meeting where he simply reiterates that he won't negotiate, then it certainly won't be very productive.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

Under the previous order, the time until 1 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I received an email this morning from an old friend. He is the father of a disabled veteran. This veteran is a quadriplegic—a victim of a roadside bomb in Iraq. He has gone through multiple surgeries. At some point most people would have given up on him. In fact, they even talked about, at the age of 24, his being sent to a nursing home for the rest of his life. His father said: No, we are not going to let that happen to our son. He brought him to Chicago, where he received extraordinary treatment at the Rehabilitation Institute, and he started his slow, steady climb back to life. He is home now. He is a father, married, has two small children, and his mom and dad live with him to help out. The people in the community he lives in—it is not in Illinois, it is in North Carolina—have been so generous, building the perfect home for him and his wheelchair and giving him as many opportunities as he could possibly enjoy in his life.

This is a great story of a great family and a great American hero. But his father wrote me an email today and said: We are worried. We are worried about the November disability check. Senator, we need it. We need that check.

I wrote back to him and I said: I will move Heaven and Earth and do everything I can to make sure that payment is made.

And I believe it will be made. Somehow, it will be made. But I had to tell him that we are facing an unnecessary crisis in America created by politicians on Capitol Hill.

Shutting down the government of the United States of America? What does that say about our Nation? What does it say about us in the Senate and the House that we have reached this point, that we are deciding today on the four or five bills that just passed the House? The House has decided what little agency of government, what little spending program they will approve each day—each day. It is estimated it will take them almost 2½ months to fully fund the government at this pace—2½ months of uncertainty as they decide day by day what little program, what little agency they will reopen. Well, that is just plain wrong, and every time they have offered that, we have said to them: Open the government. It is essential.

There was a story 2 or 3 days ago about five American families who were notified that they had lost their sons and daughters, who were killed in Afghanistan. Traditionally, the U.S. Government comes through quickly after that tragic information is shared with the family and gives them a financial helping hand to arrange for them to come to Dover, DE, for the arrival and return of their fallen hero. But because of the government shutdown brought on by the Republicans, there was a question as to whether we could even make that payment.

Luckily, a charity stepped forward—Fisher House. This is an extraordinary charity that does so many great things for veterans who are disabled and need help. They said: We are going to step in and help these families until the government gets its act together, until the politicians reopen the government.

Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel announced yesterday this new development. Well, God bless the Fisher House charity, but it shouldn't have been necessary. If we had done our job, it wouldn't be necessary; the government would be open; this family whom I love, with this disabled veteran, wouldn't be worried about that next check if we simply did the responsible thing and opened the government.

Then there is a second issue which, although hard to believe, is even larger in scope. The Republicans refuse to give us a chance to extend the debt ceiling of America. What is the debt ceiling? This morning I listened as the minority leader said it is raising the credit card limit. No, it isn't. That is not an accurate statement. It is raising the authority of our government to borrow money to pay for what we have already spent. Many of the same politicians who voted for the spending bills now don't want to pay for them. They do not want to extend this debt ceiling—the credit of the United States. That is totally irresponsible. It is like ordering the biggest meal on the menu and then refusing to pay when the bill comes. That is where they stand. That is what they are arguing.

But it gets even worse. It will be the first time in the history of the United States of America that we will have defaulted on our national debt—the first time we have called into question the full faith and credit of the United States of America. How serious is that? Let me tell you how serious it is. Pick up the morning paper. "World leaders fear a default by U.S." in the Washington Post. I read it, and it says:

That default scenario is bringing increasingly urgent pleas from foreign leaders, some who describe their grave concern, others who chide the United States about the risks of political brinkmanship, beg its leaders to act responsibly and wonder whether the world's superpower is showing some cracks.

Now, are you ready for this? Do you know who was preaching to us yesterday about responsibility in governing

the United States of America? Are you ready for this? This is a quote from Russian President Vladimir Putin:

This is highly important for all of us. I am hopeful that all the political forces in the United States will be able to resolve this crisis as quickly as possible.

So now we are being preached to by President Putin about how to run a country. Well, that is embarrassing, and it is totally unnecessary. The failure to extend the debt limit of the United States is irresponsible and reckless.

It isn't only the Russians who are calling us to task but our closest ally, the United Kingdom. This is what an analyst in London's financial district had to say:

The outlook for the British economy is decent but still fairly fragile. Anything like a U.S. debt default with significant global repercussions would be bad news for the U.K.

That is a quote from Howard Archer, chief UK economist at IHS Global Insight in London.

The Japanese, now emerging from a terrible economic circumstance, one of our greatest creditors, are worried about their debtor, the United States, paying its debts. Is anyone else embarrassed by this? We all should be. This is the creation of politicians in Washington.

The Republican shutdown, the Republican refusal to extend the debt ceiling is irresponsible and reckless. It will not only hurt these foreign nations, it will not only hurt the reputation of the United States as an economic leader in the world, it is going to hurt families and businesses all over the United States. But don't take the word of this Democratic Senator; go to the Business Roundtable, one of the strongest supporters of the Republicans in Congress. They sent us a letter last week and called the default on America's debt catastrophic, begging Republicans and Democrats not to do anything this senseless.

What impact will it have on families? Hold on tight. Watch what happens as we get up to this cliff or go over it when it comes to the debt ceiling. You can follow it every day. If you have a mutual fund, if you own a stock, if you have a savings account, or if you have a retirement account, you can watch it melt away as the politicians give their speeches on Capitol Hill.

It is totally irresponsible and reckless.

We need to open this government. We need to pay our bills. We can sit down and negotiate everything and anything—that is the offer that has been made—only after we have met our responsibilities.

Let me also add that Speaker BOEHNER said last week and some of us were relieved to hear it: There will never be a default on America's debt. He followed that up within 24 hours with a list of nonnegotiable conditions before

he would agree to that. That is not responsible. It is reckless. It is reckless political conduct. How can we do this to the families, to businesses, to the farmers, and to our allies around the world?

It is time to say, as the Chaplain of the Senate did yesterday, enough is enough. It is time for grownups to stand up on the other side of the aisle and join grownups on this side of the aisle to do the right thing: Open the government, pay our bills, sit down, and honestly negotiate through these issues. We don't have much time. October 17 is the deadline. Today is October 10. We have 1 week before the bottom falls out of our economy and the economies around the world.

I listened to economists on the other side, the so-called really conservative economists, say: It really doesn't matter. We can default. We really don't need to extend our debt ceiling. These flat-earth economists are the same folks who are in denial when it comes to other scientific evidence in so many other areas, whether it is climate change or evolution—you pick it. They are entitled to their views, as fringe as they may be, as extreme as they may be. But to think that Members of Congress, Members of the Senate are buying this line of baloney is hard to understand and impossible to justify to the American people.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I think one of the things we ought to be observing, here at least, is courteous rules among ourselves. This is meant to be the greatest deliberative body in the world. If we follow the rules, follow the regular order, follow the committee process, and follow the ways through the committee processes for resolving disagreements and disputes, I think we can get through this.

I believe on both sides of the aisle there are pragmatic people devoted to this country who want to solve the two major problems we have facing us right this minute; that is, to reopen government, because we are now in the 10th day of a shutdown; and, No. 2, to meet the debt obligations of the United States of America as mandated in the 14th Amendment of the Constitution.

I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the dome: Let's reopen government. Let's pay our bills. And let's get through the regular committee processes to solve our problems.

There are those on the other side of the dome in the House of Representatives that are proposing a new supercommittee. We have been there, and we have done that. After the 2011 crisis, when we faced our debt limit, there was a process put in place called a supercommittee. It went nowhere. This new idea will go nowhere as well. It is

a new process that will only result in more delay.

I think we have two supercommittees. I call them supercommittees because they are great committees. They are wonderful committees. That is the Budget Committee chaired by Senator PATTY MURRAY and her ranking member Senator JEFF SESSIONS, himself a distinguished judge from Alabama, so he knows about conflict resolution. There is the Appropriations Committee that deals with discretionary spending, chaired by me and my vice chairman Senator RICHARD SHELBY, again a seasoned fiscal conservative who knows how to concentrate on the bottom line so we can be a more frugal government but also be an effective government. Let that committee do its job.

There is also the Finance Committee chaired by Senator MAX BAUCUS. I know the ranking member Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa is on the floor. He has an incredible history of being a compassionate conservative and he knows the Tax Code and knows the values of Iowa—which is, let's put country above party.

Instead of inventing new committees and new processes, free us up to do our job. Free us up to be able to do what the committee process is meant to be able to do.

For me and the Appropriations Committee, we moved all of our appropriations bills. We are ready to come to the floor. We are ready to go to conference if called up, if we have a method for being able to move. We are ready to do it.

Senator MURRAY on the Budget Committee is ready to go to conference with the House. But 21 times she was blocked by 6 naysayers primarily representing a tea party, small faction within the Republican Party.

The Republican Party, the Grand Old Party, has traditionally understood that you maintain the values of the country, that you are fiscally conservative, but you follow the rules that were established. The rules of the Budget Committee passed by the Senate in the Budget Control Act say they were supposed to have their job done on April 15. Well, we moved the budget on March 23, over 200 days ago, and over 20 requests to go to conference with me, with Congressman PAUL RYAN, and with his House counterparts to work out what our discretionary spending should be. What should our revenues be? What should we evaluate in terms of our mandatory spending where we can take a look at it but not shrink those earned benefits like Social Security and VA benefits that people count on and work their whole life for and even put their life on the line? We have to be able to do our job.

I will tell you what has been the latest situation that has so shocked me. We are on the verge of being a deadbeat nation. We are on the verge of being a

global deadbeat nation. What is a deadbeat? A deadbeat is someone who does not meet their financial obligations.

Over the last 3 days, we have heard about how the families of the men and women who died in the line of duty serving their country and are entitled to a death benefit were not going to get it because of the government shut-down.

The Fisher family—well known for serving military families, well known and so deeply cherished—offered to step forward to pay that. The philanthropy of the United States, instead of the public responsibility of the United States.

I want to thank the Fisher family for stepping forward. But, my gosh, what humiliation. We are the United States of America, with the strongest and best military in the world, and to honor its obligation to its own, the United States has to borrow money for a death benefit. That is deadbeat. I think it is humiliating. I think it is despicable. It shows just how low we have sunk.

We can get it back. It is in our power because this isn't being inflicted on us. This is what is being inflicted on us by other Americans sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America. When they took that obligation, they didn't take that obligation to just uphold the Amendments they like—like the second one—but they took that obligation to uphold all of the Amendments.

Let's start with the 14th, which says that the debt of the United States of America should not be called into question. That is clearly in the Constitution. No matter what, America will pay its bills. The reliability of the United States of America to meet its debt obligations is the financial glue that helps to hold the global economy together.

I am not going to go into doomsday or Armageddon or whatever. But if you actually read what the ambassadors of China and Japan—one a great ally and the other a formidable competitor—say: We are holding your debt. Pay your bills, or a fiscal crisis will begin to unravel in your country and around the world.

We cannot be a deadbeat nation. If we are a superpower, we must first of all show our power by meeting our financial obligations. How we get our public house in order by reducing our public debt is the subject again of the Appropriations Committee, the Budget Committee, and the Finance Committee. We have the capability to do it. I am really calling upon my friends on the other side of the aisle—and there are many. And it is not that we are pals. It is because we have come together out of mutual respect to solve mutual problems, being of help to each other mutually, that we have been able to keep the government functioning and doing it in a way that is smart and affordable.

So I say, please, let's reopen government. I am calling upon the House to pass the Senate continuing fiscal funding resolution that would reopen government on November 15 and that process to lay the groundwork for resolving our appropriations bills and canceling sequester.

I call upon those six that are blocking us—meaning the Senate—from going to the Budget Committee to do this. Those are two simple acts within our power to do. I hope that we can do it.

I intended today to speak about how the shutdown is affecting Maryland. We are really being hard hit. Maryland and Virginia have the largest concentration of Federal agencies, both civilian and military, in America. And, gee, we are proud of that. We are so proud of the fact that we have the National Institutes of Health, the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, which works with our private sector that enables us to sell products around the world.

We are so proud of the fact that we have the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, to make sure that we are looking out for large and small, whether it is to make sure that our mattresses are not flammable or that our cribs and swimming pools are safe for our children. I am proud of those agencies.

I am sorry that my Federal employees are not working. It is having a terrible impact on the Maryland economy. Both our comptroller and our Governor are talking about the significant amount of lost revenue that we are having because people aren't working and they aren't buying. If you talk to small businesses where these agencies are located, it is just terrible.

I just want to tell one story. The Social Security Administration is headquartered in Maryland in a community called Woodlawn, a wonderful community with a vibrant, civic engagement. It is just great. Across the street from the Social Security Administration is a small business called the Salsa Grill. It is usually crowded with lunch hour people, early morning coffee, those little baby showers that we women like to have or a birthday party the guys are throwing for one of their pals at lunchtime. The Salsa Grill last Friday, instead of 30 customers, had 3. The owner was quoted as saying if the shutdown goes on much longer, he won't be able to hang on any longer. This is what makes our economy great.

I talked to one of the largest automobile dealers in Maryland. The showrooms were empty in the Baltimore-Washington corridor last weekend, even though they had wonderful cars, new cars. They were ready to do deals for the old 2013 models they wanted to move out—empty; empty. This ripples

through our economy. This is not just, "Oh, we are going to contain government." We are hurting ourselves.

The fight about ObamaCare is over. Let's say goodbye to that fight. Let's get on to the fiscal issues of the United States of America. I say here, as the chair of the Appropriations Committee, I am ready to negotiate. I am ready to meet, to compromise, to see how we can have our domestic and defense discretionary spending done in a way that begins to reduce our public debt but will also have a progrowth way of public investments, making sure our country is safe, that we are building roads, building the superinformation highway, educating our young people, and doing research and development.

I know my time is up, but I believe very strongly that we have to solve our problems. I am ready to say to the other side of the aisle that I am ready to work together. That is because I have done it in the past. We actually like doing it, for us pragmatists to get into a room, solve problems, give and take, and actually learn from each other. I could give many examples of that.

Right now we need to set the example for the world that we are the greatest deliberative body. We have to get back to deliberating instead of delaying.

Please, for the House, pass the continuing funding resolution. For the Senate, limit your objection to the Budget Committee going into conference. Let's reopen the government, let's pay our bills, and sit down and negotiate in a way worthy of a great country, and let's honor the Constitution of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments by the distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee. As she said, she is ready to meet, ready to negotiate, ready to compromise, ready to work together.

I come today to say tomorrow Republican Senators are finally going to get a chance to talk with President Obama about reopening the government and dealing with the debt this Nation has, dealing with the debt limit.

Until very recently, President Obama has been far more interested in speaking with the press than in actually speaking with Republicans. Then we have this invitation to the White House. This morning in the Washington Post, what the administration says—it is a front-page article and it continues over to page 4—it says the White House "emphasized that Obama will not be negotiating."

We have the chair of the Appropriations Committee saying she is ready to meet, negotiate, and compromise, and the White House says President Obama will not be negotiating.

The question is, why are we going over to the White House in the first

place if the President is not interested in negotiating? Is it just to give him a photo op? I went to meetings like that during the health care debate more than 3 years ago. The President at the time would invite Republicans to a meeting and then he would reject every idea we would offer. If he had been more willing to accept Republican ideas, negotiate then, we would have had a bipartisan health reform bill that was accepted by the American people instead of a law that continues to have more people opposed than in favor of it.

That is going to be my message to the President tomorrow morning when we meet. This needs to be a real discussion, a real negotiation, when we agree on how we can reopen the Government, reduce our debt and help our economy grow. This is the sixth time in 5 years that President Obama has requested an increase in the debt ceiling. How much is he asking for? According to the majority leader, I understand it is \$1 trillion to extend between now until after the 2014 election.

That is an incredible amount of money. Just trying to figure out how much money that is, it is over \$1 million a minute. It is \$1 million every minute between now and 14 months from now. The President needs to realize that is unsustainable. We have a \$17 trillion debt. It is a debt on the back of our children and our grandchildren. We have families all across the country who have aspirations, anxieties, and anger about even the idea that their children and grandchildren will not be able to get careers, get jobs.

If we as a nation are going to incur more debt, we also have to find real savings. We cannot continue to increase our credit card debt, another new credit card after the President has maxed out the last one, and send this bill to the American people. It is time to set priorities. We want to get moving on real solutions, not just to our short-term problems but the long-term issues that face us as a nation as we try to work together in governing this Nation.

The House of Representatives has passed 12 individual continuing resolutions. These bills would open many different parts of the government right now, parts that we all agree should be kept operating. The House voted to pay for FEMA, Head Start, the National Institutes of Health, to open our national parks. Those bills have been sent to the Senate. They have been sitting here without action at all.

Here in the Senate I know a lot of Democrats are saying they support these functions. We see this picture on the front page of the Washington Post this morning with the mayor, Mayor Vincent Gray, the mayor of Washington, DC, on the steps of the Capitol, talking to the majority leader saying, "Sir, we are not a department of the government. We are simply trying to

be able to spend our own money." Yet the majority leader, who is blocking these votes to allow the District of Columbia to do what they are requesting and what the House has said yes, they should be able to do, the majority leader is saying, "Don't screw it up, OK? Don't screw it up."

The majority leader continues to object to votes on these bills. History supports bipartisan action of the House and not the stonewalling of the President and the Democratic leadership in the Senate.

In the middle of the last government shutdown, Congress passed and President Clinton signed laws to allow a wide variety of specific programs to function. It is a precedent we should be following today.

The President also keeps saying he will not negotiate on the debt limit. He tries to make people believe that never before has Congress included "issues that have nothing to do with the budget and nothing to do with the debt"—this is the President's quote—in its negotiation over the debt limit.

The facts are not on the President's side. Even the Fact Checker in the Washington Post gave the President four Pinocchios on that claim, essentially saying it was completely not true. Negotiations have actually occurred many times on the debt limit.

From 1978 until 2013, the debt limit has been raised 53 times. Of those votes, the debt ceiling increase was linked to something else more than half the time. So more than half of the debt limit increase votes since 1978 carried other provisions. They were not, as the President claims, clean increases.

The President wants to ignore that history. The President wants to pretend that raising the debt limit is something that has to be done without any deliberations, negotiations, dissent, and on his terms alone. He says he will not negotiate at all.

It is strange to be coming from his mouth because that is very different from the position that came out of his mouth when he was Senator Obama. That was not that many years ago. In 2006, Senator Obama voted against a debt limit increase because he said it was a sign that Washington cannot pay its bills. Senator Obama complained that the Federal debt had increased by \$5 trillion in 5 years. Under President Obama, Washington's debt has grown by more than \$6 trillion in 4 years.

Senator Obama said, "The more we depend on foreign nations to lend us money, the more our economic security is tied to the whims of foreign leaders whose interests might not be aligned with ours."

Under President Obama, foreign holdings of Federal debt have increased by 82 percent.

Senator Obama said that, "Washington is shifting the burden of bad

choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren." He said at the time, "America has a debt problem, and a failure of leadership."

A debt problem and a failure of leadership.

President Obama is now asking for his sixth increase in debt in less than 5 years. Why is this, then, not a debt problem and a failure of leadership?

Senator Obama was right to say at the time we have a debt problem. President Obama should remember what made him say that in 2006, and do something about it now. He should join Republicans willing to talk about real entitlement reform as part of negotiations over raising the debt ceiling. He should be willing and anxious to talk about his health care law and how it is going to become a major factor driving Washington's debt even higher in the future if we do not replace it with responsible reforms today.

The President should embrace bipartisan continuing resolutions passed by the House as a way of reopening as much of the government as possible while we have responsible and reasonable discussions, deliberations, and negotiations. President Obama should stop posturing, stop playing games, and stop punishing the American people as he has been doing under this current government shutdown.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday we learned that for the remainder of the government shutdown one of America's great charitable organizations, the Fisher House Foundation, will provide survivor benefits to military families who have lost a loved one on the field of battle. Fisher House is really just almost too good to believe, a wonderful charity that has helped military families all across our country, including folks in seven different facilities in Texas, from the VA North Texas Health Care System to the William Beaumont Army Medical Center in El Paso, the Carl R. Darnall Medical Center, the Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center, to the Brooke Army Medical Center in San Antonio, the Wilford Hall Ambulatory Surgical Center, and the South Texas Veterans Health Care System. I personally extend my thanks and express my gratitude to Fisher House for making such a tremendous commitment to our military heroes and making such a generous offer for the families of the fallen.

Secretary Hagel was quoted when he announced that Fisher House was going to fill the gap left by the cutoff of Federal funds, saying he was “offended, outraged, and embarrassed that the government shutdown had prevented the Department of Defense from fulfilling this most sacred responsibility in a timely manner.”

I agree with his outrage and sense of offense and embarrassment. But I want to recall how we got here. If our friends across the aisle had simply agreed to delay the individual mandate and to eliminate the special congressional carveout under ObamaCare, this never would have happened.

We have now reached day 10 of the shutdown. Over the last week and a half, administration officials have done as much as they possibly can to make this shutdown as painful as possible. They made the decision to barricade the World War II memorials and monuments along the National Mall, hoping to keep out our veterans, many near the end of their lives, for whom these monuments were built as a way of honoring their sacrifice. They kept these barricades in their way to impede or perhaps prevent them from visiting things such as the World War II Memorial.

The Obama administration we know has temporarily closed or interfered with privately run parks and historic sites, such as the Claude Moore Colonial Farm in Northern Virginia.

Why would the administration, in order to turn up the heat or increase the pain of the shutdown, impose itself to shut down a privately run park? Well, there is a reason for that, and it is because this is a cynical game—not one designed to get to a solution but one to gain political advantage. It should be offensive, embarrassing, and outrageous—to use the words of Secretary Hagel—for a political party to try to use a shutdown for such craven political gain.

Meanwhile, our Democratic friends have refused to support legislation that would reopen our memorials and national parks and fund the National Institutes of Health. I heard the distinguished assistant majority leader come to the floor a few days ago and decry the fact that cancer research for children was being temporarily stopped because of the shutdown. We have come to the floor and offered a bill that would reopen it, along with clinical trials, and it has been refused by our Democratic colleagues. We have come to the floor—and the House has passed these bills—and said: Let’s fund the Veterans’ Administration to make sure the backlog of disability claims gets taken care of and so our veterans who have given so much and sacrificed so much don’t have to wait on getting their disability claims processed. That was objected to by the majority leader. They also objected to funding our mili-

tary Reserves. As I said, they seem intent on maximizing the pain in hopes of gaining political advantage. That is outrageous, that is embarrassing, and it should be embarrassing.

Before I conclude, I want to say to all the military families out there who have lost a son, a daughter, a husband, a wife, a father, or a mother on the field of battle—I want to leave you with the words of a great American President who said:

I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

Those noble and inspiring words in that prayer are the type of tribute we should be giving to those families who have lost loved ones on the field of battle, not the sort of shortsighted political treatment that has been given by the efforts across the aisle to shut down every reasonable opportunity to alleviate some of this hardship and to mitigate some of the pain.

We have done it together successfully when it comes to paying our uniformed Active-Duty military. We got a unanimous consent agreement between the parties to make sure our Active-Duty troops are getting paid. Why is it we can’t do the same thing with the survivors of those who lost their lives on the field of battle?

When I asked unanimous consent yesterday for the majority leader to agree to that piece of legislation, he asked to delay consideration of that request until the Defense Department could announce its proposal with the Fisher House. Again, I commend the Fisher House for stepping up and trying to fill the void, but why should we not do our job? Why should Congress not act? We should act and I hope very soon. We can do our job and honor these fallen and their families in an appropriate way by coming together as Republicans and Democrats and making sure these survivor benefits to the families who have lost loved ones on the field of battle are paid on a timely basis without being caught up in the political games occurring inside the Halls of Congress.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, a colleague recently described on this floor his experience flying in a private aircraft when a fire broke out in the cockpit of the plane. He observed that putting out the fire distracted the pilots from flying the aircraft and that

they precipitously lost altitude. This tea party shutdown and the tea party’s threat to our country’s credit, like that fire in the cockpit, are distracting us from flying the plane.

I dispute the notion that those who caused the shutdown have good standing to come to this floor and criticize the way the Obama administration is implementing a shutdown that we don’t want on our side of the aisle and that the Obama administration does not want. The tea party and Speaker BOEHNER, for their insistence on lighting that fire in the cockpit, are answerable to history and their consciences.

In the spirit of getting back to flying the plane, I will talk about, as I usually do, a real and looming crisis—not the manmade fire the tea party has lit in the cockpit of our government. That tea party shutdown could end tomorrow if the Speaker of the House would simply call up the measure the Senate passed. He refuses to do so, and it is his continued indulgence that keeps this shutdown going.

Climate change is for real. It is not manmade, nor is it something the Speaker can turn off with a vote. It is coming at us, and it is time to wake up to what carbon pollution is doing to our atmosphere and ocean.

Regrettably, one of the reasons Congress is still asleep is that the worst culprits—the big corporations that do the worst carbon polluting—are pretending it is not that bad, it is not that serious, and they should keep doing what they are doing; the status quo is fine. It causes me to wonder why it is that corporations seem never to admit they are wrong. Why is “oops” a word they can’t seem to use?

When it turned out that people would be a lot safer with seatbelts, did the car industry say: Oops. We should have put those in and put seatbelts in the cars. No. They fought and they had to be defeated, and then we got seatbelts.

When cigarette makers found out their product made people really addicted and really sick, did they say: Oops. We better figure out a way to not kill so many people. No. They fought and they lied for decades.

When it turned out that lead paint damaged children’s brains, did the lead paint companies say: Oops. We better warn folks about that and clean it up. No. They fought against protections and had to be defeated. Indeed, they are still fighting.

When it turned out that aerosol refrigerants and propellants were eating away at the Earth’s ozone layer, did the manufacturers say: Oops. That is dangerous, and we better come up with a safer product. No. They fought the change, but they lost, and now they are making money making new safer products.

When acid rain was killing off the fish in the northeastern lakes, did the big utilities say: Oops. We better clean

up our emissions. No. They fought the changes until they were forced to clean up.

When the flame-retardant industry found out its product was dangerous and ineffective, did they say: Oops. This flame-retardant stuff is hurting people and doing creepy things in nature, so we better knock it off. Nope. It is still fighting while whales turn into swimming toxic waste.

Now that carbon pollution has blown through 400 parts per million of CO₂ in the atmosphere—a first in human history—and launched the most rapid acidification ever seen in the oceans—and by that I mean going back to geologic time—are the polluters saying: Oops. We better take our billions of dollars in profit and trillions of dollars in capital and invest seriously in new fuels and power sources. Fat chance.

Corporations that are harming people never say “oops,” and for two big reasons. One reason is there is a lot of money at stake. They would not be in the business if they were not making money, and they don’t want to stop. The other reason is that corporations don’t have consciences, they have reputations. A reputation is something you can manage. Huge chunks of Madison Avenue and K Street are dedicated to managing corporate reputations. So with no conscience and only a reputation, you manage the problem that you are harming people.

By now, the strategy for managing a corporate reputation while hurting people is well developed. It is a common one across cigarettes, acid rain, lead paint, flame-retardants, refrigerants, and now carbon pollution. There is a playbook, and guess what. The big carbon polluters are following the playbook: one, pretend to care—that is important; two, attack the science, and if you can’t attack the science, attack the scientists themselves; three, claim it will cost consumers a fortune; and four, make your goal not victory but doubt.

Pretend to care.

I don’t know if you remember those phony-baloney Exxon ads that were all over the place a while ago with guys in lab coats, and they had these Lucite molecules floating around. They wanted you to believe they were out there looking for tomorrow’s clean fuels. Well, you got had.

Since 2005 ExxonMobil has been making tens of billions of dollars in profit every year. It is hard to pick through their numbers, but sources report that over that same time it only spent tens of millions per year on clean energy—about what it spent on advertising. They spent as much advertising their clean energy, it appears, as they did investing in it, and it was a tiny fraction of their profits, let alone their revenues.

Remember BP and their green Sun baloney? BP pulled completely out of

solar and completely out of U.S. wind investments once it had laid down a fat barrage of advertising about being beyond petroleum. Pretend to care.

Attack the science and even the scientists themselves.

The polluters have to do this through proxies. Nobody will really believe it if Exxon’s fingerprints are all over the attack on the science, so others do the dirty work.

One example is Virginia’s tea party attorney general Ken Cuccinelli, who attacked the top climate scientist at the University of Virginia. He used his powers of office—the special powers of office that are entrusted to attorneys general. Having been an attorney general, I know something about how precious and special those powers are. He used those powers to harass and subpoena a college professor. UVA’s lawyers stuck up for the professor, and the Virginia Supreme Court threw that nonsense out. But for the polluters behind it, it was right out of the playbook.

You may remember the polluters whipping up a phony scandal called climategate, pretending that a group of climate scientists were doing dishonest work. The scientists had to endure audit after audit, every single one of which gave them a totally clean bill of health. It turned out it was the cooked-up, phony scandal that was dishonest, but the polluters had a field day in the meantime. It was right out of the playbook.

Claim it will cost consumers a fortune.

This is a playbook classic. The big polluters are always talking about how it will cost you to clean up their act. Implicit is that they are going to put all the costs on to you and that they are not going to eat any of it and that their shareholders are not going to bear any of it.

Let’s get past that. What they conveniently overlook is that, for instance, under the Clean Air Act—yes, complying with the Clean Air Act did cost utilities a lot of money, but for every \$1 that was spent cleaning up to comply with the Clean Air Act, Americans have saved about \$40. They spend \$1, you save \$40, and they want you to believe that is a big problem?

The Office of Management and Budget does a little calculation called the social cost of carbon. The latest cost is \$36 per ton of CO₂ emitted. For every ton of carbon pollution the polluters don’t sell, we save \$36. But they will never tell us that side of the story, nor that there are more jobs now in green energy than in the entire oil and gas industry, nor that we are in an international race for tomorrow’s clean energy technology innovations. It is a race these big international corporations are perfectly happy to have America lose. It is no skin off their nose.

Last, their goal is not victory, it is doubt. They don’t want to convince anyone that climate change isn’t happening. They don’t need to do that. Of course, they couldn’t do that in any kind of a fair debate. All they need to do, the playbook strategy says, is to convince us, as we are driving down the road listening to the radio, that nobody is sure yet; that there is some doubt, but we don’t need to do anything just yet; that people can move on to their next worry; this one is still up for grabs. They will keep trying to push action on carbon pollution over that horizon of doubt, never having to prove their case.

The American people are being played for chumps in this game. It is a racket, and we are the mark.

Even so, even with all of that, the facts around us—what is happening to our woods and shores and farms and weather—are becoming so clear that even with the playbook they are losing, just like they ultimately lost on cigarettes and seatbelts, on lead paint and acid rain and the ozone hole.

Here is what Americans are saying: 61 percent of Americans say the effects of climate change are already affecting them personally or they see it happening in their lifetime.

Fifty-eight percent said the country should do more to address climate change, including 51 percent of Independents, while just 14 percent—14 percent—said we are doing enough already.

Sixty-five percent of voters support “the President taking significant steps to address climate change now”—65 percent. That number jumps up to 70 percent when looking at voters under 40 years old.

Sixty-six percent of young voters—two out of every three—say climate change is a problem to address, while just 27 percent say climate change is a natural event that humans can’t affect, and only 3 percent don’t believe climate change is happening.

Fifty-three percent of people say they would be less likely to vote for a politician who did not understand that climate change is a real problem.

Even in the red State of Texas, 70 percent believe global warming is happening, and more than half say more should be done about global warming at all levels of government.

Today is day 10 of the tea party shutdown. As we have pointed out over and over, it is a manufactured crisis. It goes away the instant Speaker BOEHNER stands in the House and calls the measure the Senate has passed, without amendments and without gimmicks, to the floor. It will pass. The crisis will be over.

This crisis is different. This is not a crisis of a fire in the cockpit that is being kept burning by Speaker BOEHNER who could stop it at any time; this is for real. This is Mother Nature—400

parts per million for the first time in 800,000 years is serious.

The tea party Republicans are wildly out of step with the American people on both issues, and it is time for them to wake up.

Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request, if I may ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia to yield for one moment.

I ask unanimous consent that Senators on the majority side be limited to 10 minutes each until 1 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized for up to 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QRM RULE

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, on August 28 of this year, the six Federal regulators of the banking industry reported out on their charge to promulgate a rule required by Dodd-Frank known as the QRM rule or the qualified residential mortgage.

The qualified residential mortgage rule was a rule that Senator LANDRIEU, Senator HAGAN, and I put into the Dodd-Frank legislation to provide for a parameter for residential mortgage loans to be exempted from the risk retention requirements of Dodd-Frank if they met a certain standard. These regulators were charged with establishing that standard. That law passed over 5 years ago and we are just now getting the promulgation of the rule, but I am happy to say I rise on the floor of the Senate to memorialize my support for a job well done. The qualified residential mortgage rule, which is being circulated now until October 28, is the right answer for the requirement of Dodd-Frank and for the American housing industry.

For the education of the Senate and the public at large, the Dodd-Frank law, in its desire to make sure loans that were underwritten were better underwritten and loans that were made were better made loans so there would be less default and less problems in the housing industry, required the banking industry to make only qualified residential mortgages as defined.

The original discussions within the banking industry were that part of that definition would be a required 20-percent downpayment, which I and many people in America strenuously objected to, because a 20-percent requirement to exempt from risk retention would be far too great a downpayment for most American families to meet, would have probably meant a decline in the housing market, even greater than we experienced in 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011, and would have had a negative impact on America's economy, unemployment, and America's health and well-being.

So the banking regulators did a great job in their rule which does the following: First of all, it equates QRM, or the qualified residential mortgage rule, with the QM rule, or the qualified mortgage rule, which Richard Cordray, the Director of the Consumer Finance Protection Bureau, promulgated 1 year ago. Mr. Cordray did an outstanding job of seeking input from people in the industry and the trades affected by the housing industry and wrote a rule that made sense. That rule required the following: It required good, solid underwriting. It required a maximum ratio of total debts to total gross income of 43 percent so we would not have somebody borrowing more than half of their take-home pay or their gross pay in order to service debts. That would mean people would have the money to pay their mortgage.

It required people to verify their income, credit, employment, the value of the property that is being purchased with the loan. All of those things are the standards that served America well for years until the subprime lending took place from 1999 until 2006.

So I commend Richard Cordray and the Consumer Finance Protection Bureau for defining a qualified mortgage as one that is well underwritten. A required downpayment is not necessary to have a qualified mortgage because underwriting is what led us into the difficulties of the past 5 years in the housing industry.

We went through a recession that was not a downpayment recession but an underwriting recession, and Congress itself was partially to blame when it mandated that Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae hold a certain percentage of their portfolios in what is known as qualified residential mortgages for the purposes of meeting the needs of underserved people in our society. Those underserved people in society ended up being credit risks or higher credit risks. They became known as subprime lenders. They got guaranteed by the government. They were sold in securities. When they defaulted, the securities went down, the American housing industry went down and the American Federal Reserve had to bail out people such as AIG and we went through the worst housing crisis in the history of the United States.

So the proposal of the six banking regulators to merge QRM and QM, they are recognizing that underwriting is the key to sound loans. By requiring good underwriting to exempt from the 5-percent risk retention required in Dodd-Frank, we are ensuring a robust housing market, robust and available capital through Freddie Mac, Fannie Mae, and private institutions, to ensure housing in America can return to the heights it has known in the past.

Quite frankly, we are never going to get below 7 percent unemployment, we are never going to get higher than 2

percent growth in America in our economy until we return to a robust housing market. We are not going to return to a robust housing market until we get liquidity in the credit markets for residential mortgages of a conventional nature. That is only going to happen when Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae can secure well underwritten loans and guarantee them so they can be sold in the marketplace.

The banking regulators who are now circulating the QRM rule for public comment did precisely the right thing by recognizing that underwriting was the problem and not downpayments.

Lastly, one of the things the regulators did put in their proposal for circulation for input was what if they did require a downpayment of 30 percent, would that be an exemption for the risk retention under QRM. I would implore the regulators not to consider doing that because a 30-percent downpayment would be even worse than a 20-percent downpayment. It would restrict even more Americans from becoming homeowners, and it would not address the problem. The problem was underwriting. The problem was not downpayment. Credit enhancements such as private mortgage insurance and things of that nature can supplant a downpayment requirement, but nothing can supplant quality underwriting.

Richard Cordray wrote a good rule, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is enforcing that rule, and I commend the bank regulators for merging the QRM rule with the QM definition to ensure that we return to a robust economy with a strong housing market, don't revisit the problems of the past with shoddy underwriting, and instead look forward to a brighter future for the American housing market.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, for nearly 2 weeks I have watched the debate on the Senate floor as well as on the House floor, and I have become more and more frustrated. My frustration is, in part—I would say in large part—driven by the contrast to what I see going on in my home State of Colorado.

During the past several weeks, Coloradans have come together in the wake of Biblical rains and beyond devastating flooding to begin the long process of rebuilding our State better and stronger. We in the West—and I think I can say we as Americans—are rugged cooperators. Sure, we are each strong individuals—and that is a strong point of view in the West; it is the core of who we are, that we are strong as individuals—but we know we are best when we band together, despite any political or philosophical differences, to face our shared challenges. I am doing my level best to bring that spirit to Washington, DC, especially

now in this time of shutdowns and ultimatums and ideology that doesn't make sense to the people I represent in Colorado. I invite all of my colleagues to come to Colorado to see the collaborations occurring in these flood-ravaged communities such as Jamestown, Lyons and Estes Park and Fort Morgan. There are no games. There is no posturing. There is no politics. There is just a doggedness to make their communities better. I surely hope the strength and the focus of Coloradans could be an inspiration to all of us as we tackle what are very pressing policy issues.

On that note, I wish to speak about one of my constituents, someone I work for—Jeff. He is a Federal employee. He demonstrates the resilience, to me, of the people of Colorado. But his situation also typifies the worst of what this shutdown and this brinkmanship is doing to the real people, the good people of my State of Colorado.

Jeff is a Federal employee. He was trapped for 3 days in last month's flood. That flood cost him almost everything. He has very few possessions left. Once he was free, he went immediately back to his day job. He was working for an agency that is integral to the flood disaster response. What happened? The government closed. So now he rents out an apartment. His home is inaccessible, literally, due to the flooding. He doesn't have a paycheck and he is being told he is not essential and he shouldn't come in to work.

There are a lot of reactions I have to that. There are a lot of reactions anybody who is paying attention would have to that. One is that now there is one less pair of boots on the ground helping with the flood response efforts in Colorado.

To a certain extent, politics is about finding the right strategy to advocate for what a person believes is right. But what is going on right now is shameful. What is happening to Jeff is flatout shameful.

What we are seeing is one faction of one party, in one Chamber, in one branch of government, holding this Nation's health, economy, and security hostage and, in the process, causing the Federal Government to shut down and threatening a government default on our obligations. By doing so, these individuals are holding our flood recovery hostage. It makes no sense.

I guess you have to ask yourself why. Why would a small group, a faction, be doing this? It strikes me that in part they are doing it because they are obsessed with undermining a law that is providing affordable health care to Americans, some for the first time in their lives, a law that is saving seniors hundreds of dollars a year on prescription drugs and is leveling the playing field when it comes to providing health care and putting consumers back in charge of their own health care.

I want to make this clear: After having legally passed both Houses of Congress, being affirmed by the Supreme Court, and then serving as a referendum in the just concluded campaign that overwhelmingly reelected President Obama, the Affordable Care Act is settled law. Let me say that again. The Affordable Care Act is settled law.

But describing it as settled law alone I know is not enough to resolve this latest crisis. So I would like to take viewers and my colleagues back a decade when the Presiding Officer was a Member of House at that time, when President George W. Bush pushed us to pass what was an unpaid-for Medicaid prescription drug benefit.

Members of my caucus over in the House felt that this massive unpaid law was thrust upon us without due consideration and at a time when we should not be racking up further debt. Many of us on my side of the aisle were literally reeling with anger after it passed. It also passed in ways with which we disagreed, in the middle of the night, literally. The desk in the House was kept open—I think the Presiding Officer knows—for close to 4 hours to find those last votes.

I was angry. I voted against that Medicare prescription drug benefit. I am sure I was as angry as some of my colleagues were when the Affordable Care Act passed over 3 years ago.

So what did I do? I took a lot of deep breaths. I listened to the counsel of people I respect, I listened to my own counsel, and I not only decided it was settled law, but I decided to start holding townhalls and listening sessions so I could help my constituents sign up for it. I knew it was the settled law of the land, just like ObamaCare is today, and I wanted my constituents to be best served by its implementation.

So I went out and spread the word about the benefits, figured out what questions my constituents would have. I wanted them to sign up. I wanted to make it a success. I wanted them to have those benefits.

So let's fast forward to today. Far from helping people, our friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle have relentlessly spread uncertainty about ObamaCare, attacking its implementation at every turn, and now to close down the Federal Government over their concerns about it.

We are in the 10th day of a government shutdown. Our national security has suffered. Seventy percent of the intelligence community is furloughed. We do not have enough food inspectors on the job. Our veterans are not getting the services not only that they need but that they have earned. Our national parks are closed, hurting economies like ours in Colorado. I mentioned Estes Park. Estes Park is the gateway to Rocky Mountain National Park. If Estes Park is going to

recover from these devastating floods, Rocky Mountain National Park has to be open for business.

This is not how the greatest Nation in the world can go on doing business. I have said from the very beginning—I think the Presiding Officer agrees with me—the Affordable Care Act is far from perfect. No mandate law is. As with every law, it will undoubtedly need some improvements and some constructive changes during its implementation. I am committed to doing that, just like we did after President Bush moved his prescription drug law to the finish line.

In the past few days we have seen statements indicating that some Republicans are starting to understand that this partisan focus on ObamaCare is futile. So as their next step they have seized on yet another destructive tactic, manufacturing a new crisis, an even more serious, potentially devastating crisis than shutting down the government. What have they done? They are threatening the full faith and credit of the Federal Government to push their budget demands. They have threatened to force us past the deadline, which is October 17—that is a week from today—when the United States will no longer be able to meet its financial obligations.

Grandstanding on funding the government is bad enough. If we do not agree on a way forward to reopen the government, but we also do not agree on a way to ensure that the Treasury Department does not default on our Nation's debt obligations, we will seriously damage global confidence in the United States, make no mistake. There are some voices in this building who think that will not happen. They are wrong.

If we damage the global confidence in the United States, we are going to hamper our economic recovery, we will slow job creation, and we will make borrowing costs more expensive for government and families alike. This is no way to win the global economic race in which we find ourselves. Coloradans are telling me in every way they can that they expect a lot better than this.

Ronald Reagan used to joke in only the way he could that he was not worried about the debt; it is big enough to take care of itself. But every American should worry if Congress refuses to meet the obligations we have already made.

I know many Americans are worried about our debt and our capacity to pay the bills we have incurred. I have been worried about this for a long time. I think if you would ask anybody around here, they would tell you I would vote in a minute for a sensible grand bargain. It is true. I have worked across the aisle and built a record of efforts to reduce wasteful spending and set our budget on a more sustainable footing. It should be one of our top priorities. It has to be one of our top priorities.

I have been a longtime supporter of the line-item veto. I supported the initial structure around which the Simpson-Bowles deficit reduction commission worked. I called for an end to earmarks. I worked with Senator COBURN from Oklahoma on ending some wasteful public subsidies, including those for the political party conventions every 4 years. It is why I was the first Democrat to champion a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution in many a year. I am not the only Member, as well, of my party who has been fighting for commonsense reforms.

This is critically important work. I would love nothing more than to bring a serious deficit reduction plan to the floor and pass it along with raising our debt limit to avoid an American default.

But let me be crystal clear: To default on our debt because a grand bargain eludes us would make our debt and deficits even worse and thrust us into an economic tailspin. It is irresponsible to even suggest forcing America into default as a legitimate negotiating position.

Let's sit down and have a grownup discussion about these important issues, but not like this. Let's fund the government, let's pay our bills, and then let's sit down and negotiate again. Negotiation is good. Compromise is good. But we cannot have this important set of discussions with one party constantly threatening to shut down the government or throw our country into default, each of which makes our deficits and debt even worse.

We have, literally, centuries of examples of a Congress collaborating, working together. We have done that for over 200 years. We can debate, we can have contentious back-and-forth, but in the end we need to compromise and agree. We need a comprehensive and balanced deficit reduction plan that can pass both Chambers and be signed into law.

No party gets to threaten the American economy and shut down the government when they do not get their way. No party gets to jeopardize middle-class families' 401(k)s or senior citizens' retirement savings or set our economic recovery back just because their positions are not strong enough to prevail on their own.

That just is not the way to address our Nation's shared problems. And trust me, our debt and deficits are a shared problem. We can do better.

I want to begin to conclude by again referring to the Coloradans I am so fortunate to represent, just like the Presiding Officer, I know, is honored to represent the good people of Wisconsin. Coloradans have shown the true strength of our State in the wake of this tragic flooding that literally has wiped communities off the map and destroyed thousands of homes. If we could have done anything to prevent that natural disaster, we would have.

We now face a potential manmade disaster. We have to protect Americans from a looming manmade disaster that is emerging right here. We have to bridge the partisan divide. We have to end this government shutdown. We have to stave off an American default. We have to pay our bills. We could do this today if Speaker BOEHNER would just allow the House to vote on a clean funding resolution that we have already sent to the House, with the House numbers in it, by the way. So let's just see a vote in the House. The continuing resolution would pass in the House today with Republican and Democratic votes.

So let's just vote. Let's hold the vote. The Presiding Officer and I served in the House. When we were eager to go to work we would shout: Vote, vote, vote; work, work, work. It is time for the House to go to work. Let's vote to end this debt ceiling crisis and make sure our Nation pays the debts it has already incurred.

These are the basic functions of Congress. If we fail to act, history will never forgive us—any of us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the multiple issues that have now presented themselves to us in the Senate and to the U.S. Congress and, frankly, the American people.

I have been in several hearings this morning. The first was with Secretary of the Treasury Jack Lew, where the Finance Committee discussed with him the pending expiration of our debt ceiling and what his understanding is of how that will impact the country. He raised a lot of serious concerns—very legitimate serious concerns—that others are raising.

We then followed that up with a hearing in the Banking Committee where we had representatives from a number of the various industries in the United States also discussing what is going to happen in the United States if the country does not increase the debt ceiling. And there are serious consequences that will happen if we do not do this.

But what I tried to do in both of those hearings—and I will refer to my conversation with Secretary Lew—was to focus us back on the broader, bigger threat. Secretary Lew basically said that we have a manufactured crisis in the United States because of our unwillingness at this point to face the debt ceiling and simply extend the debt ceiling without any kinds of conditions or negotiations.

I reminded him that the crisis we face—the big crisis we face—is the debt crisis, and it is very real. I guess in a sense it has been manufactured over the last 20 or 30 years by Congresses and Presidents who have refused to

control spending and have put us into tremendous debt.

Our debt ceiling we are negotiating about right now—or I think wishing we could negotiate about right now—is \$16.7 trillion. It has grown by trillions of dollars over the last 5 or 6 years.

What the President has asked us to do is to once again increase the debt ceiling by another \$1 trillion or more with no reforms, no fiscal changes in our policies to deal with the mounting spending crisis we face. The President's position is: You give me this \$1 trillion or more of new debt authority, and I will then talk to you about reforming our fiscal policy. The problem is we have been trying to negotiate over fiscal policy now and trying to get reforms put into place for years and we have not been able to get there.

When I asked Secretary Lew about this, he basically said: We have made progress on our overall debt crisis in the past few years, and I think we can continue to work on those kinds of steps if you will simply pass this clean debt ceiling extension and do so in a way that involves no negotiations from the President in any way.

I reminded him that a major part of the progress we have made in the last couple of years was made when we met the debt ceiling 2 years ago in 2011. It was the Budget Control Act that put into statute over \$2 trillion of reductions in our spending path. That was attached to the debt ceiling as we moved forward. It was literally the debt ceiling negotiation that generated the only significant spending controls this Congress, this country, has seen for years and years. Yet the President refuses to take another step now that we have met the debt ceiling again and negotiate for further reforms.

By the way, there is another reason we have made some progress in the past few years. That is that we have implemented massive new taxes on the American people. The ObamaCare legislation itself contains nearly \$1 trillion of new taxes, and although they were delayed for a few years, they are now beginning to fully hit the American people. Last January, the President was able to win his argument and succeed in getting the top income tax brackets raised, an impact on our Tax Code that I think was harmful rather than helpful and clearly was damaging to the creation of jobs and to businesses across the United States. But, nevertheless, another \$500 billion to \$600 billion of tax revenue was put into the mix there.

So what have we done? We have made a plan to control discretionary spending over the next 10 years and reduce it by about \$2 trillion. If we stick to that, we will get \$2 trillion worth of spending reductions. We have raised taxes by at least \$1.6 trillion over the next 10 years, all of which, I believe, has been harmful to our economy, but has generated revenue to try to help reduce

the debt cycle. But we have not addressed the two critical parts of reform that we must address in this country if we are ever going to get control of our spending excesses and stop the out-of-control spiral toward insolvency that we see; that is, reforming our entitlement system and reforming our broken Tax Code.

What have we seen there? Virtually minimal, if any at all, reforms of entitlements. They seem to be off the table. Yet they are the part of our spending problem that is the biggest and the most out of control. On tax reform, we have seen no reform of the Tax Code. We have a Tax Code that is the most unfair, the most complicated, the most expensive to comply with, and the most anticompetitive code we probably could have created if we did it on purpose. Yet we have no reforms of the code. Instead what we have done is add to the code another \$1.6 trillion of new taxes on the American people.

What we are asking is whether we can move forward in trying to deal with our fiscal problems in this country by negotiating over entitlement reform and tax reform. I frankly believe we ought to be at the negotiating table talking about that. But what we have been told is: No, as soon as you raise the debt ceiling by—the amount we are hearing is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1 trillion—as soon as you raise the debt ceiling, then we can talk further about other negotiations, then we can get engaged in trying to deal with our debt crisis.

I pointed out, as I said to Secretary Lew, that the last major progress we made on spending reform happened in negotiations relating to our debt ceiling. Why cannot we negotiate now and make significant fiscal reform in addition to dealing with our debt ceiling? It is that debt crisis that is the biggest problem.

I was on the Bowles-Simpson Commission, the President's own commission, that he put together some years back, 2 or 3 years now. We spent a full year studying the impacts on our economy of America's fiscal excess and what we needed to do. The Bowles-Simpson Commission came up with a plan. It was a proposal. We concluded that—this was 2 or 3 years back—we needed to reduce our spending path, our debt path in the United States by at least \$4 trillion. We concluded we had to deal with that by reforming our entitlement system and we had to deal with it by controlling discretionary spending. We agreed to having some of that tax revenue the President was demanding. We also agreed that in the overall mix we would have about a 3-to-1 ratio of spending cuts to revenue.

The President did not accept that recommendation. Many of us tried for months and months and months afterward to get that recommendation to the floor for a vote. But it has not made it to the floor for a vote.

My point is, negotiations have been under way for years and years. Significant plans have been developed that would help us move forward. We know what to do. We need to have the will to do it. So far, the only reforms we have been able to get in the last few years as a result of the debt crisis that we face have come when we have met these pressure points dealing with our debt ceiling.

We are not asking to shut down the government for the purpose of simply making a point. We are trying to get to negotiations. We want to see the government reopened. We are not seeking to have the debt ceiling expire. We want to have negotiations to be able to put together the kinds of fiscal reforms that should always accompany extensions of the debt ceiling.

I believe the reason Congress put a statutory debt ceiling in place in the first place was because it wanted to give America a gut check every so often about the spending problems we have. We have put almost half of the entire spending system of the government on auto pilot. We do not even have the opportunity to vote on it here in Congress.

Ultimately, we have to deal with the debt ceiling. Ultimately, we have to deal with the funding to keep our government operational. Let's not just move forward and accomplish those objectives, leaving in place the unrestrained fiscal crisis we are dealing with in this country. Let's use this opportunity to put together the kinds of fiscal reforms that should accompany decisions to allow our country to increase its debt.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Yesterday I came to the floor with the distinguished majority leader to raise the issue of survivor benefits to those who died in the line of duty. Reportedly, 26 servicemembers have died since the government shut down on October 1, including 5 in combat. Their families have been denied the basic survivor benefits, which include a death gratuity, \$100,000 of life insurance, a housing allowance paid for a year, paid in a lump sum, as well as burial and other related expenses.

Yesterday I asked unanimous consent that we take up and pass the House bill. The majority leader and I entered into a conversation, and there was a question as to the intervening action by the Department of Defense to try to work around the lapse of the

funding. Fisher House, which is a wonderful charitable organization, helps to operate and fund seven different facilities in my State alone. I know they are extraordinarily generous and do very good work. They offered to enter into a contractual agreement with the Department of Defense to fill the gap during the interim. But what I would like to do is ask unanimous consent that we take up and pass the House legislation, which would alleviate the need for Fisher House and the Department of Defense trying to figure a workaround. We would actually pass legislation that would reopen that stream of funding so that these families could get the benefits they deserve.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 91

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 216, H.J. Res 91, making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military servicemembers of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; that the measure be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, the senior Senator from Texas has always been very courteous to me. Yesterday was no exception in withholding his unanimous consent request when we discussed this issue. It was about 2 o'clock in the afternoon, as he indicated.

I indicated that I thought that if we waited until 3:30 we would have this matter revolved, as that is what I had been told. In fact, it was a little after 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon that Secretary Hagel issued a statement announcing that the Department of Defense had entered into an agreement, as my friend said, with the organization my friend mentioned, and that would provide the family of fallen servicemembers—over the weekend, the Senator from Texas is correct, we had five soldiers killed, one of whom was a woman, four men and one woman. The agreement Senator Hagel came up with would give everyone—provide to family members of the military the full set of benefits they have been promised, including the \$100,000 death benefit gratuity. So the death benefit issue has been resolved. The Department of Defense stepped forward and took care of everything, so this issue is largely moot. It is clear the action on this legislation is now just for show here.

We all agree it is bad that the government shutdown led to this added grief for the families who had suffered such a terrible loss. Now we need to do what we can to prevent any further bad results—and there have been plenty of them in other areas. The right thing to

do is to prevent more of these in other areas, and the House should just vote to open the government. This issue has been taken care of, and it is terrible that we even got to this point.

We should not forget that as long as the government remains closed and the Republicans refuse to open the government, the military is unable to, for example, buy armor and equipment needed to prevent future deaths in the military. For the families of FBI agents killed in the line of duty, it is the same problem—they can't receive their death benefits. Veterans' benefits are delayed and disrupted.

As for this bill, the Secretary has now acted. We all agree the issue is taken care of. If my friend from Texas feels more comfort as a result of doing this, which I think is unnecessary, I don't object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 91) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, if I could respond briefly, I appreciate the majority leader not objecting to the consideration of this legislation. He believes this issue has been resolved by this contractual arrangement between Fisher House and the Department of Defense, but ultimately the Department of Defense would have to reimburse Fisher House under what I understand is the purported arrangement to be made. This obviates the need for any of that kind of workaround, together with any legal questions that might arise as to whether this is actually something the Department has the authority to do. I am not suggesting they don't; I am just saying this alleviates all those considerations.

So I am pleased we were able to come together in a bipartisan way, as we were on the military pay for uniformed military, and pass this narrow piece of legislation. I think maybe now that we have passed the pay for Active-Duty military and we have passed the provision that provides for survivor benefits for the families of the fallen, perhaps that paves the way to be open for some other narrow bills until we can come together on a larger bill.

We have offered, for example, funding for the National Institutes of Health, NIH. A few days ago the distinguished assistant leader from the Democratic side gave a very eloquent speech about children's cancer research. Under the bill that was passed by the House on a bipartisan basis that we have called up here, that funding would be restored, as would funding for the Veterans' Administration so they can process disability benefits, which they are not able to do now because of the cutoff in funding.

There are a number of areas where I think we can work together construc-

tively if we will do so. I am pleased we were able to take care of this one.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORNYN. I yield for a question.

Mr. DURBIN. I would ask a question through the Chair.

I say through the Chair, I think what we did here was the right thing to do, and I am sorry. I am painfully sorry that this government shutdown is hurting so many innocent people. It could come to an end with one decision by the Speaker to call one bill on the floor of the House. He refuses to do so. So we are trying to put out these little fires and spare the American people the pain and injustice that is coming about as a result of this shutdown. But I would say to the Senator from Texas that even the Veterans' Administration bill passed by the House fails to fund some critical areas for veterans. It does not fund the appeals process for veterans disability claims. Those have stopped. Secondly, it doesn't fund the cemetery rights of veterans who are seeking to be buried in national cemeteries. While we pay for funerals, the people who prepare the grave sites and such are not being paid. It doesn't have the Department of Labor program to hire unemployed veterans coming home. That is not funded. The HUD program for homeless veterans is not being funded. The notion that we are somehow taking care of veterans with the House action is far from true.

The last point I wish to make is that over 500,000 Federal employees are actually veterans. Many of them are furloughed today. One-fourth of all employee veterans are disabled. Many of them are furloughed today.

If we really care about veterans, opening the government to make sure all of these agencies are serving our veterans seems to me to be a reasonable approach. I ask if the Senator agrees.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, responding to the question of the distinguished assistant majority leader, I would say that we would all like to try to find some way to get back to business as usual when it comes to funding the government through the regular appropriations process. We haven't done that for a long time, and so we have been operating not on individual bills—I think there are 13 separate bills as part of the appropriations process. So now we have unfortunately already degenerated to this continuing resolution process, which has its own problems.

I would say to my friend that for every one of the hardships we can mitigate through passing narrow legislation absent a global agreement on the continuing resolution, it seems to me we ought to be doing that. If there are other suggestions the Democratic side has about how we can do that, I think that would be a good thing to do.

The problem is that I know the majority leader—I will give the majority leader the benefit of the doubt. I hope he didn't really mean he thought this was a show process, trying to restore these survivor benefits through this unanimous consent request, and I will give him the benefit of the doubt.

I do think there are a lot of questions raised in the minds of the American people whether what is happening here is being done purely for political purposes. We have veterans of World War II and Korea who come to the World War II Memorial only to be met with barricades. I have met a number of the Honor Flights of the "greatest generation" at a number of these memorials, and they have basically decided to go around the barricades, as I believe is their right under the Constitution.

It seems as if there is an effort made to maximize the pain associated with the shutdown. We know 83 percent of the government is being funded. Why can't we try to chip away at some of these narrow provisions and mitigate some of the hardship that we can rather than getting in our corners, squaring off, and creating more and more problems? I think this is important. We ought to be doing this. We should have done this a long time ago.

I would say to my colleagues, there were reports that Secretary Hagel notified the administration of this lapse in survivor benefits before the shutdown even occurred. It took the President 9 days before he finally ordered the Department of Defense to come up with a workaround, thankfully with the help of the Fisher House.

I think there is an impression that a lot of gamesmanship is going on. I don't think it becomes the Senate. I think Congress's approval rating is in the toilet, and we ought to be doing everything we can to address the problems where we can.

Mr. DURBIN. Would Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORNYN. I yield the floor to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. I would make several points.

First, I was with an Honor Flight group at the World War II Memorial last week, a great bunch of World War II veterans who came in from Illinois, and it didn't surprise me one bit—there was no barricade stopping these veterans. They were on their way to their memorial, and they went.

The reason why there was any question about this memorial and access was because of the decision by the Republicans to shut down the government.

I was going to remind the Senator of Texas, who is a learned attorney and a former Texas Supreme Court justice, of the story we were told in law school. It was an anecdotal story, an apocryphal

story of someone who killed both his parents, went to the courtroom, and then threw himself on the mercy of the court because he was an orphan. In this situation we have our Republican friends lamenting the impact of a government shutdown on World War II veterans coming to Washington, and on these tragic stories of families who have lost someone they love in combat. But all of this is unnecessary. All of it could have been avoided if the Republican Speaker of the House would call one bill for a vote which he knows will pass. It would open the government. That is the simple and honest answer.

This notion we are going to have a series of small appropriations to fund our government—all of the appropriations bills that have been called so far and passed the House amount to about 18 percent of the discretionary domestic budget. At this pace, the House only has to pass 79 more bills to open our government. We think at this pace it will only take them about 2½ months to do it. Is that any way to run a great Nation? It isn't.

We need to open our government, serve our people, spare them the injustice and pain which comes from this Republican shutdown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, gave an analogy that applies to a lot of what my friend from Texas said. First of all, we haven't done appropriations bills. We haven't done appropriations bills because the Republicans won't let us. We can't even get cloture on a way to proceed to one of them.

But I want to be sure the record is clear that my friend from Texas doesn't have to give me the benefit of the doubt on what I said. If there were ever an example of this whole process being for show, it is this: We have a lot of things we should be working on. The country is within 1 week of defaulting on its debt for the first time in the history of this country. We should be focusing on that. The government should be open.

We had the unfortunate incident where we had five of our troops killed over the weekend in Afghanistan, and it brought to our attention they were not going to get their benefits because the part of the government that gives them that money is closed.

Now, we didn't close it. But Secretary Hagel, a former Republican Member of this body, worked it out so they are all taken care of. They are all taken care of. So this unanimous consent I agreed to is for show. It doesn't mean anything. They are being taken care of anyway.

So I appreciate the Senator giving me the benefit of the doubt, but he doesn't need to give me the benefit of the doubt. This whole thing is for show.

This whole government shutdown is for show. It is a show that I don't quite understand the ending of, but that is where we are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, may I inquire, under the previous order, how much time remains for the minority?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 8½ minutes remaining for the Republicans.

Mr. RUBIO. I ask unanimous consent that 5 minutes be added to that total, for a total of 13 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, with all this focus on the fighting going on in Washington these days, I think we are losing focus on the biggest issue facing this country, and that is the pervasive and growing sense we are losing control of our country; that we are losing the American dream.

Why do people feel this way? Because millions of them have been out of a job for months, and maybe even years, and because millions more find themselves stuck with jobs that don't pay enough for them to live on or certainly for them to live as they used to.

When people hear news that the economy is recovering, that unemployment is down by .1 percent this week or this month, that the stock market is up and that the recession is over, it makes people angry. And rightfully so. Because the recession might be over on Wall Street, but it is not over for millions of people who are out of work or stuck with jobs that do not pay enough to live on.

What makes all this worse is that while their paychecks aren't growing, their bills are growing. Ask the young couples out there, the single parents, how much it is costing them every month or week to provide childcare for their kids. Ask the young Americans who are saddled with thousands of dollars in student loan debt.

How are people making it through these times? Well, I am reminded of a few years after we got married, when my wife and I hit a rough patch in our finances. What we did was we got rid of one of the cars and we moved in with her mom for 6 months. That is what many of us have had to do at some stage in our life, but it was usually temporary. Now people are doing that with the feeling it might not be temporary; that this might be the way it is for a while. And they ask themselves: Is this the new normal? Is this the way it is going to be from now on?

This is what millions of people across this country are feeling these days; that maybe the American dream—if you work hard, you can improve your life—isn't what it used to be; that maybe the American dream is actually even slipping away.

But why is this happening? Whose fault is this, is the normal reaction some people have. Well, there are a few reasons why this is happening. One is the economy has changed. The nature of our economy has changed. Globalization, for example, has sent thousands of middle-class jobs overseas. Information technology and advances have replaced many of our middle-class jobs with machines. Another reason why is that we simply have too many people who never get the education or the skills they need for the better paying jobs this new economy is creating. And we can't ignore, for example, the breakdown of our culture and our families and what that is doing. It is trapping people in a cycle of poverty and of dependence. These are all contributors to what we face today.

But one of the major reasons why this is happening, why so many people are trapped in dead-end jobs, why so many people have been unemployed for so long, is because our economy is not creating enough jobs to live off of. One of the reasons why that is happening is because our country is headed for a debt crisis. The real debt crisis is not the looming debt limit. The real debt crisis is that every year our government is spending more money than it takes in. And, by the way, one day we are not going to have to worry about raising the debt limit because no one will want to lend us money anyway.

Too often around here we talk about the national debt as if it is simply an accounting problem. The national debt is a lot more than that. How does the economy create good jobs? It creates good jobs in two ways: No. 1 is through innovation—when people invent a new product or service. The other is through investment—when people risk the money they have to start a new business or when a business reinvests its profits into the business to grow. The fact we are headed for a debt crisis and that we have no serious long-term plan in place to address it is discouraging innovation and that is discouraging investment.

Who wants to innovate in an economy that is headed for a debt crisis? Who wants to risk their money to start a new business in an economy that is headed for a catastrophic disruption? And who wants to reinvest their profits to grow their business in a country where the government is going bankrupt?

Having people trapped in low-wage jobs, having people unemployed for months or years at a time, having people unable to afford to get married or start a family doesn't have to be the new normal. It doesn't have to be this way forever. We can turn this around. But to do so we have to stop chasing all these temporary gimmicks that promise us some sort of momentary boost to our economy. We have to stop

ignoring the problems headed full speed at us. We have to return to the basics—to the basics that made us such a prosperous nation.

Our national debt today stands at close to \$17 trillion. In the last 5½ years alone it has grown by over \$6 trillion. So when you hear the President or the Democrats here in the Senate say they want us to pass what they call a clean debt limit increase, here is what they are really asking for: They are asking us to borrow another \$1 trillion but not do anything meaningful to slow the growth of that debt.

Why would we continue to do this? When are we finally going to get serious around here about putting in place a serious long-term plan to bring this debt under control? In order to do that, the first thing we have to understand is what is causing this debt.

Look, we have a broken Tax Code. It is full of all sorts of special-interest loopholes. But the reason why we have this massive debt isn't because rich people aren't paying enough in taxes. Even if we taxed every millionaire every penny they made this year, it wouldn't make even a small dent in the debt. Yes, there is some serious waste going on throughout our government. For example, we have to reverse the changes the Obama administration has made to these welfare programs that basically gut the work requirement and leave people dependent on government. We need to reform the way we give foreign aid. We must and should do all of these and even more. But even if we did all that, it is still not enough.

What is driving our debt is the way we spend money on two very important programs: Medicare and Social Security. They are spending more money than they take in, and that gap is growing rapidly every single year.

I warn you, anytime anyone talks about making changes to these programs, you get accused of trying to hurt the elderly. So speaking for myself personally, let me set the record straight. I come from a State with millions of people—millions of retirees—who depend on these programs, and one of them is my own mother. She worked hard for her entire life and paid into these programs so they would be there for her when she retired. I would never support any changes to these programs that would hurt my mother. But these programs are going bankrupt, and anyone who is in favor of doing nothing about them is in favor of bankrupting them.

The good news is this: The good news is we still have some time to save Medicare and Social Security, and we still have time to do these changes without making any changes to the benefits of seniors such as my mom. But to do so is going to require younger workers, like myself, to accept that when we retire, our Medicare and our Social Security is going to be different than our parents.

So instead of spending all of our time around here trying to figure out how to raise the debt limit, we need to spend more of our time trying to figure out what we can do to put in place a serious long-term plan to bring this debt under control so that our economy can start creating more of those good-paying, middle-class jobs, so that people can start building for themselves the better future they always dreamed of.

The American dream is under assault. That is the real crisis. When are we going to get serious about solving it? This dream of earning a better life is the universal hope of people everywhere. But we are reminded that for much of human history most people found themselves trapped by the circumstances of their birth. That meant no matter how hard they worked, no matter how talented they were, they were only going to go as far as their family went. They could only do whatever it was their parents did. One of the things that made America so special is that here that has been different. Here, through hard work and sacrifice, people from all walks of life, from every corner of the world, have had the real opportunity to earn for themselves a better life.

This is what we call the American dream. As Americans, that is our identity. It is what holds us together as a nation. It is what holds us together as a people, and it is what has made us exceptional.

I know people are discouraged about how tough times are. I know some people are very disappointed about how the last election turned out. I know many people are angry and, quite frankly, disgusted by the way this process is working or failing to work these days. But no matter how bad things may seem, we cannot give up on America and we cannot give up on the American dream. We have to do everything we can to make sure this country remains a place where anyone from anywhere can accomplish anything.

So despite how ugly Washington looks right now, I actually remain confident that, in the end, that is exactly what we are going to do. I have no doubt that, in the end, our children will grow up to be the most prosperous generation that ever lived. Despite all the challenges we face right now, when all is said and done, I believe with all my heart we will still go down in history as the generation that saved the American dream and left our children what our parents left for us—the single greatest Nation in the history of the world.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, mindful of the hour and that the Senate is about to recess, I want to say to my colleague from Florida, who is my friend, that I have optimism and I have faith in our country as well.

I think it is interesting that the stock market, the Dow Jones, has surged 243 points—I just checked it a couple of minutes ago—on just the rumors that the debt ceiling will be lifted and we will not go through this crisis. But I am told at the other end of the Capitol, the House of Representatives is going to have difficulty in getting any agreement to stop the shutdown of the government and pass a continuing appropriations bill. So here we are, back in the soup again.

If we do just a short-term debt extension, lifting the debt ceiling, then for however long it is—5, 6 weeks—come Thanksgiving we are going to be back in the soup again.

There has got to be a change in attitude, and the attitude has got to be I respect the other fellow's point of view, I respect his difference of opinion, now let's work it out together. And it is only then we are going to solve this problem.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair until 4:04 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COONS).

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 6 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, and that the Democrats be limited to 10 minutes each. Basically, the reason is we have lots of speakers on this side. I need not say more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, we are hearing a lot of discussion right now about the role of government and the role of the public sector.

We know there is a minority in the House of Representatives who ran on shutting the government down and think they have achieved something as we see the economy teetering now, as we see people who have been put out of work, who have mortgages, car payments, and concerns about their children and so on, and all the services that are in jeopardy, from food safety to law enforcement to what happens in the case of an oil spill and all of the things in between.

I found it interesting with our colleagues who have embraced the idea that in the greatest country in the

world and in the greatest democracy in the world there is no need for the public sector. No one else is having this debate around the world. They are embracing every tool of the public sector to embrace their private sector to try to beat us by outeducating and outinnovating us in a global economy, as the distinguished Presiding Officer understands. So we are in a global race where everybody understands it is all in. We use all the tools that we have.

We have the greatest private sector, the most robust private sector entrepreneurs that can beat anybody in the world. But we also have a public sector that creates the framework and support for that by having a rule of law, by having basic protections in place for the public.

As I had the opportunity to listen to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, particularly in the House, it seems every time there is a story—a salmonella outbreak—gosh, we had better bring some folks back. We have veterans hurting so we had better bring something back. We have women and children not getting baby formula through the WIC Program so we should do something about that. We have concerns about national safety so we should do something about that. It is almost as if we are educating these Members about the role of government in this process as they go. I didn't realize we did that. So maybe that function ought to be working. It is a chaotic way for the greatest democracy to operate, but that seems to be what is happening right now.

I remember in my times traveling to China, the last time I was there, where they said to me: Oh, you are here in Beijing on a great day; you can see across the street.

We are lucky. We can see across the street almost every day because we collectively have decided that one of the things we need to do to be able to breathe the air is to have certain rules, certain protections and standards in place so we can breathe the air. That is important to do through the public sector. We can't say: I will do the air in front of this desk, and you do the air in front of this desk, and somebody else will protect the air over here. It doesn't work that way. We do it together. So we don't have to worry about saying: I am in D.C. on the 2 days a year we can breathe the air and look across the street. We have the confidence of knowing that we have a quality of life, including the ability to see across the street and breathe the air, because in a civilized society, the greatest democracy in the world, we have made sure that those standards are there for our citizens.

I remember on a trip to Russia a few years ago they were talking about wanting to get more private sector investment into Moscow in Russia. I came home talking to our businesses

and they said: The problem is they don't have a rule of law. We don't trust how we can invest there because we are not confident in their government, their rule of law. We don't have that problem here. We have the epitome of a system with checks and balances, a rule of law. Up until all of this had begun, we have had the confidence available in the private sector on how to invest and know that there is a system in place.

I had the opportunity, with my agriculture hat on a few months ago, to be in Haiti where we see a great desire, meeting with the Haitian president, to bring in more business and investment from the United States. The problem is, you bring a shipload of cargo into the harbor, and you can't get it off the ship without paying bribes. They have no law enforcement system, judicial system, rule of law.

That is not true in our country. We do it through something collectively that we call government, that creates a way for us to make sure we can drink the water, breathe the air, see across the street, drive on the roads, have the opportunity for education for all of our children, and know that we can walk into a restaurant and have some level of confidence that the food is safe or go into the grocery store and know that.

We have research institutions that suddenly, after our colleagues in the House have been saying—and for years I have had personal debates with folks who said: We don't need a National Institutes of Health. Let the private sector do it. Yet we know collectively we are willing to share a risk of basic research to try to find cancer cures, to go over and over again on research until they get that one that may be able to move forward and be successful, in which case the private sector comes in and takes it from there. But we have done it together and shared the risk because we know it is in all of our interests to save lives—in our own, our family members, and others—whether it is Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, juvenile diabetes, cancer. All of those things are done collectively through this thing that we call government. That is why we have the best standard of living in the world. We are the wealthiest country in the world. We are the envy of the world. People want to come here and invest. They want to be a part of the opportunities in this country. And now we are debating whether or not, literally, there should be a public sector. Should we fund the police and the firefighters and the judicial system? There are those on the other side of the aisle who would say: We don't mean that. Every time we bring up something: We didn't mean that. I am not sure what they mean then in a civilized society.

We know we have challenges around issues of finance and debt. As chair of the Agriculture Committee, I am proud of the fact—and I have said so many

times on the floor—that we are the only committee on a bipartisan basis that has actually brought a deficit reduction bill to the floor that has passed in the Senate. So I take a backseat to no one when we are looking at ways to cut duplication, to cut things that aren't important, to strengthen those things that are, and to save money.

But we do not do it by destroying our economy, by shutting down the services we all count on to protect us as consumers, to make sure our children have opportunities, to make sure we are safe and secure in this country. Obviously, that makes no sense. It is totally irresponsible.

What we are not talking about enough is that we have begun to see things happening in terms of the debt and deficit. We can continue to do that. In fact, the yearly deficit has been cut in half. I don't hear people talking about that, but the numbers say that.

A few years ago we set a goal of \$4 trillion in debt reduction over 10 years. We are more than halfway there—not all the way there, but we have put in place a mechanism through cuts, through new revenue, through interest savings yielding \$2.5 trillion in debt reduction out of the \$4 trillion.

What is happening by shutting down the Government and threatening a default? That debt is going to go back up. We are going to undermine the work we have already done by adding increased costs through interest payments and delays that will actually increase the debt. We saw that in the last go-around in 2011. Even though there was not actually a default on the full faith and credit of the United States of America, we saw it because of exactly what is happening now. We had a lot of talk—in my judgment some very irresponsible talk—and posturing back-and-forth instead of working together in a reasonable way. We saw the markets affected, a drop of 2,000 points in the market, \$800 billion in retirement savings of folks who worked hard all their lives and maybe are still working and cannot figure out why in the world we cannot work together in a reasonable, rational way to solve problems. There was \$800 billion retirement savings gone. During that time in 2011, that summer, July and August, anyone who was signing up for a new mortgage is paying on average \$100 more a month in payments because the interest rates were higher.

Instead of building on what we have already done together or even acknowledging it—it may not make good politics to acknowledge folks on the other side of the aisle. Unfortunately, it seems they certainly do not want to give credit to the President or give credit for anything we have actually been doing together. But the reality is the deficit has been cut in half and we are more than halfway to the goal that was set for savings over 10 years.

There is nothing that has been happening in the last few days—shutting down the government, threatening possible default on the full faith and credit of the United States—that is helping us reach that goal. It is actually going in the opposite direction. As interest rates go up, billions of dollars will be added to the debt.

We have tried to figure out over the last number of months how to continue bringing down the debt and tackling long-term challenges while, by the way, creating jobs. The best way to get us out of debt is to create jobs so people can go back to work and be part of the economy. That is the best thing, and we are sure not hearing enough talk about that.

I am very proud to come from a State that makes things and grows things. It is manufacturing that is bringing us back, that is driving the economy, and it is agriculture where we have the biggest exports, in terms of export surpluses, in the country. We need to make things and grow things, focus on that. That will bring down the debt as we create more opportunities and more jobs.

In the last 6 months we have tried to go to a conference committee, a negotiating team, a formal negotiating process between the House and Senate on a 10-year budget that will bring down the debt, create jobs, do things in a fair and balanced way that puts middle class families first. We have tried to do that, as of today, 21 times. In fact, the chair of the Budget Committee has come to the floor and moved that we get to that process 21 times, joined by distinguished Members of the Republican caucus in the Senate who have come to say the same thing, let us go to a budget negotiation, a formal budget negotiation. Over 21 times the same folks who shut down the Government, the same folks who say it doesn't hurt anything if we default as a country, even though every economist, every business leader is begging and pleading and providing facts and information as to why it would be a complete disaster—the same people who are saying defaults don't matter, government doesn't work, except when they are reading something in the paper and somebody is saying there is a problem—they, those same people have, 21 times been able to block the Senate from going to a formal negotiation with the House on the budget.

We are in this crazy place where, on the one hand, when we step back we are actually seeing the economy slowly moving forward—of course until now, when it is beginning to be stymied by all of this. But the economy has been moving forward. The yearly deficit is coming down. We have been tackling the long-term debt. We are coming out of this. Then we have a group of folks who have decided in the big picture

that there is no value in a democracy, in the greatest country in the world, in government. They don't seem to care about what it takes to provide an economy and so on.

Now they are saying they are willing to jeopardize the faith and credit of the United States of America, have America default on our bills and potentially send us not only and probably into a great recession similar to the one we just came out of, but economists tell us it could send us back even further, into the thirties or forties. They just do not know.

We are in a global marketplace right now where we don't know what happens when we default on our bills, when we lose the confidence of the world to invest in America or to even purchase our debt. We don't know what happens when small businesses see all their capital dry up and people are not able to get mortgage loans again or they cost much more than they did before and all the other ramifications of our not paying our bills.

There are colleagues who say the Secretary of the Treasury—who, by the way, came down and did an excellent job in the Finance Committee today. It was very serious. It was very sobering, but I thought he was clear and he was factual and I very much appreciate his coming to the Senate Finance Committee. But there are those who say he says October 17 is the last time extraordinary measures can be used to stop us from falling off the cliff and going into default and losing the full faith and credit of the United States—except, no, it could be the next day, it could be the day after.

Coming from a car State it reminds me of someone who is driving in their car and they look and it is on empty. You may have a little bit more. Sometimes they say you have 5 miles more, you have 10 miles more, maybe you have 30 miles more, but you are on empty and you are going to stop—the car is going to stop. The question is how often do you want to risk that and play that game when you know the car is going to stop.

That is, in my judgment, the kind of absurd and irresponsible debate going on right now—about whether the car stops immediately or in 2 miles or 3 miles or 30 miles. Why in the world would you want to put yourself in that position? Lord knows, defaulting on the full faith and credit of the United States of America is much more serious than running out of gas in your car.

There is no reason for this—none, zero. This is a manufactured crisis. Do we need to continue to work together to tackle the long-term debt of this country? Absolutely. Count me in. Do we need to focus on what is happening to middle-class families who are getting squeezed on all sides and have a hard time just holding on? Do we need

to focus on jobs in this country, making things and growing things and outeducating and outinnovating the world? Absolutely. Count me in. Count me in at the head of the line on that.

We in Michigan right now, in terms of our hard work and ingenuity, take a backseat to nobody. But to find ourselves in this craziness is beyond my understanding. I know people at home are going: What in the world is going on here? Can't you guys just come together and figure this out and quit making up crises and quit creating artificial deadlines and get things done?

I think it is important at this point in our history that we remember President Ronald Reagan said: "Never before in our history has the Federal Government failed to honor its financial obligations."

We are the greatest country in the world. Others look to us. They want to be like us. They want a vibrant middle class like America has had. We need to fight hard to keep ours and keep it growing. We need to make sure we do not fail to honor the financial obligations of this great country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I just listened to my colleague from Michigan talking about the need to reopen the government and the need to deal with the debt. Of course, I agree with that, as do my colleagues on this side of the aisle. We also heard discussion about the fact that we should not be manufacturing crises. Unfortunately, we have a crisis on our hands; that is, the crisis of debt at record levels, so I wish to talk about that a little today and talk about why this discussion is so important, particularly on extending the debt limit because that would be the place naturally for us to deal with the problem that faces this generation and certainly future generations reaching this historic level of debt.

In a matter of days, we are told, our Nation is going to be reaching this debt limit which is \$16.7 trillion. Think about that. That is sixteen thousand billion dollars. It is impossible to comprehend that number, but let's try: \$16.7 trillion would produce a stack of \$1 bills 1 million miles high. That is enough, by the way, to go to the Moon and back. It is now bigger, by the way, than our entire economy. Only once in our history have we had debt as a percent of our economy so large and that was after World War II. We were able quickly to address that. We didn't have the long-term liabilities we have now, and we had very high defense spending from World War II we were able to reduce. But other than that, we have never been here before. I would say we are in uncharted territory.

By the way, it is not just that we have this huge level of debt and deficit

and the overhang on the economy, but it is the fact that the economy is also weak. I think they are related. I think this huge level of debt and deficit is akin to a wet blanket over the economy.

Here is an interesting chart. It shows the debt limit rising twice as fast as the economy has grown in the last 2 years so the debt increase has gone up by about \$2.4 trillion and unfortunately our GDP increase has been less than half of that. That is the problem we are trying to face. It is a lot of back-and-forth.

I know for some people it looks as if this is politics. It is not. It is about a fundamental issue. There are fundamental disagreements, and I respect those disagreements, but we have to address this problem and we have to do it in the context of the debt limit. If we do not, we will simply be kicking the can down the road again and letting down the people we represent. If you divide that debt among the American people, each of us—every man, woman, and child in America—owes around \$50,000. By the way, of course, that is far more than the annual per capita income for that man, woman, and child in America. If you think about that, it is about \$140,000 to \$150,000 per household on average. That is where we are today.

I don't think it is constructive to be pointing fingers of blame because, frankly, for decades Republicans and Democrats alike have spent more money than the government takes in. There have been more promises made than can be kept, and we have gone through a process of mortgaging the future of our kids and grandkids as a result. Here we are. In some respects, the greatest single act of bipartisanship here in the Congress has been the overspending. The question is not how we got here but what we are going to do about it. Where are we going?

Yesterday the President said that raising the Nation's credit limit by another \$1 trillion really pays for last year's deficit spending, not next year's spending. I guess we could have that debate. I would say it is about the future because we are borrowing more money to pay the bills of the country going forward, and that is what many of us want to talk about—how, going forward, we can reduce those bills.

The truth is that whether you say you are paying for the past or paying for the future, it really doesn't matter to the American people and it doesn't matter to our children and grandchildren who end up paying the bill. Long after we are gone, this huge level of debt and deficit is going to be something they are going to have to deal with.

We all know the consequences if we don't raise the debt limit. Without a debt limit increase, the Federal Government will be unable to borrow to

meet its expenses. We are borrowing 20 cents of every dollar the Federal Government spends, so the government would be unable to meet all of its obligations.

There has been discussion about meeting the interest on the debt, and that is only about 8 percent of revenue coming in. I assume that could be met, but it is true that there are other obligations that can't be met if the government can't borrow because the government is spending more than it takes in and needs to borrow to make up the difference.

The deficit, some have said—including some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle today—is lower now, and somehow that is an indication that we are OK in terms of the deficit. I would remind folks that the deficit this year is the fifth largest deficit in the history of our country—in our entire history. It is over \$640 billion. More significantly, the Congressional Budget Office, which is the nonpartisan group around here that analyzes this stuff, says it is temporarily lower than \$1 trillion. In other words, they say that within a decade it will get back up to \$1 trillion. Whether it is \$640 billion or \$1 trillion, it is way too high.

Entitlement spending, by the way, will then push these annual deficits up to the equivalent of \$3.4 trillion a year—five times what they are today—within a few decades. That is based on the Congressional Budget Office. At that point, the national debt would be 2½ times as large as the entire economy. Today it is about the size of the economy; it is a little bigger. It would be 2½ times as large as our whole economy. I saw one CBO report recently that simply stops calculating the interest cost at that point because they cannot foresee our economy functioning under those kinds of conditions. Think about your own family budget or think about your business. You could not function either. The bank would not be able to lend you any money.

Both of these outcomes—default today and bankruptcy in the future—are unacceptable. That is why it is time for us to work together to try to do something about them. As the debt ceiling is raised, it is time to address the underlying problem. That is what we are saying.

By the way, the American people are saying that too. Based on the polling I have seen this week, the American people by better than a 2-to-1 margin are saying: Don't raise the debt limit without doing something about the spending. They get it because for them it is like the credit card—when you reach the limit, you realize you have to do something about the underlying problem, which is how much you are spending.

The President says: "Pass the debt limit increase now and we will address the spending later." I wish it were that

simple, but I think he knows, as well as everybody in this Chamber and every person who is watching at home today, that Congress simply doesn't reduce spending unless it is forced to do so. If you don't think that is true, let me remind you of what the history is here. In the past three decades—I have gone back and looked at all of these deficit reduction plans that did get through Congress, and there were not many, but there were some. In every single instance where there was any significant deficit reduction, it came as a result of what? A discussion about the debt limit because that is the time in which there is some pressure here in Congress to actually do something about it. I found one in 2005, which was a relatively small reduction in spending, but otherwise every single one of them—the Gramm-Rudman rescissions in the 1980s; the 1990 Andrews Air Force Base agreement that the first President Bush conducted with Democrats; the 1993 balanced budget talks; the 1997 balanced budget agreement Bill Clinton negotiated with Newt Gingrich—a Democratic President and a Republican Speaker; and, of course, the pay-go rules that many Democrats are fond of. Those pay-go rules came out of a debt limit discussion; and finally, we only have to look back a couple of years ago to the Budget Control Act. As my colleague has said on his side of the aisle, there have been some successes in reducing spending on the discretionary side of spending—which is about one-third of the budget that is appropriated every year—that came out of the Budget Control Act, which is a result of what? The debt limit. In other words, Members listening to the folks back home.

I am listening to my constituents back home in Ohio right now, and they are saying: Don't max out the credit card again and go over the limit unless you do something about the problem. It is little wonder that the American people, by this margin of 2 to 1 that I talked about, are saying: Don't do it without the spending reductions. They know that is the only way the spending cuts are likely to happen.

Why is it that any increase in the debt limit should also include progrowth provisions? Well, because one way to get at the debt and deficit is spending restraint. We talked about the discretionary spending being about 35 percent of the budget, and we made progress there. The other 65 percent of the budget is the mandatory spending side, and we have not made progress there. The other part would be revenue, and on the first of this year taxes were raised by \$620 billion. What we have not done is deal with the mandatory side.

Finally, of course, economic growth helps. As we are extending the debt limit, we should also look at how we can help give the economy a shot in

the arm. Tax reform is the way to do that, and I think there is a consensus in this body that we need to do it. That would seem to make sense as well.

We have already made progress on one of the three legs of the stool, which is dealing with the discretionary spending. It has been pretty much flat for the last couple of years. By the way, for the first time since the 1950s there has actually been a reduction in spending for 2 years in a row, but that is only 35 percent of the budget. The fastest growing—again, 65 percent of the budget—we have not dealt with. That 65 percent grows to 76 percent of the budget in the next 10 years based on the Congressional Budget Office.

On the tax side, the same Congressional Budget Office tells us that starting in 2014—that is next year, around the corner—taxes as a percentage of our economy will be above the historic level. In other words, there will be more taxes coming in from the tax increases that, in part, we passed earlier this year, but the part we have not dealt with is mandatory spending. It is the biggest and the fastest growing part of our spending. Let's face it. It is politically difficult to deal with, but that is what we were hired to do, and that is what the President was hired to do in terms of providing leadership.

With ObamaCare, of course, we added a new health entitlement program to this part of the budget—the 65 percent. These health entitlements were already growing more quickly than the rest of the budget, even the rest of mandatory spending. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office tells us that in the next 10 years the health entitlement programs grow by over 100 percent. These are vital programs—Medicare and Medicaid—but they have to be reformed so they are sustainable in the future and are there for our kids and grandkids. With 10,000 baby boomers retiring every day and health care costs continuing to rise, we have a real problem, and we have to address it. All of us know that—Democrats and Republicans alike, as well as the President and the Congress. Again, history tells us the best way is to link this with the debt limit because that is the opportunity and has traditionally been the opportunity to make progress.

By the way, over the long term, overall revenue is projected to increase and discretionary spending is projected to be flat. The entire increase in our deficit—these huge debts and deficits going forward that I have been talking about—is due to the mandatory spending. Again, that is the Congressional Budget Office, not me.

A good place to start, of course, would be some of the mandatory spending reforms the President has proposed. That would seem to be less controversial. If they are in the President's budget, that means he supports them. The President sent up a budget this

year, and he included over \$700 billion of spending reforms on the mandatory side of the budget. That is why what I have been advocating is, let's start there. Let's look at the President's own proposals. These are not the proposals that all Republicans support, but after all we should have a negotiation.

This notion that the President says he refuses to negotiate has never been true. Every President has negotiated. I think the American people are confused by this. How could the President of the United States say in the context of this debt limit discussion that he refuses to even talk to the other side? That makes no sense. The first President Bush rolled up his sleeves; we talked about the 1990 agreements. President Clinton rolled up his sleeves; we talked about the 1997 balanced budget agreement he negotiated with then-Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich. That is what Presidents do. We need them to lead, particularly on these tough issues.

As we talked about earlier, these are politically tough issues. The President says he doesn't want to be held hostage over the debt limit. He is not. He has been given the opportunity to lead using his own proposals—at least that is my suggestion.

We can also take a very simple step as we are going through this to be sure that this newest health care entitlement, which is the Affordable Care Act, which is a new entitlement program, doesn't become even more of a deficit driver than many of us on this side fear it will already be. The Affordable Care Act includes a provision that requires that when you get your subsidies under the exchanges, you have to verify your income. That makes sense. You have to verify your income between 100 percent of poverty and 400 percent of poverty. Below that it would be Medicaid, and above that it would be the subsidies under the exchanges.

Under a final regulation the administration put out, they said: We know you should verify your income, and that is what the law says, but we are going to give all of the exchanges another year to do it—not until 2015. Well, obviously the concern there is that will be an invitation for fraud, waste, and for big new expenses.

As a result, the Federal Government body in charge of this, the CMS, came out and said: No, for Federal exchanges, we will require people to file their income, but not for State exchanges. There are about 17 States and the District of Columbia that have State exchanges. They said to them: You guys can wait—in fact, not just until 2015, but there is no date certain.

That is something we in the Congress should deal with. The Democrats here in the Chamber who voted for the Affordable Care Act certainly should support that because the intent of the bill

when they signed up for it and when the President supported it was, of course, that you would verify your income. That is an example of a simple step we could take to prevent the distribution of subsidies until we have a system to verify those subsidies are going to the right people.

Finally, let's give the economy a shot in the arm. As part of this process, let's take a step forward and say: Let's reform the Tax Code. We are going to differ about the details, but let's get started on it.

So my proposal would be, as we have a vote on extending the debt limit, let's do these important reforms we talked about on the monetary side, but let's also commit to tax reform. Let's force the process. Let's facilitate it. Let's expedite it.

The American people are not looking for us to just get the spending under control; they want to see this economy grow. Again, they are not happy with this, where the debt is increasing at twice the rate of the economy. They want to see opportunities for their kids to get a job. They want to see the opportunity to have the dignity and self-respect that comes with a job.

We know that tax reform, done properly, will promote growth, it will create jobs. Again, we are going to differ on some of the details, and that is OK. Let's get started on it.

Perhaps the President doesn't think that spending and the deficits are a real problem. If he thinks that, he should say it. He says just the opposite. He has said he does think it is necessary for us to address these problems. In fact, in his own budget, he sent proposals forward. So what we need to do is get together and negotiate and talk and deal with this underlying problem. A debt that is nearly \$17 trillion is unacceptable to everybody, I hope, and I would think we would welcome the sign that Republicans are giving now that we want to negotiate, we want to talk.

Negotiations, by the way, I don't think are a sign of weakness. I don't think coming to the table is a signal of a failure of leadership. I think just the opposite; I think it shows strength and shows leadership. Again, I can promise my colleagues Republicans don't support all of the President's suggested savings in his budget, and a purely Republican agenda would look very different from whatever might emerge from bipartisan negotiations. But, again, the American people sent us here to get this done.

Using President Obama's own proposals, let's take that first step toward entitlement and progrowth tax reform and onto some common ground to break the gridlock in DC and finally do something positive about that underlying problem we all acknowledge.

Yes, we face serious problems, real challenges, but we also have an opportunity to do something positive, to

deal with the problem we all acknowledge—something that will not only prevent a debt limit crisis today but a debt crisis tomorrow.

I hope to move forward on this important project. I think we owe it to the people we represent.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, October 1 was a significant day. Two things happened to the constituents in my State. The first we talk a lot about here, and that is basically the shutdown of the government, the failure to pass a continuing resolution that would keep the doors of government open for the thousands and thousands of Americans, and North Dakotans, who depend on government services. This horrible impasse continues to have a horrible impact and continues to have consequences that people didn't foresee.

The second thing that happened, which hasn't gotten a lot of attention, is the expiration of a long-term farm bill. After negotiating in this body, and with a large bipartisan vote, we were able to accommodate concerns. We came together after negotiating, and we came up with a package that included real reforms, eliminated direct payments, included real reform in SNAP, streamlined conservation programs, and basically offered \$25 billion of debt relief to the country. It was a great package.

We sent it over to the House and waited for the House to pass their farm bill. They initially couldn't pass a farm bill. Then they decided to divide the farm bill, pass part of the farm bill, pass the other part of the farm bill with nutrition, now have a vote to bring them back together, and we are patiently awaiting the appointment of a conference committee.

The passage of the farm bill has never been a partisan issue. In fact, it is a regional issue. Things that are good for North Dakota may not be good for the Presiding Officer's State of Delaware, but we all work together, we all compromise, and we all come together.

This past weekend South Dakota and southwestern North Dakota were hit with a terrible snowstorm. Over 2 days that region was blanketed with anywhere from 2 feet to 7 feet of snow and contained winds over 70 miles an hour. Because of the early storm, tens of thousands of cattle died because they were suffocated, mired and drowned in stock dams or dropped in exhaustion. The pictures and the stories are devastating.

This image is one that is all too common after the recent blizzard in the Dakotas. These cattle that died over the weekend near Hettinger, ND, were owned by the Christman family. As is the case with many North Dakota

ranchers, this hard-working family lost many cows and calves during this surprise fall storm.

What people may not understand about the cattle industry is they might think one cow is like the next cow; people can just replace them. These herds are the product of years and years of selective breeding, years and years of working to improve the quality of their herd and to meet different specifications in the market. They are more than cows. They contain an intellectual property component that is not easily replaced.

This is where the crisis of the dysfunction that is Washington, DC, meets natural disaster. When livestock die from a natural disaster, farmers report the number of cattle that died to the Farm Service Agency—the FSA. However, because the doors are closed on the Federal Government, North Dakota ranchers, South Dakota ranchers, anyone who is experiencing livestock losses, have no place to report those losses. And even worse, they have no one at USDA to consult with about the information they need to collect to eventually report their claims. This is critical information. If farmers aren't collecting the information they need to make disaster claims in the future, the safety nets put in place to provide some support to these hard-working ranchers may be denied simply because of a paperwork error.

Unfortunately, this is an avoidable problem. As has been the case with so many in recent years, it is the product of congressional dysfunction. Because we haven't passed a new farm bill, the livestock program that helps ranchers withstand losses to livestock herds due to extreme weather events—the Livestock Indemnity Program—has expired, and the emergency assistance for livestock and honeybee producers program, which is in the stalled farm bill and which helps producers stay in business after they experience significant losses because of natural disaster, isn't available to the ranchers and the beekeepers who were hit the hardest by the storm. Until Congress passes a farm bill, livestock producers are in danger of losing their business, and they will not be eligible for support.

These ranchers and the farm bill are more collateral damage of the government shutdown. Because we are debating whether to fund the Federal Government, Congress isn't able to work on a farm bill. We have been waiting and waiting and waiting for the appointment of conferees. The chairwoman, I think, intends to make a floor speech about the farm bill yet today. She has been working very hard to encourage the collection of information and to encourage the appointment of conferees to the conference committee and get focused on this issue. Unfortunately, it is not happening until next week, if it even happens then.

In addition, the lack of assistance for ranchers in the aftermath of this devastating storm as a result of the shutdown is hurting farmers and agricultural industries, which is a key piece of North Dakota's economy.

Here are some additional examples of where the shutdown is hurting our farmers. Frequently, because farmers who use FSA loans have a joint obligation with FSA, when they receive their checks after they sell their products, the checks are frequently made out to both the Farm Service Agency and the farmer. Consequently, the farmer cannot cash the check unless he can get an endorsement from the Farm Service Agency. Guess what. They go, knock on the door, and no one is there to cosign their check. So that money in their hand that they need to make the investments for next year, that they need to pay the person who maybe supplies the feed, that they need to pay the fuel bill—that money is not available to them, even though they have earned it and they have sold their products. So the government shutdown prevents FSA from cashing these checks and from signing these checks. This is money the farmers have earned and they deserve, and denying them their income is outrageous.

What is worse, farmers and ranchers enrolled in the loan programs are new and beginning farmers, farmers who are just starting. It is a great thing that is happening in the Dakotas and all across farm country as we look at the increasing commodity prices and we look at a farm program that for the last 5 years has been stable and provided risk management. As a result, our farmers are getting younger and younger. The people who are going to feed the world and continue to develop our rural areas are younger and younger. They cannot withstand cashflow problems. They cannot withstand this loss.

Another impact of the shutdown: Agricultural reports from the National Agriculture Statistics Service aren't available to farmers. These reports are crucial resources that farmers need to make decisions such as how to price crops, which commodities to grow, and when to sell those commodities, and the reports enable farmers to track cattle auction prices. Not only has NASS stopped putting out new reports about demand and supply, exports, and prices, but all Web sites with past information have been taken down because of the government shutdown.

Farmers aren't receiving assistance from farm programs. The Department of Agriculture's local farm services offices have been shut down because of the shutdown and, as a result, farmers can't apply for new loans, sign up acreages for farm programs, or receive government checks for the programs they are already enrolled in. Devastating to so many of our people living on fixed

incomes in North Dakota, who have engaged in and basically put their land into the conservation reserve program, is conservation reserve checks are not being issued. That has a huge impact, particularly on those ranchers and those landowners who use CRP payments to supplement their Social Security.

The list goes on and on. As time continues, this list will only get longer and longer.

I understand the strategy, perhaps, in the House is to—whatever is the headline of the day, whatever becomes the issue of the day, we will simply write a little mini CR to take care of that, and say, see, we are dealing with that issue. But we know it is only a slice. It doesn't take care of those small businesses that have applied for small business loans and maybe got this close to being able to realize their dream and now have it delayed. It doesn't deal with the critical functions of government in its entirety. Instead, it picks and chooses the winners and losers. Let me tell my colleagues, these ranchers who have experienced this loss are the losers under this system.

It is time for this Congress to begin to do the responsible thing, which is open government, fund all of government, and start telling the American people that their interests are paramount. Start telling farmers and ranchers in the Dakotas who have experienced this tremendous loss that we care about their loss, that these programs have to work for them, and we have to do everything we can to make sure America is working again.

I wish to close with one thought. In the great recession, one place where we have experienced a tremendous amount of opportunity and support has been in agriculture. Those States that had a good agricultural base had some of the lowest unemployment numbers in the country. Sixteen million jobs depend on agriculture in this country, and all they ask for in return is a little bit of help, a little bit of a safety net for guaranteeing a food supply in this country. But we can't seem to even deliver that obligation. We can't seem to deliver that promise. We have to tell the American people that their interests are ahead of any petty or partisan interest in this body and in this Congress. We have to get the Congress back working for the American people, particularly for the hard-hit ranchers and farmers of southeastern North Dakota and West River, SD.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Here we are again at the same crossroads. We know the

landmarks. We know the signs. We have been here before. We negotiated in good faith to avert the last shutdown, the last default threat. We opposed the sequester, but that wasn't enough. So here we are, once again, and here we will be again in a week, a month, 6 months, a year, being asked for more concessions to a minority of extreme Republicans who seem to have forgotten that we operate under the rule of law. They simply have chosen to ignore it.

The fact is we passed the Affordable Care Act. It went through the legislative process, was signed by the President, tested in the Supreme Court, but so what, they say. It does not count. Similar to the schoolyard bully, they want a do-over or they will take over your lunch money.

The rightwing Republican minority claims to love the Constitution, adheres to the strictest interpretation of its tenets but apparently is not interested in living by it or by the rule of law that this Nation stands for and lives by.

They say Democrats have failed to negotiate in good faith and voted against trying to reach a compromise. The fact is for 6 months Senate Republicans have stood in the way of budget negotiations—what they want, negotiations—by blocking requests for Budget Committee members to conference with the House of Representatives. They have objected over 20 times to those budget negotiations.

The Senate followed regular order and passed a budget resolution for fiscal year 2014 on March 23 of this year. Our budget resolution provides just over \$1 trillion by replacing the irresponsible sequestration cuts while following the spending limit imposed by the Budget Control Act. The House wants to keep sequestration cuts by funding the government at \$976 billion or about \$80 billion less than the Senate. The fact is we have already compromised with the House by agreeing to a continuing resolution at a level of \$986 billion—much closer to their numbers than to ours. If you ask me, that is more than \$70 billion in compromising. But they simply will not take yes for an answer.

What the past weeks have shown us is that this is not even about budget numbers. They just want to make a political point, and they are holding the country hostage in order to make it. They simply do not want either the Affordable Care Act or, for that fact, this President to succeed. But that train has left the station. The President is already turning the economy around from the massive deficits he inherited when he took office, and the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land.

Make no mistake, it is not a coincidence that we are here again doing the same thing much like "Groundhog Day." Mark my words, we will be here

again tomorrow and in the future if the Republican shutdown strategy continues.

We are being asked to capitulate yet again at the threat that Republicans will keep the government shut down, that they will force America to default on its obligations and risk a global consequence and America's leadership role in the world.

It is a deliberate, if fatally flawed, Republican strategy. One might go so far as to call it a conspiracy—adopted to achieve through bullying what they cannot achieve at the ballot box.

We know it is a deliberate effort hatched many months ago. In fact, it goes back to 2010 when the House Republicans threatened to push the Nation into defaulting on its obligations and shut down the government unless we agreed to aggressive and deep structural cuts that met their political objectives in the midst of one of the deepest recessions in our history, a recession President Obama inherited when he took office.

Then, in November of 2010, the antitax, antigovernment, antispending, antiprogress side of the Republican Party exercised their newfound power and hamstringing their leadership into rejecting any kind of compromise, forcing the House Speaker and majority leader to reject any grand bargain proposed by the Democrats. They did it gleefully. It was part of their strategy to block any successful effort to actually govern. They chose instead to fuel the rightwing flames, burn down the house, and bring government to a halt until they achieved their objectives.

From December 2 to December 21, 2010, we enacted four separate continuing resolutions to keep the government open—four of them—to keep the government functioning until March 4. Let's not forget that these appropriations actually cut the Congressional Budget Office's projection of discretionary spending from 2013 through 2022 by \$400 billion. But that was not enough. They wanted more.

On March 2, 2011, as the new deadline approached, we passed another short-term CR, taking us to March 18—just 16 days—that cut spending by yet another \$4 billion. Still not enough.

On March 16, the deadline approaching once again, we passed another continuing resolution, taking us to April 8, with another \$6 billion in spending cuts. Was it enough? Of course not.

On April 4, House Republicans applauded the Speaker's announcement to begin preparations, for what, yes, a shutdown of the government. Clearly, nothing is enough.

On April 14, just before midnight, the Speaker agreed to the seventh short-term extension with more cuts that analysts said would amount to an additional \$350 million in that year alone.

All in all, we agreed to \$40 billion in total cuts, and we have cut even more

since then, including the current Senate-passed clean funding bill that would reopen the government today if the House would just pass it.

They say we have not taken votes. We have taken a bunch of votes on what they have sent us. They have not taken one vote on the one resolution we have sent them.

It is a clear pattern, a clear strategy. They will not stop. They will not take yes for an answer, and they clearly will not govern until they achieve their political and ideological goal to end government as we know it. That has been their plan all along.

In fact, last Sunday the New York Times reported that after the President was sworn in to his second term, a coalition of top conservative activists, including former Attorney General Ed Meese, along with the Koch brothers, devised a take-no-prisoners legislative strategy to derail health care by shutting down the Federal Government. Now we are being blackmailed again. As further proof of this take-no-prisoners strategy, Jonathan Chait of New York magazine recently reported on something called the Williamsburg Accord. Mr. Chait wrote:

In January, [this year], demoralized House Republicans retreated to Williamsburg, Virginia, to plot out their legislative strategy for President Obama's second term. . . .

They called it the Williamsburg Accord. He said:

If you want to grasp why Republicans are careening toward a potential federal government shutdown, and possibly toward provoking a sovereign debt crisis after that, you need to understand that this is the inevitable product of a conscious party strategy. . . .

His article goes on to say:

The way to make sense of it is that Republicans have planned since January to force Obama to accede to large chunks of the Republican agenda, without Republicans having to offer any policy concessions of their own.

That is not negotiation. We saw the implementation of that strategy beginning early in the spring when we did exactly what Republicans wanted. We passed a budget in the Senate, and the House passed a budget, and we attempted to go to conference to work out the difference between the two. Actually, we have attempted to do that more than 20 times now, and every single time Republicans have blocked action.

For 6 months they have refused to talk, they have refused to negotiate, they have refused to have a conversation. As we now know, this all was planned out from the beginning, going back to their January Williamsburg Accord.

They have intentionally driven us to the edge of the cliff to serve their own political interests at the expense of the Nation's economy, the jobs of working families, and the retirement savings of our seniors.

Now the GOP's solution to get us out of this Republican shutdown is the equivalent of Whac-A-Mole. It is their form of governing. Whatever issue pops up that they see a problem with as a result of their shutdown, they draft a bill to address a single issue. Last week it was national parks. This week it was death benefits for soldiers. What will it be next? Anyone who has ever been on the boardwalk and has played that arcade game of Whac-A-Mole knows you can never quite get ahead of those pesky moles that keep popping up. How long do they plan to govern in this way?

Bill Moyers recently wrote in an essay:

Despite what they say, Obamacare is only one of their targets. Before they will allow the government to reopen, they demand employers be enabled to deny birth control coverage to female employees; they demand Obama cave on the Keystone pipeline . . . they demand the watchdogs over corporate pollution be muzzled and the big bad regulators of Wall Street sent home. Their ransom list goes on and on. The debt ceiling is next. . . .

At least let's name this for what it is: sabotage of the democratic process.

Kevin Drum of Mother Jones wrote:

How do you get across how insurrectionary this is? Raising the debt ceiling isn't a concession from Republicans that deserves a corresponding concession from Democrats. It's the financial equivalent of a new nuclear bomb.

Warren Buffett used equally stark terms when he said in Fortune magazine:

It ought to be banned—

Referring to defaulting on the Nation's obligations—

It ought to be banned as a weapon. . . . It should be like nuclear bombs, basically too horrible to use.

Clearly, in the name of some misguided allegiance to an extreme ideology, a handful of ultraconservative extremists in the Republican Party are putting at risk the rule of law. They are putting at risk the full faith and credit of the United States, America's influence—as well as our obligations—around the world, and our national security, embassy security, intelligence collection apparatus, and American diplomats, Foreign Service officers, and contractors serving in posts around the world.

This is not a game. Real people are already being hurt by these tactics. I find it pathetic that some Republicans are willing to risk the full faith and credit of this Nation and inflict unnecessary harm on hard-working families and put the very principles of this democracy on the line all just to show how ideologically pure they are.

It is one thing to come to Washington wanting to destroy your government. It is quite another to destroy our economy in the process.

If you want to negotiate, let's negotiate. Let's do it constructively, in

good faith, and without threats. Let's try, as we have tried over 20 times, to get to that moment. Let's reopen the government, let's pay our bills, and then we will negotiate.

It is time to reject the schoolyard bully political strategy that Republicans hatched months ago, ratchet down the rhetoric, and do the hard work of solving problems together.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I heard the previous speaker plead for a solution. I think we are all pleading for that. We are now in our 10th day of a government shutdown—quite frankly, one that did not have to happen.

To some extent, it seems that this administration—meaning President Obama's administration—is going to great efforts to inflict as much pain through this shutdown as possible.

Mr. President, the administration went to great lengths to try to keep World War II veterans from viewing the memorial dedicated to their service, the World War II Memorial. It is an open-air memorial. It likely took more effort and personnel to close and barricade the memorial than it does to keep it open. It is one of those memorials where 24/7/365 you can go there. There is no reason it could not have been the same way during this recent period.

The government could be open and fully operating today but for the majority and its unwillingness to engage in legitimate debate over proposals to amend ObamaCare or any other legitimate issue of dispute. With regard to ObamaCare, not to defund or delay it is something that is not right in a body that is a deliberative body. You ought to consider all issues.

Instead of wasting a lot of time being in quorum calls or days of not voting, there could be legitimate discussions of pieces of legislation, and in the process maybe reach some sort of conclusion through what we call "regular order."

The House has passed and the Senate has defeated three different continuing resolutions. Each one of those would have kept the government open and prevented a shutdown. That looks like that is something that was debated here and decided here. But it was decided in a manner that was not debatable, a motion to table the House amendments. These three offers from the House of Representatives were rejected by the Senate majority. We are in this position because the Senate majority refused to give the American

people relief from the individual mandate and treat President Obama and his political appointees the same as all other Americans when it comes to Federal employees and officials being covered by health insurance.

In addition to negotiating an end to the government shutdown, Congress now needs to deal with the approaching debt limit. This will be the sixth debt limit increase in President Obama's 5 years in office. During President Obama's term in office thus far, the United States has added \$6 trillion to our national debt.

We had 4 consecutive years with annual deficits above \$1 trillion. Federal debt held by the public is now 73 percent of our gross domestic product. The historical average has been about 40 percent of GDP. This unsustainable debt path is threatening our economic growth and our stability.

This administration is quick to point out that the deficits have fallen faster than at any point since World War II. They fail to mention, however, that the deficit remains over \$600 billion this very year from highs near \$1.4 trillion. Remember to compare the \$600 billion for this year with the largest annual deficit under President Bush of \$458 billion.

Much of the recently improved deficit picture is also due to the spending cuts imposed by the Budget Control Act of August 2, 2011, that was enacted as part of the last debt ceiling increase. There is no better time to negotiate policies to address our fiscal problems than when debating debt ceilings.

But the President and the Secretary of the Treasury maintain that they will not negotiate on the debt limit. There happen to be families all over this country which, because of the slow economy and unemployment, are being forced to make tough decisions to make ends meet.

A lot of those families are looking at their budgets, looking right now trying to determine which expenses can be cut. Maybe they will try to reduce their cell phone bill or perhaps they will cancel a newspaper or a magazine subscription or perhaps eat at home instead of eating at restaurants.

The point is, when families face tight budgets and increasing debt, they look for ways to cut spending and get their fiscal house in order. That is the prudent thing to do. When bills come due, families make tough decisions on where to trim the budget. That is a family example of the Federal Government's legitimacy for looking at our spending.

At the very same time we are trying to increase the debt limit, we need to consider possibilities and make compromises to get our budget deficit down. Why can't the Federal Government then do the same? Why can't we use this opportunity to put our Nation on a sound fiscal course? Why can't we

work right now to enact policies that will hopefully then negate the need to take on more debt.

This seems to be a reasonable proposition, to do this when you are talking about increasing the federal debt. Treasury Secretary Lew and his boss, President Obama, have repeated the talking points that negotiating deficit reduction policies on a debt ceiling increase is unprecedented. They claim that now is not the time to negotiate our budget and fiscal problems.

The President stated last month:

You have never seen in the history of the United States the debt ceiling or the threat of not raising the debt being used to extort a President or a governing party and trying to force issues that have nothing to do with the budget and nothing to do with the debt.

The President just does not understand history or even recent history when he makes such a statement. President Obama and Secretary Lew can make this claim as much as they want, but it does not make sense. It is not true. The Washington Post fact checker gave this exact quote from President Obama four Pinocchio's, which rates the statement as a "whopper."

The Post indicated that since 1953, Congress at times has used the debt limit as a way to force concessions by the executive branch on spending. It also states that the Congress has used the debt limit on many occasions to force changes in unrelated laws.

At least four major pieces of deficit reduction policies were enacted as part of a debt limit increase: Gramm-Rudman, 1985; the Budget Enforcement Act, 1990; the Balanced Budget Act, 1997; the Budget Control Act, 2011. So the facts are very clear. The debt limit has been used in the past as a means to enact different deficit reduction policies and other reforms. Surely the President knew these facts when he made that statement that the Washington Post fact checker rated as a "whopper" with 4 Pinocchio's.

According to the Congressional Research Service, since 1978, Congress has voted to raise the debt ceiling 53 times: 27 of those times or 51 percent of the time the debt limit increase was tied to reforms. I questioned Secretary Lew on this point this morning during our Finance Committee hearing. Unfortunately, I got the same tired talking points that have been proven time and again to be wrong.

It is difficult to understand how an administration can expect us to take them seriously on the offer of future negotiations when they misrepresent such simple facts. The President and Congress must come to the table and negotiate policies to get our fiscal house in order. Does that put everything on the shoulders of the President of the United States? Absolutely not. It is just a fact that in this town, with our form of government, for over 225

years Presidential leadership is a very important part of the legislative process.

We have taken steps to address discretionary spending. We did that in 2011 with the Budget Control Act. Now it is time to tackle entitlements. Without reform, entitlement spending will continue to consume our budget. They will begin to squeeze out spending on discretionary spending, such as defense, education, and infrastructure. According to the CBO, spending on entitlements will double as a percentage of GDP from the historic average of 6.9 percent to 14.2 percent by 2038.

What does this mean for our economy? It means we will need to borrow more and more to fulfill our obligations. That will crowd out money that would otherwise be loaned in the private sector. This will lead to slower growth, less prosperity. It means that future generations may be less well-off than previous generations. The longer we kick the entitlement can down the road, the bigger the fiscal problems become and the harder the solutions will be.

It is time to make tough decisions and once and for all strengthen and secure these programs for future generations. These reforms will not take place without presidential leadership. The President must now demonstrate courage and the political will to put our Nation on a sound fiscal course.

That is not just the President's responsibility. That is a shared legislative responsibility between that end of Pennsylvania Avenue and this end. But it requires leadership that will bring people together. It requires compromise. It requires concession. Most of all, we need to get back to basics. We have to be sitting at a table across from each other negotiating. We will not be able to address those looming fiscal problems if President Obama is refusing even to sit across the table from Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats.

So I hope he will reconsider his "no negotiation" strategy so that we can reopen the government, deal with the debt ceiling and begin to address our unsustainable long-term fiscal challenges.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 7 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators on the majority side limited to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I have heard a number of speeches from my colleagues on the floor today, both while presiding and in the last few moments, that call on President Obama for Presidential leadership to help us

reopen the government, address our serious long-term fiscal issues, and move us forward.

I want to note for the folks who might be watching that the President is at this very moment sitting with the leadership of the Republican caucus in the House of Representatives. Tomorrow morning, I believe, he has invited the Republican Members of this body to the White House for conversation.

I think we agree. One of the core challenges we face as this Federal shutdown goes into, I believe, its 10th day is discerning exactly why the Federal Government is still shut down. When initially taken over the cliff into the shutdown, it was to prevent the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. That is what a number of Senators said on this floor was their purpose. Now, many days and many unintended and unexpected harmful consequences later, we are told what this was really all about was to force the President to negotiate.

I serve on the Budget Committee. We passed, more than 200 days ago, more than 6 months ago, a budget on this floor, and we have tried to go to conference on that budget now 21 times.

Yet each time it was blocked, objected to by a small number of Senators from the other party.

Frankly, my expectation, my hope is that we will return to a rational rules-following process here, reopen the government, not default on our national debt, and begin those serious negotiations, those Budget Committee negotiations that are long overdue to deal with the very real challenges that are facing our country.

I wanted to speak today about one of the consequences of shutting down our Federal Government. We see new ones every day, and we hear about them on the Senate floor. As the days drag on, we hear more and more about the impacts of the shutdown, sometimes with surprise, sometimes with regret, sometimes with outrage.

There is a lot on the line, and we have heard a lot about what the shutdown means for the various functions of the executive branch and of the legislative branch. I have heard colleagues come and speak about the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, about the FDA, about its impact on higher education, its impact on families, and its impact on small businesses. I have heard many folks come to this floor and comment on how the executive branch and its functions that affect communities and families all over this country are affected by the shutdown.

We have heard from our constituents who are trying to reach Senators and are trying to seek our help with a variety of Federal services. They are frustrated that the legislative branch is largely shut down, but there is another branch to our three-branch coordinate government. Absent from this debate

and discussion is how the shutdown is affecting the judicial branch of our government.

When the Federal Government shut down 10 years ago, the Federal court system was initially seemingly largely unaffected because they had enough funds in reserve to remain open for 10 business days—a period that will come to an end early next week.

On Tuesday the Federal judiciary of the United States will run out of the reserve funds it has been using to stay open. The big question is, What happens then?

The chief judge of the bankruptcy court for the District of Delaware, my home State, told me:

We are really in an uncertain situation, particularly when it comes to employees. I am fearful for them and how they are going to be able to pay for rent and mortgages, and provide food and day-care for their families.

This is uncharted territory for our Federal judiciary. When the money runs out, Federal, circuit, and district courts will each be on their own, much like each Senator who has to choose which of his employees or her employees are essential, deemed vital, and need to stay, and which should be furloughed and stay home, uncertain whether they will be paid. Each district court and circuit court will figure out on its own how to keep the lights and which employees will keep working without a salary.

As the chair of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts, I have heard from a number of Federal judges this week who are frustrated by the amount of time they are spending trying to figure out what the shutdown means for their courts and their employees rather than doing the job for which they were confirmed, which is to judge cases.

This is an enormous distraction, a profound waste of time. This is not advancing our core objective, which should be growing our economy, strengthening our country, confronting the fiscal challenges in front of us, and working together to achieve some principled compromises in the Congress of the United States. In my view, Federal judges should be deciding cases, not deciding how to keep their courthouses running during this Federal Government shutdown. This needs to end. It could end literally today in a matter of minutes if Speaker BOEHNER would bring to the floor and allow a vote on a bill sent over from this Senate more than 10 days ago that would allow the Federal Government to reopen.

The judicial branch is not another Federal agency. It is not a program that can be suspended or a benefit that can be delayed. It is a branch. The Federal court system was created in our Constitution as the third pillar of our democracy. It is an independent branch of government whose fundamental mission is being undermined by folks,

some of whom claim to love and to rigidly interpret the Constitution. Yet the consequences for our constitutional order of this senseless shutdown, I am afraid, will soon become clear in the days ahead.

The subcommittee has heard from a number of Federal judges and clerks this week. I must warn you there are a lot of unanswered questions there. The path forward is murky. The central question in the courts—as it was here in Congress and in the executive branch—is who is considered “essential.” Is it the people directly involved in the resolution of cases or are the staff who support that process also expected to work without pay?

Here is the type of question our judiciary was dealing with today instead of resolving disputes or working on long-term cost-saving measures. Evidence in our Federal courts these days is typically presented electronically to jurors rather than handing out photocopies, which is great as long as the technology is working in the courtroom. Case files are processed electronically these days as well. But what if there is a problem? What if the technology doesn't work and a trial is disrupted? At what point does a technological glitch become a legitimate due process issue? If the courtroom technology can't get an upgrade to fix a bug, will it result in a costly mistrial? The Constitution and the Sixth Amendment guarantee criminal defendants a right to a speedy trial. What happens when our courts can't live up to that Sixth Amendment guarantee because of this ongoing Federal shutdown?

The problem is equally severe in civil and bankruptcy matters. With the DOJ's Office of the U.S. Trustee in shutdown status, the number of trustee attorneys in Delaware has been cut from seven to two. This can dramatically slow the bankruptcy process and leave real jobs and real lives hanging in the balance as cases are unresolved and as resolutions don't move forward.

This raises another fundamental question. At what point in this ongoing senseless shutdown does our civil justice system fail to live up to America's promise as a free market economy grounded in the rule of law?

When an investor anywhere in the world looks to make a bet on a new company, a new idea, that investor will obtain certain rights in exchange. Those rights may include a share of equity or a priority right in the event of liquidation. What gives those rights meaning is ultimately a highly functioning, impartial, and reliable court system. That historically has been one of our great advantages competitively in the world economy. Our courts, even while plagued by persistent vacancies, lack of new authorized judgeships, and the sequester, continue to perform this vital function. Without these courts, these rights mean nothing. Without

the reliable enforcement of these rights, there is no more new investment, no more new job creation, and no more new ideas successfully brought to market. We are not the only country in the world competing for investment capital and for ideas. When we undermine our civil courts, we are being hostile to those very investors who could help get our economy back on track.

The Federal shutdown is already slowing the resolution of civil cases involving the Federal Government. Clerks at district courts around the country have confirmed to my subcommittee that the Department of Justice is requesting continuances broadly and across-the-board and trying to juggle the demands of their caseloads with the constraints of this reckless shutdown. Think about it. Social Security appeals, civil forfeiture cases, business disputes, consumer protection cases, Medicare fraud cases, incidents of employment discrimination—they are all being pushed to the background. This shutdown is bringing new meaning to Dr. King's famous words: "Justice too long delayed is justice denied."

Only this morning I heard from the head of Delaware's district court, chief judge Gregory Sleet. He said, in essence—no insult intended, but his observation was that Congress is letting our country down. The subcommittee also spoke with a district court clerk yesterday who said—and I thought this was particularly striking—he was glad he was nearing retirement so he could escape the dysfunction of the Federal Government and our ongoing, seemingly routine manufactured crises.

This shutdown is exacerbating what is a more profound problem—a disregard for the upkeep of our Federal judiciary. More than 90 Federal judgeships are vacant. There are 39 vacancies that are deemed "judicial emergencies." We need to do more to support and sustain the staffing, quality, and future investment that is required to make our Federal courts work as well as they possibly can.

I wish to make a point or two in conclusion. First, one of the essential questions every district court and circuit court will face is which of its employees are essential. After all of the cuts of the sequester and all of the burdens and challenges facing our Federal Government, aren't all the employees of our Federal judicial system, this separate branch, essential? The chief judge for the Third Judicial Circuit of the United States believes so, and I agree with him. This morning he announced that nearly "all functions, with few limited exceptions, are essential . . ." I join the chief judge of the Third Judicial Circuit and urge other circuits to follow suit and to recognize that this independent third branch of our constitutional order is essential.

Last, this shutdown has dragged morale in our courts and our court system

to a new low. We in Congress are blessed with a record number of attorneys who serve in Congress. It is my hope that this body recognizes the unique value of our Federal court system. Our democracy cannot afford to furlough justice. We cannot shut the doors to our courthouses. It is my hope that Speaker BOEHNER, following the conversation unfolding at the White House, will come back and put to the vote an action that will allow the courts and this country to get back to work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. I understand that the order of the day is that time is divided equally until 7 o'clock, with the majority setting a limitation of 10 minutes but no limitation on the minority?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COBURN. I rise to speak about the issue in front of us. I want to spend a few minutes putting things in context. I won't repeat things I have said routinely on the floor, but I think it is important for the American people to understand where we are in our country.

Using generally accepted accounting principles—these aren't my numbers—we have almost \$126 trillion in unfunded liabilities and we have \$17 trillion worth of debt. We have a lot of obligations in front of us. If we add up every asset in the United States—all the bank accounts, all the lands, all the possessions, everything we own, plus what we own outside of the United States—it comes to \$94 trillion. In essence, we are almost \$50 trillion in the hole. That is called a negative net worth.

I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Delaware. I have the greatest admiration for him. I am not one of those who think we should be in shutdown. I also am not one of those who think we should just, without any solution to our problem, raise the debt limit.

I would also note that we don't have to have a budget right now in the Senate because we agreed to the Budget Control Act, which sets the discretionary spending levels for the next 10 years in this country. They are set by law. What is important is that appropriations bills come through the committees—the House first and the Senate second—so that we can address the issues. We didn't do that in the Senate. They did about half of them in the House. We wouldn't have a continuing resolution—which, by the way, I think all of us agree is very difficult for our Federal employees to operate under.

But I wanted to make a couple of points. One is that in July of 2011, after 7 years of oversight, I put out \$9 trillion of what I think are commonsense eliminations and changes we could

make that today would put us at a \$200 billion surplus instead of a \$750 billion deficit. Those savings were \$3 trillion total in discretionary spending, \$1 trillion in defense spending, \$2.7 trillion in terms of modernization of our health entitlement programs, and \$1 trillion from the Tax Code. We actually have earmarks in the Tax Code for those who are well-heeled and well-connected—a benefit—and the average American gets nothing. There are interest payment savings of \$1.3 trillion and a 75-year solvency for the Social Security. That was put out 2½ years ago. Very little of it has been used. As a matter of fact, most people haven't read it. It was put out in a binder. We didn't print many binders because I am so tight, I don't want to print that many binders, but this is what it looks like. It is online. People may read it and see if it makes common sense. Most people won't.

I am going to spend some time outlining some of the things that came from that and some of the excesses of the Federal Government.

Most Americans know we are not efficient. They understand that we are not doing a good job spending their money, but they have no idea how bad it really is. I have actually spent the last 9 years in oversight of almost every segment of the Federal Government. None of us can be proud of the way we spend the money. Most of it is very well intentioned, honorably intentioned, with minimal oversight, minimal control, with over \$150 billion of fraud every year, and I am talking pure fraud, and with \$250 billion of real duplication—programs that do exactly the same thing, run by different agencies, with no consideration to streamline those. None of those things have been considered.

We won't even do tax reform to get rid of unemployment for millionaires. What people don't realize is we paid \$60 million out over the last 2 years to people who were making \$1 million a year. We are paying them unemployment. They hardly need the unemployment check. Yet we won't even regulate those kinds of things.

I think we have failed to do our job, and that is a Republican and Democratic thing. That is us. That is not a partisan statement.

The last time the President signed an individual spending bill into law—an individual appropriations bill—was 4 years ago. Four years ago was the last time he signed an independent appropriations bill into law. That tells you Congress hasn't done its job. We haven't passed them.

According to studies, if you poll the American people in terms of the sequester, less than one in four felt any impact at all from the sequester. And I think the sequester is a terrible way to determine spending. I voted against the Budget Control Act for that very reason, because we are not responsible

enough to do the management and the oversight. But most Americans see no impact from it, and that is because in what we do there is so much waste and mismanagement. There is so much duplication, there is so much error that we could easily take that out and most people wouldn't notice it. They haven't noticed it.

Some of our Federal employees have noticed it, but the average American, 76 percent of them have never felt any impact from it whatsoever. They do not even know it happened. There has been no impact on their daily life. Increasing the debt limit and passing another CR isn't going to do a thing to eliminate government waste, fraud, or duplication.

It is time we kind of reassess where we are. One of the reasons I am against a debt limit increase is because it takes the pressure off Members of Congress to make the hard choices. If we raise the debt limit, that means we don't have to make the hard choices and we will run a deficit again and again. Toward the end of this decade, just 7 years from now, the deficits start climbing well above \$1 trillion again—\$1 trillion a year. Our deficit is growing twice as fast as our economy is—our debt is. It is growing twice as fast as our economy is. So we are going down in a hole.

We ought to be about—Democrats and Republicans—holding hands and saying let's stop this nonsense. Let's put some brakes on ourselves. Let's put in some limitations so we don't continue to fall prey to ducking the very difficult decisions facing this country. Households do that, businesses do it all the time. They assess where they are, they assess how deep the hole is, because nobody gives them the ability to say: You don't have to make those hard choices, we will give you more borrowing power. What they do is make those hard choices. We refuse to do so.

Another example. We just finished year end and there is this syndrome in Washington called "use it or lose it."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post with the lead-in "As Congress fights over the budget, agencies go on their 'use it or lose it' shopping sprees."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 28, 2013]

AS CONGRESS FIGHTS OVER THE BUDGET, AGENCIES GO ON THEIR "USE IT OR LOSE IT" SHOPPING SPREES

(By David A. Fahrenthold)

This past week, the Department of Veterans Affairs bought \$562,000 worth of artwork.

In a single day, the Agriculture Department spent \$144,000 on toner cartridges.

And, in a single purchase, the Coast Guard spent \$178,000 on "Cubicle Furniture Rehab."

This string of big-ticket purchases was an unmistakable sign: It was "use it or lose it" season again in Washington.

All week, while Congress fought over next year's budget, federal workers were immersed in a separate frantic drama. They were trying to spend the rest of this year's budget before it is too late.

The reason for their haste is a system set up by Congress that, in many cases, requires agencies to spend all their allotted funds by Sept. 30.

If they don't, the money becomes worthless to them on Oct. 1. And—even worse—if they fail to spend the money now, Congress could dock their funding in future years. The incentive, as always, is to spend.

So they spent. It was the return of one of Washington's oldest bad habits: a blitz of expensive decisions, made by agencies with little incentive to save.

Private contractors—worried that sequestration would result in a smaller spending rush this year—brought in food to keep salespeople at their desks. Federal workers quizzed harried colleagues in the hallways, asking if they had spent it all yet.

"The way we budget [money] sets it up," said Sen. Tom Coburn (R-Okla.). "Because instead of being praised for not spending all your money, you get cut for not spending all your money. And so we've got a perverse incentive in there." But, Coburn said, "nobody's talking about it but me and you."

Coburn said he had meant to mention it in his floor speech Wednesday. Then, when he got to the podium, he forgot.

"Use it or lose it" season is not marked on any official government calendars. But in Washington, it is as real as Christmas. And as lucrative.

And—it appears—about as permanent. "We cannot expect our employees to believe that cost reduction efforts are serious if they see evidence of opportunistic spending in the last days of the Fiscal Year," President Lyndon B. Johnson wrote to underlings in May 1965. Even then, Johnson said an end-of-year binge was "an ancient practice—but that does not justify it or excuse it."

Today, government spending on contracts still spikes at the end of the fiscal year on Sept. 30.

In 2012, for instance, the government spent \$45 billion on contracts in the last week of September, according to calculations by the fiscal-conservative group Public Notice. That was more than any other week—9 percent of the year's contract spending money, spent in 2 percent of the year.

Much of it is spent smartly, on projects that had already gone through an extensive review.

But not all of it.

In 2010, for instance, the Internal Revenue Service had millions left over in an account to hire new personnel. The money would expire at year's end. Its solution was not a smart one.

The IRS spent the money on a lavish conference. Which included a "Star Trek" parody video starring IRS managers. Which was filmed on a "Star Trek" set that the IRS paid to build. (Sample dialogue: "We've received a distress call from the planet NoTax.")

"That is a major problem," acting IRS commissioner Daniel I. Werfel told Congress in June, explaining the role of "use it or lose it" in that debacle.

Other end-of-year mistakes are less spectacular—but they still cause problems. One recent study, for instance, found that information technology contracts signed at year's end often produced noticeably worse results than those signed in calmer times.

And late-September waste also weighs on its witnesses, federal workers. After Presi-

dent Obama set up an online suggestion box for federal workers, many asked to get rid of the "use it or lose it" system. They suggested "rolling over" money for use in the next year. And they listed dumb things they had seen bought: three years' worth of staples. Portable generators that never got used. One said the National Guard bought so much ammunition that firing it all became a chore.

"When you get BORED from shooting MACHINE GUNS, there is a problem," an anonymous employee wrote.

"People want to do the right thing," said Dean Sinclair, a former State Department employee who is crusading to change the system. "It's not that the federal workforce is filled with bad people. The system sort of forces them to make bad decisions."

He suggests giving bonuses to managers who return leftover money to the Treasury at year's end. "It takes time and effort to waste money," Sinclair said. "Remember that."

Obama, like presidents before him, has exhorted agencies to plan better and avoid rushed decisions at year's end. But the White House says Congress is making that job harder.

"Twenty-five percent of my business, right, will happen in this month. Twenty-five percent of my year," said Art Richer, the president of ImmixGroup, a contractor in Tysons Corner that helps software and computing companies seeking government business.

September in Washington used to be a time for selling face to face. Contractors visited the Pentagon. Small-town mayors queued up in the hallways at the Commerce Department, waiting to make a late-night pitch for grants.

But those buildings are off-limits now. So you sell from your desk. You sell with your voice. You sell with empathy, for the poor harried bureaucrat on the other end of the line. "Answer the phone smiling," Richer tells his people.

Of course, the feds were stressed.

"We see them in the hallway, and you go, 'How much money are we going to lose?'" one Army officer said this past week. That officer was involved in setting budgets for future years, and the meaning was clear: How much money are you not going to spend? Whatever that number was, it would be taken out of budgets for fiscal 2015, too.

This is not normal math. But this was not a normal time in Washington: You didn't save money to spend it later. You spent now, to spend later. "They know they're under the gun," the officer said, who spoke anonymously to talk about internal budgeting discussions.

On Monday, Immix began bringing its sales team three catered meals a day. If workers walked to Subway, they might lose a sale. On that day, Immix handled \$16 million in business. A normal Monday is about \$2 million.

Across the government, agencies were making big-ticket purchases—buying things with this year's money that could be used next year.

On Monday, VA paid \$27,000 for an order of photographs showing sunsets, mountain peaks and country roads. They would go into a new center serving homeless veterans in Los Angeles; a spokeswoman described the art as "motivational and calming, professionally designed to enhance clinical operations."

On Tuesday, the USDA bought \$127,000 worth of toner cartridges ("end of year," the

order explained). VA spent another \$220,000 on artwork for its hospitals.

On Wednesday, the Coast Guard paid \$178,000 for cubicle furniture, replacing high-walled cubes with low-walled ones to improve the air flow in a large office area.

"Other higher-priority projects were not able to be executed, so they moved [money] to this lower-priority project" before the year's end, said Coast Guard spokesman Carlos Diaz. "The money was going to be spent anyway."

On Thursday, VA was buying art again. It spent \$216,000 on artwork for a facility in Florida. In all, preliminary data showed that the agency made at least 18 percent of all its art purchases for the year in this one week. One-sixth of the buying in one-fifth of the year.

On Friday, the end was in sight.

"I feel good. Four days, right?" said Corey Forshee, a contracting officer at Joint Base Andrews in Maryland. Forshee was part of a team at Andrews that had done its best to beat the September rush.

The commander, trying to avoid a last-week rush, set his own deadline of Sept. 20. The pizza came early. The chaplain's office visited early ("use it or lose it" season is traditionally stressful enough to get the chaplain involved). The buying was nearly done.

Now, they had to wait for the last act of the last act: the "fall-out money."

This was cash that other parts of the Air Force had not been able to spend. It would be redistributed to this office at the last minute.

"We're waiting for money for that," Forshee said, going down a list of unfunded projects. A roof for the workout area. A bathroom renovation. "Just waiting for money," he repeated.

Across Washington, everybody had to wait. "It's going to come down to Monday," said Richer, at ImmixGroup. On Friday, he said his sales had been about equal to last year's, despite worries about sequestration.

On Monday, Richer's people will sell until midnight. Then they will keep selling. "Money rolls across the continent," the feds say. Cash not spent in Washington might be spent by federal offices in California in the three hours before it is midnight there.

When it is midnight in California—3 a.m. in Washington—they will keep on. There are federal offices in Hawaii, after all. And it will still be three hours until midnight there.

Mr. COBURN. Let me give the American people a little taste of what we spent in the last week.

In the last week, the State Department spent \$5 million on new glassware for all our embassies. Was that something we needed to do? No. Was it an absolute requirement that we couldn't operate our embassies without another \$5 million worth of glassware? No. The State Department had \$5 million, and if they didn't spend it, they would be accused of not needing all their money. So they spent \$5 million on something that was not absolutely necessary.

In the last week, VA spent more than \$560,000 on artwork. As a matter of fact, in the last 2 days. I mean, we are bankrupt. We are running three-quarters of a trillion dollar deficit and we are going to buy a half million dollars worth of artwork because if we don't

spend it on something we won't get it next year? Where does that fit in with any common sense? Where does that fit with the integrity or the honor that will preserve the future of our country? It doesn't. We have to change that.

We have not done things that incentivize Federal employees not to spend it and we will give you part of it next year for your budget and the rest of it against the debt our kids will have.

The Coast Guard, in the last day, spent \$178,000 on cubicle furniture rehab. They signed a contract on the last day and sent the check out the door. It may be it needed to be rehabbed, but they made sure they got it in this year to consume the money.

The Agriculture Department, in 1 day, spent \$144,000 on toner cartridges. Think about it—\$144,000. These are all small amounts relative to Washington numbers, but the principle is exactly the same.

On the night before the government closed, the last day of the fiscal year, the Pentagon awarded 94 contracts right before midnight. I can't get the information on what they were yet, but I will. I will find out if they were necessary, if it is something that we needed to have in light of our debt and our dysfunction.

They also spent \$5 billion on everything from robot submarines, Finnish hand grenades only hours before the closing of the fiscal year. So they spent the money, not saying it was a priority, other than it was a priority to spend all the money we have because we are afraid we might not get enough money next year.

The Defense Logistics Agency spent \$65 million for military helmets on the last day, \$24 million for traveling wave tubes to amplify radio signals.

How do we think the hundreds of thousands of people who are furloughed right now feel about us spending money that way when that could be paying them and they could be working?

We are sick. We need a wakeup call.

Let me cite a couple others from the Department of Defense just to show you how parochialism plays into this. Twelve brandnew—brandnew—airplanes, C-27J Spartans, were delivered right before the end of the year. Guess where they are. They are in mothballs in Arizona in the desert because we don't need them. But we spent \$567 million for something we didn't need. So what do we do? We store them in the desert because the humidity is so low. So we take them right off the manufacturing line and fly them right to storage. They are not needed.

We have the same problem on the C-27As in Afghanistan. We spent \$596 million for those. We finally canceled the contracts because the supplier couldn't supply the spare parts. And you know what the military is getting ready to

do, rather than bringing them home or giving them to somebody else? They are getting ready to cut them into pieces in Afghanistan—\$½ billion worth of airplanes.

Where is common sense in this country? Why wouldn't we think about maybe selling them to somebody else and getting some of our value back? But we are thinking about cutting them up.

Then there is the M1A1 Abrams tank. We had testimony from Secretary of the Army John McHugh saying this is the most modern piece of equipment the military has. Its average age is less than 2½ years old. We don't need any more M1A1 Abrams tanks, but they are still being produced this year to the tune of \$3 billion so we can keep people employed in a factory making something we don't need.

Isn't that wonderful? Isn't that a great way to steal the future of your kids? But I am sure the politicians where they are made are very happy we are continuing to buy something we don't need because it helps the economy in their area.

Despite the sequester, the National Science Foundation is still funding hundreds of products and studies that do not fit with common sense or a priority. Even if they fit with common sense, they do not fit the priority of where we find ourselves financially.

The Department of Agriculture grants that were announced in the last week before we shut down, before we went to the next fiscal year and don't have a continuing CR—let me read this and see if you think this is how we should be spending our money: 35 wine-tasting projects, wine trail smart phone apps. We are going to supply the money for these. The Federal Government is going to supply the money for these so you can have a good time when you go to whatever vineyard it is. We are going to take Federal taxpayer money.

Those are private businesses. Yet we are spending our grandchildren's money on that?

Four Christmas tree initiatives: Virginia Christmas trees, Michigan Christmas trees; training seminars on how you sell Christmas trees.

You know, Christmas trees are in pretty good demand around Christmas. I am not sure you are going to markedly increase the demand for Christmas trees by learning how to sell them better.

The USA pear road show to China; social media for apples, radio advertisements—paid for by the Federal Government—for blueberries from New Jersey, strawberries, organizing a maple weekend in the state of our Presiding Officer—Massachusetts.

We are spending our grandkids' money, money we are borrowing, to do things that are not a priority. They may be a priority to those folks who

get the money, but in terms of our national priorities, they are not anywhere close.

Other examples of ongoing government waste and duplication not eliminated but instead funded by the CR: \$30 billion for 47 job training programs that aren't working. They are not working. The GAO says they are not working, we know they are not working, and all of them duplicate one another except for three. But we are continuing to spend \$30 billion a year on them.

The House has passed a skills act which consolidated all of them. We won't even take it up over here. We won't even look at it. It would save us about \$7 billion or \$8 billion a year. They read the GAO report, they acted on it, but we won't.

We have 20 Federal programs across 12 different Federal agencies and offices for the study of invasive species. I think we ought to study invasive species, but I don't think we need 12 different Federal agencies involved in it. And I don't think we need 20 programs on it.

I mentioned the unemployment for millionaires. That is in the CR. We didn't do anything to fix that.

There is \$30 million for 15 different financial literacy programs at 15 different agencies. We just created a new one at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Rather than eliminate the ones that are not working, we are creating more of them.

There is \$947,000 in the NASA budget to talk about foods that can be eaten on Mars. We are 30 years away from going to Mars. Yet we are going to spend \$1 million of taxpayer money we don't have to think about foods we might eat 30 years from now on Mars? I don't think that is a priority for us right now.

There is \$3 billion on 209 science, technology, engineering, and math programs at 13 different agencies. Think about that. We all know we need to get it together when it comes to education in our technical and scientific areas. But why would we have this many—209—programs, with 209 different sets of administrators and 209 sets of reporting?

There is billions of dollars in bonuses and Federal payments to contractors who fail to pay their own taxes. We have tried to pass in here multiple times that if you are a contractor with the Federal Government and you are not paying your taxes, you are either going to lose your contract or that tax debt is going to be reduced from what we pay you. But we can't get that through. So people who aren't carrying their fair share are still reaping the benefits of contracting with the Federal Government even though they are tax cheats.

Here is one small one, but this one really gets me. It is bigger than you

would think. We have an agency that spends \$66 million a year. It is the NTIS. I asked GAO to study them. They studied them. In their report this year, GAO explained there is an office in the Department of Commerce, which is this office, that sells reports to other agencies.

When we had GAO study this, we found 74 percent of the reports they sell to other agencies you can get from this one Web site for free. Their budget hasn't gone down, it has expanded. But the need for the agency is going away. So why are we continuing to spend \$66 million—which is what we directly spend and doesn't count what they collect from all the other agencies—for only 26 percent of the information that is not available other than at Google? It makes no sense. It is called the National Technical Information Service, and it was established in 1950, tasked with collecting and distributing certain reports.

GAO noticed this 10 years ago; they noticed it again now. Congress has done nothing. What GAO estimates is 621,917 of the 841,000 reports this agency puts out are available for free on the Internet. Go to Google and every American can find it for free. All the agencies that are paying can find it for free. But we haven't eliminated this agency.

I will stop with that, and I will make a couple points.

It is wonderful that we have a difference of opinion in the Congress, but we can't have a difference of opinion about where this country is headed. We are bankrupt. People don't like to say that word. This is America; we couldn't be bankrupt. But from a balance sheet standpoint and from an income sheet standpoint, we are bankrupt.

So what are the American people to do about this? Are we to continue to spend money every year to the tune of \$500 billion to \$1 trillion and not make the tough choices or should we do something about it? Should there be a resolution to this addiction of spending money we don't have on things we don't need?

As a physician, for every person I have ever encountered who had an addiction, the first step in confronting that addiction is to recognize the reality of the addiction. Quite frankly, Members of Congress haven't done that. The American people have. They are figuring it out.

The reason I know we haven't recognized the addiction and we are not worried—we can say our debt can be such a percentage of GDP. We don't have to live within our means. We can handle it as long as we don't get above a certain percentage. That is the rationalization of an enabler in a family who allows somebody to continue to be addicted.

Every addiction needs a 12-step program, and the first step is recognizing

that we are addicted. And we are. So one of the things the American people are starting to ask about us, given that we can't even pass a CR—and we are going to pass a debt limit increase and not make any of the hard choices. They won't be made this year. They won't be made next year. The only time we are going to make the hard choices is when the international financial community forces us to make those.

But what Americans are asking now, the confidence is so low, is who decides? Do we really represent their thoughts about spending, about priorities, about waste?

If we recognize that all this is there—these trillions and trillions of dollars over 10 years that could be changed without any marked impact on America, and we don't do anything about it—what they are asking is who is deciding? Who decides? Do I represent my constituents if I won't try to change these things?

The confidence level in us, as reflected in the polls, and when you talk to anybody, is they don't have any confidence in us because we won't admit to our addiction, come together, get on the wagon and solve the addiction.

A long time ago in this body I said there was a rumble out in America. It wasn't long after that the tea party came along. I know they are thought about with some disdain. They are not crazy. What they have done is lost confidence and they want something changed. But it is not just the tea party anymore. It doesn't matter your political persuasion. They think we don't get it, that we are not willing to make the sacrifices of our own political careers to solve the problems. What we need to be doing, in my opinion—and my prescription for us is, American people, don't let us get out of the box by letting us raise again the shackles that are going to be increased by increasing the debt in this country. Because if we do—and we will—what will happen is we won't perform. We won't make the tough decisions. We won't make the sacrifices. There will be no sacrificial leadership on the part of Members of Congress. Their sacrifice will be, How do I get reelected, rather than I don't care if I lose; our country needs to be fixed, and we need to be about addressing that even if it costs me a political position.

When it is all said and done and America has blown through and we see the real results of our profligate spending and the hyperinflation and the marked decrease in the standard of living in this country, what they are going to remember about us is there was a challenge and we didn't rise to it. We didn't rise to the occasion. We saw short term and we forgot and ignored the long-term consequences of our actions.

My hope is that will change on both sides of the aisle; that we would truly

embrace a long-term picture and recognize the tremendous difficulty. We have heard all this talk about how we have to raise the debt limit; otherwise, we are going to default. We are not going to default on our bonds, ever. It requires less than 7 percent of our total cashflow that comes into this country. We use that as a scare tactic.

I am not saying we should necessarily not increase the debt ceiling, but we sure shouldn't increase it until we have made a commitment that we are going to solve the problem, because we will be back here in 1½ years doing exactly the same thing with exactly the same excuses that say why we can't.

What America is wanting to hear from us is why we can. They are not wanting to hear about division. They are wanting to hear about unity. They are wanting to hear about what pulls our country together rather than tear it down. The best way to show them is that we are serious about solving this problem. I hope that is so.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, this past weekend I was with a group of heroes from the "greatest generation." These men and women faced some of the biggest challenges our Nation has seen. They put aside their own needs to make the country and the world a better place.

These World War II veterans from Arkansas were flown in on an Honor Flight to see their memorial. They didn't have much to say to me personally about the shutdown. We talked about it, but talked more about the branch of the service they were in, what they did during the war, and the various things that happened to them during that period—and, of course, about Razorback football. We didn't have to spend and take time to visit a great deal about the shutdown for me to know their thoughts. Their presence alone was enough of a reminder that we need to solve this issue.

As the shutdown drags on, it spills into the debt ceiling discussion. These are two major issues with very serious impacts if left unresolved.

To everyone outside of the Beltway, it seems both sides are digging their heels in deeper, both sides are ratcheting up the rhetoric, and nothing is getting done. The American people are tired of this. Dismissing the other side's offers without consideration and trading barbs do not help out one bit. No one is being asked to abandon their principles. What needs to happen, how-

ever, is both sides must respect the will of the American people.

We must find a way to do what the public demands—reopen the government and get our spending under control. The President and the Senate majority want to say that their health care law is an entirely separate issue from this debate. That is simply untrue. It is not the way Americans see it. One major reason the American people are rejecting it is because of its budget-busting pricetag. We have a budget that can't be strained any further. Our debt stands at almost \$17 trillion, and \$6 trillion of that has been added on President Obama's watch. You can't take on that much debt and pretend it is not a problem. Americans do not have the luxury of telling their credit card company to stop calling because they do not want to pay the debt that they racked up.

This mess could be avoided if we simply followed regular order here in Washington, but we have not done that in 10 years. What I mean by that is during my time in the Senate we have passed one individual appropriations bill prior to the end of the previous fiscal year. We didn't consider a single appropriations bill on the Senate floor last year. Let's return to regular order by passing an annual budget and the accompanying spending bills, not one large bill.

The good news is that many Members on both sides believe we simply need to get that done. But that doesn't get us out of our current mess. We have to get the government operating again, and we have to avoid a default.

Impassioned debates on major decisions like raising the debt ceiling in the past have resulted in positive policy changes. In fact, half of the 53 times Congress has agreed to raise the debt ceiling since 1978, they have attached conditions to it. The Gramm-Rudman act is a perfect example. We talked a lot about the need to cap spending in Washington. Gramm-Rudman actually did that, and it led to a balanced budget. Even the situation we are currently in with the Budget Control Act was born out of this type of constraint. Some in the Chamber still are not happy with that, but the Budget Control Act is the first time in a long time that we have managed to curb the growth in Washington spending.

Anyone who has ever bought a house or a car can tell you that it takes some time to reach a mutually beneficial agreement. There is lots of haggling involved. The owner says here is what it costs. The consumer makes an offer in return. This brings a counteroffer and so on. This continues until both parties reach an agreement where everyone is satisfied.

But the key to this process is that both parties have to engage in the discussion. Everybody needs to come to

the table. It is simply not enough to say this is where I stand and I will not take any other options into consideration. I am fairly certain you will never buy a house with that approach.

The good news is it seems we are heading in a positive direction. I believe there is movement toward a consensus. At the very least, both sides seem to be coming out of their respective corners and discussing their options. We need everyone to come to the table, to develop a way forward that puts us on the path to fiscal responsibility. These discussions serve as a starting point for how to rein in reckless spending so we can eliminate the blank check, the philosophy that has become so pervasive in this town.

If we need inspiration to solve this problem, the men and the women I visited with at the World War II Memorial this past weekend are a perfect place to look. They have accurately been named the "greatest generation" in part for their willingness to take on enormous challenges because it was the right thing to do.

We have an enormous challenge in front of us now. Let's follow the inspiration of the "greatest generation." Let's put our country before ourselves and solve this problem.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, with the Presiding Officer's permission, I ask the clerk to report the cloture motion I have filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

Harry Reid, Max Baucus, Patty Murray, Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mark Udall, Bill Nelson, Barbara Boxer, Jon Tester, Brian Schatz, Benjamin L. Cardin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Maria Cantwell, Tim Kaine, Elizabeth Warren.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NAVY CELEBRATIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, on October 13, 1775, Congress enacted legislation providing for the outfitting of America's first two warships, manned by crews of 80, to be sent out on a 3-month cruise. Their mission was to intercept transports carrying munitions and supplies to the British army in America. Navy missions have evolved significantly over the last 238 years; however, the essential role America's maritime forces play in defending our Nation and allowing prosperity to flourish is unchanged. The United States Navy has the finest men and women in uniform on, above, and below the high seas safeguarding America's interests at home and around the globe.

This Sunday we celebrate the U.S. Navy's 238th birthday. We remember the great sacrifices made by sailors who came before, we mourn those we lost along the way, we celebrate their successes and we applaud the new generation of sailors serving our great Nation today. The United States Navy is comprised of over 323,000 active duty sailors, over 109,000 on ready reserve, and a civilian force around 201,000. The United States Navy cannot exist without the commitment of its active duty, reserve and civilian forces, in addition to the support of Navy families. The sacrifices made by over 630,000 proud men and women serving the Navy provide the freedoms all Americans enjoy daily; freedoms paid for by those in uniform, many who are aboard the 102 ships deployed around the world as I speak right now, serving on the front lines in defense of freedom.

There are no finer men and women in uniform anywhere in the world than those who serve the United States Navy. Today, the value of having a strong naval power cannot be underestimated; 70 percent of the Earth's surface is covered by water and 90 percent of international trade travels by the sea, which means our sailors need to be 100 percent on watch. No other branch of the military conducts missions on all fronts like the Navy does. The seas are America's lifeline; our Navy protects vital shipping lanes ensuring prosperity and free trade for our Nation and our friends abroad. The Navy is essential in protecting our Nation's cybersecurity at a time when, according to former Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Gary Roughead, 95 percent of digital information is traveling on cables at the bottom of the

seas. Our national security is ever-dependent on our Nation's sea power. For each of these reasons and more, the United States Navy deserves our thanks and admiration.

I must also pay tribute as today marks the 168th anniversary of the United States Naval Academy. When Secretary of the Navy George Bancroft founded the Academy in Annapolis, MD, I think he could only dream that it would continue to inspire and help create the high caliber graduates it does today. I truly must commend those graduates and their brothers and sisters serving in arms. The incredible flexibility and can-do attitude of the Navy were instrumental to the withdrawal of military forces in Iraq and the drawdown of military forces in Afghanistan. From the Seabees to the Navy Seals, the entirety of the Department of the Navy is integral to securing our national defense around the world.

Artfully inscribed above the chapel doors at the Naval Academy are the Latin words "non sibi sed patriae." Though the Navy has no official motto, these words, translated as "not for self but country," encapsulate the sacrifice and dedication of our amazing Navy Men and Women serving across the globe today so that our society may be free. The real strength of our Navy is not the ships or weapons or technology at our disposal, but the highly trained, motivated, and professional sailors who make our Navy the envy of the world. For 238 years, the U.S. Navy has witnessed many changes in missions, in geopolitics, and in technology. But in all that time, the one thing that has not changed is the importance of quality people, for it is the sailors who make it all happen, and who make the real difference in a Navy's effectiveness. To all who serve: thank you for your continued vigilance. Let us remember our Navy sailors and Naval Academy midshipmen for their historic achievements in defense of our Nation and in defense of freedom, and wish them a happy birthday.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR CHARLES H. CANNON

• Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to my constituent MAJ Charles H. Cannon for his exemplary dedication to duty and his service to the U.S. Army and to the United States of America. Major Cannon will depart from Active military duty in 2013 but will continue to serve in the National Guard in our great State of Georgia. He has served for the last 2 years as a congressional budget liaison for the Secretary of the Army.

A native of Moultrie, GA, Major Cannon left his family's 2,000-acre farm to

become a cadet at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1997. While there, Chas played for the Army football team and earned a bachelor's degree in systems engineering. He was commissioned as a field artillery officer in June of 2001, just 3 months before the horrific attacks on September 11 that would shape the rest of his active duty career.

Major Cannon's assignments have been diverse. While a lieutenant, he served in C Battery, 1-10 Field Artillery Battalion as a fire direction officer, platoon leader, and executive officer. His first deployment was with them during the ground invasion of Operation Iraqi Freedom. After promotion to captain, he served in 2-69 Armor Battalion as a staff officer during his second deployment to Diyala, Iraq. Eleven months later, as part of the surge, Chas returned to East Baghdad, Iraq for a 15-month deployment as the commander of A Battery, 1-10 Field Artillery Battalion.

After returning from his third deployment, Major Cannon earned a master of professional studies in legislative affairs from The George Washington University. He was then assigned as a congressional fellow in my office with a subsequent assignment as a legislative strategist in the office of the Chief of Legislative liaison and then as a budget liaison officer in the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management and Comptroller, where he was tasked with managing the Army's wheeled and tracked vehicle portfolio.

Major Cannon's leadership throughout his career has positively impacted his soldiers, peers, and superiors. As a budget liaison officer he worked directly with the Senate and House Appropriations Committees to educate and inform Senators, Representatives, and staff about many diverse and important procurement initiatives of the U.S. Army.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending MAJ Chas Cannon for over a decade of active service to his country. We wish Chas, his wife Beth, and their two little girls, Allie and Catherine, all the best as they continue their journey of service in the Georgia National Guard.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 6:26 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker of the House of Representatives has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

The enrolled joint resolution was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolutions were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution making appropriations for the salaries and related expenses of certain Federal employees during a lapse in funding authority for fiscal year 2014, to establish a bicameral working group on deficit reduction and economic growth, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 120. A bill to expand the number of scholarships available to Pakistani women under the Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1570. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to authorize advance appropriations for the Indian Health Service by providing 2-fiscal-year budget authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. BEGICH):

S.J. Res. 24. A joint resolution to amend the Department of Defense Survivor Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014 to make continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased members of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 116

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 116, a bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act.

S. 232

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 232, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 583

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 583, a bill to implement equal protection under the 14th article of amendment to the Constitution for the right to life of each born and preborn human person.

S. 669

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 669, a bill to make permanent the Internal Revenue Service Free File program.

S. 932

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 932, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for advance appropriations for certain discretionary accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNES, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1564

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1564, a bill making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits and services in the event of a Government shutdown.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2000. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1569, to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2001. Mr. REID (for Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1276, to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management.

SA 2002. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 58, expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations.

SA 2003. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 58, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2000. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1569, to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. NO BUDGET, NO PAY.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “No Budget, No Pay Act”.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “Member of Congress”—

(1) has the meaning given under section 2106 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) does not include the Vice President.

(c) **TIMELY APPROVAL OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.**—If both Houses of Congress have not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget as described under section 301 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632) for a fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year and have not passed all the regular appropriations bills for the next fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year, the pay of each Member of Congress may not be paid for each day following that October 1 until the date on which both Houses of Congress approve a concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year and all the regular appropriations bills.

(d) **NO PAY WITHOUT CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be appropriated or otherwise be made available from the Treasury of the United States for the pay of any Member of Congress during any period determined by the Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under subsection (e).

(2) **NO RETROACTIVE PAY.**—A Member of Congress may not receive pay for any period determined by the Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under subsection (e), at any time after the end of that period.

(e) **DETERMINATIONS.**—

(1) **SENATE.**—

(A) **REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATIONS.**—On October 1 of each year, the Secretary of the Senate shall submit a request to the Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate for certification of determinations made under subparagraph (B) (i) and (ii).

(B) **DETERMINATIONS.**—The Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall—

(i) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with subsection (c) and whether Senators may not be paid under that subsection;

(ii) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Senators may not be paid under subsection (c); and

(iii) provide timely certification of the determinations under clauses (i) and (ii) upon the request of the Secretary of the Senate.

(2) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATIONS.—On October 1 of each year, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives shall submit a request to the Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives for certification of determinations made under subparagraph (B) (i) and (ii).

(B) DETERMINATIONS.—The Chairmen of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives shall—

(i) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with subsection (c) and whether Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under that subsection;

(ii) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under subsection (c); and

(iii) provide timely certification of the determinations under clauses (i) and (ii) upon the request of the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on February 1, 2015.

SA 2001. Mr. REID (for Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1276, to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management.”.

SA 2002. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 58, expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations; as follows:

On page 2, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 3, line 2, and insert the following:

(1) finds that the provision and availability of religious services and clergy is important to the morale and wellbeing of many members of the Armed Forces and their families; and

(2) hopes the Secretary of Defense is able to determine that contractor clergy provide necessary support to military personnel, and would therefore be covered under the appropriations made available under the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113-39).

SA 2003. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 58, expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations; as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the Department of Defense determined that some contractor clergy, like other Department of Defense contractors, were unable to perform their contractual duties during the current lapse in appropriations;

Whereas this determination may have impacted the ability of members of the Armed

Forces and their families to worship and participate in religious activities;

Whereas military chaplains on active duty, like all military personnel on active duty, continue to perform their duties during the current lapse in appropriations;

Whereas the Department continues to analyze its authorities under the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113-39) with respect to contractors; and

Whereas the Pay Our Military Act appropriates such sums as are necessary to pay contractors of the Department whom the Secretary of Defense determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces: Now, therefore, be it

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 10, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 10, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Impact of a Default on Financial Stability and Economic Growth.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 10, 2013, at 8 a.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “The Debt Limit.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 10, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECURITY CLEARANCE OVERSIGHT AND REFORM ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 199, S. 1276.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1276) to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management, strengthen the authority to terminate or debar employees and contrac-

tors involved in misconduct affecting the integrity of security clearance background investigations, enhance transparency regarding the criteria utilized by Federal departments and agencies to determine when a security clearance is required, and so forth and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Security Clearance Oversight and Reform Enhancement Act”.

SEC. 2. OVERSIGHT OF THE REVOLVING FUND OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.

Section 1304(e) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the first sentence, by inserting before the period the following: “, and for the cost of audits, investigations, and oversight activities relating to the fund and the functions financed by the fund, conducted by the Inspector General of the Office”; and

(2) in paragraph (5), by adding at the end the following: “Each budget submitted under this paragraph shall include an estimate from the Inspector General of the Office of the amount required to pay the reasonable expenses to adequately audit, investigate, and perform other oversight activities relating to the fund and the functions financed by the fund for the applicable fiscal year, which shall not exceed 0.33 percent of the total budgetary authority requested in the budget estimates submitted to Congress by the Office for that fiscal year.”.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the Carper title amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1276), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The amendment (No. 2001) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management.”.

CONTINUING RELIGIOUS SERVICES TO MEMBERS AND FAMILIES OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H. Con. Res. 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 58) expressing the sense of Congress regarding

the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Levin amendment to the concurrent resolution, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the concurrent resolution, as amended, be agreed to; that a Levin amendment to the preamble, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2002) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the resolution)

On page 2, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 3, line 2, and insert the following:

(1) finds that the provision and availability of religious services and clergy is important to the morale and wellbeing of many members of the Armed Forces and their families; and

(2) hopes the Secretary of Defense is able to determine that contractor clergy provide necessary support to military personnel, and would therefore be covered under the appro-

priations made available under the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113-39).

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 58), as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2003) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the Department of Defense determined that some contractor clergy, like other Department of Defense contractors, were unable to perform their contractual duties during the current lapse in appropriations;

Whereas this determination may have impacted the ability of members of the Armed Forces and their families to worship and participate in religious activities;

Whereas military chaplains on active duty, like all military personnel on active duty, continue to perform their duties during the current lapse in appropriations;

Whereas the Department continues to analyze its authorities under the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113-39) with respect to contractors; and

Whereas the Pay Our Military Act appropriates such sums as are necessary to pay contractors of the Department whom the Secretary of Defense determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces: Now, therefore, be it

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m. on Friday, October 11, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair to allow for a Republican special caucus with the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:45 p.m., adjourned until Friday, October 11, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, October 10, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 10, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IMPROVING HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this body has attempted to repeal the health care law 41 times. The act's repeal or delay is being used as leverage in the current budget fight, but I just want to take a few minutes to remind people why we passed the health reform law in the first place.

Let's remember the situation before ObamaCare became law. Clearly the status quo was not sustainable. The number one cause of personal bankruptcy in the United States was medical costs, and 60 percent of those who filed for bankruptcy had insurance. Forty-seven million Americans were without health care. Premiums were rising three times faster than wages, eating up more of our paychecks and bottom lines.

The average family was already paying a hidden health care tax of over \$1,000 annually in premiums as a direct result of subsidizing the cost of the uninsured. Small businesses were paying 18 percent more than larger employers for health insurance. People with pre-

existing conditions were denied coverage or thrown off their coverage when they got sick and needed it most. Senior citizens fell into the doughnut hole and had to pay hundreds of dollars out of pocket for their prescriptions.

We cannot go back. We cannot repeal this essential law. We must move forward together and fix the very real problems with health care reform; but before we do that, we have to stop spreading falsehoods and set the record straight about what is in the law and what is not.

Myth number one: Members of Congress and their staffs are somehow exempt from the law. Not only are Members and their staff not exempt from the law, but they are actually subject to extra requirements. Insurance marketplaces that Members and staff must now join were actually designed for people who currently do not have insurance or get it on the individual market. People who already have insurance through their employers, like Members and their staff, don't need to get insurance through the marketplace because they already have coverage. Still, due to a messaging amendment in the ACA, Members and their staff were required to get their insurance through the marketplace and they will.

Myth number two: the Affordable Care Act is a job killer. First of all, 97 percent of small employers are exempt from the requirements to provide insurance. Second, most large employers who are required to provide coverage already do so. Aside from reporting requirements, the ACA will only require about 1 percent of businesses to do anything differently. Some on the other side of this aisle often cite a Congressional Budget Office report which said the ACA would lead to a reduction in the amount of labor in the economy by one-half of one percent. What the critics failed to add is that the same report noted that the small reduction in labor would come primarily from people choosing to work less.

There are legitimate concerns from small restaurants and hospitality entities that are worried about affording affordable coverage for their part-time employees. These concerns are real and should be addressed; but exaggerating claims that the ACA is a job killer and trying to repeal or defund it rather than remedy it does nothing to help those businesses with real concerns.

Myth number three: the Affordable Care Act is driving up premiums. Some historical context is important here. Premiums grew 119 percent between

1999 and the year 2008. Over the last 2 years, premiums have only increased an average of 4 percent. On the individual level, because insurance companies can no longer charge older individuals significantly more than younger folks, this will shift some costs to younger Americans. However, the insurance subsidies provided by the law will significantly blunt those potential cost increases. Those who are uninsured with preexisting conditions who previously could not get coverage will likely pay less. Finally, those with employer-provided coverage, the majority of Americans, will see little change.

We need to do more to hold down the cost of health care; but rather than talking about real cost reduction reforms, opponents of the law are simply trying to repeal it—41 times. This Nation's health care system faces real challenges, and we need real solutions. If critics of the law spent as much energy on developing legitimate solutions as they do on perpetuating falsehoods about the ACA, we might make some progress. Let's stop the fear-mongering, come together and have a real conversation about improving our health care system.

END HUNGER IN AMERICA NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, here we are, 10 days into the Republican government shutdown and just a few days away from hitting the debt ceiling, and the Republican leadership continues to spin its wheels. The American people are rightly blaming congressional Republicans for this shutdown, and they will blame Republicans for a default too.

Every day seems to bring a new Republican strategy: repeal ObamaCare, defund ObamaCare, delay ObamaCare, stage a non-filibuster filibuster, ask for the entire Romney economic platform in order to raise the debt ceiling, yell at park rangers, fund this part of the government, fund that part of the government, pay furloughed employees, pay essential employees, hold a conference meeting, hold a press conference.

Meanwhile, as the Republican Conference tries to get its act together, Americans across this country are feeling the impact of the shutdown, and that impact grows every day. Last month USDA released the annual figures on food security in America.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

These are the statistics of the number of people who don't know where their next meal will come from, essentially the number of hungry people in this country; and once again we see the effects of the Great Recession showing up in these food security numbers.

According to USDA, over 49 million people are food insecure. That means they are hungry. Seventeen million are children. These figures are virtually unchanged from previous years. It means hunger is not getting better in America. It is not getting worse, but that is no consolation.

While these figures are bad enough, House Republicans apparently thought they should be worse and decided to pass legislation cutting \$39 billion from SNAP, our Nation's best, most efficient and effective anti-hunger program. Those cuts would cause hunger to get worse; 170,000 unemployed veterans would lose access to SNAP. Two million kids would be kicked off the free school meal program. Overall, around 4 million people would lose access to SNAP because of these terrible cuts.

Now, that is pretty bad, especially considering that hunger is still a problem in America; but it is still not bad enough for the Republicans, so they shut the government down. Now, I know this shutdown isn't about hunger; it is about irrational demands by a few Republicans. But like the bill cutting SNAP by \$39 billion, the impact of the shutdown is beginning to make hunger worst in America.

Look at Nevada, where 362,000 food stamp recipients will see their benefits halt on November 1—not reduced, halted; 425,000 women, infants, and children would see their food benefits provided under WIC halted as well. That is right, nearly 800,000 hungry low-income Nevadans would lose access to food because of this Republican shutdown.

But it is not just Nevada. North Carolina announced on Tuesday that it had discontinued issuing food and nutrition benefits through WIC to women, infants, and children specifically because Federal funding for the program has dried up. Eighty percent of those Carolinians eligible have already received their October benefits, but that means 20 percent of the 264,000 enrolled low-income women, infants, and children will not get the help they qualify for to buy the food they need including formula, fruits, and vegetables.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue hearing stories like this as the Republican shutdown continues. More and more low-income families will see the food they rely on taken away from them simply because Republicans in Washington will not open the government.

This is not the way to end hunger now, Mr. Speaker. We will only end hunger now if we finally come together and decide that ending hunger is a priority, that it is something we believe

we can do, and that we commit ourselves to accomplishing it.

Mr. Speaker, we can stop hunger from getting worse by reopening the government. We can stop hunger from getting worse by preventing \$39 billion in SNAP cuts from being enacted. We can stop hunger from getting worse by preventing the automatic cut to SNAP already scheduled to take effect on November 1 from taking place.

We need to end this Republican shutdown today. Republicans should not let poor Americans go hungry simply because they can't agree on a political strategy in Washington. That is not right. That is not how we should treat our fellow Americans. It is wrong, and they know it. We should be working to end hunger now, not to make hunger worse. We can eliminate it. This is a fight we can win if we just find the political will and courage to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying once again to my Republican colleagues, bring a clean continuing resolution to this House floor so we can have an up-or-down vote so that we can reopen this government and so we can prevent hunger from getting worse in this country.

HUMAN CONSEQUENCES OF IRRESPONSIBLE AND IRRATIONAL SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue speaking out about the human consequences of this irresponsible and irrational government shutdown. We are now 10 days into this ridiculousness, and what I have been doing is spending time on the phone each day with the people from my region who tell me their stories about suffering due to the needless and increasingly maddening shutdown.

I recently spoke with the family of Jeremiah Johnson. They are from a town called Prophetstown, Illinois. It is a small town of about 2,000 people in Whiteside County, right in the heart of my congressional district.

Jeremiah is a disabled combat veteran who served his country bravely in Iraq. He now is also a Federal law enforcement employee who happens to be working without any pay; and while he is receiving no paycheck, he is also worried about the disability benefits being delayed because of the shutdown. So absolutely a double whammy for this father and husband.

In fact, he and his wife, Pam, just celebrated their 18th wedding anniversary on Monday; and rather than go out and celebrate like many couples do to mark their joyous occasion, they ate at home because they don't know when to expect their next paycheck. So Pam made a pie for her husband and Jeremiah gave his wife an anniversary

card, very simple and very sweet. On top of that, their 12-year-old daughter, Carissa, actually offered her parents her entire savings in case they need it. When Pam told me this story, she got a little emotional about it and spoke over and over about just what a good daughter they have.

So in spite of their seventh grader's loving offer and Pam and Jeremiah removing any extravagance from their wedding anniversary plans, of course they remain worried about the lack of a paycheck and really their own ability to be able to pay their car payment and their house payment. This is absolutely an unacceptable way that we would ever as a Nation treat our disabled veterans like Jeremiah.

We have the votes right now to open up our government and put Jeremiah and his family at ease; but there is one way to do this, and it is only if Democrats and Republicans come together. That is our path. It is that simple. It is commonsense, it is reasonable, and it is absolutely the right thing to do.

TRIBUTE IN CELEBRATION OF THE LIFE OF MARVIN DANIEL PRICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Marvin Daniel Price, who passed away July 21 at the age of 81. Mr. Price came to my attention because he is the youngest known person ever to play professional baseball in the United States of America. At the age of 14, Marvin played with the Chicago American Giants in 1946.

One might wonder how this happened. Well, his sister, Ms. Gloria Price Simpson, tells the story that one day Marvin couldn't come out to play because he was sick. The other kids looked up to him, so they spotted him in the window and asked him if he would call the balls, and so he called out, safe, foul ball, fair ball.

He always imagined that baseball would play a major role in his life, and in fact it did. At the age of 14, professional baseball soon became a reality for Marvin when he was spotted playing baseball in Washington Park by the legendary Chicago Giants outfielder Jimmy Crutchfield. A tryout was soon arranged with then-owner J.B. Martin at Comiskey Park where manager Quincy Troupe originally thought he was the new bat boy.

It didn't take long for him to show that he wasn't there just to distribute the equipment. Marvin put on such a show that the Chicago American Giants decided to take him on a barnstorming trip to the South where he could play without jeopardizing his amateur status back in Chicago. Playing against hardened black baseball

veterans in the South, Marvin displayed an awesome hitting performance.

After a week he returned home to Englewood High School, where he graduated and went on to play professionally with the Cleveland Buckeyes, New Orleans Eagles, and Chicago American Giants where he batted .390. Just as it looked as though Marvin was headed for baseball stardom, he enlisted in the military and spent 4 years in the United States Coast Guard.

After his stint in the military, he continued to play semi-professionally; and over the next 30 years, he worked as a supervisor with the Chicago post office while working part-time with the Chicago Park District teaching young people not only about the game of baseball, but the game of life.

On Friday, October 11, at U.S. Cellular Field, formerly known as Comiskey Park, there will be a memorial ceremony in Price's honor. Family members, friends and supporters, members of the White Sox and others are invited to come and celebrate his rich life and history. He was indeed a legend before his time, and so we salute you, Mr. Marvin Daniel Price, the youngest known professional baseball player in the United States of America.

VERY REAL AND DANGEROUS CONSEQUENCES OF A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues would have us believe that our current Federal shutdown has no real consequences. I have heard some even suggest that this period of suspended government should be thought of merely as a slowdown or a slimdown. There is talk that the shutdown is causing no real pain. The most extreme anti-government politicians even express the hope that such a cutback in government programs and services should be made permanent, and too many others are content to hang back and let those with extreme views have their way for the time being.

But I stand here today to remind my colleagues and the public that cuts in government funding and government programs have consequences, sometimes deadly. It is a lesson we learned in 2006 when annual coal mining deaths soared to 45, a 10-year high, reversing an 80-year trend of steadily falling fatalities, a trend attributed in part to years of underfunding the Mine Safety and Health Administration.

It is a lesson we should heed now. This year, as of September 4, 14 coal miners had died on the job in our country; and this past weekend alone, three coal miners lost their lives at work over 3 consecutive days, including one

miner in West Virginia. Think about that. In the first 9 months of the year, 14 coal miners perished on the job. In the first 9 days of the government shutdown, three coal miners have perished.

Mr. Speaker, even one death is one too many. Now, no one has linked these recent deaths directly to the government shutdown, but the inability of this Congress to pass a simple bill to fund all the operations of our government has resulted in cutbacks of routine inspections that are essential to the complex system of safety oversight of this complex industry.

Miners and operators know that MSHA's multi-layered inspection and enforcement system has been hampered. Assistant Secretary Joe Main has said:

Three miners killed on 3 consecutive days is extremely troubling. The fact that this occurred over a weekend when there may have been a greater expectation that an MSHA inspector would not be present is a red flag.

I hope that everyone in the coal industry, from the CEOs to the office staff, to security guards, to the coal miners themselves, will redouble their vigilance and take every possible step to ensure health and safety; and I urge my colleagues in this body to abandon this ridiculous political showdown that is undercutting the safety in our mines, our industrial facilities, our food chain, and so much more.

This is not a slowdown. It is not a slimdown. This is a politically driven shutdown, and it has real and dangerous consequences for the people who put their faith in us to provide them with basic services to ensure their well-being, to protect their lives, and to simply do the job that we have been elected to do: to lead.

PAIN OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN IS TOO GREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as this shutdown drags on—and I concur with the comments of my colleague from West Virginia—it is serious and having serious consequences. The American people are left to wonder why.

Back here in Washington, D.C., you have all kinds of talking points and spin, and it circles around and can easily get very confusing as everyone seems to focus on the wrong things as to what caused this. And, really, it is very simple; and I think understanding it and getting Democrats and Republicans to stop talking past each other is the first step to getting out of this.

We have to understand that basically when you pass a budget to fund the government, the first thing you argue about is how much money is spent on it; and we had that argument and, be-

lieve me, there are deep disagreements between the Republican House, the Democratic Senate, and the White House on that.

But an agreement was reached between Speaker JOHN BOEHNER and HARRY REID on the level of funding; and that level of funding, frankly, is vastly lower than Democrats want, and we were going to go forward with that until the Speaker changed his mind and decided that he wanted something else. So if you are wondering why HARRY REID, the Senator, the Majority Leader in the Senate, is upset about this situation, it is in part because he had a deal and the Republicans went back on that deal.

But it gets worse than that. So instead of simply agreeing to the amount of money that would fund the government, Republicans are now saying, no, they want policy changes within the budget in order to fund the government, in order to just simply keep it open and in order to raise the debt ceiling so that we can pay our bills.

Now, policy changes do occasionally happen within appropriations bills, but only when they are agreed upon between the House, the Senate, and the White House. And the problem that the Republicans have and what they have had for 3 years is they simply do not have the votes to pass the policy changes that they want because they didn't win the election last time. President Obama won the election, Democrats control the Senate, and, ironically, Democrats actually won 52 percent of the vote for Congress, but because of gerrymandering, Republicans wound up with more seats.

But however we got here, they do not have the votes to advance the agenda that they want to advance, and they are willing to shut down the government and stop funding it and not raise our debt ceiling; and, by the way, every day we get closer to that debt ceiling and not raising it is a day that is bad for this economy, all because they can't pass their policy agenda through the present Congress. Which raises the interesting question, What is that policy agenda? And that perhaps is the most frustrating thing about this.

We heard originally that they didn't pass the continuing resolution to fund the government because they wanted to end ObamaCare. Now editorials have been written by leaders; by the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR. I have heard PAUL RYAN say, no, no, no, it is not about ObamaCare; we understand we are not going to get that. Okay. So what policy change is it that you want? And this is where you get into the deficit. But, again, the Republicans haven't specified what they want on this.

Now, we know if you go back through 3 years of history, what they say they want, they want tax reform, though it hasn't been specified, and they want

cuts in entitlements to get us closer to a balanced budget. They are completely unwilling to consider any revenue increases.

Now, the problem with this is the President doesn't agree. The Senate doesn't agree. The deficit is a problem, no question, but Democrats believe that part of that solution has to be revenue; and to this point we get \$600 billion in revenue as a result of the deal that was reached last January in exchange for over \$2 trillion in cuts, \$2 trillion between the cuts that were made in the Budget Control Act of 2011 and the cuts that have now been forced on us by sequestration, \$2 trillion in cuts and \$600 billion in tax increases.

But be that as it may, the Republicans don't have the votes. They don't have the support of the President, and they don't have the support of the Senate to get those cuts, and yet they insist on shutting down the government.

Now, the big problem is what is it that they would want in tax reform and entitlement reform? And this is the thing that I think the American public is unaware of. The Republicans keep saying that they want entitlement reform, which means cuts in entitlements. They keep saying that they want tax reform. They have been in charge of this House for 3 years. They have not brought to the floor or passed out of committee any tax reform or any entitlement reform.

They put it in their budget, which is just sort of a big-picture list of future objectives of what they want to do. Why haven't they passed legislation? If they are willing to shut down the government and cause all of the pain that we have heard because they fervently believe that we need entitlement cuts and tax reform, the least they can do is bring it to the floor and tell us what it is.

Oddly, the President and Democrats have put more on the table in terms of reforming our entitlements. As part of the Affordable Care Act, we made reductions in Medicare, which the Republicans beat us up for and which has been responsible for Medicare actually going down in inflation.

The only solution for this, tell us what you want and understand how this situation works. The pain is too great.

VOTE FOR A CLEAN CR AND DEBT CEILING BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge you to turn away from this destructive path of threatening the full faith and credit of the United States Government as a means to extort political concessions and to subvert the democratic principle of majority rule. I urge you, Mr. Speaker, to be-

come the Speaker of the House and not spokesperson for a fringe cult within the GOP caucus.

The Affordable Care Act is settled law. In fact, the negotiation for any change to the Affordable Care Act is possible and perhaps even desirable under so-called regular order, and that goes for the other ransom demands that the GOP has made.

Now, of course, the reason for this crisis, this shutdown of the government and the debt crisis, has now shifted from repealing or delaying ObamaCare to vague demands for negotiations. We have seen a laundry list, Mr. Speaker, of other so-called demands: approval of the Keystone pipeline; concessions on payments to Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid; tort reform; repeal of job-killing regulations, that is, protections for clean air and clean water.

The latest demand is Republicans passed a bill to create a superdupercommittee that includes instructions that the committee can only resolve our budget crisis by considering spending cuts and entitlement cuts, but no new revenue. In other words, Mr. Speaker, you don't really want to negotiate. It is just obvious from your words and deeds, Mr. Speaker, since you, Mr. Speaker, have blocked negotiations 18 times over the past year.

Mr. Speaker, you are putting the country through this "shut-er-down" theater that you called for in the last Republican campaign, in the last cycle. "A nuclear weapon" is how Warren Buffett characterized failure to raise the debt ceiling.

Let me say that again. The world's most respected financial markets expert compared this now familiar Republican tactic as a weapon of mass destruction, a weapon that is "too horrible to use."

Let me quote Yalman Onaran in Bloomberg:

Failure by the world's largest borrower to pay its debt, unprecedented in modern history, will devastate stock markets from Brazil to Zurich, halt a \$5 trillion lending mechanism for investors who rely on Treasuries, blow up borrowing costs for billions of people and companies, ravage the dollar and throw U.S. and world economies into a recession that would likely become a depression. Money managers, economists, bankers and former government officials interviewed for this story, few view default as anything but a financial apocalypse.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, you continue to take default off the table. Meanwhile, even the discussion of default is driving up borrowing costs for the U.S. as investors demand higher yields to buy short-term U.S. Treasury bonds. Short-term borrowing costs have doubled and now are at the highest levels since late 2008. Heaven help us if you, Mr. Speaker, actually drive the U.S. into default.

Think about this: the \$12 trillion of outstanding government debt is 23 times—23 times—the \$517 billion Leh-

man owed when its bankruptcy sparked the 2008 financial crisis. The full faith and credit of the U.S. debt is the collateral for banks, financial contracts, and repurchase markets throughout the world, the collateral that stands behind global finance and investment. It is why we are the world's reserve currency. Any default by the U.S. will have very real and extremely serious consequences and trigger a self-inflicted global financial crisis.

In my mind, Mr. Speaker, the full faith and credit of the United States is not open for negotiation. I urge my colleagues to cease using the debt ceiling and economic calamity as a political tool and vote for a clean CR and debt limit bill.

NEED TO REOPEN GOVERNMENT NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the gentlelady just expressed the dynamics of a pending default, and I could not agree more with the horrors of her description. It baffles me, literally baffles me, that in actuality we are sitting idly by, the Republican leadership, watching Rome burn.

Let me read for you a note that I got from my district, Mr. Speaker. "I have no idea if any of you still are in office, but until further," this is asking whether my staff is still in office, "but until further notice we have been furloughed effective at 9 a.m. today. I will send you an email when back in the office, which I hope is soon, especially since the Senate has not yet passed a bill to pay us even if furloughed. So we just all hope this is a short time off."

Who is this? The Houston VA regional office. Isn't it interesting my friends rise to the floor of the House with such indignation about the VA, the VA centers, and, yes, tragically the devastation of families not receiving their memorial benefits; yet here we are today, another day of the government shutdown, and an email into our district offices indicating that the VA office is closed.

Another emergency call came into my office as a fire ravaged a home of 40 or so veterans. In ordinary circumstances, they would have the VA office to help resettle them; but we are rolling up our sleeves in Houston and my message is to those veterans that we are going to work to find you a place to stay. But, Mr. Speaker, the problem is that the VA services are shut down while the home of those veterans burned. Who are we in this country if we cannot think of those who are lesser than we or who need to be helped with a helping hand?

Mr. Speaker, let me also say to you that while we are in the midst of this shutdown, this Republican obsession

with the Affordable Care Act, poor people are suffering. There are millions of dollars impacted with the supplemental nutrition program, the school lunch program. Poor people need us to open the doors of this Congress to raise the minimum wage. Today is the day that I will celebrate and encourage America that the people of this country need to have a minimum wage of \$10.10—\$10.10.

But we can't get any action in this place for the poor people of America. The families, the young families, the young mothers and fathers, the millions of children impacted by Head Start, some 57,000 seats lost and growing across the Nation, poor people who need access to early education, poor people, both rural and urban, who need to have a minimum wage—Mr. Speaker, we can't do that because the government is shut down.

Why is it shut down? Has there been a hurricane or has there been an earthquake? Is there a volcanic eruption? Is there some other natural disaster? Are we under siege by a foreign territory? No. There is an extreme faction in the Republican Party that dominates the dialogue and the action.

What the American people want us to do is to vote now to open the government. They want what the Democrats want: to pay the bills. They want us to talk. We have been willing to talk. They want us to cooperate. We have been cooperating. We have agreed to the Republican number. We agreed to their tax issue, and yet they want to be obsessed with the Affordable Care Act. They want to take away health benefits from Americans.

And then the votes that they put on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker, these are political votes. We will vote again today, political votes, while people are suffering with cancer. And the Friends of Cancer Research will tell them a thing or two. Their letter says:

The Friends of Cancer Research, a cancer research think-tank and advocacy organization that brings together people and stakeholders who have overcome the barriers standing between patient and treatment, urges Congress to take a comprehensive approach to fiscal policy.

They don't need a piecemeal bill on the floor of the House.

We need to stop the extreme attitude. We need to recognize that the poor people of America, the people of America, need this shutdown to stop; and the extreme element of the Republican Party needs to stand down while Republicans, 20 of them, and Democrats, 200-plus, vote to open the government now.

THE CONTINUED SHUTDOWN OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BY HOUSE REPUBLICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, day 10 of a Republican shutdown of the Federal Government. Where are we? Well, the consequences are cascading. They build up: \$373 million a day in new Small Business Administration loans frozen, preventing small businesses from getting started, preventing small businesses from expanding and hiring new workers; 10,000 applications a day for Social Security benefits and Medicare frozen. Veterans benefits, we have reduced the backlog by 30 percent. The people who are reducing that backlog, furloughed.

I had a constituent in my district who lost a loved one at Walter Reed Army Hospital. When the funeral home came to collect their loved one for preparation for his final burial, there were no doctors for the death certificate because they had been furloughed.

This affects every American. Sometimes we are not aware of how interwoven Federal services are in our lives. We count on and take for granted that the Federal Government is protecting us from diseases. There is research being done on a crash basis to make sure that antibiotic-resistant infections don't kill us and our children. It is a real threat. Those researchers, furloughed. Protecting illnesses and invasive species, including deadly species, from coming into the United States, at risk because the men and women who are charged with that mission are furloughed.

We are now a subject of conversation all around the world. What happened to America? How can we be a beacon for others? How can we be a model for how to run a country? How can we lecture an emerging country about democratization and how it works for its people when we allow this kind of brinksmanship, this kind of spectacle, and the danger to our own country and its people?

It is reckless. It causes real harm. The solution is at hand, and that is a clean funding bill for the government and a clean debt ceiling to make sure we are good for our debts. We have been good for our debts since the founding of the Republic, since Alexander Hamilton established the creditworthiness of the United States in George Washington's first Cabinet.

Never has there been a risk that we wouldn't be good for our bills, and yet we have one faction in the Republican caucus seemingly dominating that conversation on that side of the aisle, more than willing to embrace the threat of default. Almost every major business group has pleaded with this Congress not to do that, not to even play with that. The last time they did, in 2011, our debt was downgraded for the first time in American history; \$2.4 trillion worth of household wealth was lost, including \$800 billion on the equity markets that fell 625 points the next day. It hurt America. It is hurting America now.

We can bring up a clean funding bill before the floor of this House tomorrow—today. We have got the votes to pass it. It is a matter of Republican leadership. Will they allow the democratic process to work in this body? On behalf of the country, can we not put aside partisanship just once for the sake of our country and do the right thing and reassure the world we are standing together to do that right thing, protecting the creditworthiness of this country, protecting the American people by providing government and turning our backs on anarchy? That is really what some are preaching: you don't need government; government is always bad; government never works; government doesn't protect you.

That philosophy is dangerous and that philosophy, unfortunately, is at work here in the House of Representatives.

It is time to turn our backs on that philosophy and embrace the needs of this country and the wonderful people we serve.

THE HIGH COST OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I received an email from Scott, a constituent of the 5th District who lives in Boone, North Carolina. Here is what he had to say:

With all of the talk to this point about the effects of the Affordable Care Act, it has just turned into brutal reality for me and my family. I received a letter from Blue Cross Blue Shield this week regarding my coverage. All of the promises of if you like your current health coverage, you will be able to keep it is absolutely untrue. Blue Cross has dropped my current plan that I was relatively happy with and was expecting to continue using. Blue Cross will be moving me into a new plan where the cost is devastating for my family. My monthly premium is increasing 55 percent, \$3,816 more per year, and my out-of-pocket expenses will cost my family an additional \$3,650 per year. So, all in all, I will be paying an additional \$7,466 next year for health insurance and copayments on top of my already high premiums. I do not qualify for any of the subsidies either, so this one is all on the back of this middle class family of four. I have a 4-year-old daughter and a 2-year-old daughter. I have no choice but to keep them covered any way I can as any father would. But the new outlays of \$7,466 will be a huge burden. We will all have to make some big changes in our family to be able to afford this. I knew the Affordable Care Act would be tough on someone like myself, but I had no idea how hard it would hit me and my family.

Mr. Speaker, Scott is not alone. Families across this country are baffled by ObamaCare sticker shock. Accepting the devastating truth that costs will be much higher for them next year, some families are trying to

find a way to make it work, but they can't even get to the Web site.

But what do they hear from Washington? ObamaCare apologists say, Be patient with us. We will get these glitches sorted out. It will take a few years, and you will all be used to it.

Mr. Speaker, if only those voices in Washington would be willing to give the American people the same time and patience they are demanding. A bipartisan House majority has asked for families to have 1 penalty-free year to figure out what ObamaCare will mean for their families and for their budgets, 1 penalty-free year, not unlike the penalty-free year the President gave to Big Business all on his own.

Fairness: that is what we have asked for. Fairness: that is what Senate Democrats are refusing to discuss. Fairness: that is what the President describes as ransom.

ENDING THE SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President of the United States had the House Democratic Caucus in the East Room for a discussion. Today he will have the Republican caucus, and he will also have the Democratic Senators.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all the Republicans go engage the President, because the President gave such a clear and convincing argument about why what is going on is wrong and has to stop. If the President is told by the minority party in one of the Houses to get a funding bill passed to fund the government that he has to repeal some act, where does that stop? If we get a continuing resolution, and this one was until December 15, and they ask the President to abolish the landmark legislation that he signed and that this Congress passed a few sessions ago, the next thing could be, well, we are not going to continue the government again unless you repeal the EPA, or we are not going to do it unless you repeal the Fair Labor Standards Act, or maybe 6 months down the line we are not going to repeal it unless you and Vice President BIDEN both resign.

You can't give in to these types of tactics to have bills repealed because of a minority within a minority of one branch of government and not go through the regular order of the House passing, the Senate passing, the President signing or vetoing, and then let the Court decide if it is constitutional, which has happened with the Affordable Care Act.

The President made it clear that he wants to work with both sides; but he is not going to give in to these types of tactics because it wouldn't be fair, not only for him but for the next President and the next President and for the

United States of America. Presidents and the country should not be held ransom by the demands of one group, and the President is standing for the Presidency and for the country and for the Constitution.

The Affordable Care Act is not going to be repealed, and the other party knows that. Now they have proposed working on entitlements and long-term deficit reduction. The President will talk to them, engage in dialogue; and hopefully after the Republicans attend and listen to the President today, they will see that this has been a mistake for the American people and a mistake for their political party and they will end this shutdown, reopen government, pass a continuing resolution, and pass a debt ceiling, even if for only 4 or 6 weeks, which the pundits think may happen. It will get us out of this crisis.

And hopefully the minority group within the Republican caucus will let the Republican Party continue to be what it had been in the past, a party of business, and not a party that was anti-business and threatening a debt ceiling issue and a default on our debt which would be catastrophic to the national markets and world markets. Hopefully, within those 6 weeks of dialogue with the President and the leaders of Congress, they can come to some agreements, and we won't have this type of brinksmanship again.

The President is a convincing individual. He is very knowledgeable, he has great people working for him, and he is looking out for the future of this country. This shutdown was totally avoidable. The continuing resolution, which was only going to be to November 15 on the Senate side and December 15 on the House side, accepted the House of Representative's budget figures, which was the Paul Ryan budget.

The Paul Ryan budget is anathema to Democrats. We don't like it. It has got cuts to so many services that are important to people in this country: cuts to Head Start; cuts to SNAP payments, formerly known as food stamps; cuts to veterans; cuts to programs that help people get through the day; energy programs when it gets cold to help you pay your utility bills. These cuts are anathema to us, but we accepted them to keep the government going. The Democrats in the Senate accepted them, the Democrats in the House, the President.

But the House Republicans who put that figure out and got accepted, that wasn't enough. They had said, all right, now you have got to repeal, abolish, and/or change to the point of trying to get to abolishment of the most important bill that has been passed in this House of Representatives since 1965 when the Civil Rights Act and Medicaid and Medicare were passed.

It is not going to happen. We are the last industrialized country on the face of the Earth to have national health

insurance. It is the right thing to do; and it is folly for Governors and the States that haven't allowed the Medicaid expansion to go forward to do that and I hope they would.

I hope the Republicans come to their senses and we end this shutdown.

TIME TO GET AMERICA BACK TO WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, it is day No. 10. Mr. Speaker, today is day No. 10 of a government shutdown, a totally unnecessary government shutdown. This is a manufactured crisis, Mr. Speaker. It is time that we open the government back up.

Mr. Speaker, if our leadership is not able to get together, if the House, the Senate, and the President are not able to sit at the table, then maybe it is time to turn to rank-and-file Members.

This morning over 50 of us came together, Democrats and Republicans, from all over America, from Kansas, from New York, from Florida, from California. We came together not to fight, but we came together to fix problems. We came together as no-labels problem-solvers.

Mr. Speaker, we are ready to get America back to work. We are ready to start moving this country forward. We need to start solving problems, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that there is an easy three-step solution to get the country back on track.

Mr. Speaker, number one, let's open up the government.

Mr. Speaker, number two, let's pay our bills. We have always done that. So let's raise the debt ceiling.

Number three, let's come together as Democrats and Republicans and let's negotiate. Let's actually put a real budget together, a budget that starts to address our debt and the deficit; a budget that starts to make sure what we hand off to our children and grandchildren is the same as the country we inherited from our parents and grandparents—a country that thrives, a country that leads the world.

We have to get serious about the challenges that we face and we have to stop these manufactured crises. We have to stop the bickering. This is divided government. It means Democrats and Republicans coming together.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to join with the no-labels problem-solvers and do what our motto is, let's fix problems, not fight. We are ready to go and get America back to work.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Guillermo Maldonado, King Jesus International Ministry, Miami, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we come together in this House of the Congress to exalt Your Holy Name, thanking You for the rights and freedom You have given us. We ask You for Your wisdom to come upon each Member of Congress as they come together in the business of establishing righteous laws.

We pray, Lord, that Your Kingdom come, that Your will be done in this place as it is in Heaven. Only by Your Holy Spirit can there be real unity, real reconciliation, and real solutions to the pressing issues that come through this House.

Lord, Your Kingdom is righteousness, peace, and joy. May Your righteousness prevail. May Your peace cover each Member of Congress. Give them wisdom. May Your joy be heard throughout the land. May You bless the United States of America.

In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND GUILLERMO MALDONADO

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, today we have just heard the words of Pastor Guillermo Maldonado. We are honored to have him as our guest chaplain in the House.

Pastor Maldonado is the founder and senior pastor of King Jesus International Ministry in Miami. His ministry, Mr. Speaker, is one of the fastest-growing multicultural churches in the United States and is recognized as the largest Hispanic church in the entire Nation.

Pastor Maldonado, by the way, along with his family, has demonstrated unsurpassed leadership and dedication not only to his local ministry but to communities and ministries across the Nation. He and his lovely wife, Ana, are dear friends of mine and my family who I trust and I greatly admire. So again, we are truly blessed to benefit from his spiritual wisdom and his guidance.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

BIPARTISANSHIP STARTS WITH A TALK

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in 2006, then-Senator Barack Obama decried a proposed debt ceiling increase as a "sign of leadership failure" and then voted against raising the debt limit. Two years later, Candidate Obama referred to the \$4 trillion debt accrued by his predecessor as "irresponsible" and "unpatriotic." \$6.1 trillion and 4½ years later, he is demanding that Congress raise the debt ceiling without so much as a conversation as to what we can do to get control of spending and leave less debt to our kids and grandkids.

This seems less than responsible to me. To have any hope of solving the challenges before us, leaders have to be willing to work together. So let's defend our credit rating by getting control over our bills and strengthening our fiscal foundation.

Whether the challenge is ending the shutdown or confronting our debt, divided government demands bipartisan solutions, and finding bipartisan agreement starts by sitting down to talk.

A LOST PRIVILEGE

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, my constituents back home in Flint, Saginaw, and Bay City, Michigan, sent me here because they felt that I could represent them in a democratic body and protect their interests. Unfortunately, because of the willfulness and intransigence of

some on the other side, we can't have a simple "yes" or "no" vote in this body to reopen government. Despite the fact that all Democrats and around 30 or so Republicans would be willing to take up the Senate-passed bill to reopen government, we have not been given the opportunity to do that.

What very few know—and I assume some on the other side may not even realize—is that the rule that was adopted here on October 1 takes away a longstanding privilege of Members of the House to call up a Senate bill in the event of a dispute between House and Senate versions of the same legislation. You have taken away that basic right that my voters and the Representatives of this body all should continue to possess in order to achieve or pursue your ideological goal of using a government shutdown to get what you can't get at the ballot box. This is wrong. It needs to end. We need to bring up the Senate-passed bill to reopen government today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

HEALTHCARE.GOV

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, online enrollment for ObamaCare has been open for just 10 days, and healthcare.gov has already proved to be an unmitigated disaster.

Madam Speaker, the launch of ObamaCare's Web site was originally slated to cost the American taxpayers \$93 million. It is now reported to have cost over \$634 million and, with so many problems and failures, will undoubtedly cost even more. Already it has been taken offline to try to fix the glitches.

What is worse is that the administration hasn't been able to give a clear picture of what this \$634 million has gotten us. The number of people who have actually been able to enroll is completely unclear.

Madam Speaker, the Web site has been a failure thus far and a complete waste of taxpayer dollars. President Obama insisted on a mandate but didn't figure out the details of how it would actually work.

MEMORIAL FOR 1ST LIEUTENANT JENNIFER MORENO

(Mr. VARGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VARGAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in memory of 1st Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno, who died on October 6, 2013, in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan. Lieutenant Moreno died of injuries sustained when an improvised explosive device detonated near her dismounted patrol. Lieutenant Moreno

was a member of the Cultural Support Team supporting a Joint Special Operations Task Force for the U.S. Army's Special Operations Command.

Born and raised in San Diego, Lieutenant Moreno graduated from San Diego High School and went on to receive a bachelor's degree in nursing from the University of San Francisco. She was commissioned in the United States Army as a nurse corps officer, where she served as a clinical staff nurse on a medical surgical unit.

The commander of the Ranger battalion, Lieutenant Colonel Patrick Ellis, said, "She was a talented member of our team who lost her life while serving her country in one of the most dangerous environments in the world. Her bravery and self-sacrifice were in keeping with the highest traditions of the 75th Ranger Regiment." Her awards and decorations are numerous, including being awarded the Bronze Star posthumously.

Madam Speaker, I know we all extend our deepest condolences to her family and friends who have suffered this tragic loss. Her loved ones will continue to be in our thoughts and prayers.

HAPPY 90TH BIRTHDAY, JACK MATES

(Mr. HECK of Nevada asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to recognize and wish a happy birthday to World War II veteran and Las Vegas Distinguished Flying Cross Chapter chairman Jack Mates, who will celebrate his 90th birthday on October 14.

Mr. Mates served in the United States Army Air Force during World War II and was a B-17 squadron leader based out of Italy. He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for extraordinary achievement while participating in aerial flight against the enemy in the Mediterranean theater of operations. According to his award citation, Lieutenant Mates consistently displayed outstanding courage, aggressiveness, and intensive devotion to duty throughout all engagements.

With his aircraft frequently severely damaged by heavy enemy fire, Lieutenant Mates courageously remained at his station, battling his way through to his targets to aid materially in the utter destruction of vitally important enemy installations and supplies.

After his honorable discharge, Jack Mates worked closely with his father, learning the marketing business, and in 1959 was part of the group responsible for the introduction of Velcro to consumers across the United States. He later became president and chief executive officer of Velcro USA in 1980, upholding his central role while helping

expand the brand until his retirement in 1986.

Mr. Mates helped found the Distinguished Flying Cross Society in 1996 in order to preserve the history and tradition of military aerial heroism. Since that time, he has remained an active participant in DFC society activities and served as Las Vegas chapter chairman.

According to friends and family, Jack truly lived the American Dream and embodies the reason we refer to his generation as our greatest. It is with great pleasure that I join Lieutenant Jack Mates' family and friends in wishing him a very happy 90th birthday.

IT IS TIME TO VOTE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a letter from the veterans cemetery in Houston, Texas, that is notifying us to indicate that, as of October 15, this cemetery will have reduced staff and will have to reduce the number of burials for our heroes who all of us commit to honoring.

Mr. Speaker, our Federal employees are locked out of serving the government, of serving America. I just came from visiting with the representatives of thousands of Federal employees who were out in the rain, begging to come back to work. So the extreme faction of Republicans that don't want to open the government and raise the debt ceiling need to listen to the plea of those people.

I am going to introduce today a resolution that says that we will no longer tie a legislative issue to the idea of continuing to serve the American people, keeping the government open, and raising the debt ceiling. We have been ready to talk. We have been ready to cooperate. We have given in to their number. We have done everything, as Democrats, to be part of the American leadership. Now, it is time to vote. Unlock the door for the workers who want to work for America.

THAT WOULD BE LEADERSHIP

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am appreciative of the 57 Democrats in the House who have consistently voted with Republicans to pass targeted appropriation bills to fund the Federal Government. I am disappointed that so many House Democrats have cast votes to support a continued shutdown.

Last night, the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C., Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, a Democrat, confronted President Obama over the Dis-

trict's budget in a White House meeting with the House Democratic conference. Ms. HOLMES NORTON argued for Senate Democrats and President Obama to pass and sign the bill she supported with Republicans to permit the District of Columbia to utilize tax revenue it collects to fund municipal services during this shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is correct. It is long past time for the Senate leader to take up H.J. Res. 71 and all of the other bipartisan targeted appropriation bills that have been passed out of the House. By rolling the 11 House-passed bills into one, more than half of the partial government shutdown would be over. The American people deserve as much.

□ 1215

HONORING THE SERVICE OF CONGRESSMAN BILL YOUNG

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great pleasures that I have had serving in this august body is the people with whom I have interacted over the years, and one such person is Representative BILL YOUNG.

Now, I know that we have a lot of issues to be discussing, and I will be discussing them, but I wanted to take time out today to say how much I appreciate serving with a gentleman whom I have gotten to know, love, and respect. He has been in this body for over 42 years, and I have spent my better than 20 years mostly serving on the Appropriations Committee. It was a great pleasure serving with BILL YOUNG.

BILL has said to reporters that he is a bit disappointed in the current state of affairs. He says this is a different Congress. He is right. It is going to be even more so without his great service.

THE REPUBLICAN PLAN

(Mr. POSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, most people are shocked to learn that the House and the Senate have already agreed on a level of funding.

There are only two issues stopping the shutdown from stopping right now: number 1, make Congress and the White House obey the same ObamaCare laws as everybody else; and, number 2, the President gave Big Business 1 year off. We want families to have an opportunity for 1 year off.

Equal treatment for America's families who work hard and play by the rules, that is the Republican plan. That is what the argument is about.

To give special benefits only to big corporations and special interests is not fair, it is not right, and it is not good for the United States of America.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the millions of men, women, and children victimized by domestic violence.

This is an issue that is very personal to me. Nine years ago, my cousin, Dr. Robin Lynn Mitchell, my namesake, was murdered in her sleep by her husband in an act of domestic violence. A few months later, a campaign volunteer of mine, Velton Lacefield, was shot and killed by her husband in a similar crime.

Their stories, however heart-breaking, are, unfortunately, not unique. These tragedies play out over and over every day in our communities across America. The National Network to End Domestic Violence estimates that three women are killed each day as a result of domestic violence. It touches just about every home, no matter your ZIP code or your income bracket. Nearly three-quarters of Americans know a victim of domestic violence.

But that is just the human toll. Domestic violence also costs the U.S. economy over \$8 billion annually in emergency room visits, mental health services, and lost productivity.

So as we observe Domestic Violence Awareness Month, let's commit ourselves to working to put an end to these tragedies, for Robin, for Velton, for all of us.

THE OFFER STILL STANDS

(Mr. MCCLINTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on September 30, after two previous attempts to keep the government fully funded, House Republicans adopted a measure that fully funded the government, fully funded ObamaCare, but simply delayed the individual mandate for a year. Now, this proposal was summarily rejected by House and Senate Democrats, and the government shut down.

Now, I can understand why they might take that position. They actually thought the exchanges would work, but they haven't worked. They have been a complete and unmitigated disaster. And after more than 3 years and \$600 million of development costs, they are far, far from being ready.

So, with this new experience, what is so unreasonable about delaying the mandate for a year while these problems are addressed?

This should be a win-win for everyone—reopen the government and give the Democrats' signature program 1 year's reprieve from complete collapse. That is what Republicans offered on September 30, and that offer still stands.

HOW THE GOVERNMENT SHUT-DOWN IS HARMING THE PEOPLE OF HOUSTON

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague and classmate from South Carolina on how we will miss Chairman YOUNG. He has been a great statesman in serving our House.

But today I am here to talk about how we are 10 days into the Republican shutdown of the government services. Every week the shutdown continues cuts 0.3 percent of our gross domestic product, and the stock market has dropped 900 points in the last 2 weeks. Now they want to hold the full faith and credit of our country hostage.

This is how it is hurting our Houston area economy:

Over 3,100 NASA employees at Johnson Space Center in Houston have been furloughed as a result of the House majority's refusal to keep the government open;

The Small Business Administration has closed its Houston office and is unable to issue grants and loans and services to small business owners;

Houston's regional VA center is closed. The government shutdown has forced VA to furlough 9,000 employees, delaying processing of the VA benefits.

If the shutdown continues into late October, payments for more than 3.8 million veterans will stop. We owe it to our Nation's veterans to make good on our commitments to them, and we can't do this with closed facilities.

OBAMACARE? NO, THANK YOU.

(Mr. DESANTIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to get my hands wrapped around this ObamaCare thing.

The policy is: the IRS is going to tax Americans unless they purchase a government-sanctioned product, which they may not want, off a government-run Web site, which costs \$634 million to create and does not work.

And what do they have to expect for that, once they go through that process and put their personal information there?

One disclaimer in one State's exchange goes as follows:

Any or all uses of this system and all files on this system may be intercepted, monitored, recorded, copied, audited, inspected, and disclosed to authorized State government and law enforcement personnel, as well as authorized officials of other agencies, both domestic and foreign.

Mr. Speaker, no, thank you.

IT IS TIME TO DO OUR JOBS

(Mr. POCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, last night, I spoke with a woman in Madison, a Federal employee who works as an air traffic controller and helps ensure the safety of thousands every day, and she asked me why should she be working when she doesn't even know if or when she will get paid—and I didn't have a reasonable answer for her.

I received a letter from a woman in Baraboo who relies on Federal contracts to run her small business. She asked me how she is going to be able to make payroll this month if the government doesn't pay its bills—and I didn't have a reasonable answer for her.

I don't have a reasonable answer for why the Wisconsin National Guard can't conduct its training, why local small businesses can't grow their business and have loans through the Small Business Administration, and why 113,000 infants, children, and pregnant women can't receive nutrition assistance from the WIC program.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the GOP House leadership starts acting like responsible Representatives. Let's reopen government; let's prevent our country from defaulting; and then let's sit down and negotiate our budget, as Democrats have been requesting for the last 6 months. It is time to do our jobs.

NEW ENTITLEMENT SPENDING

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today just to ask this simple question to my colleagues here in the House and to our counterparts in the Senate, and that is simply this: Does it make sense for us to speed ahead with \$1.3 trillion in new entitlement spending when our country is in the middle of a debt crisis and Medicare and Social Security are on the brink of bankruptcy?

If the answer is "yes," then you can go home and explain that to your constituents. If the answer is "no," maybe we could explain why we are doing it.

STOP HURTING THE PEOPLE WE CAME HERE TO HELP

(Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I received this letter from Lori Sywensky. She wrote:

As a Commissioner of the Northampton County, Pennsylvania, Housing Authority, I wanted to make you aware that the County's Housing Authority issued layoff notices today to over half of its staff members because of financial uncertainty created by the government shutdown.

The next pay period would be payable on November 1, 2013, and since we cannot assure that there will be sufficient funds to honor that payroll, it has been determined that there is no legal choice other than to shut down operations of the Housing Choice Voucher Program and effect a temporary layoff beginning on Monday, October 14, 2013.

If not resolved soon, over 500 landlords will next be notified by the Housing Authority that rent payments will not be issued, resulting in lost income for them and potential eviction for 637 families.

That is what she wrote.

Mr. Speaker, isn't it time we stopped hurting the people we came here to help?

OBAMACARE

(Mrs. ELLMERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, today is day 10 of ObamaCare exchanges being up, or supposedly being up. We now know the problems with the exchanges are not just due to high traffic; rather, technology experts have reported the real problems are with the actual structure and shoddy software used for the exchanges.

The Hill reported on October 8, from one expert, James Turner, software engineer, "It's probably the most broken release that I have ever seen."

I am hearing firsthand the frustrations from my constituents. One constituent said:

The program freezes up when you try to enter your tax filing status. You can't get past it. Same thing happens when I try to apply over the phone. I've called every day since October 1, all different times of the day, and have gotten nothing but the run-around, one excuse after the other, that their system is down.

I've called during peak time. I've called during off-peak time, but apparently there are no on-peak hours. If I can't get qualified for a subsidy before January 1, we will have to let our insurance lapse.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I say, this is a defective exchange, and it is only part of the problem.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN THREATENS THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF SOUTHERN ARIZO- NANS

(Mr. BARBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, the safety and security of Southern Arizonans

is my first priority. I represent 83 miles of the U.S.-Mexico border, and the people who live near it are very seriously affected by criminal activities along that border.

Since the shutdown, our Border Patrol agents have faced uncertainty about their pay and the future of their mission. These brave men and women are our first line of defense in securing the homeland. They deserve our respect and support.

Last week, an agent's wife called my office about a decision her husband was forced to make, the decision between missing a loved one's funeral or attending it on furlough, putting his paycheck and his family at risk.

This reckless shutdown hurts the families of our agents who put their lives on the line every single day. This is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and we must end this irresponsible shutdown now and restore certainty to the Border Patrol for the safety and security of Southern Arizonans and our entire country.

PRAY FOR OUR LEADERS

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, as we all are well aware, a lot of emotion is in this Chamber and in this body at this time, and maybe that is the way it should be.

We remember back to the first Constitutional Convention that it almost shut down as well, until Benjamin Franklin stood up and said, We need to go to prayer, asking for the wisdom of the Almighty. Maybe that is what we need as well.

Mr. Speaker, above your rostrum there are words etched into stone from Daniel Webster, who said:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we need to be doing. And so, as today, thankfully, the President and leadership in the House are meeting in negotiations, I call for our citizens, as well as us, to be in prayer, asking for wisdom for the President, for our leaders to come to a conclusion that will move this country forward.

TELL THE SPEAKER TO PUT AMERICA BACK TO WORK

(Mr. ENYART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, my wife had a call last night from one of her best friends. She was angry, disappointed, and frightened. Her husband

is a civilian worker at Scott Air Force Base. His paycheck was one-half what it usually is. Their son is a community college student who just got laid off. Their daughter is disabled. They are my voters. They are my friends.

What do I tell them?

What do I tell the veterans whose disability claims aren't being processed?

What do I tell the laid-off prison guards in southern Illinois who will lose their food stamps?

What do I tell the retired mine workers who have lost their pensions in bankruptcy and now have to worry about their Social Security checks?

I can't tell them to call their Congressman. They already have.

I tell them, Call 202-225-6205, and tell the Speaker to put America and its government back to work.

□ 1230

CAN WE TALK

(Mr. RICE of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. President, can we talk?

I am pleased to hear that President Obama, 10 days into a government shutdown, is finally willing to talk with a contingent of House Republicans at the White House this afternoon. After all, there is plenty to discuss.

Everybody in this room, Democrat or Republican, knows that too many of our youth are underemployed or unemployed. Mr. President, our youth want to work.

Everybody in this room knows that we need tax reform to make our businesses competitive in the world and bring American jobs back to America.

Everybody in this room knows that Social Security and Medicare are on a pathway to insolvency and have to be shored up so that we can make our promises good to our seniors.

Thank you, Mr. President, at long last for sitting down to talk. Maybe if we could spend more time talking and less time posturing, we might be able to deal with some of these very significant problems.

Let's all pray that these talks are fruitful and improve the lives of all Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

LET'S VOTE AND KEEP THE GOVERNMENT OPEN

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, across the country, Americans are asking a simple question: When will their government open?

Every day, more Americans are denied services they need. Children who rely on Head Start are being turned away. New mothers and their infants are being denied nutritional assistance from WIC. Small businesses are losing demand for their services or are having trouble accessing loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration, costing jobs we cannot afford to lose and at a time when our economy continues to struggle.

While this is happening, what have our colleagues on the other side of the aisle done? They waste precious time with incremental bills that have no chance of enactment. That is not responsible governing. It is an excuse to put out a press release. The American people do not want more press releases. They want action.

Every day that the government stays closed is a lost opportunity for our economy and our communities. Let's vote and keep this government open.

THROWBACK THURSDAY

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Throwback Thursday, I would like to read to my colleagues the words of then-Senator Barack Obama during the debate on March 16, 2006, about raising the debt limit:

The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the U.S. Government can't pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our government's reckless fiscal policies.

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

I therefore intend to oppose the effort to increase America's debt limit.

That was spoken by Senator Barack Obama on March 16, 2006.

Mr. Speaker, we have a \$17 trillion debt today under the leadership of President Obama. I would say today is the day to come together as reasonable people to resolve this crisis.

SHUTDOWN EFFECTS IN EL PASO

(Mr. O'ROURKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, the government shutdown continues to harm the communities I represent and the more than 43,000 Federal employees in El Paso who dedicated their careers to public service.

The Federal district court in El Paso is one of the busiest in the country. It

handles a large volume of immigration and drug cases, among many others. I recently heard from Maureen Franco, a Federal public defender, regarding the shutdown's impact in El Paso.

In the U.S. Attorneys Office there, the prosecutors and public defenders are working, but not getting paid. In addition, their staffs have been furloughed. The result: prosecutors brought only 35 cases on Monday. On Tuesday and Wednesday, only nine people were brought into court. When our government works, the average is 55 a day.

The same number of people are being arrested, but the shutdown means we are not prosecuting them in a timely manner. It is likely that these individuals are remaining in detention at taxpayer expense, costing us more than if the government were open. Justice is not being served, nor are the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end the shutdown. Please allow an up-or-down vote. It will pass this House on a bipartisan basis. It will be signed into law by the President. We can reopen the government today.

PASS A FARM BILL

(Mrs. NOEM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, for 2½ years, I have come to this House floor and talked about the importance of a farm bill and the need to have a farm bill for our national security interests. Our producers in this country make sure the people that live in this country have the opportunity to partake in an affordable and safe food supply, not relying on another country to feed us, or they truly would control us.

We don't have a farm bill today, but the Speaker has assured me we will go to conference soon and get one done. But let me tell you about a tragedy that happened in South Dakota last week.

This picture beside me would be very sad if it just reflected one situation in South Dakota, but western South Dakota is littered with tens of thousands of dead cows, horses, and sheep that were killed by a tragic blizzard that hit South Dakota just last week.

The stories we have heard of losses to families are tragic. One mother visited with us and told us about driving her kids to school every day, and it looks like she is driving down a road covered with dead cattle filling the ditches.

We have a farm bill because we need to make sure that there are disaster programs to cover situations like this. The livestock programs that I authored that are included in the farm bill that needs to be signed into law would help protect some of these families and keep them in business in the future.

WE HAVE WORK TO DO

(Ms. BONAMICI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, it is day 10 of the unnecessary and harmful government shutdown and a week away from when we reach the debt ceiling and risk an economic shutdown. It is time to end this dysfunction.

Across this country, people are out of work and wondering, When will this shutdown end? Will the United States default on its debt? And, importantly, Why can't our elected Representatives resolve this?

We can resolve this, and we can do it today. A majority of the House and Senate and our President support compromise legislation to reopen the government. The Speaker should schedule a vote now. And the majority of Americans—our constituents—are opposed to letting a debate about the Affordable Care Act excuse Congress from fulfilling its basic obligation to pay the Nation's bills.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, let's get the government open, make sure we don't cause the Nation to default, and sit down and face the challenges together. We have work to do to build the economy and to begin to rebuild and restore our Nation's confidence in this United States House of Representatives.

GET OUR FISCAL HOUSE IN ORDER

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is so interesting to hear my colleagues talk about how they want a clean CR. Just so that everyone realizes, Mr. Speaker, what they are saying is give us the money—no strings attached, no accountability.

What we continue to say to our colleagues is we want an accountable CR—accountable to the U.S. taxpayer, who is footing the bill for this government. It is not Federal money that we appropriate or that we spend. It is taxpayer money coming out of the pockets of hardworking men and women.

As I read emails from my district in Tennessee, what I hear repeatedly is, number one, We cannot afford the \$17 trillion in debt. It really scares us. It frightens us for the future of our children and grandchildren.

We cannot continue to monetize \$75 billion worth of debt each month. We have to get our fiscal house in order. That is what we seek to do.

VOTE ON A CLEAN CR

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, while Republicans are trying to destroy the Affordable Care Act, the American people are embracing it—and have been for the past 3 years. Even my district, which is rightly upset over not being included in the exchanges like other Americans, has benefited.

Let me tell you a story I heard from one of our doctors.

According to one doctor, the preventive care without copays and 26-year-olds being able to stay on their parents' insurance has helped keep her practice afloat. The up-to-35 percent tax credit for small businesses and the rebate from insurance companies that didn't meet their medical loss ratio allowed her to relieve her employees of their portion of the health insurance premiums. This, and many other ways, is how the Affordable Care Act is working in my community.

Like a few other places in the law, fixes may be needed, like for the territories. The President and Democrats will address them, but in a rational manner.

So I am calling on my Republican colleagues to end the hostage-taking of this Congress, of our Federal employees, of our economy, and the good faith and credit of our Nation. Don't fight us. Join us. Support the Affordable Care Act—a good law that is expanding access to affordable health care for all of us. When some of us benefit, all of us benefit.

Let's vote on a clean CR, open up our government, and lift the debt ceiling today.

WE AS A NATION NEED TO RETURN TO GOD

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a gentleman who is with me in the Capitol. He was the high school valedictorian at Liberty High School.

This summer, during his valedictorian address, he ripped up his approved speech and delivered The Lord's Prayer in defiance of the school district's decision to no longer include prayer at graduation.

This is someone that reminds us that we as a Nation need to return to God. I am thankful for him and the inspiration of his generation.

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has now been more than 1,000 days since I arrived in Congress, and Republican leaders have still not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis.

We have lost millions of jobs through outsourcing and technological changes. We have lost millions of jobs due to the Great Recession. We are losing millions of jobs through sequestration and State budget cuts. And now we have the nerve to shut down the government, risk default, and bring our employees to the gates of hell.

Mr. Speaker, open up this government. Raise the debt ceiling, and get us back to dealing with the real crisis: job creation.

The mantra of this Congress should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

CONGRESS OF UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 9, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 803 (a)), I am pleased to appoint Mr. Mitchell Draizin of New York, NY, to the Congressional Award Board.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 51312(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York

BORDER SECURITY AND ENFORCEMENT CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 79

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution or in the Pay Our Military Act of September 30, 2013, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113-6) under the headings "Security, Enforcement, and Investigations—U.S. Customs and Border Protection", "Security, Enforcement, and Investigations—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement", "Security, Enforcement, and Investigations—Coast Guard", "Protection, Preparedness, Response, and Recovery—National Protection and Programs Directorate—Office of Biometric Identity Management", and "Research and Development, Training, and Services—United States Citizenship and Immigration Services".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for

operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Border Safety & Security Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Border Security and Enforcement Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1245

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 79, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise to present the House with a bill that sustains our critical border security and enforcement operations within the Department of Homeland Security.

Right now, at this very moment, there are brave men and women patrolling our borders, manning our ports of entry, and conducting border enforcement, drug interdiction and investigative missions, but they are not being paid.

Right now, at this very moment, border security and enforcement operations are being conducted but with minimal essential personnel.

Right now, at this very moment, the National Targeting Center, at which Customs and Border Protection officers check traveler watch lists and ensure that dangerous criminals and cargo never reach American soil, is operating, but its personnel are not being paid.

Right now, at this very moment, the E-Verify system is not operating, making it impossible for employers to check the lawful immigration status of potential employees.

So this bill before us provides for continuing appropriations to ensure that frontline agents along our borders receive their pay and that certain components of DHS can carry out their

border security and enforcement missions at full strength.

Let me remind my colleagues that our border is not secure. In fact, our border is constantly under siege from smugglers and traffickers alike, and it is our duty to ensure that sufficient resources are provided to carry out the necessary security, enforcement and interdiction efforts. That is precisely what this bill does.

This bill ensures that Border Patrol can fully conduct its operations from San Diego to Brownsville and all along our northern border as well. This bill ensures that ICE can fully conduct its investigations. This bill ensures that the Coast Guard can fully conduct interdiction in both the source and transit zones and off the coasts of California, Texas, Florida, and all maritime approaches to the United States. This bill ensures that our immigration verification and biometric identity systems are up and running. This bill also takes steps to turn on our E-Verify system.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware that the government is shut down despite the numerous attempts to move forward. We have repeatedly offered versions of continuing resolutions to sustain the government's operations, but to no avail. Furthermore, we have offered to negotiate, to convene a conference and work out the differences in a professional and orderly manner, but such offers have been refused out of hand.

This bill is yet another offer to the other side of the aisle to at least fund vital components of the government. We have a duty to ensure our borders and coastlines are safe and secure and that our laws are being enforced. This bill does this without increasing the rate of spending and in a manner entirely consistent with the text of the noncontroversial H.J. Res. 59. In short, the bill before us is about getting our priorities right.

It is my hope that the passage of this bill will not only support our border security and frontline agencies but will also lead to the reopening of the entire Federal Government.

In closing, I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to lower their partisan blinders, to come to the table and work out the current impasse so that we can get on with the business of fixing our Nation's budgetary mess.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Have we had enough yet?

The American people are fed up with partisan games and procedural gimmicks. They see right through them, and they are demanding that we come together and get the government back to work today.

If the Speaker of the House is so sure that the votes for a clean funding bill

are not there, he should call the vote to prove it to the American people. But he won't do that, because everyone in this Chamber knows that the Senate-passed continuing resolution would clear this House in a heartbeat and end this Tea Party-fueled dream of government collapse.

Today, the majority has decided that the government function they want to give political cover to is border security. Border security, obviously, was not very high on their list. We have had to wait 10 days before they have gotten around to it.

Of course, the question remains: Why didn't they think more about border security or cancer research or the national parks or women's and children's nutrition when they were shutting the government down in the first place last Monday? Ten days late and billions of dollars short, you might say.

As someone who has worked for years in a bipartisan spirit to secure our Nation's border, I certainly appreciate that border security is one of the most sensitive and dangerous areas of the budget with which to play partisan political games. But I have to ask: What about the many other critical homeland security functions that this bill wouldn't do anything to fix, including protecting our Nation from cyber attacks, for example, or keeping our aviation and mass transit systems safe or funding the Secret Service or developing the next generation of explosive detection technology?

We cannot continue to pick winners and losers by providing temporary funding for government services, operations and personnel. This piecemeal approach to governing is failing our constituents and is failing our economy. The only solution is to reopen the entire Federal Government by calling up the clean funding bill passed by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, last week, we were told by Republican leaders not to worry. Furloughed employees should stand by, they said, while the House votes to open the government one news cycle at a time. Americans' livelihoods can't wait for another news cycle. We are tired of waiting. We are tired of this charade.

Let's dispense with this political theater. Let's get back to our basic job description: to keep the government open, to pay the country's bills, and to negotiate a comprehensive budget plan that lifts sequestration, revives our economy, and secures our fiscal future. The first step is a clean continuing resolution. Let's do that today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I rise in support of his bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is around the 15th time that we have been trying to engage the other body in conversation about how we can reopen the government. They just simply refuse to talk about anything. We have sent over CRs. We have sent over amendments. We have sent over bills. This is the 11th of the many appropriations bills—CRs—at the sequester level that we are going to send to the Senate, and they just simply refuse to talk. I have never seen such a show of negligence and attendance to public duties.

Normally, the time-honored tradition in the Congress—since the founding of this great country—is that, when the House passes a measure and when the Senate passes a measure and they differ, we appoint conferees: the Senate picks out some Members, the House picks out some Members, and we send them off to the back room to work out the differences and to bring the bills back. That is the way it has operated for all of these years. Yet the Senate just simply refuses to talk anything about how to reopen the government.

This bill will help protect our homeland from terrorists, drug traffickers, smugglers, other criminals, and it facilitates legal immigration and ongoing investigations. Right now, our frontline operations are operating at a bare minimum. The men and women who are at work to protect our borders and our ports of entry are working without pay, and employers cannot guarantee the lawful immigration status of their prospective employees.

To reinstate these critical functions, H.J. Res. 79 provides funding for border security efforts at the current annual rate of \$18.8 billion. This includes funding for the Customs and Border Patrol, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the Coast Guard, Citizenship and Immigration Services, and the Office of Biometric Identity Management.

These are functions of the Federal Government that are critical to our safety and well-being. They should not have to suffer the effects of this shutdown, but if we pass this bill today and if the Senate passes it and if the President signs it into law, it will stop any further adverse effects from befalling our border security while we work toward reopening the entire Federal Government.

Piece by piece, the Republican House has been working toward reopening the government over the past week. We have done this all with no help—no input—from the Senate. The only thing we have heard from the Senate is a resounding “no”—“no” to working with us on a task force or on a committee to reopen the Federal Government and “no” to talking with us about our concerns over the multitude of fiscal crises we face. Despite this, the House has

passed 15 bills over the past week to fund the government. This is on top of the continuing resolutions we put forward prior to the end of the fiscal year and the regular appropriations bills the House passed. Imagine what we could do if the Senate would come to the table and work with us. We could solve the problem.

There is no question about it that we are never going to be able to get out of this mess if we don't come together, have a real, adult conversation, listen to each other earnestly, and negotiate in good faith. This crisis can't be solved by one party alone or by one body of the Congress alone. This bill is an effort to keep the ball moving toward our goal of ending the entire government shutdown.

The Senate has asked for a clean CR to achieve that end. The funding in this bill is clean and in line with the spending from the last fiscal year. It is essentially what I put forward in my initial, clean CR. So I hope, with that in mind, the House and the Senate will pass this bill in short order.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee of the Homeland Security authorizing committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the distinguished ranking member, and let me thank the chairman of this committee. Let me ask again for the hardworking employees of the Federal Government and for the hardworking employees of the Department of Homeland Security to stop being locked out.

Mr. Speaker, as my ranking member indicated, I am the ranking member on the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee. This piecemeal approach does not comprehensively address the question of the needs of homeland security.

Frankly, I am in support of the work of Customs and Border Protection, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Citizenship and Immigration Services, and the Coast Guard. You will find, probably, no greater supporter on these issues, but we need to be able to pass legislation such as H.R. 1417, comprehensively, to address all of the border aspects of this Nation. This is a gamble. This is throwing the dice. This is seeing whether or not we can get this piece and that piece, but it doesn't comprehensively deal with the entrances and exits. It doesn't comprehensively deal with comprehensive immigration reform.

My message is to have a clean CR, to open the government, to protect our homeland security employees, and to protect the homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 79, the “Border Safety and Security Act.”

As Ranking Member of the Homeland Security Committee's Subcommittee on Border and

Maritime Security, I strongly support the missions of Customs and Border Protection, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Citizenship and Immigration Services, and the Coast Guard.

You will find no greater advocate in Congress for the men and women of the Department of Homeland Security who work on the frontlines every day.

That is why I am greatly troubled that the Republican Majority continues to take a piecemeal approach to funding our vital homeland security agencies, activities, and personnel.

They know this bill has no chance of becoming law, but are putting on a piece of political theater today to pander to a fringe element within their party.

We must not gamble with our Nation's security by picking winners and losers at DHS.

Instead, this House needs to do its job and provide appropriations for the entire Department of Homeland Security, so that all of our Federal border, immigration, and homeland resources are operational.

I call on the Republican Leadership to allow reasonable Members on both sides of the aisle to approve a clean CR so that we can get DHS, and our entire government, working as it should be for the American people.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the chairman of the authorizing Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. MCCAUL. I want to thank my colleague and good friend from Texas, the chairman, who knows the border, perhaps, better than any other Member in this body.

We are all here, Mr. Speaker, to try and work through our differences over government funding. I hope that no one in this Chamber truly believes that we should play politics with the security of our borders, our last line of defense.

□ 1300

Yet right now, as we debate this important funding bill, our agents at the Department of Homeland Security—the Border Patrol, CBP, and ICE—are not fully funded, which diminishes their ability to secure our Nation's borders and puts American security and lives at risk.

What kind of message would it send to our constituents all over this great country if we threw up our hands and said that providing for the common defense under the Constitution is no longer a priority? Yet that is exactly the debate we are having today.

As the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, I will not stand by and let politics get the best of us. Our brave men and women on the border in my home State risk their lives daily. Just a few weeks ago, I visited with Border Patrol agents, border sheriffs, and ranchers in the Rio Grande sector in south Texas, which has seen a 55 percent increase in illegal border crossings. This is not just an immigration issue, Mr. Speaker; it is a national security issue. Our border agents on the front line must be fully funded.

I urge my colleagues to support the Border Safety and Security Act.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), an outstanding member of our Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the latest in a long line of disingenuous bills that won't bring us closer to ending the dangerous and reckless Republican shutdown.

This bill represents an irresponsible approach to the serious challenge of defending the homeland in an increasingly dangerous world. This bill purports to protect the public; yet, it leaves critical functions of the Department of Homeland Security unfunded.

For example, there is no money for TSA to keep the flying public safe; there is no money for the Office of Intelligence and Analysis to identify terror plots that endanger American lives; and there is no money for the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office to guard the homeland against smuggled weapons of mass destruction.

Clearly, Republican obstructionism is undermining our American democracy and threatening our American national security.

Mr. Speaker, the Boehner shutdown and Republican gamesmanship are hurting American families and endangering the American public. Let's defeat this bill, vote, pass a clean budget, and get all our government working to serve and defend all the American people and our American way of life.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan, CANDICE MILLER, vice chairman of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the chairperson of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security and a member of the great class of 2002.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of the bill that we are debating here, the Border Safety and Security Act.

As vice chair of the House Homeland Security Committee and chair of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I, along with so many others, have worked to ensure that Congress gives the agents and the officers in the field the tools and the direction that they need to keep drugs and terrorists and others who would do us harm from entering our country. That is what this legislation is about today.

Much of the controversy surrounding the government shutdown has actually focused on ObamaCare. But, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing, absolutely zero, in the bill that we are talking about right now that has anything to do with ObamaCare.

The only thing that is in this bill and that we are discussing today is whether or not we will help provide the funds to ensure that we can protect our Nation's borders and pay the men and women of the U.S. Border Patrol, the Customs and Border Protection, and also the Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

I know many of our friends on the other side of the aisle will once again oppose this legislation because they say they need an entire government funding bill or they won't accept anything else, yet I would note that they are calling Republicans "absolutists."

I also know that there are many on the other side of the aisle that will support this bill and will help us pass this, again, with a very strong bipartisan majority. I simply hope that the leaders of the Senate will look at the strong bipartisan support of this bill and take it up. Border security, Mr. Speaker, cannot be a casualty of our inability to compromise. The agencies that are responsible for protecting this country must be fully funded.

I urge the House to support this bill today, to pass this bill today, and I certainly urge the Senate and the White House to join us in supporting the men and women across the Nation charged with protecting our border.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the ranking member of the full authorizing Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I thank Ranking Member PRICE for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express strong opposition to H.J. Res. 79, the Border Safety and Security Act.

This is the second time in 2 weeks that I have come to the House floor to discuss cherry-picked funding at the Department of Homeland Security. Neither last week's measure nor the one before us today stands a snowball's chance of ever being enacted into law. Even if they did, Congress still would not have done its job to fully fund the important homeland and non-homeland security activities carried out by the Department of Homeland Security.

As ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am troubled that the Republican majority is not only picking winners and losers within the Federal Government, but also within the Department of Homeland Security.

This country faces real threats every day—from natural disasters, to accidents with catastrophic results, to terrorism. The people we represent deserve real action, not petty posturing. For today's installment of the "mini-CR" show, the majority is shining the spotlight on ICE agents, Border Patrol agents, Customs and Border Protection officers, and Coast Guard personnel.

Americans see through this hollow attempt at using patriotic Americans serving in the front lines of Homeland Security as pawns.

If the majority is serious about ensuring that our patchwork of Federal border, immigration, and homeland resources are operational, they would reopen the entire Department of Homeland Security. This majority is not serious about taking real action. They want to score political points with a fringe element in their party.

I call upon like-minded colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand with me and approve a clean CR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. With every passing day, more injury is done to our economy and our standing in the world. The once unthinkable—a default on U.S. debt—is looking more and more possible.

We must stand together and inject some rationality here and bring an end to this long national tantrum that has been orchestrated by 50 of the most radical Members of the majority.

Mr. Speaker, the majority must let this House consider and pass a clean CR so that we can get this government up and working again.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), my colleague, the chairman of the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and a hardworking member of our subcommittee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Chairman CARTER.

Mr. Speaker, the question we are about to vote on is very simple: Do you support—yes or no—fully funding our law enforcement officers on the border and our Immigrations and Customs Enforcement officers?

This is not complicated. It is not anything more complicated than we are, as the majority in the House, seeking to find areas of agreement. Common sense and common courtesy and any negotiations require that you find areas of agreement that are absolutely essential, set those aside, and move on to the issues where you may have some disagreement.

This is not complicated. Yes or no, do you support fully funding our Border Patrol agents and our Immigrations and Customs Enforcement agents? That is the only issue before us.

We have, as a Congress, already fully funded our military. We made sure that our men and women in uniform were paid. We have already, in this House, set aside funds to make sure that our veterans are paid. We passed legislation to ensure that they receive all the benefits that they have earned by their service to the country.

Any negotiation—anyone, anywhere in the country—if you have a disagreement, you find areas where you can agree that are very important and you get those behind you, and then you get to those areas where there are disagreements.

There are fundamental important differences that are a core principle to us as constitutional conservatives. We do not want to participate in bankrupting the United States of America. We do not want to participate in socializing the greatest health care system the Nation has ever and the world has ever created. We will not idly stand by and allow our children and grandchildren to inherit such a crushing level of debt and taxation that they cannot afford and their quality of life will be diminished. These are matters of core principle to us.

Our right to be left alone as Americans is, I think, one of our most important. Certainly, Texans feel that way. But, first and foremost, we believe in law enforcement. We believe in supporting our military, and we urge our colleagues to vote with us today to enforce the law.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the reckless Republican shutdown.

While the men and women who secure our border risk their lives, their paychecks are in jeopardy. I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, that the majority is talking about border security, particularly after they have frozen salaries for the Border Patrol for the past 3 years.

Yes, we should fund border security. I have been a strong advocate for funding border security. But we cannot adequately protect our homeland by funding one agency at a time. We also must fund the Secret Service, the TSA, and cybersecurity, none of which, Mr. Speaker, is included in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the claim that Democrats aren't negotiating is absolutely false. The Senate adopted the most important part of the House bill—the funding level—and the President supported it even though Democrats want greater investments to support economic growth. The only thing Democrats say “no” to are irresponsible efforts to put health care decisions back in the hands of insurance companies, which has nothing to do with keeping the government open.

That is democracy. That is negotiation. We have done more than meet in the middle, but the Republicans now say “no” to their own bill.

We could end the shutdown today if the majority would only support a reasonable solution to allow a vote on the Republican-written, Senate-passed bill.

Vote “no” and demand a House vote to immediately end the reckless Republican shutdown.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), another fine colleague from the Appropriations Committee.

□ 1315

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman PRICE for yielding.

I was sitting in my office listening to this, and I realized that what our sessions are about are telling the American people some of the truth some of the time. The truth of the matter is that this is all about the fact that an extreme division of the Republican Party doesn't like the Affordable Care Act, which was signed into law 3½ years ago, and so they are using the appropriations process to shut down Congress.

We keep saying you don't need to do this. It has been a law for 3½ years; and guess what, in those 3½ years we have passed 17 CRs; 17 CRs have been passed since the Affordable Care Act was enacted. And guess what, Republicans voted for almost every one of them. So what is the difference now?

This is just craziness. Our whole country is being put at risk because they won't do what we have done every year because they don't like the Affordable Care Act. Now if you don't like something, use a law-making process called an authorization. When you don't like something, you take a different bill and fix it. You can say, well, we don't like it; we don't even want to fix it. I use the argument that the Democrats didn't like Medicare part D because of the way it was being done. We voted against it, but we never shut down government. We got around to saying, yes, it is the law; let's fix it. When you pass a big law, there are always some things you need to fix. We can fix things, but this is not the process to do it, shutting down government. And the idea of bringing you whatever you like today, we are just going to vote on one thing, one part of government. Now we are onto just one piece. You know we are never going to get around to all of the pieces because they don't like all of government. So they hold these votes.

This is ridiculous. This is putting the country, the world, and lots of people at risk. We could just pass a keep-the-government-open bill, which we have done 17 times since 2010, 17 times without this rancor, without this division.

Come on. Don't give us part of the truth some of the time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has any more speakers.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I am prepared to close.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues today have spoken accurately of the time-honored tradition of passing a budget in this Congress and then passing appropriations bills, one hopes on budget and on time, in an orderly fashion, conforming to the agreed-upon budget resolution.

Now, for a while this year, we thought we were on the same page with regard to agreeing on a budget going forward. In fact, colleagues will remember that Republicans badgered the Senate in past years for not having passed a budget. This year, the Senate passed a budget. The Senate worked hard and passed a credible budget; we looked forward to a more normal process being resumed.

But we were soon disabused of that, because the Republican leadership of this House steadfastly refused to go to conference to work out a common budget with the Senate which, of course, is the normal process.

We have been urging that the House go to conference for months. Why did they refuse? We have thought a lot about that. One possible reason is that no comprehensive budget plan could possibly pass their conference, given the Tea Party influence in that conference these days. That is the explanation that is suggested. I have to say, by the failure of Speaker BOEHNER's “Plan B”: remember that, back in December? They left President Obama's budget overture on the table, never taking him up on that comprehensive offer.

But then after a while, our Republican friends warmed up to the idea of stalling on this, and we gradually realized: They are running out the clock! The Republicans are running out the clock. Why are they doing that? Maybe they are looking for a crisis atmosphere, letting the government shut down, running up against the possibility of default. In a crisis atmosphere, maybe they think they can extract more. Maybe they can extract more, by demanding a ransom, a political ransom. The Affordable Care Act, whatever. Because now with the clock run out, you are talking not just about negotiating a budget; you are talking about demanding a ransom merely to keep the government open; demanding a ransom merely to pay the country's bills, basic constitutional responsibilities which this body should meet without any threat of extortion.

Meanwhile, of course, they understand the public doesn't like this. So we have the spectacle today of yet another bill seeking political cover, to fund piecemeal a function of government which has been in the news and which people value.

Well, this charade has to end. Yes, we need to get back to the normal budget process in this country. The first step is to pass a clean funding bill to reopen the government, and the votes are here in this body to do that this afternoon. We also must lift the threat of defaulting on the Nation's debt.

And then, sure enough, let's get on with the negotiating of a comprehensive budget agreement, a budget agreement along the lines of the budget plans of 1990 and 1993. These budget plans helped produce a robust economy, and eventually produced 4 years of budget surpluses. We paid off \$400 billion of the national debt in those years. Those were comprehensive agreements, to be sure. They were politically tough. They did include revenues. They included all categories of spending. They were painful votes for many in this body, but I continue to think they were among the best votes I ever cast. That is where we need to go. We all know that.

The question is, can we find the political will to get there? Let's muster that political will. We have had enough of the ransom demands. Let's reopen the government, let's lift the debt ceiling, and let's get on with serious negotiations, the kind of budget negotiations we should have been having all year.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone has been watching what has gone on in this House for the last couple of weeks and this week, it reminds me of the movie "Groundhog Day." The alarm rings, and we stand up and we do the same thing and we hear the same arguments consistently. I mean, you could have just heard this argument, and that is the argument that has been made throughout the entire almost-2 weeks now. So maybe it is time to talk about something that is called regular order in this House of Representatives.

We have something called the appropriations process. We divide up the funding of the government into 12 sections, and we have classification of those sections and each subcommittee presents a bill to the committee for the funding of a certain Department. In our case, Mr. PRICE and I deal with Homeland Security. That bill is then brought to the floor and passed by the floor after it passes out of regular committee, and then it is sent to our colleagues in the Senate on the other side of this great building. At that point in time, normal procedure would be for them to deal with the appropriations process on their side.

So I can't speak for all of government, but I certainly can speak for Homeland Security, and Mr. PRICE, I don't think, would dispute this: we passed our bill out of the House. So we don't even need to be here today, and

we shouldn't even have needed to be here last week when we were here because, quite frankly, we have given a bill to deal with the problems of financing and supporting those people who defend our borders and all of the other things that we take care of in Homeland, and it has been sitting on the desk of Mr. HARRY REID in the Senate since June of this year, a long time before this so-called crisis arose. We could have it completely passed and signed by the President if the Senate had just done regular order. But they haven't.

So as it relates to the issues we discuss here today, the reason these issues even come up is that the Democrat-controlled Senate has not done their job, and they have not dealt with the appropriations process.

Today, as last week, we are dealing with an important portion of this process. It is so important that the very security of our Nation depends upon a secure border. The great debate that has gone on for 3 or 4 years, recent years as we look at the overall immigration crisis, is: What about the security of our borders?

We have spent billions of dollars making it as secure as we can, and we will continue to secure those borders. All we think we should do is pay the people that are doing the job now and get the border secure. This is important to the future of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res 79, a bill which claims to fund border security, but in reality is just a continuation of the piecemeal approach to funding government operations being used by the House Republican leadership to create political cover for their continued refusal to hold a vote to immediately reopen the entire government.

I support funding border security and appreciate greatly the dedicated men and women who work to keep our borders secure, but I do not support this bill because, in the end, it does more harm than good.

I believe the proper way to fund border security is for Congress to fulfill its responsibility to pass regular appropriations bills. The House passed a full year funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security in June that would provide \$40.1 billion more for DHS than the bill before us today.

Using a cherry-picking approach to fund selected programs within an agency neglects other important programs within that same agency. In this case, supporting H.J. Res 79 funds border security at the expense of other Homeland Security-related functions like the Secret Service, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Transportation Security Administration and the Office of Disaster Assistance at the Small Business Administration.

The fact is that by taking up the Senate's clean continuing resolution and sending it to the President for his signature tonight, we can fund border security, DHS and all the other important programs and services of the gov-

ernment. That is why I call on my colleagues to bring up the Senate CR so we can end this shutdown and get all our federal workers back on the job.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned that the Republican-Majority has brought a bill (H.J. Res 79) to the floor that would provide funds solely for specific offices within the Department of Homeland Security. DHS deemed 86 percent of its employees essential during this forced Republican government shutdown; however, this bill only provides funds for: Immigration and Customs Enforcement, National Protection and Programs Directorate's Office of Biometric Identity Management, Coast Guard, Customs and Border Protection, and Citizenship and Immigration Services.

The bill does not provide critical funding for many of the other offices within the DHS that play a vital role in protecting our country. As the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, I advocate for funding of the offices and programs that protect our nation from cyber attacks and monitor our critical infrastructure.

The consequences of accepting this piecemeal bill are very severe, a very risky impediment to the daily duties and services that DHS provides for our country's protection. Providing funds for the DHS, as a whole, is vital to our homeland security. Republicans continue to use this piecemeal approach; showing a reckless disdain for the Federal government and her dedicated employees, which fails to grasp the bigger picture, and have failed to bring an end to this government shutdown. We must, and cannot accept these extortion tactics.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and vote for a clean CR, and to raise the debt limit now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 79 is postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1335

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah) at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution.

S. RES. 267

In the Senate of the United States, October 9, 2013.

Whereas Rod Grams faithfully served the people of Minnesota with distinction in the United States Congress;

Whereas Rod Grams was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1992 and served one term as a Representative from the State of Minnesota and later served as a chief of staff in the House of Representatives;

Whereas Rod Grams was elected to the United States Senate in 1994 and served one term as a Senator from the State of Minnesota;

Whereas as a Senator, Rod Grams served on the Senate Standing Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, Energy and Natural Resources, Foreign Relations, and the Budget and on the Joint Economic Committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Rod Grams, former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Rod Grams.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 91. Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

BORDER SECURITY AND ENFORCEMENT CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 79 will now be resumed.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Shea-Porter moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 79 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint reso-

lution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a motion to recommit to end this harmful and unnecessary government shutdown. I do this by offering a motion that would bring to the floor the continuing resolution that has already passed in the Senate and awaits consideration in the House.

I know that not everyone is thrilled with this level of funding. Many of us in the Democratic Caucus think it cuts too deeply into important investments, while many of our Republican colleagues feel it doesn't cut enough. The Senate bill is a compromise, but it is a compromise that is acceptable to the majority of us in order to continue the vital functioning of the government that all Americans pay for and that all Americans deserve.

Unfortunately, a small faction of the majority party continues to hold the entire government hostage while it tries to obstruct the Affordable Care Act. I understand they disagree with the Senate and the President on certain issues, but shutting the government down to try and achieve an ideological goal that could not be achieved through the legislative process, through the Supreme Court, or through the ballot box is beneath the dignity of this body. That is why I urge my colleagues to support my motion and allow us to get the government up and running again. Then, and only then, can we resume debate and discussion on other critical issues like creating jobs, supporting our veterans, and, yes, improving the Affordable Care Act.

As of today, it has been 10 days since the government shutdown. That is 10 days where we haven't had studies going forward at the National Institutes of Health, 10 days where the Small Business Administration hasn't been lending money to entrepreneurs and small businesses, and 10 days where families haven't had access to the critical services to protect those who need it most.

In my own district, the Small Business Administration normally gives

out an average of \$237,000 in loans each and every day. That is a total of \$2.37 million in loans that haven't been made to the small businesses of New Hampshire's First District.

The majority has failed my State and others. All the American people are asking for is for us to open the government. They would be happy with a clean bill. We could put people back to work with a clean bill. We could continue lending money to small businesses with a clean bill. We could fund cancer research with a clean bill.

But instead of putting an end to the government shutdown by passing the funding bill that the Senate has already agreed to, Republican leaders in the House are offering bills to open individual agencies and programs instead of the entire government. Make no mistake, that is not an honest attempt to open the government. These cherry-picked funding bills serve only to give political cover to the very people who caused the government shutdown.

As former Republican Presidential candidate and Senator Bob Dole said, along with my dear colleague, JOHN DINGELL:

Piecemeal or partial spending plans do not adequately ensure that our veterans—and, indeed, all Americans—have access to the system of self-government established to serve and protect them.

Former Republican Senator Judd Gregg, who was chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, said:

A small group of Republican legislators led by the junior Senator from Texas decided to take as hostages government operations and the raising of the debt ceiling. The price of release was to be the death of ObamaCare. This approach never had a snowball's chance in Texas of succeeding.

However, here we are still shut down 10 days after the start of the new fiscal year; and, instead of voting on legislation that if brought to the floor would pass and open the government, what are we voting on? The same little, tiny piecemeal appropriations designed for messaging and attack ads that we have been voting on all week. It is Washington politics at its worst.

It has been 10 days of this sort of chicanery, and it is time to give it up. Let's stop the gamesmanship; turn the lights back on; reopen the government; and address the actual critical problems addressing the country.

We need more jobs. We need to find ways to grow the economy, make education more affordable, and invest in our decaying infrastructure. All of these are problems that our constituents sent us here to deal with, and they are what they expect us to work on.

That is probably why, yesterday, when Gallup released polling on what Americans believe is the most important problem facing our country, it should come as no surprise to find that, for the first time in history, they picked dysfunctional government. It has always been either the economy,

unemployment, or jobs that were the most pressing problems. In yesterday's poll, though, it was us. I can't say that I am surprised because I agree with them. We need to fix this, and that starts by doing the basics like funding the government and raising the debt ceiling.

I will end with one final quote from my former Republican colleague, Senator Gregg. He said:

People who have no interest in governing cannot be allowed to be the dominant voices in a major party.

I thank you for your support, and I hope you will support this critical motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires that the amendment be germane to the bill under consideration.

As I am sure you are aware, the Chair has ruled on October 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 9 of 2013, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from New Hampshire wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Hampshire is recognized on the point of order.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us set up a commission to examine deficit reduction?

My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so that our taxpayers can receive the benefits they have already paid for, to recommit deals with government expenditures. And right now we are running a deficit. So isn't the amount the government is spending a relevant topic to the deficit reduction?

We have voted to pay workers furloughed during a shutdown. I supported that bill. But what sense does it make to have workers paid to sit at home and not be able to do their jobs? What kind of a strange House is this that would force this situation on our Federal workers?

Mr. Speaker, if you rule this motion out of order, does this not mean that we will not have a chance to keep the entire Federal Government open today? Can the Chair please explain why we can't keep the entire Federal Government open today?

□ 1345

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order that the instructions

proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to the Department of Homeland Security. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair most recently ruled on October 9, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds because such motion addresses a matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the underlying measure.

Therefore, the instructions propose a nongermane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommital.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 196, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 539]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Coffman	Gardner
Amash	Cole	Garrett
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Gerlach
Bachmann	Collins (NY)	Gibbs
Bachus	Conaway	Gibson
Barletta	Cook	Gingrey (GA)
Barr	Cotton	Gohmert
Barton	Cramer	Goodlatte
Benishek	Crawford	Gosar
Bentivolio	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Bilirakis	Culberson	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Daines	Graves (GA)
Black	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Blackburn	Denham	Griffin (AR)
Boustany	Dent	Griffith (VA)
Brady (TX)	DeSantis	Guthrie
Bridenstine	DesJarlais	Hall
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Harper
Broun (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Buchanan	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Bucshon	Ellmers	Hastings (WA)
Burgess	Farenthold	Heck (NV)
Calvert	Fincher	Hensarling
Camp	Fitzpatrick	Holding
Campbell	Fleischmann	Hudson
Cantor	Fleming	Huelskamp
Capito	Flores	Huizenga (MI)
Carter	Forbes	Hultgren
Cassidy	Fortenberry	Hunter
Chabot	Fox	Hurt
Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)	Issa
Coble	Frelinghuysen	Jenkins

Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Schweikert
Johnson, Sam	Noem	Scott, Austin
Jones	Nugent	Sensenbrenner
Jordan	Nunes	Sessions
Joyce	Nunnelee	Shimkus
Kelly (PA)	Olson	Shuster
King (IA)	Palazzo	Simpson
King (NY)	Paulsen	Smith (MO)
Kingston	Pearce	Smith (NE)
Kinzinger (IL)	Perry	Smith (TX)
Kline	Petri	Southerland
Labrador	Pittenger	Stewart
LaMalfa	Pitts	Stivers
Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Stockman
Lance	Pompeo	Stutzman
Lankford	Possey	Terry
Latham	Price (GA)	Thompson (PA)
Latta	Radel	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Reed	Tiberi
Long	Reichert	Tipton
Lucas	Renacci	Turner
Luetkemeyer	Ribble	Upton
Marchant	Rice (SC)	Valadao
Marino	Rigell	Wagner
Massie	Roby	Walberg
McCarthy (CA)	Roe (TN)	Walden
McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)
McHenry	Rogers (MI)	Webster (FL)
McKeon	Rohrabacher	Wenstrup
McKinley	Rokita	Westmoreland
McMorris	Rooney	Whitfield
Rodgers	Ros-Lehtinen	Williams
Meadows	Roskam	Wilson (SC)
Meehan	Ross	Wittman
Messer	Rothfus	Wolf
Mica	Royce	Womack
Miller (FL)	Runyan	Woodall
Miller (MI)	Ryan (WI)	Yoder
Miller, Gary	Salmon	Yoho
Mullin	Sanford	Young (AK)
Mulvaney	Scalise	Young (IN)
Murphy (PA)	Schock	

NAYS—196

Andrews	Doyle	Levin
Barber	Duckworth	Lewis
Barrow (GA)	Edwards	Lipinski
Bass	Ellison	Loebach
Beatty	Engel	Lofgren
Becerra	Enyart	Lowenthal
Bera (CA)	Eshoo	Lowe
Bishop (GA)	Esty	Lujan Grisham
Bishop (NY)	Farr	(NM)
Blumenauer	Fattah	Lujan, Ben Ray
Bonamici	Foster	(NM)
Brady (PA)	Frankel (FL)	Lynch
Braley (IA)	Fudge	Maffei
Brown (FL)	Gabbard	Maloney,
Brownley (CA)	Gallego	Carolyn
Bustos	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean
Butterfield	Garcia	Matheson
Capps	Grayson	Matsui
Capuano	Green, Al	McCollum
Cárdenas	Green, Gene	McDermott
Carney	Grijalva	McGovern
Carson (IN)	Gutiérrez	McIntyre
Cartwright	Hahn	McNerney
Castor (FL)	Hanabusa	Meeks
Castro (TX)	Heck (WA)	Meng
Chu	Himes	Michaud
Ciilline	Hinojosa	Miller, George
Clarke	Holt	Moore
Clay	Honda	Moran
Cleaver	Horsford	Murphy (FL)
Clyburn	Hoyer	Nadler
Cohen	Huffman	Napolitano
Connolly	Israel	Neal
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Negrete McLeod
Cooper	Jeffries	Nolan
Costa	Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Crowley	Kaptur	Pallone
Cuellar	Keating	Pascarell
Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Pastor (AZ)
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Payne
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Pelosi
DeFazio	Kilmer	Perlmutter
DeGette	Kind	Peters (CA)
Delaney	Kirkpatrick	Peters (MI)
DeLauro	Kuster	Peterson
DelBene	Langevin	Pingree (ME)
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Pocan
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Polis
Doggett	Lee (CA)	Price (NC)

Quigley Scott (VA) Tonko
 Rahall Scott, David Heck (NV)
 Rangel Serrano Hensarling
 Richmond Sewell (AL) Holding
 Roybal-Allard Shea-Porter Mica
 Ruiz Sherman Miller (FL)
 Ruppertsberger Sinema Miller (MI)
 Ryan (OH) Sires Visclosky
 Sánchez, Linda Slaughter
 T. Smith (WA) Walz
 Sanchez, Loretta Speier Wasserman
 Sarbanes Swallow (CA) Schultz
 Schakowsky Takano Waters
 Schiff Thompson (CA) Watt
 Schneider Thompson (MS) Waxman
 Schrader Tierney Welch
 Schwartz Titus Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Grimm Higgins Rush
 Hastings (FL) Lummis Smith (NJ)
 Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY) Young (FL)

□ 1410

Mr. CONYERS and Ms. BASS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 539, I was detained in a hearing and missed rollcall 539. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 175, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 540]

YEAS—249

Aderholt Capito Fleischmann
 Amash Carter Fleming
 Amodei Cassidy Flores
 Bachmann Chabot Forbes
 Bachus Chaffetz Fortenberry
 Barber Coble Foster
 Barletta Coffman Foxx
 Barr Cole Franks (AZ)
 Barrow (GA) Collins (GA) Frelinghuysen
 Barton Collins (NY) Gallego
 Benishek Conaway Garcia
 Bentivolio Cook Gardner
 Bera (CA) Cotton Garrett
 Bilirakis Cramer Gerlach
 Bishop (UT) Crawford Gibbs
 Black Crenshaw Gibson
 Blackburn Culberson Gingrey (GA)
 Boustany Daines Gohmert
 Brady (TX) Davis, Rodney Goodlatte
 Braley (IA) DelBene Gosar
 Bridenstine Denham Gowdy
 Brooks (AL) Dent Granger
 Brooks (IN) DeSantis Graves (GA)
 Broun (GA) DesJarlais Graves (MO)
 Buchanan Diaz-Balart Griffin (AR)
 Bucshon Duffy Griffith (VA)
 Burgess Duncan (SC) Guthrie
 Bustos Duncan (TN) Hall
 Calvert Ellmers Hanna
 Camp Farenthold Harper
 Campbell Fincher Harris
 Cantor Fitzpatrick Hartzler

Hastings (WA) Meadows Ryan (WI)
 Heck (NV) Meehan Salmon
 Hensarling Messer Sanford
 Holding Mica Scalise
 Hudbal Miller (FL) Schneider
 Huelskamp Miller (MI) Schock
 Huizenga (MI) Miller, Gary Schweikert
 Hultgren Mullin Scott, Austin
 Hunter Mulvaney Sensenbrenner
 Hurt Murphy (FL) Sessions
 Issa Murphy (PA) Shimkus
 Jenkins Neugebauer Shuster
 Johnson (OH) Noem Simpson
 Johnson, Sam Nugent Smith (MO)
 Jones Nunes Smith (NE)
 Jordan Nunnelee Smith (NJ)
 Joyce Olson Smith (TX)
 Kelly (PA) Palazzo Southerland
 King (IA) Paulsen Stewart
 King (NY) Pearce Stivers
 Kingston Perry Stockman
 Kinzinger (IL) Peters (CA) Stutzman
 Kline Peters (MI) Terry
 Labrador Petri Thompson (PA)
 LaMalfa Pittenger
 Lamborn Pitts
 Lance Poe (TX)
 Lankford Pompeo
 Latham Posey
 Latta Price (GA)
 Lipinski Radcliff
 LoBiondo Reed
 Loebach Reichert
 Long Renacci
 Lucas Ribble
 Luetkemeyer Rice (SC)
 Lummis Rigell
 Lynch Roby
 Maloney, Sean Roe (TN)
 Marchant Rogers (AL)
 Marino Rogers (KY)
 Massie Rogers (MI)
 Matheson Rohrabacher
 McCarthy (CA) Rokita
 McCaul Rooney
 McClintock Ros-Lehtinen
 McHenry Roskam
 McIntyre Ross
 McKeon Rothfus
 McKinley Royce
 McMorris Ruiz
 Rodgers Runyan

NAYS—175

Andrews Deutch Kildeer
 Bass Dingell Kilmer
 Beatty Doggett Kind
 Becerra Doyle Kirkpatrick
 Bishop (GA) Duckworth Kuster
 Bishop (NY) Edwards Langevin
 Blumenauer Ellison Larsen (WA)
 Bonamici Engel Larson (CT)
 Brady (PA) Enyart Lee (CA)
 Brown (FL) Eshoo Levin
 Brownley (CA) Esty Lewis
 Butterfield Farr Lofgren
 Capps Fattah Lowenthal
 Capuano Frankel (FL) Lowey
 Cardenas Fudge Lujan Grisham
 Carney Gabbard (NM)
 Carson (IN) Garamendi Lujan, Ben Ray
 Cartwright Grayson (NM)
 Castor (FL) Green, Al Maffei
 Castro (TX) Green, Gene Maloney,
 Chu Grijalva Carolyn
 Cicilline Gutierrez Matsui
 Clarke Hahn McCollum
 Clay Hanabusa McDermott
 Cleaver Heck (WA) McGovern
 Clyburn Himes McNerney
 Cohen Hinojosa Meeks
 Connolly Holt Meng
 Conyers Honda Michaud
 Cooper Horsford Miller, George
 Costa Hoyer Moore
 Courtney Huffman Moran
 Crowley Israel Nadler
 Cuellar Jackson Lee Napolitano
 Cummings Jeffries Neal
 Davis (CA) Johnson (GA) Negrete McLeod
 Davis, Danny Johnson, E. B. Nolan
 DeFazio Kaptur O'Rourke
 DeGette Keating Owens
 Delaney Kelly (IL) Pallone
 DeLauro Kennedy Pascarell

Pastor (AZ) Sarbanes Tierney
 Payne Schakowsky Titus
 Pelosi Schiff Tonko
 Perlmuter Schrader Tsongas
 Peterson Schwartz Van Hollen
 Pingree (ME) Scott (VA) Vargus
 Pocan Scott, David Veasey
 Polis Serrano Vela
 Price (NC) Sewell (AL) Velázquez
 Quigley Shea-Porter Visclosky
 Rahall Sherman Walz
 Rangel Sires Wasserman
 Richmond Slaughter Schultz
 Roybal-Allard Smith (WA) Waters
 Ruppertsberger Speler Watt
 Ryan (OH) Swallow (CA) Waxman
 Sánchez, Linda Takano Welch
 T. Thompson (CA) Wilson (FL)
 Sanchez, Loretta Thompson (MS) Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Grimm Higgins Young (FL)
 Hastings (FL) McCarthy (NY)
 Herrera Beutler Rush

□ 1418

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMEMBERING ROD GRAMS

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the podium today in recognition of the passing of my predecessor and one of the Members of this body. Joining me at the podium are two members of the Minnesota delegation. Representative ERIK PAULSEN of Minnesota's Third Congressional District was a longtime friend of former United States House of Representatives Member and Senator, Rod Grams. Also joining me at the podium is United States Representative RICK NOLAN of Minnesota's Seventh Congressional District, which was also part of the territory represented by former Representative Rod Grams.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a former Member of both this House and the United States Senate from the State of Minnesota, Representative and Senator Rod Grams. Rod peacefully passed away late Tuesday evening after a lengthy battle with cancer. He was only 65 years old.

Rod Grams was a very humble man of principle. He grew up on a family farm in Crown, in eastern Minnesota, where he received his “eternal crown.” It was the same farm that his father grew up on. It is the farm where Rod acquired his diligent, hardworking, Minnesota-grown work ethic.

Rod Grams worked in broadcasting for nearly 25 years in Minnesota. He earned a reputation as a positive communicator who understood how to speak with his fellow Minnesotans. He then built his own business and realized the happiness and challenges of creating jobs and making a go of his American Dream.

Rod lived life to the fullest, and he showed others how to do the same. He successfully navigated the real world, which shaped his views before serving as Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District Representative and then the entire State of Minnesota in the United States Senate.

Rod Grams was dedicated to maintaining personal liberty and doing everything within his power to protect Americans against the constantly growing size and scope of the Federal Government's intrusion into the lives of real Americans that he represented at this great Capitol. With his keen eye and long-term vision, Minnesotans had a dedicated advocate here in the Halls of the United States Congress.

It was an honor for me and my husband, Marcus, to know Rod Grams for decades. He was a leader, an example, but, more importantly, he was my friend. My heart goes out to his wife, Christine, to his four beautiful children, and to the light of his life, his grandchildren.

While Rod Grams will be greatly missed here in this body, we take comfort in the fact that he contributed so much by way of his service to the great State of Minnesota and to our country. We all benefit from Rod Grams's monumental legacy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask now that the House of Representatives observe a moment of silence to honor the incredible life of former United States Senator Rod Grams.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADEL). Will all Members please rise.

REMEMBERING ROD GRAMS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Minnesota for organizing this delegation, along with Congressman KLINE, who has joined us as well, and acknowledge the passing and remember a wonderful servant from Minnesota, Congressman and U.S. Senator Rod Grams, who lost a very courageous battle to cancer recently. He passed away peacefully with his wife, Christine, by his side.

I actually got to know Rod Grams first. Our families went to church together. I was just a young student, but I always remembered Rod Grams not only as a successful small businessman, but someone who was a famous anchorman on Channel 9 KMSP. That is where he got his start in politics. He left the news and actually ran for Congress back in 1992 and then the United States Senate in 1994.

The one thing I will always remember about Rod Grams is that he always maintained his small-town, rural Minnesota values. He embodied those values. He shared those values. He always lived them to the fullest, and we remember his service to our State.

REMEMBERING ROD GRAMS

(Mr. KLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for being down here to remember somebody who was, in many ways, bigger than life: big, tall Rod Grams.

He wanted to do something for his State and his country, and he did. He came to the House of Representatives to serve one term. While he was here in his freshman term, he ran for the United States Senate and won.

Rod had a lot of things he worked on, but one of them was the child tax credit. It was a long, tough slog that he brought all the way across the finish line, and that is just who Rod was. He didn't quit. He knew what he was about. He was an independent thinker. He was unafraid to take a stand and speak up for his State and his country. We will miss him.

□ 1430

REMEMBERING ROD GRAMS

(Mr. NOLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am proud to say that Rod was a constituent of mine in the last years of his life, running a small town radio station at which he did just a wonderfully good job.

He was always so thoughtful and so dedicated to public service and so highly regarded by all who knew him. He was a wonderful public servant. He contributed much to the well-being of Minnesota and to this Nation and to the civility of this Chamber, itself. His contributions are enormous, and his presence will be forever apparent here, and we will miss him greatly.

We extend our deepest, heartfelt sympathies to the family and to all of those who had the good fortune to know and work with Rod Grams.

REMEMBERING ROD GRAMS

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues here to simply pay great tribute and honor to a dedicated public servant—a person who loved his country, who put it all on the line for the betterment of his neighbors and fellow Americans. Rod Grams is a proud son of Minnesota, and he will be deeply missed.

YERTLE THE TURTLE

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as we enter day 10 of this reckless and irresponsible government shutdown, I once again turn to Dr. Seuss, the well-known author, best known for being able to communicate well to children.

Some wisdom from "Yertle the Turtle":

I am Yertle the Turtle. Oh, marvelous me, for I am the ruler of all that I see.

Your majesty, please. I don't like to complain, but down here below, we are feeling great pain.

THE REPUBLICAN SELF-IMPOSED GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss how the Republican self-imposed government shutdown is affecting our Nation's veterans. Just yesterday, VA Secretary Shinseki testified in the Veterans Affairs' Committee, and he put several points straight ahead.

If the shutdown continues, there will be over 3.8 million veterans who will not receive disability compensation payments. That means they will not get their checks in the mail by November 1.

315,000 veterans and over 200,000 surviving spouses or dependents will not see their pension payments.

Education payments to more than half a million veterans using the GI Bill will end.

It is really very shameful that the Republicans are doing this to our veterans—over \$6 billion in benefits. Nearly 5 million veterans and their families will not receive their pension payments.

Shame on the Republican House of Representatives.

THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET,
A BUDGET FOR VETERANS BY VETERANS,
October 3, 2013.

House Speaker JOHN BOEHNER,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

House Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Senate Minority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, LEADER REID, LEADER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCONNELL: On behalf of The Independent Budget—co-authored by AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and Veterans of Foreign Wars—we would like to express our tremendous disappointment that Congress' inability to pass a full annual budget has led to a government shutdown. Your failure is already causing real harm to the brave men and women who have served and sacrificed for this nation.

The current government shutdown has stopped work on the more than 250,000 Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) disability

claims that are awaiting adjudication; compensation, pension and education benefits are in jeopardy of not being paid; Vocational Rehabilitation offices are working with reduced staffs; and the Department of Labor's VETS programs and federal employment OneStops are closed. These are real impacts on veterans, many of whom are struggling to transition back into civilian life.

Furthermore, funding the operations of the VA through short-term continuing resolutions (CRs) or other stop-gap measures are not acceptable solutions. Typically, short term CRs don't take into account the effects of inflation or increased demand for VA benefits and services. CRs also prevent VA from starting or expanding critical programs and disrupt or delay vital new research and construction projects.

As the leaders of Congress, we call on you to immediately take all actions necessary to give final approval to legislation providing the full year's FY 2014 appropriation for all veterans programs. Our organizations and the millions of veterans we represent will no longer tolerate Congress leveraging veterans' health and wellbeing to achieve unrelated political ends.

In order to prevent future disruptions to veterans' programs, we also urge you to approve legislation that would extend advance appropriations to all VA discretionary and mandatory appropriations accounts. Advance appropriations have shielded VA health care from most of the harmful effects of the current government shutdown as well as prior continuing resolutions. Now Congress must provide the same protections to all remaining discretionary and mandatorily funded veterans programs, including disability compensation processing and payments. There are currently bills pending in both the House (H.R. 813) and the Senate (S. 932) that could be quickly amended and approved to achieve this goal.

Both government shutdowns and continuing resolutions represent failures in leadership. Congress' obligation to veterans does not start in the eleventh hour of a national crisis; you have an obligation to pass a timely, sufficient budget for all veterans programs, benefits and services.

On behalf of our organizations and all of America's veterans, their families and survivors, we call on you to work together to immediately approve a full year's appropriation for all veterans programs, and subsequently to approve pending legislation to extend advance appropriations to all VA discretionary and mandatory funding. Anything less is unacceptable to the men and women who have served this nation in uniform.

Sincerely,

STEWART M. HICKEY,
National Executive Director, AMVETS.

GARRY J. AUGUSTINE,
Executive Director, Disabled American Veterans.

HOMER S. TOWNSEND, JR.,
Executive Director, Paralyzed Veterans of America.

ROBERT E. WALLACE,
Executive Director, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

[From ABC News Chicago—Associated Press, Oct. 9, 2013]

2013 GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN COULD HIT MILLIONS OF VETS, VA CHIEF SAYS

WASHINGTON.—The government shutdown is having a big impact on the country's mili-

tary. One problem—funding the death benefit of military families—has been solved. Another issue—veterans benefits—could turn into a massive headache later this month.

VA hospitals, like Jesse Brown on the West Side, are open during the government shutdown. But veterans are concerned that disability and other checks could be in jeopardy.

"I got a little money saved up, but a lot of guys here live from check to check, month to month, that's going to be the hard part," said Jesus Lebron, Vietnam Vet and Purple Heart recipient.

"I think very few of us are prepared for this—we just have to weather that storm," said David Brewster, Vietnam War veteran.

Vets are worried after the VA secretary testified on Capitol Hill Wednesday, warning politicians that the shutdown has slowed the process for disability claims—and the impact could be widespread.

"It's over 5 million individuals who will be involved. This is serious. And I'm hoping the leadership of this committee will help us resolve it," said Eric Shinseki, VA secretary.

Shinseki broke down the numbers like this: 3.8 million vets will not receive disability compensation; 315,000 vets and 202,000 surviving spouses or dependents will see pension payments stopped. And because of that, vets are disappointed with elected officials.

"We put our butts on the line. I would like to see them put their butts on the line," said Leonard Soria, Vietnam War veteran.

In the meantime, the caskets of 4 fallen soldiers killed in Afghanistan arrived at Dover Air Force Base on Wednesday afternoon. Their families scrambled to raise money for funerals because they did not immediately get the \$100,000 death gratuity because of the government shutdown.

"She sacrificed for the country, for her family. Why wouldn't that be taken care of? There is no excuse," said Alexandra DiBella, friend of Army 1st Lt. Jennifer Moreno.

Late this afternoon, Congress took action to fix that problem by approving the death gratuity. That impacts 26 families who have had loved ones die since the shutdown.

It's important to note, however, that all VA hospitals will remain open during the shutdown.

In all, more than \$6 billion in benefits to about 5 million veterans and their families would be halted with an extended shutdown.

In some areas, like health care, there have been few adverse effects. Health care services are funded a year in advance. In others, such as reducing the claims backlog, Shinseki noted that the backlog has increased by 2,000 since the shutdown began Oct. 1.

At the end of September, the disability claims backlog stood at 418,500, a drop of about 31 percent over the previous six months.

Shinseki drew comparisons to the last shutdown in 1996, a time of sustained peace. The current shutdown occurs as the war in Afghanistan is in its 13th year and as hundreds of thousands have returned from Iraq. They are enrolling in VA care at higher rates than previous generations of veterans.

"They, along with the veterans of every preceding generation, will be harmed if the shutdown continues," Shinseki said.

Rep. Jeff Miller, the Republican chairman of the committee, questioned whether the Obama administration had been forthcoming enough in letting veterans know the impact of the shutdown. For example, VA's initial guidance did not mention any impact on payments to veterans or the processing of their benefits, although it was updated before the shutdown began.

Miller said a statement by President Barack Obama made it unclear about whether veterans would be able to continue getting counseling for PTSD. They can, at any VA health care facility.

"We've had some difficulty in the last couple of weeks getting good information about VA's contingency plan and the effects a lapse in appropriation would have on veterans," Miller said.

Shinseki said the VA has confronted "unprecedented legal and programmatic questions" and would do its best to keep lawmakers informed.

The House has passed legislation that would provide veterans disability, pension and other benefits if the shutdown is prolonged. But the White House has urged lawmakers not to take a piecemeal approach to continuing government services.

Shinseki made that case as well, saying it's not the best solution for veterans. He noted that even if the VA were fully funded, some services to veterans would suffer.

He said the Labor Department has largely shut down its VETS program, which provides employment and counseling services to veterans. The Small Business Administration has closed 10 centers focused on helping veterans create and operate businesses. And the Housing and Urban Development Department is not issuing vouchers to newly homeless vets, though those already receiving the housing aid will still get it.

White House spokesman Jay Carney said Wednesday that veterans had done their job and that it was time for Congress to do its job.

Mitch McConnell's spokesman, Don Stewart, noted that the senator pushed for a vote on House-passed legislation that would protect disability benefits, but Majority Leader Harry Reid objected.

"Maybe Carney should give him a call," Stewart said.

The shutdown has disrupted the generally bipartisan workings of the veterans committees in both chambers.

"Do you think Senator Reid doesn't like our veterans or the VA in particular?" Rep. Tim Huelkamp, R-Kan., asked Wednesday.

"Personally, I think he very highly values veterans," responded Shinseki, the only Cabinet member to testify before a congressional committee since the partial shutdown began. "As to why we are unable, Congress is unable to do its business, I will leave to the members to discuss."

Meanwhile, some Democrats said a GOP bill passed last week that would continue to fund disability payments didn't include money for such things as medical or prosthetic research and no money to maintain national cemeteries or various construction projects.

"I keep hearing the Senate, the Senate. I put the responsibility directly in the House. We could pass a clean (continuing resolution) and you wouldn't be sitting here," said Rep. Corrine Brown, D-Fla. "I don't blame the Senate. I thank God for the Senate."

Miller said there was bipartisan support in the House for legislation that would fund the entire Department of Veterans Affairs a full year in advance so it—so it would not be subject to end-of-the-year brinkmanship. The VA had so far not endorsed the effort.

OBAMACARE AND OUR NATIONAL DEBT

(Mr. BARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, in the context of the debate that is going on in the country right now about how we get our national finances in order, I think it is very important to remember that it would be unfair for future generations of Americans—for our kids and our grandkids—if we raise the debt ceiling without making the reforms necessary to get government spending under control. No one wants to default on our national debt, but no one should want to leave mountains of debt to our future children and grandchildren.

Congress must continue to focus on reforming government to avert a national debt crisis. The President says ObamaCare shouldn't be part of the discussion related to funding the government or to raising the debt limit, but ObamaCare is fundamentally connected to spending and debt. The President's signature health care law, after all, was passed through the reconciliation process, which is reserved exclusively for budget-related bills.

For those who use this special budget process to now say that it is not budget-related is very cynical. ObamaCare's projected cost has more than doubled since the President originally claimed it would reduce the deficit. It will cost this country \$2 trillion over the next 10 years. I urge everyone to remember that ObamaCare is part of the discussion about how we reduce our national debt.

IN MEMORY OF NEVADA ASSEMBLYWOMAN PEGGY PIERCE

(Mr. HORSFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today saddened by the news that Nevada Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce has passed away.

She was the staunch liberal conscience of the Nevada State Legislature, but she commanded respect from both sides of the aisle because of her steadfast belief in her principles, because she was a hard worker and because she cared so deeply about the well-being of her constituents and the people of Nevada.

I first met Peggy before her time in the assembly, when she was a fellow organizer, helping to coordinate rapid response for displaced workers in Las Vegas after the tragic events of September 11. She was as committed to helping others then as she was in her tenure in the Nevada State Legislature.

She succumbed to cancer, but she did not lose the fight. She put her constituents before herself, and in that sense, she had always been a true public servant.

My thoughts and prayers are with her family.

You will truly be missed, my friend.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN IN THE GOLDEN STATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, today, I will be hosting a number of Members from my home State of California, a State in which the population is so diverse and in which the culture is so rich that it is often described as a microcosm of America.

Every language, every nationality, every ethnicity is represented in the Golden State—a State that is the 12th-largest economy in the world. California's economy is so big that its GDP rivals that of some full-blown, industrialized nations, including those of Australia, Spain, Mexico, and South Korea. The economy in California is crucial to the national economy.

I am here tonight with my colleagues to speak against the government shutdown that has been manufactured and orchestrated by the House Republicans—a shutdown that is harming the national economy, a shutdown that is harming the California economy and a shutdown that is harming the very communities that we represent.

In my district, the 41st District, which represents Riverside, Moreno Valley, Perris, the largest employer is March Air Reserve Base, with 8,500 people working at the base in some capacity. When the shutdown hit, 500 of these workers were affected by the furloughs. While Congress passed legislation allowing these employees to go back to work, roughly 1,000 National Guardsmen at the base still will not be able to drill this month and will not receive pay.

It is not just our servicemembers who are hurt by this reckless shutdown. Low-income children in my district are suffering, too. The Riverside County Office of Education receives Federal funding through the Head Start program in order to provide childhood development services and to promote school readiness for children under the age of 5. Because of this shutdown, the county is not able to draw down their grant money, jeopardizing these vital services for nearly 3,500 young children in my county.

About an hour east of my district is Joshua Tree National Park, where 92 park employees were given furlough notices. When the shutdown happened, park rangers were forced to notify campers that they had to vacate the park within 48 hours. There are 7,000 people a day who visit Joshua Tree National Park, and this shutdown is estimated to cost nearly \$8,000 a day.

Not just the park and its employees are going to suffer; local businesses

will suffer as well. A cafe next to the park normally has a line out the door. The other day, the manager reported that the cafe made only \$39. This is a small business, Mr. Speaker.

We have to end this shutdown, not just for the furloughed public employees but for small businesses like that cafe.

I am very pleased to be joined by several of my California colleagues, the first of whom is from southern California, the distinguished gentleman, ALAN LOWENTHAL. He represents the cities of Long Beach, Garden Grove and Cypress. He sits on the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Committee on Natural Resources.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California's 47th District.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Thank you, Congressman TAKANO.

Our economy, as you pointed out, is being held hostage by Speaker BOEHNER for his refusal to put forth a clean budget funding bill, what is called a "continuing resolution," after we Democrats agreed to use his number. This is keeping us from really dealing with the real job of Congress also, which is to create jobs and to grow the economy.

I've been talking to people in my district to get some specific examples of some of the impacts of this irresponsible shutdown. Then I would like to also talk about some of the personal experiences that people have called me and told me about.

For example, in terms of one of my cities, the largest city in my district—the city of Long Beach—I will talk about the Small Business Administration, the SBA. In the 47th Congressional District, the SBA gives approximately \$308,000 in loans per day. It has not given out one loan to small businesses in California's 47th Congressional District since the government was shut down.

What about Women, Infants, and Children, the WIC program? In Long Beach alone, 25,000 women and children use WIC vouchers. That is to keep people from starving. That is to provide food. That funding runs out this month, and there is no other money to provide any funding for the WIC program.

What about housing? There are 23,000 people in the city of Long Beach, and 6,600 housing units receive section 8 vouchers. They pay their rent once a month with these vouchers, and those apartments and those units get reimbursed by the government. There will be no payments to landlords in the city of Long Beach with section 8 vouchers.

□ 1445

But that is just kind of the overview. What about some of the specifics?

Over 20 years ago, a dear friend of mine opened a card shop right near our house in part of the revitalization. I

don't want to mention his name, but he opens this shop in the city, works very well, part of the revitalization.

About a year and a half ago, he hurts his leg, goes to the hospital, and finds out that he has, unfortunately, ALS, or Lou Gehrig's disease. This past December, he loses his business because he can no longer operate, and today he lies in his living room almost totally paralyzed and barely able to breath on oxygen.

His partner of 24 years—he and his partner adopted a child 19 years ago, who is now 19—his partner is employed by the Department of Defense. He was furloughed. So my dear friend and his partner do not know how they are going to pay their mortgage as he lies in his living room gasping for air. This is not the America that we know.

I have another constituent who is a young lieutenant in a local police agency, local law enforcement agency. After 2 years of applying and going through all the applications to enter the Federal Bureau of Investigations, an 11-week training program here in Washington, 211 of the most selected and highly chosen people throughout 48 States and 24 nations arrived last Monday and Tuesday—they closed down the FBI training facility. All the instructors were furloughed. He will lose his opportunity, the one opportunity to move forward that he had, because we and the Speaker will not bring up—this Congress cannot act, and the Speaker will not bring up a clean funding bill.

I will close by bringing up one other email that I received:

Currently, an exempt Federal employee working but not being paid, I will be defaulting on my mortgage, unable to pay several obligations. However, stay strong in your resolve. Do not succumb to extortion. We, the people, are suffering. Your colleagues are clueless and, apparently, heartless as well. Please remind them who they work for—we, the people. I am a civil servant. So are Congressmen and Congresswomen. It is time for a wake-up call in the Capitol.

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you, Mr. LOWENTHAL. I appreciate it. I know you have to run on to a committee, and good luck.

Next, I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), my friend and colleague from the Second District, a great leader in the environment, somebody who, in the California Legislature, authored some landmark bills that have improved the environment. He is also among one of the most progressive Members of this body. I sit with him in the Progressive Caucus. Representative JARED HUFFMAN of California's Second District, which includes the cities of Crescent City, Fort Bragg, San Rafael, and other cities. He sits on the Budget Committee as well as the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I want to thank my friend from inland southern California very much for including me in this Special Order hour.

There are so many ways in which this Republican government shutdown is hurting the people of California, hurting the people of my district. But I just wanted to speak for a few minutes about some very particular ways in my district that people are feeling the pain.

The Second District of California is an amazing place. I am honored to represent it. One of the things that makes it special are the abundant public lands. We have protected coasts, parks, recreation areas, forests, and wilderness areas. These public lands are essential to our region's tourism, recreation, and resource economy.

The north coast's tourism economy is a big deal. It creates \$3.5 billion in annual tourism spending, more than 42,000 jobs, and nearly \$225 million in local and State tax revenue. Visitors from all over America—and, in fact, all over the world—come to our public lands. Thanks to the Republican shutdown, much of that economic activity is grinding to a halt.

The Point Reyes National Seashore is closed. In 2011, this seashore received 2.1 million visitors and brought in \$93.3 million in economic activity to the area. The shutdown is starting to impact small business owners in and around the park in West Marin. These are folks who subsist on the tourism dollars that this world-famous seashore and working landscape attracts.

Nearby, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is also closed. That collection of lands welcomes 14.5 million visitors a year. The spending on an annual basis is nearly \$300 million for the region because of that visitation. The commissaries and vendors right now are shut down. They aren't purchasing the locally-sourced food that they serve. They are further hurting the Marin and Sonoma County farms and dairies because of that shutdown.

Tourism is one of the most important drivers of Mendocino County's economy further to the north. It pumps in \$314 million directly to that county's economy. That was in the year 2011. Seventy-four percent of the visitors to the county come to the public lands—lands that are now closed.

What about California's redwood coast further north in Humboldt County? You guessed it: Redwood National Park is being forced to turn away visitors.

Yet, in response to the shutdown, this House has spent the last week voting on Band-Aid bills that attempt to pit one part of government or one program against all the others. This is a surreal proposition: the idea that our economy is hemorrhaging more than \$300 million a day because of this political stunt and our GOP majority offers these Band-Aid bills that aren't going to end it. The Senate is not going to take up and approve these bills, and the President has made it clear that he

would veto them even if they did. So this is not going to solve the problem; but that, unfortunately, is how we have been spending our time.

These are not honest attempts to restore funding for our public lands. They wouldn't begin to undo the damage that this shutdown is doing to our resources and our recreational industries. The House majority is pursuing a cynical PR strategy. It is creating Hollywood storefronts rather than seriously trying to reopen our government.

Even if these piecemeal bills were to pass, let's not pretend that it would solve the problem. To give you just one example, one of the Band-Aid bills that we debated and voted on over the last week pretended to reopen our parks, and yet it would not reopen—it completely ignores, in fact—the 2.4 million acres of National Forest Service land. There are many other examples of park and recreation areas and public lands that would have been left behind and still subject to the government shutdown.

In my congressional district, we have major Forest Service lands and a Forest Service presence. Many people in businesses rely on our national forests being open for business. Just this week, I got word that a salvage logging operation in the Shasta-Trinity National Forest is at risk of being shut down because of where we are with this Republican government shutdown. This is a salvage logging operation in the wake of a serious fire that we have seen. It is a consensus project to harvest trees, to avoid public hazards, to do something that is good for the forest, good for the local economy, and it is at risk of not happening because of this political stunt. This is causing real economic damage and potentially real fire safety damage to the communities that I represent.

So let's stop posturing. Let's stop the PR stunts. Let's stop the Hollywood storefronts. Stop deflecting, stop insulting the intelligence of the American people. Let's have an up or down vote to reopen our public lands and, indeed, to reopen our government.

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you, Mr. HUFFMAN. If you want to—care to stay just a few minutes to have a little back-and-forth.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I would.

Mr. TAKANO. We come from different parts of our great State of California. I know we both share a deep love for our State. I have been to your district, to Sonoma and the great forests that you have in your district. It is a terrible thing to see, just as California is coming out of this recession—I don't know about you, but I visited a number of these businesses during the congressional break, during the work period, during August and early September, and there were so many hopeful stories about people saying, We have gotten through this hump, we

have gotten through the worst of the 2008, 2009, and 2010 recession. There was even talk that real estate in my area of the State, which was hit hard, was coming back. I told all these folks I am so glad to hear these wonderful stories.

I just hope that we don't, in Washington, end up, through any unnecessary actions, irresponsible and reckless actions, set back the gains that we have made. I don't know about you, but in my district, certainly, I can see how shutting down the government and threatening to not raise the debt ceiling would have just tremendous adverse consequences on the twelfth largest economy in the world.

Mr. HUFFMAN. There is no doubt about it. I think you are exactly right. Of course, prior to my election in Congress, I spent 6 years in the California Legislature, where we had our own fiscal crises and, yes, at times the government practically shut down. We worked through it. We found compromise.

You are absolutely right, Congressman. California is on the verge of a tremendous comeback. Jobs are coming in; investment is coming into our State. Things are really beginning to happen in a great way in the State of California after a tough period.

Just as it seems we are getting started, along comes this Federal Government shutdown with so many impacts to our economy. The debates that we have here in Washington don't even scratch the surface of how this is hurting people and undermining consumer confidence and setting us back in places like California, where we have the potential to do enormous things in terms of research and so many other ways we contribute to the national economy.

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you so much for coming down to speak about how this shutdown, this GOP-imposed shutdown, manufactured shutdown, and how this threat to not raise the debt limit is jeopardizing our entire Nation. But we in California are a tremendous engine behind the whole big picture of the economic mind of our country. An economy which represents 12 percent of the global economy is nothing to be cavalier about.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Absolutely. As we talk about this incredible economic damage and risk that politicians are taking with our economy, what I am hearing from my district is how incredible people are because there is such an obvious and simple solution and way forward.

Let's have an up-or-down vote on whether we should continue this government shutdown or end it, and even end it, at least temporarily, on Republican budget numbers. That seems so eminently reasonable and sensible. In fact, it was the deal that one House struck and advanced out of that House with bipartisan action. Yet here we are

in the House of Representatives with a small faction rejecting that deal, holding the entire country's economy potentially hostage for political reasons. It is just something my constituents can't understand.

Mrs. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman. Now, I would like to recognize the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD), a Representative from a neighboring district, California's 35th District. I have known Congresswoman GLORIA NEGRETE MCLEOD, gosh, more than 20 years, when we both began our careers as community college trustees. It is such a great honor to serve alongside her and sit in this Chamber sometimes when we are voting. She sits on the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, on which I also sit. We are both committed to the huge veterans population that we have in the inland empire of the region of California that we both represent in inland southern California.

Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, with each day that passes that the Nation is in government shutdown, we put the very livelihood of Americans and the economy in uncertainty: like the over 3,800 Federal employees who live in the 35th Congressional District, these are all hard-working men and women in the Federal Government workforce; like the constituent who wrote us asking why death benefits for veterans were not being paid out; like the dairy owner that called this very morning and wanted to know why they had not received money that was owed to them from the Federal Government.

□ 1500

These are just a few of the cases that are going on in my district; and while progress has been made in the Nation's economic recovery from the greatest recession since the last depression, the Federal Government's shutdown hampers that very recovery. The shutdown sends a bad message to the business community, that government is unreliable.

The 35th District's constituents are not being helped by the Small Business Administration because of the shutdown. The SBA is currently approving zero general small business, real estate, and equipment loans. This hurts the economic development of California's 35th Congressional District.

Last year, the SBA approved almost \$500,000 a day in small business, real estate, and equipment loans in my district. This money enabled job growth and benefited the community by spurring economic development in the region. This equates to more than \$1 billion not currently being lent to small businesses across the country in 1 month. Businesses in my district, the

State, and across the Nation are losing money every day because of the government shutdown. We should be helping businesses start up and grow. We should be doing everything we can to grow jobs and grow our economy. Congress should not be an impediment that slows prosperity in America.

Without a solution to the Federal Government shutdown, low-income women and children will suffer without programs that Congress fought hard to secure. Federally funded programs like the Women, Infants, and Children program, commonly known as WIC, is at risk of having its funding diminished under a government shutdown. WIC provides nutrition education and healthy foods, enabling families to make lifelong healthy eating and lifestyle choices.

In California alone, 1.5 million low-income women and children will be impacted should Congress not act to end this shutdown. This is at a time when 27 percent of California's children are considered to be food insecure, children lacking access to enough food or nutritionally adequate food.

Letting a government shutdown occur when children's nutrition is at risk is irresponsible. Let us be part of the solution and end political gamesmanship that hurts average Americans. Let us feed America's hungry children. Let us get businesses back to business and help America prosper.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank my friend and colleague, the gentlelady from California's 35th Congressional District, GLORIA NEGRETE MCLEOD.

Now I yield to a true champion of small business. She sits on the Small Business Committee, as well as the Judiciary Committee. Representative JUDY CHU has been a friend of mine in California. I know her from various roles we have played in California governance. She represents California's 27th District, which includes Pasadena, Rosemead, Monterey Park, and many other communities. I yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. CHU. I thank Congressman TAKANO.

Last week, domestic violence shelters and rape crisis centers all across the country got a notice from the Federal Office of Justice Programs that as of last Friday, thanks to this Republican shutdown, they will not be able to draw down the funds they normally rely on and may have to stop operating.

The shelters in my district showed me the notice, and it gave us all chills. They would be forced to shut their doors, leaving abused victims and children with nowhere else to turn.

Just yesterday, I was in a Judiciary hearing in which an advocate said that their agency had just seen a young girl who was beaten, tortured, and raped for 5 hours. If these centers are not open, where is a girl like this to go?

As a former rape crisis counselor, I know firsthand the damage that domestic violence and sexual assault causes. We can't just leave these victims to fend for themselves, vulnerable to their abusers at the most critical times of their lives. That is why agencies in my district, like YWCA Wangs Haven House, the San Gabriel Valley Center, Asian Women's Center, and House of Ruth, exist, to help victims get their lives together.

This GOP shutdown is beyond shameful; it is disgusting. Enough already. It is time to end the shutdown. It is time to let us vote.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the very distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services. I have known Representative MAXINE WATERS also for a number of years, more than I care to even sort of count. She represents California's 43rd District, which includes south Los Angeles, Hawthorne, and Inglewood.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman TAKANO for organizing this very special Special Order so that we can talk about what is happening with our great State of California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again call for an end to this unnecessary government shutdown and talk about the significant consequences it is having for the people of my district, California's 43rd.

The recession hit the people of my district hard. Delinquencies, foreclosures, and job losses crippled our economy and our neighborhoods. Five years later, we are just beginning to emerge from these hard times.

But the irresponsibility of the Republican Party has threatened our fragile recovery. Their strategy, planned and financed by extremists like the Koch brothers, Heritage Action, and the Club For Growth, is to hold the American people and the economy hostage in order to push an extremist ideology.

Their desire to eliminate the Affordable Care Act is misguided, wrong, and harmful to the American people. The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. It has been validated by the reelection of President Obama and supported by the Supreme Court of the United States of America. It is settled law, and we should not be threatening American jobs and the American economy to repeal it.

Mr. Speaker, veterans in my district are being harmed by the shutdown. If this unnecessary stalemate does not

end by November 1, the Veterans Affairs Department will not be able to issue checks to more than 5 million beneficiaries. This is unacceptable.

In addition, small businesses in my district are being severely harmed. The Small Business Administration's lending program has been stopped, and the process to obtain government contracts has also been halted. In 2012, the SBA approved over \$366,000 in small business, real estate, and equipment loans every day in my district. Each day this senseless shutdown continues, hundreds of thousands of dollars in economic development all across my district is being undermined.

In Torrance, Inglewood, Gardena, Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Los Angeles itself, retail stores, restaurants, and small businesses are hurting because of the shutdown. Prominent business groups in my district, such as the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, the Torrance Chamber of Commerce, California Chamber of Commerce, California Manufacturers and Technology Association, and 14 other local chambers of commerce across the State have all said that the impacts of a shutdown could be harmful and disruptive to their businesses.

The Republican Party likes to talk about how much they support small businesses, but when extremist billionaires like the Koch brothers start throwing their money around, Republicans tell small business owners, You are on your own.

The Head Start program, which has put thousands of children on a solid path to a well-rounded education, has effectively closed services in many States and regions across the country. California is no exception. I am outraged that our Nation's children are suffering the consequences of these Republican games. The Republican sequester already cut 57,000 children from Head Start. This program is a crucial lifeline in my district, combating poverty and making our communities safer, better places to live. We need to restore it today.

Finally, I want to discuss the shutdown's serious impact on California's fledgling housing market. My district's housing market is finally finding its footing after years of instability. The Republican shutdown is throwing a massive wrench in that process. A prolonged shutdown will cause tremendous harm to home buyers seeking to close on mortgage loans. These delays are detrimental to all home buyers, but particularly those who are buying for the first time.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will mark the first paycheck many affected employees will miss as a result of the shutdown. These are hardships many in my district cannot afford. Each day this senseless shutdown continues risks further irreparable damage to my district's economy, families, and businesses. It must end now.

Just yesterday, we heard more bad news for our State. Governor Jerry Brown announced that he will soon be forced to make the difficult decision of whether the State will pay for the continued operation of Federal programs used by millions of Californians. These include programs such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, subsidized school meals, and nutrition assistance for pregnant women and infants, all of which could be interrupted in November.

I urge my Republican colleagues to stop using the American people and the American economy as pawns in this debate. It is time for the Republican Party to end this ridiculous game and open the government today.

I thank Congressman TAKANO for organizing this very important Special Order.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentlelady for participating. We both love our State. It is such an honor to serve with you in this body.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman who represents California's 29th District. He sits on the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on the Budget, Representative TONY CÁRDENAS, who was also formerly of the California State Legislature. His district includes the cities of Van Nuys, North Hollywood, and other areas of the San Fernando Valley.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. I thank my colleague for yielding me this time, and thank you for putting this opportunity together, Congressman TAKANO.

It is a great opportunity to speak here today. I would like to speak to what this is costing my district, and this is just a microcosm of what this Republican shutdown is costing all districts in America, all communities in the United States of America.

Recently, some of my colleagues here in the House have chosen to harm America, harm American families, seniors, veterans, and businesses across the country. They have refused to do their job of providing a budget for America, a budget which would simply pay our Nation's bills. Ladies and gentlemen, this is something every family in America has to do. We must pass a reasonable budget. We must reopen our government. Every day we sit on the sidelines, American families and businesses are losing. They are suffering. There is \$300 million in economic loss every day. That is \$300 million a day, poof, gone.

When I am at home talking to the people I am proud to represent, their number one concern is creating well-paying American jobs. This Republican shutdown demonstrates how out of touch the party is with the needs of working-class families who are focused on feeding their families and making ends meet. This Republican shutdown hurts America.

In my district alone, the shutdown has stalled the completion of a major project for the Mission City Community Network, a health network that provides medical, dental, and mental health services. Once construction is completed—eventually—they will be able to help 10,000 patients a year going forward. However, this program is stalled because Republicans refuse to allow a vote on a budget.

Congress needs to stop the fighting and should focus on growing our economy. The uncertainty about how long the shutdown will last is crippling our economy. The possibility of defaulting on America's bills is having a serious and negative impact on our position as the greatest country in the world.

□ 1515

It is important for the government to provide stability and security for the people and businesses in our country, and the world is watching us.

This shutdown has sent 800,000 Americans home, telling them don't go to work. For example, in my district, I have a Federal building where hundreds of Americans work every single day serving my community. I went to that building just a few days ago, and it is closed down. The only person that I found working there now is one security guard.

American families cannot afford to wait on Republicans who are holding the Nation's economy hostage. For example, even children are affected. Head Start programs in my district are wondering how long they are going to be able to keep their doors open before they turn those children away. Every time we say that those 800,000 people are not going to work, those government workers, just ask the corner grocery store, the restaurants how they feel about this shutdown. It is affecting everybody, public and private businesses alike.

I want to bring to your attention that it was just reported to me that the districts around Los Angeles, including the one that I represent, that every day the average amount of money that is lent to small businesses is \$360,000 in loans a day from the Small Business Administration. That is more than \$7.5 million per month. Last year in our district, more than \$84 million in loans were approved. That is the equivalent of 2,400 new jobs last year. That is good government at work. However, now that the Republican shutdown is in full force and in place, zero dollars are being lent out through the SBA in my district. That means zero new jobs every single day that the Republican shutdown is in place.

I am very proud to say that I grew up in a family where my mother and father made ends meet to raise us 11 American citizens, and I am very proud that they raised us in a nice, clean, good environment. I have brothers and

sisters who have gone to college to get their doctorate degrees, master's degrees, bachelor's degrees; and I am very proud to say I worked with my engineering degree for a while, but then I decided to strike out on my own and run my own business. I know what it is like when a business is trying to grow. And when you don't have access to capital, you don't grow; if you don't grow, you don't create new jobs.

I just wanted to make sure that people understand what it means when the Federal SBA stops lending money. When they stop lending money, new jobs stop in communities throughout America.

House Republicans must allow us to do the one thing Americans want more than anything else from our Congress, and that is to let us pay our bills, let us act responsibly, and let us put Americans back to work. It is simply that, ladies and gentlemen.

Let's get back to work in this Congress. Let's get this government back to work. Let's reinvigorate an economy that was barely starting to get back on its feet but has been shut down.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to my friend and colleague, Representative MIKE HONDA, from the 17th District. I know you, Mr. HONDA, have been a former school principal. You have been in local government as a county supervisor, I think, of Santa Clara County. You have served in this body, I think, since 1996. It is an honor to serve with you, and I know we both love our great State of California. We are very anxious and sad over the potential impacts that both the government shutdown and this threat to not raise the debt ceiling will have on this fragile recovery that we are now, I think, beginning to see evidence of.

Mr. HONDA. I want to thank you, my friend, for this opportunity and this dialogue.

It is a shame that we don't have the same dialogue across the aisle, but our rules prohibit us from being able to create that dialogue and debate in front of this country. As a result, we have this moment in time where we are able to share as members of the California delegation, but also as members of this Democratic Caucus.

We are here today, on day 10, of the Republican government shutdown that has cost over \$3 billion in lost economic activity so far. And because of the compounding nature of the economic effects, it is estimated that over a month's time, the economy will be drained of \$50 billion.

Almost 1 million people should be working today, and they are not. When our government is forced to shut down, it hurts our economy, closes essential services for low-income families, and disrupts the lives of real people in all of our districts, regardless of where we represent. Important government serv-

ices that benefit all of us are suspended.

In my district, I have heard from young people that were furloughed, the young employees of the NASA Ames facility. They are wondering how they are going to be able to make rent to stay in their homes or to make ends meet.

The investigators that were working on finding the underlying causes of the Asiana crash and coming up with ways to make air travel safer, we sent home.

I have also heard from those who are waiting to hear back on their Social Security benefits appeals. Because the appeals office is closed, they will not hear back on their cases until this shutdown is over, which means they have less means to make ends meet.

There is no reason this should be happening. All of this pain is absolutely and completely unnecessary. We do have the bipartisan votes, however, to end this shutdown today if the Speaker would allow a clean vote. That might be the most frustrating part of all of this.

Actually, it is the most frustrating part of all of this, that we have the votes here on both sides of the aisle if the Speaker allows us to vote. I am not sure what it is that he is afraid of, but if he let that go and let us vote and let the people vote, then we may be able to reflect the desires and the reflections of what people are feeling in this country.

Speaker BOEHNER and the Republican majority in the House refuse to do their job, and I think they really do believe they are doing their job. I pray that they see and understand that there is real human suffering and economic suffering that comes as a direct result of these irresponsible political tactics, both on the government-wide shutdown and on the debt limit.

For House Democrats, this is not a game. On the debt ceiling, the full faith and credit of the United States should never be in jeopardy. That is our position, and that is the position of economists and business leaders, and that should be the attitude of this Congress.

Warren Buffett called the debt limit a nuclear bomb. Goldman Sachs CEO Lloyd Blankfein said:

Economic damage associated with default or near default will be severe and have serious consequences for the recovery of the U.S. and global economy.

Bank of America CEO Brian Moynihan said:

There is no debate that the seriousness of the U.S. not paying its debts is the most serious thing we have.

The president of the American Bankers Association and former Republican Governor of Oklahoma, Frank Keating, said a default would cost "hundreds of billions of dollars," and even the slightest impact on interest rates "would cascade throughout the economy."

This government shutdown and the looming threat of an unprecedented government default are doing significant harm to our economy. The only ones that can't see that are Speaker BOEHNER and the Tea Party Republicans.

House Democrats have started the process on forcing a vote on a clean CR to reopen the government and will soon do the same with a vote on the debt limit. Americans want a vote. A reasonable majority in Congress want this vote. Speaker BOEHNER can call this vote today. But since he won't, we will try to force a vote as soon as House rules allow.

Let's not go 1 more day without a functioning government. Let's stop these games, reopen the government, start the process of ending this manufactured crisis, lift this cloud from over our economy, and have the vote that Americans have been waiting for. Let us vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you, Congressman HONDA.

I know that before you became a Member of Congress, you had experience as a county supervisor, and I know that counties are often the fiscal agents for major programs, like our nutrition programs, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the Women, Infants, and Children nutrition programs. I understand that the stimulus funds that we are supplementing, some of these assistance programs—let me try to translate this into ordinary everyday language.

We are talking about food stamps. We are talking about people being able to buy food in order to have the basic necessity of eating. I don't know about your district, but in my district, I know that during the height of the recession, we saw people who were middle class families for the first time having to access these programs. As I say, we are still not fully out of this recession. It is a fragile recovery.

The other effect that these assistance programs had is that they serve as a kind of stimulus to the local economy. People on these assistance programs have to spend the money locally, at local supermarkets. It injects some stimulus effect on the local economies. My understanding is that, come November 1, we are going to see a significant reduction in those programs because we have not been attending to reauthorizing the legislation that funds these programs. We have grave doubt as to what is going to happen to the 47 million people who rely on SNAP.

Mr. HONDA. That is true.

Mr. TAKANO, as you know, I represent a majority of the area that is commonly called "Silicon Valley." We were doing relatively well with the shutdown; however, government contracts, entrepreneurship are going to be affected, and that trickles down throughout the system, including what

we call the "supply chains," where other companies throughout this country, in other parts of the State are affected also. This is almost like an arithmetic kind of extension of this impact when—I guess Warren Buffett said it best, that it is a nuclear bomb, because it just continues to spread its impact throughout our country and our economy.

Mr. TAKANO. Isn't it true in Silicon Valley—let's kind of talk about that for a moment—there has been a resurgence of investment, that we are seeing our California budget sort of recovering with additional revenues because your area of the State is helping to lead the recovery?

There are two different subject matters here: the government shutdown, and also this issue of the debt ceiling being raised. We have seen on the Hong Kong markets the short-term debt or the premium that they are charging for this uncertainty about our debt ceiling being raised. In other words, interest rates are likely to raise. Raising capital is going to be a problem.

Do you have any thoughts on what that is going to be doing to our Silicon Valley entrepreneurs?

Mr. HONDA. It is a dampening effect. I think people are less likely to invest, even though there is a great faith in the kinds of activities we have in Silicon Valley. I think those who have the resources to make the investments, they are going to be looking at it twice before they can move forward. I think that they are very concerned about the government's behavior in terms of how we manufacture crisis around the debt limit, how we manufacture crisis about the CR or the budget. All we need is what we proposed a few months ago, and that is a good, balanced budget that would drive this country forward economically and logically.

No family functions without a good budget. What we are doing is we have created a budgetary crisis that guarantees—they have already done it—closure of the government or the dysfunction of a family. When you do that, all hell breaks loose. This is what is happening to our elders, our children, our preschools. There is not a system that has not been affected. The military, our veterans, they are all being affected. So we have to really make sure that the public understands what it is that is happening.

□ 1530

Mr. TAKANO. Well, I don't think we want to normalize or make routine a mode of governing where either party threatens to shut down the government because of a political end they want to achieve or either party decides that they want to threaten the full faith and credit of the United States and threaten the establishment of the American dollar as the world reserve currency because they want to achieve some sort of political end.

We need to give the American people—every business, every family, investors, whether they are domestic or whether they are international investors who want to invest in our economy, including in Silicon Valley, the certainty that we have a responsible government in the United States.

Whoever would have thought we would come to a place where within a year and a half, the last time that this issue came about was—I remember seeing you on August 1 of 2011 when the Budget Control Act of 2011 was passed. But it was linked, I think, unfortunately, to the debt ceiling raise. And the idea that we would normalize this practice, to me, is something that we don't want to see our Nation continue to do.

Mr. HONDA. Yes.

I just want to close by thanking you for this opportunity. The gentleman and I are both educators. And educators know one thing: how to ask a question and come to a logical conclusion. And the logical conclusion right now is that we should have never gotten to this point. We should have never gotten to a point where we shut down this government. We should have done the right thing to make sure that the full faith and credit of our country, like our reputation, is honored. So we need to get back to that point.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman.

Let me just go into my final remarks for this Special Order hour. And I want to remind the American people that the Democrats did offer a point of compromise when we accepted funding for the continuing resolution, which is actually below the PAUL RYAN budget figure. It is a number that the President agreed to, the Senate agreed to, and the House Democrats are willing to agree to. And we know that there was a deal that was brokered by the Speaker and the Senate Majority Leader related to it, and we thought that the result would be a clean CR.

But what we cannot afford to do, what I cannot unconscionably do as the Representative for the 41st District, is to bargain away the Affordable Care Act. Twenty-four percent of my population of Riverside County is uninsured. My constituents need the Affordable Care Act to help them get the quality health care that they deserve.

The law includes important consumer protections that prevent insurance companies from denying coverage for people with preexisting conditions. It eliminates annual and lifetime caps on care and allows young people to stay on their parents' plans longer. In addition, the law requires insurance plans to cover free preventative health services, and it lowers prescription drug costs for seniors by closing the Medicare part D doughnut hole.

So, America, my community's seniors have a lot at stake. The California State marketplace, Covered California,

has already received 1 million unique site visits, more than 16,000 applications have been completed, and another 27,000 are partially completed. That is more than 43,000 Californians who have taken the step to get covered in just 10 days.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is all very simple. Congress has a handful of basic functions. Two of them are to keep the government open and to pay our bills on time. These things Congress should be doing already.

The situation we are in reminds me of when my brothers and I thought our parents should pay us an allowance for making our beds. My parents argued that making our beds was something that my brothers and I should be doing anyway, that an everyday responsibility like making our beds wasn't something that was done for a payoff.

What should I get for brushing my teeth? That is obviously a personal responsibility that I shouldn't get anything for. Refusing to fulfill a responsibility should not be leverage for getting something that you want.

The House Republicans are expecting to get something out of this. They are expecting to get something out of refusing to fulfill their basic responsibilities. They are expecting to get something out of refusing to fund the government and refusing to be faithful stewards of the full faith and credit of the United States. They are willing to threaten the American dollar and its status as the world's reserve currency.

There are several Members of this body who do not believe the chaos that would be created by not paying our bills on time. One Member said he believed it would "bring stability to the markets." Others have said that it is a "scare tactic" being used by the administration and Democrats. They say this despite every credible economist stating that America defaulting on its debts would be catastrophic.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, imagine if Democrats were this cavalier about an issue as serious as the debt ceiling. We would be run out of town, and for good reason.

I thank my colleagues for joining me today. Let's end this shutdown. Let's end this shutdown, Mr. Speaker. Let's make sure we pay our bills and pay them on time. And let's give the American people the certainty that they need and that they deserve.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have spent my career in San Diego, Sacramento, and DC working with all of my colleagues—no matter the party—to get things done for my constituents in San Diego.

But now sadly, I stand on this floor and watch what I consider to be the greatest show of political dysfunction I have seen during my time in public service.

I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle speak of winning, of putting points on the board. Winning? Mr. Speaker, there is no winning to be had here.

But, I can tell you who is losing—hard working American families, my constituents in San Diego, and the great state of California.

Every day that this shutdown continues more of my friends and neighbors are harmed.

My city of San Diego loses \$7 million a week every week that this continues. \$7 million. Imagine the investments in our schools, roads, and small businesses that we could be making with that money.

Jobless claims are surging as the many San Diegan contracting businesses are forced to lay off their workers.

Small businesses in San Diego are finding it difficult to sustain their operations, as they lose thousands in stalled federal small business loans and grants.

The many veterans who live in San Diego are finding their hard-earned and well-deserved benefits delayed.

And now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk of negotiating?

The Senate passed a budget in March—in March. For months and months, I have joined with my Democratic colleagues requesting that the House appoint conferees to negotiate a compromise. Nothing. No willingness to open up a dialogue, to negotiate. Nothing.

Now, the government is shut down, and my friends and neighbors in San Diego are suffering. We can fix that right now. We can take a vote to reopen the government right now.

Then we can get together and talk like adults about our differences on the budget—and not use my friends and neighbors as leverage to score points in a game that no one will win. This isn't a game, this is lunacy.

FARM BILL OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today as a Central Valley farmer, a friend of farmers, an agricultural employer and an agricultural worker, and the Representative of a community that is dependent upon agriculture for its livelihood.

As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I understand the specialized needs of various sectors of our ag economy across the country. My priorities for this farm bill are:

First and foremost, providing a 5-year certainty for farmers while saving taxpayers dollars by eliminating direct payments and reforming nutrition programs for the first time since 1996.

Second, we need to support innovative research and development on specialty crops, a major export for our region and our country as a whole.

Third, we must support programs and increase exports and take advantage of all of the new trade agreements we have strengthened and established in the past years and prepare for those markets which are beginning to open to our ag products.

Fourth, we must also protect domestic produce and farms from pests and

diseases that primarily come from other countries.

And fifth and finally, it is imperative that we uphold a State's right to protect its own agriculture industry by passing laws related to safety and agricultural production.

It is time to conference on the farm bill and work with our Senate counterparts to produce a final product that will maintain a safety net for those most in need and give American growers and producers a competitive and productive global edge while saving taxpayers money.

I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from California, my friend and colleague and a strong advocate for agriculture in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Americans do not like being dependent on foreign oil, and Americans sure don't want to become dependent on foreign food. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the importance of passing a farm bill.

In my home State of Georgia, agriculture plays a major role in the overall success of our State. Last year, Georgia agriculture was valued at over \$14 billion, and the total economic contribution to Georgia was \$72 billion. This contribution makes up approximately 10 percent of our gross domestic product and 360,000 jobs. In my district, one of every eight jobs is tied to agriculture.

As a major economic driver of our State, the agricultural industry has suffered without the certainty of a farm bill. Over the past several months, our farmers have had to deal with this uncertainty within the industry because Washington has not been able to agree on a farm bill.

Many of my constituents are left in limbo, trying to decide what to do next year with regard to their crops, wondering if there will be crop insurance or the other things that they depend on for their farm operations and their livelihoods. That is why it is critical to provide the certainty of a farm bill, to boost our economy and help our farmers and our farm families succeed and create jobs.

The farm bill we passed in the House saves taxpayers over \$20 billion. I want to reiterate that, Mr. Speaker—over \$20 billion and it makes real progress in tackling the drivers of our debt. It consolidates more than 100 programs administered by the USDA and improves agricultural programs to be more cost effective and market oriented by repealing outdated and unworkable permanent law.

I ask my colleagues to join me so we can move to conference and sign a new farm bill into law in order to provide certainty for our country and America's farmers.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

I now yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, whenever I drive across Montana, I see signs of our State's strong ag heritage in about every turn in the road. From the fields of sugar beets and wheat to grazing cattle and sheep, these are visual reminders of the importance of agriculture to our State and everywhere across this country.

Agriculture is the backbone of Montana's economy. And as a fifth-generation Montanan, I have a deep appreciation for the value of this industry to our State. Agriculture injects several billion dollars into Montana's economy every year, and one in five Montana jobs rely on agriculture.

But agriculture is more than the economic driver of our State. It is a way of life for thousands of Montana families who have lived off the land for generations. My own great, great grandmother came to Montana as a homesteader. In fact, she homesteaded up in the Golden Triangle of Montana, north of Great Falls, in the heart of Montana's wheat country.

I know how important it is to ensure that young Montanans have the opportunity to continue working on family farms and family ranches. And that is why Montanans are so frustrated and I am so frustrated by Washington's persistent failure to pass a long-term farm bill that provides Montana's producers with the certainty they need and deserve.

Montanans are sick and tired of the political games that have long delayed the passage of a 5-year farm bill. This critical legislation is long overdue, and it is unacceptable that Congress continues to stand in the way of providing our ag producers and rural communities with a long-term solution.

Agriculture is not only an important part of Montana's economy, but it is a critical industry that impacts each and every American. And as Montana's sole voice in the U.S. House of Representatives, I am committed to being an advocate for Montana's farmers and ranchers. We can't wait any longer. We need a farm bill now.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

I now recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1947, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

Over the last 4 years and after more than 40 hearings, the House of Representatives has produced a bill that implements needed commonsense reforms for America's farmers.

The FARRM Act is like any other farm bill previously passed. It has strong bipartisan support and makes substantial reforms, repealing outdated policies while streamlining and consolidating over 100 programs.

□ 1545

Advancing a new farm bill into law this year is crucial to the entire country, especially to those in California's Central Valley.

The legislation makes critical reforms to traditional farm programs. The Market Access Program, MAP, will improve export market development and assistance to programs that promote U.S. agricultural products overseas, allowing our specialty crop farmers here in the Valley to expand their businesses.

We eliminate direct payments. We move to a more market-oriented approach where we provide more risk management tools, instead of making payments regardless of market conditions. Many farmers in my district have questioned these economically unfeasible \$5 billion payments that go out every year, regardless of market conditions.

The bill makes improvements to the crop insurance program through successful public-private partnerships that ensure farmers have skin in the game. This will eliminate some of the unrealistic requirements that crop insurance agents face every day, such as asking an agent to verify his or her customers' income.

The legislation relieves farmers of unnecessary burdens by including multiple regulator relief provisions. FARRM eliminates the duplicative permitting requirements for pesticides that are already federally regulated. Failure to remove the additional permit requirement will result in an administrative and financial nightmare for agriculture producers, public health agencies, and Federal Government and State agencies.

The FARRM bill makes even more important changes that substantially affect California's 21st Congressional District:

Reauthorizes, strengthens, and fully pays for livestock disaster assistance;

Continues to support specialty crops, just as the 2008 farm bill did, by fully funding core specialty crop industry priorities such as Specialty Crop Block Grants. These grants will fund innovative research for my district's fruit, vegetable, and nut farmers to combat disease and promote consumption across the U.S., and that is important for food security. A nation has to be secure in its food.

The FARRM Act of 2013 will implement the most significant reforms to traditional farm policy in history, while maintaining commonsense, fiscally responsible policies. Passage of this legislation will provide America's farmers and ranchers, especially those in the Central Valley, the certainty and resources they need to produce an adequate and affordable food supply for our country and the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this much-needed legislation.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PASS THE FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, thank you, and thank you to my colleagues who have joined me here today to talk about an important piece of legislation that seemingly has gone by the wayside, like many, many other important issues, because of the dysfunction of Washington right now: a farm bill.

Many here in America don't realize that our current farm bill has expired. But we have an opportunity to pass a food, nutrition, and jobs bill that Congress is supposed to authorize every 5 years. But since it expired on September 30, the good news, though, is that there is still an opportunity to get this 5-year farm bill passed; and when we do, we are going to be able to give our farmers and producers the tools they need to do what they do best. We can do this before next planting season.

Why do we need a farm bill? To promote and grow our economy, to provide certainty to our farmers and producers, and to give them the tools they need to succeed.

For example, crop insurance. Mr. Speaker, crop insurance is working. I even had the opportunity to talk to Secretary Vilsack in one of the hearings on our Ag Committee, and he agreed with me that crop insurance is working. This farm bill strengthens crop insurance, which strengthens our economy, because it strengthens agriculture.

Ag is one of the bright spots in our Nation's economy right now, Mr. Speaker. That should not be forgotten, which is why it is crucial that we pass this farm bill.

We have other policies within that bill that are very crucial to my district and many districts throughout this Nation: conservation, ag research, and trade.

As we stand on the floor today, many of the farmers I represent are out in the field. Mr. Speaker, it is harvest time. That is why we are down here today: to let our producers know we have not forgotten and that we are still fighting for that 5-year farm bill.

Farmers used to just have to worry about the uncertainty of the weather. Now, Mr. Speaker, they have to worry about the uncertainty of Washington. That is unfortunate, but it is something that we can correct when we work together.

Mr. Speaker, I came here to govern. I sought a seat on the Ag Committee because I knew we would have an opportunity to leave our mark on this jobs legislation. We want to get this job done so that our farmers can continue to get their job done.

I appreciate the many colleagues who have already spoken before me and the rest who are down here today for this farm bill Special Order, as well as many others who have helped move the farm bill forward. And before recognizing my colleagues so that they may share with those watching why we must advance a new farm bill, I want to talk about why the farm bill is important to the district that I represent.

In central and southwestern Illinois, agriculture is key to our local economy. It is 14 counties in central and southwestern Illinois that I am proud to serve here in Congress on their behalf, and it is home to some of the most productive and costly farmland in America.

It is also home to many in the agribusiness sector: ADM, the University of Illinois. My district is home to the largest gathering of ag producers and agricultural-related products in the country.

This is the Farm Progress Show that was just completed in Decatur, Illinois, in July, a whopping success. Sloan Implement is in the 13th District of Illinois. GSI, another global leader, one of the largest employers in my district, and it happens to be the largest employer in my home county of Christian County. Kraft Foods in Champaign, Illinois. The National Corn-to-Ethanol Research Center in Edwardsville, at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, also plays a crucial role for jobs, innovation, and energy independence in our area. These are just some of the reasons that Congress needs to keep working together to advance a 5-year farm bill.

And let's not forget, again, what a bright spot agriculture has been on our Nation's economy. Every \$1 billion in ag exports supports nearly 8,000 American jobs. Earlier this year, the USDA, they projected \$139.5 billion in ag exports. That is more than 1.1 million jobs supported by American agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from the great State of Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), my good friend and my colleague.

Mr. BENISHEK. I thank my colleague from Illinois for allowing me to speak here today, and I want to thank you for hosting this Special Order hour in general.

Mr. Speaker, although we speak today at a time when Members are very busy working to resolve the government shutdown, it is critical to remember that, while the government may have stopped, the work of our

farmers certainly has not. Farmers in each of our districts, whether they are busy picking apples or harvesting fields of corn, are busy at this time of the year; there is no doubt about it. Autumn is the time that farmers in our districts normally look forward to. That is when they have the chance to reap the bounty of the great work that they have done this past year planting and tending to the land.

Our farmers, producers, and agribusiness owners deserve better. They have put in the hard work. They are feeding not only Michigan's families, but America's families and much of the world. We owe them certainty. We owe them a farm bill.

As the only Member from Michigan on the Agriculture Committee, I regularly speak with farmers, not only from my district, but from around the State. Over the last year, they have continually expressed the need for certainty. While they have different ideas on some specific provisions of the overall farm bill, they all agree that we need to get this done.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked hard with my colleagues to move the farm bill forward. I have worked with many local stakeholders in Michigan to ensure that their concerns are addressed in the bill. Now is the time to move forward to a conference.

This afternoon, I come to the floor to say, simply, let's get this done. Let's go to conference, work out our differences, and get a farm bill done. We owe it to our farmers. We owe it to the hardworking families around the country that rely on the food that our farmers produce.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the farmers of northern Michigan for the outstanding work that they have done this season. Now let's get this farm bill done.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my colleague, Mr. BENISHEK.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for again allowing us this opportunity to talk about how important ag is going to be in our economy.

Let's talk about how important this farm bill is to get passed and how we are not that far apart when it comes to the differences in the funding levels with the Senate bill that should be conferred. And let us not also forget—let us not forget that agriculture isn't just important to the Midwest. It is also important to States like Michigan, where my colleague who just spoke was from. We have heard from individuals from California, from Georgia, from Montana. Ag is a nationwide issue, and we have seen nationwide success in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. YODER. I appreciate my friend from Illinois for putting together this

hour for us to be able to come down and have a conversation about how we protect the American farmer.

For months and months now, we have been having a debate in the United States House and Senate about how we can put together legislation that will ensure that the men and women who bring in the crops, who tend to the livestock, who create the food source for our Nation and the world have certain policies that are predictable and that encourage farming as a way of life to continue in the United States.

So I join my colleagues here, those from down in southern Illinois to—we just heard from my colleague, DAN BENISHEK from Michigan, who believes passionately in agriculture and protecting farmers. We are here together today united, standing on behalf of the farmers in our country.

So I call on my colleagues to help us get a farm bill done. Farmers have been waiting a long time for Congress to work together to find a solution. We are obviously divided on a lot of things, but we ought to be united on helping protect the American farmer and our American food supply.

In Kansas, farming is not just a means to make money, and certainly, it is a significant part of the Kansas economy. Along with several other parts, farming and agriculture is a key component of the Kansas economy. But it is also a way for Kansans and Americans to put food on the table for the world. Kansas is the number one wheat producer in the country, wheat that ends up feeding hungry Kansans, hungry Americans in all 50 States, and on most continents. They put in long, hard hours to bring in millions of bushels of grain, grain that will end up on the tables of the entire Nation and the entire world.

But it is also a way of life. Now farmers at home right now—I just spoke with a farmer earlier today. Farmers are bringing in—they are harvesting their soybeans. Some are still picking corn.

For generations, people have come to States like Kansas and Illinois and California and Michigan, and they have come to build a way of life. They have taken, in the case of Kansas, a prairie—it was undeveloped—and they came out there, and they brought their families and they took risk, much risk to carve a lifestyle out of the prairie. And through that hard work, through that determination, through that sweat off their brow, they tamed the wilderness and, in the process, they helped build the greatest nation the world has ever seen. And along the way, they asked for little in return. They built a nation with great bedrock values, good schools, good communities. It was all centered around the small family farmer.

So that is one of the things we are down here to protect and to talk about

is continuing that American tradition of the small family farmer. And so they have worked hard. They work long days, sunup to sundown. Sometimes farmers will work through the night, 24-hour shifts even, to bring in the crops when the time has come.

I grew up on a farm myself. I remember going out, my dad going out in the middle of the winter and bringing a round bale to our cattle and ensuring that the livestock could have feed. And that meat that they produced, we produced and farmers produce all across the country, that ends up taking care of Americans everywhere.

So now those farmers, they are counting on us. When they plant their fall crops, they need predictability and they need certainty. It is time to move past short-term bills. It is time to move past short-term promises. We need to move towards long-term policies that will create stability, that will allow farmers to plant, allow farmers to go back to doing what they do best: growing food, feeding a hungry Nation.

This fall, Kansas farmers are hard at work bringing in the autumn harvest, and they are planting the 2014 crop. They have patiently waited for Congress to act on a farm bill. Now is the time to move forward.

The farm bill provides farmers with crucial safety net programs that allow them to protect their operations from uncertainty and the sudden downturns that can occur when growing crops and raising livestock. These programs are essential in providing farmers with the certainty they need to be successful.

So as we have this larger debate about how to solve the debt crisis, I think farmers have been admirable in this debate. Farmers came forward and said, Look, you know, we receive direct payments. We know that is a burden on the Treasury. We know there are a lot of burdens on the Treasury. We hope that we can all pitch in to help solve our national debt crisis. We are going to voluntarily, we are going to give those things up.

And every other group that comes before Washington, most groups give up nothing. They want more. In fact, in Washington, when you don't get more than you got last year, it is a cut.

Farmers said, We are willing to take a cut. We are willing to take billions of dollars of cuts because we want to do our part to ensure that we are helping resolve the national debt crisis.

□ 1600

So they were first in line to give up support, and some of that support was very crucial to farms and has been crucial to farmers to keep them from ending up in bankruptcy or farms from going under. They are giving that up. No more direct payments. Those are the kinds of reforms we need to do.

Now, what they have asked for in return is a little protection of risk. The

expense today to put out a field of crops like corn, soybeans, milo, or wheat, in Kansas, creates a tremendous amount of risk—risk that banks won't cover unless there is some sort of protection in the event of a flood, hailstorm, or a drought, and sometimes all of the above. You can wipe out a single crop overnight.

These farmers have invested their entire livelihood. They don't have a 401(k). They don't have a pension. They don't have some corporate plan to protect their retirement. Their future is in the crop they're laying out in that field, and the proceeds from that crop are going to go to investing in the next crop. And so if that crop goes under and there is no crop insurance, there is no protection for those farmers, then those farmers go under, they go bankrupt, and that way of life ends.

And so my heart goes out to those farmers that that may happen to, but it is a larger issue than just the farmers. Without crop insurance, without that protection, those farmers lose those farms and that means we don't have a food supply that we can count on. That means that the world doesn't have the food that they need to feed the hungry. I know most people get food from the grocery store these days, but it comes from the fields of Kansas and Illinois and places in between.

So it is my hope that Democrats, Republicans, House, Senate, and the President will work together in the coming days to put a farm bill on the floor that we can all get behind that can go to the President's desk and receive his signature. We've got a lot of divisions, but we would be united today—all of us—in protection, in fighting for the American farmer.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. My colleague, Mr. YODER from Kansas, brought up so many great points of why it is crucial to have this debate here on the floor of the House.

It seems as though farmers get a bad rap. There is a lot of talk on this floor about growing our economy; and, frankly, ag has been a bright spot in our economy, Mr. Speaker. It is just like Washington. Because of inaction of—a lot of times, Republicans and Democrats—we are not able to continue to allow them to grow their portion of the economy. It just seems like the right hand works against the left sometimes here in Washington. I just want to see us put some good Midwestern common sense that many of us learned right on the family farms in the Midwest, right here to work and into action in Washington, D.C.

Speaking of common sense, I want to introduce my good friend, my colleague from the great State of Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. I couldn't agree more. I would like to see a little farm-country sense brought to Washington. I

think if that were leading the charge on a lot of fronts, we could resolve some of these issues we have been facing pretty quickly.

I am real proud, Mr. Speaker, to be here to talk about agriculture. When I was first elected in 2008, sworn in in 2009, one of my first picks that I asked for on committee assignments was Agriculture. Today, I'm proud to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee for Conservation, Energy, and Forestry on the Agriculture Committee.

I am proud to be from the Keystone State. I had a number of colleagues at that point in 2009 ask me why would I ever be on Agriculture when I am from Pennsylvania. The fact is, it is our number one industry in Pennsylvania. We have many commodities. We are one of the top providers and producers for the United States—and sometimes other parts of the world—in terms of our commodities that we raise and we grow. We can't speak enough about the importance of this farm bill.

There are a lot of reasons why we all, every colleague in this Chamber, should be supporting the farm bill. I have to say that there are fewer than, I believe, 100 of our congressional districts, out of 435, where we actually grow and raise the food to feed this Nation and much of the world. But the fact is every district has Americans that shake hands with a farmer at least three times a day every time they pick up a fork.

And so one of the principles that guides me, Mr. Speaker, in terms of my decisionmaking on any issue, I call it principle-based leadership. I always start and try to define what my principles are first. By the way, we have been working on this for 4½ years, actually. I remember having hearings. I was in the minority my first 2 years, and we had hearings. The first hearing was in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, specifically on the dairy title.

But the principles that have guided me since day one here in terms of agriculture is that America should always be the place where we have the most affordable, highest quality, and safest food supply anywhere in the world. So every decision I have made in supporting the development, the writing, and actually the passing of this farm bill has been to honor those three principles.

In addition to that, my good friend from Michigan talked about the importance of food security, and I agree with that. It's the biggest threat to our national security. And there are a lot of them out there, Mr. Speaker. I have got two kids that just got back from Afghanistan. I understand terrorist threats and threats to our financial situation, but the most imminent threat to our national security would be at whatever point we would begin to rely on another country for our food supply. This farm bill is the single most important piece of Federal legislation to

make sure America has the most affordable, highest quality, and safest food supply.

There are a lot of things that this bill does. It repeals and consolidates more than 100 programs. This is a great example for the rest of government. This is exactly step one on how we begin to reduce our spending appropriately—looking at things that either don't work, things that are duplicative, things that are just not fulfilling the purpose for which it was designed.

It eliminates direct payments, which farmers receive regardless of market conditions.

I am not sure I would have supported past farm bills, to tell you the truth, that were passed before I came here; but I support this one because the reforms we have brought to the agriculture side and the nutrition side are very good. They are very good for the sustainability of our food supply and programs such as our SNAP program.

It streamlines and reforms commodity policy. We are also giving producers a choice in how to best manage risk. It includes the first reforms to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program since the Welfare Reform Act of 1996.

Why is that important? Because the reforms we put in place, it preserves the future integrity of the food stamp program so that those in the future who need those programs, those men, women, and children who find themselves in poverty circumstances where they need that assistance, they will get it, if we protect the integrity of that program. It is only through these reforms that we are putting into place that we offer those protections so we will be assured that the food stamp program continues into the future to meet the needs of those who need.

It consolidates 23 conservation programs into 13, improves program delivery to producers, and saves more than \$6 billion. That's an area of the farm title that I chair. The subcommittee has jurisdiction on conservation.

There are at least four reasons I can think of why that move is extremely important. Number one is cost. This country is facing significant debt, and so we have to be conscious and careful with our spending. We knew that the farm bill—the pie itself—would be smaller. So I think that is just one of the realities.

Second is the need. We are a country that feeds not just 311 million Americans, but we are feeding a lot of the rest of the world. And to allow land to sit idle under the context of some government-funded conservation program is just wrong. We don't want people to go hungry, and so putting more land that is appropriate back into productivity is a very appropriate thing to do; and we do that with this farm bill.

Third is effectiveness. The fact is that under the existing conservation

programs, before the reforms we proposed, we have had perfectly sound, tillable, very productive land sitting idle and sitting fallow and receiving some type of government support under a conservation program to do that.

I have met young individuals I am very impressed with that want to go into farming that have never been in farming before. Some have been in farming, but they can't afford to go out and purchase acreage; and so they have to rent acreage. And they are competing under the existing conservation programs with the government; and in competing with the government, they can't do that. They just can't pay that.

All the parts of this farm bill have been well thought out and well prepared. I am very appreciative of the work that has been done on the part of land grant universities, the fact that we are strengthening the role of science and technology when it comes to agriculture. A lot of people talk about STEM—science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. I like to talk about how agriculture is all about science and technology.

And I shout out to my own alma mater, Penn State University, which is a land grant university. Those universities help us advance that science and innovation and that technology.

I will finally talk briefly about we have probably one of the best forestry titles that we have ever had in this farm bill in maybe a hundred years. We've got great things in there in terms of making sure that timber is recognized and eligible for that biopreferred labeling.

Today, of all things, the original renewable resource of wood has never been eligible. You could buy a box of bamboo flooring—we don't grow bamboo in this country—and it has got a USDA stamp of approval, biopreferred. But if you buy a box of good hardwood cherry from the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, it is not eligible. That changes in this farm bill that we passed out of the House and we are going to go to conference with the Senate on.

The categorical exclusion allows the Forest Service not to have to waste money during these NEPA analyses every time they do trail maintenance or clear power lines or just routine things that take money away from actively managing a forest in a healthy way.

Finally, the forest access road was a great amendment which basically reinforces that our forests are non-point sources of pollution. That goes a long way in terms of allowing our forests to be managed under State-adopted best practices.

And so I want to thank the gentleman for coordinating this Special Order on a subject that every American should be fully in tune to because of

how important it is to have affordable, high-quality, and safe food. That is what our farm bill does.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to address something that my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) brought up. He talked about research. Research in agriculture is crucial to our ability here in America to continue to feed the world. We feed the world from America's farms, and it is under-appreciated and taken for granted.

Part of this farm bill is a research title, where the Agricultural and Food Research Initiative through the National Institute for Food and Agriculture was reauthorized.

Other ways we strengthen and promoted ag research in this bill are doing things like providing new research funding for specialty crops, beginning farmers, and organic agriculture. We have improved accountability and transparency of the ag research programs, and we have harmonized policies under the various competitive grants programs to improve program efficiency and reduce wasteful spending.

Many of my colleagues are talking about ag leading the way in reducing spending here in Washington. Our farmers need to be congratulated for that.

The University of Illinois, in my district—another land grant institution—uses many of these public research programs. Our students are being trained on how to make our food supply safer and better; and through AFRI, the University of Illinois has conducted cutting-edge research aimed at improving food security, achieving more efficient crop production, and promoting animal health through livestock genome sequencing.

Let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, the Southern Illinois University Corn-to-Ethanol Research Center. This is an example of a public-private partnership that is working, where public funds were used in its initial construction; but private entities are doing cutting-edge research to make our Nation's fuel supply cheaper and make our Nation's security better.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend and colleague from the great State of Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. I want to thank my colleague and friend from Illinois, Congressman DAVIS, for his incredible leadership on this issue. I know of nobody in Congress who is working harder for the American family farmer than Congressman DAVIS. This Special Order today is just one more example of your leadership.

Farming is hard work, and it is vital to Indiana. Ag industries contribute almost \$38 billion a year to the Hoosier economy, supporting nearly 190,000

jobs. The farmers who provide these jobs work from dawn until way past dusk and face great risks when withering droughts or excess rains threaten to wreck their crops.

Despite these challenges, Hoosier farmers manage to overcome adversity, succeed in their businesses, and feed the world. Too often, their work is made even harder because of uncertainties and inefficiencies in Federal farm policy.

□ 1615

The problems with Federal farm laws are many:

Price supports inflate the prices of some consumer goods; payments are made to people not actually farming; outdated and duplicative programs waste money that could be put to better use; rules regarding disaster assistance are too complicated; and they fail to provide enough certainty about whether and what return farmers will receive when they reinvest any profits in their family business.

Many are surprised that the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, commonly called “food stamps,” is administered by the Department of Agriculture, the USDA. Most agree the program is not well managed. It pays too many people who should not be eligible for help, diverting help from those who really need the assistance. There aren’t enough incentives to encourage people to find work, and there is too much waste, fraud, and abuse.

That’s why we need a farm bill.

The farm bill which passed the House is not perfect, but it would save \$40 billion over the next decade, in part, by repealing or consolidating more than 100 programs that don’t work, could work better, or are duplicative in purpose. The bill would stop the nonsense policy of paying people not to farm. Instead, it would give farmers greater flexibility to utilize federally backed crop insurance to manage risk. It also would require food stamp recipients to work more, get drug tested, and become self-sufficient.

American icon Paul Harvey once said:

And, on the eighth day, God looked down on his planned paradise and said, “I need a caretaker,” and so God made the farmer.

Others have spoken about how important it is that we stand up and be a champion for those who farm. A defeat of the farm bill maintains the status quo. We need a conference, and we need a farm bill. A defeat would hurt farmers and taxpayers, but both need the certainty of knowing that farm and nutrition assistance programs work as they should so scarce taxpayer resources aren’t wasted on food stamp fraud or on programs that just don’t work.

We need commonsense farm reform policy to prevent waste and to make sure the next generation of farmers gets its chance to run the family farm.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my good friend and colleague, Congressman LUKE MESSER, a true leader on so many issues here in Congress and for the Midwest. Thank you for being here today to talk about how important agriculture is to our economy.

I know much has been brought up about crop insurance. Some who don’t represent agricultural districts think crop insurance is a program that is wasteful, that it is welfare for farmers. Let me remind everyone, Mr. Speaker, that before we had the crop insurance program, farmers didn’t have to have skin in the game. They have to pay premiums just like we have to do for life insurance, auto insurance and other types of insurance. This is what makes America work. This is why crop insurance is working.

Before this program, we would have supplemental, ad hoc disaster assistance, and Members of Congress who served before many of us would come to this floor and pass bills to fund disaster assistance. Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that those weren’t budgeted. At a time when decisions were made to basically put the financial future of our country in jeopardy decades before now, they were still passing disaster assistance bills that cost taxpayers billions. Crop insurance changed that. Farmers have skin in the game. They pay their premiums, and it stops us—it stops Congress right now—from spending beyond its means.

It has been said before that this farm bill is an example of how Washington begins to work once again. We are looking toward our financial future, and we are looking to balance our budget through bills like this farm bill. We are going to begin to put a down payment on the unsustainable \$17 trillion of debt that your kids, Mr. Speaker, and my kids shouldn’t have to pay.

With that, I yield to my friend from my birthplace State, the great State of Iowa. He is my good friend and colleague and a leader in ag policy, Mr. KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for organizing this Special Order here today and for committing one hour of floor time to the discussion of the farm bill and the need to get one passed.

Mr. Speaker, we don’t get very many debates on agriculture here in the House of Representatives, and fewer and fewer people actually represent agriculture districts. There has been not so much a migration of people from the farms, although that has happened, but a concentration of people in the cities, and they lose track of where their food comes from and what it takes to produce that food.

So we are here at this point, and I want to start off with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois with regard to crop insurance. I am going to

pull these numbers from memory, and anyone can go back and check them, but they’re going to be conceptually accurate and, perhaps, even precisely right.

If my memory serves me, back during some of those years when it couldn’t rain—and that existed back in the eighties—it seems to me that, in 1988, we had 13 percent of the producers who actually had crop insurance. Since that time—from that time forward until this modern era—there were disaster payments after disaster payments. For any place that had a drought, for any place that had a flood, there was a discussion in Congress, and sometimes those disaster areas got rolled up together. Let’s take a disaster out West and add that to a disaster in the Midwest and add that to a disaster in the South, and there might be a flood and two droughts packaged together with a disaster payment to bail people out.

I remember, when I first came here in 2003, there was a drought out West in Nebraska. And was there going to be disaster money? We looked at that, and we looked at aerial photos. Gee, it looked like here were these really beautiful, green circles from the air, and they were going to be in areas that got disaster payments. You all know what those are if you come from farm country. Those were the pivot irrigation systems. You’re not going to have a drought if your irrigation system is running, but in the corners where they didn’t have the boom to lay down and irrigate the corners, they were burned out. They said, Gee, we ought to get a disaster for the corner of our 160—the four corners of it—even though we’ve got a good crop, 200 bushels of corn, underneath the pivot system.

Those kinds of things were discussed here in this Congress, and I want to thank the Representative from Nebraska, Tom Osborne, who also was a pretty good football coach, for saying, This isn’t right, and let’s get that part correct.

We don’t have those discussions anymore because, back in ’88, there was the 13 percent who had crop insurance. It’s back up to the point now where, I believe, the number is 88 percent due. We suffered through the worst flood in my lifetime in 2011 when the Missouri River ran hill to hill from mid-June until mid-September and flooded out, according to the Secretary of Agriculture, 500,000 acres. 500,000 acres were under water. Of course, all of that was a complete wipeout. You could fly over it, and you could see corn. As we say, you could row corn that was in 3 feet of water and corn that was about a foot and a half tall when it got covered by the flood. We didn’t have a disaster payment for that because the crop insurance covered the flood out. In the following year of 2012, there was an epic drought. It was the same situation in that the crop insurance covered it.

In many of these States—and let's start out with my State, which I know—the premium reflects the risk. Now, it shifts from State to State and history to history, but it's hard to do that calculation. You can't do a snapshot of 1 year because, of course, 1 year might be a drought year, and the next year might be a flood year, and the next 25 years might be excellent, and I hope they are. So, if you look over a span of time—a decade is a minimum, and maybe a generation is a better way to look at this—and are able to frame the kind of experience we have with weather, the premium needs to be moved in a direction in which it better reflects the risk, but it has been a very good thing, the crop insurance piece of this.

Then, as I look at this farm bill, I want to remind the people, Mr. Speaker, that, for years, there have been direct payments, direct payments that went in to the producer who signed up per acre—roughly, a \$20 per acre payment might be reflective of that era—and we saw this: we saw commodities prices going up, and we saw profitability in agriculture. When that happened, our producers came to us, people like the Farm Bureau, the Corn Growers, the Soybean Association, and they said the time comes when we need to just let go of these direct payments. They came forward and said, Here. Will you take my direct payments? I don't need them.

Hats off to anybody who has got Federal dollars coming into their operations. They gave up direct payments willingly. That's in this bill. It's in this bill, and it makes it permanent, putting an end to direct payments. By the way, in the last farm bill—the 2008 farm bill, it turned out to be—I tried to rename the direct payments then as the “conservation compliance payments” because that's what they actually were. If they existed, I would say “they are.” It's a way to say to producers that all of us are invested in the future productivity of our soil. We are going to ask you to be good stewards of the soil, and this is, actually, in many cases, a token incentive that you do that. So that's going by the wayside.

This bill also eliminates several existing programs and rolls into two separate programs a shallow loss and a deep loss program that, I think, is a prudent use of the resources. We also said we are going to cut money out of this ag side, not just the direct payments, but we have dialed this thing down to the tune of \$20 billion. There are \$20 billion in cuts out of this bill on the agriculture side.

To draw a comparison, Mr. Speaker, one could think of the other part of this farm bill that is not much discussed—I don't know today—which is the jurisdiction of the subcommittee that I chair, the Nutrition Subcommittee. Now, the numbers were

that about 78 percent of the previous farm bill went to nutrition and a little better than 20 percent went to agriculture and then some miscellaneous along the way. So we just rounded it. For easy talking purposes, it is 80 percent to SNAP—food stamps—nutrition programs and 20 percent to farmers. We call it the “farm bill,” but it is 4 to 1 nutrition. When I came to this town, there were 19 million people who were on food stamps, and we called them “food stamps” then. By the time Barack Obama became President, that number was about 28 million people who were on food stamps, and now that number is north of 47 million people—on its way to 48 million people—who are on food stamps. Now, it is partly because this administration believes and has said openly—in fact, I will just quote our Secretary of Agriculture:

For every dollar that you hand out in SNAP benefits—that would mean food stamps, Mr. Speaker—you get \$1.84 in economic activity.

I've heard STENY HOYER, the minority whip, say to us:

The best stimulation that you can get—the quickest you can get in your economy—is food stamps and unemployment checks.

Now, that's an economic development plan for you, isn't it, Mr. Speaker, if you could just hand out more food stamps and hand out more unemployment checks? That's the best bump you can get to grow your economy? What kind of a country are we if they think that's what is going to drive our economy?

People on that side of the aisle resisted their reduction in the food stamp program, and we brought categorical changes into it. So, as it has grown into an over \$800 billion program—that's over 10 years, roughly, a number that approaches about \$83 billion a year—we have gone from 19 million people a year on food stamps to 28 million people when Barack Obama became President, up now to nearly 48 million people on food stamps, with millions of dollars being spent by the USDA to advertise food stamps in order to get more people to sign up on food stamps—millions—and minions are going out there who are, actually, physically signing them up. That's what is going on.

We don't need to be expanding the dependency class in America. We need to expand the independency class in America, and we want to make sure that we get those resources to the people who need them. That's what this bill does. It changes the categorical eligibility in such a way that those who need those resources still have access to them.

One of those categorical eligibility changes has to do with, if a child qualifies for a free and reduced lunch, it isn't automatic that the family gets food stamps any longer under this bill. People on the other side of the aisle,

Mr. Speaker, have used that to argue that we are going to kick 120,000 kids off of food stamps. It is not true. That is the most extreme example they can come up with to embellish a number to try to scare people off of the reform that we need. What it really means is, if that number is right, they have to go reapply in a legitimate way. If they are eligible, they are eligible, and they will still get their food stamps.

□ 1630

But they found a little sliver to make an argument that is not the objective vision on what is going on.

We see that EBT cards, the Electronic Benefits Transfer cards, have been used for tattoos. They have been used at the massage parlor. You can see the neon signs that say, “We take EBT.” That is just straight up. That is not talking about the 50 percent discount that is the going rate for cash that you can get for your EBT card.

We need to be responsible with the taxpayers' money. We need to move these reforms in place. We have seen our agriculture producers step up and say, I am going to give up my conservation compliance/direct payments. And we reform some of the programs. We keep the pieces in place that we need so that there is a predictability in agriculture.

Our producers need predictability. There is no guarantee when it comes to agriculture. You are taking a risk. But at least we can predict the Federal Government's policy. We need to give 5 years of policy guarantee for our agriculture producers.

We need to start the long march to start to reform the expansion of the dependency class that has been a political calculation on the part of the administration. Do the responsible thing for the taxpayers. And, by the way, slow down on this burden that is being heaped upon those children yet to be born called our national debt.

That is the picture. There is an urgency. Let's get this done.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his leadership here.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a question, absolutely.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. As chair of the nutrition jurisdiction, are the school lunch programs within title IV of the farm bill?

Mr. KING of Iowa. In response to the gentleman's question, no, school lunch programs are not.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. That was my reading. I have read the farm bill, yet I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk a lot about the changes to the reforms.

As I mentioned in my remarks, and you reaffirmed, we are trying to preserve this program for people who truly

need it who meet the eligibility by filling out an application. But I guess I get confused when I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle use rhetoric that they claim that somehow school lunches are impacted or the school breakfast program is impacted by our work on the farm bill.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I would say that there are times when people that are in the political business will intentionally conflate terms and arguments because it suits their agenda rather than informs their constituents, Mr. Speaker. That is what I believe is happening here.

If anyone is looking for proof positive that the school lunch program is not part of title IV—any part of this farm bill—all they have to do is look at the record of the committee and they can see that this person right here, STEVE KING, offered no amendment to the school lunch program that would have prohibited the Secretary of Agriculture from rationing calories to our kids in the school lunch program.

I wish we had that language for us here on the floor of the House of Representatives. We would have an engaging debate.

In fact, a year and a half ago, if I have got my dates right, the First Lady had an idea that she wanted a Let's Move program to go. The Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act was passed during a lame duck session in 2010 by the then Speaker of the House Speaker PELOSI. They passed the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act. That gave no authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to ration calories to kids in the school lunch program, which is not part of this farm bill, but they did it anyway. Now we are starving kids in school. That ought to be something that outrages the other side. But they will not show any outrage because they defend the First Lady's Let's Move, which, by the way, is a critical service and it was not shut down in the shutdown.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I love the discussion about school nutrition programs. I have spoken to many superintendents in my district who used to run programs in their cafeterias where kids would eat the school lunches. Now those once profitable programs are not profitable anymore. Some school districts are opting out because of the stringent rules and requirements to reduce calories and serve food that kids won't eat.

Let me also, for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, state that we are missing an important part of any equation in

tackling childhood obesity, and that is exercise. Illinois, my home State, is the only State in the Nation that requires physical education in K-12. Maybe we make that part of the debate, too.

As I wrap up this Special Order, I want to thank everyone, all of my colleagues, for coming down and talking about the importance of this 5-year farm bill. It cannot be said enough that farmers have decided on their own to help us save billions in your tax dollars. Twenty billion dollars is what the farmers of this country have given up in direct payments to really allow us to balance our budget and put a down payment on the national debt.

There are some other crucial aspects of this bill, Mr. Speaker, that we don't talk a lot about in the ag sector, but it is about the rules and the regulatory process.

I was happy to introduce an amendment that actually gives the Department of Agriculture a seat at the table when those at the EPA decide to come up with rules like maybe treating milk spills like oil spills from the *Exxon Valdez*.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you one question: Which one of those spills could be cleaned up with cats? You know the answer and I know the answer, but when they come up with crazy ideas like this, we believe that the United States Department of Agriculture also deserves a seat at the table to say—in a good, commonsense, Midwestern way, Hang on a second here. Let's think about this. That is why an amendment like that is crucial to a farm bill like this, because it is crazy ideas like that that cost our farmers their livelihoods in some cases.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that is going to save taxpayers billions. It is reforming crucial agricultural programs. It is putting us on a path to certainty for America's agricultural future.

There are some in this body, Mr. Speaker, that believe we shouldn't be involved in ag policy in this country. Well, my response to them is: Do you want America to be a food exporter, like we are now, or do you want to import our food supply?

We know the answer to that, Mr. Speaker. The answer—the solution to make sure that doesn't happen—is getting this bill through a quick conference committee, bringing it back to the floor of the House, and ensuring that all our family farmers and all those who rely upon the ag economy for their livelihood are put first.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I thank everyone who has been involved in this process—my staff, many interns that have worked for me to put this Special Order in place.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 30 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the Speaker for his courtesies and thank my friends on the other side of the aisle who engaged in an hour-long discussion that I am sure many of my colleagues were certainly interested in.

I want to congratulate the organization in my constituency, Catholic Charities. Catholic Charities in Houston is 70 years old and has a storied history of service.

I had the privilege of being inspired by a wonderful mass led by Cardinal DiNardo that catapulted that special day into the understanding of who we are in this country and how our service is guided by the principles of our faith. I remember that, in his words to the congregation, he offered these phrases: "The just live by faith," "even a little faith can do great things." He added, "When you are acting in faith, you are serving."

I think those are powerful words for all of us, whether we are Republicans or Democrats or other in our political beliefs. That is what we are sent here to do. We are really sent here to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves, to speak for the vulnerable, and to ensure that the United States of America remains an umbrella on a rainy day, for our country's principles are vested in a wonderful Constitution that says that we all are created equal, with a number of rights that allow us the pursuit of great things, such as liberty and health—if we interpret the term "happiness" to mean that we have a variety of rights, certain unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

So where we find ourselves on October 10, in the midst of this government shutdown, the 10th day, does not comport with the very principles of this Nation and our Constitution that says that we have organized to create a more perfect Union.

As I listened to my friends have a long discussion, they had some very vital points about the importance of the farm bill, a bill that we have not been able to bring to closure because the government is shut down. But even more importantly, we have not been able to put the phrases of "just" and "acting by faith" in the midst of that legislative initiative.

Our friends did not take note of the fact that \$40 billion was cut out of food stamps. They didn't take note of that—\$40 billion for people who are hungry. Forty-six million Americans live in poverty. They are poor, but they are Americans. They deserve equality. Sixteen million of those are children. But yet someone says it is the dependency group. Maybe the 47 percent. I say

those are the next astronauts, captains in the military, Presidents of the United States, teachers, inventors, scientists who may need food stamps.

So I would like to talk this afternoon in the short period of time that I have in finding the truth, also recognizing the difficulties that we are now in with the government shutdown.

Let me pause for a moment and say that I know, as I speak, Republicans are meeting with the President. We met yesterday and the President made it very clear and was very strong on wanting to see America move forward, but was very strong on the fact that we needed to come together around a clean bill, a bill that could be put on the floor with 200-plus Democrats here in the House and a sturdy amount of Republicans. That is just.

We know that Republicans were invited, the whole Conference. Of course, they decided that they wanted a few to come and meet with the President. Of course, it is their choice. In a sense of humor, I say there is an IOU to my other Republican friends that didn't make it to the White House today.

But I hope the discussion doesn't center around leaving the government closed. I hope it doesn't center around a 6-week raising of the debt ceiling, though I am open to any way forward; but I would hope in my discussion you would see why that is faulty thinking.

I do want to thank my original co-sponsors who joined me today to introduce this very important legislation, H. Res. 375, which now makes a statement that this House will never—I want to say it again, never—I want to say it again, never—tie a nongermane legislative issue to the running and opening of this government.

What does that mean? We will never do what we have done, which is to defund a law approved by both Houses of Congress, the President of the United States, and the United States Supreme Court—the Affordable Care Act—and hold up the government while we are fighting against it because we don't like it.

H.R. 375 is legislation to have this House go on record to ensure that we do not ever do that and tie the government's hands and void the services that are relevant to my constituent who, again, I will call in a few moments, who is a cancer patient coming out of a hospital and is fearful of losing her disability checks because of the government shutdown.

□ 1645

We are getting any number of phone calls on that matter.

So here is why I hope many of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, will support H. Res. 375, which will put us back in regular order and do things in the right way.

My friends, I will acknowledge that all States are hurting, but let me first

of all just cite for you the State of Texas, one of the largest States in the Union, and show the faces of those who are looking to go to Head Start, our children. This is what they are facing. This is all over America; 57,000 Head Start seats are lost because of the shutdown, because of the furlough, because of sequester. And now we continue down this road. Sequestration cuts are forcing Marlen Rosas to defer her preschool dreams for her 3-year-old Hector, who may be the next captain in the United States military, who may be the next pediatric surgeon, who may be the next outstanding professor of law, who may be the next wonderful teacher in an elementary school. But right now the Head Start program for 3-4 year olds in Houston is being cut by \$5.34 million, 109 employees, 699 slots for children. This is in Texas. This is in Houston, not even in the entire State. This is what we get when we begin to think of the dependency crowd, and it is important that we understand the results of what is happening.

So I want to keep this particular poster in mind. I just want you to look at those faces and what is going on across America. We have got the government shutdown. We can't fix the sequester, which by the way, the Van Hollen Democratic budget is not only growth for jobs, but it also fixes the sequester. It gets people back to work. It is well known that we are losing jobs here, and 1 percent of the economy is going down because of sequester. We can't fix it because the government is shut down.

Now, if you want to know what is happening across America, \$2.24 billion in Title 1 grants have been cut, and so our young people who attend high-poverty schools and who need to be able to have Title 1 grants to help them in education, Mr. Speaker, it is simply gone. And Title 1 funding at current levels does not merely reduce the level of services to our poorest and lowest-achieving students, but would likely cause the elimination of services to millions of students. The teachers know that. They know what is happening by losing \$2.24 billion. So Hector and Ms. Rosas don't get Head Start. Then we take it beyond the pre-K to the K-12 and to our high school where we are looking for these young people to take their rightful place in society, and here we are cutting them again. I guess it is the dependency crowd.

These cuts come after the number of children living in poverty has grown from 16.3 percent, as I said earlier. So let me update it to 21.9 percent—losing opportunities for our children.

Here is a more tragic feature. For our special needs children because the government is shut down, we cannot fix the \$1.73 billion that we have lost out of for helping our special needs children, the very children who need a stair step to help them climb up and to

be all they can be. Some parent is out there feeling the pain of not having the services for their special needs child because the government is shut down, and we cannot get back to the business of appropriations, fixing the sequester.

Child care and development block grant, another problem where we are losing dollars, \$142 million in real per capita dollars. To be able to say that we don't have child care, developmental block grants, I just want to refer you to my good friend, Hector, and his mother. These are the problems that we are facing because we have a shutdown of the government.

A good friend, the Speaker, is meeting with the President as we speak. He is entertaining the idea of a debt ceiling increase to pay our bills, the full faith and credit, to save us from a mortgage collapse, to save us from our interest rates on credit cards shooting through the roof, to hopefully start small business loans and young families trying to get mortgages on their homes or get a home. What a country if that happens. But, Mr. Speaker, they are suggesting that, in fact, we will not open the government. How is that possible? How is that possible?

I see my good friend here, and I am going to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY DAVIS), who has been a champion on childhood development, on dealing with the special needs child, on dealing with assisting in developmental issues of children, dealing with rehabilitating families, giving a second chance to some of our individuals who have found a different path. As I do that, I want to remind my colleagues that we are not too far away from Veterans Day. And as of October 15, and this is probably happening around America, veterans cemeteries will reduce their staff and reduce their burials. This is the friend that we talk about over and over again. In fact, we have heard a constant refrain: Why are you giving me accolades and you are cutting my veteran service centers? You are not allowing homeless veterans to be placed or get job training, and here we are telling families that there will be a slow process in burying and honoring your loved one because of the government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, let us unlock these doors and let the workers work. I have heard from them personally. They want to get back to work.

I now yield to DANNY DAVIS from Illinois, who served on the Ways and Means Committee, served on the Education Committee, and we have co-chaired a number of summits or seminars and sessions, brain trusts on the issue of childhood development.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Let me first of all thank you for the leadership you have provided and continue to provide. Those of us who know you well, we often joke and say we don't know anybody that has got as much

energy as you have got. You are here this minute. You are someplace else the next minute. You were dealing with a group of ladies in the hallway the other day from Houston. They were the wives of ministers. One happened to have been a lady who had once lived in the community where my office is located in Chicago, and so I said, Hey, you went out to Houston and found yourself a minister who is a preacher and you have got a husband and so it must be a good place for people to go.

But I just want to join you in highlighting that we talk a great deal about low-income people, and we talk a great deal about the safety net; and it seems to me that our colleagues have decided to attack every safety net program that there is, no matter what it is. They believe that it is providing too much and that government really ought not be a government of service, that government should be a government of coordination and should just be a government of rules and regulations, but it should not provide any help, any assistance to those individuals who have fallen on hard times and tough times.

I have always believed you could measure the effectiveness of a government by how well it treats its young people, how well it treats its old people, and how well it deals with the needs of those who have difficulty caring for themselves.

But I represent a very diverse district, and so not only do I have all of these individuals who have all of the needs that we just mentioned, but I also represent the futures industry—the Board of Trade, the Mercantile Exchange, and the stock market. I was sitting beside a trader on the airplane last week, and he was moaning and groaning and talking about how devastating this shutdown is on the overall economy of our country. You know, you think in terms of the individuals who receive the benefits of a WIC program; but, guess what, if those who produce the food, if they can't sell it, if they can't move it, if they can't do anything with it, what is going to happen, it sits in somebody's warehouse and rots. It sits in somebody's warehouse and spoils. And so this slows down the economy. In order for the economy to get a lift, to pick up, people must be buying and selling, providing services, exchanging goods, exchanging ideas, moving money, moving money around, otherwise the economy goes flat. Nothing is happening.

So I don't know how we think that shutting down the government, and Chicago is a big town and of course it is a regional office town, and so there are a lot of government workers. We are the regional headquarters for Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. A lot of government workers are there. Now, all of these individuals are laid off. They are not able to

ride the CTA. That takes money out of the transit system. Then not having to come downtown and park their cars, that takes money out of the parking garages, just like it is around here now. It is practically dead. All of things that people would normally be doing, the people who work in the cleaners, they can't work because there is nobody here to bring their clothes. The restaurants are practically empty. And so it seems to me that there is an effort not to move the economy, but to shut down the economy of our country. It makes no sense at all. None whatsoever. And so we have actually seen a shift now.

People are finally beginning to decide that, hey, ObamaCare, as they like to call it, but let me tell you, for me it is the best thing that ever happened to health care since the Indians discovered corn flakes. It provides an opportunity for millions of people to get care who never, ever had health insurance during their lifetime. Never, ever. And so now we see that that is going to stay. I mean, there are so many people signing up in Illinois, we can't even keep up with them. Our county government has signed up more than 100,000 people in one county, in Cook County alone. They started before we really started because they got a waiver and were able to do it.

I want to commend you again for the leadership and for the dynamic way in which you function, helping the American people know that we can't stand still, we can't stop, we have to keep moving and that struggle, struggle, strife and pain, as Frederick Douglass would say, are the prerequisites for change. So if we want change, we have to keep struggling, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

□ 1700

Ms. JACKSON LEE. What a significant, enlightened presentation by Congressman DAVIS, if I might summarize his very broad and effective presentation and the educating of our Members.

He has spoken about the collateral damage, and the collateral damage, Mr. DAVIS, is spreading like wildfire. You added that it is parking garages, it is the CTA or the MTA or the Metro. It is the restaurants. It is the District of Columbia that is collateral damage, a city that has to keep its doors open, but lo and behold, it is being impacted by the shutdown. Again, workers are shut out and shut down.

If I might ask the Speaker how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 9 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. DAVIS may want to comment as I proceed on some facts. I know that he has been a leader on some of these issues of SNAP and WIC.

Texas is just viewed as a well-to-do State and we don't need anything.

Again, the previous dialogue and debate on the floor struck me that it talked about the dependency crowd on food stamps. I have already said that there are 46 million people living in poverty, and growing. I did not say they were undeserving. I did not say that they were deadbeats. I did not say that they were making up their poverty. I didn't say they weren't working. I said there are 46 million people living below the poverty line, and large numbers of them are children.

It bothers me for individuals to talk about that we have got a dependency crowd and we have got to have these reforms, and what we are doing with reforms and sequester is we are taking food out of the mouths of children. We can't say it in any other way. So I just want some of our friends to know that even though there is a bemoaning about getting the agriculture bill passed—and I am out of Texas and have always voted for the agriculture bill because my district is surrounded by ranchers and others who need the farm bill. We have never separated on the farm bill in the State of Texas. We have had a lot of support. But when you cut \$40 billion out of food stamps and you begin to talk about the deadbeats, that gets to be a problem.

With regards to SNAP and WIC, 47.8 million people are on SNAP and 8.6 million are women, infants, and children on WIC. Funding for these programs needs to be assured.

I have no problem with the documentation of everyone and ensuring that the one or two that are violating the requirements—nobody is arguing for maintaining those individuals. What we are saying is that there is collateral damage. Farmers are being impacted.

By the way, regarding Rural Development and Farm Service agencies, 99 percent of those employees are furloughed; and my good friend just got through talking about the commodities.

Let me just say these points. I am going back to Texas again, which is noted as a big and well-to-do State. In actuality, in a couple of days, Mr. DAVIS, we are standing to lose and have an impact or cutback of \$64.7 billion. The government is shut down. \$518 million of that is on Federal highways.

We were just in a meeting with the Texas Department of Transportation. We have got 1,200 people a day moving into Texas with \$411 billion for interstate highways—shut down; \$130 million in home energy assistance for the poor—shut down; \$71 million in homeland security grants and our ports—shut down; our borders—shut down; \$55 million in coordinated border infrastructure. When I say the border is shut down, what I mean is resources that they need. And \$97 million is something very important that I have worked with Senator LANDRIEU on,

Federal adoption assistance to help our children.

I started by saying that we organized to form a more perfect Union. I am aghast that the wheels of justice have come off. The Department of Justice is in a complete dilemma. There are people keeping the lights on and doing what is needed for the absolute necessity of making sure the principles of our Constitution are not destroyed, but we have lost 950 lawyers who have cases pending, 4,000 U.S. attorneys.

We are seeing immigration review cases where people are fighting to keep their loved ones who legitimately should be here and 950 are gone; in the environmental division, 350 lawyers; the tax division, 200. People are expecting their refund so they can pay their bills. The U.S. Marshals, what a disgrace, 500 are gone. Why? Because the government is shut down.

Before I close, if the gentleman wants to offer a word on this, where are we in this shutdown?

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Let me say one thing about the farm bill, because I am very sympathetic and empathetic with farmers.

I grew up on a farm, so I know a little bit about farming and how valuable. Of course, Illinois is a great farm State. But I am not in favor of all of these great big subsidies that we give to some people, like sugar growers that help to keep the price of sugar so high until the candy makers and the cookie makers and ice cream processors and all these people have serious difficulty making or producing the products that they sell.

There is a lot of give-and-take in these decisions that we make, and there ought to be enough give-and-take to know that it can't just be my way or the highway. It can't just be my thoughts and ideas. It is time to really put behind us all of the difficulty that we have had. I am hoping that the next time I go home that I can tell the people in my district, Yes, we have reached an agreement. The government is going to reopen. We are going to function, and America is going to move like we know it can, like we know it will. That is going to be the legacy of this shutdown, that we are going to cut it off and reopen.

I thank you for the opportunity.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank you so very much.

Let me just say that I am on the sugar farm side of the issue, but we are on the same side of the coin on opening the government. And I want to thank Congressman DAVIS.

I also want to make mention of my fellow Texas Democratic colleagues who stood together at 1 p.m. today, all of them calling for a bipartisan solution, actually calling upon our good friends, our Senators in the other body out of the State of Texas to come and stand with us and follow in the tradi-

tion of the Catholic Charities mission of helping our brothers and sisters, the most vulnerable, of the words of "just live by faith," of the words that "this government is an umbrella on a rainy day," cancer victims, children who need Head Start seats, the justice system of America, the interstate highway of America, sick patients in hospital beds needing disability checks, veterans who need service centers and need the resources of hospitals, all of these and beyond; teachers who are living under the pressure of a sequester that cuts off the money for their impoverished students and the services for special needs children, all tied into the sequester, all at a standstill because of the shutdown.

What is our plea today? Our plea today is to recognize that we can't live in this world alone, and that it is imperative that we unshackle ourselves. I have even gotten a Koch brothers letter that was sent to the Senators. The Koch brothers, the Koch industry, said, Don't blame us. We never tied defunding ObamaCare to the funding of the government. I consider that a get-out-of-jail card. I hope all the Senators are getting it. I hope all the Members of Congress here are getting it. It means that you can vote on a clean bill and lift the debt ceiling for a period of time that allows America to pay her bills, young couples to get mortgages, young families to get loans. That is what we should be doing, and I will take in the words of my good friend, We want a way forward in a bipartisan manner.

But what I would offer to say to you, that America, the greatest country in the world, has a Constitution that has said we are organized for a more perfect Union, and, in fact, we have that perfect Union if we can open this government. We all are created equal with certain inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak. I believe that tomorrow we may have something on the floor that opens the government. Vote. Put it on the floor, a clean bill, so that we can vote and open the government and that we have a method for lifting the debt ceiling.

I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1859

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 6 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending a funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 11, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3271. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's "Major" final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-Weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule (RIN: 3064-AD95) received October 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3272. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors Regarding Special Disabled Veterans, Veterans of the Vietnam Era, Disabled Veterans, Recently Separated Veterans, Active Duty Wartime or Campaign Badge Veterans, and Armed Forces Service Medal Veterans (RIN: 1250-AA00) received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3273. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors Regarding Individuals With Disabilities (RIN: 1250-AA02) received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3274. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0216; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-206-AD; Amendment 39-17521; AD 2013-15-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3275. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Mahmomen, NM [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1283; Airspace Docket No.: 12-AGL-15] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3276. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace, and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Oceana NAS, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0038; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AEA-2] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3282. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to reauthorize the predisaster hazard mitigation program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3283. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to modernize and implement the national integrated public alert and warning system to disseminate homeland security information and other information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 3284. A bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.J. Res. 93. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Mine Safety and Health Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BASS, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H. Res. 375. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should refrain from conditioning the resolution of fiscal and budgetary disputes on the taking of action relating to non-germane legislative matters; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. HONDA:

H. Res. 376. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 233) to amend chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, to provide for an orderly process by which the debt ceiling is increased; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 377. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Justices of the United States Supreme Court should make themselves subject to the existing and operative ethics guidelines set out in the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, most of which are already legally

binding on them; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

138. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 27 urging the Congress to reauthorize section 5056 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

139. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 17 urging the Congress to restore the presumption of a service connection for Agent Orange exposure to United States Navy and United States Air Force veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

140. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Virgin Islands, relative to Resolution No. 1794 urging the Congress to adopt H.R. 92; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, and Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 3284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 4 of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.J. Res. 93.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 292: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 411: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 494: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 541: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 649: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 669: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 676: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 713: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 855: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 962: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1010: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1014: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1094: Mr. CLAY and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1179: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 1199: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1201: Mr. WITTMAN and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1318: Mr. HOLT and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1334: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 1354: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1463: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1502: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 1518: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. REICHERT, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1528: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1666: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1692: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1708: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1732: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1755: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1770: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LATHAM, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1801: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1803: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1814: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 1875: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1921: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2001: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2027: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 2037: Mr. FALLOMAVAEGA, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2101: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2134: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2178: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 2179: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2187: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2199: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2203: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KIND, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2247: Mr. RADEL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 2302: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 2315: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2328: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2409: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2415: Mr. MAFFEI and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2426: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2429: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 2536: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 2541: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 2692: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2697: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2734: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2791: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 2807: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. REED.
H.R. 2818: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 2839: Mr. YARMUTH and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2876: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 2880: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2893: Ms. NORTON and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2925: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2956: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3024: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 3103: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3108: Mr. VELA.
H.R. 3111: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DUNCAN of

Tennessee, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 3121: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 3168: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3179: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 3205: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3236: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 3279: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.J. Res. 12: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. ROKITA.
H. Res. 135: Mr. HOLT.

H. Res. 208: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 239: Mr. WALZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. PAYNE.
H. Res. 281: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. CONYERS.
H. Res. 360: Mr. FINCHER.
H. Res. 365: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. ENYART.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

53. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Autonomous Municipality of Catano, Puerto Rico, relative to Internal Resolution No. 1 requesting the immediate and unconditional release of Oscar Lopez Rivera from prison; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MS. SANDY COLVIN ROY

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Ms. Sandy Colvin Roy for her many years of public service to the citizens of the Twelfth Ward of Minneapolis and to congratulate her on her receipt of an award of Lifetime Achievement from the National Organization to Insure a Sound-controlled Environment (NOISE).

Ms. Colvin Roy has represented the Twelfth Ward of Minneapolis on the Minneapolis City Council for the last 16 years. As a member of the council, Ms. Colvin Roy has been a vocal advocate for the health and well-being of communities located near airports and other noise-polluted transportation centers. While Ms. Colvin Roy has spearheaded efforts at the federal level to reduce the impact of aviation noise, she has also led local efforts to protect funds that support the abatement of aviation noise pollution.

The National Organization to Insure a Sound-controlled Environment seeks to honor elected officials who have firmly supported their constituents' concerns regarding noise impacts. They have chosen Ms. Colvin Roy to receive their Award of Lifetime Achievement for her steadfast commitment to the reduction of aviation noise in the Twelfth Ward of Minneapolis.

I congratulate Ms. Sandy Colvin Roy on her Lifetime Achievement Award and thank her for her dedication and service to the citizens of the Twelfth Ward, the City of Minneapolis and the great state of Minnesota.

HONORING MIKE SUTFIN'S LEADERSHIP IN FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mike Sutfin for his impressive leadership in floodplain management and his exemplary service to the City of Ottawa, Illinois, and the State of Illinois.

The City of Ottawa sits at the confluence of the Illinois and Fox Rivers which makes it one of the most flood prone communities in the State of Illinois. In 2008, the City of Ottawa was impacted by a devastating flood as part of the Hurricane Ike storm system. The flood damaged homes beyond repair and also caused an Ottawa Elementary school to close for nearly two years.

In an effort to reduce or avoid future disastrous floods, Mike Sutfin and the City of Ottawa developed a floodplain management plan that has since received state and national recognition. Mr. Sutfin has worked tirelessly to raise public awareness of the river valley floodplain through public meetings, maps, and an informative website. At his recommendation, the Ottawa City Council has incorporated better floodplain management regulatory standards into the City's ordinances. Additionally, he has helped reduce reoccurring flood loss through a major City of Ottawa buyout program and other mitigation initiatives.

In recognition of his diligent work, Mr. Sutfin has received the 2011 Floodplain Manager of the Year Award from the Illinois Association of Floodplain and Stormwater Managers (IAFSM). Additionally, he recently received the 2013 Community Rating System (CRS) Award for Excellence from the National Flood Insurance Program. Currently, the City of Ottawa is rated at Class 5 under the CRS, but with Mr. Sutfin's leadership the community will likely be upgraded to Class 2. This would make it one of the best rated communities in the State of Illinois and across the United States.

Mr. Sutfin has accomplished a great deal as Ottawa's Floodplain Manager and the resulting benefits, such as increased public safety, peace of mind, and reduced damage to property, are priceless to his community. His expertise is clearly put to good use in the City of Ottawa as well as at the IAFSM where he serves on the Board of Directors and chairs the Floodplain Management Committee.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 16th District of Illinois, I wish to express our deepest thanks to Mike Sutfin for his leadership in floodplain management and his diligent work for the City of Ottawa.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE ANNUAL GATHERING OF THE MACON-THOMAS CHAPTER OF THE TUSKEGEE AIRMEN INC.

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Macon-Thomas Chapter of the Tuskegee Airmen as its members and the Greater Detroit community gather to honor its founders and celebrate another successful year.

As the end of the 1930s approached, America faced unprecedented challenges in our nation's history—recovery from the Great Depression and the looming specter of World War II—which threatened the values that all of us hold dear. The greatest generation responded to these threats with selfless sacrifice

and unwavering determination to protect our country. The Tuskegee Airmen are a shining example of our greatest generation, rising above the divisions of that time to answer the call to serve their fellow citizens. The Tuskegee Airmen fought with the honor and valor becoming of any soldier in the United States Armed Forces and demonstrated that our differences pale in comparison to our shared ideals of equality and democracy. The record of the Tuskegee Airmen during World War II is exemplary and they were often on the front lines protecting American bombers to ensure they would be able to complete their missions.

The Tuskegee Airmen were at the forefront of so many important events in our history—as fighter escorts for American bombers, as trailblazers in the efforts to integrate the United States Armed Forces, and as leaders in the Civil Rights movement that followed their return from World War II. Their determination and hard work paved the way for great steps forward in the endeavor to ensure that all Americans are treated and protected equally under the law.

In the Greater Detroit region, our local chapter of the Tuskegee Airmen, Inc. is named after Captain Richard D. Macon and Lieutenant Colonel Donald C. Thomas, Jr.—two men who embodied the courage and tenacity of the American spirit. Their bravery not only secured our nation from harm and precipitated an incredible expansion of rights in our nation, but their determination to ensure continuing progress has led to a strong local chapter that has preserved the history of their achievements and inspired future generations of Americans from every community and ethnicity across our land to pursue a future in aviation and aerospace industries. Furthermore, the Macon-Thomas Chapter of the Tuskegee Airmen undertakes many programs that also help youth develop and hone their leadership skills to empower as a force for positive change in our society.

Mr. Speaker, the bravery, courage and sacrifice of the Tuskegee Airmen are an inspiration to all of us who heed the call to serve our country. Their actions paved the way for great steps forward in our country's history and I am proud to honor the local Macon-Thomas Chapter of the Tuskegee Airmen in West Bloomfield, Michigan. I congratulate its members and supporters on another year of great accomplishments and wish them continuing success in their future endeavors.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HONORING 100 YEARS OF THE
DEERFIELD BANNOCKBURN FIRE
PROTECTION DISTRICT AND REC-
OGNIZING COMPLETION OF THE
DEERFIELD BANNOCKBURN FIRE-
FIGHTER MEMORIAL

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Deerfield Bannockburn Fire Protection District on its 100th anniversary and on the completion of its Firefighter Memorial.

We can never fully express our gratitude for our nation's first responders and emergency personnel for the work they do and the dangers they willingly face. Our communities rely upon and look up to these brave men and women.

Mr. Speaker, in my home town we are most fortunate to be under the watchful eyes and extraordinary service of the Deerfield-Bannockburn Fire Protection District. This May marked 100 years of firefighting in the Deerfield, Bannockburn and Riverwoods area.

Its mission is simple: "With pride, integrity, and professionalism the members of the Deerfield Bannockburn Fire Protection District will provide emergency response, education, and quality service to all who call upon us."

The Deerfield Volunteer Fire Department was originally organized under the leadership of Lincoln Pettis, with a single two-wheeled, horse drawn cart. Today the Deerfield-Bannockburn FPD is a team of over 40 highly trained professionals. Each and every day, these heroes utilize the most modern techniques and technologies to provide fire protection and emergency services, as well as dealing with hazardous materials and technical and underwater rescue and recovery.

This centennial gives us the opportunity to recognize the profound courage and inspiring achievements of our community's firefighters and emergency personnel.

This centennial also allows for us to recognize the dedication and contributions of firefighters past. The Deerfield Bannockburn Firefighter Memorial will be opened on October 19, and it will be dedicated to former Chiefs Jack Gagne and James Quinn, who combined to lead the Fire District for more than 80 years. Their example is legendary, and their work will never be forgotten.

I congratulate the Deerfield Bannockburn Fire Protection District for 100 years of brave service to our community, and I thank all past, current and future firefighters for being a part of this legacy.

RECOGNIZING THE FIRST UNITED
METHODIST CHURCH OF CROWN
POINT

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and profound respect that I rec-

ognize First United Methodist Church of Crown Point as its congregation and church leaders join together in celebration of its 175th anniversary. Bishop Michael Coyner, Reverend Mark Wilkins, Senior Pastor, Reverend Tom Shanahan, Associate Pastor, and the congregation will be commemorating this momentous milestone with a celebratory church service and reception on Sunday, October 13, 2013.

First United Methodist Church of Crown Point was founded in 1938 by Isaac Stagg. The first church services were held in log cabin homes. In 1887, the first church building was completed in Crown Point and became the place of worship for parishioners for many years. By 1957, a new church building was completed and remains the home of First United Methodist Church of Crown Point today. Throughout the years, more than seventy ministers have served as leaders of the church, and the devoted congregation has grown to over 800 members. With the increase in membership, the church has been able to organize numerous programs that have played a major role in the church's success. These remarkable programs include the United Methodist Women's Group, the Epworth League, a teen-age youth group, Methodist Men, Caring Cooks and the Older Adult Ministry.

The leaders and parishioners of First United Methodist Church of Crown Point touch the lives of countless individuals through their compassionate service, especially to those most in need. Over the years, they have come to the aid of many through their selfless support to various charitable organizations, including Meals On Wheels, Saint Jude Home, Adopt a Family at Christmas, and Adopt a Highway. The church has also supported missionaries both nationally and abroad, and is currently raising funds to help build a church in Roatan, Honduras.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in honoring the church leaders and congregation of First United Methodist Church of Crown Point for their exceptional community service and congratulating the church on its 175th anniversary. The outstanding work of this truly admirable congregation continues to touch lives in Northwest Indiana and far beyond, and for their selfless service, the leadership and members at First United Methodist Church of Crown Point are worthy of the highest praise.

IN HONOR OF JESSE CARSON HIGH
SCHOOL

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jesse Carson High School. This school, established in 2006, has been awarded the Wells Fargo Conference Cup for overall interscholastic athletic performance within its individual conference.

Last year, the school's volleyball team won the Western Regional Championship, and the baseball and softball teams were also tournament champions.

These accomplishments exemplify the hard work and dedication of the students, teachers and mentors of Jesse Carson High School.

Principal Kelly Withers is dedicated to her students and believes that with the right opportunity and environment, each student can achieve his or her goals.

I believe that a strong athletic program teaches students the importance of teamwork and how to overcome challenges. Along with a strong academic background, these skills will help our students in future endeavors.

Jesse Carson High School has made the Eighth District of North Carolina proud, and its success serves as an example to other schools in North Carolina and across the nation.

RECOGNIZING THE 102ND ANNIVER-
SARY OF DOUBLE TEN DAY FOR
THE PEOPLE OF TAIWAN

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the people of Taiwan on the upcoming celebration of the 102nd anniversary of "Double Ten Day." Double Ten Day traces its roots to the Wuchang Uprising that occurred on October 10, 1911. The Wuchang Uprising signaled the end of the Qing Dynasty and the start of a democratic movement that we continue to celebrate and recognize. Double Ten Day is a celebration of the birth of democracy and the Republic of China.

I want to especially recognize the people of Taiwan on this important occasion. The strength of the relationship between the people of Taiwan and the people of the United States is strong. I look forward to continue working to expand business opportunities as well as deepen our mutual appreciation for each other's unique cultures. Exchange of our cultures is clearly evidenced on Guam, which is home to many people of Chinese ancestry. Guam continues to benefit from their cultural contributions to our community and the promotion of trade and economic opportunities.

Again, I congratulate the people of Taiwan on the 102nd anniversary of Double Ten Day. We celebrate this historic occasion with them and we honor their friendship with the American people.

HONORING THE 10-YEAR ANNIVER-
SARY OF THE WOMEN'S BUSI-
NESS CENTER AT CANISIUS COL-
LEGE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Women's Business Center at Canisius College on the occasion of its 10th anniversary.

The Women's Business Center at Canisius College is a comprehensive resource for small

business owners and professional women providing training and networking opportunities to empower women with the critical skills necessary to develop their business.

The Center gives participants access to the college's business courses, counseling, advice from business coaches, forums and an annual Women's Leadership Conference that featured "Creativity and Innovation" as one of its themes.

The Center not only benefits women in business but also benefits the Western New York economy. Bolstered by an initial federal grant from the Small Business Administration, the Center has served over 21,000 participants, helped start over 200 businesses, and created 290 jobs since opening in September of 2003.

The Women's Business Center at Canisius College, one of 28 Jesuit universities in the nation, also deserves recognition for the link it continues to provide between the local educational institutions and the economic centers of our community. The success of small businesses is crucial to the prosperity of our region and nation and we are fortunate that for the past decade this group has worked to leverage funds and build new private-public partnership and establish unique and nurturing mentoring relationships that have ensured women have equal opportunity to start their own business.

The success of the Center is realized in the economic gains and confidence generated by its many participants and program graduates. Yet, for every success, there is a daily reminder that the Center's work is not complete as our region's entrepreneurs and small business owners remain in need of the valuable resources, experience and support needed to strengthen our economy and to create equal opportunities for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is with appreciation and acknowledgement of their important contributions, that I rise to congratulate all those responsible for achieving this milestone as the Women's Business Center celebrates its 10th anniversary in the Montante Cultural Center on the campus of Canisius College.

RECOGNIZING CHRIS COX, AN AMERICAN PATRIOT AND ONE-MAN MEMBER OF THE MONUMENT MILITIA

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an American who has shown enormous commitment to our country and veterans during this stalemate in Washington. In response to the partial government shutdown, Chris Cox, a resident of South Carolina, travelled to Washington to assemble the Monument Militia—a one-man mission to maintain the National Mall.

As some of our leaders in Washington, D.C. are unwilling to negotiate with members of the opposite political party to devise a solution to re-open the federal government—something the American people want and deserve—our national monuments and museums remain

closed and National Park Service employees normally tasked with keeping the Mall clean remain furloughed.

Therefore, Mr. Cox took it upon himself to ensure the lawn of the iconic Lincoln Memorial was mowed and kept tidy for the thousands of veterans who will descend on our nation's capital this weekend for the Million Vet March.

When Mr. Cox was asked why he travelled from South Carolina armed with just a chainsaw and lawn mower to clean up our National Mall, he responded, "These are our memorials. If they shut down our memorials, we're still going to take the trash out, we're going to clean the windows, we're going to cut the grass, we're going to pull the weeds, we're going to do the tree work."

I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Cox just this weekend when riding my bike around the monuments—surveying how the shutdown has impacted our National Mall. Mr. Cox, carrying his state flag of South Carolina, expressed his sincerest hope that he would be able to clean the area around the Lincoln Memorial to the World War II Memorial because our veterans dedicated their lives and fought for us so we should fight and honor them even if the government is shut down.

This is the American spirit. This is the attitude and perseverance our Founding Fathers demonstrated in the face of adversity. Patriotic acts, like the ones recently displayed by Mr. Cox, serve as a great reminder of how Washington should conduct itself in this frustrating time.

I again offer Mr. Cox my sincerest and humble gratitude for his service and commitment to our nation and its veterans, as well as the passion and conviction that led him to Washington to make sure our National Mall looks its best for our heroes.

RECOGNIZING THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY AND CONSERVATION TRUST

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust (River Parkway Trust) in celebration of its 25th anniversary. The land around the San Joaquin River is protected due to the efforts of the River Parkway Trust, and we must thank them for all of their hard work.

The formation of the River Parkway Trust began in 1988 when citizens, landowners, and agencies joined together to outline their goals. Over the past 25 years, the River Parkway Trust has worked with 18 land owners to protect almost 3,000 acres of land. In addition to the number of land purchases made by associates of the San Joaquin River Conservancy and the California Wildlife Conservation Board, the total amount of protected land has increased to over 4,000 acres.

The protected land provides individuals with a place to enjoy outdoor activities. One of the signature attractions of the River Parkway Trust is the Lewis S. Eaton Trail. The trail is used daily by bikers and hikers. It truly is a gem in our Central Valley.

A priority of the River Parkway Trust is to encourage young people to visit the river. Many school districts participate in field trips, so thousands of students have the opportunity to view the beautiful nature and landscape. In addition, the River Parkway Trust has a summer youth program that provides children with a week full of fun river activities. Each year, more than 1,000 youth visit the camp.

The River Parkway Trust also serves as a "natural defense" to floods. It keeps pollution from flowing into the water; therefore, preventing our drinking water from becoming contaminated. The River Parkway Trust has contributed to restoring the area's cultural past so that symbolic structures like the Riverview Ranch on Old Faint Road do not disappear. Maintaining structures that are significant to the area is important for the 20,000 visitors that go to the parkway each year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust as they celebrate 25 years of preserving the invaluable land around the San Joaquin River. Their outstanding commitment to protecting the Central Valley's natural resources must be commended.

IN HONOR OF TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. GEORGE HOLDING

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join Taiwan in celebrating its National Day.

The United States and Taiwan enjoy a long, enduring relationship. Our partnership, codified in the Taiwan Relations Act, has been of great benefit to both our nations. Earlier this year, I was pleased to support legislation which was signed into law, that encourages Taiwan's participation in the International Civil Aviation Organization.

To further our relationship, I support more bilateral exchanges between our two nations and would encourage my colleagues to familiarize themselves with the cultural and economic benefits that this relationship has produced.

Once again Mr. Speaker I rise to congratulate Taiwan on its National Day and I am confident that the close relationship between United States and Taiwan will continue for many years to come.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE ROBERT T. STAFFORD DISASTER RELIEF AND EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT TO REAUTHORIZE THE PRE-DISASTER HAZARD MITIGATION PROGRAM

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to introduce a bill to amend to the

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to reauthorize the pre-disaster hazard mitigation program.

First authorized in 2000, the pre-disaster hazard mitigation program has a proven history of saving taxpayer money by investing in cost effective projects that are designed to reduce injuries, loss of life, and damage and destruction of property in the event of a disaster. As the old adage goes: an ounce of prevention is worth its weight in gold.

This is true for the pre-disaster hazard mitigation program. In 2005, the Multi Hazard Mitigation Council of the National Institute of Building Sciences found that for every \$1 spent on mitigation, \$4 was saved in potential disaster costs. Other corollary benefits and indirect savings at the local level and within the business sector were also identified. Moreover, the Congressional Budget Office confirmed the cost savings of the program. Using a different analysis, the CBO found in 2007 that for every \$1 spent on mitigation, \$3 was saved in potential disaster costs.

But it is not just empirical studies that have confirmed the benefits of this program. There are numerous examples of flood control projects, voluntary acquisitions of real property located in flood zones, and the construction of safe rooms that have saved lives and prevented future damage. Areas that have experienced flood damage in the past, and have flooded again, experienced reduced or no damage thanks to effective mitigation. For instance, in Iowa, pre-disaster mitigation funds were used to purchase riverfront homes from homeowners that had suffered flood damage and then converted to green space. When the area subsequently flooded again, there was no new damage, thanks to the pre-disaster mitigation efforts.

With today's ongoing fiscal challenges, increasingly severe storms, and escalating effects of climate change, it makes sense for our country to prepare for these disasters now in order to prevent or reduce damage. Smart planning to mitigate the adverse impact of disasters not only saves lives, but saves money—especially over the long run.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy when there were initial damage estimates in the billions of dollars, many Members from both sides of the aisle streamed to the floor to express sympathy to the victims, as well as decry the extent of the damage and large costs. This program represents an opportunity to curb similar costs in the future while also saving lives and protecting property.

It is time to reauthorize the Pre-Disaster Hazard Mitigation Program at a sufficient level to make an impact. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF JOSE ALVAREZ

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Jose Alva-

rez, Commissioner for the City of Kissimmee, for his outstanding career and service to the community.

Mr. Alvarez was born in Cuba, and moved to the United States in 1971. He was raised in Miami, where he worked for the Bridge and Road Engineering Department of the Florida Department of Transportation, before relocating to Central Florida.

Mr. Alvarez has tirelessly served the Hispanic community in Kissimmee, Florida, while also achieving success in the local real estate market. He has held many positions both in the public and private sector including the Board of Directors for League of United Latin American Citizens, the Board of Directors for National Association of Hispanic Real Estate Professionals, and the Board of Directors for Osceola Association of Realtors. He has demonstrated a thorough understanding of both the business and real estate market.

In 2012 Mr. Alvarez was elected to be Commissioner for the City of Kissimmee. He has developed a flourishing career and earned the respect of his constituents for his dedicated service to the community. Mr. Alvarez is happily married to his wife Darlene, with whom he has five daughters and two grandsons.

I am happy to recognize Mr. Alvarez, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his proven commitment to his community and leadership in Osceola County.

RECOGNIZING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF JONATHAN EVANS

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Jonathan Evans for his commitment to public service.

Jonathan possesses a Bachelor's degree in Social Work and a Master's Degree in Public Administration, both from the University of Central Florida. He is currently working on another Master's Degree in Business Administration from Saint Leo University.

Jonathan has worked as a public servant for several Central Florida communities including the City of St. Cloud, the Town of Celebration, the City of Largo, and Haines City. Jonathan was hired as the Haines City Assistant City Manager on July 16, 2012, and was appointed as Acting City Manager on May 16, 2013. Prior to his work in Haines City, Jonathan worked for the City of Largo for nearly 6 years as the Assistant to the City Manager.

Jonathan is a full member of the Florida City and County Management Association, FCCMA, and has served on numerous boards for the organization. He is also a member of the International City/County Management Association, ICMA, and is taking the required steps to become an ICMA Credentialed Manager.

Jonathan has a strong grasp on municipal government and a great work ethic that has not gone unnoticed. He has received numerous awards including the United Gold Award, the Children's Empowerment Award, and was named the Employee of the Month by the City of St. Cloud.

I am happy to honor Jonathan Evans, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his outstanding leadership and public service.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF ELLEN OCHOA

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the inspiring career of Ellen Ochoa, astronaut, engineer, and Director of NASA's Johnson Space Center.

Ellen Ochoa received a Bachelor of Science degree in Physics from San Diego State University in 1980. She then went on to attend Stanford University, where she received a Master of Science degree and Doctorate in Electrical Engineering.

She was selected by NASA in January 1990 and became the first Hispanic female astronaut in July 1991. Her technical assignments in the Astronaut Office at the Johnson Space Center included crew representative for flight software, computer hardware and robotics, Assistant for Space Station to the Chief of the Astronaut Office, lead spacecraft communicator (CAPCOM) in Mission Control, and Acting Deputy Chief of the Astronaut Office. As a veteran of four space flights, Ellen has logged nearly 1000 hours in space.

Ellen is a pioneer of spacecraft technology. She is a co-inventor for three patents for an optical inspection system, an optical object recognition method, and a method for noise removal in images. At the NASA Ames Research Center, she led a research group working primarily on optical systems for automated space exploration. She has received numerous awards for her accomplishments including NASA's Exceptional Service Medal, Outstanding Leadership Medal, and four Space Flight Medals.

Since 2007, Ellen has served as Deputy Director of the Johnson Space Center, helping to manage and direct the Astronaut Office and Aircraft Operations. On January 1, 2013, Ochoa made history again by becoming the first Hispanic and second female director of NASA's Johnson Space Center.

I am happy to honor Ellen Ochoa, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her exceptional career, numerous accomplishments, and contributions to the Hispanic community.

HONORING THE CAREER OF JOSE FELICIANO

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month to recognize Mr. Jose Feliciano, a Puerto Rican musician whose international success is a true testament to his amazing talent.

Mr. Feliciano was born in Lares, Puerto Rico. At the age of five he immigrated with his parents and siblings to New York City. Due to congenital glaucoma, he was left permanently blind at birth. However, his disability has not hindered his passion for playing music. Mr. Feliciano's love for music began at the age of three, when he first accompanied his uncle on a tin cracker can. By the age of six, he had taught himself to play the concertina simply by listening to records and practicing. When Mr. Feliciano received his first guitar, he spent hours practicing each day and started taking classical lessons with a guitar instructor.

In 1963, Mr. Feliciano signed a contract with RCA Records. Over the course of his career he has had numerous chart-topping singles in multiple countries. His famous single, 'Feliz Navidad,' tops the charts every year during the holidays. The American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers named 'Feliz Navidad' one of the top 25 most frequently played and recorded Christmas songs worldwide. Mr. Feliciano has received numerous awards over the course of his career including nine Grammys, a star on Hollywood's Walk of Fame, and the Hispanic Heritage Foundation's Lifetime Achievement Award. The City of New

York also honored him by renaming Public School 155 in East Harlem, "The Jose Feliciano Performing Art School."

Mr. Feliciano is not only a talented musician, but also a humanitarian. He serves as the International Immigrants Foundation's Honorary Ambassador and Official Delegate before the United Nations. He also serves as a board member for New Hampshire's Association for the Blind. The Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulchre, an ancient and prestigious Papal Order of the Catholic Church, knighted Mr. Feliciano at St. Patrick's Cathedral. He also received a Doctorate Degree in Humane Letters from Sacred Heart University for his musical and humanitarian contributions to the world.

I am happy to honor Mr. Jose Feliciano, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his many contributions to music and humanity.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF DENISE DIAZ

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize a hard-working community organizer, civil rights activist, and working mother of two.

Originally from Puerto Rico, Denise Diaz's parents raised her and her brother on the northwest side of Chicago. Her parents worked hard in the airline catering industry to provide a better life for their children. As union members, they instilled Denise with a strong sense of collective action and a passion for justice.

Denise Diaz received her BA in Political Science from the University of Illinois at Chicago. Her activism began in organizing on the South Side of Chicago. She later became a tenant rights organizer in immigrant communities outside of Washington, D.C.

In 2007, Denise moved to Central Florida to raise her two children and continue community organizing on workers' rights issues. Denise can often be seen picketing in front of major employers, meeting with workers, and leading community events with the support of her husband Mark and her two children, Zoe and Zion.

For over five years, Denise has served as the Executive Director of Central Florida Jobs with Justice. She is also a National Jobs with Justice board member and a board member of the Florida Institute for Reform and Empowerment (FIRE).

Denise's work with the Central Florida Jobs with Justice, a coalition of unions, community based groups, faith based and student groups that work together on economic justice campaigns, has empowered and improved the lives of working families in Orlando.

I am happy to honor Denise Diaz, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her incredible accomplishments on behalf of the working families in Central Florida.

RECOGNIZING JOSE F. MENDEZ FOR 40 YEARS OF EXPANDING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the inspiring career of Jose F. Mendez. He has committed the last 40 years to expanding educational opportunities both in Puerto Rico and the United States.

Mr. Mendez has served as President of Ana G. Mendez University System (AGMUS) since 1974. In 1978, Mr. Mendez advocated for the creation of a Televised Study Center to make

university education accessible to students who could not attend a traditional style university. Through his efforts, a televised education program was created and has since been utilized by thousands of students and the prison population of Puerto Rico. In 1985, under Mr. Mendez' stewardship, AGMUS founded Channel 40 (today, Sistema TV), Puerto Rico's first privately operated television station affiliated to PBS.

Mr. Mendez formed partnerships between universities in the United States and Puerto Rico to spark an interest in science and technology among minority groups. Under his leadership, AGMUS has grown to become the second largest private university in Puerto Rico. AGMUS also has three campuses in Florida, including one in my district, and one in Maryland.

Mr. Mendez has held various positions in educational leadership and received numerous awards. One of his crowning achievements was the creation of AGMUS's Permanent Fund for scholarships which provides education to talented students from low income areas.

Mr. Jose Mendez has focused his efforts on education because he believes that our ability to learn and to contribute to human progress is our greatest gift. I am happy to honor Jose F. Mendez, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his unwavering commitment to expanding educational opportunities for all.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF BETSY FRANCESCHINI

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the career of Betsy Franceschini. Mrs. Franceschini is a leader in both the Central Florida and national Hispanic community.

Mrs. Franceschini has a Bachelor's Degree in Social Work and a Master's Degree in Guidance and Counseling from the Pontifical Catholic University of Puerto Rico. She has received multiple awards and recognitions, including Magellan Media Corporation's Businesswoman of the Year Award in 2001, the Dove of Peace International Award in 2006 for her outstanding community leadership, the Hispanic Business Initiative Fund—Success Story Award, and the Entrepreneurial Excellence Award in 2008. Mrs. Franceschini was also recognized in 2012 as one of the Top 25 Most Influential Hispanics in Central Florida by Vision Magazine and the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando.

Mrs. Franceschini has been extremely active in the community since moving to Florida in 1985, focusing on issues affecting minorities. In 2003, Mrs. Franceschini was appointed by Mayor Buddy Dyer to serve in the City of Orlando's Strategic Team and Transportation Committee. She also served on the Board of the Hispanic Initiative Business Fund from 1999 to 2006 and headed the Hispanic Task Force for the Census 2000 in Orange and Seminole Counties. Just before that, she served as President of the Asociación Borinqueña (Puerto Rican Association of Central Florida), from 1997 to 1999.

In February 2011, Mrs. Franceschini was one of 15 Latino leaders selected by the White House to meet with President Obama to discuss issues important to the Hispanic community. In addition, she successfully organized

and executed the first ever White House Hispanic Summit in Central Florida. In March 2011, she was appointed as the first Hispanic Outreach Director for the Florida Democratic Party and successfully accomplished the goal of increasing Hispanic voter participation in Central Florida.

Mrs. Franceschini recently worked as the Deputy District Director and Hispanic Outreach Coordinator for my office in Orlando. On July 1, 2013, the Governor of Puerto Rico, Alejandro Garcia Padilla, appointed her as the Florida Regional Director for the Puerto Rico Federal Affairs Administration. Over twenty-eight years of dedication and commitment has earned her a high level of respect, support, and admiration as a national Hispanic leader in public service.

I am happy to honor Betsy Franceschini, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her outstanding accomplishments and service to the Hispanic community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE GREAT LAKES REGION CHAPTER OF B'NAI B'RITH FOR 170 YEARS OF ADVOCACY FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as B'nai B'rith International celebrates 170 years of advocacy and leadership in support of the security of Jewish people around the world, including the Jewish State of Israel, and to recognize its local chapter for the Great Lakes region.

When it was founded in 1843, the members B'nai B'rith set out to create a support network for newly arriving Jewish immigrants in the United States. Among its first actions, B'nai B'rith created an insurance policy to provide members' widows with resources to cover the cost of funeral services and a weekly stipend for the remainder of their lives. It also provided a stipend to each member's children and assured male children that they would be taught a trade. From these initial programs, which were an immediate response to the living conditions of Jewish immigrants in New York, B'nai B'rith rapidly grew, with many fraternal lodges and chapters in the United States and around the world.

As it grew, B'nai B'rith quickly became involved in international affairs which became necessary to respond to rising anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe. As part of its response, the United States opened its first Consulate General in Romania, expanding the reach of American diplomacy. From this initial foray into foreign policy, B'nai B'rith has developed into a global voice for the safety and security of the Jewish people and their homeland.

In addition to its international initiatives, B'nai B'rith has cultivated and maintained a number of programs to address the changing needs of the Jewish American population. As the Jewish population in the United States has aged, B'nai B'rith has responded to the needs of seniors, opening its first senior residence in

1971 which has grown into an international network of forty residences worldwide. The array of services offered by B'nai B'rith now includes programs for youth, seniors, humanitarian aid and young professionals, as well as programs that are designed to foster cross-cultural dialogue.

In the Great Lakes region, we are fortunate to have an active and dedicated local chapter of B'nai B'rith which is celebrating its 156th year of service to communities across the upper Midwest. Among the local programs it supports are scholarships for college-bound students, Project H.O.P.E. to provide special kosher food to seniors and community members in-need during Passover, and countless cultural events that share the richness of Jewish traditions with the community at-large.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the outstanding advocacy and leadership that B'nai B'rith has displayed in the last 170 years on behalf of the Jewish people and the Jewish State of Israel. I am further pleased to congratulate B'nai B'rith's local Great Lakes chapter for its incredible work, not only as a leading voice for the Jewish community of the Greater Detroit, but as an important partner that enables cross-cultural dialogue that strengthens the region. I congratulate all of my friends in the Great Lakes chapter of B'nai B'rith and I wish them success as they continue to be a clear and passionate voice for the Jewish communities in the Midwest and around the world.

**CONGRATULATING 2013 HONOREES
OF THE TOLEDO AFRICAN AMERICAN
LEGACY PROJECT**

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate fifteen individuals who were recently recognized for outstanding achievement by the Toledo African American Legacy Project. The Toledo African American Legacy Project is dedicated to bringing together people to document and preserve the history of Northwest Ohio's African American communities and to celebrate their impact and influence upon Toledo and the greater world community. The organization honored six people, as well as two posthumously and eight up-and-coming residents during its ninth annual celebration.

The six people receiving honors this year were: Myra Waters, who graduated from Toledo's Libbey High School and is now the Director of the Counseling Center and Adjunct Faculty Member at the University of Baltimore. Samuel L. Price, a Scott High School graduate, is a respected businessman and restaurateur. Joseph Somerville is a Professor Emeritus in the University of Toledo's College of Education. Lola Glover is a champion for our region's marginalized residents and founder of the Coalition for Quality Education. Dr. Crystal Ellis, a Springfield High School graduate, is an educator who became the first African-American superintendent of the Toledo Public Schools. Wilma Brown, also a graduate

of Toledo's Scott High School and the first African-American to become president of the Toledo City Council, served the citizens of Toledo in elected office.

The Toledo African American Legacy Project also posthumously recognized Daniel Mack, who owned and operated the highly regarded Candlelight Café and Robert Powell who owned Toledo's iconic Powell's Beauty and Barbershop.

In addition to honoring current leaders from northwest Ohio's African American community, the Toledo African American Legacy Project also highlights young, emerging African American leaders from the region. This year eight people were recognized for their efforts: Kenyetta Jones an autoworker from Toledo who last year introduced President Obama in Ohio and later addressed the Democratic National Convention; Alicia Smith, an educational coordinator at Toledo's Padua Center; Hope Bland, a field instructor at the University of Toledo and Wayne State University School of Social Work; Merdia Allen, Associate Director of the Office of EXCELlence and Multicultural Student Success programs and part-time instructor at the University of Toledo; Joshua Peterson, an associate at Eastman & Smith Attorneys at Law; William Pierce, Interim Director of Undergraduate Admission at the University of Toledo; Rodney Eason, Jr., Director of Human Resources at The Andersons; and Keith Jordan, President of the Toledo Board of Community Relations.

I join our community in congratulating this year's African American Legacy Project honorees. Each person's contributions have made us stronger and bettered the lives of many in our region. We salute the efforts of each honoree.

**IN MEMORY OF FIRST LIEUTENANT
JENNIFER MORENO AND
HER SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY**

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of First Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno who died on October 6, 2013 in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan. Lieutenant Moreno died of injuries sustained when an improvised explosive device detonated near her dismounted patrol. Lieutenant Moreno was a member of the Cultural Support Team supporting a Joint Special Operations Task Force for the U.S. Army Special Operations Command. Born and raised in San Diego, Lieutenant Moreno graduated from San Diego High School and went on to receive a bachelor degree in Nursing from the University of San Francisco. She was commissioned to the U.S. Army as a Nurse Corps Officer where she served as a Clinical Staff Nurse on a medical surgical unit. The Commander of the Ranger battalion, Lt. Col Patrick Ellis, said: "She was a talented member of our team who lost her life while serving her country in one of the most dangerous environments in the world. Her bravery and self-sacrifice were in keeping with the highest traditions of the 75th Ranger Regiment." Her

awards and decorations are numerous, including being awarded the Bronze Star posthumously. Mr. Speaker, I know we all extend our deepest condolences to her family and friends who have suffered this tragic loss. Her loved ones will continue to be in our thoughts and prayers.

**HONORING RONALD D. MCINROY
AND THE NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS
FEDERATION OF LABOR,
AFL-CIO**

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ronald D. McInroy, Director of the United Auto Workers (UAW) Region 4, on being named the Northeastern Illinois Federation of Labor's Person of the Year, and also to recognize the positive impact and advocacy of the Northeastern Illinois Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO.

Director McInroy was elected in 2010 by his peers to lead UAW Region 4, which includes many of the Great Lakes and Great Plains states. He was chosen on the basis of more than 30 years of active membership and leadership in the union. From his earliest affiliation with UAW, dating back to his membership in Local 838 as a John Deere employee, Director McInroy has been a strong and effective advocate for his fellow workers and his union.

Today, Director McInroy services more than 180 locals and 200 collective bargaining agreements within Region 4. The Region is committed to maintaining and strengthening the system of checks and balances that has defined our economy following the labor movement, empowering both employers and employees to create the most dynamic and productive economy the world has ever known.

Through more than classic advocacy, Region 4 and Director McInroy have demonstrated a commitment to improving the lives of its members and their families. Region 4 is the country's only UAW Region with a free-standing education center, which I am proud to say is in my great state of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate Director McInroy for receiving this great honor, and I would also like to recognize the entire Northeastern Illinois Federation of Labor for the outstanding and important work it does. In a democratic society, the interests and views of all people must be heard and considered. The Northeastern Illinois Federation of Labor works tirelessly to improve the lives of working families and ensure their voices are heard loud and clear. I thank the members of the Northeastern Illinois Federation of Labor for their advocacy, for their dedication, and most of all, for the good they have done on behalf of working people everywhere.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. ARNOLD L.
MITCHEM

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Arnold L. Mitchem, the founding president of the Council for Opportunity in Education. On October 1, 2013, Dr. Arnold L. Mitchem stepped down and assumed the position of President Emeritus.

Dr. Mitchem has been a voice for low-income, first-generation students, individuals with disabilities, adult learners, and veterans throughout his entire career. The mission of the Council for Opportunity in Education (COE) is to advance and defend the ideal of equal educational opportunity in postsecondary education. COE is the core advocacy and professional group for the federal TRIO programs, which consist of nearly 2,800 federally funded college opportunity programs at more than 1,000 colleges and universities nationwide.

Dr. Mitchem's knowledge of grassroots organizing and understanding of the political landscape at the local, national, and international level has propelled COE to become the "voice for college opportunity." He introduced the concept of "first-generation students" through his Congressional testimony in the late 1970s—and the term was incorporated into the Education Amendments of 1980. Dr. Mitchem has testified before Congress more than a dozen times to share his expertise on education reform, the importance of a quality education, and student loan issues.

Dr. Mitchem is a member of the Executive Committee of the European Access Network and serves on the Board of Trustees for Marquette University. He is a former trustee of the College Board; past president of the Committee for Education Funding, a Washington, D.C.-based coalition of national education associations; and served on INROADS, Inc.'s first national board. Dr. Mitchem is also the recipient of both the 2013 Award for Advocacy of Independent Higher Education from the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities and the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities' Award of Excellence (2013).

Because of his tireless advocacy for underrepresented students, Dr. Mitchem was awarded a Lifetime Achievement Award from the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, and honorary doctorates from 10 universities. His writing has appeared in The Washington Post, The New York Times, The Chronicle of Higher Education, Forbes.com, The Huffington Post, and numerous other print and online publications.

Dr. Mitchem began his career on the history faculty at Marquette University, where he was later named director of Marquette's Educational Opportunity Program. Dr. Mitchem served in that role until 1986, when he moved to Washington, D.C. to assume the presidency of the Council for Opportunity in Education. He holds a bachelor's degree from the University of Southern Colorado, did graduate work in

European history as a Woodrow Wilson Fellow at the University of Wisconsin, and earned a Ph.D. in foundations of education from Marquette University.

Mr. Speaker I am honored to recognize Dr. Mitchem for all he has done to improve the life outcomes of disadvantaged students. He has left an indelible mark in the lives of so many, including my own. I feel blessed to call him my mentor and my friend.

COMBAT PAPER PROJECT

HON. CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the incredible work done by the Combat Paper Project in California, New York, New Jersey and across the globe in helping combat veterans transition into civilian life.

Having served 24 years in the United States Army, one of my most profound responsibilities as a commander was to help my troopers readjust when we returned home from combat deployments and assist in their transition to civilian life after leaving the Army. Since retiring from the Army and becoming a United States Congressman, I have been proud to support the countless public and private sector groups, businesses, organizations, and individuals who are also dedicated to this mission of assisting our veterans.

The Combat Paper Project is an outstanding example of this effort. Founded by artist and papermaker Drew Matott and Iraq War veteran Drew Cameron, this organization seeks to assist in the veteran's transition by turning the uniform of the soldier, sailor, airman, or Marine into a piece of unique art. Notably, this is a collaborative process with the veteran helping to make the transition, breaking down the uniform and personally turning it into a unique piece of art that captures their own interests or life experiences, made up of the fabric in which they served their country.

I recognize the difficulty in finding ways to acclimate our uniformed men and women back to civilian life. Combat Paper is a unique way to do so and I thank its founders, supporters, and participants for its success to date. I wish this organization continued success and I and my colleagues in Congress will continue to work alongside them in repaying these men and women who have sacrificed so much.

ROSIE THE RIVETER

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, seventy years ago this year, an iconic image of American strength, perseverance and sacrifice splashed across the front page of The Saturday Evening Post. The cover soon found its way to immortality, embedded by Norman Rockwell into the spirit of America. As much message

as art, it featured a strong armed, can-do, hard working warrior in laborers clothes. It was the symbol of a nation's fierce determination, a reminder that every ounce of American life and family was mobilized in war. Seventy years ago, America met Rosie the Riveter.

But the introduction wasn't really needed. We already knew her. The cover was at long last recognition of what had happened all around America. A showing of homefront strength that had already sent so many sons and daughters to war.

When I was growing up, my Grandma told stories of how, in the early 1940's, she and her husband left Colorado in desperate search of work. Leaving the landlocked high plains and heading west to the shipyards of Oregon in a beat up old car, she and Grandpa left behind generations of family and familiarity. To pay for the trip's final-stretch tank of gas they sold the headlight off the car somewhere in Idaho, eventually finding work in Portland. There, Grandma became a welder, building liberty ships and making the machines of war and commerce.

They lived in a one room apartment above a grocery store, their only meal a daily serving of Dinty-Moore stew prepared in a kitchen that consisted of an electric burner. Grandma cannot look at that red stew can to this day.

In Oregon, a lady from the plains of Colorado learned to weld on the deck of a ship in drydock. There, drawing a bead with sparks flying, heat and sweat, smoke and steel filling the air, she went off to war. Nearly dying after falling from the top deck of a ship to the deck below, she became an equal partner in the fight for our nation's freedom. She and her co-workers never sought recognition, but a future. And Rosie the Riveter spoke for them all.

Decades later, she would share her welding skills with her astonished grandsons staring wide-eyed as Grandma showed us up.

Everyday we come face to face with the blessings of our great nation, made possible not by men, but by all. Seventy years ago, Rosie helped America welcome my Grandma, and women across the country, in the fight for freedom.

So to let us give thanks to her, Rosie, and everyone like her who pioneered the way.

IN RECOGNITION OF RUBY'S
PLACE

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the tenacious and courageous survivors of domestic violence as we observe Domestic Violence Awareness Month. In particular, I would like to recognize a special organization in my district that makes life possible again for these survivors and their families.

Ruby's Place in Hayward, formally known as the Emergency Shelter Program, has helped hundreds of survivors throughout my district and across the East Bay. It is more than just a support system, it has proven to be a lifeline for so many in need.

The organization's namesake, Ruby, a survivor, serves as a beacon of hope to many who have faced the pain of abuse by someone they love.

Domestic violence impacts so many lives. While the wounds may heal, scars are left behind. Domestic violence affects the whole family and, sadly, all of our communities. Support services and resources are crucial to the survival of many of these individuals. That is why we are so fortunate to have Ruby's Place.

Domestic violence must stop, and with strong, courageous, and passionate advocates like those who grace Ruby's Place, I know that message is being heard loud and clear. Change will come if we all take a stand together.

I offer Ruby's Place my heartfelt gratitude and my support as it continues to provide critical services to my constituents and people throughout the East Bay.

COMMEMORATING TAIWAN'S 102ND
DOUBLE TEN DAY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today, October 10, Taiwan celebrates their National Day. This is Taiwan's 102nd anniversary and it is known as Double Ten day because it occurs on the tenth day of the tenth month. Their national birthday, they celebrate it with the same passion and pride with which Americans mark the Fourth of July.

Taiwan has many reasons to celebrate their nation's history. Our friends in Southeast Asia excel in a number of areas, one of the most important being their national healthcare system. Taiwan has an effective single payer system, the National Health Insurance Program (NHI), which provides healthcare for virtually all Taiwanese citizens.

I have been fighting for a similar program in the United States of America for the last 10 years. In February, I reintroduced H.R. 676, "The Expanded and Improved Medicare For All Act," which would create a similar program of high quality coverage for all Americans.

Taiwan also has a leading education system, which reflects the important investments that the nation has made in their children's futures. I too hope that Americans can learn from their example, and begin to invest similarly in the talents and capacity of our next generation.

I congratulate my friends across the Pacific, and I wish them a very happy 102nd Double Ten Day. May they have as much to celebrate next year as they have today.

LETTER TO NASA CLARIFYING
CONGRESSIONAL RESTRICTIONS
ON BILATERAL RELATIONS WITH
CHINA

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I submit a letter I sent to NASA Administrator Charles Bolden on Tuesday clarifying the statutory restrictions on bilateral cooperation with China, which were misrepresented by NASA Ames Research Center staff and reported in a recent article in the Guardian newspaper. I expect NASA to immediately correct the record on its policies and await a response from Administrator Bolden.

In the letter, I also raised the rationale for congressional restrictions on additional collaboration with the Chinese government, including its abhorrent record on human rights abuses and its continued cyberattacks, espionage campaigns and development of space weapons to use against the U.S.

I also challenged Nobel Prize nominee Dr. Geoff Marcy, who made public comments disparaging statutory and NASA policies, to advocate for the 2010 Nobel Prize winner Liu Xiaobo, a Chinese dissident who has been jailed by Beijing since 2009, saying "It's an ethical breach that is unacceptable. You have to draw the line."

Will Dr. Marcy similarly "draw the line" regarding China's deplorable human rights record and join the Nobel Committee in speaking out for Liu Xiaobo? The Nobel Committee took the unprecedented step of holding Liu Xiaobo's ceremony with an empty chair on stage because he and his wife were not allowed to leave China to receive the award. Whether Dr. Marcy receives the award or not—and I hope he does—he and the other Nobel nominees should speak out for Liu Xiaobo. This will be a real test for the science community.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
October 8, 2013.

Administrator CHARLES F. BOLDEN, JR.,
NASA,
Washington DC.

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR BOLDEN: Earlier this year, I invited you to meet with an impressive group of Chinese human rights activists in my office. I appreciated your willingness to sit with them and hear their stories. As you witnessed, to a person, each loved their country and were rightly proud of their heritage. But all sought fundamental change. They longed to live in a land where they could worship freely, speak openly and enjoy the basic protections of a constitution grounded in rule of law.

Their quarrel—and mine—is with the thin layer of leadership at the helm of the Chinese communist party that rules by fear and oppression. China's repression knows no boundaries: the government has been a major arms supplier and source of economic strength to the regime in Khartoum, Sudan, headed by an internationally indicted war criminal and architect of the genocide in Darfur. The Chinese people know that such leadership is destined for the ash heap of history, and they long for the U.S. government,

to find common cause with the Chinese people not with those who persecute them.

Few in Congress have done more to advocate for the Chinese people than me.

As co-chairman of the House's bipartisan Human Rights Commission, I have worked closely with many victims of repression. I have spent hours with countless Chinese dissidents ranging from legal advocate Chen Guangcheng, who escaped from house arrest seeking asylum in the U.S. embassy, to Uyghur Muslim activist Rebiya Kadeer, herself a political dissident, to house church pastor and advocate Bob Fu, to former laogai prisoner Harry Wu. I have traveled to China to meet with human rights and religious freedom activists oppressed by Beijing. In 1997, I slipped into Tibet with a trekking group to meet with Buddhist monks and nuns living under the repressive watch of Chinese security agents. They showed me forbidden pictures of the Dalai Lama. In 2008, I returned to China the week before the start of the Olympics to meet with a group of activists and pastors—all but one was arrested on their way to the meeting.

The Chinese people are good people who yearn for freedom and the same universal human rights that we in the West enjoy, including freedom of speech and religion. In contrast, the Chinese government is fundamentally corrupt and systematically abuses the basic human rights of its own people. We only need to ask the Catholic bishop under house arrest, the house church pastor languishing in prison, the Tibetan monk willing to set himself aflame in desperation at the abuses suffered by his people to know this is true.

Consider that at the same time that the 2010 Nobel Prize recipient Liu Xiaobo, a Chinese dissident, was jailed, the 2009 Nobel Prize winner, President Obama, was hosting a state dinner for Chinese premier Hu Jintao. No such welcome was afforded to the Dalai Lama during his first visit to Washington during Obama's presidency. Much like Solzhenitsyn before him the Dalai Lama was denied an audience with the president because the White House didn't want to there to be any impact on the president's trip to Beijing the next month.

These events, coupled with former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's comments during an early visit to Asia, in which she famously said that U.S. concern with human rights issues in China "can't interfere with the global economic crisis, the global climate change crisis, and the security crisis," have sadly set the tone for this administration. Too often, the Obama Administration has willfully turned a blind eye towards human rights abuses as well as systemic Internet censorship, crackdowns on free speech and protestors and prolific theft of intellectual property all in the name of currying favor with the Chinese government.

In light of these realities, I have supported efforts to limit new collaboration with China until we see improvements in its human rights record, as well as a reduction in its well documented cyberattacks and espionage efforts against the U.S. My record on this has been clear and well publicized, especially with regard to language I have included in legislation affecting NASA and other agencies. However, I was concerned to read an October 4 article in The Guardian that reported on poor guidance about these policies with regard to restrictions on Chinese nationals attending a conference next month at NASA Ames Research Center. Unfortunately, the article is riddled with inaccuracies, as is, it appears, the guidance provided by NASA Ames staff to the attendees.

According to the article: "Chinese applicants were told they could not attend the conference in an email sent by Mark Messersmith, a Kepler project specialist at Nasa Ames. 'Unfortunately . . . federal legislation passed last March forbids us from hosting any citizens of the People's Republic of China at a conference held at facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Regarding those who are already working at other institutions in the US, due to security issues resulting from recent Congressional actions, they are under the same constraints' according to the email, seen by the Guardian."

As you know, the congressional provision—which has been in place since early 2011—primarily restricts bilateral, not multilateral, meetings and activities with the Communist Chinese government or Chinese-owned companies. It places no restrictions on activities involving individual Chinese nationals unless those nationals are acting as official representatives of the Chinese government. As such, the email from NASA Ames mischaracterizes the law and is inaccurate.

I believe what Mr. Messersmith may have been referring to was a temporary restriction on Chinese nationals that you put in place earlier this year after serious security protocol flaws were brought to your attention by some in Congress, including me, specifically regarding violations at Ames and Langley Research Center. You indicated at the time that security policies for foreign nationals for particular countries of concern would be reevaluated and new accreditations would not be approved until the security process was vetted. However, any restriction against Chinese nationals on NASA centers is entirely an agency policy and not covered under the statutory restriction. Furthermore, it was my understanding that NASA's temporary restrictions had been lifted after a review of security protocols for foreign nationals at all NASA centers.

As you know, NASA's inspector general recently produced a report documenting the serious failures in the security process that led to violations involving a Chinese national at NASA's Langley Research Center. I hope a copy of this report will soon be made public. For these reasons, I supported NASA's policies that were put in place earlier this year to ensure that these security flaws had been dealt with. I continue to support every effort you deem appropriate to ensure that NASA centers are fully compliant with laws and regulations governing security.

However, it is clear the NASA Ames guidance provided to conference attendees was inaccurate and not reflective of the statutory restrictions enacted by Congress. NASA headquarters needs to send updated guidance to both the conference attendees and to the press to correct this misconception.

That said, I was struck by comments from individuals quoted in the Guardian article who indicated their intent to boycott this conference. How many of these same people are all too willing to participate in science conferences in China that are hosted and paid for by the autocratic Chinese government, with its clear and undisputed record of abuses and censorship? Which begs the question, where then was their righteous outrage?

According to the article, "Geoff Marcy, an astronomy professor at the University of California, Berkeley, who has been tipped to win a Nobel prize for his pioneering work on exoplanets, or planets outside the solar system, called the ban 'completely shameful

and unethical.' In an email sent to the conference organizers, Marcy said: 'In good conscience, I cannot attend a meeting that discriminates in this way. The meeting is about planets located trillions of miles away, with no national security implications,' he wrote. 'It is completely unethical for the United States of America to exclude certain countries from pure science research,' Marcy told the Guardian. 'It's an ethical breach that is unacceptable. You have to draw the line.'"

Again, while the conference guidance provided by Ames was inaccurate, I hope Dr. Marcy will draw a similar line when it comes to cooperation with Chinese government funded agencies and programs due to their systemic human rights abuses. In fact, as a Nobel nominee himself, has he publicly advocated for the 2010 Nobel Prize recipient Liu Xiaobo who to this day languishes in Chinese detention?

In the powerful words of the Nobel Committee which asserted, in awarding the prize to Liu, that "there is a close connection between human rights and peace . . ." The Committee continued, "The campaign to establish universal human rights also in China is being waged by many Chinese, both in China itself and abroad. Through the severe punishment meted out to him, Liu has become the foremost symbol of this wide-ranging struggle for human rights in China." Will the international science community stand with those who are struggling for human rights in China? Will they take a similarly public stand against the "shameful" and "unethical" activities of the Chinese government which our own State Department characterizes as an "authoritarian state" which routinely engages in "repression and coercion" and resorts to "extralegal measures such as enforced disappearance, 'soft detention,' and strict house arrest, including house arrest of family members, to prevent the public voicing of independent opinions"?

Given the attention raised in the Guardian article about the statutory restrictions on bilateral relations with the Chinese government, it is worth recalling why the Congress has deemed it appropriate to put these provisions in statute since 2011. In addition to the myriad human rights and religious freedom abuses described above, there are serious concerns about widespread espionage against the U.S., including NASA, as well as recent developments in China's space warfare program.

Over the last year, there has been much discussion about the unprecedented espionage campaign run by the People's Liberation Army (PLA) against the U.S. government—including NASA—and industry. The director of National Security Agency recently described Chinese espionage of U.S. technology as "the greatest transfer of wealth in history."

Other senior U.S. military and intelligence officials have become increasingly vocal about their concerns about the scope of Chinese espionage and cyberattacks. Defense Intelligence Agency chief General Ron Burgess testified last year that "China has used its intelligence services to gather information via a significant network of agents and contacts using a variety of methods . . . In recent years, multiple cases of economic espionage and theft of dual-use and military technology have uncovered pervasive Chinese collection efforts."

The evidence of prolific Chinese cyberattacks and espionage have become increasingly clear with the release of the Mandiant report in February as well as the newspapers that have come forward to report

targeted attacks from China based on reporting critical of the Chinese government. Then, in April, Verizon released its annual cyber report which found that "96 percent of recorded, state-affiliated attacks targeting business' trade secrets and other intellectual property in 2012 could be traced to Chinese hackers." These are just the latest reports in a series of official documents that have built a damning case against Chinese cyber espionage against the U.S. government and industry.

In late 2011, the Office of the National Counterintelligence Executive released a report for foreign spies in the U.S. Not surprisingly, much of the report focused on China's espionage operations. According to the report, Chinese espionage efforts "combine collection of open source information, [human intelligence], signals intelligence, and cyber operations" to "develop a competitive edge over the United States." The report also explicitly notes that China views itself as a "strategic competitor" of the U.S. and is one of the "most aggressive collectors of U.S. economic information and technology."

It is particularly notable that the president's strategy on mitigating the theft of U.S. intellectual property specifically singled out core technologies that NASA develops, including "unmanned aerial vehicles, and other aerospace/aeronautic technologies" and "civilian and dual-use technologies in sectors likely to experience fast growth" as information of the greatest interest to Chinese espionage.

In response to the public attention to the Chinese espionage threat, earlier this year the White House released a white paper detailing its strategy to mitigate the theft of trade secrets. Notably, of the 19 trade secret espionage cases that have been brought under this administration, 16 of the 19 cases involved Chinese nationals spying for Chinese institutions. That's 85 percent of all DOJ espionage cases that have involved Chinese espionage.

At the same time, the PLA—which runs China's space program—is developing space weapons to use against U.S. satellites. According to a recent article from respected national security reporter Bill Gertz, "China last week conducted a test of a maneuvering satellite that captured another satellite in space during what Pentagon officials say was a significant step forward for Beijing's space warfare program. The satellite capture took place last week and involved one of three small satellites fitted with a mechanical arm that were launched July 20 as part of a covert anti-satellite weapons development program, said U.S. officials familiar with reports of the test."

The article continued: "The official said the satellites are part of China's 'Star Wars' space weapon program that has been largely ignored by the Obama administration over concerns that pressing China to explain its space weapons program would upset U.S.-China relations. The ASAT program is a 'real concern for U.S. national defense,' the official said."

There is good reason Congress is concerned about providing the Communist Chinese government with additional opportunities to work with the U.S. on space given their continued cyberattacks, espionage campaigns and development of space weapons to use against the U.S.

Returning to Ames, the misrepresentation of NASA policy quoted in the Guardian article is the latest in a series of questionable actions taken by the Ames center leadership that have resulted in criminal investigations

of export violations and inspector general reviews of illegitimate contracts issued by the center. I believe the center has become a rat's nest of inappropriate and possibly illegal activities that appear to have occurred with the concurrence of the center's leadership.

In one troubling example, last month, The Wall Street Journal reported on a Space Act Agreement between Ames and Google's executives to use taxpayer-subsidized airplane fuel intended for military aircraft for personal travel by Google's leadership. A dubious scientific data collection scheme appears to have been developed as an excuse for this preferential treatment for these executives.

According to the article, "The main jets in the fleet—a Boeing 767, Boeing 757 and four Gulfstream V's—have departed from Moffett a total of 710 times since 2007, FAA records show. The most frequent destinations were Los Angeles and New York, but the planes also flew 20 times to the Caribbean island of Tortola; 17 to Hawaii; 16 to Nantucket, Mass.; and 15 to Tahiti." It would be difficult for anyone to make the case that these taxpayer-subsidized trips provided any credible scientific value to NASA.

The article continued: "In total, [the Google aircraft holding company] has bought 2.3 million gallons of jet fuel since early 2009, according to Pentagon records viewed by The Wall Street Journal, paying an average \$3.19 per gallon. 'I don't see how in the hell anybody can buy it that cheap,' said Fred Fitts, president of the Corporate Aircraft Association, a nonprofit that negotiates discounted jet-fuel prices for 1,600 corporate flight departments at airports around the U.S. Mr. Fitts provided figures showing that CAA members paid an average of \$4.35 a gallon across the U.S. over that period."

Although the article noted that this arrangement was recently terminated, the fact that Ames leadership approved this sweetheart deal for the Google executives and allowed it to continue for six years knowing that there was no serious scientific merit is unacceptable.

In addition to this troubling relationship, I also have been outspoken about my concerns that a number of Ames staff were investigated for a number of years by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the NASA Office of the Inspector General and other law enforcement agencies relating to the alleged illegal transfer of ITAR-controlled technology by individuals at the NASA Ames Research Center. It is my understanding that this illegal technology transfer may have involved classified Defense Department weapons system technology to foreign countries.

According to whistleblowers that contacted Congress, large numbers of foreign nationals were invited to work at NASA Ames over the last six years and that federal information and physical security safeguards may not have been used or may have explicitly been ignored on multiple occasions. Additionally, my colleagues and I were informed that Ames staff may have traveled to foreign conferences and disseminated information about ITAR-controlled technologies in public forums, with Chinese and other foreign officials present.

In correspondence that I have seen, the FBI believed it had a solid case that was ready for prosecution and referred it to the U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of California. However, after a series of unexplained delays and the removal of at least one assistant U.S. attorney working the case, the charges ran up against the statute of limitations, and the first charge expired

on December 15, 2012. The case was ultimately declined by the Justice Department for reasons that have never been explained to the Congress or federal law enforcement. I believe these inexplicable delays and ultimate declination was a product of politicization within the Justice Department, and I have included language in the FY 2014 Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations bill further addressing this matter.

Nonetheless, it appears that federal law enforcement felt there was a solid case against certain Ames staff members involving export violations. Yet there has been no accountability at Ames for these alleged criminal violations. This is inexcusable.

Again, I hope you quickly correct the record and take appropriate action to inform the conference participants of NASA's actual policy regarding foreign visitors. I look forward to your prompt response.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF DEAN AND JEAN NICHOLSON

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dean and Jean Nicholson for their years of dedication and service to their community. Sanger, California, is a better place today because of the Nicholsons' positive influence and compassion.

Dean and Jean met at Nebraska State Teachers College in Kearney, Nebraska. Dean was raised in Superior, and Jean grew up in Fairbury. In 1941, Dean joined the United States Military, and served in the Army for two years. After Dean completed his service, the Nicholsons moved to Sanger.

Dean was hired at Sanger High School, and taught algebra, geometry, and trigonometry for 38 years. Students and faculty admired Dean and his ability to teach, and for 20 years he served as Chairman for the Math Department. When Dean was not in the classroom, he could be found on the court. He was the head varsity basketball coach for 23 years. For five of those years, he led his teams to the championship. Dean also coached varsity golf and tennis. In addition to his notable career at Sanger High School, Dean also taught advanced algebra and trigonometry for 42 years at Fresno City College. Coach Nicholson had thousands of students in his classroom during his long career as a teacher and he had a profound influence on all of them.

Dean and Jean raised three children: Bob, Cindy, and Tom; and they have six grandchildren. Jean was a stay-at-home mom with three children, but most would agree that she was a mother to countless individuals throughout the community. Her kind and loving character makes it easy for people to go to her when they need to hear caring words or sound advice. Family and friends who are close to the couple often say that, "you can hardly say Dean without Jean." They are an amazing team who exemplify the meaning of true love.

Teaching and coaching have always been important aspects of Dean and Jean's lives

but above everything else is their faith. Since 1954, they have been members of the Presbyterian Church of Sanger. For 20 years, Dean and Jean played a prominent role in the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, and for the last several decades they have both taught Sunday school. Dean and Jean have positively impacted the lives of hundreds of students with their guidance and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dean and Jean Nicholson for their years of service to the community that they love so dearly.

RECOGNIZING THE POSITIVE COMMUNITY IMPACT OF PADS LAKE COUNTY AND WISHING CONGRATULATIONS ON THE OPENING OF ITS NEW FAMILY CENTER

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate PADS Lake County on the grand opening of its new Family Center and to recognize the incredible impact PADS has on our local community.

PADS has been battling homelessness in Lake County, Illinois for more than 25 years, and in that time, they have offered a hand up and a path forward to countless individuals and families who fell on hard times. PADS' mission can be summed up simply by their guiding phrase: "Helping the Homeless Find a Way."

Through a broad variety of services, including those specifically for veterans, families and children, PADS Lake County not only offers temporary support and shelter, but helps guide their clients to a long-term, positive path forward.

With the opening of this new Family Center, PADS will be able to reach even more people who are suffering from homelessness, particularly important just a few years removed from one of this country's most severe economic meltdowns. Just last year, PADS saw a 20 percent increase in the services it was able to offer.

Those numbers translate to real families and real lives touched—improved. Since 2009, PADS increased the number of individuals served by 96 percent. There are people who need the assistance PADS offers, and through the heroic work of its staff, the commitment of its volunteers and the generosity of its supporters, PADS can reach further than ever.

This new Family Center will expand PADS' reach in the area and create a refuge for even more struggling families in the community.

PADS stands for Providing Advocacy, Dignity and Shelter. Through their hard work, they have achieved these aims, and through their example, they have inspired the community.

I congratulate PADS Lake County on this ribbon cutting, and I thank them, the entire community thanks them, for the work they have done and will do.

HONORING SENATOR ROD GRAMS

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a friend and colleague, long time Minnesota Senator Rod Grams, who passed away Tuesday night losing his fight against colon cancer.

Rod Grams and I came to Washington at roughly the same time. He served on the Banking and Finance committees while I served on the Agriculture and Government Operations committees.

Everyone knew Senator Grams as being a conservative member of the Republican Party. He was often times juxtaposed against the other Minnesota Senator, Paul Wellstone on the extreme left. Early on we discovered that we were both fiscal conservatives and almost immediately found common ground on economic issues.

Although conservative, Senator Grams was always searching for common ground and had a willingness to discuss his position with folks. Known for his humble demeanor, Rod Grams quickly became known for one of his greatest achievements, the passage of a \$500-per-child income tax credit that he shepherded through Congress and into law in 1997.

I was struck by his dedication to serving others even in remote parts of the State. I remember during the 1997 floods in the Red River Valley, although he showed up in a finely pressed suit and dress shoes, Senator Grams quickly threw himself into the East Grand Forks flood recovery, mud and all. From that day on he had a constant presence in my District and also realized he doesn't need to wear a suit everywhere.

Senator Grams was a distinguished public servant and a true model of what serving means. He knew when to hold the line and when to work with others. He is a true example of leadership. Senator Grams will be missed in Minnesota politics and I extend my deepest sympathies to the Senator's family and friends.

IN HONOR OF SAUL LANDAU

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend who spent his life trying to educate people about America's role in the world in an effort to make that world a better place.

Saul Landau passed away last month at the age of 77 after battling cancer for almost 2 years.

Saul was not only a very close friend of mine and my wife Cynthia's. He was a constant mentor, educator, and agitator. He was one of the smartest and hardest working people I have had the pleasure of knowing, and he was one of the funniest.

Saul will be remembered as an award winning documentary filmmaker, an author, an in-

vestigator and a columnist. Upon his death, his friends and colleagues and family were treated to a collection of obituaries across the country that paid tribute to his exhaustive body of work, his infectious personality, and his deep caring and passion for his country and the world around it.

I am including here for my colleagues' benefit just two of those remarkable pieces so that others may benefit from reading about this one man's extraordinary life.

To Saul's family, I extend my sincere condolences for their loss. But I offer to them as well a deep appreciation from the halls of Congress of the work and thought that Saul Landau contributed to our public debate.

One of the obituaries carries this quote from Saul. "You want to do what you can while you're on this earth." Saul should rest easy knowing that he did that and more.

I will miss my friend.

Following are obituaries that appeared in the New York Times on September 11, 2013 and in the Los Angeles Times on September 13, 2013.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 11, 2013]

SAUL LANDAU, MAKER OF FILMS WITH LEFTIST EDGE, DIES AT 77

(By Douglas Martin)

Saul Landau, a determinedly leftist documentary filmmaker and writer whose passion for asking what he called "the most intrusive questions" yielded penetrating cinematic profiles of leaders like Fidel Castro and Salvador Allende, died on Monday at his home in Alameda, Calif. He was 77.

The cause was bladder cancer, his daughter Julia Landau said.

Mr. Landau aspired to marshal art and literature to illuminate social and political problems, and his point of view was almost always apparent. In the 1980s, he wrote essays berating the administration of Ronald Reagan for trying to depose the leftist government in Nicaragua, and recently he urged the United States not to become involved in Syria.

He said he saw no difference between documentary and fictional films. In both, he said, a director manipulates light and sound to put across a vision. "One has to simulate reality," he said in 2005 in an interview with The Capital Times in Madison, Wis. "The other one says, 'Here's reality,' whether it is or isn't."

Mr. Landau emerged from the roiling New Left politics of the 1960s to make more than 40 documentaries, including six about Mr. Castro. One of them, "Fidel," released in 1969, was a rare intimate look at the Cuban leader. It shows him arguing with a finger-wagging peasant woman, visiting his nursery school and playing baseball and striking out.

"I found Fidel a sympathetic figure and a hell of a good actor," Mr. Landau told The Washington Post in 1982.

His most acclaimed film was "Paul Jacobs and the Nuclear Gang," which he directed with Jack Willis in 1980. With cinematography by Haskell Wexler, the documentary, broadcast on PBS, told of the cover-up of health hazards from a 1957 nuclear-bomb test in Utah. The film won an Emmy Award and a George Polk Award.

The title referred to Mr. Landau's friend Paul Jacobs, a journalist who died of cancer—believed to have been caused by radiation exposure—before the film was completed.

Other films by Mr. Landau portray poverty in big-city slums, the destruction of indige-

nous Mexican culture, the inner workings of the C.I.A., torture in Brazil and life inside a San Francisco jail. Most have a leftist political edge that some saw as propagandistic, but Mr. Landau characterized the films as educational.

"All my films try to teach people without preaching too hard," he said. "I try not to be too tendentious."

Mr. Landau released two films relating to Mr. Allende, the Chilean who had become Latin America's first democratically elected socialist president the year before. One was an interview with Mr. Allende.

The other film, "Que Hacer!" (1970)—the title is a translation of the title of Lenin's book "What Is to Be Done?"—is a fictional movie, a playful spy story with music concerning a C.I.A. case officer in Chile. There are two casts: a Chilean one directed by Raul Ruiz and an American one directed by Mr. Landau and Nina Serrano, his wife at the time. Country Joe McDonald performed and produced the music. The film won awards at film festivals in Cannes, Venice and Mannheim, Germany.

Orlando Letelier, Chile's ambassador to the United States, invited Mr. Landau to screen it at the Chilean Embassy in Washington, and they became friends. A few years later, Gen. Augusto Pinochet overthrew the Allende government and imprisoned Mr. Letelier.

Mr. Landau worked with other international supporters to win Mr. Letelier's release and to arrange a job for him at the Institute for Policy Studies, a left-wing research organization in Washington Mr. Landau had joined in 1972. In 1976, Pinochet agents used a car bomb to kill Mr. Letelier and another institute worker. In 1980, Mr. Landau and John Dinges published a book about the case, "Assassination on Embassy Row," documenting the Pinochet government's ties to the killings.

Mr. Landau was at least as prolific a writer as he was a filmmaker. He wrote 14 books and thousands of newspaper and magazine articles and reviews.

Saul Irwin Landau was born on Jan. 15, 1936, a few blocks from Yankee Stadium in the Bronx, and grew up playing stickball in the streets. His father was a pharmacist who had fled pogroms in Ukraine to come to New York in 1920. His mother was a teacher.

As a youth, Mr. Landau once abandoned school to hitchhike across America. When he returned, his mother urged him to take the test for the academically elite Stuyvesant High School. He passed, and went on to perform brilliantly there.

The summer after he graduated, he met Ms. Serrano at a camp in the Catskills, where he was the fry cook and she the drama teacher. Ms. Serrano, who became a published poet, encouraged his interest in leftist politics and a bohemian lifestyle, according to their daughter Valerie Landau.

Ms. Serrano also accompanied Mr. Landau when he went to the University of Wisconsin. When a dean found out that they were living together, he threatened to expel Mr. Landau (Ms. Serrano was not a student then) if they did not marry. They did.

At Wisconsin, Mr. Landau got involved in a so-called Joe Must Go club, which advocated the recall of Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin over his demagogic attacks on people he accused of being Communists.

After earning bachelor's and master's degrees in history at Wisconsin, Mr. Landau became a researcher for C. Wright Mills, the sociologist, traveling with him to Western Europe, the Soviet Union and Cuba.

Moving to Northern California with Ms. Serrano, he worked toward a doctorate at Stanford but did not complete the studies. In San Francisco, they gravitated to the Beat poets and the emerging New Left movement. Mr. Landau joined Students for a Democratic Society and helped organize the leftist magazines *Ramparts* and *Mother Jones*.

He also joined the San Francisco Mime Troupe, for which he wrote, with R.G. Davis, a parody of a minstrel show, "A Minstrel Show, or Civil Rights in a Cracker Barrel." Performers in the show, which satirized racial perceptions, appeared in blackface. The show traveled to New York and elsewhere.

"Through the entire evening there is really nothing to laugh at, no matter how funny it is," Richard F. Shepard wrote in *The New York Times*. "There is the ominous theme of what hypocrisy and oppression breed."

In 1966 Mr. Landau got a job as a reporter at KQED-TV, San Francisco's public television station, and a year later went to Cuba to make a news documentary. Mr. Castro liked it, and invited Mr. Landau to return to do an in-depth documentary about him. Mr. Landau's marriage to Ms. Serrano ended in divorce. Besides his daughters Valerie and Julia, he is survived by a son, Greg, and two other daughters, Carmen and Marie; his second wife, Rebecca Switzer; a sister, Beryl Landau; seven grandchildren; and four great-grandchildren.

"You want to do what you can while you're on this earth," Mr. Landau said in 2006. "Otherwise the alternative is to go shopping."

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction:

CORRECTION: SEPTEMBER 17, 2013

An obituary on Thursday about the documentary filmmaker Saul Landau omitted a survivor. Besides his wife, children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren, Mr. Landau is survived by a sister, Beryl Landau.

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction:

CORRECTION: SEPTEMBER 19, 2013

An obituary on Sept. 12 about the documentary filmmaker Saul Landau omitted a writing credit for the San Francisco Mime Troupe production "A Minstrel Show, or Civil Rights in a Cracker Barrel." It was written by Mr. Landau and R. G. Davis, not solely by Mr. Landau.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 13, 2013]

SAUL LANDAU DIES AT 77; LEFTIST WRITER AND DOCUMENTARY FILMMAKER

SAUL LANDAU WAS BEST KNOWN FOR DOCUMENTARIES, INCLUDING 'FIDEL' AND 'PAUL JACOBS AND THE NUCLEAR GANG,' WHICH WON A GEORGE POLK AWARD

(By Daniel Miller)

Saul Landau, a leftist writer and filmmaker best known for the documentaries "Fidel" and "Paul Jacobs and the Nuclear Gang," died Monday at his home in Alameda, Calif. He was 77 and had bladder cancer.

His death was confirmed by John Cavanagh, director of the Institute for Policy Studies, a Washington, D.C.-based think tank where Landau had been a fellow since 1972.

In a prolific career that spanned nearly 50 years, Landau wrote 14 books, directed or produced 10 film or television documentaries, and worked as an investigative journalist. His 1979 political documentary "Paul Jacobs and the Nuclear Gang," about the coverup of health hazards associated with atomic bomb testing in Nevada in the 1950s,

won the George Polk Award for best documentary in 1979. The filmmaker and his partners—who included Oscar-winning cinematographer Haskell Wexler—also won an Emmy Award for best documentary.

Cavanagh, who collaborated with Landau on film projects, said his documentaries were meant to be educational, "but with the very explicit intent to mobilize people to work for social justice."

In 1968, nine years after the Cuban Revolution, Landau was invited by Castro for a tour of Cuba and an in-depth interview. The filmmaker turned footage from his time with the Cuban strongman into the PBS documentary "Fidel," with premieres set for New York and Los Angeles in 1970.

But New York's Fifth Avenue Cinema was bombed before "Fidel" could be screened, and an office building in Los Angeles that housed leftist groups and was slated to show the picture was burned down before it could be shown there.

The filmmaker's daughter Julia Landau said her father was affected by the bombings, which she attributed to an anti-Castro Cuban faction.

"Throughout his life he felt threatened by zealots like this," she said. "He was really on the hit list for a while."

Landau made five other films about Cuba. The most recent, "Will the Real Terrorist Please Stand Up?" was released in 2010. Julia Landau collaborated on the project, which focused on anti-Castro militants. Several of the filmmaker's five children worked with him on various movies over the years.

"It really brought us close together," Julia Landau said.

Besides his children Julia, Greg, Valerie, Carmen and Marie, Landau is survived by his wife, Rebecca Switzer, as well as seven grandchildren and four great-grandchildren.

Born in New York to Leon Landau and Sadie Frishkov on Jan. 15, 1936, Saul Landau grew up in the Bronx and went on to attend the University of Wisconsin.

He studied U.S. history there, obtaining an undergraduate degree in 1957 and a master's one year later.

"I came out of Madison with a passion for social justice and the idea that you only get one shot at participating in the history of the world and that you have to make the most of it," Landau told Madison's *Capital Times* in 2006, the year he donated his papers to his alma mater.

He moved to San Francisco in 1961. Around that time, Landau began traveling to Cuba, a place he'd visit frequently over the years.

"He described it in his later years as a marriage he couldn't break free from," Julia Landau said. "He was incredibly supportive of the ideals of the Cuban Revolution, and he was also critical of the Cuban government for its censorship."

Landau also had a deep connection with Chile, making films in the early 1970s about the democratic election of President Salvador Allende. Landau became friends with Chilean ambassador Orlando Letelier, who was imprisoned after Augusto Pinochet overthrew the Allende government.

Landau and others worked to free Letelier, who was later assassinated by agents of Pinochet's government. Also killed was Ronni Karpen Moffitt, who worked alongside Landau at the Institute for Policy Studies.

With the backing of the Institute for Policy Studies, Landau investigated the killings. In 1995, he published a book about them—"Orlando Letelier: Testimonio y Vindicacion."

Landau, who from 1999 to 2006 taught a variety of subjects at Cal Poly Pomona, had ec-

lectic interests: In addition to filmmaking, he was a member of the San Francisco Mime Troupe in the 1960s and published a volume of poetry, "My Dad Was Not Hamlet."

At the time of his death, Landau was working on another documentary about Cuba. The project, about the fight against homophobia there, will be completed by filmmaker Jon Alpert, codirector of the film.

"I think my work holds up with relevance to today," Landau told the *Capital Times*. "The headlines in the mainstream media come and go every day, and there is a trivialization of what is happening. So you try to make a movie of what makes people pay attention in larger context that will endure."

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,747,409,787,772.33. We've added \$6,120,532,738,859.25 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING BAYLOR UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR DAVID GUINN

HON. BILL FLORES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Baylor University Professor David Guinn. Professor Guinn was recently named the 2013 Baylor Lawyer of the Year. Mr. Guinn serves as the Lyndon L. Olson and William A. Olson Professor of Local Government and Constitutional Law and Master Teacher at Baylor, where he has taught for nearly half-a-century. The Waco Campus refers to Professor Guinn as "the Godfather," a tribute not only to his long tenure at the University, but also the wide influence he has had on state policy and generations of Baylor Lawyers.

Professor Guinn attended Baylor University and majored in Political Science. He received his J.D. from Baylor School of Law in 1963. Following Law School, he worked for the United States Securities and Exchange Commission for two years. He then attended the University of Michigan Law School where he received his LL.M. in International Law in 1966 and returned to his alma mater soon after. During his long tenure at Baylor Law, Professor Guinn has assisted in the drafting of the Texas Administrative Procedures Act and has served on numerous advisory bodies in the State Bar and on numerous committees at Baylor University. In addition to constitutional law, he teaches courses in the area of civil rights and local government.

Professor Guinn has also been involved in the redistricting process at the state and local

level. After the 2000 Census was released, he helped redistrict cities, counties, and school districts throughout Texas. Professor Guinn served as Faculty Representative to the Southwest and the Big XII athletic conferences from 1986–2001. He also served on the first Division I Management Council of the National Collegiate Athletic Association in 1997 and has continued to work with the athletic program since that time.

Aside from his teaching and redistricting work, Professor Guinn spends time traveling, reading, and exercising. He estimates he has run 28,000 total miles, and currently averages 15 miles a week. Each year he travels to South Texas and Mexico with friends, colleagues, and former students to hunt pheasant and white-wing.

Professor Guinn has two sons, David, Jr., and John, who graduated from Baylor Law School and a daughter, Catherine, who is a graduate of Baylor University.

CONGRATULATIONS TO TAIWAN
ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR NA-
TIONAL DAY

HON. STEVE STOCKMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the people of the Republic of China (Taiwan) on their upcoming National Day on October 10th.

Through three decades marked by momentous social, economic and political transformation, Taiwan remains to be a strong and trusted ally of the United States and shares with us the ideals of freedom and democracy. I still remember in 1996, when I first came to Congress, Taiwan held its first democratic presidential election in history. Today, Taiwan has emerged as a beacon of democracy and free enterprise in East Asia and our peoples have enjoyed a close friendship forged by our political, economic, cultural, and strategic ties.

The U.S. Congress has continuously played a unique and important role in supporting U.S.-Taiwan Relations. The Taiwan Relations Act passed by Congress in 1979, remains to be the cornerstone of our bilateral relations. It codifies America's commitment to support the people of Taiwan as they seek a safe and secure place in the world. Earlier this year, Congress passed a bill (H.R. 1151) in support of Taiwan's participation in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). Subsequently, Taiwan has been invited as a guest to the ICAO assembly this year.

Looking forward, I believe that our government should further strengthen this important partnership by sending Cabinet level officials to Taiwan, as well as welcoming high-level officials from Taiwan to meet with their American counterparts, so that the Administration can witness first-hand the strategic and economic benefits this relationship has produced.

I am confident that our relations with Taiwan will continue to grow and flourish, and I heartily congratulate the people of Taiwan on their 102nd anniversary.

HONORING LISA MAKI

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Lisa Maki, who will be honored with the 2013 Inspiration and Impact Award presented by Imagine LA.

Imagine LA's unique program pairs individuals exiting out of homelessness with mentors to provide critical support as these people enter the next chapter of their lives. As a board member with a personal experience overcoming homelessness, Lisa has taken a leadership role to ensure Imagine LA achieves its mission—to empower families to transition from homelessness to self-sufficiency.

Immediately after being admitted to the California State Bar in 1992, Lisa opened her own legal practice dedicated to protecting consumers and enforcing our State's civil rights law. Lisa currently serves as the President of the Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles (CAALA) because of her unceasing advocacy to protect our citizens' rights.

For her tireless work, Lisa has received countless awards and titles that highlight her expertise and character and further emphasize her prominent standing among top attorneys across the State. Her accolades include the 2006 Orange County Trial Lawyers' Association's Employment Lawyer of the Year, the Consumer Attorneys of California's first ever "Street Fighter" Award and nominee as Trial Lawyer of the Year by the Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles for four consecutive years.

I am delighted to congratulate my friend Lisa on this most recent accomplishment as the recipient of the 2013 Inspiration and Impact Award. I am confident that she will continue to be an active and effective leader in the discourse of civil rights and a champion in the struggle to combat homelessness in California.

ON RECOGNITION OF THE WEST
BLOOMFIELD TOWNSHIP PUBLIC
LIBRARY FOR SEVENTY-FIVE
YEARS OF SERVICE TO ITS COM-
MUNITY

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to once again recognize the West Bloomfield Township Public Library, this time on the occasion of its Seventy-fifth Anniversary of service to the residents of the Greater West Bloomfield community. Just two years ago, I was honored to recognize the Library as it was awarded a National Medal for Museum and Library Service from the Institute of Museum and Library Services, an award given to only five libraries each year and which is the top honor that can be bestowed upon a public library.

The residents of West Bloomfield Township and its neighboring cities are fortunate to have

access to this great educational and community resource. What began as a small project by the Keego-Cass Women's Club in 1934 has grown into a library system with a 63,000 square foot state-of-the-art main branch and a satellite branch in the Westacres subdivision that serves residents in the northern area of the township.

Public libraries occupy a vital function in our communities; they equalize the access to information, making it accessible to everyone in the areas they serve. The West Bloomfield Township Public Library is an exemplary institution that embodies this important role—providing computers to assist residents with job searches, helping seniors with Internet access, implementing outreach programs that provide residents with opportunities to build important life skills, and creating programs that foster a lifetime of literacy and love of reading in our children.

For the Greater West Bloomfield community, its library has been an important part of its residents' lives—providing programs that help them attain the American Dream. For children, the Library has created its Grow Up Reading program, which works with youth from birth to the elementary school years and partners them with a family member, childcare providers or educators to cultivate literacy skills that will assist them later in life as they grow and join the American workforce. As part of its commitment to the newcomers to our nation, the Library offers English as a Second Language discussion groups that assist them on their journey to become Americans. For students, the library assists them with preparation for SAT, ACT and AP exams by providing physical and electronic study materials. And to help all residents, the Library offers career empowerment classes that help them hone their job skills and increase their ability to obtain employment.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly proud to celebrate and recognize this award-winning community institution that continues to make a positive impact on the lives of all residents in the Greater West Bloomfield community. Seventy-five years is a great milestone in the Library's service to its community and I congratulate its staff and trustees on all of the accomplishments they have made in fulfillment of its mission. I know their passion, their advocacy and their determination will continue to result in future generations of West Bloomfield residents that possess a lifelong love of reading and I wish them success in the Library's future endeavors.

FARM BILL

HON. TED S. YOHO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, farmers and ranchers all over this country need certainty. Each year, farmers put their property on the line in order to feed our nation and the rest of the world.

Agriculture is a unique enterprise, affected by both market and weather conditions. That is why we need to pass a 5 year farm bill and we need to pass it before the year is out.

I represent the 3rd district of Florida, with thousands of acres of farmland with millions worth of production each year. This farm bill will ensure that those farmers can continue to produce the safest, most affordable food source in the world.

Let us not forget that a nation is not truly a nation unless it has a secure and abundant food supply—that has been the reason for the existence of the farm bill since the 1930s and it is still the reason we need a farm bill today.

I urge all my colleagues in the House and the Senate to begin a conference so that American farmers and ranchers have the security they need for the next 5 years.

RECOGNIZING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. PETER'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH, PHOENIXVILLE, CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate St. Peter's Episcopal Church, Phoenixville, Chester County, Pennsylvania, on the occasion of its 175th anniversary.

St. Peter's Episcopal Church, boasting a rich history stretching back to February of 1838, is part of the Phoenixville Historic District and is particularly famous for its 19th Century Gothic Revival architecture. St. Peter's is also well-known for providing a home for The Clinic, a free-service medical facility for the uninsured located in the former rectory next to the Church. The St. Peter's Food Pantry, sponsored by Church volunteers, feeds more than 80 people every other week from its Prospect Street entrance. These are just two programs sponsored by St. Peter's that have had an enduring, positive impact on the Phoenixville community. Since the day the Church doors opened 175 years ago, St. Peter's has always been a place that the Phoenixville community could look to for support and assistance in times of need.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of its 175th anniversary, I ask that my colleagues join me today in recognizing St. Peter's Episcopal Church, Phoenixville, Chester County, Pennsylvania, and its long and storied heritage of worship, fellowship, and community service.

IN TRIBUTE TO HAROLD SHARP

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Harold Sharp for his 44 years and 3 months of dedicated government service. Arizona is in sincere gratitude for the assistance, guidance, and leadership you have provided for the Federal Aviation Administration for so many years.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE NATIONAL DAY OF TAIWAN

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of 102nd anniversary of National Day for the Republic of China, commonly known as Taiwan.

October 10th, or Double Ten Day, as it is better known in Taiwan, commemorates the first day of the Chinese Revolution, which overthrew the Qing Dynasty and led to the founding of the Republic of China on January 1, 1912.

National Day is celebrated throughout the island of Taiwan and in many Chinese-American communities here in the U.S., including in my hometown of Houston, Texas. National Day is commonly celebrated with large parades, entertainment and folk performances, fireworks, and recognition of Sun Yat-sen, the first president and founding father of the Republic of China.

It is important that this chamber and American people join the Republic of China and the Chinese-American community in celebrating this day. The Republic of China was an important ally to the United States in World War II and the Cold War and has continued to be one of our country's biggest partners in peace and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific Region.

Today, Taiwan and the United States enjoy a dynamic trading relationship in both goods and services. Taiwan was the 11th largest U.S. trading partner in 2012 and is a major innovator and producer of information technology products. Taiwan is an important market for our Nation's agriculture, chemicals, and semiconductor industries.

In 1996, Taiwan became the first Chinese democracy in the world when it held its first direct presidential elections and has held successful presidential elections every four years since then and acts as an important example that democracy can flourish for the Chinese people on both sides of the Taiwan Straits.

America should continue its strong support for the people of Taiwan and we can do this by supporting Taiwan's entrance into international and multilateral organizations and agreements. Earlier this year, this House passed legislation supporting Taiwan's entrance into the International Civil Aviation Organization. Mr. Speaker, I encourage this chamber to continue to vote on similar legislation, voice the American people's support for a prosperous and democratic Taiwan, and congratulate Taiwan on its National Day.

HONORING THE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF I.C. NORCOM HIGH SCHOOL IN PORTSMOUTH, VIRGINIA

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Centennial Celebration of

I.C. Norcom High School, located in Portsmouth, Virginia. This weekend, members of the I.C. Norcom High School Alumni Association, Inc. are gathering for a parade and banquet celebration honoring their alma mater's 100th anniversary.

I.C. Norcom High School was founded as the High Street School in 1913 as the first high school for black students in Portsmouth. The school was originally located in the True Reformers Building at 915 High Street and graduated its first class of just nine students in June 1915. After the end of World War I, the school was relocated to a facility at the corner of Chestnut and South Street and again in 1920 to the corner of Chestnut and Clifford Street. In 1937, the school relocated to a larger building nearby, sharing the facility with George Peabody Elementary School. Sixteen years later in 1953, a new facility was built at the cost of 2 million dollars on Turnpike Road, to honor the legacy of its first supervising principal, Israel Charles Norcom. In 1998, the school relocated to its present location, a new, state-of-the-art facility located at 1801 London Boulevard.

The school carries the name of the pioneer educator Israel Charles ("I.C.") Norcom, who was born in Edenton, North Carolina on September 21, 1856. Norcom attended Yale Preparatory School in Connecticut, graduated from Andover Preparatory School in Massachusetts, and studied at both Yale and Harvard Universities. He also took courses at Howard University, Hampton Institute (now Hampton University) and the University of Virginia. Norcom taught for several years in Bedford County, Virginia before relocating to Portsmouth in the 1880s. Norcom served as a teacher and supervising principal until his death in 1916. Norcom was described as a pioneer educator, civic leader, churchman, businessman, fraternalist, guidance counselor and an outstanding citizen. It has been said that Norcom guided with unmatched intelligence, wisdom and greatly expanded the educational opportunities for young African Americans in Portsmouth.

Norcom's successors have faithfully carried on his tradition. William E. Riddick served as principal of the High Street School until 1942. William E. Waters followed Mr. Riddick as principal from 1942 to 1966. Mr. Waters built on Norcom's educational methods and tailored the school's operations to meet the special needs of its students. Waters was so proud of I.C. Norcom High School that he often claimed that it was the best high school in the South. Albert T. Edwards succeeded Waters as principal in 1966 for 14 years. By then the school's total enrollment exceeded 1,900 students for a facility built to only accommodate 1,400 students. Since Edwards' retirement, many more have committed themselves to enhancing the educational opportunities of I.C. Norcom's students. These principals include Mr. Eugene Blair, Mr. Lindell Wallace, Mr. Vernon Randall, Dr. DeWayne F. Jeter, Jr., Mr. Walter Taylor, Jr., Mr. Timothy E. Johnson (acting) and Ms. Lynn F. Briley. It was under the tenure of Ms. Briley that I.C. Norcom's basketball team won both the 2010 and 2011 AAA Virginia state championship—something I remember fondly having personally attended many of those games. Today, Dr. Rosalynn

Sanderlin serves as principal of I.C. Norcom High School and continues the tradition of excellence set by her predecessors.

The world has changed dramatically since I.C. Norcom High School's founding in 1913. But one thing has not, and that is the commitment of the faculty and staff to ensuring that every student that enters the doors of I.C. Norcom has every opportunity to succeed, graduate and go onto college or into the workforce. I commend the Mighty Greyhounds on their Centennial Celebration and 100 years of educating the young men and women of Portsmouth. They have so much to be proud of and so much to celebrate.

HONORING AN AMERICAN HERO:
SFC CEDRIC KING

HON. RENEE L. ELLMERS

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of North Carolina's most heroic sons: Airborne Ranger SFC Cedric King of The United States Army.

On July 25, while out on patrol during his third tour, SFC King nearly lost his life in an IED explosion in Azickzia Afghanistan. After losing both of his legs and sustaining numerous other life-threatening injuries, Cedric has in so many ways come back from the dead. In just a few months, he has come so far and so fast it is beyond words. With the help of his lovely wife Khieda, and his two beautiful daughters Amari and Khamya, he charges forward each day towards recovery. He is also an instructor and pathfinder graduate Ranger.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this poem, penned in his honor by Albert Carey Caswell.

IF I WERE KING

(By Albert Carey Caswell)

If . . . I were King . . .
I'd be one splendid thing!
I'd be the one to freedom bring!
If I were King!
I'd wear that uniform . . .
of such brave hearts who walk with hearts so
very bold and warm!
Who are Airborne!
And I'd be a Ranger who freedom so forms!
As over the enemy I so swarm!
If I were King . . .
To bring hailing down upon our enemy,
such a most magnificent deadly force all at
light speeds!
And if I were King,
I'd be an American Hero from who freedom
so breathes . . .
All with that is so inside of me!

And so live by such a creed,
and so march off to war to such places where
angels so fear to be!

To so say what must so be said!

To do what must so be done!

If I were King!

I'd so sing what must so be sung!

If I were King

I'd be a United States Ranger . . .

Who would so laugh at danger . . .

Who mountains can so climb!

All for love of country so sublime!

For only the few can so say!

That they so wear that beret . . .

Who with all of my most courageous Brothers
In Arms,

have so watched our Brother's blood so run
as they died that day!

With tears in eyes as their fine lives are now
so done,

as he'd kneel and pray!

And if were King,

as an Airborne Ranger over evil I would so
reign!

For Rangers lead in all things!

And if I were King,

all for God and Country I would have so bled!

For in history Rangers have always led!

As its life and death in what is said!

And if I were King,

I would have given up my two strong legs,

as from out of the darkness armed but with
only my courage and faith!

To so awake from such harm!

As my tears so brake,

as my heart so tells me to somehow move on!

As with each new day,

I must wade through such pain and heart-
ache formed . . .

With the help of a great wife Khieda who
stands by her man so very warm!

And my two beautiful daughters Amari and
Khamya,

who lovingly call out my name each morning
. . .

If I were King!

And though my task is great . . .

These new giant steps I would now so
take . . .

For time for no man so waits . . .

And pity will only weak hearts so create!

So wipe all of your tears away . . .

As I stand here much more than a man on
this very day!

As my strides have gotten stronger and
much more great!

Look at me,

because I'm Airborne as it's up out ahead
you'll find me leading the way!

To So Teach You!

To So Beseech You!

To So Reach You and All Of Your Hearts
This Day!

As Hero I was not trying to be,

but this is what my Lord God has so made
me . . .

So get out of my way!

For I've got mountains to so climb!

And hearts to so heal all in my time!

And I've got Blue Skies up ahead of me . . .
When, I go back home to my most beloved
Carolina someday!

If I were King how proud I would so be . . .

In life,

most people never reach so high!

And jump so heroically from the skies!

Who are Rangers who are Airborne,

all so selflessly to so live and die!

And so live by such a heroic creed,

ith but such tears in eyes!

And so bury their dead up on high!

For its far . . . far better to live a noble
life . . .

Than, just to do the ride!

Better, to give up your strong fine legs . . .

Then, in the end so wish somehow better
choices you had made!

And die with such regret as you so ask your-
self,

what did I do all in my life?

For I'd much rather live like a King,

and know that my life had meaning in every
way!

Then die just marking time day after day!

If I were King!

I'd hold my head up high until my dying
days!

Knowing full well,

what to this world I gave!

For in life,

only a few Kings so lead the way!

If I were King,

heaven would me await.

NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC
OF CHINA, COMMONLY KNOWN
AS TAIWAN

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Day of the Republic of China, commonly known as Taiwan. National Day commemorates the beginning of the Wuchang Uprising in 1911, which led to the establishment of Taiwan.

Taiwan has been a friend of the United States and a shining example of democracy in the Asian-Pacific Region. They share our values and respect for human rights, freedom, and a market-based economy. Taiwan is a key trading partner and trusted ally. The relationship between our two countries continues to grow along with the cultural and economic benefits it creates.

I am pleased to recognize Taiwan's National Day and voice my support for our nations' continued friendship.

SENATE—Friday, October 11, 2013

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, JR., a Senator from the State of Maine.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, we desperately need Your steadfast love to sustain us during this difficult time. Lord, give our lawmakers the wisdom to distinguish between truth and error and the courage to act upon those insights. Help them to avoid the shortcuts that lead away from Your will, as You make them Your eyes, ears, feet, and hands to bring solace to those who suffer. Give them a hatred of all hypocrisy, deceit, and shame, as they seek to replace them with gentleness, patience, and truth.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 11, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, JR., a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KING thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, the debt limit bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will recess subject to the call of the Chair to allow for a Republican special caucus meeting with President Obama.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this is my opinion. If we allow the United States to default on its debt for the first time in our glorious history, it will be a black mark on our reputation, and that is a gross understatement. There will be a financial disaster, and it will spark a global recession.

As I indicated when I began, this is my opinion, but this is not my opinion alone. If we listen to the economic leaders of this country, respected economists, bankers, and business leaders, this is what they say.

For example, yesterday the chief executive officer of the American Express, whose company is valued at almost \$80 billion, said this about default:

What's important to understand is if the United States hits the debt ceiling and is unable to pay its debts, the consequences will be immediate and dramatic. . . . If the U.S. defaults, the [global financial] system literally unwinds.

So no one misinterprets what he said, I will read it again.

What's important to understand is if the United States hits the debt ceiling and is unable to pay its debts, the consequences will be immediate and dramatic. . . . If the U.S. defaults, the [global financial] system literally unwinds.

His dire warning has been accepted and echoed by reasonable Members of Congress, including many Republicans. Even Speaker BOEHNER admitted in 2011, the last time Republicans forced this country to the brink of default, that failing to pay the bills would be catastrophic. He said:

Not raising the debt limit would have serious—very serious—implications for the worldwide economy and jobs here in America.

But this year Speaker BOEHNER seemed willing to risk default day after day, holding the full faith and credit of the United States hostage to extract extreme political concessions.

Yesterday it was very good to see my Republican colleagues, some at least,

come around to the idea of a clean bill to avert default. Think about that. They are talking about extending the debt ceiling for 2 months—for 6 weeks. Please.

But some have admitted the clean bill to avoid default should be the standard. I certainly agree with that.

I repeat, we do not believe a 6-week delay of a catastrophic default is enough to give the economy the confidence it needs to continue growing and recovering. Using their theory, we would have another one of these periods of bedlam in Washington before the most important purchasing season at any time during the year, Christmas, right before Christmas, when people are beginning to buy things for Christmas.

We will vote tomorrow on a 15-month measure to ensure the United States lives up to its obligations, giving the economy certainty and stability over the long term. But Congress's work to restore faith in government won't end with avoiding default.

The Federal Government is still closed for business, causing hardship and heartbreak for millions of American families, such as the Trowbridge family in Reno, NV. They have a 17-year-old son Austin who was scheduled to receive an experimental bone marrow transplant at NIH in Washington. Without the transplant, he could die, just as his brother did 5 years ago from the same disease.

But the National Institutes of Health are shuttered, along with the rest of the government and the Centers for Disease Control. The assistant Democratic leader has laid out 79 different programs that would need to be reinstated to open the government, and we are getting them piecemeal—piecemeal.

In the meantime, people are suffering, not only Federal employees but the people who depend on them. We have four States that are trying to work something out with Secretary Jewell to have the States pay for opening national parks.

It is time for Republicans to give the Trowbridge family and others some relief. Reopen the government, the whole government, so kids such as Austin can get the treatment they need. Families of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty can't get the death benefits they deserve. Why? Because the government is closed. Every American family who relies on the Federal Government can't get the help and services they need.

Reopen the Federal Government, let's pay our bills, and then let's negotiate a sensible budget solution that

secures our country's long-term fiscal leads.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Shortly I will join my Republican colleagues at the White House. It will be a good time to engage in a frank exchange of ideas with the President, if that is what he is looking for. But if all the President wants is to drag us over there to say he won't negotiate, that won't be particularly productive.

Throughout this crisis, the President has taken what you might call an unorthodox approach to governing. His basic position could be summed up in basically three words: He won't negotiate.

I think that has left many Americans scratching their heads. I know the President and the Democratic leaders in Congress want to borrow more money without any strings attached. But the rest of us actually want to enact some commonsense reforms to get our debt under control, and we want to keep our commitments to the American people.

A key point is: Nobody wants a default. That is why, in 50 years of negotiations over multiple debt ceiling increases, we haven't had a single default, not a one. We have negotiated over debt ceilings for 50 years and never had a default. Let's put this hysterical talk of default behind us and instead start talking about finding solutions to the problems.

There are a variety of ways to get debt and spending under control, a lot of innovative reforms we should consider. But we need to talk to each other if we are going to make any of that happen.

I will bet that some of my Democratic friends have spending-cut ideas as well, and we would like to hear them. Let's sit down and talk this out. Members on both sides of the aisle in Congress are discussing solutions, and these discussions will continue as soon as we get back from the White House.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:40 a.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 1:15 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Kaine).

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, we are in the 11th day of the government shutdown. We have caused great harm to the people of this country. We have already caused harm. We have hurt the United States on the international front. The President, as I mentioned previously, was absent at the Asian economic summit. The Asian economic summit was the opportunity for America, the President of the United States, to be the headliner. Instead, the President of China, President Xi, became the headliner. There were questions asked about whether America is "open for business" with our trading partners. We have been hurt by this shutdown, make no mistake about it.

Our economy has suffered. Just the threat of defaulting—of not paying our bills—has hurt consumer confidence. Consumer confidence measures whether consumers are ready to go out and buy that car, buy that home, go on vacation. After the terrorist attacks on the country on September 11, 2001, consumer confidence dropped by about 8.8 percent. I could go over other calamitous moments in history, but the debt ceiling debate today is about twice as damaging to consumer confidence as the 9/11 attack. We are talking about paying our bills when we talk about raising the debt ceiling—bills that have already been incurred. We are just paying the bills.

Mr. President, we are hurting our country. We are hurting our economy. We are wasting taxpayer dollars. We all talk about dealing with the debt. But in the government shutdown, we have wasted over \$2 billion of taxpayer money as a result of it.

As the Presiding Officer knows, in this region—Maryland, Virginia, the District—we have over 300,000 Federal workers who are on furlough of the 800,000 who are furloughed nationwide. That has a direct impact on families as well as our economy. These Federal workers are not buying in their local shops, they are not eating in the local restaurants. I stopped into a restaurant for a sandwich over the last weekend. I said: How are things going? The shopowner said: Terrible. Social Security employees are not here. I cannot keep my business open without their business.

We have seen the direct impact. I have tried to put faces on these numbers. We could talk about the statistics and the numbers. Let's talk about people, the individual people I hear from—I know the Presiding Officer has received calls from constituents in Virginia. It is the same story.

Over a week ago we brought in Amy Fritz who works at the National Oce-

anic & Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). She is a Federal worker who is furloughed. She tracks weather conditions and works on the computer models to predict how storms will behave. It is a pretty important position she has. She was telling of the hardship to her family. The Baltimore Sun reported today that at NOAA it is not just the Federal workers, it is the contract workers who are suffering. The Sun cited the example of Tiffany House, a person who lives in Hyattsville, MD. She is a single mom, a contract employee of NOAA, who has been laid off as a result of the shutdown. It is more than just 800,000 Federal workers; we have the contract workers who have been laid off as a result of the shutdown.

She said, "Even though we're furloughed and we are not getting paid, the bills keep coming."

There are a lot of hard-working families who live paycheck to paycheck. We are 11 days into this government shutdown. Families are wondering what they are going to do when it comes to paying their bills.

The Sun reported about Keith Tate from Hyattsville. He works for FM Talent Source in Silver Spring. Almost 30 percent of their contract employees, 92 people in total, have been laid off. He was starting work on October 1—his luck. He was looking forward to it. He went to work on October 1 but then was furloughed as a result of the government shutdown.

The effect goes well beyond individual people that you would expect, like Federal employees and contractors. I have a friend, Hugh Sisson, who started Heavy Seas Brewery in Baltimore. It is one of America's great craft breweries. He is doing a great job and hiring people. You may say, "How does this affect him? He sells beer." Well, beer sales are affected by furloughs and a drop in consumer confidence, but it's worse than that. The Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB) employees at the Department of the Treasury have been furloughed. They're the people who review and approve new breweries, recipes, and labels. Hugh told me, "We have eight labels waiting for approval and 10 formulas we would like to start the process on but can't at this time."

Craft brewers like Hugh Sisson are innovators, constantly introducing new beers and seasonal beers, fresh products. They are being hurt all over the Nation as a result of the TTB staff being furloughed. They don't just hire their own staff; they support jobs in agriculture for barley and hops and other ingredients; in manufacturing for stainless steel kettles and fermenters and bottling and canning lines; and in distribution and retail. These are blue collar jobs and white collar jobs. All across America. These are jobs that won't be outsourced overseas. And this

shutdown is hurting America's craft brewers.

This shutdown is hurting our economy, hurting our country, hurting individuals, hurting taxpayers, hurting businesses. We can do much better. In my State of Maryland 10 percent of our workforce works for the Federal Government. The dedicated employees at these agencies do work that's important to all Americans, not just Marylanders.

As I pointed out previously, Harbor Point is one of the most important economic developments in downtown Baltimore, but it's RCRA site—that stands for the Resource Conservation & Recovery Act—which means it requires the consent of government, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), before this enormous economic development project can move forward. The people at EPA who would approve this project have been furloughed. This economic project now is on hold.

I could mention other examples of agencies that are critically important. I could also talk a lot more about private employment. It is not just government employment, it is private employment. Convergence Technology Consulting, located in Glen Burnie, MD, does cloud computing services for the Department of Defense. Twenty percent of the firm's 65 employees have been laid off.

TW Corporation in Hanover does cyber security work, and one-third of its 700 employees were furloughed. The list of the damages caused by the government shutdown goes on and on.

My message is pretty simple. We have to make sure government is open. We have to make sure we open government, and we have to pay our bills.

I understand we would like to have an agreement on a budget. I would like to have an agreement on the budget. For 6 months we have been trying to go to conference. The Senate passed a budget, the House passed a budget. They are different. The Senate budget, one that I supported, the Presiding Officer supported, would provide more resources for job growth by investing in infrastructure, by investing in education, by investing in research. Yes, we do provide more revenues by closing tax loopholes. We also start to rein in government spending and continue to do that. The House-passed budget has fewer of those investments. It does not close the loopholes in our Tax Code. That is what we have to negotiate between Democrats and Republicans. That is what we need to do. But the first order of business is to reopen government—all of it—and pay our bills, and then let's sit down and negotiate. We cannot wait. We must have government open.

I quoted before from the Baltimore Sun and the paper's analogy of negotiations. It is difficult when this is all one-sided. As Sunpapers said:

So when Speaker Boehner lashes out at President Obama for failing to negotiate, one has to ask, what is this thing he describes as negotiation? House Republicans are not merely leveraging their political position—as some dryly claim—they are threatening to do grievous harm to the global economy and the American public. The gun isn't raised to Mr. Obama's head or to the Senate's. The Democrats have no particular stake in passing a continuing resolution or in raising the debt ceiling other than keeping public order and doing what any reasonable person expects Congress to do. No, the gun is raised at the nation as a whole. That's why descriptions like "ransom" and "hostage" are not mere hyperbole, they are as close as the English language gets to accurately describing the GOP strategy.

Our message is clear to House Speaker BOEHNER: Put down the gun. Put it down. Open government. Allow us to pay our bills. And, yes, we want to sit down and work out our differences. Let the democratic process proceed. Open government, pay our bills, and then let's negotiate a fair and comprehensive agreement on the budget.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to speak for about 10 minutes. I understand there may be other Senators coming to the floor. I wanted to express my concerns about a few issues that are really important to the people of Louisiana.

I understand that the meeting with the President and the Republicans in the Senate—our friends—has just concluded. I am hoping there will be some positive steps forward from that meeting so we can open this government, remove the threat of an economic collapse, and get to the bargaining table to which we have literally been trying to achieve for 6 months. We voted 21 times in the Senate to get to the negotiating table in the budget conference, which is the first starting point to agree on numbers and revenues and spending limits.

As an appropriator—I would know this as chair of the Appropriations Committee—the next step in regular order is for each individual committee to negotiate with our Republican counterparts about how we allocate the money given to us through that budget process.

None of that has been able to happen—none. It is not because Democrats have been unwilling to go to the negotiating table, but because some friends on the other side have taken hostage innocents—Federal employees, the economy generally—and demanded things that are way beyond their abil-

ity to use their political leverage. So instead of using it correctly, they have held innocent hostages. It is very troubling, and I think it is very wrong. Hopefully, we are going to find a way forward.

FLOOD INSURANCE

I wanted to spend my time this afternoon talking about what I am hearing from the people in Louisiana, such as: Could you all get back to work because we have some serious problems that need to be solved. One of the problems—Mr. President, maybe your State is affected by this because the Presiding Officer has a coastal area, as do we—is fixing this very broken flood insurance system. In our State it is referred to as Biggert-Waters. It was named after the two Members of Congress who led this "reform effort."

MAXINE WATERS has subsequently completely disassociated herself with the legislation and said it was not the right thing to do. She has made several public statements. She has urged, as the leader in the House, with Republicans and Democrats, to get this fixed.

For the people of Louisiana, this is our No. 1 problem and challenge right now because a year and a half ago the Federal Government passed a law that was supposed to cure something. But the cure is worse than the disease. The disease was we had a flood insurance program that spent more money than it had taken in. And, yes, premiums were probably too low to sustain the program, but it was giving people at least some option and hope when they had a flood, so they could get some of the equity in their home protected and recovered.

This bill came along and was never debated on the Senate floor. It was stuck in a conference committee report, and now it is being implemented, and it is a disaster. We have 400,000 flood insurance policies in Louisiana, Texas has 700,000, Florida has over 2 million, Pennsylvania has over 75,000, and Virginia probably has between 40,000 and 50,000. I don't have the list in front of me.

The problem is that the law that passed had stated one goal: to make the program sustainable. But it left out an equally important aspect: to make it affordable. You can sustain a program all day long, but if nobody can afford to be in it, A, how long will it sustain itself? Not long at all. And, B, we are hurting the people we are trying to help the most.

A group of us have been working for quite some time on fixing this. These new regulations went into effect on October 1. We are going on 11 or 12 days—I forget the date, but we are past October 1. These new rates have gone into effect, and some people are seeing rates quadruple—or tenfold. Some of these rates are going up from \$300 a year to \$3,000. In some cases we have heard \$1,500 to \$30,000. I am not exaggerating

or making this up. This is all in the record.

We have a way to fix it. The good news I wanted to share on the floor today is that we had 24 Senators, Republicans and Democrats, come together this week and send a “dear colleague” letter to our leadership—to the Republican leadership and the House leadership—to say that we are very close to a compromise that will do two things: It will give us time to get the affordability study that was supposed to be done actually done. It will allow FEMA to potentially—with some oversight from Congress—set rates that would keep the program functioning but not jeopardize people’s equity in their homes.

It would, of course, remove the automatic trigger provision that has been very detrimental in the law, which basically says: The rates will stay low, but the minute people put a house up for sale or sell a house, whatever grandfathered rate they had is gone. And it doesn’t go up 25 percent a year, it goes up to where it should be. In some cases that is a move from \$1,000 a year to \$30,000 a year. It makes their house worthless, and that is what is happening to thousands of people. They have lost equity in their home. It is one of many problems this Congress has to fix. We can’t fix any of them if we can’t get back to work. We need the officials that have been laid off at FEMA to go back to work.

One point I want to make today is let’s find a way forward to negotiate. I hope part of the negotiation could potentially be a fix to Biggert-Waters. I want to thank Senator MERKLEY from Oregon, Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey, Senator WICKER from Mississippi, and Senator VITTER from Louisiana. Senator ISAKSON has been giving us some good input. I want to thank the realtors and the bankers because they realized that we made a mistake and that the law we passed was not a good one. Sometimes that happens.

We have to fix it. We don’t have to fix the whole of it, but we are working on some pieces that must be amended so that it accomplishes the goal of having a program and so that taxpayers do not have to pick up a big tab every year. It will allow real estate markets to function, people to be able to retain equity in their home, and to pay their fair share. It will also encourage smart growth and development.

Also—and very importantly, which is part of the problem with Biggert-Waters—the bill we are trying to fix didn’t even recognize levees. I don’t know if the Presiding Officer has a lot of levees in Virginia, but we have to have them in Louisiana because we are below sea level. We have been that way for 300 years. We moved there below sea level. We had to be there to create the Port of New Orleans.

Thomas Jefferson leveraged the whole Federal Treasury to buy us for 3 cents an acre, if I remember correctly—the bulk of 19 States. It was the greatest real estate purchase in the history of our country. Alaska may argue, but we think the Louisiana Territory is equally as valuable, if not more so, and our State is proud to carry that name. People understand the history of this.

Why would Thomas Jefferson leverage the whole Treasury of the United States to buy something that was not worthwhile. Of course it is worthwhile. It was worthwhile then, and it is worthwhile now.

People live there because we run the biggest port system in the world, and we need to continue to live there with all of the industries—oil and gas, and fisheries, et cetera.

This Biggert-Waters bill undermines our region’s ability to function. We produce 17 percent of the GDP for the country, so this is not a small parochial issue to the Southern States: Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, et cetera—but it also affects interior states. We have seen what happened in Colorado. We have seen what happened to the east coast States, with New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, et cetera.

Let’s get to the negotiating table. Let’s work together, as we know we can, and let’s put on the top of that agenda a potential fix for Biggert-Waters.

Again, I thank my colleagues for working so cordially together even in this difficult time.

Let me move to another subject for a minute and put into the RECORD, in the event that my colleagues—do I have to ask for an additional 3 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this letter that I received. I think all of the Members received this letter that was addressed to Senator REID, Senator MCCONNELL, Speaker BOEHNER, and Representative PELOSI from the National Governors Association that came yesterday.

Governor Mary Fallin and Governor John Hickenlooper signed the letter on behalf of all the Governors, and it says:

The nation’s governors urge Congress and the Administration to quickly reopen the federal government.

The fiscal health of states is inextricably linked to the fiscal stability of the federal government, and while state economies have improved, a failure by our national government to secure a solution to the current government budget issues undermines our states’ recovery and endangers the U.S. economy.

It goes on to say:

States have thus far managed to avoid closing or suspending most programs and services by using carry-over funds or, in some cases, by using state spending to fill in

missing federal dollars. However, states are not in the position to be the bank for the federal government.

As a former Governor, the Presiding Officer understands this. I was a former Treasurer. I most certainly understand that the budget of Louisiana is almost 70 percent Federal funding. So when the Federal Government cuts off that funding, it starts to affect the way States—and the 300-plus cities in my State—operate, and it affects our private sector partners that work with us to provide State-level and community services. It affects nonprofits such as Catholic Charities, who are running some of our low-income housing, our justice programs in some of our neighborhoods and communities.

This shutdown is just bad. It is bad all around. It should not have happened. We need to get this government open and operating, which will help our States and their economic recovery plans to start focusing on fixing things. We need to fix things like Biggert-Waters and repeal that old insurance reform bill so we can find a better way forward.

I might also mention two other things quickly. What is also happening in our State today—I got news this morning—is that permitting in the Gulf of Mexico for offshore oil and gas drilling is now shut down. Right at the time when America is about to overtake Russia as the largest domestic producer of gas and oil, right when we are about to take first place, the Republican tea party has shut the government down and shut down permitting in the gulf.

Ever since the Deepwater Horizon, we have been fighting to get that back up and going. Now we find it has been shut down again. The people I represent cannot take another shutdown of permitting.

We have levees to build. We have a big problem in our river parishes, as we call them, along Lake Pontchartrain. We have Morganza to the gulf, which is an important levee project for Houma, which is one of the centers for oil and gas production. This not only helps the people of Houma and Terrebonne Parish, but it helps the whole region and the whole country. It is sort of like a little Houston, if you will. Houma is like a little Houston. We don’t have all of the corporate structures, but we have all of the know-how, the goods and services, the providers, the boats, the planes, the ships, and the helicopters. They might have the gleaming office towers in Houston, but we have a lot of the hard workers in Houma.

The levee that protects them and their homes is now basically—the plans for it are shut down along with this tea party shutdown.

NATIONAL
GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, October 10, 2013.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID, SENATOR MCCONNELL, SPEAKER BOEHNER, AND REPRESENTATIVE PELOSI: The nation's governors urge Congress and the Administration to quickly reopen the federal government.

The fiscal health of states is inextricably linked to the fiscal stability of the federal government, and while state economies have improved, a failure by our national government to secure a solution to the current budget issues undermines our states' recovery and endangers the U.S. economy.

States have thus far managed to avoid closing or suspending most programs and services by using carryover funds or, in some cases, by using state spending to fill in for missing federal dollars. However, states are not in a position to be the bank for the federal government. As this impasse continues, we call on Congress and the Administration to commit to fully reimbursing states and territories for the federal expenses they absorb during the shutdown. These expenses include funding for programs, state employees who are paid through federal funds and any other outlays that would normally have been supported by federal funds.

As governors, our citizens expect us to work together to balance our budgets and make government work. We will do whatever we can to serve our citizens and deliver the core services they need and expect during this uncertain time. In return, we ask our federal partners to quickly find a path forward that reimburses states for incurred federal expenses; restores certainty in the federal budget process; creates long-term stability; and strengthens the fiscal condition of the nation for the benefit of all citizens.

Sincerely,

Governor MARY FALLIN.
Governor JOHN HICKENLOOPER.

It is time to open our government. It is time to get back to work, solve real problems, and negotiate in good faith without taking innocent hostages. There are too many innocents being harmed, whether it is children with cancer, whether it is businesspeople who have put everything on the line for their business and through no fault of their own now have no customers coming in the front door and can't pay their note—and the banks aren't going to wait until we get our act together.

I thank the Presiding Officer. I wanted to, if I could, take 1 more minute to speak on behalf of the people who don't have a Senator here; that is, the District of Columbia.

The District of Columbia is technically not a part of the Federal Government. They are not an agency of the Federal Government. They are not a department of the Federal Government. The District of Columbia is the

district in which the Federal Government resides. Contrary to popular belief, they raise most of their money through their own tax revenue generated—about 75 percent local. Twenty-five percent of the budget of the District of Columbia—which has about 750,000 people, which is a pretty big city as cities go—comes from the people who live here. They have been caught up as if they were an agency of the Federal Government.

Let me argue on their behalf to my colleagues and suggest that they are a group of innocents—a city. Baltimore's budget is not shut down, Richmond's budget is not shut down, New Orleans' budget is not shut down, Chicago's budget is not shut down, New York's budget is not shut down, San Francisco's budget is not shut down, but the DC government is shut down because of this threat. They have gotten caught up. They should be let go, and we can then negotiate on all other things.

I think the President understands this. I know majority leader HARRY REID understands this. I am hoping minority leader MITCH MCCONNELL will give his support so this can be done in a bipartisan way, recognizing this is the Nation's Capital—not asking for any special preference for them, just allowing them to use their own money and operate their own city while we try to figure out how to get the rest of the government open and operating. I hope we can do that today. We have been working across the aisle.

I thank Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for her leadership. The District of Columbia does not have Senators, so a few of us have to stand and speak for the people of the District, and I am happy to try to do that on occasion when I, of course, believe strongly in what they are asking.

I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, it is no secret to anybody that the American people are frustrated and they are disgusted with what is going on in Washington.

The Presiding Officer may have seen The Onion magazine, the satirical magazine that ran a story which says that at a time when 5 percent of the Amer-

ican people approve of what is going on in Congress, The Onion reported psychiatrists are deeply worried about the mental health of 5 percent of the American public. In other words, all over this country, regardless of political persuasion, people literally cannot understand what is going on, and they have every reason to be outraged and frustrated because so many people today are being hurt.

We can disagree about the Affordable Care Act. We as a nation can disagree about how we address Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, global warming, or any other issue out there. But what should not be happening is that this government and the American people should not be held hostage by an extreme right wing of the Republican Party saying: Well, yeah, we lost the election by 5 million votes, we lost two seats in the Senate, we lost seats in the House, but nonetheless, unless we get the agenda we campaigned on and lost, we are going to shut down the Federal Government. We are going to punish millions of Federal employees and tens of millions of taxpayers who paid for Federal services. Also, for the first time in the history of the United States of America, we are not going to pay our bills and as a result perhaps thrust the American financial system and the world's financial system into a horrendous recession.

What the American people are saying over and over, regardless of political persuasion, is, yes, we can disagree on issues; no, we cannot bring the U.S. Government to a halt and default on our payments because a particular faction disagrees on certain legislation.

Interestingly enough, a couple of days ago I gathered that we had to bring the government to a halt and that we had to not pay our bills and bring the world's financial system into crisis because of the horrors of ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act. That was the reason. Well, 2 days have come and gone and guess what. It is not the Affordable Care Act. That is no longer being discussed. Today, I gather—I haven't seen the news in the last 15 minutes, but the last I heard the reason we are shutting down the government and threatening not to pay our bills is that we are spending too much money and the deficit is too high. I gather that is the latest reason.

Clearly, a deficit of \$700 billion and a debt of \$16.7 trillion is too much, but let's make a couple of points about that issue.

First, in the last 3 years we have cut the deficit in half. A few years ago it was \$1.4 trillion, and today it is \$700 billion. That is not an insignificant effort.

Second, and perhaps most important, we have to understand how we got to where we are in terms of the debt and in terms of the deficit. Do we have a large deficit because we are spending

too much on Social Security? Well, actually not because Social Security is independently funded through the payroll tax and hasn't added one nickel to the deficit. So it is not Social Security. We will talk about Medicare and Medicaid in a moment. But the reason we have seen a spike in the deficit in recent years has to do with the fact that many of my deficit hawk Republican friends—and some Democrats—voted for the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, but they forgot to pay for that war—just a slip; they just forgot about it—and those wars are going to cost between \$3 trillion and \$6 trillion. So I want everyone to remember that the great deficit hawks who are busy trying to cut every program that working families in this country need forgot to pay for wars in Iraq and Afghanistan that will cost between \$3 trillion and \$6 trillion.

The third issue is that our great deficit hawks had no problem during the Bush era giving huge tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country.

Fourth, of course, is that as a result of deregulation and greed and recklessness and illegal behavior, Wall Street brought us to a financial collapse and a recession, with the result that revenue substantially declined.

I raise those issues, giving a little bit of history about how we got into the deficit today, because now, I guess, Congressman RYAN and others have decided that the reason we shut down the government is not because of ObamaCare, it is because there is too much spending, and that translates into their desire to cut Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and to cut other vitally important programs for the middle-class and working families of this country.

Before we talk about the pain that would be caused by making savage cuts in Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, it is important to put this discussion in a broader context. If we go out to the American people and ask people in Virginia and people in Vermont and people all over this country and if we look at virtually every single poll that has been done in recent years asking the American people what they consider to be the most important issues facing them, do we know what they say? They say the deficit is important, but what is much more important is the issue of high unemployment and the economy in general. That is what every single poll shows. And the American people are right.

The deficit is important. What is even more important is addressing the reality that almost 14 percent of our workforce—if we count those people who have given up looking for work and are working part time, almost 14 percent of our workforce today is unemployed. What the American people are saying to Congress is create jobs, deal with unemployment.

The other issue out there that all across this country people are deeply worried about is that most of the new jobs being created—and this has been the case for a number of years now—most of the jobs being created are part-time, low-wage jobs.

How is somebody supposed to survive working for \$10 an hour and getting 25 hours of work a week? You cannot do it, and we are seeing more and more of those types of jobs in the economy—by the way, jobs that provide little or no benefits.

What the American people are saying is raise the minimum wage. I cannot remember what the last poll was, but surely more than 70 percent of the American people have said: A minimum wage of \$7.25 an hour is a starvation wage. We need to raise the minimum wage.

Anybody who has kids in college today understands it is harder and harder for working-class and middle-class families to send their kids to college. The American people are saying to us: Do something. You tell us what is true—that it is hard to make it into the middle class unless kids have a college education. Well, do something to make college affordable. Do not have my kid leaving college or graduate school \$50,000 in debt or \$80,000 in debt. Do something about that.

Anybody who drives anywhere in America, in Vermont or in Indiana or anywhere else, understands that our infrastructure—our roads, our bridges, wastewater plants, water plants, our rail system—is deteriorating rapidly, and they say: Do something about the infrastructure.

As global warming is perceived as more and more of a crisis, people are telling us: Do something about energy efficiency. Why are we emitting greenhouse gas emissions into the air when we can be a much more energy-efficient country?

On and on it goes. The American people are hurting, and they want us to address their problems.

The other point that needs to be made is that when we talk about the financial and economic problems facing this country, it is terribly important to take an overview of what is going on in the economy in general. There is no debate about this: The middle class in America today is disappearing. Median family income today is less than it was 24 years ago. Despite all of the increase in productivity and technology, median family income is less today than it was 24 years ago. That is rather extraordinary.

We have 46.5 million people in this country living in poverty—more than at any time in the history of this country; 22.5 percent of our kids live in poverty. That is the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world. Poverty among senior citizens is increasing. So we have major economic challenges that we face.

Our Republican friends, who a few days ago were telling us they had to shut down the government and threaten not to pay our bills because of the horrors of ObamaCare, now apparently are no longer concerned about ObamaCare, and they are now concerned about the national debt and they are concerned about our spending.

Well, this is what I want to say: If we want to have a conversation or a conference or a discussion or a special committee—call it whatever you want—we cannot just look at cutting Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, as Congressman RYAN and many others want. We have to put into that discussion how it happens that one out of four major corporations in this country does not pay a nickel in Federal income taxes.

Do you think that should be part of the discussion? I think it should be. We have to put into that discussion how it happens that corporate America is putting their money in the Cayman Islands and in other tax havens and avoiding paying tens and tens of billions of dollars in Federal taxes. Do we need that in the discussion? I think we do. If you are going to talk about a conference on the economy, the conference must include the need to create millions of jobs, it must include the need to raise the minimum wage, it must include pay equity so that women get the same wages men get for the work they are doing, and it must include rebuilding our infrastructure.

This discussion on the economy cannot simply happen on Republican terms. We live in a country in which the middle class is in rapid decline while the wealthiest people and the largest corporations are doing phenomenally well. Any discussion we have—after we reopen the government, after we pay our bills—has to include that important reality. We cannot and we must not—for moral and economic reasons—balance the budget on the backs of the elderly, the children, the sick, and low-income people. The wealthiest people and the largest corporations have to get involved, have to pay their fair share of taxes, and we have to create the millions of jobs this country desperately needs.

As I see the constantly changing agenda on the part of my Republican colleagues as to why they have shut down the government, I want to make it clear that the first thing that has to happen is they have to understand this government has to be reopened, and it has to be reopened with a strong budget that lasts for the rest of this fiscal year. And we have to pay our debts so this country and the entire global economy does not descend into financial chaos. We have to do that, and if Mr. BOEHNER were to give the Members of the House of Representatives a vote on that issue today, I expect it would win.

But as we go forward and we discuss broader issues, as we should, the agenda cannot simply be the agenda of the Republican candidates for President and Vice President who lost by 5 million votes. The agenda has to be what the American people want, and that is expanding the middle class, creating jobs, raising wages, rebuilding our infrastructure, pay equity, and making college affordable. Those are the issues that have to be on the agenda as well.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my friends in Vermont watch what is going on, and it is hard to explain it to them—especially people who are hard working, who rely one way or the other on government programs and they do not come through.

It was in the press today about the polls, saying how angry people are at the small group in the other body who has held things up. And I understand that. It is probably difficult for those people, who work hard every single day, pay their bills, trust in their government, and then see what is happening.

I appreciated the meeting with the President yesterday. The distinguished Presiding Officer was there. I know how much President Obama wants to have the shutdown end, have people go back to work, have the United States pay its bills. And I agree with him. I think the vast majority of Americans agree with him. Now he has to get a tiny minority in the Congress to agree with him. It is unfortunate—it is unfortunate—that they do not because ultimately we should be serving the best interests of our country, not what might work at a tea party rally or a fundraiser to get one's face on television.

I will give an example. When September 30 came and went, it was not just the Federal Government that shut down. The farm bill extension also expired. I can speak to this with some sense of knowledge of how that works. I have been able to serve on the Senate Agriculture Committee for 38 years. I have served as the chair of it. We have a superb chair now in DEBBIE STABENOW. But I have seen both Republicans and Democrats in that committee traditionally over the years come together, work closely together.

I think of two people who were nominees of their parties for President who were miles apart in political philosophy—Senator George McGovern, a

Democrat, and Senator Bob Dole, a Republican; one a liberal Democrat, the other a conservative Republican—but on the farm bill, on the nutrition programs, they worked closely together for what was best for America, what was best for the country.

We passed an excellent farm bill, a bipartisan farm bill in this body, in the Senate. But because the other body would not take it up and either pass it or vote to improve it, the farm bill extension expired. This one-two punch of political reality is needlessly harming our Nation. It is leaving farmers with great uncertainty about the future of vital farm programs, all the while with no staff at USDA to answer farmers' questions.

I know the distinguished Presiding Officer has a lot of agriculture in his State. His State is much larger than mine. But we also have a lot of agriculture in the State of Vermont.

There is a basic essential responsibility of Congress to fund the government. Why has that been ignored? Regular business is replaced by bumper-sticker politics. This shutdown is and was entirely avoidable. It is perpetuated by the reckless leadership of the House that is willing to imperil the economy and negatively impact every single American family.

They are not asking for compromise. Compromise has already happened here in the Senate. We conceded to the House terms. We adopted and leader HARRY REID had to fight to get the votes to give the House what they had asked for by adopting an appropriations bill at the funding level the House wanted, which maintains sequestration.

But even though he had been told by the House leadership that would get us back, that would have the government stay open, after we did it they said: Oops, we changed our mind. They moved the goalposts again.

You cannot run government like that. That is by whim. That is not by commitment. That is by changing your views by the moment. It is not by keeping your word. Anyone claiming that the Senate has been unwilling to compromise has conveniently ignored the fact that the Senate came forward and passed a continuing resolution at the level the House requested.

So I, like the American people, certainly like my fellow Vermonters, am tired of having a political process obstructed. It is time to reopen the government for business. Stop the silly season. Stop the games. Stop rushing to the TV cameras to get your face on there and say: I am the only person serving America, as I try to destroy America.

Let's reopen. For the farmers in Vermont who have found their local USDA office dark, they know the shutdown is even more troubling, because it has diverted attention from the now-

expired farm bill. This manufactured crisis is making it next to impossible to reach compromise on this important agriculture, rural development, and nutrition legislation.

The bipartisan Senate farm bill would provide \$25 billion in savings. This is a bill both Republicans and Democrats voted for in the Agriculture Committee and on this floor—\$25 billion in savings that could be applied toward reducing the federal deficit.

But no; instead, the House forced us into the shutdown, which is costing the Federal Government hundreds of millions of dollars a day, \$1.6 billion a week, for nothing. So they can go on television and say: Look at us. Rally to us because we are standing up for America.

No, you are costing American taxpayers \$1.6 billion a week. That is straight to the taxpayers. But more and more of the damage of the government shutdown is spreading across the Nation. In every city and every community, with each passing day, the State governments, local governments feel the pinch and may go bankrupt.

We heard last week that the CME Group, the world's largest futures exchange, informed their customers that the shutdown and USDA furloughs could affect dairy and livestock contracts. While much of Wall Street is worried they will not have the Bureau of Labor Statistics employment numbers this month, on Main Street and our Nation's farms, our agriculture businesses, the concerns are growing about missing agriculture pricing information that impacts dairy and livestock futures contracts and options for milk, cheese, butter, and other dairy products. That may sound esoteric to some, but if you are one of those farmers who gets up before dawn, works hard all day long, until after dark, 7 days a week, paying your bills, paying your mortgage, being an integral part of the community, this is real. The farmers are doing their work and their job. We ought to do ours.

Let me give you an example of the uncertainty the shutdown is imposing on farmers and businesses from coast to coast. Vermont's own Cabot Creamery Cooperative, which makes some of Vermont's award-winning cheeses, could be hit by the missing pricing information. In recent years, Cabot, being good business people, has increased the use of futures contracts as an active part of its risk management effort. It makes sense. We have seen many farmers and food companies and dairy cooperatives across the country do the same after the disastrous collapse in milk prices in 2009.

But the USDA staff is furloughed, and farmers and businesses like Cabot can no longer have a daily or weekly report of cash prices for agriculture products. These are the benchmarks of these futures contracts that are used

to hedge against risk and big price swings.

To make matters worse, the entire USDA Web site is shut down, keeping farmers from seeing and using previous agriculture reports from the agency. These are the same people who are working long hours. They are obeying the rules. They are doing what is expected of them. But suddenly they are having their legs taken out from under them.

I have heard from the Vermont Economic Development Authority. We call it VEDA. It is Vermont's statewide economic development finance lender. They are focused on supporting Vermont industrial, commercial, and agriculture enterprises. Nearly their entire agricultural portfolio, \$70 million—probably not much in some States, but a lot in my little State—intersects in some way with USDA. Their ability to service current loans and work on new agriculture loans is quickly freezing up. The list is growing for the number of customers that are going to be locked out in the cold because the shutdown is quickly causing the whole agricultural lending scene to seize up.

I am hearing from our apple growers in Vermont. We have a very short harvest this time of the year in Vermont. Fall harvest, and then it snows. They are in the middle of a fantastic, long-awaited harvest. They have to keep one eye on the weather forecast on how their crops are doing, and the other on the Department of Labor to ensure that their apple harvest workforce, which is a seasonal workforce, will actually be there.

Many of our farms use the Federal H-2A temporary worker program. I am starting to hear a litany of problems due to the tea party shutdown of the Federal Government. Farmers are unable to get their workers required Social Security numbers, because the Social Security Administration is not issuing new numbers and cards during the shutdown—during the tea party shutdown.

These farmers are Republicans, Democrats, Independents. They do not want to play politics. They want to play by the rules. They cannot understand why the tea party is playing politics with their business. It is resulting in farmers needing to pay huge amounts of backup withholding taxes, which they otherwise would not need to do if their workers would be able to acquire Social Security numbers.

Farmers needing new H-2A workers are being stymied in the application process since the Department of Labor is not administering the necessary parts of that process thanks to the artificial, made-in-Congress, tea party shutdown. The ripple effects of the shutdown are spreading ominously outward across Vermont and every other State.

I spoke about one aspect of agriculture. My colleagues represent all parts of this country and could talk about a whole lot of other aspects of agriculture. That is just one multi-multi-multibillion dollar industry across this country that is being hurt and ultimately being devastated. Some will go out of business, all because of the tea party shutdown.

All these problems could be solved right now. They can be solved this afternoon. So let's stop this shameful politicking. The House should end the shutdown. Vote on the Senate-passed continuing resolution. After all, it has the numbers the House asked for. All they have to do is keep their word. We in the Senate did. Now it is time for them to.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, there are two issues wrapped together right now that are causing dire consequences for people all across the country. The first, as we know and as we have been debating, is the government shutdown and all that has happened in terms of people being hurt, jobs being lost, small businesses not being able to get the loans they need, people not being able to complete their mortgage requirements to get the homes they want, the concerns about health and safety and all of the other issues, children, what is happening to so many people, senior citizens, veterans, and so on—very, very serious.

This is the 11th day of the government shutdown that is costing us jobs, slowing the economy, and hurting families all across the country. It is an absolute drag on the economy, on our markets and on, frankly, America's standing in the world, which we should all be concerned about right now.

It is, frankly, an embarrassment that in the greatest, wealthiest country in the world our government is shut down while a small minority tries to score political points. Unfortunately, that is what has been happening.

The second issue is also very important; that is, the lapse of a farm bill, the agriculture and food policy bill in this country. The farm bill has been actually expired for 376 days—376 days—because it ended on September 30 of 2012.

Last January there was a partial extension that extended subsidies that we all said should be eliminated as it did not include reforms and did not include deficit reduction, but there was a partial extension until September 30 and that has also lapsed.

I know the distinguished Presiding Officer from Indiana, who is a member of my committee, fights very hard for Indiana. I am grateful he is a member of our committee. I know the Senator understands and shares my tremendous concern and urgency, both about the government shutdown and that we are seeing agricultural programs and rural economic development shut down because we don't have a farm bill.

Nowhere is this felt more strongly now than in South Dakota. The Presiding Officer and I are not from South Dakota, but we have colleagues in the Senate who have been speaking on the floor. I have talked to the Senators from South Dakota who are deeply concerned, as well as the Senators from North Dakota.

In South Dakota last Friday, October 4, an early autumn blizzard killed an estimated 75,000 head of cattle. This is one of the many pictures of what is happening as a result of this blizzard. Many producers lost half of their entire herd. Keep in mind that many thousands of these cows would have produced calves in the spring. These losses are huge for ranchers and families and will be felt for many years to come. These cattle ranchers and their families have no safety net, zero safety net. They don't receive direct payment subsidies. They now have zero safety net. They only had livestock disaster plans which expired on October 1, 2011, 741 days ago. Their losses are expected to reach into the tens of millions of dollars.

Our Senate farm bill, which we passed with strong bipartisan majorities last year and this year—we have actually done it twice—includes permanent livestock disaster assistance for these ranchers' families to make sure ranchers, such as those in South Dakota, don't go bankrupt, which is what is going to happen if we don't get this farm bill in place as soon as possible.

But there is no farm bill. Even if there were, those farmers wouldn't be able to get help because the farmers can't document their losses or get the answers they need from the Farm Service Agency offices because they are closed due to the shutdown.

These ranchers, such as many other ranchers across the country, are getting a one-two punch by not being able to go to their local FSA office to get the help they need, while at the same time not having the long-term certainty of agricultural policy and a safety net when there is a catastrophe.

Three things have come together to make this a major disaster for ranchers, such as the need for a farm bill with livestock disaster assistance, which we have. We have a great livestock disaster assistance program in our bill.

The good news is the House has one as well. If we can get a farm bill done,

which could be done any day—we are willing to be a part of any agreement anyone does—and we will be able to help those South Dakota ranchers. Of the three items, one is that we don't yet have the final farm bill, even though the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, has done its job twice.

Secondly, we have a government shutdown that is not allowing these ranchers to get the help they need.

Thirdly, we have a blizzard.

Two out of three of these are self-inflicted. Think about it. Because there is no farm bill, because there is a government shutdown, somewhere ranchers are going to lose everything—their homes, their land, everything—because of the freak blizzard in early October. We can debate the larger issues around that as well.

The irony is those ranchers in South Dakota have 3 days under the law to dispose of their dead cattle. They were just hit by blizzard, suffered unbelievable losses, and they have 3 days to clean it up. They don't get an extension. They can't kick the can down the road. They can't wait forever either. They can't wait any longer for us to get a farm bill done. This needs to be done right now. If there is the political will to do it and there is support from the Speaker to do it, we can get this done quickly.

Those cattle ranchers aren't alone. Producers in the Midwest, the Northwest, the West, and much of the South went through one of the worst droughts in a generation last summer. Many producers sold off most of their herds because there wasn't the grass for the cattle to graze on. Feed was scarce and expensive. As a result, cattle inventories dropped to their lowest levels in five decades, 50 years. For all of us who enjoy eating meat, we are seeing the consequences of the lowest level in five decades. Farmers all across the country suffered from this drought. In addition, fruit growers from my State suffered heavy losses last year from an early spring followed by a late frost, and our cherry growers were some of the hardest hit. In fact, they were virtually wiped out. Their crop was wiped out last year. They also don't have a safety net. Similar to ranchers, they aren't eligible for direct payment subsidies and they weren't able to get any crop insurance either.

We worked hard in this farm bill to make sure there were risk management tools, not only subsidies because a farmer grows something. As taxpayers, we can't afford to do that. It is not the right thing to do. We have a deficit we have to address, and it makes no sense. We work hard to make sure the risk management tools are available to help farmers and ranchers manage their risk when there is a disaster such as South Dakota, but there is no help until we get the farm bill signed into law.

For all the men and women, all the families—and the vast majority we are talking about are middle-class families—small farmers, medium-sized farmers who are working hard from sunrise to sunset, day-in and day-out with the riskiest business in the world, they can't kick the can down the road. When the crop is ready to be harvested, they have to do it.

They are looking at us and saying: Get the job done. Get the farm bill done now.

All of those middle-class families and 16 million people in this country have jobs because of agriculture. They are saying we have waited long enough. How many disasters have to happen without the right tools before this gets done? With 16 million people, the biggest bill we are going to pass this year is the farm bill. This is for rural economic development, energy, food-related industries, conservation efforts, our help for people who are caught up in their own personal economic disasters, which is so critical, and they are all counting on us.

The men and women who are working hard to bring in the harvest are counting on us to get this done. We did a farm bill. I am grateful to leaders on both sides of the aisle who came together. That is how I know we can stop this shutdown and pay our bills because we have done things together in the Senate. We need our colleagues in the House to be willing to step in and do the same.

People have waited long enough. It is time to get it done, and it is time to get it done now.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I have been on this floor many times over the past 2½ years, and here we are again, talking about yet another fiscal cliff, another drama, another soap opera playing out before us.

The American people are wondering what in the world is going on down there in Washington? How come we can't get resolution to some of these problems? Why can't we remove the dark cloud of uncertainty about the fiscal future of this country? It is stifling economic growth.

We are growing at an anemic 4-to-5-year rate of less than 1 percent. That does not put people back to work. That does not solve our unemployment problem. It only makes it worse. That does not revive an economy. Even with all the new discoveries in energy and the

lower cost of manufacturing and more competitiveness, we have not revived the economy for the American people—whether they have just graduated from school with a degree and can't find a job except at maybe a fast-food restaurant, or whether they are a middle-aged man or woman who had their hours cut back, or they have been laid off; whether it is a family trying to save for their children's education—people are hurting all the way up and down the line and it is frustrating. It is frustrating for all of us.

It is particularly frustrating for the people I represent in Indiana, and I think for all Americans, to watch the dysfunction taking place in Washington, this inability to come together to find a solution to our problems, and this careening from cliff to cliff, debt crisis to debt crisis; with people on edge and markets on edge, up 300 1 day and down 250 the next, waiting for any glimmer of hope for some solution—or, reacting with gloom and doom if we fail to come forward with a solution.

Now we have a government shutdown; now the clock is ticking toward the debt limit expiration, and we have not yet come to any resolution or solution to these problems. People are sick and tired of this broken process here in Washington, DC. I am sick and tired of it. My colleagues are sick and tired of it. Yet we have not been able to find a solution that addresses the problem.

Republicans just came from a constructive 2-hour meeting at the White House with the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of Treasury. It is a step forward. It is not a Neil Armstrong step forward because it is not a giant leap for mankind. It is a baby step forward. And it is an important first step forward because unless you come to the table to negotiate, unless you are willing to open up where you are in the same room together sharing your concepts, your thoughts, and your concerns, you can't even begin to find a solution. So this was a step in the right direction.

The President met with House Republican Members yesterday and Senate Republican Members today. Our meeting was candid and transparent. Most everybody was able to say what was on their mind and talk about possible solutions.

I wish I could say we walked out and stood together, as has been done before in solving these types of problems between Presidents and Members of the leadership in both the House and the Senate. I wish I could say we were able to do that, but we weren't. But going from "I will not negotiate, period, don't even bother to even think about it," to, "Let's sit down and at least talk this through and see if we can come to a resolution" is a step forward. So I take some hope from that.

I made the decision in early 2010 to come back to the Senate to try and

solve what I thought were some of the most fundamental issues affecting the future of this country that perhaps we faced in a long time; namely, this continued deficit spending and plunge into debt, this accumulation of a debt that is so jeopardizing our future and our children's future and the future of America.

The passage of ObamaCare by one party without any bipartisan support, jammed through the Congress by a waiver of the rules, has turned into a nightmare—a nightmare of implementation. It is part of the fiscal problem. I didn't come here today to necessarily talk about that. I have been here before talking many times about what I think we need to do to address our health care problems—clearly in a different way than the Affordable Care Act.

We see unfolding before our eyes yet another dysfunctional piece of legislation that can't even be implemented, even though the party that passed this law has had 3½ years to implement it. We hit the October 1 date when people can start to enroll, and the systems aren't even up and ready. Now if this law had been in effect for 3 or 6 months, we could say they rushed it. It has been 3½ years—actually 3¾ years, and they still don't have it right. There still are major questions. This is an issue we must continue to deal with. We haven't been successful so far because we have not gotten any bipartisan support to make any significant reforms. That is part of our fiscal issue, and that fiscal issue is eating up the promise of America which has been given to every generation in the history of this country, and stands ready to be denied to the next generation and succeeding generations because of our inability to summon the political will to do what we all know we need to do.

We cannot keep spending more than we take in. We cannot keep borrowing money to cover that difference. We have seen in just the last 4½ years of this administration a staggering increase in the amount of debt we have accumulated—from just a little over \$10 trillion to now \$17 trillion in the space of one administration, with 3 more years to go. It is unsustainable. I doubt there is a Member of this body—Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative—who could simply ignore it and say this is not a problem. It is a huge problem. Every day, every week, every month, every year we postpone it, the problem becomes worse.

We have made effort after effort—bipartisan effort, Simpson-Bowles, Domenici-Rivlin, laying out plans as to how to address this over a period of time to put us on a path to solvency, the Gang of 6, all the efforts of a Republican, SAXBY CHAMBLISS, and a Democrat, MARK WARNER, and those of us who supported those efforts to try to find a way to solve this problem, the

supercommittee, the dinner group which I was part of, substantive discussions with the White House, with the Chief of Staff, with the President himself over a 7-month period of time—we have been unable to reach a resolution, unable to even come to the conclusion that this problem is so great it needs to be dealt with now, not pushed down later for some other administration. It has been too many Congresses and too many administrations simply saying, “We can't get it done.” We will have to push it off for yet another term, yet another election, yet another President.

Well, time is running out. So despite all these efforts, we have failed. In my opinion, and I think in the opinion of most, the reason why we have failed is because we have not had Presidential leadership. The kinds of changes that are needed to address a problem this large, to bring parties together, to put us in the position where we are willing to risk our careers, willing to stand up and do what is right for America regardless of the political consequences, willing to stand together—Republican and Democrat—to basically say this problem transcends politics, and not use it against each other, but stand together and say this problem is of such magnitude that we have to stand together and have the will to go forward—that can only be accomplished, and only has been accomplished if you look to past history, by Presidential leadership.

I was privileged to be here as a Member of the House of Representatives when we faced not as great a problem, but still a significant a problem with entitlement spending—in this case Social Security. The trust fund was running dry. The case was made to the American people. A Republican President reached out to a Democrat Speaker of the House of Representatives—a divided government, Democrats in one House, Republicans in the other—reached out and said, We have a problem and it can only be solved if the two of us stand together in a bipartisan way. And that they did. It wasn't easy, but it was successful, and through it we made a substantial, meaningful change to our Social Security system, which bought about 35 years from insolvency.

Now we face an even more dire crisis than that, but the solution will be the same—and that is, we need to have Presidential leadership.

I have proposed a number of things. It looks as though we are going to be limited. I did not get any indication from the President that he is willing to take these kinds of risks to so-called go big.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am not going to wait to speak, but if I

might ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana a question, and then certainly agree to however much time he wants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COATS. I would be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from Indiana is very sincere as he has worked diligently and in a bipartisan way to tackle this budget problem. It is this Senator's hope we can continue those kinds of discussions we had a couple of years ago.

Would the Senator agree that the shutdown situation we find ourselves in, however—which started for a different reason than the budget questions. It started for the reason of people wanting to defund ObamaCare—that the shutdown creates a crisis atmosphere in which it is very difficult to have those budgetary discussions the Senator yearns to have, as does his colleague from Florida?

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I answer to my friend from Florida, who did work with a group of us, Democrats and Republicans, in past efforts to address the larger question which I am addressing, I know he is as disappointed as I am that we were not able to come to a resolution.

Republicans do not want a shutdown. We want a solution. We have found in the past that the leverage of a financial situation often gives us the opportunity to raise the issues and hopefully reach at least a partial solution. That has happened in the past.

I stand with those who simply say: I want to find a solution to the larger problem, including the shutdown of the government. I was focusing my efforts on the debt limit we are reaching because it is very hard to make a case for asking the American people for yet another trillion dollars of debt loaded on their shoulders without some efforts to address why this debt is being accumulated and why it continues to go forward. Why has the Congress not stepped up to address this spending?

It is like having a credit card and the bank calls and says you have hit your limit. You have asked us several times in the past to raise that limit, and we have done so, but you keep reaching the limit and you keep asking for more credit. At what point are you going to amend your reckless spending so you do not have to keep coming in here and so we do not have to keep giving you more credit? How do we know you are ever going to pay this back? How do we know you are not just going to declare bankruptcy and insolvency because you have simply hit the point where you do not have the means to pay this back? We might be willing to give you some increase in your credit, but first you have to give us something back; that is, you have to get off your addiction to spending that keeps driving you into this situation.

What I was trying to address here is, yes, a solution to get this government back to work combined, hopefully, with a renewed effort—by the Senator from Florida, myself, and others—to strip out the unnecessary spending, the duplication, the egregious misuse of taxpayers' dollars for nonessential functions of this Federal Government.

There is no disagreement between us that we need to fund our national security. There is no disagreement about some of the essential cancer research and a number of other things this government engages in that cannot be handled at the State level, cannot be handled at a private level, substantially. But there is a lot of concern about excessive spending that continues to push us more and more into debt.

In answer to the question from my friend, Republicans do not like this shutdown any more than Democrats. We want to have some solution to the underlying problem. The underlying problem is the merger of not only excessive spending but the debt limit that is the result of that spending.

I know my time is rapidly running out, down to zero here. Let me conclude by saying I believe we have a duty—a duty to the American taxpayer but beyond that a duty to the future of this country, which is not just our children and grandchildren but everybody's children and grandchildren, all the generations to come. We have a duty and a moral responsibility not to so laden them with debt that they will not have the opportunities many of us enjoyed, simple opportunities of owning a home, saving money for our kids so we can give them a good education, getting the bills paid on time, and living the American dream. That is not to become a millionaire or billionaire—maybe for some, but for most, to live just a quiet, normal, peaceful life, passing on those values and giving our children those opportunities we have found for ourselves.

I suggest that until we summon the political will to do so and until, frankly, we have a President who has that same will, we will not solve that problem.

I will conclude with this. It is a story—maybe you heard it before. A man walks into the doctor's office and says: I don't feel well at all.

The doctor gives him all the tests and all the exams and calls him back in and says: The disease you have is terminal. It is going to kill you. There are two ways to address this. There is a cure. It has some pain attached to it. You cannot just ignore it. But if you will agree to this medicine we are going to give you and these procedures, we can save your life. If you are not willing to do that, if you do not have the will to go through that process to get yourself back to health, there is another alternative. The alternative is

that we can transplant that disease into your children and into your grandchildren and then let them deal with it.

That is exactly what we are doing here by not having the will, summoning the will to do the things we all know need to be done to prevent this country from becoming insolvent, from denying and destroying the American dream. The future of this country rests with our decisions. To date we have not made those decisions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I see the great junior Senator from Virginia waiting to speak. I would like to make a quick statement.

I again want to remind the Senate and anybody who is listening what brought about the shutdown. It has been going on now for a week and a half, and we do not see any relief in sight. What started the whole thing on the shutdown is this: Shut down the government unless you agree to reverse a law that was passed and declared constitutional by the Supreme Court. By reversing that law, by taking the funding away from the Affordable Care Act—that is what started this a week and a half ago.

I have just come from the commerce committee, where Senator ROCKEFELLER had a hearing on everything from consumer finance and the consumer federation on how consumers are not being protected; everything from the National Transportation Safety Board and how all of these accidents that have occurred within the last week and a half of the shutdown cannot be investigated because all of their staff is on furlough; to the aerospace industry—they cannot deliver airplanes that are ready for delivery because they have to have their final FAA certificate; to, of course, the space program in NASA, and 97 percent furloughed; to over 60 percent of NOAA furloughed and all of the weather satellites we are trying to get going. Then you take all these government employees who are furloughed, and what about all the contractors to the government who are now laying off all the contractors?

We had an Alaskan captain talking about how he needs the government certificates so he can go to sea on the Alaskan crab catch. He cannot get that. Guess who is lurking out there. Russian captains, to come in and start supplying the world market, including the domestic U.S. market, with crab. You can go through the whole thing.

Then, of course, the other side says, in the midst of the shutdown, with the default of the credit rating of the government facing us, you are not negotiating.

That reminds me of a story. Two people are talking.

One says: Can I burn your House down?

No.

Can I burn your second floor down?

No.

Garage?

No.

How about your utility room?

No.

Oh, you won't compromise.

You cannot compromise over something that is hurting so many people's lives and is threatening the security and safety of people's lives. You cannot compromise on that. You cannot compromise on this Nation going into financial default.

Come on. Let's use a little common sense and get back into government functioning again and stop the nonsense about threatening a default of this country. Then let's do what the very sincere Senator from Indiana said. Let's continue those discussions about what we can do for the long-term financial integrity of this country.

I yield. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his indulgence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I rise to deliver a status report on what the government shutdown has meant to Virginia this week. I gave one last week, and I am back on the floor to share some additional news.

I associate myself with the comments of the Senator from Florida. I will talk about some similar effects. These effects are felt everywhere. It is not just furloughed employees; it is contractors, it is local communities and nonprofits, and it is the housing market.

Let me talk a bit about Virginia. Some of the pages might have been on the floor last week when I talked about a tiny community in Virginia, Chincoteague, which is a barrier island off the eastern shore of Virginia. It is not the place you might think of when you think about where Federal shutdown effects would be felt in a very specific way. But Chincoteague's economy is oriented around tourism. There is a national seashore and national wildlife refuge there, adjacent to Chincoteague Island, and so these few thousand people over the years have built up an economy that is hotels, motels, restaurants, grocery stores, drive-ins, and other shops for visitors. The fall is a very busy time. The island gets about 1.5 million visitors a year, and they are coming to the National Wildlife Refuge and the National Seashore.

On October 1, when government closed down the seashore and wildlife refuge closed down, the visitors have stopped coming. All those businesses, all those small mom-and-pops—I can see the faces of Tommy and Donna, and Jack Tarr, who is the mayor, and Glenn and Jane, my friends over there—they have called me to say: We are hit so hard because this is a busy time for us and we are closed down.

Last weekend there was a huge festival. There is a historic lighthouse on the island, and they have been working for 6 years to restore it. The opening was last week, and they were expecting hundreds or even thousands of visitors. They had to cancel it because it is on the wildlife refuge.

This weekend there was another big festival. Some of you might have read the book "Misty of Chincoteague," which is about the Chincoteague Island ponies. Children read this book about ponies, probably ponies that came there from Spain, swim across the sound twice a year to Chincoteague, get shots, get inoculated. In the spring, some are sold for population control so they do not overrun the island. This weekend was the fall pony roundup. They had to cancel it because the wildlife refuge is closed.

It is not just a tourism event. It hurts all the businesses, but it is more than that. It is a fundraiser for the volunteer fire department that keeps every home and business on Chincoteague Island safe. They do not have a fire department other than the Chincoteague Volunteer Fire Department. They have two fundraisers a year. This weekend was one of them. They have canceled it. The volunteer fire department put up on their Web site: "The fall pony roundup is closed because of the childish and idiotic antics of our Government."

The other main economy in Chincoteague is NASA. There is a facility at Wallops Island, 5 miles away, and over 80 percent of the thousand employees and contractors who work at NASA, 5 miles from Chincoteague Island, are furloughed.

So you pull the guts out of the tourism economy, which this community relies on, and you pull the guts out of NASA, which the community relies on—this community has been devastated by the government shutdown, and why? Why?

Mark Wright is a retired lieutenant colonel from the U.S. Army who served in the Army for 23 years, including service tours in Iraq—a very solid veteran. We are so proud. One out of eight Virginians is a veteran—an amazing number of people. When he retired, he got a job at the Pentagon as a civilian, a DOD civilian. He got that job earlier this year. Mark Wright was furloughed earlier this year because of the sequester. He has a wife and two kids in elementary school. He was furloughed, days off work, less pay, he got through that furlough. Then October 1, furloughed again. So this veteran who served his country, put himself in harm's way, and fought in theaters of battle more than once has been furloughed twice this year.

Mark Wright and his wife and children live in an apartment in Stafford County—south of DC. They wanted to buy a home for the first time in their

lives. They are in the housing market. They decided they can't buy a home now because he doesn't know if he will have a paycheck to make a mortgage payment. He will be lucky enough to keep making the rent payment every month. It hurts their family, but it also hurts the real estate market in Stafford County.

Just this week it was reported that foreclosures in Virginia are up 52 percent from August to September, the biggest jump since the start of the recession because of the effect of sequester and these kinds of foolish antics, as the volunteer fire department described. So what Mark Wright and his family are asking is why; why are we doing this?

I had an employee roundtable with about seven furloughed employees and contractors on Wednesday afternoon in my office. They shared their anxieties about their own finances. They shared their own anxieties about having kids at home and getting a paycheck and what it would mean to them. I said to one participant: Tell me about your family. He said: I am lucky. I don't have a family. Then he caught himself and he said: I wish I was married and had a family, but for now when I am not getting a paycheck and I don't know whether I will get a paycheck, I am lucky I don't have a family. This was a DOD civilian who was a West Point grad who served as an Active-Duty Army officer for 10 years and fought overseas.

Others talked about how it felt to be kicked around just because they are trying to serve their country. One said: I have gone on unemployment. I never wanted to go on unemployment, but I have to for my family. Even those who were financially secure said: I am looking elsewhere for a job. Why would I put myself and my family through this? I have other skills. Maybe I can't serve the public anymore if the Congress is not going to back me.

Why are we doing this to these people?

A Virginia business that I am going to leave nameless called me the other day. They have thousands of employees in Virginia. The shutdown caused their weekly revenue to fall by 85 percent immediately. They are still doing work, and they are still being told—because they are contractors—that they will get paid, they are just not told when they will get pay. But they are paying for office rent and they are paying for utilities and they are paying salaries of employees and they are paying monthly health insurance premiums. They don't know when they are going to get paid, but they are having to write checks to others every day.

The owner of the business said: A few more weeks of this, and we will be bankrupt and hundreds of people will lose their jobs.

Why are we doing this to these businesses?

Yesterday the Presiding Officer was with me in a hearing before the Armed Services Committee, and a woman by the name of Jo Ann Rooney was nominated to be Under Secretary of the Navy. I asked her a question about morale in the Navy and the Pentagon now. Her answer was interesting.

Jo Ann Rooney had been working in the Pentagon for quite a while and then left 1 year ago to be president of a women's college. So she has been away from the Pentagon for 1 year. Now she is back in the Pentagon as a nominee to be Under Secretary of the Navy. Her name is pretty important in Virginia.

She said the difference in the Pentagon and with the Navy folks she was working with from when she left 1 year ago to today is completely stark. In the year that she has been gone, the furloughs hit and now the shutdown has hit. She said she is walking around the halls and looking at how people are responding. They feel like they are not supported when they are doing this important mission. She had one question: Why are we doing this to people who are working for the U.S. Navy whom we count on to protect us every day. Why?

We know, as the Senator from Florida said, that the House pushed this shutdown through unwillingness to have a budget conference. We passed a budget in March. We wanted to sit down and find a budget compromise with a very different House budget. We were going to have to compromise and do that, but Senators and House Members have blocked a conference. With no conference, we don't get a compromise. With no compromise, we don't get a budget. With no budget, the government shuts down. They pushed this through a shutdown and only after the shutdown have they said: All right. Let's talk.

Yesterday they revealed a new plan in the House. Their plan was we need to make sure we don't default on our debt, but after 11 days of shutdown, we just want to keep the government shut down. We will make sure we pay our foreign creditors, but we want to keep the government shut down.

Why? Why cause this pain? Why hurt the economy? Why push businesses to the brink of bankruptcy? Why harm the housing market? Why degrade and devalue public servants, especially those who are veterans? Why jeopardize cities and towns such as Chincoteague? Why hurt nonprofits such as the Chincoteague Island Volunteer Fire Department? Why leave families vulnerable to unemployment and force them to go on unemployment for the first time in their lives? Why cause all this pain?

No one in this country is benefiting from the U.S. government being shut down. So why is the House continuing to insist that this government remain closed?

I am continually reminded of the words by the Founder of the Republican Party 150 years ago at Gettysburg—Abraham Lincoln. At the end of that amazing speech, he resolved, and we resolved, that government of, by, and for the people shall not perish from the Earth, not for a year, not for a month, not for a week, not for a day, not for an hour, not for a minute, and not for a second.

Why can't the House agree to open the government and stop all this unnecessary pain?

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, tomorrow morning—unless it has otherwise changed—we will be voting on the request from the majority leader and the President to raise the debt ceiling by more than \$1 trillion. It will not actually be a dollar figure. It will be suspended for roughly 1 year—the debt ceiling, that is. So everybody understands what the majority leader and the President are asking us to do: America has maxed out its credit card. It is about \$16.7 trillion.

I know we talk about millions and billions and trillions as if we could actually conceptualize what that means, but here is an interesting comparison: Under President Obama—he has been in office for about 5 years now—our national debt has gone up \$6.1 trillion. The debt accrued by all 43 previous Presidents was \$10.6 trillion.

Our national debt is \$16.7 trillion, and President Obama has asked to raise that credit limit another \$1 trillion. Here is the catch: If he had a plan to actually deal with how we are going to pay down this \$16.7 trillion, then maybe there would be a discussion. What he wants is what he called a clean debt ceiling, which is a blank check. President Obama wants a blank check to continue to borrow more and more money—not so we, the present generation, can live up to our responsibilities and make sure we are fiscally responsible but, rather, to foist that debt off onto the next generation and beyond with absolutely no plan in place to repay it.

We have heard discussions about grand bargains. We were with the President this morning. He was kind enough to invite Republicans in the Senate over to the White House. He sort of chuckled about the grand bargain that he and Speaker BOEHNER and others have been pursuing over the last few years. He likened it to a unicorn. In other words, he likened it to a mythical creature no one has actually ever seen. That is what the grand bargain is, at least under this administration.

We reminded the President this morning that none of us wanted a government shutdown. This is not what we actually want, and we are all eager to

end it. We also told the President that now is the time—and divided government is perhaps the best time—to end our fiscal crisis and to be responsible for the \$16.7 trillion and come up with a payment plan.

If you went to the credit card company and said: I want to raise my credit card limit another \$10,000, they would say what is your plan to actually pay down the debt you already accumulated? If you come back to us with a plan, then maybe we can talk about raising the limit on your credit card.

As I said, for the 220 years between the start of George Washington's Presidency and the end of George W. Bush's Presidency, the Federal Government accumulated \$10.1 trillion in debt. During the Obama Presidency alone, it has been \$6.1 trillion. If the President gets his way tomorrow in the vote, we are going to have to get a blank check to raise it another \$1 trillion-plus. It won't be \$6.1 trillion; it will be \$7.1 or \$7.2 trillion with no plan to pay down the debt and deal with the impact of this growing indebtedness on our economy and on our next generation.

It is important to remember what the President has said about the debt. In 2008, when he was a Member of the Senate, he said adding \$4 trillion to the national debt was, in his words, "irresponsible" and "unpatriotic." That was President Obama back in 2008, and here he is again asking for a higher debt limit with no plan to repay the \$16.7 trillion or any portion of it.

President Obama is also the same person who said in 2009: "I refuse to leave our children with a debt they cannot repay." He is the same person who said in 2010 that America's massive debt "keeps [him] awake at night." I can't imagine he is getting much sleep these days if that is true.

This is the same person who in 2011 echoed the comments of the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff ADM Mike Mullen when he was asked what his biggest concern was as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Admiral Mullen said the greatest long-term threat to America's national security is America's debt. President Obama said he agreed with that.

Finally, President Obama is the same person who in 2012 said he was running for reelection "to pay down the debt in a way that's balanced and responsible."

The most amazing thing I thought about the meeting we had with the President this morning is that he was actually taking credit for a reduction in the deficit. Of course, the deficit is different from the debt. The deficit is how we measure the amount of money coming into the Treasury and how much goes out in a given year. We are now spending roughly 16 cents on the dollar of borrowed money; in other words, more money than what is coming in.

The President was actually taking credit for the annual deficit's decrease.

The deficit can be zero this year, and we would still have \$16.7 trillion in debt. Those are related but different issues because the debt accumulates over many years when you spend more money than you have actually coming in.

In fact, if we look back, the two reasons the deficit has gone down this year is because, No. 1, one of the largest tax increases in American history that the President demanded in January of this last year—that was the fiscal cliff negotiation—and, secondly, it was the Budget Control Act and the sequester, which has actually capped discretionary spending for the last 2 years. That is what has caused a reduction in the deficit, not anything else.

So now the President said it is no big deal, this debt—\$16.7 trillion is no big deal. And \$17 plus trillion is no big deal, either, to hear the President say it today.

Now the President has changed his tune. Earlier he told "ABC News": We don't have an immediate crisis in terms of debt. In fact, for the next 10 years, it is going to be in a sustainable place.

Well, besides being completely irresponsible and not making decisions today but, rather, kicking the can down the road to the next generation and beyond, this high debt is having a present-day impact on slow economic growth. All we have to do is read the Congressional Budget Office reports, which say when the Federal Government borrows this much money from foreign governments such as China and elsewhere, that is money—the Federal Government is actually competing in the marketplace against the private sector for credit and it actually drives down private sector investment. With the debt this high, people know something is going to happen. Either the Federal Government is going to have to cut spending to deal with this debt or the President is going to want to raise taxes again, and that is exactly what he has requested year after year.

Speaking of the next 10 years, the President's latest budget proposal, which he unveiled in April, would increase our debt by \$7.4 trillion as well as raise taxes by another \$1.1 trillion, even though the President has raised taxes by \$1.7 trillion already.

There is a reason why our economy is growing so slowly, why the private sector is sitting on the sidelines rather than investing and creating new jobs. There is a reason why the percentage of people active in the workforce is at a 30-year low. That is called the labor participation rate. All we have to do is Google the Bureau of Labor Statistics and it will tell us what the labor participation rate is. It is at a 30-year low.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. So not only is the unemployment rate unacceptably high, those are people still looking for work. We know more and more people are simply giving up because they have quit looking, and they are reflected in that smaller percentage of people actually in the workforce.

As we all know, the President has had multiple opportunities to make that grand bargain for long-term debt reduction. He has endorsed a grand bargain but walked away from his own bipartisan fiscal commission, the so-called Simpson-Bowles Commission, in December of 2010. He might have also endorsed a grand bargain put forward by the Bipartisan Policy Center's Domenici-Rivlin Commission, but he walked away from that one too.

President Reagan negotiated with Tip O'Neill. President Bush 41 negotiated with George Mitchell. President Clinton negotiated with Newt Gingrich. President Bush 43 negotiated with Ted Kennedy. That is what Presidential leadership requires, and which is so obviously missing in this context.

I hope the President will follow up on this meeting we had this morning and begin the kind of negotiations that would provide a payment plan to pay off the debt America already owes—by the way, it is not just America, it is every man, woman, and child in this country—before he comes back here and asks us to raise the credit card limit by another \$1 trillion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, yesterday I came to the Senate floor to talk about how the government shutdown is affecting North Dakota ranchers and farmers, particularly my ranchers who were hit by last weekend's storm and lost a vast number of cattle, jeopardizing their livelihood for years to come, and aren't getting the help they need from the USDA and the Farm Service Agency.

Today I wish to talk about another devastating consequence of this shutdown, and that is the consequence of this shutdown on Indian Country in my State, and undoubtedly Indian Country all across this Nation.

In North Dakota we have five Indian reservations which are home to many Native-American families. These are communities where economic development and many times employment have been trying to get a foothold, trying to catch up, and where many of my State's most vulnerable individuals live. We have heard a lot and much has been made about the United States living up to its obligations, its contract obligations, its obligations to the entities that hold our debt, but we haven't talked about the United States living up to its treaty obligations to Indian tribes in this country. This shutdown poses a serious—and I am not exaggerating—a serious threat to the basic services the Federal Government provides to Native-American families as part of its trust, its contract, its obligation to Native Americans and Native-American nations.

I recently had a discussion with tribal chairs all across North Dakota. I was hearing more and more of the kind of horror stories we hear when all of a sudden weather is coming and food assistance is needed and fuel assistance is needed. I wish to share with this body today the stories I heard, because they are telling stories about how foolish and how dangerous this government shutdown is to many very vulnerable families, particularly vulnerable Native-American families.

By way of introduction, most of the five tribes in North Dakota are direct service tribes, which means BIA itself performs critical functions to help Native-American families. So BIA is the place where people go to get assistance. With the shutdown, there are few or no BIA employees in each reservation to carry out this very important work. That means BIA's general assistance programs are no longer able to serve, for example, the 600 families on the Turtle Mountain Reservation who would otherwise receive an average of \$97 per person to meet essential needs of food, shelter, and utilities. The food banks and the food pantries are overrun. It is not an exaggeration to say this shutdown has caused people in the Turtle Mountain Reservation to go hungry.

At the Spirit Lake Nation, something we have heard a lot about in the last year is that social services are stretched to the max, where we have problems in even a fully funded government; but today the vast majority of BIA child social service agencies have stopped, leaving children stuck in limbo in the court system, waiting for someone to find them a safe and decent home. Some examples: A woman wishing to report a sexual abuse of her son has been attempting to contact Child Protective Services for over a week now. When she went to the office, the doors were shut and the 24-hour on-call person didn't answer the phone.

At the same time, BIA law enforcement is limited—and there is a lot of acreage out there that they have to cover—to one officer per shift. They are patrolling 252,000 acres with one officer.

At the Sisseton-Wahpeton Reservation, almost 50 percent of the tribe's ongoing budget consists of Federal funds. The tribe is preparing to furlough more than 200 employees. Right now, the tribe is able to pay them out of carryover funds, but unless the government reopens soon, it won't be able to afford to pay these employees and they will be furloughed.

In a couple examples of great tragedy, the Sisseton-Wahpeton community recently lost a 3-month-old baby and, because of the shutdown, the mother has been turned away for burial assistance for her child.

Gerald Thompson, an elder at Sisseton-Wahpeton and a Vietnam vet—and I know on the floor with me is our Senator from South Dakota and he can attest to the great number of Native Americans who serve in our military, at a much higher rate than almost any other group. Gerald is a proud Vietnam vet. He receives a small Federal stipend which is not even enough to cover the basic essentials. His stipend is no longer available because of the shutdown. His wife is suffering from diabetes and stage 3 kidney disease. He worries about not being able to afford the gas to drive her to Fargo once a week, and he wonders how he is going to buy propane for heat for his family and his home.

At Indian Health Service facilities, health care workers such as those at Standing Rock recognize people still need medical attention, so they are still coming to work with no promise of a paycheck and probably, some people would argue here, doing so illegally.

The Mandan Hidatsa and Arikara Nation, which is at the epicenter of oil and gas development in the Bakken oil shale in North Dakota, will see that development slowed. There is always competition for rigs in North Dakota. Where are those going to move? Everybody is waiting for the rig to show up and begin to drill their wells. The tribes have had a tremendous opportunity not only to develop the resource that will help them economically, but to develop this resource which is moving us in the right direction for energy independence. But because of the shutdown, MHA Nation is losing a substantial amount of Federal oil and gas revenue. Right now, the tribes aren't able to get energy development agreements. They can't get drilling permits approved or have environmental impact assessments completed because BLM and EPA are shut down and not available. Those rigs will move someplace else. The tribe has hundreds of drilling permits awaiting approval and this is only going to delay them further.

The situation is also dire in urban Indian communities. U-Tech, United Tribes Technical College, is one of several tribal colleges that serves over 600 students trying to better themselves and another 300 children who attend their K-through-8 elementary school on the college campus. But because of the shutdown, they are reducing those education services to both the college students and to children.

The list goes on and on and on. It will only get worse. If we continue to not address this problem, we are turning our back on these very real needs. But I think also, importantly, we are turning our back on an obligation this

country undertook when it signed treaties with the tribal people of my State.

All across North Dakota, families, workers, children, people who are disabled, are losing access to services and assistance and are losing their paycheck. Why? Why is this happening? Because Congress, arguably the greatest democratic body ever envisioned, is bickering and plagued with inaction. House Republicans continue to bring up individual bills that only address the issues of the day and programs that have only been written about in headlines. Whenever there is a headline, we can fund that because we want to say we are responding to those needs. Well, I think I need a headline for our Native-American families who are in dire straits, and for the Bureau of Indian Education as well as BIA. So I ask: What about Native-American families who are unable to get critical social services to afford food or housing because BIA is closed during the shutdown? Where is the bill for them? Also, equally important, where is the public safety for them? Where is the public safety for those tribal members?

What about the ranchers who lost a huge percentage of their herd not only in my State in the southwest corner, but also all across West River and South Dakota, who can't get assistance from the Department of Agriculture? Where is the bill for them?

What about our young farmers who are trying to build the farms of tomorrow and feed our country, who aren't able to receive their income checks because the Farm Service Agency is shut down? They can't even get their money. Where is the bill for them?

What about North Dakotans trying to start a small business or get a home mortgage and aren't able to access those Federal programs? Where is the bill for them?

It is time we stop this. It is time we respond to the very real hurt in America.

We hear a lot about who is winning and who is losing politically. That is a sad day when that is the deliberation we have, because it is the American people whom we are here to serve. It is the American people to whom we have an obligation. We need to end this impasse and to open the government.

My people in Indian Country in North Dakota need and want and believe they have earned that respect and a commitment to their treaty rights.

Thank you so much, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from South Dakota.

LIVESTOCK DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, a week ago today western South Dakota was preparing for a coming storm, but no one had any idea it would be one of the worst and most devastating snowstorms in that area's history.

I grew up in western South Dakota. I was born and raised there. We saw a lot of nasty blizzards over the years—storms that swept through the middle of our State and all across our State, with the destructive impact that can have, the way it would close down roads, the difficulty it would create for people and, obviously, the loss of livestock that comes with that. We have seen over the years blizzards that have taken their toll on one of our State's most important industries.

But the storm damage I saw yesterday when I toured western South Dakota was epic, looking at the mountains of branches that were piled high waiting for disposal, or the gut-wrenching scenes of fence lines, draws, and pastures that were scattered with dead livestock.

This snowstorm started out as heavy rain—and I know the distinguished Presiding Officer had much of this in her State of North Dakota as well—but that soaked the livestock. Then it turned into a raging blizzard, with heavy snow and sustaining winds of 60 to 70 miles an hour. These winds drove livestock for miles—some more than 12 miles from their pastures. The fortunate ones lasted through the storm, miles from their origination, but still alive.

As I speak, South Dakota ranchers are still assessing their losses, trying to determine ownership of those that survived but are miles away from home, and hauling away or burying the tens of thousands of dead livestock. To add even more challenges to an already devastating situation, this area is now experiencing heavy rains. Flash-flood warnings have been issued this morning for areas of the Black Hills, with an additional 2 or more inches of rain in the forecast.

This storm-damaged area of 17 counties in western South Dakota contains more than 6,000 ranches and more than a million cattle and sheep. For most of these ranchers, their livestock is their sole source of livelihood. These ranchers have a 365-day-a-year obligation to care for their livestock, which they have done for generation after generation.

Madam President, I want to show you the impact of this storm and what it did to some of these livestock. As shown in this picture, this is an area we saw from a helicopter yesterday—a low-lying area where there was some water. As you can see, there are upwards of 40, 50 head of livestock that are lying there dead in that area.

We saw numerous examples like that yesterday.

This is another photo we took yesterday of trucks, rendering trucks that were coming to pick up some of the dead livestock. As you can see, not only are the trucks filled, but there are livestock along this road. We saw that situation, that image, over and over

yesterday, as well, along highways in western South Dakota.

The point I am simply making is, this was an incredibly powerful impact—this storm—that created an enormous amount of damage to the No. 1 industry in western South Dakota. The people who work the land, the people who raise these animals, they are independent, they are hard working. These ranchers are the best friends and neighbors anybody could have, all willing to lend a helping hand. They are first to provide assistance and the last to seek it.

The best thing we can do right now, the most effective assistance we can offer them right now is found in the livestock disaster section of the farm bill, which has passed here in the Senate, is now passed in the House of Representatives, and is awaiting action by a conference committee.

The Livestock Indemnity Program, known as LIP, was something Senator BAUCUS and I authored as part of the 2008 farm bill. It provides much-needed financial assistance to these livestock producers. But in order to get this assistance to them, a new farm bill has to be passed.

This program, the Livestock Indemnity Program, or the LIP program, in the farm bill is fully paid for with cuts in other farm programs, and it has eliminated the need for ad hoc disaster assistance that was the standard emergency assistance in past years.

I remember past years, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, something like this would happen, and we would have to come to Congress for ad hoc disaster assistance, emergency assistance. The whole point of getting a disaster title in the farm bill was to eliminate the need for that ad hoc disaster assistance on an annual basis sometimes.

So this title was put in the farm bill back in 2008. It created a permanent program, paid for. As I said, the one in the farm bill that is being considered now is offset by cuts in other areas of the farm bill.

What we are waiting for is for the conferees to get together in a conference to work out the differences between the two bills and to report them back to the House and to the Senate, where they can be voted on, hopefully, passed and put on the President's desk. That is what it is going to take to get assistance back to these livestock producers, because the existing disaster title, as I said—the Livestock Indemnity Program in the disaster title of the farm bill—expired. It expired at the end of 2011.

When we passed a bill in the Senate in 2012, it reauthorized it, and in the farm bill that passed this year it has been reauthorized. But until we get the farm bill passed, that authority that can help producers in circumstances like this no longer exists. That is why

we have to get conferees together in a conference committee and, ultimately, a bill on the President's desk that can be signed into law that would allow the Department of Agriculture to issue the regulations that are necessary to put this program back into effect.

I have been encouraged by reports I have heard that they are going to soon name conferees to move a farm bill forward in the House. I wrote a letter earlier this week to Speaker BOEHNER asking him to name conferees so the conference committee could begin its work and make this assistance available to livestock producers.

I have also sent a letter to Secretary Vilsack asking him to determine that the Farm Service Agency personnel in the impacted counties are essential so they can open these offices and begin the process of preparing damage assessment reports that are going to be needed for Federal disaster declarations. The distinguished Presiding Officer mentioned in her remarks the impact this is having in western South Dakota. In western North Dakota, the Farm Service Agency personnel are not working, and in this circumstance they are the ones to whom the producers would go and the States and affected parties would look to to do the damage assessments.

So I am hoping Secretary Vilsack, who has that authority, particularly in this sort of a situation where you have an emergency, will declare these people as essential and get them back on the job so they can begin those damage assessments and prepare the way for, hopefully, when a farm bill passes and the disaster title is authorized again.

So those are a couple of things that have to happen, in my view, fairly quickly. And I will be the first to say that I have had concerns about the farm bill as it worked its way through the process here. There were some things in the commodity title that I thought could have been done differently—perhaps a better policy approach and, arguably, something that is more compliant with our World Trade Organization obligations and less market distorting. There were a number of things in the commodity title, there were some things in other titles of the bill that we had some concerns with, but there were a number of things in the farm bill that we worked very hard to have included, and the disaster title was one of those.

I am hoping as this farm bill works its way through the process, and hopefully as conferees get named by the House of Representatives, they can begin their work, work out some of those differences, and I will continue to be a strong proponent of the livestock disaster assistance that was created in the 2008 farm bill and was included in both versions of the 2013 farm bill—both the one that passed the House and the one that passed the Senate.

I appreciate the work Chairman STABENOW has done, and our ranking member Senator COCHRAN. I thank them for their tireless efforts to try and get a new farm bill enacted as soon as possible.

This past week's snowstorm is only one example of the urgency behind that to get it done so the programs can once again support our farmers and ranchers and the millions of others whose jobs rely on agriculture. Again, in my State of South Dakota, it is our No. 1 industry. It always has been and it probably always will be. We have so many farm and ranch families who look to their leadership here in Washington, DC, to provide some certainty with regard to the rules they are going to play by. When we do extensions such as the one we are in the middle of right now—we did a 1-year extension last year of the old farm bill—but we do not make the reforms, some of the changes that are necessary to update farm policy, then we do not give producers the certainty they need as they make their planning decisions for the future. So getting a 5-year, a multiyear reauthorization in place is important, and it is timely.

My hope would be that in the very near future the conferees can sit down, they can work out the differences between the two bills—reconcile those differences—and get this thing moving again. I say that not only because it is critically important to these livestock producers in western South Dakota but because it is critically important to all producers across South Dakota.

The farmers in the eastern part of my State, the people in the entire farm belt and the regions of this county who depend upon agriculture for their existence need to know what the policies are going to be, so they can plan and plan effectively, and so we have the mechanisms in place, so when something like this happens—like happened in western South Dakota this past week—there is a mechanism in place, there is a way in which we can respond and provide support for the hard-working farmers and ranchers and the millions of people whose jobs rely on agriculture.

Looking at those images yesterday was very gripping, in many ways very disturbing. As you fly over these areas and you see these massive losses of livestock, you realize what that means for the people who are out there every single day, who for generations have made their living on the land by raising these cattle, and it has contributed in such an enormous and significant way to the economy not only of western South Dakota but of this entire economy—people who literally every single day are out there feeding not only America but feeding the world. Agriculture has a tremendous impact domestically, obviously, but it has a profound impact around the world, and it is something that from an economic

standpoint creates thousands and thousands and millions of jobs here in this country.

I hope we can get the farm bill done. I hope the conferees will get named soon by the House, and that we will be on our way toward passage of a farm bill and, hopefully, the certainty that producers across this country need and the ability to respond to this type of emergency.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, we are now in the 11th day of this unnecessary government shutdown. Just as my colleague from South Dakota, Senator THUNE, pointed out, there are some impacts in South Dakota as a result of this shutdown. We are seeing those very real consequences in New Hampshire as well, and I am sure the Presiding Officer is seeing those in North Dakota.

It has become clear to me by talking to people in New Hampshire that the longer the shutdown goes, the worse the impact on families, on small businesses, on people who need the services from this government.

But as difficult as the shutdown is, there is actually another crisis that looms on the horizon that would have even more disastrous consequences for our economy, and that is the possibility of a first-ever default on this country's debt.

For the first time ever, if we default, the country would not pay the bills it has incurred—the bills it has incurred because of decisions made by this Congress or previous Congresses.

As economists across the ideological spectrum have warned, the consequences of a default would be severe. We could see businesses stop hiring. That would have an impact, as we are already seeing as a result of this shutdown, on the economic recovery we are experiencing. Retirement accounts and families' nest eggs would lose much of their value in a very short time. Interest rates would rise, which would mean higher costs for consumers, for small businesses, and for the Federal Government, as we need to borrow. And consumer confidence, which is so important for small businesses and for the economy, would drop sharply.

Some people have suggested that these are scare tactics. But these consequences are very real, and we know that because we have been here before. In 2011, which was the last time we came close to defaulting on our debt, the mere prospect of that default was enough to have significant impact on our economy.

In late July and early August of 2011, the period that led up to the debt deal in 2011, the Dow Jones Industrial Average dropped 2,000 points. As a result American families saw their household wealth plummet by \$2.4 trillion. We

saw a sharp drop in consumer confidence, and by the way the current circumstances that we are in have seen a similar drop in consumer confidence over the concerns about the shutdown and the default.

In the last few weeks we have seen the biggest drop in consumer confidence since Lehman Brothers collapsed in 2008. Then in 2011 our credit rating was downgraded for the first time in America's history. The crisis in 2011 resulted in \$1.3 billion in additional borrowing costs for the Federal Government, thereby increasing the Nation's debt.

So for all of those people who said we are not going to raise the debt ceiling, we are not going to pay the bills this country has incurred because we are worried about the debt and deficits we face, the fact is that action alone increased our debt by \$1.3 billion.

There is no question that we need to get this country's debt and deficits under control. I think all of us who are here believe that. But the best way to do that is to reach a comprehensive long-term bipartisan agreement that looks at all areas of spending, that looks at the domestic side of the budget, at the defense side of the budget, at mandatory programs and at revenue.

Despite the partisanship that we have seen too much of here, I still think that kind of an agreement is possible and that is critical. Senator THUNE talked about certainty for farmers who are not sure what is going to happen with the farm bill. But that kind of uncertainty is going across the economy for businesses, from whatever sector they are in, because people do not know what we are going to do here in Washington about dealing with this country's long-term budget.

As some of my colleagues have noted, the response to the financial crisis and the great recession led to a higher deficit. There is no question the country was in trouble. One of the ways we helped to address that was to increase spending on vital safety net programs, while revenues declined—to try to stimulate the economy, to put people back to work.

Those policies as well as the fiscal policies that were enacted over the past decade, including two wars, tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, all of those things made the country's debt and deficits increase. Actually in the last few years we have seen significant progress to reduce spending and to narrow our deficit.

We put in place discretionary spending caps that have reduced spending by the Federal Government, and we let the tax cuts for wealthiest Americans expire which raised additional revenue. All told, we put in place approximately \$2.4 trillion in deficit reduction. This has not been easy. There has been a lot that has been affected that I would not have chosen, but the fact is we are on a more sustainable budget path.

One of the best ways we can improve our budget outlook is by growing the economy, by focusing on jobs that boost revenue and decrease the need for social programs. While we certainly have more work to do on that front, consistent job growth has helped increase revenue and reduce our deficit.

Since this President took office, we have seen this country's deficit fall by over 50 percent. That represents a remarkable improvement, and all that is coming with the financial crisis and the recession that began in 2008. So just think about that. We have reduced this country's deficit by over 50 percent.

The Congressional Budget Office projects that our deficit will drop to 2.1 percent of GDP by 2023 from its current level of 4.2 percent. We have made great progress, and we are on a path to make even better progress. The budget that the Senate passed is a very good place to look at how we achieved additional savings and how we continue to grow our economy.

That budget would give us an additional \$1.8 trillion in deficit reduction over the next 10 years. It would also make very important investments in our economy, in families in this country, in infrastructure, in business, in education. That is a conversation we need to have. I think we should go to a conference committee on the budget. It has been unfortunate that we have not been able to get agreement in this body to do that because we have a small group of people who keep preventing that.

But that is not really what I wanted to talk about this afternoon. What we need to do is, we need to get this government back up and running. We need to agree that we should pay the bills this country has incurred and not default. We are continuing to see, as I said when I started, the very real impact of this government shutdown on families and small businesses across New Hampshire and the country.

I talked earlier on the floor about some of the small businesses that have been affected in New Hampshire. But today I want to talk about some of the Federal employees who are affected. I heard from an employee at the Federal Correctional Institution in Berlin, NH. This is a medium-security prison. It is new. It has not even been completely staffed, and it does not have all of the inmates there yet. This is from one of the employees who is currently working there—without pay as she points out.

She told me that her husband had already seen his hours cut at his job. Now she says:

I sit in fear that I will not receive a pay check at all. I will not be able to pay my mortgage payment, my student loan payments, our vehicle payments, or any other debts. I also assume that my daughter's daycare is not going to accept an IOU. I also will not have the money to buy pellets for

my stove or fuel for my furnace for the upcoming winter.

She is worried about the long-term mental and physical well-being of those who are working without paychecks at the prison because many of her colleagues are living paycheck to paycheck.

We have talked a lot about the courage and dedication that many of our Capitol Police officers showed on October 3 during the shooting incident here. It was extraordinary to see people put their lives on the line without getting paid. The same is true of people who are working at our Federal prisons. They are putting their lives on the line every day they go into work in a dangerous environment.

I heard from another furloughed employee of the prison. She said:

I am a single parent with two sons . . . My sons depend on me and only me. I have to pay for my sons' lunch and extracurricular activities, which keep him out of trouble and gives him something to do. I also have medication that my son and I need on a monthly basis which we cannot go without . . . The oil here in Berlin, NH, is absolutely high.

Berlin is in the north country of New Hampshire so it gets cold there in the winter. She concluded:

What are we going to say to the bill collectors? Can anyone answer that?

What kind of answers can we give to these people who are putting their lives on the line every day working for the government to protect all of us? Yet we are not giving them the paycheck that they earned.

I also heard from a furloughed employee with the Department of Agriculture in New Hampshire who is on furlough. She said:

It is an understatement to say I am a bit anxious and scared. I live from paycheck to paycheck.

She told me she is worried about going into debt as a result of this shutdown. She said, "I love my job at USDA and feel I make a difference every day to make this a better world." She urged me to work with my colleagues here to get her back to work.

Those are just a few examples of the stories that we are hearing every day from people in New Hampshire who are affected by this shutdown. The consequences are very real and they get worse with every day that it goes on.

As bad as that is, the consequences of a default of this country refusing to pay its debt are even worse. While Social Security and Medicare have not been affected by the shutdown, that would change if we default. A default could delay or disrupt Social Security checks that are due to go out at the beginning of November. Medicare, Medicaid, veterans benefits, and military salaries, all of those could be affected by a default. According to the Treasury, delayed or disrupted payments would prevent 57.5 million Americans

from receiving Social Security benefits in a timely manner and interfere with payments to 3.4 million veterans.

This could put the most vulnerable in jeopardy and prevent them from receiving the benefits they have earned. That is why the majority in both parties, in both Chambers in Congress, recognizes that defaulting on this country's obligations is not an option.

My former colleague and fellow Senator Judd Gregg, who is a Republican—and while we do not agree on everything, this is one issue we certainly agree on. In an op-ed published by The Hill newspaper he said that brinkmanship on default is:

The political equivalent of playing Russian roulette with all of the chambers of the gun loaded. It is the ultimate no-win strategy . . . A default would lead to some level of chaos in the debt markets, which would lead to a significant contraction in economic activity, which would lead to job losses, which would lead to higher spending by the federal government and lower tax revenues, which would lead to more debt.

In other words, as Senator Gregg said it so well: It is short-sighted and irresponsible. There is no doubt we need to keep working on a long-term budget for this country. But we have to do it in a way that is responsible. That is why I certainly hope that the Senate will be able to agree on the legislation that is currently before this body. I hope the House will come to the table. I hope we can all agree that allowing this country to default on our debt, to not pay our bills, would have disastrous consequences.

We are not going to be that irresponsible. We still have some time to get this done. Not long. So far the financial markets and the American people have been more than patient. Everybody is frustrated. Everybody understands that it is time for us to act and to act now.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, as we know, this is the 11th day of a completely manufactured crisis, a self-inflicted wound that came about because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are obsessed with repealing a law that is called the Affordable Care Act—a law that passed almost 4 years ago, and the benefits have taken root. I will

go over those benefits for all Americans and a group of Americans who have had a very hard time getting insurance. We are only now being able to see them enroll for health insurance, and for some of them, this is the first time.

Because our colleagues are so obsessed with repealing this law, which passed almost 4 years ago and was upheld by the Supreme Court as being totally constitutional and about which there was a Presidential election and a Senate election in which the people who wanted to keep this law and make it better won, of course—the Republicans can't accept it. As a result, they have shut down the government.

We wouldn't know it if we listened to the speeches now because they have somewhat changed. Now they are saying they want cuts in Medicare and Social Security. That is what they want. But when we go back 11 days, before the government shutdown, Speaker BOEHNER was crystal clear. He said: The American people don't want a government shutdown, but they don't want ObamaCare either.

The government shut down. They didn't listen to us. We explained to them that if the government shuts down, that won't stop the Affordable Care Act because those funds come from a different part of the government; they don't come from the appropriated moneys. At least 85 percent of the Affordable Care Act comes from another part of the government. We begged them and told them: If you shut down the government, health care is going to go forward anyway. Why on Earth would you shut down the government? They didn't listen. Now people in the country are saying: What are you guys doing?

I am prayerfully hopeful they will turn around and let us reopen this government—the government of the greatest country on Earth—and that they will also allow us to pay our bills and stop the possibility of default. If default happens, it will be the first time in our history.

Yes, we are in the middle of a crisis, but it is manufactured and it is made up. If you think about deficits, look at what has happened since President Obama took office. Deficits have been cut in half. It can't be about deficits. The Affordable Care Act is not going to be stopped. What is this all about? A temper tantrum? A childish way to handle a situation about which they are not happy?

So Republicans who are listening to me know, I have served five Presidents since I came to Washington, first as a House Member and then as a Senator representing the largest State in the Union, the most fantastic State in the Union—but that is only my personal view—California. There have been five Presidents—three Republicans and two Democrats. Obviously, I didn't agree

with these Presidents all the time. Sometimes I really disagreed with them, such as over the Iraq war and tax breaks for billionaires. Both of those added mightily to the deficit. I opposed those, but I accepted the fact that all I could do was work to change things in a democratic way, try to pass legislation on those issues to bring the troops home and to make sure everyone pays their fair share. I didn't win those issues.

We all know that, yes, there are many times one votes against the debt ceiling as a show of displeasure, but we have never brought down the full faith and credit of the United States. The last time the Republicans tried this a couple of years ago, the Dow Jones average plunged and it cost us \$19 billion. You would think they would have learned a lesson from that, but they didn't. You would think they would have learned a lesson from the Newt Gingrich shutdown that made their poll numbers plunge then.

We need to behave like grownups. I am prayerful and hopeful that we can see the talks that are starting in the Senate continue across party lines to resolve this.

Let's be clear. It is easy to solve this problem. This is the great news: It is easy to solve the problem. Allow our bill that passed here about 12 days ago to be voted on in the House—it will allow this government to reopen—and do not attach any riders to it, such as cutting Medicare, Social Security, or whatever your pet idea is. Then let's sit down and negotiate through the Appropriations Committee chairman, BARBARA MIKULSKI, and through the Budget Committee chairman, PATTY MURRAY. Then they can sit down with their counterparts and resolve our differences on spending, the deficit, and deficit reduction. It is very easy.

What Senator REID is saying is absolutely the right thing to say. Pay our bills, and don't allow us to default. Pay our bills, open the government, and then we can talk about anything and everything that has to do with the budget.

Last week when we were in the middle of this, I went home to see how the Affordable Care Act was working in California. We are a State that has fully embraced the Affordable Care Act. We are 38 million strong, and we have millions of uninsured—millions of uninsured. I am getting daily reports from constituents. They are talking about the Affordable Care Act and what it means to them. These are constituents such as Janice Brown, a semiretired travel agent from Prather, CA. She called the help line and downloaded an application to buy a plan for \$1,500 a month for herself and her husband. She said to the Associated Press that was \$1,000 less than her current private plan. She said:

I'm thrilled. The coverage is better. It's fantastic.

Why do my friends want to shut down the government and stop Janice Brown, a semiretired travel agent from my State, from getting affordable health care? Why? Does it make them feel better to do that? I would hope not.

Dr. Travis Sanchez runs a chiropractic clinic in Salinas. It is one of the small businesses buying coverage under Covered California. Under the Affordable Care Act, Sanchez plans to offer his full-time employees the health care coverage which they currently lack. Do you know what he says? The Affordable Care Act is going to be life-changing for many of the people whom I see as a clinician every day.

Then Covered California told us about Paul Torrigino of Sacramento. He enrolled in a bronze plan. In California, you can get a gold plan, a silver plan and a bronze plan and the higher the plan—the gold plan—the less of a copay. The bronze plan is less costly. So he said he enrolled in a bronze plan that was extremely affordable. He said:

Oh my gosh, the insurance has been going up for the last few years like crazy. All our money was going to pay for medical insurance.

Now he has this very affordable plan.

Leslie Foster, a 28-year-old freelance filmmaker in Hollywood, told the Wall Street Journal he found a plan that will cost him \$62 a month. Because Leslie earns \$20,000 a year, Federal assistance will pick up three-quarters of the cost of his premium. Leslie says he hasn't had comprehensive health insurance since 2006.

Why are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle trying to stop Leslie from getting comprehensive affordable health insurance? Because they didn't like the results of the election? Because they were mad the Supreme Court said the bill was constitutional?

I am at a loss to understand it.

Then I have San Franciscan Paul Cello. He told KQED that he selected a plan that would save him more than \$300 a month. He said:

It's like a whole 'nother world. The coverage is better . . . a lower premium, no pre-existing condition exclusions, I get mental health coverage, so there's way more coverage than I had and I'm going to be saving.

These are real people with a heart and a pulse and a life and hopes and dreams and they are finally getting health insurance. Yet my friends on the other side of the aisle are stamping their feet and having a tantrum because they don't like it. I don't know why they don't like it. They ought to come to meet these people.

I have Rachel Mansfield of La Quinta. Nothing could dissuade her. She sent in an application for Covered California on Tuesday. She has been waiting for the exchange to start so she and her husband could get health insurance. She got it. Her new premium will be around \$400 for both of

them, with higher quality coverage than she currently has.

Melissa Harris, a communications student at Fresno State, stopped at a Covered California tent on campus Tuesday. She is paying \$600 a month—with help from family members—for insurance through her former employer. She has diabetes, hypertension and other medical issues and lives on disability payments. Under the Affordable Care Act, which prevents insurance companies from denying coverage for preexisting conditions, Harris said she can afford health insurance on her own. "It's a godsend for me—a blessing," Harris, 33, said.

At the Fresno County Department of Social Services, people were signing up for Medicaid. "I came in for food stamps," Kevin Burke, 51, told the Fresno Bee. An assembly worker, Burke said he has been out of work for two years. He had Medi-Cal previously, but was disenrolled when his daughter turned 18, he said. Under the Affordable Care Act, Americans under 133% of the federal poverty level are now eligible for Medicaid, regardless of how old their children are, or if they have children at all.

At Vista Health Center, Rufina Arango, who is diabetic, filled out an application for coverage through a significant expansion of Medi-Cal, the state's Medicaid program. Rufina and her family lost their health insurance several years ago, when her husband was laid off after 22 years working for a wood products manufacturer in Windsor. "It's great, because it is going to help many of us. If not for Obamacare, many of us would not qualify for health insurance," Rufina told the Press Democrat.

I have to point out an op-ed piece that appeared in the Washington Post this week about the experience of one of my constituents with the Affordable Care Act. This constituent of mine and her son were also on the Lawrence O'Donnell show last night. Anyone who watched that show—anyone with heart and a soul—would understand how amazing it is for her that the Affordable Care Act passed. Let me tell you the story.

Janine Reid is a writer from the San Francisco Bay area. This is the title of her opinion piece that ran in the Washington Post. "ObamaCare saved my family from financial ruin." Let me repeat the title. "ObamaCare saved my family from financial ruin."

She relates her experience with her loving son, Mason. He had brain cancer and he had to undergo major surgeries and multiple surgeries. He would have hit his lifetime limit and the family would have been driven into, in her words, the "financial abyss" without the Affordable Care Act. Do you know what she says? She writes that the family thanks "God and whoever else would listen for our good fortune to

have coverage." She ends her piece with this line: If I could get those who are trying to repeal this law:

. . . on a conference call, I would explain this to them. I would tell them that while they were busy trying to derail the Affordable Care Act over the past two years, Mason has again learned to walk, talk, eat and shoot a three-point basket."

Why would anyone—anyone in the Senate, in the House, in the country—want to hurt a family like that? I am just saying, I don't get it. Because a law is a law is a law. We don't decide that one day we are going to undermine a law. You don't do that. You live by the law. If you want to change it, of course, you have a chance. They tried 43 times to repeal it. It didn't get repealed. They shut down the government over it and it didn't get repealed and it will not get repealed. My constituents are not going back. No one is going to take away their benefits.

Most Americans may not even realize the benefits they are already getting under the Affordable Care Act. Wherever they live, whether in the State of the Presiding Officer or my State, 3 million young adults are now covered through their parents' plan. Three million young adults are now insured through their parents' plan, and 71 million Americans are getting preventive care, such as checkups, birth control, and immunizations. Let me say it again. Millions of Americans are benefiting from the Affordable Care Act. Seventy-one million Americans are getting free preventive care, such as checkups, birth control, and immunizations. Three million young adults are now insured through their parents' plans.

Why do my colleagues want to take that away from Americans? Why do my colleagues want to shut down the government? Because they don't like it. What is it they don't like about this; that some young person doesn't have to fret or his parents don't have to be worried sick that their kid doesn't have health insurance. Now 17 million kids with preexisting conditions, such as asthma and diabetes, can no longer be denied coverage. Why do my friends want to take that away from the families in the United States of America? Why? Why did they shut down the government to take that away? What are they thinking?

Insurers can no longer cancel your health insurance because you get sick. The Chair knows as do I that you could be going along 100 miles an hour and all of a sudden get an illness and be shocked and all of a sudden imagine getting a note from your insurer saying: Sorry you just got sick, Senator BOXER, but we are canceling your health insurance. That happened every day of the week, but it can't happen anymore. Why do my Republican friends want to cancel out that benefit? No lifetime limits on coverage.

I just told the story about the woman who lives in the San Francisco Bay area whose son was born with a brain tumor and who needed constant operations. They hit up against the lifetime limit. But when ObamaCare went into effect, otherwise known as the Affordable Care Act, guess what, no more lifetime limits and the child was saved and the family was saved from financial ruin.

These are just some of the benefits that are going into effect and now are in effect.

Then the Republicans said: Oh, the Affordable Care Act is going to make everything cost so much. No, health care costs are growing at the slowest rate in over 50 years, and insurance companies have to justify premium hikes, so we are getting back checks if they overcharge us. Listen, 8.5 million Americans have received rebate checks from their insurance companies because of the Affordable Care Act. Do my friends want to get that money back, take it away from the people? They shut down the government. They must think that is a very bad idea.

I can't answer the question as to why they want to take away these benefits, but I can guess at their motivation. They are throwing a temper tantrum. They don't like the way the election turned out. They don't like what the Supreme Court did. A law is a law.

I don't get it. Speaker BOEHNER said he is shutting down the government, punishing people, because of ObamaCare. We told him you can't stop it. He tried and failed 43 times to repeal it. He stamped his foot and he shut down the government. Now that we have proven to him he can't stop the Affordable Care Act, now that he sees how many people are benefiting from it, he should open the government. Eleven days the greatest country in the world has been shut down.

I have to tell you, in my great State—and we could all talk about our States, I know the Chair did this—we have a magnificent national park called Yosemite. Honest to God, the first time I stepped on that valley floor I thought I was in Heaven. I had never seen anything like it. There are 3,500 Park Service employees who have been furloughed, with 600 of them at Yosemite.

Here is the thing people don't seem to understand. It is not only the pain of the people who have saved to get to a place such as Yosemite and saved for their families and are looking forward to this opportunity, it is also the small businesses that surround the park.

Douglas Shaw, co-owner of Yosemite Bug Rustic Mountain Resort, may have to lay off 30 percent of his staff. He said:

We're a good example of a business that could die if this continues. This is all we've got, and I'm scared, honestly. I don't think a lot of people realize how important this issue

is for a great many people whose livelihoods are at stake.

Derek Arakelian and his wife Marielle Debree were laid off from their jobs at Yosemite. They held a yard sale to raise money. They held a yard sale to raise money. They said:

We've got a new little boy and a lot of expenses. We need to make money to pay our bills.

Why are they shutting down the government? The Affordable Care Act is moving forward. A law is a law is a law is a law. We all have our issues. Serving here for a long time, as I said, I have opposed wars, opposed tax cuts for the wealthiest among us, I have opposed rollbacks in environmental regulations that I thought were critical, and I saw us turn away from sensible ways to protect our people. I wasn't happy. I have a right not to be happy, and they have a right not to be happy. But I don't have a right to decide which laws I am going to say should be enforced. I have an obligation, if I don't like the law, to work my heart out in the next election and change things. That is what you do in a democracy. You don't pick and choose.

Then they have their little bills coming over here. I call it governing by press release. Something gets hot, they hear a story I am going to tell, and they say: Oh, well, we will open that little segment.

We don't run a country that way. We don't run a country by press release. We don't run a country in order to get political cover. We have an obligation to keep the doors open, to make sure things work better, to negotiate over budgets. You don't negotiate by taking hostages. This time the hostages are the American people—people such as Doug Shaw, co-owner of Yosemite Mountain Resort, and people who are laid off—firefighters at the Forest Service. They are working without pay. Lovely. We are getting our pay. One of these firefighters says:

Most people here live paycheck to paycheck.

It is a disgrace. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention will stop its seasonal flu tracking program, and furloughed 9,000 employees. My understanding is they have brought back some of their employees, but they are not getting paid, and they are standing sentry.

David Johnson of San Francisco is the CEO of GigaGen, which does immune system research to help organ transplant succeed. The NIH awarded him a small business grant of over \$1 million. He has already hired staff, but he can't get the funds until this shutdown ends. How many of us have read about people who get into trouble because their body rejects the organ? Here is a guy getting \$1 million from the NIH, and he can't get the funds. It is shocking.

Why do they shut down the government? They don't like the health care

bill that is helping so many people. Now they don't even talk about it. Now they talk about cutting Social Security and Medicare. That is their new dream. That is what they want now. I don't know how that makes us a better country. They can explain it for themselves. Open the government, pay our bills, stop the default, and then we can negotiate. The President has been clear. There is nothing he won't talk about.

Speaking as the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee and as a member of the commerce committee, 93 percent of the EPA have been furloughed. The Environmental Protection Agency has the support of about 75 percent of the American people, if not more. They are under attack constantly. That is one reason we never saw a mini-bill to restore the Environmental Protection Agency. They don't care over there. But what do these employees do? They guard our landmark environmental laws. They ensure our drinking water is safe, our rivers are safe to swim in, and our air is safe to breathe. They make sure that Superfund sites are cleaned up. Five hundred Superfund sites, and they have stopped the cleanup. And look at what a Superfund site is: It is a toxic brew of toxins that can hurt you, such as arsenic, benzene—you name it, the worst things. My Republican friends shut down the government because they want to stop the Affordable Care Act. They are also now stopping cleanup of Superfund sites in their own communities where they are a threat to children, to pregnant women, and to our families and our seniors. How does that make us a better country when we have no inspectors on the ground, not one in California, to make sure the air is safe and the water is safe?

Then, if we care about farming—and I know most of us do—EPA is responsible for the inventory of pesticides imported from abroad. This means that millions of dollars of imported agricultural chemicals have been stuck at U.S. ports because EPA personnel are not on hand to approve them for entry. This could be devastating for our agricultural economy, and it could further raise food prices for consumers.

Somebody explain to me how a government shutdown helps the farmers who are waiting for these pesticides to be cleared by the EPA. Somebody explain to me how a government shutdown helps when we have many road projects that are just getting ready to go forward, but we don't have any of the agencies ready to complete the studies to make sure they are safe enough to go forward. There are hundreds of thousands of jobs at stake, and most of them, when it comes to the highway bill, are in the private sector.

We just learned yesterday that 92 percent of the workers at the Nuclear

Regulatory Commission have been furloughed. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission fulfills a critical mission. The NRC was created "to ensure the safe use of radioactive materials." Anyone who has been alive the last year or so knows about Fukushima and what happened to the people there and understands when you are dealing with radioactive materials you are dealing with danger. The NRC had to furlough 92 percent of the workers because the Republicans don't like the Affordable Care Act, and they shut down the government.

Open it up. Enough is enough. Give the people back the government they asked for in this last election.

I understand. I didn't like it many times in my life, but I dealt with it. Grow up. Curling up in a corner and having a temper tantrum with a blanket and your teddy bear is not the right way to deal with it. Open the government, sit down with us, and tell us what you want to fix.

We have already agreed to a low number in the continuing resolution, a number we don't like at all and think is too low. We think it is a hardship. We agreed to the lower number because we wanted to have a chance to negotiate. Senator MIKULSKI is ready. Senator MURRAY is ready. We tried 21 times to get to conference with them and negotiate a budget, and 21 times they objected. And then they have—I have to use the word now—the chutzpah to say we won't negotiate when we tried 21 times to go to conference. There are no inspectors on the job to make sure the air is clean, to make sure the water is safe, and to make sure the nuclear powerplants are safe.

The Republicans talk about the parks, and I appreciate it. But they fail to mention that the Army Corps manages 12 million acres of public lands and waters nationwide, and the recreation areas host 370 million visits annually. These recreation areas support local businesses like resorts, marinas outfitters, grocery stores, gas stations, and hotels which provide goods and services to visitors as well as boost our Nation's economy. Because of this Republican shutdown the Corps closed Lake Mendocino located north of San Francisco. Lake Mendocino hosts half a million visitors annually, and in 2010 visitors spent \$12.7 million at businesses within 30 miles of Lake Mendocino, supporting 106 jobs and \$2.8 million in labor income.

So we get a little mini-bill over there, open the parks. No, open the government. Open all our recreation areas. Don't do this government by piecemeal, government by press release, government by your favorite agency. It is ridiculous. No party, Republican or Democratic, has the right to say to a community: You will thrive, but you will die. No party has the right.

I have a community near Los Angeles called University Park. The L.A. Times did a big story. The children there are suffering illness and everyone believes it is from an oil and gas site nearby. It is an environmental issue. The kids are suffering, and we don't know what is wrong with them. We called the EPA. They said: Senator we will be right on it. The government shut down. We don't have any inspectors in California.

Those kids are sick. So we get a small bill. Let's help the kids with cancer. Of course we want to. What about these kids? We don't know what they have. No party, Republican or Democratic, should say this child lives, and we are not sure about this child.

That is not America. This is one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. It is not for the Republicans to decide what they want to fund. It is for all of us to decide. Open the government. You shut it down because of the Affordable Care Act; I appreciate it. Fight that. We were with the President for a couple of hours yesterday. Republican Senators were with him today. He said he would look at everything. But don't keep this government closed and don't bring us to the first default we have ever had.

The National Transportation Safety Board furloughed 380 of its 400 employees. In my State we had an investigation going on into the Asiana Airlines Flight 214 crash. This crucial hearing was to include the testimony of foreign officials from Asia. Its postponement and the ongoing shutdown will delay the entire investigation. We need to know what went wrong, but this shutdown has shut down that investigation. Two weeks ago there was a small plane crash at the Santa Monica Airport that killed four people, and the NTSB is unable to investigate the crash. They had to take their materials, stick them in a file, and hopefully, some day they will come back to it.

Open this government. Don't say this community will thrive and that one will die, this family will get help and this one won't, this Federal worker will get paid, but we are not sure about that Federal worker, while they take their checks. This is stunning.

It is no wonder the American people are expressing their views, and I hope they will continue to put pressure on those who have this government shut down. There is no winner in a shutdown. It is devastating. And my friends keep saying they don't want it.

So open the government. It is easy. We did it here. It is waiting over there for JOHN BOEHNER to call it up. Don't add your pet peeves to it. I have a lot of pet peeves I would like to add to it, too. This shutdown is devastating for our workers, our businesses, our contractors, for our economy.

Speaker BOEHNER, put that bill on the floor. Let's open this government. Let's not default for the first time.

I was here in the House when Ronald Reagan was the President. Here is what he said about default:

The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar.

We named an airport after him, a building after him. Let's pass this debt ceiling in his honor. He warned us. What has gone wrong with the party of Ronald Reagan? Where have they gone? What are they thinking—shut down the government? The last time they did, it cost a fortune. The last time they played with the debt, it cost a fortune. We hear about people dumping American bonds. Is that what they want?

Open up the government. Let the people have their government. It is a self-inflicted mess.

It is as though you wake up in the morning, it is a pretty nice day, you feel pretty good and, all of a sudden, you decide you are going to hit yourself with a brick. Oh my God.

These little mini bills—how ridiculous.

That reminds me, one of my friends gave me this analogy, which I think is right on, which is you see a woman drowning and you grab her and you take her halfway to the shore and you leave her and she drowns anyway. That is what these mini "press release" bills are. You find someone bleeding to death but you only sew them up halfway. It is a self-inflicted mess. That is the bad news.

The good news is, because it is self-inflicted, it is easy to get out of it. All you have to do there is take up the Senate bill and pass it. The Presiding Officer knows, she served there proudly. It has the Republican budget numbers in it, which we think are way too low, but we agreed to them as a compromise because we did not want to see the government shut down.

Take up the bill and pass it. Then we can talk about all these issues. Don't allow the greatest Nation in the world to default.

Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar.

I used to work on Wall Street—a very long time ago. We saw what happened when the markets thought we were not going to get together and resolve this default situation. The markets started to go down, 300 points, 200 points, and then at the mere hope that we could fix this problem, the markets shot up. The markets are watching. They know what is happening here. We are going to have a vote to lift the debt ceiling, to make sure we do not default on bills that were already incurred.

Let me be clear on that. We are talking about paying the bills we already

incurred. You have to do that when you are a homeowner. You pay your mortgage. You pay your bills.

Then they started to say, what is a default? That was unbelievable. I looked it up in Black's Law Dictionary. If you don't pay your bills, that is a default. Don't tell me you pay the interest on the debt but you cannot pay the other bills—no, no, that is not the Black's Law Dictionary definition. Pay your bills. Don't make this Nation a deadbeat. If you want to treat your family that way, that is your choice, but this is the USA family. We do not default and we do not threaten default. Ronald Reagan warned us:

Open up the Government, pay your bills.

It is basic stuff. It is not complicated. Majority Leader REID has been clear. He is a guy who can compromise, negotiate, talk—he has been around a long time. But he just said it: Open the government, pay our bills, and we will negotiate.

We are going to hear a lot of words, but I want people to understand why the government is shut down. The government is shut down because the House, Republican House under the leadership of JOHN BOEHNER or ERIC CANTOR or PAUL RYAN—we are never sure. Every day it is someone new but it is supposed to be JOHN BOEHNER—fine. I like him. That doesn't change where we are. They refuse to take up the bill that opens up the government—let's be clear—just until November. And it takes the numbers the Republicans like and we do not like and we say OK, we will give you that, let's keep the government open. We did it over here. I thank my Republican friends who voted to allow us to vote on that bill. That was a hard vote for them and I am very appreciative of that.

All BOEHNER has to do is take up that bill and pass it. That is all. Then we are out of the shutdown mess and that self-inflicted wound is gone. We can negotiate over the budget as we should. Then all they have to do is join us and make sure we do not default for the first time in history and make this country a deadbeat nation. How horrible. How embarrassing.

I will close with this. This self-inflicted wound mattered so much that President Obama had to cancel a trip to the Asian countries. That trip was important for our economy and for jobs and to get foreign investment. They did not care. We did our best, we sent the best face we could, Senator Kerry, Secretary of State. He did his best, but I know that was not a good thing to do because it gave China the upper hand. China made some cracks about the dysfunction here in the West. We are dysfunctional here, self-inflicted dysfunction, self-inflicted crisis.

This is not Hurricane Sandy. This is not the horrible blizzard that happened in South Dakota. I want to send my

best to our colleagues there who are suffering because of what happened from that blizzard. Someday we will talk a little bit about climate change—maybe we can move forward—and the extreme weather that is happening. But I am not going to talk about that now. I have enough problems.

What we need to do today is the right thing for the country: Open up the government that belongs to the American people. It is easy. That is our job. Make sure we do not default. Then we sit down as friends, as colleagues across the aisle, and we negotiate all the important issues that Republicans care about and Democrats care about. I look forward to those negotiations.

I hope as they are going on around now in little back rooms around us that we are finding a way out of this mess. But we cannot forget what brought us here and the reason I wanted to be here today is to make it known in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the harm that has been done. There is a reason why there has not been a shutdown since I think it was 1996. There is a reason—because the people who lived through it recognized it was devastating. I guess the memory faded. People say: Oh, there have been 19 shutdowns. Yes, but there has not been one in all those years, since 1996. It is a lot of years. The reason is, it was devastating.

I want to put in the RECORD, first of all, how the Affordable Care Act is benefiting the people of this country already. Yes, it has had its major problems on getting on its webpage and the rest. We had that the first day in California, but we had millions of visits to the site, millions. We didn't expect it. It is going to be smoothed out. Yes, there will be ways to fix it. But I wanted to put in the RECORD the individual stories of my people and how they will benefit and how, it seems to me, so counterintuitive to stop a bill that was passed almost 4 years ago, upheld by the Supreme Court, and now finally is going into place. It is wrong to shut down the government because of such a law that is bringing peace of mind to so many—tens of thousands already in California signed up. I had to make that point.

I also want to reiterate what Ronald Reagan said, President Reagan, about playing with the full faith and credit of the United States. I want the American people to think about why we are in this place and how they can stop this from ever happening again, because I think it is a disgrace and it is wrong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I have enjoyed—well, not really, but I listened to my colleagues from the left talk about just reopening the government. I think to myself as she used the analogy of saving someone's life, dragging

them halfway to the shore and stopping—I think to myself, think about the veterans. The House of Representatives passed a bill to fund the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I think about all those veterans who served our Nation, put their lives on the line. The House of Representatives sent over a bill to fund the very crucial needs of our veterans. Yet the Senate has failed to take it up. I think about the national parks and all the opportunities we have to see our parks reopen, see our veterans from World War II not denied. But, no, the Senate refuses to take it up.

I think of NIH and the critical funding that is necessary to continue the research. Yet our friends on the left refuse to take up this critical piece of legislation.

I enjoy being lectured to. I call it “the Democrat lecture series,” but at the end of the day we ought to have action and not simply words. I understand it is important for us to figure out who to blame.

In politics, the lowest common denominator is always fear. Our friends on the left do a very good job of assigning blame to someone, someplace, somehow, all the time, but what we need is leadership, not more information about polls but leadership. We need people committed to a cause. In a town that seems to be the epicenter of activity for the economy, we have two-thirds of this legislative process, the White House and the Senate, being run by our Democratic friends. Yet they want to blame the Republicans for the shutdown.

I call this, no question, undeniably the Democratic shutdown. I hope we find ourselves in a position to tell our veterans we were not kidding when we made the promise. Promises made should be promises kept. There ought to be no question of our commitment. We have seen that commitment demonstrated by our friends in the House, Republicans and Democrats, working together to pass legislation to take care of our veterans. We need more of that. That is leadership, working together, finding common ground to take care of those who have made America possible. But not today, not in this Senate, not when those bills sit idle. But the men and women who served our country cannot sit idle. They go without their benefits. I wonder why. I wonder why we are not seeing the sense of urgency to take care of those areas where there is full agreement. Why are we not taking advantage of the opportunities presented to us on a consistent basis by our friends in the House of Representatives? I do not understand that. I simply do not understand that.

I will say I do find it very difficult to find common ground in the Senate at times. It is going to be very difficult for Republicans and Democrats to find something we have in common. I believe we strive to work in a bipartisan

fashion on a consistent basis, and I will tell you that on the most important issues it is very difficult. But I have been encouraged in my research in the last few days of looking for common ground—I have been encouraged that I have found some friends on the left who actually seem to agree with my position on some of the most important issues facing the Nation today. I will even quote some of my friends to the left as I think through the debt ceiling debate.

As a matter of fact, the first quote I will start with from my friends on the left:

The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure.

I concur with my friend on the left. Another quote:

Interest payments are a significant tax on all Americans. A debt tax Washington did not want to talk about.

I concur and agree with my friend to the left. Another quote:

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that the buck stops here.

I agree with my friend on the left. My colleague on the left is now the President of the United States. These are quotes from Senator Barack Obama.

Our President of the United States and our Vice President, combined, voted approximately I think it was 10 or 11 times not to raise the debt ceiling of our country. They called it a failure of leadership. I think it is interesting. As a small business owner for the last 15 years I have had the opportunity to borrow what I considered at the time real money. Now that I am in Washington, I have to redefine the definition of real money. But at the time I was trying to get my business started. I went to a bank to borrow some money. The banker had some very interesting questions for me. He wanted to know how I was going to pay it back. He wanted to know what assets I was willing to put up in order to receive the resources I needed to fund my business.

I see the debt ceiling debate as a debate over how we explain to our investors, the American taxpayers, that we are handling responsibly the underlying causes for the need to increase our debt. I cannot tell our investors that we are handling our debt—our spending responsibly. I cannot tell our investors that we have a plan to balance our budgets. I cannot tell our investors, the taxpayers of America, that we are even thinking about controlling our spending. No. As a matter of fact, over the last 5 years we have spent nearly \$5 trillion more than we brought in. And our friends on the left want to have a serious conversation about the spending of this country.

I cannot tell our investors, the American taxpayers, what I want to tell them, but I can tell them that we do

not deserve an increase in the debt ceiling unless we produce a plan. I can tell our investors here at home that we do not deserve an increase without balancing our budgets. I can tell them, the taxpayers of America, that until we are willing to cut our spending at the same rate that we increase our credit card limit, we don't deserve their confidence in raising the debt ceiling.

Some would ask: Senator SCOTT, where, pray tell, would you find the revenue when our friends in the House of Representatives say that there is just no more money for us to cut? We can't find any place to cut anything in this \$4 trillion spending plan. Really? Well, there are many options on how to cut spending here in America.

Senator TOM COBURN regularly shares reports on government waste. Last year he showed how the Market Access Program provided \$20 million to the Cotton Council International. They used that money to create reality TV shows in India intended to promote the use of cotton. India, for the record, is an exporter of cotton and produces twice the amount the U.S. does.

The OMB released a report that improper payments for Medicare amounted to \$47.9 billion in 2010, or 9 percent of Medicare's budget. The Chamber of Commerce looked at the Davis-Bacon requirements and found that it inflates the costs of Federal construction projects by as much as 15 percent and costs the taxpayers over \$1 billion annually.

There are over 1,500 programs in the U.S. Government that are in duplication and costing the taxpayers more than \$400 billion.

I would like to be able to share with the investors of America, the taxpayers, that we have a plan. I would love to share with the taxpayers of America that one day we will balance our budget. I would love to tell the taxpayers of America, our investors, that they can have confidence in our ability to lead us in such a way that future debt increases will be less likely to happen. I have not seen such a plan. I have not heard conversations about controlling our debt, only conversations about increasing the limit to create more debt.

I am concerned that as we wrestle with the problems of today we have no focus on tomorrow. I hope that this body will work diligently not only to have a conversation about the debt limit of America but to have a conversation about how we take care of the underlying problem.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from California.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WORLD BANK REFORM EFFORTS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the World Bank-IMF Annual Meetings are this week, and President Kim is expected to propose and seek approval for significant changes to the Bank's strategy, organization, and budget. After years of promised but undelivered change, serious and lasting reform at the World Bank is long overdue.

An October 9th Washington Post article, entitled "Wider Impact Eludes World Bank," describes the limited impact of billions of dollars spent by the Bank on some 700 projects in 100 countries since the global financial crisis because of delays, poor oversight, cost overruns, and projects that did not deliver promised economic benefits.

This track record raises serious questions about the World Bank's relevance as developing countries struggle with growing demands for energy, water, food, education, health care, and jobs.

There are many capable, dedicated people at the World Bank who chose to work there because of their belief in its development mission. But for too long the Bank has been an insular, inflexible, arrogant, and risk-adverse institution, more responsive to government elites than the needs of the poor.

Beyond that, an October 7th New York Times article entitled "World Bank, Rooted in Bureaucracy, Proposes a Sweeping Reorganization," describes a recent survey of the Bank's 10,000 employees. The survey revealed a "culture of fear" and a "terrible environment for collaboration."

I have voiced concerns about this culture myself. Fiefdoms are jealously guarded by Bank managers. Staff has been retaliated against, ostracized, and had their careers destroyed because they had the audacity to complain about incompetence, corruption, waste, or instances of sexual harassment and abuse.

For literally decades, I have heard promises of reform from one president of the Bank after another, yet the Bank's bureaucracy has defended the status quo. The Bank has become expert at appearing open to reform while fiercely resisting change.

So it is refreshing to hear a World Bank president openly acknowledge that the Bank has drifted away from its core mission of fighting poverty, and that its bureaucracy has become "concretized." President Kim has denounced the culture of fear that leads to risk avoidance, and he has shown a willingness to challenge the conventional wisdom.

He has said that the employees of the World Bank's multiple components

must work together if they are to have any hope of meeting the goals of eliminating extreme poverty by 2030 and increasing the incomes of the poorest 40 percent. He has also said that the World Bank must become more efficient and responsive to balance the increasing influence of countries like China. And to get there, he is proposing the first major strategic realignment in 17 years.

How does President Kim propose to change the Bank?

He has already shaken up senior management and brought in new people from outside. And he is proposing changes to the way the World Bank is organized and does its work. He wants to take down the bureaucratic silos that are inefficient, promote rivalries, and keep people from working together.

President Kim wants the technical staff to have greater influence within the Bank and he wants them to share their knowledge with countries. He thinks the Bank should be a better partner, helping governments make sound education, health, and job training investments for their people.

President Kim recognizes that the Bank requires increased resources to achieve its goals but that the Bank's long-term financial health is ultimately dependent on its ability to become more self-reliant. He wants to leverage private sector funding, increase revenue, and seek new financial tools to support country development.

He proposes to cut the World Bank's operating costs by \$400 million over 3 years. He estimates that for every \$100 million reduced in the Bank's operating budget an additional \$1 billion would be available for new loans.

I am encouraged by President Kim's energy, focus, and willingness to address long-standing entrenched problems at the World Bank. He and the Bank's many employees should know that those of us in Congress who are responsible for appropriating the funds for the U.S. share of payments to the World Bank will be strongly supporting his efforts, and basing future appropriations on the results.

NATIONAL CYBER SECURITY AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, this month, our Nation commemorates the 10th anniversary of National Cyber Security Awareness Month—a time to raise awareness about the need to ensure a safe and secure environment for all Americans in cyber space.

All of us have a stake in improving the Nation's cyber security. That is why I join with stakeholders in the government, academia and the private sector in calling attention to the need to address new cyber threats.

In today's digital age, we face new challenges in securing our computer

networks from cyber threats and cyber crime. Even as the Internet and other rapidly advancing technologies spur economic growth and expand opportunity, there is growing uncertainty and unease about how Americans' sensitive personal information is collected, shared and stored. National Cyber security Awareness Month provides an important reminder about the need to update our Federal laws to keep pace with this new reality.

As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I continue to work to update our outdated Federal privacy laws. Earlier this year, I reintroduced bipartisan legislation to update the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, ECPA. The bill requires that the government obtain a search warrant—based upon probable cause—before gaining access to the content of our email and other electronic communications, when those communications are stored with a service provider. This common sense legislation, which I have cosponsored with Republican Senator MIKE LEE, enjoys broad support from a diverse coalition of organizations including the American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Tax Reform, the Center for Democracy and Technology, and the Heritage Foundation.

I remain disappointed that a Republican Senator has objected to the unanimous consent request to pass this bipartisan bill, which overwhelmingly passed the Judiciary Committee in April. These privacy reforms are too important to delay. I hope that the Senate will consider and pass my bipartisan privacy bill without further delay.

I will also continue to work to better protect Americans from the growing threats of data breaches and cyber crime. For several years, I have sought to enact comprehensive data privacy legislation that would establish a single nationwide standard for data breach notification and also clarify and strengthen the criminal penalties for violations of the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act. These critical privacy proposals will help make all of us safer and more secure in cyber space and I will continue to push for enactment of these privacy reforms.

I commend the many citizens from Vermont and across the country who are holding events to recognize National Cyber Security Awareness Month. I look forward to working with these stakeholders and with Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to help ensure that our right to privacy is protected in cyber space.

GILLESPIE RESPONSE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, earlier this week the majority leader quoted from a speech delivered on September 30 by Ed Gillespie, the former chairman of the Republican National Committee

and the current chairman of the Republican State Leadership Committee. The majority leader used this quotation to attack Congressional Republicans and defend the hardline strategy embraced by Democrats. Unfortunately, he took Mr. Gillespie's words out of context and failed to mention some of the other remarks Mr. Gillespie made in that very same speech.

Not surprisingly, Mr. Gillespie has responded with a letter. He ends his letter by saying: "Republican governors and legislators work across the aisle daily to solve the most critical issues in their states. It's an example of executive and legislative leadership you and President Obama would do well to emulate."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Gillespie's entire letter, along with his entire speech to the 2013 Republican State Leadership Committee Annual Meeting.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RSLC CHAIRMAN ED GILLESPIE LETTER TO SENATOR HARRY REID

WASHINGTON, D.C. (October 9, 2013).—Today the Republican State Leadership Committee released the following letter from Chairman Ed Gillespie:

DEAR SENATOR REID, Yesterday on the Senate Floor you cited remarks by me at the Republican State Leadership Committee National Meeting to bolster your own flawed policies. I'm sending you a copy of the remarks as they were released so you can see that they explicitly criticize your position and support Republicans in Congress.

Specifically, at the beginning of my remarks you'll see that I said: "It's hard to see how President Obama could oppose a legislative extension of the individual mandate when he's issued an extension for big businesses by executive fiat, and it's hard to see how Harry Reid could oppose funding the rest of the government just to protect a carve-out for himself and his colleagues."

You neglected to mention this in your floor statement yesterday.

Nor did you quote the full context of my RSLC remarks, which were: "On top of that, Republicans in the House majority and Senate minority, are nearly always in the position of talking about what they're against—what they want to block or repeal or defund. "And we join them in staunch opposition to the President's harmful policies—but our party might be better off if we spent more time speaking in positive terms about WHY we're against those policies and, more importantly, why we're FOR the policies we're for—as our state Republican leaders do so consistently."

To be clear, I agree with House Speaker John Boehner when he said, "The way to resolve this is to sit down and have a conversation to resolve our differences."

Republican governors and legislators work across the aisle daily to solve the most critical issues in their states. It's an example of executive and legislative leadership you and President Obama would do well to emulate.

Sincerely,

ED GILLESPIE,

Chairman,

Republican State Leadership Committee.

CHAIRMAN ED GILLESPIE REMARKS AT 2013 RSLC ANNUAL RETREAT, AS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

As we're meeting here today, things are pretty messy in Washington, D.C.

And Americans are growing increasingly frustrated with President Obama and Congress. The approval ratings for everyone in Washington are dropping, but sadly Republicans in Congress are the ones in the basement, with approval ratings below President Obama and Democrats in Congress.

I'm hopeful today's decision by the House leadership to pass a Continuing Resolution which funds the government while delaying the individual mandate in Obamacare for a year, and eliminating its subsidies for Members of Congress and staff will change that.

It's hard to see how President Obama could oppose a legislative extension of the individual mandate when he's issued an extension for big businesses by executive fiat, and it's hard to see how Harry Reid could oppose funding the rest of the government just to protect a carve-out for himself and his colleagues.

So while there has been some very positive developments in this debate, I also think our Republican friends at the Federal level could benefit from sounding more like state leaders like those here today—lieutenant governors, attorneys general, house speakers and senate leaders—who talk all the time about improving the quality of life for the people you serve, in tangible terms.

When it comes to improving schools, growing jobs, creating opportunities, making communities safer, helping families in need, providing affordable housing for the working poor, fixing roads, and effectively responding to natural disasters—Republicans at the state level practice what they preach.

And the majority of Americans—53 percent to be exact—who live in states with a Republican governor and Republican majorities in their state legislatures, like what they hear and, more importantly, what they see.

Our caucuses continue to grow, expand and set records because of the positive leadership people like the elected officials we're honored to have with us here today are providing back home.

Now, I worked on Capitol Hill for more than a decade, and I've served in the White House as Counselor to the President. I was there for the confrontations between Speaker Gingrich and President Clinton, and President Bush and Speaker Pelosi. So I understand the dynamics when one party has control of congress and the other the presidency, from both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue—and the advantage of the "bully pulpit" over often competing voices.

On top of that, Republicans in the House majority and Senate minority, are nearly always in the position of talking about what they're against—what they want to block or repeal or defund.

And we join them in staunch opposition to the President's harmful policies—but our party might be better off if we spent more time speaking in positive terms about WHY we're against those policies and, more importantly, why we're FOR the policies we're for—as our state Republican leaders do so consistently.

I mean . . . when it comes to health care, Republican policies would protect people with pre-existing conditions, hold down premiums which are skyrocketing today, let people truly keep the health insurance they have if they like it, and allow workers to earn wages for 40 hours per week instead of 29.

Republican energy policies mean lower gas prices at the pump, lower home heating bills in winter, high-paying American jobs and less reliance on foreign sources of oil.

Republican economic policies mean more working families enjoying a better quality of life, and more people knowing the difference between holding a job as opposed to building a career.

We want American companies to expand jobs here rather than invest profits abroad by eliminating loopholes and tax breaks to bring the tax on business down from the highest in the world, so 401(k)s and pensions get bigger for those wanting to retire and young people graduating from high school and college are able to start a life on their own instead of living with their parents.

A friend once told me, "The American dream is not just owning your own home, it's getting your children out of it."

Those are some of the positive impacts of Republican policies in people's lives, and voters of every kind would welcome hearing about them—and they could lead more minorities, women and young people to think about voting Republican.

Unfortunately, all they too often hear from us is, "Repeal Obamacare. Approve the Keystone XL pipeline. Pass tax reform."

Repeal. Approve. Pass.

Short-hand process arguments that resonate strongly with people who already agree with us, but not really music to independent ears. We need to break out of a speech pattern that dwells on process, and discipline ourselves to talk about the benefits of Republican policies.

Democrats talk more than we do about lifting people out of poverty, expanding the middle class, and addressing income inequality.

And yet it's our policies that actually do those things and their policies that make them worse.

Most Americans realize that the constant stream of taxes, mandates, regulations and programs coming from the Obama Administration are not making our lives better, and certainly not helping our economy.

And I think deep down, many worry that these policies are not only killing U.S. jobs, but—worse—they run the risk of destroying the American work ethic.

They're worried about themselves and their families, and are pessimistic about our country's future.

Now, I sometimes find myself feeling angry and frustrated that more of my fellow Americans aren't more angry and frustrated. But while expressing anger and frustration gives voice to our core voters, it doesn't do much for all those worried and pessimistic voters.

They want hope and optimism.

They want to know how Republican policies will make things better, and it's our job in the states to explain that in relatable terms and demonstrate it with tangible solutions based on our conservative principles of freedom, liberty and equal opportunity.

Republicans understand that prosperity results from an economy based on creating wealth, not just redistributing it; and that if you truly care about helping the least among us and lifting millions of people out of poverty and expanding the middle class, history proves you should favor a system of democratic capitalism over a government managed economy.

We need to start measuring compassion not by how many of our fellow Americans are living off government programs, on food stamps, or in public housing but by how . . . many have become able to provide for them-

selves and their families through good jobs, like we're seeing more and more in Republican-led states.

It is no coincidence that the boom in natural gas occurring across our country is taking place in the one sector of the energy industry regulated by the states rather than the Federal government—and no coincidence that so much of that is taking place in states with Republican governors and legislatures who know how to protect our environment and property rights while also unleashing a transformative source of abundant domestic energy.

Republican policies promote equal opportunity. We know that eliminating discrimination is a moral imperative, but it does not alone guarantee the equal opportunity we all believe in.

So Republican attorneys general not only enforce anti-discrimination laws, Republican state legislators fight to improve our schools, empower parents and give children in poor neighborhoods a quality education that enables them to get into college or qualify for a good paying job.

The quality of a child's school should not be decided by the zip code in which she lives, and state legislators like the ones in this room are the ones who consistently stand up for those children against entrenched education establishments.

Another issue that's being resolved in the states is a very sensitive one, and it's being worked out in a more respectful way than it would be at the Federal level. I'm talking, of course, of same sex marriage.

As with, I'm sure, many of you, I have friends and family who are gay. And according to the tenets of my Faith, I accept them for who they are and love them. But the tenets of my Faith also hold that marriage is between one man and one woman. Indeed, in the Catholic Church, marriage is one of seven holy sacraments.

You see, for me, this is not a matter of opinion, or even really a choice. But I understand that what is a sacred rite to tens of millions of Americans is also in our civil law the means by which couples garner survivorship benefits, hospital visitation rights, insurance coverage and other benefits. So while I don't support same sex marriage, I do not begrudge its advocates their position on the issue.

And, I don't believe that everyone who supports same sex marriage is anti-Catholic, or a religious bigot. But in the same vein, it would be nice if so many of them would stop accusing everyone who doesn't share their views of being anti-gay or homophobic. Freedom of Religion is still in the very first Amendment to the Constitution.

We may not all agree on whether we should redefine what constitutes marriage, but hopefully we can agree not to redefine what constitutes tolerance.

So on the state level, and in particular in states with Republican leadership, we're seeing the benefits of respectful dialogue, problem solving policies and fiscal responsibility. Republicans are balancing budgets, reducing tax burdens, improving schools and making families safer and better off.

I know you're all familiar with our Future Majority Project at the RSLC, where we are recruiting hundreds of candidates for state legislatures who more fully reflect the growing diversity of our nation. So in addition to a positive message, we'll have fresh-faced messengers as well.

The RSLC's sole purpose is to help elect Republicans. Doing that means getting a majority of votes in thousands of different districts, and dozens of states.

We understand that Republican legislators here in Hawaii will not pass legislation identical to those in Texas or Ohio or North Carolina; and that attorneys general in North Dakota, Georgia, or Idaho won't have the same list of priorities.

But their shared beliefs, principles and values take each of their states in a much better direction than their Democratic opponents would.

Republicans don't seek to win elections to gain power, but to translate our principles into policies that make our country stronger and make lives better for our fellow citizens. And that means winning majorities in legislative chambers, electing governors and other statewide officeholders, and—ultimately—winning a majority of the Electoral College again.

If Republicans can have unified state government where a majority of Americans live, we can win back the White House. But to do so, we'll have to learn valuable lessons at the national level, and those lessons are being taught at the state level.

The United States of America is a great nation, but we can see how President Obama's policies are making us weaker—here at home and in the world. The Republican Party is a great Party. But we have not won the national popular vote in five of the last six presidential elections.

For our country to be stronger, our party must be stronger.

And that begins with all of us.

RECOGNIZING NIH RESEARCH

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, today I wish to honor Dr. Tara Palmore and Dr. Julie Segre, 2013 Federal Employees of the Year, for their groundbreaking research to stop the spread of deadly hospital-acquired infections. Each year approximately 100,000 patients die from hospital-acquired infections. These deadly infections affect patients who are in the course of receiving healthcare treatment for other conditions; therefore, the patients often already have compromised immune systems. These two doctors created a revolutionary model to identify and halt the spread of infection for the rest of the health care industry to follow.

Over the course of a 12-month period in 2011 and 2012, a rare and deadly “superbug” was spreading from patient to patient at one of the Nation's premier research hospitals, the National Institutes of Health's Clinical Center. This two-woman team—Dr. Tara Palmore, a deputy hospital epidemiologist, and Dr. Julie Segre, a senior investigator—partnered with a talented team of doctors to accomplish an extraordinary achievement. For the first time ever, they were able to sequence the bacteria's DNA to decipher how the pathogen spread from patient to patient. This allowed doctors to detect the origins of the infections, trace the transmission, and implement measures to put an end to the outbreak.

Tragically, 18 seriously ill patients acquired the bacteria and seven ultimately died from the infection, but this use of genomics could profoundly change the way hospital-acquired in-

fections are identified and halted, leading to quicker response times and saving tens of thousands of lives. Dr. Francis Collins, the Director of the NIH said,

“It is a groundbreaking advance in one hospital that will now have an impact across the world and will become the standard. It is a fantastic example of taking a challenging medical problem and applying technologies in a new way to come up with a remarkable result. We now have a new weapon in the battle to stop the spread of drug-resistant organisms.”

Dr. John Gallin, the Director of the NIH's Clinical Center, said the breakthrough by the NIH team is “a magnificent demonstration of how a hospital can contain these infections when they occur.”

There are a limited number of antibiotics available to fight these types of highly resistant bacteria, so this new discovery provides a new approach for hospital infection control that will benefit numerous patients in the future. I congratulate Drs. Palmore and Segre for their hard work and critical contributions to the health care community and to all of their colleagues for the great work at the National Institutes of Health.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ORTHEIA BARNES

• Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, on November 3, the many friends and admirers of Ortheia Barnes will gather in Detroit to pay tribute to her remarkable life and career. “Careers” would actually be more appropriate in Ortheia's case, because this extraordinary lifelong Detroit resident has excelled in multiple fields.

Some Detroiters know Ortheia as an entertainer. They have heard her voice accompanying Motown legends and recording stars such as Aretha Franklin, heard her powerful renditions of gospel songs or watched her sing during the annual Thanksgiving parade downtown or they have seen her in stage productions or local television programs.

Other Detroiters know Ortheia from her civic involvement. She is active in a host of charitable endeavors, from the American Cancer Society to Focus: HOPE, to programs that help people recover from addiction.

Some may know Ortheia from her political activism. She has long been active in Michigan elections, from city council to Senate, and she is an energetic advocate for the idea that every American, regardless of race or creed or color, is welcome and needs to be active in the political process.

If you do not know Ortheia as an entertainer or supporter of worthy causes, you know her for her faith. She has ministered around the world, not only sharing her faith but doing the good works that are so fundamental to it.

I am fortunate to know Ortheia for all the gifts she has given our community and in one more way: My wife Barbara and I have known her as a longtime family friend. Her family and ours have been linked through three generations, beginning with Barbara's and Ortheia's mothers. Ortheia herself briefly babysat our kids while she was in high school. We know how proud Ortheia's warm and wise mom Belle was of her daughter back then and of her growing pride as the multigifted adult Ortheia emerged.

When Detroit gathers on November 3 to celebrate Ortheia's birthday, the dress will be sharp, the music will be proud, and the stories will be many. Whether we know Ortheia from the pulpit or the stage, from campaign strategy sessions or gatherings of family and friends, Detroiters admire her spirit, her energy, her dedication and her talent, and we thank her for all she has done and all she will do for our community and its people.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 51312(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy: Mrs. McCarthy of New York.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 803(a)), the Minority Leader appoints the following member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Congressional Award Board: Mr. Mitchell Draizin of New York, New York.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following joint resolutions were read the first time:

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions,

with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1094. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-113).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PAUL:

S.J. Res. 25. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to applying laws equally to the citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. Res. 268. A resolution condemning the September 2013 terrorist attack at the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, and Reaffirming United States support for the people and Government of Kenya, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 610

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 610, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 666, a bill to prohibit attendance of an animal fighting venture, and for other purposes.

S. 699

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes.

S. 955

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 955, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide liability protections for volunteer practitioners at health centers under section 330 of such Act.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1352

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1352, a bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1531

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1531, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the types of wines taxed as hard cider.

S. 1557

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1557, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

S. 1570

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1570, a bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to authorize advance appropriations for the Indian Health Service by providing 2-fiscal-year budget authority, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 268—CONDEMNING THE SEPTEMBER 2013 TERRORIST ATTACK AT THE WESTGATE MALL IN NAIROBI, KENYA, AND REAFFIRMING UNITED STATES SUPPORT FOR THE PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT OF KENYA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 268

Whereas, on September 21, 2013, armed terrorists attacked the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, killing more than 60 people and injuring at least 175 from at least 12 different countries during a four-day siege;

Whereas the attack was the most deadly terrorist incident in Kenya since the 1998 al Qaeda bombing of the United States Embassy in Nairobi;

Whereas al Shabaab, a Somali Islamist extremist group with ties to al Qaeda, has claimed responsibility for the attack, declaring that it was in retaliation for the Government of Kenya's participation in the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM);

Whereas al Shabaab was designated a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the United States Government in 2008 and a Specially Designated Global Terrorist entity in 2012;

Whereas the investigation to identify those responsible for the attack and efforts to bring them to justice are ongoing;

Whereas Kenya is an important ally and regional security partner, playing a vital role in breaking al Shabaab's recent stranglehold on Somalia through its participation in AMISOM;

Whereas the Republic of Kenya and the United States have a strong and enduring partnership based on a shared commitment to promoting peace and prosperity in East Africa and around the world; and

Whereas Kenya is a culturally rich and ethnically diverse country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns, in the strongest possible terms, the heinous atrocities and terrorist attack that occurred at the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, from September 21 through 24, 2013;

(2) offers its condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of those who were killed in the attack and expresses its hope for the recovery of the wounded, including United States citizens;

(3) recognizes the many heroic and selfless act by Kenyan citizens, first responders, and the Kenya Red Cross to rescue those caught in the Westgate Mall during the attack;

(4) reaffirms United States support for the efforts of the Government and people of

Kenya to combat terrorism, counter extremism, promote tolerance, and bring the perpetrators of the Westgate Mall attack to justice;

(5) commends the Government of Kenya's continued participation in the African Union Mission in Somalia; and

(6) recognizes Kenya as an important regional ally and partner of the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 11, 2013, at 1 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building. The Committee will conduct a hearing entitled, "The Impacts of the Government Shutdown on Our Economic Security."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ FOR THE FIRST TIME—H.J. RES. 79

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I understand that H.J. Res. 79 has been received from the House and it is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the joint resolution will be read for a second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR SATURDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2013

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m. on Saturday, October 12, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that the time until 12 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, at noon tomorrow there will be a cloture

vote on the motion to proceed to S. 1569, the debt limit legislation.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators SESSIONS and BLUNT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alabama.

THE DEBT INCREASE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, the Republican Senators met with President Obama earlier today and discussed many of the financial issues facing America and the difficulties we are having in achieving an agreement that puts us on a sound financial path. There surely are actions we can take together to improve our situation. I believe there was some progress made, and there are some avenues for progress that could be opened in the hours to come. I hope we can do that.

But now it is well to recognize that our Medicare and Medicaid programs are surging in costs, and—as the President rightly noted to us at our meeting earlier today and has done so for a number of years—that government health care costs are the biggest drivers of our debt. In other words, it is increasing at a faster rate than other programs, and we project it will continue to increase at those rates.

I think that is true. It is true. We have a huge challenge there. But importantly to this whole discussion, I recall during a formal address to a joint session of Congress in September 2009, the President promoted his Affordable Care Act and stated that he would help fix this problem of growing costs of health care and then flatly and unequivocally promised, "I will not sign a plan that adds one dime to our deficits either now or any time in the future, period." That is astoundingly inaccurate, and we have to know this. We are voting and wrestling on what to do about our health care bill and other spending programs. But one thing that has been overlooked is this promise that the health care bill—the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare—is not paid for as it was promised, and it is astoundingly over budget.

Let me talk for a few minutes about this issue and its importance. As we work together to try to reach a compromise, we have to understand that fact. As we work to deal with some of our long-term financial challenges, we need to focus on that matter.

Indeed, it appears, according to the Government Accountability Office, that over the long-term accounting period used to evaluate the unfunded liabilities of the United States, that the

Affordable Care Act will add \$6.2 trillion to the unfunded liabilities of America. That does not count the interest on that over this long period of time which may well double that figure. It puts it almost equal to the liability of Social Security—and maybe even more. So this is a big deal.

I want to share with my colleagues some thoughts as good faith negotiations are going on by Members. Republicans and Democrats are talking, the White House staff people are talking, and House Members and the Speaker are talking. There are some principles they need to be aware of as we go forward. I have a budget warning, and will make this point: Trust fund improvements—Social Security and Medicare primarily—are produced by savings or increased revenues in these programs. A number of ideas have been floated that could do that, and they need to be done. But those savings through revenue or new cutting of expenses cannot be used to justify or pay for breaking Budget Control Act caps, and that is very important.

It is essential in these hours of financial debate that all Members of Congress and the American people understand that the savings gained from much-needed reforms of our financially unsound Social Security and Medicare trust funds can only be used to strengthen those funds and not be used simultaneously to support spending for a new program, such as the Affordable Care Act. We can't use the money twice.

Our vital Social Security and Medicare programs are not solvent at this time. We know they are going into deficit right now. Our revenues will increase for those programs or costs to those programs will be brought down—as many ideas are being floated, and indeed, a number of them are in the President's budget and have some merit—and the resulting funds can only be spent once. The Budget Control Act restricts discretionary spending. It says: We are not going to increase spending over a certain rate. We are going to reduce the rate of increase in government spending.

The Budget Control Act is in the law. It was negotiated by the President, Senator REID—the majority leader here—the Speaker, and Senator MCCONNELL, and they agreed on certain limits on spending over the next 10 years. At that time we were projected to increase spending over 10 years by \$10 trillion. If it was flat spending, we would spend \$37 trillion; under projected growth it would go to \$47 trillion.

Under the Budget Control Act we said: OK, we are going to cut spending. It really wasn't a cut in spending. But we would reduce the growth of spending from \$10 trillion to \$8 trillion, and that is why we are hearing so much today.

In the 2 years-plus since that agreement, Congress—except for a few budget gimmicks that my staff members bring up—has largely stuck to those limits. The President and the Democratic Senate have openly and directly opposed those limits. The President—6 months after signing the Budget Control Act—submitted a budget to this Senate that would increase spending \$1 trillion over the limits agreed to in the Budget Control Act. Can you imagine that? There was a bipartisan meeting. As we worked on the debt ceiling to raise the debt ceiling \$2 trillion, we agreed that over 10 years we would cut spending by \$2.1 trillion.

Six months later, the President submits a budget to the Senate and to the House that calls for spending \$1 trillion over that amount. So I think that was a breach—a serious act of the President to move away from the promises he had made and the act he signed into law.

To be more specific about it, one of the proposals in the President's budget that received a lot of discussion is an alteration of the way we calculate the inflation index for Social Security. It has been referred to as chained CPI. It is projected to save a certain amount of money—maybe \$128 billion or maybe more. Let's just say it is going to save \$100 billion—chained CPI—and it would, in fact, increase the revenue into Social Security, and it would reduce the amount of money that is paid out of Social Security. It would save, let's say, \$100 billion. So this would strengthen Social Security, there is no doubt about that. It would strengthen Social Security because the Social Security liabilities are going down and the revenue is going up.

What I wish to say to our colleagues as they wrestle with how to bring our numbers into better balance is that those savings cannot benefit Social Security and simultaneously justify increased Treasury spending over the Budget Control Act levels.

We can't use the money twice. This is so basic. We are talking about hundreds of billions of dollars.

CBO, our Congressional Budget Office, has analyzed this kind of maneuver, and they have clearly affirmed that even though the budget score over 10 years, using the unified budget accounting methods, would suggest otherwise, we cannot spend the money in both places.

So if we know how to ask a question of CBO, over the 10-year budget window, it can give the appearance that we have this money because it creates more money coming into the government that we can spend over here. But the money is dedicated to Social Security. It is Social Security money. It can't be spent twice. If it is going to strengthen Social Security, it can't be spent over here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Presiding Officer most graciously.

CBO has flatly called this in a letter, at my request, double-counting. Can my colleagues imagine the Congressional Budget Office saying that the U.S. Congress is double-counting? Actually, in that case, in dealing with the Affordable Care Act, \$500 billion of money extracted out of Medicare was being used to claim it would pay for the Affordable Care Act when it was Medicare's money.

So I am talking at this point and just sharing an example from Social Security and the chained CPI, but the principles are the same because both are trust funds. So it is double-counting.

In fact, any Social Security or Medicare trust fund savings so produced are legally assets of the trust fund, and debt instruments of the U.S. Treasury are issued and interest paid from the U.S. Treasury to Social Security and to the Medicare trust funds on the monies that are borrowed in that way. If the savings, as is likely, do not result in a trust fund surplus, then there is really no surplus that they can borrow. It simply tends to show more income to the U.S. Treasury—falsely showing that because, again, the money is committed off-budget to Social Security.

The critical fact is that all of those moneys are already obligated to Social Security and Medicare and will be needed by those programs, and more money, actually, is going to be needed by those programs to meet the future obligations of those trust funds, which are insolvent. They don't have enough money coming in to pay the obligations they will be required to pay in the years to come.

So the scope of this abuse of our accounting system is truly enormous and threatens our Nation's very financial future. For example, it has allowed the President to falsely assert that the Affordable Care Act would not add one dime to the debt when, absent double-counting, the act would increase our debt by over \$500 billion over the next 10 years—\$500 billion. It is going to adversely impact the financial condition of America.

The same accounting manipulations enabled many supporters of the Gang of 8 immigration bill to assert that their legislation was paid for. They were going to spend all of this money and they were going to make us safe from illegal immigration and it was all paid for—every dime of it—and wouldn't add to the debt. Do my colleagues know how they did that? Well, they were going to give Social Security cards to millions—11 million or however many would come forward—and

they would pay Social Security, and they would have more Social Security money coming into the U.S. Treasury, and therefore that would pay for the extra border patrol and other expenses they said they have to spend money on.

But I ask my colleagues to think about it. The money paid by the people who have been given legal status, the Social Security they have paid for is their money. It is their money. They are going to draw out every penny of it when they get older. We can't say it is available to pay another expense today. If we do, it is not going to be there, to pay for their Social Security when they retire. How simple is this? This was the message here on the floor. They steadfastly insisted that the bill was paid for, double-counting Social Security money.

So we have to get straight about this, I have to say. Legislation must be adopted to stop this double-counting. It is open to abuse and manipulation and has been done, really, by both parties in the past but not as much as we have seen lately. It is enabling the Nation's dangerous financial trajectory.

Finally, as we work to end the Nation's financial impasse, another warning is needed. All should understand that consent to passage of a continuing resolution or debt ceiling bill cannot be achieved until we have sufficient time to have a complete CBO score of it so we know what kind of maneuvers are being used in the bill. So I am going to object. We are not going to wake up one day and say we have to run to the floor and pass a bill with 30 minutes' notice or 3 hours' notice. That would be a mistake.

Madam President, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

SETTING PRIORITIES

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, first of all, I wish to follow up on a comment my friend from Alabama just made on Social Security and Medicare. I think it is very important that we listen carefully to what he had to say, that if we do things that are so-called reforms—and I think there are many places where we could reform those programs—we should use those savings to save those programs. We shouldn't say we are going to have reforms in Medicare, more likely, perhaps, right away, then Social Security, and then not use those reforms to extend the life of these important programs.

These are programs, we have told Americans—in the case of Social Security since the mid-1930s, and in the case of Medicare since the mid 1960s—that people would be able to rely on. We see that those programs can be extended and adjusted and reformed, but I think our leader on our side of the budget effort who spends so much time trying to

make the case for the right kind of budget decisions is clearly pointing out that if we make savings in these programs and then use that money to fund other discretionary spending, is that the fair thing to do with Social Security or Medicare? I don't think so, and I think the Senator from Alabama has raised a very good point.

As we try to figure out how to move forward this year, we need to be sure that savings are real savings, that they are not double-counted, that we are not saving money in one program that clearly should go toward the priority of that program rather than the other priorities we haven't yet set.

This brings me to the topic of setting priorities. We had the opportunity to go to the White House—the Democrats yesterday, Republicans today—to talk to the President about how we move forward with the budget year, the spending year that has already started. When we were there, the President made it clear once again that we shouldn't negotiate, but on more than one occasion in the morning when we were there, the President said we shouldn't be allowed to negotiate for things we couldn't get or didn't get in the regular process.

My view of that is there is no regular process. As the President said that, I thought, this is like pouring gas on a fire of frustration for Members of the Senate and particularly in the House who are frustrated that there is no process. There is no place earlier than a crisis to say: Let's debate these issues, let's debate these priorities.

How many of the 12 spending bills for the year that began 11 days ago have we had on the floor of the Senate? One. One of the bills that should have been done starting in about last March and April and that should have been completed over the summer. That money would have been spent beginning October 1. Not one of the 12 was on the floor, and, frankly, it was a bill the majority leader had every reason to believe wouldn't pass if it was brought to the floor. Let's assume it would have passed. It still would have just been one of the 12 bills we need to run the government.

So when the President or anybody else says we shouldn't use these crisis moments to try to get our priorities discussed, they are the only moments we have. They are the only time we have.

I don't like government by crisis. I think it is very unfortunate for this Presidency that if we really look at how the government has worked in the last 5 years, it is from one crisis to another. If I could do anything to help President Obama pull away from this crisis management, I would be inclined to want to try to do that, particularly if pulling away from crisis management meant we were going to come back and have a fair debate between a

divided Congress that leads to some way forward that can actually accomplish something.

The idea that we won't negotiate at this moment—or the President, feeling that somehow he won't be held hostage to the debt limit—I am certainly going to vote tomorrow not to even move forward with this discussion for a \$1 trillion debt ceiling increase with no discussion of what we are going to do to change our behavior.

President Obama, to his credit, entered into a negotiation just 2 years ago, in August of 2011, and in return for \$2.5 trillion worth of spending cuts over a decade, he got \$2.1 trillion in additional debt ceiling. Now, the President agreed to that in August of 2011 and then in October of 2013 says nobody should ever negotiate on the debt ceiling.

Fifty-three times since 1978 we have had a change in the debt ceiling, and since 1978 more than half of those debt limits included legislation dealing with either spending or other matters.

The President says: I will not put this on future Presidents, to be the President who goes forward with increasing the debt ceiling under some—with a negotiation.

Well, every President since 1978 has had the same situation the President had in August of 2011, the same situation the Presiding Officer and I would have if we were going to get our line of credit extended and we had exceeded our line of credit. Whoever is going to extend that line of credit is going to say: What are you going to do to change the behavior that allowed you to blow through your last line of credit?

The President and others will say: This is about America paying its bills. This is about wanting the current Congress to pay the bills it has incurred.

Well, most of the bills that have been incurred weren't incurred by this Congress; they were incurred by past legislation. Sixty-two percent of the spending is now in last year—it will probably be higher in the year we are in at this moment—62 percent of the spending was mandatory spending. It was spending put in place by Congresses beginning in the 1930s, through the health care bill. That is mostly mandatory spending. The current Congress didn't get to vote on the health care bill, but more importantly, most of the current Congress wasn't alive when the Social Security Act passed. Many of the Members of the Congress and even some of the Members of the Senate were not alive when Medicare passed.

This is the time for this Congress to look at those pieces of legislation and say: What do we need to do to adjust them to the future needs of the country? What do we need to do to adjust them to the current and future demographic realities of society? People live longer. People need these services

longer. What do we do to make this work in a way that these programs can last?

These are not programs put in place by this Congress. These are not bills incurred by this Congress. These are bills, in fact, for which this Congress and this President can decide we are going to look for these programs and be sure they last and look at these programs and be sure they can be paid for.

That is exactly the kind of discussion we should be having when we ask the American people, through their Congress, to extend the line of credit.

The idea that we will not negotiate on the debt ceiling or we will not negotiate on how to spend the money—if we do not negotiate on how to spend the money by bringing the appropriations bills to the floor, how are we supposed to negotiate and set priorities and let democracy work? I do not like democracy by crisis. Whatever we do in the next few weeks or months that it takes to finish out the year we have already started, what we should all do is commit ourselves for the year that begins next October 1 to be prepared for that like the Congresses until just 6 or 7 years ago generally were prepared at or near that date.

When there was a government shutdown in 1995, six of the appropriations bills had been passed, signed into law, and all those parts of the government were working after a debate that provided funding.

So I would just say, as I conclude, we need to move away from management by crisis, but we also need to understand that if we do not do the work the regular way, there is no other place to take a stand, there is no other place to have this debate. As to the President's sense that you could get this at some other point, there is no other point if the Congress and the President are not doing their job.

I will just say, we should do our job, we should do it in a way people can see. We should do it in the small bites that the budget process is set up to allow us to look at and debate. We have not done that over the last 12 months. We have started this year in about the worst possible way. Hopefully, we will get through this and then resolve to do the work the right way for what begins 1 year from now. But at this moment, the President thinking we can just go ahead and move forward without negotiating is a wrong decision on the President's part.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:04 p.m., adjourned until Saturday, October 12, 2013, at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, October 11, 2013

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 11, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Lord, You know there are many Americans who look to the people's House as uncertainty about the future of the economy and their livelihoods hang in the balance. Petty partisanship and ever-politicizing rhetoric should have no place at all when men and women of goodwill come together to serve the common good.

We ask again that You bless the Members of the people's House with the understanding that it is their work to develop the strategies and plans to assuage the fears of their fellow countrymen and -women.

We ask again that You impel those who possess power here in the Capitol to be mindful of those whom they represent who possess little or no power and whose lives are made all the more difficult by a failure to work out serious differences.

May all that is done today be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WITTMAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

LET'S GOVERN RESPONSIBLY

(Mr. WITTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, in July, I stood at this same podium arguing it shouldn't take a government shutdown threat each year to force Congress to do its job. I voted against Congress adjourning for the month of August, insisting that Congress remain to complete critical business.

The work of the people remains unfinished. Today is day 11 of the government shutdown. Thousands of workers stay home, without a paycheck, and yet Congress has not done its job.

This shutdown has failed to will Congress and the administration to the finish line, and we have seen a cycle of crisis management rather than responsible governing.

Mr. Speaker, Washington is broken. This is not governing. This is not what our Founding Fathers intended.

I urge Congress and the leadership in Washington to return to regular order of business. Instead of governing by crisis, let's responsibly govern, by getting the people's business completed on time.

END THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, as we slug through the second week of the government shutdown, American families and small businesses are hurting. Every day of the last 10 days I have been contacted by constituents who cannot operate their stores, pay tribute to their loved ones at a Federal memorial, or secure a small business loan.

These unnecessary hardships damage our economy, and could have been avoided if House Republicans were not obsessed with taking away health care benefits from the public we serve.

Government has the duty to keep its doors open, provide vital services, and pay its bills. These items should not be considered a Democratic Party wish list. They are basic functions of government and should not be used as an opportunity to secure political points or hold America's economy hostage.

It is well past time to vote to end the government shutdown, pay our bills, get the Nation back to work, and grow our economy.

A PICTURE IS WORTH A THOUSAND WORDS

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, a picture is worth a thousand words, and I felt like it was appropriate today because so many of our colleagues say, Why do we want to discuss ObamaCare when we talk about the budget or talk about the continuing resolution?

And here is the reason why. It is a program that is too expensive to afford.

Take a look at this graph. We all know that, supposedly, when ObamaCare started out—by the way, as an insurance access program for the nearly 40 million that didn't have insurance—it was to be under \$1 trillion, exactly \$863 billion.

So now we look at what has happened to the growth of this program. CBO shows us, looking at this, when you address \$1.4 trillion, 1.7, we are now at \$2.6 trillion in costs over a 10-year period of time.

So to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I say, this is why we have to put this program on the table and discuss it. It

is now a nationalization of 17 percent of our Nation's economy and has gone from under \$1 trillion to \$2.6 trillion. Let's get the spending under control.

THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as the House Republicans continue to shut down our Federal Government, I rise to draw attention to the impact it is having on our labor markets and job creation in this country.

The House Republican shutdown has prevented even the Bureau of Labor Statistics from releasing the September jobs report, and the Bureau is down to just three employees from its usual number, while the Republican shutdown is, in effect, making it impossible to compile the data for a jobs report for our country.

All we know is that our labor market, the number of people applying for unemployment benefits, increased somewhere between 66,000 and 300,000 people. We don't know what the unemployment rate actually is because we don't know how many people are looking for work, and we can't find the data. So we don't know what actually happened completely in September and this month.

This is creating needless uncertainty in our markets and makes it harder for businesses to know what is actually happening in our economy.

Before the House Republicans shut down the government, what we did know about our labor market was we still had 11 million people looking for work following the deepest recession since the Great Depression.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Republicans to bring the clean continuing resolution to the floor that has their budget number in it, and let's reopen the government.

IT IS TIME FOR DEBT SOLUTIONS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it is time for solutions. We're 11 days into a Federal Government shutdown and days away from exhausting government's \$16.7 trillion credit limit. Both parties need to be committed to opening government and getting our debt under control.

House Republicans want to reopen the government, pay our bills, and defend America's credit rating. So let's keep talking and work to build common ground.

It doesn't matter if you are a Republican or a Democrat. Each side can see the mathematical writing on the wall. In 10 years, discretionary spending will

grow 17 percent. Meanwhile, mandatory spending on our debt drivers will grow 79 percent.

Let's agree to start there. Let's reopen government, and let's reform what's driving our debt. Let's talk about making our Tax Code fairer and more competitive. Let's do the responsible thing to make sure we don't find ourselves in this situation year after year.

REPUBLICANS DON'T WANT TO REOPEN THE GOVERNMENT

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans don't want to reopen the government. If they did, all they have to do is bring up the Senate clean resolution and pass it here on the floor today. It'll go back to the Senate—I don't even know if it has to go back to the Senate—and the President has already agreed to sign it.

They are keeping the government closed as hostage because they want to negotiate—I don't even know what anymore. Initially, it was because they wanted to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act. I'm not sure it is even that anymore.

I think sometimes they just want to keep the government closed to show that they can. Clearly, the budget numbers are there. We have agreed to their budget numbers, so that is not the issue.

So, Speaker BOEHNER, please bring up a clean resolution today. The impact on the economy is getting to be more and more devastating every day. As my colleagues have mentioned, more and more jobs are being lost.

Instead of losing jobs, Speaker BOEHNER, we should be here trying to create jobs and use the government to work with the private sector to create jobs and grow the economy.

Don't continue to keep this government shut down. It is 2 weeks now, and the longer it goes on, the more it is going to have an impact on the economy and make it more difficult to create jobs. We will continue to lose jobs.

Bring up the clean resolution, Mr. Speaker.

LET'S GET OUR SPENDING AND DEBT UNDER CONTROL

(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, it has been a while. I know the American people are frustrated with the shutdown, and a week from now, the country will default if action is not taken.

How we got into this situation is not that complicated. You can only continue to spend so much of the public's

money, and then you run out of the public's money.

After years, 4 years of unchecked spending, when the Democrats controlled the House, the Senate and the White House, it has caught up with us. We put the brakes on 2 years ago, and this is a difficult way to put the brakes on now.

No one likes it. The American people don't like it. But we have got to get our spending and we have got to get our debt under control. You continue to spend, you incur debt.

Next week we'll go from \$17 trillion to probably a request for another \$1 trillion. That's not sustainable. We must work together to resolve this in the long-term interest and national economic and financial security of our Nation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled joint resolution was signed by the Speaker on Thursday, October 10, 2013:

H.J. Res. 91, making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military servicemembers of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 76

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) of the National Nuclear Security Administration that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint

resolution or in the Pay Our Military Act of September 30, 2013, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the following headings:

- (1) "Weapons Activities".
- (2) "Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation".
- (3) "Naval Reactors".
- (4) "Office of the Administrator".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Nuclear Weapon Security & Non-Proliferation Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "National Nuclear Security Administration Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Joint Resolution 76, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present critical legislation that will ensure our Nation's nuclear security, the Nuclear Weapons Security and Nonproliferation Act, the joint resolution just mentioned.

This legislation continues funding for the National Nuclear Security Administration at the current level provided in fiscal year 2013 until December 15, or until full-year appropriations have been signed into law. There are no new anomalies and there is no special treatment, but continuing these activities without interruption is vital to our national defense.

The National Nuclear Security Administration is responsible for maintaining our nuclear deterrent, securing vulnerable nuclear materials around the world to keep them out of the hands of terrorists, and supporting our Navy's nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers.

Funds will be used to keep the doors open so our scientists and engineers can keep our nuclear arsenal at the ready and our nuclear fleet operating efficiently.

□ 0915

These vital programs keep our country safe and secure and require well-trained, dedicated personnel.

So far, these high-priority national security missions have been sustained during this shutdown by operating off prior-year funding. While most of the Department of Energy's science and energy laboratories have enough carry-over funding to operate through November, the national security laboratories and stockpile production sites of the NNSA are not in that same position.

This week, the NNSA sites began notifying workers that they would be shutting down as early as October 17 to preserve remaining funds for essential functions like protecting nuclear materials. By the end of the month, 90 percent of the personnel at our nuclear weapons sites may be laid off, halting work to keep our nuclear weapons reliable. Once laid off, some of these vital workers may never return.

Suspending an ongoing nuclear production operation is no simple task. That interruption will lead to higher

costs and only make it more difficult to maintain an aging stockpile. We must act now to prevent disruption of these important nuclear security activities.

We must also sustain the critical work the NNSA's nonproliferation experts perform overseas. Despite hopeful press reports, Iran has not turned off its centrifuges; North Korea may have restarted its reactors to make more plutonium; and the Russian and Chinese Governments continue to build nuclear-armed ballistic submarines.

The technical expertise provided by our nuclear security experts is essential to our Nation's ability to monitor and respond to international developments such as these. We simply cannot afford to lose this oversight of nuclear weapons and their potential for proliferation.

Finally, our nuclear deterrent relies on the mission of our submarines, the very capable assets of which are maintained by the Naval Reactors Program at the Department of Energy. We must ensure they have adequate support to perform their mission across the globe.

Colleagues, I do recognize that this bill will not solve the larger funding problem. We must enact full-year annual appropriations to meet today's requirements, as voted on earlier this year, and not rely on continuing resolutions to keep the government open.

In this regard, my thanks to Ranking Member KAPTUR for her leadership and support of our annual appropriations process. Until we get back to regular order, this bill will provide critical funding to our Nation's security, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my colleague, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN, for his comments though, obviously, I have serious reservations about this bill because our country has been the world's shining example in how a democratic Republic can actually work efficiently, successfully, and democratically. Yet, today, we continue with the shenanigans from a minority of the majority, wasting God's good time.

For my colleagues who are listening, and for the country, let me say this bill should be coming to the floor at a level of \$31 billion to meet the national security, energy, and water needs of this country. The measure before us today contains \$10.6 billion and only deals with the nuclear security portion of the legislation. That is simply not sufficient for this great country.

We cannot continue to be governed by staggering from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis, and the folly—some would say madness—of what is going on here must be stopped. It is creating great uncertainty inside this economy, and it is harming us globally

with our trading partners and with countries who simply can't understand what is happening here.

Over the course of the last several weeks, my Republican colleagues have loudly called for compromise. They have said, Negotiate to reopen the government, but, all the while, changing their demands daily and moving the goalpost. They moved it up the field, down the field, off the field. We start the day and never know exactly where we are.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Members of this House have agreed to a total spending level that is the Republican level of \$986 billion for all of our bills. That is not a number I personally agree with. It will not meet our Nation's needs, but it is a compromise offered in good faith to move our country forward.

My advice to all those who are listening is to bring that clean continuing resolution with the Republican budget number in it to the floor. Let's reopen the government, and we can deal with our tangential issues that have nothing to do with operating the Government of the United States.

Our economy is still in the process of recovering from a horrible Great Recession. We have still not come back to the preemployment levels in this country that were so deeply harmed by the Wall Street-induced housing crisis. Shouldn't we be debating ways to spur economic growth, not continuing to debate a shutdown that is slowing economic growth?

Under the Obama administration, we have had 42 consecutive months of economic growth. We are crawling out of a mammoth hole. The American people view the disarray here as very, very destabilizing to their own security because they are worried about their futures, and what is going on here adds to their anxiety.

For the entire country, the Republican shutdown is already having real and negative consequences. Over 800,000 workers have been furloughed. They are having to borrow on their credit cards because they don't know how they are going to make their mortgage payment. They have to put their kids in school. They have to buy groceries.

From coast-to-coast, we know—although we don't have people in place at the Department of Labor right now—that over 66,000—up to 300,000—more unemployment claims have now been filed in the country because of what is going on due to these 800,000 more people that have gotten some form of a pink slip.

For the entire country, this shutdown is wrong and unnecessary. The impacts will be felt across this economy—and already are—in the services that the American taxpayers pay for and that the Federal Government has, up to now, provided. As we continue to shortchange critical energy and infra-

structure investments so vital to a strong economy, we will witness, as dusk follows dawn, the slowing of economic growth and the hindering of American competitiveness.

Let me turn to what is not funded by the piecemeal approach that this bill represents. Our bill should be coming to the floor with all the parts of the Department of Energy and Army Corps of Engineers and National Nuclear Security Administration in it. The bill should be coming to us at a level of \$31 billion. The bill is but one-third of that. At a level of \$10.6 billion, it is two-thirds underfunded.

Let me turn to what is not funded in the bill that is before us.

First of all, the Corps of Engineers, one of the most important instrumentalities in our government to create jobs, is not even in this cynical bill. Communities across our country will continue to feel the consequences of this decreased investment. We should be doing more to prevent flooding, to build infrastructure, to create jobs, not less.

For those of you who have been yelling from the rooftops about the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, this bill does nothing—zero—for your ports and harbors.

This bill does not fund any of the energy technology accounts so critical to our Nation becoming energy independent again. As our foreign competitors double down to develop 21st century technology—look at the Chinese stealing our solar technology—and undermine our markets through illegal dumping and intellectual property poaching, our choice in this bill: do nothing.

So, renewable energy will receive cost competitiveness by whom? Which countries will succeed? Who will develop it and own that technology? According to this, we are ceding the turf to them, ceding the field to them.

If you look at U.S. trade accounts, you don't have to be a mathematical genius. What is the number one category of trade deficit of this country? Imported energy. And what is the number two category of trade deficit? Automotive and automotive parts. It is all connected. If America doesn't heal those accounts, we become weaker as a country; we have fewer jobs here at home, less wealth creation here at home.

And this particular bill is absent any forward thinking about new energy systems for our country. The United States has spent \$2.3 trillion importing petroleum just since 2003.

I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say we have a \$17 trillion debt that we have to pay off. We sure do. And where do you think it has come from? It has come from the lack of wealth creation inside this country for a quarter of a century, starting with imported energy.

This represents thousands and thousands and millions of jobs across this country lost and dollars out of the pockets of working-class Americans who see their purchases of fuel transferred to build giant hotels in Dubai, supporting universities in Dubai, all across the Middle East, while we see companies close, communities shut down, Detroit go bankrupt; and all these problems because we are not energy independent and we are not transportation independent.

These are dollars spent not in much-needed job creation but siphoned off overseas, assisting our competitors in developing their economies and their energy futures, not our own.

Is it any wonder that America has a debt? It is rooted in very major holes inside this economy. You could start with two wars. What did those cost us? Probably \$4 trillion to \$6 trillion—unpaid for. There wasn't any war tax imposed when President Bush took us to war.

I remember Donald Rumsfeld saying, Well, you have got to go to war with the military you have. Well, they borrowed to do that, and now this President has begun to keep his promise to the American people. We are out of Iraq and we are moving out of Afghanistan, as we try to hold those sad places together with our allies.

The housing crisis of 2008, it is anybody's guess what that cost us, but we know it hollowed out money creation in this country. We have the largest transfer of wealth and loss of equity in modern history. Do you think you crawl out of that in a month or 2 months? It takes years. We have had 42 months of steady job creation.

The trade deficit, America hasn't had a balanced trade account in three decades. Since 1975, the cumulative trade deficit of this country was \$8.4 trillion. There was more petroleum coming in here from abroad than American energy exports out, more cars and auto parts in here from abroad than cars and auto parts out, and more electronics components coming in here than American electronics exports out.

So if you add up \$8.4 trillion of trade deficit, \$6 trillion of war expenditures, if you take the cost of the meltdown on Wall Street—only God knows how many trillions that cost us—is it any wonder that the United States has a budget deficit and debt and the Federal Government is trying to hold the Republic together and our 50 States from coast-to-coast? It is pretty clear to me what is going on here.

So we look at this bill. Our Republic will not compete in the 21st century and beyond if we further reduce investments in energy and cede our energy future to other countries. The bill before us today does nothing about that. In fact, in one of the most important related sectors to us, manufacturing, this bill does nothing in manufacturing.

One of the reasons we don't have as much economic muscle in this country is because every community you go to, what do you see? Shuttered factories. Every product you pick up, what does it say? "Made in China." Anytime I go to the store and find anything made in America, I buy it in hopes that it will help somebody somewhere along the way.

This bill does nothing for manufacturing. We have lost 15 percent of our manufacturing jobs. And it isn't just because of technology; it is because they have been shipped out, outsourced, made in China, not made in the USA, made in countries some of my constituents don't even know where they are, and these goods come in here. And every time American jobs get displaced in the manufacturing sector, 8.8 million manufacturing jobs disappear.

□ 0930

Manufacturing is one of the most important drivers in our economy, and yet we have a huge trade deficit in manufacturing. There is little merit in using Federal dollars to foster technological advances or breakthroughs for products that are not ultimately manufactured domestically in our country. This bill usually provides a means for us to do more to reverse the trend of domestic firms shifting manufacturing overseas because, to put it simply, domestic manufacturing drives domestic innovation, and that drives wealth creation and job creation in our country. This bill does nothing in the advanced manufacturing sector—off the table.

How sad. How sad for those people across our country who know the value added from manufacturing.

This bill does nothing for science or advanced science and energy. Return on investments from our publicly funded research and development ranges from 20 to 67 percent. What a bang for the buck. With this rate of return, we should be passing a bill that invests in science and high sciences, but that is not happening inside this bill. In fact, across this country, at all of our major labs, the workers are furloughed or have the threat of being furloughed hanging over them—at Livermore, at Sandia, at Argonne. The brain power of this country is being put on the shelf while they watch this charade here inside this Chamber.

This bill does nothing to address the funding for the Office of Environmental Management, whose mission is to complete the safe cleanup of what they call an "environmental legacy" and that I call a "nuclear mess," brought about by five decades of nuclear weapons development and government-sponsored nuclear energy research.

So what do we do to clean up nuclear mess around our country in this bill? Zero. We do nothing.

What about our promises to the people who live near those communities? What about those who sacrifice so much for America's nuclear superiority? We shut the door. So long. Nothing. There is nothing in this bill.

This energy and water bill is one of the most critical investments we can make in this country. It should promote job creation. It should ensure national security. It should protect and promote our vital infrastructure and advance American competitiveness through energy independence and through strengthening manufacturing and scientific capability right here at home, right here in the good old USA. Unfortunately, a minority of the majority of Republicans is choosing to ignore all of these critical investments in order to execute a blatantly political stunt that is already harming our country, upsetting our people, and tamping down on job growth.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is stronger when we come together. We as a people can solve the serious challenges facing our country; yet here we find ourselves today again, wasting time on a lopsided bill which only extends the GOP-driven shutdown. We should be spending our time passing a clean continuing resolution, not holding the entire country hostage to a reckless political stunt that some must get great pleasure out of but that is such a sadistic approach to the governing of this country. We ought to work together toward a long-term solution, not continue to award a faction of one party which has no interest in governing this country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Nuclear Weapon Security and Non-Proliferation Act.

Yes, it is a narrow scope, but it is a terribly important piece of the government. Like the bill we passed yesterday, this legislation addresses matters of critical importance to our national security. The National Nuclear Security Administration maintains our nuclear deterrents here at home, but it also helps to ensure that nuclear weapons and materials don't fall into the wrong hands—those of terrorists and other enemies of our Nation.

H.J. Res. 76 provides funding for the NNSA to continue this vital work—to keep our nuclear arsenal at the ready and our Navy ships powered—and, ultimately, to keep this country safe and secure and protected.

This is particularly important at a time when we face multiple threats from unpredictable nations and groups.

When our government shut down, it did not also shut down nuclear power reactors, research and testing in Iraq, Iran, or North Korea. Funding is provided at the current annual rate of \$10.59 billion to sustain the national labs, to continue the work of skilled workers and scientists, to conduct ongoing non-proliferation intelligence operations, and to maintain the safety and readiness of our nuclear stockpile.

As with the prior 14 mini-CRs this House has passed in the last week, this language is essentially identical to what was included in my initial short-term continuing resolution. So this is a clean bill, Mr. Speaker, adhering to the Senate's demands in that regard. Also, as with the prior bills, this funding will last until December 15 or until full-year appropriations are enacted. It is my hope that the latter is what happens.

Our Nation deserves the certainty of an adequately funded government with appropriations bills that reflect current needs but also current fiscal restraints. To achieve this, we must come together with our Senate counterparts and have a meaningful discussion that establishes a single, common, top-line number for discretionary spending that Members of both parties and both Houses of Congress can work toward.

The ongoing standoffs are not productive. They aren't getting us any closer to reopening the government. While it is not the ideal path forward at this time, passing this funding bill does get us a step closer to ending the shutdown, which I know is the goal of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

So far, this House has voted on a bipartisan basis to reopen critical government functions, including the support for those who serve the country in the Department of Defense. Our nuclear security efforts are equally important to our defense and should have ongoing funding to keep the country safe and sound. So I urge my colleagues to support this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to the time remaining on this side, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 12 minutes remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from New York, Congresswoman NITA LOWEY, our esteemed ranking member.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican shutdown.

Of course we support funding for nuclear weapon security and non-proliferation activities, but this bill does nothing to address a number of other critical energy and water priorities, including the Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Energy's

Office of Science, ARPA-E, and the Office of Environmental Management, which is responsible for cleaning up five decades' worth of weapons development and nuclear energy research.

Even if House Republicans' irresponsible, piecemeal bills were enacted, at the rate they are going, it would take until after Christmas before the government would be fully up and running.

We could end this shutdown today if Republican leadership would just allow a vote. The claim that Democrats won't negotiate is a farce, my friends. Throughout the year, we have pleaded with Republicans to sit down and negotiate a broader budget agreement; and dozens of times Republicans have refused. Now, after wasting the first 10 months of the year and after shutting down the government as they steer the country towards economic catastrophe, they claim they want to negotiate. Democrats and the President have already agreed to the Republicans' funding level. If only Republicans would allow a vote, we could have the government reopened tonight.

Vote "no" on this bill, and let's vote to immediately end the Republican shutdown.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

To all of my colleagues in this great United States House of Representatives, I want to ask each and every one of you to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent the Third District of Tennessee. In the Third District of Tennessee is a very special city. It's called Oak Ridge. At one point in time, it was called the Secret City. That's where we had the Manhattan Project and brought World War II to a close because of the efforts of the men and women who worked there and who succeeded there. We won the Cold War there.

Today, this bill does one very specific thing: it honors the almost 5,000 workers who work every day at the Y-12 National Security Complex for our nuclear deterrent.

Let me be clear: this is not a matter of partisan politics; this is a matter of national security. So I stand here, putting a very human face on this for the workers who work hard every day, who have toiled for years. They deserve better, and this bill does that.

Again, let me be clear: Y-12 is going through an orderly shutdown. We cannot allow this to happen, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans. The Nation's security is at risk. This bill keeps Y-12 open, and this is exactly what we need to do.

Let's put aside the partisan rhetoric, and let's honor the hardworking men and women of Y-12. Let's keep them working, and let's keep the greatest

Nation on the face of the Earth safe and secure.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the gentleman from New York, Mr. HAKEEM JEFFRIES.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, this is day 11 of the reckless Republican shutdown of the United States Government, and you have still failed to provide a way out of the mess that you have created.

The communities that I represent in Brooklyn and Queens are still struggling from the devastation of Superstorm Sandy; yet this bill fails to fund the Army Corps of Engineers.

This was a wholesale government shutdown, and all that is offered is a piecemeal reopening. You have burned down the entire house, but offer only to rebuild the kitchen. That is a shameful dereliction of duty and a woefully inadequate remedy. This shutdown is hurting the American people. It is undemocratic, unconscionable, unnecessary, unreasonable, and unjust.

It is time to get back to doing the business of the American people. Let's reopen the entire government. Vote "no" on this piecemeal approach.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership and for bringing this measure to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the bill the gentleman brought to the floor on Wednesday, just the day before yesterday, passed the House, passed the Senate, and it was signed into law by the President last night. So the argument that you can't fund any of the government unless you fund all of the government is, obviously, not true. Every single Member of the House voted for the bill that the gentleman from New Jersey brought to the floor that was dealing with military death benefits.

We have set priorities. We have said the military has to be paid, and this bill also sets priorities because the nuclear deterrent is absolutely central to our national security just as the military is.

For 60 years, the centerpiece of our country's security has been the nuclear deterrent that has helped keep us secure. These are aging weapons, however, and so that means there are maintenance issues, there are safety issues, there are reliability issues, which a very highly skilled, dedicated workforce must address every single day.

So that's what this bill does. This allows that work to continue, as well as the very important work in dealing with nonproliferation, as well as keeping our nuclear-powered ships operating. All of those things central to our

country's security are empowered by this bill.

□ 0945

Mr. Speaker, it is the easiest excuse any of us can use to oppose a bill because of what it does not do.

What we ought to do is look at what a bill does do. What this bill does do is keep the central part of our country's security operating even as we sort out our other budget woes.

I think it deserves the support of all Members of the House, and I encourage them to vote for it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the esteemed gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman BEN RAY LUJÁN.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, funding for the NNSA is critically important to my State of New Mexico, for we are home to both Los Alamos and Sandia National Labs. However, this bill denies these national security labs the funding they need as it locks in the deep cuts of sequester for 2 more months.

There is not a Member of this body—Democrat or Republican—that says they like the sequester, Mr. Speaker, but my Republican colleagues refuse to lift it. They say they want to keep the government open, but they place conditions on it.

This piecemeal approach in this bill to the Department of Energy and to the NNSA is picking winners and losers with employees that are going to be furloughed. This is a shame, and it is a sham—this Republican charade that is going to go home to my State of New Mexico and direct the Directors of the labs to tell employees who is going to go home without a paycheck and who will not—because there is still not assurance that the Secretary of Energy, through the Department of Energy, will make these employees whole through allowable costs that will be accepted. Enough is enough.

Mr. Speaker, this is a shame. Let's do the right thing and open the government.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK), also a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), for bringing this important measure to the floor.

Since the start of this partial shutdown 11 days ago, the House has focused on one of our core constitutional functions: funding key portions of the Federal Government.

We have come together in a bipartisan way several times over the past few days to pay our troops, provide benefits for the families of fallen soldiers, reopen the NIH, provide money for disaster relief efforts, and fund

other crucial governmental departments and operations.

These are the types of tough spending choices the American people, and people in my district, demand we make. When you are nearly \$17 trillion in debt, you have to prioritize, just like any business or family does when funds are tight.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we turn our focus to a critical issue of national security and public safety. That is ensuring that the National Nuclear Security Administration has the funding it needs to secure our nuclear stockpile and materials.

Recent reports indicate that the Department of Energy may begin furloughing employees and contractors at the eight NNSA sites around the country starting October 21. Sites such as the Nevada National Security Site, which is home to approximately 2,500 employees and contractors, will reduce staffing to levels sufficient to maintain "minimally safe operations." This situation presents a threat to national security, public safety, and our economy.

The Nevada National Security Site is charged with supporting our national stockpile. Additionally, the Security Site oversees the administration of training for first responders in the prevention of, protection from, and response to possible terrorist use of radiological or nuclear material. With critical functions such as these, "minimally safe operations" is simply not an option.

The same is true at NNSA sites around the country. The men and women who work at these sites not only have critical duties, but they are also critical to our local economies.

In fact, contractors at NNSA sites may reduce their workforce by as much as 80 to 90 percent. Such attrition would take a great deal of money out of the economy at a time when States like mine, with an unemployment rate of 9.5 percent, can ill-afford to lose jobs.

H.J. Res. 76 maintains our national security and prevents harm to our economy.

I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Oregon, Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentelady's courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talked about our being the "greatest Nation in the world," but Republicans are running it like a banana republic. People who ran out of this Chamber gleeful that the government was going to shut down have suddenly discovered that there is 20 percent of the government that they want to operate.

There is a simple way to resolve this impasse. If you want to negotiate

truly, appoint the conferees to the Budget Committee. The Republicans have refused to do that for 6 months. If you want to control spending, bring your own appropriations bills to the floor and see if your people have the fortitude to slash government spending further.

Remember, they stopped operation on the Transportation-HUD bill 2 months ago. It can be brought up today. But they refuse to do so because their spending levels are so unrealistic their own Members won't vote for them. They would rather deal in the abstract. They would rather hold America hostage. It is shameful. It is unnecessary.

Bring a continuing resolution to the floor and put the government back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Congressman RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, for yielding. I am very grateful for your leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, funding our national security interests within the Department of Energy must be a priority in order to protect every American family. Today, the House will pass an important measure that will fund the National Nuclear Security Administration. The NNSA will provide necessary resources that are critical and allow our country to continue operations for dozens of vital national security missions.

I am fortunate to represent the Department of Energy Savannah River Site in Aiken and Barnwell Counties, South Carolina. I especially appreciate its personnel, as the only Member of Congress who has actually worked at the site.

The passage of this bill is essential, as it will provide our dedicated workers who are handling these operations the security they need to complete their vital missions. Our Nation is a much safer place because of ongoing tritium operations and the mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility currently under construction at SRS. These missions are essential to our Nation's national security, as they allow us to service our nuclear stockpile and honor international nuclear obligations of nonproliferation.

Additionally, the Savannah River Site, which established victory in the Cold War, has thousands of committed employees working on Department of Energy environmental management projects. These professionals also provide crucial services to our country through their nuclear nonproliferation and environmental cleanup efforts.

Although I am encouraged by today's legislation, I remain hopeful that Congress can work together to provide necessary funding for these projects as well.

I appreciate Chairman HAL ROGERS for bringing this bill to the floor today and urge all of my colleagues of both parties to vote in support of this legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his dedication and commitment to the important issue of our strategic assets.

When we look at the NNSA, they have had for a number of years difficulty in getting support from this administration for the important efforts of modernizing our nuclear weapons infrastructure and ensuring the strategic assets that are so essential to our Nation's security.

This issue also is one that represents, I think, a great analogy to the difficulty that we are having in resolving this conflict. We have the President of the United States, who openly states that he will have negotiations with Russia on our strategic assets, on our nuclear weapons. He will even have secret negotiations—as we saw in his open mic incident—with his secret deal with the Russians concerning our missile defense systems; yet, the President openly says he will not negotiate with the legislature. He will negotiate with Syria, he will negotiate with Iran, but he won't negotiate with the legislature.

Also, this issue illustrates some of the difficulties that we have in this House itself. We are putting on House bills that should have 100 percent unanimous support. Yet when these bills come to the House, these bills predominantly have been divided on a partisan basis because people want to say, Well, it doesn't fund everything.

Everyone knows when you have a disagreement, you start first upon the things you agree. The bills that have been coming forth on this House floor should be the things that we agree on, but partisan politics continues to divide us where, instead of the House coming together on all of these bills and saying, yes, these are the things that we agree on, and we will put aside the things we disagree on for later, we have difficulty in getting even the important things done, and this is an important one.

I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his commitment to ensure the safety of our nuclear deterrent, the workers, and the important work that is being done at the NNSA.

This is a discussion, though, that needs to go beyond just this stopgap bill and even the issue of a CR. This administration has continually cut the

resources for our nuclear deterrent in ways which jeopardize the future of our strategic assets. We need to make certain that this conversation continues.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Ms. KAPTUR, do you have any further speakers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio's time has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would thank the chairman for that courtesy and just say that I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this particular piecemeal continuing resolution. Hopefully, others will come to their senses and we will be able to vote for a clean continuing resolution, which I think the majority of members of our subcommittee would appreciate, so we can reopen the government and deal with all of the responsibilities that we have under this particular bill and meet our responsibilities to energy and water across this country.

I thank the gentleman for his courtesy, and I hope to reciprocate sometime.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to work with Ms. KAPTUR.

In closing, Robert Spalding wrote in The Washington Post recently an article called "Nuclear Weapons are Instruments of Peace." In his close, he wrote:

The sensible path to peace starts with the realization that peace can be secured only through strength. Nuclear weapons represent that strength. We must embrace it through funding and rhetoric.

Indeed we do. Nothing is more important than the reliability of our nuclear weapon stockpile, as is obviously our responsibility to the world to prevent nuclear proliferation, and one of the ways that we protect America and provide for a strong national defense is to have a strong naval reactor program so that our aircraft carriers and subs can truly do the work of freedom.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 76 is postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1025

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 76 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Kelly of Illinois moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 76 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my amendment is a long-overdue commonsense improvement that has bipartisan support in this House and has the majority of support of the American people. If my amendment passes, it will end this costly and irresponsible government shutdown and reopen the entire Federal Government so that we may once again appropriately serve the American people.

As written, the bill before us offers the men, women, and children we rep-

resent little comfort. This piecemeal approach to funding the government is hurting folks in all of our districts. How can we commit to protecting nuclear security but not commit to the security of our Federal Government by completely funding it? How can we protect nuclear weapons but furlough our intelligence personnel who serve on the front lines in defending us from terrorist attacks? Why are we paying hardworking Federal employees, who want to get back to work, to stay at home and not to do the job our Nation depends on them to do?

As we sit here voting to fund bills bit by bit, our constituents are being dealt the full blow and consequences of this shutdown. They can't afford for this shutdown to drag on as we mull over whether it is more important to get our food inspectors back on the job or for America's veterans to have their benefits claims processed.

The piecemeal approach isn't working. The gimmicks must stop.

As we discussed nuclear weapon security, I was reminded of the movie "War Games." This was the eighties movie with Matthew Broderick as the slacker hacker facing off against a supercomputer that was programmed to go to war when it doesn't even know what it is fighting for.

I will allow a quick second for a "spoiler alert" and summarize: after several failed attempts at starting a global nuclear war, the computer runs through all the possible scenarios—all of which end in stalemates—before it discovers the concept of mutually assured destruction, the very simple concept that the war it was trying to launch was an exercise in futility because it would destroy the U.S. in the process.

"A strange game," the computer says. "The only winning move is not to play." And that is where we find ourselves as a Nation, heading toward a mutually assured destruction at the hands of an ideological few, programmed to go to war when they don't even know the risk of the game they are playing and the consequences of their fight.

We have had a week go by without the lessons resonating that there are no winners in the funding scenarios that have been brought to the floor, and the American people are losing out worst of all.

But this isn't a game. This is reality. This isn't a fictional eighties movie. This is the United States of America in October of 2013.

For the past week, we have pursued a fundamentally inept method for reopening the government. Today we need to pay particular attention to one number, 79. That is how many different appropriations bills the House and Senate will have to pass to fund the full nondefense portion of the Federal Government, given the rate of funding and

the bills passed or announced in the House of Representatives so far.

The men, women, and children in my district—in all of our districts—are dealing with the taxing reality of a shut-down government. We can't cherry-pick who to fund and who not to fund bit by bit.

I ask all of you to vote "yes" on this motion because Congress has a duty to offer the security of a functional government to our families, our veterans, and our economy. Vote "yes" on this motion. Vote "yes" to open up all of our government right now.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires that an amendment be germane to the bill under consideration.

As the Chair most recently ruled on October 10, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and, therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from Illinois wish to speak on the point of order?

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized to speak on the point of order.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us fund a portion of the Federal Government? My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so that all of the benefits that the taxpayers have paid for with their hard-earned dollars are available.

Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to open up all of the government instead of just a portion of the government? Mr. Speaker, if you rule this motion out of order, does that mean we will not have a chance to keep the entire Federal Government open today? Can the Chair please explain why we can't keep the entire Federal Government open today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to the National Nuclear Security Administration. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair most recently ruled on October 10, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds because such motion addresses a matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the underlying measure.

Therefore, the instructions propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 195, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivoglio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher

Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador

LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)

Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert

Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner

Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—195

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallo
Garamendi
Garcia

Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke

Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schroder
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Coble Maloney, Rush
Crenshaw Carolyn Whitfield
Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY) Young (FL)
Higgins McIntyre

□ 1055

Messrs. GARCIA and RICHMOND changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 176, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 542]

AYES—248

Aderholt DeSantis Hurt
Amash DesJarlais Issa
Amodei Diaz-Balart Jenkins
Bachmann Duffy Johnson (OH)
Bachus Duncan (SC) Johnson, Sam
Barber Duncan (TN) Jones
Barletta Ellmers Jordan
Barr Farenthold Joyce
Barrow (GA) Fincher Kelly (PA)
Barton Fitzpatrick King (IA)
Benishkek Fleischmann King (NY)
Bentivolio Fleming Kingston
Bera (CA) Flores Kinzinger (IL)
Bilirakis Forbes Kline
Bishop (UT) Fortenberry Labrador
Black Foster LaMalfa
Blackburn Foxx Lamborn
Boustany Franks (AZ) Lance
Brady (TX) Frelinghuysen Lankford
Braley (IA) Gallego Latham
Bridenstine Garcia Latta
Brooks (AL) Gardner Lipinski
Brooks (IN) Garrett LoBiondo
Broun (GA) Gerlach Loeb sack
Buchanan Gibbs Long
Bucshon Gibson Lucas
Burgess Gingrey (GA) Luetkemeyer
Bustos Gohmert Lummis
Calvert Goodlatte Lynch
Camp Gosar Maloney, Sean
Campbell Gowdy Marchant
Cantor Granger Marino
Capito Graves (GA) Massie
Carter Graves (MO) Matheson
Cassidy Griffin (AR) McCarthy (CA)
Chabot Griffith (VA) McCaul
Chaffetz Grimm McClintock
Coffman Guthrie McHenry
Cole Hall McIntyre
Collins (GA) Hanna McKeon
Collins (NY) Harper McKinley
Conaway Harris McMorris
Cook Hartzler Rodgers
Cotton Hastings (WA) Meadows
Cramer Heck (NV) Meehan
Crawford Hensarling Messer
Culberson Holding Mica
Daines Hudson Miller (FL)
Davis, Rodney Huelskamp Miller (MI)
DelBene Huizenga (MI) Miller, Gary
Denham Hultgren Mullin
Dent Hunter Mulvaney

Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene

NOES—176

Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens

Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Coble Higgins Young (FL)
Crenshaw McCarthy (NY)
Herrera Beutler Rush

□ 1106

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1359

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) at 1 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 378, EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS FOR RAW AND REFINED SUGAR; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 379, EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO CROP INSURANCE

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-244) on the resolution (H. Res. 380) relating to consideration of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar; and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 379) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 11, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 11, 2013 at 10:15 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1276.

That the Senate agreed to with amendments H. Con. Res. 58.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1400

RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF
HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE
AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642, FED-
ERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM
AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF
2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDER-
ATION OF H. RES. 378, EXPRESS-
ING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING
TO TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS FOR
RAW AND REFINED SUGAR; AND
PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H. RES. 379, EXPRESSING
SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO
CROP INSURANCE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 380 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 380

Resolved, That it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order for the chair of the Committee on Agriculture or his designee to move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 and agree to a conference with the Senate thereon.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative Pitts of Pennsylvania or his designee and an opponent.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 379) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance. The

resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative Ryan of Wisconsin or his designee and an opponent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 380 provides for a motion to go to conference with the Senate on H.R. 2642, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, also known as the farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule authorizes House Agriculture Committee Chairman FRANK LUCAS to make a motion to go to conference with the Senate on the farm bill and provides for consideration of two resolutions expressing the sense of the House regarding specific provisions in the farm bill.

Conference committees are a crucial step in resolving policy differences between the House and Senate, and I am encouraged that the House is taking this step to provide certainty for farmers across this country by reauthorizing Federal agriculture policy.

The House proposal is not perfect, but it moves Federal agriculture policy in the right direction; and my hope is that during a conference committee with the Senate, we can find common ground.

Additionally, the rule makes in order the consideration of two resolutions that express the sense of the House on crop insurance and the U.S. sugar program. The first resolution expresses the sense of the House that conferees should agree to limit crop insurance based on average adjusted gross income in excess of \$750,000. This commonsense proposal ensures that crop insurance is appropriately targeted to those who need it most.

The second resolution instructs conferees to advance provisions to repeal the administration of tariff rate quotas and, thus, restore the Secretary of Agriculture's authority to manage supplies of sugar throughout the year to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices. I strongly support this resolution, as it restores free-market principles to the U.S. sugar program.

This rule provides for the business of legislating and resolving differences between our two Chambers to find common ground and move forward in reauthorizing Federal agriculture policy. I urge my colleagues to support this rule, the motion to go to conference, and the motions to instruct provided by this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are finally going to conference on the farm bill. I believe strongly that we need to reauthorize a 5-year bill to provide some clarity and provide some certainty not just for our farmers, but also for the millions of Americans who rely on nutrition assistance to feed themselves and their families.

I need to just say a few words about the process. I do not think I have ever seen a motion to go to conference with two motions to instruct conferees to the majority party in the House as all part of one rule. This is kind of an odd precedent, Mr. Speaker; but there are a lot of odd things going on around here during these last few days. We see major pieces of legislation, appropriation bills, coming to the Rules Committee that have never even been considered on the floor; and all of a sudden, they are brought before the House under a closed process. But anyway, I think it is pretty clear that regular order has been discarded in this House.

But putting that aside, let me say that I would like to take most of my time here to talk about the issue of hunger in America because this bill is very relevant to that subject.

After a \$20 billion cut to the SNAP program was voted down by the House in June, the Republican leadership sadly decided to double-down on the cruelty with a nearly \$40 billion cut. That bill also narrowly passed, and I want to thank the brave Republicans who stood with us, who listened to their own constituents, and who listened to their consciences and joined with us in voting "no" on that \$40 billion cut.

Supporters of those cuts say it is all about "reform." Well, this is not about reform, Mr. Speaker. It is about trying to destroy a very important part of the social safety net.

I am happy to talk to anyone and everyone about how we can improve SNAP. Where there is waste or there is fraud or there is abuse, we should crack down on it; but the House bill takes a sledgehammer to a program that provides food—food, Mr. Speaker—to some of our most vulnerable neighbors.

The CBO says that the nearly \$40 billion cut would throw 3.8 million low-income people off SNAP in 2014 and millions more in the following years. These are some of America's poorest adults as well as many low-income children, seniors, and families that work for low wages. Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker, so there is no confusion. People who work or who don't make enough to feed their families would be cut from this program.

Well, if that weren't bad enough, 210,000 children in these families will also lose their free school meals; and 170,000 unemployed veterans will lose their SNAP benefits. Now, we all stand up here and tell our constituents how much we care about our veterans and how much we honor them; but to throw 170,000 of these veterans off this food program because they can't find work, that is unbelievable. That is unbelievable, and it is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to be poor in America. It is not a glamorous life. It is a struggle just to make it through the day. The average SNAP benefit is \$1.50 per meal. Housing costs, transportation costs, child care costs—they all add up.

Fighting hunger used to be a bipartisan issue. Think of people like Bob Dole and Bill Emerson working with George McGovern and Tony Hall.

I am hopeful that once we get to conference, we can resurrect that bipartisan spirit and work together to strengthen our Nation's food assistance programs.

I would also note that we are approaching November 1, a day of reckoning for my Republican colleagues. Automatic cuts to SNAP are already scheduled to take place. If they do not end the Republican shutdown, we are going to see even more terrible, terrible consequences for the hungry in this country. We have already seen some assistance delayed or denied. If this shutdown isn't ended, SNAP, WIC, Meals on Wheels, and the Emergency Food Assistance Program will all be devastated.

I would say to my colleagues, you can't approach the budget in a piecemeal way, and you can't approach the social safety net in this country in a piecemeal way. If you miss a part of that net that makes up the social safety net in this country, then people fall through the cracks; and people are falling through the cracks because of this ridiculous shutdown that my Republican friends have thrust upon this country.

We shouldn't be here talking about a shutdown or about whether we are going to default on our debt come October 17. We should be talking about how we create jobs for people or how we strengthen programs to end hunger in America and how we make life for people in this country better, not worse. And yet here we are, as we are

about to go to conference on the farm bill, dealing with this shutdown that is making hunger worse in America.

I would urge my colleagues to, once again, come to the floor with a clean continuing resolution. Bring up the Senate bill, the Senate bill that is at Republican numbers, the budget numbers that my Republican friends said they wanted, the sequester numbers that I think are awful; but let's bring it up and have a clean vote.

I am willing to compromise and cooperate with my Republican colleagues to pass a short-term continuing resolution at their numbers to keep the government going. I think that is the least we could do. And I would urge my colleagues, before the day is out, to bring that kind of resolution to the House floor.

So I urge my colleagues to pass a clean continuing resolution and remove the sword hanging over the heads of the hungry in this country. I would also urge all of my colleagues, as we go to conference, to insist that in that conference we fix this terrible, terrible mistake that this House of Representatives made when they passed a \$40 billion cut in the SNAP program.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

□ 1415

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the rule to consider my resolution to reform the sugar program. At the time we passed the farm bill this summer, opponents of sugar reform were telling us that the program didn't cost taxpayers a dime. Now, just a few months later, the program is costing taxpayers \$250 million.

Sugar is the only commodity program in the farm bill that had no reform. Even as other commodities were modified to put more risk on farmers, sugar continues to get its sweet deal. Cotton, peanuts, dairy farmers will all see changes in the coming year, but not sugar farmers.

It is a sweet deal that is sour for consumers, for taxpayers, and for businesses across the country. For consumers, those who use sugar, high prices mean they are paying an additional \$3.5 billion a year. For taxpayers, low sugar prices mean bailouts rising to hundreds of millions of dollars. For businesses, for those who use and consume sugar in the food industry, high sugar prices place them at a distinct disadvantage to foreign competition.

The Department of Commerce estimates that 127,000 jobs were lost in food industries between 1997 and 2011. There are 600,000 jobs across the country at risk.

My resolution does not repeal the sugar program. It is very modest re-

form, modest reform that would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize the price of sugar. Stabilizing the price isn't just good for consumers, it is good for farmers who can rely on a more constant price and not be subject to wild swings in the market.

With the truth about the sugar program even more clear now, it is time we had an honest debate about fairness in our agriculture programs. This does not require the import of a single additional pound of sugar. It gives the Secretary flexibility to meet domestic demand.

So I urge Members to support the resolution and support the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise to oppose this motion because we have been trying to get this farm bill resolved since May of 2010, back when I was still chairman of the committee, so we have been working on it this long and we need to get this resolved. But what is being done here today is unprecedented as far as I can tell in the history of the House, where we are giving these two sense of the Congress resolutions to the majority.

From what I can tell, this has never been done before, and we are re-litigating issues that were settled on the floor of the House when we debated the farm bill. These motions take a contrary position to the position that the House took, so we are going to be voting to go against the position that we took here just a couple of months ago. So that is my problem with this.

Historically, the minority gets a motion to instruct, and that has been the way it has been. In all the years that I have been here, that is the way it has been. But there's never been a situation like this. I think it is a bad precedent. It is going to be confusing to people, and we need to get to conference to get this resolved.

Given the way this conference appears it is going to be put together, I am not so optimistic that it is going to work because you are bringing people from outside of the committee into this process, which is what blew this thing up in the first place in June. And it's not going to make anything easier.

We are going to work together and try to get this resolved, but the way all this is coming down is making our job a lot harder, rather than a lot easier, which is the wrong direction, as far as I am concerned.

So I encourage Members to oppose this rule. This is unprecedented. It is apparently being done because that is the only way they can get the votes. And we are doing a lot of things around here because of that, and that is not the way we should do things.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2642 makes commonsense, market-oriented reforms to agricultural policy, which is why it is time to begin conversations with our Senate colleagues on a path forward that ultimately gets these important reforms enacted into law.

This bill isn't perfect, but it puts us on a path to provide certainty to America's farmers and ranchers by adopting a 5-year farm bill that will actually become law.

This measure is the result of more than 3 years of debate and discussion, including 46 hearings and a 2-year audit of every farm program. The bill repeals or consolidates more than 100 programs administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, including direct payments.

It eliminates and streamlines duplicative and overlapping conservation programs and trims traditional farm policy by almost \$23 billion. The bill eliminates direct payments and ensures no payments are made to those who do not actually farm.

The bill also provides regulatory relief for farmers and ranchers. It eliminates a duplicative permitting requirement for pesticides and prohibits the EPA from implementing the unjustified and unscientific biological opinions of the National Marine Fisheries Service until there is an unbiased, scientific peer review of those opinions.

The bill requires regulatory agencies across the government to use scientifically sound information in moving forward with their regulatory initiatives. It requires the Secretary of Agriculture to advocate on behalf of the farmers and ranchers as other agencies move forward with regulations affecting food and fiber.

The bill also eliminates duplicative reporting requirements for seed importers.

Finally, H.R. 2642 repeals the underlying 1949 permanent law and replaces it with the 2013 farm bill. This is important, Mr. Speaker, because without reauthorization farm policy will revert to permanent statutes established in the 1938 and 1949 laws which are drastically different from current programs.

The permanent statutes exclude many commodities such as rice, soybeans, and peanuts; set support prices much higher than current levels; and prevent new enrollment in various conservation programs.

Permanent agriculture law established by the Agriculture Adjustments Act of 1938 and the Agriculture Act of 1949 does not reflect current farming and marketing practices, trade agreements or market circumstances.

Farmers, as well as taxpayers, will benefit from a modernized bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to associate myself with the remarks of the ranking member on the Ag Committee, Mr. PETERSON, when he talks about kind of how unusual this process is with the sense of Congress resolutions that are put into this rule, basically, to instruct conferees on what to do.

It is highly unusual that the majority gives itself two of these sense of Congress resolutions. But this whole process has been really strange.

I would just say to my colleagues, I come to this floor every week and I talk about the issue of hunger and food insecurity in America. There are 50 million people who are hungry; 17 million are kids. I think it is something we all should be ashamed of.

I am on the Agriculture Committee, as well as being on the Rules Committee. I am on the Subcommittee on Nutrition. I was anxious to get on that committee so I could talk about the importance of a social safety net, about the importance of making sure that people in this country have enough to eat. Much to my surprise, Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Nutrition held a total of zero hearings on SNAP. The full committee held no hearings.

Then, even more surprising, Mr. Speaker, was that the nutrition title wasn't even written in the Agriculture Committee. It was written in the majority leader's back room somewhere by God knows who wrote this thing. But it never came to the Agriculture Committee.

It was never brought up for a hearing. There was no markup. There were no amendments that were to be offered. And then it showed up at the Rules Committee magically and was brought to this floor, a \$40 billion cut that would throw 3.8 million people off the program, that would throw 170,000 veterans off the program.

No hearings, nothing. Nothing.

And my colleagues like to talk about regular order. That is not regular order. That is blowing up the whole process.

If my friends have concerns about the SNAP program, which, by the way, is the most efficiently and effectively-run Federal program we have, with one of the lowest error rates—I wish the Department of Defense had those kind of low error rates—then you hold a hearing.

You talk to the people who are on the program. You talk to the people who administer the program. You do this thoughtfully. You do it so that people who don't deserve to get the benefit don't get it, and people who deserve to get it get it.

But my friends come to the floor with this sledgehammer approach, this mindless approach of just gutting the program, close to \$40 billion.

We are slowly but surely getting out of this terrible economy, and as we do, fewer and fewer people will be on the program.

That is the way it works. When the economy is good, fewer people need the benefit. When the economy is bad, more people need the benefit.

But to pull the rug right from underneath people who are still struggling—my friends say all we want to do is make sure that able-bodied people who can work, work. Well, most of the people who are able to work, work, who are on SNAP, but they earn so little that they qualify for this benefit.

If my friends want to help lift people off the program, raise the minimum wage. But there is something wrong in this country when you have got people working full time and earning so little that they are still in poverty. That is what we should be addressing.

But rather than going through regular order, rather than having the Agriculture Committee, the committee of jurisdiction, come up with a proposal, the majority leader takes this in his own hands and does it on his own and brings it to the floor, and we are all supposed to just take it.

I want to, again, thank the handful of Republicans that had the guts to stand up and do the right thing and vote against it. We came very close to defeating it.

But I will tell my friends right now that people like me are not going to support a farm bill that makes more people hungry in America.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I respect my colleague from Massachusetts, and it is obvious that every time we have anything on this floor or in the Rules Committee where we are dealing with the subject of hunger that he is extraordinarily passionate about the issue.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans care about Americans who are hungry. We care about hunger issues. He makes it sound as though we are heartless people. We are not.

What we are doing here is our best to preserve the program for the truly needy and those who are hungry in this country.

My colleague says it is the most efficiently and effectively-run program in the country, with low error rates. That is not what the research shows. It isn't even what TV programs find out on their own with very little research.

They go out and they find the terrible abuse with the program, the SNAP program, which used to be called the food stamp program, but it was given this Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program name some time ago to get away from the term "food stamps." But that is what it is. It is a food stamp program.

Almost everybody in this country knows of people who have abused the program. Now, we don't want to deny help to truly needy people. If we can make these reforms in this program, Mr. Speaker, we have a chance to preserve the entire program for those who truly need it.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013, as I said, is designed to preserve the integrity of the SNAP program, or food stamps for families, and especially for children who rely on food stamps. Its cost-saving reforms are a step in the right direction and are long overdue out of respect for needy Americans and taxpayers.

This bill makes the first reforms to the program since the Welfare Reform Act of 1996, and these reforms were strengthened during a rigorous amendment process on the House floor.

Despite media reports to the contrary, House Republicans are not cutting SNAP for individuals who currently meet the program's eligibility requirements. Instead, our reforms focus on eliminating fraud and abuse that exist within the program and remove from the programs individuals who do not qualify for the benefits.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, I think that bears repeating. What we are doing is eliminating fraud and abuse and removing from the program individuals who do not qualify for benefits. That is what the American people expect us to do in our oversight processes here.

Because of several well-documented and legally questionable efforts by President Obama's Department of Agriculture and by the individual States that administer the program, SNAP benefits have been extended to a number of recipients who would not otherwise qualify. The growth in SNAP spending caused by such expansion efforts will strain the safety net until it breaks, necessitating much higher taxes and indiscriminate cuts that would hit the poorest Americans the hardest. From a moral perspective, such an outcome would harm the very people programs like SNAP are intended to help, and that is unacceptable. That is why I voted for H.R. 3102 when it passed the House on September 19.

The bill ensures benefits are reserved for legal recipients and aren't directed to illegal immigrants.

The bill closes the "heat-and-eat" loophole related to electricity bill assistance, gives States the authority to require drug testing for recipients, and prohibits felons from receiving SNAP benefits.

H.R. 3102 reinstates work requirements for all able-bodied adults, without dependents, receiving SNAP benefits.

An overextended, unchecked SNAP program won't be capable of serving

the citizens it is purposed to help. It is the job of this Congress to ensure the program is held accountable as a steward of taxpayer dollars and to provide a safety net for the needy.

For the first time, the House separated farm policy from the food stamp program, which is only appropriate, as 80 percent of the so-called "farm bill" in the past was spent on providing nutrition assistance to needy families. The farm-only portion of the farm bill authorizes farm programs through fiscal year 2018; however, H.R. 3102 authorizes appropriations for SNAP only through fiscal year 2016.

If enacted and if the two bills were addressed on 5-and 3-year intervals, respectively, this would decouple SNAP from the authorization of farm programs until 2031. Considering agriculture and nutrition programs independently, going forward, will help take politics out of the equation and allow for reforms that will sustain both categories of programs in years to come.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I strongly disagree with the gentleman's statement—strongly disagree. My friend talks about oversight. There were no hearings—none.

She talks about research somehow shows that there is lots of fraud, waste, and abuse. What research? The Government Accountability Office and the USDA have all documented fraud, waste, and abuse in the SNAP program, and it is minimal—a little over a 2 percent error rate—and much of that is underpayment. People are not getting what they are entitled to.

Enough of this demonizing poor people; enough of diminishing their struggle. We ought to do the right thing and make sure that people in this country have enough to eat. That shouldn't be a radical idea.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I could not agree more with my friend from Massachusetts, who has actually spent the time getting inside this program. In fact, if the Republicans really care about hungry people in this country, these legislative efforts are a strange way to show it.

They are restricting the ability of Governors to grant waivers in places where people have no access to jobs. Governors, Republicans and Democrats alike, have requested these waivers because people need help, and the system couldn't meet their needs.

If they are concerned about fraud, waste, and abuse, look at the Crop Insurance Program, which has a higher rate of abuse than the miniscule amount with the food stamp program. And yet they are in the process not of

reforming crop insurance, but enriching it and putting in another provision, the so-called "shallow loss" provision.

They are cutting benefits for poor people, increasing payments for wealthy farmers, and not dealing with simple, commonsense reforms that would give more value to the taxpayer—and not at the expense of the neediest Americans.

This is kind of a through-the-looking-glass situation. There are two proposals on the floor—"sense of Congress"—that I will probably support.

I have worked on a bipartisan basis to try and reform the egregious sugar program and to try and move in a modest sense to reform crop insurance, but we can do far more. And I note that these have bipartisan support.

It is outrageous that we are giving more money to farmers who need it least, shortchanging farmers and ranchers in States like mine in Oregon, cutting into the benefits for poor people who have no alternative, and taking away the right of the Governor to provide waivers for them.

It is an Alice-in-Wonderland situation that exemplifies the weird space that we are in today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If we would return to regular order, if we would have honest debate on this floor about getting more value for taxpayers, we could come forth with a farm bill at a fraction of what it costs now. It would be better for farmers and ranchers. It would be better for hunters and fishermen. It would be better for the environment and better for the taxpayer.

I strongly hope that we will stop this Alice-in-Wonderland experience, reopen the Federal Government, and get back to doing our job right.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule and the \$40 billion in disastrous cuts to the food stamp program that the House Republican majority is trying to make law.

This is a cut of \$40 billion from the food stamp program. It goes against decades of bipartisan support for the fight against hunger in the United States. It is a reflection of how extreme today's Republican Party has become. Even former Republican Senator Bob Dole has called these egregious cuts "an about-face on our progress fighting hunger."

If these cuts become law, over 4 million of the Nation's poorest citizens—children, seniors, veterans, and the disabled—would go hungry in the United States of America, the most bountiful

Nation in the world. This is even as Republicans continue to give \$90 billion in crop insurance subsidies to some of America's wealthiest families and agribusiness.

For food stamp recipients that include a family of four, if their income is \$23,000 or less, that would give them eligibility for food stamps.

Let's talk about the Crop Insurance Program. You have got 26 beneficiaries of that program today who get at least a million dollars in a subsidy from U.S. taxpayers. They do not have any income threshold. They can get the money under any set of circumstances. And the top 1 percent of most farm operators in the Nation each get \$220,000.

You want to talk about the most needy? These are not the most needy. Cut out the \$90 billion in the subsidies to the richest people in the Nation.

The cuts are awful enough, but the majority's plan also includes cruel, mean-spirited restrictions. For instance, it encourages Governors to slash families from the food stamp rolls who cannot find work or a job training program for 20 hours a week. It rewards these Governors with half of the savings and allows them to use the money for tax cuts for the wealthy or whatever else they want.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Even if the food stamp recipient, including parents with young children and those with disabilities, is actively searching for a job, the House majority would end their benefits.

This is immoral. It goes against the values that we hold dear in the United States of America. Cutting 4 million Americans who live on the edge while providing subsidies for the wealthiest is wrong, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and to oppose the cruelty that this rule embodies.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule and this legislation underlying it is not designed to abuse or demonize poor people. What we are trying to do is to save these programs for the truly needy.

Mr. Speaker, we are not simply doing oversight on the farm bill and on agriculture issues. The House has been doing its job of oversight throughout the Federal Government. We have been doing that throughout this entire session. We are looking to find fraud, abuse, and waste in every program. It just happens that today we are talking about this program.

But as you know, Mr. Speaker, almost every day we bring forth legislation that will help us identify waste, fraud, and abuse and do everything we can to protect hardworking taxpayers in this country who are providing the funds to take care of the truly needy in

this country and to allow us to help those people, and that is what this legislation does.

Mr. Speaker, the work of making these improvements and reforms to longstanding Federal policy is not easy. I commend Chairman LUCAS and the members of the Agriculture Committee for their thoughtful work. I was pleased to work with them and to have three commonsense amendments included in H.R. 2642 when it passed the House.

The spending safeguard amendment will cap spending on the Farm Risk Management Election program at 110 percent of CBO-predicted levels for the first 5 years in which payments are disbursed.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that this amendment passed with bipartisan support, as did most of the amendments to that legislation.

In the event government's cost projections prove completely wrong, the amendment will ensure taxpayers are not forced to automatically pay the difference between Washington's mistake and reality.

My second amendment, the Sunset Discretionary Programs amendment, will automatically end discretionary programs in the 2013 farm bill upon expiration of the bill's 5-year authorization period. Many programs authorized by the farm bill are authorized indefinitely. This amendment will require Congress to justify a program's continued existence and funding through regular reauthorization efforts.

As our national debt approaches \$17 trillion, Mr. Speaker, Congress simply cannot afford to add to the number of costly Federal programs that are on autopilot. This was really an excellent amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, Congressman KEITH ELLISON, my Democrat colleague, and I offered the crop insurance transparency amendment, which will require the government to disclose the names of key persons or entities receiving Federal crop insurance subsidies. Specifically, disclosure would be required for Members of Congress and their immediate families, Cabinet Secretaries and their immediate families, and entities in which any of the preceding parties are majority stockholders. This information is already recorded, but members of the public have to petition the government under the Freedom of Information Act to acquire the data.

□ 1445

It shouldn't take a 4-year request for the American people to figure out whether their leaders are receiving government farm subsidies. This bipartisan amendment makes this information available to the public without a FOIA request.

Mr. Speaker, we want transparency, and my amendment takes us much

closer to that. I appreciate Chairman LUCAS' willingness to work with me on these amendments, and I look forward to seeing them maintained during the conference committee.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my colleague from North Carolina that I look forward to the day when she and her Republican colleagues bring to the floor a bill to go after fraud, waste, and abuse in defense contracting; but, instead, they have chosen to go after poor people and are not even giving them the benefit of a hearing. There has been no hearing, no markup on this at all. This came out of thin air in the majority leader's office. This wasn't even brought to the committee of jurisdiction. This is astounding. My friends are talking about reform. This isn't reform. This is a joke.

At this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentlelady who is managing this legislation and indicate that I wish we did have, Mr. MCGOVERN, a bipartisan mission like Mickey Leland and Bill Emerson. If anybody remembers those late Members, they founded the Select Committee on Hunger in order to stamp out hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we had the kind of passion that drew Robert Kennedy to Appalachia to show America that the hunger that existed in this Nation was not a respecter of race or region—or maybe even the sensitivity of Martin Luther King in the same year. Tragically, they both lost their lives in 1968. He was galvanizing poor people to come to Washington because they wanted jobs, because they wanted to eat.

Here we are on the floor of the House, Mr. MCGOVERN, and I read from the statement made from the gentleman of Iowa last night on the floor that we need to start the long march to start to reform the expansion of the dependency class. Who is in the dependency class? There are charges that President Obama has put 48 million people on food stamps. How has President Obama put 48 million people on food stamps?

People are hungry, and 16 percent of the poor people in America are children. What our friends want to do with regard to reform is if you get a school lunch and a school breakfast, that is not evident that your family needs food stamps. So maybe this family is dysfunctional. Maybe these mothers and fathers are desperate, so now you are going to put them through another maze. You haven't documented that they are fraudulently taking food stamps, but you are going to drop them off food stamps and say, Guys, if you want to get out of your hospice bed or if you want to get out of your sick bed

or if you want to get out of your disabled bed and if you have these children who are getting lunch and breakfast, you have got to come and reapply, because there is something ingrained about those who are getting a hand up or who are in the dependency class.

I didn't say that. Robert Kennedy didn't say that.

Let's put a clean CR on the floor, by the way, to open the government, and let's stop talking about the idea. I just can't understand. We need a clean CR, and let's get it to the floor.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), who is the ranking member on the Nutrition Subcommittee on the Agriculture Committee. It is the subcommittee that should have held a hearing on this SNAP bill, but it never did.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just had the opportunity with 10 of my colleagues to go to a community shelter today to serve lunch to some of the poorest people in our community. The community shelter is So Others Might Eat, and I listen to my colleagues talk about waste, fraud, and abuse.

I am disappointed and embarrassed to serve in a House in which we would not want to take care of the poorest people in this Nation. Some of the poorest people in our Nation, many of them children, seniors, and veterans, depend on SNAP. SNAP puts food on the tables of struggling parents who need to send their children to school properly nourished. It also gives low-income working families—by the way, who represent nearly half of all SNAP recipients—and seniors the necessary support they need.

Last month, this House passed a bill that cut nearly \$40 billion in food stamps. It is both inappropriate and inexcusable to cut food assistance when more than 7 percent of the Nation remains unemployed and when we will not pass a jobs bill. Our economy is struggling to produce enough jobs so that families can eat without needing this assistance; and we all know that, beginning on November 1, SNAP recipients will see a reduction in their benefits when the 2009 Recovery Act's temporary benefits end. According to the CBO, benefits will be reduced by as much as \$300 per year. This cut will result in less food for more than 47 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, at some point we have to be honest with ourselves. We either have to believe that we are doing our jobs by taking care of the people of this country or that we are only taking care of a few.

So I say to those of you who believe that all of this is about fraud, waste, and abuse: go to the same shelter that

I went to today. Go into your neighborhoods and your communities, because we all have them. There are poor people and hungry children everywhere. I want you to go and tell them that it is okay for you to cut \$40 billion in food stamps.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a leader on this issue of food security and on so many other issues to combat poverty.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for his determination to eliminate hunger, not only in our own country, but throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, there are 46 million Americans living in poverty, 16 million of whom are children. Instead of focusing on serious ways to lift people out of poverty and into the middle class, Republicans have insisted on placing a larger burden on the backs of the poor and the most vulnerable, effectively kicking them while they are down. That is what the Republicans' farm bill nutrition title did when it was passed on September 19. It would have decimated the anti-poverty SNAP program and would have left hundreds of millions of veterans, children, seniors, and millions of working poor hungry and with nowhere to turn for a meal. SNAP has one of the lowest fraud rates amongst government programs.

House Republicans were unsuccessful in their attempts to pass a farm bill this summer, so the Republican leadership doubled down on this immoral stance, surrendered the governing of the House down to the extreme Tea Party fringe of their party, and passed \$40 billion in cuts, which means cutting 24 meals a month for a family of four. This would be in addition, I might add, to SNAP cuts already scheduled to go into effect on November 1. This means about \$29 less per month for food for a family of three. These cuts to the SNAP program are really heartless. Let me tell you that I know from personal experience that the majority of people on food stamps wants a job that pays a living wage, and SNAP provides this bridge over troubled waters during very difficult times.

In my own congressional district, for example, over 22,000 households would have been impacted in more than 1.6 million homes throughout California. In 2011, SNAP lifted 4.7 million Americans out of poverty, including 2.1 million children. In addition to feeding the Nation's hungry, SNAP is vital to our economy. For every \$1 increase in SNAP benefits, we have received back in economic activity \$1.70.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Without SNAP, millions of families would fall into poverty while millions more Americans would suffer extreme hunger and our economy would create even fewer jobs.

Let me remind you that millions of people on food stamps are working. Their wages are stagnant and low. Many make less than \$8 an hour; yet they are working every day to feed their families. Paying billions in farm subsidies and cutting SNAP benefits for the most vulnerable is not a value that a majority of Americans embrace. Cutting SNAP benefits is not the American way.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close whenever the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared, so I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Let me inquire of the gentlelady if she would be willing to yield us a few minutes on this side because we have a lot of speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to close whenever the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I remember one time when I lent the gentlewoman a couple of minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans continue to demonstrate just how far out of whack their priorities are.

Here we are in the 11th day of the Republican government shutdown—a shutdown for the sole purpose of denying health care to millions of Americans. I guess America shouldn't be surprised. After all, last month, the majority pushed through severe, painful cuts to the nutrition programs for hungry families. We are now moving toward going to a conference with the Senate on these damaging cuts. By insisting on these nearly \$40 billion in cuts, the Republicans have made clear where they stand, even clearer where they don't stand.

Now, understand. I know that the gentlelady talks about the truly needy, but what she is really saying is that the somewhat needy, the sorta needy, the kinda needy, the "needy" needy need not apply because they are not in need of food stamps. When you look at the number of \$20 billion, it was the original number, which is a block number, and it was without consequences to who they would hurt.

When that failed, they said, What would work? Let's use \$40 billion. Yes, \$40 billion will do it—a nice, neat number without any consequences to who might get hurt. Someone had a bright idea on the other side and said that this number will work, and it was without a rationale for the number and

without any understanding of what the impact would be.

So we know where they stand. They don't stand with 900,000 veterans who receive food assistance each month. They don't stand with 2.1 million children who have been kept out of poverty by the food stamp program. They don't stand with the seniors who have to choose between food and medicine—or with the families of disabled children or with our military families who turn to food stamps to stretch their budgets. Heaven forbid we suggest taking away subsidies from Big Oil or tax breaks from owners of corporate jets.

What does that say about Republican priorities and their vision? The fact is that their vision leads to a world in which millions more go hungry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CROWLEY. In New York City alone, the Republicans' cut would result in 130 million fewer meals. That is unacceptable to me, and it ought to be unacceptable to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. The fact that it is not unacceptable tells us something we need to know about our Republican colleagues' view of struggling families in this country: they don't care about their struggles. They wouldn't recognize a needy person if they tripped over him on the street outside the Capitol.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I would challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in terms of whether we recognize poor people or not. Some of us probably grew up poorer than anybody on the other side of the aisle. I am one of those people. I have great empathy for people who are poor, but I am so pleased that we live in the greatest country in the world in which we have the opportunities to overcome poverty because of the great opportunities that are given to us in the country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of comity and goodness, I yield the 3 minutes that is requested of me to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts has an additional 3 minutes to control.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for her graciousness in allowing my side a few more minutes. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to vote on the Senate's clean continuing resolution so that we can send it to the President for his signature today and end this government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous materials, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

□ 1500

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of goodness, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we would end this idiotic government shutdown and not go on recess later today. The American people expect us to act today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure now to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we may end this irresponsible Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this unnecessary Republican shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request

cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I again ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can finally end this Republican shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end the Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr.

HORSFORD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, the clean CR, so that we can go to conference on a budget so we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support the idea of the House and Senate reconciling their differences on the farm bill and going to conference. It is certainly long overdue.

I caution, however, that I will not vote for deep cuts in the SNAP program or the food stamp program, nor do I believe that Democrats will vote to take food away from those Americans who suffer from food insecurity. They have shut down the government, and now they want to shut down food assistance to the most vulnerable, many of whom live in my congressional district.

Open up the government, open up food banks, open up Meals on Wheels for seniors, and give a hand to those who are hurting. It is good for families, and it is good for farmers.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished Member of the Democratic leadership.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on this bill because I have worked very hard over the years helping to put together various farm bills, and this is one that I felt very, very good about from the outset. I even felt okay when the bill came back from the Senate. Although I had some issues with the Senate version, I thought that what we were doing made some sense.

But we have reached a point with this bill—\$40 billion in cuts to the food

stamp program—that will not only impact negatively those people who would receive those stamps in fighting off poverty or hunger, but it would do tremendous harm to various community outlets—stores, family-owned markets—where so much of the income of small businesses depend upon this program and what it will do to help further the economy in various communities.

I am also very concerned that in this legislation, we treat the recipients of food stamps as if they are responsible for what may or may not have taken place with respect to drug addiction to children or to siblings. I think there is something erroneous about drug testing in order to receive food stamps. I think that if you are going to have drug testing to get Federal assistance, then we ought to test all those people who get farm subsidies and see whether or not they are deserving of such assistance from the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Then I saw some reference as to whether or not people who may have been convicted of a felony, what it would do to their qualifications, as well as their family qualifications. At one instance—I hope this is out of the bill—we talked about barring for life a person who may be convicted of a felony. That is not the kind of treatment our society ought to be visiting upon anybody who may or may not have made a mistake early on in their lives.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that there is much in this farm bill that ought to be supported, but I really believe these extraneous things ought to be taken out of this bill. We can't do it now, but I would hope when it gets to conference that those cooler heads will prevail, and we will have a compassionate piece of legislation that all of us can support.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, several unanimous consent requests have been offered and have been ruled out of order because they have not been pre-cleared by bipartisan leadership. It is my understanding that they have, in fact, been pre-cleared by the Democratic side.

Would it be in order to ask the Republicans if they would pre-clear the unanimous consent requests so that we can vote up or down on a clean CR?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As indicated in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, it is not a proper parliamentary inquiry to ask the Chair to

indicate which side of the aisle has failed under the Speaker's guidelines to clear a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time is remaining, and whether the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining, and the gentlelady from North Carolina has 8½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I close, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown. It is the right thing to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding us additional time. It is important, I think, that we be heard on these issues.

One of the reasons why we are so passionate about reopening the government is because this government shutdown is hurting people, and it is hurting the most vulnerable people in our society the most.

One of the things that has troubled me about the direction the Republican leadership has taken in this Congress is that it has become unfashionable to worry about the poor and the vulnerable in this people's House of Representatives. Time and time and time again, my friends seek to balance the budget by cutting programs that help the most vulnerable. The \$40 billion cut in SNAP will throw 3.8 million poor people off the program, it will throw children off the program, it will throw working people off the program.

A lot of the people—contrary to what my friends say—who are on SNAP work for a living, they work full time. If you are earning minimum wage working full time, you still qualify for SNAP.

There are people in this country who are hurting, who are depending upon us to be there, to make sure that there is a social safety net that will make sure that people don't fall through the cracks.

One of the reasons we object to this nutrition provision in the farm bill is because it will hurt people—it will hurt people. We were sent here to help people. This used to be a bipartisan issue. Democrats and Republicans need to join together on this.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question and vote “no” on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, Republicans want to see the government reopen also. We have sent many pieces of legislation over to the Senate, but the Senate has refused to act on them. We hope very much to get the government open again.

We are not opposed to helping the truly needy in this country. We want to help those people. We believe by reforming the legislation related to food stamps that we will be able to save the program for the truly needy.

Mr. Speaker, negotiations are an absolute necessity in a divided government, and conference committees provide an avenue for the House and Senate to meet and resolve policy differences.

□ 1515

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule, to provide a motion to go to conference on the farm bill so we can move the reauthorization process forward.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 380 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, shall be taken from the Speaker's table and the pending question shall be, without intervention of any point of order, whether the House shall recede from its amendment and concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The question shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the question of receding from the House amendment and concurring in the Senate amendment without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

Sec. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 59 as specified in section 4 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT
REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the de-

mand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Maryland seek recognition?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues on either side of the aisle have stated their preference for, as the gentlelady from North Carolina said, opening the government. They want to open the government as soon

as possible and would vote for a clean bill.

Mr. Speaker, we can have that vote right now. I would like to give my colleagues the opportunity to be heard right now in this Chamber and show the American people whether they want to reopen the government today or not.

Mr. Speaker, as a result, I request that this vote be conducted by a roll-call under clause 2 of House rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those in favor of the yeas and nays will rise and be counted.

A sufficient number having arisen, the yeas and nays are ordered.

In response to the gentleman from Maryland, under clause 2(a) of rule XX, a record vote is conducted by electronic device unless the Speaker directs otherwise. This vote will be conducted by electronic device.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Does that mean if you ruled that we would take the vote in the manner in which I requested, that we would do so?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the Speaker's discretion, and the Chair advises that this vote will be conducted by electronic device.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 193, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

YEAS—219

Aderholt	Conaway	Graves (GA)
Amash	Cook	Graves (MO)
Amodei	Cotton	Griffin (AR)
Bachus	Cramer	Griffith (VA)
Barletta	Daines	Grimm
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Barton	Denham	Hall
Benishek	Dent	Hanna
Bentivolio	DeSantis	Harper
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Harris
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Black	Duffy	Hastings (WA)
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Heck (NV)
Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Holding
Bridenstine	Farenthold	Hudson
Brooks (AL)	Fincher	Huelskamp
Brooks (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Huizenga (MI)
Brown (GA)	Fleischmann	Hultgren
Buchanan	Fleming	Hunter
Bucshon	Flores	Hurt
Burgess	Forbes	Issa
Calvert	Fortenberry	Jenkins
Camp	Fox	Johnson (OH)
Campbell	Franks (AZ)	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	Jones
Capito	Gardner	Joyce
Carter	Garrett	Kelly (PA)
Cassidy	Gerlach	King (IA)
Chabot	Gibbs	King (NY)
Chaffetz	Gibson	Kingston
Coffman	Gingrey (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)
Cole	Goodlatte	Kline
Collins (GA)	Gosar	Labrador
Collins (NY)	Gowdy	LaMalfa

Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen

NAYS—193

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel

Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Pitts
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster

Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)

Bachmann
Clay
Coble
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Gohmert

Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey

NOT VOTING—19

Granger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Jeffries
Jordan
McCarthy (NY)
Pelosi

Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Runyan
Rush
Scalise
Slaughter
Young (FL)

McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo

Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)

NOES—189

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah

Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum

McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)

□ 1540

Mr. GARCIA changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BRADY of Texas and MEEHAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 189, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

AYES—223

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barietta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer

Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxo
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna

Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie

Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Waters
Tierney	Vela	Watt
Titus	Velázquez	Waxman
Tonko	Visclosky	Welch
Tsongas	Walz	Wilson (FL)
Van Hollen	Wasserman	Yarmuth
Vargas	Schultz	

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann	Granger	Runyan
Clay	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Coble	Higgins	Scalise
Crawford	Jeffries	Slaughter
Crenshaw	Jordan	Young (FL)
Culberson	McCarthy (NY)	
Gohmert	Pelosi	

□ 1551

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during roll No. 544, on agreeing to H. Res. 380. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, October 10, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, this is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for documents in a third-party civil case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

DANIEL J. STRODEL,
Chief Administrative Officer.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 380, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and con-

tinuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Peterson moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House Amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2642 (an Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes) be instructed to (1) recede to section 1602 of the Senate amendment (relating to suspension of permanent price support authority) and (2) recede to the Senate position in title IV of the Senate amendment providing at a minimum a five-year duration of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and other nutrition programs.

Mr. PETERSON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

□ 1600

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This motion contains two instructions for the farm bill conferees. One is to support the permanent law provisions in the Senate farm bill and what we currently have and have had for years and years. The second is to support the Senate position of a 5-year reauthorization of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

To be clear, this motion keeps intact the longstanding alliance needed to pass a strong farm bill.

America's two largest farm organizations, the American Farm Bureau Fed-

eration and the National Farmers Union, both wrote in opposition to the House's original consideration of H.R. 2642, the "farm only" farm bill.

Farm Bureau president Bob Stallman wrote:

It is frustrating to our members that this broad coalition of support for passage of the COMPLETE farm bill appears to have been pushed aside in favor of interests that have no real stake in this farm bill, the economic vitality and jobs agriculture provides in this country, or for the customers ranchers and farmers serve.

The Farm Bureau joined a broad coalition of 532 agriculture, conservation, rural development, finance, forestry, energy and crop insurance groups that expressed their opposition to splitting the nutrition title from the farm bill and urged House leaders to pass a 5-year farm bill.

When such a large group of organizations, most with different if not conflicting priorities, can come together and agree on something, we should listen to them. Doing the exact opposite of what everyone with a stake in this bill recommends does not make sense, and it is not the way to achieve success, in my opinion.

I will insert both the Farm Bureau and coalition letters into the RECORD.

The farm bill's nutrition program needs to be on the same timeline as the bill's other provisions. It makes no sense to de-couple farm and food programs; they go hand in hand. I worry that separating the two of them sets us on a path to no farm bill in the future. The Senate farm bill preserves the partnership between farm and food programs, and we should defer to that approach.

As Farmers Union president Roger Johnson wrote:

Repealing permanent law would remove the element of the bill which would force Congress to act on a piece of legislation that provides a safety net for farmers and ranchers and the food insecure in this country, and protects our Nation's natural resources.

I will insert the Farmers Union letter into the RECORD.

The permanent law provisions are important to ensuring that Congress revisits farm programs every 5 years. These are farm laws from 1938 and 1949 that, if Congress does not pass a new farm bill, would go into effect. Actually, because we have not passed a farm bill at this point, and it expired on October 1, we actually are operating under permanent law right now.

Obviously, farming has changed a lot since then, and everybody knows these programs don't make a lot of sense today, but that's the point of permanent law. It is the reason that we work together and we pass a new farm bill, because the alternative is not very acceptable.

Farm bills are traditionally a compromise, and there are things that some people like and things that some people don't like. Permanent law encourages both groups to work together

because no one wants to go back to the outdated and unworkable farm programs of 1938 and 1949.

Without these permanent law provisions, it will make it more difficult to make changes, improvements, and reforms over time as we discover that they are needed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this motion to instruct, and I reserve the balance of my time.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
July 11, 2013.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: National Farmers Union (NFU) strongly urges you to vote against the rule and final passage of H.R. 2642, a bill that divorces the nutrition title from the rest of the farm bill and repeals permanent law.

The two largest general farm organizations in the country have spoken out multiple times in opposition to separating nutrition programs from the farm bill. Splitting the bill is a shortsighted strategy that would effectively undermine the long-standing bipartisan coalition of rural and urban members that have traditionally supported passage of a unified bill. We are also very concerned that including a provision that would repeal permanent law did not receive any outside scrutiny or ability to weigh in through hearings. Repealing permanent law would remove the element in the bill which would force Congress to act on a piece of legislation that provides a safety net for farmers, ranchers, the food insecure and protects our nation's natural resources.

Last week, NFU led a coalition of 531 other organizations in writing a letter calling for the House of Representatives not to split the bill. This broad-based coalition, composed of agriculture, conservation, rural development, finance, forestry, energy and crop insurance companies and organizations is now being undermined by extreme partisan political organizations that do not represent constituents affected by the farm bill.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter. We urge you to vote against the rule and final passage of H.R. 2642 and encourage leadership to bring a unified bill to the floor as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

ROGER JOHNSON,
President.

AMERICAN FARM
BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2013.

The Hon.
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP.: The American Farm Bureau Federation is our nation's largest general farm organization, representing more than 6 million member families in all 50 states and Puerto Rico. Our members represent the grassroots farmers and ranchers who produce the wide range of food and fiber crops for our customers here and around the world. To achieve this, farmers and ranchers depend on the variety of programs such as risk management, conservation, credit and rural development contained in H.R. 2642 that is scheduled to be voted on by the full House today.

Last night the House Rules Committee approved the rule for considering H.R. 2642, which also includes separating the nutrition title from the remaining provisions of H.R. 1947, a complete farm bill that was reported

out of the House Agriculture Committee by a 36–10 bipartisan vote.

We are very disappointed in this action. The “marriage” between the nutrition and farm communities and our constituents in developing and adopting comprehensive farm legislation has been an effective, balanced arrangement for decades that has worked to ensure all Americans and the nation benefits. In spite of reports to the contrary, this broad food and farm coalition continues to hold strong against partisan politics. In fact, last week, more than 530 groups representing the farm, conservation, credit, rural development and forestry industries urged the House to not split the bill. Similar communications were relayed from the nutrition community. Yet today, in spite of the broad-based bipartisan support for keeping the farm bill intact, you will vote on an approach that seeks to affect a divorce of this longstanding partnership. It is frustrating to our members that this broad coalition of support for passage of a complete farm bill appears to have been pushed aside in favor of interests that have no real stake in this farm bill, the economic vitality and jobs agriculture provides or the customers farmers and ranchers serve.

We are quite concerned that without a workable nutrition title, it will prove to be nearly impossible to adopt a bill that can be successfully conferenced with the Senate's version, approved by both the House and Senate and signed by the President.

We are also very much opposed to the repeal of permanent law contained in H.R. 2642. This provision received absolutely no discussion in any of the process leading up to the passage of the bill out of either the House or Senate Agriculture Committees. To replace permanent law governing agricultural programs without hearing from so much as a single witness on what that law should be replaced with is not how good policy is developed.

As recently as last December, the threat of reverting to permanent law was the critical element that forced Congress to pass an extension of the current farm bill when it proved impossible to complete action on the new five-year farm bill—an action that not only provided important safety net programs for this year, it ensured Congress would have time this year to consider comprehensive reforms that contribute billions to deficit reduction.

We urge you to oppose the rule as well to vote against final passage of this attempt to split the farm bill and end permanent law provisions for agriculture.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,
President.

JULY 2, 2013.

The Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
H-232 The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: America's agriculture, conservation, rural development, finance, forestry, energy and crop insurance companies and organizations strongly urge you to bring the Farm Bill (H.R. 1947, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013) back to the Floor as soon as possible. This important legislation supports our nation's farmers, ranchers, forest owners, food security, natural resources and wildlife habitats, rural communities, and the 16 million Americans whose jobs directly depend on the agriculture industry.

Farm bills represent a delicate balance between America's farm, nutrition, conserva-

tion, and other priorities, and accordingly require strong bipartisan support. It is vital for the House to try once again to bring together a broad coalition of lawmakers from both sides of the aisle to provide certainty for farmers, rural America, the environment and our economy in general and pass a five-year farm bill upon returning in July. We believe that splitting the nutrition title from the rest of the bill could result in neither farm nor nutrition programs passing, and urge you to move a unified farm bill forward.

Thank you for your support. We look forward to our continued dialogue as the process moves forward and stand ready to work with you to complete passage of the new five-year Farm Bill before the current law expires again on September 30, 2013.

Sincerely,

1st Farm Credit Services, Advanced Biofuels Association, Ag Credit, ACA, AgChoice, AgGeorgia, AgHeritage Farm Credit Services, AgriBank, Agriculture Council of Arkansas, Agriculture Energy Coalition, Agricultural Retailers Association, AgriLand, Agri-Mark, Inc., AgCarolina, AgCountry, AgFirst, AgPreference, AgSouth, AgStar Financial Services, ACA, AgTexas, Alabama Ag Credit, Alabama Cotton Commission, Alabama Dairy Producers, Alabama Farm Credit, Alabama Farmers Cooperative, Alabama Farmers Federation.

Alabama Pork Producers, Alaska Farmers Union, American AgCredit, American Agriculture Movement, American Association of Avian Pathologists, American Association of Bovine Practitioners, American Association of Crop Insurers, American Association of Small Ruminant Practitioners, American Association of Veterinary Laboratory Diagnosticians, American Bankers Association, American Beekeeping Federation, American Biogas Council, American Coalition for Ethanol, American Cotton Shippers Association, American Crystal Sugar Company, American Dairy Science Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Farmers and Ranchers Mutual Insurance Company, American Farmland Trust, American Feed Industry Association, American Fruit and Vegetable Processors and Growers Coalition, American Forest Foundation, American Forest Resource Council, American Forests, American Honey Producers Association.

American Malting Barley Association, American Pulse Association, American Public Works Association, American Sheep Industry Association, American Society of Agronomy, American Sugar Alliance, American Sugar Cane League, American Sugarbeet Growers Association, American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers, American Soybean Association, American Veterinary Medical Association, Animal Agriculture Coalition, Animal Health Institute, WAArborOne, Archery Trade Association, Arizona Farm Bureau Federation, Arizona BioIndustry Association, Arizona Wool Producers Association, Arkansas Farm Bureau, Arkansas Farmers Union, Arkansas Rice Federation, Arkansas Rice Producers' Group, Arkansas State Sheep Council, Associated Logging Contractors—Idaho, Associated Milk Producers, Inc.

Associated Oregon Loggers, Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Association of Veterinary Biologics Companies, Badgerland Financial, Bio Nebraska Life Sciences Association, BioForward, Biotechnology Industry Organization, Black Hills Forest Resource Association, Bongard's Creamery, Boone and Crockett Club,

Bowhunting Preservation Alliance, Calcot, California Agricultural Irrigation Association, California Association of Resource Conservation Districts, California Association of Winegrape Growers, California Avocado Commission, California Canning Peach Association, California Farm Bureau Federation, California Farmers Union, California Forestry Association, California Pork Producers Association, California Wool Growers Association, Calvin Viator, Ph.D. and Associates, LLC.

The Campbell Group, Can Manufacturers Institute, Canned Food Alliance, Cape Fear Farm Credit, Capital Farm Credit, Carolina Cotton Growers Cooperative, Catch-A-Dream Foundation, Catfish Farmers of America, Central Kentucky, ACA, Ceres Solutions LLP, Chrisholm Trail Farm Credit, CHS, Inc., CoBank, Colonial Farm Credit, Colorado BioScience Association, Colorado Farm Bureau, Colorado Timber Industry Association, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Connecticut Forest & Park Association, Connecticut United for Research Excellence, Inc., The Conservation Fund, Continental Dairy Products, Inc, Cooperative Credit Company, Cooperative Network, Cora-Texas Mfg. Co., Inc.

Corn Producers Association of Texas, Cotton Growers Warehouse Association, Council for Agricultural Science and Technology, Crop Insurance and Reinsurance Bureau, Crop Insurance Professionals Association, Crop Science Society of America, CropLife America, Dairy Farmers of America, Dairy Farmers Working Together, Dairy Producers of Utah, DairyLea Cooperative Inc., Darigold, Inc, Delta Council, Delta Waterfowl, Deltic Timber Corporation, Ducks Unlimited, DUDA (A. Duda & Sons, Inc.), Eastern Regional Conference of Council of State Governments, Empire State Forest Products Association, Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Family Farm Alliance, Family Forest Foundation—Washington, Farm Credit Bank of Texas, Farm Credit Banks Funding Corporation.

Farm Credit Council, Farm Credit Council Services, Farm Credit East, Farm Credit MidSouth, Farm Credit of Central Florida, Farm Credit of Central Oklahoma, Farm Credit of Enid, Farm Credit of Florida, Farm Credit of Maine, Farm Credit of Ness City, Farm Credit of New Mexico, Farm Credit of North West Florida, Farm Credit of Southern Colorado, Farm Credit of SW Kansas, Farm Credit of Western Arkansas, Farm Credit of Western Kansas, Farm Credit of Western Oklahoma, Farm Credit Services of America, Farm Credit Services of Illinois, Farm Credit South, Farm Credit Virginias, Farm Credit West, Farmer Mac, FarmFirst Dairy Cooperative, FCS Financial.

FCS of America, FCS of Colusa-Glenn, FCS of East/Central Oklahoma, FCS of Hawaii, FCS of Illinois, FCS of Mandan, FCS of Mid-America, FCS of North Dakota, FCS of Southwest, Federation of Animal Science Societies, First District Association, First FCS, First South Farm Credit, FLBA of Kingsburg, Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, Florida Sugar Cane League, Forest Investment Associates, Forest Landowners Association, Forest Products National Labor Management Committee, Forest Resource Association Inc., Fresno-Madera Farm Credit, Frontier Farm Credit, Fruit Growers Supply Company, Georgia Agribusiness Council, Georgia Farm Bureau Federation, Georgia Forestry Association.

Georgia Pork Producers Association, Giustina Resources, LLC, Global Forest

Partners LP, GMO Renewable Resources, Great Plains Ag Credit, Great Plains Canola Association, Green Diamond Resource Company, Greenstone, GROWMARK, Inc, Growth Energy, Hancock Timber Resource Group, Hardwood Federation, Hawaii Farmers Union, Hawaii Sugar Farmers, Heritage Land Bank, Holstein Association USA, Idaho Ag Credit, Idaho Dairymen's Association, Idaho Farmers Union, Idaho Forest Group, Idaho Forest Owners Association, Idaho Grain Producers Association, Illinois Biotechnology Industry Organization—iBIO®, Illinois Farm Bureau, Illinois Farmers Union.

Illinois Pork Producers Association, Independent Beef Association of North Dakota, Independent Community Bankers of America, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., Indiana Farmers Union, Indiana Health Industry Forum, Innovative Mississippi—Strategic Biomass Solutions, Intermountain Forest Association, Intertribal Agriculture Council, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, Iowa Farmers Union, Iowa Pork Producers Association, Iowa Sheep Industry Association, IowaBio, Irrigation Association, Irving Woodlands, LLC, Izaak Walton League of America, John Deere Crop Insurance, Kansas Cooperative Council, Kansas Dairy, Kansas Farm Bureau, Kansas Farmers Union, Kansas Grain Sorghum Producers Association, Kansas Pork Association, Kansas Sheep Association.

Kentucky Forest Industries Association, Kentucky Pork Producers Association, Land Improvement Contractors of America, Land O'Lakes, Land Stewardship Project, Land Trust Alliance, Lone Rock Timber Management Co., Longview Timber LLC, Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., Louisiana Forest Association, Louisiana Rice Growers Association, Louisiana Rice Producers' Group, Louisiana Sugar Cane Cooperative, Inc., Lula-Westfield, LLC, Maryland & Virginia Milk Producers Cooperative, Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc., Maryland Grain Producers Association, Maryland Sheep Breeders' Association, Inc., Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., Massachusetts Forest Alliance, MassBio, MBG Marketing/The Blueberry People, Michigan Agri-Business Association, Michigan Farm Bureau.

Michigan Farmers Union, Michigan Pork Producers Association, Michigan Sugar Company, Michigan-California Timber Company, Mid-West Dairymen's Co., MidAtlantic Farm Credit, Midwest Dairy Coalition, Midwest Environmental Advocates, Midwest Food Processors Association, Milk Producers Council, Minn-Dak Farmers Cooperative, Minnesota Canola Council, Minnesota Corn Growers Association, Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, Minnesota Farmers Union, Minnesota Forest Industries, Minnesota Grain & Feed Association, Minnesota Lamb & Wool Producers, Minnesota Pork Producers Association, Minnesota Timber Producers Association, Mississippi River Trust, Missouri Coalition for the Environment, Missouri Dairy Association, Missouri Farm Bureau Federation, Missouri Farmers Union.

Missouri Pork Association, Missouri Sheep Producers, Missouri Soybean Association, The Molpus Woodlands Group, Montana Grain Growers Association, Montana Farmers Union, Mule Deer Foundation, National Association of Counties, National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, National All-Jersey, National Alliance of Forest Owners, National Association for the Advancement of Animal Science, National Association of Clean Water Agencies, Na-

tional Association of Conservation Districts, National Association of Farmer Elected Committees, National Association of Federal Veterinarians, National Association of Forest Service Retirees, National Association of FSA County Office Employees, National Association of Resource Conservation & Development Councils, National Association of State Conservation Agencies, National Association of State Foresters, National Association of University Forest Resource Programs, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Barley Growers Association, National Bobwhite Conservation Initiative.

National Catholic Rural Life Conference, National Coalition for Food and Agricultural Research, National Conservation District Employees Association, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Cotton Ginners' Association, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Farmers Union, National Farm to School Network, National Grange, National Grape Cooperative Association, Inc., National Milk Producers Federation, National Network of Forest Practitioners, National Pork Producers Council, National Renderers Association, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National Sorghum Producers, National Sunflower Association, National Trappers Association, National Wild Turkey Federation, National Woodland Owners Association, Nebraska Cooperative Council, Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, Nebraska Farmers Union, Nebraska Pork Producers Association.

Nevada Farm Bureau Federation, Nevada Wool Growers Association, New England Farmers Union, New Jersey Farm Bureau, New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau, New Mexico Sorghum Association, New York Farm Bureau, Inc., New York Forest Owners Association, Nexsteppe, North American Grouse Partnership, North Carolina Farm Bureau Federation, Inc, North Carolina Forestry Association, North Carolina Pork Council, North Dakota Farmers Union, North Dakota Lamb & Wool Producers, North Dakota Pork Producers Council, Northharvest Bean Growers Association, Northeast Dairy Farmers Cooperatives, Northeast States Association for Agricultural Stewardship, Northern California Farm Credit, Northern Canola Growers Association, Northern Forest Center, Northern Pulse Growers Association, Northwest Dairy Association, Northwest Farm Credit Services.

Novozymes North America Inc, Ocean Spray Cranberries, Inc., Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., Ohio Farmers Union, Ohio Pork Producers Council, Oklahoma Agribusiness Retailers Association, Oklahoma Agricultural Cooperative Council, Oklahoma Farmers Union, Oklahoma Grain & Feed Association, Oklahoma Pork Council, Oklahoma Seed Trade Association, Oklahoma Sorghum Association, Oklahoma Wheat Growers Association, Oregon Association of Nurseries, Oregon Cherry Growers, Inc., Oregon Dairy Farmers Association, Oregon Farmers Union, Oregon Sheep Growers Association, Oregon Small Woodland Association, Oregon Women in Timber, Orion the Hunter's Institute, Panhandle-Plains Land Bank, Partners for Sustainable Pollination, Pennsylvania Farm Bureau, Pennsylvania Farmers Union.

Pennsylvania Forest Products Association, Pheasants Forever, Plains Cotton Cooperative Association, Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., Plum Creek Timber Company, Pollinator Partnership, Pope and Young Club, Port Blakely Tree Farms, LP, Potlatch Corporation, Prairie Rivers Network, Premier

Farm Credit, Puerto Rico Farm Credit, Quality Deer Management Association, Quail Forever, Rayonier Inc., Red Gold, Inc., Red River Forests, LLC, Red River Valley Sugarbeet Growers Association, Renewable Fuels Association, Resource Management Service, LLC, Rhode Island Sheep Cooperative, Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers, Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, Rolling Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., Ruffed Grouse Society.

The Rural Broadband Association, Rural Community Assistance Partnership, Select Milk Producers, Inc., Seneca Foods, Shasta Forests Timberlands, LLC, Sidney Sugars, Inc., Sierra Pacific Industries, Society of American Foresters, Soil and Water Conservation Society, Soil Science Society of America, South Carolina Farm Bureau Federation, South Dakota Association of Cooperatives, South Dakota Biotech Association, South Dakota Farmers Union, South Dakota Pork Producers, South Dakota Wheat Growers, South East Dairy Farmers Association, Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association, South Texas Cotton and Grain Association, Southeast Milk Inc., Southern Cotton Growers, Inc., Southern Minnesota Beet Sugar Cooperative, Southern Peanut Farmers Federation, Southern Rolling Plains Cotton Growers Association of Texas.

Southern States Cooperative, Inc., Southwest Council of Agribusiness, Southwest Georgia Farm Credit, St. Albans Cooperative, Stapleco, State Agriculture and Rural Leaders, Sugar Cane Growers Cooperative of Florida, Sustainable Forest Initiative, Sustainable Northwest, Tennessee Clean Water Network, Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation, Tennessee Forestry Association, Tennessee Renewable Energy & Economic Development Council, Texas Ag Finance, Texas Agricultural Cooperative Council, Texas Farmers Union, Texas Forestry Association, Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute, Texas Land Bank, Texas Pork Producers Association, Texas Rice Producers Legislative Group, Texas Sheep & Goat Raisers' Association, Timberland Investment Resources, Timber Products Company, The Amalgamated Sugar Company.

The Bank of Commerce, The Nature Conservancy, The Small Woodland Owners Association of Maine, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, Trust for Public Land, United Dairymen of Arizona, United FCS, U.S. Animal Health Association, U.S. Beet Sugar Association, U.S. Canola Association, U.S. Cattlemen's Association, U.S. Dry Bean Council, U.S. Pea & Lentil Trade Association, U.S. Rice Producers Association, U.S. Sportsmen's Alliance, USA Dry Pea & Lentil Council, USA Rice Federation, Utah Farmers Union, Utah Wool Growers Association, Virginia Farm Bureau Federation, Virginia Forestry Association, Virginia Grain Producers Association, Virginia Pork Industry Board, Virginia Nursery & Landscape Association, Virginia State Dairymen's Association.

Washington Biotechnology & Biomedical Association, Washington Farm Bureau, Washington Farmers Union, Washington State Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Washington State Dairy Federation, Welch Foods Inc., A Cooperative, Wells Timberland REIT, Western AgCredit, Western Growers, Western Pea & Lentil Growers, Western Peanut Growers Association, Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, Western Sugar Cooperative, Western United Dairymen, The Westervelt Company, Weyerhaeuser Company, Whitetails Unlimited, Inc., Wild Sheep Foundation, Wildlife Forever, Wildlife Manage-

ment Institute, Wildlife Mississippi, Wisconsin Agri-Business Association, Wisconsin Farmers Union, Wisconsin Paper Council, Wisconsin Pork Association, Wisconsin Woodland Owners Association, Women Involved in Farm Economics, World Wildlife Fund, Wyoming Sugar Company, Yankee Farm Credit, Yosemite Farm Credit.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am so overjoyed to rise today to be at this point in the farm bill process, where we are on the verge of sitting down with our friends in the other body and beginning to put the final bill together. This has been a long and challenging process for both myself, the ranking member Mr. PETERSON, and all members of the House Agriculture Committee.

We have touched on many subject matters. We have had the most amazing open markups in committee, with amendments almost beyond galore. Twice we have been across the floor of this great body in, essentially, an open process, considering literally 100-plus amendments almost every time it seems.

From that process we are now, with a product, ready to go to conference with the other body. This motion, and the next two sense of Congress resolutions, address several things that were decided on the floor of this House.

While I appreciate mightily the opportunity to reassess the judgments of the body, I would just simply say this, looking at the various points: my good friend the ranking member is exactly right. This motion would restore 1938 and 1949 law as the permanent base farm bill.

Franklin Roosevelt was President, of course, when the 1938 law was signed into place. President Truman signed the 1949 law into place. Those laws were designed at a time when I suspect the average tractor was 55 horsepower. I suppose the average dairy might have been 40 cows.

They were put in place on the assumptions of parity and production controls and allotments and production history, a lot of things that have long since faded away in subsequent farm bills.

I know my friend and a number of groups, in good faith, advocate that we keep that 1938 and 1949 law in place. But I would suggest to my colleagues, the open process we have been through, the open process we are about to have in conference, if we can come up with good language that a majority of both bodies can agree on, that a fellow down at the White House will sign if it is good policy, maybe the conference should be given the option, as is now the case within the farm bill language, of using the 2013 farm bill as base.

The Senate retains the old permanent law from 1938 and 1949. At present, we don't do that in the House draft, so we have got the ability to discuss it. We have got the ability to work on it. I, personally, think that's a good thing.

Now, the other portion of this motion, and this reflects, again, some very serious, sincere differences of opinion, both in committee and on the floor, about how to address the fundamental nature of the nutrition title. This House decided that the reauthorization should be for 3 years instead of what would be the more traditional concurrent authorization with the rest of the farm bill. I think every Member has to vote their own conscience on that issue.

But, understand: the motion, as structured, would take away the potential option for moving permanent law from the Roosevelt-Truman administration to the present day, and it would also restore that 5-year authorization on nutrition programs, things my colleagues have to take into consideration and factor.

Mr. Speaker, I note to my colleague I am my only speaker on this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), one of our subcommittee ranking members.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota, as well as the chair from Oklahoma.

I rise to support this motion to instruct, and let me tell you why.

The farm bill traditionally, around this place, has been one of the most bipartisan efforts that we engage in. Unfortunately, for over the last year, it hasn't seemed that way.

I think that the importance of maintaining the permanent law of 1938 and 1949 is not to suggest that farming today is as it was then. Of course it is not.

But the fact is that it has always provided, in the past efforts, back in 2008, and back in the last three or four decades, the sort of incentive necessary to come together, in a bipartisan fashion, to put together a bill that reflects not just current farming needs throughout this great country of ours today, but also to focus on the necessary importance of the nutrition programs that go to so many of those in our society that are in need.

Now, that brings me to the second point that is reflected in the Senate measure, that is reflected in this motion to instruct, and that is, bifurcating the nutrition programs. It makes absolutely no sense.

There has been a tradition here that I think has worked well in maintaining the incredible amount of cornucopia of food that we produce in this Nation and also never forgetting those in our society who are most in need. That marriage between the nutrition programs, which have benefited from the food that our farmers and ranchers and dairymen produce, and those who need a helping hand has worked well.

So, therefore, why should we separate it?

Why should we have a 3-year nutrition program instead of the 5-year that marries and complements the ongoing farm programs?

So, for all of those reasons, I support this motion to instruct.

And let me finally say, the time has come. The time has come to put away the posturing, go to work, go to conference, and pass a farm bill that reflects America's needs.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), one of our subcommittee ranking members.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the FARRM Act, which is H.R. 2642, reauthorizes Federal farm, rural development, and agricultural trade programs through fiscal year 2018, or 5 years.

However, H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act, which passed last month, reauthorized nutrition programs for only 3 years. This separation is problematic, and it needs to be addressed.

Farming and feeding go hand in hand, and a comprehensive farm bill recognizes this connection. We can restore this connection by ensuring a 5-year reauthorization for all programs that come under the farm bill.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the link between nutrition and farm communities. Support a farm bill that meets the nutritional needs of all Americans.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this motion and thank the ranking member for his work. Reauthorizing nutrition programs for 5 years is sound policy and the right thing to do.

The farm bill has always been built on a successful coalition of rural and urban communities and Members of Congress who come together in a bipartisan way to create responsible farm and food policy.

By authorizing farm policies for 5 years, but only extending nutrition programs for 3 years, we are leaving millions of working families, seniors, and children with great uncertainty when they need our help the most.

Let's be honest. Changing the authorization for nutrition programs reduces the likelihood of Congress passing a bipartisan farm bill that works for our farmers, food producers, and families. So, too, does repealing permanent farm law, as the current House bill does.

For the last 2 years, Congress has failed to act. Why are we making it even harder to pass a final farm bill?

SNAP helps nearly 47 million Americans, including over 22,000 in my dis-

trict, afford nutritious food and not go hungry. It has proven to be efficient and effective with error rates at historic lows. It helps Americans at every district across the country by preventing them from falling into poverty and lifting them up through job training and education programs.

I am proud that I was able to include a SNAP employment and training pilot program modeled after a program from my home State of Washington in the nutrition bill that will go to conference.

Even at the height of the recession, 60 percent of those in Washington's programs found employment, and more than half were off assistance in 2 years. This is a commonsense policy to increase education and job training while decreasing the number of people who need SNAP.

This bill has been hijacked long enough. Let's get back to the bipartisan, cooperative process in which the House Agriculture Committee drafted the farm bill. Let's not make things more difficult than they need to be.

We were sent here to do our jobs, to govern and pass policies that will grow our economy, and it is no secret that Congress has been failing at fulfilling this basic responsibility.

So I urge my colleagues to support this motion to authorize both farm and nutrition programs for the full 5 years. Let's get to work and pass a 5-year farm bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), a new member of the committee—well, an old member. He was a member of the Ag Committee back in the 1970s.

□ 1615

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the work that has been done here in this bill. I want to commend Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member COLLIN PETERSON for the tireless work that you and your staffs and your subcommittee chairs put into writing this legislation. It is the product of many years and a wealth of experience that has brought consumers and producers together, that has brought urban and rural people together, and that has produced an abundant supply of food for people here in this country and all over the world.

American agriculture is just absolutely one of the wonders of the world. I believe that this motion helps to keep that great success and progress moving forward.

Last but not least, I want to say how refreshing it was to be part of that committee markup. As you know, I was on a 32-year hiatus—the longest in history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. NOLAN. I have been asked time and time again how things are different from the way they were then. Believe me, there are a lot of differences, big and small; but one of the most refreshing things was to be a part of that Ag Committee open, bipartisan, free-wheeling markup, where anybody and everybody got their moment, got an opportunity to offer their resolution, got an opportunity to have a vote on it.

I commend you, Mr. Chairman, for that kind of spirit. That is the kind of spirit that has moved this country and accounted for so much of our great success over the years.

I urge adoption of this motion.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct the conference committee to reauthorize America's nutrition and antihunger programs for 5 years.

At the moment, the majority's farm bill extends crop insurance and other agricultural programs for 5 years, but the nutrition portion only reauthorizes food stamps and other programs for 3 years. This 2-year discrepancy would allow for all kinds of shenanigans the next time these programs are up for debate. We should stop that from happening now.

When this majority severed the nutrition title from the farm bill, they broke a longstanding bipartisan compact on antihunger initiatives that goes back decades, connecting the programs that help farmers produce and the programs that help poor families escape hunger. This arrangement separates farm programs from nutrition programs on a permanent basis. They break the coalition that supports this bill. Quite honestly, it is being done to put food stamps at risk. Indeed, this is a shell game.

The critical antihunger programs have been supported by Republicans and Democrats all across the country—the east coast, the west coast, the heartland—because hunger is not a partisan issue. We all have a vested interest in ending hunger in our country. But with this farm bill, the House Republican majority has betrayed this fight. By cruelly cutting \$40 billion from food stamps, our most important antihunger program, they are telling over 4 million of our most vulnerable citizens—children, seniors, veterans, the disabled—you may not know where your next meal is coming from.

The majority is making this \$40 billion cut, robbing poor families of food, even while continuing to dole out over twice as much—\$90 billion—in crop insurance subsidies, taxpayer dollars, to some of the Nation's wealthiest families and agribusiness.

In the Crop Insurance Program, there are no income eligibility requirements.

You can be a billionaire and still collect the subsidy. In the food stamp program, you can only make up to \$23,000. With that, you can only spend almost \$1.50 on a meal. That's the inequity we are talking about here.

There should be a condemnation of what that House majority is trying to do to hunger and nutrition programs—and there is. It has been near universal. Nutrition, agriculture, homeless, seniors, education, and health care organizations—even Republican leaders like former Republican Senator Bob Dole—all have announced their opposition to this reckless and extreme plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentle-lady an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Let us understand what the cuts to nutrition programs that the majority is suggesting mean in terms of our children.

Roughly 20 percent of these households that receive the benefits have children under the age of 18; 23 percent have children that are 4 years old and under. The damage that hunger does to children is irreparable. If they go to school hungry, they cannot learn; and if they cannot learn, they cannot succeed.

I only ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to read the data. Read the report in *The Lancet* journal just in the last week or so that tells you what the scientific data is that shows what the impact of hunger is on children's brains and their ability to learn.

We know that the learning period for children is from zero to 3. Why would we want to do irreparable harm to the children in this Nation by cutting off food, of which the United States has a great abundance—and overabundance—and yet we want to cut \$40 billion from the food stamp program? It is reckless and it is extreme.

I just say to my colleagues, if the farm programs are being reauthorized for 5 years, the nutrition programs should be reauthorized for 5 years, just like they have in the past, with that coalition that is coming from all over the country, region by region, Democrats and Republicans, in one unified farm bill. I urge my colleagues to go in that direction.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to follow on the remarks of our colleague from Connecticut.

The SNAP program is in jeopardy, which means children's health is in jeopardy, and we should extend the ARRA-created benefits as well as to fully fund, not cut, the SNAP program.

My colleague referred to the article this past week in *The Lancet*, the

prominent medical journal. Allow me to quote from that.

Many studies have shown positive associations between receipt of SNAP . . . and a lower risk of anemia, obesity, poor health, hospital admission for failure to thrive, and reports of child abuse and neglect. Children aged 5–9 years of SNAP-participating families have better academic outcomes and less obesity than children in nonparticipating families.

Between 1961 and 1975, the program was implemented county by county, thus, allowing for comparison across counties that differed only by SNAP availability. In SNAP-available counties there was . . . a significant increase . . . in mean birthweight for both Black and White Americans, compared with those counties where SNAP was not available.

As the Speaker knows, that is an important measure associated with infant health.

Children of low-income women in SNAP-available counties were less likely to have metabolic syndrome [ill health such as diabetes] in adulthood, and women who had received food stamps during early childhood were more likely to be economically self-sufficient.

These are children who had the benefits of SNAP. As adults, they were healthier. This seems, to me, to be a very important point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOLT. The societal benefits of food stamps extend far beyond a temporary reduction of hunger pangs. The benefits last for years—even into the next generation. Why on Earth would we consider reducing support for such an important humane and, yes, economically beneficial program?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would note to my colleagues that many of the points of great merit offered over the course of the discussion of this motion were points debated and discussed on the floor and in committee. I respect the sincerity of all of my colleagues, but we need to remember this motion has two key central points:

Number one, the 1938 and 1949 law remain permanent. We take away the conference's ability to negotiate that point with the United States Senate. Take it away, take it off the table is the goal of this motion to instruct.

The second point, of course, deals with the authorization on SNAP. Should it be 3 years? Should it be 5 years? That is the question you have to decide in this motion. Do you take away the House's ability to have the option of making whatever we can all agree on permanent law? Do you insist that we continue to have the food program, SNAP, run concurrently with the rest of the farm bill? It's a very simple set of issues to consider.

From my own perspective, I would ask the House to allow the conference

committee as much flexibility as possible in negotiating with the other body—as much flexibility as possible—and that would require rejecting the motion to instruct.

With that, Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I look forward to the joys of hopefully not quite as challenging a conference as this first 2 years of this process has been but, nonetheless, an acknowledgment that we need to get our work done in a timely fashion and bring a product back that a majority of this body can accept and support.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I just say that we have had a way to deal with this for the last 40-some years that has worked pretty well. I think it is a big mistake, as most groups that are involved in the farm bill feel it is a mistake, to eliminate permanent law and to have a situation where one part of the bill is authorized for a different length of time than the other. People that have been involved in this for a long time think this is a mistake. I think it is a mistake.

I ask my colleagues to support this motion to instruct, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1630

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS FOR RAW AND REFINED SUGAR

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 380, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 378

Resolved, That the managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2642 (an Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes) should advance provisions to repeal the Administration of Tariff Rate Quotas language as added by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, and thus restore the Secretary of Agriculture's authority to manage supplies of sugar throughout the marketing year to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the resolution and call on the House to support reforming the sugar program in upcoming negotiations on the farm bill.

Just a few months ago, I offered a reform amendment to the farm bill that gained unprecedented support and which made modest, but essential, reforms to our government's sugar program. Today, we debate this resolution, one that is even more modest but just as critical to bringing stability and balance to our sugar market. As a matter of fact, my resolution is even more timely. Following our debate on this program, the government began shoveling out money to support sugar growers—\$250 million worth in 4 months. We were told by the opposing side that it operated at no cost. We need to address this wasteful practice.

Mr. Speaker, every single one of us has a small food business in his district. Sugar is an essential ingredient even in many foods that aren't necessarily sweet. We all know how hard it is on small businesses right now. We know how critical these jobs are to our economy. Shouldn't we do everything we can to help them grow strong?

Today, millions of American families are on tight budgets. They watch their spending carefully, especially when it comes to buying food; and when they walk down the grocery aisle, they may not realize the costs that go into the products that they buy for themselves and their children. Very few of them know that they are paying significantly more for these products in order to ensure the profits of a small handful of sugar producers. They don't realize that, altogether, Americans are paying an additional \$3.5 billion a year because of a government sugar program that makes little sense.

Tens of millions of Americans are looking for jobs. Many don't under-

stand why there isn't more work available right now. What they don't know is that a nationwide industry is suffering because we have a sugar program that favors the few over the many. There are more than 600,000 jobs in sugar-using industries today. However, that industry has seen tough times. More than 127,000 jobs have been lost since the late 1990s. The Department of Commerce estimates that, for every one job the sugar program saves, three are lost in sugar-using industries. The sugar program is a bad deal for businesses, for consumers, for job seekers, and for taxpayers. When the House passed a farm bill this summer, every single commodity program was reformed except for one—the sugar program.

The sugar program is probably more in need of reform than any other commodity. The program controls prices to ensure that at all times sugar farmers and producers profit. When prices are high, as they were for 4 out of the last 5 years, producers do very well. When prices are low, the government buys sugar and makes sure that farmers and producers make their money back. This isn't a functioning sugar market. It is a nonstop bailout.

Meanwhile, the world price for sugar is typically much lower than here in the United States, and this is a big advantage for foreign competitors. In fact, Canada even advertises their access to the world sugar market as a reason for American companies to relocate or to build new facilities in their nation. Mexican food companies also have lower and more stable prices and the advantages of importing products to the U.S. under NAFTA. Simply put, we are handicapping our food industries at a time when they face intense competition. Good jobs are flowing out of the U.S. into other nations.

In the farm bill we sent over to the Senate, every single commodity program was reformed except for sugar. Dairy farmers, peanut growers, cotton growers, and many more will all see changes to their programs. The resolution on the House floor today proposes a modest change to the sugar program.

Currently, the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to manage imports of sugar for 6 months out of the year. The other 6 months of the year, he can do nothing even if prices spike unreasonably high. The Secretary basically has to make an educated guess about how much sugar should be imported. The way the statute is written, the Secretary must err on the side of the growers and producers. This means that, if the guess is wrong, Big Sugar benefits and consumers get fleeced.

It is time that we put an end to a policy that makes little sense—a policy that didn't even exist until the 2008 farm bill. This is a failed experiment that has hurt lots of people and has helped only a handful.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that this resolution is on the floor today. I believe that the House should make a strong statement—that our conferees should work to get good reform to the sugar program in this year's farm bill. I am also grateful for the bipartisan support for this measure. At a time when it seems like Democrats and Republicans can't agree on much, we have a very strong bipartisan group working across the aisle to stand up for consumers, for job seekers, for businesses, and for taxpayers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to oppose this resolution and to say that we have very strong bipartisan opposition to this resolution. Frankly, I don't know why we are doing this, because we settled this issue when we had the debate on the floor earlier in June. This is a sense of the Congress, and there is no requirement that the conference committee pay any attention to this, so I don't quite understand why we are going through this process; but in any event, we are here.

We have a sugar policy that supports \$20 billion in economic activity and 142,000 jobs. The reason we have it is that every country in the world that produces sugar subsidizes those industries or supports them, in most cases substantially more than does the United States. So if we change this program or give up what we have put together here, what you are going to do is give this industry away to countries that subsidize and support their industries more than we are doing here in the United States. I don't know why we would want to do that, but that would be the effect of this.

The Government of Mexico owns 20 percent of the industry in its country; and with NAFTA, we gave Mexico open access to our market. This is in spite of the fact that they own the industry down there. President Reagan once said that unilateral disarmament has never worked, that it only encourages aggressors. Reagan had it right. So whether it is defense policy or economic policy, you don't give something away for nothing to people who are doing more than what our opponents claim we are doing.

The United States is the largest sugar importer in the world. We bring in 1.5 million tons of sugar from 40 countries. Nobody else does that. This is sugar we could make here in the United States, but we gave away 15 percent of our market to help other countries. We have been doing that for a long time, and we have had pretty good prices. All of a sudden, because Mexico had a good crop, I guess, the prices have collapsed. If you think that the loan rate—the bottom price that we have in the sugar program—is giving us some kind of a profit or some

kind of a “fat cat” deal, I invite you to come up to American Crystal’s annual meeting in December in my area and in Representative CRAMER’s area, at which they are going to be reporting that they have lost money this year because the sugar prices are at loan rates. So the loan rates that are in the bill are not guaranteeing anybody a profit. They are just putting a floor under it, trying to keep us in business until next year.

There is no good reason to be doing this. We settled this issue before. The reason for the April 1 date is that, in the past, the USDA has made mistakes in terms of where we were with the market. So by having an April 1 date, we can make it less likely that these mistakes are going to happen in the future. That is the main reason that we have got it in there.

The sugar program has operated at no cost for a long time. During that time, the opponents claim that the prices were too high. Now the prices have collapsed, and they are saying the safety net costs too much. So they are still complaining about the prices being too high. I will guarantee you that you could get the price down to almost nothing, and it wouldn’t change the price that people charge for candy bars. You could probably give it away, and they wouldn’t lower the price.

This has been a good policy. It keeps sugar stable. There was a time in this country when we got rid of the sugar program. What happened? We had prices go up to 50 cents a pound, and we had the candy companies and the sugar users come in and ask for the government program to be put back in place so they could get the prices down to a more affordable level. I will guarantee you, if you get rid of the sugar policy, what you are going to have is a feast or famine situation. You might have low prices for a while, but you are going to have a time when high prices are going to do a lot more harm to you than this sugar program does.

This is a bad idea. It doesn’t need to be done, as we have already settled this issue. I ask my colleagues to reject this for any number of reasons.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, DANNY DAVIS, the cochair of the Sugar Reform Caucus.

□ 1645

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been very pleased to work in a very bipartisan way with Representatives PITTS, GOODLATTE, BLUMENAUER, and others as we have shaped H. Res. 378.

The domestic sugar program is an outdated system of strict government controls that cost consumers \$4 billion a year in higher prices. Historically, the sugar program not only hurts consumers but it also costs us jobs. High

sugar prices were responsible for the loss of 112,000 jobs in sugar-using industries in the last decade. While growers of all commodities, including those for cotton, rice, peanuts, corn, soybeans, and wheat, have seen their benefits cut and their programs reformed, for some inexplicable reason sugar growers and processors continue to get a free ride and keep their program without any reform.

No other crop has a program like sugar, which restricts both domestic production and imports. Peanut and tobacco growers once had a quota that limited production, but Congress reformed those programs a long time ago.

Now we are only left with the sugar program, where it remains permanently in the 2013 farm bill to continue to cause higher consumer prices for food products containing sugar. This program is designed to benefit a few at a tremendous cost to many. Our current sugar policy offloads the program’s cost onto consumers and food companies, entices U.S. companies to relocate overseas, destroys U.S. jobs, and limits export market opportunities for the rest of the economy.

It is time for Congress to finally reform this relic of a program of the past and put an end to sugar’s special status. We can now correct a specific aspect of the 2013 farm bill by supporting H. Res. 378.

The 2008 farm bill directs the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture to manage the overall U.S. sugar supply, including imports, so that market prices on average can stay higher in the United States compared to the overall world price of sugar. We need to eliminate this same provision in the 2013 farm bill that would limit the Secretary of Agriculture’s ability to allow sufficient sugar imports into the country so that consumers can pay their prices.

All that we are asking is to give the Secretary of Agriculture some flexibility to adjust.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the relevant subcommittee in the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Pitts-Goodlatte amendment for a number of reasons.

First of all, we have already voted on the Pitts-Goodlatte amendment provisions during the farm bill, and the House voted to reject it. I am not sure why we are here again today to retread all of these issues. Even if this resolution were to pass—which hopefully it doesn’t—I hope our Members remember how they voted in July and understand why they voted the way they did in July and stick with that this week. But

because the provisions in both bills in the House and Senate are the same this has even less effect than for the conferees to ignore it.

Our trade laws allow a lot of sugar to be imported in this country. We can and do grant extra access above and beyond the commitments if, in fact, we do need more.

But the farm bill simply says, let’s wait to see how much Mexico is going to send us before we grant others extra access. Remember that Mexico has 100 percent access to our market. They heavily subsidize their sugar, and the Mexican government owns 20 percent of that industry.

The Pitts resolution would ignore market forecasts and start granting extra access to Mexico and other countries right off the bat before the growing season. Mr. Speaker, that is reckless. The effect of this would glut our market with foreign subsidized sugar, depress our prices, and make it impossible for our farmers to repay our loans, resulting in forfeitures and additional taxpayer costs that shouldn’t be there. How good is that for taxpayers?

Sugar farmers are currently experiencing a 57 percent drop in sugar prices. I would argue that not one consumer in this America has benefited from that drop. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle argue that sugar costs way too much money. Yet with a 57 percent drop, where are those savings going to those consumers that you want to protect? Where are those reduced soda prices? Where are those reduced candy bar prices? It is nowhere to be seen.

I would argue that the policy works when prices are high, at above the levels. There is no cost to taxpayers. Then when prices are depressed, like they are now because of extra access from rural markets which are all subsidized, then prices are depressed and the safety net steps in. You either have a safety net or you don’t. The argument that this one was not adjusted in this farm bill is specious on its face.

Simply to say we change it for the sake of change makes no sense. If there is a legitimate change that you want, fine. But that is not what these folks are proposing. They are saying change it just because everybody else got changed. This program worked for 10 years without any cost to the taxpayer directly, and it would continue to work that way going into the future.

They picked a great year to pick this price because prices are down. The safety net is supposed to kick in. I would argue that we need to maintain the sugar program because it works for American sugar producers.

Confectioners cannot argue that prices in Canada are less. Prices in Canada right now are 29 cents a pound. So where are all those jobs coming back to the United States because sugar in America is 26 cents a pound?

Where are the jobs that went to Mexico because sugar was cheaper there? Oh, it is not cheaper; it is 28 cents a pound there. Where are all those jobs coming back?

You cannot argue with a straight face that sugar prices drive all those jobs out of this country.

Reject the Pitts amendment, and let's move forward with a farm bill that we can make for American farmers.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Illinois for their leadership on this issue.

A few months ago, we offered a reform amendment to the House farm bill that would have saved taxpayers money, kept American jobs at home, and ended special treatment to one farm commodity at the expense of all others.

This farm bill makes major policy changes that leave no commodity untouched, except one. The farm bill makes absolutely no change to the sugar program. In fact, the sugar program wasn't even given the scrutiny of a hearing as the Ag Committee was constructing the current farm bill.

Since 2008, manufacturers across the country have been struggling to run their operations due to the uncertainty created by the sugar program. In fact, for every job that proponents of this horrendous policy claim is maintained by the current sugar program, the Commerce Department estimates that the sugar program eliminated three jobs in food manufacturing.

Although I wish we could be here debating even greater reform, what we are debating today is quite modest.

This motion to instruct simply restores to the Secretary of Agriculture the flexibility to manage sugar imports, an authority the Secretary had prior to the 2008 farm bill. To be clear, this language will not allow a pound—a pound—more sugar to enter the U.S. unless the Secretary authorizes that it can come in upon a finding that is needed.

Many of you may be wondering why we are discussing sugar again. Since the House last debated the farm bill, the negative effects of the sugar program have only gotten worse. While proponents of the current sugar program claim it is “no cost,” nothing could be further from the truth. The sugar program has cost American taxpayers more than \$250 million since July.

To put this in perspective, in less than 3 months this broken policy has cost American taxpayers \$250 million, which is almost as much as the amount

of money available for an entire year for The Emergency Food Assistance Program, TEFAP, the USDA program that purchases commodities for food banks. It is nearly \$50 million more than the Commodity Supplemental Food Program for our Nation's senior citizens.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Comedian Jay Leno recently joked—“The Department of Agriculture wants to use our tax money to buy 400,000 tons of sugar to limit supply and boost prices so sugar producers can pay back government loans that they could default on. You follow me here on this? We loaned them money and now we're giving them more money so they can pay back our loan. You still wonder why we're 16 trillion dollars in debt?”

Sadly, this is no longer a joke. This is the reality of the sugar program and it is the American taxpayer who is saddled with the cost of this program.

Since this government shutdown began we have been intensely debating the spending priorities for our country. I don't know how we can justify this horrendous program at all!

While I wish we were able to go further in reforming the sugar program, today we have the opportunity to return a small bit of sanity to the program.

Please join me in supporting the Pitts sugar reform resolution to restore common sense to America's sugar policy.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that for the 12 years before July there has been no cost at all, and the food stamp part of the farm bill had no hearings either.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I am here today on behalf of our farmers in Minnesota and the midwest.

My State is number one in sugar beet production. That means my State's economy and the State's rural economy take a direct hit because of this resolution. This resolution hurts our farmers, small businesses, hospitals, schools, the lives of real people in rural communities.

American-grown sugar creates more than 142,000 jobs in 22 States and nearly \$20 billion in annual economic activity. We have farmers in the beet fields right now finishing up harvesting. This resolution sends a message that this House wants to shut down sugar production, which will shut down jobs here at home.

But some jobs will be created—in Brazil. Let's defend U.S. jobs, defeat this resolution, and stand with sugar beet farmers in Minnesota and across the United States.

The Republican majority has shut down the Federal Government. I am not going to stand by and shut down the sugar program. So let's protect U.S. communities and U.S. jobs and vote “no” on this resolution.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California, JACKIE SPEIER.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is kind of uncomfortable being on this side of the aisle, but it is also, I guess, a recognition that this is truly a bipartisan effort, and I am really thrilled to be joining in it.

Imagine that when the farm bill was debated here, every single commodity program in the farm bill was amended, was reformed, with the exception of sugar. Now, why would that happen? Well, maybe it is because of some sweet-talking sugar lobbyists that made that happen.

But nonetheless, let's be clear about what this resolution doesn't do. It does not undermine the sugar program in this country. The sugar program that exists in terms of price support remains, the domestic marketing allotment for sugar remains, and it does not eliminate sugar import quotas.

What does it do? It basically says that the Secretary of Agriculture can make sure during the entire year, and not just 6 months, that the market supply is appropriate.

What do we know about research that has been done on the cost to consumers? It is said to cost consumers \$3.5 billion. Now, this figure doesn't come from the candy manufacturers; this figure comes from a number of studies by the Government Accountability Office, by OECD, by the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Now, what has happened since July? Since July, the taxpayers of this country have spent \$250 million because they are guaranteed as sugar producers to 17 cents per pound. When they couldn't get 17 cents per pound, the U.S. had to buy the sugar and then try to sell it to ethanol producers.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to reform the system.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Texas, Judge POE.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our current U.S. sugar policy maintains that sugar will not become a solely foreign-grown product for the United States. When we weaken our sugar and our sugar growers, it hurts America but it helps Brazil, it helps Mexico—the biggest competitors for the United States.

Brazil's yearly \$2.5 billion subsidy has led them to controlling 50 percent of the global sugar exports.

Mexico has already unlimited access to the United States. And who is the biggest sugar producer and exporter in Mexico? The Mexican government. Mexico owns and operates 20 percent of the Mexican sugar industry. On top of that, Mexico already owes Texas 300,000 acre feet of water out of the Rio Grande. It is improperly taking that water out of the Rio Grande River—water that should go to Texas sugar growers, but it is not.

House Resolution 378 will weaken the U.S. sugar industry, giving advantage

to Mexico and Brazil. By allowing more foreign sugar into the United States we create unnecessary and hurtful competition. We prefer, if we pass this legislation, foreign farmers over American farmers.

□ 1700

Weakening our sugar program is not reform; it is crippling. It is crippling to the United States market, to the 140,000 sugar industry jobs. Once again, it only leaves us dependent on other countries for our sugar.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to become dependent on foreign countries for our energy; it is another thing if we start moving into the area of becoming dependent on foreign countries for what we eat. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), a leader in sugar reform.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about this issue, as are many of my colleagues. I strongly support this resolution by Messrs. PITTS, DAVIS, GOODLATTE, and others for a whole host of reasons, but let's be very clear about a few things here.

This country consumes more sugar than it produces. We must import sugar, whether we like it or not. We also have to deal with some other very basic facts.

I listened with intensity to the gentleman from Minnesota, a good friend, who talked about American Crystal losing money. Well, the answer is not to bail them out with our tax dollars. We have seen enough of that around here. It is time to stop those types of unnecessary bailouts.

We also heard my good friend from Texas, who, I was relieved today, did not complain about sugar companies making money or confectioners making money, as if profits are something that is evil. We want these companies to make money. We have had 4 years of high sugar prices, and that simply incentivizes more Mexican imports. It provides more incentives for those imports.

But let's look at the numbers. The current program is a remnant of the Depression era. It puts 600,000 American jobs in the food industry at risk. Between 1997 and 2011, nearly 127,000 jobs were lost in segments of the food and beverage industries that use sugar in their operations. And, yes, Hershey is located in my district.

The current sugar program hits American consumers and businesses with \$3.5 billion of extra costs every year. The CBO projects that the Sugar-to-Ethanol Program, known as the Feedstock Flexibility Program, will cost taxpayers \$239 million over the next several years, including \$51 million this year alone. Some analysts

project costs of up to \$100 million this year and \$250 million over the next 2 years combined.

When sugar prices drop below a certain level, the Federal Government buys that sugar and then sells it at a loss to the ethanol producers. The taxpayers are abused twice. When is enough enough? It is unacceptable and wrong to call on the American people to support the current sugar program, not only with their hard-earned consumer dollars, but with their tax dollars as well.

Yes, we are having debates around this place right now about the government shutdown and the debt ceiling. The point is we need to get on with this. Let's protect the American people, show them we can do our jobs. I ask my colleagues to reform, not repeal, the current sugar program, but reform it. Let's save the American consumers money in the midst of this tough economy. Let's show the American people we can act responsibly on their behalf.

I strongly support the amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I would like to correct the RECORD. We do not need to import. The farmers in my district could easily produce that 15 percent. We gave those markets to these countries out of the goodness of our heart.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the ranking member, and thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. Again, it is nothing but an attack on thousands of family farms in this country and in my district.

If it were the sense of Congress that it was right to end the successful sugar program, the House would have done that last June. Instead, we did the opposite. We defeated this same attack, clearly indicating that this program should be preserved.

The district that I represent is home to Michigan Sugar. And I hear these references—I heard them on the floor earlier, and I just saw it again—to Big Sugar. These are family farms that have banded together in cooperatives. You can call that Big Sugar if you want. It is a term I suppose that is intended to elicit certain thoughts about who these farmers are. That is a shame. These are family farmers who work hard every day and are forced to be in competition with multinational corporations.

We talk about the price of sugar. The price of sugar in a candy bar in 1985, there was 3 cents of sugar in that candy bar and it cost 35 cents. Today, that same candy bar is \$1.39, and there is 3 cents of sugar in that candy bar.

Let's deal with the facts here. This is a struggle between companies that want to marginally increase their prof-

it because not enough profits are going to these companies. They are among the highest, most profitable companies in the country, and they should be. That is good. But when is enough enough? Why is it that the family farmers are always the ones that are asked to give more, to potentially risk their livelihood, generations of livelihood?

This is wrong. It was wrong when we defeated it in June, and it is wrong again today.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), another leader in sugar reform in our Nation.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, I don't want to get into the crosshairs of my friend from Minnesota, and if I had sugar beet farmers in my district, I suppose I might have a different position; but I would like to talk about jobs because that is why I support restoring the Secretary of Agriculture's ability to keep sugar prices at a reasonable level year-round, not just during the arbitrary 6-month period dictated by the 2008 farm bill.

Between 1997 and 2011, nearly 127,000 jobs were lost in segments of the food and beverage industry that use sugar in the products they make, while employment actually rose in food industry segments that don't use sugar. Today, there are an estimated 600,000 Americans directly employed in the food manufacturing industry. It is an enormously important industry. The U.S. Department of Commerce says that for every one sugar production job saved, our current sugar program eliminates three jobs in food manufacturing. That is a loss of manufacturing jobs at a rate of 100,000 per year.

And the fiscal impacts of our sugar policies are just as disturbing. Since this issue was debated on the House floor only 6 weeks ago, the sugar program has cost the taxpayer \$90 million. And I am informed that the total cost to the taxpayer this year alone will exceed \$150 million. The Congressional Budget Office projects another \$239 million in the outyears of the bill.

We don't need to be hitting up the taxpayer for this money. We can make modest reforms to U.S. sugar policy while still leaving a safety net in place for U.S. sugar farmers and processors. This motion strikes the right balance. It is modest and commonsense policy. It is scaled back to include just one of the reforms that the House considered 2 months ago.

Madam Speaker, I think this should be supported. It is a modest, important reform. I think it is appropriate in light of the context of our farm policy. We are making reforms in other areas, and this is one area where we really do need to reform on behalf of the American consumer and on behalf of the need for more manufacturing jobs in the United States of America.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, we have heard a lot of things today. We have heard from those of us who think that it is a good program, that it has been efficient, and that it hasn't cost the taxpayers money for the last 10 years; and we have heard from the other side that it is not efficient. We have heard conflicting numbers of jobs, about potentially what jobs may have been lost. But what is not debatable are the jobs that are created by the sugar industry, including 142,000 nationally and 12,000 jobs just in Florida alone.

We are going to continue to hear conflicting sides here, but let me tell you what is not really debatable. What is not really debatable is that this is an industry that, around the entire planet, is subsidized. And what we are talking about here is a unilateral disarmament of the U.S. industry that creates, again, 142,000 jobs.

I keep hearing, also, the fact that consumers here are struggling. Wait a second. Sugar here for consumers is among the lowest prices on the entire planet.

And then I have heard, again, that it is affecting the food manufacturing industry. By the way, now we are getting to the real substance of the issue. But let's ask the question: prices of sugar have dropped dramatically this year. Have you seen a dramatic shift, the lowering of prices in the food manufacturing industry? By the way, let me not get that dramatic. Have you seen a dramatic lowering of prices of diet sodas versus ones that contain sugar? No.

Look, if that was the case, if the price reductions were going to be passed on to the consumers, then you would see, obviously, products that don't contain sugar would be a lot less expensive than the ones that do contain sugar.

Again, we are going to hear a lot of conflicting issues, but let's not forget the basic principle here: We have thousands of jobs that depend on this industry, including in Florida. We have, again, some large manufacturers that want lower prices, and I don't blame them. But please don't say they are going to pass them on to the consumer, because they never have. Just look at the price of Diet Coke versus regular Coke.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Speaker, I spoke earlier on the floor today, and I think it is wonderful that we are having this great debate in this great Chamber. Obviously, this is a bipartisan issue, and I am so glad that some

of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle have joined me in this great debate for sugar reform.

I represent the great Third District of Tennessee, and I have spent a lot of time in my district in manufacturing plants where I believe, and I would argue, that we manufacture the best baked goods in the country, some of the finest candies in the country, and we distribute these goods all over our great Nation. We use sugar. We use a lot of sugar.

But as we have been involved in this great debate and since the last time on the farm bill, I have noticed a couple of things. It is just not working. Since we had that last vote, it has cost the American taxpayer over \$250 million. In addition to that, I have made a commitment to the workers in these plants that I am going to fight hard to keep their jobs in the United States of America, in particular in the great Third District of Tennessee. In order to do that, we have to stop this madness. This is not a radical change to sugar reform. It is a modest proposal that allows the Secretary of Agriculture the discretion to help the American consumer against skyrocketing costs and potential skyrocketing costs in the price of sugar.

Let's face it; sugar is a commodity, plain and simple. And if you use it and the price goes up, and if it is kept artificially high, it drives the price up and you become uncompetitive. I believe in the free market. I fervently argue for the free market, but the Pitts-Goodlatte amendment does a couple of things. It protects American consumers; it protects American jobs; and it is the right side of the argument for good, free-market Americans.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRAEDER).

Mr. SCHRAEDER. Madam Speaker, I think it is important to put all this in perspective. U.S. sugar policy from the 2008 farm bill has been very, very successful. As a matter of fact, the committees of jurisdiction both on the House and Senate side decided not to alter the sugar provisions in the 2013 farm bills passed by both the House and the Senate. As a matter of fact, this has been argued, as we have heard, again and again. This amendment and amendments similar to this have been rejected each time.

This would be a very damaging amendment at a time when American farmers are already hurting. This is exactly the inappropriate time to go after American jobs. These guys would end up going bankrupt, and I don't think you want to sacrifice existing American jobs with the hope that some new jobs might be created.

The other thing that is missing here is the acknowledgment that the Secretary of Agriculture already has the

authority to increase U.S. sugar imports if there is an emergency. So why do we need this instruction? I don't get it.

The other point, if we are going to get back to some semblance of regular order in the conference process, since the House and Senate farm bills are identical here, this should not even be conferenceable at the end of the day. I think it is out of order and inappropriate.

Right now, Mexico, as has been stated, is well subsidized. Twenty percent of their production is outright subsidized, owned by their government, is driving sugar prices in the tank for Americans. That is not right. This should be WTO conferenceable at the end of the day.

This is the wrong time to go about trying to end a policy that has worked great for the last 12 years and finally is paying off for those sugar producers, sugar farmers, and all the sugar beet seed growers in my district that need a little help in this tough, tough time. I think if you are in favor of supporting a good balance of trade, supporting American agriculture, supporting the American taxpayer, at the end of the day, you do not want to vote in favor of Pitts amendment. I urge its defeat.

□ 1715

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong support of the Pitts amendment on the House resolution on the farm bill.

The sugar program included in the 2008 farm bill that became permanent in the 2013 House farm bill, contains a harmful restraint on trade and sugar between the 6 months of October and April, which makes it so that the Secretary of Agriculture cannot allow an increase in sugar imports, even if the marketplace needs it.

This detrimental restriction led to record-high prices for both the sugar producers and consumers alike. The higher costs resulted in many manufacturing companies, some are located in my district, struggling or having to even shut down because they are unable to sustain these high costs, killing good manufacturing jobs in the process.

This resolution ensures that the U.S. will not be forced to face higher sugar prices that are two times the world price because of an erroneous restriction in the current law. These high sugar prices have unfairly cost consumers \$3.5 billion a year.

Simply, the U.S. should be able to control these costs and adjust accordingly so that we do not impose unjust costs upon our consumers, especially in these economically trying times.

The bottom line is this: the problem is not Mexico. The problem is an outdated anti-taxpayer, anti-consumer,

anti-business sugar-reform program. The Pitts resolution will help restore some balance to the program and remove artificial pressure from the current government intrusion into the marketplace, which is what we are looking for here.

What will the Pitts resolution do? It will help fix our broken sugar program by, one, allowing sugar farmers to retain their commodity program; two, to help ensure taxpayers will be less likely to have to pick up the tab for this program; and, three, help to ensure that hundreds of thousands of good manufacturing jobs and sugar industries will be less threatened.

I urge support of the Pitts resolution. It is a commonsense approach.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH).

Mr. YOH. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota.

I oppose the gentleman from Pennsylvania's resolution, H. Res. 378.

Sugar is the only commodity where the U.S. is a net importer. This puts U.S. producers at a disadvantage. Our sugar farmers have to compete with sugar-producing governments and countries that heavily subsidize their farmers' production. Yes, this year this program did cost our government, but it is because Mexico is allowed to dump their sugar on our market because of NAFTA. This is a trade issue that we need to look at deeper.

U.S. farmers would gladly give up their safety net as long as every other country discontinued their heavily subsidized programs as well. U.S. sugar farmers can compete with any other foreign sugar farmer and we can outperform them, but they can't compete against a foreign government and subsidies. At the end of the day, this is a jobs issue. There are over 142,000 jobs in the domestic sugar industry, with over 12,000 in Florida alone. Many of these jobs would move to Brazil or Mexico if the intent of this resolution becomes law. There again, another industry would be weakened by our government policies.

We in government should work to keep America stronger and more competitive, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 378.

The current U.S. sugar program is uncompetitive, outdated, it stunts American job creation, harms U.S. confectioners, and forces food manufacturers and families to pay a higher cost for any product made with sugar. Recent data suggests that without reform, the program puts 600,000 jobs in the sugar-using industries at risk. I am

all too aware of these negative economic impacts during a recent visit to a leading confectioner in my district.

Headquartered in Bryan, Ohio, Spangler Candy Company is a family-owned business that has been providing consumers with Dum Dums, Saf-T-Pops, Circus Peanuts, candy canes, and other confections since 1906. This company currently has over 400 U.S. employees; but if it could purchase sugar at world-market prices instead of U.S. prices, that number would be closer to 600. That's a difference of 200 highly skilled manufacturing jobs in a single small midwestern town. Imagine the positive economic growth that would result from sugar reform nationwide.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution. Reforming the U.S. sugar program will restore fairness in the sugar market, encourage U.S. investment, and spur job creation in our local communities.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Speaker, listening to the debate here this afternoon, I am reminded of a statement from an old University of Minnesota law professor who once said that "all political decisions revolve around who you're for." And I've heard both sides of this issue castigating one side or the other; but it becomes rather clear, as you listen to this debate, that the supporters of this resolution are in support of those multinational corporations and foreign corporations and foreign governments that stand to benefit from a change in our U.S. sugar policy.

On the other side, the side that I choose to stand with, we have the producers such as the cane growers, the beet growers who put their crops in the field at risk every year, the men and women who work in the fields, who work in the plants processing sugar, and the consumers who benefit from a stable supply of reasonably priced sugar to satisfy our food needs here in this country.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge that we defeat this resolution and stick with the sugar program that has worked so well in this country for so long. In Minnesota alone, we have 32,500 people working in that industry. There are 142,000 people working throughout the country in this industry.

Madam Speaker, this was a jobs bill. This was an American manufacturing and production bill. Let's defeat this resolution. Let's support the farmers. Let's support the workers. Let's support the consumers. Let's defeat this amendment.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I ask for support of my colleagues on a

resolution in support of making a simple correction to the House-passed farm bill during the conference with the Senate.

The 2008 farm bill overreached in limiting the USDA's ability to allow sugar imports if there is a shortage in domestic supply. This misguided policy has resulted in extreme shortages and now surpluses, adding unnecessary volatility to the marketplace and creating uncertainty for our manufacturers. Because of these policies, we have been losing food manufacturing jobs at the rate of almost 10,000 per year. We cannot afford these job losses.

The district I represent in Illinois is home to a number of food manufacturers, including Jelly Belly, TruSweets Confectionery, Cornfields, Ford Gum, and Long Grove Confectionery. These companies employ hundreds of people and support hundreds of families in the 10th District. These are economic drivers of our community.

In addition to costing our manufacturers and workers, this policy is costing taxpayers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Since July, this policy is estimated to have cost more than \$250 million. Keep in mind that we were told this program would operate at zero cost.

The reform called for by this resolution would make a modest change to U.S. sugar policy while still maintaining a safety net for U.S. sugar farmers and processors.

Please join me in supporting this commonsense resolution. Express support for this reasonable reform.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), my good friend and the cleanup hitter on our side.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member and my neighbor for yielding the time and for his leadership on this very important issue that supports the sugar farmers of the Red River Valley of the north, and I am very pleased to confirm that there is, in fact, plenty of room for all of our colleagues to attend American Crystal Sugar's annual meeting; so I appreciate his invitation, as well.

How many Federal programs only cost money every 10 to 12 years? We hear that this program has cost \$250 million since July. Yeah, since July of 2002. That's all it has cost.

I want to speak less, perhaps, to the merits of the program because they have already been so eloquently illustrated and speak more to an issue of unity. At a time when unity is so rare, it is unfortunate that some of our colleagues have chosen to attempt to dismantle one of the very few, frankly,

successful achievements of this Congress.

The committee work on the 2013 farm bill began years ago before many of us were even elected to Congress. An anti-sugar amendment was thoughtfully debated on this floor, including the provisions in this resolution, and the House killed it. At that time, a sense of the House was reached and a farm bill was passed.

The Senate passed the exact same language pertaining to the sugar program that is making today's action not only divisive, but a total waste of time, as House rules prohibit the conferees from even considering its language. This maneuver undermines the very integrity of this great institution, and it ignores the unifying achievement of this farm bill by dismantling the support system for our sugar farmers who are facing a 57 percent collapse in prices as we speak.

We don't need more division, Madam Speaker. We need accomplishments. Let's not impose division where there is unity. Let's vote "no" on this amendment. Let's allow our conferees to do their jobs, bring back a report that a majority of us can vote for and a farm bill that we can all vote for, that the Senate can agree to, that the President can sign, and demonstrate our functionality once again.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 378.

The current sugar policy in this country is outdated and this year will cost American taxpayers millions upon millions of dollars. It is time for us to recognize that there is a global supply of sugar that American manufacturers need to be able to access, and the world price for sugar futures consistently trades lower than domestic futures. If it weren't bad enough that our policy causes food prices to be artificially high, this year taxpayers will pick up the bill to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars when the USDA purchases the excess supply. We will be converting our excess sugar into ethanol to support an industry which does not need any more taxpayer help. In fact, that is another discussion for another day of bad policy.

At a time when we are all taking a hard look at every dollar we spend, we need to take a hard look at this sugar program. Every Member of Congress should ask themselves: Is this the best way we can use limited taxpayer dollars?

Taxpayers are paying for the current sugar program when they write their checks to the IRS, and they are paying for it when they write their checks to the local grocery store. We need to support this resolution, Madam Speaker.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

□ 1730

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I rise to talk about the importance of this resolution.

Prior to coming to Congress, I spent a decade working in economic development in Tacoma, Washington; and during that time, it was my job to go and meet with employers and find out how to keep jobs and try to grow jobs in our area.

One of the first meetings I had was with a company called Brown and Haley, a confectioner that has been producing the legendary and, if I might add, delicious Almond Roca since 1923. In discussing the economic challenges facing that company, the number one issue that they raised was the competitive disadvantage they faced from the high cost of sugar.

We are a northern border State. From where I grew up, on a clear day you could see Canada. For a region that is struggling to grow jobs and keep jobs, the threat of businesses in my district moving across the border isn't a theoretical policy conversation; it is a real threat.

The current program puts 600,000 American manufacturing jobs at risk in all 50 States. Since the 2008 farm bill, the U.S. cost of sugar has skyrocketed to almost two times the world price. That price increase is passed directly on to our confectioners, who have to make tough operating adjustments to sustain their business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KILMER. Our neighbors realize how expensive U.S. sugar is and how high the prices are; and in the case of Brown and Haley in my district, those north of the border have already explicitly approached and advertised the cheaper sugar prices across the border.

This current sugar program doesn't just affect large corporations. It impacts small family-owned businesses like Brown and Haley in Tacoma, Washington, that have been in our communities for generations. So I ask for support for this resolution to help American small businesses and American manufacturing jobs.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I call on my colleagues this afternoon to support this resolution, to further reform a harmful and unnecessary sugar program that puts 600,000 American manufacturing jobs at risk.

Back home in Indiana's Third Congressional District, companies like Aunt Millie's, small candy maker Plyleys Candies in Lagrange, Indiana, and Edy's Ice Cream in Fort Wayne are forced to pay artificially inflated prices, thanks to Washington's top-down control. This kind of price-fixing should be a bygone relic of the Soviet era and has no place in free-market policies. Today we have an opportunity to make commonsense reforms to help protect these jobs.

I would also like to urge this body to protect the victory for limited government when the House split the farm bill and ended the unholy alliance between food stamps and agricultural policy. These policies are completely different and must be considered separately, just like we are doing now in debating sugar policy.

For the first time in 40 years, we gave taxpayers an honest look at how Washington spends their money. We took a commonsense approach and considered food stamp policy and traditional ag policy separately.

Today the House sent to conference a bill that keeps these policies separate. We can make sure that, going forward, we keep our commitment to transparency and limited government.

I urge the conference committee to adopt this resolution, protect these jobs, and keep food and farm policies separate.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, in closing, I would just reiterate that we, in sugar-producing areas, we, who are in the sugar production business, would happily give up the sugar program if everybody else in the world gave up their sugar programs. That is the problem; and as I said in my opening statement, as President Reagan said, when you unilaterally disarm, you are asking for trouble.

We are bringing in 15 percent of our market in imports that we don't need to do. We could easily produce that in the United States.

So I would say to these other countries, you give up all of your support for your sugar industry, you bring in 15 percent in Brazil and Thailand and these other big sugar-producing areas, and we would be happy to compete because we will run them out of business.

The problem is, that is not the real world. So if you want to maintain these jobs and this industry in the country, the way to do it is with this current program. That is why it was put in in '08. That is why it was supported on both sides, in both the House and the Senate in 2013. And it works.

One of the speakers had said that we have these high consumer prices in the

United States. That is not true. We have the cheapest, most affordable, most abundant, and safest food supply in the world in the United States, including sugar. And one of the reasons is because of the policies we have in place. One of those policies is the sugar policy.

So I would encourage my colleagues to oppose this resolution. As it was stated, it is unnecessary. It is not something that is going to be considered by the conference committee anyway. I don't know why we are doing it, but it should be defeated in spite of that.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PITTS, Madam Speaker, in conclusion, again, this is reform. It is not a repeal of the sugar program. It is a very modest reform, simply going back to what the Secretary had before 2008 with the ability, the flexibility to allow sugar imports, when necessary, to meet domestic demand.

It allows sugar farmers to retain their price supports. It helps save American taxpayers and consumers money, about \$3.5 billion per year. It helps protect hundreds of thousands of good American manufacturing jobs. It does not require the import of a single additional pound of sugar, and it reduces market manipulation.

Madam Speaker, I urge the Members on both sides of the aisle to support this resolution. And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PETERSON, Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO CROP INSURANCE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 380, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 379) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 379

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the managers on the

part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2642 (an Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes) should—

(1) agree to provisions relating to a limitation on premium subsidy based on average adjusted gross income in excess of \$750,000;

(2) agree to provisions relating to a requirement for the Secretary to carry out a study on crop insurance and the impacts of an adjusted gross income limitation, as specified in paragraph (1); and

(3) not agree to provisions relating to a delayed effective date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 379.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I would like to thank Chairman LUCAS for his work on passing a farm bill through the House. It was not an easy task.

And the farm bill got a lot right, in my judgment. It eliminated direct payments. It made reforms to the food stamp program, which are in desperate need of reform. It consolidated duplicative programs, and the Agriculture Committee has started to implement very needed reforms of these programs. Unfortunately, I don't think it went far enough, which is why I am offering this sense of the House.

I think that we should accept what the Senate did—and they did it in a bipartisan fashion—to impose limits on premium subsidies going toward the wealthiest of farmers.

What this sense of the House does is it simply says, let's agree to the Coburn-Durbin amendment which said, for those making above \$750,000, the sense of the Congress is that their premiums for crop insurance should not be as generous as everybody else's. In fact, their premiums should be subsidized by 15 percentage points. This is hardly draconian. In fact, I would support going much farther than this, as I have voted consistently in the past.

But what this says is, if you are a farmer and you make more than \$750,000, all you will get is a crop insurance subsidy that is not as generous as everybody else's. It will be 15 percentage points less.

Let me give you an example. If you have protection for 50 percent of your

yield, right now the Federal Government will subsidize 67 percent of that. Under this, if you make over \$750,000, you would be subsidized by 52 percent of your crop insurance. Hardly draconian.

So what we are simply saying is, we had a vote that was 59–33 in the Senate to limit the subsidy for crop insurance for very wealthy farmers. That is 1 percent of all of our agricultural producers in the country, and what we should do is concede to that. We should agree with that in conference, and that is what the sense of this House resolution encourages.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS, Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

First, I would note, again, to my colleagues that this is one of the final stages of this long, challenging process of putting a comprehensive farm bill together.

With the conclusion of this debate on this sense of the Congress resolution and the votes that I suspect will come sometime later today or tomorrow, we will begin then with the appointment of conferees, the formal process of working out the differences between House and Senate bills. That is no small accomplishment, considering how many years Ranking Member PETERSON and I and the members of the House Agriculture Committee have put into this effort. As a matter of fact, when we started the process of gathering information and putting the hearing record together, I was the ranking member, and Mr. PETERSON was the chairman. So this has been a long, long process.

Now, I must say that I am obligated to rise in opposition to the resolution. I think the world of the author of this amendment, and in his role as chairman of the House Budget Committee, not only is he well-intentioned in this amendment and his many other efforts, but let's be honest, our friend has a tremendous amount of work on his plate, addressing everything from the issues about how we work our way out of this debt ceiling matter, how we address funding the Federal Government, how we finally put a budget resolution together. I know he is a busy, busy man; but I must say the committee focused very hard for literally years on all of these issues.

I won't pretend that with all of the things going on right now, not that many weeks after some very intense debate on the floor of this House, the goodly number of our Members are not focused on particular nuances of the farm bill, but on everything else going on.

But I would remind my good friends, the perspective of the House Agriculture Committee and the perspective of the majority—yes, maybe I have had too much fun with farm bills in recent

years—of this process has led us to believe that it was important that we encourage participation in crop insurance. Crop insurance is like other insurance. It is about creating a pool of risk and spreading it out as far as you possibly can, having as many participants as you possibly can to share adversity, to contribute more premiums into that pool so that when you have that inevitable loss somewhere, you are better able to address it. And that is the perspective the committee took and I believe the House, as a whole, took. Get as many people involved in utilizing and expanding the insurance pool as is possible.

Now, this sense of the Congress language is, in many ways, similar to the Senate language and would restrict the number of people based on AGI that would be able to participate, taking people out of the pool, shrinking the pool. These are, in all fairness, some of the most efficient farmers.

I will just simply ask my colleagues, remember the work of the committee and the work of this body. Help us keep this program as viable as possible.

□ 1745

Help us make sure that all farmers have the tools to mitigate their risk.

Now, there is one other perspective here, and we have talked about this many times, and it is the perspective of, what is the farm bill about? Is it about raising food and fiber? Is it about meeting the nutritional needs of our citizens in this country and having our surplus available to consumers around the rest of the world?

Or is it about deciding who a farmer should be, and using policy decisions within the farm bill to pick people who we want to farm, and to deny resources to people we don't happen to like who want to farm also?

I reject that also. Farm bills are about farming, raising food and fiber, meeting the needs.

I would ask again, very respectfully, of my colleagues, honor the decisions of the full House not all that long ago. Reject this sense of the House resolution.

Remember that you are helping us build on something that is kind of amazing in this session of Congress, a bill that came out of committee with \$40 billion in mandatory spending reform, with a bipartisan vote, a bill that left the United States House with a total of \$60 billion in mandatory spending reforms.

I can think of no other committee in this session of Congress that can lay claim to that—\$60 billion in mandatory reform.

Let us go to conference. Let us have as much flexibility as possible. Let us finish our work. Let us finish our good work, and we will bring a product back to you from conference that you can judge on its merits.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), the vice chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership on this issue and so many others and for allowing me to join him on this resolution.

Madam Speaker, under our current system, every farmer buying crop insurance gets a subsidy. The question is, How big should that subsidy be? Should all farmers receive a 62 percent crop insurance subsidy or more? Or should 1 percent of the most successful folks in agriculture receive a 47 or a 48 percent subsidy, which is exactly what this resolution would do?

While I support many of the reforms found in the House versions of our farm bill, unfortunately, no provision has been included which would limit crop insurance subsidies, and this resolution rectifies that glaring oversight.

This commonsense resolution will save the taxpayers nearly \$1 billion by instructing conferees to implement an economic test for those farmers with adjusted gross incomes over \$750,000. Those with incomes which exceed \$750,000 will see their crop insurance premium subsidy reduced by 15 percentage points.

We all understand and recognize the need for having a safety net in place for our Nation's farmers. This resolution does nothing, nothing, to undermine that safety net.

We all know the need for serious reforms also to our crop insurance programs. Last year, it cost more than \$14 billion, and without reforms, it is projected to be more than twice as expensive as the conventional commodity subsidy programs over the next decade.

So agreeing to this resolution would put into place the same provisions put forward as were mentioned in the Coburn-Durbin amendment in the Senate. That passed the Senate with significant bipartisan support earlier this past summer.

Currently, Madam Speaker, 4 percent of farmers receive 33 percent of the benefits of crop insurance. A stunning 73 percent of subsidy dollars goes to the top 20 percent of agribusinesses. That just doesn't make sense.

In a time of fiscal challenge, programs like crop insurance need serious modifications, and this is a step in the right direction. Though an incremental step, and a small one at that, it is, indeed, a step in the right direction.

Also, at a time when there is little bipartisan agreement in this town, this is just such an opportunity to enhance bipartisan cooperation.

Now, most folks on our side of the aisle, this side of the aisle, have been strongly supportive of an economic

test for most taxpayer-subsidized programs. More actions like this are necessary in order to avoid this Nation's fiscal ruin.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of our primary subcommittee on the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the chairman for allowing us time to talk.

Madam Speaker, it is a bit surreal on a couple of levels, one, to be speaking from this side of the Chamber, and two, to be speaking against two of my colleagues who it is rare in my term here in Congress that I have been on a different side of an issue from—my good colleagues from Georgia and from Wisconsin. But on this one I stand in strong opposition to the Ryan-Price amendment.

I just wanted to say how weird this feels to talk against something that my good colleagues from Wisconsin and Georgia are proposing to do.

One point that was just made was that there was a \$14 billion payout last year in disaster insurance losses to farmers in America. That's a cherry-picked year. Folks, remember, 2012 was historic droughts throughout most of ag production America, and so, consequently, last year was a much higher year than would have normally been the case. It is normally about \$4 billion a year in that regard.

I would also remind our colleagues that we fought this fight in July. Just like the Senate went one direction with the vote, we went the other direction, with a 208-217 vote on this floor. So we have had these conversations already and won this argument already.

This effort will punish success, will punish efficiency. It is hard to farm using \$300,000 tractors if you have got a small farm. It takes 3,000 acres to be able to support the implements and the tools needed to farm as efficiently as American farmers produce. And so we are punishing the folks who are the best at what they do.

Also, Madam Speaker, I would argue that this is a risk tool. This is not an income support tool. Income support tools, as some of our approps have gone, clearly means-testing those makes sense. We have had those in place for quite some time. But this is a risk management.

Risks at big farms are no different than risks on small farms, and to limit crop insurance, to restrict crop insurance this way is, in my view, wrongheaded.

I would also argue that using AGI at this stage in the development of the broader issues going on in this country creates several unknowns.

Both my colleagues from Wisconsin and Georgia are working very diligently on the Ways and Means Committee to, in effect, have a fundamental tax reform. That fundamental

tax reform will have the impact of eliminating deductions and credits and, in effect, raising AGI. They can't tell us today where that AGI number is going to go to, so that creates one of the additional unknowns.

A second unknown is in their bill itself. Their resolution says they don't know what the impact is going to be. We heard the Budget Committee chairman say one percentage. We heard Mr. PRICE say a different percentage. So even on their side of their arguments, they are not clear yet on what the impact will be for folks who go above the \$750,000 AGI.

But their amendment itself, or their resolution says, in paragraph 2, agree with the provisions relating to the requirement for the Secretary to carry out a study on crop insurance and the impacts of an adjusted gross income limitation that this is going to impose.

All of my colleagues who will speak in favor of this are generally much more rational and logical about how they want to do things. Creating this new test would be like the fellow who dove into some unknown waters. As his feet left the bank he's saying, Wow, I wonder how deep it is going to be, and I wonder how cold it is going to be.

We don't know, they don't know exactly what impact this is going to have. So I would argue that, until we can fix a number on the AGI—and again, let me make sure that everybody understands. I am not saying anything whatsoever in opposition to the fundamental tax reform work that is going on. That has nothing to do with my comments.

They are going to change the number that they want to use. That, they cannot argue against. They cannot tell us yet where that is going to be. They are going to raise it, I know, because you can't lower and limit deductions and not raise folks' AGIs because business deductions will be involved in this. So they can't tell us where that is going to be for normal farmers.

So you can't look at a farmer today who might be making \$500,000 AGI—lowering the rates the way they are going to do may raise that farmer's AGI to something in excess of 750.

That person is in the exact economic circumstances they are now with respect to crop insurance and the risk management tool that that has provided, and yet they are going to be fundamentally impacted by this.

So I think this is ahead of its time. Wait on the study that the Senate bill calls for. I suspect my chairman will agree on that study that is going on.

But do not put this economic limit on crop insurance at this point in time. We have won this fight once with our colleagues. I would expect us to win it again. And I would urge my colleagues to vote against the Ryan-Price amendment that would have the impact they don't know yet on crop insurance.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the courtesy of my friend from Wisconsin, and I am pleased to join with him on the floor this evening debating this issue. It is something we have done over the years, working with Mr. KIND, with now Senator FLAKE, trying to inject a little more rationality and fiscal responsibility into this debate.

Madam Speaker, it is true that the House rejected a proposal during the debate on the farm bill, but 208 of our colleagues voted for a much more ambitious proposal. In fact, I believe that there were more votes for that crop insurance reform than were available for the first iteration of the farm bill itself.

This is a very modest step, and I appreciate it being brought forward, not because I think it is where we need to go ultimately, but I think that this is the sort of thing we ought to be doing on the floor of the House because there are, in fact, areas of agreement to do a better job for the taxpayer, do a better job for more farmers and ranchers, protect the environment. The farm bill is replete with these opportunities.

I find the rhetoric about somehow picking winners and losers and shutting down the richest farmers ironic. The proposal that is offered by my friend, Mr. RYAN, does not deny the richest 1 percent of the farmers crop insurance. It just says, your subsidy is going to be about 50 percent. You have a 15 percent reduction.

That's not picking winners and losers. That's not denying them the use of this tool. But what we should be doing is actually doing a deeper dive.

Crop insurance right now is so lucrative that it, in many instances, actually pays farmers to plant ground that they know is going to fail. They can make money off of it because of how lavishly the crop insurance program is subsidized.

The premiums, the people who sell it, insure it against loss—I mean, study after study from independent, outside agencies suggests that there is a lot that we could do.

In fact, it is ironic that there has been this attack on food stamps, the SNAP benefit, which has a lower percentage of abuse than the crop insurance program. We are on board now, the next 10 years, to have crop insurance likely to be pushing up against \$100 billion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. But the fact is that this is an expensive entitlement in need of reform, with more areas of identified abuse than the food stamp program, which gets whacked, and we

have a farm bill that is going to provide more lavish benefits for the wealthiest farmers.

I appreciate this discussion this evening. I hope it is the beginning of a more ambitious effort to do what needs to be done with crop insurance. But I think it is healthy to have it here.

I am pleased to join with my friend, Mr. RYAN, to agree with everything TOM PRICE said. Now that hasn't happened, I think, in any speech that he has given on the floor to this point. I am sure I am making him nervous agreeing with him.

But it illustrates the opportunity that we could have if we would take the time to work together on areas where there is bipartisan agreement and there is a clear need.

I appreciate the gentleman giving me the time. I appreciate him bringing it forward, and I urge support.

□ 1800

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 19 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding the time and for his long-suffering and persistent leadership on this important issue.

I rise to ask my colleagues to please oppose efforts in this House to punish success and vote "no" on the Ryan resolution.

The viability of any insurance instrument requires broad participation. To maintain and foster improvement to our farm base and the stable food supply it provides, proper risk mitigation is essential. Although attacking the "wealthy" may appear to be noble, AGI limits for crop insurance will drive out large-risk pool participants, making the program less affordable for the farmers least able to do without it.

In North Dakota, the average farm is markedly different than the farm in Wisconsin. North Dakota family farms are thousands of acres involving multiple generations. The proposed AGI limits ignore this reality. They not only include income from farm operations, but other wholly unrelated earnings. USDA research shows average off-farm income greatly exceeds on-farm income, making the targets of this provision more collateral than intentional.

American farmers largely support the major policy shift that eliminates direct payments, relying solely on this cost-sharing arrangement with the Federal Government, resulting in 10 percent taxpayer savings. Unlike previous subsidies, farmers pay for this protection by contributing around 40 percent of the premium. The other 60

percent is not even expended by the government unless a claim is made.

The increasing role of Federal crop insurance as the foundation of the family farm safety net in recent years has diminished the need for crisis appropriations. Absent the stability of an actuarially sound program, future catastrophic disasters will result in greater ad hoc disaster payments. Let's not lose the momentum to shift from direct payments to crop insurance by compromising the financial soundness of this important program.

As the world population grows, the demand for food will increase. We should herald efficiency and increased productivity. Neither is achieved by punishing our most successful farmers.

Please oppose the Ryan sense of the House resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I thank Chairman RYAN for putting this resolution together. I also want to take time to recognize and thank Chairman LUCAS. In his tone and tenacity in putting together a farm bill, I think he has served as an example in this House of how to be a chairman and bring together divergent groups. I was very supportive of what we have done, but I am also very supportive of this resolution here today.

Implementing a 15-percentage point reduction in crop insurance for producers with an adjusted gross income exceeding \$750,000, or \$1.5 million for joint filers, just like the Senate amendment, seems to be common sense, in my mind. However, this resolution calls for the elimination of delayed implementation in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment delays this. We are simply getting rid of the delay of this implementation. This means test proposal would save roughly \$1 billion over 10 years, something I think is very worthy for this body to consider.

On average, taxpayers are covering about 62 percent of crop insurance premiums. This proposal would reduce that to be about 47 percent, roughly, for high-income producers. It is still a very generous deal for very profitable producers. We encourage profitability. We want them to be as prosperous as they possibly can be. That does not mean that we have an unlimited amount of money that we can continue, as taxpayers, to cover some of those risks.

This reduction impacts roughly the top 1 percent of producers. There are other government assistance programs, such as Pell Grants and food stamps and earned income tax credits, that have some sort of means test to them. The least we can do is implement a modest means test for crop insurance subsidies for those making more than \$750,000 or, again, \$1.5 million for joint filers.

To be clear, nobody is kicked out of this program. Nobody is eliminated from this program. Contrary to the opponents' claim, this will not harm the insurance pool by driving out low-risk producers. Even with a 15-percent point reduction, the subsidy would still be huge and would be a good deal for high-income producers, since about half of the premium would still be subsidized.

I encourage passage.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the good gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the chairman. I want to also commend him for his hard work on the farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, I know this has been a long and drawn-out process. Obviously, there are a lot of changes in agriculture, and also with the food stamp policy and with the economy. I know that this has been very difficult.

But I do want to rise in opposition to this sense of the House. As a farmer from Indiana who uses the crop insurance program, I understand a little bit about how this does affect farmers.

First of all, I would say that I think it is the right thing for us to do to eliminate the direct payment program. I think that is the right policy. That is in the bill, and I would continue to support it. I do think that we have some work to do on the crop insurance program, but this is not the answer. If we are trying to limit or put a means test on those whom you would define as the wealthiest farmers in the country, I don't believe this is the correct way to do it.

Look at agriculture across the country. You have corn farmers in the Midwest, soybean farmers in the Midwest. You have specialty crops, whether it is green beans, strawberries, carrots, or potatoes. All of these have different variables in the amount of income that comes in per acre. So whether it is 10 acres or whether it is 10,000 acres, I believe that the risk is still great to American farmers and producers.

Let's also remember that the premium support is not a cash subsidy to farmers. Farmers don't all of a sudden open the mailbox and get a check in the mail, with premium support, which I think is an appropriate system for our insurance programs that the Federal Government can participate in; but I don't believe that using the AGI is the correct way to measure whether farmers should be participating at certain levels or not.

If we really wanted to means test, we would use taxable income, where farmers would be reporting certain incomes. AGI can vary from crop to crop, from farm to farm, and so taxable income would make much more sense if we are going to talk about any sort of means testing.

Also, I believe that it undermines the important landlord-tenant relationship. I have specifically been involved

in this. Whether it comes to direct payments, obviously, with the increased cost of farmland over the past several years, those relationships are very, very important and very valuable.

Almost half of the farmland in this country is rented. I know that on our farm we rent almost three-quarters of the land that we farm. If land owners can no longer afford crop insurance, they can simply transfer that risk to tenants through cash leases. You end up hurting the smaller farmers that rely on rented farmland.

So I don't believe that this particular idea is ready for us to move forward on. I think that it needs more work. I think that the intentions by the author are sincere in trying to lessen the burden on the American taxpayer; but, at the same time, let's not hurt the American farmer and create, basically, a system that can treat a farmer in the South differently than a farmer in the Midwest or a farmer in the North.

Let's go back and reevaluate the system. I think that if you talk to the farming industry, you talk to farmers, they will come to the table and will try to find a reasonable way.

At this time, I would oppose this sense of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Ryan sense of the House resolution which would improve the 2013 farm bill by reducing insurance subsidies for the wealthiest producers, saving taxpayers almost \$1 billion.

The Senate bill includes a provision authorized by Senators RICHARD DURBIN and TOM COBURN to reduce the level of crop insurance premium subsidies for participants with an adjusted gross income over \$750,000 by 15 percent. The amendment was approved in the Senate on a bipartisan basis, 59-33. During the House consideration of the farm bill, I offered a companion amendment which was, unfortunately, not made in order.

By supporting this sense of the House, our Chamber now has an opportunity to go on record to support this modest, very commonsense reform. The limitation is expected to impact only 1 percent of the wealthiest farmers in the entire country. The vast majority of farmers in our district will see no change in the level of premium provided by the Federal Government.

Last year, the Federal Government spent \$7 billion to cover 62 percent of crop insurance premiums. A 2012 GAO study found that 4 percent of the most profitable farmers accounted for nearly one-third of all Federal premium support. Now is the time to include modest means testing to reforms in crop insurance programs.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Ryan sense of

the House to protect taxpayers in the new farm bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you, Chairman RYAN, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be on the floor on this bipartisan issue, which we certainly don't have enough of today, and I am happy to be here as well with the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, whom I have had the privilege to work with, even though we possibly don't agree on this issue.

I, too, was pleased to offer a similar amendment during the farm bill process and was glad to see Mr. HANNA speak on that earlier. That amendment was actually called the Hanna-Pingree amendment. I digress for a minute because I was particularly sentimental about that amendment since my daughter is named Hannah Pingree. Unfortunately, that amendment met its demise. I am just pleased to see we are back here discussing this topic.

The sense of Congress is a very small step toward a basic, commonsense reform: modestly reducing premium payments for the most successful farm businesses in America. Don't let anyone tell you otherwise—99 percent of crop insurance holders will see absolutely no change in their premium payments; but for a very few, the absolute richest, they will see a very small increase in their premiums. We are just asking those few to pay something a little closer to their fair share.

To put this in perspective, crop insurance is the only farm income support program that is not subject to some form of payment limitation or means testing. Honestly, I would like to see a much stronger crop insurance reform; but for now, for this farm bill, for today, this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this commonsense reform.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This debate is coming to a conclusion. I appreciate that greatly. The civil tone, the nature of the discussion, is something that we should do more of in this body; but I would note a couple of quick thoughts to my colleagues.

There have been many references made to the historic crop insurance payments made in the 2012 crop year. One of those amazing circumstances was huge amounts of the Midwest, some of the most productive corn land in America, simply didn't produce a crop—or not much of a crop. That is no fault of the farmer involved. That is Mother Nature's decision not to pro-

vide the right amount of moisture or, in other places, too much moisture.

□ 1815

But, you see, that is what crop insurance is all about. When I first came here, we had a system that worked around—not crop insurance, which didn't work very well and wasn't subscribed to by a lot of people. We had a system of ad hoc disasters. If you had a problem here or a problem there, then you would have a special appropriations bill to fund that disaster. Those special bills tended to grow and expand; and over time, they became a huge drain on the Treasury.

That is why, starting aggressively in the '96 farm bill—pushed even harder by then-Chairman PETERSON in the 2008 farm bill—the focus became: no more ad hoc disasters bills. Have a crop insurance program that works. Make it clear to producers that, if you have a problem, you have to have insurance, that you have to participate, that you have to pay the premiums.

Now, over the course of approximately the last decade, setting the 2012 year aside, this has become an amazingly orderly system. Many Members in this room don't remember ad hoc agricultural disaster bills because this has worked that well. I would challenge you in most—in more than in the majority of the years—that the resources coming into the program have been greater than the payments going out, but that is the way insurance is supposed to work—you pay in in good years, and you hope you never use the product; but in bad years, the assistance is there. Call it crop insurance. Call it life insurance. Call it fire insurance on your house. It is the principle behind the concept.

Now, the specific language we address here.

There has been much discussion about the draft that the United States Senate has adopted in its farm bill. It is the same 750 number, and he does include a study; but one of the main differences between what we are addressing today and what the Senate has in its language in going to conference is that the study, in effect, requires the USDA look at the effect of this limitation on the participation in the program and determine if that affects the viability of the program. Does it change the dynamics? Does it suddenly become a greater expense as you shrink the pool? It gives the Secretary the authority, if that study determines that this will be negative to crop insurance, to suspend the provision. That is not in this sense of Congress. It says, "You shall." "You will."

One other passing thought: there has been a lot of discussion about reducing the numbers, the percentages, from 65 to 50. I will just simply note to you that in many cases that, in effect, is not just a 15 percent move; that is a 40

percent move. Think about that. If you are a farmer—who is a businessperson—assessing the cost of your inputs and trying to match that up with a potential return on your outputs, you are going to make those hard business decisions.

Again, I think the world of my colleague, the chairman of the Budget Committee. I know he has a lot of things on his plate, and I know he has had a great many challenges in his tenure as chairman of the House Budget Committee; but I will tell you that I think the Ag Committee has worked very diligently to craft language that we are now about to send to conference in order to work out the ultimate bill that reflects a lot of open process—in committee, on the floor, in a lot of input with motions to instruct today, and in another sense of the House resolution. We have acknowledged and responded to that input.

You have battled as Members of this body—and debated and discussed and voted—on all of these issues before. I would just ask my colleagues to remember what this body decided not all that long ago and that, also, as we go to conference with the Senate, it is going to be a very difficult thing to protect our \$60 billion in mandatory spending reform that you have directed us to do. Give the committee, give me, give the ranking member as many tools and as much flexibility as you can so that we may prevail from the House's point of view in accomplishing common policy with the Senate that meets not only the goals of this Chamber, but the needs of this country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask for a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee for a very civil debate. He and I have talked about so many of these issues. We have worked so well together, and he has done the yeoman's work on moving these bills to the floor. On this particular issue, we don't agree. He may not think that I am helping, but I think I am helping by passing this. The reason is that this passed 59-33 in the Senate. If we pass it here, that just takes off the table one contentious issue that they don't have to negotiate in conference, making it easier to focus on the other things that you have yet to reconcile in conference. So we are actually trying to help the Ag Committee out here. That is one way you can put it.

On a more serious note, I want to talk about a few of the criticisms.

Pooling. My friend from North Dakota mentioned that it is important to have crop insurance with these people with very, very high adjusted gross incomes in the pool to make the cash flow. That is an actuarial argument

that works with health insurance—healthy people subsidize sick people—but that is really not an argument but that, I think, flows with this kind of insurance.

Point number two: no one is saying that a person who has a high net worth, who has a high adjusted gross income can't get crop insurance. All we are saying is just don't subsidize him as much as everybody else. That is really not asking a lot. What we are saying is, if you are a farmer and if you make \$750,000 of adjusted gross income or higher, you don't get subsidized by the taxpayer for your crop insurance as much as everybody else. Your subsidy is 15 percentage points lower than that of the people who make less than \$750,000. You still get crop insurance. You can still buy it. You will still get a subsidy, just not as much as everybody else.

Look, if you buy insurance on 50 percent of your acres, instead of the government paying for 67 percent of that insurance, it will pay for 52 percent of your insurance. If you buy insurance to cover 65 percent of your acres, instead of the government paying 59 percent of the cost, it would pay 44 percent of the cost. If you buy insurance on 85 percent of your acres, instead of the government subsidizing 38 percent of the cost of that coverage, it will subsidize 23 percent of the cost of that coverage. So there is still a subsidy.

You are not penalizing or punishing success by not subsidizing people as much. If we were having a tax debate—if we were talking about raising taxes—then you are penalizing success. If we are talking about taxing and taking money from producers—from successful people, from businesses making any amount of money—then you are penalizing success. What we are saying is just don't subsidize people as much because this subsidy is taking money from hardworking taxpayers—from their taxes—to give to somebody else. What we are saying is let's not take money from hardworking taxpayers to give as much to farmers who are making more than \$750,000. We just don't want to subsidize them as much. That is not punishing success.

The other point is that this is one of those rare moments in which I think there is bipartisan agreement that a farm bill really ought to be for family farmers. The purpose of the farm program is to make sure that individual families can stay farming, and that means the safety net needs to be there for that family farm. I know in Wisconsin most of our farmers don't make \$750,000, so it probably doesn't affect many of the corn and bean or dairy farmers whom I represent. Maybe in North Dakota and in other States there are people with thousands of acres who make that kind of money. I think that is great—I think that is wonderful—but I still think that our taxpayers

shouldn't have to subsidize them as much as the family farmer.

This is one of those opportunities in which I think Congress can speak with a bipartisan voice. I really believe, if the Hanna-Pingree amendment or the Blumenauer-Mulvaney amendment had been made in order, it probably would have passed. So this is our chance here in the House to speak with one voice on a bipartisan basis. Let's not subsidize folks at the high end as much, and let's protect that family farmer. Let's agree with the Senate and take this issue off the table as one of those contentious issues because we are agreeing bipartisanly and bicamerally that we ought to have a farm program for the family farmer and somewhere limit these subsidies. That is all we are asking for.

With that, I ask for its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this Sense of the House that the Durbin-Coburn amendment on crop insurance should be included in a farm bill conference report. This measure limits crop insurance premium subsidies for the wealthiest producers, saving more than \$900 million over ten years. The bipartisan amendment was adopted in the Senate by a 59–33 vote, and enjoys bipartisan House support as well. As we look to trim spending in all areas of the budget, limiting taxpayer handouts to farmers making over \$750,000 is a sensible place to start. Currently there are no limits to crop insurance premium subsidies or payments. This proposal doesn't eliminate assistance for those well-off producers, but simply limits it. In fact, I supported an amendment last June—offered by my colleague Congressman RON KIND—which would have shrunk taxpayer subsidies for crop insurance even further than the measure being considered today. I look forward to working with other Members of the House, and our colleagues in the Senate, to reform the nation's agriculture safety net in a way that provides security to our farmers while reducing the deficit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORE DEMOCRAT VOICES MUST BE HEARD

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, more Democrat leaders are finding their voices and courage to speak out against the continued shutdown of government services by Senate Majority Leader REID. This was evident on Wednesday as District of Co-

lumbia Mayor Vincent Gray crashed a Senate Democratic press conference near the Capitol.

Mayor Gray took the opportunity to ask a simple and logical question of the Senate: Would the Senate vote on the House-passed measure to permit the District of Columbia to utilize tax revenues it collects to fund municipal services during this shutdown?

This measure, H.J. Res. 71, passed the House more than a week ago with support from Washington Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and other Democrats in the House. This targeted appropriations bill, like the many others the House has passed with bipartisan support, still languishes in the Senate.

When the Mayor approached Senator REID to discuss the funding for the District of Columbia, the Senate Majority Leader replied: I am on your side, okay? Don't screw it up.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whose side the Senate Majority Leader is on, but it has not been on the side of the American people.

A WEEK IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to my friend from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

OBAMACARE

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words about accountability.

Normally, the way it works is that Congress can consider a piece of legislation. Maybe it passes. Maybe the President signs it. You implement it. Then the voters can decide whether they like it, whether it lived up to its billing, so to speak.

With ObamaCare, it was interesting because this was rammed through Congress at the beginning of 2010; yet it is just now really being implemented. I am starting to get a lot of people in my district contacting my office who are really shocked at some of the stiff premium increases they are seeing. So I think it is useful just to review some of the promises that were made and whether any of those promises have been kept. I think what you will find is that this is a law not only that the public opposed, not only that was rammed through with no bipartisan support, but a law that in many ways is resting on false pretenses.

Promise one, the President made this: it will lower premiums by up to \$2,500 for a typical family per year.

I have not seen that true anyplace. In fact, people are seeing \$2,500 increases. There was a family in California, it was reported, who saw an increase of

\$10,000. So I think, right here, as this is being implemented, we know that that is just not going to be the case.

□ 1830

Promise number two, the President said this: "If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan." Period.

Well, we know that that is not true. We see spouses losing spousal coverage. We see people with major companies losing their employer-provided insurance, getting pushed into some of these exchanges.

So the idea that "if you like your plan, you can keep it" is absolutely not proving to be true for thousands of people throughout the country.

This is just beginning. People who have looked at this from the Congressional Budget Office to other groups say you could have anywhere from 7 to 30 million Americans who actually lose their employer plans because of ObamaCare.

Of course, if you are losing your plan and you are getting pushed into an exchange, you may not be able to keep your doctor because that doctor may not be in the network, may not be available based on the plan that you are having to take because you have lost your original plan.

Promise number three—this is the President: "I can make a firm pledge: under my plan no family making less than \$250,000 will see any form of tax increase."

Well, we know that the individual mandate he said wasn't a tax. Then when it got challenged in the Supreme Court, his administration was saying, yeah, uphold it because it is a tax. That is eventually what the court did, saying that it is a tax. That is a tax that hits blue collar "salt of the Earth" people, forcing them to buy a product that essentially they may not even be physically able to obtain because the Web sites don't work, and if not, they are going to tax you. That certainly hasn't been true.

But there are a whole bunch of other things in the law that hit middle-income and lower-income people. There is a cap on flexible spending accounts. It is actually harder under ObamaCare to deduct medical expenses from your income taxes. Even a tax on indoor tanning salons. I think there are a lot of people who make less than \$250,000 a year who are doing the tanning salons.

Then, of course, there are a whole bunch of other taxes—over a trillion dollars—that may not be directly levied on somebody making less than \$250,000, but the costs will end up being passed on. For example, the employer mandate, the tax on health insurance plans, the medical device tax. Those taxes are on companies, but those costs are going to get pushed to individuals,

and they are going to have to bear the cost of that. And, oh, by the way, certain good health care plans that a lot of union members have who are not making \$250,000 a year, those are considered Cadillac plans, and those will be taxed extra going forward.

Finally, the President said: "I will sign a universal health care bill into law by the end of my first term as President that will cover every American." It is interesting—people on the other side of the aisle will say, oh, you Republicans, why don't you want everybody to be covered? The most recent analysis from the Congressional Budget Office said that in 10 years from now—so after 13 years of ObamaCare being the law—you will still have in this country 31 million Americans that don't have any insurance. Of course, we know ObamaCare is causing people to lose the insurance that they have.

So this is not something that is a universal health care bill, by any stretch of the imagination. There are going to be a lot of people who aren't going to have any insurance.

The point I just wanted to make with this is, there has got to be accountability in government. People want to have a redress of their grievances. These issues were not necessarily teed up in the election, and so now people are coming to terms with what has happened. So the point I would just make is, at a minimum when you are dealing with the broken promises of ObamaCare, we have got to communicate to the public that this has got to be based on some semblance of fairness.

For example, the Members of Congress who wrote this law must live under the exact terms of the statute. They should not be granted any extra legal relief from the burdens of ObamaCare. The fact that businesses have had the law delayed for them—and, of course, Members of Congress have gotten special treatment as well—I think individual Americans have got to be given the same deal. It is just wrong to have the IRS tax people to buy something from Web sites that aren't functional—and buy products that they may not like.

So accountability is key. This is a law that was passed. There were specific promises made over and over again. What we are finding now, unfortunately, is those promises are not being kept.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much my friend from Florida. I am always greatly appreciative and thrilled when I find somebody who attended an Ivy League school that got a good education.

The points are well made by my friend from Florida. There were many promises made and promises not kept. Go from top to bottom:

"If you like your insurance, you can keep it." Not remotely true.

"If you like your doctor, you can keep them." Not remotely true. So many stories are coming forward.

"It is actually going to be cheaper for Americans under ObamaCare." Not remotely true, unless perhaps you are in New York. There is a small part of the country, a small group of individuals, who were already paying so much because of a massive amount of waste or laws that allowed for a great amount of waste or abuse; in those there may be some people that actually saved money. But for most Americans, they are not only going to have to pay more, they are going to pay dramatically more.

As we have seen the government shutdown play out, it has been interesting to note the things that have been open and the things that have been closed. We were told that only essential government services would be provided.

We had also passed immediately before the shutdown and sent to the Senate a military pay bill. Now, that military pay bill was intentionally left broad enough so that it could take care of the need to take care of the death benefit, broad enough to take care of the needs of the family that are always provided by the military, by the Department of Defense, for those who paid the ultimate sacrifice in losing a loved one in the course of combat. And lo and behold, even though that was made clear, it also was made clear in the bill that civilian employees could be included. Even independent contractors under that law were allowed to continue working that were supporting the role of the military. So it was a very broadly worded act in order to give the Obama administration, and particularly the Defense Department, great latitude to make sure important things got done.

Now as we have seen, the Secretary of Defense has laid off hundreds of thousands of civilian workers, though the bill gave him latitude to leave them working and they supported the military. It was only after about a week that they finally said, okay, we are going to let a whole lot of those employees come back now that we have made the determination that the bill gives us enough latitude to allow them to work.

We told him it did. The bill gave him that kind of power. Perhaps he had talked to President Obama and they decided, yeah, let's put lots of people out of work, or perhaps he had not talked to the President. We don't know.

But as Peggy Noonan pointed out recently, talking about things that have gone on here in the last couple of weeks, she reminded us of Harry Truman's sign that was on his desk: "The buck stops here."

They didn't have to hurt all those civilian employees. They could have left

them working. But they chose to send them home, creating more hardship. They chose not to pay the death benefit for families who were entitled to it after losing a loved one who is a patriot. They chose to do those things.

They have chosen to close parks, farms, different things that don't cost the Federal Government a dime, don't cost anything. But they have strategically chosen to close things that create suffering, some chaos, different problems for people. It is as if the park rangers, who were quoted recently, were exactly right in saying that they were told: make life as difficult as possible for people, because that is what the administration has done.

But there is good news. This story was published by FOX News:

National Parks Are Closed, the IRS Call Centers Have No Staff.

And I insert parenthetically here:

The IRS is still getting your money in, the money is still flowing in, they are just not helping people as it flows in.

The article says:

Countless government Web sites have been taken down.

We know even the panda camera was turned off, even though it required no monitoring.

Yet despite these changes, which range from inconveniences to major headaches, a number of not so essential government operations are still up and running. Here are a few that have evaded the partial government shutdown:

The Denali commission.

You have probably never even heard of the Denali Commission. But the tiny Alaska-based economic development agency gained some notoriety after it emerged that the group's inspector general was petitioning Congress to defund it.

But guess what agency survived the shutdown? According to its own contingency plan, because the Commission's staffers are paid under the prior year's budget, all 14 employees are exempt from furlough, and "reporting to work."

That is a commission that its own inspector general petitioned Congress to defund.

Another government function that was left up: "The White House Twitter." Oh, sure, there were plenty of government help Web sites that would have made life easier for people having to deal with the Federal Government. They were shut down because they would have helped people. But the White House Twitter was left up and rolling. As the article says:

Right as Congress missed the deadline last week to pass a spending bill, First Lady Michelle Obama's office informed its Twitter followers that: "Due to Congress' failure to pass legislation to fund the government," updates to the official First Lady Twitter account would be limited.

But the White House Twitter account is alive and well.

The account has blasted out a series of tweets calling on Congress to end the budget impasse.

Another item that has been left up and running despite all of the government Web sites and help call centers and all that have been shut down, and that is "Let's Move." The article says:

While a number of government Web sites have been temporarily taken offline, and the First Lady's Twitter account has been largely abandoned, not so for Michelle Obama's Let's Move campaign.

The Web site for the First Lady's healthy-living initiative remains operational—though it doesn't appear to have been updated much since September. The top of the site displays the message: "Cheers to Water!"

Another thing left up was the "Park Rangers on Patrol."

Despite national parks and monuments being shuttered across the country for lack of funds, the National Park Service is devoting considerable resources to putting up barricades and patrolling them.

An innkeeper along the Blue Ridge Parkway who was forced to close his business due to the partial shutdown told FOXNews.com that park rangers have set up a "24/7 blockade" outside his inn—to prevent would-be customers from coming in.

Another thing, the "Obama Campaign Stop."

President Obama canceled a long-planned trip to Asia over the budget impasse.

But he, nevertheless, ventured outside the beltway last week for a rally in nearby Rockville, Maryland, to pressure Republicans to pass a budget bill.

□ 1845

The article says budget bill, but actually we are past the budget time. Now it is appropriation time, and that is what we need.

The Patent Office. If you happened to invent something during the stalemate, good news. The United States Patent and Trademark Office is open for business. According to the office, it is using fees from the prior year to keep running and should be able to for roughly 4 weeks.

The IRS is taking but not giving. IRS call centers are closed. The IRS is not issuing refunds during the partial shutdown. The agency, though, will gladly accept tax payments during that time. The IRS says in a statement on its Web site:

The IRS will accept and process all tax returns with payments, but will be unable to issue refunds during this time.

Another article from the Right Scoop had talked about the Amber Alert Web site being taken down. Although some have been kept up, the Amber Alert Web site was allowed to go down. And, thankfully, the administration realized there was enough pressure. For heaven's sake, it is for children who are kidnapped, lost. So, thankfully, the administration finally decided after enough pressure to bring the Amber Alert Web site back up.

It has been amazing to me, and I saw it again today in some of our memorial sites, memorials that are down on The Mall, the Iwo Jima monument, or the

memorial, we have spent—this administration, that is, has spent more money keeping people out of open-air memorials than it ever spends just to leave them open. They are open 24/7. I have been up to the Iwo Jima, the U.S. Marine Corps monument so many times since I have been in Congress, again, all hours of the day and night. I don't sleep that much while I am here on the Hill.

Although we have some park rangers who don't know the parking laws and give tickets to people who are lawfully allowed to be there—apparently not enough training for our rangers—but they have gone to the trouble to get barriers to make life difficult for veterans, World War II veterans that fought to secure Iwo Jima, being kept out of seeing the Iwo Jima monument. Why? Because they put barricades in the way to keep people from going up and being able to drive up there.

One of the times I went up there during the last couple of weeks, there were probably 200 people up there, but they had to park over by the townhouses, go over rails, down steep embankments and get in there. Unfortunately, as this administration knows, our World War II veterans in their eighties and nineties that I have been with and that I have helped and pushed wheelchairs for, they are not able to climb over rails and go down steep embankments, although they sure did while fighting in the Pacific, European theater, and North Africa. But they cannot do it now. And for anyone to keep putting up the barricades at that Iwo Jima monument just to screw over our veterans is outrageous. I don't know who is doing it, but shame on the people who are doing it.

I was gratified last weekend, on one occasion I went up there, and there were plastic barricades that had been filled with water to hold them in place, make them too big for a person to push over, and yet there were three busloads of World War II veterans up at the Iwo Jima monument, and someone had rammed those plastic barriers, knocking them over, spilling the water everywhere. Once the water was dispersed, pushed them out of the way. A wooden barricade looked like it had been run over so the buses could go up there. I don't know if those buses did that or not. I like to think they did, that those World War II veterans were not going to have some mean-spirited person in the administration up there to prevent them from seeing the Iwo Jima monument for one time before they left this world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the people in this administration that keep trying to punish the American people so that they can get the money that they are demanding, that S&P and Moody's has said you guys have to get responsible about the money you are spending, the money that American taxpayers gave

the Republicans, the majority, in 2010 to do something about. My friends across the aisle are constantly saying elections have consequences. That is right. The American people didn't like ObamaCare, and so they voted the Democrats in the House out of the majority with people running on that main issue. We will do everything we can to get rid of ObamaCare.

It is true that the President won reelection. Many of us still believe that if we had had a candidate that could challenge the abuses of ObamaCare before the last election last year instead of one that gave a prototype for it in his home State, the President would not have been reelected. But Republicans chose a very nice man, a philanthropic man, a great businessman, a very caring American, but somebody who had already shown he supported a type of socialized medicine in his home State.

ObamaCare, as it was passed, as it was originating in the Senate and then passed in the Senate, sent down to the House as bill H.R. 3590, should have originated in this House because it raises revenue, called penalties. It is called penalties throughout the bill. The Supreme Court noted that. In a very hypocritical opinion, the Supreme Court went to page 15 and noted that Congress called it a penalty. It only is applied if people don't do what is required. That makes it a penalty. Clearly, it is a penalty because the anti-injunction act makes very clear that if Congress passes a tax, then no Federal court can take it up and make a decision on it until the tax is actually imposed and the person suing has standing by virtue of having the tax actually imposed on them. That is a nutshell.

So if the Supreme Court had found that ObamaCare contained a tax and not a penalty, then it would not have jurisdiction. But the Supreme Court opinion at page 15 decided it is a penalty; it is not a tax. If it was a tax, we couldn't go any further on the opinion. The opinion would be over. We would have to dismiss and wait for the tax to actually be assessed. But since it is a penalty, like Congress called it through the bill, and since it is a penalty, as President Obama made very clear to the American public—it is not a tax; it is a penalty—the Supreme Court went on. Eventually, after determining that ObamaCare, as written, based on what the proponents said was the interstate commerce clause that gave it the authority to pass ObamaCare, the Supreme Court said, no, it doesn't. The interstate commerce clause does not give authority to Congress to pass a bill that takes over health care. That is not constitutional.

Then eventually they got over and took up the issue of exactly what was involved in the individual mandate, the business mandate, and the Court concluded that actually, despite Congress

calling it a penalty, the President assuring America it was a penalty and not a tax, the Supreme Court ends up saying it is a tax, and, therefore, it is constitutional. So we, as the Supreme Court, will rewrite the law and uphold it as we have rewritten; because as it is written, it is not constitutional, but we will rewrite it. Though that would be legislating and it would be unconstitutional, they did it anyway.

So when I hear people say it has been upheld by the Supreme Court, no, the bill that was passed was not upheld by the Supreme Court. It was struck down as violating the interstate commerce clause, but the Supreme Court did them a favor. They rewrote it legislatively, violated the Constitution in doing so, and then sent it back.

And now Americans across the country, by the millions, are suffering as a result of a tax the majority of Americans did not want, that all Americans promised was not a tax, and now it is taking away their insurance. It is taking away a way their doctors. It is taking away, really, quality health care that most Americans had.

So it would seem if the idea behind ObamaCare was strictly to help those who are uninsured, we should have dealt strictly with those Americans. But that is not what ObamaCare was about. It was about the G-R-E, the government running everything.

I am amazed at how many friends across the aisle who have screamed and hollered about we don't want the government in our bedroom voted for a bill that puts the government in your bedroom, in your bathroom, in your kitchen, in your closets. It puts the Federal Government everywhere. And you combine that with what the all Democratic majority House and Senate passed with President Obama at the helm, that created a bureau under the guise of making sure that credit card companies were fair, and now that bureau is gathering everyone's credit card information and debit card information under the guise of making sure they are playing fair. This Federal Government has seized more private information. They have been more vindictive through weaponizing the IRS, and we are finding out about other agencies and departments. It is more than any administration has ever done, and American people will ultimately pay the price.

I hope and pray that the Supreme Court will take up the origination clause litigation because that bill did not originate in the House; and the origination clause says any bill that raises revenue must originate in the House, and the only single thing in that bill that was left was the number. Even the title about being a change to the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax credit for first time home buyers who were in the military or veterans, they didn't leave a single word of that bill; and they brought in something

completely ungermane to that bill for veterans and military members.

□ 1900

And instead of taking care of the millions they said were uninsured, that was the whole purpose of ObamaCare, they have done tremendous damage across the country to so very many.

As the shutdown has gone on that was brought on, not by the House Republicans, who passed a bill, we said, Look, Americans are being devastated by ObamaCare. The health care industry is being decimated.

Since a majority of the American people didn't want it, gave us control of the House as a result of it, let's get rid of it. We have got to start acting responsibly about the money we spend. Taking away Americans' rights to decide whether they should have knee surgery, back surgery, get a pacemaker, taking away the right and the ability of Americans to determine what kind of treatment they should get is not something, when we are in financial difficulty, we should be doing. That was struck down. It shouldn't have been a surprise. HARRY REID didn't want to pass it. The President didn't want to.

Then the House began sending down one compromise which was turned down. Okay, let's just suspend it for a year. That would be the fair thing to do. As so many have said, Republicans and Democrats across the country, it was not ready for prime time. It was a train wreck. It was a nightmare. Let's just suspend it for a year. We know the President wants it, so we are not talking about getting rid of it like a majority of Americans want to do. Let's just suspend it for a year.

When that didn't go and the Senate said, No, we want a shutdown, we are not doing this, then we sent down a further compromise to basically suspended for 1 year the individual mandate just as businesses had gotten, as the President rewrote the law. The Constitution doesn't allow him to do it. Congress is supposed to step up, as happened in past generations where I'm told no matter whether a Democrat or Republican President, no matter who controlled the House and Senate, when a President overstepped his constitutional authority this far, usually there would be a trip down Pennsylvania from leaders of the House and Senate, both parties, that would privately tell the President, You overstepped your bounds. Back off, or we are going to defund everything that you are trying to push through on this, and it would get worked out.

Unfortunately, at the other end of the Hall in the Senate, they are not bothered by the fact that the President, by a stroke of the pen, wrote legislation and undid what the law said and made up his own law. That is not supposed to happen under our Constitution, but it did. We were bothered by it

in the House, so we said, Look, let's work this out like gentle people. Let's just postpone it for a year. When that didn't work, we said, Let's at least suspend the individual mandate. You have suspended it for the business community. Let's do it for individuals. They wouldn't even do that.

Then when that didn't work, we sent a bill to the Senate that said, Okay, we are not trying to push anything on you. Just sit down and talk. Here are our negotiators. You appoint your negotiators. That is what the Constitution, law, and the rules require, and we will have this worked out probably by the time people get up in the morning; and they would not even appoint negotiators. Why? Because I believe they believe the conventional wisdom from the last 3 years that if the Democratic Senate and President forced a shutdown, the Main Street media would blame Republicans. It would enure politically to their benefit, and it would be worth causing the pain of a shutdown. So they refused to even negotiate at that point. It was not until the polls showed that the President had dropped to 37 percent from a favorable rating of 53 percent to an unfavorable rating that we finally had a willingness to sit down and talk.

During those times that so many things have been shut down, including the Normandy Cemetery—this story emerged yesterday from Marketplace.org:

Coming Soon to Your Favorite TV Shows: Plot Lines About the Affordable Care Act.

Hollywood Health & Society, a program with the USC Annenberg Norman Lear Center got a \$500,000 grant this week from The California Endowment to help TV writers tell better stories about the new health insurance law.

That is \$500,000 to Hollywood for propaganda to tell people who are suffering from the ravages of losing their insurance, losing their doctors, losing the ability to make decisions under new policies as they once did, telling them how good they had it. That \$500,000 would have paid to open a lot of memorials and parks. It would have kept the Moore farm going for years that doesn't get a dime of Federal money and hasn't since 1980, but may lose the farm because of the outrageous actions of the National Park Service in forcing it closed; as the park Ranger said, making it as difficult as they can for people.

Here is an article from Ken Blackwell:

When President Obama signed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act on March 23, 2010, it was the starting gun for a massive Federal effort to get the new system up and running. The administration had deliberately allowed for 3½ years for the launch, October 1, 2013.

That's a long time. It's 1,288 days. You would think, in that length of time, we could have brought a system online that would not be bedeviled with glitches. And more glitches.

By comparison, FDR had 912 days from the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, to D-day, June 6, 1944, the Allied invasion of Normandy. The D-day Museum at Portsmouth, England maintains a Web site that offers some idea of what was involved in mounting the invasion.

It says further down:

Today, Obama administration officials are making the rounds of TV talk shows touting the millions of Americans who have logged on day one of ObamaCare. They are not able to tell us how many of those millions have actually signed up for ObamaCare. But that, of course, may be due to the fact that 85% of Americans already have health insurance and the rest, primarily healthy young adults, may have reasons for not having health insurance.

It's interesting to hear administration spokespersons dodging and weaving about how many Americans actually are eager to give all their personal data to the IRS and then be guided about by navigators chosen by Mr. Obama out of his compassionate concern for his people. Obama Cares was an inspired idea for a bumper sticker last fall. It helped the incumbent easily gain a second term in the White House.

It's odd, though, that after 4 years of major liberal legislation, the FDR comparisons have largely disappeared.

Americans today can judge how warm-hearted President Obama is. His administration has ordered the closure of the World War II Memorial in Washington. Ninety-year olds on Honor Flights faced barricades as they made that last trip to see the monument to their heroism on D-day and a thousand days.

White House spokesman Jay Carney raced to tell reporters that it was not the intent of the Obama administration to deny death benefits to families of soldiers recently killed in Afghanistan. It just seems to have been another glitch. The Obama spokesman's efforts to avoid responsibility were strenuous. But he might have consulted another veteran of that great WWII generation. Harry Truman kept a plaque on his desk in the White House: The Buck Stops Here.

That was the article I was thinking of earlier.

Here's another article from October 10 by Jocelyn Maminta from New Haven, Connecticut.

In the midst of major changes in health care, UnitedHealthCare has sent thousands of pink slips to Connecticut doctors.

Termination letters went to physicians caring for Medicare patients. Those letters were sent out to doctors caring for "Medicare Advantage" patients. It's a plan, marketed to seniors to provide additional services through UnitedHealthCare.

A mix of primary care and specialty doctors are affected by it. And it comes at a questionable time.

Open enrollment for Medicare starts next Tuesday, and it's still not clear at this time as to which doctors are still in the United network.

The Connecticut State Medical Society is fighting back. The biggest concern is patient access to healthcare.

"What the government is looking for is to manage better care by adding a patient-centered medical home so that you have a doctor who is totally invested with taking care of every aspect of the patient and coordinating it. This is clearly not a patient-centered decision," said Dr. Michael Saffir, president of CT State Medical Society.

Perhaps that is Connecticut Medical Society.

Anyway, it has an update at the bottom:

In an email statement, UnitedHealthCare spokesman Ben Goldstein told News 8, "With the many changes happening in health care, we are building a network of health care providers that we can collaborate with more closely to have the most positive impact on the quality of care for our members."

And what a lot of people didn't realize, but they soon found out, ObamaCare, the so-called "Affordable Care Act," actually cut over \$700 billion in Medicare reimbursements. It took money that was going to be used for senior citizens' health care and put it towards trying to get this horrendous, this unworkable bill to the American people.

May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. In an article from WND Radio published October 10, they wrote:

Sticker Shock! Americans Floored By ObamaCare Cost.

The technical problems with the ObamaCare insurance exchanges are no surprise, are further evidence the whole program should be delayed or scrapped and Americans will be even more horrified when they can get somewhere on the Web site, according to health care policy expert Grace-Marie Turner.

The first 10 days of the ObamaCare insurance exchanges have been a technological and public relations mess for the administration. Many Americans have suffered through hours of stalled or crashed Web sites, no reporter has yet been able to navigate the site, and many people have entered personal information that online security experts believe could make them targets for identity theft.

□ 1915

When WND spent hours online and on the phone trying to get a cost estimate for an ObamaCare plan, it was told to expect a quote by January 1. As WND reported, anecdotal evidence on the government's own health care Facebook page suggests both problems are significant factors.

A few users seemed simply confused, but the overwhelming number of comments were critical, and many of those were scathing. Complaints about the application process had three recurring themes: long waits, glitches, and sticker shock. There was also much ridicule of the site's ability to handle "tremendous demand."

Information technology experts told The Wall Street Journal the Web site "appeared to be built on a sloppy software foundation."

Another article from WND published yesterday—I am not sure I like the title, "Pulling Out Hair" Over ObamaCare Web Site 'Nightmare.'" Sometimes people look okay with their hair out. Sometimes they don't.

The article says:

Forget, for a minute, all those arguments about the new health care law's "death panels," the forced cancellation of existing coverage, the violations of religious liberty, and

the transformation of full-time jobs into part-time work. Even people who want to sign up for ObamaCare are finding it impossible.

Digital Trends reports the healthcare.gov Web site already has “shut down, crapped out, stalled, and misloaded so consistently that its track record for failure is challenged only by Congress.” That is even though taxpayers paid “more than \$634 million” for “the digital equivalent of a rock,” the report said.

The site itself, which apparently underwent major code renovations over the weekend, still rejects user logins, fails to load drop-down menus and other critical components for users that successfully gain entrance, and otherwise prevents uninsured Americans in the 36 States it serves from purchasing health care at competitive rates—healthcare.gov’s primary purpose,” the report said.

It goes on to talk about the massive nightmares of the people that are trying to sign on to it.

Here is an article from Peggy Noonan from *The Wall Street Journal*: “Now is the Time to Delay ObamaCare”:

The Obama administration has an implementation problem. More than any administration of the modern era, they know how to talk but have trouble doing. They give speeches about ObamaCare, but when it is unveiled, what the public sees is a Potemkin village designed by the noted architect Rube Goldberg. They speak ringingly about the case for action in Syria but can’t build support in the U.S. foreign policy community, in Congress, among the public. Recovery summer is always next summer. They have trouble implementing. Which, of course, is the most boring but crucial part of governing. It is not enough to talk; you must perform.

There is an odd sense with members of this administration that they think words are actions. Maybe that is why they tweet so much. Maybe they imagine Bashir Assad seeing their tweets and musing: “Ah, Samantha is upset—then I shall change my entire policy, in respect for her emotions!”

That gets us to the real story of last week, this week, and the future, the one beyond the shutdown, the one that normal people are both fully aware of and fully understand, and that is the utter and catastrophic debut of ObamaCare. Even for those who expected problems, and that would be everyone who follows government, it has been a shock.

They had 3.5 years to set it up! They knew exactly when it would be unveiled, on October 1, 2013. On that date, they knew millions could be expected to go online to see if they benefit.

And it goes on. It is an excellent article. She says:

A quick summary of what didn’t work. Those who went on Federal and State exchanges reported malfunctions during login, constant error messages, inability to create new accounts, frozen screens, confusing instructions, endless wait times, help lines that put people on hold and then cut them off, lost passwords and user names.

After the administration floated the fiction that the problems were due to heavy usage, the *Journal* tracked down insurance and technology experts who said the real problems were inadequate coding and flaws in the architecture of the system.

... The founder of McAfee slammed the system’s lack of security on Fox Business

Network, calling it a hacker’s happiest nocturnal fantasy. He predicted millions of identity thefts. Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius—grilled, surprisingly, on “*The Daily Show*”—sounded like—and that is unkind, but—she failed to justify why, in the middle of the chaos, individuals cannot be granted a 1-year delay, just as businesses have been.

More ominously, many of those who got into the system complained of sticker shock—high premiums, high deductibles.

She goes on to say, talking about Republicans:

They would make a mistake in dropping ObamaCare as an issue. A few weeks ago, they mistakenly demanded funding—a move to please their base. They will be tempted to abandon even the word “ObamaCare” now, but this is exactly when they should keep, as the center of their message and their intent, not defunding ObamaCare but delaying it. Do they really want to turn abrupt focus to elusive Medicare cuts just when it has become obvious to the American people that parts of ObamaCare (like the ability to enroll) are unworkable?

The Republicans should press harder than ever to delay ObamaCare—to kick it back, allow the administration to at least create a functioning Web site, and improve what can be improved.

There is an article from CNN from today about Utah’s national parks will reopen despite ongoing government shutdown.

Utah will reopen its five national parks by Saturday, as well as three other nationally run locations. Utah’s Governor Gary Herbert made the announcement Thursday, saying a deal had been reached with the U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Sally Jewell. “Utah agrees to pay the National Park Service up to \$1.67 million—\$166,572 per day—to reopen eight national sites in Utah for up to 10 days.”

The sad thing is, they don’t have to do that. We passed the bill to keep them all going. We did it at a rate, at an amount the Senate already agrees to. All they have got to do is pass it, send it to the President, and it will be taken care of.

I have an article here from the Mercatus Center, George Mason University. It is a research summary.

Before I mention that, I want to mention something about one of our Senators, a Senator from Arizona. Some people have tried to take things I said in an inappropriate way.

I know that Senator from Arizona. We owe him a great deal for what he endured on our behalf in North Vietnam. There is no question about it. And I know that Senator would never intentionally hurt this country. But he has made mistakes that have hurt it but certainly it was never intentional.

Let me mention this Mercatus Center, George Mason University research summary. It says, “*The Debt-Limit Debate 2013: Addressing Key Myths*.” Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important the people understand that there are a lot of myths about the debt limit.

One myth is this:

Standard & Poor’s U.S. credit rating downgrade in August of 2011 was caused by Wash-

ington’s brinkmanship over increasing the debt limit. Congress must, therefore, avoid attaching spending cut demands to the current debt limit increase if they want to avoid jeopardizing the Nation’s fragile economy.

The reality, it says, is:

Washington’s failure to deal with unsustainable Federal spending mostly related to entitlement programs and debt caused the 2011 S&P downgrade and is spurring warnings of another downgrade by the credit rating agencies.

Of course this administration went after them through the judiciary system—after they got a bad rating, they got a downgrade. But they point out that in June of 2011 that:

S&P reported: “If the U.S. Government maintains its current policies, it is unlikely that S&P’s ratings services would maintain its AAA rating on the U.S. Government. From the same report: “One contributing factor in our negative outlook decision is our view that there has, as yet, been no significant progress in addressing these long-term cost drivers nor any consensus developing among the Obama administration, the Senate, and House of Representatives regarding the specifics of a comprehensive plan to address the long-term budgetary challenges.”

On July 14, 2011, S&P warned it would downgrade U.S. debt if “Congress and the administration have not achieved a credible solution to the rising U.S. Government debt burden and are not likely to achieve one in the foreseeable future.”

So the downgrade was because we did not adequately address the massive debt that had been building up.

Another myth—and there are plenty more to back up their contention about that, just facts: “Had Congress and the administration failed to raise the debt limit by the Treasury’s stated deadline in 2011, the Treasury would have been forced to default on the Nation’s debt.” Make it very clear. The reality, “had the 2011 agreement to increase the debt limit been postponed, the Treasury could have met Federal Government obligations, including Social Security benefits and interest on the debt until the end of the fiscal year, possibly longer.”

And then it goes into the options that the Treasury Department had. Another myth: “If Washington agreed to significant spending reforms and cuts—and then actually followed through on them—it would cripple the recovery and devastate the economy.” The reality is that “the most dangerous thing Washington can do is continue on its current course. The economic literature is clear: Chronic overspending and its result, chronic excessive debt, lead to economic harm. Washington must agree on meaningful spending reforms—and begin implementing these policies immediately to satisfy markets about the credibility of spending cuts.

“Myth number four: The real problem with the last debt limit deal was that it failed to apply a ‘balanced approach’ of spending cuts and tax increases.” The reality is, “Replacing

borrowing with higher taxes does not solve the fundamental problem: Federal spending—including Social Security, Medicaid, and especially Medicare—is unsustainable.

“Fiscal reform that focuses on large revenue increases and modest spending reductions is likely to inflict the most damage on the economy. A study of 21 countries looking at 37 years of data representing 107 episodes of fiscal reform, shows that reform efforts that focus on a package of both spending and revenue reductions”—that is, tax decreases—“tend to be much more effective than those that have modest spending reductions but continue to increase revenue.

“Of more than 100 attempts to reduce the debt-to-GDP ratio in all developed countries over the past 30 years, some 20 percent succeeded. They had two common components: one, a focus on spending cuts; and two, policy reforms that increased competitiveness.” And that is the truth.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MULLIN (during the Special Order of Mr. GOHMERT). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

□ 1930

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S SHUTDOWN AND ITS IMPACTS ON OUR DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL LABORATORIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order, the Federal Government's Shutdown and Its Impacts on our Department of Energy National Laboratories.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I also want to thank Science Committee Ranking Member JOHNSON for her support of national laboratory employees.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress knowing that in the policies I helped and worked to enact and the legislative

agenda that I would work on that I could either help people or hurt people. And the decision for me was quite easy, Mr. Speaker: I came to Congress to help people. I came to Congress to think big.

I was very excited when I was told prior to being sworn in that I was going to be serving on the Science Committee. I was even more thrilled when I learned that I would have the opportunity to serve as the lead Democrat on the Energy Subcommittee, knowing that the Energy Subcommittee would have partial jurisdiction over two national laboratories which are in my congressional district in Livermore, California: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratory.

These two national laboratories, with about 6,500 employees at Livermore and 1,500 at Sandia, work every day to uphold our national security mission to maintain our nuclear weapons stockpile and also provide for energy security for citizens in the United States.

Prior to being elected to Congress, I had the opportunity multiple times as a city council member in Dublin to visit these national laboratories. And since being elected to Congress, I have had opportunities to visit the laboratories and also interact with their officials here in Washington.

What I have learned about these employees, these scientists, these engineers who work at our national laboratories is they care deeply about our country, but they also care very deeply about the science and the research that they work on every day and the laboratory environment that allows them to do that. So you can imagine how hard it is right now. We are in day 11 of a government shutdown, and laboratory employees were told about 2 days ago that, effective next week, they will be furloughed, too.

As you all know, Federal workers across our country from almost every agency have been furloughed or are working without pay. But at our national laboratories, which operate as GOCO facilities, which stands for government-owned/contractor-operated, these workers are not Federal workers but they are government contractors. They are scientists.

It is estimated that Livermore, California, has more Ph.D.'s per capita than any other city in the world because of the approximately 7,500 employees at our national laboratory. It was one of the hardest phone calls I have had to take since being sworn in to Congress when both laboratory directors called and said that in an hour they were going to tell their employees that they were going to be furloughed, and that they needed me to do anything I could in the Congress to help to get the government up and running and make sure the United States pays its

bills so that their workers can continue to do the great things they are doing at our national laboratories.

This evening, I look forward to talking about what caused our shutdown, the truth behind what has caused the shutdown. I look forward to talking about the effect that the shutdown is having on people inside and outside of government—employees who are Federal workers, people who depend and rely on government services, people outside who work as government contractors—with a particular focus on what is happening at our national laboratories.

I also want to offer what I see as a way forward and a way that we can get out of this government shutdown, a way that we can get the Federal workforce working again, a way that we can make sure that our laboratory experts, our scientists, are able to go back to work and do great things to keep us safe and secure and move the ball forward on our energy policies.

I also want to tell all laboratory employees that today we submitted to Secretary Moniz, Members of Congress from the California delegation and Senator FEINSTEIN, a letter asking Secretary Moniz at the Department of Energy to allow our national laboratory employees—and there are about 30,000 of them across the country who have been furloughed—to be paid backpay for the time that they are furloughed.

I am honored to be joined on that letter by Bay Area House Members ZOE LOFGREN and also JERRY MCNERNEY, who will join me tonight. I am going to yield in a moment to both of those Members and allow them to talk about the national labs and the shutdown.

Congressman JERRY MCNERNEY, who has represented the Tri-Valley area prior to redistricting back in 2010, knows greatly about our national laboratories. He is a Ph.D. serving in the Congress. He has a Ph.D. in mathematics and is somebody who worked as a wind engineer and has worked at our national laboratories. He will talk about the effect on our national laboratories.

Another champion of our national laboratories is Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN, who also serves on the Science Committee with me. She is somebody who has been a champion for our national laboratories, and particularly Lawrence Livermore and Sandia. Although they are not in her congressional district, I am grateful for her constant support on every issue, knowing that she and I share a vision and a goal that one day we will realize fusion ignition.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as my friend and colleague Representative SWALWELL has

pointed out, the government shutdown is causing serious damage to our country. The shutdown is putting Americans out of work and hurting the economy—not only the jobs of Federal employees, but the thousands of small businesses who provide goods and services to the government and to government employees who are not spending money that they no longer are getting in paychecks.

This harm is being felt across the country by millions of people. The closures impact thousands of important programs and services. We know parks are closed, stopping travel plans. We know that the Small Business Administration is not lending to the tune of a billion dollars a month. Federal business statistics are not being released, leaving us essentially flying blind when it comes to how the economy is doing. Army Corps of Engineers projects are halted. The Consumer Product Safety Commission is not reviewing products to keep us safe. The VA is not able to decide claims from veterans. We saw the horrifying news earlier this week that death benefits for members of our armed services and their families were impacted. Meals for seniors are not being served, and children are being thrown out of Head Start. These are real issues. The economy is being held hostage.

But what we want to talk about this evening is not just those impacts that have been so well covered in the press, but how our economy's future is being held hostage by this government shutdown and by a lack of funding for science.

We were very proud in the San Francisco Bay area that we had three Nobel laureates just this week—Stanford's Michael Levitt and Thomas Sudhof and UC Berkeley's Randy Schekman—for terrific success. They were funded not through the labs but through the National Institutes of Health.

However, it is worth noting that this government shutdown is resulting in the furlough of 13,000 researchers. It is blocking hundreds of projects. The amazing thing to me was that their partner, James Rothman of Yale, who shared in the Nobel Prize, because of budget cuts and sequester, the research that actually got him the Nobel Prize was cut. Because of the sequester, the funding was cut for the research that got him the Nobel Prize. So there is an issue here not just on the shutdown holding the economy hostage, but also the underlying poor funding.

But let's talk just a minute about the national labs. A lot of people don't really know what the labs are. Those of us who are close to them do.

They were founded in 1943, and they were really meant to address the need to mobilize the Nation's scientific assets to support the war effort. Subsequent to that, they were utilized to bring the smartest people in the coun-

try together to focus on things that would keep us safe. As a matter of fact, they have helped keep us quite prosperous. Out of the lab have come things such as optical digital recording technology that is behind all music video and data storage, communications and observations satellites, advanced batteries now used in electric cars, supercomputers that as a society we would be lost without. So much from the national labs.

But one of the things that I think is enormously important and, unfortunately, has not received the kind of publicity it should have is the National Ignition Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

At 5:51 a.m. on September 29, there was a leap forward in the fusion experiment underway at that national lab. That Saturday shot was the latest in a series of carefully designed and incremental ignition experiments that have increased the yield. But here is the interesting thing. For the portion of the target, the 192 lasers that went into that target, there was more energy coming out than was put into the target. That has never happened before. So this is not the end of the quest to finish that science, but it is a major, major step forward. It is something that is actually threatened by this government shutdown.

I just received a copy of a notice that is going out to Lawrence Livermore tomorrow, and here is what it says, from the management at the lab to all the scientists:

This is to remind you that beginning today, October 11, the lab will begin shutting down normal operations. Only essential functions necessary to assure safety and security will be ongoing.

The lab is shutting down. The employees are furloughed, as we have just gotten the most important step forward on this most important experiment going on in the United States. How can that be possibly be good for the United States of America?

Of course, Lawrence Livermore is not the only national lab that is adversely impacted. Just up the road from my home in Santa Clara County, we have the Stanford Linear Accelerator Laboratory, with their fabulous Linac Coherent Light Source. It is the world's most powerful x-ray laser. Its focused beam, which arrives in staccato bursts a few quadrillionths of a second long, is allowing researchers to probe complex ultrasmall structures and freeze atomic motions. They will be able to see what is going on at a molecular level in real-time.

What is happening at the Stanford lab? The same cutbacks that are afflicting the Lawrence Livermore lab.

Look at some of the things that are coming out of these fine science facilities, like the wonderful corkscrewing lasers that can be the key to unlimited bandwidth that was recently devised at

the Stanford Linear Accelerator, and the national lab at Livermore that has developed a safe and versatile material known as DNA Tagged Reagents for Aerosol Experiments. It is going to be a critical tool for protecting the United States.

All of these things are at risk. And for what? For a stupid, foolish partisan fight.

We could change this this evening, tomorrow morning. All we need is to have a bill on the floor to vote to reopen this government and to allow these scientists to continue to move forward to change the world and to create a brilliant future for our economy and for our safety and security.

So I thank my colleague, Representative SWALWELL, who does such an excellent job of representing the two labs in his district, as well as all the other constituents who are so proud of him here in his service in the Congress and for standing up for them—not just for their jobs, but for America's future.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LOFGREN), who has been a tireless advocate for our national laboratories and is a fighter on the Science Committee day in and day out as we wage these battles and try and think big and challenge our colleagues to do everything we can to move the ball forward so that we can reach that point where we have clean energy fusion, where we have a renewable source that is safe and reliable and does not require us to look across oceans and time zones to provide our country's energy.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from California, my colleague, my former Congressman, my friend, who today is honoring Bow Tie Friday as well, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. I certainly want to thank my friend and colleague from Dublin, California, ERIC SWALWELL, for bringing this topic up tonight. I want to thank my friend, ZOE LOFGREN from San Jose, for being an advocate and a champion of the labs long before I got here and carrying on that great tradition.

□ 1945

What I would like to do tonight is talk about my experience at the lab.

When I first got my Ph.D.—and I won't tell you how long ago it was—I started working for Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque. I will tell you that there were a lot of great things about that experience. My colleagues were Bill Sullivan and Don Lobitz. There was Paul Veers. They were tireless; they were very well educated; they worked hard; and they were very inspirational to me as a young Ph.D. Our boss, whose name was Dick Braasch, went out there and delivered us the resources that we needed in order to carry out the research that was ahead of us.

In using that money and in using those tools and in using that resource, basically we developed wind energy technology from the very ground up. We were working on vertical access windmills, and we understood and worked very hard on the aerodynamics in order to understand exactly how to design blades to best maximize power and how to best maximize energy production from windmills so that wind turbines could be designed economically and make money. Now we see wind energy is a tremendous success. We see new windmills going up by the thousands—giant windmills that are 2, 3, 4 megawatts. If you drive underneath them, they are just an incredible sight to see.

I just loved the experience, and I hope that we can continue to provide the resources for young scientists and young engineers who understand and who have the passion to go out there and make a difference and discover new technology and develop new energy sources and develop new health technology so that we can move forward.

The United States of America is truly the leader in this kind of technology. We lead in health care. We lead in health science. We lead in energy development. We lead in all kinds of sciences. Our universities are tremendous resources, but our laboratories are where the seasoned scientists go and produce real technology that can be transferred to the public sector.

Right now, if you look in Livermore, which is right outside of my district, there is a technology transfer operation. There is a cooperative organization between the laboratories—Sandia National Laboratories; the Livermore National Laboratory in the city of Livermore; in the city of Davis; Berkeley National Laboratory; Berkeley University; and so on. All of these institutions are working together with private companies to develop this technology and to transfer it into the private sector to give our businesses and our companies the edge they need to become successful and to create jobs and to lead our Nation.

One of the things they are doing in Livermore that is so exciting, which my colleague ZOE LOFGREN talked about, was the National Ignition Facility, the fusion facility there in Livermore. If you don't know about fusion, I will back up a little bit. "Fusion" is when you break apart a uranium or a plutonium atom to create energy. It is a source of what you call the atomic bomb nuclear power, but fusion is the other side of the scale at which you actually fuse nuclei together to form bigger nuclei, and even more energy is released. The prototype is the hydrogen bomb. What they are doing in Livermore is actually trying to understand how to contain fusion energy. There is an unlimited amount of fusion fuel out there. The ocean. It's heavy water. The

ocean contains heavy water. It contains tritium.

So it is a matter of understanding this basic force of nature and controlling this basic force of nature. As ZOE LOFGREN mentioned a few minutes ago, what happened in Livermore just this last month was that they were successful in creating more energy in the fusion reaction than was put into the energy. It was put in the reaction.

So we see progress being made month by month, year by year. I've been out there to that facility. I've met with these scientists. I've met with the leaders. I can tell you that they have the same exact environment of just encouraging young scientists to do their best to make a difference, to understand science. It is very exciting for me to see that, and I would love to see that operation, that type of research continue at our national laboratories.

Los Alamos Laboratory, in Albuquerque, is also another fine institution like Sandia National Laboratories, like Livermore National Laboratory, and like Argonne Laboratory. There are several across the Nation. They do basic research, and they do basic development. My understanding is that the United States, with the NIP facility, have about a 5-year lead over other countries—over China—which are desperately trying to catch up with us.

When we furlough those scientists, when we stop that process, we set back our scientists for not just the amount of time they are laid off, but we stop the infrastructure. When you develop the technology that they have developed, this is several years of lead time to get the mirrors, to get the amplifiers that they use for this equipment. When you tell your suppliers, Well, we are not going to be using you for the next few months, those suppliers go away.

It takes years to develop the new technology, the new infrastructure, for these scientists to be able to purchase these items that are right now available. As we furlough these scientists and shut down that program, those people are going to go away. Maybe they will find customers in China. I hope not. So this is very, very critical for our national energy security and for our national security to keep on top of that and to not let that lapse.

The labs do other very useful things, like nuclear arms reduction. Some of the nuclear inspectors are from the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. We have chemical weapons inspectors. I would bet some of the inspectors who are getting ready to go to Syria right now are from these laboratories. I would bet a bottom dollar on that. If you are worried about cybersecuri-ty, if you know the threats that we may face in our country with cybersecuri-ty, then you are going to want to know what they do at the Livermore National Laboratory and at the Sandia

National Laboratories. They have some of the top—I don't want to call them "hackers"—they have some of the top folks who really understand how to get into computer systems and how to protect them and how to attack if they need to attack. We have some of the very best people in the world at these laboratories who are working on cybersecuri-ty. We want to make sure that we continue to employ those folks and to get the best we can out of these folks who have so much passion on this subject.

Now, ZOE LOFGREN also mentioned the Stanford Linear Accelerator, SLAC. They have an x-ray laser. X-rays are incredibly hard to control, and designing an x-ray laser which makes laser beams which are monochromatic and coherent is an unbelievable achievement. The things that they are going to be able to do with that are beyond what we can imagine today. So keeping those types of operations in progress are absolutely essential.

We don't want to be laying these people off. We don't want to be giving them the message that their work is not essential. We don't want to be giving them the idea that, Well, maybe I would be better off in the private sector; maybe I would be better off making big dollars instead of working on things that are so important to our national security.

If you have watched in the last few months, I have been doing 1-minute presentations on science achievements in this country, science achievements that are funded by the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. We have seen things like the Boltzmann equation move forward, which explains how gases behave, how they expand and contract. We have seen how statistics are used in neuroscience, how differential equations are factored to get new insights into the behavior of nature. These are ideas that are funded through grants from the National Science Foundation and also from the National Institutes of Health. They fund things on cancer, on understanding epidemics in order to keep us safe. If you understand what is happening in the biological world, there is always a threat of a new virus.

These folks are understanding that. They are giving us the tools to protect ourselves, and I think it is absolutely essential that we restore funding to the pre-sequester levels for the National Science Foundation and for the National Institutes of Health.

We see our colleagues—well meaning, I know that—who want to reduce the size of government. They want to reduce funding for science for the National Science Foundation and for the National Institutes of Health, and they think there are no consequences. There are consequences. The consequences are going to be that we see less science

in this country and that we see more science in other countries. So we need to work together to find a solution.

Yes, we are absolutely willing to negotiate. Just don't hold a gun to our heads. Don't hold us hostage. Don't make this extortion. Come to us with reasonable ideas. We will sit down with you at any time, at any place, and if you want to demand that we eliminate the medical device tax, we will even be willing to talk about that but after we get the government functioning, after we pay our obligations. Then we can talk about things that we want, like funding for the National Science Foundation, like funding for the National Institutes of Health. Those are the things that we want to see. There are so many other things that have been reduced, like food stamps and the WIC program.

We want to make sure that our voices are heard and that the extortion sort of tactics that we have seen from the leadership and from the far right wing do not hold sway so that we can negotiate fairly, so that we can use the rule of law, so that we can use the traditions of this tremendous body—the House of Representatives—and the United States Senate within the standard practices of bringing bills to the committee, of negotiating, of adding amendments, and then of voting on them, and moving those forward to the Senate to agree and then to the President. That is the regular order. That is the order we want to use. That is the order that has been used in this country. If you decide that that isn't the way to do it, then we are going to fight you tooth and nail.

I want to thank my colleague again, ERIC SWALWELL. I see another colleague who represents Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque, which is where I used to work. I appreciate the true effort tonight.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you to the gentleman from California. His passion for our laboratories, for science really shows. I am so glad he talked about what the Democrats have already done as far as compromising. That is really important here because I had a town hall last weekend. I went home on the one day we didn't have votes, and I went to the City Hall Chamber in Dublin, California, the council chamber there.

A number of folks rightfully asked me, What are the Democrats willing to give up in these negotiations?

I think it is important for folks to know that the Democrats have already made concessions, that we have made very, very difficult concessions. The best way to describe those concessions is with that ugly, terrible word called "sequester," which has been across-the-board cuts, and they have hurt our national labs with these deep, deep cuts.

This chart here demonstrates it better than anything I have seen, which is

that you have the President's budget, which is about \$1.2 trillion. Then you see the 2011 debt limit deal at \$1.6 trillion. You see Paul Ryan's budget at \$967 billion. Then, across the Capitol, the Senate passed a budget at \$986 billion. To get a budget to keep the government running, you need what I call the Holy Trinity. You need the Senate, the House, and the President to all agree on one number.

You have the President, who wanted something in the low trillions. You have the Senate that compromised at \$986 billion. The House has said that we will take \$986 billion, and the President has now agreed that he would take \$986 billion. The House has one very, very harsh exception. It will take \$986 billion, but it started with wanting to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The Democrats have compromised. This chart shows that we have made deep and hard concessions during this budget negotiation. The biggest one, as I mentioned, is this mindless, across-the-board cut called "sequester." Now, sequester is not targeted cuts. We are not going after bad programs. Rather, we are taking good programs, and we are taking bad programs, and we are seeing across-the-board cuts. It is indiscriminate.

At our laboratories, they have programs called LDRD, Laboratory Directed Research and Development. In the private sector, many companies allow their employees, especially in high-tech and innovation, about "20 percent time," is what they call it. Google calls it "20 percent time." So, for one day a week, effectively, an employee is allowed to work outside his assigned area—his subject matter, his expertise—on something that he thinks can move the ball forward in his industry. So "20 percent time," they call it. At the laboratories, they call this "LDRD." They are given about 8½ percent. So it is an over 50 percent less cut than what you are seeing in the private sector. It is 8½ percent that they are getting at our national laboratories. Because of these sequester cuts, that 8½ percent has been cut by more than half. Now they are below 4 percent for their LDRD, and the LDRD work at our national laboratories has produced some tremendous results in science.

□ 2000

I just want to go through some of them.

The gentleman from California talked about nonproliferation and what the research has done at the National Laboratories as far as reducing the stockpiles across the world.

Well, because of the LDRD work, what we have seen is that we are able to better test nuclear weapons and verify countries in the numbers they are claiming they have for nuclear weapons across the world because we have this LDRD research.

Also, we are able to provide cleaner energy vehicles because of LDRD research. The Volt, the Chevy Volt, for example. The Chevy Volt would not be able to cruise on battery power were it not for the advanced cathode technology that emerged from a National Laboratory.

Also, airport security. We are all so thankful and grateful that at the airport they are able to detect many of the explosives that terrorists would seek to use to take down an airplane. LDRD we can thank for much of the research that has come out that makes our airports so much safer.

I was a prosecutor for 7 years. In so many cases, whether it was homicides or sexual assaults, we were able to put perpetrators away because of DNA research that was conducted at our National Laboratories. To DNA testing we can now add human antibody detection, a precise method of catching suspects and attaching them to crime scenes. This was something I was able to use in a courtroom to great effect. That science is so powerful when you have so many questions of who committed the crime that all jurors can accept the scientific research that has come out of LDRD and the DNA advances that we have seen there.

I want to yield now to a colleague of mine from New Mexico who represents the Albuquerque area and the other Sandia laboratory, our sister over there in New Mexico. I have Sandia and Livermore and the gentlelady from New Mexico has Sandia in New Mexico. I am going to yield to her and have her tell us about this shutdown and what effect it has had on our National Laboratories, particularly in her district.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Thank you very much to my friend and colleague from California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the hard work of the men and women at New Mexico's National Labs who protect our Nation's security and help grow our economy.

Sandia National Labs in my district is home to 9,000 of those dedicated public servants. These are the best and brightest physicists, chemists, mathematicians, engineers, and technicians. They have chosen to serve our country instead of taking more lucrative jobs in the private sector because they are passionate about the lab's mission.

Sandia is a national security asset that uses technology to find solutions to the most challenging problems that threaten our Nation. Their work supports numerous Federal, State, and local government agencies, companies, and organizations.

During the BP oil spill, Sandia employees were called in to help cap the well. The work they do is absolutely remarkable.

Since 1976, Sandia has received 101 coveted research and development 100

awards, often referred to as the “Oscars of invention” or the “Nobel prizes of technology.”

While New Mexico’s National Labs have been able to use carryover funds to stay open during the shutdown for the past 11 days, that money is quickly running out. Within the last week, employees at both Sandia and Los Alamos National Labs received letters informing them that they would face furloughs if the government doesn’t reopen soon.

Despite the fact that they play a crucial role in our Nation’s security, the employees at New Mexico’s National Labs are technically not Federal employees. As a result, the legislation we passed to provide back pay to furloughed Federal employees, which I was proud to support, unfortunately does not protect employees at these labs.

Earlier this week, Congressman LUJÁN and I, along with Senators UDALL and HEINRICH, sent a letter to Energy Secretary Moniz requesting that he allow the labs to use their funding to back pay any employees furloughed because of the shutdown.

I remain hopeful that the furloughs can be avoided because I have heard stories about the damage that they can do, and I have seen firsthand the damaging and devastating effect that the other Federal furloughed employees and their families have suffered in Albuquerque, my district, and the entire State of New Mexico.

In fact, last Sunday in Albuquerque, I hosted a roundtable meeting with lab employees, furloughed Federal employees, and members of the business community. They told me that any missed or delayed paychecks would prevent them from paying their mortgage payments, household utility bills, car loan payments, and credit cards on time.

But they are not just worried about their pay; they are also worried about their careers. Lab employees who hold security clearances are in danger of losing their clearances if their credit scores are impacted because they cannot pay their bills.

After the meeting, I reached out to community partners to see if they would be able to help us in any way. Several credit unions, banks, utility providers, and other community partners reached out because they all want to help.

If nonprofits in the business community can step up, then it is time for Congress to step up too. We need to do our job; we need to pass a funding bill to keep New Mexico’s National Labs open. National Labs should not be forced to operate under the threat of shutting down just because a few dozen reckless Tea Party Republicans decided that destroying the Affordable Care Act was more important than keeping the government open.

New Mexico’s National Labs deserve and require the certainty and stability

of a full funding bill and so does the rest of the country. We need to vote on the Senate-passed clean funding compromise right now.

I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership in protecting our national security interests and the labs in my home State.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico. I am glad she brought up the examples of the toll that this shutdown is taking on our National Laboratory employees.

We are hearing back at Livermore, at Sandia, and at Lawrence Livermore so many examples like what the gentleman mentioned with security clearances. You wouldn’t think about it. But when thousands of employees have security clearances that depend on them continuing to have financial stability, that stability is threatened when our National Laboratories furlough them and they are unable to meet their debts and obligations and pay their bills and keep their families running.

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) also talked about the effects of furloughing these scientists. When you furlough scientists, you also furlough scientific progress.

I mentioned the town hall that I had last weekend in Dublin, California. Lab employees from Sandia and Lawrence Livermore showed up for that town hall. I am going to fly home this Sunday, and we are going to host another town hall at Lawrence Livermore and Sandia. It is going to be at 1:30 on Sunday. We have alerted laboratories to that town hall, and I look forward to talking to them. I hope to have a more positive update than what I can provide today. I hope that I can tell them that the shutdown will not continue; that they will be able to continue their work at our great National Laboratories.

Now, I talked a little bit about how we got here. That we had a budget from the President and the Senate at \$986 billion, but the House’s budget wouldn’t accept only \$986 billion; it wanted to repeal and defund the Affordable Care Act.

The reason I am so hopeful that we hold firm in the Senate, and that the President continues to hold firm and insist that we pass what is called a clean budget at \$986 billion, is because of the dangerous, dangerous precedent it would set should we allow either side to try and seek concessions or seek a ransom for simply doing their job of providing a budget.

Our job being here in Congress and working under article I of the Constitution requires us to pass a budget that funds the government to pay the debts and obligations of the United States.

It would be a dangerous precedent if we had an environment where every 45 days, 60 days, or if we ever got back to

passing a budget on an annual basis, that one side in one Chamber attempted to use that budgeting process to revisit and try and resettle scores that have already been settled.

That is so obviously occurring here with the Affordable Care Act. This is a provision that was initially brought up and contemplated in the 2008 campaign for the Presidency, where one person, one candidate, said that if he was elected he would seek to bring our country for the first time in over 100 years since it was first proposed affordable health care for all. That person was overwhelmingly elected to the Presidency—Barack Obama.

In 2010, the Congress, the 111th Congress, passed the Affordable Care Act. It was signed into law by the same President who campaigned on it.

In 2012, the chief justice of the Supreme Court, who was appointed by a Republican President who served before President Barack Obama, wrote a majority opinion that said that that law, the Affordable Care Act, was constitutional.

That same President who ran on the Affordable Care Act in 2008, who signed into law congressional action in 2010, who saw it upheld in 2012 by a Republican-appointed Supreme Court chief justice, ran for reelection, and again was overwhelmingly elected.

The Affordable Care Act will do many great things to provide affordable, quality health care to many Americans. But like every government program, it will not be 100 percent perfect. It too will require fixes and updates.

Just recently, Social Security celebrated a birthday. It is in its late 70s now. Social Security is not the same program that it was over 70 years ago. It has gone through different modifications and changes through the years. Just as the Affordable Care Act, we owe it to the American people to look at it as it is implemented, to look how it is helping people, to look at where glitches are and what we can do to make it work.

We must mend any problems with the Affordable Care Act, but not end it. We must not use the Affordable Care Act as a way to hold up a budget that provides so many jobs for the Federal workforce, so many services that come from the greatest government that presides over the greatest democracy in the world, so many services being held up for so many people across our country.

It would be a dangerous, dangerous precedent if we allowed either side to do this. Let me just offer an example: if we were to make concessions on this budgeting process—say at the very best buy us a 45-day continuing resolution where the government would be funded for another 45 days—what would the other side ask for next? Would it ask for us to privatize Social Security,

something they attempted to do in 2006 but weren't able to do? Would they ask us to turn Medicare into a voucher system, something that they are not able to achieve because of a majority in the Senate and a Democratic President who has vowed not to let that happen?

But also think and reverse the situation: imagine if you had a Republican in the White House, a Republican-controlled Senate and a Democratic majority in the House. Imagine if that Democratic majority tried to use the budgeting process to achieve what it couldn't achieve at the ballot box. You can imagine the different scenarios where we can try and do this—whether it is passing background checks, something that has frustrated so many House Democrats that we couldn't get that passed in the Senate; whether it is passing an assault weapons ban, something that so many House Democrats would like to see renewed, as we had back in the '90s. It could be comprehensive immigration reform, something that our country is calling for. People are coming to our capital asking to have a roadmap to citizenship in reforms and work visas. We can't do that legislatively right now. But imagine if Democrats had a majority here and a Republican in the White House, and they said: No budget; we are shutting down the government until we get what we want because we couldn't do it at the ballot box.

We have never operated that way, and I hope we do not continue to operate that way, and that more reasonable minds come forward and allow us to put our National Laboratory employees back to work, allow us to put our Federal workforce back to work.

This shutdown is affecting and hurting real people. I mentioned in the beginning of this hour that I came to Congress to help people, but right now it is hurting innocent Americans.

Even though the Federal Government is closed, essential services must continue so hundreds of thousands of Federal employees are being forced to work but with no paycheck. How can we treat such dedicated public servants this way?

We saw just last week as an erratic driver tried to drive through the barricade on Capitol Hill that our brave men and women of the Capitol Hill police force rushed to protect the doors of democracy. And what thanks did we give them in return? We told them to keep working, keep protecting this House, but we are going to hold your paycheck.

Many more aren't even allowed to work in the Federal Government, denied the chance to do the jobs they love, serving on behalf of the American people, and they are left worrying if they will ever get paid or if they are going to be lost.

□ 2015

The loss also ripples throughout our economy, affecting businesses through-

out the country. It is estimated that this shutdown is costing the economy \$300 million a day. And so you can see, people are asking across the country: Will I get paid this month? Will there be enough money for food? Can I pay my mortgage this month? I am a first time home buyer; some of those FHA loans look very good for me, but they are delayed, they are on hold. Will I be able to pay my child's college tuition? All of the questions that folks in our Federal workforces, folks who are working at our national laboratories are asking.

Small businesses can't get SBA loans. Small business centers which help women and veterans are closed. Our national parks are closed. Technology updates for all of our Federal programs are being delayed. And mentioned earlier, our cybersecurity centers, employees there are going to be furloughed, the cybersecurity centers that work to protect our Nation's networks, that work to ensure that nation-states and individuals who wish to do us harm aren't able to do so.

I would like to now yield to the greatest champion in this House to end and reduce the effect of poverty on our community and somebody who has the honor of representing Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, which has over 4,000 employees. I have visited that facility, and they are doing such great work to advance the progress of science.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, but also for your tremendous leadership on this issue and on so many other issues. It is a pleasure to serve with you. You have really hit the ground running as a new Member of this great body. I also want to thank you for your work on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. As a fellow member of the Bay Area congressional delegation, you have made such an impact and your work is so important for our entire California delegation, so thank you.

My district is California's 13th Congressional District, right next door to your congressional district. As you said, it is home to Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Let me just say first how proud I am to represent one of the most esteemed centers for scientific research and technological advancement in the world. I have had many, many opportunities to visit the lab where I have met some of the most brilliant scientific minds on our planet. The employees, the scientists, all of those who work at the lab are phenomenal individuals, and it is just amazing to see how the scientists and engineers especially use our Federal investments in our national laboratory system to make unbelievable leaps in every field, from nanotechnology and supercomputing to energy efficiency and astrophysics.

The history of the lab is unbelievable. It was established in 1931 by Nobel Prize-winning physicist Ernest Orlando Lawrence. The lab has been associated with 13 Nobel Prizes. Fifty-seven of the lab's scientists are members of the National Academy of Sciences. Thirteen have won the National Medal of Science, our Nation's highest award for lifetime achievement in the field of science.

Over the years, Berkeley Lab scientists have discovered 16 elements; made the world's smallest motor, 100,000 times smaller than a human hair; used ultraviolet technology to bring safe drinking water to thousands across the world; and helped decipher the human genome.

I could go on and on, but we are not here today to laud the accomplishments of the national labs in our district, but I think it is very important to do that even in this very difficult environment.

We are here because these institutions of innovation are under a real and immediate threat, thanks to the Republican shutdown of our government. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory employs over 4,200 scientists, support staff, and students in my congressional district. Its economic impact is even greater, creating 5,600 local jobs and 12,000 jobs nationally, with a total economic impact estimated at \$1.6 billion a year.

If this shutdown continues, the Berkeley Lab will be forced to furlough its employees in waves beginning in late October. Not only does the shutdown threaten the livelihood of my constituents, the scientists, the administrators, and the support staff that keep the lab running, it also threatens to stall projects that could be the next scientific breakthrough that changes how our world works or produces the next Nobel Peace Prize winner. So this is really an absurd price to pay for the Republican insistence on keeping people from receiving affordable, quality health care. That is where all of this started.

For the life of me, I don't understand why my Republican Tea Party colleagues are continuing these cynical ploys that threaten our Nation's competitiveness and force our Nation's most brilliant minds out of their labs. We need to end this shutdown. We need to fund the entire energy and water bill, which provides funding for our national laboratories through the Department of Energy's Office of Science. We need an up-or-down vote on a clean budget bill to reopen this government.

Democrats have already—and I know you have heard this over and over again, Mr. SWALWELL, because you know we have already accepted a short-term budget bill to reopen our government even though we don't believe its funding level is nearly adequate.

The American people deserve a functioning government, and they deserve affordable, quality health care. They deserve both. I hope more people are listening and more people understand that we know how to open the government. We know how to begin to negotiate on a real budget that makes our entire government, including our national laboratories, whole.

And so hopefully this alarm that we are sounding tonight, Mr. SWALWELL, will continue to wake up the country and continue to ensure that people know that we have their backs and that we know how to open this government and we want to shut down this shutdown immediately. Thank you again for your leadership.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentlelady from California. She is absolutely correct. Democrats have compromised. We have accepted a \$986 billion sequester budget, which the gentlelady and I do not accept. When you cut those programs, we are cutting the opportunities to lift people out of poverty. I agree with the gentlelady, we have made deep, deep concessions when it comes to a budget. We are ready to open up the government and turn the lights back on, but we are doing so at a painful price with the budget we are accepting.

With that, I will close. I want to say to what my colleague from Berkeley and Oakland was saying: Keep our national labs open. Keep those great scientists at Lawrence Livermore, Sandia, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, keep them on the job, moving the job forward on science.

It was alluded to earlier that the National Ignition Facility in Livermore, as the government that funds it was unraveling 2 weeks ago, at the National Ignition Facility in Livermore, they achieved something they had been attempting to achieve for the past 3-4 years. That is fusion. For the first time, they have been able to get more energy out than what they have put in. This is a remarkable achievement. They have achieved fusion, and they are knocking on the door of ignition at the National Ignition Facility. They are closer than they have ever been. They are closer now to meeting the 84th milestone. They have 84 milestones they have to meet. They have met 83 of them. They are so close to providing this renewable energy resource which will change the game on how every person in the world receives their energy, no longer requiring us to be dependent on foreign sources of energy if we can achieve this and then transfer this technology to the private market.

The data achieved at NIF is critical for understanding nuclear fusion, which we need for keeping a reliable stockpile of nuclear weapons. So this is a critical energy issue and a critical defense issue. Understanding fusion, as

I mentioned, allows us to get closer to the goal of civilian fusion energy. And nuclear fusion energy, unlike what we currently use, nuclear fission essentially would produce no waste or carbon emissions. It is the "holy grail" of clean energy, and I want to make sure that the scientists at Lawrence Livermore are able to accomplish it.

Sandia also has a facility called the Combustion Research Facility. This is a partnership, a public-private partnership with our automakers and those who are making automobiles in Detroit. What they are trying to do is make the American automobile engine more efficient at the Combustion Research Facility. There are important, remarkable achievements going on at our national laboratories.

With the furlough at our laboratory, all of their exceptional work will be put on hold. So what does that mean in relation to the National Ignition Facility and the Combustion Research Facility? It means that work will stop that is being done to maintain our nuclear stockpile; the great fusion energy project I mentioned; efforts to understand climate change will stop; all while we stand still, other countries like Russia and China will zoom past us in science, math, and renewable energy.

And this isn't just what happens today. If these highly skilled, highly intelligent employees are prevented from working, they will go somewhere else. These people are Ph.D.'s. They will find somewhere else to go.

At the beginning of the hour, I said I would not only tell us how we got here, what it means, I would also offer a way forward. The way forward, as I see it, is for the Speaker of the House, Mr. BOEHNER, to allow this House to have an up-or-down vote on passing the same budget that the Senate has agreed to, the same budget that the President of the United States said he would sign. We know the votes are there. Twenty-five to 30 Republicans have said they would pass that vote.

So let's get the government back to work. Let's end the partisanship games, the obsession with defunding the Affordable Care Act, and let's get the government back to work. In the meantime, a short-term solution I have offered is that Secretary Moniz allow furloughed employees at all of our national laboratories, at all 17 sites, all 30,000 employees, to receive back furlough pay.

I have also worked since January with a small group of freshmen, about 30 of us, Republicans and Democrats evenly divided. It is called the United Solutions Caucus. We have been meeting almost every week since sworn into office, pledging that we will work together and build the foundation of a bipartisan relationship. In these trying times and dark days over the last 2 weeks, we have met nearly every other

day, talking about what we can do to work together to turn back on the lights of the government for the greatest democracy of the world. This group gives me hope.

Just yesterday, the group met with two senior members, a Republican and a Democrat, from the Appropriations Committee. Nobody in that group and neither of those senior members want to see the government continue to be shut down, so I am hopeful that we can continue to talk. I am hopeful that this group can continue to work together, the United Solutions Caucus, to provide a way forward, a way that ensures that the Federal workforce is back to work; and for my district, ensures that those hardworking scientists who want to think big, just like I did, the same reason I came to Congress, that want to move the ball forward on our nuclear and energy security, that they can go back to work and they aren't ever furloughed.

So I ask my colleagues on the other side: Did you come here to help people or did you come here to hurt people? I think you came here for the same reason I did, to help people, and so I hope you will prove it to the American people. Allow an up-or-down vote; allow us to pass a clean resolution; and together, all of us, Republicans and Democrats, can help the American people.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Energy's National Laboratories are vital to our national security, our economy, and our environment. They have often been called "crown jewels" of our federal research and development infrastructure, and for good reason. This is why I am extremely concerned about the impacts of this senseless government shutdown on these important facilities—and this is on top of the harmful cuts that they have already had to endure under budget sequestration.

It is worth reminding my colleagues here today that we have seen how our past investments in the national laboratories have paid off when it comes to energy development. DOE labs were key to the development of high-efficiency gas turbines for coal plants, nuclear reactors, and the directional drilling and hydraulic fracturing practices that have led to the shale gas boom of today.

I think it is also important to note that DOE's Office of Science—which oversees most of these national laboratories—is actually the largest supporter of basic research in the physical sciences in the nation, and it operates more than 30 national scientific user facilities whose applications go well beyond energy innovation. Our nation's top researchers from industry, academia, and other federal agencies use these facilities to examine everything from new materials that will better meet our military's needs, to new pharmaceuticals that will better treat disease, to even examining the fundamental building blocks of the universe. I believe that this stewardship of unique scientific research, including the nation's major national user facilities, is another

very important role that the Department plays in bolstering our national competitiveness today and in building the industries of the future.

It's no secret that Congress's inability to date to come to an agreement on a sensible budget plan has led to some devastating cuts to many of these important facilities, with serious impacts to our nation in both the short-term and the long-term. Until we resolve the current crisis, even more of our nation's best and brightest will be forced out of work and some of their most critical research tools—for which the U.S. taxpayers contributed hundreds of millions of dollars to build—will have to cease operations. I believe that we are doing damage to the seed corn of our future, and as the Ranking Member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I believe that ending this shutdown and reversing these drastic cuts need to be our highest priorities going forward.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRENSHAW (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and October 12 on account of family obligations.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after 11:30 a.m. and for October 12 on account of a family medical emergency.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1276. An act to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 91. Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, October 12, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3277. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the Department's intention to expand the assignment of female Field Artillery Officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3278. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3279. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3280. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Endangered Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for the Neosho Mucket and Threatened Status for the Rabbitsfoot [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2012-0031] (RIN: 1018-AX73) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3281. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Listing, Endangered Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for the Florida Bonneted Bat [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2012-0078] (RIN: 1018-AY15) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3282. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for the Taylor's Checkerspot Butterfly and Threatened Status for the Streaked Horned Lark [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2012-0080; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AY18) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3283. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Dispute Resolution Pilot Program for Public Assistance Appeals [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0015] (RIN: 1660-AA79) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3284. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0671; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-124-AD; Amendment 39-17547; AD 2013-16-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3285. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on four Agency's Drug-Free Workplace Plans, pursuant to Public Law 100-71, section 503(a)(1)(A) (101 Stat. 468); jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 380. Resolution relating to consideration of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 379) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance (Rept. 113-244). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3285. A bill to make technical corrections to the Pay Our Military Act to include midshipmen at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, who are appointed as midshipmen in the Navy Reserve; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COOK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 3286. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse States that use State funds to operate National Parks during the Federal Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 3287. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide veterans service organizations with the same access to Department of Veterans Affairs facilities during the Government shutdown as such organizations had immediately prior to the shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 3288. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to exempt expenditures or obligations of funds derived from user fees from certain limitations under the Antideficiency Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3289. A bill to provide funds during the lapse of appropriations for the payment of military death gratuities and funeral and related transportation and housing expenses

through the transfer of unobligated amounts in the Health Insurance Reform Implementation Fund; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KINGSTON (for himself, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 3290. A bill to provide that all Federal employees shall be deemed to be employees excepted from furlough for purposes of the Government shutdown commencing on or about October 1, 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WATT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that financial institutions should work proactively with their customers affected by the shutdown of the Federal Government who may be facing short-term financial hardship and long-term damage to their creditworthiness through no fault of their own; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H. Res. 378. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. PRICE of Georgia):

H. Res. 379. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance; to the Committee on Agriculture; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 381. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Latino AIDS Awareness Day" on October 15, 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 3285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 3286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 3287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 3288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18). Further,

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of section 9 of article I: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law"

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States"

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ."

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 22: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 383: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 460: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 541: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 647: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 669: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 679: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 713: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 724: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 961: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1078: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1094: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1146: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1150: Mr. CONYERS and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1281: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. NUNES, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1317: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1318: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1354: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1355: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1501: Mr. KING of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1518: Mr. GERLACH, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HALL, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 1563: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1645: Mr. TONKO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1732: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1775: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1812: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1821: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1827: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1905: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1918: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1998: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2000: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2101: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2213: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 2241: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 2286: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 2305: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2350: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2502: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2509: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2540: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2578: Mr. WELCH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2585: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2591: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2697: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2717: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2734: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2772: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2785: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 2810: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 2839: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2866: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2925: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2932: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. CAS-

TOR of Florida, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HOLDING, Mr.

LONG, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CAL-

VERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAMER,

Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms.

DELBENE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona,

Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr.

HARPER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HUDSON,

Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LIPINSKI,

Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr.

MAFFEI, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr.

MCKEON, Mr. MICA, Mr. NUNNELLEE, Mr.

PITTENGER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. LO-

RETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHIMKUS,

Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr.

WAXMAN, Mr. VELA, Ms. WASSERMAN

SCHULTZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO,

and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2939: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Ms. WASSERMAN

SCHULTZ, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 2967: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 2988: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 2997: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr.

LAMALFA.

H.R. 3002: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 3043: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 3077: Mr. HONDA, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr.

HALL.

H.R. 3090: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3097: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3103: Mr. COHEN and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 3111: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr.

DENHAM, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 3121: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 3128: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3189: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 3211: Mr. KING of New York and Mr.

RENACCI.

H.R. 3218: Mr. RADEL, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms.

FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 3276: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. POCAN,

Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 3279: Mr. MARINO, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr.

SCALISE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr.

DAINES.

H.R. 3284: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. BECERRA.

H.J. Res. 56: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BARBER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HOLT,

Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. HANABUSA, Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CHU, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PAS-TOR of Arizona, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Res. 254: Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 375: Mr. CONYERS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

54. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Global Union of Scientists for Peace, Iowa, relative to a letter regarding the prospect of ending the violence in Syria through a scientifically proven approach; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE 170TH ANNIVERSARY OF B'NAI B'RITH INTERNATIONAL

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 170th anniversary of B'nai B'rith International. I am proud to acknowledge the accomplishments of the oldest existing Jewish service agency and celebrate their achievements.

On October 13, 1843, twelve German Jewish immigrants convened to address the challenges of their growing community. Immediately, they established a financial support system for families of the deceased, open a Jewish public library, and assisted flood victims in Baltimore. They also began to speak out against anti-Semitism. These early priorities of advocacy, education, and community support can still be seen in B'nai B'rith's work around the world today.

B'nai B'rith is one of Israel's strongest advocates in the United States and Europe. Working with policymakers in the United States, the European Union, and the United Nations, B'nai B'rith has championed Israel's right to defend itself, advanced the rights of Jewish refugees in the Middle East, and ensured that life insurance companies cannot refuse coverage due to travelling to Israel.

B'nai B'rith has also sustained the health and well-being of the aged through advocating for senior services, tirelessly working for affordable access to medical care, and providing housing for seniors. In partnership with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, B'nai B'rith is the largest Jewish sponsor of subsidized housing in the United States. Residents are accepted regardless of religion, race, or handicap.

Following the Jewish tradition that every life is sacred, B'nai B'rith assists victims of natural disasters around the world. From the Great Chicago fire of 1871 to the 2010 earthquake in Haiti, B'nai B'rith is on the front lines helping those who need it most.

This esteemed organization is a beacon to all who strive for a safer, healthier, more tolerant world. I welcome the opportunity to stand with B'nai B'rith International on the 170th anniversary of its establishment.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHIEF
GEORGE BAKER

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chief George Baker upon his retirement from the Mashpee Fire Department.

Chief Baker has spent the past thirty years serving the town of Mashpee through his invaluable service to the Mashpee Fire Department, filling the role of Fire Chief for the past two decades. His many friends and colleagues describe him as a man truly dedicated to his service, always putting his fellow firemen and the Mashpee community first. Even on his last day at the Department, Chief Baker chose to wear a blue firefighter's uniform instead of his usual white chief's uniform to remember his earlier years of service, and he spent the day responding to emergency calls throughout the community. His dedication to helping others sets an example for us all to follow, and I know I speak for many when I say that his accomplishments have been invaluable to the town of Mashpee.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Chief George Baker upon his retirement from the Mashpee Fire Department. I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Chief Baker for his many years of service.

TRIBUTE TO UNITED STATES VETERANS INITIATIVE

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the United States Veterans Initiative upon its 20th anniversary.

U.S. Vets is the nation's largest nonprofit provider of comprehensive services such as housing, counseling, and career development to homeless and at-risk veterans. Since its founding, U.S. Vets has established 11 facilities across the nation dedicated to providing vital services to over 20,000 veterans and their families.

In 1992, the West Los Angeles Veteran Affairs Medical Center discovered that 25% of its veterans were being discharged into homelessness. As a result, "The Genesis Committee" was formed under the guidance of Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Harry Pregerson, a Marine veteran of World War II, to address the dire need for veteran housing. "The Genesis Committee" later became the first U.S. Vets Board of Directors.

U.S. Vets opened its inaugural site, the Westside Residence Hall in Inglewood, California, in 1993 with five veterans. Since then, U.S. Vets has risen to national prominence with locations in Houston, Texas; Las Vegas, Nevada; Phoenix, Arizona; Honolulu, Hawaii; and Washington, D.C. In 2000, U.S. Vets opened the largest transitional housing facility for homeless veterans in the nation, Villages at Cabrillo, a 26-acre project in Long Beach, California that houses over 550 veterans.

To address the continually evolving needs of veterans, U.S. Vets has expanded their ef-

forts into specialized programming to provide services to veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan, female veterans, and the chronically mentally ill.

The time, energy and care the United States Veterans Initiative has given to our veterans in need is truly extraordinary, and the nation as a whole has greatly benefitted from their dedicated efforts. At this time, I ask all Members to join me in congratulating the United States Veterans Initiative upon its 20th anniversary.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of Northwest Florida State College located in Niceville, Florida. Throughout the past 50 years, its faculty and students have exhibited an assiduous dedication to excellence that has led to the college's growth from its beginnings as a junior college with a makeshift campus to now a state college with seven campuses and centers and six bachelor's degree programs. I am proud to congratulate them on this great achievement.

Access to education is one of the most vital components for a successful society, and in the spring of 1963, the Florida Legislature, recognizing the opportunity to better serve the educational needs of the citizens in Northwest Florida, authorized the establishment of a junior college to be located in Okaloosa County. Originally named the Okaloosa-Walton Junior College, its doors opened for the first time to 767 students in a temporary location in the City of Valparaiso, Florida on August 24, 1964. In honor of the heroism of the Doolittle Raiders, the students chose "Raiders" as their college's official mascot.

Just a few years and an Act of Congress later, the permanent home for the college in Niceville was established. In 2004, the college name was officially changed to Okaloosa-Walton College in reflection of the new accreditation to award bachelor's degrees, and in 2008, it was changed to Northwest Florida State College, upon the creation of the Florida College System.

While its name and structure has evolved throughout its 50-year history, students have never stopped pouring through its doors. Students of all ages made the college their alma mater, whether high school students taking dual enrollment courses or adults simply interested in expanding their knowledge in a variety of areas. Fifty years; seven locations; numerous state, regional, and national athletic titles; and more than 350,000 students later,

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Northwest Florida State College is recognized for its cultural enrichment and stellar educational opportunities provided to the Northwest Florida community.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is an honor for me to rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of Northwest Florida State College. My wife Vicki and I join the citizens of Northwest Florida in congratulating the faculty, students, and alumni of the college on its golden anniversary. We wish them many more years of continued success.

HONORING THE FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY FOR OVER 40 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE IN OFFERING VALUABLE HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Florida Atlantic University (FAU) for their excellence in offering valuable educational opportunities to the residents of South Florida for more than 40 years.

FAU first began operating in my district in 1971 with the opening of the Commercial Boulevard campus in Fort Lauderdale. This campus saw high enrollment and immediate success, and in 1987—just eleven years later—FAU began construction of the Reubin O'D. Askew Tower in downtown Fort Lauderdale. In 1989, the Florida Legislature designated FAU as the lead state university serving Broward County. Shortly thereafter, another large campus was established in Davie. The latest addition to these FAU campuses is a state-of-the-art, 12-story Higher Education Complex, also located in downtown Fort Lauderdale.

Throughout its history in Broward County, FAU has worked in close cooperation with Broward College, establishing a system of seamless transition from lower-division to upper-division work that can be called a model for the Nation. Thousands of place-bound students who otherwise would have been unable to obtain a university education have earned degrees on FAU's Broward campuses, and have gone on to pursue successful careers in fields that include architecture, public administration, business, communication, engineering, computer science, criminology and criminal justice, social work, urban and regional planning, education, nursing, the arts and sciences, and many more.

FAU boasts the most diverse student body in all of Florida's public universities. With nearly half of the population representing minority groups or foreign nations, their 30,000 member student body was recently ranked the 27th most diverse university in America by the U.S. News & World Report. Students from Broward make up almost 40 percent of this body, maintaining the county's historic status as the home of the greatest number of FAU students and alumni.

Furthermore, it is focused on preserving and protecting the future of South Florida and helping cities all over the world face the challenges of the 21st century. On the Davie cam-

pus, FAU researchers are engaged in a critically important initiative to understand and mitigate the major human-caused stressors that have created grave damage to the Everglades. In the Atlantic Ocean, off the coast of Broward County, FAU engineers affiliated with the Southeast National Marine Renewable Energy Center are working to establish the world's first offshore turbine test site, with the goal of advancing the effort to generate energy from ocean currents.

In Dania Beach, residents are being served by a new nano-filtration facility that has vastly improved the quality of the water they receive in their homes. Designed with input from FAU engineering faculty members and students, this is the first water treatment plant in the world to receive Gold Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design certification from the U.S. Green Building Council.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to recognize Florida Atlantic University for the tremendous work that the institution has done in South Florida for over 40 years. I want to express my sincerest gratitude for their leadership in both providing opportunities for higher education and addressing many environmental issues in the community. I wish the University all my best and many more years of continued success.

COMMENDING NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY FOR ITS SECOND ANNUAL HIGHER EDUCATION INNOVATION PUBLIC SURVEY

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, with jobs and the economic recovery continuing to be a top concern of many of my constituents, I rise today to call attention to the results of a new public opinion survey about higher education and workforce development recently released by Northeastern University.

There's a great deal of public concern about whether colleges and universities are preparing students for employment—as well as how best to prepare them. To ensure hard data is part of this discussion, Mr. Speaker, Northeastern University has released a new, timely national public opinion poll about the future of higher education.

Last year, Northeastern released a poll focused on innovation in higher education, including public attitudes about the online revolution that is currently underway. This year, Northeastern has taken it one step further by not only asking the public for its views, but also asking hiring decision makers at a cross-section of employers nationwide what they expect from our higher education system.

The results, which challenge the conventional wisdom, provide an important window into how well our colleges and universities are doing in preparing graduates to be competitive in the 21st century global workforce. In particular, the poll finds that—nearly two-thirds of Americans (65 percent) and almost three-quarters of hiring decision makers (73 percent) believe that having employees who are well-

rounded with a range of knowledge is more important than possessing industry-specific skills.

While almost two-thirds (62 percent) of those surveyed say that the higher education system is doing a “fair” or “poor” job of preparing recent college graduates for the workforce, Americans continue to believe higher education is critical to achieving career success. A large majority (70 percent) say that a person's level of education is the most important factor in a job candidate's success in the employment market. Nearly three in four Americans (74 percent) believe that a college degree is more important today than it was for their parents' generation, by far exceeding other factors such as current economic conditions, socioeconomic status, nationality, and race.

Mr. Speaker, Northeastern's poll results show that Americans also see a shared responsibility when it comes to preparing recent graduates for success. They believe the number one reason for employers struggling to find qualified job candidates is that companies do not invest enough in training new hires. However, hiring decision-makers say that colleges and universities are not in tune with industry needs and not preparing graduates accordingly. In fact, 55 percent of business leaders surveyed say their firms have trained recent college graduates on skills they should have learned at an academic institution.

Consistent with the findings of last year's Northeastern survey, Americans strongly support experiential learning in which a student's classroom education is integrated with professional work experience. Nearly nine in 10 Americans (89 percent) believe that students with work experience related to their field of study are more successful employees—and nearly three in four hiring decision-makers (74 percent) agree. Among those that gained work experience during college, a large majority (82 percent) says it was valuable for their personal and professional development.

Mr. Speaker, other important findings from Northeastern's survey include:

A strong majority of hiring decision-makers (87 percent) believe teaching students about entrepreneurship, including how to start their own businesses, is important to prepare students for the workforce;

A majority of Americans (64 percent) believe the federal government should grant visas to international students who graduate college in the U.S. so they can remain in the country and work, while only 41 percent of hiring decision-makers agree; and

Although only a small percentage of Americans surveyed have studied or worked abroad in college, the majority of them (66 percent) believe that global experience was valuable for their personal and professional development. While most Americans (58 percent) believe that students with global experience are generally more successful employees, only 39 percent of hiring decision-makers agree.

These important results were released on September 17, 2013 at The National Press Club here in Washington, DC, where Northeastern hosted its second annual summit on issues facing higher education. The summit, entitled *Innovation Imperative: Enhancing Higher Education Outcomes*, featured a high-

profile panel of experts and a keynote address by Northeastern President Joseph Aoun. Moderated by Catherine Rampell of The New York Times, the panel included Mitchell E. Daniels, president of Purdue University; James Kvaal, deputy director of the White House Domestic Policy Council; Jeff Wilcox, corporate vice president for engineering at Lockheed Martin Corporation; and Deborah L. Wince-Smith, president and CEO of the Council on Competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Northeastern University, under the strong leadership of President Aoun, for undertaking this important work. As discussions get underway in the House about renewing the Higher Education Act, it's important that we focus on approaches that generate value and produce excellent outcomes for students. As policymakers, understanding what the American people, education consumers, and employers want and need from our higher education institutions is vital. Northeastern's work in this area is a great contribution to the public dialogue. I urge all of my colleagues to take the time to review Northeastern's important effort.

HONORING INTERNATIONAL DAY
OF THE GIRL CHILD

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the second International Day of the Girl Child, which takes place on October 11. This day was designated by the United Nations General Assembly to promote girls' rights and shine light upon the discrimination and inequalities that girls suffer to this day.

In December 2011, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution to declare October 11 as the International Day of the Girl Child to "recognize girls' rights and the unique challenges girls face around the world."

The theme this year is "Innovating for Girls' Education" because education is the key to ensuring women's social and economic empowerment in this world. It leads to lower poverty, lower mortality rates, democratization, and fewer child marriages.

This is not just a far-away problem. American youth can take action now working to ensure that women's rights and girls' rights are a priority in our foreign policy and by advocating for educational opportunities for girls at home and around the world. Annie Gersh from Marlborough High School in Los Angeles is doing that now. She is on my Youth Advisory Board and was a teen advisor for Girl Up, a project of the UN Foundation. I am proud that Annie is a constituent, and I hope that she and other young people like her will continue their fight for girls' rights in America and around the globe.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHIEF GLENN
OLSON

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of Fire Chief Glenn Olson upon the occasion of his retirement from the Eastham Fire Department.

Chief Olson has given over 3 decades of invaluable service to his community. I know I speak for many when I say that his outstanding achievements are evident in his distinguished career as a Firefighter and Paramedic in both the Hyannis and Eastham Fire Departments. The Eastham department recognized his skill and value when they appointed him to Shift Lieutenant in 1987. Chief Olson continued to honorably protect the people of both Hyannis and Eastham for 13 years until he was chosen as Fire Chief of the Eastham Department. On November 1st of this year, Chief Olson will retire having spent thirteen years as Fire Chief.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Fire Chief Glenn Olson upon his retirement from Eastham Fire Department after thirty-three years and eleven months of invaluable service. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating him on this important occasion and in thanking him for all that he has done for his community.

IN RECOGNITION OF LOU CIAMPI,
SR. FOR BEING THE 2013 ITALIAN
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
LUZERNE COUNTY'S "PERSON OF
THE YEAR"

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lou Ciampi, Sr., who was selected "Person of the Year" by the Italian American Association of Luzerne County. Lou started his printing career over fifty years ago as a teenage apprentice in Pagnotti Coal's in-house print shop. After serving in the military and working in several shops in both Luzerne and Lackawanna counties, Lou joined the PA Hutchinson company in Scranton as a folder operator in the late 1960s. He quickly rose from bindery foreman to plant superintendent and was soon on the road as a salesman. His experience as a salesman fueled his entrepreneurial spirit, so he opened Lou's Bike Shop in the mid-seventies.

In January 1980, Lou and his partner Ted Heoffner founded Independent Graphics, Inc. At first, Lou did everything for Independent Graphics—he printed flyers, forms, stationery, and policies for Mr. Heoffner's American Independent Insurance Company. In 1984, Lou purchased the company from Mr. Heoffner.

Lou quickly made an impact on the Wilkes-Barre community by founding the Craftsman's Club. The club included printing owners and laborers, and provided a place where vendors

could share cutting edge ideas to improve the industry. Business blossomed and the company moved to a new facility in Port Blanchard, PA. By the turn of the millennium, Independent Graphics, Inc. offered everything from black ink on post cards to full color digital printing and wide format.

In 2002, Independent Graphics was named the Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce's small business of the year. When the New York Yankees moved their Triple A franchise to Scranton, Independent Graphics became their "play ball" printer, producing program books on third shift for the next day's game. Independent Graphics also sponsors the Scranton Chamber of Commerce's Momentum Magazine. "Our Impression Will Sharpen Your Image" is the company's motto, and Lou's company has improved the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre community's image for three decades. The company Lou built from the ground up now employs 27 people full time, working round the clock providing imaging services. In May 2013, Lou was inducted into the Junior Achievement Business Hall of Fame.

Over the last four decades, Lou has generously supported many local charities. He has donated services to numerous local little leagues, youth football teams, high school teams, cheerleading squads, and many others. In the 1970s, Lou was the president of the West Pittston Rams and the general manager of Greater Pittston Legion baseball. The American Heart Association and Garden Village Youth racing have also benefited from his generosity.

Lou is a graduate of West Pittston High School. He and his wife Marianne have been married for 51 years. They have four children: Louis, Jr., Michelle Reilly, Joseph and Jimmy. They are also blessed with six grandchildren. I convey my congratulations to Lou for being honored by his community.

RESOLUTION TO COMMEMORATE
INTERNATIONAL PLASMA
AWARENESS WEEK

HON. LYNN JENKINS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker:

Whereas October 13–20, 2013 marks International Plasma Awareness Week with observances throughout the United States and Europe designed to raise global awareness of the need for plasma to create lifesaving therapies, recognize the value that plasma donors contribute in saving and improving lives, and increase understanding of rare diseases and plasma protein therapies;

Whereas, plasma-derived therapies and recombinant blood clotting factors, collectively known as plasma protein therapies, are unique, biological products for which no substitutes or alternative treatments exist save and improve lives of individuals throughout the world;

Whereas, plasma protein therapies are used to treat bleeding disorders, primary immune deficiency diseases, alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency and certain rare, neurological disorders;

Whereas, these therapies are also used in emergency and surgical medicine to save and improve lives;

Whereas, plasma protein therapies have significantly improved the quality of life, markedly improved patient outcomes, and extended life expectancy for individuals with rare, chronic diseases and conditions;

Whereas healthy committed donors provide plasma essential to manufacture these life-saving therapies;

Whereas, there are over 400 plasma collection centers in the U.S. that have demonstrated their commitment to plasma donor and patient safety and quality by earning International Quality Plasma Program (IQPP) certification; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 113th Congress that October 13–20, 2013 is recognized as “International Plasma Awareness Week” in the United States of America.

INAUGURATION OF CHRIS
EISGRUBER AS PRESIDENT OF
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House the wise remarks of Dr. Hunter Rawlings, President of the Association of American Universities, delivered at the ceremony installing Dr. Christopher Eisgruber as President of Princeton University, September 22, 2013.

REMARKS OF DR. HUNTER RAWLINGS, PRESIDENT, ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES, FOR THE INAUGURATION OF CHRIS EISGRUBER AS PRESIDENT OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2013.

It is a great pleasure and privilege to be here for Chris's inauguration.

As a graduate alumnus, and longtime colleague of Bob Goheen, Bill Bowen, Harold Shapiro and Shirley Tilghman, and now Chris, I feel closely connected to this university, which has a unique place in higher education globally.

Let me begin my brief remarks with my favorite Princetonian, James Madison. When Madison finished his degree here in 1771, like many humanities majors today he did not know what to do with himself, so he asked President Witherspoon if he could spend an additional year studying Hebrew and theology with the president. Witherspoon said yes (Chris, I hope you will be open to such invitations from Princeton seniors), and Madison devoted a postgraduate year to pursuing more of the “useless knowledge” he had acquired previously. When that year was over, still at a loss for something to pursue, Madison committed what Americans today consider the ultimate sin: he went home to live with his parents. And he stayed there for four years, jobless and clueless about his future.

Today, the young Madison would be counted a failure, and his education would be condemned as worthless by many Governors and other public leaders. His post-graduation salary of zero would in turn count against Princeton's ledger when it comes to rating universities by the now-fashionable measure of the average salaries of their alumni shortly after graduation.

The current rage for reductionist metrics depends in turn upon a purely instrumentalist view of the purpose of higher education. Society wants universities to be instruments of its short-term will, and to abandon or at least to curtail their traditional role of giving students a broad and deep education that will last a lifetime.

This preoccupation with utilitarianism is a product of our success: America's research universities are so strong now, and so dominant globally, that governments, corporations and families are demanding many quick fixes from them: fast and cheap degrees and certificates, patents and jobs and economic development, mass education through online lectures, mass entertainment through intercollegiate sporting events, not to mention the current Beltway preoccupation, a fix for cyber security, and, that perennial Congressional fantasy, a biomedical cure for death.

To accede wholeheartedly to all these demands is to convert our universities fully into that most American of objects, a commodity. Many states are already proceeding in this direction by tying funding for their public universities to the average salaries of alumni 18 months after graduation, and our President has recently made such metrics a feature of his new plan for evaluating universities.

Accountability rules the day, but as Stanley Fish reminds us (the New York Times last month), metrics measure only what can be quantitatively valued and push everything else aside as irrelevant. “Everything else” comprises intellectual stimulation, moral and ethical insight, critical acumen, deep thinking about complex problems, sharpened intuition, immersion in human cultures, the urge to challenge received opinion, and similar intangible, ineffable, uncountable qualities. In other words, the qualities you need to be an educated person and an informed citizen capable and desirous of contributing to a democracy, the qualities you gain and hone at a great university.

I want to add one more item to the list of qualities engendered by great universities pursuing their fundamental mission: pleasure. We are so busy being utilitarians today that we derogate pleasure as an end in itself. And yet intellectual and aesthetic pleasure is an essential goal of higher education, one we omit at great cost and peril. Let me give two examples of what I mean. In 1870 Henry Cabot Lodge took a course at Harvard from Henry Adams. Here is what Lodge has to say about the difference that course made in his life:

In all my four years, I never really studied anything, never had my mind roused to any exertion or to anything resembling active thought until in my senior year I stumbled into the course in medieval history given by Henry Adams, who had then just come to Harvard. . . . [Adams] had the power not only of exciting interest, but he awakened opposition to his own views, and this is one great secret of success in teaching . . . I worked hard in that course because it gave me pleasure. I took the highest marks, for which I cared, as I found, singularly little, because marks were not my object, and for the first time I got a glimpse of what education might be and really learned something. . . . Yet it was not what I learned but the fact that I learned something, that I discovered that it was the keenest of pleasures to use one's mind, a new sensation, and one which made Mr. Adams's course in the history of the Middle Ages so memorable to me.

To teach students that it is a pleasure to use one's mind is our single most important

task at universities, I think, and it seems inescapable that we cannot measure how well we perform it. Instead of talking metrics, let's listen to another source of wisdom on intellectual pleasure, namely, Lionel Trilling.

. . . if we abandon the idea of literature as an independent, contemplative experience, as a pleasure, . . . if we continue to make it conform to philosophies of immediate ends, . . . and do not keep clear its own particular nature, we shall be contributing to the loss of two things of the greatest social value. Of these one is the possibility which art offers of an experience that is justified in itself, of nearly unconditioned living. Upon such experience, or even the close approach to it, we have learned to turn hostile faces: that is one of the strategic errors of our culture, for in the long run the possibility of such experience is a social necessity. The second thing we shall lose is the awareness—it is ultimately practical—which comes only from the single-minded contemplation of works that arise from the artist's own contemplation of events and objects; this is an awareness of the qualities of things. In the realm of art we call these qualities style, in the realm of morals we call them character, in the realm of politics we have no name for them but they are finally important. To these qualities, especially in times of crisis, society seems to be stolidly indifferent; actually they are, after survival, the great social concern.

We are in the age of big data, accountability, and hurry-up offenses. But long-term quality, not instant quantification, should be our concern in universities: helping our students gain “an awareness of the qualities of things” for a lifetime of personal pleasure and democratic contributions.

Intellectual contemplation and pleasure are, to put it mildly, not much in vogue these days, but they are clearly what Princeton gave to James Madison almost 250 years ago. Knowing Chris Eisgruber and his passion for intellectual engagement as the true measure of higher education, I have no doubt that Princeton will remain faithful to this central principle. And I wish him and all of you a lot of pleasure in its pursuit!

GREATER CARLISLE AREA CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Greater Carlisle Area Chamber of Commerce in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, which celebrated its 100th anniversary on October 10, 2013.

Founded in 1751, the borough of Carlisle is a historic community in south-central Pennsylvania. The Greater Carlisle Area Chamber of Commerce was founded in 1913 and serves to encourage economic growth and stability throughout the area. The Chamber takes on many roles vital to the prosperity of the borough including helping start and grow local businesses, planning and hosting networking and professional development events, and assisting tourists in exploring the town. They continue to be an important asset to this growing community.

Mr. Speaker, for 100 years the Greater Carlisle Area Chamber of Commerce has been a catalyst for economic growth in Carlisle, PA. Therefore, I commend all those who have served to improve their community as part of this important organization.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF
REVEREND LAWRENCE E. AKER III

HON. HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the achievements of Reverend Lawrence E. Aker III. During his years of service, Rev. Aker has ministered to thousands and worked tirelessly to improve the lives of all those he encountered. In honor of his tenth anniversary as pastor of Cornerstone Baptist Church, Rev. Aker was honored at a celebratory banquet on April 27, 2013 at Steiner Studios in Brooklyn, New York.

In 1917, Cornerstone Baptist Church was founded in Brooklyn, NY by a small group of forward minded individuals. Today, it is a thriving church of over 1,500 members with active boards, clubs, Sunday school programs, and choirs. In the last decade, Cornerstone Baptist Church has continued to thrive under the outstanding leadership of Rev. Aker. In order to meet the needs of his ever-growing parishioners, an additional Sunday service was added. By embracing technology, Rev. Aker has made his church more accessible to all who are called to worship. During his tenure, the church underwent extensive renovation to the exterior of the edifice. This beautification of the church was greatly celebrated by the community, lifting not just the congregation but all those in its vicinity. As a visionary, Rev. Aker plans to continue the church's enhancement through the renovation of the church's gym and community center.

His strong commitment to nurturing the next generation led to the creation of "Friday Nite Fire," a weekly bible study for youth and young adults. He also created the Women of the World (WOW) ministry, which offers spiritual guidance to women. Rev. Aker's reach extends outside the parish: I experienced this first hand as a member of the Assembly when we worked together to organize a community career fair at Cornerstone Baptist Church.

This past winter, I was privileged to accept the Martin Luther King, Jr. Award with the Reverend, given to us from the State of Israel and presented by Ambassador Ido Aharoni, Consul General of Israel in New York, for "spreading compassion and uniting communities of all backgrounds." As a life-long parishioner of Cornerstone, I could think of no higher honor than to be counted among his company.

Rev. Aker holds a Bachelor's degree in Communications from Howard University, a Master in Theology from Dallas Theological Seminary, a Master of Sacred Theology from Yale University, and is currently a Doctor of Philosophy candidate at Drew University.

Rev. Aker is an inspirational leader whose work would not have been possible without

the love and support of his wife Cynthia Aker and their devoted children. We thank his family for sharing him with us all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating Rev. Aker on his 10th pastoral anniversary. For his commitment to the people of Brooklyn, he is worthy of the highest praise.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALLEN CHAPEL AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 80th anniversary of Allen Chapel African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church of Asbury Park, New Jersey. Since its founding, Allen Chapel AME Church has provided outstanding spiritual guidance and outreach to the community.

Allen Chapel AME Church has grown structurally and in membership since its founding as a mission in 1933. First worshipping at a local Presbyterian Church temporarily, the founding committee acquired property and moved the mission to its permanent and current location in 1934. The congregation assisted in renovating and rebuilding the site to a house of worship, a study room, choir room, lecture room, kitchen and a large yard for outdoor events. Twenty-two years later, the church purchased another adjacent building to use as a parsonage. In 1960, design and construction began to replace the original church building with a new, modern church on the same site. Church leaders, congregants and friends volunteered to help with the demolition and rebuilding and the new church was completed in 1964. Less than 10 years later, the mortgage burning was celebrated.

Allen Chapel AME Church is dedicated to expanding its ministry, social action and community outreach. In 2012, it began a prayer line during the Lenten season that was eventually extended to a weekly occurrence. Allen Chapel AME Church also facilitated bringing Covenant House to Asbury Park, providing a haven to the homeless youth throughout the community.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in congratulating Allen Chapel AME Church on its 80th anniversary. Its dedicated service to its congregants and the greater Asbury Park community is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN A. WESTMORELAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 532, I was unable to cast my vote due to conflict which did not allow me to return to the floor in time to make the vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING THE ORGANIZERS OF THE LAC-MÉGANTIC BENEFIT CONCERT AND THE AREA FIRST RESPONDERS

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the people of Farmington, Maine, who continue to aid and assist the residents of their "sister city," the town of Lac-Mégantic, a small town located near the Canadian border.

Early on the morning of July 6, 2013, a train derailment and horrendous explosion devastated the center of this scenic lake-side town of 6,000 residents. 40 buildings were destroyed, 47 people lost their lives, 2,000 residents were displaced and countless lives were forever changed. The heroism of the local fire department aided by fire crews from the Franklin County towns of Chesterville, Eustis, Farmington, New Vineyard, Phillips, Rangeley and Strong helped to avert an even greater tragedy.

In rural Maine, people know what it means to be a good neighbor, and I am heartened by the outpouring of support that has come from the local communities. Four days after the tragedy, local business leaders and municipalities joined together to launch the Lac-Mégantic Relief Fund, a fundraising campaign to assist the town to recover from this disaster. At last report, over \$32,000 has been raised, and I know that this generosity will help the town through this difficult time.

On Saturday, October 12, 2013, a benefit concert will be held in the University of Maine at Farmington's South Dining Hall, and the community will host Lac-Mégantic's mayor, police chief and head of the Chamber of Commerce. I want to thank Farmington Selectman Ryan Morgan, the Wilton Selectmen, and Maine State Senator Tom Saviello for their hard work in organizing what will be a wonderful evening of entertainment, fellowship and solidarity.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring all of the first-responder heroes who responded to the Lac-Mégantic tragedy and those fellow Mainers who continue to support this community as it rebuilds and recovers.

IN THE BATTLE IN HONOR OF A REAL AMERICAN HERO SPC COREY GARMON BRONCO TROOP PLATOON THE UNITED STATES ARMY

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of one America's and one of Alabama's most heroic sons, and his family. SPC Corey Garmon of Boaz and the United States

Army. On July 11, 2012 while out on patrol in Kandahar Corey was almost killed in an IED blast. Losing both his legs and sustaining numerous other life threatening injuries he has battled back. Just recently he celebrated his alive date, marking the one year anniversary of brush with death. His lovely wife Megan has been by his side from the beginning, giving him the love and support to help bring him through these darkest of all nights. They are about to have their first child. We are not sure if this is blast related or not, but one of Alabama's brightest sons is a Gator fan. We hope in the coming years once he gets back home we can make him see the light. I submit this poem penned by Albert Caswell in honor of his valor and courage and his family's.

IN THE BATTLE
(by Albert Carey Caswell)

In ...
In The Battle!
All In The Fight!
There are but all of those who but bring their light!
Men of honor!
And Men of might!
Who so march off to war with hearts and souls of steel so very bright!
To leave behind all that they so love and adore!
As where they go,
Angels so fear to tread so for sure!
For no day is so promised all in war!
All in this darkest of dread all the more ...
As all around them the red blood flows and pours!
Where it's, one for all ... , and all for one!
A place to where fine hearts of Strength In Honor so run!
For these are America's greatest of all Daughters and Sons!
The Men and Women of Bronco Company,
who for all of us do what must so be done!
For they so live by a code!
As they so lock and load!
A Code of Honor!
A Code of Faith!
While, all around them such darkness waves!
As they so bravely stare death right in the face!
As upon each new morn as they awake,
not knowing if this is to be their last and final day!
While, thousands of miles away ...
their families now so cry and pray!
As they so ask our Lord,
to so let their loved ones live just one more day!
As somehow out into that darkness they make their ways!
To a way of honor!
To a way of faith!
To a way of courage,
that so makes the Angels pray!
As they do battle upon each new day!
As their families,
the tears in eyes they make!
And for all of those who upon battlefields of honor who've died!
It's for all of you and your families we now so cry
Because all in that Battle,
all of your promises you did so keep!
As you so pledged your fine lives away,
to all of your Brothers In Arms all in this bond which binds you so very deep!
For in The Battle,
there is something so magnificent of so to speak!
That Keeps Them Strong,
Them So Keeps!
That So Helps Them To So Fight On an On!

That which will not allow their most courageous hearts,
to so retreat!
All In This Battle,
This Battle Oh So Very Deep!
And one such Southern Son,
who to sweet home Alabama his fine heart so speaks!
Specialist Garmon,
whose heart so shines like the mid day sun!
This BO from BOAZ,
and he knows how to lock and load!
And so lives by such a code!
Who is but Army Strong!
Who all for his Country Tis of Thee,
his fine heart beats loud and long!
Who so came out of death to rebuild his life just like a song!
While, all in those moments between life and death ...
As upon him he could so feel but that hand of death!
As it was in that moment Corey,
when to yourself you so made a pledge!
To win this new battle that which to you this war had left!
With your two strong legs now gone,
your most courageous heart would crest!
As somehow it so helped you to move on only with what you had so left!
As it was Life or it was Death,
as you got up and out of the bed to our hearts catch!
All at speed,
as this Bama would not so rest, would not so heed!
For you had mountains to so climb!
And people to so inspire all in your time!
And a great wife named Megan,
so divine!
And with the help of your fine wife,
as she so stood by her man, so by your side!
As together you've so passed one of the greatest tests of time!
In our times, and in our lives ...
There are Battles that we must fight!
Will we so find the strength and the courage,
to somehow deep down inside all of our hearts to so nourish!
The strength to so find!
Or in a town called pity will we now so re-side,
and feel so sorry for our selves and begin to cry?
Or will we like Corey,
get up and so begin our climb?
All with hearts of courage full,
to once again to do Battle one more time!
For moments,
are all that we all so have!
To change the world!
To so make the good from out of the bad!
To make a difference with it all!
To so teach us!
To so beseech us!
To against all odds in the end still so standing tall!
But your not perfect Corey,
because you're one of the biggest Florida Gator fans of all!
I wonder if that sticks in coach SABANNNNN'S crawl?
Why you won't roll with The Tide at all?
I'm sorry Lou,
but out to this hero The Gator calls!
And when you get back to Bama,
there's work to be done!
We've got to get you to roll with The Tide,
or as a War Eagle fly high my son!
Corey my son,
you are just a young man!
But already,
look at what all in your short life what you have done!

More than most anyone!
And up ahead,
there's so much more for you my son!
Better to live life like a hero,
all in your most heroic sun!
Than to die in the darkness of a life,
of which nothing you have done!
Because, we will all die some day ...
but only heroes up in Heaven will so run!
For life is but a Battle,
that only with but hearts of courage full can so be won!
And Corey, you are one of America's and Alabama's ...
Most Heroic of all Sons
In life and in War ...
All In That Battle,
will we be the ones to so bravely march forth?
All in our most selfless quests, to ourselves to so ignore!
Is that not who Heaven is for?
Specialist Gorman,
you are a real American Hero so for sure!
For only The Few,
will In The Battle so march off to war to so answer that call!
And the last time I saw Specialist Gorman,
he was walking tall!

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following.

HONORING JOSEPH ACABA FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISPANIC COMMUNITY

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Joseph Acaba's inspiring career as an astronaut, hydrogeologist, serviceman, and an educator.

Mr. Acaba received his Bachelor's degree in Geology from the University of California, Santa Barbara and his Master's degree in Geology from the University of Arizona. Mr. Acaba was a Sergeant in the United States Marine Corps Reserves where he served for six years. He also worked as a hydrogeologist in Los Angeles, California.

Mr. Acaba spent two years in the United States Peace Corps and trained over 300 teachers in the Dominican Republic in modern teaching methodologies. He then served as Island Manager of the Caribbean Marine Research at Lee Stocking Island in The Exumas, Bahamas. Upon his return to the United States, Mr. Acaba moved to Florida where he became the Shoreline Revegetation Coordinator for Vero Beach. He also taught science and math at Melbourne High School and taught for four years at Dunnellon Middle School.

On May 6, 2004, Joseph Acaba became the first person of Puerto Rican heritage to be selected as an astronaut candidate by NASA. After completing training, Mr. Acaba was selected as an Educator Mission Specialist and assigned to the crew of space shuttle Discovery's mission which launched on March 15, 2009. Mr. Acaba, carried a Puerto Rican flag with him and requested that the crew be awakened on March 19 to the Puerto Rico

folklore song "Que Bonita Bandera." During his mission, Mr. Acaba performed a spacewalk that successfully unfurled the final "wings" of the solar array that will augment power to the International Space Station.

Mr. Acaba was also a crewmember aboard the Soyuz spacecraft which launched from Kazakhstan and docked with the International Space station in May of 2012. He and the crew spent 30 days at the International Space Station before returning to Earth on September 17, 2012.

Mr. Acaba has received numerous awards recognizing his accomplishments including the Ana G. Mendez University System Presidential Medal, an honorary Doctorate from the Polytechnic University of Puerto Rico, and recognition from the Senate of Puerto Rico.

I am happy to honor Joseph Acaba, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his contributions to the Hispanic community and his many achievements.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF LEO LAMOS

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Leo Lamos for his service to Florida's Ninth Congressional District.

Mr. Lamos is a tireless and devoted public servant who has continuously given back to his community. One of Central Florida's great music educators, Leo serves a crucial role in the south Orlando community as the Director of Bands at Cypress Creek High School. As a former student at Cypress Creek High School and later a student at the University of Central Florida, Leo has brought his talents and leadership to a community with which he is very familiar. Under his direction, Cypress Creek's band program has continued to uphold its tradition of excellence by bringing national attention to its burgeoning group of music students.

In order for public school bands to travel, perform and compete on a national level, involvement and sponsorship from the community is crucial. Encouraging partnerships and sponsorships from locally owned businesses, Mr. Lamos has been tireless in his efforts to create an unparalleled musical experience for his over 100 students. Mr. Lamos's efforts in mentoring and educating his students have produced promising young musicians that have gone on to study at the prestigious Manhattan School of Music and several other universities.

I am happy to honor Leo Lamos, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his dedication and service to the students of Florida's Ninth Congressional District.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF ELIAS "RICO" PICCARD

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Elias "Rico" Piccard for his service to our country and to my district.

Rico Piccard, born Elias Piccard, was born in Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico in 1946. In 1966, he left the island and relocated to New York City. A year later was drafted by the U.S. Army to serve during the Vietnam war. After his honorable discharge, Piccard attended the Hostos Community College in the Bronx, NY, where he graduated with an Associates of Arts degree and completed his Bachelor's Degree in Liberal Arts. He later went on to attend Columbia University, where he completed a Master's Degree in Social Work.

Piccard's career is characterized by his selfless dedication to help others. During his career he worked as a Social Worker for Volunteers of America and spent ten years working at the Montifiore Hospital in New York City's Rikers Island assisting inmates with mental health issues.

In 1994, Piccard left his position at Montifiore Hospital and moved to Orlando, FL. In Orlando, he became a community leader and helped organize multiple rallies and marches in the Hispanic community. In 2000, he started a new tourist transportation company called Rico Transportation.

Piccard began writing a column called "Rico Informa," Rico Informs, for Puerto Rico's El Nuevo Dia newspaper to describe issues affecting Puerto Ricans living in Central Florida. In 2009, Piccard helped create United Front 436, Frente Unido 436, a community organization formed by a group of neighbors concerned with the physical deterioration and lack of security in the east side of Orange County and Orlando.

I am happy to honor Elias "Rico" Piccard, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his tireless service to his community.

RECOGNIZING THE CULTURAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF PALMIRA UBINAS

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month to recognize Palmira Ubinas. Mrs. Ubinas has made invaluable contributions to the arts and Puerto Rican culture.

Mrs. Ubinas has mastered many art forms and uses them to represent her heritage and traditions as a Puerto Rican American. She currently serves as the President and Founder of the Hispanic Arts and Culture International Association (ALPEH), as well as the Co-Chair for the 500th Florida Discovery Council Round Table.

A native of Puerto Rico, Mrs. Ubinas received a Bachelor's Degree from the University of Puerto Rico in Psychology and Political Science. Later, she completed her post-graduate studies in Communications, Public Relations, and Hispanic Literature. Mrs. Ubinas has showcased the talents she obtained through her childhood in Puerto Rico and her university education in her various professional positions. As a journalist, event coordinator, editor, TV and radio host, Mrs. Ubinas has been able to represent her culture and heritage proudly. She has earned several awards and recognitions and served as the Educational Specialist and Commerce Development Officer for the Puerto Rico Federal Affairs Administration.

I am happy to honor Palmira Ubinas, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her continuous service to the arts and commitment to the Hispanic community.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MARYTZA SANZ

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the accomplishments of one of Orlando's true leaders, Marytza Sanz.

As founding President and CEO of Latino Leadership, Inc., Marytza Sanz has worked tirelessly to improve the quality of life of families in Central Florida. Through Latino Leadership, Mrs. Sanz has implemented social enrichment programs that incorporate leadership development and empowerment, education

advancement, and economic community development. Her contribution to our community has helped pave the way for young Hispanics to succeed and become leaders in their own right. Mrs. Sanz truly understands the need to invest in future generations.

Mrs. Sanz lends her expertise to the University of Central Florida President's Minority Advisory Board, the Homeless Coalition Board of Directors, and Florida Devereux Board of Directors. Her work in voter engagement and health education has received national and statewide coverage from media outlets such as CNN, Univision, Telemundo, the St. Petersburg Times, NPR News and the San Juan Star. Mrs. Sanz can be heard on her radio program, *Al Oído de la Comunidad*.

Mrs. Sanz is a leader and staunch supporter of minority representation. Her work to ensure fairly drawn electoral districts in Orange County has been celebrated in the Hispanic community. Ms. Sanz's work against voter suppression has helped protect the integrity of the democratic process in Central Florida and empower our citizens and families.

Before founding Latino Leadership, Mrs. Sanz worked for the Census Bureau and served as the Central Florida Hispanic Outreach Coordinator for the Gore/Lieberman campaign. More recently, Marytza Sanz was appointed by Governor Charlie Crist to serve on Florida's 2010 Statewide Complete Count Committee to ensure a comprehensive count of Florida's population during the 2010 Census.

I am happy to honor Marytza Sanz, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her accomplishments and service to the Central Florida Hispanic Community.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MARISSA SALAS

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Marissa Salas for her dedicated civic engagement.

Marissa is a leader in Central Florida who believes in equality and advocating for the rights of the LGBT community. She currently serves as the GLBT Statewide Caucus Campaign Director and President of the Rainbow Democrats of Orange County, Florida.

Marissa graduated with her Bachelor's Degree in Social Science and her Master's Degree in Urban Planning from Florida State University. During her career, she has served as a GIS Test Manager and Analyst for Geonetics, Inc. in Boston, MA, and as a Senior Project Director for Lopez and Cheung, Inc. in Tampa, FL.

Marissa has participated in several campaigns including as the Campaign and Political Director for John Alvarez in the 2012 Florida House of Representatives race in Brevard County. She is also the principle and owner of her own consulting firm, Marissa Salas Consulting. Her public policy research has been published by the New York Times, and used as reference material by the UCLA School of Law. Marissa has also received many awards, including the 2007 Civic Award from the Municipal League of King County.

I am happy to honor Marissa Salas, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for being a champion of equality and an inspiration to the Central Florida community.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MARIA ISABEL
BARAJAS-MARTINEZ

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize an amazing young woman named Maria Isabel Barajas-Martinez.

Maria was an active leader in the immigration reform movement since she was in high school. She graduated from Lake Region High School with high honors in 2009, where she was also the president of the National Spanish Honor Society. She went on to pursue her education at Polk State College and aspired to become a pediatrician. While attending Polk State College, Maria joined the local chapter of Students Working for Equal Rights. In May 2010 she founded a youth organization dedicated to community service called the Young American Dreamers.

With the help of her organization, Maria focused on raising funds to provide scholarships for high school students seeking a higher education. Maria and the Young American Dreamers committed themselves to helping their community. The Young American Dreamers adopted Lake Blue Park where they planted flowers and trees during its construction and participated in the yearly Martin Luther King Jr. parade in Winter Haven.

Maria was also a volunteer at Angels Care and at the Lakeland Regional Medical Center. Every year, she organized her friends and family to participate in the National Kidney Foundation "Kidney Walk" around Lake Hollingsworth. She was a mentor and tutor at Snively Elementary School and an active member of her church, Our Lady of Guadalupe Catholic Mission, where she was a member of the Youth Choir and Youth Group.

Although she was a U.S. Citizen by birth, Maria sympathized with the struggles of undocumented immigrants and dedicated her life to improving the lives of others. Until her untimely death in June of 2012, this outstanding young woman helped countless others through community service and activism.

I am happy to honor Maria Isabel Barajas-Martinez, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her selfless dedication to her community and her many accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF
MARIA PADILLA

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Maria Padilla, a champion of diversity within the Central Florida community.

Maria is a well-respected journalist and currently serves as the editor of Orlando's oldest Spanish-language weekly newspaper, La Prensa.

Maria graduated with a Bachelor's Degree in English from Rutgers University. She also has a certificate in Hispanic Marketing Communications from Florida State University and graduated from the Leadership Orlando class in Fall of 2013. Maria broke new ground as a senior reporter covering diversity in Central Florida for the Orlando Sentinel in 1997. She later launched and headed El Sentinel, a new Spanish-language weekly newspaper and website. Maria also created Viviendo, a bilingual quarterly magazine. Her blog, Orlando Latino, was nominated best Latino blog in Central Florida by LATISM (Latinos in Social Media).

Maria has received numerous awards and acknowledgements for her contributions as a successful journalist. She received the National Association of Hispanic Publications award for a Multiple Series Article, was recognized multiple times for her work with the Orlando Sentinel, and was a finalist in the Knight-Wallace journalism awards. Maria is also a founding member of the National Association of Hispanic Journalists and was elected twice to their national Board of Directors.

I am happy to honor Maria Padilla, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her contributions to journalism and dedication to informing the Hispanic community on issues impacting their daily lives.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF
LETICIA DIAZ

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great leader in the Central Florida community.

A native of New Jersey, Leticia Diaz is one of the founding faculty at Barry University's Andreas School of Law and currently serves as Dean there. Before joining the full-time faculty, Dean Diaz pursued a full-time law practice while teaching part-time at the school. She practiced in the areas of personal injury, toxic torts, and workplace chemical exposure.

Dean Diaz attended law school at Rutgers University where she received the Merck Patent Scholarship and was recognized for academic achievement by the Association of Latin American Law Students. Before entering law school, she received her Ph.D. in organic chemistry from Rutgers University. She also spent two years as a post-doctoral research chemist at Hoffman-LaRoche, where she primarily worked on the synthesis of anti-HIV compounds.

Dean Diaz teaches in the areas of torts, environmental law, toxic torts, and product liability. She is faculty advisor to the Hispanic Association of Law Students as well as the St. Thomas More Society. Her publications range from analysis of the FDA's role in consumer protection to environmental law and consumer health.

Dean Diaz invites leaders from around the country to the Central Florida area to discuss the important issues of the day. She also convenes meetings and events that bring together varying perspectives on issues that affect the Central Florida community. Central Florida is a better place for the leadership that Dean Diaz has provided.

I am happy to honor Leticia Diaz, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her service and her work to educate, train, and inspire the leaders of tomorrow.

IN RECOGNITION OF SAM
FALCONE, SR. FOR RECEIVING
THE 2013 "LIFETIME ACHIEVE-
MENT" AWARD FROM THE
ITALIAN AMERICAN ASSOCIA-
TION OF LUZERNE COUNTY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Sam Falcone, Sr., who re-

ceived the 2013 Italian American Association of Luzerne County "Lifetime Achievement" Award. Sam has dedicated nearly 60 years to his family's local business, Falcone Beverage Co., which his father started along with Sam and his brothers, Raymond, Charles, Carmen, Leonard and Angelo.

Throughout his life Sam has been an outstanding American and active citizen in his community. He was one of the original founders of the Luzerne County Sports Hall of Fame and its first president. He has been involved with an array of charities including the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, YMCA, the American Red Cross, and he served on the board of the American Lung Association. He worked with many professional organizations such as the Better Business Bureau, the Chambers of Commerce in Wilkes-Barre, Scranton and the Greater Pittston Area, and he served as the vice-president of the Malt Beverage Distributing Association. Sam also actively worked to preserve the resources within his community by taking part in the Susquehanna River Watch and the Rails-to-Trails Riverfront Revitalization Committee.

Sam has lived in the city of Pittston his whole life and has devoted himself to the welfare of his hometown. A practicing Catholic, Sam attends St. Joseph Marelo Parish and is a Fourth Degree Member of the Knights of Columbus Council 372, Pittston. He also served on the Pittston Child Development Center's Advisory Council. Recently, Sam had the honor of being the Grand Marshal of the Pittston's annual Tomato Festival Parade. Today, I am proud to recognize Sam Falcone, Sr.'s lifetime of achievement and service to his community.

RECOGNIZING PLEASANTON CITY
COUNCIL MEMBER ABRAHAM
SAENZ, JR.

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pleasanton City Council Member Abraham Saenz, Jr. for his 30 years of service to the city of Pleasanton and to the state of Texas.

Councilman Saenz, a Pleasanton native, is a remarkable and highly respected member of the community who has dedicated his career to promoting the quality of life for all residents of Pleasanton. First elected in 1983, Mr. Saenz has served the community as a Member, and now Senior Member, of the Council of Pleasanton.

During his tenure Mr. Saenz has been instrumental in implementing many city projects. Some of the most important include: paving roads throughout his district and other areas of the city, preparing the city to have an ample water supply for the next 50 years, improving infrastructure in the areas of drainage and wastewater collection, facilitated the construction of a sports complex for youth, and the construction of a new City Hall, Police Headquarters, Public Works Facility, Library, and

Civic Center. More recently Mr. Saenz represented Pleasanton in Economic Issues with Atascosa County and has been at the forefront of planning initiatives to accommodate the exponential growth of the city due to Eagle Shale Oil and Gas Play.

Not only has Mr. Saenz held an esteemed and honorable career in the Council, he has devoted his life to his family, community, and country. After attending Pleasanton High School, Mr. Saenz joined the United States Air Force in 1952. While in the Air Force, Mr. Saenz fought in the Korean war and was honorably discharged in 1956. Upon his return to Pleasanton Mr. Saenz began working as a barber, becoming the sole proprietor of the City Barber Shop in 1971. In 1961 he married Ermelinda Gomez Saenz with whom he now has 5 children, 6 grandchildren, and 4 great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored and pleased to have had this time to recognize Councilman Abraham Saenz Jr. on his career and community involvement. He has contributed his time, knowledge, and efforts to his community.

SERGEANT PATRICK C. HAWKINS

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Army Ranger Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins from Carlisle, Pennsylvania who was killed in action on October 6, 2013 in Afghanistan.

Sgt. Hawkins was on his fourth tour in Afghanistan and serving as a rifleman, gun team leader and Ranger team leader when he was killed by an Improvised Explosive Device in Kandahar Province. He was tending to another wounded Army Ranger when he died.

Sgt. Hawkins graduated from Carlisle High School in 2007 and went on to spend three years studying culinary arts part-time at Harrisburg Area Community College before enlisting in 2010. He is survived by his wife Brittanie, of Lansing, Kansas, and his parents, Roy and Sheila Hawkins, of Carlisle.

Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Hawkins was clearly following part of the Army Ranger creed which says "I will never leave a fallen comrade" when he gave his life for our country. Therefore, for his dedicated service and sacrifice to protect our great Nation, I commend Army Ranger Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins.

RECOGNIZING MS. KRISTIN BECK
FOR HER COURAGE AND SERVICE
TO THE NATION

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Ms. Kristin Beck, a decorated U.S. Navy SEAL who not only spent 20 years fighting for her country in uniform, but is now leading the charge for equal rights for transgender Americans. During the

course of her distinguished military career, Kristin was known as Chris Beck, and served through 13 deployments in Bosnia, Iraq, and Afghanistan, including seven combat deployments, before retiring and coming out as the first openly transgender Navy SEAL. From fighting terrorists overseas to knocking down gender barriers at home, she is a true patriot and source of inspiration.

At the age of five, the young Chris Beck knew that he was different, being drawn to his sisters' feminine clothes and toys. The son of socially conservative, dogmatically religious farmers, however, he was sent to a Christian school operated by televangelist Jerry Falwell and pushed into traditional masculine roles, such as playing football and riding motorcycles. Fifteen years later, Chris found his calling with the SEALs, the Navy's elite special operations force. He proved himself to be a courageous and much respected hero, while developing the deep bonds of brotherhood with his fellow SEALs. In between missions, though, when Chris had a little time to himself, he could not help but dress in women's clothes. Over the next two decades, he went on to serve on a tour with the counter-terrorism unit known as SEAL Team Six, famous for its harrowing missions and rescues, and earned the Bronze Star with "V," the Purple Heart, and other numerous honors.

In 2011, Chris retired from the military and embraced his true feminine identity as Kristin Beck. She started undergoing hormone therapy and physically transforming herself into a woman. With this metamorphosis came the decision to officially come out to the world. It began with replacing her LinkedIn profile picture with one of her dressed as a woman, and changing her name from "Chris Beck" to "Kristin Beck." On February 9, 2013, Kristin officially came out to the military in a press release, in which she stated that she "respectfully remained silent regarding her gender identity" during the era of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" and deeply desired to be "afforded the freedom to live in a manner consistent with her life-long gender awareness as a female."

With the pain of shrapnel, broken bones, and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) as reminders of a life of extraordinary military service, Kristin agreed to participate in a study of "resilience" by Dr. Anne Speckhard, a Washington-area psychologist and adjunct professor at Georgetown University Medical Center. An expert in the psychology of terrorism, Dr. Speckhard wanted to study how service members draw upon coping mechanisms to integrate the stresses and exhilarations of combat with their workday lives back home. What she found was the disjointed story of a woman coming into her own following a lifetime of military service and societal pressures. After more than 100 hours of interviews that often resembled psychotherapy, Kristin and Dr. Speckhard co-authored the book *Warrior Princess: A U.S. Navy SEAL's Journey to Coming Out Transgender*.

Kristin has embarked upon perhaps the greatest mission of her life: self-actualization. Since her return to civilian life, she has worked tirelessly to raise awareness of the issues affecting both the transgender community and veterans. Kristin works closely with Healing Grounds, the non-profit organization

she founded to support returning Iraq and Afghanistan veterans. Healing Grounds lends therapeutic help to them by providing specialized training in landscaping and gardening to build a place of tranquility in their own backyards. In addition, she has two teenage boys from a previous marriage, and works as a Pentagon consultant.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Kristin Beck for her outstanding bravery and service to our nation. All her life, she has selflessly put duty and country ahead of her own needs. Kristin's story reminds us of the many daily struggles faced by transgender Americans and veterans alike, including the continued discrimination faced by transgender service members who must hide their identities in order to serve in the military. As she continues working to advance lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) equality and address the needs of veterans, I remain an ally in Congress and wish her the very best in her new life's mission.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 90TH
BIRTHDAY OF OSCAR JACKSON
MOONEY, JR.

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to honor Oscar Mooney, Jr., a distinguished Alabama veteran, on his 90th birthday.

Mr. Mooney was born on December 2, 1923 at home in Weogufka, Alabama. In 1943, Mr. Mooney enlisted in the U.S. Army and served as a sergeant in the 16th Armored Division. The 16th Armored Division was instrumental in the liberation of Pilsen, Czechoslovakia. Mr. Mooney has received the WWII Victory Medal, the American Service Medal, the European-African-Middle Eastern Service Medal with one bronze star and the Good Conduct Service Medal. This long list of accomplishments highlights the bravery with which Mr. Mooney has lived his life.

On July 21, 1950, Mr. Mooney married Jeannette Rodgers. Together they have two children, Roger Emory Mooney and Emma Elizabeth Mooney Fielding. They also have 4 grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

After 18 years of working full-time for the Kimberly Clark Corporation, Mr. Mooney retired to work full-time on their farm, the Mooney Home Place.

Mr. Speaker, please join me and Mr. Mooney's family in celebrating 90 years of Mr. Mooney's life, and please join me in thanking him for his outstanding service to our nation.

RECOGNIZING TULLYTOWN BOROUGH
POLICE CHIEF PATRICK
PRIORE

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a career of service to the

community of Tullytown Borough by Police Chief Patrick Priore.

Chief Priore retired from the force at the end of August after serving more than 15 years as chief and nearly 24 years with the department overall.

The Chief's commitment to the people of Lower Bucks County was well known and widely respected. His dedication to protecting the people of his region continued even after he was seriously injured in the line of duty in May of 2009—an injury that forced him into an early retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Chief Priore for many years. A law enforcement professional of the highest integrity, Pat has been a good friend and confidant to me and an abiding influence on his officers and community. Most of all, he is a great father and husband. These traits are being passed through Pat's family and in to the community that has been privileged to have been blessed with his leadership, courage and faithful commitment to service.

While Chief Priore may no longer be the head of the Tullytown Borough Police Department, we still recognize and honor his service and sacrifice today and wish him the best during his retirement.

I thank you; the people of Tullytown thank you.

CONGRATULATING HONDA
MANUFACTURING OF INDIANA

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Honda Manufacturing of Indiana on celebrating their fifth anniversary of mass production. Honda's Indiana facility is located in Greensburg, in my congressional district.

On October 9, 2008, Honda opened their seventh North American auto assembly plant in my hometown of Greensburg, Indiana. The facility has grown to employ over 2,000 associates and has been a valued asset for the economy of Greensburg and Southeastern Indiana. Each vehicle produced at the Greensburg facility contains about 900 parts from hundreds of suppliers, many of them in Indiana, Ohio, Michigan and Kentucky. In 2011 alone, Honda spent \$16 billion with suppliers, supporting good jobs throughout the region. To-date more than 650,000 vehicles have rolled off the Greensburg facility production line. These include the Civic Sedan, Civic Natural Gas, and the Acura ILX.

I ask the entire Sixth Congressional District to join me in congratulating Honda Manufacturing of Indiana on this milestone. Their leadership and economic impact on our state has been invaluable. On a personal note, I am very appreciative of the impact Honda has had on my hometown of Greensburg and the Decatur County community at large. Honda Manufacturing of Indiana is a great community partner, and I look forward to celebrating many more milestones in the future.

IN HONOR OF MISSIONARY KATHERINE CASH GRIFFEY'S 80TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a special tribute to an outstanding evangelist, life coach, minister, nurse, missionary and all-around phenomenal woman, Evangelist Katherine Cash Griffey, who will be celebrating her 80th birthday on Saturday, October 12, 2013, at the Crowne Plaza Atlanta Perimeter at Ravinia in Atlanta, Georgia.

Missionary Katherine Cash Griffey was born on October 18, 1933, in Atlanta, Georgia to the late Mr. Robert Cash, Sr., and the late Mrs. Mary Jane Moss. The first of five children, she lived with her parents in the home of her grandparents, Rev. Lewis Woods and Missionary Irene Woods, who had founded Rome Church of God in Christ. Surrounded by religion, she was raised in the Christian Pentecostal Faith. Missionary Woods anointed her at birth, baptized her in the church at one year old and instilled in her a mindset of "Holiness is Right." Missionary Woods also showed by example that a pure, righteous, and true walk in life is the one taken on God's Path.

Mother Woods passed away when Evangelist Griffey was nine, but not before leaving her with these final words that she carries with her to this day, "You are to do great things for the Lord, and to be about His mission in your life." After Evangelist Griffey's grandmother passed, her mother suffered a nervous breakdown, her father joined the Army and the children were separated, each going to live with other family.

Evangelist Griffey went to live with her aunt, who had fifteen children, nine of whom lived in the home, so she never had her own bed in which to sleep. Her world torn apart, Evangelist Griffey became very ill and depressed, leading her to become inactive in the church.

Missionary Griffey attended Wesley Avenue Elementary School-Atlanta Public School System until her father took her and her brother to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where she attended and graduated from Westinghouse High School.

After graduation, Evangelist Griffey returned to Atlanta where she met her husband, Joseph Griffey. They began attending Antioch East Baptist Church, where she joined the Usher Board. The Rev. E.W. Lumpkin noticed her and called her in to tell her, "You have something to do. The Lord is trying to speak to you." This was a pivotal moment in Evangelist Griffey's life.

Encouraged by her pastor to accept a call to minister for God, Evangelist Griffey moved to Jacksonville, Florida, where she scrubbed floors while attending the Duval School of Nursing to earn her license as an LPN. She matriculated in the Zeta Van Gibson School of Theological Studies to better understand how she could fulfill the calling that God placed in her life. In 1967, she graduated with her License in Religious Bible Doctrine, Pages in Healing and Spiritual Advising and Teaching

and simultaneously, the Spirit of God laid upon her heart the need to start The St. Katherine's Prayer Band at her home in Jacksonville, Florida. Then in 1969, while in constant prayer, Missionary Griffey made the decision to move back to Atlanta and continue her ministry with the Prayer Band.

In April 1982, Missionary Griffey purchased her current home and welcomed the Lord and the Prayer Band inside. The Prayer Band's services were held every second Sunday and every Thursday Night in the "Prayer Room" of the house. A debt-free Missionary Griffey was then led by God to mortgage her home and add the money to the funds that had already been raised to purchase a church building. Finally, on August 9, 1989, the church's first home at 1153 Ormewood Avenue was purchased with cash and officially named and registered as The St. Katherine's C.O.G.I.C., Inc. Through divine intervention and a developer as a benefactor, the church was able to relocate to a larger facility on Covington Highway, where it continues to flourish to this day.

Missionary Griffey has achieved much in her life, but none of this would have been possible without the love and support of her husband, Joseph, two sons, Joel and Jonathan, and her beautiful granddaughter, Brittani. Missionary Griffey has reared her family on the faith and belief that "Keeping God first will allow you to get far in life; Prayer without ceasing."

In her eighty years, Missionary Katherine Griffey has endured many tests and trials, but she has survived them all and has come out stronger for it. She has survived sickness, heartbreak, ridicule, and scorn. She has been shot and her office was fire bombed. She has overcome colorectal cancer, heart valve replacement surgery, and 10 hospitalizations since 2006. Although the load may seem heavy, she knows that the Lord would never give us more than we could bear. Through it all, her sturdy faith in the Lord was never shaken and her mission to win souls for Christ never ceased. She has come a long way from the malnourished child with severe asthma to a strong pillar firmly grounded in the Lord.

Always pressing towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus, to better improve the craft of Christian ministry and discipleship, Missionary Griffey has helped to shape the lives of many, including Members of Congress, Governors, Mayors, state politicians, foreign leaders, ministers, and lawyers, among others, by means of counseling, prayer, service, and support. She has had a tremendous impact in my own life and I am forever grateful for her counsel, guidance, and wisdom. She is truly a nurturer at heart and she loves everyone purely and genuinely with both her soul and with the love of Jesus.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me, my wife Vivian, and well wishers all across the world in paying tribute to Missionary Katherine Cash Griffey. Ephesians 4:11-12 says, "So Christ himself gave the apostles, the prophets, the evangelists, the pastors and teachers, to equip his people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up." Evangelist Griffey embodies every one of these roles and we are so blessed that she was put here on this Earth to do so much for so many for so long.

THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF REVEREND DR. CLARENCE NORMAN, SR.

HON. HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the achievements of Reverend Dr. Clarence Norman, Sr. During his 60 years of service, Rev. Norman has ministered to tens of thousands and worked tirelessly to improve the lives of all those he encountered. In honor of his six decades of service to our community, Rev. Norman was honored at a celebratory banquet on Saturday, April 6, 2013 at Russo's on the Bay in Howard Beach, New York.

In 1953, he helped found the First Baptist Church of Williamsburg located in Brooklyn, New York, which later relocated to the Crown Heights neighborhood. Shortly after the church's founding, he was ordained as pastor. Today, the First Baptist Church of Crown Heights has a congregation of over 2,000 people.

In addition to his ministry at the First Baptist Church of Crown Heights, Rev. Norman has been dedicated to improving housing and education in the community.

Rev. Norman's commitment to education is evidenced by his own academic achievements: he received a Bachelor of Arts from Bloomfield College, and a Master of Divinity and Doctorate in Religion from Howard University. The importance of education was imparted to the youth he mentored and taught. He served as the Director of the John Edward Bruce Day Care Center and Dean and Assistant Principal of the Whitelaw Reid Junior High School. Additionally, he taught social studies at the Nathaniel Macon Junior High School.

In 1987, Rev. Norman founded the Local Development Corporation of Crown Heights, which has developed over 800 housing units for senior citizens and low-income families.

He has received numerous honors and awards including the 1969–1970 Parish Ministry Fellowship by the Fund for Theological Education and the First Annual Ecumenical Award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews. In 2002, he was honored by Ebony Magazine as a "great black father." Rev. Norman is an inspirational leader whose work would not have been possible without the love and support of his wife Ellen Norman and their devoted five children. We thank his family for sharing him with us all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating Reverend Norman on his 60th pastoral anniversary. For his commitment to the people of Brooklyn and to his service of those less fortunate, he is worthy of the highest praise.

TEXAS' OLDEST ACTIVE LAWMAN—LOCAL LEGEND LIEUTENANT TOM MORGAN

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, no one brings meaning to the phrase "Don't mess with Texas" more than our lawmen. Every once in awhile, when I have the chance to escape from the Devil City, I get together with what I call the "Poe-leece". The Poe-leece are a group of my friends in the Texas law enforcement community. I have been friends with most of them since my days on the bench. When we all get together we like to exchange "war stories". The most seasoned veteran of them all is a man named Tom Morgan.

Tom Morgan is the oldest active lawman in Texas. This year Tom turned 93 years young. I first met Tom 25 years ago at the North Harris County Criminal Justice Association breakfast meeting in Humble. This sprightly veteran still has the same passion for our country and our military that he did the day he enlisted. Tom served three tours of duty, but that is not the only remarkable part of his career.

Tom was born on September 20, 1920, in Bossier City, Louisiana, about twenty miles from the Texas border. He was a child of the Great Depression and grew up very poor. His town was very patriotic, especially since it was home to Barksdale Air Force Base.

When World War II began, Tom was just 21 years old. He answered his country's call of duty to serve and joined the U.S. Marines. During this time, the United States' first major offensive was launched against Japan in the Guadalcanal. Japan was trying to solidify its stronghold on the Island of Guadalcanal, because of its closeness to Australia. The Japanese had built an airfield and had about 8,500 men on the island. Tom's first tour was in Guadalcanal, in the Solomon Islands, in August 1942. Sergeant Tom Morgan and the Marine Corps—members of the Greatest Generation—secured the airfield and killed half the Japanese force. But the fierce fighting took three months. Conditions were harsh for our warriors—thick jungle, heavy rainfall, swamps, mud, mountainous terrain and a determined enemy. The Japanese sent in reinforcements during the "Tokyo Express"; 4,000 of the enemy reached land. However, by February 1943, the U.S. marines took control of the island. Tom's unit played a pivotal part in the Battle of Guadalcanal. Over 1,500 American warriors were killed in action and 4,000 injured; thousands contracted malaria—including Sergeant Tom Morgan. Tom later recalled that malaria had put him near death.

He rested as much as he could and took the little yellow pill, Atabrine, which doctors prescribed. In the summer of 1944, Tom was sent to fight in the Battle of Saipan. Marines go where others fear to tread, and they fight for all American freedoms. They landed on the beaches of Saipan with a goal of gaining a crucial air base from which they could launch B-29 bombers. The Battle of Saipan was fierce and bloody; the enemy put up barbed wire along beaches and dug trenches to trap and ambush the marines.

Our boys laid claim to the beachheads inch by bloody inch. Nearly 30,000 Japanese soldiers died trying to defend the island and 3,426 Americans were killed with 13,000 wounded. On July 8, 1944, the United States flag was raised in victory over Saipan, and Tom survived his second major battle.

Less than a year later, Tom was sent to fight in the Battle of Okinawa, referred to as Operation Iceberg. This battle was the first time that U.S. troops fought on Japanese soil and it would be the bloodiest. Tom and the Marines were on board a transport ship Easter Sunday morning, 1945, eating breakfast in the mess hall when an enemy plane hit the ship. Water began filling up the mess hall and Tom thought he was going to meet his maker. However, the man above had different plans for Tom. The hatch flew open and he was able to escape. The marines went on to land in Okinawa. The battle lasted 82 days and was referred to as "typhoon of steel". American casualties were the highest experienced in any campaign against the Japanese. Battle casualties for the Japanese were 49,151, of which 12,520 were killed or missing and 36,631 wounded. Marine losses, including those of the Tactical Air Force, were 2,938 killed and missing and 13,708 wounded. On June 22, 1945, the United States flag was raised in victory over Okinawa and Tom survived his third battle.

Not many Americans fought in all three battles of Guadalcanal, Saipan and Okinawa. Tom remained in the Marines until 1946 and continued his service in the Reserves; he even served three months in the Korean war. After the war, Tom enrolled at the University of Louisiana to pursue his degree in mechanical engineering. During that same year, he decided to pay a visit to an old friend in Houston, Texas. It was there he met a Texas beauty; her friends called her Pat. Tom told me he fell in love with Pat at first sight. He immediately decided to move to Texas, transferred to the University of Houston, and married Pat the following year. He finished college, became a pipeline engineer and designer and began a family. He and his wife, Pat, raised three children in their home in Pasadena, Texas. He retired from Gulf Interstate Engineering in 1982, at the age of 62.

Now this is where I would normally say, "And that's just the way it is." But, Tom's story is not over. Ten years after retirement, Tom decided to join the Harris County Sheriff's Office Reserve Command. At first, Pat was not too happy. He told Pat he was tired of following her around the grocery store and that he needed to be busy. So at the age of 72, he graduated from the Harris County Sheriff Office Academy and became the oldest rookie.

Today, Lieutenant Tom Morgan is assigned to the HCSO Marine Division where he patrols the waters of Lake Houston, San Jacinto River and the Ship Channel. Once a Marine, always a Marine. As a reserve deputy he works at least 500 hours a year. He conducts boat safety inspections and boat stops to enforce all aspects of boating law.

For 21 years, he has put on the badge and a gun to protect and serve the people of Harris County that he loves. He patrols the Ship Channel, where he works closely with Homeland Security at the Port of Houston.

Retire? Not Tom. Again, let me remind you. Tom is 93 years old. Tom is the oldest lawman in Texas.

In 2008, Tom's Texas beauty, Pat, passed away. Tom and Pat were married for 61 years. It's been five years since her passing; Tom told me not a day goes by that he doesn't miss his Pat. He says it's good for him to stay busy: working, volunteering at his church, spending time with his three children who all live in the Houston area and enjoying his grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

Ronald Reagan best summed it up when he said, "Some people spend an entire lifetime wondering if they made a difference. The Marines don't have that problem." And Tom definitely does not have that problem.

Soon, Sheriff Adrian Garcia of Harris County, Texas, will recognize Lieutenant Tom Morgan with the Lifetime Achievement Award. A fitting honor for a remarkable man. Semper Fi! Oooh Rah! Marine and Texas Lawman—Tom Morgan.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING CC YIN OF SOLANO
COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. CC Yin, who is being honored by the Asian American Bar Association of Solano County for his countless contributions to his community.

Mr. Yin's life exemplifies the "American Dream" that many immigrants have when they come to America. Mr. Yin arrived in America 48 years ago with no English language skills and very little money in his pocket. He worked his way through college to earn a degree in Engineering. After a successful career as a civil engineer, his entrepreneurial spirit drove him to seek an opportunity to own a McDonald's franchise. Along with his wife and two daughters, Mr. Yin owns one of the largest McDonald's franchises in the country, with 28 franchises in 11 cities. They have received national and international accolades for their successes.

CC Yin and his family have embraced the McDonald's motto of giving back and investing in the community. The Yins are active in numerous civic organizations and give generously to many charitable causes throughout their community.

Above all, Mr. Yin has invested his personal energy and resources to build the non-profit organization, Asian Pacific Islander Public Affairs Association (APAPA). The goals of the organization are to promote the importance of political awareness and civic engagement for Asian Americans and new Asian immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, CC Yin has dedicated his life and resources to the betterment of all peoples in Solano County. It is therefore appropriate that we honor Mr. Yin today and wish him well in his future endeavors.

CELEBRATING THE GROUND-
BREAKING OF THE GATEHOUSE

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to announce and celebrate the ceremonial groundbreaking for The Gatehouse, a truly transformative community for women in difficult situations, which will occur soon on October 16, 2013, in Grapevine, Texas.

The Gatehouse will be a unique community of transitional housing for women (and their children) coming out of abusive, impoverished, or other challenging situations. Gatehouse will be an entire suburban neighborhood complete with new houses of various sizes, a community center for counseling and events, a general store, a clothing boutique, and plenty of beautiful open green space. In addition to the physical amenities, Gatehouse is extraordinary because of its Independent Life Program—a two and one-half year program of practical and emotional assistance to ensure that women and families at Gatehouse are not just shuttled through life but make a positive long-term life transformation. The Independent Life Program at Gatehouse is also faith-based, though it does not affiliate with any particular church or take government funding, and is purely funded by generous private donors.

Gatehouse was founded by Lisa Rose and grew out of projectHandUp. In 2008, projectHandUp began as a group providing wisdom, hope, and practical resources to abused women at monthly "First Friday" meetings. Their first meeting drew 169, and they now are attended by 350 to 1,000 people. Financial assistance was also made available in some cases to those in need. Over a period from 2011 to 2012, a group of women from the project worked with the Grapevine City Council to develop the idea for Gatehouse, and approval was granted on August 21, 2012.

In June of this year, work began on the roads and infrastructure for The Gatehouse. The groundbreaking ceremony will occur on October 16. The community is expected to open in the Fall of 2014 with the first neighborhood, Phase I, providing 24 units. At Gatehouse, great importance will be placed on healthy and compassionate relationships within the community in order to foster a sense of dignity and lasting improvement in women's lives. I commend the good work done by those who are laboring to make The Gatehouse a reality and look forward to seeing the success of their mission to provide women with a "hand up."

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating the groundbreaking of The Gatehouse in Grapevine, Texas.

BENITO A. TRANGUCH

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Benito A. Tranguch, an outstanding member of the UNICO Hazleton, Pennsylvania Chapter.

A lifelong resident of the area, Mr. Tranguch served as the president of the UNICO Hazleton Chapter from 2002–2005. UNICO is the largest Italian American organization in the United States. Members seek to improve their communities by providing assistance to area and national charities through fundraisers and donations. Additionally, they strive to honor and educate others about their Italian culture and ethnic heritage.

Mr. Tranguch's commitment to the community does not end with his service to UNICO. He is an active member of the Men of Malvern, the Hazleton Quarterback Club, Hazleton Community Concerts, Hazleton Gourmet, and the Queen of Heaven Church, where he serves on the Financial Committee and as an usher. He supports the Muscular Dystrophy Association (MDA), the Committee to Help Handicapped Infants and Parents Succeed (CHHIPS) and the United Rehabilitation Services (URS). Mr. Tranguch was also awarded V.I.P. of the year from the Helping Hands Society.

Mr. Speaker, for his dedicated service to both his Italian heritage and our community, I commend Benito A. Tranguch, an outstanding member of the UNICO Hazleton, Pennsylvania Chapter.

ENDING THE REPUBLICAN
GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, today is the 11th day of the government shutdown, with 800,000 government employees still out of work, including 1,400 of my constituents, due to this reckless, irresponsible and high-risk venture of House Republicans. \$12.5 million is being lost every hour in work and services the government is unable to perform. Thousands of small businesses and startups—the backbone of America's economy—are without SBA's guaranteed loans and regulatory approval. And the latest estimate from the Treasury is that if Congress doesn't vote to raise the debt ceiling by October 17th there is a virtual guarantee that our economy and the global economy could implode.

Let's recall how we arrived here as we reach the end of the second week of this government shutdown. It all began when House Republicans insisted that the Affordable Care Act be repealed in order to win their votes to keep the government functioning.

This non-starter demand has now bled into the debt ceiling debate and mutated into a litany of others: offshore oil drilling permits; ending "net neutrality" policies; approving the

Keystone XL pipeline; defunding the 2010 Wall Street reform law; and piecemeal funding of popular government programs. If I were to try to explain this to small children, I'd say it's as if Harry Potter overdosed on polyjuice potion.

What I can only expect next from House Republicans is something we'd find in a children's fantasy book, which is meaningless in the real world. It's meaningless for the millions of Americans the government shutdown affects, and the low-income mothers and their infants without nutrition benefits. It's meaningless for pre-school children left without a Head Start program, and the hundreds of people infected with salmonella because the FDA couldn't do its job.

Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans need to drop the fantasies and bring a bill to the floor to reopen the government with no strings attached. Let's raise the debt ceiling like we've always done to pay America's bills. Let's end this manufactured crisis so we can negotiate a long-term, fiscally responsible path forward for our country. Let's do the job the American people sent us here to do.

RECOGNIZING MRS. CARMEN GARCIA BARRIOS

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the celebration of Mrs. Carmen Garcia Barrios de Garza's 100th birthday. With a century passing, Mrs. Garza has dedicated her life to her family, loved ones, and giving back to the community.

Mrs. Garza was born October 6, 1913. Throughout her lifetime, Mrs. Garza and her family have lived in Jim Hogg County and Webb County, Laredo, Texas.

Since her marriage to Benito Garza Herrera, Mrs. Garza has been devoted and dedicated to her husband and her family. In the midst of World War II, Mr. Garza bravely left to serve in the Philippines with the U.S. Army 5th Air Force. In her husband's absence, Mrs. Garza stayed in Texas caring for their children and keeping busy with her hobbies of sewing, cooking and gardening.

Upon his return from war, Benito Garza served as Deputy Sheriff of Jim Hogg County. It was here that Mr. and Mrs. Garza raised their 6 children—Oscar, Anita, Lidia, Hilda, Benito, and Ciria. Since then Mrs. Garza has been blessed with 19 grandchildren, 32 great-grandchildren, and 14 great-great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had the time to recognize and celebrate the tremendous life of Mrs. Carmen Garcia Barrios de Garza and her 100th birthday celebration.

PRESIDENTIAL INSTALLATION: THE IDEAL OF A LIBERAL ARTS UNIVERSITY

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House the eloquent remarks of Dr. Christopher Eisgruber at his installation as President of Princeton University, September 22, 2013.

Friends, colleagues, students, teachers, Princetonians:

I am honored to be standing here this afternoon and I am very touched, indeed a tad bit overwhelmed by the generosity of the remarks delivered by the speakers who have preceded at this podium. I am grateful for their gracious words. I am also honored by the presence here on stage of three great presidents of this University, Bill Bowen, Harold Shapiro and Shirley Tilghman.

In the past weeks, people have occasionally asked me whether I could have imagined, in the days when I was a student here, that I might someday be the university president. I reply very honestly that I never crossed my mind, not when I was a student and not, for that matter, when I returned to join the faculty in 2001. My dream job, both as student and a faculty member, was to be a Princeton professor teaching about the Constitution. And, when my dream came true, when I came back to Princeton as a member of the faculty, I reckoned that I had been very clever. I thought that by becoming a law professor at a university without a law school, I had reduced if not eliminated any chance that large administrative assignments might ever distract me from the teaching and research that I loved.

Of course, by returning to Princeton, I had also come home to a university that I loved more than any other, and where the responsibilities of administration would be more meaningful to me than anywhere else. Princeton's wonderful 19th president, Shirley Tilghman, realized that before I did, and she changed my life by offering me the opportunity to become her provost.

I suppose that all of us, as we move through this complicated world, require some time to realize what matters most in our lives. The path to and through adulthood takes unexpected turns. Childhood heroes show hidden flaws; youthful causes lose their luster. If we are lucky, though, we find certain ideals from which we can draw enduring inspiration and to which we can commit our life's energies. In my life, there have been two: constitutional democracy, as manifested personally for me in the American constitutional tradition, and liberal arts education, as exemplified especially by the blend of research and teaching at this great University.

The iconic building behind me combines these traditions. Nassau Hall was once all of Princeton University, and this University's alumni still regard it as the symbolic heart of their alma mater—even if it has now become an administrative office building into which few students ever venture. Nassau Hall was also briefly, in 1783, the home of the Continental Congress, and so the seat of this nation's government. And Nassau Hall was, as Hunter Rawlings has so movingly described, the site where James Madison (undergraduate Class of 1771, graduate Class of

1772) acquired the learning that eventually made him the father of America's Constitution.

Constitutionalism and liberal arts education also have deeper connections, ones that depend not on the contingencies of history and geography but on their relationship to human nature. Both of them are long-term institutions that recognize simultaneously humanity's virtues and its imperfections, and that aim to cultivate our talents, orient us toward the common good, and make us the best that we can be.

In one of the most famous passages from his extraordinary arguments on behalf of constitutional ratification, Madison wrote, in *Federalist* 51, "What is government . . . but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary." [Madison, *Fed.* 51; Rossiter ed. 322] Madison used gendered language, but I have no doubt that in this respect at least James Madison was a feminist: He meant his skepticism to apply equally to both sexes. If people were angels, they would cooperate, look out for one another, and generally do good deeds. They would need no laws, no courts and no constitutions. But people are not angels, so they need constitutions that create institutions, define processes and separate powers.

We might equally well add that if people were angels, they would have no need for teachers. Students would need no one to inspire their studies or correct their errors. If students were angels, they would need, at most, a few syllabi, a library, some laboratories, a computer and perhaps a few Massive Open Online Courses. They might then all be more or less self-taught, as were Benjamin Franklin and Abraham Lincoln, those almost superhuman, if not quite angelic, heroes of the American constitutional tradition.

But people are not angels, and very, very few students are like Franklin and Lincoln. The generations of students who have come to Nassau Hall, including the great James Madison, have wanted teachers to fire their imaginations, dispel their misconceptions, explode their prejudices, stir their spirits and guide their passions. And students have found mentors here, not just in professors and preceptors, but also in chaplains and coaches, counselors and graduate students, conductors and directors, deans and administrators.

I expect that all of you in the audience today can look back upon your lives and identify teachers whose support and guidance were valuable beyond measure and without whom you could not have achieved the successes that matter most to you. I am especially pleased that in attendance today are two teachers whose mentorship has guided me throughout my career: Mr. Pat Canan, who taught me physics at Corvallis High School; and Professor Jeffrey Tulis, who taught me about the Constitution and political theory when I was an undergraduate at this University.

I have kept in touch with both of these teachers for more than 30 years now. Thirty years is a long time. As I have already said, education, like constitutionalism, is a long-term enterprise. Great teachers, and great universities, make extraordinary investments in students and research in anticipation of future benefits that are usually unknowable and occasionally implausible. Perhaps the seeds you plant in the mind of 19-year-old students today will guide careers that blossom and mature many decades hence. Or, to take an example from our Department of Chemistry, perhaps your curiosity-driven research into the pigmentation

of butterfly wings will, 50 years later, produce a drug that improves the lives of cancer patients.

If human beings were angels, we would cheerfully focus on long-term goods. We would invest enthusiastically in schools and colleges for our own children and for everybody else's children, so that they could become productive, engaged citizens in the future. We would happily support speculative research projects so that we could reap the benefits of discovery and innovation. We would gladly nurture humanistic inquiry because it provides an essential foundation for understanding what makes life meaningful and sustains the wellsprings of civil society.

Indeed, we need not be angels to do these things. We would do them if we were perfectly rational investors, because economists like Claudia Goldin and Lawrence Katz have shown convincingly that education and research are powerful drivers of economic prosperity.

But we are not perfectly rational any more than we are angels. We live embodied in the present, sensitive to short-term pleasures and pains. Notions of the common good and promises about future returns feel abstract and feeble by comparison to the intensity of immediate experience.

This bias seems especially fierce in America today. Our world features a non-stop news cycle, continuous political campaigns and an obsession with quarterly earnings statements. We demand that messaging be instant, and we talk in tweets.

This short-term perspective threatens America's colleges and universities. Already it has done significant harm. Our nation has reduced its support for public colleges and universities, and it has squeezed the funding needed for research, innovation and scholarship.

In so doing, we risk squandering a national treasure. America's colleges and universities are a beacon to the world. Parents around the globe dream of sending their children here, scholars dream of landing a place here, and nations dream of creating universities like America's. Yet, here at home, we see a parade of reporters, politicians and pundits asking whether a college education is worth it—even though the economic evidence for the value of a college education is utterly overwhelming.

People discount this evidence because they worry, quite understandably, about the cost of college. They say that higher education should be more efficient so that it can be cheaper in the short term and equally valuable in the long term.

Make no mistake about it: Those of us who lead universities must make our institutions as efficient as possible. We must also ensure, through financial aid and other programs, that our colleges are accessible and affordable to students from every sector of our society. But there is a difference between expense and inefficiency. Expensive investments can be both efficient and valuable if their returns are sufficiently high.

When professors provide individualized attention to students, their time is expensive and valuable. When scholars strive day and night to enhance our understanding of the world, their activity is expensive and valuable. Great colleges and universities are not cheap. They require big investments, and they are also among the very best investments that this nation, or any nation, can make. And, as I have said in the past, great universities are also places where the human spirit soars. They are special communities where students, teachers and researchers

strive to transcend their limitations and, on occasion, to expand the boundaries of human achievement.

I am grateful to be joined on this stage by Princeton alumni, and by former Princeton faculty members and administrators, who now serve as presidents of an extraordinary range of colleges and universities from throughout the world. Their presence here today symbolizes our need to work together on behalf of higher education. It also reminds us of Princeton's obligation and opportunity to play a leadership role in public discussions about the value of research and collegiate education today. Those debates are urgently important to the nation, to the world, and to this University's mission, and Princeton University must be boldly active within them.

Long-term institutions, be they educational or political, can flourish only if they inspire energetic commitment in the short term. Madison knew this. Even "the most rational government," he said, must have the "prejudices of the community on its side." (Fed. 49, Rossiter 315).

In his famous debates with Stephen Douglas, Abraham Lincoln called attention to this country's annual celebrations on the Fourth of July. He insisted that the "cannon which thunders [the] annual joyous return" of our independence serves to remind us of the basic principles upon which this country is founded and which unite us as a people. [P. Angle, *Created Equal: The Complete Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858*, at 130 (Ottawa); see also *id.*, at 40 (Chicago)]. Civic pride, and the colorful and noisy celebrations that go with it, can reshape self-interest and motivate people to care about their collective future.

We, too, at Princeton have traditions of joyous return. We even have cannons—though our most famous one is buried deep in the ground behind Nassau Hall and none of them thunder anymore. But joyous return: We do that very well. "Going back to Nassau Hall" is woven into the music and the soul of this place. We go back to Nassau Hall for Reunions, for Commencement and Baccalaureate, for Alumni Day and the Service of Remembrance, and occasionally for special ceremonies like this one. In so doing, we renew the camaraderie that enlivens our commitment to this University, and we rededicate ourselves to the principles for which Princeton stands and upon which it depends.

I would not presume to enumerate all of those principles, but prominent among them are these basic convictions:

That liberal arts education is a vital foundation for both individual flourishing and the well-being of our society;

That residential and extracurricular experience both supplement and reinforce the lessons of the classroom, building character and skills that last a lifetime;

That rigorous research and scholarship are indispensable for understanding the human condition and improving the world;

That learning, discovery and understanding are valuable not only instrumentally but also for their own sake, as sources of the joy and fulfillment that make a human life worth living;

That scholarship and teaching are mutually reinforcing activities—that scholars learn from their students' questions, and that students learn best when they are exposed to, and can participate in, research that extends the frontiers of knowledge;

That we must cultivate new generations of talent enthusiastically and unselfishly;

That all social and economic groups should have access to the educational resources of

this great University and to higher education more generally;

That we as a University, and we as alumni, must constantly rededicate ourselves to the nation's service and to the service of all nations; and last, but most certainly not least,

That a great university can and should be the heart of an alumni community that not only engages in a lifetime of learning, leadership and service, but that continues to do all it can to sustain, strengthen and nourish this University—ensuring that it can live up to these principles and achieve its highest aspirations through all the generations yet to come.

I am honored to accept the presidency of this, our beloved University, and I will work with you enthusiastically to sustain the excellence of what we are doing now, to realize more perfectly the ideals to which we are committed, and to demonstrate by argument and deed the extraordinary value of Princeton University, and of all the colleges and universities that help to bring out the best in the people of this country and this world.

Thank you for welcoming me so warmly this afternoon, thank you for coming back once more to Nassau Hall, and thank you, most of all, for your sincere commitment to this place and this community that matter so deeply to all of us. Thank you!

THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF FULL GOSPEL ASSEMBLY CHURCH

HON. HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 35th anniversary of the founding of Full Gospel Assembly Church in Brooklyn, NY. Pastor Michael Bacchus and members of the congregation commemorated this milestone at a banquet on October 4, 2013 at the Grand Prospect Hall in Brooklyn, NY.

Full Gospel Assembly was founded on October 1, 1978 by Pastor Michael Bacchus, Assistant Pastor Jesse Persuad and Brother Colin Wronge. The people of New York are grateful for the exemplary service and leadership of Pastor Bacchus, whose vision led the church from meeting in a classroom at Long Island University to building its own sanctuary on Sullivan Place in the Crown Heights neighborhood of Brooklyn. Under the direction of Pastor Bacchus, the Queens Campus of Full Gospel Assembly opened in 2011. The Full Gospel Christian Academy, which was founded in 1985, continues to offer pre-K and kindergarten classes.

The leaders and parishioners of Full Gospel Assembly have touched the lives of countless individuals through their compassionate service. In 1986, the church sponsored its first missionary trip, where 45 parishioners traveled to Guyana to minister to the residents of Georgetown and Linden. The Berean Bible Study Center, which opened in 1989, has trained hundreds to be leaders in the church's ministries. To meet the needs of its diverse congregation, the church has a wide range of active ministries including those for children, youth, and families.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating Full Gospel Assembly on its 35th anniversary. The church leaders and parishioners have dedicated themselves to serving the people of New York, and for that they are worthy of the highest praise.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE
TUSKEGEE-MOREHOUSE FOOT-
BALL CLASSIC

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a classic gridiron rivalry, the 78th Annual Tuskegee-Morehouse Football Classic, which is known as the "Matchless Classic of All Historically Black College Football Classics." This year, the Maroon Tigers of Morehouse College will meet face-to-face with the Golden Tigers of Tuskegee University at A.J. McClung Memorial Stadium in Columbus, Georgia on Saturday, October 12, 2013 at 2:00 p.m.

The Tuskegee-Morehouse Football Classic, one of the longest running NCAA Division II classics in the nation, marks a rivalry that began in 1902 and has been played seventy-seven times in over a century. It first began as an entertainment event for the African-American civilian community and African-American U.S. Army soldiers in Columbus and Fort Benning, Georgia and Phenix City, Alabama. Today, it helps raise funds to provide young men and women with scholarships to help them attend college.

In 1955, the Classic Committee was formed by the late Mr. Gordon H. Kitchen, Mr. A.J. McClung, and Mr. Carl Haygood. The Committee continues to organize the Classic and has preserved the vision and mission of its legendary founders and past leadership. This year, the Committee will welcome Dr. John Silvanus Wilson, Jr., the Eleventh President of Morehouse College; Dr. Gilbert L. Rochon, the Sixth President of Tuskegee University; and Dr. Beverly Tatum, the Ninth President of Spelman College.

This is the ninth year the Tuskegee-Morehouse Football Classic will be played in the A.J. McClung Memorial Stadium, which was named for the late Honorable A.J. McClung, a 1933 graduate of Tuskegee University, Chairman Emeritus of the Tuskegee-Morehouse Football Classic and 29-year member of the Columbus Council who served as Mayor of Columbus in 1973.

The weeks leading up to this longstanding tradition are filled with excitement and anticipation. The Tuskegee-Morehouse Classic Parade is widely attended and filled with fanfare. The weeklong schedule of events also includes church services, recruitment activities, a media press conference, a golf tournament, Presidents/Queens Brunch, VIP Reception and high-spirited tailgating with thousands of fans from all over the United States and abroad.

Throughout the years, the high quality of play and competition between the two teams

on the field has represented college football at its best. The players and coaches of both teams train and work tirelessly to ensure a memorable classic. Each Classic features a spectacular show put on by the marching bands, the Piperettes, Mahogany in Motion, cheerleaders, flag teams and other auxiliary units. It always generates enthusiastic responses from proud fans cheering loudly for their teams.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in saluting the Maroon Tigers of Morehouse College and the Golden Tigers of Tuskegee University as they compete in this classic gridiron rivalry. Naturally, I will be cheering for my beloved alma mater, Morehouse College. Despite the outcome, however, the 78th Annual Tuskegee-Morehouse Football Classic is sure to be a memorable affair overflowing with spirit, pride, and tradition on behalf of the students, alumni, administrations, families, and supporters.

RECOGNIZING DAVE EDWARDS'
COMMITMENT TO THE COMMUNITY

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Dave Edwards' retirement from public office following more than four decades of service. Mr. Edwards, formerly the Department of Public Works Superintendent of the Town of Caneadea, officially retired at the end of September.

Mr. Edwards' impact on my district is truly difficult to quantify as he has influenced countless aspects of the community. Dave Edwards has served on the Allegany County Fire Service Advisory Board for five years and is currently a member of the Allegany County Volunteer Fireman's Association where he is Chairman of the Memorial Committee. He has also played a pivotal role in the transformation of the Houghton Volunteer Ambulance Service, Inc. into the thriving corporation that it is today. This passion for service drives him to be a strong advocate for the maintenance and preservation of his community's firefighting history.

Mr. Edwards' impact on the district has also been felt by the Caneadea Boosters Organization. He assisted with raising funds to repair the old steel-framed bridge within the town and has been a proud supporter of the Allegany County Republican Women's Club's 50/50 raffle for many years.

Perhaps most importantly, Dave Edwards is a devoted husband and father. He and his wife Linda have been married for thirty-four years and have one daughter, Stacey. It has been an honor and a privilege to work with Dave Edwards while serving the constituents of the Southern Tier and I wish him all the best in his well-deserved retirement.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,747,421,858,503.24. We've added \$6,120,544,809,590.16 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

TAIWAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 10th Taiwan celebrates the 102nd anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of China. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Taiwan on its impressive economic progress and strong record of democratic achievement.

On this important anniversary the U.S. Congress should commit itself to strengthening our relationship by singing a bilateral investment agreement (BIA).

Greater economic cooperation between Taiwan and the United States will benefit both our peoples, and support the economic integration and material well-being of the entire Pacific region.

Such an agreement would provide protection for investors of the two countries and expand market opportunities for investors all over the world.

I applaud the efforts of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in Washington to maintain the strong ties that exist between the people of Taiwan and the U.S. Congress.

I look forward to ever greater cooperation between our two nations.

REFORMS ADD INTEGRITY TO
SNAP FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, Americans are a good and generous people and don't begrudge helping needy families, and especially children, when times are tough. Sometimes our friends, neighbors, and their kids need a little help to get by after a layoff or personal hardship. But we do demand that our tax dollars be spent honestly and in direct support of those who need the aid. Today, that's not always the case.

The United States Department of Agriculture is spending tax dollars to advertise the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

(SNAP) on TV, radio, billboards, and through agreements with foreign governments. Through loopholes and questionable recruitment activities, people whose incomes exceeds the SNAP threshold, illegal immigrants, and even the deceased are counted among those receiving taxpayer benefits. Able-bodied adults, too, are receiving food stamp assistance at record levels.

In a down economy, heightened demand makes sense, but with the President's 2009 waiver of work requirements for SNAP recipients, the percentage of able-bodied Americans receiving aid has increased 163%. By comparison, total participants in the SNAP program, including the able-bodied population, increased 70.3%.

This week in the House of Representatives, we voted to make America's food stamp program stronger and more accountable to the American people.

The Nutrition Reform & Work Opportunity Act is designed to preserve the integrity of the SNAP program for families, and especially children, who rely on food stamps. Reforms in this legislation put stronger protections in place to ensure that SNAP money is reserved only for those who qualify for food stamps and isn't wasted on government public relations campaigns, medical marijuana purchases, or lottery winners. Questionable loopholes and recruitment activities which extend assistance to those who make too much money are also ended.

Further, consistent with the bipartisan belief that the solution to poverty is found through work, not just aid, the Nutrition Reform & Work Opportunity Act reinstates Clinton-era SNAP work requirements. These rules stipulate that able-bodied adults, with no dependents, must be looking for work, developing job skills, volunteering for community service, or obtain employment to draw food stamp benefits. Not only will this provision ensure that the truly needy continue to receive aid, it will help beneficiaries compete and prepare for jobs.

An unchecked SNAP program that wastes its limited resources on publicity campaigns or subsidizing those who do not qualify is unable to provide the best service to the people it is designed to help. It is the job of this Congress to ensure the program is held accountable as a steward of taxpayer dollars and as a safety net of last resort for the needy.

Nothing in this legislation adds to SNAP's eligibility requirements, so not one law-abiding beneficiary who today meets SNAP's income and asset tests, and who is willing to comply with applicable, bipartisan work requirements, will lose their benefits.

Yet this legislation has its critics on the right and on the left.

Many on the left are crying foul because enforcing eligibility rules, requiring work or job search from the able-bodied and eliminating loopholes will lead to some current SNAP beneficiaries being dropped. Although that is true, it is because there are people today drawing benefits who should not be.

One of America's greatest strengths is that we are a nation of laws. Regardless of the example set by this White House, the govern-

ment cannot operate outside of the law. We cannot pick and choose which to obey. If our laws set forth a standard for eligibility, recipients must meet the standard.

On the right, some are asking whether the savings and reforms in this legislation go far enough. I echo those concerns, and agree that even \$40 billion in SNAP savings seems a small sum compared to Washington's vast mandatory overspending machine.

Do we need to find more savings? Absolutely. But the Nutrition Reform & Work Opportunity Act improves the existing SNAP system and gives our country a unique chance to reform a mandatory spending program and rid it of inexcusable waste, fraud, and abuse.

The Nutrition Reform & Work Opportunity Act is a step in the right direction toward ensuring the integrity of the SNAP program and that benefits are reserved for those who qualify and for those working to get back on their feet. Supporting this legislation is the responsible and conservative choice.

IN SUPPORT OF FISHING GUIDES IN THE EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the government shutdown, middle class and working poor Americans all across this country are suffering, including fishing guides whose livelihood depends on tourism in Florida's Everglades National Park.

On October 9, 2013, nine days into the government shutdown, more than 100 boats gathered outside the shuttered Everglades National Park to rally support for re-opening park waters. I wholeheartedly support the efforts of these hardworking fishing guides.

One guide stated that he has lost \$10,000 in revenue since the waters were closed. There are around 350 such licensed guides in the area alone, not to mention the hundreds of employees who work in and around the park. It is time that Speaker BOEHNER and his Republican colleagues stop this charade, end the government shutdown, and let people get back to work.

This shutdown exemplifies government at its worst. American families should not fall victim to Washington's dysfunction. Wrong-headed cynical politics is interrupting the life, liberty and pursuit of happiness of American workers who have done nothing wrong. Government is supposed to help its citizens, not make it harder for them to put food on the table.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that Congress must re-open the government. South Florida's fishing guides are ready to work. It is absolutely outrageous that politics is standing in their way.

RECOGNIZING MYKE REID

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Myke Reid for his distinguished service and commemorate his retirement from the American Postal Workers Union (APWU). From the beginning of his postal career as a clerk in 1976, through serving as the Legislative Director of the APWU since 2004, Mr. Reid has tirelessly fought for and proudly represented our Nation's postal workers.

Since arriving in Washington, DC in 1984, Mr. Reid played a major role in shaping important legislation and worked tirelessly as a strong and effective advocate for postal workers across the country. As first the Assistant Legislative Director of the APWU, then the Legislative Director, he played a key role in the development and passage of many bills that made life better for people everywhere. His accomplishments can be seen in the bills he fought for, including the Family and Medical Leave Act, reform of the Hatch Act, and the Postal Employees Safety Enhancement Act. His career was dedicated to serving our nation's postal workers and strengthening our nation's postal system.

Mr. Reid's accomplishments and dedication to serving others extended far beyond the halls of Congress and the legislative arena. While working, he remained very involved and active in his community. His energy and enthusiasm also carried into his love of golf and photography. He also was a great fan of jazz music and the great New Orleans Jazz and Heritage Festival.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Myke Reid on his retirement and commending him for his years of service to our nation's postal workers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 11, 2013

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for the following votes on October 8, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on H.J. Res 84, rollcall vote 530; "nay" on rollcall vote 531, and "nay" on rollcall vote 532.

While I am a strong supporter of the Head Start program, I oppose the Republican piecemeal bills to fund the government. Vulnerable children and their families need and deserve critical government services that this legislation does not fund. I continue to stand ready to vote for a clean continuing resolution to end the Republican Shutdown and fund the entire Federal Government, including Head Start, the Community Services Block Grants, Child Care aid, and nutrition programs.

SENATE—Saturday, October 12, 2013

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we are indebted to You for Your many mercies and continue to look to You for our well-being. Remind us that prayer is listening more than speaking, an act of empathy rather than self-expression.

Give our Senators this day the special gifts of wisdom and understanding, patience and strength, motivating them to follow what is true and do what is right. Lord, inspire our lawmakers with a renewed trust in You and a commitment to work together for Your glory.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, the debt limit bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. The time until 12 noon will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

At noon there will be a rollcall vote on a motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.J. RES. 79

Mr. REID. I understand H.J. Res. 79 is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I would object to any further proceedings at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The measure will be placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 340; that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. James M. Kowalski

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senate will now resume legislative session.

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. REID. Madam President, it is very hard to comprehend that 4 days from today, unless and until a few extremist Republicans—we hope it is a few—too radical to compromise, could force a default on the Nation's financial obligations for the first time ever. Economists say it won't be long before financial markets react negatively to this continued uncertainty.

I believe Monday is a legal holiday and I believe the markets will be closed. That is good. What I see staring us in the face is not a pleasant picture.

Everyone should understand that a bad day on Wall Street doesn't only affect these great big banks or wealthy investors. It affects everyone in our country, not only those with 401(k)s but those who have no savings. It affects everybody, because everyone will lose, not only in America but around the world. The life savings of ordinary Americans are at risk, and that is an understatement.

While this uncertainty is bad, default would be unthinkable worse. To show my angst is real, one only need look at what took place in the House of Representatives this morning. They walked out of another meeting, a conference, a caucus—call it what you want—defiant: We couldn't do anything.

Therefore, the government remains closed, and the debt ceiling is, every day, closer and closer—every hour now. While this uncertainty is bad, I repeat, default is unthinkable worse.

Because of the collapse on Wall Street a few years ago, the State of Nevada and States all over the country were hammered. This was only 5 years ago. Americans lost their jobs, their homes, and their savings, as did people around the world. The country is beginning to recover, but it is not in great shape.

The crisis we now face is one of even greater proportion. The government has remained closed for 12 days. Think about this. Four States are buying into programs so national parks can stay open. National parks. They were the brainchild of Republican Theodore Roosevelt.

It is very sad what is happening to our country. Defaulting on our debt would risk millions of American jobs—not thousands, not tens of thousands, not hundreds of thousands, but millions of jobs. Social Security checks will likely be halted, Medicare payments and even payments for our troops wouldn't happen.

Without exception, the most respected economists and business minds of our time have said that if America defaults on its debt, there will be dire consequences here and around the globe. We have heard this from everybody, not only economists but business people.

I was pleased to see the Republicans engaged in talks with the President, the House Republicans. That is over, it is done. They are not talking anymore. We learned that this morning.

I say to my friends on the Republican side of the Senate, time is running out. They have urged their more radical Members to compromise.

For example, my senior friend from Arizona came to the Congress of the United States with me and the assistant leader. We have been together for 31 years. These are the sensible words of the senior Senator from Arizona:

Sooner or later, the government will resume its function. Sooner or later we will raise the debt limit. The question is how we get there. . . . Why don't we do this sooner rather than later? Why doesn't the Senate lead?

To that end we are trying. We are going to have a vote in 50 minutes on a long-term measure to avert default and give the economy what it needs.

I have told my Republican friends that allowing the government to operate again is not a favor to me; it is not a favor to the Presiding Officer; it is not a favor to Democrats on this side of the aisle. It is something that should happen. We shouldn't consider this a time for doing favors for individuals or groups. We should understand the government should open because it should never have closed in the first place.

The debt ceiling—reasonable Republicans should understand this should be extended, not for a couple of weeks or a couple of months, it should be extended for a long time. We shouldn't have this fight. To think that this is only a motion to proceed to the legislation, it is not a vote on the measure itself, and the Republicans, I have been told, are all going to vote against this. What a sad day for America. They are voting to not allow us to even debate whether the debt ceiling should be raised. Are they afraid of that? Do they want this to go away? It is not going to go away. Each hour that goes by, we are closer to a calamity for our country.

The economy needs more stability than short-term Republican proposals. Congress and the country must not be back in a position a few weeks from now wondering whether Republicans will force our Nation to default on our financial obligations.

To think the House Republicans are saying: Well, we will extend the debt for a little while but we are not going to reopen the government, wow, that is so logical, sensible and good for the country—and I say this very sarcastically.

The Senate Democrats' position has been and remains this: We open our government and pay our country's bills so we can move forward with good-faith negotiations on a long-term budget. It is not too late for my Republican colleagues to do what is right for this country.

I am very concerned. It seems the worry about whether our country should have a functioning government and should extend the debt ceiling is

only from Democrats. This isn't the way it should be.

I admire President Obama for what he has done the last few days. He has invited every Member of Congress, 535, to meet with him. First he had the House Democrats and then the Senate Democrats, another meeting, then Senate Republicans, and House Republicans. Remember, the last time my friend Speaker BOEHNER was on television, he said: Maybe, oh, 18 times, I haven't counted.

He wanted to have a conversation. The President took him up on that. He invited all 232 Members of the Republican Caucus to come to the White House and visit with him. They refused that. They sent down 20.

I appreciate the President being willing to talk with all of us, and he has done that in detail. The problem is the conversation is one way. The Republicans are not interested, it appears at this stage, of doing anything constructive to extend the debt ceiling and open the government. "Later" is what they always say.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The assistant minority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, at 12 o'clock noon we will vote on the motion to proceed to S. 1569. It is barely 1 page, but it is of more significance than anyone can imagine. It basically is an opportunity for us to start the debate—not to end the debate but to start the debate—on whether the United States of America will default on its debt for the first time in the history of this Nation. Other nations have defaulted: Argentina, Venezuela, Cameroon. We have never defaulted.

As a result, the U.S. dollar is the soundest currency in the world. Think about it for a second. Where else would you turn? The U.S. dollar is the soundest currency. Buying the debt of the United States is considered to be the single safest investment any person, business, or country can make.

We didn't just inherit this. We earned this, because every year the United States has been a nation, we have paid our bills, and now this is being brought into question.

Today at noon on the floor of the Senate there is going to be a vote on whether we proceed with the debate over paying our bills. Sadly, we are told not a single Republican Senator will join us in allowing the debate on paying our bills. That is a sad commentary. When we think about it, it is taking the events of the past week or two to the extreme.

It was bad enough to shut down the United States. When Republicans de-

cided that shutting down the government was a great political move, the American people said: Are you out of your mind? Eight hundred thousand people are going to be furloughed, and we are going to stop the services of our government?

For the last 12 days we have seen every single day another indicator, another piece of news, about how this government shutdown is hurting ordinary people across America, whether it is those who were denied clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health outside of Washington, DC—clinical trials that were literally life-and-death decisions; whether we are talking about food inspection, reading the newspaper about salmonella poisoning and realizing the Republican government shutdown is reducing the number of food inspectors. The list goes on and on and on.

But I will tell you this: As sad and unfair as it is for the Republican shutdown of the government to result in 800,000 furloughed Federal employees, the hardships on their families and the hardships on all Americans who count on their jobs and on the basic services of the Federal Government is worse.

This is worse. The Republican shutdown has reached a new level of recklessness, a new level of irresponsibility if we default on America's debt. Sadly, it will mean the victims will not just be Federal employees and their families. No, not even just those who count on government services. The victims will be virtually every person and every family in America.

Is that an exaggeration? Is it just another politician reaching extreme rhetoric here on the floor? Let me quote a few people who do this for a living—the people we trust. Treasury Secretary Jack Lew in a Finance Committee hearing on October 13 said:

Failing to raise the debt ceiling will impact everyday Americans beyond its impact on financial markets. Between October 17 and November 1, we have large payments to Medicare providers, Social Security beneficiaries, and veterans, as well as salaries for Active-Duty members of the military. A failure to raise the debt limit could put timely payment of all of these at risk.

Of course, he is a government employee, an appointee of the administration. One might say: Well, let's discount that. He is just putting the President's political spin on this. Let's go to Frank Keating, no friend of the administration. He is the head of the American Bankers Association. Before a banking committee hearing on October 10, he said:

Ordinary Americans will bear the brunt of the damage if our leaders do not prevent the United States from defaulting on its debt for the first time in history.

He went on to say:

It would . . . raise the cost of borrowing for businesses, meaning job losses and price increases . . . be a blow to retirement funds, leaving fewer resources available for retirees. For banks, which hold \$3 trillion in

Treasury, agency and mortgage-backed securities, the sharp decline in value of these securities would translate into fewer resources available for mortgages, business, auto, credit card and student loans.

To put it in layman's terms, Mr. Keating, the head of the American Bankers Association, is saying if the Congress fails to extend the debt ceiling, as we are proposing to do today, interest rates will go up—interest rates on ordinary Americans, ordinary families, and ordinary businesses.

This is entirely preventable. Let me just lay the cards on the table. I have been in the House and in the Senate. Nobody wants to vote for this because most people don't understand it. They think: Oh, so you want us to go further in debt, Senator? That is why you voted for it.

But that is not the case. The debt limit is paying off the bills we have already incurred. It is like going to a fancy restaurant and ordering the best meal on the menu, eating the meal, and when they come to ask you to pay the check you say: No, I am not paying the check. You see, I am a fiscal conservative. I just don't believe in extravagant eating. But you just ate the meal, and now you are not going to pay the check?

That is what this is about. We have incurred these bills, and now the question is whether we will pay these bills. That is what it comes down to. This is basic and fundamental.

At noon there will be a vote on the floor of the Senate which will have a direct impact on everyone in this country. The question is whether the Republicans, fresh from the failure of their government shutdown, are going to dig a deeper hole, not just for their party—forget that completely—but for this Nation; whether they are going to create a new group of victims beyond Federal employees that includes every person, every family, and every business in America. That is what is at stake.

Madam President, I am not exaggerating. I think this may be the single most irresponsible thing I have seen in the time I have served in Washington. To let this happen is not good for this Nation, and it is not fair to the people of this Nation.

The majority leader said the markets are closed on Monday. It turns out, I am told, that the bond market is closed, but the stock market is open. That stock market, incidentally, is where mutual funds live, where the stocks people own for their savings and retirement live, and where their savings live. This irresponsible action, sadly, is likely to create a decline in the value of their hard-earned savings.

But it can be avoided. What would it take? Six Republicans. That is what it takes. The Democrats are prepared to move forward and extend the debt ceiling. We need six moderate Republicans

to step up and join us. If they will, we will move forward. We will accept the responsibility of ultimately voting for whatever bill there is to extend the debt ceiling. We are asking six Republicans to give us a chance to vote. If they say no at noon today, the consequences could be awful for this great Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I hope the country listens to what the senior Senator from Illinois has said about the ramifications of this shutdown. This is not a political exercise. This is not a bumper sticker thing. This is hitting every single family, every single person in America. It doesn't make a difference whether they are Democrats, Republicans or Independents. It is going to hurt and hurt badly. Whether you are saving money for your child to go to college, to put away for your retirement or are paying bills for an illness, all of us are going to be impacted. So I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois for those comments.

Madam President, on this 12th day of being paralyzed by this unnecessary shutdown, there are real results that will come about because of it. I have given several examples on the floor about how Vermonters are suffering due to this tea party shutdown. And I am sure the distinguished Presiding Officer probably has similar examples from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or others as well.

Earlier this year I worked with Senator CRAPO, a Republican from Idaho, to build the support we needed to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act—VAWA—and I was proud when both the Senate and House passed the legislation with strong bipartisan votes and the President signed it. We put our differences aside—and we are philosophically very different—to help the people we serve, whether they are in Idaho, Vermont, Massachusetts or anywhere else. We sent a clear message that violence against women will not be tolerated. We put the needs of victims first when we promised rape crisis centers and domestic violence shelters they would have the resources they need to keep their doors open and to keep their 24-hour hotlines staffed. But now we are here in October, which marks Domestic Violence Awareness Month, and so many of the lifesaving programs we put in this legislation are caught in the crossfire of the tea party shutdown.

Today, as Federal funds are being held hostage by the tea party shutdown, we are starting to see the real toll of this brinkmanship. In Franklin County, VT, a northwestern county in our State, advocates were hopeful when they learned a new grant would allow one staff person to help victims of

LGBT domestic assault in that rural region. Of course, this hope has given way to frustration because the funds promised on October 1 did not come through due to the shutdown.

Barre City, Vermont, is the town where my father was born. It has a population of 9,200. In Barre City, the police force has furloughed two half-time detectives who were providing 24/7 coverage for special responses to domestic violence cases. They were also providing critical training for their colleagues on how to answer these challenging calls.

I was a prosecutor in Vermont, and I saw how terrible these domestic violence cases could be, and they occur in every State. I would bet that every single State can give an example of what this shutdown has meant, the same as Barre, VT.

There is a long list of programs funded with VAWA grants that continue to provide services to victims—and incur the related costs—based on the hope they might be reimbursed once funding is restored. Meanwhile, the tea party says maybe the check will be in the mail. They have no choice because despite what the tea party might think, when you close the spigot of funding, it doesn't mean the victims go away.

I still have nightmares of some of these scenes I saw at 3 o'clock in the morning when I was a prosecutor. They are still occurring. We can at least cut way back on them and help people in America.

But I also want to know what is going to happen to victims and their children when the money for WIC and the TANF programs runs dry. We know many victims of domestic violence have to rely on this support when they leave their abusers. In the past they had to stick with their abusers because they had to feed their children. Now at least they have a lifeline out there. If you combine that with the impending cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program the tea party wants, I wonder whether this is going to cause these victims and their children to stay in the homes of the abusers just so the children can be fed. That is shameful.

This is America. This is America. All of these tea party members get paid. They are getting paid today. They get their expenses. They get their staff. They can fly back and forth. They can go on television and all of that. They are not facing this abuse or the question of how they feed their children.

Kris Luken, director of Voices Against Violence in St. Albans, VT, says the uncertainty is the hardest part, both for her agency and for the victims it serves. At the end of last week, the first of the tea party shutdown, she said:

We are fielding a lot of calls from survivors who don't know how they are going to make ends meet. People just don't know what the impact will be.

So you get abused first by whoever the abuser is, and now you are going to get abused by this tea party shutdown. In these difficult economic times, it is more important than ever to ensure that our safety net is in place. We cannot turn our backs on these families—that is not who we are as a country.

When we reauthorized the Violence Against Women Act this year, we included provisions to specifically address the high rate of domestic and sexual violence experienced by Native American women. Sadly, this shutdown disproportionately affects that already vulnerable population. Tribal lands rely heavily on Federal funding and one tribal domestic violence shelter in South Dakota has lost 90 percent of its funding. That shelter is at capacity and the loss of funds means victims are being turned away. They are left with no place to turn. That is simply unconscionable.

The District of Columbia's Sexual Assault Nurse's program relies on Federal funds to provide necessary medical assistance to rape victims, including rape kits. Absent emergency funding which will soon dry up unless we end this foolish shutdown, rape kit examinations will cease, leaving victims without the specialized care they deserve and the DNA evidence they need to prosecute and convict their rapists.

Let's end the uncertainty. Let's end the shutdown and fulfill our promises to the people we are here to represent.

The continuing resolution passed by the Senate—a resolution which, after all, was asked for by the House of Representatives and was a compromise with them—could end this stalemate. The leadership in the House of Representatives should have the courage to bring it to a vote—the courage not necessarily for their own political needs but the courage for the needs of America.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I first of all want to thank my colleague, the Senator from Vermont, for his comments and his relentless voicing of the concerns of folks who are not often heard in the halls of this institution. I thank him for his work and for letting everyone know who continues to be hurt by this absurd government shutdown.

I really think we are almost in a kind of era of the theater of the absurd at this point. We have a government shutdown for 11-plus days and are 4 days, 5 days from a default. What I keep wondering is—we hear about some of the least fortunate who are being hurt—how much of our economy is being hurt all across the board.

I received a call 2 nights ago from the chairman of a company from Northern Virginia with 5,500 employees. This company has been built by this first

generation of Americans. He is extraordinarily proud of what he has done for his company, for his employees. His company serves our government as a so-called government contractor. A lot of these companies are not only in Virginia, in Maryland, but across this region and across this country.

When the shutdown started, 30 percent of his 5,500 employees were told they are not essential. So the company has been trying to make ends meet keeping these folks furloughed but not firing them, trying to pay them a little something during this period. The remarkable thing is that 70 percent of the employees that were deemed essential are not getting paid either—even though the government says they are going to pay them—because the folks who process the checks are furloughed.

Anybody who operates a business on a cashflow basis knows that when the money runs out, even if you have a potential IOU, if you can't go to the bank and borrow money, you shut down. This company, 25 years in the building, this CEO, this chairman, said if this goes on 1 or 2 more weeks, his life's work and—more importantly than his life's work, he said—the 5,500 people who depend upon this company's existence may very well disappear. That is just part of the government shutdown.

Today we are going to vote on an issue that I never thought in my time in the public sector or the private sector we would be seriously considering; that is, the default of the United States of America. I have spent more time in the private sector than I have in the public sector, but I never thought I would see the headline I saw this week in the *Financial Times*, an international financial newspaper, where the headline was that Japan and China and Russia Say: America, pay your bills. America, pay your bills. America, the largest economy in the world, the country that, because of our exemplary behavior for decades, has been granted the status of the reserve currency.

What does reserve currency mean? It means that every American business does a little bit better than every other business around the world because the dollar is the currency everybody else goes to when times are tough.

There are countries—not all of them friendly to us—that are saying that maybe the dollar shouldn't be the reserve currency anymore, and if we lose that status, it doesn't come back overnight. It is not where the tea party crowd can say: Maybe we made a mistake; we want to roll that back. Once it is gone, it could take literally decades to get it back.

Since the beginning of the 21st century, there has only been one industrialized country in the world that has defaulted since the year 2000—Argentina. America is not Argentina, but back in December 2001 Argentina defaulted.

Prior to that time, Argentina—per capita income—was the richest country in South America, way ahead of Chile, Brazil, and other nations in that region. Once Argentina defaulted, the value of its currency fell by 75 percent, inflation hit over 100 percent a year, and every Argentinean family lost over half of their net worth. Today, 12 years after Argentina defaulted, on an annual average income basis, it falls way below most of the countries of South America.

America is not Argentina. It may not be that catastrophic, but why would anyone take the chance? Why would anyone decide in this uncharted area to potentially threaten default? That is like playing Russian roulette with one bullet and only two chambers. No responsible nation would do that.

We have heard from some on the other side: Here is what we ought to do. Maybe we will kind of default, but we will pay our bonds and we will pay Social Security, pay our military, and then everything else will be put on hold.

That, to me, shows a remarkable, fundamental lack of understanding of how government or economics works. No government has ever tried that. But for the sake of argument, let's suppose that somehow that "prioritization" scheme might stave off America defaulting for 1 or 2 weeks.

Here is the other half of the story they don't acknowledge. Even if America pays its debt, on that list of prioritization does not appear Medicaid, education, transportation, law enforcement, and those dollars don't stay spent at the Federal level, they are spent at the State government level and the local government level.

I had the great honor of being Governor of Virginia before I came to the Senate. We worked really hard to keep a triple-A bond rating. The Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Maryland, Louisiana—every one of these States, at least one-third of their State budgets are dollars that pass from the Federal Government down to the State level. We could see within a week or maybe even less every State government and every local government in America either have a budget crisis or default. What is happening in Detroit could happen across every community in America—not because of mistakes made at the local level or the State level but because of the irresponsibility of a group of folks up here who don't understand the economics that you don't mess with the full faith and credit of America.

What other costs are we playing with? Many of the folks who have been most adamant about keeping the government shut—which, by the way, will cost the taxpayers more and will not save us a dime. Federal employees will be paid, but starting and stopping all these government contracts will hurt

the economy, decrease tax revenues, and actually cost taxpayers more.

But what may be even more jeopardizing than those actions with this kind of irresponsible testing of the markets or brinkmanship is that we could see interest rates rise. Every 1 point of increased interest payment on our debt accounts for \$110 billion of additional Federal Government payments every year. A 1-percent interest in the debt increase over a 10-year basis is an extra \$1 trillion of government spending that has a priority over any other aspect of Federal Government spending. Talk about a tax hike that gets America nothing from a group who says: We don't want to increase taxes at any cost—well, playing with the debt ceiling, 1 percent interest, a \$110 billion tax hike on every American family and every American business, and again, you can't say a few days later “oops” and the market would then take back down our interest rates.

I know other colleagues are here and want to speak as well. In my business life, in my time as Governor, in my time as Senator, I have never seen an action nearly as irresponsible as the actions taken—and I don't think this is the majority of the colleagues on the other side—by a small cohort of ideologues who are willing to do whatever, including burn down the house, to try to achieve their goals.

We will have a chance here in the Senate in about 20 minutes to decide whether we will take off the threat of America defaulting. The Asian markets open within 40 hours. The world is going to see whether America is going to maintain its position as reserve currency, the world's largest economy, and the most stable financial basis. I hope we will take a step today to at least remove the threat of default, to encourage our friends on the House side to do that as well as reopen this government, and then, yes, let's get our fiscal house in order. But putting America's fiscal reputation and putting companies in jeopardy with the shutdown is not the kind of governance America needs at this point.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Virginia for his outstanding work. He knows this from a business perspective, an economic perspective, and a political perspective, and has been such a strong and vibrant voice about America paying its bills.

I would like to add a couple of things.

We have a group of people in the House and the Senate—not a majority—whom we call debt ceiling deniers. They deny that letting the debt ceiling lapse and going into default could be cataclysmic for America. They are wrong. Every person who has studied this knows it is wrong.

The debt ceiling deniers fall in two camps. Some say: Well, we can pay certain debts and not other debts and that would be all right.

Well, let them choose. Pick Social Security over veterans? Pick payments to pregnant mothers versus payments for food safety? We can't do it.

Then they say: Well, maybe we should just pay Treasuries that come due and not pay Social Security.

Well, let me tell you, as somebody who has consulted experts on the market, the overwhelming view is that if we don't pay any of our bills for the first time in U.S. history, the markets could very well freeze up, tighten, and create huge damage to our country.

The second group of debt ceiling deniers say: Well, we don't know the date.

And we don't. The markets are mystical, but once they come to their own most magical conclusion that the United States is going to default, we will be in trouble. That could be the 17th. It could be a day or two before, importuning us to action as soon as possible. It could be a little bit later. But we don't know when it is. And what a risk.

We are like a blindfolded man walking toward the edge of a cliff. If we keep walking, we will fall off. We can debate whether we fall off in 5 yards, 50 yards, or 500 yards, but we will fall off and we don't know what that line is. Why risk it?

I have one final point. This could be as bad or worse than the 2008 recession. It is the same basic principle. A very important security—in that case, mortgage securities, and in this case, Treasuries—loses tremendous value, the markets freeze, loans can't be made, interest rates rise, and then all the ensuing economic damage. Auto sales will go down and thousands of auto-workers will be laid off. Home sales will go down and construction workers will be laid off. That is what happened in 2008, and it could well happen again and be worse because this will be worldwide. U.S. Treasuries are probably the most widely held denomination of assets on financial institution books and deeper—more institutions have more of them than have mortgage securities. So we are playing with fire.

I make a plea to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I know we all have political agendas. I very much would like to see the immigration bill passed. We all have agendas that are very important to us. Please do not hold the debt ceiling and paying our debts hostage to any other condition. Pass the debt ceiling unconditionally, and then we can go back to our business, debate these issues, and see where the political chips fall. But please, for the sake of this country, for the sake of the men and women who labored before us and never let us default, do not play with fire, pass a clean debt ceiling,

and let's move on and debate the other issues that so much deserve debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I come to the floor today to add my voice to the voices that have spoken since 11:00 our time about the importance of opening this government and sending a strong signal that the Congress will not default on its debt; that we will pay our bills and we will honor the commitments we have made not only to bondholders outside of our country but to our own constituents who hold Treasury bonds in their pension funds and their 401(k)s, who use it to balance their investments in their businesses because they know they can count on those notes being paid. Until just a few days ago it seemed as if that would happen.

Recently, in the last 48 hours, there is a real question as to whether a small group of Republicans in the House understands how high this cliff is and how close we are to it. This problem is completely manufactured by a group of people elected to office to do this exact thing—shut the government down at any expense and, as the Senator from Virginia just said, burn the whole house down with the children inside. They came here with that express purpose. They are wrong, and they are pushing this country to a terrible place.

Leader REID has explained it. Senator SCHUMER from New York has explained it. MARK WARNER, the senior Senator from Virginia, who is literally one of the finest Governors we have had in the last 50 years in America—and I say that respectfully and honestly; we all know what a great Governor he was—he is now joined by another great Governor from Virginia, Governor Kaine—these men are Senators, but they understand our Governors now are at risk, every Governor, Republican and Democrat, and all the leaders of the State governments and the thousands of cities and villages.

Yesterday we received a letter signed by the Governors Association, Democrat and Republican Governors, saying open the government. Do not let the government default. Why? Because in our system of government, which is the best in the world—it is not perfect, but it is the best in the world ever created by men and women. We are frail human beings. We make a lot of mistakes. We made so many mistakes in the creation of our country and we still continue to do it, but we are trying to build a model of democracy, the best the Earth has ever known.

There is a group of people in the House who decided that for some reason they do not like the democracy. I do not know what they want to go back to, but it has taken us 230-plus years to

get here. I don't think anybody wants to go back to a place where the world had no democracy.

There were elections. People won those elections. President Obama won his election. He did not carry my State, but he won his election fair and square. He campaigned on providing middle-class families for the first time in America a way to purchase health insurance—not a single-payer system, not the government system—to purchase health insurance so they would not be one accident away from financial ruin. “Shame on President Obama. Shame on him for suggesting something so radical that moms and dads could go to sleep at night knowing that if an accident happened the next day they would not have to take bankruptcy or choose between a child disabled or a child who needed to go to college. Shame on President Obama. How dare he suggest such a thing.”

If they do not like the bill, they can change the bill. We did not wake up one morning and declare this the law. The people of the United States declared this through us as their Representatives. If they do not like it, they can unelect us. Believe me, they will have a great chance because I am up for reelection right now. They will be able to do that. But that is the way you do it. You do not threaten to shut down the government.

I am going to run for reelection. I am standing in this election as a supporter of the Affordable Care Act—not because it is a perfect law but because it is much better for all the people I represent than what we had before—the wealthiest people, the middle-class people, and the poor people.

We argued and fought in public, in meetings for 40 years on how to do this. This was not a last-minute, behind-the-scenes deal that nobody read. Have they lost their minds? We debated this for 40 years through every kind of President you can think of, conservative, liberal, different kinds of Congresses.

I know we have devoted 10 minutes, and I know other people want to speak, but I will take just a few minutes.

Contrary to popular belief and what FOX News said, people here read the bills. For 40 years we read the bills. But we did not have to read the bills; all we had to do was look at the faces of kids dying of cancer who had no way to get cured. All we had to do is talk to people who came to our office every day who said: Senator, can't you do something? My insurance is going up. I can't afford it. I want to get out of my job. I worked for GE my whole life. I have a better idea. I want to get a better job, but I can't leave because my wife has cancer.

I don't need to read a bill. I listen to my constituents. That is what this is about. Then when they decide they are going to shut down the government be-

cause they can repeal this law—now they are deciding that did not work so well. That is not making a lot of sense to people. Now we are going to negotiate on we don't know what, but we have to get something out of this. How dare they? How dare this group of radicals, led by the Senator from Texas—how dare they take the greatest democracy on Earth hostage? Who gives them that right? Do they think they are divined by God? They are not—none of us here are.

God could run this world perfectly, but he doesn't run it. He is in Heaven. Until then we, as imperfect as we are, have to figure out His will through the democratic process. But they have decided that is not good enough.

I don't know anything on Earth that is better. Maybe they can figure it out in the next 48 hours. People have been thinking about that for 6 or 7 or 8,000 years or longer. I don't think 48 hours is going to help them.

Anyway, we are here today. What I would like to say is that I agree with everything my Senate colleagues have said. I urge our colleagues to vote to open the government, to not hold the U.S. Government and the world and all the kids in the world, all the adults in the world, all the businesses in the world hostage over their antics. In Louisiana, let me say, we have 400,000 people who need us to fix flood insurance. They are truly hurting. We have 200,000 people who live in Houma who have been waiting for a levee around their city for 25 years. Then they were told by the Corps, yes, they will build it. Then they didn't; yes, they will build it. Then they didn't. I need to get on that.

We have permits in the Gulf of Mexico, I say to Senator BOXER. I see my friend from California. I am going to turn it over to her. We have a little different view on this, Senator BOXER and I, but people in Louisiana would like to drill for oil. We would like to get our permits to do that. But because this ideological group has shut down the government, there are no permits being issued to produce the oil and gas necessary to keep our country strong. I could go on.

Let us reason together. We can find many issues to negotiate about. I am open to many negotiations, as are the Democrats, but to threaten the core of this democracy, fought for so long and hard over decades by men and women, is beyond the pale.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Louisiana. I am so appreciative of her because she is telling it like it is. She is sincere. She cares about her State.

Let me reassure her, she and I do not agree in terms of the parameters of oil drilling and Keystone and other issues.

That has nothing to do with our friendship. But the Senator is exactly right. She deserves to have the permits run through the process. It is ridiculous. Just as the roadbuilders are waiting to have the EPA finish the environmental studies so they can get these roads—this government shutdown is brutal.

The reason I am rising—very briefly because I want to leave time for my friend from Oregon to say a few words—is because I wish to be so crystal clear to the people who might be watching us on this unusual Saturday session. We are in the midst of a Republican government shutdown. I am going to say that again. We are in the midst of a Republican shutdown of the government of the United States of America. The Senate passed a clean bill to reopen the government. It is sitting over there at Speaker BOEHNER's House, and he is blocking all ability to open this government. That is No. 1.

Now we are getting frighteningly close to a default. We are getting very close to the point where America will not be able to pay its bills. The cost of that to our Nation, to our people, to our reputation, to our economy, to our taxpayers cannot be overstated: disaster. We have a chance now to pass a clean debt ceiling bill, which means we will not default. I hope my colleagues will vote for it. They are filibustering it. We need 60 votes. I hope somebody will come to their senses over there because the results of not doing it would be disastrous. I think Senator WARNER has spoken very clearly about what this means from the perspective of both a former governor and a businessman.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper article entitled “Business, labor and nonprofits demand that the shutdown end ‘immediately.’”

I am going to read a little bit from it and leave the remainder of time for my friend from Oregon:

The most prominent names in business, labor and the nonprofit world on Friday demanded that Washington “immediately” end the government shutdown.

In a joint letter sent to President Obama and lawmakers, leaders of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO and United Way Worldwide said the shutdown shouldn't continue another day.

“As leaders of business, labor, and the nonprofit sector, we are writing to urge you to end the federal government shutdown immediately,” the letter says.

“While we may disagree on priorities for federal policies and we even have conflicting views about many issues, we are in complete agreement that the current shutdown is harmful and the risk of default is potentially catastrophic for our fragile economy.”

It goes on. I want to say to my Republican friends: Wake up. This isn't a letter from one Democratic group or a liberal group or even a centrist group. This is a letter from America, from the business leaders and the workers and the nonprofit leaders. You are so out of

step it is frightening. Vote with us for a clean debt ceiling so we will not default and we do not send a terrible message to the markets. Open this government now. Take up the Senate bill over there, Speaker BOEHNER, put it up for a vote. Let's open this government and give it back to the American people because they deserve it. They do not deserve to be treated this way. They do not deserve to be hurt.

I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hill, Oct. 11, 2013]

BUSINESS, LABOR AND NONPROFITS DEMAND
THAT SHUTDOWN END "IMMEDIATELY"

(By Kevin Bogardus)

The most prominent names in business, labor and the nonprofit world on Friday demanded that Washington "immediately" end the government shutdown.

In a joint letter sent to President Obama and lawmakers, leaders of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO and United Way Worldwide said the shutdown shouldn't continue another day.

"As leaders of business, labor, and the nonprofit sector, we are writing to urge you to end the federal government shutdown immediately," the letter says.

"While we may disagree on priorities for federal policies and we even have conflicting views about many issues, we are in complete agreement that the current shutdown is harmful and the risk of default is potentially catastrophic for our fragile economy."

The signatories on the letter were Tom Donohue, the Chamber's president and CEO; AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka; and Stacey Stewart, the U.S. president of United Way Worldwide.

"Our three disparate sectors share a common view—no one benefits from the current shut-down and everyone will be harmed if the government defaults. It is in the interest of our nation that Congress restore the normal functioning of our political process, fund the government immediately and quickly move to resolve the impasse over the debt ceiling limit," the letter says.

The shutdown is in its 11th day even as the Oct. 17 deadline to raise the debt ceiling approaches. Talks between the White House and Republican lawmakers to resolve the budget crisis picked up on Thursday, but an agreement is far from certain.

Business leaders fear a failure to raise the debt ceiling by the deadline will send the stock market into a tailspin and plunge the economy into recession.

Labor unions have been protesting the government shutdown since last week. Trade groups have also been active—from the American Hotel & Lodging Association to the International Franchise Association—telling lawmakers that the shutdown has hurt business.

The Chamber, the AFL-CIO and United Way said both parties need to work together to resolve the impasse.

"We urge all of our leaders in Washington to set aside the many issues we disagree about, reach across the aisle and end the shutdown and the threat of a national default," the letter concludes.

TO PRESIDENT OBAMA AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: As leaders of business, labor, and the nonprofit sector, we are writing to urge you to end the federal government shutdown immediately.

Our country is navigating the most challenging economic times in a generation. While we may disagree on priorities for federal policies and we even have conflicting views about many issues, we are in complete agreement that the current shutdown is harmful and the risk of default is potentially catastrophic for our fragile economy.

Large and small businesses, the workforce (especially federal workers), people who rely on public and privately-funded social services, and communities at-large, are being harmed by the shutdown. The federal government is our nation's largest consumer of goods and services, our largest employer, and the single largest source of financial support for state and local governments and for private social services. Several hundred thousand public servants are at home without pay. The longer the shutdown continues, the more people and communities' economic security will be damaged. Ultimately, our economy could be driven back into a recession.

As we often have in our history, our country benefits from strong differences of opinion on many important issues affecting both federal legislation and the federal government. We believe it is important that we turn to the normal processes our government has for resolving these issues. We cannot afford to have either our government closed or our nation's creditworthiness called into question as part of the way we resolve these important issues.

Our three disparate sectors share a common view—no one benefits from the current shutdown and everyone will be harmed if the government defaults. It is in the interest of our nation that Congress restore the normal functioning of our political process, fund the government immediately and quickly move to resolve the impasse over the debt ceiling limit. We urge all of our leaders in Washington to set aside the many issues we disagree about, reach across the aisle and end the shutdown and the threat of a national default.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. DONOHUE,
President and CEO,
U.S. Chamber of
Commerce.

RICHARD L. TRUMKA,
President, AFL-CIO.

STACEY D. STEWART,
U.S. President, United
Way Worldwide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. The word's "fiscal responsibility" have echoed in this Chamber time after time and they have been put forward in defense of a series of strategies this year that can only be described as incredibly irresponsible.

Let's turn the clock back 6 months. We tried to convene a budget conference committee with the House and it was blocked. The budget conference committee was not blocked with the argument of fiscal responsibility. Yet there was a blockade of putting together a budget so we could have a smart plan to go forward and a foundation for the appropriations bills.

Then colleagues across the aisle blocked the appropriations process. They argued it was fiscally responsible to do so. But that meant keeping programs that are not working and con-

tinuing them rather than replacing them with better plans. So that, too, was irresponsible.

Then we had folks argue it would be fiscally responsible if we shut down the government. But this is costing America. This is decreasing revenue. This is increasing expenses and it is increasing the deficit. Therefore, we have imposed by this group who argues in the name of fiscal responsibility that we have a tax across America, the government shutdown tax imposed on families across the land. If that was not enough, not enough to block the budget process, not enough to block the appropriations process, not enough to shut down the government, now we have a group wanting to go even further. They have their grand default strategy. They want the United States to default and they argue this will do us well fiscally.

They could not be more wrong. In the Banking Committee we had a series of experts come in and we asked the question, What will happen if we default? Just simple examples were given. For example, the interest rate will go up on mortgages. A 1-percent increase on a mortgage means for a family buying a 200,000 house, about \$120 more a month. That is the shutdown and the default tax that colleagues are imposing on families across America.

It doesn't stop there. Everything based on interest rates goes up. Everything based on income from economic activity goes down. Expenses of safety net programs go up; in other words, the deficit goes up and the debt goes up.

Let's stop this irresponsibility of blocking the budget process, blocking the appropriations process, shutting down the government, and imposing a default tax on families across this land. It is not only incredibly wrongheaded, it is doing great damage to families in every county, in every State across the United States of America. At this moment in this vote we are about to have, let's end this attack on the American families. Let's end this irresponsibility.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

Harry Reid, Max Baucus, Patty Murray, Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mark Udall, Bill Nelson, Barbara Boxer, Jon Tester, Brian Schatz, Benjamin L. Cardin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Maria Cantwell, Tim Kaine, Elizabeth Warren.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 216 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden
Hagan	Murphy	

NAYS—45

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Reid
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Chiesa	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johanns	Sessions
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Coburn	Inhofe
--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 45. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, was I originally recorded as “yes”?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. REID. The record should reflect that I have changed that to “no.”

Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to S. 1569.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to speak now during our morning hour business for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I have just been told by my able assistant here that we are still on the motion to proceed. So we are not in morning business.

Now, Mr. President, just a quick announcement: Democrats will caucus in the Mansfield Room forthwith, right now.

Mr. President, I think it would be appropriate for everyone—this has been cleared with Senator McCONNELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. REID. Following the remarks of Senator LANDRIEU and Senator JOHANNIS, I would ask that—well, I will say that the Senate will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I know the Members of the Senate are going to be retiring to caucuses to try to figure out how we are going to move forward, and I am confident, with the good work of the people in this Chamber, we will find a way.

Senator JOHANNIS and I have been working, along with many of our colleagues, to try to come to some resolution about funding a city in the United States, the District of Columbia, that is not an agency of the Federal Government that happens to be the city that the seat of government sits in.

While I am not going to ask for consent now, I want to, through the Chair, ask Senator JOHANNIS to express, if he could, a few views about this, as we try to work our way forward for sometime maybe later this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the good working relationship with Senator LANDRIEU. We have been talking back and forth. We exchanged phone calls through the evening—never quite did connect—but we have been talking here today. It is our desire to find a solution to this issue.

We understand that what the District of Columbia is asking for is the simple ability to use its funding. We are talking and working, and I am optimistic we are going to find a solution.

I would also say, as a former mayor, I can only understand the sleepless nights the mayor is going through. So both of us want to try to solve this issue, and I think the Senate does.

What I would like to do is continue our conversations over the next hour or so. They have been fruitful, and I think we are working our way toward a solution.

I appreciate the opportunity to work with Senator LANDRIEU.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield the floor.

• Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am opposed to S. 1569. Our national debt is nearly \$17 trillion and has nearly dou-

bled since the beginning of the Obama administration. If we allow the Nation to continue on its current path, it will only lead to economic destruction. Raising the debt ceiling without any strings attached would be irresponsible and reckless.

The President has already increased the debt limit five times since coming to office. The first occurred just a month after President Obama took office. At \$789 billion, the increase was provided to pay for his massive, unsuccessful stimulus package. With supermajorities in the House and the Senate, the President was able to push nearly everything he wanted into law.

Because the stimulus package ended up being more expensive than expected, the President got another increase of \$290 billion just 10 months later. Then, just 2 months after that, the President pushed another increase through, this time for \$1.9 trillion. Thirteen months into his Presidency, President Obama had already increased the debt limit by nearly \$3 trillion.

Then, following the 2010 midterm elections, Republicans in Congress welcomed reinforcements, which changed the dynamic. With control of the House and an increased margin in the Senate, Republicans were able to force spending cut concessions from the President before agreeing to any debt limit increase.

In August 2010, after nearly exceeding the debt limit, the President agreed to increase the debt limit by \$2.1 trillion in exchange for \$2.1 trillion in spending cuts, including what has become known as sequestration. While I supported the total reduction in spending enacted by the bill, I voted against it because I believe the cuts should have been allocated in a different way. In total, nearly \$1 trillion was cut from national security spending, which is having a very real, hollowing effect on our ability to protect the Nation. Further, these cuts did not include anything from mandatory entitlement programs like food stamps, and too little of it came from other domestic programs that are better suited for the States to run.

Earlier this year, the President demanded another debt limit increase. He received it, but only after agreeing to force Senate Democrats to consider a budget, which until this year had never been done during the Obama administration. This bill also suspended Congressional pay until a budget was agreed to. I oppose this bill because I do not believe that simply passing a budget was enough. Real spending cuts with real reforms to our permanent programs are needed.

Today we find ourselves in the same situation, and my position has not changed. Spending is continuing to spiral out of control, and if we do nothing to rein it in, our national debt will skyrocket to \$25 trillion in the next

decade. Even the President agrees with those numbers. We cannot allow this to happen, which is why I oppose S. 1569.●

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:36 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 2:16 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HEINRICH).

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President. I understand that we are in session for Senators to speak for up to 10 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, we are here on Saturday, and we just had a very significant vote in the Senate. The vote was on whether we would move to a bill, fully debatable, to raise the debt ceiling without any strings attached.

The Republicans, en bloc, voted against that. As a result—since we need 60 votes to bring a bill to the floor—the vote was 53 to 45. There should be no mistake in anyone's mind. This was a very clear vote, simply to move to a bill, fully debatable, amendable even, but the Republicans would not even vote to go to that bill today.

Quite frankly, I must admit that when I was driving in to the Senate, I was thinking about this. I thought what we will do is that we will get on the bill. Obviously they will vote for cloture to proceed to the bill, and then we will get on the bill. I was wondering to myself how long we will have to be on the bill, what kinds of amendments would be offered, and then would we have to file cloture on that bill also.

I was quite surprised to see every Republican vote against even going to the bill. It begs credulity. I am incredulous at this, especially with the markets opening in Asia later tomorrow, on Sunday. How are they going to read this? I think if we had voted to at least move to the bill and debated it, they would have stabilized somewhat because they would say at least they are willing to talk about it. Now they can look at the bill and say simply, Republicans are not going to discuss this.

It is shocking that this would have transpired today at this last minute. No one gave up anything in the bill. It was simply to move to the bill, and the Republicans said no.

We have been closed for 2 weeks. I have come to the floor several times,

as I know others have, to talk about this irresponsible and dangerous episode in our Nation's history. I understand that different groups are coming together trying to float some kind of an idea.

I hope something comes of it. I truly hope cooler heads will prevail and we will reach some agreement that will allow the government to reopen, allow the debt ceiling to be extended with no strings attached for at least 1 year or more—at least to get us through the next elections of 2014—and then we ought to go to negotiations.

Our Budget Committee passed a budget. The House passed its budget. They should meet and try to work it out in conference. Our Appropriations Committee passed our bills. The House hasn't passed all of them. Then we could go to work and work these things out in the next 6 weeks, up to December 1. I hope that works and we get that kind of a compromise, but I do not want to see some kind of compromise which says to one side or the other that you have to do this or you have to do that.

It should be open. Our Budget Committee is under the able guidance and direction of Senator MURRAY of Washington. I am not a member of the Budget Committee, but they ought to go to conference without any strings attached or some artificial levels put in. They ought to take what we passed as the budget, as the House did.

What is happening is that—and it is getting worse every day, another week, another 2 weeks—it is unfathomable how many more people are going to be hurt.

A lot of Americans may think sequestration wasn't a big deal or that closing the government wasn't. I saw a piece in the paper where some tea party people were meeting. What came through is they weren't being directly hit or hurt by the government shut-down.

One respondent was quoted in the paper as saying: We need to go back to the late 1800s, the way this country ran then, where everybody grew their own vegetables.

I would say to that person: If you want to grow your own vegetables, you can grow your own vegetables. If you want to live somewhere without electricity, air conditioning, with no health care, and never go to the doctor, you should be able to do that. But why should you make the rest of the country go back to the 1800s?

This is what a handful of people are trying to do. They can't do it legislatively, they can't do it through the courts, they can't do it politically, and they can't win elections on that basis. So they are trying to do it by holding a gun to our heads, keeping the government closed, and threatening to default on the full faith and credit of the United States.

I wish to say in the few minutes I have remaining what another yearlong sequester would mean in human terms. These are things that come under the jurisdiction of my Appropriations Committee, which I have been privileged to chair or where I have been the ranking member since 1989. We have never had these kinds of problems before—Republicans or Democrats—when Republicans ran it or Democrats. I have been back and forth on this many times, in terms of Republicans chairing it—Democrats, Republicans, Democrats. We have never had these kinds of problems.

If we go 1 more year under sequester, that means 177,000 fewer children will get Head Start services—177,000—and 1.3 million fewer students will receive Title I education assistance. What is Title I? This goes to the poorest kids, the poorest families, the poorest areas. So 1.3 million low-income kids won't be helped.

Oh, our kids will be fine, kids from the middle class, the upper class, and of Senators and Congressman. They have money. I am talking about the poor kids, and there are 1.3 million.

There are 760,000 fewer households that would receive less heating and cooling assistance under the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, and mostly they are elderly poor people.

There will be 9,000 fewer special education staff in the classroom. In other words, under IDEA we provide money for special education teachers and support staff for special education students, and 9,000 will be cut.

There will be \$291 million less for childcare subsidies for working families, for people who need childcare subsidies. They are low income, they are going to work every day, but they need some childcare help—\$291 million cut away from that. How many will not be able to go to work or what will they do with those children? Will they put them in substandard childcare facilities?

One thing that is mind-boggling is we have a program in Medicare that goes after fraud, waste, and abuse. We know from the past that for every dollar that we put into that, we actually recover \$7.90. I don't mean something phony. I mean we actually bring back \$7.90 for every \$1 dollar we put into it.

Because of the cut under sequester that means in the next year there will be \$2.7 billion that we will not recover. By reducing the number of people in the fraud, waste and abuse section, that means it opens the door to fraud. People say: Oh, they are not there. They are not checking, right?

People say: Well, now we are going to give them flexibility under sequester. But there is no flexibility. That has to be cut.

Another yearlong continuing resolution under sequester means \$2 billion

less for the National Institutes of Health, which means 1,300 fewer research grants.

Again, I would say that people say: Well, we will give flexibility. My colleague on the other side says: We will have sequester, but we will leave flexibility to the departments.

Let's see how that goes.

The funds for the Administration for Children and Families—what would they do? Would they preserve Head Start slots by cutting childcare subsidies?

At NIH, would you preserve cancer research by cutting Alzheimer's research? These are terrible choices. Flexibility does not answer these questions. It is not the answer.

When they talk about flexibility, I know what is on their mind—military spending. Everybody likes to talk about the sequester and the level of sequester. Do you know what the House did? A sequester says it is 50/50, 50 percent cut from defense, 50 percent from nondefense discretionary. What the House did in the Ryan budget was to leave things whole and take it out of things like Head Start, IDEA, special education, and programs such as that. They took it out of there, but they left defense whole. That is not at all what was in sequester.

In my area of Health and Human Services, education, labor, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, NIH, next year we would cut about \$34 billion. People will say, I don't know what that means. As I said, it is how many more children will not be in Head Start, how many more families will not get childcare subsidies, how many more research grants will not be funded by the NIH. We will not have our Centers for Disease Control and Prevention epidemiologists out in the field watching for food outbreaks, food-borne illnesses, et cetera.

It is a disaster if we continue with the yearlong sequester and a continuing resolution. That is why we need a short-term one, so our committees can go to work. Perhaps cooler heads will prevail, and we can get a better budget for next year before the end of the year. To me, this is the way to proceed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. I commend the words of our chairman, the senior Senator from Iowa, for his warnings about the impact of sequestration and the across-the-board indiscriminate cuts. We are grateful for that because we need to be thinking about what happens down the road when we have a budget agreement.

I want to start today with a brief comment on what happened earlier. At about noontime we had a vote, which is a procedural vote which I was hoping would go in a certain direction, but it

didn't. It was a vote to move forward on the question of how we are going to avoid default. I don't think it is the last word on this issue for the next few days, but I was hoping that the Republicans would at least allow a debate on how we can avoid default. So far that hasn't happened, but we are confident that in the next couple of days we will resolve this. But I do think it is important we lay a foundation for why we need to avoid default, because we have talked a lot about the consequences and the impact of a government shutdown—and that remains what might be called a clear and present danger to the middle class and to our economy—but we have to talk at the same time about the consequences of default because we are only days away from the deadline.

Maybe the best way to start is not with numbers but with part of a letter I received from a constituent this week. The letter was dated October 8, so my assumption is that most of what is contained in this letter are fears about and the impacts from the shutdown only. The sentiments expressed in this letter will only grow in significance and severity as we get closer to the deadline and closer to default. I am reading just in pertinent part. This particular constituent is from northeastern Pennsylvania, about an hour from where I live, but in the same basic region. She talked about her own circumstances and that of her husband and then she continued on:

Besides our personal difficulties due to the budget impasse, my elderly parents live with the worry of when and if they will receive their Social Security checks. At 85 and 83 they should not have this uncertainty. These should be their golden years. It breaks my heart to hear my mother say she can't sleep and has a stomachache from the worry about where our country is headed. Middle- and low-income families cannot afford another economic downturn. We are just barely recovering from the last one.

That is what she says about her parents. Now, again, it is my assumption the worry and the anxiety expressed in that paragraph are solely attributable to the government shutdown. Those worries and anxieties, and, frankly, real pain, the physical pain expressed in that paragraph about her mother, will only grow the closer we get to default, because we know the consequences of default are almost unimaginable—about the worst economic hit we could take as a country. So that is why we have to take every step necessary to avoid it.

But I think the words of a constituent from Pennsylvania speak in this case for the Nation. Why should people have a worry, even if that worry is unfounded? We know Social Security checks are going out now, thankfully, but they are slowed down substantially if there is a default. We know even in a shutdown, if you reach the age of 65, it is going to take you a while to get the checks you are entitled to because

the process of validating your eligibility is held up. But why should there be uncertainty? Why should any mother or father or grandmother or grandfather have an anxiety and a worry that leads them to have a stomachache, in the case of this letter, or where they can't sleep because of the political agenda of one part of one political party in one House of Congress?

So that is where things are with people's feelings and their anxieties, and we have to be able to respond to that.

The default question itself is of great significance now. Maybe 10 days ago it wasn't, but I am afraid we are in a period now where just the talk of default, just getting close to default, will have an adverse impact on our economy. This did happen in 2011. That is irrefutable. All the data, all the facts, show just getting close to default has an adverse impact on the economy. By one estimate, a recent estimate, that was almost a \$20 billion hit to the economy, if you measure it over 10 years. There are all kinds of other consequences that I won't dwell on right now.

There were two statements made by Secretary of the Treasury Jack Lew in his opening statement to the Finance Committee on Thursday morning that I think we should be reminded of. This was in reference to the question, what if you go over the line in default and you have to decide which bills to pay, which is the wrong way to go, but Secretary Lew posited these two questions.

How can the United States choose whether to send Social Security checks to seniors or pay benefits to our veterans?

That is question No. 1. Question No. 2.

How can the United States choose whether to provide children with food assistance or meet our obligations to Medicare providers?

These are the kinds of questions we are all going to have to answer if we—as some people apparently want us to do—go over the default line for the first time in American history. To say it is fiscal madness doesn't begin to describe it.

Secretary Lew also said something else which we should contemplate today. He said:

It is irresponsible and reckless to insist that we experience a forced default to learn how bad it is.

We have heard talk in this body and in the other body about maybe we can survive if we go over the line; that maybe it is okay, maybe we can prioritize payments. I think we should be reminded of those words. Again, that quote:

... to insist that we experience a forced default to learn how bad it is.

It makes no sense and, fortunately, there is a consensus against it, but we still have work to do to prevent it from happening.

I will read as well a couple of lines from a letter I received from a friend of

mine who has spent a lot more years in the financial markets and has spent a lot of years trying to get both parties in Washington to come together fiscally. I will read some lines from this memo he sent me. He was talking about what happens with default. It is like anything else—if you default on your mortgage, if you default in your personal life, you have a credit problem. He said:

From the standpoint of our creditworthiness, a default is a default. Once you have defaulted, you are a—

And I will leave the word out he put in there because it may not be appropriate for this Chamber, but I think people can figure out what the word might be here.

And everyone fears they will be the next party not to be paid. As in the Lehman bankruptcy—

And here he is talking about the fall of 2008.

the potential for unintended consequences that spiral out of control is enormous. In short, toying with default is not akin to playing with fire but is more like handling financial weapons of mass destruction. It is a violation of the trust we place in our elected leaders to safeguard the welfare of our country.

That is what this person, who I know has a lot of experience in the markets, describes could happen in the event of default.

I will conclude with some quick references to the impact of default as described by economists, as described by experts in the field of measuring the impact of default, and folks who know a lot about what would happen. I will read them as quickly as I can, because we know some of these already but we have to remind ourselves: Increasing borrowing costs. Many have talked and written about that. Damaging economic growth. Higher interest rates. Higher debt payments. Slow economic growth.

One expert was talking about the Lehman bankruptcy and then putting that in the context of a default, and making the case that a default has a much bigger impact than even the Lehman bankruptcy had.

Consider this: In 2008, the Lehman bankruptcy was an “event that triggered the financial crisis that caused the stock market to lose half its value over just 5 months and helped to trigger the worst recession since the Great Depression.”

That was just the Lehman bankruptcy. Imagine in the context of default how much worse it could be.

Retirement savings. According to newer data, an equivalent hit could cost—comparing it to what happened in 2011—the average person in his or her fifties, who has been saving for 20 or 30 years, as much as \$11,000.

Mortgage payments would be hiked. After the 2011 shutdown, mortgage spreads jumped by 70 basis points,

which would have added \$100 per month to the cost of a typical mortgage.

So we have data from 2011 that measures the adverse impact on mortgages just by getting close to default, not in the event of default itself.

Disrupted payments. Delayed or disrupted payments would prevent 57½ million Americans from receiving Social Security benefits in a timely manner and interfere with payments to 3.4 million veterans.

I will read two more. Moody's chief economist Mark Zandi, who has testified in front of the Senate many times—who, parenthetically, as relates to the shutdown testified yesterday over in the House, because the Joint Economic Committee is a joint committee—predicts that, just as it relates to the shutdown, in this fourth quarter, the fourth quarter we are in, we will have lost ½ point of growth. So instead of the GDP growth in the fourth quarter being 2½ percent, as Mark Zandi would have projected absent a shutdown, with the shutdown we will go from 2½ percent growth to 2 percent. That is a shutdown in one quarter. Just imagine the impact on growth if we default.

Here is what Mark Zandi says. I am quoting him directly:

It would be devastating to the economy. Confidence will evaporate, consumer confidence will sharply decline, businesses will stop hiring, consumers will stop spending, the stock market will fall significantly in value, borrowing costs for businesses and households will rise.

And he goes on from there. But, look, you don't have to be an economist to know the impact of default. All you have to do is read what economists are saying across the board. These are people who disagree on a lot of things. They might disagree on a budget item. They might disagree on econometric modeling. They might disagree on tax cuts. They might disagree on a usual Democrat versus Republican approach to the economy. They might have fundamental disagreements on everything, but on this they are speaking with one voice: Don't default, they are telling us. Don't even get close to defaulting. Don't even talk about or debate defaulting. Just prevent it from happening. That is the overwhelming consensus.

Let me conclude with one reference here. When I got to the Senate, one of the leading Republican voices on the budget—because he happened to be the ranking member on the Budget Committee—was Judd Gregg from New Hampshire. He had been a Governor of New Hampshire and then served in the Senate for many years. This is what he had to say recently in talking about what would happen in the event of default and brinkmanship with the debt limit.

[It] is the political equivalent of playing Russian roulette with all of the chambers of

the gun loaded. It is the ultimate no-win strategy. A default would lead to some level of chaos in the debt markets, which would lead to a significant contraction in economic activity, which would lead to job losses, which would lead to higher spending by the Federal Government and lower tax revenues, which would lead to more debt.

So says the former ranking member of the Budget Committee, the former Republican Senator from New Hampshire. So the idea that some think for some reason we could go into default or even get close to it doesn't make a lot of sense.

I will conclude with this thought. That letter I started with from my constituent in Pennsylvania, who speaks for the country, I believe, when she was talking about her parents—her 82- or 83-year-old parents—and about the uncertainty they have, about the worry and the anxiety that is literally causing, in the case of her mother, according to this letter, physical pain, but even if it didn't rise to that level, just the idea of a government shutdown coupled with the potential default is causing that kind of anxiety and is really disturbing, and I think it is an insult to so many Americans.

We have to come together and open the government at long last and make sure we pay our bills and not even get close to defaulting, and then we can have negotiations and discussions for weeks and months about long-term and short-term issues. In the meantime, we have to make sure we pay our bills and open the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, as we exited the Chamber to go to our Democratic caucus, I am certain my Republican colleagues and friends were talking among themselves as well, trying to find a way forward.

A reporter stopped me and said: What do you think the Senate is going to do?

I don't know the specifics, but I am most certainly hopeful and remain cautiously optimistic that the Senate will step up to the job at hand and fulfill the promise and hopes of our Founders, who created the Senate to operate at times just like these where there seems to be no way forward, to find a way forward; where the political winds have gotten so bitter and cold, for the 100 of us to find a way forward to help keep our economy whole and operating and functioning well, not just for our Nation but for the world, which is important; to help support and bolster the recovery that is underway; to set aside the bitterness and the rancor and try to find a way forward.

I am very encouraged despite the fact that the vote was very divisive—all Republicans on one side and all Democrats on the other. I am confident because I know Members of this body well and I have been here long enough to know that the many people of good will on both sides of the aisle can try to find a way forward. And I know the President of the United States is open to negotiation.

Maybe we can find resolution within the political parties, but that is not what is important. What is important is finding a resolution in the Senate of the United States for all of the people of the United States. We do not represent narrow districts with narrow ideologies. We represent States—big ones, such as California, medium-sized ones, such as Louisiana, and small ones, such as Delaware. But inside of Delaware, inside of Louisiana, and inside of California, there are people of all different political persuasions. As Senators, when we run for office we have to listen and take all of that in and then try to make the best decisions we can. It is an honor to serve in the Senate even though it is tough, it is hard, and it is very difficult at times.

I have been proud to serve here for 18 years and be among many groups that have found compromise and the middle ground, that have tried to work to understand where the other side is coming from and move our country forward. It has not always been perfect, and none of us are perfect here, but I am proud I have at least been one to say: Count on me to try to see what we can do to resolve the situation. I want to say that today for my constituents. That is what they want me to do. That is what they sent me here for 18 years ago and what I know they want me to continue to do. I do feel strongly on their behalf that the government should open and the 21,000 of them who have been wrongly laid off by the actions of a minority—the government needs to open, and the debt of the United States most certainly needs to be honored so this economic recovery can continue.

But there are plenty of things we can negotiate. The debt of the country is too high. We do need to have some earned benefit and potential entitlement reform—not necessarily cutting benefits from people who count on them but for the government to do its part to meet people halfway. There are always efficiencies that can be created if we work together.

So on behalf of my constituents, I am very hopeful that we can find a way forward. I think Senator REID has been providing extraordinary leadership, and hopefully we can find a way forward.

I would briefly mention that there have been some very good conversations going on about funding for the

city of Washington—not a part of the Federal Government—which has not been resolved yet, but Republicans, Democrats, and the White House are working together to find a way so the District of Columbia, the city of Washington—with its own mayor and city council, its own budget, its own local funds—does not have to be caught up in a very tough circumstance that is not of their making. They are not part of the Federal Government, and neither is New York, Chicago, New Orleans, or Baltimore. They are separate cities, and they should be treated that way. We haven't found a way yet, but we are working on it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind words of the Senator from Louisiana, but I want the RECORD spread with the work she has done that I have seen in our years together in the Senate. No one has been more of an advocate for a State than the senior Senator from Louisiana. What she did after that terrible hurricane hit that area is now legendary—the ability that she had to change what had been standard procedures and law in this country for decades. We changed that for a lot of reasons. One was her advocacy. We did it because of her.

In fact, the Democrats in the Senate voted for things they never voted for before because of the good Senator from Louisiana. It was not done to help on a temporary basis but long term for the State of Louisiana.

I hope they understand what a difference one person can make. She has made a difference and she has changed things forever in Louisiana already. I am sure the best is yet to come.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRELIMINARY TALKS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as most know now—we did a press event so everybody knows, I guess, but I will say it again—I had a meeting with Senators MCCONNELL, ALEXANDER, and SCHUMER this morning to work on issues before us. The conversations are preliminary, but we are talking. I hope everyone understands how positive this is. It is the first discussions we have had here, period, during the whole pendency of this artificially driven government shutdown and not raising the debt limit when we should.

I am confident Senator MCCONNELL understands that defaulting on our debt would mean millions of jobs in the United States, not thousands, not hun-

dreds of thousands but millions. It could halt Social Security checks, Medicare payments, and even paychecks for our men and women in uniform.

Democratic Senators agree with President Obama and we share a simple goal. We want to reopen the government and pay our bills so we can move forward in good-faith negotiations for a long-term budget to protect jobs, the middle class, and the American economy. That is our goal.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

At 12:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints the following Members to be the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of the House amendment and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. LUCAS, KING of Iowa, NEUGEBAUER, ROGERS of Alabama, CONAWAY, THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, CRAWFORD, Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. DENHAM, RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, PETERSON, MCINTYRE, COSTA, WALZ, SCHRADER, MCGOVERN, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. VELA.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title III of the House amendment, and title III of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROYCE, MARINO, and ENGEL.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sections 1207 and 1301 of the House amendment, and sections 1301, 1412, 1435, and 4204 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CAMP, SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and LEVIN.

For consideration of the House amendment to the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Ms. FUDGE.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following joint resolution was read the first time:

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

S. 1571. A bill to permit the District of Columbia to obligate and expend local funds in accordance with the local budget adopted by the Council of the District of Columbia during any period of fiscal year 2014 in which no Federal law appropriating such local funds is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 395

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 395, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide further protection for puppies.

S.J. RES. 24

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 24, a joint resolution to amend the Department of Defense Survivor Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014 to make continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased members of the Coast Guard.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON RESERVOIRS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Energy Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 812 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 812) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take actions to implement the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 812) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 812

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES CONCERNING TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON RESERVOIRS IN THE GULF OF MEXICO.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to take actions necessary to implement the terms of the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, which is hereby approved, including—

(1) to approve unitization agreements and related arrangements for the exploration of, and development or production of oil or gas from, transboundary reservoirs and geological structures;

(2) to disclose as necessary under the Agreement information related to the exploration, development, and production of a transboundary reservoir or geological structure that may be considered confidential, privileged, or proprietary information under law; and

(3) to accept and take action not inconsistent with an expert determination under the Agreement.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.J. RES. 76

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told that H.J. Res. 76 has been received

from the House and is at the desk and due for activity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the joint resolution will be read for a second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR SUNDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 1 p.m. tomorrow, Sunday, October 13, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, Senators be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:58 p.m., adjourned until Sunday, October 13, 2013, at 1 p.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 12, 2013:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

L.T. GEN. JAMES M. KOWALSKI

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Saturday, October 12, 2013

The House met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 12, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JASON CHAFFETZ to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We thank You for Your ongoing presence and sustaining grace in us all and Your concern for our Nation. Continue to bless and inspire the Members of the people's House.

May they be encouraged in the movement that has occurred, and may the hopes and prayers of the American people, and indeed the world, that a break in our current impasse may be imminent be fulfilled.

Forgive our failures, our lack of faith. May the good intentions of all acting in this House be rewarded by solutions to our struggles that benefit our Nation.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. KAPTUR led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

TAKE THE BARRICADES OF CONSTITUTIONAL OPPRESSION DOWN

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Mall and the memorials on the Mall are public places open 24 hours a day. The Park Service has closed them, using the excuse of the shutdown. But the Park Service discriminates who may exercise the First Amendment and who may not. It allowed a free speech immigration rally on the Mall but denies people access to the World War II Memorial. This is arbitrary action, thus constitutionally unlawful.

The Park Service forgets also that the First Amendment includes the right of the people to peaceably assemble. The Supreme Court sometimes limits the First Amendment by citing a compelling State interest, even though the First Amendment doesn't really give that exception.

The Government's compelling State interest here: lack of money. Does this mean any time the government claims it has no funds, it can shut down the First Amendment and deny the right to peaceably assemble? I think not.

This excuse is ludicrous, unlawful, arbitrary, and in practice, it discriminates. The First Amendment was written to prevent this very type of action by government.

Let the people assemble. Take the barricades of constitutional oppression down.

And that's just the way it is.

IMPACTS OF REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on House Republicans to end the Federal Government shutdown.

The shutdown is causing significant negative impacts on our economy, jobs, and consumer confidence across our country. The number of people applying for unemployment benefits jumped by 66,000 this week. Local economies across our Nation are losing \$76 million

a day from people not able to visit our Nation's parks. Just in one location, the closing of Zion National Park in Utah has cost the surrounding community over \$3.5 million in lost visitor spending.

The Head Start program already has turned away over 7,000 children across this country. U.S. consumer confidence has deteriorated in October to its weakest in 9 months, since the first Federal shutdown over 17 years ago. The Federal shutdown is stalling almost 130 highway and bridge projects in 35 States, which means lost jobs.

Mr. Speaker, let's end this uncertainty for our Nation. Let's stop the battering of jobs in this economy. Bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor and reopen the government of the United States.

TIME FOR BIPARTISAN SOLUTIONS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it is time for solutions to end the government shutdown and resolve the uncertainty of America's rapidly approaching credit limit. Every day House Republicans are working to shape a bipartisan agreement to reopen the Federal Government and restore services for the American people.

While the Senate has refused to talk, House Republicans have worked to find bipartisan common ground and pass legislation to restore services that should be open and running for North Carolinians and for all Americans. Republicans and Democrats in the House of Representatives passed 15 separate measures to pay our military, restore the WIC program, open national parks, and end delays to veteran benefit applications, among other important things.

Like my constituents, I think the gridlock in Washington needs to stop. To have any hope of solving the challenges before us, be it this shutdown or our debt crisis, Democrats can't simply refuse to negotiate. They have to be willing to work together. Divided government demands bipartisan solutions.

DAY TWELVE

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Day No. 12—Mr. Speaker, today is the 12th day of a government shutdown and 1 day closer to defaulting on our debt. In the history of our great Nation, we have never

failed to pay our bills. We are Americans. We always pay our bills.

Mr. Speaker, enough with the gamesmanship, the finger-pointing, the name-calling. It is time to get back to business. We can do it in three easy steps.

Step one: let's open the government.

Step two: let's pay our bills.

And step three: let's negotiate a real budget that begins to rebuild jobs and an economy that rebuilds middle class America.

Mr. Speaker, everyone wins—especially the American people.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, in New Hampshire and across our country, we continue to see that the leadership in this House has led to congressional dysfunction that is damaging our lives and damaging our economy.

Every day, I have been speaking with mayors, business owners, and constituents in my district to hear how Washington's inability to do its job is hurting their ability to do their job.

This week, I held a telephone town hall and heard from Granite Staters who don't understand why the leadership in this Congress can't simply fix this problem that is hurting our State and our economy. Our banks are diverting time and effort planning for a potential default instead of focusing on serving families and businesses in New Hampshire. The Small Business Administration has frozen general loans to small businesses. The shutdown is threatening funding that keeps families in their homes and infuses millions of dollars into our economy.

Every day this shutdown continues is a day that Congress does not focus on the economy and the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, let us vote to open the government.

SHUTDOWN HARDSHIPS FOR REAL PEOPLE

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, the reason dozens of my colleagues are here is to reopen government. Too often, what is lost in this discussion of this shutdown is the real hardship that is faced by the people we represent.

I heard from a woman this week who told me that she was attempting to find a job and move her family out of a shelter. She made the necessary appointments to fill out the paperwork for a housing voucher, set up a job interview, and was given an opportunity.

Let's talk about how this shutdown affected her. She can't be brought onto

the job—no one can—because the job relies on a government contract that is on hold in this shutdown. She can't move into permanent and safe housing because her housing voucher can't be processed during this government shutdown.

There are others. I spoke with the leaders of the Emergency Food Network in Tacoma who said that, as this shutdown continues and as funding for Women, Infants, and Children nutrition programs deteriorate, they are struggling to even provide baby formula.

We need to reopen this government. It is harming our economy and it is straining the social fabric of our country.

REOPEN GOVERNMENT

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to joining my colleagues in that line to sign a discharge petition that will reopen government. Not with conditions, not on the condition that we want this thing or we want that thing, and we won't open the government until we get it, but just to open the government with no conditions.

My Republican friends know very well that this shutdown is for one reason, and one reason only. It is because they wanted to delay, defund, and destroy health care for the American people. They are ready to destroy the American economy unless they get it.

We don't have to go through this long line. We can open up the government in 15 minutes if Speaker BOEHNER puts a clean continuing resolution on the floor right now. Let's get it done.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION, AND INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 80) making continuing appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 80

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated,

and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the following headings:

(1) "Department of the Interior—Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education";

(2) "Department of Health and Human Services—Indian Health Service".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "American Indian and Alaska Native, Health, Education, and Safety Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Indian

Education, and Indian Health Service Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 80, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Idaho yield to the gentleman for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

□ 0945

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to put the clean bill on the floor from the Senate to open the government?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of this important legislation to continue funding for the Bureaus of Indian Affairs and Indian Education and for the Indian Health Service. This bill focuses on education, law enforcement, health care, and many other vital services to American Indians and Alaska Natives.

Mr. Speaker, long ago, the Federal Government made treaty commitments to American Indians, who, in return, ceded the vast lands that make up the United States today. Visit just about any Indian reservation today, and you will quickly realize that the Federal Government hasn't even come close to living up to its end of the bargain.

My colleagues on the subcommittee who are on both sides of the aisle and my predecessors before me, Mr. MORAN and Mr. Dicks, who chaired this committee, have been working hard over the past several years to address the critical needs and challenges in Indian country. Even in declining budget environments, on a bipartisan basis, our committee continues to make funding

for Indian country a priority. That is why I doubt my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle will oppose the merits of this bill. They might oppose the strategy of getting here, but they probably won't oppose the merits of the bill. It is something on which we agree on a bipartisan basis.

For the past 11 days, the House has been attempting to reopen parts of the government without further delay and without trying to extract any further concessions from the Senate or the President.

Mr. Speaker, you can't go wrong by trying to do the right thing. Right here, right now, those of us who care about Indian country have been given an opportunity to do the right thing. Let's not waste this opportunity by pointing fingers and arguing over everything other than the topic at hand. The topic at hand is Indian health, Indian education and the BIA. This is the hand we have been dealt. Let's do the right thing. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Here we go again. Each day, the gaping wound that the government shutdown represents grows bigger, and the House Republican response continues to be these little Band-Aids.

Of course, we on the Democratic side want to see all Native American programs funded. The other side knows that. In fact, this has been one area in which we have achieved bipartisan agreement. Both Chairman SIMPSON—and I want to particularly mention Mr. COLE on our subcommittee—I, and Ms. MCCOLLUM have tried to put as much money as possible, given very severe fiscal constraints, into Native American programs; but this bill that is on the floor today, in fact, doesn't serve its stated purpose. We are going to hear from House Republicans as to what this latest Band-Aid temporarily funds, but here are just some of the Native American programs and offices that are not funded by this resolution:

Native American education programs that are funded by the Department of Education; Native American law enforcement programs that are funded by the Department of Justice, including the programs to carry out the Violence Against Women Act. That is an area in which we had achieved, finally, bipartisan agreement. This doesn't allow us the funds to carry out that program. Native American social services programs that are so important to the American Indians, particularly on our reservations, are not funded by this bill. It includes child care and temporary assistance to needy families because they are funded by the Department of Health and Human Services. It includes Native American housing programs that are funded by the Depart-

ment of Housing and Urban Development. HUD has the highest percentage—almost 100 percent—of its employees who are furloughed still.

What is this—the 11th day, Mr. Speaker? That was a rhetorical question.

While this resolution temporarily funds the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Indian Education, it fails to fund the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, which oversees those agencies. So we are not even willing to fund the office that is responsible for managing the programs that we purport to fund today.

What about the Office of the Special Trustee, which administers \$3.7 billion in tribal funds and \$728 million in individual Indian accounts? That is not funded either. So let's not be deluded that this is going to fix the situation with regard to our Native Americans. That is why a number of tribes have opposed this way of doing it. They want all of the government to open up because it is their government as well.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying basis for the Republican shutdown of the government has been an irrational and intransigent opposition to the Affordable Care Act. That is how it started. House Republicans voted 43 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act. At the same time, they were voting to repeal the permanent reauthorization of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act. Every time the other side voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, they were voting to repeal the permanent reauthorization of the Indian Health Care Act as well as voting to repeal many new programs that are contained in the Affordable Care Act which are designed to assist the Indian Health Service in meeting its mission to raise the health status of Native Americans. These 43 attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act and the shutting down of government is all the more disheartening because we on the Subcommittee on Interior and Environment have so strongly supported Native American programs.

Now, unlike what we have seen in the last week—that of certain Members who have marched the floor to claim support for the NIH and Head Start, all of which we strongly support—even as Members have pushed sequester and proposed additional cuts to these programs in 2014 on the other side, this subcommittee has the bipartisan commitment to Native American programs. That is something we should be proud of.

This subcommittee, I know, does not want to go about funding Native American programs in this manner. It is a halfhearted, Band-Aid approach. It is wrong. We need to fund all Native American programs. We need to fund all of the Federal Government. It is long past time for this shutdown to end, so let's release all of the Federal

employees who have been taken hostage. Let's reopen the people's government.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of this resolution to fund the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

While House Republicans continue to offer solutions to end this government shutdown, we will continue also to take steps to provide funding for important areas of our government.

This measure fulfills the Congress' unique responsibility to fund programs vital to Indian tribes and Alaska Natives. There are 56 million acres of Indian trust lands in the United States. Unlike other privately owned lands, in most cases, Indian trust lands may not be leased for development purposes without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. These lands are critical for Indian tribes to create jobs and to generate revenue for their reservation economies.

For example, in my central Washington district, two tribes are major producers of timber that employ hundreds of people and produce income for tribal governments and thousands of individual members. In other parts of the country, tribes utilize their trust lands for oil, natural gas, coal development, and for a variety of business leasing and housing. It is critical to ensure continued funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs to perform functions necessary for tribes and individual landowners to lease and develop their lands.

The joint resolution additionally provides funding for the Indian Health Service programs. While direct care for acute and chronic health conditions is being provided as an essential government service to Native Americans during this shutdown, other services, such as preventative care, have been scaled back. It is critical that these be restored to normal operations.

The President repeatedly stresses the importance of the United States' unique relationship with Indian tribes. He now has an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to match his rhetoric with action by supporting the passage of this resolution and signing it into law.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York, NITA LOWEY, the ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican shutdown.

Of course, we support the funding for Indian Education and Health Services. Unfortunately, the House hasn't had

the opportunity to approve the funding for these programs this year because the majority did not have the courage of their convictions to bring their FY14 Interior and Environment or the Labor-HHS appropriations bills to the House floor. Don't for a moment think that today's bill fulfills their commitments to Native Americans. Under this bill, they will still not receive the funding they are due from the Department of Justice and the Department of Education.

This is nothing more than a Republican ploy, and the claim that Democrats are not negotiating is absolutely false. House Republicans wrote a bill and sent it to the Senate. The Senate adopted the most important part of it, the funding level, and the President agreed to sign it even though Democrats wanted greater investments to support economic growth—jobs. The only thing Democrats oppose are the irresponsible efforts to put health care decisions back in the hands of insurance companies, which have nothing to do with keeping the government open. That is democracy. That is negotiation. We have done more than meet in the middle, but the Republicans now say “no” to their own bill.

We could end this shutdown today if the majority would only support a reasonable solution to allow a vote on the Republican-written, Senate-passed bill. Vote “no.” Demand a House vote to immediately end the reckless Republican shutdown.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution to appropriate funds for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Health Service, and the Bureau of Indian Education because our Native Americans cannot sustain another day of this Washington gridlock.

In my home State of Montana, we have seven Indian reservations and also the State-recognized Little Shell Tribe, and we are working right now to get Federal recognition for the Little Shell Tribe. Native Americans encompass 6 percent of Montana's population, but on our reservations, unemployment can rise as high as 50 percent.

The Indian Health Service and the Bureaus of Indian Affairs and Indian Education can literally be lifelines for many. Earlier this year, when I visited the Salish Kootenai College, I learned about their slogan: “Grounded in Tradition, Charging into the Future.” Our reservations want to be self-sustaining, but without adequate health services, education, and economic opportunities, that goal is unattainable.

I want our Native children to be able to thrive in my home State of Montana. That is why I support this resolution today.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time remains for both sides in the debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 12½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Idaho has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota, Ms. BETTY MCCOLLUM, the chair of the Indian Caucus.

□ 1000

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this bill. As the Democratic cochair of the Native American Caucus, I am here to promote respect for tribal sovereignty, to fight for the needs of Native American families, and to call our Federal Government to uphold its trust and treaty obligations.

Mr. COLE, my Republican cochair, Ranking Member MORAN, and Mr. SIMPSON, the author of this legislation, share those very same goals; but I strongly believe that the bill before us today does not meet the needs of Indian Country; a broader solution is needed.

The National Conference of American Indians has asked us to “reopen government operations for all Federal agencies that meet trust and treaty obligations to tribal nations, and to stop the sequester of 2014.”

And I have heard that same message loud and clear from Minnesota tribal leaders. Mr. Speaker, when we consider Federal funding for tribal nations, we are talking about government-to-government relationships. This means the entire Federal Government needs to be open and functioning. Many services, as has been pointed out, that are vital to Indian Country are not funded within BIA or IHS. The Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Education, Justice, Transportation, and other agencies within HHS or Interior all have Native American accounts. Food distribution on Indian reservations is administered by the Department of Agriculture, and no funds are able to replenish food reserves that support 76,000 low-income Native American Indians each month.

In Minnesota, winter is on its way, and tribal development housing has been brought to a halt for the White Earth Nation because the Bureau of Land Management is closed. Mr. Speaker, I could list dozens of other important tribal partnerships and contracts that this bill will not reopen, and I have one example I am going to enter for the RECORD from the Oglala Sioux on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation.

To support tribal nations, we need to bring an end to this shutdown and vote on a clean funding bill for the entire government. I will vote “no” on this bill.

The Oglala Sioux Tribe issued a press release that the U.S. Government shutdown is creating untenable economic

conditions for some of the poorest Indian tribes. The tribe, with its 45,000 membership and 3.1 million acre Pine Ridge Indian Reservation located in southwestern South Dakota, stands to suffer severe economic repercussions directly caused by the shutdown of the United States Government. Federal funding for critical tribal programs is inaccessible during the shutdown which will force the Tribe to close programs and furlough hundreds of tribal employees if Congress does not reopen the United States Government. Over fifty percent of the Tribe's programs will be affected. The USDA Food Distribution Program will be terminated. The Suicide Prevention Program (SAMSHA Department of Health and Human Services), the Homeless Veterans Program (Department of Veterans Affairs), and the Emergency Youth Shelter Program (Department of Interior) will be suspended. Low-Income Home Energy Assistance and other vital services will be cut off, which is especially concerning given that tribal members, including elders, are struggling with the aftermath of the blizzard.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleagues, this is an important piece of legislation. When you vote against this legislation, you are voting against the first Americans. Every one of you in this room is an immigrant. We made a trust relationship with American Indians to take care of them, provide for them, and a trust relationship we should fulfill.

You say this won't go anywhere. Very frankly, we should have done this a long time ago. We should set up a system because of the trust system that they are front-end loaded for their health care primarily. We have a system now that does not work. They have to hold their hand out and beg; and a lot of you on that side, all of you will say, Don't say too much. Take your blanket and your half a beef and go home and be quiet. No other minority would be treated that way. This health system has to be fixed. We have an opportunity to fix it now. We should fix it now.

When people stand up and say, I support the American Indian, the first Americans, you are not really supporting them. You are paying lip service. You are paying lip service. That is all you have been doing for all these years ever since Columbus landed on these shores. And you broke treaty after treaty after treaty, both sides of the aisle. I have been under eight Presidents, and they pay lip service. They pay lip service.

The President will have a big First American conference, the fifth one, and all they do is tell them again is, Be quiet. Take your blanket and half a beef and go home.

For those who talk about the minority, this is the first minority. Yes, I get a little emotional about this because I have 10 American Native grandchildren. I have two beautiful American Native children that have given me those 10 grandchildren, and I had a wife that was, in fact, one of the first Americans, and I am proud to be associated with that. We should vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my good friend from Alaska on the unconscionable treatment that has been accorded our Native Americans, and I agree that there should be a unique commitment to our Native Americans.

At this point I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Look, we all know what is happening here. If anybody believes that there is a true commitment to fully fund the promises that we have made to America's Native American tribes, you've got to be joking. Look at what is not funded in this legislation. It would be really simple to meet the promise that the gentleman spoke so eloquently about, and the way we would do that is to simply bring up a clean bill to reopen the entirety of government. Instead of picking and choosing which promises we will keep to America's Native American tribes, we would keep them all, instead of skipping the housing programs, the social service programs, and providing a talking point, but not meeting the obligation that this Congress has made to America's Native American tribes.

If any community in this country understands broken promises, it is the Native American tribes of this country in this bill, this legislation. This continues the trail of broken promises.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a valued member of our subcommittee and probably the largest advocate for Indian issues in Congress.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I can agree with parts of what my friends have said, and parts I frankly can't agree with. I have worked in a bipartisan manner across the aisle and with the White House on Native American issues ever since I have gotten here, no matter who was on the other side of the aisle or who was in the White House. And I have to tell you, when you question the commitment of our side on Native American affairs, you clearly haven't looked at the record.

Because of this chairman, Indian health expense is up 29 percent in 3 years. Each year for the last 3 years, we have raised above what the adminis-

tration requested in Native American spending, and that is a fact. And we did it, by the way, working in a bipartisan manner. I want to give my friend, Mr. MORAN, and my friend, BETTY MCCOLLUM, a lot of credit for those achievements, and I want to give our predecessor, Norm Dicks, who operated the same way, a lot of credit for that. This is a good-faith effort to do exactly what my friends suggest—make sure that critical programs in Indian Country are funded right now. I will continue to work in a bipartisan manner with my friends on these and other issues, but to suggest that they are being used as a pawn, no, for the first time they are just not being forgotten about because that is what tends to happen around here; and that has happened under Democrats and Republicans.

So with that, I would urge the adoption and support. I want to thank my friend for being the leader in this House on funding Native American programs. He has done more than anybody in this country to improve the quality and the level of Federal services on that. He ought to be given the credit that he deserves. I want to thank my friend, Mr. MORAN, for working with him every step of the way to accomplish those things. I saw them do it when their roles were reversed when he was the chairman and he was the ranking member. It is not an effort to divide. It is an effort, actually, to put something out that has united us in a bipartisan sense and to make sure that the first Americans aren't the last Americans anybody around here thinks about.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, this releases 1.5 percent of the Federal Government, leaving more than 99 percent of the Federal Government still closed.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the Republican position is clear. Either affordable health care for millions of Americans goes or we will keep the government shutdown. In an effort to avert the public's attention from this extreme and destructive hostage-taking, they have been putting forward a series of piecemeal, two month, sequestration level, funding bills.

However, today's piecemeal bill reaches a new level of hypocrisy. The irony here would only be lost on a Republican Party as intransigent and dominated by the Tea Party as the one we have here in the House.

The Affordable Care Act, which the Republicans are demanding be eliminated in exchange for allowing the government to reopen, includes the permanent reauthorization of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act. As the author of the reauthorization of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, I know the challenges that the reauthorization faced and just how long it took for us to finally get it into law—a decade, in case you are wondering.

If we yield to Republican hostage-taking and throw out the Affordable Care Act, we throw out the reauthorization of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act. This will be devastating to Indian Country.

Furthermore, this bill provides funding for a relatively small number of programs that support tribes. While not taking away from the importance of these programs, there are many more programs that go unfunded. To name just a few, this bill does not fund food distribution on Indian reservations, child nutrition programs, Fish and Wildlife Service support, and the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians.

This bill also continues the damaging sequester cuts that the National Congress of American Indians have said, "pose particular hardship for Indian Country and the surrounding communities who rely on tribes as employers." But while I support repealing sequestration, the Democrats have done their part. We have said let's keep the government open while we negotiate and work out our differences.

It is time for us to stop this nonsense. If you truly do believe in the sacred trust responsibility our government has to tribes, then let's have a vote on a clean CR and re-open the government.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the tribal leaders in my district join me in calling for a vote on a clean funding bill to restart our government.

Arizona's district one has 12 native American tribes. These families are suffering and our economy is taking a direct hit as a result of this irresponsible, unnecessary shutdown.

House leaders have wasted precious time, offering nothing but a daily trickle of piecemeal bills that are going nowhere.

These partisan games—and this lack of urgency—show a reckless disregard for the people, communities and economies hurt by this shutdown.

Today, as house leadership puts forth yet another piecemeal bill that will go nowhere, I would like to share some comments from my district's tribal leaders:

Navajo Nation President Ben Shelly said—quote—"The current piecemeal approach house republicans are using to fragment tribal communities from the rest of the country is insulting. Tribal communities, like the majority of Americans, want a comprehensive resolution."

And Peterson Zah, the former Navajo nation chairman and president said—quote—"Tribal issues should not be used as political props in this shutdown. Our kids, families and elders are all a part of the larger community, and we all suffer from a shutdown. We need the House to vote on a clean funding bill to reopen the entire government."

On the White Mountain Apache Nation, where I grew up, tribal chairman Ronnie Lupe said—quote—"Head start and impact aid are vitally important to tribes, but we also need the furloughed workers from BIA, Interior and all other agencies allowed back on the job. Our tribal members need their paychecks, our small businesses need their customers, and our veterans need their benefits without any lapses."

And from the Hopi Tribe, Vice Chairman Herman Honanie said—quote—"Piecemeal bills are empty gestures that have no chance of passing both chambers and being signed into law. We need real action to reopen the entire government or we will continue to lose important resources like those from VAWA that help protect women and families."

Mr. Speaker, if House leadership were genuinely concerned about our native American tribes, then I suggest they listen to the tribes—and allow a vote to reopen the government.

Congress should stop picking winners and losers. Stop playing games that only prolong the shutdown.

House leadership could stop this shutdown right now.

Let's vote on a clean funding bill to restart our government and protect our economy.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this piecemeal approach to fund the government that fails to meet our trust responsibility to our Native American brothers and sisters.

I wonder if they bothered to consult with tribes before bringing up a bill that cuts tribal programs even more than they have already been cut and locks in sequester cuts that are hurting tribes in my district and across the country.

Mr. Speaker, it seems clear to me that Republicans are not listening to anyone these days, because if they were, they would know that tribes do not support this piecemeal course of action.

Navajo Nation President Ben Shelly called this approach "insulting" and said Tribal Nations want a comprehensive resolution as well as an end to sequestration.

By taking a piecemeal approach to fund our government, this bill fails to restore many critical services that are important to tribal communities.

In fact, it makes the problems facing Indian Country worse, not better.

Rather than vote on this piecemeal bill that is opposed by Native American communities, we should vote on a clean funding bill that opens the entire government, get to work ending sequestration, and fully fund tribal programs to meet our trust responsibilities.

NAVAJO PRESIDENT SHELLEY URGES
LAWMAKERS TO PASS A CLEAN SPENDING BILL

SHIPROCK, NM.—Navajo Nation President Ben Shelly strongly urged the U.S. House of Representatives to pass a clean spending measure that would stop the federal government shutdown.

The president said it must be done and that a continued piecemeal approach is not right and is hurting the Navajo people.

"The current piecemeal approach House Republicans are using to fragment tribal communities from the rest of the country is insulting. Tribal Nations, like the majority of Americans want a comprehensive resolution," said President Shelly.

Meanwhile, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is furloughing roughly a third of its workers, most of whom live in tribal regions and serve Native people daily.

"Our funding for basic programs that provide support to working families will soon dry up. And nearly 3,000 employees who work on Indian Affairs for Interior will be furloughed. We strongly urge GOP leaders to work with the true majority in the House: the bipartisan group of lawmakers that stands ready to restart the government. Allowing a vote on a clean funding bill is the right way to help our tribes and our communities move forward," President Shelly added.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 80 would provide sequester-level funding for a

limited number of federal programs that serve Native American Tribes. I support ensuring that the federal government plays a strong role in addressing the needs of tribal communities and I voted against H.J. Res. 80 because it doesn't do that. It provides less than 50% of funding that tribes receive from the federal government and omits a number of important programs.

This legislation is merely the latest iteration of the Republican piecemeal funding strategy they hope can provide cover from the fallout of their ongoing reckless shutdown. It is not part of any serious effort to reopen the government. It is time to end this shutdown and get to work making necessary tough budget decisions.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our very distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for the purposes of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain that request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. AL GREEN from Texas for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I, too, ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and to go to conference on a budget so that we can end the Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59,

to open this government and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown that is hurting so many American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so we can end this Republican shutdown now and get the American people back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in order to end this Republican shutdown today to get the people's government working for them again, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59 and open the government without further delay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown and give the American people the relief that they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO),

a member of the Appropriations Committee, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask that any Member seeking recognition remove any communicative badge while making such request.

Mr. SERRANO. You mean this sticker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SERRANO. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SERRANO. We are allowed to bring posters and photographs and other items to the floor, why not this red, white, and blue sticker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Communicative badges are not allowed to be worn while Members are under recognition.

Mr. SERRANO. Well, then I will take it off, but it is with great pain that I do so.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and to go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown and get our Nation back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

□ 1015

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, instead of leaving for a 3-day weekend, that we open the government, go to conference on a budget, and end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Ms. PELOSI has already cleared it. Who is objecting? Who is not clearing it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open up the government and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown that is costing the U.S. economy \$160 million a day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California, Mrs. SUSAN DAVIS, a member of the Armed Services Committee, for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, because many families today are not able to pay their mortgage, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on the budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown hurting the children of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama, Ms. TERRI SEWELL.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open government and go to conference on a budget so we can end this unnecessary Republican government shutdown that hurts veterans and children and American citizens. Let's open up the government now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida, Judge HASTINGS, for a unanimous consent request.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. What I would ask the Speaker to advise this Member of is as to the definition of "appropriate clearance."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, clearance must be given by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Does the Chair know, as Speaker, whether or not such an attempt has been made and maybe denied with reference to the bipartisan clearance?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As indicated in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, it is not a proper parliamentary inquiry to ask the Chair to indicate which side of the aisle has failed under the Speaker's guidelines to clear a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. The Chair is a Republican and I am a Democrat. I seek appropriate clearance from the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not received clearance from the appropriate parties.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) to complete his unanimous consent request.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican shutdown, and that's with or without clearance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlelady from California (Ms. BASS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the vice chair of our Democratic Caucus, Mr. CROWLEY from New York, for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown. It is time to shut down the shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open up the government and go to conference on a budget so we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown and we allow the government to do the people's business again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member of our Financial Services Committee, for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this ridiculous Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Chair has ruled that these unanimous consent requests cannot be entertained because they have not been pre-cleared. It is obvious the Democratic leadership supports these motions, and I wonder if it would be in order for the Republicans here and now to pre-clear these unanimous consent requests so that we can vote to reopen government?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As indicated in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, it is not a proper parliamentary inquiry to ask the Chair to indicate which side of the aisle has failed under the Speaker's guidelines to clear a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, apparently the Chair cannot do it. Is it in order for me to ask the Republicans to pre-clear the unanimous consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is free to try to obtain clearance.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to anybody on the Republican side at this time under my parliamentary inquiry to pre-clear.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may not yield while under recognition for parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open up the government and go to conference on the budget so that we can end the Republican shutdown. Let the RECORD reflect that the Republicans have had an opportunity to pre-clear one of these unanimous consent requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown and stop holding the economy hostage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, our country is asking and I am asking unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open our government and go to conference on a budget so that we will end this Republican government shutdown now and get our government back to work for the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on the budget so that we end this Republican shutdown now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request

cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today and ask unanimous consent that the House immediately bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we end the Republican shutdown immediately.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Tea Party Republican government shutdown and put people back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the American people's government and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUZ) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we end this reckless and irresponsible government shutdown and do the right thing for the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

□ 1030

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the dean of the New York delegation, Mr. RANGEL.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANGEL. Under what circumstances could a senior Member of this august body protest the shutdown of government at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not making a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, I am asking from a parliamentary point of view. I don't want to violate the House rules, but as a Member of Congress representing 700,000 people, I feel that I have to scream out in protest as to what is happening to the country and my constituents. There has to be some way for me in a parliamentary way, without violating the House rules, to express myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is following established guidelines for recognition of unanimous consent requests.

Mr. RANGEL. With all due respect, that has nothing to do with my parliamentary inquiry, nothing at all. The rules for unanimous consent do not have anything to do with a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is engaging in debate. Does the gentleman have a unanimous consent request?

Mr. RANGEL. Are you saying that you are ignoring my parliamentary inquiry? I am just asking.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not made a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANGEL. That is how I started. I could ask the reporter, but I don't want to waste a lot of time on this weekend legislative session. I started asking permission to make a parliamentary inquiry, and that was granted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong this, but aren't you talking about a unanimous consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, I am talking about a parliamentary inquiry. If you tell me I am out of order for making a parliamentary inquiry, I am not prepared to challenge the Chair, even though I truly believe that you and I know you will be incorrect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, how do you state it properly? I ask: How could I properly state the feelings of my constituents as a member of this august body in a parliamentary way? What could be more parliamentary than that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may be yielded to for debate.

The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. RANGEL. So the parliamentary inquiry is not going to be recognized?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. RANGEL. Okay, I accept that.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I had yielded to the gentleman from New York for a unanimous consent request, if the gentleman has a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RANGEL. I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker and the Parliamentarian take a good look at the rules of this House so that Members can protest the closing down of the United States Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not made a proper request.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Honorable Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues asking unanimous consent that this body in which we serve, the House of Representatives, bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, to open the government and go to conference on a budget so that we may end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59 to open the government and to go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown so hurtful and harmful to the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 80 is postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 378; the motion to instruct on H.R. 2642.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS FOR RAW AND REFINED SUGAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 192, nays 212, answered “present” 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]

YEAS—192

Amash	DesJarlais	Horsford
Andrews	Duncan (SC)	Huelskamp
Bachmann	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Barletta	Edwards	Hurt
Barr	Esty	Israel
Barton	Fitzpatrick	Issa
Bass	Fleischmann	Jenkins
Beatty	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Black	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Blackburn	Poster	Jordan
Blumenauer	Foxx	Joyce
Bridenstine	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Kilmer
Broun (GA)	Fudge	Kind
Bucshon	Garamendi	King (NY)
Burgess	Garrett	Kingston
Campbell	Gerlach	Kuster
Cantor	Gingrey (GA)	LaMalfa
Capito	Gohmert	Lance
Carney	Goodlatte	Langevin
Cartwright	Gosar	Lankford
Chabot	Graves (GA)	Latta
Chaffetz	Griffin (AR)	Lee (CA)
Cicilline	Griffith (VA)	Lipinski
Cleaver	Guthrie	LoBiondo
Coffman	Gutiérrez	Lowey
Collins (GA)	Hanna	Maffei
Collins (NY)	Harris	Marino
Conyers	Hartzler	Massie
Cook	Heck (NV)	Matheson
Cooper	Heck (WA)	McCaul
Cotton	Hensarling	McClintock
Davis, Danny	Himes	McHenry
Delaney	Holding	McKinley
Dent	Holt	McNerney
DeSantis	Honda	Meadows
		Meehan
		Meeks
		Messer
		Moore
		Moran
		Mulvaney
		Murphy (PA)
		Neugebauer
		O'Rourke
		Olson
		Pallone
		Pascarell
		Payne
		Perry
		Peters (CA)
		Petri
		Pittenger
		Pitts
		Polis
		Pompeo
		Price (GA)
		Quigley
		Reichert
		Renacci
		Rice (SC)
		Rigell
		Roe (TN)
		Rohrabacher
		Rokita
		Roskam
		Rothfus
		Royce
		Ruppersberger
		Ryan (WI)
		Salmon
		Sanford
		Sarbanes
		Schakowsky
		Schiff
		Schneider
		Schock
		Schwartz
		Schweikert
		Scott, David
		Sensenbrenner
		Sessions
		Shimkus
		Shuster
		Sires
		Smith (MO)
		Smith (NJ)
		Smith (TX)
		Smith (WA)
		Speier
		Stivers
		Stockman
		Stutzman
		Swalwell (CA)
		Terry
		Tiberi
		Titus
		Tsongas
		Turner
		Upton
		Van Hollen
		Veasey
		Visclosky
		Wagner
		Walberg
		Walorski
		Waters
		Waxman
		Weber (TX)
		Wenstrup
		Westmoreland
		Whitfield
		Williams
		Wilson (SC)
		Wittman
		Wolf
		Womack
		Woodall
		Yoder
		Young (IN)

NAYS—212

Aderholt	Farr	McDermott
Bachus	Fattah	McGovern
Barber	Fleming	McIntyre
Barrow (GA)	Fortenberry	McKeon
Becerra	Frankel (FL)	McMorris
Benishek	Gabbard	Rodgers
Bentivolio	Galleo	Meng
Bera (CA)	Garcia	Mica
Bilirakis	Gardner	Michaud
Bishop (GA)	Gibbs	Miller (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Gibson	Miller (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Miller, George
Bonamici	Grayson	Mullin
Boustany	Green, Al	Murphy (FL)
Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	Nadler
Braley (IA)	Grijalva	Neal
Brooks (AL)	Grimm	Negrete McLeod
Brown (FL)	Hahn	Noem
Brownley (CA)	Hall	Nolan
Buchanan	Hanabusa	Nugent
Bustos	Harper	Nunes
Butterfield	Hastings (FL)	Nunnelee
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Owens
Camp	Hinojosa	Palazzo
Capps	Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)
Cárdenas	Hudson	Paulsen
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Pearce
Carter	Hunter	Perlmutter
Cassidy	Jackson Lee	Peters (MI)
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree (ME)
Chu	Jones	Pocan
Clarke	Kaptur	Poe (TX)
Clyburn	Keating	Posey
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Cole	Kennedy	Radel
Conaway	Kildee	Rahall
Connolly	King (IA)	Rangel
Costa	Kinzinger (IL)	Reed
Courtney	Kirkpatrick	Richmond
Cramer	Kline	Roby
Crowley	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
Cuellar	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (MI)
Daines	Larson (CT)	Rooney
Davis (CA)	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, Rodney	Levin	Ross
DeFazio	Loeback	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Lofgren	Ruiz
DeLauro	Long	Ryan (OH)
DelBene	Lowenthal	Sánchez, Linda
Denham	Lucas	T.
Deutch	Luetkemeyer	Sanchez, Loretta
Diaz-Balart	Lujan Grisham	Scalise
Dingell	(NM)	Schrader
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Scott (VA)
Doyle	(NM)	Scott, Austin
Duckworth	Lynch	Serrano
Duffy	Maloney	Sewell (AL)
Ellison	Carolyn	Shea-Porter
Ellmers	Maloney, Sean	Sherman
Engel	Marchant	Simpson
Enyart	Matsui	Smith (NE)
Eshoo	McCarthy (CA)	Southerland
Farenthold	McCollum	Stewart

Takano Valadao Watt
Thompson (CA) Vargas Webster (FL)
Thompson (MS) Vela Welch
Thompson (PA) Velázquez Wilson (FL)
Thornberry Walden Yarmuth
Tierney Walz Yoho
Tipton Wasserman Young (AK)
Tonko Schultz

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ribble

NOT VOTING—26

Amodei Gowdy Miller, Gary
Brady (TX) Granger Napolitano
Capuano Herrera Beutler Pelosi
Clay Higgins Runyan
Coble Huizenga (MI) Rush
Crawford Jeffries Sinema
Crenshaw Lewis Slaughter
Culberson Lummis Young (FL)
Fincher McCarthy (NY)

□ 1059

Mr. COLE, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. ROGERS of Michigan, ELLISON, ROGERS of Kentucky, LABRADOR, HARPER, SOUTHERLAND, PEARCE, BROOKS of Alabama, COLE and DENHAM changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. LANCE, HECK of Washington, HONDA, COOPER, WAXMAN, CLEAVER, GUTIERREZ, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, WEBER of Texas, Ms. ESTY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. TSONGAS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 545 I inadvertently voted "yes" when I intended to vote "no."

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 195, nays 204, answered "present" 2, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

YEAS—195

Andrews Bass Bera (CA)
Barber Beatty Bishop (GA)
Barrow (GA) Becerra Bishop (NY)

Blumenauer Hastings (FL)
Bonamici Heck (WA)
Brady (PA) Himes
Braley (IA) Hinojosa
Brown (FL) Holt
Brownley (CA) Honda
Bustos Horsford
Butterfield Hoyer
Capps Huffman
Cárdenas Israel
Carney Jackson Lee
Carson (IN) Johnson (GA)
Cartwright Johnson, E. B.
Castor (FL) Johnson, Sam
Castro (TX) Kaptur
Chu Keating
Cicilline Kelly (IL)
Clarke Kennedy
Cleaver Kildee
Clyburn Kilmer
Cohen Kind
Connolly Kirkpatrick
Conyers Kuster
Cooper Langevin
Costa Larsen (WA)
Courtney Larson (CT)
Crowley Lee (CA)
Cuellar Levin
Cummings Lipinski
Davis (CA) LoBiondo
Davis, Danny Loebsack
DeFazio Lofgren
DeGette Lowenthal
Delaney Lowey
DeLauro Luetkemeyer
DelBene Lujan Grisham
Deutch (NM)
Dingell Lujan, Ben Ray
Doggett (NM)
Doyle Lynch
Duckworth Maffei
Edwards Maloney,
Ellison Carolyn
Engel Maloney, Sean
Enyart Matheson
Eshoo Matsui
Esty McCollum
Farr McDermott
Fattah McGovern
Fitzpatrick McIntyre
Foster McNerney
Frankel (FL) Meeke
Fudge Meng
Gabbard Michaud
Gallego Miller, George
Garamendi Moore
Garcia Moran
Gibson Murphy (FL)
Grayson Nadler
Green, Al Neal
Green, Gene Negrete McLeod
Hahn Nolan
Hanabusa O'Rourke
Hanna Owens

NAYS—204

Aderholt Chaffetz Gardner
Amash Coffman Garrett
Bachmann Cole Gerlach
Bachus Collins (GA) Gingrey (GA)
Barletta Collins (NY) Gohmert
Barr Conaway Goodlatte
Barton Cook Gosar
Benishek Cotton Graves (GA)
Bentivolio Cramer Graves (MO)
Bilirakis Daines Griffin (AR)
Bishop (UT) Davis, Rodney Griffith (VA)
Black Denham Grimm
Blackburn Dent Guthrie
Boustany DeSantis Hall
Bridenstine DesJarlais Harper
Brooks (AL) Diaz-Balart Harris
Brooks (IN) Duffy Hartzler
Broun (GA) Duncan (SC) Hastings (WA)
Buchanan Duncan (TN) Heck (NV)
Bucshon Ellmers Hensarling
Burgess Farenthold Holding
Calvert Fleischmann Hudson
Camp Fleming Huelskamp
Campbell Flores Hultgren
Cantor Forbes Hunter
Capito Fortenberry Hurt
Carter Poxx Issa
Cassidy Franks (AZ) Jenkins
Chabot Frelinghuysen Johnson (OH)

Jones Sensenbrenner
Jordan Nunes Sessions
Joyce Nunnelee Shimkus
Kelly (PA) Olson Shuster
King (IA) Palazzo Simpson
King (NY) Paulsen Smith (MO)
Kingston Pearce Smith (NE)
Kinzinger (IL) Perry Smith (TX)
Kline Petri Southerland
Labrador Pittenger Stewart
LaMalfa Pitts Stivers
Lamborn Poe (TX) Stockman
Lance Pompeo Stutzman
Lankford Posey Terry
Latham Price (GA) Thompson (PA)
Latta Radel Thornberry
Long Reed Tiberi
Lucas Renacci Tipton
Marchant Rice (SC) Turner
Marino Rigell Upton
Massie Roby Valadao
McCarthy (CA) Roe (TN) Walberg
McCaul Rogers (AL) Walden
McClintock Rogers (KY) Walorski
McHenry Rogers (MI) Weber (TX)
McKeon Rohrabacher Webster (FL)
McKinley Rokita Wenstrup
McMorris Rooney Westmoreland
Rodgers Ros-Lehtinen Whitfield
Meadows Roskam Williams
Meehan Ross Wilson (SC)
Messer Rothfus Wittman
Mica Royce Wolf
Miller (FL) Ryan (WI) Womack
Miller (MI) Salmon Woodall
Mullin Sanford Yoder
Mulvaney Scalise Yoho
Murphy (PA) Schock Young (IN)
Neugebauer Schweikert
Noem Scott, Austin

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Ribble

NOT VOTING—30

Amodei Granger Miller, Gary
Brady (TX) Grijalva Napolitano
Capuano Gutiérrez Pelosi
Clay Herrera Beutler Peters (CA)
Coble Higgins Runyan
Crawford Huizenga (MI) Rush
Crenshaw Jeffries Sinema
Culberson Lewis Slaughter
Fincher Lummis Wagner
Gowdy McCarthy (NY) Young (FL)

□ 1107

Mr. STEWART changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 2642:

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of the House amendment and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. LUCAS, KING of Iowa, NEUGEBAUER, ROGERS of Alabama, CONAWAY, THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, CRAWFORD, Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. DENHAM, RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, PETERSON, MCINTYRE, COSTA, WALZ, SCHRADER, MCGOVERN, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. VELA.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title III of the House amendment, and title III of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROYCE, MARINO, and ENGEL.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sections 1207 and 1301 of the House amendment, and sections 1301, 1412, 1435, and 4204 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CAMP, SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and LEVIN.

For consideration of the House amendment and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Ms. FUDGE.

MOTION TO TAKE FROM THE SPEAKER'S TABLE H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to take from the Speaker's table H.J. Res. 59 with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, to recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment to open the government now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under section 2 of House Resolution 368, that motion may be offered only by the majority leader or his designee.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The standing rule of the House is rule XXII, clause 4; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. And the standing rule of the House reads, Mr. Speaker, "When the stage of disagreement has been reached on a bill or resolution with House or Senate amendments, a motion to dispose of any amendment shall be privileged."

Mr. Speaker, my question is: Does the parliamentary status of the bill meet the requirements of rule XXII, clause 4?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House has altered the operation of that standing rule.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. So I just want to understand, Mr. Speaker. This standing rule of the House, which I have here, has been altered by the House. Is that what the Speaker is saying?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House adopted a resolution altering it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. When was that alteration made?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In House Resolution 368.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. House Resolution 368.

Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I want to make sure I have the right one. I have in my hand H. Res. 368, October 1.

"Resolved," and section 2 of that says, "Any motion pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII relating to House Joint Resolution 59 may be offered only by the majority leader or his designee."

Is that what you are referring to, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. So, Mr. Speaker, just so I understand the situation, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. H. Res. 368 changed the standing rules of the House to take away from any Member of the House the privilege of calling up the Senate bill to immediately reopen the government; is that right?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It did change the operation of the standing rule.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Right.

Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. So a privileged motion, Mr. Speaker, would have allowed any Member of this House—Republican or Democrat—to call up the Senate bill to open the government; is that right?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not give advisory opinions.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. But, Mr. Speaker, a privileged resolution, as cited in rule XXII, clause 4, of the standing rules of the House would allow any Member of the House to offer that resolution; is that right?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not give an advisory opinion.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Well, Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I think the Chair, just as I understood, said that that was changed so that it no longer would be a privileged motion for any Member, but it would be exclusively the right of the Republican leader or his designee. Am I right about that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will apply House Resolution 368.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Just again, Mr. Speaker, I want to be absolutely clear that H. Res. 368 changed the standing rules of the House so that only the Republican leader or his designee could call up the bill to open the government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I would ask my colleagues whether the majority leader or his designee is on the floor of the House today.

Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, and this will be my last one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I just want to understand, Mr. Speaker. The Rules Committee, under the rules of the House, changed the standing rules of the House to take away the right of any Member to move to vote to open the government and gave that right exclusively to the Republican leader; is that right?

□ 1115

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House adopted the resolution.

The Chair is now prepared to entertain 1-minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that under the regular standing rules of the House, clause 4, rule XXII, the House take up the Senate amendments and open the government now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under section 2 of House Resolution 368, that motion may be offered only by the majority leader or his designee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, why are the rules rigged to keep the government shut down?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

U.N. ARMS TREATY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in October of 2009, the Obama administration reversed the policies of both President Clinton and President Bush by committing the United States to U.N. Arms Trade Treaty negotiations. Since then, Members of the House and Senate have voiced their strong opposition.

I joined 130 of my colleagues in sending a letter to the White House to express my concern about the dangers posed to Americans' Second Amendment rights. In the Senate, which must only approve the treaty by a two-thirds vote, a bipartisan coalition of Senators remains united in opposition to its ratification.

Despite overwhelming opposition from Congress and the American people, Secretary of State John Kerry signed the treaty—a decision that is sure to have far-reaching consequences for American foreign policy and American sovereignty.

I have joined my colleagues in the House in sending another letter to the administration voicing our continued opposition to this misguided and dangerous policy.

I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to stand strong in their opposition.

END THE SHUTDOWN

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. This morning, 186 Democrats signed a petition to end the Republican shutdown and routinely continue to fund the government through November 15 while we work out our differences.

We need only 32 more signatures. I expect every Democrat to sign. Will some on the other side of the aisle cross over to reopen the government, go back to regular order, and negotiate our differences without a shutdown government, without threatening to default on the United States of America?

Earlier, we tried to bring up a bill that would do that under unanimous consent, but the Republicans changed the rules of the House. After more than 200 years, they changed the rules to say "no," we couldn't bring that bill up. We cannot have a vote on continuing to run the government.

Now, man up. Man up over there. Give us a vote. If you have got the votes, then you can keep the government shut down. If we have the votes, we go back to routinely funding a continuing resolution for the government until November 15. I think that would be a service to the American people.

REMEMBERING ERNIE
BLANKENSHIP

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, Ernie Blankenship lived a life of service to his faith, his family, his country, and his community. It was a pleasure to help Ernie and Rita celebrate their 50th anniversary last year, as it was to see him on Sunday mornings at St. Mary Church.

Ernie passed away earlier this week—a loss that will be felt not only by his family but throughout southern Ohio.

Ernie served his country in the Army, played minor league baseball, and earned degrees from the University of Cincinnati and Xavier University. He coached youth sports teams and enjoyed a broadcasting career that spanned over 50 years.

Earlier this year, Ernie retired as the senior vice president of NCB Savings Bank in Hillsboro. He touched all of our lives in countless ways. He will continue to touch our lives and the lives of so many young men and women through the scholarship that bears his name.

Ernie Blankenship's legacy will continue through his children and grandchildren, who learned firsthand his lessons on a life of humble service, faith, and patriotism.

It has been a true honor to know Ernie and to represent him in Congress.

OPEN UP THE GOVERNMENT

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, shutting down this House for the next 2 days—after shutting down the government—is truly an act of great irresponsibility. The threat to the security of our families grows with each hour of the government shutdown and with each hour that we approach an historic breach of the full faith and credit of the United States.

One economic expert after another tells us that to move into this uncharted water and economic calamity, along with the consequences it brings to our families—our economy and our standing in the world are jeopardized.

We have two ways to avoid this. Any Member can call up the Senate resolution to continue operations of the government. Republicans have blocked that with a special rule that gives that power only to ERIC CANTOR, the Republican leader.

You see many Members wearing these stickers, which is the second way. It is to sign a petition to open the government. We have done that. We have reached almost 200 Members of this House. If only a few Republicans will join us, the government will open up.

COSTS OF OBAMACARE

(Mr. BARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, the President says ObamaCare should not be part of any negotiations to fund the government or raise the debt limit. But my constituents in Kentucky recognize the President's health care law for what it actually is—a massive increase in Federal spending.

Its projected cost has more than doubled since the President originally claimed it would reduce the deficit. It will cost American taxpayers \$2 trillion over the next decade, and its true costs will continue to grow.

ObamaCare was rammed through Congress on a partisan basis through a process specifically reserved for budget-related bills. So for anyone to suggest that ObamaCare should be left out of budget discussions in Washington is both cynical and inconsistent with Congress's ongoing responsibility to constantly scrutinize Federal spending.

After racking up \$7 trillion in debt in just 5 years, the President stubbornly refuses to negotiate over ObamaCare. But make no mistake, Mr. Speaker: Congress would not be doing its job if it ignored ObamaCare and its massive

costs in the ongoing debate about how to save America from bankruptcy.

VOTE ON A CLEAN CR

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Republican leadership pulled H.J. Res. 80 from further consideration today. It is the American Indian and Alaska Native, Health, Education, and Safety Act.

The Affordable Care Act, which the Republicans are demanding be eliminated in exchange for allowing the government to reopen, includes the permanent reauthorization of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act. As the author of the reauthorization of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, I know the challenges that the reauthorization faced and just how long it took for us to finally get it passed into law—a decade, in case you are wondering.

If we yield to Republican hostage-taking and throw out the Affordable Care Act, we throw out the reauthorization of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act. That would be devastating to Indian country.

This bill, H.J. Res. 80, continues the damaging sequester cuts that the National Congress of American Indians have said pose particular hardship for Indian country and the surrounding communities that rely on tribes as employers.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to stop this nonsense. If you truly do believe in the sacred trust and responsibility our government has to tribes, then let's have a vote on a clean CR and reopen the government.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. DUCKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my neighbors cannot understand how we could actually recess today with so much work left to today.

In 2012, businesses in my district were approved for \$391,000 in Small Business Administration loans per day. That is the most of any district in Illinois. Yet zero SBA loans have been approved in the last 12 days because our government is shut down.

ACME Design in Elgin, Illinois, was founded by Clint Borucki and has been a part of our community since 1992. Clint has 10 employees and has designed and manufactured models for advertising, businesses and government. Now, an important project for his business is on hold because a military contractor is unable to move forward during the Republican government shutdown.

Last Monday, in Schaumburg, I spoke with Federal employees who

serve their country and play by the rules. These middle class Americans who live paycheck to paycheck are being punished for our inability to fund the government.

Church of the Holy Spirit Food Pantry in Schaumburg told me that they will be unable to fill the gap the government shutdown has left for families in need in my district.

My neighbors can't understand how we could recess for 2 days while this Republican government shutdown remains in effect. Let's stay in session, get to work for the people we serve, and reopen the government.

VOTE FOR A CLEAN CR

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, why did our Republican colleagues shut down the government? Why don't our Republican colleagues allow the United States to pay its bills?

House Democrats want to open the government and have the country pay its bills. Senate Democrats want the same. Even Senate Republicans want to open the government and pay its bills. But not House Republicans.

Do you remember when you were in school, Mr. Speaker, and we learned how a bill becomes law? One of the tenets of this great Nation is that majority rules.

Put the Senate CR on the floor, Mr. Speaker. Let a majority of the House make a decision. Why is democracy being thwarted by the Republican majority? Pass the CR.

The American people are tired of these political games. We have the votes here to pass a clean CR and open the government again. If the Republican leadership allowed that bill to come to the floor, we could do it today.

MEANING OF THE TERM "REDSKIN"

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, not only is the word "redskin" inappropriate, but just plain offensive. It is a derogatory term towards the American Indians.

I want to share with my colleagues and the 181 million football fans all over America how the word "redskin" came about.

In 1749, it was a standard procedure among the colonial settlers who lived in what is now Maine and Nova Scotia to kill and scalp as many of the Indians who were members of the Micmac Tribe. The same policy was also implemented in 1755 by settlers who lived in what is now known as the State of

Massachusetts. Their objective was to kill and scalp members of the Penobscot Indian Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the colonial policy was that you get paid for killing and scalping Native American Indians. If you kill an Indian boy, you get paid 50 pounds. If you get a scalp, that is an additional 40 pounds. Not only is it for the men, but also for the women and children that are scalped and killed. And you get paid for it.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that these scalps were called "redskins."

Native Americans are human beings, Mr. Speaker. They are not animals.

□ 1130

AMERICA DOES NOT WANT OBAMACARE

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the Republican side of the House has put out everything that the other side wants except for what America doesn't want—and that is ObamaCare. Instead, people are going to be railroaded into a program that fines them for not buying a product that they don't want and from a Web site that doesn't work.

Is this America or is this something a whole lot different?

Choices are being taken away, and people are being forced into a program they don't want. That is why our side fights for liberty and fights for one's choice of determining one's own health care system and health care plan.

Would my colleagues on the other side of the aisle please join us in putting out what we need to do to get done since we agree on almost everything in the CR except for the continued forcing of people into the ObamaCare program.

THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, it is very disturbing that we are here on day 12 of the Republican government shutdown, but it is even more disturbing when we heard the point of order that was made just a little while ago, the point of order on October 1, about a special rule that was passed. What has happened by that vote—the vote, again, by the majority party—says that only the majority leader or his designee can bring the matter of calling up by motion the ability to rule, the ability to ask people to vote on the continuing resolution as amended by the Senate.

In this process of not only shutting down government, what we have also done is shut down the people's right to have a representative form of government. So, out of all of us—435, who are mandated by law to be the Members of the House of Representatives—only one or his designee has the right to bring forth this critical, critical issue on which the people throughout this Nation are asking for a resolution. Only one can do it. Yes, it passed by the majority of the Republican votes in this House. Now, not only have we shut down government, not only have we made things unbearable for the people, but we have deprived them of their representative form of government. That, Mr. Speaker, is something that the people should be absolutely outraged about.

I would like to begin this Special Order by first yielding to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I would ask the gentlelady about the number of Federal employees you have in your area who remain unable to do their work.

Ms. HANABUSA. To the gentleman from Texas, I appreciate the inquiry.

As you may probably be aware, because of its unique location and its location before the time we were a State, Hawaii has a large Federal presence, and a lot of them are in the military. Because of the actions of this House, plus the Senate, plus the President, about 20,000 of them are defense. The last time I was able to check, we just had a small handful that were yet not back to work, but we do have a large number who did not work.

What is being impacted now are the other agencies which had some funds like, for example, the courts, the U.S. Attorney's Office and the other people like, for example, the State Department. All of them we are watching very carefully, but we have an additional number—somewhere between 6,000 to 9,000—who are being affected. As the gentleman knows, it is not only they; it is the people they service, and it is their families who are being impacted.

Mr. DOGGETT. That is exactly what I wanted to explore with you.

First of all, all of those public service workers, whether they are at work or not at work, continue to face the uncertainty of whether their paychecks will arrive when the car payment is due or when the rent is due or when they need to buy another round of groceries. They don't know if those checks will be there.

I think that there are some people out there across our country who are watching this shutdown, and they are saying, Well, at least we are saving some money by not paying hundreds of thousands of workers across the country—Federal employees—who are not yet able to return to work.

In fact, isn't it true that, under the Tea Party faction rule here in the Republican Party, they have passed a resolution through this House to pay every one of those hundreds of thousands of Federal workers to stay idle—to pay them not to work—at a time that they could be delivering the services they were hired to provide so that then the taxpayer has to pay them to stay idle and cannot receive the benefits of the many varied services that these public service workers would like to provide?

Ms. HANABUSA. The gentleman is correct that we as the House of Representatives unanimously passed that bill that we would pay the furloughed workers. You are also absolutely correct that, because the government is still shut down and because the Republican position is to open up government piecemeal, with no concurrence on the Senate's part, that that is exactly what is going to happen.

Many of these Federal workers feel like, Why can't we go to work? We are getting paid to work. Why isn't that happening?

I believe that that is clearly a disservice, not only to the workers, themselves, but to the people of this great Nation. It makes no sense.

I yield to the gentlelady from Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Last weekend, I left. I went to Florida. Many people in church came up to me, and they wanted to know about this. These are not Federal employees; they are contract employees. So, therefore, they do service for the Federal Government, but they will not get paid; is that correct?

Mr. DOGGETT. That is correct.

The other thing that happens: suppose you have a cafe across the street from a major Federal installation. Suppose you have a dry cleaners or a service station or an auto repair. Your business has fallen through the floor because that workforce is not there, not only to do the public's work, but to do business with you.

There is not any plan from this irresponsible Tea Party caucus to reimburse the many small businesses around America as well as the contractors to whom you referred. There is not any plan to give them a dime. So they will suffer at the same time they pay Federal workers not to work and not to deliver the services that they were hired to provide and are willing to provide.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Lockheed Martin indicated that they are going to lay off over 3,000 employees. There are many companies that do work with the Federal Government, but because the Federal Government is shut down, they are going to furlough their employees, and they are not going to be paid.

Mr. DOGGETT. That is one of the reasons I feel that, with every hour

that we go through this government shutdown and with every hour that we get nearer to a default—an historic default on the full faith and credit of the United States—we are jeopardizing our security. As to your comments regarding Lockheed, we are talking about the national security of the United States, and I am also talking about the economic security of your fellow church members and of our veterans.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. We had the Secretary of the VA come to our committee. He indicated that by the 1st of November, if he did not have his appropriations, over 5,000 veterans and their families and their spouses would not get their benefits in the mail.

Mr. DOGGETT. I view that as a real disgrace.

This week in Texas, in San Antonio and in Austin, as we attempted to call the Veterans Administration about problems some of our veterans were having, they said they had turned off their equipment and that they had furloughed some of the representatives we work with—I am sure that happened in your areas also—so that we cannot be the advocate we want to be for our veterans.

Additionally—I think it is around a fourth or a little over a fourth of our Federal workforce who are veterans. They are people who have served our country and have put their lives on the line, and now they are serving our country in a different way. Those are some of the families who are being paid not to work, and all of them, whether they are at work now or not, are left with great economic uncertainty about when they will get paid.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. The list goes on and on.

For example, we have furloughed most of the HUD employees, so we are going to have more homeless veterans. The list goes on and on. Cemeteries. We have furloughed cemetery employees. The other issue is, if we default on Thursday, then the Social Security payments will not be made.

These people in this House of Representatives want to operate by management. For example, yesterday, I heard over the news the number of cows that had died—or had been killed—because of a storm. We came back the next day and did the farm bill. Because everyone has been furloughed, they can't even provide the assistance they usually provide. We are going to tackle this, but there is a whole array of services that we are not picking up. For example, when you look at the number of, let's say, people who work at the universities, their checks say the universities, but they are really working for national foundations or the Mayo Clinic.

Mr. DOGGETT. You are talking about things like cancer research or someone who is working on childhood disease.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Or on Alzheimer's research. So all of this work is brought to a halt for no good reason.

Mr. DOGGETT. For no good reason.

That is why it is outrageous that we could be here on this Saturday and that the Republicans have recessed the House until Monday night. They know that this default is approaching. They have outlined no plan to avoid default. They had one coming up on the floor 2 or 3 weeks ago, and they could not get agreement among their own Members about how to avoid default. Now at a time when you—like all of us who are here—have signed a petition to reopen the government and are prepared to address the default issue right here, they have gone home.

Mr. CANTOR was here on the floor a few minutes ago. He is the only one under the rules—the Republican majority leader—whom they will permit to offer the motion to continue the operation of the government. That is why we turned, as you know, to this petition of all of us coming together. We are approaching now—are headed toward—200 Members of the House. We only need about 17 or 18 Republicans to come join us so we can reopen this House and then move to address the default issue.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. The sad issue here in the House is that the minority has no rights.

Mr. DOGGETT. Because they were specifically, as you know, cut off in the rules. The rules of the House, which have existed for so many years, would have given the gentlewoman from Florida, the gentlewoman from Hawaii, or any of our colleagues who are here now from across the country the right to say, Mr. Speaker, let us vote on continuing the operation of the government.

Now, why would they deny us that traditional right as Members of the Congress—all Members, Republicans and Democrats—and give Mr. CANTOR, as the Republican majority leader, the sole right to do that?

I say it is because of fear. They are fearful that this House will continue the government operations, and they can no longer hijack the country the way they have hijacked the Republican caucus and jeopardize the security of our families.

□ 1145

Ms. BROWN of Florida. In the Veterans' Committee, members kept alluding to the Senate, the Senate, the Senate. Let's be clear, the Senate passed the bill, and I thank God for the Senate. They passed the bill and took the House number, which was unacceptable to all Democrats, unacceptable, took those low numbers in order to pass a continuing resolution so we could have discussions. But what happened to the House? They are missing in action because there is no leadership on the Republican side.

Mr. DOGGETT. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii for the opportunity to join with her on this because the numbers she refers to is back during the summer—and Speaker BOEHNER acknowledged this last Sunday on ABC. There was an understanding reached between the House and the Senate that Democrats would compromise and agree to a level of government services that we think is totally unacceptable.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Would you repeat that again, sir.

Mr. DOGGETT. There was an understanding, that he acknowledged, reached between the House and the Senate that we Democrats, in order to keep the government functioning, would agree on, for a time this fall, to accept an unacceptable low number that we know won't deliver the level of services that we need for Head Start, for education, and for cancer research.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Sir, are you saying that the Democrats in the House held their nose and voted for the Republican irresponsible numbers?

Mr. DOGGETT. We have said we will do that now if it will keep our government open and protect our families and avoid default, open the government. And it is that motion, not a motion to give us all that we have asked for, but a motion to take the Republican budget number and put it in place as a compromise, and I might say not a very good compromise, not a favorable compromise.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Say it again. Say it again. We lost on the compromise.

Mr. DOGGETT. We agreed to do that. The Speaker indicated that he had agreed to that, and then this Tea Party faction took control, the shutdown caucus.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Sir, a conversation. Can we have a conversation. Can you repeat what you just said again. A conversation. You mean to tell me that the Speaker had a negotiation with the House and with the Senate on the Republican's low levels? That it was unacceptable to the Democrats in the House, we held our nose and voted, would be willing to vote for it if they bring it up in order to move forward and get a conversation going?

Mr. DOGGETT. Absolutely.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we just want a conversation.

Mr. DOGGETT. I want to yield back to the gentlewoman from Hawaii and in doing so thanking her for this time. The reason that it is alleged that they would not continue to stand by the agreement that was made between the House and the Senate for this bad number was they wanted to shut down the Affordable Care Act and our opportunity to get health insurance for millions of Americans. And as the gentlewoman from Hawaii knows, they have failed utterly and completely to do

that. They are now in search of some other rationale, some rationalization, some justification for keeping the government shut down.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Sir, just one other question. I want to know how many times did the Republicans pass their bad bill in the House and then send it over to the Senate, and they think that the Senate is supposed to pick up their bad bill? How many times did they pass it—44?

Mr. DOGGETT. They have passed little partial bills many times.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. No, I am talking about on the health repeal.

Mr. DOGGETT. Oh. They have sent that over there, I guess, 40 times to repeal.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. No, I think it was 44.

Mr. DOGGETT. Forty-four? One can lose count because they do every time you turn around.

But I thank the gentlewoman from Florida and the gentlewoman from Hawaii. This totally unjustified shutdown must end, and we must stand for American families to avoid the insecurity, the threat to them that grows by the hour.

Ms. HANABUSA. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

I think what everyone needs to understand clearly, what the gentleman from Texas was referring to was the level of funding in the continuing resolution which was amended by the Senate at \$986 billion. As the gentlewoman from Florida said, for many Democrats that was unacceptable. But you know what, the Democrats haven't had the opportunity to vote because it hasn't come to the floor, but it is a compromise.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If the gentlewoman would yield, we have agreed. We have compromised. We have had a conversation. We have agreed to put our politics aside and do what is in the best interest of the United States of America. It is unfortunate that we have people that serve in the House of Representatives, what is supposed to be the people's House, and they do not care about the people of the United States of America. They only care about their petty politics.

Ms. HANABUSA. I thank the gentlewoman the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN). Do you wish to speak further?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I think I have said everything I need to say, but I do want to say one thing jokingly. I went home last weekend, and I was looking for some snake oil since they said that CRUZ had given the House Republicans snake oil. I couldn't find any snake oil, but I did find some holy oil, and I asked my pastors to pray for us because we need all the prayer we can get.

It is shameful. The Republican Party, particularly in the House of Representatives, con-

tinues to hold the nation hostage in a futile attempt to defund Obamacare.

I am so deeply disappointed that Republicans, especially those tea party Republicans in the House, continue to keep the government closed by appealing to the most extreme members of their Party by refusing to pass a clean funding bill to keep the government working.

SPEAKER BOEHNER'S REPUBLICAN SHUTDOWN MUST STOP

Republican recalcitrance has once again brought about a manufactured crisis designed to promote right wing ideology at the expense of the needs of all Americans.

Instead of working together to develop a budget that will work for Americans, Republicans let extremists and ideologues drive their agenda and drive us all into a national crisis.

Why did Republicans so carelessly shut down our government? Because they continue to be obsessed with eliminating the Affordable Care Act.

The Republican crusade against providing affordable access to health care for all Americans knows no bounds, and it has become apparent that they are even willing to sacrifice the basic functions of the U.S. government just to prove a point.

Even though millions of Americans were clamoring to sign up for insurance benefits on just the first day the exchanges opened up to the public.

Members of Congress are elected to make sure our government functions, and Americans have had enough with this Republican led shutdown.

There is a solution to this problem.

The Senate passed CR would fund the government for an additional six weeks, and all Speaker BOEHNER has to do is bring that bill up for a vote to end this stalemate.

In fact according to some reports, there are enough votes to pass a clean CR now.

This short term bill to fund the government already represents a compromise, after a negotiation, by Democrats and is the level requested by Speaker BOEHNER.

But Republicans cannot take "yes" for an answer. They are continuing to play more games by pushing a piecemeal approach to resolving this shutdown. This will not work.

As USA Today put it, it's like seizing a school bus full of kids then offering to release the cutest ones.

The Senate will not pass these bills, because they do nothing to address the real problem—that we need to fund the whole government.

Instead of working together to do our jobs and resolve these critical issues, Republicans have taken a decidedly different approach, one that they seem to have been looking forward to for some time—to make another desperate attempt to stop the Affordable Care Act.

In fact, as one of their chief spokespeople, Congresswoman MICHELE BACHMANN put it, "We're very excited. It's exactly what we wanted, and we got it."

Republicans seem not to care too much about the consequences of a shutdown, even though the consequences are significant.

Thousands of Federal employees have been furloughed. National parks are shuttered.

Loans to small businesses, farmers and families trying to purchase homes have been shelved. Lifesaving scientific research at NIH is halted. People waiting for travel visas and passports will be even further delayed. Those who need assistance to get back on their feet like recipients of the Women, Infants and Children program (WIC) are struggling to find other means to get by. Veterans and their families applying for hard-earned benefits are waiting indefinitely for their fair due.

But the plan is in place, the Republican slash and burn approach to governance continues, and they have shown that they are willing to put it all on the line to appease the extreme right wing of their party.

As if their work to dismantle the programs Americans rely on like Head Start and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) wasn't clear enough when they pushed the sequester through, they have now chosen to just stop our government from functioning.

The cavalier attitude on display by House Republicans makes it clear that the Majority is more interested in ideology than action.

Their government shutdown could be the most damaging thing to hit our economy since the budget sequestration they imposed on Americans.

Rather than passing a jobs plan to get Americans back to work, help rebuild our economy and create good jobs with good benefits, the GOP has gotten what they really wanted all along—shutting the doors of the government of the United States.

As the old saying goes, be careful what you wish for. You just might get it.

Ms. HANABUSA. I thank the gentlelady from Florida.

Now I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. I want to thank the gentlelady from Hawaii. I just have to say offhandedly that this is a wonderful, candid interchange, one that needs to be heard, witnessed, and participated in because the way the rules of the House are set up, there is very little exchange between the different parties here on the floor. The rules are very rigid, and it disallows debate and interchange of ideas and discussion, a discussion that is very, very needed in this country because through this discussion that we just had, as candid and as colorful and as interactive as it was, it was informative. And, hopefully, the information that was shared between the gentleman from Texas and the gentlewoman from Hawaii and the gentlewoman from Florida was helpful and would raise some questions in the minds of individuals watching and listening to us, and perhaps asking themselves, Is this all true? Hopefully, it will drive them to check it out and see if the information that was exchanged was valid and factual. I believe they will find it is.

Ms. HANABUSA. To the gentleman from California, I want to say aloha and mahalo. You are from California; but as far as I am concerned, you have been a great friend of Hawaii all along.

Your concern over the shutdown is not only for your constituents in California but the constituents of the United States. And I know we in Hawaii, we also have a special place in your heart. So I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HONDA. As our past Senator Inouye would have said, mahalo, sister.

Mr. Speaker, I come here from California. My friend, Ms. HANABUSA, comes from the islands of Hawaii. All of us here in this body came here to do things that will make our country better, to help us build a more perfect Union. We have different ideas on how we would do that; but like in the medical field, we should observe one rule before all else: do no harm. We should not be causing unnecessary suffering, inflicting unnecessary pain on our country or on our economy and those who sent us here to try to improve their lives.

Here we are on day 12 of the Republican government shutdown and less than a week from an unprecedented government default; and every day that the Republican majority does not allow a clean vote to reopen the government and give us a long-term certainty on the debt ceiling, they are violating that most important rule: do no harm.

Critical child care, nutrition support, lifesaving research, small business capital, high-tech and groundbreaking research and development, home loans, affordable housing, veterans benefits, tax support, visas and passports are all negatively affected. And the list goes on and on to touch nearly every sector of the economy, with the cost to our economy compounding every day; \$50 billion is the estimated cost to the economy over a month's time.

As we get closer and closer to defaulting on our debt obligations, we are causing more and more undue harm to our economy. A failure to make payments on any part of our debt for any amount of time would cause severe disruptions in the global financial markets, downgrade the creditworthiness of the United States, and do long-term harm to the economy. If we defaulted, Social Security, Medicare, and veterans benefits could all be disrupted. Retirement accounts would be devastated, State and local governments might be forced to default, and their ripple effects would be felt all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, time is running out, and the world is watching. There is nowhere for us to hide from our obligations. Let's start the process of ending this manufactured crisis and stop inflicting unnecessary harm to our economy and to our people. Let's lift this cloud from over our economy and have the vote that Americans have been waiting for.

Let me just close, my friend, with this other personal observation. We know the phrase PTSD, and we know

about its devastating effects on people. I suspect the kinds of things we are doing here—or not doing here—is causing or inflicting a massive PTSD upon our seniors, our families, and those who are trying to make ends meet. I appreciated you doing this Special Order for us.

Ms. HANABUSA. I thank the gentleman from California. The gentleman from California makes some great points, including that we are never fully aware of the impacts, and that is what is the saddest part of what has been done with the shutdown, and that is we do not know what are the true impacts. I can say for my Democrat colleagues, that is the reason why we fight so hard on trying to reopen government. But the question is for the majority party and especially for the Speaker, what about the people? The gentleman raises a great point.

I just would like to share something before I call upon the gentlelady from Illinois. I just learned recently in visiting with some of the most decorated members of the Greatest Generation, members of the acclaimed 442nd Regiment in Hawaii, everyone knows about them, and one person came up to me and said, You know, we found out that although our fathers sort of suffered quietly as a result of that war and the result of the rejection by a Nation that didn't want them, that they were suffering from PTSD, we just didn't know that it was called that back then.

I think the gentleman from California makes an amazing point, that we have got to see the hidden injuries, because if we can all look upon the hidden injuries; no one, on either side of the aisle, can let this craziness continue.

With that, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

Mrs. BUSTOS. Thank you very much. I appreciate this opportunity, and I also appreciate that you are talking about the human consequences of this shutdown. That is what I have been doing for the past couple of weeks now is trying to draw attention to the human consequences of this senseless government shutdown because this is about people we are here to serve, and now we are in week two of this crisis.

What I have been doing is spending a lot of time on the telephone talking firsthand with the people from my region of Illinois who are suffering through no fault of their own. Today, I would like to share a story about a family who not only wants a piece of the American Dream, but is striving to achieve that and is working their tails off to achieve just a piece of the American Dream.

This is a story about a woman named Jill King. She is a wife and mother of two young girls and a disabled veteran from Moline, Illinois. Jill also happens to be a Federal employee who works at the Rock Island Arsenal, which is the

largest employer in the district I am here to serve.

□ 1200

On top of all that, Jill has gone back to college as a way to continue her education, and her husband, also a veteran, who lost his job recently, has gone back to school to increase his employment opportunities. All they want to do is provide a better life for their two young girls. They are ages 4 and 6. One is a preschooler, and one is a first-grader. But because of this government shutdown, Jill has been furloughed and is afraid that now she will lose her VA benefits on top of it. With her husband back in school, not knowing where their next paycheck is going to come from, Jill and her husband are rightly worried about how they are going to make their home mortgage payment, or, for that matter, even pay their most basic bills.

Jill and her husband worked very hard for a number years in order to buy a home. They had to rent to save that money. They have never missed a payment of any sort. They have never even been late with any payment. Now what Jill is left doing is calling her banks just to talk about the what-ifs, because, like many people throughout the country, they don't know what the next steps are. They have had to cut back, and Jill has even had to stop going to her doctor appointments because of the injuries that she has been treated for that are associated with her military service. Her husband now is considering dropping out of school in order to bring home more money to help their family, and Jill is now applying for a second job.

What especially worries her is that if she has to work both night and day, and with her husband now not sure what he's going to have to do as far as his education or going back to work, is that her children—again, ages 4 and 6—might have to be at the babysitter not only during the day, but at night now. I would ask any mother, or for that matter any parent: Who thinks that that is acceptable?

There is so much sacrifice that we have asked of our veterans and their families, and in this case we are asking so much of this family when all they want to do is do better. Jill King and her family want more from their government. And on week two of the shutdown, I ask of this Congress to do what is right for families like Jill's. That is nothing more than let's talk, shake hands, work together, be civil, be kind, and allow Congress to vote on a measure that simply reopens this government.

We have been talking this morning and now into the afternoon that the votes are there. Republicans and Democrats, together, but only together, can reopen this government. We can do it right now. We could do it right this

minute for that matter. I think everybody here today—at least here today—would say let's do that. Let's bring this up for a vote. Let's open up government. Let's do what is right for Jill King and her family and all the families throughout this country.

Ms. HANABUSA. If the gentlelady would stay for some conversation.

I had the opportunity to actually go to Rock Island. I know people are probably saying, what is somebody from Hawaii doing in Rock Island? I also want people to know how difficult it must be for Jill because Rock Island Arsenal, what many may not be aware of, is the last foundry of the United States Army we have in the United States. They actually do do things like the necessary plates to keep people safe in the Humvees and the Strykers and things like that. They are also faced with the question as we withdraw or draw-down from Afghanistan, and as we have drawn down from Iraq, of what happens to Rock Island Arsenal, and what they are able to do for the military—the whole idea of reset, and what do we do with that? I can just imagine the uncertainty with sequestration, with the drawdown, and now with this unnecessary shutdown that it must cause her amazing and critical concern about the future of her family, and to put on top of that the concern over veterans benefits.

Because we have talked about this, I would like for you to share how your office has been able to get this kind of information because you have actually adjusted your schedule and what your office does to service your constituents. I would like for you to say that because it is so important as to how you have tried to adjust and make things easier for them.

Mrs. BUSTOS. I appreciate greatly the kind words that you say about the Rock Island Arsenal. It is the largest employer in the entire 7,000-square-mile district that I represent that stretches from Rockford to Peoria to the Quad Cities, and so many great towns in between. We have about 8,000 employees there. Here is what they have been going through because of the nonsense, these votes that have been cast that have hurt government employees who just want to do a good job.

People like Jill and the rest of the employees there, leading up to this, they had to take 6 furlough days. Already, that was a cut in their pay of what they are used to bringing home. That was already a cut in their pay. On top of that, they haven't received pay raises going on 4 years now. We want to encourage people to go into public service in these jobs that are helping people and helping our military in this case.

You had mentioned the armored reinforcement that is built right in the heart of my district at the Rock Island Arsenal. What that did was, early in

the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, our military men and women were driving in Humvees that did not have armor reinforcement, and they were sustaining horrible injuries and death. The workers at the Rock Island Arsenal, the foundry and the manufacturing sector of this, actually developed these and produced these to save countless lives. So the work that the people at the Rock Island Arsenal are doing is meaningful work, it is life-saving work—and look how they have been treated as a result of this.

I appreciate you also bringing up the fact that in light of this government shutdown, we in our office have restructured things because we are public servants. We are here to make sure we are doing everything we can in light of this atmosphere. We have five offices in our district in Illinois, and we have our office out here. That is six offices altogether. What we have done is we have opened our office an hour early and we stay an hour late. And every single one of our employees, including myself, are all answering telephones, doing casework, and talking to the people who call in about their concerns about what is happening in the government and what they can expect next.

What I have learned from this, and something I will continue doing well after the government shutdown, is I will continue answering the telephone calls and reaching out to people because I never want to lose sight of why we are here. You understand it. Our colleagues understand why we are here. That is to serve people. Government can be a force for good.

Where government is in the way, I don't know anybody here who doesn't want to fix that. We want to fix anything that is broken or bent or just needs some tweaking. We want to fix that. We also know that government can be a force for good. That is why we run for office. That is why we are out here in Washington, D.C. That is why it is so disheartening what a few people in Congress have done to this country. It is time to move to this next level now.

Ms. HANABUSA. I thank the gentlelady from Illinois, and thank you for reaching out so clearly for your constituents.

I now call upon the gentlelady from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. I want to thank my colleague from Hawaii for yielding some time and for this opportunity to talk about the harmful effects and the hidden injuries of this unnecessary government shutdown.

My colleague from Illinois was just talking about the human consequences. We also have to talk about the economic consequences to our constituents and to this country on day 12 of a completely unnecessary government shutdown.

I really appreciate this opportunity because our constituents want to hear

and we need to get the message out there about the harm that is being caused by this. And like my colleague from Illinois, I spent a good part of this week on the telephone talking with constituents out in the great State of Oregon. I have to tell you people are concerned, they are anxious, and they are frustrated.

I spoke with our National Guard. There is so much uncertainty out there among the National Guard members about when they'll be paid. Many of them are unable to work. They are anxious.

Our community action organization that is designed to help low-income people, they are worried. They are already struggling, some of these families. They don't know if they will be able to continue getting the assistance they need.

Our Head Start organization—if you really want to make a difference in a child's life, early childhood education makes that difference. Our Head Start programs are being threatened.

Just a while ago here in this discussion, somebody mentioned health care research. I talked to one of our supervisors of health care research at the Oregon Health & Science University. It is clear and obvious that health care research is not something that can be put on hold and picked up again when the government figures things out. So much is at stake here with the researchers who have dedicated so much time on their research projects and are at a halt because they might need something like NIH approval that they can't get. They are extremely concerned, and here we are on day 12.

I have to say that the government shutdown is not just affecting Federal employees and their families, or even those directly connected, like government contractors. It is also hurting private sector businesses, and that is what I wanted to highlight in the next couple of minutes.

There is a business in my district, Leupold. It is in Beaverton, Oregon. They have about 700 employees, and they manufacture specialized optics. That is 700 employees in Beaverton, Oregon. Right now they have \$10 million in orders that they can't ship. They can't ship them because they need export licenses because they sell their scopes and their binoculars and other products overseas, and they get that approval from the U.S. Department of Commerce's Bureau of Industry and Security. So if we can't resolve this government shutdown, they are soon going to lose those sales to foreign competitors. That hurts our economy, it hurts the employees who work there, and it hurts the business.

Here is another example. Oregon, you might know, is well-known for craft beer. There are a lot of great small businesses, and those people work really hard to brew a great product. In

Hillsboro, Oregon, in the district I am honored to represent, Three Mugs Brewing Company is all set to open. They are paying their rent, they are paying their utilities, their business expenses, but they can't start brewing because they need approval from the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau. They approve the labels and recipes for brewers. So here is this great small business, an entrepreneur ready to start, and they have their store, they are paying their rent and expenses, and they can't start brewing their beer because of this unnecessary government shutdown. It is time to end this right now, and we could end it today.

I, along with my colleagues here, we signed a petition to open government today. We could end this shutdown now, because across the State of Oregon, as well as across this country, our constituents are more than ready for this government to be back open.

I try, I struggle to understand how they must view this from across the country. We are here in Washington, D.C. We have been here day after day after day ready to open up the government and get the employees back to work, but what must we look like? I thought of an analogy. So there is an accident about to happen, and those nearby can prevent the accident, but they don't because they can't agree how to prevent the accident. So the accident happens, and now the victim is bleeding. The victim has been bleeding for 12 days. Guess what? There is a disagreement about what kind of bandage to put on the victim. That is how absurd this must look to the United States of America. This is an unnecessary government shutdown. It has been 12 days now. Let's get the government open. We can do it today.

I hope the Speaker calls us back today for a vote. The votes are there. We can pass a continuing resolution. Let's pass that resolution, open up the government, and continue the conversation about how to build our economy, get our budget conference committee going. We can do that today, and I hope we do.

I want to thank again the gentlelady from Hawaii for giving us the opportunity to really highlight how this unnecessary government shutdown is hurting our constituents and our economy.

□ 1215

Ms. HANABUSA. I thank very much the gentlelady from Oregon, who clearly is in her district looking and hearing what her constituents are saying. I will always remember Beaverton, Oregon, and her 700 constituent employees of that company that is unable to ship, because that is really what this is about. We initially reacted to the immediate impact of the Federal employees, but now we are beginning to see, as

the gentlelady from Oregon pointed out, that it is more than just the immediate employees, contractors who deal with the Federal Government; it is also the people who need the Federal Government because of their businesses. So the gentlelady from Oregon has brought forth an amazing story, as well as given us further insight into how this really Republican government shutdown has hurt everyone.

Now I would like to call upon the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. First I would like to thank the esteemed Representative from Hawaii for sharing this time with me.

Mr. Speaker, I once again rise and join my colleagues in urging you to allow us to vote to reopen government. I have been up here before day after day. I have taken a nuanced approach, quoting the wisdom of the popular children's author, Dr. Seuss, but today the Dr. Seuss gloves come off.

It is no wonder, no wonder that a recent poll of Americans show that Congress is less popular than hemorrhoids, toenail fungus, dog poop, and cockroaches. Like millions of Americans, I want to put my head out the window and shout that this standoff is idiotic and this reckless, irresponsible shutdown has got to stop.

Mr. Speaker, as I speak, the Earth is in turmoil. Iran is building a nuclear weapon; in Syria, a civil war is killing thousands of women and children; in Nairobi, terrorists attacked innocent shoppers in a retail mall; and in Europe, major countries are going bankrupt.

So what does the greatest Nation on Earth do to set an example for the rest of the world? We hang a sign that says, "Closed for business." And as we try to emerge from a recession that hurt so many of our constituents, we proceed to throw 800,000 patriotic Americans out of a job, leaving them without income to pay their mortgages, their car loans, their children's tuition. Oh, but that is not all. We stop the funding for Head Start for millions of children and slow down benefits for veterans who risked their lives and their liberty for our freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this government does not belong to the United States Congress. This government belongs to the people of America, and they are demanding, rightfully so, that we open our government today.

Mr. Speaker, let us vote today.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress delays any longer, I respectfully suggest that even the Ebola virus and twerking will overtake us in the polls, and it will be well-deserved.

Ms. HANABUSA. Thank you to my good friend, the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL). As she always has the capacity of bringing things down to the basics, I would hate to admit that

we would be less popular than the Ebola virus; but knowing the gentlelady from Florida, she probably has a basis for what she has said.

Mr. Speaker, my Special Order time is running down, and I would just like to say, after listening to all of the people who have spoken—the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from California, the gentlewoman from Florida, the gentlewoman from Oregon, and the gentlewoman from Illinois—and all of their stories that they have shared and the concerns of their constituents, you have got to start to ask the question, why, and what does the Republican majority, Mr. Speaker, intend to gain—from this shutdown?

Let's also look at H. Res. 368 that we passed on October 1 regarding the amendment to clause 4 of rule XXII that says, any motion pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII relating to House Joint Resolution 59—and we all know that is the CR—may be offered only by the majority leader or his designee. You add this on top of everything else, the inability for people to come forward on behalf of their constituents to ask for unanimous consent to bring House Joint Resolution 59 to the floor, not being able to do that, and the fact that we have a petition, a discharge petition that people are signing up for because that is the only alternative, is this the message we want to give to the people of the United States, that not only does the House of Representatives shut down government because of a minority group within the Republican Party that is the majority, but in addition to that, you have taken away the ultimate form of representative government, which is that each and every one of their elected Representatives has a right to come before this body and to make a motion and to be heard? But instead we have shut that down on October 1 as well. That should be even more problematic to the people of this great Nation, that a motion and a rule such as that was passed. And, Mr. Speaker, I remind you, nine—nine—of your own Republicans couldn't even stomach that and could not vote for that.

So why are we doing this? Why? It began with, well, we will go along with the continuing resolution that the Senate sent back on the condition that we first defund ObamaCare. We had delays of ObamaCare. We had repeals of ObamaCare, and that sort of lasted for last week and then it stopped. No mention of ObamaCare. No mention at all of ObamaCare.

Then what did we start to do? We started to pick and choose and cherry-pick which part of government we wanted to open up. And you knew that was DOA, dead on arrival in the Senate. But yet, Mr. Speaker, you decided well, maybe the optics would be better. But it hasn't been better. It has not been better.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has come out against not only the failure to address the debt ceiling and saying that the United States cannot default; they also said you shouldn't allow the shutdown. And big businesses have also said that. Banks have said that. People that the average person probably associates more with the Republican Party than they do with the Democrats, and they are saying do not do this. Yet it is being done. It is being done.

The people in Hawaii will know this concept, and the concept is save face. You know, we have a saying back home that that people sometimes need to do is save face. And I think that is what it comes down to. The polls, Wall Street Journal polls are slamming the Republican position, Mr. Speaker. You are being given but a 24 percent favorable rating. So what does that say to you? It says the people are not with you. The people do not support this crazy—I don't know what to call it. I would like to say it is a plan, but I can't see anyone being behind a plan that makes the people of this great Nation suffer.

You heard the story of Jill. You heard the story from the gentleman from California who talks about he knows people are suffering PTSD. You have heard the fears of not being able—not being able—to know when you will be working and when you are not going to be working.

Yes, we in the House passed, we passed 3223—I believe that number is correct—that says we will retro pay. But that doesn't give them their paycheck because a continuing resolution hasn't passed; and it hasn't passed the Senate, though we believe the Senate will be with it, and we also believe the President will sign it into law. But for those people, yes, it is like an empty promise, the same empty promise that they believe we had when everyone said we are not going to shut down government. Why would we shut down government? And here we are, this is the 12th day of the shutdown, day 12, and do we have anything to tell them? No.

Instead, we emphasize the fact that their Representatives who want to see a vote, because we believe that there are members of the Republican Party who will support a clean CR and a voting to open up government at the level, at the level of funding which the Republicans wanted, PAUL RYAN wanted, but we are not even able to do that because of a procedural move.

Procedural moves are what the people of this great Nation dislike the most, because they feel that it is some kind of hidden deal and we are not being transparent and we are also not giving people true representation. To abdicate the ability to bring something to the floor as important as the government continuing to operate to one person or his designee is exactly what the people do not want. And that is what we are dealing with, Mr. Speaker.

We are dealing with this shutdown for no basis, because you have abandoned ObamaCare now. There is no ultimate plan.

We have the looming debt ceiling crisis, which is what Wall Street is even more concerned about than anything else, and what we should all be concerned about, because the full faith and credit of the United States should never be in question and should never be in jeopardy because we can cause a recession worldwide with that action. There is no plan. There is no plan.

You wanted to show that you could shut down government, Mr. Speaker, so you won. You shut it down. But now, now you must plan how to open it. And that has been always the criticism of our great country, that we always lack exit strategies, and this is another example of a lack of an exit strategy. You win the shutdown, but how do you open up? That is the question, Mr. Speaker. And that is the question that only you can answer to the people of this great Nation. And only you can answer to the people of this great Nation why, why you have taken away the ultimate form of representative government by abdicating the right to bring this most critical measure to this floor to one person or his designee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

UNEQUAL APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic premises of our U.S. Constitution and form of government is equal protection under the law and equal protection and equal application of the law. Now the Obama administration has developed a reputation of unequal application of Federal laws. For example, Jon Stewart, the talk show host, recently interviewed Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius, and he asked her a question that many Americans have been asking, and that was: Why has the Obama administration given waivers and extra time to companies and labor unions so that they do not have to meet the deadlines required by ObamaCare, but he is unwilling to give that waiver and the same additional time to individuals?

□ 1230

Now, we know that under the law, individuals are required to buy insurance; and if they do not buy insurance, then they will have to pay a penalty or a fine. That was a question that many people have been asking. That's been part of the debate, by the way, of this continuing resolution, as well as the

debt ceiling issue. Why cannot individuals be given additional time and consideration to meet this law, but you do give time to companies and labor unions? That is an unequal application of Federal law. By the way, Secretary Sebelius could not answer that question.

Now, just as the administration favors companies and unions over individuals in that context of ObamaCare, the administration is also giving special favors to the wind industry in the energy sector. For example, the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act have been enforced for many years by Federal prosecutors in America. To give you an example, we all are very much aware of the tremendous oil spill in the gulf a few years ago. Well, British Petroleum Company was fined \$100 million for killing migratory birds.

We have a number of former Federal prosecutors in the U.S. Congress, and I was talking to one of them just yesterday. He was telling me about a case that he had down in North Carolina in which an individual shot and killed an eagle, and that gentleman was prosecuted by the Federal Government, fined \$100,000, and had to forfeit some profits from his timber company. And so the Federal Government has been quite forceful in the protection of eagles and also migratory birds.

Now, wind projects, and I'm quoting now from an article that appeared in the paper just a couple days ago, wind projects routinely violate the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, but not one wind farm in America has ever faced a single prosecution or paid one penny in fines. As I said, BP alone paid a \$100 million fine for killing migratory birds.

I could also quote a utility company in Wyoming in which some eagles were electrocuted, and that company paid a \$200,000 or \$300,000 fine.

According to studies by the Fish and Wildlife Service and other groups, wind turbines overall kill over 573,000 birds

each year, including over 83,000 birds of prey. Now, that's according to a study this March in the Wildlife Society Bulletin.

So the Federal Government, under this administration, is not prosecuting violations of these Federal laws because of their favor of the wind industry. But worse than that, now the Department of the Interior has notified through a publication on September 27 in the Federal Register that they are going to pass a regulation so that wind companies cannot be prosecuted for killing eagles and migratory birds in most circumstances. So they haven't been prosecuting under existing laws, and now we are going to pass a regulation to give them additional protections.

As this article says, there are two scandals here. First, wind turbines are killing legally protected eagles in the name of slowing climate change, but whatever reductions in carbon dioxide emissions that may be occurring—and I'm not going to go through all the facts and figures here in this article—but whatever emissions may be occurring is equivalent, according to this article, to a baby's burp in a hurricane.

And then, second, the wind energy industry is lobbying to extend a production tax credit, the 2.2 cent-per-kilowatt-hour subsidy, that has caused windmills to be built in America. Without that subsidy, it is doubtful any would be built; but last year, the subsidy was extended for an additional year at a cost to taxpayers of \$12 billion. Now another 1-year extension is being lobbied for by the industry. That would cost an additional \$6.1 billion. So it is bad enough that this wind industry wants to continue killing eagles with impunity, but now they are asking the taxpayers to give them the money so that they can do it.

Now, as chairman of the Energy Committee, unlike President Obama, I genuinely do believe and understand that we need an all-of-the-above policy on energy. We need renewable energy, we need windmills, we need solar pan-

els, we need nuclear, we need natural gas, and we need coal. But to exempt one industry from Federal laws because they are favored by this administration is not what America is all about.

Now the President goes all over the country talking about an all-of-the-above energy policy; but how many people in America know that because of his administration and regulations at EPA, America is the only country in the world where you cannot build a new coal-powered plant. And yet even in Europe, which is known as a green energy sector, they have on the drawing board 60 gigatons of new coal-fired plants, and we continue to export more coal today than we ever have to other countries that recognize they have to have coal to be competitive in the global marketplace because coal does produce low-cost electricity.

But, as I said, unlike the President, I genuinely believe we need everything; but I do not believe that any industry, certainly not the wind industry or any other industry, should be exempt from Federal laws that protect endangered species—migratory birds and eagles—that are the symbol of this great country.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 14, 2013, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the third quarter of 2012 and the third quarter of 2013 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

October 12, 2013

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE, Vol. 159, Pt. 11

15801

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Doc Hastings	6/30	7/02	Turkey		1,334.00		(³)				1,334.00
	7/03	7/04	Azerbaijan		361.78		(³)				361.78
	7/04	7/05	Hungary		506.00		(³)				506.00
Committee total					2,201.78						\$2,201.78

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. DOC HASTINGS, Chairman, Oct. 2, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PETE SESSIONS, Chairman, Oct. 3, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. SAM GRAVES, Chairman, Oct. 7, 2013.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Luis V. Gutiérrez	6/29	6/30	Europe	252.95							
	6/30	7/03	Asia		720.00						
	7/03	7/05	Asia		622.00						
	7/05	7/06	Asia		372.07						
	7/06	7/07	Asia		399.00						
	7/07	7/08	Europe		364.84						
Hon. Devin Nunes	8/04	8/06	Europe		513.67						
	8/06	8/07	Europe		326.00						
	8/07	8/08	Europe		378.00						
	8/08	8/08	Middle East								
	8/08	8/10	Middle East		591.00						
	8/10	8/12	Middle East		474.00						
	8/12	8/13	Europe		392.00						
	8/13	8/15	Europe		569.76						
	8/15	8/18	Europe		1,706.00						
Commercial Airfare							15,017.50				
George Pappas	8/04	8/06	Europe		513.67						
	8/06	8/07	Europe		326.00						
	8/07	8/08	Europe		378.00						
	8/08	8/08	Middle East								
	8/08	8/10	Middle East		591.00						
	8/10	8/12	Middle East		474.00						
	8/12	8/13	Europe		392.00						
	8/13	8/15	Europe		569.76						
	8/15	8/18	Europe		1,706.00						
Commercial Airfare							12,305.00				
Carly Scott	8/04	8/06	Europe		513.67						
	8/06	8/07	Europe		326.00						
	8/07	8/08	Europe		378.00						
	8/08	8/08	Middle East								
	8/08	8/10	Middle East		591.00						
	8/10	8/12	Middle East		474.00						
	8/12	8/13	Europe		392.00						
	8/13	8/15	Europe		569.76						
	8/15	8/18	Europe		1,706.00						
Commercial Airfare							12,481.50				
Hon. Mike Rogers	8/20	8/22	Middle East		319.00						
	8/22	8/23	Middle East		296.32						
	8/23	8/24	Middle East		660.50						
Commercial Airfare							12,556.00				13,831.82
Michael Allen	8/20	8/22	Middle East		319.00						
	8/22	8/23	Middle East		296.32						
	8/23	8/24	Middle East		660.50						
Commercial Airfare							11,620.80				12,896.62
Chelsey Campbell	8/20	8/22	Middle East		319.00						
	8/22	8/23	Middle East		296.32						

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2012—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial Airfare							11,620.80				12,236.12
Hon. Mike Thompson	8/23	8/26	South America		783.00						
Commercial Airfare							1,283.40				2,066.40
Nate Hauser	8/23	8/26	South America		783.00						
Commercial Airfare							1,137.90				1,920.90
Linda Cohen	8/23	8/26	South America		783.00						
Commercial Airfare							1,137.90				1,920.90
Jamil Jaffer	9/04	9/05	Africa								
	9/05	9/06	Africa								
	9/06	9/07	Africa		164.31						
	9/07	9/08	Africa		541.00						
Commercial Airfare							16,120.50				16,825.81
Khizer Syed	9/04	9/05	Africa								
	9/05	9/06	Africa								
	9/06	9/07	Africa		164.31						
	9/07	9/08	Africa		541.00						
Commercial Airfare							16,120.50				16,825.81
Committee total											135,910.53

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. MIKE ROGERS, Chairman, Sept. 30, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Christopher H. Smith	6/29	7/03	Turkey	Lira	1,635.43						1,635.43
	7/03	7/04	Azerbaijan	Manat	361.78						361.78
	7/04	7/06	Hungary	Forint	506.00						506.00
Hon. Robert Aderholt	6/29	7/03	Turkey	Lira	1,703.99						1,703.99
	7/03	7/04	Azerbaijan	Manat	361.78						361.78
	7/04	7/06	Hungary	Forint	506.00						506.00
Mark Milosch	6/28	7/03	Turkey	Lira	2,129.99		2,383.80				4,513.79
	7/03	7/04	Azerbaijan	Manat	361.78						361.78
	7/04	7/06	Hungary	Forint	506.00						506.00
Committee total					8,072.75		2,383.80				10,456.55

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Co-Chairman, Oct. 3, 2013.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3286. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Sixteenth report on the Progress Made in Licensing and Constructing the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 16523 Public Law 109-58, section 1810; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3287. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification of export to China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3288. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's draft of the Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2014 through 2018; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3289. A letter from the Executive Director for Operations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Commercial Activities Inventories; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3290. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the fifth annual report of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII,

Mr. MULVANEY introduced a bill (H.R. 3291) to amend the Pay Our Military Act to make appropriations available to continue the provision of support of the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard under cooperative agreements; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY
STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 3291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7. "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in

Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 259: Mr. STUTZMAN and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 920: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1692: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 3142: Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3189: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 3279: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 3286: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 3287: Mr. HONDA and Mr. BARBER.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 5, October 12, 2013, by Mr. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN on House Resolution 372, was signed by the following Members: Chris Van Hollen, Steny H. Hoyer, Nita M. Lowey, James E. Clyburn, George Miller, Nydia M. Velázquez, Eliot L. Engel, Peter A. DeFazio, John B. Larson, Ben Ray Lujan, Lloyd Doggett, Joe Courtney, Earl Blumenauer, Sanford D. Bishop Jr., Bill Pascrell Jr., Michael F. Doyle, Joseph Crowley, Robert A. Brady, Rush Holt, Sam Farr, Xavier Becerra, Michael M. Honda, Sheila Jackson Lee, Corrine Brown, Kathy Castor, Peter Welch, Ann G. Eshoo, Paul Tonko, Jerry McNerney, José E. Serrano, Al Green, Mike Quigley, Tammy Duckworth, Jackie Speier, Sean Patrick Maloney, Mike Thompson, Ron Barber, Diana DeGette, Doris O. Matsui, Carolyn B. Maloney, Robert E. Andrews, Rubén Hinojosa, Sander M. Levin, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Janice D. Schakowsky, Charles B. Rangel, Karen Bass, David N. Cicilline, Zoe Lofgren, Judy Chu, Janice Hahn, Susan A. Davis, John Garamendi, Alan S. Lowenthal, Gene Green, Robert C. “Bobby” Scott, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Jim Cooper, Ann

Kirkpatrick, Mark Takano, Ann M. Kuster, James P. McGovern, Mark Pocan, Robin L. Kelly, Marcia L. Fudge, Joyce Beatty, Terri A. Sewell, Bennie G. Thompson, Marcy Kaptur, Alcee L. Hastings, Elizaeth H. Esty, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Patrick Murphy, Marc A. Veasey, Danny K. Davis, Carol Shea-Porter, Timothy J. Walz, Julia Brownley, Maxine Waters, William R. Keating, Denny Heck, Scott H. Peters, Joe Garcia, Jared Polis, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Daniel B. Maffei, Barbara Lee, Juan Vargas, Adam B. Schiff, Lois Capps, Raul Ruiz, Grace Meng, Joaquin Castro, Richard M. Nolan, G. K. Butterfield, Gerald E. Connolly, Timothy H. Bishop, Jared Huffman, Melvin L. Watt, Suzanne Bonamici, Donna F. Edwards, Niki Tsongas, Chellie Pingree, Keith Ellison, Tim Ryan, Gregory W. Meeks, William L. Enyart, Gloria Negrete McLeod, John A. Yarmuth, Elijah E. Cummings, Albio Sires, Steven A. Horsford, Suzan K. DelBene, Eric Swalwell, Allyson Y. Schwartz, Betty McCollum, David Scott, Daniel T. Kildee, Raúl M. Grijalva, Jerrold Nadler, Derek Kilmer, Steve Israel, John C. Carney Jr., Steve Cohen, Ed Perl-

mutter, Tony Cardenas, Lois Frankel, Stephen F. Lynch, John P. Sarbanes, Dina Titus, John K. Delaney, Nick J. Rahall II, Yvette D. Clarke, Frank Pallone Jr., James P. Moran, Henry Cuellar, Chaka Fattah, Jim Matheson, Ron Kind, Rick Larsen, David Loebsack, Cedric L. Richmond, Linda T. Sánchez, Filemon Vela, William L. Owens, Daniel Lipinski, Pete P. Gallego, Henry A. Waxman, Gary C. Peters, Ami Bera, Theodore E. Deutch, Bradley S. Schneider, Richard E. Neal, Rosa L. DeLauro, Emanuel Cleaver, Michael H. Michaud, David E. Price, Frederica S. Wilson, Adam Smith, John F. Tierney, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Mike McIntyre, André Carson, John D. Dingell, Loretta Sanchez, Cheri Bustos, James A. Himes, Henry C. “Hank” Johnson Jr., Matt Cartwright, James R. Langevin, John Barrow, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Bill Foster, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Tulsi Gabbard, Gwen Moore, Beto O'Rourke, John Conyers Jr., Luis V. Gutiérrez, Jim McDermott, Brad Sherman, Alan Grayson, Collin C. Peterson, Ed Pastor, Jim Costa, and Kurt Schrader.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN CELEBRATION OF SARA KYLER
AND BRIAN GATES

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 12, 2013

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the marriage of Sara Kyler and Brian Gates. May God be with them and keep them. May their love for one another and commitment to the life they have ahead be an inspiration to others.

IN HONOR OF RULING ELDER
ELLSWORTH G. STANTON III,
M.B.E., K.S.J., ON THE OCCASION
OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF
HIS ELECTION AS CLERK OF
SESSION OF THE BRICK PRES-
BYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE CITY
OF NEW YORK

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 12, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Ruling Elder Ellsworth G. Stanton III, M.B.E., K.S.J., to commemorate the 25th anniversary of his election as the Clerk of Session of the Brick Presbyterian Church in the City of New York, which is located in the district I represent. The Brick Church, established in 1767, is a vibrant, thriving place of worship that currently serves over 1,700 members of its congregation and is known for welcoming parishioners of all backgrounds, who live not only in the neighborhood, but in the outer boroughs and suburbs of New York. Since its founding, the Church has stayed faithful to its vision of maintaining excellent worship, continuing its mission of outreach to the City, educating children, youth, and adults, and, above all, preserving its strong tradition of congregational fellowship.

Ruling Elder Ellsworth G. Stanton III was born and educated in Evanston, Illinois. He graduated from Roosevelt University in Chicago and continued his graduate work at Northwestern University and at CUNY Baruch College. After completing his studies, he served in the United States Army Corps of Engineers in the Philippines as a Literacy Training Instructor.

Ruling Elder Ellsworth G. Stanton III joined the Brick Church in 1960 when the Church was led by the Reverend Paul Austin Wolfe. During his early years of membership, Ruling Elder Ellsworth G. Stanton III served as President of the Church's Young Adults group and as founder, director, and performer of the Brick Church Drama Council when the Church's Watson Hall served as an active theater.

In 1988, during the tenure of the Reverend Herbert Anderson, Ruling Elder Ellsworth G. Stanton III was elected by the Session to serve as Clerk. As Clerk of Session, he has faithfully kept the Session's records and those of the congregation. He was also named Beadle, a traditional office of Scottish origin charged with assisting ministers with the ceremonial aspects of worship, such as the acolytes, and the procession and recession. Ruling Elder Ellsworth G. Stanton III is also a faithful member of the Church's Chancel Choir, the Session's Committee on Worship and Music, the Senior Advisor to the Order of St. Paul, and the convener, advisor, and stout supporter of the Session's Archives and History Committee.

In addition to his work for the Brick Church, Ruling Elder Ellsworth G. Stanton III has a long and distinguished record of service for other charitable causes. He has been a Trustee of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, and President of the Board of the New York Theological Seminary, as well as President of the Board of the Burden Center for the Aging. Ruling Elder Ellsworth G. Stanton III is currently the Executive Director Emeritus of the James N. Jarvie Commonweal Service, President Emeritus of the Federation of Protestant Welfare Organizations, and Knight of Justice of The Most Venerable Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem. Ruling Elder Ellsworth G. Stanton III's efforts have been recognized by Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, who appointed him a member of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, and by the Federation of Protestant Welfare Organizations, which honored him with their distinguished Keystone and Maggie Kuhn Awards.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Ruling Elder Ellsworth George Stanton III, who, as a member of the Brick Presbyterian Church for the past 53 years, and as Clerk of Session for the past 25, has served with extraordinary dedication to his congregation and the New York Community. I am honored to recognize his many years of service that have truly improved the lives of thousands of New Yorkers, and enhanced the spiritual life of his church and its parishioners.

FISHER HOUSE FOUNDATION

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 12, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are all types of organizations in our great country that help others in need; that is one of the trademarks of America—helping those who have less opportunity. Today, I would like to recognize the good folks at the Fisher House Foundation.

Operated by Department of Veterans Affairs, Fisher House relies on donations from Fisher House Foundation, so that military families can stay at no cost while their loved ones receive treatment from nearby hospitals. Fisher House serves as a home away from home for our nation's military families, offering temporary housing for their families in a setting that feels more like a home than a motel. Fisher House has a passion for taking care of our nation's veterans by offering temporary housing for their families in a setting that feels more like a home than a motel. The houses are located within walking distance of where their loved one is being treated. Many times, family members live far away from the hospital; it can get pretty expensive paying for hotels, gas, food, and any other expenses that come up.

Fisher House is named after its founder, Zachary Fisher. Born in Brooklyn in 1910, Zachary quit school at 16 to help his family as a bricklayer. He later became a real estate mogul and philanthropist. One day, Zachary noticed a young man camping in his car in a VA hospital parking lot. Zachary asked the man why he was living in his car and the man told Zachary Fisher that he lived far away and could not afford a hotel. Thus began the idea of the Fisher House Foundation. Zachary and his wife, Elizabeth, founded the first House in Bethesda, Maryland in 1990.

Currently, there are 62 locations open in the United States and overseas, and there's still a need for more. One out of every nine servicemembers in the U.S. military is from the State of Texas, so it's no surprise that there are more Fisher Houses in Texas than any other state. We have twelve houses, and two are located at the Michael E. DeBakey Medical Center in Houston. The second house in Houston was opened this past September.

Since 1990, Fisher House has helped more than 180,000 families, saving more than 200 million dollars in lodging and transportation costs. Last year alone, over 19,000 families were able to be by their loved one's side because the Fisher House provided a place to call home for a time.

Not only do they provide a place to stay, but in some cases, Fisher House helps transport family members to their wounded loved one. The Hero Miles Program uses donated frequent flyer miles to bring family members to the bedside of injured servicemembers. The Foundation also manages a grant program that supports other military charities and scholarship funds for military children, spouses, and children of fallen and disabled veterans.

Again and again the Fisher House Foundation shows commitment and compassion for our military families. Recently, the Foundation decided to fund military families' death benefits during the shutdown. They continue to support our veterans and their families in their time of greatest need.

I applaud the Fisher House for its continued generosity and dedication to serving our

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

servicemembers and their families. This is a remarkable organization, and I commend them for the difference that they make in the lives of our veterans.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING MATT WILLIAMS

HON. ADRIAN SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 12, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent Matt Williams of Gothenburg, NE. Matt is the President of Gothenburg State Bank and has served as Chairman of the American Bankers Association for the last year.

Matt brought to the position the perspective of a rural banker serving farmers, ranchers, and small businesses in rural America. It was a point of pride for Nebraska and the Third District for one of our own to serve in this position.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Matt Williams and his service to his community, Nebraska, and the American Bankers Association.

IN HONOR OF THE HONORABLE
MARIE M. LAMBERT, LATE SUR-
ROGATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 12, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my good

friend, the late Marie Lambert, who was elected as Surrogate Court Judge of New York County in 1977 and served until 1990 when she turned 70 years old. A passionate Surrogate, Lambert was an inspiration to me and to so many women who have chosen to pursue careers in public service. She ran for Surrogate at a time when few women held elected office and her success helped open doors for other women to follow. On Friday, October 4, 2013, a portrait honoring Marie M. Lambert, the first woman Surrogate of New York County, was dedicated in the Surrogate's Court in lower Manhattan where she served.

Surrogate Lambert was an outspoken fighter throughout her life. Her family immigrated to Brooklyn from Italy when she was an infant and she did not speak English until she started school. I am told that when she was about to graduate from elementary school, she wanted to speak at the commencement ceremony, but was told that the rules of selection for graduation speakers were changed and she would not be permitted to speak. Disappointed by this decision, Ms. Lambert appealed personally to Mayor LaGuardia and the decision was overturned. In her speech, she addressed the consequences of unfairness. Spurred on by her early success in advocacy, she became a student leader in Brooklyn College and graduated at the top of her class at New York University Law School.

Surrogate Lambert's distinguished career was marked by her signature audacity and passion for combating injustice. She was involved in a case early in her career in which she fought to permit the offloading and resettlement of Jewish survivors of German concentration camps. Surrogate Lambert spent the next 30 years of her career as a lawyer fighting for tenants and those injured due to the negligence of others. She felt justice was satisfied when the negligent driver, product

producer or doctor took financial responsibility for his or her negligence. Recognized by her peers for her effective advocacy, Surrogate Lambert served as an officer and director of the New York State Trial Lawyers Association, eventually being elected as the President, making her the first woman to serve in that role and the first woman to head any statewide bar association. A single mother following the untimely death of her husband, Surrogate Lambert raised her son, Greg, to honor public service and to embrace community involvement.

In 1977, Ms. Lambert was elected the Surrogate's Court of New York County, which hears estate matters, becoming one of two Surrogate Judges in the county. During her term as Surrogate, New York County became the epicenter of the AIDS crisis, a disease that for many years was not well understood and led to the deaths of numerous members of the LGBT community. Many cases came before Surrogate Lambert involving disputes between family members and significant others of the deceased, and she handled them with sensitivity and understanding. Surrogate Lambert also presided over many adoption cases. She firmly believed that, unlike marriages which can be dissolved, an adoption is forever. In all of her cases, she took very seriously her role as an arbiter of justice. Throughout her service, Surrogate Lambert met every challenge with a spirit of dauntless optimism and valor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the outstanding contributions Marie Lambert made to the court system of New York on behalf of the most vulnerable among us and celebrating the unveiling of her portrait. An ardent voice for social and legal justice, Marie M. Lambert left a legacy of determination, fairness and indomitability.

SENATE—Sunday, October 13, 2013

The Senate met at 1 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable HEIDI HEITKAMP, a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord God of all creative possibilities, help our lawmakers turn this impasse into a bypass so that the heart of our Nation may beat vibrantly and strong.

Lord, on our coins and currency, we have placed the words "In God We Trust." Give our lawmakers the wisdom to trust You and each other, turning the stubbornness of impossibilities into the blessings of creative possibilities.

You are our God, and we refuse to entertain fears about our Nation's future, for we remember how You have led this great Republic in the past. Make a way out of no way. Answer our prayers and use Your powerful arms to keep our Nation safe and secure.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 13, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable HEIDI HEITKAMP, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. HEITKAMP thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, the debt limit bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion. The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. We have some speakers throughout the day's session with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each. We will have more information at a subsequent time how late we will be in.

Yesterday Republicans voted to stop the Senate from even debating legislation to avert a catastrophic default of the Nation's debt. They stopped this body from even discussing the single most important issue facing this Nation: the loss of the full faith and credit of our country.

They did so under the pretext that refusing to pay the country's bills would somehow make those bills disappear. No one denies that this Nation has work to do to reduce this debt. But Republicans who say this country should default on its debt today are the same Republicans who ran up the debt only a few short years ago. These same Republicans charged more than \$4 trillion in tax breaks for the rich on the American taxpayers' credit card. They paid for two wars costing about \$2 trillion with borrowed money, and they rang up a \$400 million tab for a Medicare prescription drug plan. They ran up the Nation's credit card for years and years on many things.

There was one conversation on one of the Sunday shows today that said we were trying to break the caps set in the Budget Control Act. We know that on January 15, the second year of sequestration, we voted differently than that. We voted to extend the CR until November 15, not a word about breaking the caps. We are happy to go forward with the CR, as we have already voted for in this body. Any talk about breaking caps is not anything that comes from us. Yet every single Republican refused yesterday to even talk about paying the bill now that is due.

The Presiding Officer and everyone in this body knows—and I think the American people know—that I met yesterday with Senator McCONNELL. We are in a conversation today. I am confident the Republicans will allow the

government to open and extend the ability of this country to pay its bills. I am going to do everything I can throughout the day to accomplish just this. It is important we do this, and we must do this. It is the height of hypocrisy to not pay our bills.

Americans want Congress to compromise. They want Congress to give economic certainty and security, not more indecision and doubt. Americans want Congress to do its job. That is all they are asking us to do.

Americans want Congress to reopen the government, take the threat of default off the table, and sit down and talk about a long-term budget deal that creates jobs and strengthens the middle class.

I am confident and hopeful that will be accomplished.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved. Under the previous order, Senators are permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The majority whip is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. I wish to thank the majority leader for his statement.

We are hoping there will be positive developments today, and very quickly, relative to the impasse which we have reached. It is time to reopen this government, it is time to make certain we pay our bills, and then let us engage in honest debate on the issues that are before us, and there are many.

The forum for that debate is very obvious: It is the budget conference, the conference between the two budget committees. The Senate Budget Committee, chaired by Senator PATTY MURRAY of Washington, passed the floor of the Senate 6 months ago. Senator MURRAY and others on our side have tried on 21 separate occasions to ask for unanimous consent to go to this budget conference committee to start debating the issues which we now see in the press every day. Twenty-one separate times the Republicans have objected to even meeting. This is unfortunate and it is one of the reasons we are here today.

It is hard to believe, if one is in the midst of this maelstrom, that not even 2 weeks have passed since we started this debate on the floor of the Senate, which has led to this terrible situation.

Two weeks ago our government was open. There was good thinking—or at least a good hope—that we were going to extend the debt ceiling of the United States. Now we are in a much different place. We are only 2 days away from the second week ending of a full government shutdown, a government shutdown which has furloughed some

800,000 employees. That is an unfortunate situation for these employees and their families and for the American people as well.

What the House Republicans have learned, and those Senate Republicans supporting them, is that this government shutdown has real-world consequences. I can remember taking my kids to Chuck E. Cheese's and watching this Whac-A-Mole game where something would pop up and you hit it with a hammer. This is what the House Republicans have been doing on a daily basis. If a story comes out that suggests people are being denied critical medical care at the National Institutes of Health, they say: We will open that part of the government. If a story comes out, tragic stories, that families who have lost a loved one in service to this country are not receiving benefits they are entitled to, they will pass an exception to the budget. It is the same thing with the VA and FEMA. It is no way to run a government, and it is unfair to the American people.

Their strategy, as convoluted as it is, is they will pass these bills one at a time to fund our government until it gets down to a handful of bills for agencies they don't care for. One of the agencies the rightwing spokespeople have identified they want to close down is the Environmental Protection Agency. They want to close down the Environmental Protection Agency. It is an outrageous statement.

They may disagree with the policy of that agency—I disagree with some myself—but when it comes down to its important mission to make sure we have safe drinking water and air that is not going to create public health hazards, I hope it is something that most people, regardless of their political background, would agree is an important government function.

This strategy of a piecemeal appropriation has resulted in an embarrassing predicament for our government. People laid off cannot go to work and basic services cannot be provided.

The other day a Republican Senator came to the floor and said: Let us at least agree that we should open FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Natural disasters do occur, and so he made a motion to open that agency. I asked him: Wouldn't you want to also open the weather service to make sure they are fully staffed to warn people before a disaster occurs? Wouldn't you also want to make sure the agencies that arrive on the scene of disasters, such as the Small Business Administration, that try to get businesses back in place, should also be reopened? Shouldn't the Coast Guard be fully funded to make sure if there is need for rescue, they are present?

He reflected on it and said: Yes, let's include all of those.

This is the problem with picking and choosing agencies, they are going to

miss something critically important. That is what we face.

Secondly, on this debt ceiling, as awful as it is to face a shutdown in the government, for the United States to default on its debt for the first time in history would be catastrophic. That isn't my word. It is a word given to us by the Business Roundtable. The leaders of the major businesses in the United States have said if we default on our debt for the first time, it will be catastrophic.

October 17, Thursday, is the day. If we haven't taken action by then, we risk default.

Yesterday we tried to pass what we call a clean extension of the debt ceiling with no political strings attached—just extend it until the end of next year. All we asked our Republican colleagues to do was to allow us to bring the measure to the floor for debate, for amendment. Not one single Republican Senator, not one, would vote to allow us to even proceed to the bill so that we could start the debate and in a timely way to respond to this challenge of the expiration of our debt ceiling Wednesday night.

If we listen to the business leaders across America, they will tell you there is a lot at stake. This is not only another political issue.

Since World War II, the United States has worked, effectively worked, to make the United States dollar the soundest currency in the world. Think about that. That U.S. dollar is the investment of choice of governments all around the world. They believe the safest place to be is in U.S. Treasuries. Why? Because the United States always pays its debts, period.

Now House Republicans and other Republicans have said maybe we won't pay all our debts; maybe we will go into something called prioritization; pick and choose the debts you want to pay. Many of us tried that when we were young and in college. It catches up with you. After a while, we find out we just can't do that.

Now put yourself in the position of a great nation, a nation that has to make 50 million to 80 million decisions a month as to how to pay the debts that are owed by the U.S. Government. How do we prioritize that?

Republicans, many of them argue we will first start by paying our largest creditors. In other words, pay China first. How soon then will we pay Social Security recipients, those waiting for veterans checks, those in our military waiting for paychecks, those who are owed money from our government, and the transfers to States and localities that are critical for the ongoing operations of their own government and their own credit rating? It is a ridiculous idea.

It reminds me of Soviet revisionism when it comes to history. They talk about how simple it will be to

prioritize and default on our debt. It will not. It will be disastrous. The flat-Earth economists who are preaching this don't have a leg to stand on. Economists and business leaders, many of whom are conservative Republicans, have warned the Republicans: Don't do this. This is something that will cause damage for a long time to come.

In the threat of default in 2012, interest rates on 4-week Treasury bills tripled. They are at the highest levels since 2008. Fidelity Investments, the largest U.S. money market mutual fund, liquidated all of their short-term Treasury bills just on the threat of default on our debt.

Is this default or is this debt ceiling extension something extraordinary? The honest answer is no. We have done it so routinely that most people haven't noticed. Congress has increased the debt ceiling 78 times since 1960, 49 times under Republican Presidents and 29 times under Democrats. The debt was increased by 189 percent under President Ronald Reagan—a 189-percent increase in the debt—compared to a little over 40 percent under President Obama. Debt ceiling increases have often been paired with other issues, but only recently has the threat of default been used as a bargaining chip.

I know if we fail to extend this debt ceiling it will be catastrophic. A lot of people will suffer. I think about families, working families, with their savings accounts, perhaps their retirement accounts. Imagine, if you will, what it means to them to lose 5 or 10 percent of the value of their savings. They work hard, many of them barely scraping by, just getting by paycheck to paycheck, putting a little money away for the future. Now, because of political gamesmanship on Capitol Hill, their hard-earned savings are at stake.

That is the height of irresponsibility. That is the height of recklessness.

The fact that we couldn't get one Republican vote yesterday to go forward is as troubling as anything that has happened on the floor of the Senate that I can remember. This is something we should all agree on—to move forward. I am hopeful these discussions between Senator REID, the Democratic majority leader, and Senator McCONNELL, the Republican leader, will bear fruit. I hope they can find a sensible common ground to spare us what we face. I hope we can end this government shutdown, pay our bills, and then engage in a meaningful, regular order and honest debate in our budget conference over the many other issues that challenge us as a Nation. That is what we were elected to do. That is what we must do.

There are those who are arguing we need to continue this confrontation and take it to a high-noon scenario. Frankly, that is not very courageous

on their part. It is pretty easy to be politically courageous with other people's money, and that is what is happening with those Republicans who are arguing we should default on our national debt. They are playing with the savings of working families across America. That isn't fair to those families. We should stand by them, push for economic growth, for the creation of jobs, and not what this would do—damage this Nation's recovery.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, over the last few days there has been a lot of talk about negotiating, and there has been a lot of negotiating. That is good. Various Senators in small and large groups have been talking about how long a continuing resolution should be in effect, how much to extend the debt limit, among other issues, and surely it is important that negotiations take place. We Democrats have tried over 20 times now to move to a House-Senate conference so that we can discuss and negotiate our differences on a budget resolution. Regrettably, Republicans have refused to allow those negotiations to occur.

The underlying issue is this: While negotiations are underway, our government should be open and serving the American people. Democrats believe government should be functioning during negotiations. For that matter, we believe, because government performs important duties, it should always be open and functioning. While those negotiations are underway, we surely should not have the threat of a global economic meltdown hanging over our Nation.

The American people don't want the government to be shut down or for the United States to default on its obligations while negotiations take place—or at any other time, for that matter. No one knows how long the negotiations will take. In the meantime there are real hardships being imposed on the American people because of the shutdown. Vital public services are being impaired across all of government: Nutrition assistance for women and children, Head Start programs for school children, research grants at the National Science Foundation, badly needed repairs to our highways and bridges, among hundreds of other programs.

I think all of us agree that negotiations are more than desirable; they are essential. But the issue looming before us is not that. It is whether the government will be open and the threat of default will be lifted while we negotiate. Negotiations could last a while, so they should take place while the government is functioning. It is unconscionable that Americans are denied services and benefits while we negotiate.

It is also unacceptable that negotiations take place when one side has

placed a bomb on the negotiating table and set the timer. Let me put it this way: If in the future I came to my Republican colleagues and said: As chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I am not going to allow the Defense bill to come out of the committee until the Senate raises taxes on the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans—something I very much favor—what would be the result? They would reject my ultimatum, and rightly so. Threats to do immense damage unless I get my way on an issue is plainly the wrong way to legislate and to get things done. Such threats just push people to dig in deeper on their positions.

The shutdown of our government is doing tremendous damage. We know the American people have suffered great harm because of the government shutdown, and we know the impact on our economy and the world economy would be severe if we default on our debt. Who in this Congress believes the government should remain closed while we negotiate? Who in this Congress believes the government should remain closed while we negotiate? Who in this Congress believes a default on our obligations is not damaging? Surely no more than a handful among us.

Cutting through all the fog and cutting through the talk of the talking heads is this point, which I believe is unassailable. There are a lot of differences in negotiations. People have different positions on different issues. But I believe this is an unassailable and undebatable point: The vast majority of the American people believe that while negotiations are going on, the government should be functioning and that we should not default on our obligations.

Sitting down together and discussing the many issues that our Nation faces is essential, but it is also essential we do so while the government is open and functioning and serving the American people.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I appreciate all of the speeches being given, and all of them have a seed of possibility. But evidently we are not going to water them or try to grow them. We are just going to talk about possibilities.

There is enough blame to go around. It isn't just on one side. But I would like to remind people of why we are here, hoping that we won't be here again. The reason we are here is we didn't do the appropriations bills the way we are supposed to.

I know we had a budget process, and the budget process got bogged down between the House and the Senate. But obviously we have gotten past that problem, because I noticed on the calendar we have a whole bunch of appro-

priations bills—I think, actually, all 12 of them that we are supposed to pass—and the first one went on the calendar on June 27. Obviously they didn't feel constrained by not having a budget that was agreed to by the House and the Senate. They set some parameters and came up with bills. So we are past that budget argument that there was no conference committee. I thought there should be a conference committee, but there wasn't a conference committee.

While we are talking about conference committees, I have to mention the last offer from the House we voted on in regard to this shutdown was a request by the House to have a conference committee—a conference committee made up of the Senate and House—to work out these problems before the shutdown went on this long. The Democrats voted against that unanimously. It seems to me if they want a conference committee on a budget that was supposed to be done by April 15, but that we have bypassed and done the appropriations for already, that is kind of a weak argument for saying now that there shouldn't be a conference regarding all of these issues that are coming up right now.

I don't know how you get this resolved without getting the two sides talking. Neither side can solve the problem in the Senate without some help from the other side. It will take 60 votes, and that means neither side has the clear majority that is necessary to pass it.

The cloture vote we voted on yesterday was to fix the credit cards of the Federal Government indefinitely, with no limits for another year, through 2014. That amounts to \$1.1 trillion of estimated additional debt for the country, for our kids and our grandkids. I used to talk a lot about our grandkids, then I moved it up to our kids, and now I am talking about us. We are finally the ones at risk. That should certainly make all of the seniors interested.

We went to the White House the other day, and the President did a marvelous job of going through a speech and then taking questions and giving answers. But I was very disappointed at the end because the end speech was give me what I want for the shutdown and government; give me what I want for the debt limit increase, and then we can talk. The reason we are talking is because we have a government shutdown and we have this looming debt ceiling problem. There ought to be other ways we can talk, but we don't. So like I said, there is plenty of blame to go around.

This comment about we shouldn't do it piecemeal, that is a reference to the different measures the House has sent over in regard to problems the Senate said we were having—problems that people immediately recognized. Yet none of those have been voted on. None

of them have been voted on. Maybe they weren't that much of a crisis. I think we all agreed they were that much of a crisis, but the answer is: Let's not do it piecemeal.

Do you know why the appropriations process has 12 separate budgets, 12 separate spending bills? It is so we do it piecemeal, so we can look at them with some depth and maybe get some clarity out of the spending we are doing. When we wind up doing an omnibus bill—and that is where we are headed, where everything will be grouped into one, and it will be passed for the rest of the year—we won't get to look at any of the details. We won't get to offer any amendments to it, and we won't get to say what is effective and what isn't. We will just keep doing what we have been doing, which is running up the national debt. But we can't afford to keep doing that.

I talked about the national parks being a problem. I specifically talked about the national parks that are revenue producers and how we shouldn't shut down the businesses that produce the revenue. Well, I think in response to that, the States were allowed to take over national parks, but at their own expense and not from the revenue that would be generated by the park. That creates some complications for Yellowstone park, because Yellowstone park is shared by three States. They did that specifically so Wyoming couldn't claim that Yellowstone was Wyoming's national park. So a little goes into Montana, and a little goes into Idaho. So that would require a joint agreement by the three States on exactly how that would work, and I am hoping those three States are working out a plan for that if this ever happens again.

That is one of the things government ought to do, to look at what the future possibilities are and say: No, we are never going to have a shutdown or we are never going to have a debt ceiling crisis. We create these crises. We create them by putting definite deadlines on things and then everything crescendos up to that point. The people who are then picked for the task force to deal with that crisis have a huge media listening group, which is a disincentive, actually, to get it solved before the deadline.

A few other problems that were mentioned that need to be solved: The National Institutes of Health, armed forces who are on Active-Duty training, veterans benefits—particularly veterans benefits for the year—compensation for furloughed Federal employees, special nutrition programs, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Food and Drug Administration, continuing appropriations for Head Start, and salaries and related expenses for certain Federal employees.

Traditionally, when we have had a situation like this, when the employees

do come back to work, they get compensated for the time they weren't there. Do you know what the people in my State think of that? Why are we paying people for not working?

So if the principle behind that is to go ahead and approve their salaries and expenses and get them back to work, that would take care of most of the problems. But then the people wouldn't be feeling the hurt out there, and if they don't feel the hurt, they don't know whom to blame, and if they can blame one side or the other, that makes a difference in elections.

That is not what this body is about. We should be about getting things done in the regular order, following the right spending process—which we don't do—and avoiding situations where we make it hurt.

We have a sequester in effect. It is the first time the Federal appropriations and the Federal spending have been cut probably since the Korean war. It was a true cut, but it was a 2.3-percent cut. You won't find anybody agreeing it is really 2.3 percent even though that is what the law says, and that is because we didn't do our spending process in the proper order. So we got through 8 months before the sequester went into effect, and when it goes into effect with only 4 months left, the 2.3 percent of the whole year's spending has to be taken out of the 4 months' worth of budget. That made it 5.3 percent.

I was visited by the Head Start folks of my State, and they showed me what was going to happen if the sequester stayed in place. It was kind of fascinating because they were cut 7.5 percent and are projected to be cut 7.5 percent each year after this. If we did the appropriations, the spending process, at the beginning of the year, it would be 2.3 percent, and we should anticipate that it is going to be done that way for the future, so they should have been told to watch for 2.3 percent cuts—5.3 for last year, for the 4 months they knew about it—although we knew about it for a whole year in advance, just didn't imagine it would ever happen.

So why 7.5 percent? Well, I have to believe, from other spending information I have seen by the people from Wyoming coming to Washington and telling me their dilemma, I think the Washington bureaucracy is holding on to an overproportion of the money to keep their jobs in place instead of out there where the kids are, and 7.5 percent when it should be 5.3 percent tells me that they kept 2.2 percent for running Washington. I don't think they think that is a very important part of the spending process.

The papers have been covering a number of things that people have been having trouble with. One of them is a fellow who went into the rum-making business. You can do that legally, and

there are certain requirements you have to meet. Now he can't sell the rum. I thought, well, sure, his formula hasn't been approved or there hasn't been an inspection of the premises or something disastrous like that. No. He can't do it because the FDA hasn't approved the labels. I didn't even know we had a law that said Washington had to approve labels on liquors. I know we used to have one for labels that had to go on cigarettes, but even that didn't require Senate and House or administrative or FDA approval; it just required it. But evidently, if you are making rum, you have to have somebody approve your labels. I didn't run into that before, and I questioned it.

But we don't have to be in this position. We could have the government running, people could be paid, but we need to do it through the regular process. We need to do 12 spending bills and do them over a period of at least a week each and have amendments to them. There isn't an appropriator who is the ultimate answer for any spending bill. There isn't even a committee that is the ultimate answer for each spending bill. The reason we have 100 people here and 435 people over there is so that we have 535 opinions on what could be unintended consequences or what is or what isn't important, and if they are denied the right to amendments, they are being denied the right to a voice for their constituents. It is not for us; it is for our constituents. That is why amendments are important.

We have had important bills come up here, and we worked on them for maybe 3 weeks with no votes on amendments while they tried to negotiate for a limited number of amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, my colleague, our good friend from Wyoming, has talked about the need to get back to regular order so we can discuss our funding priorities. The fact is, of course, we agree. And the regular order would be to go to conference on the budget the Senate passed way back in March. On a regular basis the Democrats in the Senate have requested unanimous consent to go to conference on that budget. In fact, only a few days ago we put in our 21st request for unanimous consent to go to conference on our budget so we can go to regular order and discuss and debate the priorities that are so important to all of us. Every single time, a Republican Senator has objected to that request.

Like so many of my Democratic colleagues have been doing, I come to the floor again today to discuss the urgent need to end the shutdown and raise the

debt ceiling. There can no longer be any doubt that the shutdown is hurting hundreds of thousands of families and businesses throughout our country. I and many of my colleagues have told the stories of these families and businesses and will continue to do so. This shutdown hurts real people in real places all across our country.

Keeping the government running should not be a partisan battle. Yet the Republicans who caused the shutdown in the first place seem to think they would be doing Democrats a favor by reopening the government so that people can get back to work, get paid, and pay their bills. The idea that Congress should simply do its job isn't a favor to Democrats; it is our responsibility to the American people.

The idea that stopping Congress from doing its job is somehow a valuable bargaining chip is incomprehensible to most people. Since the beginning of the shutdown driven by an extreme faction of the Republican Party, people of all walks of life in Hawaii have contacted me. They have shared stories about the impact of the shutdown on their businesses, their families, and their communities.

I talked about the toll of the shutdown on our Federal employees. I have shared stories from small businesses impacted by the closure of our national parks and other attractions. I have also been in contact with Hawaii's business community, our military, our State and local governments, and others. Today I would like to share some more shutdown stories and also underscore that allowing the United States to default on paying its bills would only serve to make things much worse.

One woman wrote to me:

My husband and I are both Federal employees with the Forest Service. We both work in wildland fire. I am currently furloughed and he is working, but of course neither of us will receive a paycheck. We have three children ages 5, 3, and 1. My current day care costs are \$2,300 a month. I can't stop paying for day care, because all require a 2-4 week notice and I would lose our spot for when I do go back to work. We have savings, but the money is what we have saved for things like Christmas and a special vacation together since my husband was gone for several months this summer fighting fires. This shutdown is extremely stressful for me and I am very concerned that it is going to go on for several weeks more.

The Hawaii Chamber of Commerce, representing over 1,000 Hawaii businesses of all sizes, also sent me stories from some of their members.

The president of one business wrote:

Sixty percent of our business is with the Department of Defense. We move military household goods around the world as they are restationed. As a direct result of the government shutdown, we just had to lay off 41 of our 80 employees until this is resolved and the government starts booking moves. We informed the affected employees that all our staff will be working reduced hours. We anticipate that each day of this shutdown is costing the company over \$18,000.

Another business owner wrote:

My business is working on opening a fourth location in Aikahi Park Shopping Center. I was advised by our banker that SBA loan approvals and execution may be held up due to this debacle in D.C.

How is that helping to move our economy forward? If we ran our business the way our leaders on Capitol Hill run our country—well, the “closed for business” sign would not be far behind.

These are stories about what is happening now as a result of the shutdown.

If the United States were to fail to pay its bills, it would be much worse. Interest rates would skyrocket, our capital markets could freeze, and our Nation's borrowing costs over the long term would require more of our Federal budget. In other words, a default would end up costing our economy and consumers billions of dollars.

Our country has never defaulted before. The consequences of such a default are so serious that everyone from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the National Association of Manufacturers has warned the Republicans in particular to avoid such a catastrophe. Even the uncertainty of a possible default is enough to hurt middle-class families and businesses.

For example, after the last manufactured fiscal fiasco in 2011, mortgage interest rates rose. If you were a family looking to refinance or buy a new home, your mortgage would have cost you \$100 per month more after the United States nearly defaulted than it would have cost before. That means \$100 less for families across the country to spend on groceries, gas, and other items. For most working people, \$100 means a lot. Imagine piling another \$100 or more on the family with three young children I mentioned earlier. We can't do that to them or other families like them. Remember, in 2011 we didn't default. The uncertainty alone caused mortgage interest rates to rise. It would have been much worse if there had been a default. Yet here we are again.

It is incomprehensible that there are default deniers among my colleagues who refuse to believe that default would be catastrophic for all of us when we have the 2011 experience staring us in the face. A default would be like an immediate tax on everything middle-class families do. If interest rates explode, the cost of living in Hawaii and everywhere else would rise. Student loan rates would go up. That would reduce access to a quality education for many people. Credit cards, car payments, mortgages—all of these would become more expensive. The cost of doing business would go up. The cost of borrowing money to start or keep businesses going would go up. There is not a single good result that would come from our country defaulting on paying its debts.

As I mentioned in the past few months, a government shutdown

doesn't give businesses a pause in meeting their commitments. They still have to pay rent, maintain staff, and pay to keep the lights on. Imagine if the cost of all of these suddenly went on and still nothing was coming in. That is exactly where many businesses would find themselves if the United States defaults.

In addition, with our economy still recovering from the economic crisis of 2008, finally we have businesses contemplating growing, and those plans will likely be put on hold or abandoned altogether. We should be growing jobs, strengthening the middle class, and creating opportunities for our families and businesses. A default crisis would do exactly the opposite.

In day 12 of the shutdown and with the potential of default looming on the horizon, it is way past time to give our families, businesses, and communities certainty and security. We need to open the government and avoid a totally manufactured catastrophe. Let's get on with it. I am disappointed that our Republican colleagues yesterday failed to support going forward to do just that. I ask them to reconsider their position so that we can find a path that protects our families, our communities, and our economy.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I wish to follow up on the words of my distinguished colleague from Hawaii and also comment on a few points that the Senator from Wyoming Mr. ENZI made in this important debate that is happening in Washington today—actually a debate that is happening all over our country.

First, I wish to associate myself with the effort underway by Senator COLLINS from Maine and Senator KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota, Senator PRYOR from Arkansas, and others on both sides of the aisle who have been working throughout the evening, the night, early morning hours—talking, trying to find a way forward. I thank both Leader REID and Leader MCCONNELL for blessing that effort and trying to find a way forward because, as the Senator from Hawaii said, this is a very dangerous situation.

Despite the fact that there are Members on the other side of the Capitol in the Republican Party—not in the Democratic Party, in the Republican Party—who continue to doubt that there will be any ramifications from default, I hate to say it, but they are going to be sorry they uttered those words. This is a very serious situation.

The U.S. Treasury bond is the safest investment in the world today. Let me repeat, the safest investment in the world today. Think about it. If you had a little bit of money, would you invest it in Russia? Would you invest it in Saudi Arabia? Would you invest it in

China? Where would you invest it? The Government of the United States is not perfect but, relatively speaking, in all aspects of the world what is the safest, most sure group that is likely to pay their debts? That would be the United States, and it has been that way for over 225 years.

But the Republicans in the House have decided to put that on the line because they do not like the Affordable Care Act or they put all of that on the line because they don't like the way the budget process is working. They then doubled down and said not only are we going to put the full faith and credit of the United States at risk, we are going to shut down the government while we do that until we get our way on a specific piece of legislation.

I know there are principles underlying the Affordable Care Act that are worth debating: how big the size of government should be, how much the Federal Government should spend, how much local government should spend, what level of revenues should be required to pay for it and who should put up those revenues, individuals or businesses. Those are important issues to decide. We try to make those decisions every day. But a group of 80 Republicans—3 of whom are in my own State, I am sorry to say, 3 Representatives—signed a letter saying: If we don't get exactly what we want on the Affordable Care Act—which, by the way, passed the Congress, was upheld by the Supreme Court, and is being implemented in a majority of States—we are going to put the full faith and credit of the United States at risk. Literally, the ramifications are too massive to describe.

We have only a few days. I wouldn't even say we have a few days. We are already feeling the results of this hostage-taking by a few Republicans in the House of Representatives. I am praying and hoping that my colleagues in the Senate will live up to the great hope of the Senate, which was at times such as these to walk back from the ledge, reason together and find a way forward.

I see my good friend from Tennessee. I think if there is anyone who could help us do that, he would be one who could, along with Senator MCCAIN and Senator GRAHAM and others who have been mayors, who have been elected officials for a long time, who understand how you can get wound up and that it is important to calmly wind down and figure this out.

I will yield for a minute to the Senator if he has a question. But I do want to say, because my argument is not with him, that when Senators come to the floor to say that Democrats have not wanted to go along with the regular process, I want to say again as an appropriator, because I came to the floor yesterday, I want to say the first step in an appropriations process is to get a budget.

The Democrats, amazingly, were able to get a budget. We have not for 4 years in the Senate. So we got a budget. Republicans got a budget. These are two completely different approaches to how the government should be funded, what should be spent, how much money should be raised—two different approaches. But you know what. It is two different parties. We have a Democrat Party controlling here, the Republican Party controlling there. That is the first step, two budgets. They are very different. We need to go to conference on that budget.

But the Democrats here have asked our Republican colleagues who sit right across the aisle, please let us go to the Budget Committee, 21 times. I have put this in the RECORD. We started on April 23, Senator REID requested unanimous consent; Senator TOOMEY from Pennsylvania objected. I am not going to read them all. Let's fast forward to 5/14, May 14. Senator WARNER asked unanimous consent to go to conference. Senator MCCONNELL blocked it. Then go into June, June 4. Senator MURRAY asked unanimous consent. Senator RUBIO blocked it. Then go to July 17, Senator MURRAY asked again, Senator MIKE LEE blocked it.

They blocked going to budget conference because the tea partiers in this party, the small group of Republicans, said we will go to conference, but you cannot talk about raising any revenues in the budget conference. We will go to a budget conference to try to solve the budget problems of the United States, but you Democrats cannot talk about raising revenues. That is because the only thing we want to talk about is cutting—cutting, cutting. That is all. They will cut anything: Head Start, education, EPA—don't like the EPA very much myself, but that is all they want to do is cut.

We said you cannot solve a problem with just one side of that equation. We don't know where the revenues might need to come from, but there has to be a balance and we have to start paying down our long-term debt.

That is one thing I wish to say again. I don't want anyone in this government or the world or my State or the Nation to think Democrats are not concerned about the debt. We are concerned about the debt. We do not like the debt being this high. We want to try to find ways and we have reduced—with our Republican colleagues—spending trillions of dollars.

The Senator from Tennessee, to his credit—because I have not been in those negotiations. I was not part of the group of 8, but I supported a lot of what they have done. I was not on Simpson-Bowles, but I supported a lot of that. To his credit, he has tried to come up with a grand bargain to get our country to pay down our long-term debt but in a smart way that strengthens our economy and does not pull out the rug from underneath it.

But because the Senator from Texas, Mr. CRUZ—through the Chair, Senator CRUZ from Texas, because Senator LEE from Utah, said: No, we cannot go to budget unless you Democrats agree before you ever get to the negotiating table that we cannot raise any revenue—that was what the fight was about, so we never went to conference.

When you don't go to the budget conference, then you cannot start negotiating the individual bills. My responsibility is to negotiate Homeland. I want to say I am very proud of my colleague Senator COATS. He and I were given a number by our leadership and we have completely put our bill together with virtually no disagreement on a lower number than we had last year. We had to cut a lot of things out. I might say, we were asked by some Republican leaders to add a \$700 million project that I had to absorb into my budget because of something the Republicans asked for—and the President supported, I want to be honest. I was not a big fan of it, but the President and the Republicans wanted it, so I had to compromise and put it in my bill without any additional money and take some things out to make room for it. That is what we do around here—that is what we used to do around here. We are not doing it much right now.

For anyone to come to the floor to say to Democrats you are not the ones who want to go to regular order—we will go to budget. PATTY MURRAY, the Senator from Washington, could not be working any harder. She is one of the most respected Members in this whole body, and I am not just saying that. She is very humble. She is very smart. She is very much willing to negotiate. The Senator from Maryland Ms. MIKULSKI is probably one of the most popular Senators who has ever served in the Senate. Literally everyone likes her. She is not difficult to work with.

She is tough. She is not difficult to work with. So we have two extraordinary people trying to work through this. Yet we are not so much being blocked by our side on the Senate—even though they have blocked 21 times—they are being run by a group of extreme, radical party members on their side who have now gotten the Republican Party in complete disarray. That is not good for them. It is not good for the Democrats. It is definitely not good for the country. Now we have to figure out our way forward.

I know I have run into my 10 minutes. I don't know if the Senator wants to speak or if he wants me to yield for a question. I am happy to wrap this up and I will in a minute.

But to recap, I am willing to be part of the common ground to find a solution, but I will not allow—as long as I am on this floor today and I will be here for a couple of hours—for anyone to suggest that Democrats have been holding up the process, we have been

trying to get to a budget conference for 6 months. We have been trying to negotiate appropriations bills. But we will not be held hostage, nor the Federal employees or the businesses or non-profits or our States and mayors and cities because Republicans cannot even go to the negotiation until they get 100 percent of their way or until the government is shutdown, it cannot open, or until we default on our debt.

We cannot negotiate under those terms. We can negotiate on terms where the hostages are freed and we sit down like grownups and work this out. I am hoping we can do that.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for her desire to see this to a conclusion. I appreciate the many ways we have been able to work together on so many issues.

Look, I do not rise to blame either side right now. I do not. Let's face it, I have said from day one the effort that was taking place in the House regarding the health care bill was not an effort that was going to lead to a conclusion. It was an overreach. I know that. You know that. They know that. The country knows that. So we have ended up where we are.

But in fairness what has happened over the last couple of days is—on the other side of the aisle it has gotten one tick too cute. We had a group of folks who had an idea. I thought it was a good starting place, candidly. We had six Republicans and six Democrats who had an idea of a way to move beyond this. Let's face it. We all know what happens around here. Two nights ago the White House weighed in and leadership on the Democratic side pulled back a hair, asked the 12 folks not to have a press conference yesterday to announce what their efforts were.

The fact is we are where we are. Let me say this. I am perfectly happy with the two leaders negotiating a deal, and I want to support the leaders in negotiating a deal. I truly am. But at the end of the day what happened, let's face it, is we have had a little bit of a pullback where House Republicans overreached, no question. What has also happened over the last couple of days is there has been a little bit of a push to overreach and undo what happened with the Budget Control Act back in 2011, where budget caps were put in place, the President signed it, it passed, components of it—it passed the Senate. So just as much as the health care law is law, this also is law. What we have had over the last few days is a little bit of a pullback. I hope it is temporary.

What I would say is at this moment in time we have actually had a little bit of a problem on both sides of the aisle. Let's face it. I think we have an opportunity over the next 24 hours for that to be worked out. What I would do is encourage the leadership to continue on this pace.

As we all know, it takes 4 days to move anything across the Senate floor. We all know the debt ceiling is this Thursday. What I hope is going to happen is that both sides will admit there is a little bit of an issue, on both sides. I think there is a strong desire by the vast majority of our caucus over here to do something that is a pragmatic, good-government step. At the end of the day, look, these events have always been used in times when you have tremendous concerns about what our financial situation is. They have always been used as a backstop to hopefully negotiate some reforms. We have been on the wrong page for so long, which I admitted to. We may not have even been in the right book, but we have definitely been on the wrong page, and now we are finally on the right page.

Let's face it. Not only are we on the right page where we are focused on fiscal issues relative to the debt ceiling and the continuing resolution to fund government, we are finally on fiscal solutions. Not only are we on the right page, we are finally on the right paragraph. We are focused on discussing mandatory reforms. We are on the right subject. We have the two leaders who are now talking to each other. By the way, I think the six Democrats and six Republicans who came together have helped that effort.

There has been a little bit of a pullback. I think the White House kind of encouraged—hey, let's see if there is some way we can bust the sequester. In fairness, I am pretty sure that happened. I think the Senators are pretty sure that happened. I know there has been concern by some of the appropriators about the caps that exist, but it is the law.

What I hope will happen is that we will end up with an agreement. The time is so short. We are not going to be able to do anything substantial on the mandatory issue. I think we all know that. I hope we will end up with an agreement that at least sets the framework for us to move, leave this behind us, as we should, but sets up the framework to move into dealing with the mandatory issues in such a way as they need to be dealt with.

I think it is unreasonable to ask people on our side of the aisle to have a \$1 trillion debt ceiling increase and not put some kind of framework in place to look at some of the mandatory issues we know are driving our country into the ground the way they are. I think there should be some framework for that to be discussed over the next 60 to 90 days. The House has looked at 6 weeks. Some people have said that is too short.

It seems to me that doing something for the short term to get government up and the threat of the debt ceiling behind us—but doing something over the short term—gives us some time to harness the energy the Senator from

Louisiana was alluding to. I know the Presiding Officer has intimated some of the same things. There is some energy in this body to deal with that, but the fact is we have not. A big part of it—as I mentioned—is that we have been on the wrong subject for a long time. We are finally on the right one. Let's come to a place where we can now focus on what we should have been focused on all along relative to debt ceilings and CRs.

I think the less we do—and I don't think anybody I have heard in recent time has been doing this—to barb each other at this moment would be in everybody's best interest, because this is a moment where we do need to resolve this issue. This is not a moment to take shots at each other. We know where we have been. We know the path we have been down. It has been winding, it has been in the wrong direction, and we are now in the right place. Let's let the leaders work it out. I hope they will.

I hope while the Democrats say this is settled law—the health care bill, the Affordable Care Act—that Democrats and Republicans will say the Budget Control Act is settled law. We have agreed to some caps. There is a more intelligent way of getting to those caps. I think there are probably 70 people in this body who agree.

We could do some mandatory reforms and substitute those for some of the discretionary cuts and still end up at the same levels of spending that are in this bill, which would be more intelligent for our Nation, and it would make our Nation much stronger. I think there is a lot of desire to talk about those kinds of things as long as it is done in the right way. There are all kinds of mandatory reforms. They are not the same.

I know the Senator from Alabama, who just came into the Chamber, made note of that yesterday. There are all kinds of mandatory changes, and they are not the same; they are not equal. We need to look at those and honor the trusts that have been set up.

Look, I think we have finally gotten to a pretty good place. I really do. I think both sides are a little bit at fault. People might discern that one side is more at fault than the other, but now it is time for all of us to focus on the right page, the right paragraph, so we can get this done.

I think we can get this done as long as people don't try to—as the Senator from Louisiana mentioned a minute ago—game this out to say which side ends up with a bigger win. I am afraid a little of that stepped in over the last 24 hours. I hope it will dissipate. I hope we will end up in a place that is good for our Nation. That is what we all came here to do, and I think it is going to happen, although I will say I have been a little bit concerned because over the last 24 hours that has not been

what these conversations have been about.

Hopefully we will get back on the page we were on about 36 hours ago and focus on doing something that is bipartisan, that will stand the test of time, and will go over to the House in such a way that it has a tremendous amount of support coming out of this Chamber, and that it is not something where one side tries to peel off five or six items from the other side. That is not going to stand the test of time. That is not going to take us to a place that solves this problem in time to keep the kind of things the Senator from Louisiana mentioned might happen if we don't.

In all likelihood my time is up, and I yield the floor for that reason.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I would like to respond for 5 minutes, and then I will have to take the Chair and relieve the Presiding Officer.

Let me again say how much I respect the Senator from Tennessee. No one on his side of the aisle—except perhaps the good Senator from Alabama—has spent more time on budget issues because that is actually the job of the Senator from Alabama.

The Senator from Tennessee has taken it upon himself to be a leader. I agree with him that we are on the right page, the right chapter, and in the right book to talk about some fiscal issues.

I don't agree that the strategy to get us here was the right strategy, but we are here. There is no sense in pointing fingers. I do agree that the Senate needs to try to find our way forward because—the Senator from Tennessee is correct—where we are now, there are no winners and losers. It is just about doing what is right for the American people. I want to do that for the State of Louisiana, and he wants to do that for the State of Tennessee. We have lots of people who are counting on us to try to lower our temperatures and find a way forward.

Secondly, I also agree with him that whatever we can come up with here has to be broadly supported on both sides—or at least core-supported on both sides—because it is going to have to be something we can bring to the House and say, look, this is the best we can do and we cannot go over this cliff.

Thirdly, I want to make a point. On this Budget Control Act, that is law. Let me say the Affordable Care Act, in lawyers' terms—and I am not one—would say it is not settled law. It is law that has passed and been upheld by the Supreme Court, but there have not been enough court tests. I will take the Senator's word for it, but it is settled as far as we are concerned because it passed.

The Budget Control Act is as well. But this is the point I would like to make to my good friend from Ten-

nessee: The House is willing to take the sequester, which is the lowest number, but what they do—which is very disingenuous and what the Democrats will not be for—is basically take the lower number overall, but keeping Defense at a very high number, and therefore cutting the heck out of everybody else.

There is no agriculture money, no education money, no health care money, no nothing, but they want to keep Defense whole. That is what the House is trying to do. I realize that is not what my colleagues on the Republican side here want to do. As the Senator from Tennessee knows, that is our problem. It is not about just taking the lower number, but how that number is going to be allocated across appropriations. That is how the Defense appropriations bill is put together. It absorbs all the money and leaves all the other budgets starving.

I know Defense is important. I am a Democrat who supported a strong defense. I have stood against irresponsible cuts to the Defense budget. But to take a lower number in the whole budget and then say, OK, we will take the lower number, but we are going to give it all to Defense, and then we can't fund anything in health, education, and social services, which is so important—that is not right either.

One more point is this: The Senator from Tennessee has been very brave. There are not that many brave people around here. He has been one of the brave ones around here who said we may need to raise a few revenues around here; we can't solve the whole problem by cuts alone. In the last big deal we did, we were able to figure out how to raise some revenues and also make some cuts so we could have a good and steady way to balance our budget and not pull the rug out from underneath this very promising economy.

I have 5-percent unemployment in Louisiana. I am not talking as a State that doesn't have jobs. Our problem is we have so many jobs, we need people to fill them. It breaks my heart we are ready to pull the plug on that, and we are close. I know how much my people are counting on us to get this done.

I want to thank the Senator, but I hope he will also stand up to some of the other voices over there who say we can solve this problem by cutting, cutting, cutting, and we can cut mandatory problems and cut entitlements, that is all we have to worry about, and I think he knows that is not correct.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I want to take 30 seconds and say for the RECORD, I don't want anybody to think that I thought the strategy that was undertaken was the right strategy. I think I have been clear in saying I did not think that took us to a positive place. But the point is we are where we

are, and we are finally on the right page. Let's stay there and solve this problem.

With that, I will yield the floor. I see the outstanding and distinguished Senator from Alabama is here. He is someone whom I very much enjoy working with, and I look forward to his comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LANDRIEU). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I thank the Chair for the opportunity to share some thoughts, and I thank Senator CORKER for his commitment and leadership on these difficult budget issues.

As a businessman and someone who fabulously ran an important city in Tennessee, he knows we have to live within our means. There are limits as to what we can do and maintain a healthy financial future for America. I think that is important for all of us.

I first want to respond to a couple of things Senator REID, the Democratic leader, and Senator DURBIN said earlier this morning that sort of surprised me. First of all, he said there is no plan to break the caps. I was—as the Senator from Tennessee was—with the President on Friday, and he said there was a strong push from Democratic Senators to spend above the limits of the Budget Control Act that we all agreed to in August of 2011.

The Budget Control Act allowed substantial growth in spending. Instead of growing \$10 trillion over the next 10 years, we would have reduced the growth of the budget to \$8 trillion. It is not really a cut over the 10-year period.

The President submitted a budget in February of 2012, 6 months later, that would spend \$1 trillion over those cuts. The Democratic budget that just passed this year—the first time in 4 years—would have increased spending by \$1 trillion over those cuts. I am a little bit uneasy because I think there is an effort, and there will be an effort, which is unacceptable, to deal with those cuts—or to break the caps that limit the growth of spending, which is the right way to say it. Of course, there are some cuts we need to make.

Then Senators REID and DURBIN talked about President Bush's problems with deficits. He didn't do a great job in containing deficits. The highest deficit he had in 1 year was \$487 billion. The year before he left office, the deficit he had was \$167 billion. President Obama took office and rammed through, with unanimous Democratic support, a stimulus bill that added \$1 trillion to the debt of the United States—the biggest single spending bill ever, and every penny of that borrowed because we didn't have any money. We were already in debt. So we borrowed \$1 trillion to spend.

So for 5 consecutive years we will have averaged over \$1 trillion in deficits per year. We have never been over

\$500 billion a year before that, and \$1 trillion is \$1,000 billion. So President Obama's average in 5 years is unprecedented. It is stunning. We have never, ever seen such a debt accumulation in such a rapid period of time. I think we need to understand that. Our colleagues continue to defend it and still want to spend more, and their budget would spend \$1 trillion more that they voted on and passed in this Congress.

They use the word "extreme" for anybody who wants to reduce spending and try to attack people who want to reduce spending.

Senator DURBIN talked about how we need a sound dollar. Is the dollar sounder today, I ask Senator CORKER, because we, this Congress, reached a bipartisan agreement to reduce spending by \$2.1 trillion and the growth of spending by that much? Isn't it stronger today than it would have been if we hadn't done that? It was a tense time in August 2011. People weren't sure how it would all end, but it ended in a modest reduction in the growth of spending which I think made the country better as a result. The last thing we should ever contemplate is backing off of that agreement and not at least adhering to that agreement. We need to do a good deal more.

So I wish to share a few thoughts in general. I will go into detail, if we have time, about the nature of the Budget Control Act and explain it in more detail.

We have heard the word "extremist" thrown around a lot over recent days. Let me share with my colleagues what I think is extreme. Extreme is adding \$6 trillion to the debt of the United States in 5 years—that is extreme—and saying there is no spending we can cut. "We have cut every dime we can cut."

Extreme is forcing a health care law through that the American people oppose and telling them we can take \$500 billion out of Medicare, and strengthen Medicare, and then fund ObamaCare, double counting the \$500 billion that will come back to haunt us in the future. Extreme is refusing to make any concession, negotiation, or alteration to a health care law that is going to financially bankrupt us. It will add another \$6 trillion to the long-term debt of America—almost as much as Social Security, according to the Government Accountability Office.

They say it would be fully paid for. The President said in a joint session of Congress it would not add one dime to the debt now or ever, period, and the Government Accountability Office says it will add \$6 trillion to the long-term debt of America. This is how a nation goes broke. Instead of fixing Social Security and Medicare, which need fixing, we start a whole new program that adds almost as much debt over time as they do.

Extreme is knowing we are on an unsustainable debt path and refusing

to do anything about it. In the last 5 years, we have spent more than \$15 trillion and added more than \$6 trillion to the debt. Never has so great a sum been spent for so little benefit. Consider: Nearly 60 million working-age Americans aren't working. They are out of work. I wish the unemployment rate were 5 percent, but the truth is the unemployment rate in this country is 7.3 percent, and we have the lowest workplace participation since 1975. There are fewer people working today than there were in 2007. That is the key number. How many people are working? Our population is up, but the number of people actually having jobs is down, and more and more of those are part-time jobs.

Median household income is lower than it has been on any year since 1998. Two-thirds of the job creation this year has been part-time. We spent \$1 trillion last year on welfare and poverty programs, State and Federal combined. One in six Americans are on food stamps. Let me repeat: One in six people in this Nation are receiving food stamps from the Federal Government. This economy is not healthy. Despite the endless inundation of Federal funds in some of our big cities, one in three children still live in poverty in our Nation's capital. In nearby Baltimore, one in three residents are on food stamps, and one in three youth live in poverty.

This isn't a booming, growing economy. We borrow, tax, and spend. It hasn't produced results that are good for our country. Growth is way below what it was projected to be at this time. They were predicting 3.5 or 4 percent growth. We are not likely to add 2 percent growth this year.

The only people who seem to be gaining in this economic plan is the political class who came up with it and those with enough lobbyists to profit from it. What does the President say? What does Senator REID say? How about our friends on the other side of the aisle, what do they say? Spend more money. That is what they say we need to do. But it is a budget that spends another \$1 trillion, and we have to go to conference on that budget, they say. It is rather odd that after 4 years of not even producing one at all, now they are anxious to take one to conference that adds \$1 trillion to the debt.

Put more people on government aid. Energy prices too high? Oh, mail people another check. They are hurting; let's send out government checks. Factory closed? Mail another check out to people who didn't get a job. Your school is failing? Send them more money. Families falling apart? Mail another check. Then there is this one: Too many Americans unemployed? Bring in foreign workers to do the job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, do we have a 10-minute limit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair.

By what definition can we call what we have been seeing for the last 5 years a success? It is just not. That is the problem. We have taxed more, we have spent more, we have regulated more, we have borrowed more, we have stimulated more, and it hasn't produced solid growth. We have had the slowest recovery from a recession since the Great Depression.

So this is the plan. Reduce wages that results in an increase in unemployment, more part-time jobs, more regulations, and higher energy costs. And we make that up how? Well, the government will just borrow money and subsidize people in need.

That is not the kind of compassion I think we need. I think we need to be asking ourselves, what is really happening that is hurting Americans, and why can't we create a government that is leaner, more productive, that allows growth and prosperity to occur, and not tax, regulate, and borrow our country into debt. This is the fundamental choice the Nation is going to have to be dealing with.

Indeed, my colleagues fundamentally are saying this: Well, we have a problem in Washington. We don't have enough money. We just don't have enough money. We acknowledge we are borrowing too much money, the debt is too high, and we are on an unsustainable course. But, see, the problem is not us. We haven't overspent. We don't have programs that are running out of control. We have no unmanaged agencies and departments. The problem is, American people, you haven't sent enough money. Why don't you send some more money? That is what we need to have in this country. The American people need to understand how smart we are, how good we have managed their money, and if they will just send us more money, we can figure out all of this and the government will take care of it. It is your fault, America. You are hardheaded. You won't send us more money. Send more money, and we will fix the problems in America.

I reject that idea. We have to get our house under control and make our government leaner, focused on productivity, and serving the interests of people who are hurting right now. They are not doing well, and this economy is not doing well.

I see other Senators are here, Madam President. I thank the Chair for the opportunity to share these thoughts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Madam President, I was presiding during the last exchange between the great Senators from Louisiana and Tennessee. I was struck because as a junior member of this body I get an opportunity to sit in the chair quite a bit. I would suggest to anyone, if they want to see someone who came to the floor and predicted this outcome—who said it very early on—Senator CORKER gave what I call the box canyon speech. He did it repeatedly, because he could see what this would do if we continued to take hard-line positions that really would achieve absolutely no results.

I think Senator CORKER has been a champion in calling out all of us to behave responsibly, to behave in a fiscally appropriate way. He has been a great mentor to many of us who are new in this body. We don't always share the same philosophies, but I certainly appreciate his willingness to tell the truth and to speak with common sense. That is really why I came to the floor today.

Initially, when I came here, I thought I would write a book called "That Makes No Sense," talking about all that we do and what we say and how what we do doesn't really match up all that well with what we say. I have to admit that in the last couple of weeks, my father's voice has come to me over and over. My father never went to high school. He had an eighth grade education, but he was part of the greatest generation, a World War II vet. He had an expression for his seven kids, in nine years—seven of us in nine years. When we would do things that he thought lacked common sense, he would say, "How darn dumb are you?" I am sure the Presiding Officer knows he didn't use the word "dumb," but I will use that word in the interest of propriety here. So I rise today to talk about what we are doing now that makes no sense.

We have heard in the last hour and a half a lot of discussion about fiscal accountability and fiscal responsibility. Senators have been coming to the floor and speaking about their perspective on how we need to live within our means. I totally agree. But think of this: Think about where we are right now, today, adding to our debt and deficits by a dysfunction that is completely created right here in Washington, DC.

I am going to start by mentioning three things. The first thing is the House of Representatives consistently not voting—not taking up the CR, which was negotiated—short-term, negotiated and agreed to—and not putting that CR on the floor for a vote. Then, the same people who voted to not let people work voted to pay people not to work. Think about what the American public sees when they see that, that we won't let people who want to work—they know their work is

piling up. They are committed public servants. The Washington Post has been replete with stories about people who want to get back to their jobs. They want to be public servants. So we vote so they can't go to work, but we pay them not to go to work. We won't let them work, but we pay them not to go to work.

In the meantime, we don't have anyone to check out disaster accounts in North Dakota. We don't have BLM permits being issued in Indian country to help as the struggling Indian nations in my State achieve some economic parity. We don't have things getting done. There is no bill in the House with that headline CR—that is what I call it. It is the headline CR. Whatever is in the headlines, we will pass a bill to fix that. That is no way to run a government. It makes no sense.

Let's talk about the debt. Let's talk about the need to control our debt and have a deficit reduction and a long-term plan to pay down our debt. Why is it important? Because we pay interest on the debt, and every dollar of interest we pay is another dollar we don't have for Head Start, another dollar we don't have for education or research or for higher education. So this is a real problem. What are we doing?

We have people who have said it doesn't matter; we don't need to pay our debt. We can just decide which bills we are going to pay. I am the same as every person in America. They know that when they go to check their credit score—a person goes to the bank to get a car loan, and the bank says: Well, you don't have a high enough credit score so we are going to deny your car loan.

You say: But what is the problem?

They say: Well, you missed a credit card payment and you missed your mortgage payment.

You say: But I always paid my car loan.

That is not the way it works. What they know and what the American people know is that if you do not pay all your bills, your credit rating goes down.

The tragedy is that we are not only going to add to the debt and deficit of this country by playing this brinkmanship, we are going to hurt every American who relies on credit—whether it is for a mortgage, whether it is for a car loan, whether it is for a student loan. We have now linked student loans to this problem.

Think about the dollars and think about what is happening to the American people when we do not do what we need to do. We shut down government but will not let people go to work, will not let people serve the public, but then say: Oh, don't worry, we are going to pay you. And then, by shutting down this government, we have cost millions and millions and billions of dollars, adding to the debt and deficit—dollars we did not have to spend.

Now we are going to play this brinkmanship on our debt limit. We are going to shake up not only the American markets, we are going to add to the interest costs of the American people and of this government. We already have in the markets discounting of our Treasury bills. We already have seen exactly what is going to happen. The longer this impasse stays, the more dramatic this result is going to be.

The vote we took yesterday in the Senate sent a message—and the wrong message, I tell you, the wrong message—to the markets. We need to send the right message. We need to come together. We need to lead from the Senate because the House, which is not even in session today addressing this problem, seems to think there is no problem with the debt limit, there is no problem with not paying our bills, there is no problem with paying people and not letting them work.

Do you know what my dad would say? How darn dumb are you? What I say is that makes no sense because as passionate as I know they are about debt and deficit reduction, the reality is that what we are doing is adding to the debt and deficit.

What we are doing is justifying—justifying—a 5-percent approval rating for the U.S. Congress. Every day we are here that we do not achieve a result, every day we are here that we do not solve this problem, how can you argue that the judgment of the American public is wrong?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, we are in the 13th day of a self-inflicted crisis brought to us by the Republicans. Why did this happen? Why are we in the 13th day of a shutdown, the 13th day of the American people not being able to count on their government, which is supposed to be of, by, and for the people? Why? Because Speaker BOEHNER over in the House said he does not believe the American people want the Affordable Care Act, and even though he believed they did not want a shutdown, unfortunately that is what he brought to the Nation. That is horrible news—horrible news. People are suffering. People are struggling. Hundreds of thousands of people are not getting their paychecks. Americans know a lot of us do count on that paycheck. It is not as if we have massive amounts of savings behind it. If you do not get that paycheck, you are in trouble. How do you pay the mortgage? How do you pay the rent? That is what is happening. We have police officers who talked to me yesterday, trying to use some gallows humor to explain away their fears. They are afraid. They cannot pay the bills. They have families. This is a disgrace—a self-inflicted disgrace—on our Nation.

I have not even gotten to the issue that is staring us in the face: perhaps

the first time in history that America would not pay its bills—a default—even though the Constitution is clear. It says, essentially, the debts of the United States shall not be questioned. That is in the Constitution. Well, they are being questioned.

We have a situation where not only are these employees of the Federal Government being laid off and not getting paid and the communities in which they live are going to suffer because they really cannot go down to the corner store, but the contractors are not getting paid; the small businesses are not getting paid; road projects—and I know something about this as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee—many new projects are stopped in their tracks, not because people are not ready to go but because all the various signoffs that have to be made before you start a project cannot be made; investigations into chemical explosions that kill people every single year in America stopped in their tracks; investigations into airplane crashes stopped in their tracks; little kids kept out of Head Start. Why? Because the Republicans do not like the Affordable Care Act.

What is it that they do not like about the Affordable Care Act, I ask rhetorically. Do they not like the fact that 3 million adults in America are now insured through their parents' plan—I am sure many in the Presiding Officer's State and I know in my State over 1 million. Are they that upset that they want to shut down the government because people are getting insurance?

Madam President, 71 million people across the country—8 million in my State—getting free preventive services, including immunization. Are they that upset that they would shut down the government and make our people suffer and shut the doors? Seventeen million kids with preexisting conditions like asthma and diabetes can no longer be denied health insurance coverage. The Presiding Officer is a champion for children. I can imagine how she feels about this. They want to repeal a law that finally has protected 17 million kids with preexisting conditions like asthma and diabetes. There are no more lifetime limits on policies.

There was a magnificent piece written in the Washington Post by one of my constituents—a mom, a freelance writer—who talks about her son who was born with a brain tumor, and over the years they have had to have operation after operation after operation. They came an inch away from reaching the lifetime limit on the policy—\$500,000—and they learned the Affordable Care Act passed, and this child got his health care. Now, as she says, he is talking and he is walking and he is shooting baskets. I saw that mom and son on the Lawrence O'Donnell show

the other night, and if you have not seen it on MSNBC, I think you ought to take a look at it.

So you have to wonder, what is it they are trying to do?

What is interesting is that if you listen to my colleagues now, they are off the Affordable Care Act. They kind of gave up on it because we said to them: This law passed 4 years ago. It has a steady stream of funding. It has its kinks and its problems. We are going to work with you on that. But you cannot stop it. It was upheld in the Supreme Court. You lost an election about it. Get a life. Figure it out. It is happening. OK. It is happening.

So now they have a new thing—deficits. Madam President, you are considered a fiscal conservative. I want to remind you and everyone listening within the sound of my voice that not only did the Democrats lead the way on a balanced budget, we actually got surpluses at the time Bill Clinton was President. How did we do it? We worked together with our Republican friends, but we passed a budget without one Republican vote and we set the stage. Do you know what happened? Not only did we have a surplus—in other words, we had extra money beyond a balanced budget—we had created at that time 23 million new jobs. What a glorious time. We did not do it by threatening to shut down the government. We did not do it by threatening to default on the full faith and credit of the United States of America. We did it by sitting down, looking at each other, smiling, shaking hands, and working together.

Let's open the government, let's pay our bills, and then let's sit down and really debate how we are going to get to a balanced budget. We have a lot of history to draw from. We do know when you put two wars on a credit card and the biggest tax break to millionaires in history on a credit card and a prescription drug benefit on a credit card it is a problem. That is why we saw, under George W. Bush, surpluses turn immediately into deficits. Now our colleagues suddenly are deficit hawks. Where were they when George W. was putting all this on the credit card? And now they do not want to pay the bills. It is unbelievable.

This is not complicated. This is a self-inflicted crisis. You keep the government open, you pay the bills, and through regular order, with my friend the good Senator from Alabama and my friend the great Senator also from Washington State, sitting down, hammering it out, we bring in PAUL RYAN, we bring in the House Democrats, and we sit down, and through them we get a path forward.

Everything that is happening now is unnecessary. I want to repeat that. Everything that is happening now is unnecessary—13th day of a shutdown, pain and suffering throughout the country.

I have a little community in Los Angeles. Little kids—their noses are bleeding. They are sick. They live near some industrial site. EPA said they were getting on it. EPA got the message: You are out. We cannot help you. We are closed down; 92 percent furloughed.

You will notice in all those little mini-bills, Madam President, you did not see anything about that. No watchdogs anymore. The watchdogs are gone. We cannot have government by press release. We cannot have government by mini-bills. We are the greatest Nation on God's Earth, and we need to open the doors and let the people in.

We have elections. Elections have consequences. Republicans control the House, it is true, but Democrats control the Senate and the White House. Therefore, we need to work together. We do not threaten to shut down.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 60 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. So here is the good news. The good news is we have a bill over in the House. It is a clean continuing resolution. It would open the doors to government immediately. And it is a very short-term CR—continuing resolution—and would still preserve everyone's right to sit down and negotiate through regular order. We have a strong budget chairman. We have a strong budget ranking member. America has gotten to know them well. And the same in the House. Therefore, I put my faith in those folks under regular order.

So we could open this government in 5 minutes, we could pass a clean debt extension in 7 minutes, and then we sit down and negotiate. I did speak with Leader REID this morning, and I feel he is optimistic that we are going to get there—I really do—and it lifts my spirits.

MITCH MCCONNELL and HARRY REID have been around here a long time. They have had their ups and downs and sideways and everything else like everybody in the relationships here. But I think they know the moment of history is calling them. I put my faith in that. I hope I am right.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, yesterday Senate Republicans rejected a cloture motion on a strictly party-line basis for a simple measure to prevent default for the United States of America. This bears repeating. Yesterday we voted on whether to proceed to a bill to prevent default, and not one Senate Republican voted for it.

I think it is fair to say that many of the Senate Republicans are operating in good faith and have a strong desire to get out of this mess, but they are concerned about embarrassing and undermining the Speaker of the House by

moving too quickly on this measure. Too quickly came and went a couple of months ago.

Worrying about undermining the Speaker of the House should not be our primary concern given the crisis upon us. We should be singularly focused on protecting the dollars as the reserve currency, maintaining our ability to borrow at the lowest possible rate, and retaining our ability to solve problems as the greatest Nation in the world.

The time for worrying about the implications for one or the other political party or a faction within it has long since passed. It is time to reopen the government, to pay our bills, to ensure the full faith and credit of the United States, and to return to the negotiating table on all of the challenges in front of us. In short, it is time to get back to governing in the way we should.

I would like to emphasize a point that is not made often enough about the current crisis; that is, there is simply nothing conservative about the behavior of the House Republicans. Conservatives traditionally have been characterized by holding a respect for institutions, a focus on the needs of the private sector, and a desire to not waste money.

Are these principles being upheld or subverted by the actions of House Republicans?

First, with respect to our Democratic institutions, the procedural violence being done to the Congress is hard to overstate in this case. The idea that a faction of a party is demanding concessions in exchange for ceasing their infliction of pain on America is unbelievable. Why? Because we are all Americans here. We all want to do right by our country.

So the idea that one party is willing to inflict terrible pain on our country, or else, was so beyond the pale that there is no rule against it because no one ever contemplated that a major political party would ever behave in such a way. The assumption has always been that elected leaders would find a better way to stand for strongly held beliefs than by threatening to bring the American economy to its knees. Up until now that has been a safe assumption.

This is the least conservative behavior imaginable because it throws us into a permanent crisis, unable to solve major problems for the foreseeable future.

Second, conservatives traditionally have wanted to protect the free marketplace. Some default deniers surmise that maybe the U.S. Government can service its debt while delaying other payments, that we can simply prioritize. The United States of America cannot do that. Even if it were operationally possible, which the Treasury Department assures us it is not, it would cause such severe harm to markets and undermine our credibility

so terribly that even talking like that may be doing damage to our economy.

In 2011, Congress's delay in raising the debt limit forced the Department of the Treasury to take extraordinary measures to ensure that our government could pay its bills. GAO estimates that this raised Treasury's borrowing costs by about \$1.3 billion in fiscal year 2011. That is \$1.3 billion in added government costs just for coming close to defaulting. This does not include the lingering added costs of borrowing that continued beyond fiscal year 2011.

It also does not include the wasted time and resources that these extraordinary actions meant. After all, this manufactured crisis took the Treasury Department's focus away from other important cash and debt management responsibilities. The Bipartisan Policy Center projects that the full cost of that crisis to the Federal Government alone, not to the economy, just to the Federal Government, will be around \$19 billion over the maturity of the debt.

There is nothing conservatively virtuous about defaulting on what we owe. It will cripple free markets. It is Russian roulette played with a bullet in every chamber. There so nothing conservative about that.

Finally, there is the conservative principle about saving taxpayers' dollars. Two points: First, with the likely passage of the House bill to provide retroactive pay to Federal employees, let me tell you what is happening. We are paying Federal employees to stay home. We are paying our dedicated Federal workers, who want to do their jobs, not to do their jobs. This is not conservative. This is not liberal, for that matter. It is upside down.

We are preventing Federal employees from doing their important work, such as assisting small businesses and combating terrorism. Let me be clear. Federal workers did not cause this shutdown and should not lose pay because of it. That is why I cosponsored Senator CARDIN's bill to make sure they receive back pay when the government reopens. Our Nation's furloughed public servants want to work, and many Federal civilian employees are being required to work during this shutdown without pay.

While it does not make sense to punish Federal workers for Congress's dysfunction, it makes way more sense to simply reopen the Federal Government. Still, the House refuses to vote on a clean continuing resolution that can reopen the government tomorrow but instead voted to give backpay after the shutdown ends. What is conservative about paying people to stay home?

Second, this shutdown is costing us money, not saving us money. In just the first week, it cost the economy \$1.6 billion in lost economic output and is estimated to cost an average of \$160

million each additional day. This is hurting small businesses and working families across the country, and it is completely avoidable.

As the Presiding Officer knows, people are in real pain. This needs to stop. There is nothing good in this shutdown or in the threat of default. As a progressive, I have talked on this floor about how it hurts our economy, the American people, and the priorities I am fighting for. But you do not have to share my priorities to think this is an awful mess. You can be a rock-ribbed conservative too. This is bad for all of us. There is a simple way to move forward: Open our government, pay our bills, and start negotiating on the issues that matter.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague from Hawaii Senator SCHATZ and share his points. I think most of the American people share his perspective this is an awful mess and it is way past time that we fix it.

I am hearing from people in New Hampshire every day who are affected by the negative consequences of this shutdown. I heard from some employees at the Berlin prison. This is a medium-security facility in the northern part of New Hampshire. It has not even been fully staffed. It does not have all of the inmates there. Several of the employees have emailed me talking about what their situation is.

One woman says:

We are expected to work and not get paid for the time being. But it's going to be tough when both working members of the household are government employees who aren't getting paid. I am expected to make my Federal student loan payments on time as well as my private student loans. How is one supposed to do that when the government is not paying them? They expect payment. Well, so do we.

I also heard from a gentleman whose family is back in New York because he is still getting settled in Berlin. He has a child who is ill. He says he was told last week that any sick or annual leave could be used, but it would be considered as a nonpaid day during this shutdown. He says:

I have been dealing for the past 3 months with my youngest child who's been having kidney problems and had surgery recently. My wife has been having kidney difficulty and had surgery. So now I cannot respond to my family's aid because I would be concerned about whether or not I am going to be able to get paid for these sick days.

We are hearing from people across New Hampshire. Hundreds of Federal workers have been furloughed in the State. New Small Business Administration loans have been stopped. Federal Housing Administration and VA loans have been slowed. Facilities in the White Mountain National Forest have been closed.

This is the peak weekend for foliage in the White Mountains of New Hampshire. Yet because of the shutdown, facilities, bathrooms in the White Mountain National Forest are closed, campgrounds are closed, the small businesses that depend on those for the rest of their season are taking a huge hit. So many of the manufacturing businesses in New Hampshire are being affected.

I heard from a company called Nanocomp, which is a real innovative, small New Hampshire company producing next-generation carbon nanotube technology. They have a number of Federal contracts. They have already been hit by sequestration. So this is a double whammy. Their CEO said to me:

We would burn through our very thin cash reserves as a result of this shutdown, and when that money is burned, it is not able to be replaced. So our basic financial viability can be irrevocably damaged, even after the crisis passes.

For this company, the consequences of this shutdown could be irreversible. I heard from another small business owner with a company called GlobaFone. He called because he is so frustrated because again his government contracts are not being paid. He does not know what that is going to mean. Their cashflow is uncertain. He is not sure if his line of credit with the bank is going to continue.

There are very real consequences from this government shutdown.

Then of course, on SBA loans, according to the Granite State Development Corporation, which is one of the largest SBA lenders in New Hampshire, about 20 loans have been put on hold with the Granite State Development Corporation because of this shutdown.

Then, we have heard from some of our community banks that provide for SBA loans that those loans are being held up. There is no doubt this is having a huge impact in New Hampshire on families, on small businesses. But it is having an impact across this country.

That is affecting activity. As the Presiding Officer said so well in his comments, this is having a huge impact on how the economy of this country is doing. As we think about the concerns we have heard expressed about the debt and the deficit, one of the improvements to reducing the deficit and the debt as this economy recovers is the recovery itself. It has improved economic activity. It is making sure businesses can do better. They can hire more workers, people get back to work, and they can pay their taxes.

Yet that very economic recovery is what is being threatened right now by this shutdown. We know that as bad as this shutdown is—and we are in the 13th day—that 4 days from now we have an even more disastrous potential impact to this country and to our econ-

omy looming. Economists across the ideological spectrum have warned that if the Federal Government defaults on paying our bills, if we reach that debt ceiling and we do not continue to pay our bills, we could see businesses stop hiring, retirement accounts and families nest eggs could lose much of their value overnight. Interest rates would rise, which means higher costs for consumers, small businesses, and the Federal Government. Consumer confidence, which is so important for small businesses, would drop sharply. We are seeing that already. In the last few weeks we have seen the sharpest drop in consumer confidence since the fall of Lehman Brothers back in 2008.

We have heard from some people who are debt deniers, debt ceiling deniers, that these are just scare tactics, that these terrible consequences would not happen. But, in fact, we saw that in 2011; when we were having this debate again about whether we should raise the debt ceiling, there were dire consequences to that debate. In late July and early August, leading up to the debt deal of 2011, the Dow Jones Industrial Average dropped 2,000 points. As a result of that drop, average Americans with retirement accounts saw their household wealth plummet by \$2.4 trillion.

Our credit rating was downgraded for the first time in America's history, and the crisis resulted in an additional \$1.3 billion in borrowing costs for the Federal Government. As the Presiding Officer said so well: If you care about the debt and the deficits facing this country, why would we inflict that kind of burden again on the economy by saying we are not going to raise the debt ceiling.

The potential consequences, if we refuse to raise the debt ceiling, on November 1 we have already heard from Treasury Secretary Lew that Social Security and Medicare, which have not been affected by the shutdown, would clearly be affected by a default. It could delay or disrupt Social Security checks, Medicare, Medicaid, veterans' benefits, military salaries.

According to the Treasury, delayed or disrupted payments would prevent 57.5 million Americans from receiving Social Security benefits in a timely manner. This could put the most vulnerable people in America in jeopardy and prevent them from receiving the benefits they have earned and the benefits they need to live on.

My former colleague and fellow Senator, Judd Gregg, a Republican—he and I don't always agree on everything, but we certainly agreed on the negative consequences of our failure to act to increase the ability of this country to pay its bills.

In an op-ed that was published by The Hill newspaper, Senator Gregg said the brinkmanship on default is: The political equivalent of playing Russian

roulette with all of the chambers of the gun loaded. It is the ultimate no-win strategy. A default would lead to some level of chaos in the debt markets, which would lead to a significant contraction in economic activity, which would lead to job losses, higher spending by the Federal Government, and lower tax revenues, which would lead to more debt.

That sums it up very well. Senator Gregg understands, as I think most of us do in the House and Senate, that for us to refuse to raise this debt ceiling, to allow the country to pay its bills, to allow the country to default, would be shortsighted, irresponsible, and reckless. I hope that we are all going to come together to get this done in the next couple of days and save this country from even more disastrous consequences.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. The vote yesterday was to raise the debt ceiling without altering by one penny the spending and debt path we are on.

It was demanded by Senator REID and the majority that we raise the debt ceiling, give the President another \$1 trillion or so in borrowing, and no commitment to make any changes in how we got here. That was not what we did in August 2011. Then, we agreed to reduce the growth of spending over 10 years by \$2.1 trillion in exchange for raising the debt ceiling \$2.1 trillion. Of course, we have already spent all of that.

We have already borrowed \$2.1 trillion more. Senator REID and the majority are demanding a clean debt ceiling bill, where we raise the debt ceiling but don't bother to ask us to change our spending habits, not one penny.

They say we can't negotiate on the debt ceiling. That is wrong.

I think it is perfectly appropriate. The House is prepared to do this, but they want some changes in how we are spending the taxpayers' money. The American people are tired of it. By a huge majority, they say we should not raise the debt ceiling unless we change our spending habits. Actually, almost a quarter of the American people say we should live within our income. We shouldn't raise the debt ceiling at all.

The idea that the President of the United States would not pay the bond holders of the United States, the debt holders of our country, if the debt ceiling were not raised, is unthinkable. Of course he will. He has to under the Constitution.

If we did not raise the debt ceiling, we would be bringing in \$240 billion a month. The interest on our debt is \$20 billion a month. That should be the first thing that is paid—and I am sure it would be if that were to happen.

I agree, the shutdown needs to end and the debt ceiling impasse needs to

be dealt with. It is not good for America. But we cannot just say we are not going to do anything, we are not going to make any changes in our habits around here. That is what is at stake.

I will take a few minutes to walk through our situation about how we arrived at this point, especially with discretionary spending. I hope this will be helpful to our colleagues. It is a product of our work on the Budget Committee, where I am ranking member.

Many will remember in the summer of 2011 that Congress and the President engaged in a vigorous debate, tough negotiations, about how best to address runaway annual deficits of \$1 trillion a year. As a matter of fact, over 5 years we have added \$6 trillion to the debt of the United States of America.

Our discussions were ultimately resolved with the passage of the Budget Control Act. The BCA, as it is called, had at its heart three agreements. First it required a vote in each House of Congress on a balanced budget. Of course, the Senate voted that down. A majority, I believe, voted for it, but it didn't get the supermajority for a constitutional amendment.

Second, it allowed the President to increase the debt limit by \$2.1 trillion subject to a congressional vote. That occurred.

Third, it provided spending controls of at least \$2.1 trillion over or equal to the debt limit increase over 10 years.

The debt ceiling has already been reached in 2 years, a little over, and we still have not honored the commitment to reduce the growth of spending by \$2.1 trillion over 10 years.

To rein in government spending the BCA did two things. It placed statutory caps or limits on discretionary spending. Those are the general programs of our government, which totaled \$915 billion over 10 years. It was enforced by sequestration. It also called for an additional \$1.2 trillion of future savings from any combination of entitlements and revenues agreed to by the so-called supercommittee that the legislation formed to try to reach some agreement on long-term improvements in our financial condition. This supercommittee was given the challenge to do this.

If they failed, then additional reductions of \$1.2 trillion would be enforced through a future sequester mechanism.

The sequester was very clear, very real. The legislation mandated \$2.1 trillion in reduced spending, but it allowed the committee to look for ways to do it. If the committee didn't reach agreement, there would be some automatic cuts. Nearly \$1 trillion of savings were booked initially. The supercommittee went to work, but unfortunately they failed to make recommendations to Congress to find the other savings required under the act.

I commend the members of the committee. I do believe they tried their best, but they didn't reach agreement.

With that failure, the BCA outlined the path forward: \$1.2 trillion in spending reductions, including interest savings, in both defense and nondefense operations spread out evenly over the 9 years left between the fiscal years 2013 and 2021.

Due to a variety of other laws passed over the years, primarily the 1990 deficit deal and the 2010 so-called pay-as-you-go act, which was passed on a debt limit increase also, the reductions do not apply to all Federal spending programs but only to those that are not exempt from enforcement. Many social programs are actually exempt. The food stamp program does not get a dime in reductions. Medicaid does not get a dime in reductions, for example. These cuts were to begin in January 2013, but were delayed until March of this year 2013, inside of that fiscal cliff agreement bill we reached, the American Taxpayer Relief Act, in January.

When the sequester took effect on March 1, it covered both discretionary and some mandatory spending, but less on mandatory. Discretionary spending was reduced a total of \$68 billion for this fiscal year; \$43 billion of that will fall on defense, and \$26 billion on non-defense spending. They each represent about half of the Federal Government expenditures for discretionary accounts.

Additionally, \$17 billion in identified mandatory spending was sequestered, of which \$11 billion came from Medicare.

Total reductions were \$85 billion. It is not a whole lot when we are spending \$3.5 trillion, but \$85 billion was at least progress downward in spending a little bit, at least from the growth in spending.

Looking ahead, colleagues have asked me what happens next under the Budget Control Act? In 2014, spending will be restrained on both the mandatory and discretionary side of the ledger at the approximate rates I mentioned. A sequester began on October 1 for mandatory spending—and this is mainly Medicare—totaling \$18.8 million. Medicare spending will be reduced by a little over \$11 billion, and the rest of the mandatory savings will come from reductions in defense and other mandatory spending.

There are some programs in the Defense Department that are mandatory also. Most of the Defense Department is discretionary. So the minor mandatory spending reductions hit defense and certain administrative expenses for Federal benefit programs and so forth.

For discretionary spending, the direction is down. Under the BCA, total regular discretionary spending is planned to be at \$967 billion this upcoming fiscal year, split between \$498 billion for defense, \$469 billion for non-defense, although nondefense got less of a cut than defense.

This year's nondefense number is the same as last year; it is frozen. The non-

defense discretionary spending did not take another cut this year. It is flat. Defense will be taking an additional \$20 billion reduction this year under the BCA.

A so-called clean continuing resolution would come in at an annual rate of \$986 billion, due to the fact that it keeps nondefense spending below the BCA caps while reflecting the current run rate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair. I have a number of other comments about where we are financially.

I would ask unanimous consent to have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would say, colleagues, that the defense cuts do not count the war reduction costs. Those were entirely separate and not part ever this.

The defense budget is getting hammered, but we ought to smooth some of these reductions out in a more fair way. Fundamentally, though we must remain committed to the requirements of the BCA.

I know it would be hard for my Democratic colleagues because the budget they produced would spend \$1 trillion over the BCA limits. The President proposes to spend \$1 trillion above those limits that we agreed to in August 2011.

As part of this deal, it would be wrong for us to breach the promise we made to the American people that if they let us raise the debt ceiling to \$2.1 trillion, we would reduce spending over 10 years by \$2.1 trillion. That reduction is really a reduction in the growth of spending because we would be growing spending \$8 trillion over 10 years rather than \$10 trillion over 10 years.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the cost of the Federal Government shutdown, including a cost we don't talk about—the opportunity cost. The fact is we are paying a huge price for what we are not doing here in Washington while so much of our time and energies are spent on this totally unnecessary shutdown.

Americans are rightly looking at Congress and saying: What are you guys doing? Why are you hurting people? Why are you hurting families? Why are you impeding our economic recovery? They are also asking: Why aren't you working on what we send

you there to do—on creating jobs, on improving our educational system, on addressing our Nation's long-term fiscal sustainability?

Last weekend, I came to the floor to talk about the effect of this shutdown on individual Minnesotans. I receive e-mails from people who are hurting. Let me read from a few. I will not read them in full because of time.

Charlotte from Duluth writes:

Senator Franken: Veterans' benefits are important to me, and I want to tell you my story. I have three children and my spouse who currently attends college, we just got into the hud-vash program.

The HUD-VASH program is a program that provides housing assistance and support services for homeless veterans and their families.

Charlotte continues:

We thought it was a miracle to not be homeless. Now we are facing the same thing, no check, no schooling. My family will be homeless without food, clothes, a vehicle if this government shutdown is not resolved. I am praying for a miracle in this situation; my son is turning 1 year old next month, I don't want to remember his first birthday with us losing everything we have worked so hard for. My daughter just started head-start. She loves it, but it is the last thing on my mind now. I am thinking, how will I get her to school? How will I provide a home for her to live in? What is she going to eat? This is not a joke. I have never been one to take a hand out from anyone. These are things I have earned; and are now being taken away from me because someone in Washington wants to prove a point. What point is everyone trying to make? That you have the power to do this?

Timothy from Bloomington writes:

My daughter is a single mother who cannot afford her home. She has wisely decided to sell the house. She has persevered and now has a sale pending. She is in a financial crisis and needs this sale to go through or she will risk falling into foreclosure. And now the government shutdown is threatening to prevent the sale from going through because a branch of the IRS that prints income tax transcripts is closed. At the very least the situation will cost my daughter more than \$1,000 if she has to continue making payments, at worst she may fall into foreclosure.

Last weekend, I also talked about the way the shutdown threatens to deprive our seniors of vital nutrition programs, such as Meals-on-Wheels. Here is what Millie Hernesman from Hibbing, MN, told the Hibbing Daily Tribune about Meals-on-Wheels:

I'd hate to see it disappear. It offers a variety of important meals that cover every facet—from protein to fiber—and it comes right to my door. I like it a lot.

Sandra, a Head Start director in southern Minnesota, wrote me about Head Start. She writes:

Dear Senator Franken, Thank you for your ongoing support for Head Start. If the federal budget is not settled by November 1st, the HS programming in Olmsted and Freeborn Counties will have to shut down. Our federal grant is from 11/1–10/31. As the HS Director, I know the devastating impact this would have on our families and staff.

Now let me talk a little about Head Start. Because of the sequester, we have seen children in Minnesota lose slots in Head Start. If this shutdown continues through the end of October, programs serving about 2,500 children could be affected by the lack of Head Start funding.

You know, kids are only 3 years old once. They are only 4 years old once. The learning experiences they would be missing at that age because their Head Start Program is shuttered due to this shutdown or that they are missing now because their program has already been shuttered because of the sequester can never be replaced. We are just hurting our communities and our Nation when those little children lose that opportunity.

We know from study after study that a quality early childhood education such as Head Start returns between \$7 and \$16 for every \$1 invested. Why? Because a child who has had a quality early childhood education is less likely to be referred to special ed, is less likely to be left back a grade, and has better health outcomes. Quality early childhood programs can help reduce the rates of adolescent pregnancy. Kids who have had a quality early childhood education are more likely to graduate high school, more likely to go to college, more likely to graduate from college, more likely to have a good job and pay taxes, and they are less likely to go to prison.

If we really cared about our Nation's long-term fiscal sustainability, we would be investing more in Head Start, not less. And we have been investing less because of the sequester and are now because of the shutdown. So that is just an example of the entirely counterproductive nature of this shutdown and the tremendous price we are paying for it.

But I rise today also to talk about the price we are paying for what we are not doing here in Congress, for the unmet needs which we are not turning our attention to because of the time we are wasting with this shutdown and the threat of default on our debt.

We have a skills gap in Minnesota. What is a skills gap? Well, recent studies have shown that between one-third and one-half of manufacturers in my State have at least one job they cannot fill because they can't find a worker with the right skills to fill that job. This is a nationwide phenomenon and it is not just manufacturers, it is information technology, health care, and other businesses that have jobs sitting there waiting for skilled workers to fill them. There are more than 3 million jobs in this country that could be filled today if there were workers who had the right skills—more than 3 million jobs today.

The thing is, we know how to train people for these jobs. We know it because we have done it. We have done it

in Minnesota and we have done it elsewhere in this country. I have seen partnerships in my State between businesses and community and technical colleges that have been wildly successful.

Take, for example, Hennepin Technical College in Hennepin County. A number of manufacturers needed workers skilled in precision machine tooling. They worked with Hennepin Technical College to create a curriculum, and they then donated machines for the students to work on. At a roundtable at HTC I learned they had graduated over 300 students from the program and 93 percent of those graduates had permanent jobs.

One of the manufacturers at the roundtable was Erick Ajax, CEO of EJ Ajax and Sons. It is a metal stamping and sheet metal fabrication company in Fridley, MN, that was founded by Erick's grandfather in 1945. I love what Erick has done with his company and how he has worked with HTC—Hennepin Technical College—and the University of Minnesota to train his workforce and provide them with good high-tech jobs and pays for them to continue their education.

Erick gave me an example of one of his workers that I find so exciting—not because it is extraordinary but because it is something we can duplicate over and over in this country. He hired a guy who had completed a certification program at a community and technical college. The guy was really good at his job, so Erick sent him back to continue his education and get his associate's degree. The guy continued to work for Erick, continued to be a star, and a few years later Erick paid him to go to the University of Minnesota to get his bachelor's degree, and he got it. Now the guy is head of quality control for EJ Ajax, an incredibly high-skilled job at an advanced manufacturing company.

Now, understand, this guy graduated from college with no debt—zero debt—and with a great job. This brings me to what I want to be working on here.

A number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know how enthusiastic I am about incentivizing partnerships between businesses and community and technical colleges to fill the skills gap. As I said, I have seen many successful models in my State.

I have seen it at Alexandria Technical and Community College in Alexandria, MN, which is sometimes referred to as the Silicon Valley of packaging machines. I have seen it at South Central Community and Technical College in Mankato, MN, where about 8 to 10 manufacturers, who had helped fund and had given machines to the school's Right Skills Now Program, sat with me and told me that between them they had about 50 job openings they could fill that instant.

In the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, of which I am a

member, we had a hearing a couple of years ago on workforce boards that had successfully responded to the great recession and created jobs in the face of it. We had four workforce boards testify from four different States: Virginia, Wisconsin, California, and Washington. Every model had been essentially the same: A business—manufacturing, IT, health care—had worked with a community and technical college to train unemployed workers for jobs they needed to fill. These are public-private partnerships. The businesses have skin in the game.

Where do we come in here in Congress? Well, I have gone around Minnesota to community and technical colleges and talked to businesses, and I have talked to national experts in our State and around the country, and the fact is we aren't doing this fast enough. Sometimes these partnerships could do a lot more, train a lot more people with some extra funding—maybe to buy a very expensive machine or to hire an instructor with very specialized skills.

What I am proposing is a competitive grant program. Businesses and community colleges would apply for grants based on how many jobs their partnership would create, what the value of those jobs would be to those hired and to the community, and how much skin the businesses have in the game.

Let me tell you why I think we have to do this, just in terms of global competitiveness. Manufacturing is moving back to the United States. That is because of a number of factors. Manufacturing these days is a lot more capital intensive because of the investments in machine and technology. So labor as a piece of the pie has gotten smaller, but skilled labor as a piece of the labor pie has grown. It is a much bigger piece. That is why, if we are going to be competitive with the rest of the world, we need skilled labor. Filling the skills gap is a national imperative.

I go to high schools, junior high schools, and middle schools with manufacturers all the time. I let the manufacturer describe what the work is like at their factory. It is not dark, dirty, and dangerous, as people think it is, or as it used to be. It involves advanced technical skills, critical thinking, creativity, and teamwork. These jobs, good, skilled, well-paying jobs, are available with the education you can get at a 2-year community and technical college.

One of the concerns I hear is that people often think of a 2-year education as a ceiling, and I understand that. But a 2-year education doesn't have to be a ceiling. That is not how they think of it in some European countries. They think of a 2-year education as a platform. And if you think about it, with the pace of technological advancement accelerating as it is now, and no doubt will continue, the idea

that you will have the same job in the workplace for the 40 or 50 years of your working life is kind of ridiculous, especially in any field involving technology.

So it makes perfect sense to go to a 2-year community technical college and get an education that trains you in the kind of skills that will get you a good-paying job. Then, as Erick Ajax does with his employees, the business you work for can send you back to school and pay for it, often while you continue to work and draw a good paycheck.

We just came through a big debate in Congress about student debt. Think about getting a job after 2 years or even after a credentialed degree and then having your continuing education paid for by your employer. Think about that as a piece of an evolving approach to the issue of college affordability.

Jobs, economic growth, global competitiveness, college affordability, how we think about education, aren't these the things we should be spending our time on in the Senate, in Congress? That is why I came here. That is what I get excited about. That is what I get excited about working on. Let's end the shutdown. Let's commit to not defaulting on our debt. Then let's discuss how we strengthen our economic recovery. Let's talk about which investments we make that are smart and will lead to economic growth and which ones have outlived their usefulness.

Every day the government stays shut down, every day we wake up under the threat of default, every day we spend focused on something that isn't working together to create jobs and rebuild the middle class is, in my mind, a tragedy. It is an insult to all the people who are struggling and it is a huge missed opportunity for our country. This nonsense would be ugly enough even if we didn't have work to do, but we do. We have so much work to do. It is time for Congress to stop creating problems and start solving them again.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I wish to enter into a colloquy with several of my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, it is Sunday afternoon. I am sure all of us as well as a lot of furloughed employees would rather be preparing for coming back to work. Even though Monday is a holiday, maybe they are thinking about Tuesday and getting ready.

But here we are on the Senate floor thinking about all the issues with the

shutdown, the default, and the threat of the default on us right now as we creep closer and closer to this deadline. It is unbelievable that we are at the risk of potentially defaulting on the debt of this country.

I heard one of my colleagues earlier talked about the default potential and maybe it is not as bad as people think and we will get through this. The fact is, if we go into a default, there is no question we have already seen—by the chamber of commerce, the business community, many people whom we talk to in our home communities—the impact this will have on everything from the stock market, interest rates, the ability for small businesses to borrow money at a reasonable rate.

The number that came out was a 7-year high in the sense of the least foreclosures in the last 7 years for individuals. Yet as families are finally getting back on their feet, with less defaults, here is the biggest default sitting in front of us. We have tried to do everything possible to avoid this effort in the next few days; one, by trying to get the government back open so we can have negotiations and discussions about what is necessary to ensure we don't have a default that could jeopardize the economy.

In my home State we see the impacts. We had a hearing on Friday here in Washington and we had the captain of one of the crab vessels, which is a big industry for us. My friend in Oregon deals with seafood issues also. It is an incredible impact that could happen. They have to have the permits and the quota laid out by October 15 so they can start the season because crabs don't sit around on the bottom of the sea waiting for a shutdown to finish. They have another process they go through. So if we are unable to get the permits done, this industry in Alaska which sells a lot of crab in the holiday season, especially to our trading partner Japan, Japan will go elsewhere. They will go to Russia and buy crab. Once they start buying from another seller, the odds of us recapturing that decrease.

As my colleagues on the other side like to say, we are just trying to find a solution. Every day we wait is another day we are shipping jobs overseas, and here is a clear example.

We have several Federal lands that are permitted for bear hunting and hunting in general, fishing, sports fishing, by Federal regulators, but we do not have those agencies open. So now those sports hunters who come up to our State from all across the country and the world are unable to access those places. The result? Thousands and thousands of dollars are lost to these guides. We don't get this business back. Once the season ends, it is gone. It is over.

This idea that the House has—and my colleagues and I have talked about

it. My friend from Montana talked about this a few days ago. They passed on the House side a bill to pay all the furloughed employees; 435 to 0 was the vote. The Presiding Officer spoke about this on the floor. We all support that. We want to get our employees back to work and pay them because the furlough wasn't their problem—the shutdown wasn't their problem. But here is what is amazing. They want to put them all back to work and pay them, but they only send us a few agencies to open.

In other words, if you are a fiscal conservative—and from the States we all represent we have pockets as well as full components of individuals who are concerned about the taxes of this country and the spending—why would you pay for everyone to go back to work and then not put them to work? It makes no sense.

The Presiding Officer was the Lieutenant Governor of a State. I can't imagine if he and the Governor decided that we are not going to put anyone to work, but we are going to pay them all for the next month or whatever, he would be dragged out of office before he could blink an eye. As a former mayor, I couldn't do that. It is unbelievable. But yet that is how chaotic it is over on the House side. We are ready to solve these problems, move forward, get the government open, and ensure that we do not default on our debt.

I know some claim this is all new spending. This is not new spending. These are all bills, for those of us on the floor right now, which came before our time. But they are due and we have to pay the bill. It is similar to when you buy a house. After you buy the house and you have a banker, you don't get to say: I would like to stop and think about paying you part of it or maybe not pay you all of it and still live in the house.

They like to toss numbers around and make it sound as if it is more spending. No, it is paying for what has already occurred. We have actually cut the deficit since a lot of us came to office. When I came in January 2009, the deficit was \$1.4 trillion per year. Today it is about 630. We have cut that deficit over 60 percent in a combination of efforts, and that is where we need to keep going, but this is not helping that effort.

I know my colleagues on the floor have example after example, as I do in my home State, of sports fishermen who can't go fishing and fees for those folks who manage it, to the commercial fishing, and my military folks. Here is what is amazing. Every one of the folks on the floor has the same situation. Even if we pay our furloughed Federal employees all their pay back, what happens to the contractors who work on behalf of the Federal Government? They have bills to pay. They don't get that money back. But they

are told to go back to work, and I guarantee it is going to cost the Federal Government more money. In my State there are multiple examples, and I will leave it to my colleagues. But I know when the American people are watching and when Alaskans are watching this for the last week, they think it is ridiculous, and it is. It is a self-created crisis by a few who believe the only way they can get their way is to crash the economy and at the same time crash the government.

Are there problems with the government? Sure. Are there things we can do to improve it? Absolutely. Every day we should be working on it. But this start-and-stop program doesn't work so well because we never get to the issues all of us came to work on.

So I turn to my friends if they want to add to this. The idea is going to be kind of a free-flowing conversation so people can see a discussion of what is affecting us in our home States and see how we can get to a solution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to be here with my colleagues from Montana and Alaska to talk about some of the impacts in our various States. I thought I would share six or seven different aspects of the impact of a government shutdown and the potential of a default and then turn this over to my colleague from Montana. Then I think we are going to engage in a little bit of back-and-forth.

Before I list specific examples of the challenges that are faced, I thought I would give a framework or an analogy of how to think about this.

The legislative process is very much like a baseball game where various folks come together. There are some for bills, some are against a bill, they have a competition, and ultimately one side wins. Normally, the side that loses, if they believe they are still right, will say we will be back again later in the session, next year, just like a baseball team, to compete again or we will be back next year with an improved team.

But in this case, after the team that supported health care won, the team that lost said we are going to appeal the ruling to the umpire and we are going to ask the umpire to rule the game out of order and rule that the losing team actually won. Then, if the umpire doesn't come to our rescue, we are going to hold the crowd hostage and we are going to threaten to burn down the stadium.

Those are the types of actions that are outside the sphere of the normal legislative process—and they should be—because we have to be able to have a dialog in a democracy where we consider a bill and decide yes or no and then implement it and then come back and have an argument over improvements to that framework or whether

we should throw it out completely. The American people have the opportunity to weigh in and say: Keep those folks. They did good legislation or throw the bums out.

But all that is broken if, instead of completing that cycle, we have the losing team say we are going to hold the crowd hostage and threaten to burn down the stadium. Then democracy doesn't function. That is where we are right now. Holding the crowd hostage is the government shutdown, and threatening to burn down the stadium is the threat to default on the payment of bills due.

So let's look at how the government shutdown is reverberating in some unexpected ways. Let's take home mortgages. A great majority of home mortgages across the Nation are insured by Fannie and Freddie. That insurance doesn't happen while Fannie and Freddie are shut down.

Let's take work necessary to improve our ports, where that work is on jet-ties. Now that work has to stop because we can't incur a new liability to the contractor to haul the rock out and put it into place or maybe it is on a dredger that needs to take place during a window between different salmon runs in the Columbia River. But now that gets delayed and who knows when it will get done.

Let's talk about a company in Oregon that exports, and they need for those exports an export license, but they can't get the export license because Commerce is shut down and can't issue that license. They have inventory that is waiting to ship out. Then they have cashflow problems not only because they can't ship the inventory, they can't get the payments for shipping.

Let's talk about the trickledown for folks who are unemployed. You may think about it as an employee who is staying home. One employee wrote to me and said, think about this, think about the fact that I owe child support that is not going to get paid because I am not getting paid. Then he said, think about the housing market. I am not going to be able to pay my mortgage. What impact is that going to have on the U.S. economy?

Let's take a look at the backlog of veterans' benefits. All over my State I have veterans who are applying for benefits and they want an answer, and the Veterans Department is trying to process those applications. They have a high, intense effort to catch up on that backlog. Suddenly the backlog is getting bigger instead of getting smaller because the work that was being done to get rid of that backlog grinds to a halt and therefore individual veterans are disadvantaged by not having their applications processed.

Let's think about Head Start. Jessica wrote to me.

I work in early headstart in Grants Pass. We are facing a shutdown due to the government shutdown. We have children who need

stability and a caring place where they can get their basic needs met. So many families struggle to feed their children and sometimes the food we serve is all those children get for the day.

Then she says:

We provide more than just what some consider day care. We teach, we nurture, we give hope to the next generation. Shutting down our centers would mean a higher rate of poverty and dangerous homes for families and children. We need our voices to be heard. We need someone to stand up for us.

There are so many different ways in addition that this shutdown is reverberating in Oregon. One that affects every rural community is the impact on timber planting. We have had the shutdown going on of actual logging that is taking place in Federal forests. Folks who are logging are being told to stop cutting new trees, to pull their logs, skid them out, if you will, haul them out and shut down.

What about the planning for the cuts for next year? What about the supply of logs to the sawmills that is going to keep that sawmill operating through the winter and into the spring? The reverberations are substantial. What about the economy in those small towns that depends on those log mills when folks don't have the money, because they can't log, to buy food at the grocery store?

I know the issues are not unique to Oregon. I am sure many of them reverberate in Alaska and Montana.

With that, I yield the floor for my colleague from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. I thank my colleague from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska.

For many years my Republican colleagues have railed against government. We find ourselves in an interesting time right now where government is shut down. We are on the verge of not expanding our debt limit, putting the full faith and credit of this country at risk. Some of the folks on the other side of the aisle ran their campaign last year about shutting down the government. They got their wish. They have steered us into an unnecessary, very costly shutdown.

Yet during the shutdown we found and we have learned every day, often, underappreciated functions of the government. Beyond the headlines there are countless stories of the functioning of government which is not doing its job because of the shutdown that is hurting American families. There are a number of them in Montana.

We read in the news about children with cancer. We have an NIH laboratory, Rocky Mountain Lab, in Hamilton. It is closed. It is one of eight Biosafety 4 labs in the United States. They do critical research on SARS, ebola virus, staph infections. It is not happening.

Mr. President, 98 percent of the National Science Foundation is shuttered—no new scientific research

grants. Four of the five Nobel-prize winning scientists are furloughed.

National parks are closed, disappointing tourists and impacting struggling communities around those parks. Closing fishing access sites that support local businesses—fly stores, river guides, fly fishing instructors, and just improved quality of life—does not allow people into many of the best fishing spots in this country.

Head Start Programs are struggling, depending on when you got your grant. In the small town of Box Elder, 10 miles from my hometown, they are on the cusp of laying off 20 percent of their teachers. Why? Because they can't get their Indian Impact Aid. Since that office is mostly furloughed at this point in time, it is very difficult to get them any help.

We have heard about the devastating floods in Colorado, the blizzards in South Dakota. We do not have a farm bill, but these folks are doubly impacted. Because the Farm Service Agency offices are shuttered, there is no help for livestock producers who have literally lost thousands of head of cattle.

When it comes to getting a cosignature on an FSA loan check, it is impossible to do because the FSA office is closed.

Our military members are getting paid, but the ROTC students all over America who rely on the government to help pay for their rent—that is not happening right now.

The Senator from Oregon talked about VA disability claims put on hold. The backlog is growing. It was shrinking.

The IT system for a smooth transition between the DOD to VA, the electronic medical records, is on hold. By the way, that is critically important to get our backlog to a reasonable number.

Home loans, education assistance, transportation office, workforce training—all put on hold. Domestic abuse shelters, Meals on Wheels, flu monitors at the CDC, the Mine Safety and Health Administration, National Transportation Safety Board—all furloughed except for the essential staff who are working without pay.

Along that line, I want to say thank you to the folks at the rostrum who put in 3 pretty tough weeks. In the last week and a half-plus, almost 2 weeks, they haven't been paid. They are here on a Sunday afternoon, much like the police officers who responded to a tragic and scary situation last week were running toward the problem, who were on duty but were not getting a paycheck.

The House's political appeasement approach has been an attempt to open the most popular and most noticed agencies, picking winners and losers in a system instead of working together.

Then we have the debt ceiling, a situation where there is a Republican-driv-

en government shutdown to bring us close, too close for comfort, to defaulting on our national debt. Some folks out there will say it is no big deal. I can tell you if you are in business you know it is a big deal. Some folks say you can prioritize your payments, but the fact is that without increasing that debt limit, prioritizing the payments will not fix the problem.

We have folks all across this country, business people, working families, who are losing confidence in the United States. I just met a group of World War II vets who got off a plane about 2 hours ago in Washington, DC. A number of them talked to me about how we need to get our act together here. They fought for this country, but we are not fighting for them, and we need to.

The Montana Chamber of Commerce, bankers across this country, Macy's, business leaders—all have said don't be playing with this fire. In fact, a friend of mine by the name of Tony James, who is president of Blackstone Group, wrote in the Wall Street Journal:

Using the debt ceiling to settle domestic squabbles is playing Russian roulette with a loaded gun. And worse, by continuing on the present course, we are playing a deadly game with a gun held by some of this nation's biggest rivals.

I couldn't agree more. We need to reopen this government. We need to pay this Nation's bills. And we need to put this country back in the leadership role in this world.

Senator BEGICH, the Senator from Alaska, talked a little bit about park shutdowns. I was curious to know, with Denali National Park, which is a big deal—I assume the Senator is in the same place as we are with Glacier and Yellowstone. It is closed for business?

Mr. BEGICH. Yes. Not only closed for business. As we know, the FAA also is shut down. There are elements of FAA still operational, but the fact is, in order for visitors to my State—and I am sure to the Senator's State, to Oregon, there is a lot of general aviation that moves around, moving tourists, moving businesses, moving folks from place to place. If you are in need of parts—people may not realize it, if you need parts for those planes you have to register them with the FAA. But if the FAA is closed, you cannot register the parts, you cannot get the parts for your plane, and they are not making the parts then because they know they cannot get them registered. It is like a ripple effect.

The worst part of this is those businesses that are on the outskirts of all these national treasures we have in this country—Oregon has them, Montana has them—and the net result is those businesses don't have customers. Customers do not show up. Those businesses that had prepared, built their inventories in anticipation, got material ready, got guides ready, got their businesses all ready to go for those

tours, cannot do them. They have no customers because they have no place to take them. The reality is, the net result for these individuals—I think my friend from Oregon says it so clearly in discussions I have had with him—it is almost like—my friend from Oregon can correct me if I say this wrong—but it is almost like a tax for these businesses. They do not get that money back they have invested. It is gone. It is over. They do not get to repeat the season. It is not like the movie “Groundhog Day,” you don’t get to go over and over it again. If it is gone, it is gone. All of us have that with these parks and national treasures. The Senator talked with me about this.

I want to mention one thing that is very important, because we have heard it on the floor and I have heard it in the media accounts. They say we cannot extend and pay the debt of this country, making sure we do not go into default unless we have more spending cuts. We did that. We did that. The continuing resolution cuts \$70 billion on an annualized basis out of the budget this year, this coming year. We cut \$70 billion. We actually talked about it, tried to find common ground, and the common ground was we agreed with their number, the House number. We brought it all the way down to their number. Seventy billion dollars was taken, additional cuts on an annualized basis, to our budget. Now you have to pay the bill.

When you hear this “we didn’t give one extra penny to make sure we don’t default”—first of all, the default should not be part of the debate here. We should never default on our debts, period. But if you want cuts, we have done it, \$70 billion.

Now because of the work they are doing or lack of what they are doing, the government shutdown is causing kind of an indirect tax on these business people, which is unbelievable.

Mr. MERKLEY. I thank my colleague from Alaska. He is correct in pointing out that essentially right now we have a shutdown tax being imposed on families and businesses across our country. Indeed, we are facing just a few days from now a default tax. A lot of folks from across the aisle come here and say they took a pledge to block any form of tax. But this is the worst kind of tax of all.

Mr. BEGICH. They do not get any recovery.

Mr. MERKLEY. There is absolutely no value, no revenue raised that can be applied to the important aspects of running a government or reducing our deficit. Indeed, this is a burden on American businesses and American families that has no benefit in any other way.

In fact, the Senator mentioned the ripple effect. That ripple effect means what damages a family—I gave the ex-

ample of a simple situation when an employee does not get their wages. They cannot pay their child support and they cannot pay their mortgage—and then what goes on from there.

Let’s take, for example, the cut in food stamps. If food stamps are not issued, then it is not just the family who is directly hurt—and I might mention our most vulnerable families—but it is also the grocery stores that are hurt. They may have to lay off additional employees, additional ripples. This is a huge infliction of a burden.

If we want to think of a few examples of what happens with the default, we can think of many. Let’s picture the default tax. By threatening not to pay our bills, that reduces confidence in Treasury bills, so therefore the interest rates go up on those Treasury bills. The interest rates therefore on mortgages go up and the interest on home loans go up.

Mr. BEGICH. If I can interrupt, car loans, credit cards, student loans, any type of credit you want to get to grow your business, expand your educational opportunities—maybe you are doing holiday shopping this year—all that is impacted in a negative way.

Mr. MERKLEY. Indeed, maybe you were planning to take out a home equity loan to repair your roof or make improvements to your house. You are going to pay a higher price. This is a default tax on all of America that does nothing productive at all.

This infliction of pain and agony on our businesses and our families is something that has not apparently resonated for some of my colleagues who want to threaten a default. Some of them have come to this floor and said: We think there is enough revenue coming in that we can pay our T-bills—our Treasury bills—and we can default on other obligations and therefore there won’t be much damage.

We had a group of experts come in and testify before the banking committee. They said: Look, envision a situation where you are applying for a mortgage and you tell the bank that you have always made your house payments, but you were not able to make some of your other payments, such as your student or car loan. The bank is going to charge you more for your house payment because there are bills you have been defaulting on.

The same situation applies in America. If we pay our Treasury bills but we don’t pay other obligations, that in itself will lower our credit rating and increase interest rates. A default is a default. You can choose whom you are going to default on, but no matter whom you default on, there will be a default tax on American families and American businesses with great damage to this country. That is why President Reagan simply said: Do not mess with the good faith and credit of the United States of America.

Mr. BEGICH. It makes no sense that we would be here. Earlier this week Senator TESTER and I were on the floor talking about this issue. When I went home, my 11-year-old son asked: How do you not pay your bills? We can have all the fancy economists we want, but when you have an 11-year-old ask you the question, it should tell you something about this country—what we should do to meet our priorities. When you don’t pay your bills, you are in default. When you are in default, you destroy your credit rating. When you destroy your credit rating, the cost of doing business goes up. It is very simple.

They can use all the fancy words and different ways to slice it and dice it by saying that we can pay some or we can pay a little. No, that is not how it works. Can you imagine if every household watching us today said: I think I will pay part of my bills today. Maybe I will pay another bill next week, but I won’t pay them all. Congress doesn’t pay all its bill, so I guess that is the new norm.

If my 11-year-old son can pick this up, you can surely guess what is happening when people around the country are watching us. And I say “us” in a collective way. All three of us are appropriators. We have dealt with cutting \$70 billion out of the budget already for this year. We sucked it up and said: We are going to do that because it is right for this country. Even though we may not have agreed on that number, we agreed to make sure we did this because we wanted to make sure we did not default and that we kept the government working. We will continue to fight on the issues we care about.

It is amazing to me. Sometimes we have to look to the young folks in this community and around this country, and they probably know better than we how to solve this problem. I am just guessing.

Mr. MERKLEY. I think the children across the country know that responsible individuals pay their bills and responsible governments pay their bills. I am sure this concept is common sense in the great State of Montana.

Mr. TESTER. The Senator is correct. There are so many folks out there who claim to be probusiness folks and that they know what is going on in the business community. This whole debate that revolves around the debt ceiling is about as antibusiness as we can have.

The fact is that if we don’t increase the debt ceiling—and the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska have already pointed it out—interest rates not only go up for our national debt, they go up for everybody. The economy decreases and shrinks, and as a result we have less revenue coming in. Everybody knows that if we are going to address our national debt, we have to have a vibrant economy to address it.

We came through a period of time where we had a Vice President who said debt doesn't matter, we got into two wars, two major tax cuts, a Medicare Part-D plan, and the worst recession—some would call a depression—since the 1930s, where the tax revenue dropped like a rock and the safety net programs to keep people afloat—which cost money—were decreased.

Now we have a situation with the debt that we need to deal with. The worst thing we can do is play around with the debt ceiling so our economy tanks again, and then we will see not only the interest rate go up on the debt but the debt go through the roof one more time. It does not make any sense from all the different perspectives. When people lose confidence—whether it is people within this country or outside this country who buy our debt—that means the rate we pay is going up.

Mr. BEGICH. Is it fair to say that we have been moving this annual deficit down every year? It has been on the right glidepath—down. If we have a change in the T-bill rates, this effort to keep moving the deficit down will quickly reverse because we pay interest.

Mr. TESTER. Absolutely. It could have such a negative impact on the GDP that we could have a negative fourth quarter if this crazy talk keeps going.

Mr. BEGICH. To remind folks who are listening, the gross domestic product is basically the business of the country.

Mr. TESTER. That is correct.

Mr. BEGICH. If it goes in the wrong direction, it will have a direct impact on the people who are working—meaning fewer people will be working. If there is less business, there is less need to hire people, which means higher unemployment and more foreclosures. It is a domino effect.

Mr. TESTER. That is exactly correct. I think everybody on the floor right now—and there are a lot of other folks—would love to sit down and figure out ways to get the debt and deficit under control. As Tony James said, you don't do it by holding a loaded gun.

Mr. MERKLEY. If I could just emphasize the point the Senator from Montana just made, there are those who say they want to engage in a default strategy because they think it will somehow do something positive in controlling our deficit and controlling our debt, but what the Senator from Montana pointed out is that when you engage in using default as a weapon, you reduce revenues, increase costs, which increases deficits and increases the debt.

I think what we can summarize is not only is the default strategy severely damaging to families and businesses across the country, but it is damaging to the effort to reduce our deficits and reduce our debt.

Mr. TESTER. And I might add it could not happen at a worse time. We have seen the economy rebound, and it is starting to head in the right direction. We have an opportunity to have more growth. We have an opportunity to get some manufacturing back in this country. We have an opportunity to really help rebuild this economy. Because of the actions of Congress, particularly folks over in the House, we have seen the stock market—God help us today. I think it opens right now.

Mr. BEGICH. The Asian markets open right about now.

Mr. TESTER. I can't help but think that these folks are back there shaking their heads and saying: We have no confidence in what Congress is doing.

Mr. BEGICH. For the first 15 to 18 days of debate, the market slowly slid about 800 points. Last week, when there was a sliver of opportunity and people thought maybe we would get the default off the table, that market shot up 300-plus points. The business community wants us to establish some certainty here so they can take their resources, invest in this economy and continue to move forward.

We know the resources are there. They tell us that in our home communities. I had a business that just laid off another 400 people because of this shutdown. They are ready to grow their business interests out of Anchorage and around the globe, but the challenge for them is they are not sure what we are going to do.

Within a couple of days when they saw a glimmer of hope, the market shot right back up, which tells us again that the market is ready.

Some people said that yesterday's vote was just a partisan vote. No, we had to actually not default, so we supported not defaulting on our debt. I will have debate after debate on where we need to cut. Again, the continuing resolution cuts \$70 billion on an annualized basis. We have met their number with that cut, and we are willing to keep to that agreement, but let's not throw the economy over the edge or crash it into the wall, as some seemingly want to do.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask through the Chair whether the Senator knows of any business group in Alaska that is arguing that the government shutdown strategy or the default strategy is good for business.

Mr. BEGICH. I come from the small business world. At the young age of 14 I started my first business. I don't hear the business community in my State asking me to crash the economy and keep the government shut down because it has no impact.

When we look at the concentration of Federal workers, it is Maryland, Hawaii, and Alaska, in that order. When we think of the State budget, 25 percent of the State operating budget is from Federal resources; 50 percent is

capital money that comes from Federal resources; the military is pretty strong; and over \$1 billion goes to Social Security payments. I can go through the list. It has a huge impact.

There are no businesses calling me and asking: Can you keep the government shut down longer? I don't need that permit to drill on the National Petroleum Reserve. I don't need to go fish for that crab this week. I don't need to fly my plane to move that cargo out to a rural community. I don't hear that.

I have people call me and say—I can't use the words they use because we are on the Senate floor, but you can fill in the blanks. They are very upset that they cannot conduct their basic business operations because of some of the connectivity they have with the Federal Government through permits or land use. Denali National Park is a great example. It is an unbelievable place to visit, but nobody can visit it. The hotels and the facilities around it are not getting the access they need.

Mr. MERKLEY. It is the same in Oregon. I don't think I have heard from a single business group that has argued in favor of the shutdown or default strategy. I know many businesses need the export license, and they need permission to take up the subcontract or the contract on the jetty or the dredging or any number of other areas.

We have Crater Lake National Park. The tourist industry relies on people to come to that area. There are timber companies that need to have permission to complete their logging contract. In every single way they know, they are partnered with the government groups that enable this work to go forward, and they want those doors open. They want the government open.

I ask through the Chair, what is the story in Montana?

Mr. TESTER. It is the same in Montana as it is in Oregon and Alaska. Particularly startup businesses and entrepreneurs who have a great idea are holding back because they don't want to get into a situation where they start investing money and interest rates go through the roof and they are not able to fulfill the dream they have which would also create jobs and grow more economy.

We are getting very close to October 17. The longer we play with this, there will be a point in time where the damage that will be done will take a very long time to rebuild. I think now is the time—in fact, hopefully tomorrow—to get a commonsense agreement on the Senate floor to open the government and deal with the debt limit in a way that makes sense for this country and makes sense for the world because it will not only have an impact here, but it will have an impact around the world.

We are seeing businesses in our States that are not investing right now. They are holding off at this point.

They were starting to invest. So it is very unfortunate. We are playing with fire, and we should not be doing that. We should be working to build the economy, not to try to contract it.

Mr. BEGICH. I think all of us on the floor agree that we have hope that an arrangement and deal will be made. We want to reopen the government, pay our bills, not go into default, and recognize we still have more work to do because we do need to bring down the deficit. We need to bring it down and ensure that at the end of the day we are paying off our debt long term. But we have to get through this process. We can't just keep doing these short term, stop and go. I think we are all here to make sure that happens.

So from my perspective, I am not happy that I am here on Sunday, but I am glad I am here on Sunday, trying to work with others to solve this problem. I would rather be back home with Alaskans talking about the needs they have and trying to figure out what we are going to do in the long term on education, making sure we oversee our oil and gas development, our mining and our timber, which I think both of our States have a lot of interest in.

We are here now, and we have to resolve these issues. They are going to be tough. There is going to have to be a little give-and-take to find that common ground. At the end of the day, I believe we can get there. But we can't get there if people are hardened into their views, and trying to claim that we haven't done enough already. We have done \$70 billion worth of cuts already on an annualized basis.

So I thank my colleagues for coming to the floor and spending their time on a Sunday talking about an important issue. Hopefully, the next time we are here we can talk about a great resolution that moves this country forward and keeps our economy going.

I yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. I appreciate my colleague from Alaska helping to organize this conversation. I must say, I think if we got 10 commonsense people in a room, they would agree to do that short-term continuing resolution. The Democrats have agreed to a Republican number. It is a win for the Republicans. The Democrats are asking for a negotiation. That is a win for our country. We are asking for the default strategy to be set aside completely because it is completely contrary to any responsible organization to use a strategy of not paying their bills.

On that foundation we should get back to the normal process of considering legislation we should be passing, such as how we restore the regular budget and appropriations process. I know that would be very welcome across this Nation. This Senate has to be able to get a budget process that isn't cut off right out of the gate, if you will, as it has been this year. It

was 6 months ago that we passed a budget and we started to go to a conference committee, and a small group of colleagues filibustered starting the budget conference committee. Somehow we have to have a process where we can get into a conference room and have that conversation and not have a small group basically sabotage the entire budget appropriations process that is so important for our Nation.

Mr. BEGICH. I agree. The last thing I will say this afternoon is—and I will say it as an appropriator—that is what we should do. We need to get past this stop-and-go. We need to sit down and focus on the long term. We need to get the budget resolved. We need to stop spending our time trying to get people to the table. That is all we have been trying to do. We need to get a budget resolved so people will know what their annualized budgets will be. I totally agree with the Senator from Oregon.

Hopefully, over the next 24, 48 hours, we will get down that road, and we will get this short-term stuff out of the way and get on with the longer term.

Again, I wish to thank the Presiding Officer for the time and for allowing us to speak today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, I wish to thank my colleagues for what I think was a very vivid way in which they laid out the severe damage that is occurring because of the shutdown and the potential that one of the most important economic powers, if not the most important economic power in the world, is fooling around with the notion that we not pay our bills on time.

I wish to compliment various newspapers around the country that are doing their best to point out to people that this isn't some kind of exercise that is just about all of us here in Washington. This isn't about the politics or the posturing. This is about real people and the pain they are feeling.

This morning in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the headline was "Shutdown is casting a wide net of grief." In that article, it went through a number of different people's lives and how they were hurting because of the shutdown—people such as Nancy Jones.

Nancy retired from the Army 4 months ago, and she was at a food pantry this weekend because her retirement check had not processed through yet, and now it is not clear when she is going to get her retirement check. She moved back to St. Louis to help with her four grandchildren, and now she is putting her head on her pillow tonight not knowing when her pension, which she has earned, will actually come through because of the shutdown. As a result, she is going to a food pantry at a local church to get two bags of groceries.

Then there is Rasheedah Whitfield. She went to the Social Security office

in St. Louis to do something very simple, and that was to replace her lost Social Security card. She knocked and no one was home. The Social Security Administration has furloughed people who do things such as getting a replacement for people's lost Social Security card. Why is that so important? Well, because Ms. Whitfield needs her Social Security card in order to fill out her Section 8 application, and time is running short for her to find housing for herself and her small child. She is unsure what she is going to do if she can't get that replacement card.

Then there are the people who have been furloughed who clean one of the Federal office buildings in St. Louis. They work for \$11 an hour cleaning the Goodfellow Federal Center in north St. Louis. It is an \$11-an-hour job. These people aren't sitting on a big cushion. These people are trying to figure out now, without that \$11-an-hour job, if they can either pay the rent or make the car payment, but probably not both.

Then there is Jill Ketchum who works and who is fortunate that her child, her 5-year-old daughter, goes to the Head Start school. She is not sure what she is going to do because she has been told by the Grace Hill Settlement House that the Head Start program cannot last through the month if the shutdown continues. That mother, who is working and uses that important Head Start program to make it work for her family, will have no place to take her daughter. What does she do? Does she have to quit her job? What about all the other single mothers out there with young children who have the rug pulled out from under them because Head Start can no longer operate?

Jill and Rasheedah and Nancy don't deserve this. They are playing by the rules. They are doing everything they should be doing in this great country. They are not asking us to do them a favor. They are just asking us to do our job.

Here is what I am so frustrated about. This pain is being inflicted on millions of Americans, and this pain grows every day. Somebody likened it the other day to when the power goes out at our home. In the first couple of hours, we are getting candles out and getting out the board games, and we think, Oh, this is kind of fun. I got the feeling around here the first couple of hours that we didn't understand the gravity of what this meant to so many people throughout this country and to so many people in my State. But after the electricity has been off a few hours, all of a sudden it is not funny anymore. We start to lose our food in the refrigerator, and we wonder how we are going to replace it. We wonder about what is going to happen with our jobs. We wonder about keeping warm. That is what we are getting to now. We are

getting to the point where these families across America cannot believe this is going on day after day.

Here is the weird part. What are we doing? It is not even clear to me what the other side wants. It started out with a goal that was not only irrational, but unreasonable—that somehow the election last November didn't matter; that somehow a faction of one party in one House in one branch of this great government could say: If you don't give us our way, we are going to turn out the lights, and we are going to cut the power. So it was about blowing up ObamaCare.

Now it is not about that anymore. I listened with interest this morning as the Republicans in the House of Representatives spoke about what this is about, and it is not clear to me at this point what it is about. What is it that is the problem? Because it is not ObamaCare anymore. Is it entitlement reform? Is it a grand bargain? Speaker BOEHNER walked away from one of those not too long ago.

Is it about how much we are spending? We have been asking for a conference on our budget. For years, we were getting political criticism over the fact that the Senate had not passed a budget. So we stayed up all night, took dozens and dozens and dozens of votes, and passed a budget. Then we asked to go to conference. For month after month after month, the junior Senator from Texas and others blocked our ability to go to conference and talk about the budget.

So I don't even understand at this moment what this is about. It is not about ObamaCare anymore. Is it about reforming Medicare and Social Security? That is not clear. Is it about how much money we are spending? That is not even clear.

It feels as though we are boxing shadows.

I am really hopeful about my colleagues across the aisle in the Senate, many of whom I have worked with on many different issues and a lot of whom I have worked with on bringing down spending. My colleague from Alaska said we cut our deficit in half last year. It is a good thing we are spending less money. Most of us here think we should continue in a thoughtful way to spend less money. It is my hope that my colleagues who rejected—the majority of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle rejected the effort of the junior Senator from Texas to say, "Us too," to the goal that was irrational and unreasonable, shutting down ObamaCare. Those Senators who knew this was not a game that should be played, I am hopeful they will help us reach a resolution that will not only allow the government to reopen but allow us to quit playing the very dangerous game of saying to the rest of the world that we are not the United States of America; that we are not the

grandest and most glorious democracy ever created; that we are dysfunctional deadbeats. If it gets to be Thursday and we have not gotten this wrapped up, the rest of the country is going to see this democracy as dysfunctional—a democracy that so many other countries have tried to copy and emulate because we have always managed to work it out. To me that is the saddest part of this whole thing, that we are actually playing around with the essence of what makes our country great, and that is our democracy, our ability to compromise, our ability to negotiate, our ability to not throw tantrums and say we either get our way or we shut the place down.

And the phoniest argument of all that is being made, the most disingenuous, misdirected reason we have gotten is this notion that somehow this is all about if we would just stop the congressional exemption under ObamaCare. Members of Congress and their staffs are the only people in America who are required to shop on the exchange. Let me say it again. Members of Congress and their staffs are the only people who are required to shop on the exchange. The only issue here is whether or not we get an employer contribution. That is the only issue.

Every Republican in my State who works for the State government gets an employer contribution. Every Republican who serves in Congress from my State gets an employer contribution. They do it right now; they get that employer contribution. If it is so immoral, if it is so bad to get an employer contribution, give it up. Step up, set the example. Set the example. Say, "No more employer contribution. It is evil." Until they step up and give up their employer contribution, I think it is beyond offensive that they would threaten the young lady who answers my phone with her employer contribution or the young man just out of school with a heavy debt load who thought he was going to get an employer contribution when he came to work for the Senate, who lives in Columbia, MO, and doesn't make a huge amount of money.

You do not come to work for the government if you want to get rich. You come to work for the government if you want to serve. The notion that for political purposes we are threatening the employer contribution of the people who work in our offices is, frankly, about as low as it gets. So I do not want to hear it anymore unless somebody is giving up their employer contribution. They all can. The minute I hear the Republicans who are advocating this position have given up their employer contribution—right now—then we can have a discussion that has misled the American people into thinking somehow—somehow—this is some special deal for Congress.

Real people are getting hurt. We are not even sure what the other side wants. We are threatening the essence of what makes America great, which is our democracy, and we are misleading the American people in ways that are tremendously unfair to the great people who work for all of us across this city and, importantly, across all of our home States.

So I will continue to talk to my friends across the aisle. Even today, on Sunday, all of us are having these conversations. It is my understanding our friends down the hall in the House of Representatives went home. We are having conversations. One week ago I do not think the Speaker could utter a sentence without saying the word "conversation." We are having conversations today. I hope they will continue into the night and that tomorrow will be a better day for this democracy that we all like to brag about but we are threatening to blow up.

Thank you.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.J. RES. 76

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have been told that H.J. Res. 76 is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

The clerk will read the joint resolution by title for the second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I object to any further proceedings on this matter at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

DISCUSSIONS WITH THE
REPUBLICAN LEADER

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have had a productive conversation with the Republican leader this afternoon. Our discussions were substantive, and we will continue those discussions. I am optimistic about the prospects for a positive conclusion to the issues before this country today.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER
14, 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Sen-

ate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. Monday, October 14; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that at 5 p.m. the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the Wood and Haikala district judge nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, under the previous order, at 5 p.m. tomorrow there will be 30 minutes for debate prior to a series of up to two rollcall votes on the confirmation of Andrea

Wood to be a U.S. district judge for the Northern District of Illinois and Madeline Haikala for the Northern District of Alabama.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 2 P.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:46 p.m., adjourned until Monday, October 14, 2013, at 2 p.m.

SENATE—Monday, October 14, 2013

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CHRISTOPHER MURPHY, a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, hear the prayers of all Your people everywhere, great and small alike, rich and poor together. May all people called by Your name humble themselves and pray, seeking Your face and turning from evil.

Lord, You have promised that You will hear the prayers of those who fervently seek You, forgiving our sins and healing our Nation. Inspire our lawmakers who believe in You to also pray. May their intercession bring them a tallness of stature that will enable them to see above the walls of partisan division in order to secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 14, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRISTOPHER MURPHY, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MURPHY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at 5 o'clock today the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Andrea Wood to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois and the nomination of Madeline Haikala to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

At 5:30 there will be a rollcall vote on the Haikala nomination. The Wood nomination is expected to be confirmed in another way.

LEADERSHIP NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. President, constructive good-faith negotiations continue between the Republican leader and me. I am very optimistic that we will reach an agreement that is reasonable in nature this week to reopen the government, pay the Nation's bills, and begin long-term negotiations to put our country on sound fiscal footing.

I deeply appreciate my friend the minority leader for his diligent efforts to come to an agreement. The Republican leader and I will keep Members informed as negotiations continue.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me echo the remarks of my good friend, the majority leader. We have had an opportunity over the last couple of days to have some very constructive exchanges of views about how to move forward. Those discussions continue, and I share his optimism that we are going to get a result that will be acceptable to both sides.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for such time as I may consume.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we now find ourselves, amazingly, in day 14 of a government shutdown—a shutdown that was brought to us by the Republicans in the House. They are sitting on a bill we sent them to open the government and they refuse to take it up.

My colleague, the Senator from Connecticut, served over there and I served over there, and we always had an opportunity to use the rules in some way to get a vote on a bill that was passed by the Senate. But the House, not wanting to have such a vote, has made it pretty much impossible for our colleagues over there, Democrats and moderate Republicans, to actually vote to keep this government open.

I listened very carefully to Majority Leader REID and Minority Leader MCCONNELL, and I have hopes, as I expressed them yesterday, that we will be able to reach an agreement both on the shutdown and on the debt ceiling. But the fact we are struggling, the fact that people all over the world are looking at us as if we are some kind of dysfunctional country, the fact that we have about 1 million Federal employees not getting their checks, not knowing where the next meal is going to come from, the fact we have more than 2 million workers who work for private-sector contractors who don't know when or how they are going to get paid, is something we should all take note of, and we should listen to those who say this is ridiculous. This is self-inflicted.

You know, it reminds me of getting up and walking out of your house on a beautiful day. You are walking down the street, and, yes, you have a few problems on your mind—life isn't perfect—but you are pretty optimistic; things are pretty good. Suddenly, you pick up a stone from the ground and bash yourself in the head. Honest to God, that is what they have done, these Republicans. They have bashed in the heads of the American public on a beautiful day as we are coming out of a recession, when we know we have our problems, but we also know we can solve them. It doesn't make sense.

Then, as if that isn't enough, they have another stone in their hand called default. So maybe as you are beginning to see the light of day, you hit yourself

again and say to the world: America could actually default on its debts, and the full faith and credit of the United States is in question.

Robert C. Byrd, one of the great Senators and historians, always tells us to read the Constitution. In my desk I have a couple of copies, and every once in a while I will look at it. I am not quoting verbatim, but it says the debts of the United States shall not be questioned. Nobody has the right to play with that. Yet we are doing it again because the Republicans are angry. Why are they angry? I believe it is because they lost the Presidential election. I believe it is because they didn't take back the Senate. This is a direct quote from JOHN BOEHNER. He said the American people don't want to shut down the government, but they also don't want ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act. That was his opinion. That is not the truth. The American people don't want to see us shut down the government and threaten default because of a bill that passed almost 4 years ago, a bill that was upheld by the Supreme Court and a law that was heavily debated in the Presidential election. The person who said this—Mitt Romney: On day one, I will repeal ObamaCare—lost the election.

I have been around here a while. I have served with five Presidents, three of whom were Republicans. Lord knows I didn't agree with everything the Republican Presidents wanted, and I didn't even agree with everything the Democratic Presidents wanted. I fought hard and I got annoyed and I worked in elections. I never saw Republicans or Democrats, until today, to be willing to default. Newt Gingrich did lead us to a government shutdown in the 1990s, but we haven't had one since then because it was so painful and awful. I know the grownups are now trying to resolve this. I know our leaders are going to the White House, and hopefully, they will come to an agreement. But the fact that it would take us this long, 3 days before a default and the 14th day of a shutdown, is unbelievable.

A teacher knows the rules when they get a job. They know school starts at 9 a.m., and they dismiss the kids at 3:00. If a teacher says, I don't like the start time and I am coming 2 hours later, they can't have this job because they know they have to show up. The equivalent of that is keeping the doors of government open to the people we represent, not slamming them shut in their face. That is what we have to do when we show up here; that is to keep the government going. Do we have disagreements across and even within parties? Of course we do. But we have a procedure to deal with that. It is called legislating. That is what we do when we have disagreements. It is something called debate—debate the issues, battle them out, have a vote, and pass a bill.

The other Chamber does the same. Then the House and the Senate go to a conference committee and argue out the differences. You send that bill to the President—whoever he or she may be—and the President either signs the bill or vetoes it. And if they sign it, it is a law. If they veto it, we have an override. I have been involved in those. But once the bill becomes a law, it is the law, and you carry it out. You don't decide what laws you want to enforce and what laws you don't. That is not the right way. Our founders said: We are a government of laws, not men. Carry out the law. If you don't like the law, try to change it.

Now, the Republicans didn't like the Affordable Care Act—which, by the way, is signing up thousands of people a day as we stand here. In my home State, it has signed up by now tens of thousands, and we have had about 750,000 at least unique visitors to our site. In Kentucky, they are signing up 1,000 a day. Unbelievable, never expected. This is the law that caused the government shutdown. The Republicans stamp their feet. They didn't like it. They didn't care that there was an election about it—none of that. They didn't like it, so they are going to shut down the government.

Now we don't even hear them talking about it. Now they are talking about wanting to cut Medicaid and Social Security and Medicare. That is the new thing they want to do. PAUL RYAN: Let's just forget this one. I guess we can't do anything about it. But let's now cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. We have a process to get to conference with the House. On the Budget Committee we have a strong chairman, PATTY MURRAY. She has asked now 21 times to take our budget to conference. TED CRUZ and his friends have objected, and then they have the nerve to say we won't negotiate. We want to negotiate in a conference committee. That is why there is a conference committee. They have stopped it.

The House has decided now. It is too late. We can't do anything about the Affordable Care Act. Then why don't they open up the government? They shut it down. They now admit they can't do anything about it. It has a steady stream of funding, it is beginning to work, and people are going to think: Why do you want to take away the rights I have now, having a pre-existing condition, to get health care? Why do you want to stop my child who can now stay on my health care until he is 26 and take away benefits like free trips to the doctor to get immunizations and birth control and health care? They tried to stop women's health care. They gave that up. They tried to stop us from getting cancer screenings, and we said forget it. So they are all over the place.

I have lived long enough to know when I see people who are joyless, un-

happy, and angry. That doesn't make for an optimistic country. They have the privilege of being here, even if they are only controlling one branch of the three, the House. It is the White House; the Senate, Democrats; the House, Republicans. They have a privilege, and they have a lot of leverage, but the way they are behaving is unacceptable. As I said, it is a self-inflicted wound.

I never questioned the fact that Republicans, Democrats, and Independents love this country. I never question it. But I have to say, when you start acting like you are committing domestic abuse you have a problem. I love you, dear, but I am shutting down your entire government. I love you, dear, but I am going to default, and you are going to be weak. Something is dreadfully wrong.

I see my colleague from Maryland here. I know Maryland is suffering mightily from this shutdown. He and I both have a lot of Federal employees, but the size of our States are different. As a percentage of the workforce, Maryland and Virginia are really suffering. In California we have tens of thousands of workers furloughed, not getting their pay, and a lot of contractors.

I say to my friend from Maryland, I was trying to figure out how many contractor employees are also impacted. Even taking away military contractors, because some of them are getting paid and some of them aren't. If you take that all out of the equation, there are still more than 2 million workers in the private sector who are working for Federal contractors.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Baltimore Sun.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Oct. 14, 2013]

THE SHUTDOWN'S FORGOTTEN VICTIMS:
GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS

(By Clarissa Olivarez)

In a city where government contracts make up a multi-billion dollar industry, it is surprising that with the exception of a couple of articles that received moderate attention, the mainstream media has largely ignored the impact of the shutdown on federal contractors.

There has never been much sympathy for contractors. On average, we make more money than federal workers because we normally do not have the advantage of affordable health care and/or other benefits offered by the federal government to its direct employees. As a contractor, my colleagues and I work 40 hours a week, and our company bills the government for the services we each provide. On Oct. 1, however, the federal government furloughed many of its employees, which meant that funding for contracts under certain agencies was halted. Once contractors are ordered to stop work by their contracting officer, they must comply and wait patiently at home while Congress and the White House try to find a solution.

While defense contractors are mostly still in business, since their services are considered "essential," there are thousands of others who were sent home without pay for an indefinite period of time. As a technical writer and communications specialist for a small company that supports a non-defense agency, my fate was sealed long before early media reports warned of many more impending furloughs.

When you are sent home from work for over a week, you begin to notice certain things around you that could cause you to lose heart. In my own neighborhood, I have noticed several cars parked in their driveways—cars that never leave in the mornings for work and never leave in the evening for a night on the town. The Metro parking garages are empty. People's morale is diminishing as cabin fever sets in on all sides. And as rumors of the shutdown continuing until the 17th spread like wildfire in a windstorm, my colleagues and I seem to have exhausted every resource.

Many of my co-workers have emailed several government websites only to find an automated reply shoot back at them stating that the government was shut down and there was nobody who could address their concerns. We have written letters to congressmen and spoken with local news anchors, but nothing is being done to help us in our time of need. As contractors, we inhabit a different world, and unlike furloughed federal employees, we will not be reimbursed for the time off we have been forced to take.

Unfortunately, like everyone else, there are many of us who owe student loans and are expected to pay rent. We have to pay for utilities, credit card bills, dog food and any other necessities like food and clothing. To make matters worse, my husband and I had set aside money in our savings account for a vacation later this month. That money is now going toward bills and other unforeseen expenses.

What does all this mean? An article in the Washington Post recently reported that the shutdown could amount to a loss of \$200 million a day for local businesses throughout the city. Contractors provide as much of their income to local businesses as their federal counterparts. If it is not enough that we are suffering as a group, our non-existent income will now begin to hurt certain sectors of the economy.

Small businesses within the city have been doing their part to ease the financial burdens of furloughed employees by advertising "Shutdown Specials" that would at least partially allow for the small-business sector of the economy to avoid an otherwise severe financial blow. But, with a heavy concentration of federal and non-federal patrons, the shutdown could cripple numerous mom-and-pop establishments as workers save their hard-earned money and guard their savings due to the uncertainty of a future paycheck.

Contractors, especially those contractors who work for small businesses, have been hit hard by this shutdown, and it is important that we do not go unheard. Representatives in Congress need to realize that they have only solved half of the problem by passing a bill to reimburse federal employees for time spent at home. While the government will probably not take ownership of the effects it has produced on contractors, it is critical that they remember that we are an essential part of the federal workforce and many of us are weighed down by similar worries.

I am glad my friend is on the floor, because this was written today:

In a city where government contracts make up a multi-billion dollar industry, it is

surprising that with the exception of a couple of articles that receive moderate attention, the mainstream media has largely ignored the impact of the shutdown on federal contractors.

I really wanted to bring this to the attention of my colleague. Would my friend like me to yield to him?

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me say to my friend that she is absolutely right. We have heard from a lot of contractors who employ individuals, from large contractors such as Lockheed to smaller companies that employ 30, 40, 50 people. The range is around 20 to 25 percent of their workforce has been laid off. There is no assurance whatsoever they will ever get paid. There are some contractors who don't know whether they are going to survive; it is that serious. So the private sector direct employment loss as a result of the shutdown is growing every day, and it is having an incredible impact throughout the country in every State.

The Senator mentioned Maryland, which I have the honor of representing along with Senator MIKULSKI. Ten percent of our workforce works directly for the Federal Government. The overwhelming majority of them have been put on furlough. We have estimated the number to be in excess of 125,000 in our State of Maryland. Add the private contractors who are laying off workers as a result of the shutdown.

Last week I stopped by a restaurant right off the Baltimore Beltway to get a sandwich. I know the owner. I asked him how things were going. He said: Terrible. He said: About half of my customers are not here because they are Federal employees that would normally come in during the workday and are not coming in.

The margins are very small for these businesses to be able to remain open. So the direct impact on Federal workers and the direct impact on those who have contract work with the Federal Government and the impact on our economy—it is in every State of the country, but it is particularly in the State I represent—has been devastating.

One more number. The Metro system depends upon the Federal workforce here. They need a fare-box revenue in order to keep the system operating in a moderate way. Their ridership is down 23 percent. Their revenues are down 23 percent. What is the Metro going to do?

The impact of this shutdown has had an incredibly damaging impact on our economy and on families. We have a lot of two-parent households working for the Federal Government both on furlough. So many Federal workers live paycheck to paycheck, and they are now recognizing there might not be any paycheck. How are they supposed to pay their bills?

I spoke to one of my constituents in Maryland who works for a Federal agency. He and his wife have both been

furloughed. They just recently bought a home and have a mortgage payment to make. The mortgage company isn't going to say: Sorry the government is shut down; don't pay your mortgage. He has to pay his mortgage. How is he going to be able to do that?

We have hurt people. This shutdown, which should never have happened, has had a huge impact on our economy. The tragedy is for the taxpayers. It is a waste of money, with over \$2 billion wasted as a result of this shutdown.

So I thank my colleague for allowing me to interject to underscore the point she has made. She has been on the floor just about every day, and I admire her very much for what she has been saying because she is absolutely right. The damage is clear. We never should have shut down government. We should pay our bills. It is difficult to understand the Republicans' original position that they want to negotiate the end of ObamaCare on a bill that just keeps the lights on in government.

Now we are talking about paying our bills. They are talking again about dealing with some policy issues. If we are going to get into that discussion—which we should not unless we turn the lights on—let's open government and then turn the lights on and then sit down and negotiate. That is what we have to do. We have some major issues we need to deal with, including how we are going to grow the economy, create jobs, have a modern transportation infrastructure. As chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee, my colleague fought so hard for a multiyear reauthorization of our surface transportation systems, for modern roads, well-maintained—a modern transportation system.

To Chairman BOXER, we have three major transit initiatives in Maryland that need to move forward. We have to have funding for that. That is how our economy will grow.

Yes, I look forward to sitting down with my Republican colleagues to negotiate a budget for next year but first open government and pay the bills.

Mrs. BOXER. I so appreciate my friend, through the Chair, interjecting his thoughts. I have listened to him and to Senator MIKULSKI throughout this ordeal. The Senator is right. I have been on the floor quite a lot. The reason is clear. We need to make a record so that this never, ever happens again.

There is a reason we had not had a shutdown since the last one when Newt Gingrich and Republicans brought it to us in the 1990s—because it was horrible. They got hurt by it.

We begged them not to go down this road. They went down the road. Why? Because they didn't like the fact that there is an Affordable Care Act. They didn't like it, so they stamped their foot and said: We are shutting down the government because we don't like

it. We begged them. We said: That is not going to help your cause. This Affordable Care Act—85 percent of the funds do not come from appropriated funds; they come from a separate stream of funding, and the bill and the law are going forward. They would not listen. Now they have changed their tune and decided it is about cutting Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid. That is their new thing.

My friend is right. It would be so easy to end this. Open the Government, pay our bills, get to the budget negotiations, where we will have Senator MURRAY, Senator SESSIONS, PAUL RYAN, and his counterpart begin regular order.

I want to continue about this contractor employee. What he said is so moving—actually, I think it is a she.

She says:

As a technical writer and communications specialist for a small company . . . my fate was sealed long before early media reports warned of many more impending furloughs. When you are sent home from work for over a week, you begin to notice certain things around you that could cause you to lose heart. In my own neighborhood—

I say to Senator CARDIN, she is talking about your city of Baltimore.

This contractor writes:

in my own neighborhood, I have noticed several cars parked in their driveways—cars that never leave in the morning for work and never leave in the evening for a night on the town. The Metro parking garages are empty.

The Senator alluded to that.

People's morale is diminishing as cabin fever sets in on all sides. And as rumors of the shutdown continuing until the 17th spread like wildfire in a windstorm, my colleagues and I seem to have exhausted every resource.

She says:

Unfortunately, like everyone else, there are many of us who owe student loans and are expected to pay rent. We have to pay for utilities, credit card bills, dog food and other necessities like food and clothing. To make matters worse, my husband and I—

And this is interesting—

had set aside money . . . for a vacation. . . . That money is now going toward bills. . . . What does all this mean? An article in The Washington Post recently reported that the shutdown could amount to a loss of \$200 million a day for local businesses throughout the city.

Mr. President, \$200 million a day for local businesses throughout your city of Baltimore.

She says:

Contractors, especially those contractors who work for small businesses, have been hit hard by this shutdown.

She explains how they may never be made whole.

Day 14 of a shutdown—

Mr. CARDIN. Could I ask my colleague to yield?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I am happy to yield.

Mr. CARDIN. I thank the Chair, and I thank Senator BOXER. She points out

the hardship of people not getting a paycheck. Senator BOXER points it out very clearly. Some of these people are the same people who were just furloughed as a result of sequestration, so they already had smaller paychecks because of sequestration.

Let me remind my colleagues that sequestration was put in 2 years ago as a placeholder. I don't know of a single Senator who wanted to see sequestration take effect. It was a placeholder to get to a budget negotiation. What did we do? We passed the budget. We passed the budget almost 7 months ago. We said: Let's negotiate. We knew it was not going to be our budget. We know we have to negotiate with the House to get a budget to get rid of sequestration.

I mention that because once again we have a very simple request today: Open the government and pay our bills. Sit down and negotiate. It is pretty simple. We have not brought forward our policy objectives in this, which is to have a budget that makes sense for this country, that allows growth of employment, invests not only in roads and bridges but energy and research and education so we can build a competitive economy for the 21st century. We want a budget that is balanced on how we reduce spending—not just on what we call our discretionary spending accounts but also as we look at our entitlement spending. We want to see our health care system more efficient. We want to work to make it a more efficient system. We started that with passage of the Affordable Care Act. Now we want to implement that. That will bring about some additional savings.

We believe we should pay our bills. We should have the necessary revenue. Our revenue code is full of inequities that hemorrhage revenue. My colleague from California is well aware of the fact that in our Tax Code—I serve on the Senate Finance Committee. I think my colleagues understand that we are now spending more money in our Tax Code than we do in appropriations bills. We spend more money in the Tax Code. That is tax breaks some people get—not everyone. We certainly can review those tax expenditures and close those that are inefficient, which will not only provide more equity in our Tax Code but will provide more revenue to pay our bills and reduce our deficit.

It is that type of negotiation we want to get into, but we cannot do that when the Republicans have put a gun to the head of the U.S. economy. That is what they have done by shutting government and by threatening not to pay the bills. We say very simply, put down the gun. Let's negotiate these issues.

Mrs. BOXER. Absolutely.

Mr. CARDIN. The Senator is absolutely right about the private contractor issue. When you look at 800,000 Federal workers who have been fur-

loughed, that does not include the private contractors, which are clearly going to be an additional hundreds of thousands who are not working today, yes, it is a huge drain on our economy, and there is no reason for this.

For all those reasons, we say very clearly on day 14, day 14 of this shutdown, let's open the government, let's pay our bills, and, yes, let's develop a sensible way to negotiate our budget. Let's not try to threaten the American people and then try to pass an extreme agenda as a result of that.

Through the Chair, I thank Senator BOXER.

Mrs. BOXER. Through the Chair, I thank my friend. This contractor issue is a sleeper issue in a way, as this woman writes in the Baltimore Sun, because if you look at the numbers, you may see more contractor employees affected than Federal employees because even if you take—there are millions of them. Even if you take away, if you look at the statistics, the millions who work for the military and assume they are getting paid, there are still more than 2 million who are contractors to other arms of the government, such as homeland security or border patrol—you name it. It is a sleeper issue.

This woman who is so articulate, Clarissa Olivarez—I hope she knows we are taking her words to heart and putting her words in the RECORD. She is explaining what it feels like to be scared. For what? For nothing. Because they did not like the Affordable Care Act—which they are not going to change. They tried to repeal it 43 times.

Open the government. They are so afraid they will lose the vote, they are not even allowing a vote over there.

They are coming back—my friends in the House—shortly. By the way, imagine, Speaker BOEHNER said go home over the weekend while all this is pending. They were not even in session. Outrageous.

I am going to conclude in about 5 minutes by talking about some of the other impacts of the shutdown.

Mr. President, 93 percent of the employees at the EPA have been furloughed. What do they do? They make sure the air we breathe is safe, the water we drink is safe, and the rivers we swim in are safe. They make sure Superfund sites are being cleaned up, those toxic brews in there, including things such as benzene and arsenic and every other bad thing you can imagine. In my State there is not one single EPA inspector on the ground. I have established that. That is the same in many others. Mr. President, 505 Superfund sites were being cleaned up. Cleanup is suspended. Many children live near those sites. There are many schools near those sites. There are many homes near those sites. They are toxic waste dumps. No cleanup.

Now we find out that 92 percent of workers at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission have been furloughed. What is their job? It was created "to ensure the safe use of radioactive materials."

I say to every Senator who has a nuclear powerplant in their State, make a little prayer. If something bad happens, we will have to somehow nab all those workers and get them back on the job in time. Earth to my Republican friends: Have you ever heard the word "Fukushima"? Do you know what I am talking about? Wake up. What are you doing to the American people? You don't like a bill, so you shut down the government. You take all of the watchdogs off the job so people could start dumping waste into the waterways, into the air?

We even have a circumstance in California where pesticides are being imported from other countries. The EPA has to inspect those at the site and make sure they are safe. There are no inspectors. I just told you that. So they are sitting in a warehouse, and our farmers are starting to say: Where are these pesticides? We need them.

This shutdown is mindless. The Army Corps of Engineers manages 12 million acres of public lands, recreation areas that host 370 million visits annually. These recreation areas support local businesses such as resorts, marinas, outfitters, grocery stores, gas stations, hotels—shut down. Last week the Corps closed Lake Mendocino, which is located north of San Francisco. Lake Mendocino hosts half a million visitors annually and visitors spend \$12 million at businesses within 30 miles of the lake, supporting 106 jobs and \$2.8 million in income. Those small businesses cannot go on like this. They cannot go on like this.

Mr. President, 561 national wildlife refuges are closed because of the shutdown. I say to my friend, Senator CARDIN and I—we are very close friends because we work together daily on these issues. He is the chairman of the committee that oversees water quality, these wildlife refuges. In many parts of the country, hunting season is in full swing. I say to my friend from Oregon—I just found out, but he probably knows this—that on the California-Oregon border, hunters and tourists usually head to Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuge for the opening of hunting season. But they have been denied access, which means local businesses are losing much needed revenues. The impact of this is felt with a direct hit to Federal employees, contractor employees, and local businesses. Everyone is suffering. That is why we had a letter that I put in the RECORD yesterday, or the day before, signed by the Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO, and the nonprofit sector. It is so rare, I say to my friends, that we see those three groups coming together.

They are demanding that we open the government. They are demanding a clean debt ceiling so we can pay our bills. They are demanding it, and they represent the broadest base sector of America.

Who is benefiting from this other than people who have a very dark side? That is all I can say. You would have to have a really dark side.

I will give a couple of examples of what is happening. The NTSB, the National Transportation Safety Board—we had a horrible crash in July with Asiana Airlines, flight 214. We don't know exactly why it happened, and the NTSB has been forced to postpone their hearings. These investigations help us to find out how to avoid disasters in the future.

Three weeks ago in Santa Monica, at a little airport, there was a crash that killed four people. Investigation materials were shoved into a vault, and we don't know why it happened. If we knew why it happened, we could save lives.

I remember when I first came to Congress a very long time ago, and I served in the House, there was a terrible crash. They found out it was a very small bolt or a screw that was responsible for the problems, and they grounded every aircraft that had that faulty part and fixed it. That is why these investigations are critical. These investigations are critical so we are able to not only tell the loved ones what happened but to make improvements. It is all shut down.

Another example has to do with the Consumer Product Safety Commission. Last week in San Diego a 2-year-old Annette Estrada was killed when she was crushed by a falling TV. Normally the Consumer Product Safety Commission investigates this heartbreaking incident, find out the problem, and demand it be fixed. Who knows who the next child will be. That is why we have a government—a government of, by, and for the people—to make life better for the American people.

The government is shut down. Open it. Let the people in. It is easy to do. Speaker BOEHNER has a bill. Let them vote over there. Open the government now. People are in danger. There are no winners in a shutdown. It is devastating for workers. It is devastating for small businesses. It is devastating for contractors. It is devastating to our economy, which is just coming out of the worst recession since the Great Depression. What are they thinking over there?

Then they send these little mini-bills. Oh, open this little agency, and open that little agency. I call that government by press release. The heat is on them, so they pass a little mini-bill. Since when does one political party decide which of our communities survive, which ones thrive, which ones die, which people live, which people die,

which child is healthy, and which child is not healthy?

There is a community in California where kids are suffering nosebleeds, and they are sick. It turns out that they are very close to an industrial site. I called the EPA. They were going to rush over there and figure it out and stop the pain. They can't go. I don't see a bill over there to open the EPA. They will never send us that.

Mr. CARDIN. Through the Chair, I just have to say to my colleague that she is absolutely right. She is the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee Agency. She has given great examples that show how critically important the Environmental Protection Agency is in protecting public health and protecting our environment. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is important to protect the public safety.

The Senator from California is absolutely right. I want to give another dynamic, and that is jobs. The fact that the EPA is not in full force is hurting economic growth. I will give one example: Harbor Point in downtown Baltimore, which is an RCRA site, which means it was an environmental cleanup site that has a court order on its development requiring the EPA to sign off to make sure the environmental issues are being protected in its development.

Everything is fairly well understood here, and it has gone through a long process. We are now at the point where we are ready to develop this prime spot. It is the most iconic spot in downtown Baltimore. It is going to help our city grow. Our city needs economic growth. It is on hold. Why? Because the EPA does not have its people in the office to be able to review this application in a timely way. That is just one example. The Environmental Protection Agency is critically important for public health. It is critically important for our environment and also for economic growth.

I will give another example: The Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau is not at full complement either. We have microbreweries in Maryland that are doing very well. Every time they add a new product, they have to get approval from the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau. That is on hold. Their economic growth is on hold.

I could give many more examples. Senator BOXER mentioned our refuges. The Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge is located on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. It is one of the most beautiful spots in the world. This is hunting season. The Eastern Shore of Maryland depends upon the hunting season for its economy.

I can't tell you how many hotel operators, restaurants, and shopowners depend upon the fall season being in full force with the hunting season, and now we put a real damper—not just the

weather we had over the past week-end—but the fact that the government was closed has put a damper on the economy. Actually, it was good weather for hunting. They lost that. They are not going to be able to recover that. It is lost.

As my friend pointed out, our request is pretty simple. Our request is to open the government, pay our bills, and let's sit down and negotiate. The point I hope everyone understands: The funding level we sent over to the House of Representatives is the Republican funding level. We didn't negotiate that number. That is the current fiscal year 2013 number. We didn't negotiate between that number and our budget number that this body passed. We gave up on that and said: Look, it is more important to keep the government open. We have already negotiated.

Bear with me for one more minute. Senator BOXER has given the Baltimore Sun a lot of credit today, and I would like to quote from their editorial because I think it is important to point out.

Passing a “clean” continuing resolution keeping government fully operating at funding levels the GOP has already endorsed is no compromise. It's the status quo. Raising the debt ceiling isn't a concession either—it allows the nation to pay the bills Congress has already incurred and prevents the possibility of a government default, which would hurt the economy, raise borrowing costs and increase the federal deficit.

So when Speaker Boehner lashes out at President Obama for failing to negotiate, one has to ask, what is this thing he describes as negotiation? House Republicans are not merely leveraging their political position—as some dryly claim—they are threatening to do grievous harm to the global economy and the American public.

The gun isn't raised to President Obama's head or to the Senate. The Democrats have no particular stake in passing a continuing resolution or in raising the debt ceiling other than keeping public order and doing what any reasonable person expects Congress to do. No, the gun is raised at the nation as a whole. That's why descriptions like “ransom” and “hostage” are not mere hyperbole, they are as close as the English language gets to accurately describing the GOP strategy.

I hope we are close to reaching an agreement to open the government. It should never have been closed. A lot of damage and harm has already been done.

We are on a motion to proceed to the debt ceiling. If we were not to pay our bills, that would cause irreparable harm not just to our economy, but to the world economy. That is something we should not be playing around with waiting until the last public minute.

I urge my colleagues to put the interest of this country first. This is a serious matter that affects our economy, America's future, and the global economy. If we turn the global economy into further economic disorder, it is going to have a major impact on the United States, and it will be our fault.

I urge my colleagues to immediately cease this strategy of threatening our economy. Let's open the government, pay our bills, and sit down and negotiate, as we should, a budget agreement which will not be what the Democrats want or the Republicans want, but it will be a compromise, as it should be, between the parties. We owe that to the American people.

Through the Chair, I thank Senator BOXER again for underscoring these points and pointing out the wide impact this has on all parts of our country. We have to end it. I hope we can end it tonight.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for allowing this interlude. I do want to say to my friend, I think it has been very helpful that he and I have been in this conversation because we share the view that these two self-inflicted wounds are outrageous, and we want to make sure that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is very clear and shows the pain, the suffering, the concern, and the insecurities that this dual wound, the potential of a default and an actual government shutdown, are causing. I pray that we are never facing this again.

I am very mindful of the words I use here on the floor so I am not going to say what I think about this exactly the way I would say it if I were talking to my family. There is no reason for it. It makes no sense to do this to a country they say they love. Why hurt the country they say they love?

Why make the country they say they love look like a laughingstock? Why make a President who was going to go to Asia to pitch our economy and investments in our Nation—why make him cancel a trip and have China stand there and say: Well, you can see America just doesn't have it together. If they loved their country, they wouldn't do that.

Some of the comments over there are unbelievable. One of the Republican House Members said: I have never seen us so happy. She is happy? She is happy that millions of people don't know where their next check is coming from? She is happy? She is happy that plane crashes can't be investigated? She is happy that Superfund sites can't be cleaned? She is happy that veterans are scared? She is happy that 65-year-olds and 62-year-olds who are new to Social Security can't get their checks on time? She is happy? She needs to look into her heart. That whole party has to look into its heart. Every once in a while you can see into someone's soul, and you know it when it has happened to you.

I got into a conversation with one colleague, who shall remain nameless. I was so excited. I came home from California, and I saw tens of thousands of my people who were signing up for health insurance that never had it before. I could tell so many beautiful sto-

ries. There were people with pre-existing conditions, people who had lifetime caps, people who were scared, and little kids whose parents finally were able to save their lives.

There was one incredible woman who wrote an op-ed piece in the Washington Post about this. And you know what my colleague, who shall remain nameless, said? I told him I went to a signup place, and it was exciting. There were so many people who were signing up. We were at a Hispanic community, and everybody had a smile on their face. He said: I was happy to read in one of your papers that two people had their premiums doubled. I stopped and said: You were happy? That made you happy? Look into your soul.

Why are people happy over there? How do they say they love their country, but they don't care if their country defaults on its obligations?

I want to show my colleagues what President Ronald Reagan said about defaulting—not paying our bills—President Ronald Reagan, the beloved President of the Republicans, and many Democrats. He came from my State. He is one of the most popular Presidents in the history of our country. We have airports named after him. We have buildings named after him. Why don't we see what President Reagan said about default? And just know, when he was President, Republicans and Democrats raised the debt ceiling no less than 18 times, I say to my colleagues. Eighteen times we raised the debt ceiling because, yes, we had debt from prior bills and Ronald Reagan said, Send me a debt ceiling increase. Here is what he says:

The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of a default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar.

Ronald Reagan, 1983. That is when our economy was much smaller than it is today.

So how does the party of Ronald Reagan now get us to this place where in 3 days we are about to default? I didn't hear one word out of them when they decided to put two wars on the credit card and a huge tax break for billionaires on the credit card and a big medical prescription drug benefit on the credit card—not one word out of them. Oh, vote, vote, vote, vote, vote.

What happened? We had a surplus under Bill Clinton. We had a huge increase in the deficits under George W. Bush. And, by the way, President Obama got handed an enormous deficit which he has cut in half.

So all of this talk about how the Republicans are the party of fiscal responsibility bears scrutiny. There wasn't one Republican who voted for the budget, I say to my colleagues, that Bill Clinton wanted us to vote for.

We did it all with Democratic votes. Then we got not only a balanced budget, but a surplus, and tens of millions of new jobs. George Bush came in, put two wars on the credit card, prescription drug benefit on the credit card, tax breaks to billionaires on the credit card, and the debt was off and running. But not one Republican said: Don't pass a debt ceiling. Not one Republican said: Don't default. What changed? Could it be they don't like this President? Do my colleagues think that has something to do with it? I will let people decide that.

We now know what Ronald Reagan said. He said, in other words, we need to pay our bills. We need to avoid default. There isn't one respected economist who doesn't agree with what Ronald Reagan said in 1983. The cost to taxpayers of default is enormous—billions upon billions of dollars—even the thought of it. We are still paying off what it cost us the last time.

Experts warn us against default. Warren Buffett: "It ought to be banned as a weapon." It, meaning a default, ought to be banned as a weapon. "It should be like nuclear bombs, basically too horrible to use."

Warren Buffett knows a thing or two about this economy.

Mark Zandi, who advised JOHN MCCAIN in his Presidential run: "Breaching the limit would be an economic disaster."

What would happen to average folks? Mortgage rates could go sky high. Small business, big business couldn't expand. We would go into a recession. And they are happy over there about the prospect. They need to look into their souls.

The president of the World Bank, Jim Kim: "Please consider politics beyond the Beltway, politics beyond your districts . . . This is not a theoretical impact. It's very real."

Again, Mark Zandi: "The dark scenario is so dark I can't imagine it." That is what he said.

So we pray now, as our leadership goes to the White House—and they are probably there right now meeting with the President—that they come out of that meeting with a plan—a plan to pay our bills, a plan to reopen government, and a plan to negotiate on anything Republicans and Democrats want to negotiate on. I pray so that this works out. But until it does, I am going to be here every day making the record for future Senators and for the history books that shutting down the government and threatening default, those kinds of weapons should be banned.

It is our job to pay the bills. It is our job to keep the government open, just as it is a pilot's job to fly the plane. He has to show up and fly it. We have to show up, pay the bills, keep the government open, and then negotiate our differences.

Thank you so much, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, once again I wish to thank Senator BOXER for her comments and for her strength in coming to the floor and pointing out the danger and harm caused by the government shutdown and the risk of defaulting on our debt.

Let me make it clear: Open government. Keep it open at the level the Republicans had in their budget as we continue to negotiate. We want to negotiate a budget for fiscal year 2014. We want that budget to be fair. We have been trying to do that for 7 months. We are not going to negotiate a budget in the next 48 hours. It is going to take more time than that.

We need to extend the ability to pay our bills. That should be done for a long time—for a longer period of time—because of the predictability here. We don't want to go from crisis to crisis. There should be no concessions for either one of those two issues; that is, opening government or paying our bills.

Let's work back and forth, Democrats and Republicans, on a budget in which there will be give and take. That is what we are encouraging our colleagues to do.

I join Senator BOXER in hoping there is a productive meeting at the White House today. I hope we find a game plan that will allow us to open government and pay our bills in a way in which we can sit down and negotiate the fiscal year 2014 budget, respecting each other's views and doing what our political system always envisioned; that is, true compromise, particularly when we have a House of Representatives controlled by Republicans and a Senate controlled by Democrats.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to continue the series of comments my colleagues have been making about the situation we find ourselves in at this moment, with our government shut down and with the possibility of a default on the payments of our Federal Government. This situation is virtually unprecedented, to be in a situation of near default.

I want to step back from the immediate arguments over what the answer looks like to understand that we have wandered far outside the normal, orderly lines of legislative debate. Legislative debate is like a baseball game. Folks come together, and some want plan A, some want to oppose plan A, and one team wins and one team loses. In this case, we can go back to the health care debate. Some folks wanted a health care plan that would put millions of folks without insurance into insurance and have a number of sys-

tematic reforms that would help Americans and to end abuses in the insurance industry. They wanted to create competition between companies so that customers; that is, citizens, could compare policies and thereby get a better deal, and encourage companies to drop their prices.

This debate now goes back quite a while, to 2009, 2010. The side that wanted the improved health care won. The other side normally says, Well, we will be back next year. We will be back with some changes in team members, as in baseball, and we will debate this again.

Instead of calling to have another legislative debate down the line, those who lost asked for the umpire to declare that the losing team had won. This is acceptable; that is, turning to our Supreme Court and asking them if we had violated any of the constitutional provisions that guide our Nation. In this case the answer came back, and the answer was, no, the health care plan was constitutional and it would go forward.

So now the losing team, instead of saying we are going to debate this with the public, we are going to try to get our point of view across and get people elected who support it, said, We are going to hold the crowd hostage and threaten to burn down the stadium. If a person is attending a baseball game, we know that is outside the normal rules of competition. We create these rules in a democracy so we can have an orderly process by which to consider the viewpoints of our constituents and make decisions, but threatening to hold the American people hostage is outside of the rules. Threatening to have our national government default and burn down our economy is outside the rules. Yet that is where we stand today.

Great harm, even as I speak, is coming to our communities across the Nation. This harm may not touch some of the Members of this body who may have the financial foundation to not be particularly concerned about what happens to others. But I would encourage them to go live a few days in a working-class community and find out how this impacts families across our Nation. Not only are those families who work for the government not getting their salaries as well as being furloughed, but they are not then spending their funds in the local community, which creates an impact on all kinds of other groups. It isn't just in that direct employment. We have a situation with, say, those who are affected by food stamps. If the first day of the month comes and food stamps are not available, they don't go to the stores and buy groceries, so the stores are affected. The list goes on and on in all kinds of ways.

In fact, I can turn to my home State of Oregon to demonstrate some things

known to me that maybe folks haven't considered. I have here a letter from the Port of Astoria. The Port of Astoria, in order for them to receive oceangoing ships, has to have its slips dredged to a certain depth; otherwise, those ships can't dock. This letter basically is about how the government shutdown is affecting their ability to dredge and how the inability to dredge may have a profound economic consequence on the community.

The port writes, "Every year the Port of Astoria is required to dredge to maintain operations."

They have done that in various ways for the last 23 years. The letter goes on through all kinds of details of the process through which dredging occurs. On the third page, it gets down to this: "Our biggest issue at this stage is the government shutdown has prevented our consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service. . . ." Without that consultation, they cannot satisfy the ESA requirements of section 7 of the Clean Water Act.

The letter goes on to say:

This is the only element that is holding us up. . . .

You may think: Well, if they do not dredge on time, what is the big deal? To Astoria it is a very big deal. I continue with the letter:

If we are not able to dredge soon, this Port and this community could suffer immense economic damages to the tune of 5-6 million dollars of direct economic funds per vessel that fails to dock at the Port of Astoria or 10-12 million dollars of direct economic impact per month.

That is based on the fact that there are a couple major vessels per month.

The letter goes on to say:

Furthermore, if one vessel strikes the bottom [of the river] the industry and our investors, clients and tenants will be in an uproar and our entire business will be blacklisted on the international trade market.

That would be terrible, to have a ship hit the bottom and have the Port of Astoria completely shut down as a result of the fact that they cannot consult—as they point out, that part of this is their ability to consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service.

That is just one sizable impact for a community. There are thousands of these occurring across the country.

Let me take another example. We have a company in Oregon that produces a particular device that it exports, and it needs an export license to do so; otherwise, it cannot send its items abroad to its customer. Right now it has a big stockpile of a shipment it needs to send out.

Well, they cannot get the export license because the government is shut down. This is creating a big cashflow issue because they cannot receive the funds until they ship the item, which means huge potential damage to the company—in other words, something that may not have been thoroughly thought through.

What about the rural areas in our States? Some will be surprised to find out that you have a lot more government workers per capita in rural areas than in urban areas. Many parts of my State are forested, and the forests are owned either by the Bureau of Land Management or the U.S. Forest Service—it is owned by the national government, in other words. If the folks are not there because the government is shut down, it has a direct impact. In fact, right now, the U.S. Forest Service is issuing directions on how folks who are in the middle of logging have to shut down, skid the logs they have cut, quit felling any more, and basically clean up and clear out—in the middle of an operation. That does not just mean losses for the company that is logging, it also means a loss of saw logs for the sawmill, which means layoffs or a shutdown at the sawmill.

Well, you can start to see how the consequences roll through the economy.

How about the Superfund site in the Portland Harbor? There is an intense effort going on to get a plan to be able to clean up that Superfund site. Negotiations are underway between the industries that populate that stretch and the Environmental Protection Agency.

Well, it is very important to move forward to meet deadlines. How are you going to move forward if the folks are not at the EPA?

If we go back to a timber company, it is not just the immediate impact, it is the impact a year out, because the folks who are planning the sales for a year out cannot plan those sales if they are shut down or if they are furloughed. They cannot plan those sales. And they have to have teams of biologists and folks evaluate every aspect of every sale to prepare it, put it up for auction. If you cannot put it up for auction, somebody does not buy it, there is no cutting, and then the logging companies and the mills are hurt.

This is not acceptable. What we have is a series of fiscal irresponsibilities by the group within the Senate and the House that has been blocking the budget and appropriations process. Fiscally irresponsible—let me lay that out. It is fiscally irresponsible to block the Budget Committee for the last 6 months from having a conference committee. Yet a small group has come to this floor and repeatedly objected to the conference committee meeting. Without that budget, you cannot have common numbers for the Senate and the House. That blocks the spending bills—known here as appropriations bills—so the spending bills cannot be put together. Or if they are put together, they are based on a different number than the House has, which means those become deadlocked.

That leads to a continuing resolution, which means continuing what we are already doing rather than having a

new spending bill. That is a waste of money because it means we are going to keep doing things that we know are not working instead of doing the things we know are working better. That is why you have an annual appropriations or spending process so you can cast aside the things that are not working and do the things that are working. So it is wasteful to block the budget and appropriations process.

Then we have this government shutdown. What does this mean? This means less income because of less economic activity, and it means more expenses because of more safety net responsibilities, which means more deficit and more debt. So this group that is blocking the budget and appropriations process is responsible for increasing the deficit and increasing our debt.

Then let's fast forward to the threat of not paying our bills. I think everyone in America knows, as a family, if you do not pay your bills, your credit score goes down and you have to pay a higher interest rate when you borrow. It is the same with the Federal Government.

There are some in this body who have said: Well, let's make sure we pay our Treasury bonds, make good on our debt obligations, and let's just not pay other obligations. Anyone who has had a credit score knows that no matter what obligation you fail in, it becomes part of your credit score. It raises the interest. You can go for your home loan and say: I have always made my house payment, and they are like: Yes, but you did not pay your utility bill, you did not pay your car payment. That means you are a higher risk. You say: But I have always paid my house bill, always paid my mortgage. It does not matter. It shows that you are stressed and you do not have a consistent exercise of responsibility in paying your bills.

So there is no easy out, despite that my colleagues have come to this floor, this Chamber, and said: It is not a big deal. They are, simply put, wrong. If they had come to the Committee on Banking, they could have heard expert after expert after expert say, essentially: You are wrong. All your bills matter. All your bills affect your credit rating. When your credit rating goes down, your interest rates go up.

It is very expensive for the government, and it is wasted money, money that is buying us nothing—nothing. It is just paying more for the borrowing you have to do.

It is not just government that pays. It is the families who pay. They have to pay higher interest on their mortgage, a higher payment on their home loan, if you will, their home equity loan, a higher payment on their car

loan, a higher payment on their business loan. Everyone wastes money because of this group of incredibly irresponsible, fiscally irresponsible Members of the House and Senate who have brought us to this point.

I can see my colleague has come to the floor, and I am sure he has stories from his State, and he has his insights on why this is an unacceptable, irresponsible place we find ourselves. All we really need—all we need is a short-term continuing resolution at this point to reopen government while we negotiate, and we should have a long-term resolution of the default issue because that is something that should never be threatened.

It is Ronald Reagan who said: Do not mess with the good faith and credit of the United States of America. It is time everyone on both sides of the aisle listens to what President Reagan said, because he was right on on this, that that is just a shoot-yourself-in-the-foot, self-inflicted wound that does no one in America any good at all.

Let's return to the normal process of understanding there are bounds on the legislative debate. If you lose with your perspective in a legislative battle, you can come back again next time around. You can come back the next year, you can come back 2 years later, you can come back 3 months later if the votes shift. You can propose amendments. But you do not—you do not—hold the crowd hostage. You do not threaten to burn down the stadium. You do not hold the American people hostage. And you do not threaten to burn down our economy and our international standing by proposing that we not pay our bills.

Thank you very much.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Oregon for speaking so forcefully and ably about the real-life stories in his State—stories of people affected very directly by the shutdown and the prospect of the greatest Nation in the history of the world failing to pay its bills on time. As powerfully as he spoke, so did our colleagues from California and Maryland, emphasizing again the evidence of how deep and broad the cumulative effect is of the shutdown.

I had occasion to speak to people across Connecticut, as I know my colleague, the Acting President pro tempore, has done over the past 10 days. He and I have talked about how Connecticut is affected and about the individuals there who have borne the burden of this shutdown. As in Oregon and California and Maryland, there are real-life stories of people who have been affected not just temporarily but lastingly and enduringly.

I had occasion over the last 48 or 24 hours to talk with many of them out of the glare of the public eye—privately,

candidly—and I want to tell some of their stories today, beginning with a meeting I had this morning in East Hartford at VFW Post 2083, at the invitation of my good friend CDR John Hollis of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and a group he helped to invite—veterans of conflicts ranging from Korea, to Iraq, to Vietnam, to Afghanistan—all ages, all races, religions—more than 20 of those veterans telling me their stories and imparting to me their message: Get the job done. Reach a bipartisan compromise and make sure the government opens and end the shutdown and pays its bills on time, as befits the United States of America, for which they fought, the Nation they served and sacrificed to keep free.

I was drawn by young men such as Micah Welintukonis, Jordan Massa, Michael Scavetta, David Alexander, veterans of the most recent conflict in Afghanistan; and John Hollis, Ed Dettore, Lester Yarmiel, Richard Kennedy, Mel Huston, Lucius Miles, who have fought in previous wars.

As a matter of fact, Micah Welintukonis has recently returned from Walter Reed, where he had to undergo the latest round of surgery to his arm, which was severely wounded in Afghanistan in combat there. That wound led him to receive the Purple Heart. He was there with his wife Camilla and his three children to talk to me about his fear that he will be denied benefits and compensation that he is due, he deserves, and needs—the disability claim that he may apply for.

Of course, Jordan Massa is also a Purple Heart recipient as a result of a wound that he likewise received in combat. He waited for 2 years to receive approval of his disability claim, only to learn on October 1 that he will very likely have to wait longer because of the VA furloughing so many of its employees.

Others who came to this meeting: Mike Scavetta from Wethersfield—a veteran who served in an Air Force military police unit deployed to Afghanistan, who needs the GI bill, which he credits as reconnecting him to a civil society after his return. He has applied for a higher disability rating with the Department of Veterans Affairs based on his continued experience of post-traumatic stress.

Jake Demaskiewicz in Rocky Hill, who has served not only in the Army in Operation Enduring Freedom, but on his return now in a nonprofit organization, is assisting other veterans. Thirty percent of his paycheck comes from the VA's vocational rehabilitation program, and he receives disability payments.

These payments, compensation claims will run out at the end of October, and the delays are present even now, discouraging and failing these brave combat veterans who have endured so much for our Nation—the Na-

tion that now has shut down these services because of a small fringe of extremist ideologues in one House of this Congress, one branch of this government, who have succeeded in paralyzing the process.

There are many other impacts on veterans in the denial of programs that are so important, many of which I have mentioned on the floor, such as the Education Call Center, personal interviews at regional offices, education and vocational counseling, outreach programs, including at military facilities and VetSuccess on Campus.

These programs and benefits and claims cannot be sustained by a piecemeal allocation of money. The claims need to be verified by going to other agencies such as the IRS. The labor training programs need to be provided by the Department of Labor. Opening one agency is no substitute for a comprehensive approach to serve these veterans and the people of the United States, whether it is Head Start children who depend on that program, or seniors who depend on nutritional services.

Over these past 2 weeks, I have spoken to home buyers whose loans cannot be processed by government agencies or by banks, business owners whose borrowing cannot be approved, potential victims of health threats who cannot be protected by the FDA or the CDC. There are researchers at the NIH and at places such as Yale who cannot continue their vital work to learn of new treatments, of advances in medicine that can help save people's lives and prevent suffering, and medical school applicants and Ph.D. candidates whose financial aid is in jeopardy and who cannot even, many of them, travel with government support to interview for their next possible assignment and study.

These ramifications are not limited to veterans. They affect our economy at its core. I warned about the effect on job growth and economic recovery and now it is visible, literally visible in the businesses and offices and places of employ throughout Connecticut.

Just yesterday in the Connecticut Post there was this story. The picture is of Robin Imbrogno. This picture of Robin Imbrogno from the Connecticut Post in yesterday's newspaper is of her at a meeting with her staff, preparing for their work. Their office in Seymour, CT, provides human resource services for businesses from California to Maine, across the country, to more than 150 business clients.

It begins:

Robin Imbrogno pulled her staff together after work on Thursday for an update:

How, she asked, has the federal government's partial shutdown impacted business at her company, the Human Resources Consulting Group?

"Even more ways than I'd thought," she said moments later.

I am going to quote the article.

At the company's office in downtown Seymour, the staff of about 30 was having trouble carrying out a host of tasks for their more than 150 clients located from California to Maine: For one, they can't access [the central source of information in the government]. For another, they can't finish background checks or file equal employment opportunity reports. Most vexingly, perhaps, they got more phone calls than ever on Monday complaining that pay checks hadn't arrived in people's mailboxes across America—even though the U.S. Postal Service is supposedly fully staffed.

Their report is about new businesses that cannot open, retail businesses that cannot go into business because they cannot "procure the necessary business license."

As Robin said, "It wasn't a fun phone call."

There is evidence of this effect on employment in businesses across this country, across the State of Connecticut. This relatively modest-size business in Seymour, CT, the Human Resources Consulting Group, founded and headed by Robin Imbrogno, is just one of many across the country.

Her reports about the effects on jobs—we are talking jobs—is a wake-up call for this body. It is a wake-up call for not only the Congress but for everyone in positions of leadership, because this effect will be enduring.

In the same article from the Connecticut Post, it talks about the SBA not providing loans to small businesses: \$150,000 worth of loans every day in one Congressional district in Connecticut alone. Eight companies slated to get SBA-backed loans from a private nonprofit organization will not receive them because of this shutdown.

There are other individuals. I cannot share all of their stories, but just a few. Mary Brady in Durham is trying to buy a home. She cannot do it because she is unable to verify Social Security numbers and income with the Internal Revenue Service; Jesse Pannell, who contacted my office because the buyer of his home in Union, CT, cannot process a loan from the USDA because the USDA employees are furloughed and there is no one to process his buyer's application.

In the city of New Haven, which I visited over the weekend, urban renewal is halted because of the shutdown. This city relies on the Department of Housing and Urban Development to proceed with foreclosure actions on developers. Those developers are subject to foreclosure actions when they fail to maintain their property, when that property becomes a blight on the neighborhood. But, of course, HUD employees are furloughed and they are not at their desks to help the city of New Haven.

This ripple effect spans the State and the country. It goes from loans to a physical therapy company, a car wash, a catering company, a dental firm, small businesses that populate Main Street. As much as we focus on the

markets, on Wall Street, we are talking about Main Street in jeopardy because of this shutdown. These are real-life tragedies. There are real consequences to real people, real harm and hardship in real lives. This body has to listen to them, as I did, and as I have done over the past couple of weeks.

Behind all of this real harm to real people is the prospect of an even more horrendous possible harm resulting from this Nation failing to pay its bills on time. The havoc and chaos that would result, the calamity and catastrophe across the globe, the lasting impact on our Nation, on our credibility as a world power, simply is unthinkable and unimaginable.

How would we face our children if we were to allow this Nation to go into default? How would this generation explain itself to the next and the one after? Every generation enters into a compact in America that we will leave this Nation better than we found it, just as the World War II generation fought to preserve freedom and democracy and gave of itself in combat and then came back to build the interstates and desegregate our schools and put a man on the Moon. In peace as well as war, our veterans are coming back eager and ready to contribute to this country.

The men I just mentioned and met with in East Hartford at VFW Post 283, veterans across Connecticut, veterans across the country, expect more from this government and are eager to leave this Nation greater than it was left to them, and there are millions of other Americans who also are contributing and giving back in their own ways and who are committed to following that model of courage and dedication that has characterized previous generations. How do we face the next generation if we allow this great Nation to fail to fulfill its most basic obligation that every family meets—paying its bills on time.

It is often said America always does the right thing, after it tries everything else. I know I am paraphrasing, not quoting directly. Winston Churchill said democracy is the worst of all possible governments, except for all the others.

We do not have the luxury today of trying everything else before America does the right thing. We do not have the luxury of failing democracy and failing to pay our bills on time. We must meet this challenge and follow the example of those veterans and millions of other courageous Americans who have said to all of us, as they did to me this morning: Get the job done. Make sure the Government of the United States serves the people and pays its bills on time.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will be speaking later this afternoon with regard to the judges, but I have heard a number of people, including the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut and others on the floor, speaking about the effect of the shutdown. I appreciate my colleagues who come and give real-world statements of how what is happening here impacts their constituents.

I was just in Vermont and had the opportunity to talk with people, many of whom I have known for years, about how they are being effected by the shutdown. These are hard-working people who work for our government. They have skills our government needs. They are being furloughed through no fault of their own.

They said: I know I am getting paid less in the government, but I have a skill and the country has done so much for me and my family, it is a way to give back, but I am not going to tell my children to do that. They are well educated. I am not going to tell them to do that, to get treated this way.

What is going to happen is we are going to have a lot of these furloughed people who will say the heck with it. They will leave government service. These are experts in our intelligence services, the Department of Defense, medical research, and other areas. What will happen when we try to replace them? We will be scrambling around, hiring contractors, paying a lot more for people without the skills and experience.

The private sector is being impacted. I have used the example of a person who has a microbrewery in Vermont. He put a lot of money and effort into a seasonal brew and was prepared to go with it during what we call the leaf-peeping season, the fall foliage season, in Vermont, but he needs an approval stamp from the Department of Agriculture, but the people who would give him the approval he needs have been furloughed.

There are a number of people who may need a passport for an emergency, a family member is abroad and ill and somebody has to get on a plane. A lot of passports get issued in St. Albans, Vermont, but the employees at the passport office are not allowed to go to work and get their job done.

Those who have questions of the IRS that they need for their businesses, normally they could call them, but the IRS is closed.

In another area—and someone in the press asked me about this a few moments ago—what about the court system. Our Federal court system is facing some very serious problems. If

there is a criminal case, because of our speedy trial rules, that goes to the head of the line. We also have, since *Gideon v. Wainwright*, the fact that criminal defendants are entitled to counsel. But the counsel might not be there. Defenders' offices might have to furlough staff.

Courts can't keep asking the same lawyers to just volunteer their time; maybe they will get paid and maybe they will not, and if they do, it is going to be far less than they make otherwise.

What happens is that those criminal cases start backing up. Then if there is a legitimate civil case one wishes to bring, good luck in the Federal courts. They could wait year after year after year to have their case heard. By the time their case makes it in front of a judge, whatever remedy they might have is going to be inadequate because of the delay. Justice delayed is justice denied.

This is happening in our Federal courts as the money runs out because we have not passed a Continuing Resolution to fund our co-equal branch of government. Combined with the funding cuts to the courts due to sequestration and the 93 current Federal district and circuit judgeships that are vacant 39 of which have been deemed judicial emergency vacancies because the case-loads are so high and it is not difficult to see that our courts need us act. Fortunately, we will have one judge from Illinois and one judge from Alabama confirmed this afternoon—but we have a shortage of judges because of vacancies and because we are having to wait months and months before we are able to vote on uncontroversial nominees, who in the past would have been confirmed within days.

I could give 1,000 examples, but the ripple effect on real Americans is awful. We see a salmonella outbreak in the West. We know our Department of Agriculture inspectors are out there checking—oh, wait a minute, they are not. They are furloughed or many of them are. What do we do there?

As to areas where there are ports, normally busy ports, is shipping coming in and out or is it being slowed because there are suddenly less people?

I know when I talk to the FBI, they tell me about investigations they can't go forward with or can't complete because of furloughs.

We had this horrific bus accident in the South a couple of weeks ago. I cannot imagine the grief those families must feel for those who were lost. What I found shocking was that after the accident our National Transportation Safety Board couldn't send a team down to find out what happened and whether there is anything that can be learned to prevent similar crashes because their investigators are furloughed.

I know the distinguished Presiding Officer has stood and worked hard on

this floor, in our caucuses, and with others to get the government back open and to get us to do the right thing. I am preaching to the converted.

I see our deputy leader, the distinguished senior leader from Illinois, who has spoken not only on this floor but in the national media for the need to reopen.

I yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I thank the Senator for what he is doing, as I stopped in to thank our majority leader for standing strongly on this to reopen the government.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me first thank the senior Senator from Vermont and the President pro tempore of the Senate.

I wish to say to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, it has been my great honor for 15 or 16 years to work with the Senator from Vermont. He is an extraordinary person and an extraordinary leader on one of the most important committees in Congress.

I see Senator BARRASSO on the floor. I have about a 10-minute statement if the Senator's schedule allows. I thank the Senator.

NOMINATION OF ANDREA WOOD

In a short time, a little more than 1 hour, the Senate will come to consider two judicial nominees. I will speak to one of these nominees from the State of Illinois. The other I am sure will be addressed by other Members of the Senate.

I rise to speak in support of the nomination of Andrea Wood to serve on the U.S. District Court in the Northern District Illinois.

Ms. Wood has the qualifications, integrity, and judgment to be an outstanding Federal district court judge. I was proud to recommend Ms. Wood's name to the President of the United States to be considered for this position. I was prouder still when the President concurred in that recommendation. She has my support and the support of my colleague Senator MARK KIRK to fill the Chicago-based judgeship which was left vacant by the untimely death of Judge Bill Hibbler.

I wish to say a word about Judge Bill Hibbler. Judge Hibbler was one of my earlier appointments, a State judge who became an important asset to the Federal bench in Chicago. His untimely death left an extraordinary vacancy. I was at his memorial service, and the tributes that were paid to him for his life of public service were truly fitting. Ms. Wood now has difficult shoes to fill, and it may be impossible, but I think in her own special way she will make an extraordinary contribution to the court as well.

This vacancy has been designated as a judicial emergency by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, and I

am pleased the Senate is moving to confirm Ms. Wood today.

Ms. Wood currently serves as a senior trial counsel at the Securities and Exchange Commission's Division of Enforcement in Chicago. In this capacity she represents the SEC in complex litigation matters. She is a native of St. Louis, and she received her B.A. from the University of Chicago, where she was selected as one of the student convocation speakers. She received her law degree from Yale, where she served on the Yale Law Journal.

After graduating from law school, Ms. Wood clerked for Judge Diane Wood of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. She then joined the Chicago law firm of Kirkland & Ellis, where she worked on securities, bankruptcies, tax, and other litigation matters.

She joined the SEC in 2004 as a senior attorney in the Division of Enforcement, where she investigated and litigated securities law violations, including fraud, insider trading, and other misconduct. In 2007, she became a senior trial counsel, serving as the lead SEC attorney on litigation matters and coordinating with the U.S. Attorney's Office and other regulators on parallel enforcement actions.

Ms. Wood knows the world of litigation at the highest levels. She has received numerous awards for her work at the SEC, including the Director's Award from the Director of the Division of Enforcement, as well as eight Special Act Awards for her work on individual matters. In addition to her busy government service, Ms. Wood has found time to serve the Chicago community through a variety of charitable causes.

She appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee for a hearing on June 19 and was reported out of the committee on July 18 by a unanimous voice vote. She is an outstanding nominee for the Federal bench, and I urge my colleagues to support her nomination when it comes to the floor of the Senate later this afternoon.

I see on the floor the Senator from North Dakota, who has asked permission to speak.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. I wish to thank my esteemed colleague from Illinois and take this opportunity to offer some remarks on the debt ceiling and the continuing operations of the government.

I come to the floor to make an appeal for action, action on opening the government and action on addressing the debt ceiling. Of course, that requires bipartisan effort. This is something our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have to work together to accomplish. We have been negotiating, not only our leadership, Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL, but the Members of this

body, Republican and Democratic, both sides of the aisle. We have been negotiating and talking about many different ideas, but now we need to come together and find a way to both address the debt ceiling and to reopen the government.

The kinds of ideas we have discussed include a short-term extension of the debt ceiling. Certainly Members on my side of the aisle feel we have to also address the underlying problems that are leading to our growing debt and deficit.

We need savings and reforms as part of addressing that debt ceiling. Also, we have talked about ideas for a continuing resolution to reopen the government, one that follows established law. By that I mean the Budget Control Act, which establishes budgetary caps that need to be kept in place and honored as part of this agreement.

The continuing resolution we have talked about would also include flexibility for agencies to prioritize spending subject to congressional oversight, but we have to have budget discipline. We are spending more than we are taking in. Whether it is a family, whether it is a business, whether it is the Federal Government, that doesn't work. We must exercise budget discipline.

Also, we have talked about ideas that might include addressing the medical device tax, possibly repealing the medical device tax or at least deferring it for 2 years and paying for it with pension smoothing under provisions similar to those in MAP-21. We have looked at and talked about requiring income verification under the Affordable Care Act to avoid fraud, ideas Republicans have put forward. I think there has been broad support for it on the Democratic side of the aisle.

An agreement composed of these kinds of ideas would open government and address the debt ceiling on a short-term basis, but the reality is we need to find savings and reforms to address the underlying problems that are driving our deficit and our debt. As part of a debt ceiling agreement, we need to have savings and reforms that underlie our problem. Our problem is that we are spending more than we take in. We can't raise the debt ceiling for another year and add \$1 trillion in debt to the debt that we already have of \$17 trillion. It is kind of like going to the bank. When you go to the bank and you talk to the banker, you say: Hey, I want a loan. I want to increase the loan I have, and I want to raise my credit limit.

The banker may be willing to give you the loan, but he is going to say to you: What are you going to do to address the underlying problem, the problem you have that you are spending more than you are taking in? What are you going to do to address that?

If you said to the banker: I am not going to do anything to address it, you might have a hard time getting the

loan, right? That is true whether you are a family, that is true whether you are a business, and that should be true for the Federal Government. So let's put the necessary savings and reforms in place.

In his budget, the President identified more than \$600 billion in changes and savings and reforms that he could support to mandatory spending programs, and we have talked to him about those time and again. Now is the time to implement those savings and reforms to those mandatory spending programs.

Let me cite an example of one I have been hard at work on for the last 2 years; that is, the farm bill. The farm bill is a mandatory spending program. I am a member of the agriculture committee, and we have worked hard on changes, on improvements, on actually strengthening the farm bill by strengthening crop insurance under the farm bill, which is what our farmers and ranchers want. As we worked through that, at the same time we identified on the order of \$25 billion to \$30 billion in savings that we can generate by reforming the farm program.

I am a member of the conference committee on the Senate side. The House has now appointed their conferees. We are ready to go and resolve the differences between the House and Senate versions of the farm bill, and we can have a stronger farm program and save billions of dollars.

Those are the kinds of mandatory spending program reforms we need to put in place as part of the debt ceiling agreement. And we need to find a common commitment, a bipartisan commitment, and a commitment on the part of the administration as well as the Congress to do that.

When we talk about addressing the debt ceiling, that is what it really means. It doesn't just mean raising the debt ceiling. It doesn't just mean borrowing more money. It means fixing the problem. So we need to act. We need to address the debt ceiling. We need to get the government open, but we need to have a common commitment, a bipartisan commitment to solving the underlying problems and to getting the reforms and the savings that will ensure we aren't spending more than we are taking in.

Of course, a big part of that is economic growth as well. We understand that. And at the point where we truly come together in a bipartisan way—and I would argue this is that point and this is that time—I think the markets will react, and I think business across this country will react. Businesses large and small will react because the certainty of knowing we truly are dealing with our debt and our deficit will give them the confidence to invest and hire more people, not only bringing people back to work, reducing unemployment, but getting economic

growth—economic growth not by raising taxes but, with economic growth, broadening and growing the base and generating revenue to help with our deficit and our debt.

By putting these commonsense reforms, these solutions, these savings in place as part of this debt ceiling agreement—a commitment to doing that on both sides of the aisle—we will help unleash the power of the strongest economy in the world, and that economic growth will be a huge part of solving our deficit and our debt as well. It is vitally important that we do it. It is vitally important that we do it for the strength of our country, to get people back to work, but most of all for our children and for future generations. I don't believe there is anybody here in Congress—in the Senate, in the House—or anywhere else who wants to leave our children with a \$17 trillion debt. So let's solve this. We can do it, and now is the time.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, here we are, it is October 14, and the government has been shut down for 2 full weeks. We are about 3 days away from a debt ceiling deadline. I keep hearing rumors that a deal is close. I certainly hope that is true, that we do make some breakthroughs and we get through this impasse, but I have some observations on that, and I thought I might take a moment to set the record straight based on what I have been hearing over the weekend on some of the talk shows and some things that came out over the weekend.

In the last day or so there was talk about Democrats putting "a new issue" on the table, that Democrats are now putting sequestration on the table in these talks. Well, I don't know how anyone could think this is a new issue.

In March the Senate approved a budget that replaced sequestration with a mix of entitlement reform and revenue increases.

In April the President put forward a budget that replaced sequestration with again a mix of spending cuts and revenue increases.

Throughout the spring and summer the Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, debated and passed bills that conformed to the budget resolution replacing sequestration. Republicans in the House and Senate have taken part in this debate. Republicans on the Senate Appropriations Committee responded with a letter objecting to our policy of replacing the sequestration cuts.

The House passed its own budget, the Ryan budget, which also takes their position on sequestration. They even made it worse by preventing cuts in the military and taking all the rest out of nondefense discretionary spending. I know that sounds like a big word, but it is spending that comes out of things such as education and social services and health, NIH, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and all those other things.

Now, again, we heard a lot of talk by Republicans on the Senate side that we Democrats were violating the Budget Control Act by coming in at a higher level than what sequestration called for. At the same time, the Republicans on the House side violated the Budget Control Act by not taking 50-50. In other words, the Budget Control Act said that if sequestration goes into effect, then the cuts have to be made 50 percent from defense and 50 percent from nondefense. The Ryan budget—what they did in the House—left defense whole and took everything out of—as I said, everything else, mainly out of health, education, labor, and that pot of money.

So I guess you might ask whether both sides violated the Budget Control Act. No. Both sides had their approach on how to deal with the Budget Control Act. The Budget Control Act is not the Ten Commandments written in stone for all eternity. It is a law. And when we have laws around here, periodically, guess what. We change them or modify them, of course.

So the Budget Control Act was passed, the supercommittee was set up, it didn't hit its goals, so sequestration went into effect. Now that we have seen the disastrous consequences of sequestration for this year, those on my side of the aisle said: Well, look, it is time to get rid of sequestration, and let's make our decisions as legislators on how we want to spend the taxpayers' money and how we might want to raise revenues.

The Republicans on the House side—I don't say they violated anything, they just did their own thing. They said: To heck with the Budget Control Act. We don't want to take any money out of defense. We will leave that whole and take it out of everything else.

That would have been the proper time for the House and Senate Budget Committees to get together in a conference so they could work out their differences. But 19 times we have come to the floor to ask to go to conference on the budget, and 19 times the Republicans have refused to let us go to conference to even talk about it. So sequestration is the biggest difference between these two budgets.

I might add, with regard to the budget Mr. RYAN came up with in the House, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, a Republican, called it "unworkable," for whatever that is worth.

Nonetheless, sequestration is the biggest difference between our two budgets. Again, that is why we asked to go to conference time and time again. So sequestration is not some kind of new issue. It is the issue of the year. It will be the issue of next year. Do we blindly cut everything? Sequestration is a blind cut of everything, even programs everyone here might agree are worthwhile and should be funded. But that is what we are elected to do. We are elected to make those kind of choices and work them out in a conference committee.

If you think sequestration is some kind of a new issue, I guess it is only a new issue if your memory is only 2 weeks long. If you know what has been going on for this year, sequestration is the major difference.

Two weeks ago Senate Democrats compromised in an attempt to keep the government open. How did we do that? We agreed to keep the government open for 6 weeks—at that time, until November 15—at the current levels, which included the sequestration cuts. It was not in our budget, but we agreed, to give us time before Christmas to go to conference and work out the differences. We passed it at the same level which was included in the continuing resolution passed by the House of Representatives. We agreed to compromise our level down to the House level for 6 weeks to keep the government open. We passed it and sent it over to the House. It has been sitting there ever since. Speaker BOEHNER will not permit it to come to the floor for a vote. Why? Perhaps he knows if he brings it up for a vote, it will pass and the President will sign it.

Instead, they began this by saying we had to change ObamaCare. We had to make changes in the Affordable Care Act—which has nothing to do with this budget, by the way. That didn't work. So now they have shifted to a whole bunch of other demands. And we have never really gone to conference. What the Republicans are now saying is we should give up a whole year. Forget about the budget resolution we passed here, and agree to what they passed in the House for the next year without even going to conference.

So first the Republicans in the House won't agree to negotiate on the budget unless we agree to their top priority—no revenue increases. Then Republicans insist upon shutting down the government to stop ObamaCare. Now this weekend Republicans have been saying they won't agree to reopen government or lift the debt ceiling until Democrats agree to the total spending level in the Ryan budget. This is truly unprecedented.

We heard over and over Republicans wanted the Democrats to produce a budget. We did. Now they are doing everything in their power to avoid discussing our budget. But what is truly

incredible is that Republicans want the world to believe Democrats agreeing to a compromise for 6 weeks was an agreement to give up our entire budget for the whole next year. I don't know why the press is playing into this. They seem to be saying it is tit for tat. It is one side; it is the other.

No, it is not. We agreed to 6 weeks. Now the House says that we must agree to it for 1 year. That was never part of our budget we sent to the House. So that is not a compromise.

I will happily vote for a bill that extends the current level for 6 weeks or so. We have already voted for that. The House wanted 10 weeks. But I think a debate over whether to keep or change sequestration for the year—which is the entire debate between the Senate and the House budget resolution—is too important to be used as a bargaining chip for basic government operations.

I didn't watch the Sunday shows. I rarely ever do. I have better things to do on Sunday. But I couldn't help but read the paper this morning, and there was a statement in the paper made by the senior Senator from Arizona. I guess he was on a talk show, and they were quoting him.

Senator MCCAIN said: I guess we could go lower in the polls. Right now we are down to blood relatives and paid staffers.

That is kind of cute. And I am quoting the newspapers, so I don't know if he said it this way or not. He said: But we have got to turn this around and the Democrats had better help us.

What does that mean? They are the ones that shut the government down. As I said, there is a bill before the House right now. If the Speaker would put it on the floor, it would open the government. We passed that here. We helped them. We agreed to their level for 6 weeks. How much more help do they need?

The more I read about this in the print and watch the news programs, the more it becomes clear to me there is an attitude being pushed by the Republicans that if they agree to reopen the government and if they agree to extend the debt limit, they are doing us Democrats a favor. Read between the lines. It is like they are doing us a big favor to do this. Therefore, we have to give them all these concessions because they are doing us a favor.

I tell my Republican friends, they are not doing us Democrats a favor whatsoever. If they agree to reopen the government and extend the debt limit, they are doing the Nation a favor, not the Democrats. So get that out of your head that somehow, because you are willing to do that, we have to give concessions on something else. We can talk about concessions, and we can talk about sequestration and other budgets when we go to conference—if

they will let us go to conference. Nineteen times they have opposed us going to conference. But talking about concessions now as a means of reopening government or extending the debt limit—that shouldn't even be a part of the equation. Somehow the press continues to report this as a legitimate demand on the part of Republicans; that if we want to open the government, then they get to demand certain concessions. Why is that legitimate? The legitimate thing is to reopen the government. It is very simple.

Other people have come to the floor to talk about the impact of sequestration, and I thought I would just take a moment again—I did the other day, I will do it again today, and I will continue to do this—to alert people as to what another year of sequestration would mean for programs which come under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, which I have been privileged to chair or be the ranking member of since 1989. Here is what would happen next year if we continued sequestration: Some 177,000 fewer children will get Head Start services. Maybe that is not your kid or my grandkids. Everybody here has plenty of money. But it affects a lot of low-income families in this country.

And 1.3 million fewer students would get title I education assistance—no kids of anybody in this body or the House, none of our grandkids. We have plenty of money. But low-income families all across this country, in urban areas as well as rural, get title I assistance.

And 760,000 fewer households will receive heating or cooling assistance under what we call LIHEAP, Low Income Heating and Energy Assistance Program. Again, it won't affect anybody in this body, it won't affect anybody in the House, and probably none of our families. But it will affect 760,000 households with an elderly person without much money, maybe just living off a Social Security check and nothing else.

Special education programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. We fund a portion which goes out to the States. By sequestration, the less money we put out will mean 9,000 special education staff will be cut from classrooms. Maybe the States will come up with the money. Maybe local taxpayers will come up with the money. I am just saying, under sequestration we will not be paying for 9,000 special education teachers and staff.

Sequestration next year means \$291 million less for child care subsidies for working families. These are families that go to work every day, and many are single parents. These are low-paying jobs, and the only way they can go to work is to have some kind of child

care subsidy, and \$291 million will be taken out of that. Again, it won't affect anybody here.

Two billion dollars less for the National Institutes of Health. That is 1,300 fewer research grants next year. Which one of those grants will lead to breakthrough discoveries in medicine and cures?

We have a fraud and abuse program in Medicare. It recovers \$7.90 for every \$1 we appropriate. A lot of that comes because of overcharges from drug companies. We have seen cases in Wisconsin and a number of other States with huge settlements because the drug companies were overcharging. For every \$1 that we put in, we recover \$7.90. Because of the cut, because of sequestration, we will lose about \$2.7 billion next year in funds that we would assume we would get back. Aside from that, drug companies know we won't have enough cops on the beat, and that will be an excuse for them to just start overcharging again.

So those are just a few of the things that will happen if we continue sequestration. There are probably some on the other side who just don't care. For example, one Member of the House Republican caucus asked Representative BACHMANN about the government shut down, and she said: We are very excited. It is exactly what we wanted, and we got it.

Then there is Representative CULBERSON who reportedly said: It is wonderful. We are 100 percent united.

What are they excited about? They are excited about the government shut-down. They are probably excited about sequestration. They are excited about hundreds of thousands of low-income kids not getting Head Start. They are excited about low-income families not getting heating and cooling assistance. They are excited that special education teachers will be cut. They are excited about this. This is their vision of America.

The tea party had some big gathering here in Washington the last few days. I happened to be reading about it. There was one woman there talking to reporters. She said we need to go back to the late 1800s in this country when we grew our own vegetables.

I thought to myself, fine. If you want to, you can do that. There is nothing restricting her from going out and living without electricity or running water, health care. She can go find a cabin someplace in the woods, I suppose, have a little plot of land, grow her vegetables, do her own canning. You can do that, if you like.

But why does she insist that we all want to do that? I don't think a lot of people want to go back to the late 1800s in this country. Think of what life was like then: child labor, people working 60, 70 hours a week, no minimum wage, no Social Security, no Medicare, no education for a lot of low-income kids.

If you had money, you were fine. Disease was rampant—polio, measles, smallpox. That was the late 1800s. That is what the tea party wants. They want to go back to that. They keep up this hue and cry about that; things have just gotten out of hand.

Things have not gotten out of hand. We are a big country. We are a big nation—powerful, big. We have a lot of economic assets, but we have a lot of human assets too. We have to take care not just of the economic assets but our human assets as well. There are no economic assets without human assets. We need to invest in our people and not listen to those who want to turn the clock back to the 1800s. That is what sequestration would start to do. It would start to turn the clock back—oh, maybe not to the 1800s—I don't want to exaggerate—but certainly before the Great Society and certainly, probably, even before the New Deal. They do want to get rid of Social Security. They do want to get rid of Medicare.

I guess Grover Norquist, who is sort of their patron saint, said: We want to reduce the size of government so small we can drown it in the bathtub. That is what they want. That is their vision of America. That is their vision of our future.

I am hoping we do reach some agreements and we can get out of this. But the Republicans have dug themselves in this hole, not us. Now they say they want us to help them. We already have. We passed a bill and sent it to the House to open the government. We now have before us, as we did on Saturday, a bill to extend the debt limit without strings attached until December 2014. Every single Republican voted against even going to that bill to even discuss it on Saturday. I opened the newspapers on Sunday to read about it, and there is very little talk about that. Is there something I missed? Did we not have a vote here on Saturday on a motion to proceed to raising the debt limit for 1 year—just to go to the bill so we can discuss it? People could offer amendments. Every single Republican voted against even going to that bill, even discussing it.

We have thrown plenty of lifelines out there. If what the senior Senator from Arizona meant by "help" is that we have to give up on everything in terms of our budget, sequestration, all that other stuff, that is nonsense. I made a counterproposal. I said if they are going to keep putting all that stuff on there as conditions, we ought to start putting conditions on it too.

If they want some help, how about raising the minimum wage right now? That would be something we could do. Wouldn't that be neat? If they want to reopen the government and extend the debt ceiling, let's raise the minimum wage right now for people in this country. I would put that on the table right now. I would put on the table that we

need to put more money into special education to help our local taxpayers and more money, certainly, into early childhood education. Maybe those are the things we ought to put on the table, saying: If you want help, agree to these things. I will not go there. But if they continue to push this idea, if the Republicans continue to push this idea that somehow we have to capitulate on everything else, then I think we just throw these things on the table and say: OK, you want us to agree to that? You agree to this. We will have a little tit-for-tat on that and see how far it goes.

That is why this whole talk about giving up on sequestration and budget matters is a nonstarter. Open the government—very simple. Extend the debt limit—very simple. Then go to conference and talk about this. That is the way out of this. That is the real, adult, democratic—with a small “d”—way out of this mess. I call upon the Republicans not to do us a favor. Do the country a favor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, in just 3 days, barring some action by Congress, the Treasury Department of the United States will run out of options for preventing default on this Nation's debts for the first time in our history, setting off a chain of economic events that will be felt around the world and by every family and business and State and community in our country.

We have heard a great deal on this floor the last few days about how we arrived at this point and who is to blame. There is a lot of concern and consternation about exactly who owns this and how we got here. I am not going to spend time today on that. I am going to skip the politics and the drama for now and just talk about the facts and the policy. I just want to talk to Delawareans about what would happen if we actually go over this impending cliff, if we do default, and which of the options for addressing this are viable.

First, let's be clear about what we are talking about.

What is the debt ceiling? Defaulting on our debt by failing to raise the debt ceiling is not the same as cutting up America's credit cards. It is not the same as denying the President the right to sign more checks into the future. Raising the debt ceiling does not give Congress or the President a blank check to spend more money. It allows the United States to borrow more money, yes, but only to pay bills for goods and services already incurred, to meet pledges already made.

We have had some kind of a national debt ceiling since 1917, when Congress allowed the Treasury Department to issue long-term Liberty bonds to pay for our engagement in the First World

War. Over the course of the next two decades, caps were placed on other kinds of debt as well, and finally, in 1939, Congress decided to place a ceiling on the total amount of debt the country could have.

The last time Congress raised the debt ceiling, it was up to \$16.99 trillion. Technically, we reached that limit a few months ago—actually on May 19 of this year. The Treasury Department has since been using what it calls “extraordinary measures” to keep paying our bills, but, as Secretary Lew has communicated to this Congress over and over in letter and in testimony, in just a few days the Treasury Department will no longer have enough money to keep up. These extraordinary measures will have run out, and in a week or two later we will have come up to zero.

What are the bills we need to raise the ceiling in order to pay? It is the salaries of all Federal employees, including our military; it is Social Security and Medicare payments; it is unemployment benefits, tax refunds, and interest on our sovereign debt. Raising the debt limit allows the Treasury to borrow the money it needs to pay these bills. That is it.

If on any particular day more bills come due than we have cash in our accounts to cover, then the United States of America will default on some or all of its obligations. That day is coming and coming quickly. Frankly, we cannot let it happen.

For decades investors have bought U.S. debt because it was seen as a sure thing, a safe investment. When people buy a Treasury bill, a T-bill, they do so because they know they are going to earn interest on one of the safest investments in the world. American debt is considered unimpeachable. That is what makes the dollar the reserve currency for much of the world, which is something that benefits every American company and community and family in ways that are hard to see but cumulatively powerful—the absolute certainty that we will repay our national debt.

Who are these investors? Who are the folks who buy these T-bills? Some are everyday Americans. A large number of retirees invest in our government bonds because they are such a safe bet. Pension funds and mutual funds invest in government bonds for the same reason. Some investors are the governments of other nations that look at the United States as such a good investment that they tie their financial stability to ours. So when it starts to look as if Congress will not live up to that standard, will not take the steps necessary to pay all of our bills on time and might actually default on some of our debts and transform us into a deadbeat nation, it makes investors really nervous.

Just the talk of defaulting on our debts sends a shockwave through our

economy and through the markets. For proof we need only look back to August of 2001, when Congress last brought the Nation to the brink of default. Although we didn't cross the line, just the talk of it, the mere possibility that we might for the first time default had an array of consequences.

First, it slowed job growth and led to an increase in part-time employment.

Second, consumer confidence in our economy fell. The Consumer Confidence Index—the index of consumer confidence—is a reliable indicator of Americans' willingness to spend money and fuel our economic growth. We want consumers buying products at their local stores and keeping people employed, right? The index was already on the pessimistic side of the line when this last crisis began but has fallen substantially since the government shutdown. Instability and uncertainty reduces consumer confidence and takes money out of our economy.

Third, the yield of our Treasury bills had to increase in order to prop up demand. As U.S. debt becomes perceived as a riskier investment, we have to incentivize investors by increasing what we will pay them. That means taxpayers will have to pay more over time in order to compensate. The debate in 2011 will cost American taxpayers an additional \$19 billion over the next decade. Again, just the debate as we ran up to the possibility of default in 2011 added \$19 billion in debt service costs to the bonds that were issued in the days and months after.

Fourth, the credit rating agency Standard & Poor's—one of the big three—lowered the credit rating of the United States, causing markets to drop more than 5 percent in a single day and 17 percent over the course of that crisis. It was one of the worst declines in the equities markets in history, and it was only because we talked about defaulting.

Just threatening to default is terrible for our economy in all these four different ways.

Financial analysts across the world have said Congress is already causing potentially lasting damage to the strength of the dollar just by repeatedly threatening to default. Said one:

There is a negative confidence shock rippling through the economy, and foreign investors have taken fright at developments in Washington.

Said another:

A U.S. government default is not a zero-probability event now. Although it remains very unlikely, a low-probability high-impact event like this is naturally making investors cautious.

So we simply cannot afford this talk. We cannot let our Nation default.

What happens if we do? What would actually happen if we get to the end of this week and have not resolved this crisis? I am encouraged by rumors of some resolution. I am encouraged that

there are negotiations and conversations going on. But I think we need to look in a clear-eyed way at what would happen if default should happen to occur.

For starters, we don't really know. The situation has never been this bad before this, and the United States has never defaulted on its debt.

Here is what the managing director of the International Monetary Fund said this weekend:

If there is that degree of disruption, that lack of certainty, that lack of trust in the U.S. signature, it would mean massive disruption the world over, and we would be at risk of tipping yet again into global recession.

We simply cannot afford that.

Let me share another quote from history, from President Ronald Reagan, who back in 1983 had this to say about the potential threat of default and its impact on our economy:

The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of a default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar.

As it was true back in 1983, so it is true again today. The comments from the head of the IMF and from a whole array of economists and bankers this past week remind us of the simple and enduring truth that the modern era has been one where the dollar has been the reserve currency for the world, and the strength of the American market has been critical to the strength of the American nation, our communities, and our economy. Frankly, to put that at risk over short-term political differences is reckless indeed.

What we know is we will wake up this coming Friday with about \$30 billion in the Federal Government's account, according to Treasury Secretary Lew. What we don't know is how long it will last. The moment we can't pay one of our bills, we will default. That is what is known as X date. The government will still collect revenue, but it won't be enough to keep pace with our daily bills.

Over the last year, the government collected \$7.5 billion a day and spent an average of \$9.7 billion a day. That means we come up about \$2.2 billion short on our bills every day if we are not borrowing enough to make up the difference.

Analysts at the Bipartisan Policy Center suggest that we will run out of cash—hitting the X date—roughly on October 22. To be clear, part of why we don't know exactly what date this would occur is because money flows into the Federal Treasury at uneven rates, and it flows out at uneven rates.

Let's look at a few of the bills that are about to come due in the next few weeks. On October 23, \$12 billion in Social Security benefits are due; on Octo-

ber 28, \$3 billion in Federal salaries would go unpaid. On October 30, \$2 billion in Medicaid payments are due; on October 31, \$6 billion in interest payments on our sovereign debt are due; on November 1, \$58 billion in Medicare, Social Security, and SSI payments, as well as veterans' benefits and military pay.

Those are just the major bills. There are thousands, even millions, of smaller payments that are due from every agency and entity of the Federal Government that go up and down day in and day out and where our failure to pay in a timely fashion, while technically not defaulting on our sovereign debt, would put into question our ability and willingness as a government to pay our bills when due.

With what we have left, we will not be able to pay them all, and we will be in violation of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, which says that the debt of the United States of America shall not be questioned.

If we have not raised the debt ceiling by this Thursday, we are likely to see disturbing losses in global markets. We have already started to see them as uncertainty takes over and volatility begins to spread. Investors are already pulling money out of our T-bills. If 2011 is an indication, stock prices will soon begin to drop in the absence of some progress toward a resolution.

Deutsche Bank, one of the world's most prominent investment banks, predicted the S&P 500 index will fall by a staggering 45 percent if we default. We heard loudly and clearly when we met with the credit ratings agencies after the 2011 incident that they would almost certainly downgrade the credit rating of the United States, which would reduce demand for Treasuries, particularly among investment funds that are required to hold a large number of AAA-rated securities.

With the Nation pressed against its debt ceiling and future interest payments uncertain, investors will be hesitant to buy more T-bills. The toxicity of U.S. debt may spread to Treasury notes and bonds, and investors will almost certainly demand higher yields, which will cost our country significantly more over time. This is exactly what happened in 2011 when we flirted with default.

Right now, the dollar is the world's reserve currency. Instead of keeping their money in cash, other nations buy our debt in order to get interest without risk. America has been a great investment. A default would cause other nations to sell our debt and then sell our dollars, weakening our dollars against foreign currencies, and raising the costs on every single good imported into the United States.

If Treasury interest rates go up just 1 percentage point, it would add over \$1 trillion in the next decade to our debt service cost. Anything we saved be-

cause of sequestration would be gone, and there is no reason to think that default would cause interest rates to go up by one single point. It could add \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion to our debt over the next decade. This affects everyone in our community and our country from large to small, from companies to communities to families. When Treasury interest rates go up, your interest rates go up. Mortgage rates, auto loans, student loans, business loans—they all go up, and they would go up fast. Default would make it harder for all of us to use credit responsibly. As consumers buy less, business profits would fall, GDP would fall, and the Nation once again would enter a recession. Defaulting on our debt would be an unimaginable drag on the economic health of our country, our community, and families. We cannot let it happen.

Mr. President, I see my colleague Senator MIKULSKI has joined me on the floor. If I might, with her forbearance, I will take a few minutes to review a few points here, and then I will yield to her.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am happy to yield and have the Senator from Delaware continue. He is the newest member of the Appropriations Committee. He has really articulated something everybody needs to understand. I am happy to wait my turn.

Mr. COONS. In conclusion, I will briefly touch on our options. We have all heard on this floor Senators suggest that default is really not that big a deal, that we are not really going to default, that there are other ways around this, and that we need not be scared into making some hurried deal. At the end of the day, several Senators have accused the President of fearmongering and have accused my party of suggesting that default is a major threat to our country and our economy when, in fact, it is not.

Let me briefly touch on the options that have been discussed by other Senators and, frankly, to my surprise. First, some have suggested we can pay our bills not when they are due but when we have the money—sort of on a first-come, first-serve payment approach. Let's say we ran out of money, as I suggested, on the 20th of this month and could not pay our bills on the 21st. By the 23rd we would have enough money so we would pay the bills from the 21st, late, but go delinquent on the bills for the 22nd and 23rd, and so on. This is crazy. Payments would be delinquent and the United States would fall behind on its debt.

This option would only make our situation worse. We would keep adding over \$2 billion in debt every single day while going delinquent on our bills to Americans.

The second way forward. Some have suggested we prioritize certain bills

but ignore others. The Treasury Department would continue to make payments on our sovereign debt so the Chinese would get paid, but they would avoid or default on lots and lots of other obligations. Which payments would we choose in this body not to make? Social Security? Medicare? Military salaries? Payments for cancer research? Veterans' benefits? Food inspectors? Air traffic controllers? Who goes first and who would we possibly choose? These are the ludicrous choices that have been sent to us by the other Chamber as they have attempted to fund the government in piecemeal slices in the past week.

The Treasury Department makes 100 million individual payments per month, making this option a logistical nightmare. If we prioritize our payments, it is not a question of if we go into recession, it would be a question of when. We would be taking \$2.2 billion out of the economy a day—4 percent of our GDP out of our Nation's economy on an annualized basis. This would push us back into recession, we would still be defaulting on our obligations, and the markets and the credit rating agencies would know it.

The other thing that has been suggested is to work around the debt ceiling. There are a whole lot of creative but legally questionable ideas: The minting of a \$1 trillion coin, avoiding the 14th Amendment, a fire sale of U.S. assets, superpremium Treasuries. Each has pros and cons that I won't go into, but they would face legal scrutiny and would radically increase uncertainty in the market.

There is no better option for us going forward than to reopen the government, pay our national debt on time, raise the debt ceiling, and honor our obligations as a country. That is the fourth and only good option: pay our bills, to prevent default, to put a floor under our economy, to stop these games, and to stop suggesting that there is any way out of this other than doing our jobs, preserving the AAA credit rating of this country, and making this country worthy of global respect again.

In conclusion, I can't believe that Members in this Chamber, who had the chance to avoid default, on Saturday voted in a way that suggested they chose not to. Not only did it rattle me, it rattled the markets. The idea that a sovereign government would have the ability to pay its debts but actively chose not to is unprecedented.

We cannot allow that to happen. We cannot allow this country to become a bad investment. We will not become a deadbeat nation. We need to pay our bills, do the right thing, and avoid default. We need to stop playing games and do right by the American people.

With that, I yield the floor and look forward to the comments from the senior Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I have permission to speak for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, there is a misguided myth out there—not all myths are misguided, but this myth is—by those who believe that the government shutdown is actually saving us money. I am not going to go into all those details about why that is not true, but I can tell everybody one area where government shutdown is absolutely being negatively impacted in protecting the taxpayer dollar and fulfilling the mission of the agency—particularly in Social Security, Medicare, veterans' benefits, and some others.

The Presiding Officer was the attorney general and the U.S. attorney of the Ocean State, Rhode Island, so he knows about scammers and schemers and that where there is need, there is greed. Where there are large government programs, they are open to waste and particularly to fraud.

I have been an adamant opponent of fraud, and often that is dismissed with comments such as: Oh, everybody says you are against fraud. But what are we doing about it?

Let me say this: As the chairperson of the Appropriations Committee, I was insistent that at every one of my hearings there be an inspector general testifying. I have an inspector general who advises us appropriators, who actually put money in the Federal checkbook, about how we can stop fraud in our own government. I am the first chairman of that committee ever to institute that process where we take the watchdogs of our Federal spending very seriously.

The watchdogs who protect taxpayers' funds are known as inspectors general. They are independently appointed, independently confirmed, and independently do their job. Look at the inspector general for the IRS who brought a national scandal to our attention.

But guess what. In this shutdown the ability of inspectors general to root out fraud and abuse has been severely compromised. We are not catching criminals who are trying to get a quick buck off the back of taxpayers.

I will give an example: The Social Security administration has furloughed 250 investigators and auditors in the Office of the Inspector General. This is crippling the inspector general's ability to investigate allegations of fraud and to detect improper payments in Social Security.

Just recently headlines have made the news about fraud in West Virginia field offices in Social Security where judges and others who were administering the program—administrative judges—were taking kickbacks.

Thanks to law enforcement, and the inspector general, we grabbed that.

There were actually people in Federal prisons who used the Internet and created phony identities to get both taxpayer refunds and also Social Security checks. Thanks to inspectors general being on the job, we were able to nip that in the bud.

Each year the Social Security inspector general receives 135,000 allegations of fraud and abuse. Last year the inspector general at the Social Security Administration saved the program \$500 million—a half billion dollars was saved in fraud at the Social Security Administration. But instead of pinning medals on people, we have furloughed them. They are sitting at home waiting and itching to be back on the job because they are so proud of what they do.

They believe that Social Security is a sacred trust, and anybody who tries to scheme or scam the system, they are going to come after.

During the normal operations, the Social Security inspector general saves \$9 for every \$1 spent in oversight.

Let's look at some of the other agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture. Every minute of this shutdown taxpayer dollars are being lost to fraud. When we look at the Department of Agriculture, we see that last year their inspector general investigated 331 possible frauds. They conducted 76 audits. Guess what it resulted in: 800 indictments resulting from people trying to scam various aspects of the Department of Agriculture, including food stamp fraud. Of the 800 indictments, they got 538 convictions. Guess what. They saved our Federal Government \$1.5 billion. I said \$1.5 billion, 800 indictments, and 540 convictions.

The Office of the Inspector General at the Department of Agriculture is on furlough. A minimum number of investigators are on the job. All of the Department of Agriculture inspector general audit staff is furloughed. That is not a wise use of the taxpayer dollars.

Let's go to the VA. The VA Inspector General's Office has furloughed 70 percent of its staff. The VA operates the largest integrated hospital system in the country, including 152 hospitals and 1,000 clinics. It also operates a mortgage program and an educational voucher program. It operates a disability claims and survivor benefit program. Their inspector general routinely audits this complex system. What do they look for? Possible criminal activity. They look for fraud. They make sure there is no misconduct by senior VA officials, and they are doing their job, but they have been furloughed.

We also have the General Services Administration, which is essentially the real estate arm of the Federal Government. It plays a crucial role. Guess what. Last year they handled 450 cases.

They got 3,000 hotline complaints about possible fraud. Their staff is on furlough. So they are not looking out for fraud in real estate, automobile leasing, technology, gaming the system, and furniture. Their cases range from bribery to embezzlement, to kick-back schemes. Most—99 percent—of our GSA employees are honest. So are our contractors. But guess what. In just 6 months alone, from October 2012 to March of 2013, they were able to crack down and recover over \$100 million in schemes and scams.

Look at what I have outlined already: a couple billion dollars, including Social Security, Agriculture, GSA. They are on the job.

I could go to agency after agency. Guess what. The very agency that involves us and advises us is the Government Accountability Office. That is Congress's watchdog. That is where we ask for studies on how we can do a better job and where they identify programs that are dated, duplicative or dysfunctional—dated, duplicative or dysfunctional. If they are dated, goodbye to them. If they are dysfunctional, reform or goodbye. Dysfunctional—dated, dysfunctional, and duplicative, that is our mantra on the Appropriations Committee. We are the guardians of the purse, but we need our tool. The Government Accountability Office, which we rely on, has furloughed 98 percent of its staff.

I could elaborate on agency after agency, but what I wish to show is just this: The consequences of shutdown are affecting people. If they are not on the job, they are not doing the job.

The job of our inspectors general offices—they are independent. They are supposed to come with incredible fiscal background. They are investigators. They are auditors. They are people who have to know how to find a problem, see if it is criminal or civil, whether we can get our money back, so we can make sure it doesn't happen again. Those people want to work. They love their job. It is a calling to them, and we need to call them and say: You are back to work.

So let's reopen government. Let's find a way. Let's fund government at a level that makes sure it can function the way it should. Let's also pay our debts. I do not want our T-bills to become junk bonds. I do not want our T-bills to be so shaky in terms of our ability to pay them back that they arrive at junk bond status. So let's get rid of junk politics and junk talking points. Let's get those clunkers off the road. Let's get America rolling again, pay our bills, honor our T-bills. Let's get government working and let America be America again.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ANDREA R. WOOD TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

NOMINATION OF MADELINE HUGHES HAIKALA TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Andrea R. Wood, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, and Madeline Hughes Haikala, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I know it is several minutes past 5. I doubt very much if we will use the 30 minutes. We will probably be able to yield back time so the vote can be at 5:30, although I am not making that request at this point.

Listening to the distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Maryland, I had to agree with everything she was saying. This is the fourteenth day of the government shutdown, and by refusing to pass a clean continuing resolution to fund the operations of the Federal government, Republicans continue to threaten the critical functioning of all three branches of government.

With this ongoing shutdown of the entire Federal government, a handful of ideologues in the House of Representatives are holding the entire judicial system hostage and this threatens our entire democracy.

One critical problem is that we have more than 90 judicial vacancies, including 39 that have been designated as emergency vacancies due to high case-loads by the nonpartisan Administrative Office of the Courts.

While we will vote to confirm two additional judges today, we are moving far too slowly and are not keeping pace with the urgent needs of our Federal judiciary. We must do better.

Both of the district court nominees we are voting on today have been nominated to fill vacancies that were named judicial emergencies by the nonpartisan Administrative Office of the Courts. Andrea Wood is nominated to a judicial emergency vacancy in the U.S. District Court for the Northern

District of Illinois. Since 2004, Ms. Wood has served in the Division of Enforcement of the Securities and Exchange Commission, currently as a senior trial counsel and previously as a senior attorney. Before joining the SEC, she spent 5 years in private practice as an associate at Kirkland & Ellis LLP. Following law school, Ms. Wood served as a law clerk for Judge Diane P. Wood of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Ms. Wood earned her B.A., with honors, from the University of Chicago, and her J.D. from Yale Law School, where she served as articles editor of the Yale Law Journal. She has the bipartisan support of her home State Senators, Senator DURBIN and Senator KIRK. Her nomination was approved by the Judiciary Committee by voice vote with no opposition to her confirmation expressed more than 2 months ago.

Madeline Haikala is nominated to a judicial emergency vacancy in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, where she has served as a magistrate judge since 2012. Prior to her appointment, she worked at the Birmingham law firm of Lightfoot, Franklin, & White for 22 years, first as an associate and subsequently as a partner. In addition, Judge Haikala has taught for approximately 7 years as an adjunct professor at the Cumberland School of Law.

The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary unanimously rated Judge Haikala well qualified to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, its highest rating. Judge Haikala also has the strong support of both of her Republican home State Senators, Senator SHELBY and Senator SESSIONS. Like the other nomination we are voting on today, Judge Haikala's nomination was approved by the Judiciary Committee by voice vote with no opposition to her confirmation expressed more than 2 months ago.

While I am pleased that we are finally getting to vote on these nominees, there remain far too many judicial vacancies. Because of the government shutdown, we have been unable to hold hearings, process, and approve nominees in the Judiciary Committee for the last two weeks. It does our country a serious injustice when we fail to provide our Federal courts with the resources it needs. Let us end this shutdown now so we can do what we were elected to do and carry out business on behalf of the American people.

Let me tell my colleagues another thing that has happened. This afternoon, I got a call from the chief judge of the District of Vermont, the Federal district court. She wanted me to know they are going to run out of funds on Thursday. She is very worried about the growing opiate crisis in Vermont. If the courts run out of money, they are not going to be able to monitor and

test those awaiting trials in serious drug trafficking cases.

Judge Reiss made it very clear that we are going to hear this from courts all over the country. We forget there are things our courts have to do and should do to keep the Presiding Officer safer and me safer, as well as everybody else. But we are saying, sorry, we are having this little political snit and we are not going to give you the money.

I have always been proud of being a member of the Vermont bar. I have been proud of that membership during the time I was in private practice and during the time I was a prosecutor, but throughout it all, we always relied on the courts to do their work. We expected that if after *Gideon v. Wainwright* it was necessary to appoint counsel for a criminal defendant, the counsel would be there. We expected that if one had a case they wanted heard, there would be a court that could hear it. That is not going to happen. We are going to have criminal cases that are going to get backed up because we don't have the personnel there, and behind those criminal cases are going to be people—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—who are going to have legitimate civil cases that they need to bring to court to be resolved and they are not going to be heard for years and years and years.

Some of the handful of ideologues who are holding up our ability to fund the government go down and have a disturbing and disgraceful rally on the Mall, where they ridicule the President of the United States. They distort their own roles in how they closed down the government, and then they try to use brave veterans as pawns, do they know what they are doing to the image of the United States?

I see the distinguished Senator from Illinois on the floor. One of these judges is from his state. I don't know if he wishes to speak.

I would say once more, all Americans who rely on our court and our judicial system know our system of justice is facing a great danger not because of anything the courts have done but because of a small group of ideologues in the House of Representatives who are holding this budget hostage.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent to yield back all remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Hearing no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Andrea R. Wood, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Madeline Hughes Haikala, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama?

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 217 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Ayotte	Flake	Murkowski
Baldwin	Franken	Murphy
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Murray
Baucus	Grassley	Nelson
Begich	Hagan	Paul
Bennet	Harkin	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Pryor
Blunt	Heinrich	Reed
Boozman	Heitkamp	Reid
Boxer	Heller	Risch
Brown	Hirono	Roberts
Cantwell	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Cardin	Johanns	Sanders
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Schumer
Chambliss	Kaine	Scott
Chiesa	King	Sessions
Coats	Kirk	Shaheen
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shelby
Collins	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Corker	Lee	Thune
Cornyn	Levin	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Cruz	Markey	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Mikulski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—10

Alexander	Inhofe	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Vitter
Coburn	McCaskill	
Graham	Moran	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Vermont.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we know this has been a difficult time for everyone, and Senator McCONNELL and I have been working diligently over the last few days trying to arrive at the culmination of efforts that have been ongoing for quite some time now. We have made tremendous progress. We are not there yet, but tremendous progress, and everyone just needs to be patient.

We will have no more votes tonight. We hope, with good fortune and the support of all of you, recognizing how hard this is for everybody, that perhaps tomorrow will be a bright day. We are not there yet, but we hope we will be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if I may echo the remarks of the majority leader, we had a good day yesterday. We had another good day today. I think it is safe to say we have made substantial progress, and we look forward to making more progress in the near future.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would just close by saying this: We are doing our best to make everybody happy, but everyone knows we are not going to be able to do that. So, everybody understand that we are doing the very best

we can with all of the frailties we have as people and legislators.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1306

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1306, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to improve environmental literacy to better prepare students for postsecondary education and careers, and for other purposes.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2013

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes

its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, October 15, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, Senators be permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:11 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 15, 2013, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 14, 2013:

THE JUDICIARY

ANDREA R. WOOD, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

MADELINE HUGHES HAIKALA, OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, October 14, 2013

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 14, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

OUR SACRED DUTY IS TO GOVERN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in Luke 12:48, Jesus said:

From everyone who has been given much, much will be demanded; and from the one who has been entrusted with much, much more will be asked.

The Congress and the President have been entrusted with much, namely, the responsibility to govern this country. The American people rightly expect us, regardless of party affiliation, to come together, especially during times of crisis, and find ways to get things done. They are understandably fed up with the current dysfunction, and I am, too.

Each side thinks it's winning, but, in reality, the country and the American people are losing. Senate Chaplain Barry Black says there is a level of insanity involved in the current government shutdown. Asked what it would take to end the current impasse, the former Navy chaplain said, "It's going to take humility." Wise words. Proverbs 16:18 says:

Pride goes before destruction, a haughty spirit before a fall.

There is too much pride poisoning this debate. The American people should be the winner, not one party or the other, not the administration or the Congress. Shortsighted political victories aimed at capturing the latest headline in a 24-hour news cycle will not stand the test of time, nor will they be viewed well through the lens of history, especially if, on our watch, the trust that must exist between elected officials and the electorate is frayed beyond repair.

For those of us who think ObamaCare is a disaster—and that is a growing number of people in our country—its future will not be decided by the shutting or opening of the government. In fact, the current failings of the system, including the widespread glitches plaguing the Web site, are not getting the news coverage they should because the story has become the shutdown. The public debate surrounding ObamaCare, which will undoubtedly be at the forefront in heading into the midterm elections, will play second fiddle until the government is once again operational.

It also bears mentioning that, while important, ObamaCare must be placed in a larger context of the exploding national debt and deficit and unsustainable spending and entitlement programs set against the backdrop of a public discourse bereft of civility. Only through enacting reforms based on the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles recommendations will we ever solve the drivers of our deficits. We have put these tough but important reforms off for far too long.

To my colleagues in the Congress and to President Obama who think they are "winning" at this particular moment, we would do well to remember the words of Napoleon Bonaparte in speaking of the changing nature of public opinion. Napoleon said:

The crowd which follows me with adulation would run with the same eagerness were I marching to the guillotine.

I return again to the sentiments of Scripture: We have been given a great trust, and it is demanded of us to come together to solve these problems. It is time to show some humility. It is time to govern. Let's get the government back open, ensure we don't default on our debt, and then commit ourselves to curbing unsustainable entitlement spending.

DAY NUMBER 14 OF THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, day No. 14.

Mr. Speaker, today is the 14th day of the government shutdown, and we are 1 day closer to defaulting on our debt. Mr. Speaker, we've never not paid our bills as Americans—as Americans, we always pay on time—but we are 1 day closer to a manufactured crisis. We've got to stop this.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for leadership. Enough with the games, enough with the name-calling, and enough with the finger-pointing. We have to come together as Democrats and Republicans and put the country first.

Mr. Speaker, you are the Speaker of this House. This House has both Democrats and Republicans, and you need to lead us. It's that time. I will make a quick suggestion. Here is what you can do in three easy steps:

Step No. 1, open the government;

Step No. 2, let us pay our bills; and

Step No. 3, let's negotiate. Let's come together as Democrats and Republicans and negotiate a real budget that starts to address our debt. Let's make sure we don't leave our children and grandchildren a mountain of debt. Let's do what our parents and grandparents always did, which was to leave the country better off for the next generation.

That is what it takes—leadership. Mr. Speaker, now is the time for that leadership. You are the Speaker of this House, and we need you to lead us as Democrats and Republicans. America is watching, and we need to put the people's interests first.

THE DEBT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the debt limit exists for a simple reason: to assure that public debt isn't recklessly piled up without Congress periodically acknowledging it and addressing the spending patterns that are causing it. If a debt limit increase is supposed to be automatic, as the President suggests, then there is really no purpose to it.

A new dimension has now appeared in this discussion. Unlike every one of his

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

predecessors, this President has vowed that unless Congress unconditionally raises the debt limit, the United States will default on its sovereign debt.

But a failure to raise the debt limit would not, by itself, cause the Nation to default. The Government Accountability Office has consistently held that the Treasury Secretary has “the authority to choose the order in which to pay obligations of the United States” to protect the Nation’s credit. Such authority is inherent in the 1789 act that established the Treasury Department and entrusted it with “the management of the revenue” and the “support of the public credit.” The affirmative duty of the Treasury Department to do so is underscored by the 14th Amendment.

Our revenues are more than 10 times our debt payments, so paying the debt first to prevent a sovereign default is well within the financial ability of the Federal Government—and indeed, it is a fiscal imperative.

Now, earlier this year, the House passed H.R. 807, which not only explicitly requires the payment of the national debt in the case of an impasse over the debt limit, but even allows the President to exceed the debt limit, itself, in order to protect the Nation’s credit. That measure languishes in the Senate under the threat of a Presidential veto.

Protecting the sovereign credit by prioritizing payments would mean delaying paying other bills. That is also untenable, unthinkable, and something much to be avoided, but it would not imperil the Nation’s sovereign credit. Only the President can do that.

The House leadership met with the President last week and offered to extend the debt limit until November 22 with no strings attached. The President refused. Senate Republicans offered a 6-month extension, but the Senate Democratic leader refused.

What the President threatens to do would be catastrophic and unprecedented. The full faith and credit of the United States is what gives markets the confidence to loan money to the Federal Government. Even a threat of default—exactly the kind the President is now making—could have dire consequences to a Nation that now owes more than its entire economy produces in a year.

So where do we go from here?

Republicans have miscalculated on two key assumptions: first, that the Democrats would negotiate the issues that divide our country—they have not; and second, that Democrats would seek to minimize the suffering caused by the impasse—they have not.

Given the ruthless and vindictive way the shutdown has been handled, I now believe that this President would willfully act to destroy the full faith and credit of the United States unless the Congress acquiesces to all of his de-

mands—at least as long as he sees political advantage in doing so.

If the Republicans acquiesce, the immediate crisis will quickly vanish, credit markets will calm, and public life will return to other matters. But a fundamental element of our Constitution will have been destroyed: the power of the purse will have shifted from the representatives of the people to the Executive. The executive bureaucracies will be freed to churn out ever more outlandish regulations with no effective congressional review or check through the purse. A perilous era will have begun in which the President sets spending levels and vetoes any bill falling short of his demands. Whenever a deadline approaches, one House can simply refuse to negotiate with the other until Congress is faced with a Hobson’s choice of a shutdown or a default. The Nation’s spending will again dangerously accelerate, the deficit will rapidly widen, and the economic prosperity of the Nation will continue to slowly bleed away.

This impasse may have started as a dispute over a collapsing health program, but it has now taken on the dimensions of a constitutional crisis. Yesterday, in Washington, a group of America’s veterans rose up to take a stand against these unconstitutional usurpations. I believe the salvation of our Nation now ultimately depends on the American people joining them.

HONORING 12 MEMBERS OF THE 1ST SQUAD, 2ND PLATOON, HOTEL COMPANY OF THE 26TH MARINE REGIMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VELA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor 12 members of the 1st Squad, 2nd Platoon, Hotel Company of the 26th Marine Regiment. These brave men made an important contribution to the war effort in Vietnam, but their efforts could not be honored at the time without exposing ongoing intelligence operations. Like so many of our Nation’s heroes, they have not received the recognition they deserve, and I am here today to share with my colleagues in Congress and our entire Nation the details of an incident that helped change the way the Vietnam war was fought.

On May 29, 1967, at the end of Operation Hickory and the beginning of Operation Prairie IV, the 1st Squad, under Sergeant Thomas Gonzalez, was on a reconnaissance patrol when they recovered a spent Russian SA-2 surface-to-air missile inside the demilitarized zone which divided North and South Vietnam. While Russian involvement in the Vietnam war was widely suspected, discovery of the SA-2 was a major find, and the command and control mechanism of the missile was

transported to Washington, D.C., for analysis.

Due to the ongoing cold war and heightened political sensitivities regarding Russian involvement in the war, public disclosure of the incident was withheld.

While the unit was never fully recognized for its accomplishment, the intelligence it collected had a direct impact on combat. Prior to discovery of the missile, U.S. aviators flying B-52 bombers to attack Vietnam struggled as enemy forces became more proficient at targeting and shooting American aircraft. This forced Americans to limit their missions to areas further south; and, as the North Vietnamese Army continued to move their surface-to-air missile launch sites south into the DMZ, B-52 aircraft were forced to fly even further south, limiting the effectiveness of their missions to provide support to troops engaged in ground combat.

As a result of the recovery of the SA-2 missile, B-52 bomber crews had a better understanding of the threat, and they used the intelligence collected by the 1st Squad to alter their tactics. Changing the strategy of the B-52 bomb strikes allowed the aircraft to provide better combat support to marines and other ground troops and ultimately saved countless lives.

Forty-six years later, it is time for our Nation to recognize these American heroes. Today, let us honor these men: Sergeant Thomas Gonzalez, Corporal Gerald D. Eggers, Private First Class Ronald W. Blaine, Private First Class Charles L. Melton, Private First Class Albino Martinez, Private First Class Anthony Astuccio, Private First Class Richard P. Light, Private First Class Michael McCombs, Private First Class Hector L. R. Rodriguez, Private First Class Lloyd Parker, Private First Class Thomas J. Lehner, and Navy Corpsman Mel Overmyer.

These young men, like so many of their generation, answered our Nation’s call to service. They risked their lives in defense of their comrades in arms and our Nation. We owe them a great debt of gratitude for all that they have done, and I stand here before Congress in recognition of their accomplishment and their sacrifice.

THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE MUST DISABUSE ITSELF OF THE NAME “REDSKINS”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVEGA. Mr. Speaker, I submit to my colleagues and some 181 million sports fans all over America who love the game of football just as much as I do, having played football for 4 years in high school, again and again, Mr. Speaker, this issue will not

go away; and with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I call upon the 32 football club owners of the National Football League and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell to get rid of this derogatory word or racial slur, "redskin," which currently describes the Washington football franchise.

Mr. Speaker, the National Football League cannot just casually pass the responsibility to Mr. Dan Snyder, owner of the Washington team. The Washington football franchise is about a \$1.3 billion business, rated third in the NFL, but the NFL is also a beneficiary and, I'm sure, gets a fair percentage of the proceeds from television broadcasts and concessions for selling clothing and sports souvenirs by these 32 club owners.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank President Barack Obama for weighing in on this issue just 2 weeks ago, and I hope NFL Commissioner Goodell will seriously pursue this matter. If Commissioner Goodell feels that if we are offending one person that we should listen, then listen to the leaders of the National Congress of American Indians, the oldest and the largest Native American organization, which represents the vast majority of some 5.2 million Native American Indians today. And when I say "majority," Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about 2.6 million Native Americans who do have an issue to pull with the NFL using this racial and derogatory slur's name.

I also want to thank Mr. Ray Halbritter, leader of the Oneida Indian Nation, for taking the initiative to get this to the American people so that they will better understand and appreciate why this word is so offensive to the Native American community.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is time for the NFL commissioner, Roger Goodell, and the NFL to do the right thing. Change the name "Redskins." It is a racial slur and a derogatory term for the American Indians.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of wisdom, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Prior to the Great Compromise, Benjamin Franklin addressed the Constitutional Convention:

We indeed seem to feel our own want of political wisdom since we have been running about in search of it. In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, have we now forgotten our powerful friend?

Lord, You are the powerful friend referred to by Franklin, and we turn again to You to ask that Your wisdom might break through the political dark of these days.

Bless the Members of the people's House and all of Congress with the insight and foresight to construct a future of security in our Nation's politics, economy, and society. May they, as You, be especially mindful of those who are poor and without power.

May all that is done today be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

STAND DOWN ON INDIVIDUAL MANDATE

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker:

Consumers will be able to go online. They will be able to get a determination of what tax subsidies they are eligible for; they will be able to see premium net of subsidy; and they will be able to sign up.

Those were the words spoken by the head of the Office of Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight 3 weeks ago at a committee hearing of Energy and Commerce. I had asked for a yes or no answer to the question: Will the exchanges be ready on October 1? You heard his answer.

In The New York Times this weekend, a very insightful article: "From the Start, Signs of Trouble at the Health Portal." The exchanges have been called excruciatingly embarrassing by no less than the President's press secretary for his first term. He went on to say:

I hope some people are fired, those people who were supposed to be able to make this work.

The blame-shifting between contractors and agency officials is just beginning. Further quoting from the article in The New York Times this weekend:

"These are not glitches," said an insurance executive who has participated in many conference calls on the Federal exchange.

The extent of the problems is pretty enormous. At the end of our calls, people say, "It is awful, just awful."

But here is the deal: everyone is required to sign up for this enormously embarrassing glitch that has been foisted upon us by the executive branch. It is time for us to stand down on the individual mandate.

END THE NIGHTMARE

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, the worst-kept secret in Washington, D.C., is there is a majority in the House of Representatives to reopen the government today, to reach that grand compromise that Father Conroy spoke about a few minutes ago.

Over 30 House Republicans have said that they would join Democrats to pass a clean CR, which the President has said he would sign on the spot. It has already cleared the Senate, and we could end the damage that is being inflicted on this country every passing day.

Day 14 is where we are today. Our National Guard, our veterans, Meals on Wheels—the list goes on and on—the National Institutes of Health, they are being crippled in this shutdown; and the power is here in this Chamber to end it by signing a discharge petition which was filed on Saturday morning.

If the Speaker won't bring the bill to the floor, then the Members should do it. We are elected to represent the people of our district, not to represent the leaders of our caucus.

End the shutdown. Sign the discharge petition. End the nightmare that this country is going through.

TIME FOR BIPARTISAN SOLUTIONS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in 1984, then-Senator JOE BIDEN had to make a choice about whether to support a Federal debt limit increase. He said:

I must express my protest against continually increasing the debt without taking positive steps to slow its growth.

Senator BIDEN voted not to raise the debt ceiling.

Today, my philosophy on raising the debt ceiling is very similar to Vice President BIDEN's—we can't keep upping our credit limit without taking

steps to get our future debt under control.

Fourteen days into this Federal Government shutdown and mere days away from exhausting government's \$16.7 trillion credit limit, the time for bipartisan solutions is now.

The United States should always pay its bills, but the President and Members of Congress are responsible to take steps to reduce those bills for the future. Both parties need to be committed to this responsible reality.

PRESIDENT FAILS TO ADDRESS ISSUES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on January 14 of this year, the President spoke at a press conference, saying:

I think, if you look at the history, getting votes for the debt ceiling is always difficult, and budgets in this town are always difficult.

The Federal Government has been shut down for 2 weeks. The President of the United States has a job, and it is to govern. Because of his lack of leadership, American families are experiencing smaller paychecks, limited or no access to government services, and tremendous uncertainty surrounding their futures.

Although I am glad the President did finally engage in partial negotiations with House Republicans, I find it very disappointing that it took 10 days to do so, especially seeing as he believed our current challenges to be so "difficult."

Our country is headed down a path of insolvency, destroying jobs. Over the coming days, it is my hope the President will take his responsibilities of negotiation seriously and work with House Republicans to reduce spending and reopen the government's doors.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 14, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 14, 2013 at 1:25 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 812.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 5 p.m.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION, AND INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 80) making continuing appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) has 10½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) has 9½ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a valued member of our subcommittee and an advocate for Indian issues.

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear—everyone in this body wants to end this government shutdown. We are all aware of the significant impacts the shutdown is having around the country; and I am pleased that, today, both sides have finally come to the table, and hopefully we will reach a compromise here in the next day or so. Today, we are here to consider a solution that aims to ease the urgent and substantial impacts to Indian Country.

House Joint Resolution 80, the American Indian and Alaska Native Health, Education, and Safety Act, provides immediate funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Indian Education, and Indian Health Services. As a member of the House Appropriations Interior and the Environment Subcommittee, I am well aware that Indian Country was already experiencing significant challenges before the shutdown as it adjusted to reduced spending levels. Now, with the Federal Government shutdown, Native American tribes across the Nation are facing even more uncertainty. These tribes

are now being confronted with different decisions about which services they can continue to provide without government resources. Just a few examples: tribal programs for home health care for the elderly and disabled, bus service for rural areas, and infrastructure projects that were suspended indefinitely. I believe we must take action and reopen these critical government operations throughout Indian Country.

I am thankful that my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and the House Republican leadership share my belief. Specifically, I want to thank my good friend from Idaho, MIKE SIMPSON, for bringing this bill to the floor and for his terrific leadership as chairman of House Appropriations Interior and the Environment Subcommittee.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important bill on behalf of all Americans in Indian Country. Let's pass this bill and reach an agreement to get our entire government back to work for the American people.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, PETER DEFAZIO, the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this irresponsible, unnecessary, politically motivated government shutdown is unacceptable for all Americans, but it is particularly offensive to those in Indian Country.

The government's trust obligation to the tribes is not a discretionary act; it is a fiduciary responsibility. To assume that money associated with that fiduciary responsibility can be bartered or used as a political football is more than insulting.

It is another example here of tabloid legislating, ripping issues from the headlines and trying to legislate based on negative public reaction to just some part of the Republican government shutdown. It is kind of like a game of Whac-A-Mole, where an issue pops up and the far right pretends to care suddenly—Gee, we didn't know this would happen if we shut down the government—and they draft a continuing resolution to cover it—or their posteriors.

Now, where was all of this concern for the tribes when sequestration kicked in? Where is the compassion for the poverty faced by our first Americans every day, not just when it is politically expedient? Where has the compassion been to address the high rates of unemployment, educational challenges, access to resources, challenges tribal people face every day, challenges that have only been made worse by the Republican sequester?

This is so cynical. Not only does the temporary measure for tribes inadequately fund the few programs it identifies, picks, and chooses, but it neglects other critical programs inside

and outside the Department of the Interior.

What about the Office of the Special Trustee? We haven't done so well as trustees of the moneys of the Indian nations recently. We need the Office of the Special Trustee. Oh, it is closed.

What about the Bureau of Reclamation office that disburses settlements for Indian water rights? Closed.

How about the Native American Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program? Closed.

Tribal nutrition programs? Closed.

Even if this bill passed and became law, those would all still be closed. I guess their compassion only goes so far. There are many other things missing from this bill. I could go on and on.

Already, sequestration has disproportionately impacted Indian Country. We don't need to rub salt in the wound with this continuing resolution that provides only one-third of the funding for these nations.

The irresponsible tactics need to cease. We need to open up our government to the first Americans and all Americans. It is simple.

We offered unanimous consent requests last Saturday before the Republicans adjourned in a huff and went off for a couple of days while the government was shut down. Any one of those acceded to could have brought a vote on a 6-week continuation of government at the Republican levels of funding with sequestration. That is a concession on the part of Democrats. It is your budget, those lower numbers, the Ryan budget. You could have done that. You wouldn't do it. You changed the rules of the House so we couldn't bring it up as a privileged resolution, and then you pretend to care.

Come on, guys. You can do better than that.

Mr. SIMPSON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

So here we are, Mr. Speaker. We are 14 days into the government shutdown, the shutdown that has cost this country money, has created enormous anxiety on the part of the Federal workforce, the contract workforce, the entire country.

In fact, there was a meeting of all of the leaders of the world over in Asia, and we weren't there because of the government shutdown. The Chinese, of course, took advantage of it. Both the President and the Prime Minister were over at this meeting of world leaders, trying to suggest to them that it is time that the world became "de-Americanized"—I think that was their term—because we can't get our act together. We can't even fund our own government. We can't even decide whether or not we are going to pay off our debts on time.

And all of this, apparently, we are told, Mr. Speaker, was an idea that

came from the Ted Cruz Tea Party wing of the Republican majority to shut down the government until they could have their way on what they call "ObamaCare." Even though President Obama ran on the Affordable Care Act, which is its proper name, and was elected with 5 million more votes, still, they wanted to stop it, to gut it, to gut its principal provisions.

So here we are, 14 days into a government shutdown, which is really an embarrassment to the entire institution, but it certainly ought to be to the House majority. It is ironic with this particular bill because there are 579,000 uninsured American Indians and Alaska Natives, and they would get coverage under the Affordable Care Act. Nine out of 10 of them are likely to qualify for financial assistance either through tax credits or by purchasing coverage in the marketplace where you would get cost-sharing reductions, eliminate their out-of-pocket costs, or through an expansion of Medicaid if their States choose to do that. So the vast majority of them—undoubtedly, hundreds of thousands—would be better off if we were not only to not have shut down the government, but certainly by our making available to them the Affordable Care Act. So how ironic that here we are with a mini bill, suggesting that we will fund a small share of the Interior Department to take care of American Indians and Alaska Natives.

Obviously, we should be taking care of Native Americans—it should be our highest priority—and I know it has been for the chairman of the Interior and the Environment Appropriations Subcommittee, my good friend from Idaho, and our colleagues on that subcommittee, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COLE, a number of them. We have all agreed it ought to be a priority, but we also have a bill that needs to get passed. We have other agencies that need to be funded.

If we were to continue in this manner, we would get the Interior Department funded by Halloween. That is not the way to do business. In fact, this bill doesn't fund Native American education programs and the Department of Education.

It doesn't fund the law enforcement programs at the Department of Justice that carry out the Violence Against Women Act, which was a key component. Thanks to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the Violence Against Women Act that we passed makes sure that Native American women are protected.

It doesn't fund Native American social service programs at the Department of Health and Human Services. They don't get the child care and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families that they would otherwise get.

It doesn't fund Native American housing programs at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Al-

most 100 percent of HUD employees are furloughed.

It doesn't fund the Native American employment and training programs at the Department of Labor, the Native American environmental programs at the Environmental Protection Agency.

It doesn't fund the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, which oversees the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Indian Education.

It doesn't fund the Special Trustee for American Indians, which administers \$3.7 million in tribal funds and more than \$700 million in individual Indian accounts.

It doesn't fund the Office of Navajo-Hopi Relocation, which administers the relocation settlement activities that arose from land disputes between the Navajo and Hopi tribes.

It doesn't fund the Institute of American Indian Arts or the Native American water rights activities. It doesn't do what we need to do, which is to fund the Interior appropriations bill.

So I have to ask the majority, since this bill only funds three agencies which represent 0.7 percent of the domestic discretionary budget, what are we going to do with the other 99 percent of the domestic discretionary budget? What about our other Federal obligations to Native Americans? What about their housing and their childcare services and their legal protections? This bill doesn't take care of that. It still leaves 50,000 Interior Department employees still furloughed.

Even if this bill were to be enacted—which we all know it won't until the government opens—there is no money for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management for new offshore oil drilling permits.

There is no money for the Bureau of Land Management, which processes lease sales and permits for onshore oil and gas and coal and other mineral permits. They run the wild horse and burro adoption program. They award the timber sales. No money for that.

No money for the Fish & Wildlife Service so they can manage visitors to our national refuges. No money for hunting or fishing permits. What about the Forest Service?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this was well-intended, but I know that it is an attempted Band-Aid to hide the real problem, which is the government is shut down. We need to open it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

□ 1715

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 521 years ago, an explorer named Christopher Columbus sailed west from Europe in an attempt to find a new route to the East Indies. Instead, he landed in the Bahamas, and as the story goes, he named the local inhabitants "Indians."

I note the irony that today has been designated Columbus Day, and here we are debating a bill to reopen key parts of the government so the United States can honor the treaty obligations our forefathers made to the American Indians—the first Americans.

The bill before us today is a good thing because it gives us an opportunity to continue to highlight the poverty and other hardships that exist today in Indian Country as a result of the long, complicated, and difficult history of relations between the United States Government and more than 500 other sovereign nations that were here long before we were.

So while we recognize and honor Columbus for his impact on our own Nation's history, let us also recognize and honor the first Americans for their proud history and the sacrifices they made, and continue to make, for this great Nation.

That is why I would encourage everybody to vote for this bill. Frankly, I hope this bill isn't necessary. I hope that we can find a resolution to the differences that exist between Republicans and Democrats and that we can reopen all the government, as Mr. MORAN just stated is necessary. I agree with him fully. We need to get the government open again, and we need to address the issue of the debt ceiling.

It is heartening to know that leadership in the Senate, and hopefully in the House and the White House, is having some quality time together and that maybe we can come to a resolution before more dire things happen and we can get this government open, but I don't know that that is going to happen.

In the absence of not knowing that that is going to happen, wouldn't it be wise to have at least some of these bills that fund some key elements of our government ready to go in the Senate so that we can open some areas that I think have bipartisan agreement that need to be funded and need to continue?

I said in my opening statement Saturday that Indian issues have been bipartisan on our committee. They have been supported by both Republicans and Democrats whether it was under Mr. Dicks' leadership when he was chairman, Mr. MORAN's leadership when he was chairman, or under my leadership. It has been a bipartisan issue to try to meet our treaty obligations and the moral responsibilities we have to the first Americans—American Indians.

I want people in Indian Country to know that regardless of the vote on this resolution, whether people vote for it or against it, that bipartisanship will continue. We will continue to work together to try to make sure we address these critical needs in our Nation and our treaty and moral obligations we have.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 80 is postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1820

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION, AND INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 80 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Kirkpatrick moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 80 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table

and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the tribal leaders in my district join me in calling for a vote on a clean funding bill to restart our government.

Arizona's District One has 12 Native American tribes. These families are suffering, and our economy is taking a direct hit as a result of this irresponsible, unnecessary shutdown.

House leaders have wasted precious time in offering nothing but a daily trickle of piecemeal bills that are going nowhere. These partisan games and this lack of urgency show a reckless disregard for the people, communities, and economies hurt by this shutdown.

Today, as House leadership puts forth yet another piecemeal bill that will go nowhere, I would like to share some comments from my district's tribal leaders. These are in their own words. Navajo Nation President Ben Shelly said:

The current piecemeal approach House Republicans are using to fragment tribal communities from the rest of the country is insulting. Tribal communities, like the majority of Americans, want a comprehensive resolution.

Peterson Zah, the former Navajo Nation chairman and their first president said:

Tribal issues should not be used as political props in this shutdown. Our kids, families, and elders are all part of the large community, and we all suffer from a shutdown. We need the House to vote on a clean funding bill to reopen the entire government.

On the White Mountain Apache Nation, where I grew up, tribal chairman Ronnie Lupe said:

Head Start and Impact Aid are vitally important to the tribes, but we also need furloughed workers from BIA, Interior, and all other agencies allowed back on the job. Our tribal members need their paychecks, our small businesses need their customers, and our veterans need their benefits without any lapses.

And from the Hopi Tribe, Vice Chairman Herman Honanie said:

Piecemeal bills are empty gestures that have no chance of passing both Chambers and being signed into law. We need real action to reopen the entire government, or we will continue to lose important resources like those from the Violence Against Women Act that help protect women and families.

Mr. Speaker, if House leadership were genuinely concerned about our Native American tribes, then I suggest they listen to the tribes and allow a vote to reopen the government.

Congress should stop picking winners and losers and stop playing games that only prolong this shutdown.

House leadership should stop this shutdown right now. They should stop this shutdown tonight. Let's vote on a clean funding bill to restart our government and protect our economy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires that an amendment be germane to the bill under consideration.

As the Chair most recently ruled on October 11, 2013, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and, therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized on the point of order.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us fund the Federal Government? My motion to recommit would open the Federal Government entirely so that all our needs can be met.

Why are we only providing funding for Native Americans through the Interior Department? What about education and law enforcement programs for Native Americans? Are they somewhat less important?

Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to keep all the Federal Government open instead of just a tiny slice?

Why are the Republicans in favor of closing down the Federal Government and denying taxpayers the benefits they have already paid for? This makes absolutely no sense to people who have to work hard every day to make a living.

Mr. Speaker, if you rule this motion out of order, does that mean we will not have a chance to keep the entire Federal Government open today? That we will not have a chance to vote on the Senate continuing resolution?

Can the Chair please explain why we can't keep the entire Federal Government open today? Can the Chair please explain why we can't keep the entire Federal Government open tonight?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, on the question of the point of order—and I would like to have an explanation about this—why are these rules being interpreted in such a way as to prevent the United States Government from operating? What is the purpose of this rule? Where was it conceived? And why is it constantly being put forward as a way of stopping the Federal Government from acting?

Mr. Speaker, there is a world of hurt out there. All across this Nation people want government to work; they want the parks open; they want the National Indian Health Service operating; they want to make sure that Head Start is up and operating; that the medical services are available; that Homeland Security is functioning.

Mr. Speaker, what is the point of the point of order, other than to stop the Federal Government from working?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Idaho makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair most recently ruled on October 11, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds because such motion addresses a matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the underlying measure.

Therefore, the instructions propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 180, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

YEAS—216

Aderholt	Griffith (VA)	Poe (TX)
Amash	Grimm	Pompeo
Amodel	Guthrie	Posey
Bachus	Hall	Price (GA)
Barletta	Harper	Radel
Barr	Harris	Reed
Barton	Hartzler	Reichert
Benishek	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Bentivolio	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Rigell
Black	Hudson	Roby
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Jenkins	Rooney
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Calvert	Jones	Ross
Camp	Jordan	Rothfus
Campbell	Joyce	Royce
Cantor	Kelly (PA)	Runyan
Capito	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	King (NY)	Salmon
Cassidy	Kingston	Sanford
Chabot	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kline	Schock
Coble	Labrador	Schweikert
Coffman	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Cole	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Lance	Sessions
Collins (NY)	Lankford	Shimkus
Conaway	Latham	Shuster
Cook	Latta	Simpson
Cotton	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Cramer	Long	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Daines	Marino	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Massie	Stewart
Denham	McCarthy (CA)	Stivers
Dent	McCaul	Stockman
DeSantis	McClintock	Stutzman
DesJarlais	McHenry	Terry
Duffy	McKeon	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	McKinley	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	McMorris	Tiberi
Ellmers	Rodgers	Tipton
Farenthold	Meadows	Turner
Fincher	Meehan	Upton
Fitzpatrick	Messer	Wagner
Fleischmann	Mica	Walberg
Fleming	Miller (FL)	Walden
Flores	Miller (MI)	Walorski
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Weber (TX)
Fox	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Gardner	Neugebauer	Williams
Garrett	Nugent	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Nunes	Wittman
Gibson	Nunnelee	Wolf
Gingrey (GA)	Olson	Womack
Gohmert	Palazzo	Woodall
Goodlatte	Paulsen	Yoder
Gowdy	Pearce	Yoho
Granger	Perry	Young (AK)
Graves (GA)	Petri	Young (IN)
Graves (MO)	Pittenger	
Griffin (AR)	Pitts	

NAYS—180

Andrews	Capuano	Courtney
Barber	Cárdenas	Crowley
Barrow (GA)	Carney	Cuellar
Bass	Carson (IN)	Cummings
Beatty	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Becerra	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Bera (CA)	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Chu	DeGette
Bishop (NY)	Cicilline	Delaney
Blumenauer	Clarke	DeLauro
Bonamici	Cleaver	DeBene
Braley (IA)	Clyburn	Deutch
Brown (FL)	Cohen	Dingell
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	Doggett
Bustos	Conyers	Doyle
Butterfield	Cooper	Duckworth
Capps	Costa	Edwards

Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin

Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall

NOT VOTING—35

Bachmann
Brady (PA)
Bucshon
Clay
Culberson
Diaz-Balart
Fattah
Forbes
Gabbard
Gerlach
Gosar
Green, Gene

Gutiérrez
Hanna
Herrera Beutler
Kuster
Lummis
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Meng
Moran
Neal
Negrete McLeod

Noem
Pastor (AZ)
Richmond
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Valadao
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Westmoreland
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

□ 1854

Messrs. BUTTERFIELD, RUPPERSBERGER, and CONYERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. DUFFY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 160, not voting 38, as follows:

Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blueskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NY)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (OH)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

[Roll No. 548]

AYES—233

DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy

Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis

Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—38

Bachmann
Brady (PA)
Bucshon
Clay
Culberson
Diaz-Balart
Fattah
Forbes
Gabbard
Gerlach
Gosar
Green, Gene

Gutiérrez
Hanna
Herrera Beutler
Kuster
Lummis
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Meng
Moran
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem

Pastor (AZ)
Richmond
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Tipton
Valadao
Velázquez
Walberg
Wasserman
Schultz
Westmoreland
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

□ 1903

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for the following votes on October 14, 2013. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote 547, and “nay” rollcall vote 548, on passage of H.J. Res. 80, the American Indian and Alaska Native, Health, Education, and Safety Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “Making continuing appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, although we prefer—and would support—a

NOES—160

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps

Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clever
Clyburn

Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio

comprehensive, clean continuing resolution to end the government shutdown.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 6 of rule XVI, the amendment is not debatable.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 161, noes 228, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

AYES—161

Andrews	Frankel (FL)	Nadler
Barber	Fudge	Napolitano
Barrow (GA)	Gallego	O'Rourke
Bass	Garamendi	Owens
Beatty	Garcia	Pallone
Becerra	Grayson	Payne
Bera (CA)	Green, Al	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Peters (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Peters (MI)
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Peterson
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Pocan
Brooks (AL)	Himes	Polis
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Holt	Quigley
Bustos	Honda	Rahall
Butterfield	Horsford	Rangel
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Huffman	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Israel	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	T.
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Chu	Keating	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Schiff
Clarke	Kennedy	Schneider
Cleaver	Kildee	Schwartz
Clyburn	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kind	Scott, David
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Serrano
Conyers	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Shea-Porter
Costa	Levin	Sherman
Courtney	Lewis	Sinema
Crowley	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Speier
Cummings	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Takano
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Tierney
DeLauro	(NM)	Titus
DelBene	Maffei	Tonko
Deutch	Maloney,	Tsongas
Dingell	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Doyle	Matheson	Veasey
Edwards	Matsui	Vela
Ellison	McDermott	Visclosky
Engel	McGovern	Walz
Enyart	McNerney	Waters
Eshoo	Meeks	Watt
Esty	Michaud	Waxman
Farr	Moore	Welch
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)

NOES—228

Aderholt	Blackburn	Capps
Amash	Boustany	Capuano
Amodel	Brady (TX)	Carter
Bachus	Bridenstine	Cassidy
Barletta	Brooks (IN)	Chabot
Barr	Buchanan	Chaffetz
Barton	Burgess	Coble
Benishek	Calvert	Coffman
Bentivolio	Camp	Cole
Bilirakis	Campbell	Collins (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Cantor	Collins (NY)
Black	Capito	Conaway

Cook	Kelly (PA)	Rigell
Cotton	King (IA)	Roby
Cramer	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Crawford	Kingston	Rogers (AL)
Crenshaw	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Daines	Kline	Rogers (MI)
Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Rohrabacher
DeFazio	LaMalfa	Rokita
Denham	Lamborn	Rooney
Dent	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
DeSantis	Lankford	Roskam
DesJarlais	Larsen (WA)	Ross
Duckworth	Latham	Rothfus
Duffy	Latta	Royce
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Runyan
Duncan (TN)	Long	Ryan (OH)
Ellmers	Lowey	Ryan (WI)
Farenthold	Lucas	Salmon
Fincher	Luetkemeyer	Sanford
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Scalise
Fleischmann	Massie	Schock
Fleming	McCarthy (CA)	Schweikert
Flores	McCaul	Scott, Austin
Fortenberry	McClintock	Sensenbrenner
Fox	McCollum	Sessions
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Shuster
Gardner	McKinley	Simpson
Garrett	McMorris	Slaughter
Gibbs	Rodgers	Smith (MO)
Gibson	Meadows	Smith (NE)
Gingrey (GA)	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Gohmert	Messer	Smith (TX)
Goodlatte	Mica	Southerland
Goody	Miller (FL)	Stewart
Granger	Miller (MI)	Stivers
Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary	Stockman
Graves (MO)	Miller, George	Stutzman
Griffin (AR)	Mullin	Terry
Griffith (VA)	Mulvaney	Thompson (PA)
Grimm	Murphy (PA)	Thornberry
Guthrie	Neugebauer	Tiberi
Hall	Nolan	Tipton
Harper	Nugent	Turner
Harris	Nunes	Upton
Hartzler	Nunnelee	Wagner
Hastings (WA)	Olson	Walberg
Heck (NV)	Palazzo	Walden
Hensarling	Pascrell	Walorski
Holding	Paulsen	Weber (TX)
Hudson	Pearce	Webster (FL)
Huelskamp	Perlmutter	Wenstrup
Huizenga (MI)	Perry	Whitfield
Hultgren	Petri	Williams
Hunter	Pittenger	Wilson (SC)
Hurt	Pitts	Wittman
Issa	Poe (TX)	Wolf
Jenkins	Pompeo	Womack
Johnson (GA)	Posey	Woodall
Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)	Yoder
Johnson, Sam	Radel	Yoho
Jones	Reed	Young (AK)
Jordan	Reichert	Young (IN)
Joyce	Renacci	
Kaptur	Ribble	

NOT VOTING—42

Bachmann	Hanna	Rice (SC)
Brady (PA)	Herrera Beutler	Richmond
Broun (GA)	Kuster	Rush
Bucshon	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Lummis	Schrader
Culberson	Lynch	Sires
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Valadao
Fattah	McCarthy (NY)	Velázquez
Forbes	McIntyre	Wasserman
Gabbard	Meng	Schultz
Gerlach	Moran	Westmoreland
Gosar	Neal	Yarmuth
Green, Gene	Negrete McLeod	Young (FL)
Grijalva	Noem	
Gutiérrez	Pastor (AZ)	

□ 1920

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION EXTENSION ACT OF 2013

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3190) to provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3190

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “United States Parole Commission Extension Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF SENTENCING REFORM ACT OF 1984.

For purposes of section 235(b) of the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 (18 U.S.C. 3551 note; Public Law 98-473; 98 Stat. 2032), as such section relates to chapter 311 of title 18, United States Code, and the United States Parole Commission, each reference in such section to “26 years” or “26-year period” shall be deemed a reference to “31 years” or “31-year period”, respectively.

SEC. 3. PAROLE COMMISSION REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Parole Commission shall report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and House of Representatives the following for fiscal years 2012 and 2013:

(1) The number of offenders in each type of case over which the Commission has jurisdiction, including the number of Sexual or Violent Offender Registry offenders and Tier Levels offenders.

(2) The number of hearings, record reviews and National Appeals Board considerations conducted by the Commission in each type of case over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

(3) The number of hearings conducted by the Commission by type of hearing in each type of case over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

(4) The number of record reviews conducted by the Commission by type of consideration in each type of case over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

(5) The number of warrants issued and executed compared to the number requested in each type of case over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

(6) The number of revocation determinations by the Commission in each type of case over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

(7) The distribution of initial offenses, including violent offenses, for offenders in each type of case over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

(8) The distribution of subsequent offenses, including violent offenses, for offenders in each type of case over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

(9) The percentage of offenders paroled or re-paroled compared with the percentage of offenders continued to expiration of sentence (less any good time) in each type of case over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

(10) The percentage of cases (except probable cause hearings and hearings in which a continuance was ordered) in which the primary and secondary examiner disagreed on the appropriate disposition of the case (the amount of time to be served before release), the release conditions to be imposed, or the reasons for the decision in each type of case over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

(11) The percentage of decisions within, above, or below the Commission's decision guidelines for Federal initial hearings (28 C.F.R. 2.20) and Federal and D.C. Code revocation hearings (28 C.F.R. 2.21).

(12) The percentage of revocation and non-revocation hearings in which the offender is accompanied by a representative in each type of case over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

(13) The number of administrative appeals and the action of the National Appeals Board in relation to those appeals in each type of case over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

(14) The projected number of Federal offenders that will be under the Commission's jurisdiction as of October 31, 2018.

(15) An estimate of the date on which no Federal offenders will remain under the Commission's jurisdiction.

(16) The Commission's annual expenditures for offenders in each type of case over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

(17) The annual expenditures of the Commission, including travel expenses and the annual salaries of the members and staff of the Commission.

(b) SUCCEEDING FISCAL YEARS.—For each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, not later than 90 days after the end of the fiscal year, the United States Parole Commission shall report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and House of Representatives the items in paragraphs (1) through (17) of subsection (a), for the fiscal year.

(c) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PAROLE FAILURE RATE REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Parole Commission shall report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and House of Representatives the following:

(1) The parole failure rate for the District of Columbia for the last full fiscal year immediately preceding the date of the report.

(2) The factors that cause that parole failure rate.

(3) Remedial measures that might be undertaken to reduce that parole failure rate.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DO NO HARM

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, prior to being elected to Congress, I worked 28 years as a health care provider. Through working to provide patients with the best possible care, one of the earliest lessons I learned was the principle of Do No Harm. The Nation would benefit greatly if those elected to public service followed this same principle. Unfortunately, this principle has been seriously violated throughout the government funding debate.

Mr. Speaker, the American people were harmed when President Obama failed to come to the negotiating table until 11 days after the shutdown occurred. The American people were harmed when the administration purposely sought to "win" the shutdown by causing as much pain as possible before seeking to reopen the government.

"It's a cheap way to deal with the situation. We've been told to make life as difficult for people as we can. It's disgusting," stated an angry Park Service ranger in Washington, according to *The Washington Times*.

This is not public service; this is a public injustice. It is time to do no more harm. It is time to end the politics and start solving problems. The American people deserve as much.

SHUTDOWN'S RIPPLING EFFECT

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, the devastating effect of the shutdown is now rippling beyond the Federal workforce.

Last week it was learned that scientists at Lawrence Livermore and Sandia National Laboratory who work as Federal contractors will be furloughed this week. This is the largest employer in the 15th Congressional District, and their job is to uphold the national security mission of the United States, maintain our nuclear weapons stockpile, and provide energy security.

I flew home yesterday to hold a town hall meeting for Sandia and Livermore employees, and the room was filled with fear and anxiety about how they would meet their bills and obligations and what they would do next.

Enough is enough. The responsible thing to do is to end the government shutdown and put back to work our Federal workforce and our government contractors.

I have sent a letter to Secretary Ernie Moniz of the Department of Energy asking that we guarantee back pay for the furloughed workers at Lawrence Livermore and Sandia National Laboratory.

This ripple will continue as long as this shutdown goes on. The responsible thing to do is to end this shutdown, make sure that the cause of science is advanced at Lawrence Livermore and Sandia, and we put back to work these hardworking individuals who are serving the national mission.

ODD COINCIDENCE

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I received the following email from a constituent who forwarded me comments from a former government worker:

As a former government employee, I have worked for the government for over 40 years. During that time I became familiar with requisitions, bidding, and awarding contracts. It is time-consuming with bean counters and pencil neck bureaucrats. A request takes months, not days or even hours. In less than 8 hours of the shutdown, miraculously professionally printed 3x4 signs—with logos—appeared all over the country in the 1000s saying: "This park facility closed due to government shutdown."

There has not been a government shutdown in 17 years. Signs had to be designed, requisitioned, and bids had to go out, approved and contracts signed; then the signs were made and distributed. Either this is the most efficient thing the Federal Government has ever done, or this quick shutdown was planned and determined months ago.

Mr. Speaker, if the writer is accurate, this is an interesting and odd coincidence, don't you think?

And that's just the way it is.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Tonight the country is facing great challenges—the challenges of ObamaCare, of runaway spending here in Washington, and of our fiscal crisis that is increasing our debt over and over again. Now is the time for solutions, and now is the opportunity that we have to get things right and to turn things around. I am looking forward tonight to visiting with my colleagues about the challenges we have before us as well as the opportunities.

You know, this situation that we are in today kind of reminds me of a story that I heard a few years ago. I think it is very fitting to this time in history. This is a true story. There was a man who went hunting with his dog many years ago; and as he walked through the great outdoors and came back from his hunting trip, he noticed that his pants were covered with something that in Missouri we call cockleburrs. If you are not from Missouri or that part of the country, it is basically a weed, and it leaves very prickly seed pods that are about the size of a dime. And they will stick to anything from your clothes to your pet's fur, or anything else that happens to brush against it as it passes by the weed.

So this man got to looking at all of these cockleburrs on his pants and his dog when he got back, and he was trying to pull them off and clean them off. And then he stopped a minute and got to look at that cocklebur and he got to thinking: What is it that causes this cocklebur to stick so well? And he wondered, is there a way we could use that same format to help provide some solutions.

He thought about some friends who had arthritis, that had trouble buttoning up their shirt or zipping things.

He thought about young children, and they have trouble fastening things together. And he thought, I wonder if we could take this challenge of this cocklebur and make an opportunity out of it.

□ 1930

Do you know what he did? He invented something we all use every day called "Velcro." He laid the groundwork for what I think we need to do here in Washington: take the challenges before us and use them as an opportunity in this point in history to create a better health care system that addresses Americans' needs, that gets spending under control, makes government more efficient and more effective, and it also addresses our long-term debt and reverses course so that we will get out of debt as a Nation and balance the budget. This is the opportunity that we have before us.

Before my colleagues share their thoughts on this, I want to talk just a minute about the challenges that we have in ObamaCare. There are so many reasons that at this time in history we have been taking a stand here in the House and saying: it is time to reverse this onerous policy, because the American people don't want it and it is hurting them.

I wanted to share at least seven things that are challenging about this law:

The first thing is that ObamaCare is causing an increase in premiums. I got last week an email from a constituent who sells insurance back home. They were very distraught because they had a customer come in who wanted to renew their health insurance. After they figured out what it would mean through ObamaCare, they discovered this customer was going to have to pay \$1,500 a month. That isn't even the full premium. Their employer would pay some others. So when you added it all up, this family—she had to tell them—was going to have to pay \$18,000 a year for their health care. This makes a difference in that family whether they can send a child to college or not. It is wrong. We need to have some solutions here.

Something else I heard today: I was visiting with a constituent who told me that they went on the exchanges to see what ObamaCare would do to their health care premiums. What she found out is that her insurance next year is going to cost \$200 more a month than she is paying right now, plus she is going to have to have a larger deductible and her coverage is going to decrease. So she was obviously very upset. ObamaCare is increasing premiums and increasing costs on Americans. That is wrong. It is time for solutions.

Number two, ObamaCare is killing jobs. Despite what others on the other side of the aisle say, it is killing jobs.

One in five small businesses report that they are letting employees go due to the new law. Others are deciding not to expand their business due to the new law. The Gallup survey this year found a staggering 41 percent of small business owners are holding off hiring new employees due to ObamaCare, and 38 percent have pulled back on plans to grow their business.

I have an example I wanted to share with you from my own district. I was visiting with a small business owner the other day. They are doing pretty well. They have a small business that has been growing. The exciting thing is, they said: Representative HARTZLER, we want to open up a second location, we want to hire some new workers, we are very excited about it. But they looked at ObamaCare and the requirements involved and they said: We cannot afford it. If we open up the second location and hire new workers, we are not going to be able to keep going. So they decided not to expand their business.

Now, the thing that makes this extra tragic is, in this town there has been a manufacturing plant closed down over the last few years. There are hundreds of people in my district looking for work who would love to have that job, but because of ObamaCare they are not going to be able to do it. This business owner wants to expand, but they can't. That is wrong. ObamaCare is killing jobs. That is why it is time for solutions.

Number three, ObamaCare is reducing the take-home pay. It has been many years since many Americans have got a raise. They are "making do," but if anybody goes to the store like I do every weekend and buys groceries and other things for your family, you know that things are costing more and more. So we have a real problem here. Americans aren't getting pay increases and yet the cost of living is going up.

There are many businesses that are cutting back on their employees' hours because of ObamaCare to get them under the 30-hour requirement. In fact, a U.S. Chamber of Commerce Small Business Outlook Study showed that 27 percent of businesses have and will cut hours to reduce from full-time employees to part-time. So we are becoming "part-time America" because of this law.

Just today, I got an email from a large business owner in Missouri, and here is what they said. It validates this very point. It says:

As one of the largest out of state employers in Missouri, we are not expanding or hiring. Our health insurance costs will increase by an estimated \$800,000 in 2014 due to ObamaCare, despite significant reductions in coverage for our employees and reducing hours to less than 30 hours per week where we can. Our taxes have gone up, regulations are overwhelming, and there is no end in sight.

It is happening.

Number four, ObamaCare is jeopardizing our personal security and our privacy. How would you like to have your Social Security number made available to everybody? According to an August 7 *Forbes* magazine article:

In order for ObamaCare to work, the government will need to know a lot about your financial, medical, and employment situation.

And this could very well—ObamaCare's exchanges—end up illegally exposing American's private records to hackers and criminals.

Just last week, when ObamaCare went online, McAfee, which is one of the Nation's premier Internet security companies, they tweeted out that ObamaCare is a "hacker's dream." This is very, very concerning. It is clearly time for solutions.

Five, ObamaCare is simply not working. I am sure many of you have heard the news reports. This is just a 4-page outline of all the different headlines from around the country about how this is not working.

Florida:

The glitches in the new electronic health care sign-up system began almost immediately, and they never let up.

Missouri:

But in Kansas and Missouri, it was more fizzle than bang.

North Dakota:

North Dakota Insurance Commissioner Adam Hamm said he and his staff were monitoring the Federal Web site Tuesday but were unable to access it.

West Virginia:

Ten hours later—after two attempts at signing up and one 45-minute call with a consumer service agent—technical glitches have prevented the 60-year-old grandfather from purchasing a plan.

It goes on and on. There are real problems there.

Six, ObamaCare is unfair. President Obama has exempted Big Business from having to comply with ObamaCare for a year, and he has granted over 1,300 waivers, yet he hasn't given a waiver to the hardworking American public who deserves it. That is not fair.

And lastly, something that a lot of people don't know, but a lot of people should care about, is that ObamaCare uses tax dollars to pay for abortions for the first time, and it hides the fact that people will be paying for abortions in their monthly bill.

Here is how it works. The law says that at least one policy in every exchange has to cover abortion. But it also says—the law says—that they can only disclose that as part of the huge summary of benefits in all the fine print that is there at only the time of initial sign-up. So many people right now are going online, and they have got these policies that come up and there is all this fine print. They don't even know that that policy includes abortion.

ObamaCare is going to have subsidies to help people pay for their premium. That subsidy comes from our tax dollars. Many Americans do not want their hard-earned tax dollars to go and pay for abortion, yet it will. Sadly, the people many times will not even know if their policy has abortion or not. There are many Americans who support life, and when they go to buy it directly, they will not know.

Inside the bill, not only does it cover abortion, but ObamaCare has what is called a “secrecy clause” in it that specifically says that that charge for the abortion fee cannot be listed in their monthly bill. So many pro-life Americans who value life unknowingly will buy an insurance policy that is covering abortion, and every month they will be paying their own hard-earned dollars to go towards abortion. It is just wrong.

So clearly, clearly we need some solutions. Republicans do have solutions. We are putting forth a health care bill that replaces and is better than ObamaCare. It allows for increased access and lower costs. You are going to be hearing more about it in the days to come. We call it the “American Health Care Reform Act.” There are better solutions. We have got a lot of challenges with ObamaCare, but this is our opportunity to make it better for the American people, and that is what we are going to do.

We also have a challenge of a huge debt crisis at this time in history. I know many of my colleagues here are going to share about that. We have got to quit spending money we don't have. People at home are tightening their belt. It is time for Washington to do that too.

This is where we are at tonight—Monday night, October 14, 2013. How this is going to play out, we don't know. But I know I am going to continue to fight for positive solutions that are good for the American people. I am going to be looking for opportunities to take the cockleburs of life and look at them and say: Is there a way to turn this around and make something good out of it?

I believe that is where we are right now. We can make something good of this situation. It has been hard on Americans, it is hard on families, there is a lot of uncertainty. It has been hard on us as Members of Congress.

But we can make something better than has ever happened before from this country. We can produce a health care bill that the American people deserve. We can rein in this runaway spending and get it right, make government more efficient and more effective, and we can address our debt crisis. We can do it. That is our challenge, that is our opportunity, that is why we are fighting, that is why we are here tonight.

I want to thank my colleagues who stayed tonight to share their thoughts

on this important time in history, this Monday night that we are at.

I would like to yield to my friend from Utah, CHRIS STEWART.

Mr. STEWART. I would like to thank the gentlewoman, Representative HARTZLER, for sharing the floor with myself and other colleagues tonight. It is an honor, especially on a topic that all of us know and recognize that is so very, very important.

Dean Acheson once said that “Negotiation in the classic diplomatic sense assumes parties are more anxious to agree than to disagree.”

For the past 2 weeks, President Obama and Senator HARRY REID have made it very, very clear that they are much more anxious to disagree than they are to agree with Republicans—a situation that has very honestly prevented sincere negotiations. It is impossible to work out a deal when one party just sits on the sidelines and won't talk, like we have experienced over the last few weeks with the President. Now, we heard rumors this afternoon that the President has finally begun to negotiate with Republicans. I hope that that is true because our Founding Fathers established a system that was intended to be deliberative.

Whether you agree or disagree with the President, this much we know: he has been willing to push our Nation toward an economic crisis all for the sake of a political agenda. When this happens, every American loses. It doesn't have to be this way. It shouldn't be this way.

For 14 years, I was an Air Force pilot—which was, by the way, the coolest job in the world. I loved doing that. At one point, I was selected to be a member of the START verification team—Strategic Arms Reduction Team. Of course, we were working with the Russians during this time. They would come to my base to verify that we had complied with elements of the START treaty.

During the 1990s, the Russians were not our friends. By the way, Mr. Speaker, I would cautiously add that today the Russians are not our friends either. These were in some cases tense and very carefully orchestrated events, but we did them. We extended a hand of trust and fellowship between two nations that had very little in common and had much to lose if they did not develop a working relationship.

Mr. Speaker, if we could do it then between the Russian and the U.S. militaries, surely we, with the Republicans and the President, could do the same thing now. The President is the leader of this Nation. He has a responsibility to lead. But part of leadership is being willing to sit down and in a sincere way be willing to listen to the other side. The President has failed in this responsibility and the Nation has paid a price.

Before being elected to Congress, I was the president and owner of a small

company. Being part of a small business means developing relationships that are built upon trust. With the disastrous rollout of ObamaCare, the President has clearly broken the trust of the American people.

\$634 million—\$634 million—that is how much it cost to develop the ObamaCare Web site.

□ 1945

Facebook operated for 6 years on less money than that. Twitter was launched and operated for less than half the cost. Instagram, LinkedIn, Spotify all were designed, implemented, and operational at a fraction of the price of the ObamaCare Web page. And yet, in one of the most embarrassing moments in ObamaCare history, and I believe this will be a history that will be rife with embarrassing moments, news organizations had to search high and low throughout the country to find one person who could be verified that they had actually signed up on the ObamaCare Web page. And, of course, days later we had born the legend of Chad, something many people are very familiar with.

Harkening back to my military days, if I had been given a mission and had so utterly failed to accomplish that mission, I would have been held accountable. So I ask, Mr. Speaker, when will Kathleen Sebelius be held accountable for this disaster? After more than 3 years and after more than \$630 million and a failure to launch such as this, why does she still have her job?

But let's remember this: at the end of the day, we are not talking about ObamaCare, and we are not really talking about a Web page or a sequester or a continuing resolution. What we are really talking about at the end of the day is our Nation's crushing national debt. Our national debt is now approaching \$17 trillion. Now, President Obama congratulates himself on having reduced the debt by half; but listen, when you run up a debt after 1 year in office of \$1.2 trillion or \$1.3 trillion, when you have nearly 4 years in a row of a greater than a trillion-dollar annual deficit, and then you congratulate yourself because you cut it \$6 or \$7 billion, that is not something to celebrate.

Now is the time to work together towards a balanced budget and actually beginning to pay down that debt. Yes, this is a tough decision, but we were elected to make tough decisions. My plea to the Senate and to the President is: Please, come to the table. Let's start the conversation now about how we can put our fiscal house in order. Time is running out.

With that, once again, Mrs. HARTZLER, thank you for yielding to me.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, CHRIS. I really appreciate your perspective. As a former Air Force pilot, I think what

you said about leadership is very true. It is time for the President to show some leadership and for us to get together and to talk about this. That is why it is time for solutions. Thanks for sharing those things.

Now I would like to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), who is chairman of the Republican Study Committee and a real leader here in this House, and I certainly appreciate you sharing tonight.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for her leadership as the chair of the RSC Communications Committee for leading this effort to talk about real solutions. Of course, today we are in day 14 of a government shutdown, a shutdown that has seen Republicans bring proposal after proposal after proposal to fund government. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out, there are more than 20 bills now that have been passed by the House of Representatives to fund all or parts of the Federal Government—20 bills. This chart chronicles the timeline, going back to September 20, well in advance of the midnight hour where, today, on day 14, by the way, President Obama has still yet to even engage in conversations.

In fact, we went to the White House Thursday to meet with the President, sat in a room with him for an hour and a half. The simple offer was: Mr. President, we will increase the debt ceiling. All we are asking is for you to start talking, just to agree to have conversations; and, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we left that meeting without the President even being willing to start talking.

And so we are 14 days into a government shutdown that the President is decrying and calling people names. You have got people in the White House literally calling people suicide bombers, terrorists, and all kinds of other things that are so unbecoming of the Office of the President of the United States—again, a President who said he was going to change the tone in Washington allowing people in his White House to call people on the opposition terrorists and suicide bombers—and yet he refuses to even sit at the table and negotiate our differences while we have passed 20 different bills to fund all or parts of government.

What are some of those parts of government? A bill to fund veterans affairs. Mr. Speaker, for all the areas of disagreement we have in Washington—and clearly, with a divided Nation with a divided government, there are areas where we have disagreement, but we should all be able to come to the table and say we ought to fund our veterans while we are negotiating our differences on the things we disagree upon.

And yet we sent the bill over to the Senate to fund our veterans, and HARRY REID tabled that bill, Mr.

Speaker. We sent a bill to say that disaster aid shouldn't be something that we disagree over. We passed a bill with bipartisan votes and sent it over to the Senate. In fact, we saw one of the most disgraceful acts by a Commander in Chief, Mr. Speaker, where for days we saw this administration refusing to give death benefits to our fallen heroes, a moment I don't think we have seen in our Nation's history.

And we passed a bill to say don't hold our veterans hostage, and yet you still see barricades—I call them "Obamacades"—up in front of the World War II Memorial, an open-air memorial where, in normal days, there is nobody there being paid to guard or block this memorial. It is an open-air memorial built to honor our World War II heroes. And yet when our World War II heroes come from all around the country, some in their nineties, come to see their memorial, they are greeted by barricades by this administration. This is the kind of embarrassing leadership that we are getting out of the White House when all we are saying is let's negotiate our differences like has always been done.

When Ronald Reagan was President, Tip O'Neill was the Speaker, and you had divided government. There were 12 different shutdowns during that time in our Nation's history. What Ronald Reagan did as a leader, as a great leader, one that we surely miss today, Ronald Reagan started having regular meetings with Tip O'Neill. They actually built a relationship, started getting things done. And we saw one of the greatest revolutions, economic expansion in our Nation's history because you had a real leadership in the White House.

Mr. Speaker, again, we have sent 20 different bills over to the Senate, all chronicled, many of which had large Democrat votes out of the House. Still to this day, not one word from the President over whether he would agree to start talking. Of course, he wants to make it all about ObamaCare. Clearly, there are big areas where we have disagreement, but it is not just a partisan issue. It is not just Republicans who have issues with ObamaCare. Let's start with the occupant of the Oval Office.

Barack Obama has problems with ObamaCare. He has issued over 1,200 waivers to his signature law, as the gentlelady from Missouri pointed out. I have yet to find one small business in my district who got one of those waivers, by the way. It was handed out to a lot of special-interest friends who could get access to the White House. Is that the way the government is supposed to run? In fact, he even worked out a deal to give Members of Congress an exemption from his signature health care law.

So what we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is why don't we start with the basic

premise of fairness. If this law is so good, make it apply to everybody. If it is not that good, if it is so bad you need to issue 1,200 waivers to your friends, Mr. Speaker, then why not give that same waiver to all Americans until this thing is ready to work, which clearly it is not. As somebody once said, the failures of this law, October 1 was a date that for 3 years they knew was coming, where these exchanges had to be up and running, and now we are hearing debacle after debacle, people registering 12, 14 times without being able to get through. Somebody said it is like Flowers.com not being prepared for Valentine's Day.

So as we stand here today talking about getting our economy back on track and talking about the 20 different proposals we have sent over to the Senate to get government up and running, most of which have not been given even a minute's consideration, literally tabled on party-line votes by Senator REID, what we are saying is: How about just fairness? Let's start with fairness and make ObamaCare apply to everybody. If it is that good, why don't we make it apply to everybody? Get rid of all these special waivers, all these special backroom deals to everybody from the President's friends to Members of Congress. Let's make it apply to everybody. Let's get the government back open, and let's start tackling our long-term spending problems that are causing programs like Medicare and Social Security to face bankruptcy where we have put good plans on the table to save those programs from bankruptcy and, frankly, Mr. Speaker, to save our country from bankruptcy so we can hand off to our kids and grandkids the same opportunity that we enjoy today in the greatest country in the history of the world, a country that is facing serious problems, a country, unfortunately, facing a lack of leadership from the President who, 14 days into a government shutdown, still to this day has not even agreed to start talking with people from the other party to work out those differences.

I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for creating this forum to talk about solutions, and my other colleagues in the Republican Study Committee who have been bringing forward solution after solution to get our economy moving again and restore the greatness that this country knows is there, that beacon of light that we are all fighting for here tonight on the House floor.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank you, Mr. SCALISE, talking about the leadership that we have been providing here in the House.

I think it is very important that people know, we proactively worked to make sure that government stayed open. We passed these bills way before October 1. Unfortunately, we haven't

had leadership from the White House or from the Senate willing to come together. Thank you for bringing that up.

In fact, something that a lot of people don't know is that, at this point in the House of Representatives, we have already passed one-third of all appropriations bills in the continuing resolution. We have been passing bill after bill to keep this government open, to fund it and make sure it keeps going and working for the American people. The Senate has not passed them. They haven't taken them up. So it is not us that has shut down the government or is responsible for this lapse in funding, and it is certainly not us that is keeping it shut. Thank you very much for sharing that.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER). I am glad to have you here tonight and appreciate what you have to share.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, it is good to be here.

Mr. Speaker, since 1978, the debt ceiling has been raised 53 times, and 27 of these increases have been used as a negotiating tool both by Congress and the President. So why not now, Mr. President? Can we not negotiate now? And to borrow a somewhat trite phrase from days gone by, yes, we can.

Sadly, today we have a President who does not want to make any concessions with House Republicans. You know, Thomas Jefferson once said, "Pride costs us more than hunger, thirst, and cold." Has pride gotten in the way, clouding the judgment of our President, do you think, Mr. Speaker? Has this President chosen party politics and his unworkable health care law over working with House Republicans toward fair solutions that would help hardworking Americans keep more money in their pockets?

Mr. Speaker, think with me here for a second. During the debt ceiling debate in March 2006, then-Senator Obama said:

The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the U.S. Government cannot pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our government's reckless fiscal policies. Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that "the buck stops here." Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

Yet, here we are, 7 years later, and we are debating the exact same thing. Why is that okay, now, I would ask him, Mr. Speaker. Why is that okay, now, Mr. President? Do we have a failure of leadership? Can we admit that? Yes, we can.

It is a failure of leadership also for spewing such venomous rhetoric when

the governing process doesn't go your way, calling Republicans names. It is a failure of not listening to the American people. Can we call this a failure of leadership? Yes, we can.

□ 2000

The American people want the government reopened. They want to make their own health care decisions. The shutdown the American people want is the out-of-control government spending, the \$17 trillion debt that has been amassed that the President in his own words said "is a failure of leadership," and then in another instance, "unpatriotic." Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have put forth proposal after proposal to fund this government, to keep it open, to protect the American people from the President's hostile takeover of the health care system.

Sadly, we still have a President and a Senate majority leader acting like petulant children, refusing to come to the table to negotiate, prolonging that failure of leadership. Each day that passes, with the Affordable Care Act going into effect, our Nation's fiscal health gets worse—a failure of leadership. I love America too much to let it fall under these circumstances. I will not stand by and watch as our country crumbles because of a President who is not willing to work with us and come to the table and to carry out this prolonged failure of leadership.

I am RANDY WEBER, and America is worth fighting for. I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for fighting alongside me and continuing this valiant effort.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, RANDY. It is an honor to stand beside you in this. This is a time for solutions. And people wonder, Can we get this right? Can we make things better? Can we keep the opportunity for the future? With you, I would say, Yes, we can, but we are going to keep working on it. Thank you very much.

I now yield to my friend from the Midwest, from Indiana, MARLIN STUTZMAN. What would you like to share with us tonight?

Mr. STUTZMAN. First, I would like to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and organizing this Special Order about solutions. That is what the American people expect from us as Congress, whether you are a Republican or whether you are a Democrat. The American people are looking to Washington to find solutions, to work together, to make America strong again. So I want to thank you for your comments today and for representing your district so well.

It doesn't take much to sort out and to realize the difficulty that we are facing in our country and what our Federal Government is facing: \$17 trillion in debt, a struggling economy, a health care system that does need to be fixed. People are looking to Washington to

gain confidence in the marketplace. And in spite of Washington, you will find bright spots throughout the country where good things are happening, but it is not enough. We can still do better. And it is time for Washington to find solutions for our economy, for the American people, for American families so that way when a family sits down to have dinner tonight, they are not going to be wondering if Dad is going to be going to work next week. They don't have to worry whether Mom will have her job the following month. What is going to happen after Christmas time? What is going to happen next year? They hear so many different stories about the new health care law and what it means for them. What is their insurance plan going to be like next year? There are so many unknowns and questions that are not answered because of the uncertainty that Washington has placed irresponsibly on the American people.

While we know we have \$17 trillion of debt, a deficit that is running out of balance, a health care law that is crushing the American people today, an Independent Payment Advisory Board that has 15 board members that are unelected and unaccountable who will be making health care decisions for Americans in the near term, we still have an unemployment rate of 8 percent and mandates from ObamaCare that are forcing companies to cut hours. Too much uncertainty is being created by our Federal Government.

Small businesses are trying to figure out how they are going to make ends meet next year, how they are going to plan their budget when they know the mandates and the cost of insurance continue to crush them, how they are going to create new jobs and expand their companies if regulations continue to hamper them and the new health care law continues to sidetrack them.

One of the taxes that is in the health care law that is driving jobs away from Indiana is the medical device tax, also known as the pacemaker tax, the wheelchair tax. Anything that is a medical device, such as a hip, a knee, a joint, these things are taxed now because of ObamaCare. It is over 20,000 jobs just in Indiana. Warsaw, Indiana, in particular, is the orthopedic capital of the world. It is the home to Zimmer, Biomet, DePuy, Paragon, and so many other companies that are doing so much remarkable work for the betterment of Americans.

I know that my grandmother had her hip replaced before she passed away 10 years ago, and it changed her life. It gave her a new ability to enjoy life with her children and her grandchildren. This is an industry that is being harmed by ObamaCare, and it is time that we take a step back and re-evaluate and find new solutions.

Unfortunately, this tax is putting 2,000 jobs in jeopardy in Indiana, and I

believe that it is time for Washington, for the President, for the Senate, and for the House to come together. Let's stop stumbling from crisis to crisis. That is not the best way to govern. The American people are tired of the way Washington has these cycles of political stunts and fiscal cliffs and all these other manufactured crises.

Hoosiers know, as many Americans know, that in order to get a job done, you have to sit down and figure out a way to get it done, talk about it, and then go out and do it. But Washington is broke because government spends too much and talks too little. So I think now is the time for us to get serious about our debt. We need to reform our entitlement programs. We need to work towards reforming our Tax Code. We have solutions. We have ideas. We can make things better for not only the American people, but for the world, if we would just trust the instincts of the American people. If we followed those instincts and followed the example of the American people, the Federal Government would be in a much better place today.

It is time for solutions, and I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership on this issue tonight.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you very much, MARLIN. That is right: it is time for solutions. And I very much appreciate you bringing up the concern with the taxes. We haven't talked about that yet tonight, but there are 20 new taxes in ObamaCare, and especially, as you pointed out, the medical device tax, which is very onerous and killing jobs all over.

The statement you said that is going to stick with me most tonight that I hope the American people remember and that I love that you just said is that Washington is broke because it spends too much and it talks too little. Well said.

Thank you very much for sharing your thoughts.

I now yield to my friend from Michigan, KERRY BENTIVOLIO.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Thank you. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for the opportunity to speak on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before this Chamber today to talk about the Democrat shutdown.

In the House we are standing strong to prevent ObamaCare from hurting people. Just today, the Detroit Free Press, a liberal-leaning paper, reported that two health insurance companies are dropping the low-cost plans for 146,000 Michigan families due to ObamaCare. This will cost each of these families thousands of dollars per year, more to be covered by ObamaCare-approved health care plans. That is unacceptable. Our government is shut down because the extreme liberal Democrats refuse to negotiate and

have rejected bills to keep most of the government open. This behavior reminds me of a spoiled child having a temper tantrum who runs to their room, slams the door shut, and refuses to come out until their demands are met.

This is no way to behave and is a disservice to all Americans. Mr. Speaker, they are obsessed with forcing health care legislation, which they are exempt from, onto the American people. They want two classes, the majority who live under ObamaCare and the elite who use their connections to get waivers.

By refusing to fund veterans, to keep the parks open, or support pediatric cancer research, Senate and House Democrats are showing whose side they are on, and it is not the American people.

I plead with my responsible, adult Democrat colleagues that it is not too late. Let's move forward. Join the rest of the American people and support equality under the law.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, KERRY. And thank you for your leadership. I know you have been going down to the World War II Memorial and helping to open up the barricades for our Honor Flights coming in. It is sad that we have to do that, but thank you for your leadership in that.

I now turn to one of your colleagues from Michigan, BILL HUIZENGA, and yield time to him.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Thanks. I appreciate my good friend from Missouri putting this together and having this conversation.

This is a conversation we need to have with the American people. There is obviously a lot of misinformation that is going out over the airwaves as we have talked about a number of times, and I think people are looking for that information. I know I have been tweeting out a few of the articles that I have come across on my iPhone here.

For those of you out there watching, it is @RepHuizenga. I would love for you to follow me and take a look at this, this #Time4Solutions hash tag that we have going here because it is talking about some of those challenges, as well as the solutions that, I think, we are all looking for.

I appreciate you pointing out to my friend and colleague from Michigan, KERRY BENTIVOLIO, who is a great veteran himself of Iraq, as well as earlier times, and has done a couple of tours. For me, that World War II Memorial was something very special to be able to be a part of. That first day, there weren't television cameras around, there wasn't media. There wasn't anybody around except for those of us who cared about making sure that our veterans had an opportunity to go in and see a memorial that they earned.

I will tell you, as someone who is the son of a disabled World War II veteran,

a man who suffered a B-24 crash in Italy in 1944, I can tell you I know how powerful it is for him, how powerful it was for his buddies that he was able to go to the memorial, and how powerful it was for me as a family member to be along on that very special day. The least that we can do is to open that up.

It is not just the World War II Memorial. It is the Korea memorial. I had a chance to bring a group of veterans from the Grand Rapids area in my district and in and around Kentwood and those areas. We went down to the World War II Memorial, and we also went down to the Korea memorial. That is where most of them were. They were greeted with no crowds, but the same barricades, as well as a park ranger who was in a very tough spot. He told me, Congressman, I am here to tell you that this monument is closed, this park is closed. I said, Well, respectfully I am here to tell you that I am going to help my constituents exercise their First Amendment rights and open up that barricade. We were able to get some people in there.

Today, as I was coming in, I drove past the Martin Luther King memorial. It was the same thing. There were buses lined up on the street with their flashers going, and there was a tremendous number of people in there exercising their First Amendment right, that civil disobedience that had gone on. The gate was kicked open, and they were in there going and seeing that memorial to a great man the way that it should be, open and available, right now, without the excuses, without the rented barricades, without those other things.

I also want to touch a little bit on the health care side as we are going through this. I appreciate you saying it is not just challenges, but also the opportunities. Frankly, we need to be talking to each other, to get to those solutions. This hash tag, #Time4Solutions, is very timely. We have had a Senate leader who has said absolutely no negotiations, none.

Now we are finally getting there, I think because they are hearing from their constituents back home that we need you to be talking.

□ 2015

The same with the White House. I think the White House even came around a little sooner than what the Senate leader did. But it is time to make sure that we are having these negotiations and these conversations.

A lot of us know the challenge, many of them are very well known, the signup glitches that happened. Glitches might be charitable, shall we say, for what was going on.

But one of my colleagues from Michigan, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, MIKE ROGERS, had put forward an op-ed not that long ago, and I have a copy of it here that I was reading. He is talking about the privacy threat.

If you look at the hub, the data hub that is being built, you know, our health care records are going to be exposed to a tremendous number of people.

Your privacy information, your private information, health care information, yours, mine, all the constituents that are out there watching this, their information, your information is at risk. Your information is at risk, and it is time that we do something about it.

Now, who hasn't heard the "if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor?" Well, maybe not so much.

This is one of the things I just tweeted out. CNNMoney today was reporting about doctor choice and ObamaCare—not so much. This is CNN. This isn't me. This is CNN.

They are saying that, for example, there was a major insurer that was offering policies in 14 different States, and what they are saying is that they are looking at the more heavier areas of population, eliminating up to half of the doctors.

Think of that. Half of the doctors that currently you could go to if you had one of their off-exchange plans won't be available to you. In a lesser populated area, it is "only" going to be 10 or 20 percent of those same doctors.

I can tell you, I sat, for a number of years, on the Michigan Rural Health Association board of directors as we were looking at health care issues in Michigan, especially in the rural areas. If you are starting to limit health care choices, even more so than what they already are in some of these rural areas, the damage that is going to be done to people and that relationship that they have with their doctor and with their health care provider—a place where you maybe have to do telemedicine just to be able to get the proper diagnosis and the things that are going on.

We have all heard, "If you like your plan, you can keep your plan." Maybe not so much.

Oh, but the plans are going to be more affordable. Well, they had the number right. There was a discussion that this was going to save \$2,500 for the average family. Unfortunately, we now know it is the right number, but the wrong direction. So it is actually going to cost the average family, like mine—I have got five young kids—it is going to cost \$2,500 additional. That is the wrong direction.

Some of the lesser-knowns—I will give you an example. My nephew, Andrew, is putting himself through college. He is working as a waiter in a nice restaurant.

A couple of months ago they called everybody in for the staff meeting and said, by the way, we are going to be starting this soon: No more than 29 hours per week. No more than 29 hours per week.

And he said, you know, Uncle BILL, I can get through this. It is not going to be easy. It is not going to be my choice, but I can get through it.

But he is looking at these colleagues, these single moms, these single moms that are saying, now where do I go for another 10 hours? Now how do I figure out where I am going to make ends meet and how I am going to make ends meet?

I think that is why we have seen letters by those big Republican organizations like SEIU, the Teamsters, the AFL-CIO, not exactly institutions normally related and associated with the Republican Party. They have put in formal letters saying, Wait a minute; this is not being implemented the way that it was supposed to be implemented.

They are afraid that there is an attack on the 40-hour work week, as well they should be afraid. That is exactly what is happening right now, and we need to be making sure that we are pushing back at that.

The medical device tax has been brought up a little bit. This has a significant impact in Michigan. Stryker Corporation, out of the Kalamazoo area, they have said publicly that it is going to cost them 1,000 jobs, 1,000 jobs. All right?

It is also going to be hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes that are being laid on. This ObamaCare tax, it has been deemed a tax by the Supreme Court, so let's talk about it in the terms of a tax.

It is time that we repealed this tax. It is time that we not take those 1,000 jobs away from Stryker; time that we not take those jobs out of Ann Arbor, an innovative hub; time that we not take those jobs away from the next entrepreneur in Grand Rapids, on Pill Hill, Medical Mile, as it is sometimes called; that we make sure that they have got the same opportunities, not less opportunities, the same opportunities. That isn't going to happen under this.

As you had pointed out, coverage, the mandatory, forced coverage of abortive services that is mandated in this bill, is absolutely wrong.

I have a company that is gaining some prominence in my district called Autocam. John Kennedy, the majority stakeholder and president and CEO of Autocam, was just in Washington sharing his story last week.

As a devout Catholic, he had made the decision that that wasn't going to be something that he would offer in his plans. They are self-insured, and if his employees wanted to go do that, that was their choice, but he wasn't going to be forced to pay for it, until this bill came along and said: It doesn't matter what your personal beliefs are.

It doesn't matter that you own the company. It doesn't matter that your religion says this is wrong. We know

better. This government knows better, and we are going to force you to spend that money to provide a service that you wholeheartedly disagree with.

Does that sound like the American way to you?

Does that sound like the American way to any of us? Absolutely not, yet, somehow we are viewing it as acceptable.

Waivers for the politically-connected, as has been talked about; as long as you have got a good friend that is either in the White House or at Health and Human Services, we can probably work something out for you.

Now, how does that feel?

Now, today though, we finally maybe got to the root of it. The Senate had been going along, no negotiations, no negotiations, no negotiations.

Oh, but if you want to spend some more money, if you want to roll back those automatic, across-the-board cuts that we had agreed to 2 years ago, maybe we will start talking about some reforms. That is what it is.

As we talked about, this is about spending. This is about a group of people that want to see government grow. They want to see the footprint of the government just smash down on top of everything here and take control of our daily lives. That is really what the problem is.

So now we are seeing what the Senate is really all about. It is about spending. It is about more spending and more control for them. Now, that has got to stop.

Now, the opportunity side. I want to wrap up because I know we have got some other colleagues that are here, and we are having a great conversation and, again, I appreciate your hashtag, Time4Solutions, because this really is about those opportunities, as you talked about, the invention of Velcro and how we got there.

I have learned that most of the times you learn more from the things in life that are tough, not the easy things. Major shifts in society are not easy. They might be simple, but sometimes those simple things aren't real easy. Well, this is neither simple nor easy, and it is because it is the wrong direction.

First and foremost, we need the White House to acknowledge these problems. They won't even acknowledge these problems. It is all hunkydory, peaches and cream here in Washington, D.C. We are rolling this program out.

Excuse us. We had to make sure that you don't worry about those "glitches" that were in the system as we rolled it out. Please don't look at those exemptions and carve-outs that we have had. Please don't, whatever you do, please, oh, please, don't talk about how this is a growing frustration that the American people have, because that would somehow acknowledge that the American people might know better than

they do down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

We have to acknowledge those problems. Words speak louder—I am sorry—actions speak louder than words. The words are, everything is fine. The actions are very, very different though. The actions are very, very different out of this administration, as they have signed 17 changes into this law, as we have seen these carve-outs, as we have seen them do things like make sure that the individual mandate is kept in place, but the other mandates are not put in.

I know my colleagues are here too, and I want to give them time, so I am going to wrap up with this. My friend from Missouri, thank you for doing this.

It is time that we do make those substantive changes and restore some faith, restore some faith with the American people, that we have their best interest, and make sure that Congress can live under the same laws that they vote for and that they pass.

I appreciate you having this conversation tonight.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you very much, BILL. Those were very eloquent remarks. You really brought home the need that it is time for solutions and all the challenges that we are facing.

Before I go to our other friends here, I do want to get this motion in.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, KEITH ROTHFUS, who is new here but, boy, he hit the ground running.

Appreciate your leadership, KEITH. What would you like to share tonight?

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman for organizing this talk.

Pennsylvania's 12th District in western Pennsylvania stretches from Beaver to Johnstown and to the northern suburbs of Pittsburgh.

Last week we had a visit from HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius, who was in town to tout the benefits of the health care law. She also attempted to help enroll some western Pennsylvanians in the exchanges.

According to press reports, however, those who showed up were not able to enroll, or even access the Web site. Apparently, glitches were to blame.

As reported in yesterday's New York Times, however, one industry source said, "These are not glitches. The extent of the problems is pretty enormous. It's awful." These problems took more than 2 years to build, and cost

the American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

The health care law's troubles aren't limited, however, to the Web site issues. Many western Pennsylvanians have reached out to me to share stories about how they are seeing their hours reduced, or losing their jobs. Other western Pennsylvanians are seeing their health care premiums go up, or losing coverage altogether.

A woman recently got in touch with me and told me that her family recently received a letter from their insurance company, and they will lose the health insurance they have had for more than 25 years on December 31. The alternatives they have been able to find will cost them three times what they pay today.

Mr. Speaker, it is a time for solutions. We do have a new solution that we are proposing, The American Health Care Reform Act, which will actually lower costs, and I encourage our colleagues across the aisle and in our conference to take a look at that.

I thank the gentlelady for the time.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you very much, KEITH. Good point there.

Now I yield to a friend from Kentucky, ANDY BARR.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from Missouri for her leadership in leading this Special Order.

Many Americans watching on TV right now are frustrated. They are angry with what they are seeing in Washington. They don't understand why political conflict has to get in the way of solutions.

They are saying, and they are saying to all of us, why are the politicians putting their political agendas ahead of what is good for the country?

I share that frustration and anger, and I understand what they are saying. They are saying, why can't the politicians get their act together?

Why can't they reopen the government and avert default?

But you know, as important as it is to reopen the government, and as important as it is to avert a short-term default, and those are very critical, it is equally important that we stop business as usual in Washington.

It is important that Members of Congress do what they were elected to do, which is exercise leadership, stand up for what is right and what is in the long-term best interest of the Nation.

What is in the long-term best interest of the Nation is to stop spending money we don't have. It is to stop racking up mounds of debt to end the reckless practices in Washington that are literally mortgaging the future of our children and our grandchildren and pushing this country to the brink of national bankruptcy.

Now, some have accused House Republicans of holding the country hostage solely for the purpose of repealing

or defunding the President's signature legislative achievement, ObamaCare.

Why is this relevant?

The President says ObamaCare should not be part of any negotiations to fund the government or raise the debt limit. But my constituents in Kentucky recognize the President's health care law for what it actually is, which is a massive increase in Federal spending.

Its projected cost has more than doubled since the President originally claimed it would reduce the deficit. It will cost American taxpayers \$2 trillion over the next decade, and its true cost will continue to grow.

ObamaCare was rammed through Congress on a partisan basis through a process that was specifically reserved for budget-related bills, the reconciliation process. So for anyone to suggest that ObamaCare is unrelated to the budget is both cynical and inconsistent with Congress' ongoing responsibility to scrutinize Federal spending.

After racking up \$7 trillion in debt in just 5 years, the President stubbornly refuses to negotiate over ObamaCare. But make no mistake: Congress would not be doing its job if it ignored ObamaCare and its massive cost in the ongoing debate about how to save America from bankruptcy.

□ 2030

So, Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by saying this. It would be unfair for young people and the next generation if we simply raised the debt limit without also addressing the underlying cause of our problems, without also addressing the cause of our fiscal situation, and that is runaway government spending. This is our opportunity. This is our moment. Let's seize this opportunity on a bipartisan basis. It is time for solutions.

I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership in this Special Order.

Let's not just raise the debt limit and keep kicking the can down the road. Let's solve America's problem and finally force the government to live within its means.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and my privilege today to stand in the House of Representatives, along with my distinguished colleague from the Silver State, Representative STEVEN HORSFORD, to coanchor the CBC Special Order, the hour of power, where, for the next 60 minutes, members of the Congressional Black Caucus have an opportunity to talk directly to the American people about the situation that we face in this country right now related to both the government shutdown and the impending debt ceiling crisis that we confront.

Mr. Speaker, this is day 14 of a government shutdown brought to us by reckless, irresponsible, and unreasonable behavior by our friends on the other side of the aisle. It is a government shutdown that is hurting the American people. It is hurting children, placing their Head Start programming at risk. It is hurting seniors who rely on the Meals on Wheels program. It is hurting expectant mothers who may be unable to receive the nutritional assistance that they are otherwise qualified for. It is hurting the more than 800,000 hardworking civil servants who have been unceremoniously cast out of their jobs, uncertain as to when they may be able to return. It is hurting America.

But as bad as this government shutdown has been, we are also faced with a crisis that might be even worse if we are unable in this House to raise the debt ceiling within the next several days. The Treasury Secretary has indicated that the United States effectively will run out of the capacity to pay all of its bills and its creditors if we do not raise the debt ceiling by Thursday, October 17, just a few days from now.

Now, the debt ceiling has been a vehicle that all too often has been mischaracterized, perhaps intentionally, perhaps out of ignorance. I am not certain. But let's just clear the record as to what the debt ceiling actually represents. It is a backward-looking vehicle, not a forward-looking vehicle designed to give the President the ability to spend more. That is a gross mischaracterization. The debt ceiling is a backward-looking vehicle designed to give the President and this administration the capacity to pay bills that this Congress has already incurred.

We just want the Congress to undertake its constitutional responsibility pursuant to the 14th Amendment, where, in section 4, it makes clear the validity of the public debt authorized by law shall not be questioned. And it is Congress, in section 5 of the 14th Amendment, that has the responsibility to adhere to that constitutional requirement.

We are going to explore this theme and the consequences of a debt ceiling default during this Special Order. And

I am very pleased that we have been joined by the dynamic leader of the Congressional Black Caucus, the distinguished chairperson from the great State of Ohio, Representative MARCIA FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to thank my colleagues, Congressmen JEFFRIES and HORSFORD, for once again leading the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, here we stand, nearly 72 hours before the United States Treasury reaches the debt limit. We are 72 hours away from compromising our ability to make Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and veterans benefits payments. We are 72 hours away from risking default on our international debt obligations; 72 hours away from the potential of stocks plummeting and interest rates soaring, reversing recent gains in the housing, automobile, and banking markets. Our Nation is 72 hours away from the possibility of a severe economic disaster both at home and abroad.

Unfortunately, the House majority's inability to move beyond partisan politics has created one economic crisis after another. Our country is still feeling the effects of the economic downturn and subsequent recession that began in 2007. Communities around the country continue to struggle with high unemployment, less access to loans for small businesses, and a fragile housing market. It is irresponsible to do further damage to our economy by even threatening to allow America to default on its bills.

We must first do no harm, Mr. Speaker. Yet that is exactly the position we are in because of House Republicans.

Now, don't be misled by Republican talking points that would lead you to believe that raising the debt limit leads to more spending. This only allows us to pay debts that have already been accrued, debts that have already been authorized by this Congress.

While both parties have politicized the debt limits in the past, we have never—and I repeat, never—seen this degree of brinkmanship. Prior to this dysfunctional Congress, the debt limit debates never contemplated an actual default. Members of Congress never faced the impact of crossing that threshold and artificially forcing the Nation into the depths of economic disaster. And ultimately, when legislative language was attached to the debt limit, it was a part of a package that passed with strong bipartisan support.

We simply cannot afford the catastrophic consequences of a government default. It is time for Congress to put the American people first, work together to find a solution, and put partisan bickering behind us. Our Nation has worked too hard to put us on the path to recovery.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to move forward. The American people expect Con-

gress to do its job. The CBC stands ready—ready to work with our colleagues to raise the debt ceiling, reject the politics of brinkmanship, and get our economic house in order.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished chairwoman for her insightful, thorough remarks.

I now yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from the great State of Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who has joined us today to share her remarks and observations as to this debt ceiling crisis that we are confronting right now.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman for his courtesies and look at this in a somewhat unique fashion to speak to the pending crisis and to join with my colleagues, and particularly in following the chairwoman, Congresswoman FUDGE, and thanking her for setting the tone of the interests of the Congressional Black Caucus to be collaborative and to be problem solvers.

Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for his timeliness in bringing us to the floor tonight and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) for recognizing the vital importance of speaking to the American people and certainly to our colleagues.

I do want to offer to my colleagues a legislative initiative that I hope all of my friends—Republicans and Democrats—will join in sponsoring, H. Res. 375, which commits this House to refraining from conditioning the resolution of fiscal and budgetary disputes on the taking of action related to non-germane legislative matters.

As I listened to my friends on the other side of the aisle, one person sought to refute the representation that all of us have made, which is that we have never been in a position to hold hostage the whole budgeting process through the idea of a legislative fight, and I would beg to differ on the interpretation of my Republican friends that that has occurred. It did not occur during the shutdown dealing with President Clinton and the Speaker of the House, then-Speaker Gingrich; and, in fact, we had passed a number of appropriation bills that had already been passed. So even though the government was shut down, there was not this dire, complete collapse of the government that we are facing now.

In addition, there is a representation that we have passed any number of pointed appropriations during this shutdown. Mr. Speaker, those were only political votes. The reason why they were ineffective and members of our party voted against them was because they were political votes. They were meant entirely to get Democrats on the record for half-funding Health and Human Services, half-funding Indian Services, half-funding Homeland Security, half-funding any number of

departments that, in fact, did not make sense.

So let me give you the real cost, if you will, of where we are today and give it from the perspective of my committee, and that is, the Judiciary Committee. And one of our major agencies, the FBI, that clearly has focused on the security, domestic security of this Nation, very vital work of field agents that I work with every day, just about 72 hours ago, FBI agents joined with my local officials in Houston and busted a heinous and horrific human trafficking operation, little girls sexually used and abused and manipulated, if you will—the FBI.

Well, here is a quote from the FBI:

The impact of sequestration, which is part of the budgeting process, puts us further behind enemies and criminals that pose threats to national security and public safety.

And they list a whole litany of issues that are impacted. Let me just read a few: undermining counterterrorism investigations, exposing vulnerable populations to greater risk, halting counterintelligence cases, closing white collar cases has been delayed, limiting mortgage and financial fraud cases, constraining use of official vehicles, losing informants, impeding surveillance, harming local cooperation, reducing field time, increasing retirements.

All of this impacts on the very basic responsibilities that we give to them; and it seems sad that we are putting these individuals who are putting themselves on the front lines of criminal enforcement, that we are, in fact, causing that to be halted.

Lastly, on the FBI, Quantico, we all know, is a training ground for agents and others all across America:

Quantico is quiet. I have no new agent classes going through there. I can't afford it.

There are any number of other issues, of course, that we could comment on, but let me continue by moving to my State, the State of Texas.

But before I do that, here is a document from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. Again, something that the Judiciary has concern for. And we are told, as of tomorrow, possibly, that judicial matters may be shut down, may be stopped because of the restraints on our article III judges, and that is shameful.

That means justice is stopping. That means public defenders are not being paid. Although all of those folks are continuing to come, in some instances, there may be major impacts in the court system.

But I would like to turn our attention to the discourse that is occurring here; and as I do that, let me make mention for my friends of one answer to why we should not be holding ObamaCare and the American people hostage.

First I want to say, coming from my district, I met with over 40 navigators.

They have concerns. We all want to make sure this works right, which is what I wished my Republican friends would do. But they had smiles on their faces because what they are saying is the people are eager. They are eager in Texas, a State where we have denied the expanded Medicaid. We don't have our State exchange. We have done damage to those who need insurance. It is a shame what we have done in Texas.

But those who have been assigned to get an outreach are smiling, not because they get paid a whole lot of money, but because they are reaching people who are desperate and who want to be insured.

□ 2045

And so I will put in the RECORD an article called, "ObamaCare Saved My Family From Financial Ruin." It talks about a young boy with a brain tumor and leading up to the point of losing all of his insurance. He might have been born with this tumor, but he was only diagnosed at about 6 years old. Mason is his name. He played basketball and did a lot of things until they determined in later years—I think he was age 14—that he had this horrific brain tumor. It is only because of ObamaCare that his life now will have the kind of coverage of insurance that we are all desirous of.

But I want to sort of finish my remarks. There is a lot I can say about Texas, and I may offer one point if I might, Mr. JEFFRIES, to make sure that I have that in the RECORD. We all are concerned about our individual States. And so for my friends back home, this is a State that has some 36 Members of Congress, two Senators, and I am on the floor fighting against this shutdown.

The reason that Texans need to be aware that it is important that you fight against this shutdown and put out a clean CR is that this will cost 582,829 Texas residents who took out a home mortgage or refinanced an existing mortgage last year \$36,000 over the life of a typical 30-year loan. And I am jumping to if we go into default over the next 2 days.

The Republican debt default will put at risk the retirement plans of 4.473 million Texans, and 300,000 vets would have a concern about their disability compensation for November 1; and 24,000 or 25,000 poor and disabled vets would be questionable about the pension they live on.

But I want to close with something that has disturbed me as we have watched the rhetoric. I have pages and pages. We all are emotional. We all have the talent of rhetoric. We all have, if you will, the affection for the use of words—hyperbole, metaphors, using examples, and making our point. Mr. Speaker, I respect that. I am not a thin-skinned person. I am as much engaged in the debate on this floor as

many of my friends, but all of us should be sensitive to the words that suggest that we have other motives.

So I come to the floor today to raise issue with what is perceived in many communities of the different treatment of Barack Obama. You can read between the words why he is treated so differently and why he is cast about with such utterly ugly and demeaning suggestions. And in demeaning him, you are demeaning a whole body of other folks. I take issue with that.

And so let me see if maybe Larry Klayman of Freedom Watch will call us back and give us a response to his words uttered yesterday that I find totally out of order. Protected by the First Amendment, absolutely—I have no quarrel with that. But I believe it is important to put this in the RECORD as we talk about this government shutdown because if we are going to get where we need to go, we need to all realize that we have a greater cause—and that is America's cause.

So I finish on these words.

Apparently, he was moved yesterday in front of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial—which many in the Million Vets movement denounced yesterday, and he said:

We are ruled by a President that bows down to Allah.

I am already insulted because I believe in the freedom of religion. I respect the dignity of all religions.

He is not a President of we the people, says Mr. Klayman of Freedom Watch, but a President of his people.

I don't know who that is. All I know is that the President was elected to be President of all of the people of the United States of America.

He goes on to say:

We should wage a nonviolent revolution.

I have never been ashamed of the nonviolent civil rights movement. We didn't call it a revolution. We called it a movement to give dignity to people and move them from second-class citizenship.

But he says:

We should wage a nonviolent revolution. This President should get the Koran out of his hands.

This is denigrating a religion that I believe is absolutely appalling.

Get off his knees—

Is there some documentation about the President's private prayer allegiances or responsibilities or desires that this gentleman knows what he is talking about?

—and get out of town.

That is, I believe, one of the most appalling statements that we have heard charged against a President of the United States in a time of crisis, when the American people are looking for hope, looking for serious response.

I would hope that there will be Members of the Republican Conference that will come to the floor tomorrow and

join in with the solution that may be offered as it is being discussed in the Senate; and I hope they will denounce these words, as I am denouncing them tonight. For we will never get a solution to move this Nation forward if we are to denounce religions that are respected and given the privilege of being worshipped by those who worship—by the First Amendment—and to try to denigrate a President by denigrating a religion and going in the circle of diminishing all of us.

I want to thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity. I may ask for some more time if I am able to stay around, as we go forward, because there is a long list of what I think we are being deprived of.

But I do want to let everyone know that when I was home in the district for the short period I was, I know that those in Texas who are suffering are happy about Barack Obama. They want us to get it together right like we did with Medicare part D, which did not work when it was first put in place, but they are happy.

I would hope that, as I indicated these words on the floor, that we would take the words of Chaplain Barry Black and “stop sowing in the wind” and stop, in essence, doing things that undermine our very leadership. Thank you, Chaplain Black, for giving us these words of inspiration. Maybe we will take notice. And when words are said that are ugly, inappropriate, and without any truth, I am looking for my friends tomorrow to come on the floor and denounce these ugly words that were said by this gentleman that have no bearing in truth and have the audacity to denigrate faiths that are, in essence, respected and show their love for a higher power.

We should all be grateful that the different faiths we grant in this Nation under the First Amendment of freedom of religion can pray to their God—pray to God—and ask for the blessings of God on this Nation.

With that, I thank the gentleman for his courtesies.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 9, 2013]

OBAMACARE SAVED MY FAMILY FROM
FINANCIAL RUIN

(By Janine Urbaniak Reid)

House Speaker John Boehner and his tea party friends shut down the U.S. government because of people like me. I am the mother of an insurance hog, someone who could have blown through his lifetime limit of health coverage by the time he was 14. My son has managed to survive despite seemingly insurmountable challenges, and he wears his pre-existing condition like a Super Bowl ring.

Mason, now 16, was probably born with his brain tumor. We discovered it six years ago. Biopsies showed a slow-growing mass, which was the good news. The bad news was that the tumor could not be removed because it had grown around essential structures in his brain. Under the care of some of the country's finest specialists, Mason had frequent scans. There was little we could do between tests but hope for the best. Like other chil-

dren his age, Mason played basketball, argued with his siblings and avoided cleaning his bedroom. He managed to undergo chemotherapy for eight months without getting too sick. He insisted on finding ways to laugh, saying things like: “I have brain cancer. What’s your problem?” It was an uneasy peace—until the tumor ruptured in December 2010, three years after his initial diagnosis, and Mason suffered a massive cerebral hemorrhage.

Mason spent most of eighth grade in the hospital. In the six months he was hospitalized, he spent 65 days in the pediatric intensive care unit. He underwent four brain surgeries. Halfway through his hospitalization, the Affordable Care Act was passed, alleviating lifetime limits on coverage and saving us from the financial abyss. Mason moved to a rehabilitation hospital where he was retaught the most basic skills—sitting up, eating and standing. We faithfully paid the premiums on the employer-sponsored plan through which our family is covered, along with the rest of our bills, thanking God and whoever else would listen for our good fortune to have coverage.

The biggest fear for families such as mine is that we will lose our health insurance and be rendered uninsurable because one of us has been sick. The Affordable Care Act does away with dreaded clauses barring pre-existing conditions. It also enables us to keep Mason on our insurance until he is 26; then, he will be able to purchase his own coverage on an insurance exchange. At least, that was the plan until last Tuesday, when the government was shut down in protest of such excesses.

As far as the brain tumor goes, our family might have drawn the short straw. Maybe our story lacks a certain universal appeal. People might thinking to themselves, “I’m so sorry that happened to you, but odds are it won’t happen to me.” I hope it doesn’t, really.

But having lived in hospitals with Mason for months, I have seen that bad things—accidents, freak illnesses—happen to smart, cautious and otherwise undeserving people. It’s one thing we all have in common. We are fragile beings. So what is wrong with allowing us to purchase a financial safety net? What’s so un-American about that?

If I could get John Boehner and Ted Cruz on a conference call, I would explain this to them. I would tell them that, while they were busy trying to derail the Affordable Care Act over the past two years, Mason has again learned to walk, talk, eat and shoot a three-point basket.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from the great State of Texas for her observations and certainly hope that all people of decency on both sides of the aisle will denounce the hateful words that we saw on display here in the Nation’s Capital this weekend.

We are pleased to have been joined by the distinguished Representative from the great State of Virginia, Representative BOBBY SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from New York and the gentlelady from Nevada for organizing this Special Order, and the gentlelady from Ohio for her leadership in the Black Caucus, and the other Members who are participating tonight.

Mr. Speaker, our economy has been improving very slowly over the last few

years, and we need to do everything we can to make sure that we create as many jobs as possible.

Thursday, the United States faces a crisis, and that is whether we will pay our debts or whether we will, for the first time in our history, default on our debts. The debate on the debt ceiling really isn’t much of a debate because every credible economist has already concluded that failure to adjust the debt ceiling will cause serious adverse consequences to the domestic economy, and even the global economy. That conclusion really ought to end the debate.

For those who want a little more information, you only have to look back a couple of years. The Republicans made a credible threat on the debt ceiling, and the S&P, just based on the credible threat—although we raised it in time—downgraded the creditworthiness of the United States for the first time in history.

So we really don’t know exactly what would happen. We know none of it is going to be good, but we would be looking at possible increases in interest rates, lost jobs, stock market collapse and people’s pensions at stake, government checks like Social Security and veterans benefits, and doctors not being paid under Medicare. All are adverse consequences for failing to adjust the debt ceiling.

My Republican colleagues have threatened to use this crisis as an opportunity to gain legislative advantage to pass legislation that they can’t pass through the normal process. Unfortunately for them, the Nation Magazine published their wish list. It starts, of course, with undermining ObamaCare, but then it goes on to entitlement reform, better known as cutting Social Security and Medicare; Keystone pipeline; corporate tax cuts; sabotage EPA clean air regulations; offshore drilling. It goes on and on. They published the list.

But the full faith and credit of the United States should not be a bargaining chip held hostage unless some legislative ransom is paid.

Suppose the Democrats played the same game and put on the table immigration reform, gay rights, a jobs bill, or gun safety, and we are going to shut down the government or mess with the debt ceiling unless we get our way on that legislation. How dysfunctional a government would we have then?

In the past, there have been debt ceilings; and people have referred to the fact that in the past, there have been negotiations over the debt ceiling. But those are different negotiations. Those are negotiations on the debt ceiling in the context of. Of course we are going to adjust the debt ceiling. And then you put things on the bill. So if you can get your amendment on the bill, you know you are in good shape because that bill is going to pass. You will get over the line.

It has never been in the context of, If I don't get my way, we will explode the economy—until 2 years ago when the Republicans pulled a stunt and the S&P downgraded our credit rating. About 45 times since the 1980s we have increased the debt ceiling. It has always been in the context of, Of course, the debt ceiling will be increased.

This isn't like a credit card where you increase your credit limit so that you can spend more. We have already spent it. We have passed the spending bills. We have already spent the money. The question is whether we are going to pay the bills; and if you are going to discuss fiscal responsibility, it ought to be at a time when you are deciding whether to spend the money, not after you spend it and then decide whether you are going to pay the bills that you have already incurred.

We are discussing this debt ceiling while the government is shut down. And shut down for what reason? It started off on ObamaCare. Many Republican Senators have already said that this wasn't going to happen, and it wasn't a good idea to shut down the government over ObamaCare. Apparently, they have pretty much given on that and some have said, Well, we have shut down the government; we have got to get something.

The problem with giving something for shutting down the government is that there is apparently a fundamental concept in psychology of positive reinforcement. If you reward somebody for doing something, they will probably do it again. If they get a reward for shutting down the government, this will become part and parcel of the legislative process that if you can't get a bill passed, you will shut down the government until you get it passed.

Several Republican legislators have praised the fact that we passed some piecemeal bills to reopen government one little agency at a time. It looks to me like every morning they read the newspaper and find out the latest disaster caused by their shutdown and then some things like servicemen not getting death benefits, the World War II Memorial, cancer patients not being treated at the National Institutes of Health, Head Start.

Every morning, they read the tragic effects of their shutdown and then run to the House to address the disaster of the day and try to get some 30-second sound bite to cover up the fact all they are doing is cleaning up part of the mess that they already caused.

Passage of these little piecemeal bills only serves to elongate the shutdown. We need to reopen the government and put an end to all this; and while some of us are working hard to produce jobs, this shutdown is costing hundreds of thousands of jobs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have criticized Democrats for not negotiating. I just want to remind

everybody we are talking about the budget. The Democrats started with one number, the Republicans with another number. The Democrats didn't come halfway or two-thirds of the way. They just agreed to the Republican number on a short-term basis so we can continue to negotiate without shutting down the government.

So we need to reopen all of the government and stop losing jobs. Let's pay our debts, and then we can get to the real serious negotiations on the budget.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and look forward to reopening government, paying our bills, and then getting into the tough negotiations.

□ 2100

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for his observations and for reminding the American people that the President, the Senate majority, Democrats in the House of Representatives have always been prepared to sit down and attempt to find common ground as it relates to the challenges that we confront here in the country. We have been asking for a conference committee to be put into place so we can discuss the budget passed by the House and passed by the Senate and figure out how we can negotiate around those differences since March; but the House majority has refused to appoint Members to negotiate the budget differences.

But we are not going to be put into a position where essentially you say, Give us everything we want—the right-wing Republican agenda for this country rejected by the American people on November 6, 2012. But notwithstanding that fact, give us everything we want or we are going to shut down the government or force a default that plunges this country and the world into a painful recession. We are not interested in negotiating on those terms because it is not in the best interest of the American people.

I am pleased that we have been joined by the distinguished Representative from the great State of California.

I yield to Representative BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. First let me thank you both, Congressman JEFFRIES and Congressman HORSFORD, for your tremendous leadership, your vigilance, and your diligence. We appreciate your conducting these Special Orders to make sure that the American people know the truth about what is taking place here in Washington, D.C.

Also, I have to salute our chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlelady from Ohio, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, for her leadership and ensuring that the entire Congressional Black Caucus continues to be the conscience of the Congress.

Here we are 14 days into the Tea Party Republican shutdown and 3 days

away from the Tea Party Republican government default, which would be the first in American history. Since taking control of the House of Representatives 2 years ago, the Tea Party has governed by brinksmanship. First, they were unable to accomplish their goals of decimating the government through legislation, so they have resorted to the type of tactics that eventually led to the sequester and to the shutdown of the Federal Government.

Now, the last time that the Republicans refused to lift the debt ceiling and relied on brinksmanship to get their way, a supercommittee was formed as a way to reach compromise—which of course didn't work and led to the sequester, which has caused devastating, across-the-board cuts to programs that the American people rely on, including 57,000 slots which were cut from Head Start already, and services such as Meals on Wheels that our seniors depend on for a nutritious diet.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee and the Budget Committee, I have joined Democrats in demanding an end to sequester and fought to restore the cuts to these vital programs. Yet even though we disagree with the funding level that these reckless cuts enacted—the sequester was a horrific action that we took, unfortunately. It has wreaked havoc on the lives of so many people. Even though we oppose that, we have agreed to vote for this budget, to reopen the government, and to put people back to work, and to provide the desperate services that people need.

Then, of course, to add insult to injury, Republicans insisted on shutting down the government all because of an obsession with repealing and destroying the Affordable Care Act. Now, the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. It has been upheld by the Supreme Court, and Americans are finally enrolling in coverage that they have been waiting for for years just to gain access to affordable health care. In fact, in its first week, the Covered California exchange in my home State had nearly 1 million visits to its Web site; and Californians have begun filling out nearly 44,000 applications for coverage.

The only thing that the Tea Party Republicans have accomplished with this shutdown is the loss of nearly \$4 billion in economic activity and misery and pain for the American people. They continue to deny Federal workers, the National Park Service, lifesaving cancer research, pregnant women, mothers, young children, seniors and veterans who have risked their lives for the Nation; they have denied them a fully functioning government. It is a shame and disgrace.

In my own county, funds for the Women, Infant and Children nutrition program and funds for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, these funds will run out at the end of the month.

Now, the consequences of the default: Republicans have simply refused to listen to what the vast majority of Americans are saying, and now the Tea Party Republicans are willing to risk the Nation's credit rating and the world economy to achieve their goal. If the Tea Party refuses to raise the debt ceiling and forces a default on this Nation's debt—which, mind you, are bills that we have already agreed to pay—every American household will feel the impact. Retirement savings will be lost; mortgages will be harder to get.

The full faith and credit of the United States is nonnegotiable. We are not a deadbeat Nation and should pay our bills. It is time for the Tea Party Republicans to end the brinksmanship, open the government up, put people back to work, pay our bills, and let's begin to negotiate on a real budget that will ensure the American Dream for millions of Americans for whom this dream now, quite frankly, is turning into a nightmare.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Congresswoman LEE, thank you for continuing to be an unyielding advocate for the downtrodden, the disaffected, and the disenfranchised in such a tremendous way.

I now yield to a distinguished member of the freshman class, also joining us from the great State of Texas, my good friend, Representative MARC VEASEY.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the time to thank my friend from New York and the gentleman from Nevada for helping to put together this special hour on what is really important in this country. We know just how vital and vibrant we want our economy to be, and it is hard to do that if we are not taking care of our credit. I appreciate both of these gentlemen for taking this hour to talk about this.

I would also like to thank my colleague from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who spoke so eloquently on so many different areas in government that would be affected if we were to have a shutdown and how the Affordable Care Act is helping Americans—helping working Americans do better.

Whether you are from Houston, where she lives, or the north Texas area where I am from, in the Dallas-Fort Worth area, people are concerned. People are starting to get very worried about the very dangerous prospect of approaching the legal debt limit since we are only 3 days away from default.

In 2011, the credit agency Standard & Poor's downgraded the U.S. credit rating for the first time in history. S&P said this back then:

The political brinksmanship of recent months highlights what we see as America's governance and policymaking becoming less stable, less effective, and less predictable than what we previously believed. The statutory debt ceiling and the threat of default have become political bargaining chips in the debate over fiscal policy.

Now, following that particular downgrade, it is estimated that job growth took a 28 percent nosedive. Can we afford a 28 percent nosedive right now? I think not.

This also cost Americans more than 200,000 jobs right when we are starting to do better. The economy is starting to be kicked into motion from what was a very bad period over the last several years. We can't afford 200,000 jobs right now. We have to do everything we can to get ourselves out of the situation that we are in right now.

Also important is that consumer confidence dropped to levels mirroring those during the Great Recession, which had a negative impact on economic activity. The GAO found that taxpayers paid \$1.3 billion in additional interest. Let me repeat that: the GAO found that hardworking taxpayers paid \$1.3 billion in additional interest costs because of the delayed 2011 debt limit increase. Is that what we want, the hardworking taxpayers of our country to have to pay additional taxes because we can't get our act together, because Republicans can't get their act together on the debt ceiling?

Two years after S&P's bleak assessment and the clear economic data, here we are again brought to the brink. We must be clear on what exactly the debt limit is and what it is not. Increasing the debt limit does not increase the Federal debt. It does not give a blank check to our government to spend all it wants. Increasing the debt limit will simply allow the Federal Government to pay bills that Congress has already accrued.

Some of the payments that the Federal Government must make are interest payments on Treasury bonds, Social Security and Medicare benefits, military Active Duty pay, retirement and VA benefits. If the Tea Party refuses to allow the government to honor these financial obligations that are so dear to many Americans, to our family members, to people in our communities, then investors will likely lose faith in the government and demand higher interest rates for Treasury bonds. We cannot allow our country to become a deadbeat Nation that doesn't pay its bills.

Let's move beyond these silly, partisan games. We have the American economy at stake here. And more importantly, we have the economic livelihood of every American in our hand. The full faith and credit of the United States should not be up for negotiation. It is time for Congress to raise the debt limit—like they have in the past so many times before—and for Republicans to end their losing game of brinksmanship and realize that they are damaging American lives every day.

Let's do more for the hardworking taxpayers in our country that make our country great.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for his observations and for his historical analysis, pointing out that raising the debt ceiling is something that has consistently occurred throughout the last century here in America.

I want to enter into the RECORD a White House correspondence that reads, in part, as follows:

This country now possesses the strongest credit in the world. The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and on the value of the dollar in exchange markets. The Nation can ill afford to allow such a result.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is dated November 16, 1983, and those words were written by then-President Ronald Reagan to Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker: The Nation can ill afford to allow such a result.

Ronald Reagan raised the debt ceiling 18 times during his two terms; and yet our good friends on the other side of the aisle want to come here and lecture President Obama as if he is being irresponsible, when the paragon of conservative Presidential leadership recognized the necessity on 18 occasions—and as memorialized in this correspondence—of raising the debt ceiling.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC, November 16, 1983.

Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR HOWARD: This letter is to ask for your help and support, and that of your colleagues, in the passage of an increase in the limit on the public debt.

As Secretary Regan has told you, the Treasury's cash balances have reached a dangerously low point. Henceforth, the Treasury Department cannot guarantee that the Federal Government will have sufficient cash on any one day to meet all of its mandated expenses, and thus the United States could be forced to default on its obligations for the first time in its history.

This country now possesses the strongest credit in the world. The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and on the value of the dollar in exchange markets. The Nation can ill afford to allow such a result. The risks, the costs, the disruptions, and the incalculable damage lead me to but one conclusion: the Senate must pass this legislation before the Congress adjourns.

I want to thank you for your immediate attention to this urgent problem and for your assistance in passing an extension of the debt ceiling.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

We are pleased that we have been joined by the distinguished gentlelady from Columbus, Ohio, who has conducted herself with such intelligence and grace in her 10 months here in the

United States Congress, and we are proud to call her a member of this freshman class.

I yield now to Representative JOYCE BEATTY.

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you, Mr. JEFFRIES, and to Mr. HORSFORD.

It is an honor for me to stand here on this floor with you as a colleague in our freshman class. But first let me thank you for your leadership, and also to Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE from my great State of Ohio, as president of the Congressional Black Caucus.

As I stand here tonight, I am reminded of the words of Martin Luther King when he said:

The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in a time of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy.

□ 2115

Mr. Speaker, I rise today during this time of challenge and controversy to express my strong concern over Republicans' failure to immediately raise our country's debt limit. The failure to act is threatening an imminent default on our Nation's financial obligation.

Raising the debt limit does not grow our deficit. Instead, it allows the Treasury to pay for what this Congress has already spent.

What are the facts? Since 1917, the debt limit has been raised 103 times. In recent history, it has been raised 45 times. As you have heard my colleague state, 18 times during Ronald Reagan's Presidency.

In 273 years since our country's founding we have never defaulted on our financial obligation. Yes, never. But if Republicans refuse to increase the debt limit by October 17, the Secretary of the Treasury has indicated very clearly that we won't be able to pay our outstanding debts on time. Quite frankly, this is unthinkable.

The "full faith and credit" clause of the United States Constitution directs that the United States will pay all its debts in full and on time every time.

America's full faith and credit has been the basis for our global economic superiority for at least 100 years. Like ordinary Americans, if the Federal Government does not pay its bills on time, then when it comes time to borrow in the future, the interest rates we pay will be much higher. If the debt limit is not raised, Americans will feel the impact immediately, both directly and indirectly.

Who loses? Payments owed to our soldiers and veterans for their services will be delayed. Nearly 4 million disabled veterans receive monthly payments in recognition of their sacrifice. If we default, they will not receive their benefits on November 1. In my home, the great State of Ohio, 1,183 veterans receive disability compensation. It would be unthinkable for us to fail to pay them, and the benefits that they have earned for their services.

Who loses? If the debt ceiling is not raised more than \$36 million, Social Security recipients will not receive their earned benefits. In Ohio, over 2 million residents rely on Social Security to make ends meet. A default in our obligations would force them to choose between paying their rent or buying groceries. It is not a choice that Congress should force on our constituents to make.

Americans will also see a sharp spike in interest rates offered on home mortgages, credit cards, car payments, and student loans. The spike will have an immediate, devastating negative impact on our Nation's housing recovery, which has been a driving force in recent economic growth.

If Americans default, the average homeowner will pay an extra \$100 a month in increased interest rates. This will cost families \$36,000 over the life of a typically 30-year home loan.

As the stock market reacts to the most significant defaults in modern history, you can expect steep drops in your IRAs and your 401Ks.

Just last week, the Secretary of the Treasury reported that if our Nation were to default on our debts, the consequences would be "catastrophic"—yes, catastrophic—"with many private sector analysts believing that it would lead to events of the magnitude of late 2008 or worse."

We are still recovering from the worst recession in 80 years. We simply cannot afford to go backward, to go to double-digit unemployment, declining housing values, the financial markets declining, and a climate of economic uncertainty for businesses.

Americans deserve swift action. I implore House Republican leadership to bring to the floor a bill which will raise the debt limit so the Treasury can continue to pay all of its bills on time.

And lastly, I turn to the other imminent crisis: reopening the Federal Government.

Throughout this hour, you have heard my colleagues talk about the choices that you force Americans to make when you try to piecemeal our funding. It is worth me repeating to say: it is like having a family and having parents having seven children, and decide that you are only going to feed three of them and watch the other four children starve before your eyes.

We stand on this floor as Democrats and Republicans every day and we talk about how we care for this America, how we want to provide services, but yet we are making Americans make a choice between NIH funding for children who are cancer patients, who need to be in clinical trial, and we make a decision to pull the funding, Federal funding, in 11 States that they are losing their Head Start grants. The list goes on and on.

This is not the America I know, this is not the America I love. Americans deserve better.

Let's reopen the doors of government, and let's raise our debt ceiling.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from Ohio for her very eloquent remarks.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on the Special Order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

We have also been joined by another distinguished Member of the freshman class, the always nattily dressed representative from the great State of New Jersey, my good friend, Congressman DONALD PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Nevada for having this Special Order tonight, and also our tireless and fearless leader, the Honorable MARCIA FUDGE, chairwoman of the CBC.

"Insane," "catastrophic," "chaotic," "a nuclear bomb"—these are just some of the words our top economists and business leaders have used to describe what will happen to our economy if Congress chooses not to pay our bills on time.

The last time we flirted with not paying our bills on time, the economy flew into a tailspin, the markets plummeted, consumer confidence took a nosedive, our credit rating was downgraded, and our economic recovery came to a screeching halt. That was when we only got close to a default. If we actually defaulted, the short- and long-term consequences would be unimaginable.

So, if this is the case, then how did we even get ourselves here again? The answer is simple. An extreme group of the Republican Party, the Tea Party, is so obsessed with defunding the Affordable Care Act that they are even willing to shut down the government and hold the full faith and credit of the United States hostage.

Now, what does that mean, the "full faith and credit?" Mr. Speaker, when I hear that, it makes me think about what this Nation has meant to the world, about what this Nation has done for its people—the full faith and credit of the United States. I wouldn't want that on my conscience, that I was part of this body when it defaulted, because that is what you will be remembered for. You were here during the darkest time in this Nation's history.

It is irresponsible that a small group would hold the American economy hostage simply because they don't like one Presidential policy, or the man.

The Affordable Care Act is already the law. Even now that the government is closed because of the Republican shutdown, the law is going into effect as we speak.

So I urge my reasonable colleagues on the other side to listen to the American people, because the people in my

district are still hurting from the economic recession. They don't need a manufactured crisis on top of it.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, let me now yield to the gentleman from the great State of Nevada, Representative STEVEN HORSFORD, my good friend from the silver State, my co-anchor on the CBC Special Order Hour of Power, to close us out for the evening.

Mr. HORSFORD. Let me thank my good friend. I am proud to co-anchor this Special Order hour each week with you, my good friend from the great State of New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), and to all of my colleagues who came out tonight to put a real face to the real issues that are affecting America this day. To our leader, the chairlady of the American Black Caucus, thank you for your steadfast leadership in making sure that all issues are addressed on this floor.

I listened to the other side of the aisle for more than an hour before coming to our Special Order. I tried to make sense of the arguments that they were making tonight. But do you know what? Their piecemeal approach to funding the government makes no sense.

This chart signifies just what a piecemeal approach to government looks like. This chart makes it look like the GOP has approached funding our government like a game of Pac-Man. Well, this isn't a game. There are real lives at stake. It is time for Speaker BOEHNER and the House Republicans to realize it is game over and to work with those of us on the Democratic side in the House and our leadership in the Senate and the President to reopen government.

Americans across the country are already hurting from this Republican-led government shutdown. In my district alone, 11,000 Nevadans have been furloughed, leaving families struggling to pay their bills on time while putting food on the table.

I recently returned from my district and had a town hall with constituents to hear the effects that this government shutdown and the impending debt ceiling would have on the constituents of my district.

One constituent, Fred Waggar, shared his story with me. He is a veteran who now works for the VA. He is worried that on October 25 he will not get his paycheck as a medical services coordinator for the VA. Then on November 1, he may not get his check and the benefits that he is entitled to as a veteran.

Fred said he is living paycheck to paycheck, so what is he going to do come November 1 when the rent is due, when the utility bills come due, when it is time to put food on his table, because Republicans are now determined to hold the full faith and credit of the

United States hostage because Speaker BOEHNER is too busy catering to a fringe of radicals in his caucus?

□ 2130

I also have received tweets from our #cbctalks from constituents in my district. Kevin Hooks, who is the president of the Las Vegas Urban League, says that with the impending debt ceiling not being lifted, if the Women, Infants, and Children program that the Urban League administers closes, 200 families per day will lose health services and 15 employees will be furloughed. He goes on to say that the child care subsidy would affect upwards of 225 children per day, and some 60 employees will be furloughed.

Shaundell Newsome with the Urban Chamber says that Nevada businesses are being impacted by the government shutdown. It is killing small businesses. Open it.

The fear is real.

And then I got a question from the Clark County Black Caucus asking—or saying that their members are nervous that they won't receive Social Security or unemployment checks on the first of the month; what should I tell them?

Well, I stand here, my colleagues and I, along with 196 House Democrats, in support of a clean debt ceiling increase that insures that the full faith and credit of the United States of America is protected and avoids a Republican default. Our constituents have already suffered enough from this shutdown. We need to be representing the people's interest, not punishing them. Refusing to raise the debt ceiling carries serious implications, as all of my colleagues have discussed tonight.

For an already fragile economy, if we allow the Republicans to default on our debt, middle class American families and the poor would be forced to pay higher interest rates for mortgages, auto loans, student loans, and credit cards. Veterans will be affected; disability benefits will not come on time. Is this any way to send a message to our veterans?

So we call on our colleagues tonight, you have left the building, but we are here and we will stay and work as long as it takes to ensure that our obligations are met, that the government is reopened, and that we meet our obligations to pay our bills.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, let's reopen the government, raise the debt ceiling, and get back to doing the business of the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, brinksmanship makes for poor politics, and defaulting on America's debts will make for a poor national economy and a poor global image. It should not be understated how devastating defaulting on the debt ceiling would be for America's growing economy. A default as a result of political games would be even more embarrassing.

Most games have winners and losers, but if the political games being employed by the Republican party cause a default on America's financial obligations, everyone loses. To be clear, this is not a game. The consequences on the American economy, our country's global image, and the lives of all Americans will be very real.

The Republican government shutdown has illuminated the party's willingness to put politics before people. If the Republican political brinksmanship causes a default on America's obligations, it will demonstrate their willingness to torpedo a growing American economy. This brinksmanship must end and we must raise the debt ceiling and continue advancing policies that have and will continue to allow our economy to grow.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official foreign travel.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 10, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 91: Making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 15, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3291. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft bill entitled, "To provide for the issuance of coins to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3292. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Cathay Pacific Airways Limited (Cathay Limited) of Hong Kong, pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3293. A letter from the Delegated Authority of the Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting a report on for-profit institution's revenues from Title IV and non-Title IV sources as provided by the institution in its audited financial statements in the July 1, 2011, to the June 30, 2012 reporting period; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3294. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Regulatory Guide 2.4, Review of Experiments for Research Reactors received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3295. A letter from the Speaker, Parliament of Albania, transmitting a letter wishing the United State a Happy Independence Day from the Parliament of Albania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3296. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; America's Cup Aerobatic Box, San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0741] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3297. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmit-

ting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Grain-Shipment and Grain-Shipment Assist Vessels, Columbia and Willamette Rivers [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0010] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3298. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Rules of Practice in Air Safety Proceedings [Docket No.: NTSB-GC-2011-0001] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3299. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — VA Acquisition Regulation: Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned and Veteran-Owned Small Business Status Protests (RIN: 2900-AM92) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3300. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Administration's processing of continuing disability reviews for FY 2011; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII,

Mr. HUNTER (for himself and Mr. RUPERSBERGER): introduced a resolution (H. Res. 382) supporting the goals and ideals of Red Ribbon Week, October 23, 2013 through

October 31, 2013; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 and resolutions of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 523: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 685: Mr. LEWIS and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1173: Mr. HOLT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1695: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1750: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 1803: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1992: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 2101: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2695: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2720: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2925: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 3040: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 3111: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 3121: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 3154: Mr. MESSER and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 3169: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 3179: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 3181: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3211: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 3229: Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3279: Mr. BARTON, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. DUFFY, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 3284: Mr. DOGGETT.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN TRIBUTE TO CHRISTOPHER
MOYER

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Mr. Christopher Moyer's 55th birthday. May the years ahead be blessed with good health, strong family, prosperity, and peace.

IN SUPPORT OF THE "OAKLAND
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE REPUB-
LICANS"

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the "Oakland University College Republicans" of Michigan, who like so many organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today, the roots of which are solid stock and American

made; they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American organization.

IN SUPPORT OF THE "UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN-DEARBORN COL-
LEGE REPUBLICANS"

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the "University of Michigan-Dearborn College Republicans" of Michigan, who like so many organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today, the roots of which are solid stock and American made; they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American grass-root organization.

END THE USE OF THE DEROGA-
TORY NAME "REDSKIN" AS THE
NAME OF WASHINGTON'S NFL
FRANCHISE

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I submit to my colleagues and some 181 million sports fans all over America who love the game of football just as much as I do having played football for four years in high school, that the time has come to end the use of the derogatory name "redskin" as the name of Washington's NFL franchise.

Again and again, Mr. Speaker this issue has arisen and it will not go away. With all due respect Mr. Speaker, I call upon the 32 football club owners of the National Football League and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell, to end the use of the derogatory word "redskin" as the name of Washington's football franchise. Mr. Speaker, the National Football League and Commissioner Goodell cannot just casually pass the responsibility to Mr. Dan Snyder, the owner of the Washington franchise. The Washington Football franchise is worth about \$1.6 billion, the third most valuable franchise in the NFL. The NFL has a responsibility to take steps to address the derogatory name because the NFL is also a beneficiary and receives a fair percentage of the proceeds from television broadcasts and merchandise sales from all 32 NFL franchises.

I want to thank President Barack Obama for weighing in on this issue just last week and I hope NFL Commissioner Goodell will seriously pursue this matter. If Commissioner Goodell feels that if the name were offending one person, we should listen, listen to the leaders of the National Congress of American Indians the oldest and largest organization which Native American Indians that represents the vast majority of some 5.2 million Native American Indians today.

I also want to thank Mr. Ray Halbritter, leader of the Oneida Indian Nation, Ms. Suzan Harjo a member of the Cheyenne and Hodugee Muscogee tribes, Ms. Amanda Blackhorse from the Navajo Nation, former U.S. Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell and members of our Native American Congressional Caucus for raising this issue of not using this derogatory racial slur the word "red-skin".

Again, it is time for NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell and the NFL to do the right

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

thing and take steps to end the use of a derogatory name for the NFL franchise in our nation's capital.

IN SUPPORT OF THE TROY AREA
TEA PARTY

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Troy Area Tea Party of Oakland County, Michigan, who like so many grass-root organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today, the roots of which are solid stock and American made; they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American grass-roots organization.

IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF DR.
CLAUDE ROBERT PLATTE

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and remembrance of Dr. Claude Robert Platte, a man who dedicated his life in service of his family, community and nation. Dr. Platte grew up in Fort Worth, Texas where he attended James E. Guinn elementary and graduated from Fort Worth's historic I.M. Terrell High School. Mr. Platte went on to Tuskegee Institute where he received a Degree in Mechanical engineering with a Minor in Aeronautics.

Dr. Platte joined the military where he was assigned to the 301st Fighter Squadron. Dr. Platte served as primary flight instructor, training over 400 blacks to solo and fly PT13s, PT17s and PT19s. The pilots he trained amassed an unmatched military record as fighter pilots. He broke racial and educational barriers in the military as the first black officer to be trained and commissioned in the newly reopened Air Force Pilot Training Program. He was trained at Randolph Field AFB Texas. He retired from the Air Force with the rank of Captain in 1965 after 18 years of service.

After his military service, Dr. Platte continued his work in the community as a Member of Guardianship Services, an organization that supplies court appointed guardians for people in need, and the Knights of St. Peter Claver Court 89, a Catholic organization that provides community services nationwide.

He was Founder of the DFW Tuskegee Airmen Chapter established in May 2005 to provide educational assistance to youth. Dr. Platte along with other Original Tuskegee Airmen traveled around the world sharing their story with children, inspiring them to reach their goals. In 2008 the Claude R. Platte Future Pilots Flight School was established to continue the legacy of all of the Tuskegee Airmen by teaching different aspects of aviation which includes flying, building, designing and maintaining aircraft to the youth.

Dr. Claude R. Platte received several honors for his service. He received the Good Conduct Medal and Service in The European War Medal while in the military. On February 23, 2006 he received an Honorary Doctorate in Public Service from Tuskegee University. On March 29, 2007 he was awarded the Congressional Gold Medal by the President of the United States for his service to the country as an Original Tuskegee Airmen.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and remembrance of Dr. Claude Robert Platte whose kind spirit and dedicated service touched many lives. He is survived by his wife Erma Bonner Platte; stepson Alfred M. Williams; Marie Platte Godsey; cousins, Edwina Higgins and Lois Platte, Nathaniel George Hagler, Dr. Nathaniel G. and Royace Hagler, Jr. and the Rev. Gaylan Hagler; nieces Alyssa Godsey, Ginger Platte, Attral and Arwa Platte, Jr., Gary Platte; sister in law Johanna McCully Bonner; and a host of great nieces, great nephews, other relatives and friends. I offer my condolences and deepest

sympathy to his wife and family. May he rest in peace.

IN SUPPORT OF THE RATTLE
WITH US TEA PARTY

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Rattle With Us Tea Party of Plymouth, Michigan who like so many grass-root organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today, the roots of which are solid stock and American made; they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American grass-roots organization.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding two missed votes on October 12, 2013. Had I been present for rollcall

545, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar offered by Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania, I would have voted "nay." Had I been present for rollcall 546, on the motion to instruct conferees offered by Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota to H.R. 2609, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, I would have voted "nay."

IN SUPPORT OF THE LAKES AREA
TEA PARTY

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Lakes Area Tea Party of Commerce, Michigan who like so many grass-root organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today, the roots of which are solid stock and American made; they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American grass-roots organization.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE REPUBLICAN
PIECEMEAL BILLS TO
FUND THE GOVERNMENT

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I continue to oppose the Republican piecemeal bills to fund the government. While I support funding the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service (IHS), the bill provides less than 50% of the funding that Tribes receive from the Federal Government. Native American tribes and families will not have services restored for the USDA's Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, HUD's Native American Housing Block Grant, law enforcement programs under the Violence Against Women Act, and other critical education and environmental programs across the government that this legislation does not fund. I continue to stand ready to vote for a clean continuing resolution to end the Republican Shutdown and fund the entire Federal Government.

IN SUPPORT OF THE INDEPENDENCE
TEA PARTY OF WATERFORD,
MICHIGAN

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Independence Tea Party of Waterford, Michigan who like so many grass-root organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens

rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today, the roots of which are solid stock and American made; they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American grass-roots organization.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall 546 on the Peterson Motion to Instruct on H.R. 2642, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, my vote was incorrectly recorded as "aye." I intended to vote "nay."

IN SUPPORT OF THE
"SCHOOLCRAFT COLLEGE
PUBLICANS" OF MICHIGAN

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the "Schoolcraft College Republicans" of Michigan, who like so many organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each

other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today, the roots of which are solid stock and American made; they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American grass-roots organization.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE COMPLETION OF THE GERALD E. NAFTLAY MUNICIPAL COMPLEX IN OAK PARK, MICHIGAN

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the leaders and residents of Oak Park, Michigan as they celebrate the completion of their city's new City Hall and the renovation of its community campus.

With its village charter approved in 1927, Oak Park was created from a 5.5 square mile part of southwestern Royal Oak Township in Oakland County as a community determined to make a bright future for its residents. From early in its existence, residents of Oak Park were bound by a strong pride for their community and gave freely of their time and energy to ensure its success. While the residents of Oak Park struggled with many of the same challenges that affected our entire nation during the Great Depression, they rose to overcome those obstacles and incorporated as a city in 1945. After its incorporation, Oak Park quickly grew during the post World War II boom—becoming a home to America's growing middle class and small businesses.

The City of Oak Park is a community that embodies the incredible diversity of the Southeast Michigan region and has a rich history that had added so much to the Greater Detroit area. Many middle class families moved to Oak Park in the booming 1950s and opened up businesses, and many, like Koeplinger's Bakery, grew to develop regional notoriety. Over the decades, Oak Park has held true to the dreams of its founders—a tight-knit community where families would raise their children, entrepreneurs can start their own businesses and a place that its residents are proud to call their home.

As a city that has focused on providing its residents with a high quality-of-life, the completion of the Gerald E. Naftaly Municipal Complex will ensure that Oak Park is able to continue providing top-quality service to its residents. Named after former Mayor Jerry Naftaly, who served in office for twenty years and was elected as a City Councilman for

fourteen years prior to his tenure as mayor, the renovated community campus will provide residents with expanded public safety services, expanded library access and a modernized community center. The expansion, in addition to the new City Hall facilities, also includes upgrades to Oak Park's Rothstein and Victoria parks. The completion of this project is an impressive milestone in the city's history, one that fully leveraged resources of our federal, state, county and local governments to finish the project approximately \$300,000 under budget.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mayor Marian McClellan, City Manager Erik Tungate, the City Council and the residents of Oak Park on the completion of this expanded community campus that will offer them improved service and further enhance their quality-of-life. I have no doubt they must be proud of this achievement and I wish them success as they continue to strengthen their city for future generations.

IN SUPPORT OF THE "RETAKE OUR GOV." GROUP

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the "Retake Our Gov" Group of Livingston County, Michigan, who like so many grass-root organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today, the

roots of which are solid stock and American made; they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American grass-roots organization.

IN SUPPORT OF THE "TEA PARTY OF WEST OAKLAND COUNTY"

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the "Tea Party of West Oakland County" in Oakland County, Michigan, who like so many grass-root organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today, the roots of which are solid stock and American made; they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American grass-roots organization.

IN SUPPORT OF THE "SOUTHEAST
MICHIGAN 9.12 TEA PARTY"

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the "Southeast Michigan 9.12 Tea Party" of Oakland/Macomb Counties, Michigan, who like so many grass-root organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are ac-

countable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today, the roots of which are solid stock and American made; they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American grass-roots organization.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate com-

mittees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, October 15, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 17

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

OCTOBER 23

2:15 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine the future of long-term care policy.

SD-562

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 15, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 15, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BILL HUIZENGA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

LOOK FOR AREAS OF POTENTIAL AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is slowly dawning on some of my Republican colleagues, who were so gleeful about shutting down the government 2 weeks ago, that there will be no reward for not ruining the economy. Some think they should get a prize when they stop the senseless punishment of the American people, paying our employees not to work, and inflicting needless disruption on the lives and costs to the taxpayers—billions of dollars.

It appears that the public has had a hard time figuring all of this out, but has understandably concluded that most of the blame is due to the Republican crusade against health care reform and their reckless choice of tactics.

Is it possible that something constructive can come from the Tea Party debacle? Absolutely. Maybe we can do our job and look for areas of potential agreement.

Last week, PAUL RYAN and I continued a long-standing partnership on agricultural reform. We led a debate showing the will of the House to limit subsidy for the terribly flawed and expensive crop insurance program by slightly reducing the lavish subsidies to the largest agribusinesses. It is not the final answer by any means. There is no guarantee the Ag conferees will pay attention to the will of the House, but it is a clear area in that we can reduce spending and improve programs for most farmers and ranchers.

Maybe we could find bipartisan agreement that we should not slash infrastructure spending even further. Let's have a hearing before the House Ways and Means Committee and explore how to fund the transportation bill that expires in 348 days and creates a devastating infrastructure cliff.

If people are concerned about the deficit and government spending, maybe the House could finish work on its own spending bills. My Republican friends shut down the appropriations process more than 2 months ago. It might be instructive, before demanding more reductions in funding services, to see if they can actually pass their own version of the budget. If they can't, maybe they would reconsider taking government spending down to the levels of 1962, which is what their budget program requires, when America had 140 million fewer people, when there was one-third the number of senior citizens.

Regardless, their pleas to negotiate ought to mean that they stop refusing to negotiate with the Senate about the budget. If they are serious and not cynical, they will appoint their conference committees and stop 6 months of stalling.

Let's debate whether, at a time of retrenchment at the Pentagon, we really need to spend two-thirds of a trillion dollars over the next 10 years on nuclear weapons we don't need and cannot use for American security. Ninety percent of the expensive, dangerous stockpile is unnecessary for even the most ardent believer in nuclear deterrence. It has just morphed into a grotesque jobs program.

Should America sign away its mineral wealth to foreign companies for free? Before we cut investments in our people and our future, maybe we should reexamine the Mining Act of 1872, which remains on the books exactly as it was signed into law by President Ulysses S. Grant.

These are areas worthy not just of debate but of real, honest negotiation

and compromise and action. We can agree on areas to get more value for the taxpayer, help those who need it most, not those who need it least, and allow the process of government to work. If you try in good faith, the American system of government is not as bad as it looks.

THE TIME FOR SOLUTIONS IS NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the time for solutions is now. The American people expect their elected leaders to come to the table, work together, and put people above politics.

Today is the 15th day the Federal Government has been shut down, the 15th day national parks and memorials have been closed to the American people, the 15th day the NIH, WIC, and Head Start have not had the funding they were counting on.

Today is also 2 days shy of the deadline when America might reach its \$16.7 trillion debt limit. House Republicans, as we have for weeks, will continue to offer bipartisan common ground to reopen government and protect America's credit rating.

More than 70 Senators are on record as opposing ObamaCare's medical device tax. Let's put that tax on hold and reopen government.

It is not very fair that Members of Congress receive special help to pay for ObamaCare that isn't available to others. Let's remove the special treatment and reopen government.

It is not right that the American people are on the hook to provide health care subsidies to individuals whose incomes might not even qualify. Let's demand accountability for taxpayer dollars and reopen government.

Since the shutdown began, bipartisan majorities in the House of Representatives have voted to reopen government services and spare North Carolinians from Washington's dysfunction. We voted to open our parks and memorials because their closures are punitive, and they should never be disrespected by a theater of barricades.

We agree National Institutes of Health clinical trials should continue, so we voted to fund NIH. Similarly, we voted to ensure pay for all veterans and to restore FEMA, the FDA, Head Start, and the WIC program, among others; but most of our proposals to get government functioning again face

Senate inaction and White House veto threats.

The our-way-or-the-highway mindset must stop. The challenges we face as a Nation require bipartisan solutions. Both parties need to work together to reopen government and manage our debt.

House Republicans remain committed to responsible, bipartisan solutions to end the shutdown and defend our credit rating. We hope our counterparts in the Senate are as well.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN'S HUMAN CONSEQUENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again speak about the human consequences of this reckless and irrational government shutdown. We have now reached day 15 of this foolishness.

Each day, I spend time speaking with people from my congressional district who are suffering through this through no fault of their own. Dorothy Lara, from Rockford, Illinois, shared the story of her family's history and their truly deep connection and commitment to this country. Dating back to the early 1600s, her family has literally given their blood, sweat, and tears for America's freedom and democracy.

Nine generations ago, her family helped build the *Mayflower*, and not only that, they then helped coordinate its voyage. Her family's ancestors have served in nearly every war in this country—in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Civil War, both World Wars—and just recently, she welcomed home her son from Iraq.

Dorothy said it better than I ever could myself. She said—and these are her exact words—“All of my forefathers would be ashamed of what has been going on in this country today.” She went on to say, “What happened to a government by the people, for the people?” and then said, “What I want to see is what my forebearers have fought for: equality, job creation, honor, and respect. They are owed that much.”

We have the votes right now—right here—to reopen our government. We can end this madness and go back to governing our country the way we should be governing our country. Dorothy's family and so many other families throughout our country are, indeed, owed that much.

DEFICIT SPENDING AND THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized for the

time, and I appreciate the recognition that this Chamber and my colleagues are putting on the issues before us.

As we look at Federal spending, what we have to do is say: What is causing us to be in a position where we are borrowing \$2 billion a day? And if we are borrowing \$2 billion a day, we have to ask: Is that a sustainable practice and something that we as a Nation can continue? Of course the answer to that is, no, it is not sustainable. Therefore, we have to look at what is causing us to spend more money than we are taking in, and one of the things that is at the top of that list that is too expensive to afford is the ObamaCare program, the Affordable Care Act.

What I would like to do today is focus my comments on what we are seeing from the Affordable Care Act and what has happened with the cost of this program and why it has become too expensive to afford and why we have to talk about it and focus on it and put it on the table as we talk about what our Nation spends.

Now, we all remember supposedly ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, was going to be a \$900 billion program, roughly, that was to give access to affordable health insurance for those who didn't have access to health insurance, but let's look at what has happened.

This was the estimate: under a trillion dollars, \$900 billion, when the program was passed. But, oh, remember, we had to pass it in order to read it to find out what was in it. After we read it the first time, \$1.4 trillion. My source on this is the Congressional Budget Office, the CBO. Every time it has been reviewed, with some of the nearly 13,000 pages of rules and regulations, guess what has happened? The cost estimate has gone up. Now ObamaCare is a \$2.6 trillion program. So what we are looking at is a near tripling in cost before the program goes into effect. This is why we continue to say, as we look at fiscal health, fiscal restraint, you have to look at what is happening with the cost projections on ObamaCare.

Now, for those of us from my State of Tennessee, this is something that is not new to us. We had the test case for HillaryCare in our State. It is called TennCare. What happened with the TennCare program was it ended up quadrupling in cost in a period of 5 years.

Now, this causes us a little bit of concern because we look at what has happened with the cost of government-managed and -delivered health care services. Well, let's take a look at Medicare and where it was supposed to be in 1968 and then what has happened with its costs. You can look at these lines, the red line.

These are on my Web site for our colleagues that would like to go and look at the Web site.

You can see what happened in 1968, and the red line shows where it has

grown to today. For something that was to end up being about \$12 billion a year, we are now spending over \$400 billion a year on. You can see what were to be the projections here on this bottom line, and you see how far it has exceeded its projections. So because of this, we are quite concerned with the growth and the projections of growth for ObamaCare.

Look at the track record of government spending. Do programs generally come in below their estimates? No. They generally exceed those estimates. So we continue to be very concerned about what will happen with the cost of ObamaCare and the impact this is going to have on our \$3.5-trillion-a-year budget, and we continue to say: We have to review this; it is too expensive to afford; and does it fit into what the American taxpayer is willing to pay for?

Because every penny we spend here in Washington, D.C., comes out of the taxpayers' pockets from money that they have earned and then have paid in taxes, sent to Washington, they expect us to be very careful stewards of those dollars.

Before my time expires, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out one other concern that we have with the exchanges and the way they are going to handle information. Six hundred million dollars to build a computer system that doesn't work and doesn't protect the identity and the information of enrollees in the health care exchange is another of the problems there that is worthy of discussion of this program.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN AND HEAD START

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I place a loving picture of a little one and the excitement that comes from a Head Start program to emphasize my story this morning and the discussion I want to raise this morning for a brief amount of time.

All of us have seen those western movies where the train is rushing down the track and coming to a point where the tracks are no more. Black-and-white television, we used to sit on the edge of our seats, wondering what would happen. For the aesthetics of the movie, we would see that train fall into a deep abyss, people screaming out of the window or some takeaway that doesn't see the final crash, or maybe it does.

So as I listen to my friends on the other side this morning, it seems as if I were watching that same movie. Today is October 15, the 15th day of a government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, we are in crisis, and there are those who are rising to the floor of the House to misrepresent to

the American people some discussion about ObamaCare, which is working every day in this Nation. Albeit as Medicare and Medicare part D, we all need to sit down and knuckle down and look at ways that we can make it work better for the American people.

But we are in crisis today, and I think it is important to know that there are thousands of Head Start teachers and Head Start positions for little ones like my good friend here, the son of Marlon. He is Hector, who is not able to be in a Head Start program right now today.

For my friends, let me say that we have reason to be able to engage in a reasonable solution, a responsible solution. Where are they in coming together to make sure that we don't default in the next 24 hours? Maybe I should educate them with a little graph that shows that, in actuality, the debt-to-GNP under President Obama has actually gone down, meaning the debt has gone down.

The sizable increase in the debt was in the past administration, of President Bush, under Afghanistan and Iraq—everyone knows that—with a Republican-dominated Congress, a Republican President, a war that many did not like, but no one saw the Democrats try to shut the government down. Why don't they acknowledge where this original debt has accelerated itself?

So now we want to move forward and invest in American infrastructure, and they are crying about giving Americans affordable health care. Where is the reason?

So our friends in the Senate, Senate Democrats, are leading on a proposal to which many of us yesterday would have said that we wanted a long extension of the debt ceiling.

Mr. Speaker, I have come here to be responsible on behalf of the American people. Let me read one sentence. On November 16, 1983, "Dear Howard." Howard was the majority leader, Howard Baker. "This letter is to ask for your help and support and that of your colleagues on the passage of an increase in the limit on the public debt." Signed, Ronald Reagan.

It is a misrepresentation to suggest that this is a political stunt. Raising the debt ceiling has been done year after year to pay the Nation's bills. While countries like our friends like China are pushing forward by saying maybe you don't need to rely upon America, which the world does because their currency is not flowing in the world cycle, we are watching while Rome is burning. So I am asking my colleagues to be responsible.

First, they could have put the Senate proposal of a short-term CR on the floor days ago, weeks ago. So now we have a proposal that many of us will probably find challenging to vote for, but I am ready to listen; and I am disappointed that our friends are not real-

izing the devastation that is happening with the government shutdown.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, it troubles me to hear that James Comey, the Director of the FBI, has said that he has laid off 3,000 people—3,000 FBI agents who are in the midst of law enforcement for America. What kind of country are we?

Judges—the Federal courts are saying they don't know if they are going to be able to go past October 15.

The greatest insult is the payments that are due the American people on Social Security and veterans' benefits that may be in jeopardy on November 1 if we don't do the work that we are sent here to do.

So I would ask my friends to lower the discord. Let's not wave Confederate flags in front of the White House, something that burns in my heart—individuals that want to divide America. Let's not call the President what is a faith that we should be respecting. Let's not denigrate ourselves by suggesting that our President worships Allah, but it is not denigrating the President as much as it is denigrating millions of Americans who are Muslims. I am outraged that we would raise it to this temperature.

So, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is let us be in the spirit of Abraham Lincoln, who wanted to bring America together, and let us pass a reasonable response to the government shutdown. Let's not be talking about imploding or tearing this country down.

A BATTLE FOR THE ECONOMIC SURVIVAL OF THIS NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, you can never satisfy government's appetite for money and land; they always want more. Now we are \$17 trillion in debt and are headed to \$25 trillion in less than a decade under the best case scenario. Those are figures that are humanly incomprehensible; yet our estimates of our future unfunded pension liabilities are much, much higher. They are, probably, at least \$75 trillion or more.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office is the one that has put out these estimates, and they estimated recently that interest on the national debt will quadruple in less than 10 years to an astounding \$857 billion in just 1 year. If we allow that to happen, the Federal Government could then pay only for Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and interest on the debt—nothing for defense, national parks, interstate highways, and so forth. Obviously, future Congresses cannot or would not allow that to happen, so they will then come in with a combination of huge tax increases and a tremendous inflation of the currency.

The fight we are in now is over a lot more than the "Unaffordable Care Act." It is a battle for the economic survival of this Nation. Anyone who wants their Social Security or their Federal or military pensions in order to be able to buy anything—or buy much at all in the very near future—should be demanding much more fiscal conservatism now. We either bite some very painful bullets now or we face much more difficult times in the very near future that will make our present problems look small in comparison. We could end up with problems like Detroit has now, but multiplied all across this Nation.

President Obama, when he was in the Senate, opposed raising the debt ceiling and said we shouldn't do it to our children and our grandchildren; and when we are in this war now over this spending, this battle for the economic survival of our Nation, Mr. Speaker, surely we do not want to ruin the future of our children and our grandchildren.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN AND POTENTIAL DEFAULT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this 15th day of the government shutdown, a shutdown which has put hundreds of thousands of Americans out of work, that will have untold damage on what is already a hesitant economic recovery; and I rise as we contemplate the last maybe 24, 36 hours before an event unprecedented in American history: the possibility that, for the first time in this great Nation's history, we may not pay our bills—we may default on our obligations—with a plea for sanity and a last-minute plea that we set aside the irresponsibility and recklessness that has consumed this Congress for years now, culminating in this moment.

What has it profited anybody? Seventy-four percent of Americans disapprove of the way the Republican majority has handled this. Democrats could not have dreamed of a better plan to cut the ground out from under the Republicans.

This week, the International Monetary Fund met here in Washington, and global leader after global leader stood up and basically said: What has become of the United States? How can you be so irresponsible? How can this one indispensable Nation now be a laughing-stock?

My constituents are certainly disturbed. I had a conversation with one of them, a guy I have known for probably 25 years now, and he said: Explain to me what is going on in Washington. The Republicans, Senator CRUZ, the House majority are demanding a negotiation.

I said: Yes, they are demanding a negotiation. They are using the shutdown and the debt ceiling as leverage to achieve their goals.

He said: What are those goals?

It started out with a repeal of the Affordable Care Act—that is where Senator CRUZ started a couple of weeks ago—and then it moved on to we want Congress to not have its employer contribution; and then it moved on to simply talk to us; and then there was a long list of things—we want the XL pipeline approved; we want the Affordable Care Act delayed for 2 years—a long, long list of policy wishes that the Republicans have said they want in this negotiation.

And my friend says: So what do you get? What do the Democrats get? If you build the XL pipeline—whatever it is—and if you give them five of the things they want, what do you get? Do you get investment in roads and railways and networks?

I said: No, we don't get that.

Do you get a commitment to improve the education of America's children?

No, no, we don't get that.

Do you get something that pretty much most Americans think is a good idea, which is some kind of comprehensive immigration reform?

I said: No, we don't get that.

He said: Well, what do you get? What do you get in this negotiation?

□ 1030

I said: All we get is that the government runs.

Really? The government runs. That is what Democrats get in this negotiation?

Yes.

He said: That is not a negotiation.

I said: That is exactly right. That is not a negotiation. That is something more akin to extortion.

And here we sit, where it is not just the government shutdown which is causing pain to Head Start kids in Bridgeport or fear amongst workers at Sikorsky who are building the Black Hawks that ferry our troops in and out of danger. Here we stand on the cusp of saying to the world that you can no longer rely on the full faith and credit of the United States Government.

Folks, I used to work in finance, and there is nothing in finance—there is no share of stock, there is no bond, there is no income-producing property, there is no asset out there—whose value doesn't rest on the unalterable proposition that the United States Treasury is risk free. But the House majority is saying, first of all, that that may not be true, that maybe a default is not a big problem. Maybe it can be managed. It never happened before, but maybe it can be managed. This bedrock, I like to say in doing finance without the concept of a risk-free rate, is like trying to do physics without gravity. Nobody knows what it means, and we are putting this at risk.

So I plead for sanity, and I point out the fact that there are very real costs. The Macroeconomic Advisers, a research firm, has said that the last couple of years have resulted in 900,000 jobs not being created because of this constant hostage taking, this idea that we are going to run the country by crisis. Almost 1 million American jobs are not there because this Congress has done that.

Colleagues, the American people deserve better. It is time at this moment to come together, to be responsible, and to do right by the country.

REOPEN THE GOVERNMENT AND PAY OUR COUNTRY'S DEBTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is so important as we come here today to take us back where this whole shutdown-debt ceiling crisis began, and that is when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said that we will not open and fund the government, we will not pass a continuing resolution unless you repeal, defund, delay the Affordable Care Act.

That was their mantra. They were standing at those microphones right over there. They were gleeful; they were pounding the table; and they were really thinking that—you know what?—the Democrats are willing to go back to a day when Americans were filing for bankruptcy because they got sick or got injured. They really believed we were going to allow America to go back to a day when you couldn't get insurance if you had a preexisting condition. They thought we were going to return to a time when we weren't trying to address this big doughnut hole that they created with Medicare part D.

We told them, it is not because we spent so much time on it, that it is not because you tried to repeal it 45 times and you failed, that it is not because the Supreme Court said it was constitutional, and that it is not because in the last election the Presidential candidate who said I am going to implement health care reform in the Affordable Care Act won and beat the one who said he would repeal it by 5 million votes. Those are not the reasons we stand here.

We stand here because we have little kids and seniors and hardworking Americans who go bankrupt when they get sick, who sometimes are denied access to care which results in loss of life. That is why we said no. We said we can talk about a lot of things—we can negotiate on anything you want—but we are not going to say, if we repeal, delay, defund the Affordable Care Act, then you will do what it is your duty to do, which is to open the government.

So my friends in the Republican caucus knew that—you know what?—the

American public is on to our game. We are trying to do everything we can to trick people into thinking it is not really us who are being obstructionists, extortionists, hostage takers. We don't want people to believe that is really us doing it. So, you know what? We have got to say something else. We have got to do something else.

Many of you, Mr. Speaker, who were listening heard a very interesting dialogue that occurred—and you can look it up on YouTube—between Senator RAND PAUL and Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, in which they were sort of gaming out what words they should use and how they should sort of reposition themselves to look reasonable, to say, oh, let's negotiate, let's negotiate, when, in fact, they knew that their position was to defund the Affordable Care Act. They started saying things like, Negotiate. Let's negotiate. They even came up with this hash tag, Let's talk.

The bottom line is it was 6 months ago when we wanted to talk—and we still do—but we are not going to say we are going to get rid of the Affordable Care Act and put millions of Americans back in jeopardy, and then as a condition of doing that you will reopen the government.

What they are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is to say, in exchange for throwing people off health care, they will then do their job. In exchange for putting people back at the tender mercies of an insurance company, they will do their job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, things have gotten really bad because the fact is we are only a few days—we are two days—away from when the Treasury has said they cannot engage in extraordinary measures anymore, that they cannot negotiate America's bills anymore, and on October 17 it is D-day. We have got to do something or bad things are going to happen.

As Mr. HIMES pointed out, no one really knows everything that is going to happen because no Congress in the history of the United States has ever failed to pay its bills. It will be the Republican House majority that has failed America for the first time in American history by refusing to pay our bills, not because we don't have the money, not because we are not good for it, but because their political ideology dictates that, so they are sacrificing our Nation.

Here is what is going to happen. We don't know all, but we do know a few things. We know there will be higher interest rates and less access to business loans needed to finance payrolls. We know the businesses that want to build inventories and invest in equipment and in construction are going to face higher interest rates. It is going to cost more to do that. We know it is estimated that there are about 3.4 million veterans who may see their disability benefits in jeopardy. We will see

catastrophic economic effects to our economy. We could see the average home buyer pay an extra \$100 a month.

Mr. Speaker, I will just close by saying this: we have to get our business in order, and I urge Republican moderates to join with us to reopen the government and to pay this country's debts.

LET US VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a critical moment for the 113th Congress of the United States. We have an opportunity to let this House work its will, to end the government shutdown, to protect the full faith and credit of our country, to show the whole world that after a 3-week bout with insanity, the duly elected Representatives of the people in this Congress finally came to their senses.

But I am concerned that that is not where we are heading here in the 11th hour of this crisis as we approach the precipice of the debt ceiling and the prospect of default. Instead of working together to develop a budget that would work for Americans, my colleagues across the aisle in the Republican Party continue to let reckless ideologues drive their agenda and drive all of us further into a national crisis.

I have the honor of serving on the Budget Committee; and along with Ranking Member VAN HOLLEN, the Democratic members of that committee have been calling since the spring for a conference committee so that we could actually work out a budget that could work for both parties and for the American people, but the GOP leadership in this House has refused to appoint conferees, has refused to go into that negotiation. Why did they do that? Because they preferred the strategy of taking us to this point, into this crisis with the government shutdown, up to the edge of the cliff with the possibility of default because they wanted to maximize their leverage.

Why have they shut down the government? Why have they put us in this position? Well, we heard for months that it was their obsession with the Affordable Care Act, with repealing, delaying, defunding ObamaCare. Yet all of a sudden, 3 weeks into this crisis, the goalposts are moving. It is not so much about ObamaCare. Sometimes it is in, and sometimes it is out on their list of demands. What about the deficit and the debt? Sometimes that is part of the stated reason for this manufactured crisis.

Back to ObamaCare. There is no question about it that the CBO says that moving forward with the Affordable Care Act will actually improve our deficit, will actually help us better

manage our long-term debt. We know that there are all sorts of things that we could do together if reducing the deficit and managing our debt was the goal. For example, we could pass bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform, which again the CBO tells us would lower our deficits, lower our national debt, but that doesn't seem to really be what this Republican-manufactured crisis is all about.

It calls to mind the farewell address of our first President—the Founder of our country, George Washington—who warned about political parties who were at war with their own government. He warned about factions that were driven to defeat other factions by the spirit of revenge and dissension and how that itself would become a frightful form of despotism.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are walking very close to that awful scenario that our first President dreaded. Now we are hearing a bit of good news from the other House that Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL are close to a bipartisan agreement to help resolve this crisis. I have no doubt there would be enough votes in this House to pass that kind of agreement.

So to my Republican friends, let us vote on that deal or, even better, let us vote on the clean CR that has been pending in this House for weeks that could get us out of this crisis. It would temporarily fund the government at Republican funding levels while we work on a longer-term budget solution. Let us vote.

It seems to me that the GOP needs to simply take "yes" for an answer, allow this House to work its will and get out of this crisis. Unfortunately, we have heard from Senator REID that there were deals reached weeks ago. When Speaker BOEHNER brought those deals back to this House, he found that the Tea Party faction in his caucus wouldn't support him, and, instead, they chose to shut this government down and take us into this crisis. They did something worse than that. They rigged the rules of this House with the so-called martial law that has prevented Democrats from offering any alternatives, any off-ramps for this crisis. They shut down the government, and they hardwired it to stay shut down, and now, like the dog that finally catches the car, my Republican friends don't know what to do with the situation they have created.

I have a suggestion. Instead of continuing to grope for overreaching concessions and fig leaves, cut your losses. Admit that this scorched-Earth politics of obstruction—this war against the very government that you were sent here to govern—is a bad idea. Let us vote on solutions to end this crisis.

We don't even need an apology for all of the damage you have caused—for the \$160 million a day that has undermined our economic recovery and economic

losses from this shutdown. We don't even need an apology for the thousands of Federal employees indefinitely furloughed, for the national parks and forests that have been shuttered, for the loans to farmers and families, who are trying to purchase homes, that have been held up. We don't need you to apologize for halting lifesaving research, for any of that.

Just let us vote to end this crisis. If you don't, don't bother apologizing, because the American people will never forgive the damage you have done to this country and to our standing in the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Andrew Hofer, OP, Dominican House of Studies, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

All powerful and merciful God, we ask You to put forth Your spirit of blessings upon the world which You have freely made, this Nation, which trusts in You, and upon all here on Capitol Hill who turn to You.

We have been wrong and we have sinned. Give us all a share of Your wisdom and Your mercy. Enlighten us so that we can turn from our error and live by the power of Your truth. Strengthened by You, may we stand united in necessary matters, acknowledge liberty in doubtful matters, and be charitable in all matters.

We ask this of You, the source of all unity, liberty, and charity, to whom be glory and honor now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SWALWELL of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IS CRUCIAL TO REOPEN GOVERNMENT'S DOORS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has been shut down for 15 days. For 15 days, the President and Senate Democrats have made very few attempts to work with the House to reopen the government's doors. Washington Democrats have not been willing to meaningfully negotiate with House Republicans who voted four times to avoid the fiscal crisis.

Time is ticking. The people of South Carolina's Second Congressional District are hurting due to Washington Democrats' inability to engage in the legislative process. On behalf of the Savannah River Site employee in Aiken who is at risk of additional cuts to his hardworking paycheck, and the young family in Columbia who has been denied access to a medical trial that could potentially save their daughter's life, we should reopen the government, which promotes jobs.

House Republicans understand the risk at stake. That is why we support commonsense proposals that will avoid national default and reopen the government's doors.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

STAND UP TO THE EXTREMISTS

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise personally ashamed at the political sideshow in front of the White House perpetrated by Ms. Palin and Senator CRUZ and his congressional allies. For Members to protest against the consequences of a shutdown they, themselves, caused is the height of hypocrisy. The truth is we could pass a clean continuing resolution today and get our government back to work.

I was outraged by some of the imagery we saw from the Tea Partiers who were rallying in front of the White House. Calling for the President's impeachment not a year after his reelection by a large majority of the American people and continued lies about the President's religion, including one participant saying, Put the Quran down, have no place in civil discourse.

But I was especially disturbed by the waving of the Confederate flag, a symbol of racial oppression, being waved at our first African-American President.

I call on my colleagues to condemn this hateful rhetoric and to renounce these fringe voices within their coalition.

This is a shameful display of Members on the other side of the aisle, and they ought to stand up—the majority—to the extremists in their own party, as we have with our own party, and stop trying to hold the government and full faith and credit of the United States Government hostage.

CONFEDERATE FLAG RALLY

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, this shutdown is shining a light and showing the world some of the extreme members of the Tea Party. This weekend, Tea Party Senators TED CRUZ and MIKE LEE led a rally on the National Mall where one of their speakers, Freedom Watch founder Larry Klayman, called on President Obama to "leave town, put the Quran down, and come out with your hands up."

The rally moved to the White House where Tea Partiers waved the Confederate flag in front of the President's home. The picture is unnerving; it is despicable; and it is not the same flag that we just pledged allegiance to in this House. It does not depict an America whose seal reads: "E Pluribus Unum"—"Out of many, one."

To date, neither Senator nor any member of the Tea Party Caucus in this House has publicly denounced these ugly, disgusting comments toward our President. I respectfully ask my friends across the aisle to do so.

We may disagree on many things in this Chamber, but I sincerely believe that no one in the Tea Party Caucus believes that this display outside the President's house is acceptable. Condemn this behavior. If you don't and you let it go, you are condoning it.

"Out of many, one"—"E Pluribus Unum." As one America, let's denounce this. It is time to come together.

LET'S DEAL WITH OUR DEBT AND OUR DEFICIT

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, day No. 15.

Today is day No. 15 of the government shutdown. We are less than 48 hours away from defaulting on our bills. We have never done that in the history of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, if we don't pay our bills, that would be reckless behavior and that would be irresponsible.

But we are seeing some progress.

First, it seems like both the House and the Senate have agreed to open up government until January 15. Let's make that happen.

Second, it seems like both the House and the Senate agree to lift the debt ceiling until February 7. Let's make that happen.

But let's do step number three, which says, let's set a budget process in place that negotiates a budget that starts to deal with our debt and our deficit so we can get out of this crisis mode and start getting about the business of creating jobs.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for leadership.

Mr. Speaker, we are close. Let's get this done for the American people.

LET'S OPEN THE GOVERNMENT

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln offered these words:

The rule of a minority as a permanent arrangement is wholly inadmissible so that rejecting the minority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left.

I think we have come to the point of recognizing that it is important to represent the majority of Americans, the majority of veterans, who in some short order may be questioning whether or not their veterans or their disability check or their family's SSI or their mother's Social Security will come in an appropriate time.

The Secretary of the Veterans Administration already said that he has had to discontinue overtime, slowing our review of benefit claims. This has led to delays for an average of 1,400 veterans a day.

I say to my colleagues, rather than coddling those who wish to wave a Confederate flag in front of the White House, let us respect veterans whose lives are in cemeteries or whose lives have been recognized by being buried in America's cemeteries. Let us stop the foolishness and put on the floor of the House the reasonable response to opening the government now so that men who are mourning, those who have flags that are truly the American flag, are being respected, not those who wish to be in front of the White House. Open the government now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired. Members are reminded to heed the gavel.

LET'S COME TOGETHER TO RESOLVE THE DEBT

(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICA. Here we are, folks, my colleagues, fellow Americans. In just a few days, the United States may not be able to pay its debts. That would be horrible for the country and for leadership as we know it.

Mr. Speaker, how did we get here? The other side—and you are hearing from them—took control of the place. In 4 years, the spending went unchecked. The debt rose from \$9 billion to now \$17 trillion. They are asking for another trillion dollars to continue the spending unchecked to continue the indebtedness.

We can and we should come together to resolve this; but at some point, you have to be responsible as a parent, as a Member of Congress, as citizens to hold the line, to stop the spending, and to put a check on indebtedness to the future.

Barack Obama voted against raising the debt limit when he was a Senator and said that not addressing the debt was a lack of leadership.

PUT THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FIRST

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the deadline for preventing the United States from defaulting on our debt is growing closer, and the need to act is more critical.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, we don't know the full extent of the damage that our Nation's economy would suffer.

But here is what we do know: a default would mean higher interest rates for over 278,000 New Yorkers with mortgages, a loss of disability benefits for over 100,000 New York veterans, and the threat of being unable to pay Social

Security and Medicare drug reimbursements to over 3,000 New Yorkers.

Mr. Speaker, the argument by some in this Chamber that defaulting on our debt wouldn't be a big deal is outrageous. Putting the full faith and credit of our Nation—not to mention the strength of the world economy—on the line simply to prove a political point is both reckless and irresponsible. This House must put the best interests of the American people first and avert this disaster so we can get back to rebuilding this economy and nation-building right here at home.

DEBT CEILING

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, this madness has got to stop. Yesterday, I heard from a local homeless shelter in Irvington, New Jersey, that is struggling to provide for the overwhelming number of homeless new mothers. These are new mothers who can't feed their babies now that their WIC benefits have been cut off.

Because of the government shutdown, homeless shelters across New Jersey are running low on baby formula, diapers, and the food they need to feed these mothers and their newborn babies. This kind of story is shameful, and it is happening all over New Jersey.

The pain I see in my district is very real, and it could get a whole lot worse. If we choose not to pay our bills on time, 1½ million people in New Jersey may not get their Social Security checks; 50,000 disabled veterans in New Jersey may not get their medical bills paid.

Congress has two simple jobs right now: one, to open the government; and, two, to pay our bills on time.

These are nonnegotiable. The Republican Tea Party shouldn't hold this country hostage.

Let's get to fixing America's problems again instead of creating them.

□ 1215

BAN THE BOMB

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is incomprehensible to reasonable men and women everywhere that our colleagues across the aisle are threatening to nuke the American economy by refusing to raise the debt ceiling unless their demands are met. This is irresponsible and reckless behavior. "Nuke" is the right word to use here. As Warren Buffett noted recently, even the threat of default should be likened to nuclear weapons too terrible to ever use.

Allowing the U.S. to default on its obligations, whether it be an interest payment on a Treasury bond, a check due to a Social Security recipient, or money due to a Federal contractor so they can pay their workers, would have a cataclysmic effect on our economy and would be felt around the world. It would be a mistake that would impoverish a generation and haunt us for a decade, and there could be no second opportunity to get it right.

Anyone who dismisses how great a disaster a default would be should not be taken seriously. They should not be listened to or given a seat at the table where responsible decisions are made. Let's open up the government now.

TIME FOR SOLUTIONS

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, America simply has a spending problem. That much is clear. Our national debt stands at nearly \$17 trillion; \$17 trillion. Let that number sink in for a moment.

Is it that kind of legacy that we want to pass on to our children and grandchildren?

This year alone our national deficit is projected to be around \$700 billion, and that is despite the President's \$600 billion tax increase this year. In fact, the government is going to collect more revenue this year than it has ever taken in before. How much sense does that make?

What is being done to address the real driver of our debt—runaway Washington spending? House Republicans want commonsense spending cuts and reforms. We want everyone treated fairly under ObamaCare, no special treatment, especially for big corporations or for Members of Congress. We want a secure economic future for all Americans. It is time to act. It is time for real solutions.

TRANSPORTATION SAFETY ISSUES

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a senior Texan on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I am very concerned about the transportation safety issues created by the Republican government shutdown. For example, aviation safety is in peril as the Federal Aviation Administration has furloughed approximately 1,700 safety inspectors and drastically limited aircraft maintenance. These types of safety risks created by the Republican government shutdown are intolerable.

Further, the National Transportation Safety Board has been forced to furlough more than 90 percent of its staff.

As a result, it has not been able to continue investigating deadly transportation incidents nor initiate new investigations of accidents that have occurred since the Republican government shutdown began.

Mr. Speaker, the political games being played by the Republican leadership are causing serious harm to transportation safety for all Americans, and it is totally unacceptable. We do have a spending problem created by the two Republican wars.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, many of us were still stuck in Washington, waiting for a resolution, but one of the highlights was the opportunity to be with our veterans as we helped them to gain entrance to their national monuments, their memorials, here in Washington, D.C. It is just sad that they even have to wonder if they are breaking the law or need assistance to get into open air monuments and memorials that are theirs.

It is even sadder to hear the rhetoric on this floor today that all that would be boiled down and impugned to one guy at random bringing a flag that some people don't like.

Why don't we talk about those veterans and the great service they have made for this country and about the meanness of the Park Service's arbitrarily renting barriers to shut them out. Why aren't we talking about that as much? This shutdown situation is made much worse by the attitude of those in the White House—by exerting pain on people, by shutting down the things they do care about in order to play this political game.

So this isn't a Republican House shutdown. This is a U.S. Senate shutdown as we have sent, time after time, bill after bill over there. Let's get together and get this done right for the people in California, including for the students I met with from Lyman Gilmore Middle School, who are here with us today.

IMPACT OF SHUTDOWN ON EVERYDAY LIVES

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it pains me to see the shutdown's impact on everyday lives. While ordering coffee the other day, I asked Diona, the hardworking woman behind the counter, how she was doing that day. She confided that she had been up all night taking care of her 3-year-old son, who was suffering from stomach pains.

She was exhausted. She wanted to buy the Lactaid milk that settles her boy's stomach, but because of the shutdown, her WIC office was not open. Her WIC card was out of money, and she was a long way from payday.

There are probably tens of thousands of Dionas out there—women working hard and worried about their kids and not sure how they will make ends meet. The media may be focusing on the rancor, the talking points of politics, but this shutdown is really about a little boy with stomach pains and a mother who cannot afford to give him relief. The Women, Infants, and Children program helps low-income women buy formula and other healthy foods, and it is one of our most successful nutrition programs. It is just one of the shutdown's many casualties.

Let us end this shutdown right now. Let us vote on a clean bill to fund the whole government. Let us restore vital problems like WIC, and let us stop this lunacy and get back to work for the American people.

REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the Republican shutdown of government and their move to default on our debt are like forcing the wrong medicine on a sick patient—you might get them to take it, but it could kill them.

The only way America can pay back our Nation's debt is through economic growth and job creation, not bad medicine.

Let's not forget that we are still digging our way out from the Wall Street-induced Great Recession. Where did the \$17 trillion of national debt come from? The Wall Street recession cost American households \$19.2 trillion in lost wealth and the country 8.8 million jobs.

Under President Obama, we have had 42 consecutive months of job growth, leading to 7.5 million jobs being created, unlike in the Bush years when there wasn't a single job created. In fact, we lost over a half a million jobs. In the last 12 months of the Bush years, the country lost 4.6 million jobs. Let's not forget that America has accumulated an \$8.4 trillion trade deficit since 1975 and that we have racked up \$4 trillion in unpaid-for war spending.

So what is the Republican solution? Shut down the government. Don't pay the bills. The latest idea is to govern by supercommittee.

Mr. Speaker, we need to restore regular order, to move bills, to create jobs, and keep America's promises to our debtors. Let's nurse our Nation back to health, and stop continuing the economic pain with bad medicine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Members are reminded to please heed the gavel.

RECKLESS GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN MUST END

(Mr. BARBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to come together. This reckless government shutdown must end. Southern Arizonans and Americans all across our country are hurting, and our economy has been seriously harmed. The Senate is working on a bipartisan solution to reopen the government and to avoid putting America into default. I am very hopeful that we can find a reasonable and responsible plan and immediately bring it to the House floor for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, we must end this blame game. We must put the American people first. Let us come together and act responsibly now. Let this government shutdown end, and let us ensure that we pay our bills now. It is important, and the American people are calling on us to act, to act now.

END GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Republicans have again recklessly threatened America's future by allowing the Nation, already in a Republican shutdown, to default on its debt unless the Congress votes to stop ObamaCare. The government has been shut down for 2 weeks, and the United States will default on its debt in 2 days. All respected economists say a default means devastating and definitely unnecessary damage to our economy and to the global marketplace. Yet Republicans radically and irresponsibly push us toward the precipice of default. Their disconnect from financial reality is certainly breathtaking. Their actions are reckless, radical, and irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, there is power in numbers. If reasonable Republicans would stand up to their radical right wing, we could end this shutdown and avoid a default today.

A LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, a recent letter I received:

I am writing this letter in regards to the new "affordable" healthcare. My husband and I are small business owners with two other employees. We purchase our insurance as individual insurance, and we received a letter this past week that our rates are changing. We currently have a \$5,000 deductible with a monthly premium of \$415, and on

the new plan, if we stay with the current company, it is going to be \$4,000 with a monthly premium of \$1,093.78. I have tried to access the www.healthcare.gov Web site, and have been able to register an account but have not been able to get any type of pricing. I have contacted both of my Illinois Senators and my House Representative and have been told that they are not in favor of a government shutdown, but I am here to say if a shutdown is what it takes to get people to listen, then shut down. The reason I am contacting you is because my Congressmen are not willing to stand up to the President, and I just want to say good job for standing your ground.

DOING THE RIGHT THING

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the third week of this reckless, irresponsible shutdown, it is no wonder that folks in my Arizona district and across the Nation are disgusted. They see Washington treating this shutdown as a political game. I have got news for them. How far will the House majority push our Nation just to score political points? No one wins. Everybody loses, and here is what an editorial in the Arizona Republic says today about this shutdown:

When it is all over, the huge costs will be tallied, and the hard work Congress has avoided will remain undone. America will join the world in wondering: Is that all there is? The only heroes in this tragedy are the Americans who still believe their government can eventually do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, let's show the American people that this House is still capable of doing the right thing.

DOING WHAT IS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THIS GREAT COUNTRY

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, 15 days ago, an extreme faction of the Republican Party, supported by its leader and empowered by its more complacent members, brought about a shutdown of the entire Federal Government. It has since brought us to the brink of an unprecedented default, and now it refuses to accept a compromise that will open up the government, put people back to work, and lift the debt ceiling so the United States can pay its bills.

Americans are fed up with the political obstructionism and dysfunction that has caused this unnecessary crisis. With the clock running out, we cannot afford to waste any more time. We need to act now. So I say to my colleagues across the aisle, stop your guerilla tactics; stop playing games with the good faith and credit of the United States; stop putting radical ideology ahead of

the welfare of the American people; and stop sabotaging our economy and our democracy.

We have got to bring common sense, integrity, and honor back to the House of Representatives and do what is in the best interests of this great country.

□ 1230

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 15th day of the government shutdown. I am finally encouraged that we are seeing a bipartisan agreement in our Senate that will reopen the government and avert a credit default.

There is a lot of bashing of both sides going on down here, but I want to take this time to actually applaud our leaders in the United States Senate, HARRY REID and MITCH MCCONNELL, for their coming together to turn this ship around for the American people. Mr. Speaker, I also want to give a shout-out to Senator COLLINS and Senator MANCHIN for breaking the logjam.

This past Friday, the shutdown became a harsh reality for many American families as tens of thousands of workers did not receive a paycheck. These are hardships everyday working families can't afford.

This shutdown is deeply unfair to the American people. The clock is ticking, but we are seeing the framework of a commonsense solution to put an end to the recklessness and irresponsibility of this shutdown.

I hope that this House has an opportunity to vote on the Senate proposal soon and put this whole mess behind us for the sake of the country and the American people.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1933

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REED) at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 15, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

MR. SPEAKER: Due to my appointment to the Energy and Commerce Committee, I hereby resign my position on the Education and Workforce Committee.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for October 14 and the balance of the week on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 16, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3301. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Richard W. Hunt, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3302. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Claude R. Kehler, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3303. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Edward A. Rice, Jr., United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired

list in the grade of general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3304. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting a formal response to the GAO report "Haiti Reconstruction: USAID Infrastructure Projects Have Had Mixed Results and Face Sustainability Challenges" (GAO-13-558); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3305. A letter from the Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergency Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3306. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Delaware River, Wilmington, DE [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0827] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3307. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Catawba Island Club Wedding Event, Catawba Island Club, Catawba Island, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0840] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3308. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Frogtown Race Regatta; Maumee River, Toledo, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0839] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3309. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area-Tappan Zee Bridge Construction Project, Hudson River; South Nyack and Tarrytown, NY [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0705] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3310. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pro Hydro-X Tour, Atlantic Ocean, Islamorada, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0762] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 3292. A bill to prevent the Government of Iran from gaining a nuclear weapons capa-

bility and to maximize the United States diplomatic influence to achieve, consistent with the national security interest of the United States and its allies and partners, a negotiated settlement with the Government of Iran regarding Iran's nuclear weapons program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 3293. A bill to reform the public debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3294. A bill to establish a streamlined process through which a State may claim authority over and responsibility for management of Federal lands located in the State without claiming ownership of the land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HALL, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.J. Res. 94. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 95. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.J. Res. 96. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fossil energy research and development of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 3292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, which states the Congress shall have power to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; and;

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which states the Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign Nations

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 3293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and other relevant provisions

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section III, Clause II

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 94.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ."

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 95.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.J. Res. 96.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution: No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 15: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 60: Mr. HONDA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 233: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 366: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NEAL, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 411: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 456: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 501: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 523: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 525: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 708: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 713: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 805: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 920: Mr. DAINES and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 984: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1010: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1154: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1164: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 1173: Mr. O'ROURKE and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1362: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1428: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1666: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1726: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1851: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1920: Mr. RICE of South Carolina and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1921: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2101: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2144: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2203: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DENT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DENHAM, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2213: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 2247: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 2283: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2288: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2482: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2502: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2598: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 2619: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2807: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 2810: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 2932: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 2957: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 3043: Mr. KLINE and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 3050: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 3077: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. McCAUL.

H.R. 3143: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 3212: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 3213: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3275: Mrs. BLACK and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 3279: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 3286: Mr. POLIS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 3287: Mr. HUNTER.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.J. Res. 56: Mr. HOYER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. DUFFY.

H. Res. 109: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H. Res. 381: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. HONDA.

SENATE—Tuesday, October 15, 2013

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Sovereign God, creator and sustainer of us all, You have been our dwelling place in all generations. Thank You for Your faithfulness, even when we are unfaithful.

Lead our lawmakers this day so they may work in a way that Your Name is honored. Lord, point out to them the road they should follow, as You give them the wisdom and courage to do their duty. Help them not to be dominated by what they have been, rather than by what they could become. May they never forget their accountability to You as servants and stewards of Your purposes.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, the debt limit bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate will recess from 12:30 to 2:15 to allow for weekly caucus meetings.

There are productive negotiations going on with the Republican leader. I am confident we will be able to reach a compromise agreement this week in time to avert a catastrophic default on the Nation's bills. The Republican leader and I will keep our Members informed as to how negotiations are going.

I express my appreciation to everyone for their patience.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved. Under the previous order, Senators are permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the distinguished Presiding Officer is, like myself, a New Englander and knows what fall is like in our part of the country. Late last month, I was fortunate to enjoy the most lovely settings I think can be found anywhere at any time, as Vermont's hillsides are painted orange, yellow, and red by peak fall colors set against powder blue skies. Vermonters love these sublime few weeks. We happily welcome visitors around the United States. Actually, we welcome visitors from around the world. It is interesting to walk down the streets in some of our cities and hear several different languages being spoken as visitors come here. They share the experience, and they hike and bike and fish, and they hunt in our extensive preserved natural areas.

But these best of times have become the worst of times, as Vermonters and visitors alike have found closed signs on their favorite natural areas due to the tea party shutdown of the Federal Government. The window is quickly closing in Vermont for the Fish and Wildlife biologists and national forest rangers who have work that must be done before the first snow falls. We know how Washington can close down for an inch or two of snow. In Vermont, we are talking about 10, 15, or 20 inches of snow. These Fish and Wildlife biologists and national forest rangers' schedules are dictated by the changing seasons and the biological clocks of nature. The House Republican leadership has been no more able to undo the law of the land—which is the Affordable Care Act—than they would be able to slow or stop Vermont's changing seasons.

Insisting on tying a repeal or a defunding of the Affordable Care Act to reopening the government is doing real and lasting damage to Vermont's economy and natural resources as fall quickly becomes winter.

The 26,000-acre Nulhegan national wildlife refuge in Vermont's Northeast Kingdom is among the best upland bird hunting areas in New England. There is plenty of room for everyone, but just days after the opening of grouse season, the refuge has been forced to hang up a closed sign and lock its gates. This has dealt a blow to the tourism economy of the small towns around the refuge that depend on these annual visitors and hunters.

The Missisquoi National Wildlife Refuge on the shores of Lake Champlain is, without a doubt, the best and most extensive freshwater duck habitat in New England. Huge meadows of wild rice attract thousands of migrating waterfowl and legions of bird watchers and hunters. Even with the fall migrations in full swing, the Missisquoi National Wildlife Refuge has hung up a closed sign and locked its gates for the start of the fall hunting season.

Hikers looking for the best panoramic views of Vermont's fall colors flock to the Appalachian Trail and Vermont's Long Trail which run together up the spine of the Green Mountains, through the 400,000-acre Green Mountain National Forest. Through-hikers, weekenders, and day trippers spread out to enjoy hundreds of miles of trails. But only a skeleton crew of forest rangers and fire crew remain on the job. Visitors centers and restrooms are closed; even volunteer workers have been pulled from the trail and forced to stop shelter work and trash collection at trailheads because of the tea party shutdown.

These may not seem like huge matters in the national scheme of things, but in a State of 600,000 people they are major. Not only are the livelihoods of Vermonters being devastated, but the things that we cherish the most about our State are being denied to people who want to come and see them.

Woodstock, VT, is the quintessential New England village and host to the Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park. The centerpiece of the park is the oldest sustainably managed forest in the United States. It is a beautiful forest. But visitors are denied access to this forest in all of its fall glory. Long-planned events at the park have been canceled and the gates have been locked.

Certainly there are many more places for visitors to enjoy—this has been a wonderful picture-perfect season. I am told by my friends and neighbors who live near our home in Vermont that it has been absolutely gorgeous. As much as I love all my colleagues and enjoy being with them, I

would much rather be up there seeing the same view as Vermonters are. But the closing of our Federal lands, just as hunting seasons begin and the hillsides shine, is depriving Americans from experiencing the country's natural heritage and causing serious economic damage to the small towns, and the innkeepers and guides who depend upon these areas for their living. Foreign tourists, increasingly important to our economy, and their tour operators, are confused and disappointed by these outcomes. They say: this sort of thing has never happened in our country and yet you are the wealthiest and most powerful country on the earth; why are you doing this?

Other conservation work is being curtailed, as well, in ways likely to do lasting damage. Control of parasitic sea lamprey in Lake Champlain has to be accomplished each fall to protect the game fish and threatened species. There is a very short window when the sea lamprey treatments can be applied before these parasites migrate from the rivers to the lake. That window is fast closing. It is going to be missed if U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service biologists remain on furlough. If these fall treatments do not take place, thousands of young sea lamprey will be allowed to reach the lake, where they are immune to treatment, live for years, and devastate the fishery. This will undo years of work, and taxpayer dollars invested in this program will be wasted by a small group of radical obstructionists who jump in front of the cameras and say things that make no sense at all.

In Vermont and across the country, there is a lot of work that needs to take place on Federal lands before winter snows sweep in. Snowmobiling is very popular among my constituents. It is a mainstay of our winter economy. But fall is the time the trails are graded and bridges repaired. Our most important trail networks are on Federal lands, and important maintenance is being delayed—deferred in some cases—due to the tea party shutdown. If trails are not opened before the snow flies, the devastating impact on tourism and local communities is going to last all winter long and impact people who want to go to work every day, who are hard-working, honest, good people who can't understand what is happening here in Washington.

Fall in Vermont is the most glorious season. It is my favorite one. We welcome visitors. We get outdoors more ourselves, and are busy preparing for the long winter to come. Our hard-working Federal partners are proud of the work they do on these Federal lands, and they know this manufactured tea party crisis is causing real and lasting damage to our natural resources and the Vermont economy.

National parks and refuges in Vermont are not the only places closed for business. According to the Coal-

tion of National Park Service Retirees, every day the Federal Government is shuttered costs the National Park Service nearly $\frac{1}{2}$ million in lost fee collections nationwide. And the impacts are even greater for the surrounding communities that are losing \$76 million per day in visitor spending. While some in the tea party actually have the arrogance to go on television and argue that shutting down the Federal Government is saving us money, the truth is just the opposite. It is costing every one of us taxpayers money, and it is costing everybody in the private sector huge amounts of money. And now, as we reach day 15 of the tea party shutdown, the National Park Service has been denied over \$6 million in lost revenues, and local communities—not government workers, but local communities—honest, hard-working men and women have lost over \$1 billion. This is why several States have chosen to foot the bill to reopen a handful of national parks to stop further losses to local economies. The cost of shutting down the government, paying the lost revenue—that is what is keeping us in the red.

So I say to the small group of obstructionists, stop wasting time. Put our government back to work. Show the rest of the world that we really are the great country we know we are. I want to get back to work for Vermonters; we owe it to our constituents to resolve this now and start making real decisions about our future.

Speaker BOEHNER should call up the Senate continuing resolution for a vote. It would receive bipartisan support, and we could put an end to this pointless tea party shutdown. We would reopen our Federal lands. We would be supporting our local economy.

There is more I can say, Mr. President, and I will, but I applaud Majority Leader REID for working with the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL. I applaud them for being what grownups should be, trying to bring us back and trying to bring our government back, showing what a great country we are so we do not have countries such as China saying: Oh, we should not rely on American currency. They are not reliable people.

We are getting this all over the world—Americans are not reliable. What damage these tea party obstructionists are doing to our great country. We ask our military to serve around the world and protect us—and maybe they will get paid, but a lot of the support for them, the VA and whatnot, is being closed down. It is shameful. The same people who shut down the government are saying it is terrible that the government is shut down. I think the American people can see through this.

I don't care what party you belong to or who you are, with the exemption of a small group, people know this coun-

try has to be open so it can work—can work for all of us—and can project an image of strength and stability throughout the world, can do the things that made us great in the past and that will keep making us great in the future, not this shabby exercise.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for 2 weeks the government has been shut down. It is hard to imagine. It seems a lot longer if you have been sitting here in the midst of this maelstrom—2 weeks since the junior Senator from Texas took the floor and for 21 hours held the floor, giving a speech calling for the end of ObamaCare as we know it.

In that period of time we have learned a lot about ourselves. We learned a lot about this country. I think about the 800,000 Federal employees furloughed, many of whom struggle to get by and now have no paycheck coming in. It is a hardship that is totally unnecessary, a hardship that was imposed on them because there was a strategy, a political strategy, political gamesmanship that said: We can sacrifice the well-being of those Federal employees and their families to make our political point.

It turns out they went further. They went further in suggesting they were going to cut off the benefits these government agencies offered. At this point in time, we have come to learn what that means. People who were turned away from the National Institutes of Health, children—some 30 children with cancer were turned away because that agency is closed. Families who were notified they had lost a loved one in battle were denied the basic benefits we provide to all families facing that terrible grief. There was a lack of food safety inspections when salmonella outbreaks were being reported around the country. The list goes on and on.

John F. Kennedy wrote a book called "Profiles in Courage" that talked about those in public service who showed extraordinary courage. I suggest it takes no courage whatsoever to hurt 800,000 innocent Federal employees. It takes no courage whatsoever to deny the basic benefits of government to thousands, maybe even millions, of American people. I think it is political cowardice.

Sadly, it has gone on for 2 straight weeks. The House did some curious thing there, where they voted to say: But we will pay these employees.

A friend of mine back in Edwardsville, IL, sent me an e-mail.

Let me get this straight. They closed down the Government, they turned the employees away, they said they don't have to come to work but they promised they were going to pay them? What is going on in Washington? What are you people thinking?

I couldn't defend it. I wouldn't even try. It is evidence of the kind of abandonment of reason which has become the hallmark of some Members of Congress.

What do the American people think? They are not happy with any of us, let's get it straight, but when it comes to the responsibility for this madness, they have said it is on the other side of the aisle. It is their idea—not just the tea party but many who were complicit in this strategy.

As if this were not enough, now in just 2 days, for the first time in the history of the United States of America, we face a default on our debt.

You might say: So what. Who cares. What difference would it make.

Listen to what Christine Lagarde, chief of the International Monetary Fund, said:

The failure to raise the debt ceiling would cause not only serious damage to the U.S. economy but also to the global economy as a result of spillover effects. . . .

In response to a question about debt prioritization proposals, she said:

When you are the largest economy in the world, when you are the safe haven in all circumstances, as has been the case, you can't go into that creative accounting business.

Christine Lagarde, chief of the International Monetary Fund.

It is an interesting thing in politics: you can always find somebody who is going to agree with almost any point of view. Tea party Republicans have rounded up some flat Earth economists who say default on the debt is really not a big deal. In fact, I have heard some of my colleagues on the floor argue that we just have to pick and choose who is going to get paid, that everything will work out and you really will not even notice.

It reminds me of the time—Mr. President, you were in the House when I was—when there was the Gingrich shutdown, Rush Limbaugh and others announced they would shut down the government and no one would notice. You don't really need a government. They noticed in a hurry. In less than 2 weeks they opened the government.

This, sadly, is much more grievous and will have terrible consequences for innocent people. If we default on our debt in 2 days, for first time in history we will destroy a global confidence in the U.S. dollar that we built up since World War II, since 1945. Right now the U.S. dollar is the most respected and strongest economy in the world, period, bar none. Countries far and wide that want to invest in the safest possible investment invest in U.S. Treasuries because they trust our government and its word that it will pay its debts. Those who are toying with this

possibility of default are putting that at risk.

It is not just a matter of the views of the world. It is bad enough that we are being lectured to by Vladimir Putin about responsible governance—Vladimir Putin lectures to us about being a responsible government. That is bad. What is even worse is the impact on ordinary people and their lives. We know what happened when we went through the last recession. People who had carefully saved for their futures saw the bottom fall out of their savings accounts and their retirement accounts. We run that very same risk if we default on this debt again. We run that very same risk. And many hard-working families, people who have scrimped and saved for college education for their kids, for their own retirement, for their next home, will find that they are devastated by this default on our national debt. That is the most reckless and irresponsible single act we could undertake.

They asked a Member of the House, a Republican Member of the House, if yours was the deciding vote on extending the debt ceiling—if it was up to you, one person, to decide to extend the debt ceiling, would you vote for it? He said: Not unless there were some strings attached. You think to yourself: Still bargaining, right up to the edge of the cliff. Sadly, if we go over, the pain will be felt as much by that Congressman as it will by working families in Massachusetts and Illinois. That is what this is all about.

Paul Schott Stevens is president and CEO of the Investment Company Institute. At a banking committee hearing on October 10, he said:

I also will avoid parsing the differences among "technical default," "selective default," and "actual default," or whether missing a Social Security payment is equivalent to missing an interest payment or failing to redeem a maturing Treasury bill. All such discussion misses the point. The United States, like any other major debtor, must maintain the confidence of its creditors—or risk the consequences. . . .

Once Treasury has exercised the option to delay payments, investors will learn a lesson that cannot and will not be unlearned—even after all missed or delayed payments have been made good. That lesson is simple: Treasury securities are no longer as good as cash—they carry a future risk of further missed payments.

That future risk is a political creation. It is a bargaining tool by the Republicans, and it goes too far.

At a banking committee hearing, Gary Thomas, president of the National Association of Realtors, said:

[A]n increase in U.S. Treasury rates would result in higher mortgage rates. In the event of a default, U.S. Treasury prices would fall and yields, which move inversely to prices, would rise. . . . Historically, an increase in mortgage rates of 1 percentage point reduces home sales by roughly 350,000 to 450,000 units . . . [and] roughly 700,000 to 900,000 fewer jobs would be created. . . .

This is a job-killing strategy. Default on our national debt is a job-killing strategy.

Kenneth E. Bentsen, Jr., president of the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, said:

It is important to note that Treasury securities are a key factor in the daily financing of market operations, with the U.S. Treasury repo market totaling between \$1.2 and \$1.9 trillion daily. Undermining that market could have a deleterious effect on every major market participant.

If that were not bad enough, I have received some e-mails from some friends. The one that sticks in my mind is from a friend who does not live in my State. He is a man I have come to know. I am not going to use his name on the floor—I didn't ask his permission to—but I can certainly tell his story.

He sent his son off to war in Iraq. He and his wife took care of his son's wife and little baby while his son went off to fight in a war. Sadly, his son was the victim of an IED. As a result of that terrible incident, his son is quadriplegic and cannot speak.

People had given up on the son in his midtwenties; they recommended putting him in a nursing home. And his father said: I just won't let it happen. His father took him to a hospital in Chicago, a renowned hospital, the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago. His son made dramatic progress. Eventually, he was able to return home with some limited function but was able to enjoy the things in life that make a difference to him. He loves to go hunting. His father picked up a mechanism whereby his son could actually go out, sit in a blind, and fire at those ducks and feel as if he was back where he was before he went to war.

I cannot tell you the love that the mother and father have given to their son, daughter-in-law, and now their two children. They basically gave up their life and their business and, with the help of a lot of good people in the community, built a special home for their son so that he could get around in his motorized wheelchair. I have been down there. The outpouring of generosity and charity in North Carolina for this family is just amazing, and they continue to give their entire lives to their son and his wife and kids.

He wrote me an email and said:

I hope you are doing well. We see you on C-SPAN. Thank you for taking a moment to read about our concern. This concern is about my son. It affects him and thousands of other wounded veterans. We are quite concerned about what we are hearing coming out of the VA. The thought of the VA check not arriving in November has all of us nervous. We are sure this is a feeling in households across the country. We are praying that all the parties in Washington will soon come to terms. After years of war, a sagging economy, and now the shutdown, nerves are stretched. I am writing to you to see if there is a light at the end of this dark tunnel. My

son and wife, after years of working to establish a near-normal life, have to start worrying about losing what they worked to return to and enjoy as a near-normal life.

In writing he said:

My mood does not mean to be so down, but as a parent of a family that has been through so much, the thought of this threat is very heart-wrenching.

Thank you for listening to me.

I think of that letter, and I think of that family worried about that VA check.

I received an e-mail yesterday from a family that is worried about whether they will receive their Social Security check. Why do we put the American people through this? Why do we put families through this? This is totally unnecessary.

We need to open this government. We should do it tomorrow morning, period. Just open it. We need to bring these people back to work to perform the services they need to perform for this great Nation, and we need to make certain we don't default come Thursday. The default would have a negative impact that would have far-reaching consequences beyond this political battle.

In years to come nobody may remember the names of the people involved in this political fight that goes on day after day on Capitol Hill, but they will remember the failure of the Congress to pay the Nation's debts, to stand for the full faith and credit of the United States, and to maintain our reputation as a leader in the world.

That is what is at stake. There is no political victory worth that. I hope Members on both sides will come to their senses.

I wish to salute our leader, Senator HARRY REID of Nevada. I have been standing by him through this. He has been stalwart and courageous. I know he has been exhausted at times, but he keeps on fighting.

I also wish to salute Senator MITCH MCCONNELL of Kentucky, the Republican leader, who, over the last several days, has played a very active and positive role in trying to resolve this issue.

It is time for the Senate to show leadership. It is time for the Senate to come together on a bipartisan basis and show the path that takes us out of this political crisis.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, in the midst of the current crisis there have been some who have questioned the relevance of the Federal Government to

our overall economy. Some have even called the current shutdown just a slimdown. But in my home State of New Mexico, there is no question that this government shutdown has been irresponsible, it has been reckless, and it has been absolutely devastating to our economy.

New Mexico serves the Nation in many ways, through our national labs and our military bases, with Federal lands and monuments that host Americans from every corner of the Nation. As a result, Federal dollars in 2010 were nearly 36 percent of our State's gross domestic product. This figure includes veterans' benefits, Social Security, and student financial aid.

Federal dollars go toward grants to help fund State and local health care, transportation, education, and housing. Many of us who have served as either city councilors or mayors, legislators or Governors realize the role Federal passthrough dollars play in keeping our States and municipalities solvent.

In New Mexico, Federal contracts are also critical for our small business community. Defense purchases account for almost two-thirds of total procurement spending. We are home to nearly 27,000 Federal workers—workers who want to go back to work, workers who just want to do their job.

Sandia National Laboratories and Los Alamos National Laboratory employ an additional 18,000 New Mexicans as contractors, and the U.S. Department of Energy's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Carlsbad employs 1,000 more. That is out of 2 million people. So it is an understatement to say that shutting down the Federal Government strikes at the heart of my State's economy.

Between sequestration furloughs, the shutdown, and the current impasse over averting a catastrophic default on the Nation's debt, hard-working, middle-class families across New Mexico are the ones who are saddled with uncertainty and hardship. These manufactured crises have very real consequences for these families.

Since the shutdown began, I have heard time and again from constituents who are paying the price for this reckless debacle. They say they feel like the collateral damage in the ongoing ideological battles in Washington, DC. Hard-working civil servants dedicated to their jobs and their country have been sent home without pay, while many others have to work through the shutdown without a paycheck.

Yesterday I spoke with a Rio Rancho resident named Chad Didier, a former marine who is now an air traffic controller in Albuquerque. During the shutdown he has been reporting to work every day to help keep our airspace safe, but he does not know when he will start getting a paycheck again.

This comes on the heels of forgoing pay earlier this year due to sequestration.

As the father of four young children and the sole breadwinner in his family, he is worried about making rent next month and making his car payments on time. He is frustrated because he is doing everything he has been asked of him, everything he is supposed to do to take care of his family, to serve his country, but he feels his government has failed him.

Last week, because of the shutdown, the National Nuclear Security Administration ordered that Los Alamos and Sandia National Labs should be ready to shut down by October 21.

Katy Korkos with the Los Alamos Chamber of Commerce told the Los Alamos Monitor that the impact of the shutdown at LANL could hit subcontractors twice as hard as other entities because they will never be able to recover the income they are currently losing.

EnergySolutions, a subcontractor that processes and ships transuranic waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Carlsbad, has already had to lay off 154 workers.

The general manager at a department store in Los Alamos was quoted in the newspaper as saying: "Anytime the lab sneezes, we catch cold."

In southern New Mexico, Crysta Quintero told the Las Cruces Sun-News that she was immediately worried for her 3-year-old son after hearing about the Federal Government shutdown. That is because she relies on the Federal WIC Program to supply a prescription baby formula for her son who has a disability. Unfortunately, Crysta is not alone. Tens of thousands of women and children in New Mexico who receive assistance from this program every month could be left without vital nutritional support if the shutdown continues to drag on.

What is also at stake is the incredible work being done at New Mexico's colleges and universities. These first-rate research institutions rely heavily on Federal grants to fund staff, training, and projects, including clinical trials for cancer treatment. I am told those trials—and years of hard work—will have to pause or even stop if the government stays closed. Scientists will see their salaries reduced, and research students who want to dedicate their lives to finding the next cure will have to wait even longer just to earn their degree.

Because of the shutdown, important job-creating investments in small business—the very engine of our economy—are delayed. On average, over \$300,000 in Federal loans are approved for small businesses in New Mexico each and every day—but not today. Because of this reckless and irresponsible shutdown, those small businesses are not getting the loans to grow their business. They are not hiring new workers.

New Mexico is home to many of the Nation's most treasured public conservation lands, including national parks such as Carlsbad Caverns, BLM monuments such as the newly created Rio Grande del Norte, and national forests such as the Gila and Carson that are unstaffed during the fall hunting seasons. More than 4,000 men and women work on these public lands, and they are being forced to stay home.

Andrew Graves is an entomologist with the U.S. Forest Service in Albuquerque. Specifically, Andrew is in a program called Forest Health Protection that works across agency lines providing expertise and assistance to Federal and tribal land managers, foresters throughout New Mexico so they can deal with outbreaks of disease or insect infestations. Andrew says they have already canceled or postponed meetings and training because of the shutdown.

Each day the government remains closed, thousands of people who planned to visit our national parks and our wildlife refuges will be turned away. That does not just hurt the government. Restaurants and hotels, tire shops, and grocery stores feel this pain in towns such as Socorro, Taos, Grants, Alamogordo, and Las Cruces.

Because of the shutdown, the Bureau of Land Management has stopped processing energy leases on Federal land. A lengthy delay in the permitting process will not only take its toll on New Mexico's oil and gas industry but also on the revenues generated for New Mexico's public schools. The 8,000 New Mexican children enrolled in Head Start are feeling the impact of the shutdown on top of the cuts sequestration has already imposed on that critical program.

The shutdown also endangers the benefits that we owe over 170,000 veterans in New Mexico, people who served this country with distinction. The VA will run out of money to pay mandatory benefits by the end of October if we do not act.

Americans are fed up. Other debates in recent years have been just as heated, just as partisan, but this crisis is far more dangerous for our country. The American people—my constituents in New Mexico—want their Federal Government to function again. The Federal workers in my State want to go back to work. Our constituents want us to move past the gridlock and actually govern. They want economic security and to be able to take care of their families.

It is time to reopen the government, it is time to take the threat of default off the table, and it is time to stop playing games with the livelihoods of hard-working Americans.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. We are now going into week three of a government shutdown, a totally unnecessary, totally avoidable, totally manufactured government shutdown that is now morphing together with a potential failure on behalf of the U.S. Government to pay its debts, the first time we have ever intentionally done that in our entire country's history.

This is not theoretical any longer. This is now right on top of us. On Thursday of this week we will no longer have enough money to pay all of the bills that come in to the government. We only have about 65 percent of the funds necessary to pay out all of the bills that come due to us, whether it is to our creditors or to the thousands of small businesses that rely on contracts with the Federal Government every week to pay their bills as well.

I appreciate all of my colleagues coming down here and talking about the real-world consequences of what this shutdown has meant and what a failure to pay our debts will mean. I come down and want to share a handful of stories from my State of Connecticut to tell you what is going on out there beyond the talking heads on the cable news networks. They are simple stories, but they are impactful because for hundreds of thousands of people in my State of Connecticut, there was no margin with which to operate when this shutdown hit and the consequential economic impact that has come to so many families. There was not any money stuffed under their mattress they could pull out and try to pay the bills they could not, now that their paycheck or their business had been lost.

This is a big deal to people in Connecticut, and in Hawaii, and to States all across our land because there was so much economic hurt that had already piled up for months and years that people had no wiggle room when the tea party decided to stick a knife into the backs of already hurting families.

That is why this makes no sense. It is not as though we had the cushion as an economy, it is not as though families had the ability to take on a little extra hurt when the tea party decided to shut down our government—not that it would make sense even if we were living in heady economic times. But today, right now, for families who are getting killed by an economy that has recovered for the top 5 or 10 percent of America but certainly has not recovered for the bottom 80 percent, this is no time to be playing around with people's lives.

Every single year at the start of the home heating season, I go to a non-profit in Waterbury, CT, which dispenses home heating assistance to the thousands of families in the Greater Waterbury, CT, area who know that without a little bit of help from this agency they will literally not be able to heat their home, that their children will go cold that winter, because even though they are making money, they cannot keep up with the mounting bills.

Every single year, as I watch the sort of macroeconomic numbers get better for the economy, I keep on thinking that when I go to that agency in August or September or October, they are going to tell me: Guess what, CHRIS. Less people are coming in this year than last year to ask for home heating assistance.

We are in year five of this recession now. Every single year of those five, the number has gotten bigger—every single year. Even as unemployment goes down, demand for home heating assistance in Connecticut goes up. Why? Because the top echelon of our country has recovered but nobody else has. So that is why when this shutdown hit, it hurt so badly for someone such as Rich Martin in New London, CT. Rich did something heroic during this recession. He started a new business. Frankly, even more heroic, he started a bookstore and a record store in New London, CT called the Telegraph.

He said that business has been growing for the last 12 months. Every month he has been doing a little bit better. Then guess what. The shutdown. Rich wrote me and said: After growth in my business over the last 12 months, people have stopped coming in these last weeks. Because in New London, CT, where we make submarines for the U.S. Navy, where we have submariners at our base there, we have a whole lot of people who depend on the Federal Government or contracts from the Federal Government to be able to pay their employees. Nobody is coming into the Telegraph any more. His business is getting hurt. A business, a small businessman who did something great, is now wondering whether he can make it through the next couple of days and weeks.

Here is how the trickle-down of this happens: Kathi Sanborn in Hartford is paying the bills right now by babysitting. She is babysitting for a couple. But the husband is a defense contractor. Guess what. He has been furloughed, so he cannot pay her to babysit. Frankly, he is home anyway, so he can look after the kids. So she does not have her babysitting gig any longer. He is out of work and she is out of work. Guess what. That is not where it ends. Because now that Kathi does not have her babysitting job, she is going to stop buying what she used to buy. She is going to have her groceries. She is not

going to go to the store down the street for a purchase for herself. It just keeps on going.

Don Spaeth in Putnam, small business owner, runs a little restaurant there. Small town, Putnam. He says his business has dried up the last couple of weeks. People are not coming in.

Rich from Fairfield has a severely autistic son. He is an adult, so he was on Social Security disability. But he had his disability benefits cut off because they wanted to review his eligibility. Well, guess what. The reviewer has been furloughed for 2 weeks. So his son, who was hoping to be able to have his benefits turned back on, or at least have resolution so the family would know what to do, now cannot get a resolution to his disability claim. His son cannot pay the bills to the provider who gives him housing. He is potentially going to be out on the streets because he does not have a reviewer in the Social Security office. That hurts economically, but that hurts psychologically as well.

Interfaith Volunteer Caregivers in New Haven gets Federal money to do something really simple: Provide frail seniors with rides to their doctors' appointments. They lost their Federal funding for 2 weeks, so they cannot give rides any longer. So seniors are sitting home not able to get to their doctors' appointments. Think about that. You have an 85-year-old widow who has to worry every day if she is going to get sick because she lost her ride to the doctor's office.

Then let me read you this quote from Michael in Hartford. I do not even have to embellish it:

I am an attorney and work for the IRS.

I have 3 children, a 16 year old girl and 8 year old twins. My wife is pregnant with my fourth child. My 16 year old is taking driver's education and wants her license. I cannot now pay for the insurance necessary for her. She also wanted to take a PSAT prep course, another \$1,200 that I don't have. She needs to start visiting college campuses. More money that I don't have. One of my twins, Sofia, had some learning disabilities and had private tutors and other professionals to assist her in staying on grade level in reading and math. I will soon run out of savings to pay for Sofia's support system because November 1st means that there is a mortgage payment, car payment, car insurance payments and the other dozen or so monthly bills that keep our household up and running. I do hope that the shutdown ends soon so that I can get back to work.

These stories can be repeated, frankly, hundreds of thousands of times over all across this country. While to some people they may sound like small stories—a babysitter losing a job, the inability to get your disabled daughter a little bit of help for a couple months—they add up to \$1.6 billion in economic activity coming out of our country every single week.

They add up to unemployment claims jumping to their highest level last week in 6 months. They add up to con-

sumer confidence being the lowest in this country since the Lehman Brothers collapse in 2008.

This doesn't happen in a vacuum. It is not as if we can tread water or move backwards economically while the rest of the world waits for us to resume our mantle of economic leadership.

China says they are looking to take their \$1.3 trillion in U.S. Treasuries and find someplace else for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Last month Japan announced its machinery sales were the best since 2008. The rest of the world is moving on.

If we are doing this much damage to the economy, why are we here? We are here mainly because tea party Republicans in the House see this misery as a bargaining chip. They couldn't get their way any other way. They couldn't win the legislative argument on the health care bill, a bill that passed the House and the Senate and was signed by the President. They couldn't win the judicial argument. It came before the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court upheld the health care law. It couldn't win the electoral argument.

The health care bill was on the ballot in 2012. The President who ran on it and signed it was reelected by a wide margin. Every single Senator in this Chamber who supported it was returned to their seat.

Tea party Republicans have lost the argument on health care in all three of the traditional forums by which one would get their way in the legislative process—the legislative forum, judicial forum, and the electoral forum.

Just as a criminal fleeing the scene of a crime, they have been confronted with a last desperate option, which is to grab hold of the economy, put a gun to its head, and hope then that Democrats and President Obama will relent simply because of our compassion for people like Rich in New London, Kathi in New Hartford, Don in Putnam, the seniors who rely on Interfaith Caregivers in New Haven, and the young IRS attorney with a disabled daughter. They hope it will be our passion for those people which will cause us to do something other than what the people sent us to do and repeal, delay, or displace the health care law.

The good news is cooler heads are prevailing, that people do see—in this Chamber at least—the need to let go of the hostage. Two weeks into the shutdown, the cumulative economic effects on the economy are real. Those stories I told from Connecticut can now be multiplied thousands of times, tens of thousands of times.

The House looks as if they are going to try to pass another partisan polit-

ical bill loaded with add-ons as conditions to restart the government and pay our bills. The Senate is working on a different solution, a solution that could bring together Republicans and Democrats to at least temporarily end this crisis. On behalf of my constituents in Connecticut, we certainly hope that is the result.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I am very pleased to follow my colleague from Connecticut in recounting to this body some of the voices we have been hearing from across our State, some of the individuals whose stories make very compelling evidence for the need of this body to heed the bipartisan spirit—indeed, nonpartisan spirit that so animates and moves this country—to demand that we get the job done yesterday. I used exactly that expression to tell this body how important action is to move forward.

I am on the floor today with thanks to our majority leader Senator REID, who has come to the floor and has so ably and courageously led us, not only on the Democratic side but also on the minority side as well. I hope we will demonstrate in this body the profile in courage the country expects and needs from us at this time.

I yield to the majority leader at this time if he has a message to bring to us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I appreciate my friend's always courteous attitude. I appreciate it very much.

The House Republican leadership plan that is now out—and people may look at it—is a plan to advance an extreme piece of legislation and is nothing more than a blatant attack on bipartisanship.

The past several days we have been engaged in productive bipartisan negotiations in the Senate. Everyone knows this. We have been working across party lines and making steady progress to achieve an agreement that reopens the government, protects the full faith and credit of our country, and opens talks to put this country on a firm fiscal footing. Everyone needs to know that the measure under discussion in the House is no part of what we have negotiated in the Senate.

The debt is here. The deadline is looming. Rating agencies are talking about downgrading us as early as tonight, again.

I know I speak for many of us. We have been working in good faith when I say that we felt blindsided by news from the House, but this isn't the first time. Extremist Republicans in the House of Representatives are attempting to torpedo the Senate's bipartisan progress with a bill that can't pass the Senate—can't pass the Senate and won't pass the Senate.

The House measure would take away the President's fundamental authority that has been in existence for as long as political science can remember. It has been in place for decade after decade after decade to prevent a catastrophic default on the Nation's bills. Out of spite, tea party Republicans are trying to take authority away from President Obama. They would never, ever consider doing this if it were President Romney, President Bush, President Bush, or President Reagan. Never.

As they have said—and they have cheered on the other side—the government is closed. We don't mind defaulting on the debt. It is good for the country. That is what they have said.

Their legislation would also make unacceptable major changes to ObamaCare. The House legislation doesn't even include a process for bipartisan negotiation on a sensible long-term budget. They throw out these numbers, think magic is going to happen, and somehow when January 15 arrives, everything will be hunky-dory. There are still processes we have to follow. They set no pattern, no schedule, no routine to do that.

For weeks Republicans have claimed they want to negotiate, but their legislation completely ignores the need to work together, craft a budget, and put our country on a fiscally sustainable path.

For years they have complained about why don't we have regular order here. They complained about lack of a budget. Now they don't even want us to negotiate a budget. It is hard to comprehend this logic, but the tea-party-driven part of the Republican Party doesn't follow logic. Why would they want to close the government for 15 days, have us default on our debt?

Introduction of this measure by House Republican leadership is unproductive and a waste of time. Let us be clear: The House legislation will not pass the Senate.

This is what the White House said only a few minutes ago:

The President has said repeatedly that members of Congress don't get to demand ransom for fulfilling their basic responsibilities to pass a budget and pay the nation's bills. Unfortunately, the latest proposal from House Republicans does just that in a partisan attempt to appease a small group of Tea Party Republicans who forced the government shutdown in the first place.

I am very disappointed with JOHN BOEHNER, who once again would try to preserve his role at the expense of the country.

I have worked hard to rise above partisanship and find common ground in the Senate. We have done that together for the good of the Nation. This is much bigger than the presiding Senator, who is from the State of Hawaii, or the assistant leader, who is at my side. This is much bigger than that. It is much bigger than me, it is much big-

ger than the two Senators on the floor who are from Connecticut. We have Senator MURRAY, who is chairman of the Budget Committee. It is bigger than her. It is bigger than the senior Senator from New York, Senator SCHUMER, who is on the floor.

We have to start working together as a country. This is what we have been trying to do. This is so disappointing. On the eve of financial destruction for this great country, this is what it is—to appease a small group of people over there. I am so disappointed.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the majority leader, through the Chair, one of the key elements in this new proposal from Speaker BOEHNER is to diminish this President's authority to deal with a default on our national debt. This authority, so-called extraordinary measures or emergency measures, gives to Presidents, going back to President Kennedy, the wherewithal through the Treasury Department to try to avoid an economic disaster which could impact families, businesses, jobs, and the reputation of the United States in the world.

I ask of the majority leader, through the Chair, now that we have seen the Republican Party bring us so close to the precipice on a default, it is unimaginable to me that any President, including President Obama, would surrender this authority to keep America safe in light of this type of threat. Is this one of the key elements in terms of the problems associated with the Boehner proposal?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, to my friend, the senior Senator from Illinois, we have seen what has gone on these last few months, through this whole year, with a group of people who are giving press conferences, holding demonstrations. They want the government to stay closed. They wanted it closed in the first place.

The hardship we have over this country is awful. If that is not good enough, they are boasting they want the country to fail its obligations to pay its bills.

These are not new programs. These are obligations we have. That is one of the problems. The proposal they have would not allow—for example, my friend is the chair of what some say is the most important part of the Federal Government, to protect the safety and security of the United States, the subcommittee dealing with defense that was led many decades by Senator Dan Inouye. The proposal they have sent gives the President of the United States, the Chairman of the Chiefs of Staff, no flexibility whatsoever when sequestration kicks in on the 15th.

We are not asking to change those numbers. We agreed to those numbers. We voted to approve those numbers,

but they won't even allow flexibility to allow the Department of Defense to shift that money around. I do not know how the defense of this country can go forward if they don't have flexibility with losing \$22 billion beginning January 15. They don't even give authority for that.

The bill they are sending over is doomed to failure. It is doomed to failure legislatively and it is so awful for our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would like to underscore for a brief moment what our leader has said: Default would be devastating to this country. Closing the government is awful for our country. Yesterday we all saw for the first time, after the government has been closed for too many days, when we are on the eve of default, some real progress—Leader REID and Leader MCCONNELL coming together on the outlines of a plan which made a great deal of sense, where each side had to give but could accept. And all of a sudden at the last minute, as the locomotive to avoid default is heading down the tracks and getting some steam, Speaker BOEHNER throws a log on the path. This is wrong.

He knows his proposal—we don't even know what it is yet. They have to tweak it probably to try to appease the hard right. But he knows his proposal with the measures in it already that have leaked out would not be signed by the President or pass the Senate. So instead of doing the right thing, looking at the Senate bipartisan proposal and moving forward on that, Speaker BOEHNER decides to light a match and throw it on the gasoline that is already all over the place. I hope he will desist.

We all have seen that the House can't lead in this regard. They can pass a lot of one-House bills, but they can't get anything done. Let him desist. Let him defer to the Democratic and Republican leaders here in this body so we can avoid default, open the government, and get back to America's business.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, let me add my voice to the eloquent and powerful remarks made by our majority leader and the Senator from New York, who have rightly deemed this House proposal an obstacle—indeed, an obstructionist move—designed to perpetuate and not end the shutdown, and to block and not enable our efforts to reach a bipartisan compromise which would allow America to continue paying its bills on time.

Those two goals—ending the shutdown and enabling America to pay its bills on time—are the predominant objectives we must have as a bipartisan effort goes forward here in the Senate.

This House proposal is doomed to failure. It would be a failure not just for the legislative process, not for the political actors here, but a failure for America.

I am reminded of the remarks so well made more than 10 days ago by the majority leader about one aspect of the effects of this shutdown on an industry very important to his State of Nevada and very important to the Presiding Officer's State of Hawaii—the tourism, lodging, and hotel industry. That impact is devastating.

As their Senator, I have heard this morning from staff and employees of the Starwood Hotels based in Stamford, CT, who have written to Members of Congress about the effects they see to their company and to others like theirs in this industry—hotel and tourism—which is vital to the State of Connecticut. In fact, we invest constructively and positively in promoting our State's tourism industry.

I will read from a letter from Amy Kilbury, associate director of IT finance at Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide:

The current impasse, now in its third week, is having a negative impact both on the economy in general, and specifically on the travel and tourism industry, which depends on the confidence of business and individuals on the future stability of the economy. The shutdown is having ripple effects; as federal agencies have reduced their operations so have private government contractors, and in turn, this is affecting both business and leisure travel.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this letter, and a letter written by the American Hotel and Lodging Association.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STARWOOD HOTELS &
RESORTS WORLDWIDE, INC.,
Stamford, CT.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HIMES, SENATOR MURPHY, AND SENATOR BLUMENTHAL: I am the Associate Director of IT Finance at Starwood Hotels & Resorts, which has its headquarters in Stamford, CT. I wish to express my concern over the impasse in government funding and the impending risk that the United States could default on its obligations, and to urge you to work with your colleagues to forge a bipartisan compromise to reopen the government and raise the debt ceiling.

The current impasse, now in its third week, is having a negative impact both on the economy in general, and specifically on the travel and tourism industry, which depends on the confidence of business and individuals on the future stability of the economy. The shutdown is having ripple effects; as federal agencies have reduced their operations so have private government contractors, and in turn, this is affecting both business and leisure travel.

There is no question that the future health of the American economy depends on policies that will restore robust economic growth and job creation while gradually reducing debt, and I know that you are committed to those objectives. The government

shutdown, however, and even the threat of default, will only slow the economy down and jeopardize efforts to achieve a lasting economic recovery.

The next few days are very important and I hope that you will make a major contribution towards reaching a positive compromise that will move this Nation forward. You have my best wishes as you deal with the awesome challenges ahead.

Regards,

AMY KILBURY,
Assoc. Director, IT Finance.

AMERICAN HOTEL &
LODGING ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, October 10, 2013.

President BARACK OBAMA,
Members of the U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Members of the U.S. SENATE.

The American Hotel & Lodging Association (AH&LA) and our members in every state and congressional district respectfully urge Congress and the President to reach an immediate agreement to fund the government and establish a degree of economic certainty to allow for continued growth.

Equally important is the looming breach of the debt limit and the need to come together on a plan to address our long-term fiscal challenges. Current fiscal uncertainty and the increasing lack of consumer confidence are disrupting recent economic progress and job creation, in which the lodging industry has played a significant role.

Analysts say that for each day the federal government is shut down, collective American income is reduced approximately \$200 million, and our nation's hotels are losing more than \$8 million in economic activity—putting jobs at risk and causing repercussions across many other related sectors. Communities near national parks are expected to lose \$76 million a day in visitor spending. In Yosemite National Park, for example, lodges and cabins scheduled to be filled to near capacity are instead giving thousands of visitors 48 hours to leave. Additionally, thousands who had planned to visit national parks are cancelling their trips and hotel reservations. Stories continue to pour in from AH&LA members about how their businesses are being negatively affected.

The impacts extend far beyond our national treasures. Hoteliers with international travelers have experienced a significant increase in cancellations because these visitors are confused on whether they will be able to enter and leave normally. Our members in northern states receive calls daily from Canadians checking to see if the border is open.

Current fiscal conditions are leading to increased consumer uncertainty, all to the detriment of economic growth. In short, the government shutdown is increasingly impairing the lodging industry's ability to hire, grow, and contribute to the economy.

It is imperative that Congress and the President act now to address the fast-approaching deadline to raise the U.S. debt limit, or else risk default and further economic damage. Acting to put the debt on a downward path into the future and addressing our long-term fiscal challenges are imperative to stronger consumer confidence, future job growth, and our nation's standing throughout the world. The lodging industry will continue to be a leader in U.S. economic growth if our leaders can provide fiscal certainty.

AH&LA and our members thank you for your efforts to address these critically important issues.

American Hotel & Lodging Association; America's Best Franchising, Inc.; Arizona Lodging & Tourism Association; Asian American Hotel Owners Association (AAHOA); Association of Starwood Franchisees & Owners—North America (ASFONA); Best Western International; Bev Kaftan, American Payment Solutions, Mesa, AZ; Brian Latture, The Hotel Group, Franklin, TN; California Hotel & Lodging Association; Carlson Rezidor Hotel Group; Catherine DeVane, The Hotel Group, Franklin, TN; Chandler Wiens-Thayer, RHW Management, Overland Park, KS; Choice Hotels International; Chuck Donnelly, The Lodge at Mountaineer Square and The Grand Lodge, Gunnison County, CO; Colette Wear, Country Inn & Suites By Carlson, Lincoln, NE; Colorado Hotel & Lodging Association; Cortney Damiano, Best Western Plus, Olive Branch, MS; Delaware Hotel & Lodging Association; Douglas Dreher, The Hotel Group, Edmonds, WA; Florida Restaurant and Lodging Association; Georgia Hotel & Lodging Association; Hilton Worldwide; Host Hotels & Resorts.

Hotel Association of Washington, D.C.; Hyatt Hotels and Resorts; IHG Owners Association; InterContinental Hotels Group; Jeff Gouge, The Arctic Club Seattle, Seattle, WA 98104; Jeffrey T. Kmiec, The Greenbrier, White Sulphur Springs, WV; Jim Abrahamson, Interstate Hotels & Resorts, Arlington, VA; Joe Martin, Stillwater Hospitality, Stillwater, OK; John Shingler, President, Association of Starwood Franchisees & Owners; Josh Messer, Hilton Garden Inn—Eugene / Springfield, Springfield, OR; La Quinta Inns & Suites; Lara Latture, The Hotel Group, Franklin, TN; LaSalle Hotel Properties; Laurel Gaylor, La Quinta Inn & Suites Red Rock/Summerlin, Las Vegas, NV; Liban Abdi, Holiday Inn Express on the River, Corvallis, OR; Loews Hotels; Maine Innkeepers Association; Mark G. Carrier, B.F. Saul Company Hospitality Group, Bethesda, MD; Marriott International, Inc.; Massachusetts Lodging Association; Michigan Lodging and Tourism Association; Montana Lodging & Hospitality Association; New York State Hospitality & Tourism Association.

NewcrestImage; Ohio Hotel & Lodging Association; Oklahoma Hotel & Lodging Association; Opal Wedgewood, The Hotel Group, Franklin, TN; Paresh (Perry) Patel, MRPC Hotels, Newark, DE; Pedro Mandoki, Mandoki Hospitality Group, Gulf Shores, AL; Pennsylvania Restaurant & Lodging Association; Rhode Island Hospitality Association; Robert A. Alter, Seaview Investors, Corona Del Mar, CA; Ruby Goodwin, Pacific Palms Resort, City of Industry, CA; Sam Patel, Best Western Mountain View Inn, Springville, Utah; Shannon E. Johnson, Plaza Inn and Suites at Ashland Creek, Ashland, OR; Sonny Sailesh Babu, Atlantic Hotels Management, Carrollton, TX; South Carolina Restaurant & Lodging Association; Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide; Steven Cooke, American Public University, Charles Town, WV; Tabitha Caldwell, The Hotel Group, Edmonds, WA; Tennessee Hospitality Association; Texas Hotel & Lodging Association; Toma G. Brashear, Lanier Parking Solutions, Atlanta, GA; Warren Klug, Aspen Square Hotel, Aspen, CO; William Folkerts, Quality Inn & Suites, Watertown, SD; Wisconsin Hotel & Lodging Association.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. These Starwood employees are writing to their Senators and Members of Congress because they see firsthand the effects on their livelihood and their lives. The stories recounted earlier by my colleague from

Connecticut and those I recited yesterday on the floor are real effects in the lives of real people, negative and painful—indeed, devastating effects on people who depend on the economic flow of certain and stable work by the government, contractors, and small and large businesses like Starwood that are affected.

There is no question the future health of the American economy depends on the policies we need to adopt and advance to sustain economic growth—indeed, to make it more robust to preserve job creation and, in fact, heighten and enhance it, and to make sure that these employees of Starwood are well served, not impeded, by the government they supported with their taxes and they elected with their votes. We have an obligation to them to do better than we have.

I was deeply moved by the story recounted by Senator DURBIN a short time ago on the floor about a young Iraq veteran more severely wounded than the ones I recounted yesterday. But he is a veteran like the individuals whose stories I told yesterday. They deserve better from our government. Indeed, they deserve an end to the kind of obstructionism we saw just a short time ago on the other side of this Congress, in the other branch of this legislative body, from Members of the House of Representatives who know the proposal they are making has no chance of adoption by the deadline we need to meet to make sure that the greatest Nation in the history of the world avoids default and continues to pay its bills on time.

The CEO of the American Hotel and Lodging Association, which represents Starwood, Katherine Lugar, said: Hotels are a major economic driver and job creator across the country, and the industry's ability to continue its growth is hamstrung by inaction from our policy members. The administration, the House of Representatives, and the Senate need to act swiftly in the best interests of the entire Nation and end this shutdown. Pay our bills on time.

That has been the objective of my colleagues on this side of the aisle and on the other side, like Senator MCCAIN who has just come to the floor. That bipartisan effort has to be our objective. We need to do better for the American people and meet the obligations we now have.

As chairman of the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over the hotel and lodging industry, the commerce committee, we are hearing about how States such as Arizona, Hawaii, and Nevada, as well as Connecticut, are losing millions of dollars every day in economic activity. In fact, the Weir Farm National Historic Site in Connecticut is harmed, along with the Grand Canyon, and all the communities and industries associated with it.

These issues are real and tangible. The harm is now and urgent.

I urge my colleagues to come together and resist the pressures and demonstrate the kinds of profiles of courage we have seen on both sides of the aisle—standing strong, speaking out, resisting partisanship—and coming together for the good of the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Connecticut.

In the last 24 hours a lot has been taking place. A tentative agreement has been reached between both Republican and Democratic leaders. The Speaker of the House has come forward with what we believe is a plan which would reopen the government, extend the debt limit, and has several other provisions in it.

The reaction to that has been immediate automatic condemnation by the majority leader, by the White House, and by Democrats in the House, absolutely rejecting this proposal.

I don't understand that. I don't understand that visceral reaction in a most negative fashion. Why don't we try something like we used to do around this place? Why don't we say: You have a proposal to open the government; we have a proposal to open the government. Let's both pass; let's go to conference—which we could do in 24 hours—and resolve our differences.

I understand what the polling data says, that 74 percent of the American people disapprove of the Republican handling of this issue. And I agree. Some of us at the beginning said we are going on a fool's errand to believe we will be able to defund ObamaCare. We got ourselves in a ditch, and we have to stop digging. That is well understood here by certainly the overwhelming majority of my Republican colleagues. But for the majority leader and the Democrats in the House and the White House to say absolutely, categorically, we will not consider what the Republicans in the House of Representatives are doing, in my view is piling on. It is piling on and it is not right.

I urge my Democrat colleagues: Let's sit down and work this out. We have a proposal from the House. We have a proposal between the two leaders. Let's get this resolved. To categorically reject what the House of Representatives and the Speaker is doing—and I think he is pretty courageous in what he is doing—in my view is not serving the American people.

So let's stop this. Let's stop it, sit down, consider the Speaker's proposal, get our proposal done, and then get this resolved, which we could do in the next 24 hours.

I came to the floor to express my disappointment in the categorical rejection of a good-faith effort by the

Speaker of the House—which doesn't contain all the provisions I want. I am sure the agreement made by both the Senate majority and Republican leaders will not be everything I want. Let's stop the condemnation. Let's consider the Republican House proposal as a serious proposal, as a way to end this gridlock, and then let's sit down together and get this thing done.

I again urge my Democratic colleagues. We know you have the upper hand. Isn't it time we help find a way out of this—which is what the American people want—rather than who won and who lost. The only people losing right now are the people of this country. As I have mentioned a couple times before, Al Qaeda is not in shutdown.

I urge my Democratic colleagues and the White House to reconsider their categorical rejection of any proposal from the House of Representatives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Florida.

IRAN

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, clearly the issue we are facing with regard to the budget, ObamaCare, the debt ceiling is a very important issue. In the hours and days to come I will have a lot more to say about it. I waited over the last few days, because of the urgency that confronts us domestically, to reserve my comments on the issue of Iran. At this point I believed I could no longer wait to speak out on it, so if my colleagues can indulge me for a few moments, I wish to talk about it because, as serious as the domestic challenge may be with regard to the budget, the spending, the debt limit, ObamaCare, we have another crisis brewing, one that goes to our national security interests, one that quite frankly for the most part unites us across the aisle; that is, the issue and the threat Iran's nuclear ambitions pose to the world.

The reason I believed I could no longer wait to address this is because I believe, as many of you do, that the world is entering a crucial time in the international efforts to stop Iran's nuclear program. On September 24 of this year, I, along with a group of other Senators, wrote to the President and we expressed our concerns about reports that the administration was contemplating making a fresh, new offer, fresh new series of offers to Iran. In that letter, we said Iran must not be allowed to develop a nuclear weapon; that is, if, God forbid, it becomes necessary, we could support the use of military force to prevent an Iranian bomb and that Iran must not be allowed to maintain any indigenous enrichment capability; and that now is not the time to suspend sanctions but to increase them on the Iranian regime.

All of us would like to wake tomorrow to the news that the Ayatollah has

decided to abandon his nuclear weapons ambitions, but it is especially imperative on matters of national security that we not be guided simply by our hopes. We must be guided by reality. This is true in life in general, but it is especially true and important on issues of national security that we be guided by reality. That reality is that no matter how much Iran's political leaders say they do not have plans for a nuclear weapon, their actions say something else. They have dramatically increased their ability to enrich uranium and they continue to spend millions of dollars to expand their nuclear program and to develop long-range missiles which threaten not just Israel and Europe but eventually the United States.

The only reason you put so much money and time into developing long-range missiles is to put a nuclear weapon on them. That is what they have been doing. They have been developing this missile capability.

Recently, we heard all this new talk about there is a new President in Iran and he might be a reformer. We hope so. But this is also the same person who in the past has bragged about how he has fooled the world before and bought time for Iran's enrichment capacity to increase. In the end, by the way, even if he is a reformer, he is not the ultimate decisionmaker, nor is the Foreign Minister or any of these other civilians in their government. The ultimate decisionmaker is Iran's so-called Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei. So far no one has accused him of being a reformer.

Iran's leaders are making noises about negotiating with the world now because over the last few years the United States and the European Union have imposed very significant sanctions on Iran and these sanctions are starting to hurt the Iranian regime. It is hurting, although it has not stopped, their ability to export terrorism around the world. It is hurting, although it has not stopped, their ability to buy parts for their nuclear program and for their missile program.

Do you want to understand why they are doing all this now, what their plan is? It is not that hard to understand. What they are trying to do, they are trying to get us and the world to agree to weaken the sanctions without them having to agree to any concessions that are irreversible, to any concessions that irreversibly block their ability to one day build that weapon. This ambition of theirs, this plan they have is clear as day. They are trying to figure out if they can get these sanctions suspended or lifted without giving up too much. Then at some point in the future, when the world has moved on, when we are focused on other things, they can then make their move to build their bomb.

By the way, this is the model North Korea employed over a decade ago.

They used a combination of belligerence and pretended negotiations to buy the time and the space. Now they are a nuclear power and they continue to develop their rocket technology—which does not just threaten South Korea and Japan but the west coast of the United States and potentially one day the entire country, our entire country.

This is why, as these talks between the so-called P5+1 group of nations and Iran restarted, we are at a critical juncture. We should talk to Iran. We should see if they are serious. But we cannot, under any circumstances, put at risk the hard-earned leverage that took so long to put in place and assemble.

First, we need to remember whom we are dealing with. We are talking about a regime that has earned the distrust of the entire world through its secret nuclear program, a regime that admits foul play only when they are caught red-handed, a regime that supports terrorism, killing of Americans, and has an active hand in fueling conflicts that destabilize its neighbors. This is a regime that brutalizes its own people and denies them their basic freedoms. This is the regime, by the way, that plotted to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador in this city, in Washington DC.

Given this record, the erosion of trust in Tehran is simply too great, so the United States must look long and hard at what Iranian actions could qualify as what the administration likes to call credible confidence-building measures.

I say this because of whom we are dealing with. Sanctions on Iran should not be lifted or suspended until they agree to completely abandon any capability for enrichment or reprocessing. Iran has a right to a peaceful civilian nuclear energy program. But they do not have the right to enrich or reprocess. Holding this line is especially important in light of Iran's repeated and blatant disregard for international obligations in the past and even to this day.

Even a limited enrichment program and possession of sensitive reprocessing technologies is unacceptable because of the risk that such a program would once again be abused by Iran in the future for nefarious and dangerous purposes. Suspending sanctions before Iran not just suspends but abandons enrichment would give the Iranian regime exactly what they want, an eventual path to a nuclear weapon. Sanctions relief at this time would allow them to make advances on their broader strategic objectives in their region such as propping up the Assad regime in Syria, such as continuing to destabilize Iraq, such as supporting terrorist groups such as Hezbollah in Lebanon.

We cannot allow the No. 1 exporter of terrorism in the world this opportunity. Until Iran agrees to abandon

enrichment and reprocessing, not only should we keep the current sanctions but the Congress should move to implement a new round of additional sanctions without delay. I would say that at some point Congress should consider making it very clear that if it becomes necessary, the President of the United States should reserve the right to take military action to prevent Iran from continuing to advance its nuclear weapons program.

The United States and the international community have succeeded in bringing Iran to the negotiating table through firm action, not through half measures. Personally, I hope, as do all of my colleagues, that there is a diplomatic solution to this problem. But Iran does not have forever to prove they are serious. We cannot allow them to use these talks to continue to buy time and space as they have for the last decade, as North Korea did before them, to buy time and space so they can continue to develop their nuclear weapons capability. We cannot allow them to use these talks to continue to spread terror, to undermine their neighbors, and to threaten our country or our allies in Israel and around the world.

We cannot fall into their trap. Yes, we should be willing to talk. But talk alone should not slow down our actions. Until they act, we should continue to increase pressure and speak forcefully about what these people sitting across from us have done internationally and to their own people; otherwise, I truly believe at some point in the future we are going to awake to the news that Iran has tested a nuclear weapon and we may find ourselves stuck with the reality that they have the ability to put that weapon on a missile that can reach the United States. If that day should ever come, God help us all.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, you know when you are driving along and your children keep asking you, are we there yet? Are we there yet? That is an appropriate question. I would have thought we were there—until now. We heard about the agreement that was hammered out between the two leaders in the Senate and now all kinds of changes wanting to be made in the House of Representatives. The countdown clock is ticking. The ominous sounds of default are being heard. The stock market, the New York Exchange, has reacted accordingly. Up on Friday,

up again a little bit yesterday on the hopes, but today with the new news, down—not a huge amount but a significant amount.

It is reflective of this emotional roller coaster of what is at stake, which is the financial integrity of this country.

Enough is enough. The ridiculousness ought to stop. Let's go back and look where we have been over the course of the last 2 weeks.

All of this started with a shutdown of the Federal Government, of which there are untold stories of hardship and deprivation that are going on. That ought to be enough to spur people to action to stop the shutdown. What did the shutdown start with? It started because a small group in the House, maybe folks who would affiliate with the tea party, decided they want to take away the funding for the health care reform act, the Affordable Care Act. As a result, they forced this shutdown.

In the course of the last 2 weeks, about 1 week goes by and that crowd sees this is not working and so they shift then their attacks to one of overall spending. But still today, with the two leaders in the Senate having basically come to an agreement, the House of Representatives is going back to the Affordable Care Act and wanting to extract additional things. And all the time the clock is ticking toward not only not being able to bring government back so it can function—stopping the shutdown—but also the potential default that is looming.

I really believe and I understand what the people in my State of Florida feel. They are fed up with this. It is so ridiculous. Yet that is what our politics has come to. The small group in the House of Representatives better start understanding that.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection and so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:29 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN.)

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I rise to concur with the House of Representatives to consider and pass what they seem to be focused on, which is a compromise resolution to the crisis before us which includes “no Washington exemption” language regarding ObamaCare. I strongly support, of course, that language, and I strongly support that discussion and that effort in the House, and I really encourage all of our House colleagues to look hard at that and act on it. In particular, I would encourage my Louisiana colleagues to do that.

I have pushed this issue ever since we got back from the August recess. As the Presiding Officer knows, as we went into that August recess the Obama administration issued a rule—an illegal rule, in my opinion—without statutory authority, contrary to the ObamaCare statute, that gives Members of Congress and congressional staff special status, special exemption, or special subsidy, if you will, not in the law, and one not enjoyed in that way by any other American. This “no Washington exemption” language, which I have been an advocate of with many others here in the Senate and with many House colleagues, would end that special elite status. That is what we need to do.

I think we need to do it for two crucial reasons—first of all, just on principle. I believe it should be the first rule of our democracy that Washington is treated as the rest of America is treated. What is good for America and what Congress and the administration—what Washington passes on America, it lives with itself with no special status, no special rules, no special exemption or subsidy. That should be true across the board. It should certainly be true regarding ObamaCare. That should be the first rule of American democracy.

Washington doesn't want that. It wants to impose these new rules on the rest of America; it doesn't want to live by them itself. It is sort of like when a person walks into a restaurant and hears that the chef never, ever eats at that restaurant, never, ever has a meal out of that kitchen, it makes a person wonder. The same thing is true here on a number of fronts, including ObamaCare.

So the first point is based on pure principle. Washington should live under the same rules it imposes on America across the board, including under ObamaCare. So Washington—Congress, all congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, their political appointees—should have to go to the same fallback option under ObamaCare that is there for all America—the so-called exchanges—and it should do that with no special rules or special deal or special subsidy or special exception. It should do that the same way ordinary Americans do, who

in many cases—8 million-plus—are forced out of good health care coverage they have now through their employment and forced onto the ObamaCare exchanges.

The second reason this language is so important is a very practical one, because the sooner we make Washington live by the same ObamaCare rules as the rest of America, the quicker Washington will change ObamaCare in substantial ways, will fix it not just for Washington, as it did through the special illegal Obama administration rule on this subject, but for America. We need to align policymakers' personal interests in Washington along with the interests of the American people. The way we do that is to make them live by exactly the same rules, make them walk the walk of those Americans who have to go to the ObamaCare exchanges, in many cases against their will—8 million-plus—who were satisfied with the health coverage they had prior to ObamaCare and then who realized that under this law the promise by President Obama that “if you like the health care coverage you have now, you can keep it”—they realized the hard way that promise was a lie.

So there are two crucial reasons we must pass this language into law: first, the principle, and second, the practicality—first, the principle that Washington should live under the same rules the same way as America and, second, the practicality that we need to visit upon Washington all of the burdens and challenges that face America under ObamaCare, including those 8 million-plus Americans going to the exchanges against their will.

Again, I encourage the House to include this “no Washington exemption” language in any compromise they put together with regard to these fiscal issues we are dealing with now. That would be enormously important. It would show leadership. I think it will resonate with the American people. The American people get this issue, and they resent—rightly so—Washington getting a special exemption or a special subsidy under ObamaCare that no other American in that situation gets.

Again, I urge the House to act on that important language. That would show leadership. That would align our personal interests with the folks we represent. That would honor what should be the first principle of American democracy: Washington lives under the same rules as the rest of America on ObamaCare and on everything else.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, we still remain hopeful as the hours, unfortunately, click down towards what could happen in this country if we do not pay our debts. It has never happened in American history. I know when we woke up this morning, when America woke up, they saw Leader REID, the Democratic leader, the majority leader, and Leader MCCONNELL, the Republican leader from Kentucky, coming together in discussion, coming together on a plan, and they are pretty close to agreement.

We know there are still problems in the House of Representatives. I think some of us in this body are fans of Abraham Lincoln, and many of us have studied a lot of things Lincoln said and did. Lincoln used to talk about—when his staff wanted him to stay at the White House to win the war and free the slaves and preserve the Union—he said: I have to go out and get my public opinion bath.

I think some of my colleagues in the House could learn something from going out and listening to real people, not just going on talk radio, not just going to their country clubs, but to listen to people talk about their lives and what this government shutdown has meant.

It has meant more than 50,000 jobs in my State—people who are furloughed. Madam President, 97 percent of NASA employees in Cleveland and Sandusky in northern Ohio have been furloughed. We know what it has meant to Battelle Memorial Institute, one of the great research facilities in the country. They run the energy labs. We know what it has meant to people who depend on Meals On Wheels and food stamps and depend on food safety and meat inspections and all that government does.

We know long term what this shutdown or repeated shutdowns in the future do. That is why these negotiations are so important that Majority Leader REID is insisting that every time somebody says: I am going to shut the government down, you do not repeal a law for them because then that is what becomes a matter of course.

If you are a research scientist and you are funded by an NIH grant at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland or you are at Wright State University and are a medical researcher or you are doing aeronautics research at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base or at NASA Glenn, if you see these interruptions, if you are furloughed for 3 weeks in October 2013 and then again some time next year, and again, you—some of the most talented researchers—are going to walk away, and we are going to lose so much of the edge we have in this country.

We are still the leading economy in the world. We are the greatest country in the world because, as the Presiding Officer knows in Wisconsin, we have built the kind of intellectual and physical infrastructure the world has never seen—whether it is the University of Wisconsin, which is a great university, not quite as great as a slightly larger one in Columbus, but whether it is a great university, whether it is medical research, whether it is building highways and public transit and aeronautics and all that we do as a nation and we have done together, we cannot lose that edge. These government shutdowns and threats are damaging not just to the economy today but to our long-term future as a nation.

That is why I am hopeful, as Senator MCCONNELL and Senator REID have worked together and come close to an agreement, that the House of Representatives will understand how important this is to the future of our Nation. All we are asking is—once we get this agreement in the Senate—that Speaker BOEHNER simply go along; otherwise, it really is a betrayal of our values and our future and us as a great country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. What is the pending status of the Senate floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on the motion to proceed to S. 1569.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I rise to speak for approximately 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. We are 33 hours away from the possible default of the United States of America on its debt obligations. We are 33 hours away from the possibility of the United States of America becoming a deadbeat nation, not paying its bills to its own people and other creditors.

We are 33 hours away from our T-bills becoming a junk bond. It is unacceptable that our T-bills, our Treasury bills, should move to a junk-bond status. We have to get rid of that and we have to get rid of the junk talk that is going on around here.

The Congress of the United States must have a sense of urgency and come together on a program that ensures the United States of America pays its bills and opens its government to serve its own people and to serve the role we play around the world.

I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let us pass the framework

that was originally suggested yesterday by the Democratic leader Senator REID and by Senator MCCONNELL, our Republican leader. Maybe it is not something all of us would have written, but it is something we could all do. It means the President would sign it, the government would reopen, we could extend the debt ceiling, and we could be working on both our budget and our Senate appropriations.

I say, as the chair of the Appropriations Committee, I am eager to go to work. I am eager to fashion that bipartisan compromise within the Senate in terms of what our spending should be, how we could make sure it is affordable, frugal, makes good investments in the American framework, makes sure we have national security physical infrastructure, meets compelling human need, and conducts research and development.

We can do this. I spoke with my House counterparts. We are eager to go to work, but in order to negotiate we must have this agreement.

I am very adamant that before we can get to appropriations and our budget, we have to raise the debt ceiling. If we fail or falter to address the crisis, the United States of America will irrevocably be affected. This is a manufactured crisis. It is a manufactured crisis because it is a self-inflicted crisis. This is not what our global competitors are doing to us. This is not what Russia is doing to us. This is not what China is doing to us. This is what the House of Representatives is doing to us.

I thought we had an agreement arrived at by two mature leaders willing to do statesmanship rather than brinkmanship. That became the mantra of the day, statesmanship over gamesmanship. We felt very good about it last night when we went home. It was going to take give. Certainly, it was going to take give from we appropriators, but that is OK. That is the American way.

Now we are on the verge of being a deadbeat nation. How humiliating is this, that the Federal Government, already shut down for 2 weeks, could be heading for default. The full faith and credit of the United States has always been the international standard for investment in the world and now it is a question mark.

There is a lot of confusion about debt ceiling and what it means. Debt ceiling doesn't mean permission to acquire new spending, it means to acquire funds to pay bills we have acquired in the past. The debt ceiling determines how much the government can borrow to pay for the programs it has already enacted. I wish to repeat it allows the United States to pay the bills it has already incurred.

Opponents of raising the debt ceiling say that by blocking an increase, it is going to save the United States money.

That is simply not true. We don't save money by not paying our bills. Do you know what happens when someone doesn't pay their bills? They get a lousy credit rating. When someone gets a lousy credit rating, he or she has to pay more for what they want to buy if they have a terrible credit rating. It is as if we are moving into payday loans.

This is the United States of America. We don't just erase the debt by not paying our bills. In fact, we end up owing more money, as I said, because our interest rates go up. The consequences of a default are significant and severe. For the House of Representatives to say no, to want to give up and say no to what we are working on in the Senate is the height of dangerous behavior.

The Treasury Department warns that default could create a worse economic crisis than 2008 and could cause more damage that might last over more than a generation. A generation is 20 years. I don't want children who are now 6, 7, and 8 years old to grow up in a country that is viewed as an international deadbeat. I don't want to derail our economic recovery. Economists predict we could lose over 600,000 jobs and 401(k)s would be hit hard.

The President would also have to decide who gets limited government money. We will operate only over existing limited government revenue. Should we pay our troops, continue Social Security checks? What should we do?

This isn't only about let's squeeze government programs. This is going to put the squeeze on Medicare and Social Security. I went through this in the 1995 government shutdown. The consequences are very severe to Social Security. Each month Social Security pays about \$70 billion in benefits to 63 million Americans. Most benefits are made to retirees and people with disabilities. October 16, tomorrow, we have a bill due of \$13 billion. On October 23, the next round of Social Security checks go out, which is \$13 billion. November 1 is another \$27 billion with another \$4 billion in SSI benefits.

If we have default, we might have to delay benefits. They could be delayed until there is enough revenue in the Treasury to cover the payments due that day. Let me paint the picture. Within the next 4 weeks, we have \$70 billion worth of benefits due in Social Security. Jack Lew, the Secretary of the Treasury, says that on October 17 it will be \$30 billion. In Social Security alone, we have a \$40 billion decline and a gap. The Bipartisan Policy Center estimates that not raising the debt ceiling could delay the November 1 payment by 2 weeks. We are talking about delaying Social Security. That is an earned benefit.

I would like to say what it also means to Medicare. On Medicare, if the government fails to pay, Medicare pay-

ments would be delayed. Medicare pays providers and also covers the prescription drug benefit. Let us go to the prescription drug benefit, which means a lot to many people. If someone needs prescription drugs to control blood pressure, to control blood sugar, to take an anticoagulant to prevent heart attack or stroke, he or she needs Medicare. About \$5.2 billion worth of Medicare payments to private insurance companies for the drug coverage is due on November 1.

On November 1, the U.S. Government is supposed to pay its share to private insurance companies to cover the prescription drug benefit. If it doesn't do that, what is a private insurance company going to do? They are supposed to help administer this Medicare Part D benefit. Will the insurance companies continue to provide prescription drugs if they don't get paid by us?

What happens to the seniors? I don't know.

Let us go to providers. Medicare pays doctors and hospitals that treat Medicare patients. Under the law, they are supposed to be paid within 14 days. Every day, 5 million claims worth about \$1 billion are paid to either hospitals or doctors. If we don't have money to pay that hospital or to repay that doctor for services rendered, will they continue to treat Medicare patients? Will hospitals continue to admit them? I am sure they would do it in an emergency, but the whole idea of being able to see your doctor is to avoid an emergency. Doctors are already hesitant about Medicare because of the Spartan reimbursement, but now we are talking about maybe no reimbursement at all for weeks at a time. Why? Not because of a natural disaster but because of politics, politics, politics.

The other side, particularly the other side of the dome in the House, might not like ObamaCare. There are those on the other side of the aisle who don't like ObamaCare. I think everybody likes Medicare. No matter what one thinks about ObamaCare—and I do believe President Obama does care and that is a good thing to call that health care program—but I do believe everyone likes Medicare. I know no Senator, no Member of the House of Representatives, who would like to end the Medicare Program.

If we default, we could be ending Medicare as we know it. We will shake the very confidence in the provider system. We will shake the very confidence that we have in a partnership between Medicare, private insurance, and the people who need health care. What is it that we are doing? Again, this is a self-inflicted manufactured crisis.

I say to the House of Representatives, listen to the framework of the Senate bill. Let's not add a lot of other issues the House might like to bring up. Let us pass the framework that was

discussed by Senators REID and McCONNELL yesterday.

There was a lot of give-and-take, that we would reopen government. By December 15, the Budget Committee will have met. By January 15 we would have produced our spending bill for 2014, and we would lift the debt ceiling until February 7. I think that would be a good way to go.

One might say shouldn't the Budget Committee meet anyway? You betcha. Senator MURRAY passed her budget bill on May 23 by almost 70 votes in the Senate, but she could not go negotiate with PAUL RYAN because six Senators on the other side of the aisle objected. Now we have to pass legislation mandating following the law.

We are now passing a law to tell them to follow the law. I am willing to pass a law to tell them to follow the law, because in order for me as the chair of the committee, working with my vice chairman Senator SHELBY, a really rock-ribbed fiscal conservative—we have a lot of negotiating back and forth, but we have an atmosphere of civility, candor, and an interest in the good of the country. We can get it done. We know we have to give and take. I know as a Democrat I have to, and I am willing to do it. I called him this morning and reaffirmed my commitment to work in the spirit of compromise.

So let's get on with it. Thirty-three hours to go—now it is 32 hours and 45 minutes to go. The clock is ticking on the United States of America and its standing in the world. I urge us to come together, that the Senate be able to move the framework discussed by our leadership; that the House take it up, pass it, and we get on to doing the governance we were elected to do.

I yield the floor, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask consent to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, it has now been 2 weeks since the launch of the insurance exchanges that were created by President Obama's health care law. After 2 weeks of delays, error messages, things the President calls glitches, the American people are united in saying that this is what a train wreck looks like. A recent poll by the Associated Press found that only 7 percent of Americans say this rollout has gone either very well or extremely well. The Obama administration continues to say the problems were just

because of too many people trying to check out the Web site the first day.

I bring to the floor the front page of Sunday's New York Times, Sunday, October 13, now 13 days into the exchange, with the headline above the fold, front page on Sunday: "From the Start, Signs of Trouble at Health Portal. Many Deadlines Missed. Web Site Problems May Imperil Finances of Insurance Market." This is a front-page story. It continues inside the paper. It says:

In March, Henry Chao, the chief digital architect for the Obama administration's new online insurance marketplace, told industry executives that he was deeply worried about the Web site's debut. "Let's just make sure it's not a third-world experience," he told them.

Two weeks after the rollout, few would say his hopes were realized.

For the past 12 days, a system costing more than \$400 million and billed as a one-stop click-and-go hub for citizens seeking health insurance has thwarted the efforts of millions to simply log in. The growing national outcry has deeply embarrassed the White House, which has refused to say how many people have enrolled through the federal exchange.

Even some supporters of the Affordable Care Act worry that the flaws in the system, if not quickly fixed, could threaten the fiscal health of the insurance initiative, which depends on throngs of customers to spread the risk and keep prices low.

"These are not glitches," said an insurance executive who has participated in many conference calls on the federal exchange. Like many people interviewed for this article, the executive spoke on the condition of anonymity, saying he did not wish to alienate the federal officials with whom he works. "The extent of the problems is pretty enormous. At the end of our calls, people say, 'It's awful, just awful.'"

At the time, the President of the United States—he and I talked about this directly face to face on Friday at the White House. He said we just have a problem with the cash register. I would say this is a Web site with major flaws. It goes way beyond the cash register.

One online database programmer told CBS News:

It wasn't designed well, it wasn't implemented well, and it looks like nobody tested it.

That is from a computer expert who says he supports the law but the Web site needs a complete overhaul.

I would be ashamed and embarrassed if my organization delivered something like that.

Remember, they spent \$400 million of hard-earned taxpayer dollars. This guy says he would be ashamed and embarrassed to deliver something as bad as the Obama health care exchange.

I think the Obama administration should be embarrassed about the whole law. The law wasn't designed well, hasn't been implemented well, and it looks as if nobody tested it. The problems we have seen are not just first-day glitches. The problems have continued. People still cannot sign up eas-

ily. It is still not as easy to use as Amazon. Remember the President of the United States promised it would be as easy to use as amazon.com. Why are there problems 2 weeks later?

The CEO of Aetna Insurance said yesterday—this is 2 weeks into it. He said: There's so much wrong, you just don't know what's broken until you get a lot more of it fixed.

We still have no idea how many people have been able to enroll successfully. What is the Obama administration continuing to hide?

Wolf Blitzer came out last week on CNN and said:

If they weren't fully ready, they should accept the advice the Republicans are giving them, delay it for a year, get it ready, and make sure it works.

Even Jon Stewart was asking why the Obama administration gave a 1-year delay to big businesses but not to the American people. Mr. President, if you are the Obama White House, when you have lost Jon Stewart, you know things are not going well.

The problems do not end with the media or professional comedians. A Democratic Member of the House who actually voted for the health care law called the launch of the exchanges "excruciatingly frustrating." Robert Gibbs, President Obama's former Press Secretary, said yesterday:

I hope they fire some people who were in charge of making sure that this thing was supposed to work.

The biggest cheerleaders for the President's health care law are now turning against it, the American people do not like it, and people are not buying the administration's excuses for why it has failed. This is, of course, bad for the President, but the American people have even bigger problems, and that is what we should be really focused on.

The White House is worried about how this looks from a PR standpoint. We should also be talking about the real harm this health care law is doing to hard-working Americans and their families and their jobs and their paychecks. Many of them are going to lose their doctors—doctors who are not included in the insurance plans sold in the exchanges. Many are already seeing that their premiums are going up because of all the Washington mandates.

Remember the President and his promises in passing this health care law? That is not what the people are seeing today. One mother told a TV station in Allentown, PA, that when she went to sign up on the Web site, she was told her premium would be almost \$950 for her family. That is \$765 more than she pays now. She told the station, "It would take food out of our mouths to be able to afford this coverage." This is what the President of the United States and Democrats in this body have foisted on the American people.

People are finding that not just the premiums are going up, but many of their other health care costs are also higher.

The Chicago Tribune had this headline on Sunday:

Obamacare deductibles may cause sticker shock. Insurance companies are requiring higher out-of-pocket expenses to pay for complying with new rules.

Expenses to pay for complying with rules—not expenses to give you health care, not expenses to keep you healthy, not expenses to prevent injury or illness, but expenses to pay for complying with the rules. That is the Chicago Tribune, the President's hometown newspaper.

As if all that weren't bad enough, the administration is still insisting it is going to fine people who don't have insurance, even though people can't sign up on the ObamaCare Web site successfully. The administration was saying that this is a long process and people have until the end of March of next year to enroll in the exchanges, but even that changed last week. Now it turns out people will actually have to sign up 6 weeks earlier than that—by Valentine's Day—or pay the tax penalty. What we are looking at is a tax penalty at 1 percent of income or \$95, whichever is greater that first year. That could be a sizable amount of money for some families who thought they were going to get affordable insurance under the President's health care law because that's what the President promised them. He stood in Congress and told the American people that. He stood in front of groups all around the country, and the American people feel misled and deceived. All of this frustration, expense, stress, and pain was all avoidable.

Democrats in Congress and President Obama need to swallow their pride. They need to admit that the problems with the health care law are not limited to a bad Web site. The problems with the health care law run much deeper, and they are only going to get much worse. We must do something to stop this terrible law from doing more damage to people's jobs, their care, and our country.

The President will be held to the promises he made as recently as 2½ weeks ago: If people like their doctors, they can keep their doctor, the cost will be less than a cell phone bill, and that it will be easier to use than amazon.com.

This health care law has failed miserably. We needed health care reform so people could get the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs. They have not gotten it. It is time to repeal and replace this terrible health care law.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask that the senior Senator from South Carolina, the senior Senator from Georgia, if he comes to the floor, as well, and I be permitted to enter into a colloquy for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TERRORIST PRISONERS

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about something that is fundamental to all of us, and that is the safety and security of our country.

On October 5, our special forces did an excellent job in conjunction with our intelligence community, and I commend the administration for ordering the raid that captured a key Al Qaeda terrorist whose name is Abu Anas al-Libi. When they captured him, they put him on a ship.

About a week ago, my colleague from South Carolina and my colleague from Georgia, who is the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, stood up and we said: After successfully capturing one of the most important Al Qaeda members—which is a result of the great work done by our special forces and our intelligence agents—why are we putting him on a ship for purposes of interrogation instead of bringing him to Guantanamo Bay detention facility, which is a top-rated detention facility? At Guantanamo Bay we could do a lengthy interrogation of this person who has been associated with Osama bin Laden and the current head of Al Qaeda, Anwar al-Awlaki.

He is also charged with participating and being involved in the 1998 Kenya and Tanzania bombings at the embassies that killed 224 people, including 12 Americans. He has been described as a potential treasure trove of information about the activities of Al Qaeda and their plans. The information we have, which has been released publicly, is that he is someone Anwar al-Awlaki may have sent to Libya to try to make sure that they could have the Al Qaeda network in Libya.

Let's not forget what happened on September 11, a year ago, in Libya where our ambassador and three brave Americans were murdered. Does Mr. al-Libi know anything about that?

We will never fully know what Mr. al-Libi knows because after a week on the ship where our intelligence officials were given an opportunity to speak to him, he was transferred to a Federal district court, and today in Federal district court he pled not guilty to the 1998 bombings at the embassy. He was given a lawyer. We know that when these terrorists are given a lawyer, it gives them an opportunity to say: I will not talk to anyone anymore because I have a lawyer. They are told they have the right to remain silent.

It is irresponsible for our Nation to capture a top Al Qaeda terrorist and

tell them a week later: Here is your lawyer and your right to remain silent because the most important piece we have to protect our country is information to prevent future attacks and information that our intelligence officials can use about the Al Qaeda network to protect Americans and our allies. That information was given up because this administration is so worried and concerned about political points and closing Guantanamo Bay that they would rather transfer someone who is a key Al Qaeda operative to the Federal district court in New York and give him a lawyer a week later, instead of a lengthy interrogation designed to find out everything he knows.

It took years to get the information that led to the bin Laden raid that captured and killed Osama bin Laden. Yet we only had a week of interrogation with a key Al Qaeda operative because they are so worried about adding more people to those who are present at Guantanamo Bay that they would rather put that political goal above gathering information to make sure America is protected. It is wrong, and we will never know what information we lost that could have protected Americans by only allowing this interrogation to go a week in military custody instead of a lengthy interrogation in a top-rated detention facility.

One of the reasons that the administration has given is that he had medical issues. If he did have medical issues, guess what. Guantanamo Bay actually has top-rated medical facilities. Had we captured him and brought him right there—in fact, these are the same types of medical services that our own men and women in uniform are able to receive. He could have been treated there, and we also could have kept him there and made sure that we prioritized getting information about Al Qaeda from him to prevent future attacks against America and to stop the terrorists with this information. The more information we have, the better we can protect our country.

Since I have been a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have been repeatedly asking the administration: What is your detention and interrogation policy? What if you capture the head of Al Qaeda tomorrow? And you know what I get from the top military leaders? I have gotten answers such as this: I would need lawyerly help on that one. We are still working on our detention and interrogation policy.

While they have had years to work on this, we are left where we are: A top Al Qaeda terrorist who was captured in Libya and after only a week of interrogation was given a lawyer so they can accomplish their political goals instead of prioritizing and gathering information from someone who has known and been involved with Osama bin Laden and knows the current head of Al

Qaeda, and finding out what that individual knows so we can keep America safe.

I hope that the administration will stop doing this. We can't put politics above intelligence gathering to protect our country.

I ask the Senator from South Carolina, through the Chair, if he still believes we are still at war with Al Qaeda? Also, how important is it that we gather information from terrorists who are captured, and that those interrogations be done on a lengthy basis instead of a short period such as a week?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from New Hampshire who has been one of the strongest voices since the day she got here in the Senate to talk about the difference between fighting a war and fighting a crime. The Senator has been the attorney general of New Hampshire, and I have been a military lawyer for over 30 years. The legal systems to fight a war are different than the legal systems to solve a domestic crime.

Here is the problem: Do I believe Al Qaeda is at war with the United States and our values and our friends? Would they kill us all if they could? Yes.

Why did 3,000 Americans die on 9/11/2001? They couldn't kill 3 million of us. If they could, they would have. If you believe that, then the goal of our generation is to marginalize this movement, and when we capture one of them, we need to find out what they are up to.

Dying for their cause is not a deterrent. It is like first prize. So when you tell somebody who has joined Al Qaeda that you may die in the course of this attack, they say good. The goal is to prevent them from hitting us, and the best way to do that is through intelligence gathering.

When you capture someone who is determined by our military and intelligence community to be a member of Al Qaeda, then under the law of war—the authorization to use military force passed by Congress over a decade ago—you can hold that person under the law of war to gather intelligence.

Why is that the case? War is about winning the war. Enemy prisoners are valuable captured alive because they can provide information about what the enemy is up to.

When you charge someone with a crime, you cannot spend a long time with them without their lawyer trying figure out if they committed the crime because of the right against self-incrimination in our criminal justice system. The military legal system, and the law of war, is completely different when it comes to asking questions of an enemy prisoner about future military activity or what they know about past operations.

The most dangerous thing we could do as a nation is to treat a captured Al

Qaeda terrorist as a common criminal, read them their Miranda rights, and put them in civilian court before we have a chance to gather intelligence. That is exactly what the Obama administration did here. To their credit, they captured al-Libi. Here is what breaks my heart the most: The special forces units that go into Libya, Somalia, and Pakistan risk their lives to capture these people alive, if possible, so we can gather intelligence.

It really does bother me that after completing this operation, which was very successful, we only had control of this enemy prisoner for about 10 or 11 days. I will never be convinced that in that short period of time we were able to gather the intelligence he possessed. He has been associated with Al Qaeda at the highest level for 20 years. He was a treasure trove of information.

This was a political decision by the Obama administration, not a legal decision based on the law of war. This is not what our military advises or our intelligence community advises. This is what the President chose to do because he does not want to use Guantanamo Bay.

Why was he placed on a ship? Because there is no prison available in the United States, other than a naval vessel, to hold someone as an enemy combatant under the law of war. Why? Because the President refuses to use Guantanamo Bay.

If we can close Guantanamo Bay and create a new prison to allow people to be held as enemy combatants, sign me up. But the idea of not having a jail available to the United States on land at a time of great stress, and during a very pivotal moment in the war on terror, is an ill-conceived and dangerous policy.

I applaud the Senator from New Hampshire for bringing up this issue.

Here is what we need to understand as Members of Congress: This policy cannot be sustained. When we capture high-value targets, such as a 20-year veteran of Al Qaeda, we are crazy as a nation not to use the law of war to gather intelligence.

I am not for torturing anyone. I have been a military lawyer for 31 years. I believe in the Geneva Conventions. I believe my country is special. I believe in the international regimes about how we interrogate prisoners we hold. I know what Al Qaeda does to their prisoners. I do not want to be like them. I want to be the United States. But the United States has a right, under the law of war, to gather intelligence.

The last thing a member of Al Qaeda should hear when they are captured is: You have a right to remain silent. Here is your lawyer. I don't want them to remain silent. I want them, over time, to provide us with whatever intelligence is available.

Why was he moved off the ship? Apparently, he had a medical condition

that could not be treated on the naval vessel. I believe in providing quality health care to prisoners of war simply because I want that standard to be available to our soldiers in future wars. The standard we set today will follow us into the next war and, unfortunately, there will be. But having to take him off the ship because he was sick is no excuse to stop his interrogation to gather intelligence. Putting him on the ship because we don't want to use Guantanamo Bay is an ill-conceived and ill-designed strategy that, if it is not changed or replaced, is going to come back to haunt this country.

This man possesses an enormous amount of intelligence potential. He is now in Federal court. He will be given a lawyer. Once he is charged with a crime, he should be given a lawyer. But before that, we have the right under the law of war to hold him to gather intelligence—treat him humanely but question him about what he knows about Al Qaeda, because they are still out there, lurking.

I will end with this. I wish to work with the Senator from New Hampshire and anybody on the other side who would like to try to find a detention and interrogation policy that is more rationally based. Guantanamo Bay, in its early years, did hurt the image of this country. Some of our interrogation techniques right after 9/11 hurt us as a nation.

Guantanamo Bay has been reformed. It is Geneva Convention compliant. The Detainee Treatment Act that I helped author with Senator LEVIN and Senator MCCAIN is the gold standard of how we treat people under the law of war. I am proud of the system we have created over the last several years in a bipartisan manner, and I urge this administration to create a vehicle to interrogate under the law of war people such as al-Libi so we can be prepared for the next attack. The policy they have in place today is going to deny this country the ability to gather valuable intelligence.

When it comes to defeating Al Qaeda, the more we know about how they behave and what they are up to the safer we will be, because they will not be deterred by the threat of death. We cannot deter them; we have to stop them. We have to hit them before they hit us, and the best way to do that is to gather intelligence when we find someone such as al-Libi.

I am very disappointed that we have blown it when it comes to intelligence gathering with this high-value target. I am very sad to report to the military members and their families that the bravery they have demonstrated and shown just a few weeks ago has been undermined, in my view, by an irrational political decision that denies our country the ability to learn from a high-value target they risked their life to capture.

I don't know how to fix this in the current political environment, but I know as a military lawyer it needs to be fixed, and I know we are not elevating our country by diminishing our ability to use legal systems that have been around for hundreds of years at a time when we need them the most. So I look forward to working with the Senator from New Hampshire who has become one of the leading voices when it comes to detention and interrogation under the law of war.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Let me make a correction for the RECORD. I used the name al-Maliki. It is Ayman al-Zawahiri who is the current head of Al Qaeda, and that is whose name I meant to say.

The point is this: If we capture al-Zawahiri tomorrow, are we going to put him on the ship, and is he only going to be on the ship for a week when we gather information from him to ask him what future attacks he is planning against America and our allies? Does that make any sense? And then we are going to give him a lawyer and tell him he has the right to remain silent? No. What makes the most sense is that we have a detention and interrogation policy so that with people such as al-Libi, we take as much time as we need to make sure we find out everything they know about Al Qaeda to protect America, and if we capture Zawahiri tomorrow, we make sure we protect America by finding out everything he knows. That is what we are worried about and that is what we need to do for our country.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. AYOTTE. Yes, I will.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are throwing around names. I think Zawahiri is the person who took bin Laden's place. If we captured him tomorrow, that would be the ultimate treasure trove.

Ms. AYOTTE. Right.

Mr. GRAHAM. Can the Senator from New Hampshire tell us a little bit about this individual called al-Libi? Why do we believe he would be such a treasure trove? What is his background? How long has he been involved in Al Qaeda? And what have we missed here? What opportunities have we lost by only holding him as an enemy combatant for less than 2 weeks?

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. al-Libi is someone who is alleged to have been involved in Al Qaeda for decades. He is someone who as early as the 1990s was working with Osama bin Laden. He is alleged to have been involved with—and that is what he is charged with in Federal court, as I mentioned—the 1998 bombings of the Kenya and Tanzania Embassies that killed 224 people, including 12 Americans.

He reportedly played a critical role as the intermediary between al-Zawahiri, whom we just discussed, who

took over for Osama bin Laden as the head of Al Qaeda in an effort to establish an Al Qaeda-affiliated operation network in Libya where our Ambassador, of course, was murdered, along with three brave Americans, last September 11. He has been reported to be an Al Qaeda computer intelligence and operations security expert, and he is alleged to have been involved in Al Qaeda strategic planning.

This is one of the most important captures we have had in years of Al Qaeda.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield for one more inquiry. He was captured in Tripoli, Libya; is that right?

Ms. AYOTTE. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. We believe he was in Libya before the attack on our consulate in Benghazi, right?

Ms. AYOTTE. Right.

Mr. GRAHAM. We also know him to be one of the higher level Al Qaeda operatives roaming the planet. He was involved in bombing our Embassies in 1998 in Kenya and Tanzania; is that correct?

Ms. AYOTTE. That is right.

Mr. GRAHAM. What are the odds that he was in Tripoli before the Benghazi attack, had a record of bombing embassies in the 1990s, and had nothing to do with the consulate attack in Benghazi? The Senator from New Hampshire is a prosecutor. What does my colleague think the odds are of this guy not having any knowledge or involvement in killing our Ambassador in Benghazi and being involved in the attack on our consulate that was organized by Al Qaeda affiliates? And what have we learned, if anything, about his potential involvement in Benghazi? How can we learn everything this man has done in 11 or 12 days before we give him a lawyer? I would argue we can't.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you. I would argue we can't possibly understand all he knows about Benghazi in the last 20 years of terrorism by holding him on a ship for less than 2 weeks. He should be held at Gitmo as long as it takes to find out what he knows and then he should be tried. Does the Senator from New Hampshire agree with that?

Ms. AYOTTE. I agree. We need to protect our country. That means a lot longer than a week interrogation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if I might for a moment, we have had dozens and dozens of terrorists who have been arrested. We had the so-called Underwear Bomber, a member of Osama bin

Laden's family, and many others. They were all given their Miranda warning and they wouldn't shut up. They kept talking day after day after day. It has been my experience that if they are going to talk, they are going to talk, whether they are given a Miranda warning or not. Wouldn't it be nice if we demonstrated to the rest of the world that we are not afraid of these people, and that we have the best system of justice in the world and we are going to use it? We have only had three or four convictions by military commissions in terrorism cases; we have had several hundred convictions in our Federal courts.

It is not responsible for Senators to talk about: Oh, my gosh, if we just sent them to Guantanamo. Guantanamo by itself is damaging to the United States and harms the image of the United States.

The fact of the matter is that the people we have arrested and who went through our court system will usually talk ad nauseam, whether they have been given the Miranda warning or not. So let's be realistic. It might be a nice talking point to scare people, but the people who are actually involved in prosecutions know it works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, yesterday we heard very optimistic news about steering away from the brink of American default before it became too late. Majority leader HARRY REID came to the floor and gave very optimistic reports. Minority leader MITCH MCCONNELL came to the floor and gave very optimistic reports. They hinted very strongly that a deal was close, and time was scheduled with the caucuses, presumably to make a presentation of the deal. And then what?

We have had some very interesting speeches and colloquies from our Republican colleagues on the floor. I found the debate as to whether our defense and law enforcement experts had kept an Al Qaeda captive in the right location to be interesting. I found the earlier discussion about the insurance exchange Web sites to be a very interesting discussion. I found the discussion earlier this morning about Iran to be a very interesting discussion. What is even more interesting is what they are not talking about. What they are not talking about is that today the Republican leader pulled out of those very productive negotiations and very optimistic negotiations—pulled out of those negotiations that promised an end to this crisis. I find that absolutely stunning. I am amazed, while we are in a situation where we are that close to resolving this crisis and avoiding the catastrophes that have been predicted, that one side would simply walk away. I don't blame the minority leader. The information I have is that he was asked to do so, that the message came from

the other side, from the Speaker; that Speaker BOEHNER torpedoed the productive bipartisan Senate negotiations that were at the brink of resolving this crisis.

Instead of the bipartisan successful process, Speaker BOEHNER has wanted to interrupt and bring in the same partisan House process that has been a disaster for us over and over—100-percent partisan, 100-percent politics.

We have sent bills over to the House. Those bills have never been brought up for a vote. They have been monkeyed with before they have brought them up, but House Members have never had the chance to vote on a Senate-approved measure, which would have ended this. That is the Speaker's choice. It is the so-called Hastert rule, which means that unless a strong majority of the Republicans are for something, he won't give Democrats a chance to even vote, let alone to be a part of the negotiations.

Here in the Senate we have bipartisan negotiations, with the leaders from both sides still with optimism and hope. On the other side, we have a leadership that won't talk to the Democrats, has purely made partisan decisions about whether something should come to the floor, and has not yet brought a Senate bill to the floor for a clean vote. It is a nightmare over there. And the strategy has not worked, in case they did not get the memo.

Holding the economy hostage was a terrible choice for the Speaker. Causing the shutdown was a terrible choice. Holding the credit of the U.S. Government hostage has been a terrible choice. To use words that were used on the floor this morning by one of our Republican friends, it was a "fool's errand"—it was a "fool's errand"—that put the party "in a ditch."

Well, unfortunately, because he is the Speaker, it is not just the Republican Party that is in the ditch. The whole country is in the ditch as this default looms. Some of them are trying to get out of the difficulty they find themselves in by pretending that the default is not real. We have default deniers now side by side, I guess, with the climate deniers and the other deniers. They deny that October 17 is the real date when anything might go wrong. They deny that anything bad will actually really happen if the U.S. Government defaults. They deny—if we just pay the Treasury bills and leave other things unpaid—anything really bad will happen.

Treasury bills get sold in an auction, in a market. If you are going to that auction to buy Treasury bills and you see a government that is not paying Social Security recipients on time, that has massive liquidity and cashflow problems as a result of the debt limit failure, we may say: Yes, we will pay you first, but are you really

going to pay the same rate for that security of that country while that country is facing all of these other problems? It is a preposterous notion. It is the type of notion that you can only believe when you absolutely need to believe it for your ideological purposes. Reality simply does not support a notion like that. If you are living in a cocoon world of extremist ideology, you can come up with thoughts like that. And if you are only talking to other people who think the same way, you can kind of agree that thought makes sense. But there is a little problem. Reality wins. Reality always wins.

They are playing with dynamite over there, and they are pretending that it is not even dangerous. It would be one thing if we understood that they respected how very dangerous the stunts are that they are pulling in the House Republican leadership. It is even more dangerous when they do not appear to know the danger they are causing for our economy.

I hope we will get back to work here in the Senate right away with a bipartisan solution to this rather than allowing the House and the Speaker to wreck the opportunity we had as late as yesterday in order to play dangerous partisan games. We do not have the time for that, and it is the wrong thing. It is the wrong thing in a very immediate way in terms of the damage it will do to our economy, to the world economy, to people across this country whose interest rates are pegged to Treasury bills, to anybody who depends on an economy where people have confidence that the United States is a solid investment and have confidence that our economy is going to grow. The default puts all that at risk. It creates real economic hazards for our country. But the method of getting us here has additional hazards, and I would like to close by talking about them.

From the very founding of this Republic, we have prided ourselves on our distinct American system of government. We have fought for it. We have protected it. It has seen us through world wars, civil wars, great depressions, great recessions, all types of calamity. What it fundamentally is—the phrase we use probably as much as any other about our country is that it is a government of laws. It risks being turned into—by a very small faction in one party in one House in one branch of government—a government not of laws but of threats, a government where the person who can make the scariest threat wins.

It does not matter that what they are objecting to was passed in the regular order, passed by both Houses of Congress, signed into law by the President, approved by the Supreme Court. It does not matter that it was the center of the last Presidential election and that their point of view lost convincingly. What matters to them is if they can

make dangerous enough threats, they may be able to try to get their way anyway—anyway. That is not the way a government of laws behaves. That is the way a government of threats behaves.

If we go down the road of a government of threats, we will be taking a very big step away from our American heritage, away from the procedures of our American Constitution, and away from the values that have seen us through hundreds of years of growth and pride. It is a dangerous point, and the fact that they are willing to do that, the fact that they are willing to not only wreck the economy but to wreck the status of this country as one that is run by a government of laws and turn it instead into a government of threats, shows how shallowly they wear their patriotism on their sleeves. It is bunkum patriotism to put the real values of this country into the hopper and turn us into a government of threats instead of a government of laws.

A great judge, a Supreme Court Justice, once said: Procedure is the bone structure of a democratic society. Breaking those bones to make your point is no way to enhance our democratic society.

So I hope the majority leader and the minority leader will resume their negotiations right away. I hope, frankly, they have begun already and I just do not know about it yet. But we have to get going. And if the minority leader is unwilling to tell Speaker BOEHNER: No. Knock it off. You have done enough damage already. We are going to solve this in the Senate, and we are going to sit down and have a bipartisan compromise—if he is unwilling to say that, then we need to come back to the floor and we need to bring up the bill the Republicans filibustered on Saturday that would have gotten us out of this pickle. Time is short. We have to get moving. If our colleagues on the other side then want to filibuster—to filibuster—the solution to this debt limit crisis, they will have shown their hand in a very dangerous way.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, a couple of hours ago I was on the Senate floor urging and encouraging the House to act on a compromise proposal to deal with the current fiscal issues before us that included the “no Washington exemption” from the ObamaCare language.

As I said, I think that is very important for two reasons; one, the principle.

I think the first rule of American democracy should be that Washington lives by the same rules as it imposes on America under ObamaCare, under everything; secondly, a very practical consideration. I think the quicker we do that, the quicker we start getting things right. The quicker we start understanding in a gut, personal way the real challenges and burdens of ObamaCare, the quicker we start changing that.

I return just a couple of hours later to congratulate the House because they are apparently moving in exactly that direction. All indications are that they will be going to the Rules Committee very soon with a package that features—that has as its centerpiece that “no Washington exemption” from ObamaCare language.

Again, I think it is important for all the reasons I said. I also want to point out that assuming the House passes that—I think they are going to tonight—that “no Washington exemption” language will be the only thing—the only substantial thing in that proposal that has not been essentially agreed to by Senate Democrats. Everything else is detail, a date here, minor provisions. The only major difference between what the House is hopefully passing tonight and what has been agreed to in discussions by Senate Democrats is that “no Washington exemption” language.

So the question will be is this perceived crisis, is this standoff going to continue over that, over Members protecting their wallets, their special elite status, demanding that they are treated differently than other Americans under ObamaCare? Is it going to continue and not be resolved over that?

I think that is what it will all be about, again assuming, as I hope it does, the House passes this proposal tonight. Again, the ObamaCare language, the statute itself does not allow for this special exemption or special subsidy. That is nowhere in the statute. Because of that, it was sort of an example of what NANCY PELOSI said about the ObamaCare statute in general: We have to pass it to figure out what is in it. It passed with language in it that said clearly, Members of Congress and their staff would have to go to the ObamaCare exchanges for their health care—no provisions for any special subsidy.

Then, after it passed, many folks on Capitol Hill read it to figure out what was in it. When they got to that section, they said: Oh, you know what. We cannot live under this. We cannot stand for this.

So then a fierce lobbying campaign started to get the administration to fix ObamaCare—but not to fix it for America, to fix it for Congress. That resulted in a special Obama administration rule that was conveniently issued right as Congress was leaving Washington for the August recess, right as

Congress was fleeing the scene of the crime.

That rule did two things, neither of which is in the statute. That is why it is a completely illegal rule, contrary to the statute, in my opinion. First of all, the rule said: When the statute says that Members of Congress and their staff have to go to the exchanges for their health care, we do not know who official staff are. We cannot figure that out, the administrative agency said. So we are going to leave that up to each individual Member of Congress.

That is absurd. The language is clear. All official staff are covered. The administration should have demanded in the rule that all official staff are covered and not leave it up to individual Members. But under this cozy relationship, an individual Member can exempt any staffer he or she likes. In fact, in theory, that Member can exempt all of his staff and say: It is up to me. They are not official staff for purposes of this provision of ObamaCare. That is absurd on its face.

Then the second thing this special rule only did for Congress is say: For those who go to the exchanges, including Members, they get to take a huge taxpayer-funded subsidy with them, a subsidy available to no other American at that income level—no other American. That is not in the ObamaCare statute. That is made up out of thin air in terms of this rule.

So we need to correct that situation. We need to make sure Washington is treated like America; first, because it is the right thing to do. It should be the first guiding principle of American democracy; second, for the practical reasons I stated. The quicker we do that on ObamaCare and across the board, the quicker Washington, the Congress, the President, will start getting important matters, including the impact of ObamaCare, right.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. VITTER. I will in a second. Again, I congratulate the House for doing exactly that, for doing exactly that. Again, I would point out, assuming the House does that and passes that tonight, the only significant difference between their package and what Senate Democrats have agreed to in discussions will be this “no Washington exemption” language from ObamaCare.

There will be other very minor differences: a date here, language regarding how income verification is handled, very minor compared to this central issue. So that is what it is coming down to. That will be what Senate action on that House proposal is about.

I will be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, through the Chair, since the Senator from Louisiana has raised on the floor many times the issue of the health insurance of Members of Congress, I would volun-

teer that I am under the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program, some 8 million Federal employees, including Members of Congress and their staff, are currently under the same health insurance program across the Nation.

I have the same health insurance policy as the park ranger at the Lincoln home in Springfield, IL. I would ask the Senator from Louisiana: What is your health insurance policy?

Mr. VITTER. I am under exactly the same program. What I am suggesting is merely that we follow the law. The distinguished Senator and many of his Democratic colleagues constantly make the point that ObamaCare is the law of the land. He is right. I want to change that, largely; the Senator does not. It is the law of the land as we speak. That law of the land is crystal clear. It has a specific provision about this. It says every Member of Congress, all of their official staff can no longer stay in that plan and have to go to the ObamaCare exchanges, the so-called fallback provision for the American people.

I think there was a reason for that. I think there was thinking behind that. It is simple; that we should live under that same scenario that millions of Americans have to live under, 8 million-plus, who do not want to have to go to the exchanges, who like the insurance plan they have now, who heard the President say: If you like the plan you have now, you can keep it. They found out after the fact that was not true for them.

There are 8 million-plus who are being forced off coverage they like to go to the ObamaCare exchanges. They do not get any subsidy. They do not get this special treatment. I am suggesting we should not as well.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. VITTER. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. I hope the Senator will concede that Members of Congress and their staff are going into the insurance exchanges because of an express provision requiring that to happen in the law, offered by Republican Senators COBURN and GRASSLEY.

Secondly, what we are dealing with is a strange situation. ObamaCare does not force anybody into the insurance exchanges. It is available for those who have no health insurance or those who are on individual health insurance plans and want to buy something different.

Mr. VITTER. If I can respond and reclaim my time, I do not think that is true at all. I think ObamaCare absolutely forces millions of other Americans into the exchanges. It is not the same mechanism that it is for Members of Congress. It is not an express provision. But it is forcing 8 million-plus Americans into the exchanges against their will nonetheless because there are many Americans who want to keep

the coverage they have. They heard over and over from President Obama: If you like the coverage you have, you can keep it. Then they found out that for them that was a lie. They did like the coverage they had. They are losing it against their will. I do not think that is by accident. I think that is by design because the ObamaCare statute creates clear incentives for many employers to get out of the health insurance provision business and to just let their workers go to the exchanges.

So I completely disagree with the statement from the Senator from Illinois that no other American was forced onto the exchanges. Millions of other Americans were forced onto the exchanges, in a different way, but absolutely millions of Americans were forced onto the exchanges against their will.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. VITTER. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. Since the Senator is under the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program, his monthly premiums for his health insurance and my health insurance receive an employer contribution. That is how most Americans who work get their health insurance. The employer contribution the Senator receives and I receive is about 72 percent of the premium.

The Senator from Louisiana has characterized an employer contribution as a government subsidy. I would like to ask the Senator from Louisiana, is he prepared to disclose the government subsidy, as he calls it, that he has personally received for his health insurance as a Member of the Senate?

Mr. VITTER. Absolutely. Reclaiming my time and reclaiming the floor, that is absolutely public information. That is true. What I am merely suggesting is that ObamaCare mandates the change. That is the law of the land, as the Senator and his Democratic colleagues make the point many times, and we should live by the law of the land.

As the distinguished Senator from Illinois absolutely knows, there is no provision in the ObamaCare statute for that subsidy to transfer to the exchanges for Members or congressional staff, no provision whatsoever. In fact, having that happen is inconsistent with the law because the requirements of exchange policies are different than the requirements for FEHBP policies, so it is completely inconsistent with the law for that subsidy to follow Members of Congress to the exchanges. It is nowhere mentioned in the statute. It was made up out of thin air under this illegal Obama administration rule with no sufficient statutory basis in the law.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. VITTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator is stating that no one under an insurance exchange, no one, can receive an employer contribution for their health insurance, he is wrong, flat wrong.

Mr. VITTER. Reclaiming my time and reclaiming the floor, I did not state that and I will not state that.

What I did say is there is no subsidy available to Members of Congress and congressional staff under the ObamaCare statute. There is no provision in the statute for that old FEHBP subsidy to magically redo itself as an exchange subsidy. There is absolutely no provision of that whatsoever.

Folks, these 8 million Americans who are forced out of the plans they like, they are not getting a subsidy. They are going to the individual exchange, and they are getting no comparable subsidy. If they have low enough income they get a subsidy for being at a certain income level.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. VITTER. Thank you. I urge again that the Senate stand tall and stand with the American people, not stand for Washington elites.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. I am pleased to have this exchange with my colleague because he comes to the floor repeatedly and says things which aren't altogether accurate. This is why I wanted to speak to him today. He yielded for a question and I thank him. I am sorry he has left because I would like to further engage in dialog. There is a reason he left. There are questions he can't answer. If he tries to answer them, his whole case explodes in front of him.

We created these insurance exchanges for 40 or 50 million Americans who have no health insurance or have rotten insurance. They were paying a fortune for bad health insurance policies.

When the Senator says 8 million people were forced into these exchanges, this is what the Senator was saying—8 million people had health insurance policies that were so bad that those policies, frankly, had to be rewritten.

This is what we said and is the law under ObamaCare. Offer health insurance to my family or the family of the Senator from Connecticut. They cannot discriminate against a person applying for health insurance because of preexisting conditions of anybody in your family. Does anybody in your family have preexisting conditions? We all do.

We decided that was fundamentally unfair. If one has a child with asthma, wife with diabetes, mental illness in your family, for goodness' sake, people shouldn't be discriminated against. That is one of the provisions of ObamaCare which many on the other side of the aisle want to repeal.

Secondly, we said there can be no lifetime limits on your health insurance policy. What does that mean? In the old days people would buy a policy that said they would give up to \$100,000 and then the policyholder is on his own—\$100,000. That ought to be great until one ends up in the doctor's office the next day or someone in your family has a serious cancer diagnosis. With surgery, chemo, and radiation going on for a long period of time, it can be way over \$100,000. It can happen.

I had a routine surgery 3 years ago, and it turned out well. It cost over \$100,000. If I had one of those limited policies, I would have had to start paying out of my pocket. We eliminated that and said there can't be a cap on insurance policies. They want to repeal that. They want caps on insurance policies.

It turns out that 60 percent of insurance policies in America did not cover maternity benefits. How about that? Do we love families and love children? How about making sure health insurance covers them? That is in ObamaCare and they want to repeal it.

The list goes on. This is a point I wish to get to. Members of Congress are now going to be covered by the same insurance policies offered by ObamaCare and our staff will too. That is acceptable to me. I have taken a look at what is available. It is as good as anything Members of Congress receive today. I am not worried about the quality of coverage for myself or my wife. It will be fine. I can live with that.

Currently, the Senator from Louisiana and every other Senator, when it comes to health insurance, has the same health insurance as Federal employees, 8 million Federal employees and their families. It is the same basic coverage. I think it is pretty darn good. I have said that on the floor. People have corrected me, saying: Senator, you may have a policy worth \$15,000 a year. There are people with policies worth \$40,000 a year.

I will leave it at this. I think I have good coverage for myself and my wife. I can match that coverage in terms of the quality of coverage on the insurance exchanges without fear of interruption in service and protection for my wife and me, and I feel good about that.

This is what the Senator from Louisiana is upset about. When I go on the insurance exchange, which is required by law—not voluntary, required by law—the Senator doesn't want the employer to make any contributions for myself or my family and says our staff should be under the same restriction. People who get their health insurance through their employer across America, virtually all of them have employer contributions. This is common. There is nothing sinister or sneaky about it.

The Senator calls it a government subsidy, the employer contribution. All I ask is this: I will go on the government health insurance exchange and happily do so. Treat me the same way when it comes to employer contribution for my health insurance and my staff health insurance as every other Federal employee. It is that simple. The Senator says: No, that is special treatment for Members of Congress. The Senator from Louisiana is just plain wrong, stands on the floor, and talks about special privileges for Members of Congress.

I will tell what you I am prepared to do. I am prepared to put a specific provision in the law which says no Member of Congress or Member of any congressional staff shall receive any special privileges or additional rights not available to every other person under the SHOP or insurance exchange program.

How is that? I could live with that because, as the Senator almost acknowledged, currently employer contributions can be made for those who run the insurance exchanges. It is there. We are not getting anything too unusual. It is already there. This argument about some special treatment for Members of Congress—no way. I will state what bothers me the most about this is it doesn't take an act of political courage to take money away from somebody else, in this case away from our staff people.

I started out here as an intern a long time ago when I was in college. I worked around the Hill all of my life. There are some extraordinary people here. People go to work every day to make me look darn good, to answer the phone, try to satisfy the needs of the people of Illinois, and to deal with some pretty serious cases that involve life and death sometimes or Federal benefits. They work long hours and do great work. Because of their great work they cover me in glory with regularity. I can't thank them enough.

What a thanks this is to say to them: We are going to eliminate your employer's contribution for your health insurance. You are on your own. That is what the Senator from Louisiana wants to do. If the Senator thinks an employer's contribution for health insurance is something that is sinister and shouldn't be allowed for Members of Congress and their staff, hang on tight because we have 150 million people in America who have health insurance through their work with an employer contribution.

Is that the Senator's next target? Is the Senator going after them? Then there will be a fight because people can't afford health insurance without employers helping to pay. We put it in the Tax Code, we have to protect it in the Tax Code. We have to beat the Vitter amendment.

Think about this for a minute. We started this debate 2 weeks ago. A Senator from Texas took the floor for 21 hours, stayed up all night. His goal: Let's defund ObamaCare.

What happened? The Senator's side ended up shutting down the government and is putting us within 36 hours of defaulting on our national debt for the first time in history over the issue of defunding ObamaCare. Haven't heard about that recently. They stopped talking about it because something has happened. Over 12 million people are now going on the Internet trying to find whether they are eligible for a health insurance policy. The popularity of ObamaCare has gone up as Republicans have criticized it because there are a great many people who don't have health insurance or they have health insurance they can't afford.

I am not going to make excuses for the problems with the computers and the Internet as the program kicks off. It better improve and it will. It shows us what happens when we are overwhelmed with people who want health insurance. The system broke down. We have to get better.

During this period of time when the other side was railing against ObamaCare, the numbers for approval of ObamaCare were going up across America. It didn't work. They gave up on defunding ObamaCare. I haven't heard that phrase in a long time, 2 weeks ago from the Senator from Texas but not since. They have now decided that instead of defunding ObamaCare, they are going to follow the Senator from Louisiana—who wants to take health insurance away or make it prohibitively expensive for Members of Congress and their staff. That is it. That is what this has been all about?

We have shut down the government, and we have run the risk of defaulting on our debts for the first time in history over whether our employees, the people on our staff, are going to get a Federal Government contribution for paying health insurance? It is pathetic we have reached that point.

I believe health insurance is a right. It isn't a privilege. I believe employer-sponsored health insurance is a good thing that we ought to protect. I believe Members of Congress ought to play by the same rules as everybody else in the insurance exchanges and our staffs should as well.

If he accepts those as premises, the Senator's amendment goes away, disappears. But if the Senator is out to get the employer contribution on health insurance, maybe that is the goal, have at it. I think the Senator is going to find it is a very lonely battle. Most Americans, Democrats and Republicans, value health insurance. They need to have it in their lives to give them peace of mind and give them the best care.

This war on health insurance for individuals, the uninsured, even Members of Congress and their employees, is mindless. It is mindless and petty.

We have to do better. We need to expand the reach of health insurance across America. We will. This effort to defund ObamaCare and now the Vitter amendment, we must defeat both of those efforts.

Once this program is in place and Americans have this protection, we are never going to take it away. Once people have that peace of mind with affordable health insurance, then 6 out of 10 people who go on the health insurance exchanges will pay less than \$100 a month for health insurance. It is less than a cable bill.

Finally, they will get health insurance. That is what it is all about. Once it happens, once it moves forward, it will become one of the basic concepts in America that we count on to protect ourselves and our families.

We have to defeat the Vitter amendment. It is pathetic that we have reached this point with the shutdown of the government and the idea of defaulting on the debt, that it has come to this amendment. It is very sad.

It doesn't speak well for those on the other side who started off with this lofty goal to defund ObamaCare. Yet in the end all they want to do is to raise the cost of health insurance for the people who are working night and day for them in their offices across America.

I hope the people in this country understand what this debate has finally descended into and will join us in defeating this Vitter amendment.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. I ask consent to talk for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, we are now in the third week of government shutdown. We are facing an imminent debt limit crisis. It seems that it has become a pattern around here that we live from crisis to crisis. I hope we do something about that. We obviously have to deal with the immediate issues in front of us in the next day or so, hopefully no more than that. There have been a lot of discussions that have occurred over the course of the weekend and the last few days to try to bring to a conclusion at least this chapter of this particular crisis we are dealing with.

I am encouraged when I hear our colleagues on both sides of the aisle are

meeting and having discussions. We have had a number of those that have gone on, I think so far without result. There have been meetings that have occurred between our two leaders. Also I have been working very hard to try to get a result, something they could take back to their respective caucuses and present, that could ultimately be voted on.

There are also discussions going on in the other body, in the House of Representatives, and have been for some time, trying to find a pathway forward that could get the necessary votes to pass in the House of Representatives and then ultimately here in the Senate. I heard some of my colleagues in the Democratic leadership on the floor this morning denouncing some of those efforts in the House of Representatives, which came as a surprise to many of us because I do not think it should be any shock to anyone that the House of Representatives, created in article I of the Constitution, might decide to perform some things that are consistent with its constitutional role.

They have been working on legislation. We had the leader get up this morning and make some comments on the floor with respect to what was happening in the House of Representatives. He described it as a partisan attempt to appease a small group of tea party Republicans. He described it as an extreme piece of legislation, most of the elements of which, by the way, have been part of the bipartisan agreement here in the Senate. He said it was a blatant attack on bipartisanship.

He went on to say he felt blindsided by the news from the House and that extremist Republicans in the House of Representatives were trying to torpedo the Senate's bipartisan progress with a bill that cannot pass the Senate. He went on to lament the fact he was disappointed in the Speaker of the House.

Again it was a big surprise to many of us. I don't think we should feel blindsided when the House of Representatives tries to find the necessary votes to move legislation that is so important to this country. In fact, it would appear at least that perhaps Democrats here in the Senate and the White House—which, by the way, came out and said it was going to veto the proposal from the House of Representatives, of course before it had ever seen it. There had never been anything in print with respect to that. So the Senate Democrats hadn't seen it, the White House hadn't seen it, but the President came out and said he was going to veto it and the Senate leader said he was blindsided on this, it was extreme, it was an attempt to torpedo bipartisan discussions.

It would appear at least that some of the Democrats around here are a lot more concerned about the political consequences and having the opportunity to dance on the political graves

of Republicans than in actually solving a problem that is important to the future of this country and the American people.

I think it is unfortunate that is where we are. I hope in the course of the next few hours—that is about all we have left—we will come to some agreement. Whether that originates in the House of Representatives or originates here in the Senate, one way or the other both are going to have to vote on it. Both are going to have to find the necessary votes to pass something that will avoid the disaster that is facing us if we do not take steps to do that. I guess I am one of many who, when I heard those comments this morning, was more than a little bit surprised to think that we here in the Senate would be shocked and surprised and disappointed and blindsided that the House of Representatives would decide to do some work and try to solve this problem as well. Ultimately we have to have the House and the Senate agree and concur.

I am glad to see the House of Representatives is proceeding in a way that will solve this problem. I hope we will continue in the Senate to try to find a solution in the next few hours, something we can actually pass through both Houses of Congress and put on the President's desk and something he might be able to sign into law.

But when you talk about the various elements of those proposals, most of those things that were denounced and rejected here this morning by the Democratic leaders when they came to the floor were the very things that a bipartisan group here in the Senate had been working on for several days.

I hope when we get through this immediate crisis and hopefully create the process by which we might address the real problems the country faces—because this living from crisis to crisis is not a way to govern the country. It is not a way to provide certainty to our economy. It is certainly not a way to get the economy growing and expanding.

Many of us on this side of the aisle think we ought to have a discussion, when we are raising the debt limit, about how we are going to fix the debt, what are we going to do to reduce the debt, what are we going to do to ensure that we don't continue to pile trillions of dollars of debt on the future generations of this country. We do not seem to get serious about that. I hope we will. I hope when we get past the immediate crisis we will take a look at the long term and say what can we do to put this country on a more sustainable fiscal path?

I think we all know what that entails. It means we have to get spending here in Washington, DC, under control, particularly in the areas of some of the mandatory spending parts of the budget. If you look at what the Congress-

sional Budget Office says, over the next 10 years, discretionary spending—which is that small part of the budget that is impacted by the sequester—is going to grow roughly 17 percent. During the same period mandatory spending is going to grow approximately 79 percent or \$1.6 trillion over the course of the next decade. So spending on mandatory programs continues to grow. This CBO report underscores that reforming entitlements is absolutely necessary if we are going to get spending under control.

We know what the issues are. It is not like it is a big secret. The Congressional Budget Office gives us insight on a regular basis. We have had lots of commissions that have studied these issues, they presented their findings, they put forward recommendations about how to address these long-term crises the country faces, and yet there seems to be the lack, if you will, of political will to try to actually solve the problem.

My own view is that if we can get through this immediate crisis, over the course of the next couple of months, which is basically what we have to work with, we can actually sit down—hopefully with the President engaged in this process—and negotiate in a way that will allow us to put in place solutions that actually do put us on a more sustainable fiscal trajectory for this country's future.

Over the course of the last 4½ years we have seen the publicly held debt of this country double. It took 230-some years of American history and 43 Presidents to get to the first \$6.3 trillion in debt, and that has literally doubled in the last 4½ years under this administration.

We have a huge debt problem. We added \$1 trillion a year for the first 4 years. This year everybody is patting each other on the back and saying: Gee, the deficit is down to \$650 or \$700 billion, as if that is some sort of major accomplishment. That is literally the fifth largest deficit in history behind the first 4 years of this administration, which were the four largest deficits in American history.

We have an out-of-control debt. We have an out-of-control deficit that is growing as a percentage of our economy and getting to the point where it is literally going to drown our economy if we don't do something about it.

Controlling the spending part of the equation is essential. The other part that is essential is getting the economy growing and expanding. When the economy is growing and expanding, it means that people are working, people are investing, people are making money, people are paying taxes, government revenues go up, and that makes a lot of these problems look much smaller by comparison too.

We can't have an economy growing at 1 to 2 percent and an unemployment

rate that is chronically at about 7½ percent. When we factor in the people who have quit looking for work or are working part time who would rather be working full time, that unemployment rate gets up into the double digits.

We have chronically high unemployment, massive amounts of debt, and a sluggish economy. Those are all things on which we should be focused. In order to get the economy growing and expanding again, we have to create the economic conditions for small businesses to invest, hire more people, put their capital to work, and try to get that economic growth rate back up to where it would allow us to deal not only with our deficits but also to do something that would really improve the quality of life and the standard of living for people in this country. A growth rate in the 3- to 4-percent range is significantly different—dramatically different than a growth rate in the 1- to 2-percent range, and that means a big difference in the take-home pay of middle-class Americans.

If we want to see middle-class Americans do better in this economy, we have to get the economy growing again, and that means reforming our Tax Code, broadening the tax base, and lowering those marginal income tax rates. We have the highest business tax in the world. It makes us noncompetitive in the global environment. We lose jobs every single day to other countries around the world. We need to do things that would lessen the cost of doing business in this country. We need to make it less expensive and less difficult to create jobs, not more expensive and more difficult.

One of the concerns many of us have with respect to ObamaCare is that it is making it more expensive and difficult to create jobs. It has higher taxes. There are higher insurance premiums. Obviously, that translates into fewer jobs.

Getting the cost of regulation to a more reasonable level, keeping the tax rates at a more reasonable level, and doing what is necessary to unleash this economy is the way we will improve the fiscal picture in this country, coupled with good fiscal discipline and constraints on Federal spending, and that means we have to tackle the mandatory part of the budget. That part was not affected—or at least not affected very much—by the sequester.

Those are the ingredients, components, and elements, if you will, that will lead us to a situation where we are not having a crisis every few months where we are worrying about a debt limit increase or how we are going to fund the government. We ought to get to a place where we are in a more systematic way doing what we should be doing in the first place. We should be passing appropriations bills. We didn't pass a single appropriations bill this year, which is why we are here at the

eleventh hour trying to come up with a continuing resolution to fund the government.

Those are the things we need to do if we are going to get this fiscal situation improved for our country and get the economy up and growing again and creating jobs and doing what is necessary to improve the lives of the American people. That is what I think the public wants to see.

Actually, if we look at public opinion polls—and there has been a lot of discussion about that lately—by a 2-to-1 margin, people in this country believe that if you are going to raise the debt limit, you ought to do something about the debt. I saw a survey just last week by CBS News that said 55 percent of the people in this country believe that when you are going to raise the debt limit, you ought to do something to reduce spending. I think that only 23 percent of the people surveyed said they supported a clean debt limit increase.

The American people get it. The people in my State of South Dakota understand that you can't spend money you don't have. You have to live within your means, and we have to, as a Federal Government, do the same families across this country have to do on a regular basis. They get this. They understand what this is about.

I hope that in the next few weeks and months we will be able—with the involvement and engagement of the President of the United States—to sit down and negotiate the resolutions, if you will, and proposals and solutions to this debt crisis and get this country on a more sustainable fiscal path and at a place where the economy is growing at a faster rate and creating the types of good-paying jobs that will help middle-class Americans in this economy prosper.

If we look at what happened to take-home pay or household income over the past several years, it has gone down, not up. We have seen the average household income go down by \$3,700 since the President took office. It is time we changed that and got the American people back to work, incomes coming up, and jobs that will keep the young people in this country not only employed but looking with confidence and optimism toward their future, which is something we don't see today. Let's deal with the immediate crisis, but let's work together on that.

Instead of coming over here and denouncing what is happening in the House of Representatives or using extreme language to characterize what is happening in the House of Representatives, understand we have to function together. We are the Congress of the United States, and in order for anything to get done here, we have to move legislation through both the House and Senate. It seems to me, at least, that there ought to be a recognition of that in the Senate. As I listened

this morning to the comments of some of our leaders on the other side when they came down here and denounced what was happening in the House of Representatives, it struck me that that is not a productive or constructive way to get where we need to go in the next few hours. I hope we can do that, and I looking forward to the kind of bipartisan cooperation that will solve this problem.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to use as much time as I might consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out how concerned he is about jobs and economic growth. He is concerned about our not doing enough appropriations bills. He is concerned that we have not resolved our differences in the conference.

I want him to know, since he asked for bipartisanship, that as a Democrat, I am concerned about pay and jobs and economic growth. I am concerned that we have not had any appropriations bills. I am concerned that we have not gone to the budget. But I need to speak the truth, and the truth is in the record.

Why don't we have appropriations bills? Because the Republicans filibustered our very first bill, and when we tried to get it done, they would not give us the votes, so it was taken off the floor. Senator MURRAY and Senator COLLINS—our moderate Republican colleague—were very upset about that. The Republicans filibustered the very first appropriations bill we tried to get through, and it was clear they were going to continue to filibuster each one. So to come down here and lament the fact that we didn't take up appropriations bills flies in the face of recent history.

My friend laments the fact that we have not had a chance to discuss what he now sees as a target for cuts in Medicare and Social Security. He calls them entitlement programs. That is their new thing now. They want to cut those programs. Well, you know what. We have said open the government, let's pay our bills, and we will negotiate, listen, and talk.

Our friends on the Republican side stopped us from going to a budget conference 21 times, and now they have shut down the government. All you have to do is understand why. They were very clear. They don't like the Affordable Care Act.

I have come to the floor, as I have before during this government shutdown that is in its 15th day, to raise the alarm about the harmful, terrible, hurtful impacts on America and its people as a result of 15 days of not hav-

ing access to their government. Who are they punishing? The people of this Nation. This is their government. Open the door and let them in. Let them talk to us. Let them tell us about the legislation they want us to proceed to. Let them not suffer, as they are in my State and in many States because the government is shut down. In a moment, I will talk about some of the ways my people are hurting.

They shut down the government because they didn't like the Affordable Care Act. I am so happy to say that Covered

California-dot-com—coveredCA.com, which is our Web site—has had more than 1.5 million unique visits to the site. The call volume to the service center is 104,000-plus. The average call wait time is now 1 minute 55 seconds. The average call-handling time from the time you get on until the time you get off and get your questions answered is less than 15 minutes. Our cumulative applications are approaching 100,000. Tens of thousands have already completed the signups. This is why they shut down the government. They don't want that to move forward.

I will tell some stories about health care reform in my State.

Rakesh Rikhi of San Jose is now paying \$950 a month to insure himself, his wife, and his two children with Kaiser Permanente. According to the NBC station in the Bay area, Rakesh was stunned to learn that through Covered California he can get a similar Kaiser plan for his family for \$400 less a month. So when my friend stands here and says premiums are going up, ask Rakesh. He is getting a plan for his family for \$400 less a month. He quickly did the math, and when he hung up the phone and signed up, he found out he is saving \$5,000 a year.

Why do the Republicans want to shut down the government and stop somebody like that from getting a plan? I think they have to look into their hearts.

Rakesh owns an auto repair shop. He has four employees. He is hoping that with the savings he will be able to offer his workers medical insurance. He cannot wait to sign up and complete the application. He looks forward to feeling relief from the financial pain of skyrocketing insurance costs.

Then there is Laura Hunt of Modesto. She lost her husband's employer-based coverage when he was killed in a car crash in 2006. She is suffering from income loss and the painful loss of a spouse. She contacted Covered California and found out she could have an Anthem Blue Cross policy for a net cost of \$23 a month. Why do my friends on the other side of the aisle want to stop Laura Hunt of Modesto, who lost her husband's employer-based coverage when he was killed in a car crash, stop her from getting affordable health care?

Kevin Burke, an assembly worker, told the Fresno Bee he had been out of work for 2 years and now he qualifies for Medicaid and he is going to be OK, and he is not going to wait until he is rushed to an emergency room. Why do my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to stop Kevin Burke of Fresno from getting affordable health insurance? They need to look into their hearts.

Then there is Rufina Arango, a diabetic. At Vista Family Health Center she filled out an application for coverage through a significant expansion of Medi-Cal. Rufina and her family lost their health insurance several years ago when her husband was laid off after working for 22 years. She said:

It's so great. It's going to help so many of us. If not for ObamaCare, many of us would not qualify for health insurance.

I could go on and on with these stories. I don't have the time to do it. But I am going to keep on adding these stories to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so some day, when people look back at this moment in history, they will realize that when we stood for the people and their right to have affordable health care, that we did it for a very good reason. Some day in the future people will say: You mean there was a time when we had 40 million people without insurance? Are you kidding? But that is the moment we are in now. We are either going to stand sentry, as my friend BARBARA MIKULSKI always says, for a law that is going to help people, or just walk away. No law is perfect. Of course there are glitches and issues. We are very happy to talk about making it better—very happy. The President is as well. He said as much.

I want everyone to read an opinion piece that ran in the Washington Post recently, a couple of days ago, by one of my constituents. Her name is Janine. Janine Urbaniak Reid is a writer, and so she has a beautiful way of expressing herself. She talks about her loving son, Mason, who has brain cancer and who has had to undergo multiple surgeries. Listen to this:

He would have hit his lifetime limit on the policy and the family would have been driven into—

her words—

the financial abyss if it wasn't for the Affordable Care Act.

She writes that the family:

Thanks God and whoever else would listen for our good fortune to have coverage.

She ends her piece with this line:

If I could get those who are trying to repeal this law on a conference call, I would explain this to them. I would tell them that while they were busy trying to derail the Affordable Care Act over the past 2 years, Mason has again learned to walk, talk, eat, and shoot a 3-point basket.

Why would anyone want to hurt that family and reverse our law, the Affordable Care Act, which is everybody's

law, that says no more lifetime limits and no more annual limits. We have to ask the Republicans why they want to do it. They come to the floor and they say: Health care costs are rising; these things are happening; the sky is falling. But then we look at the facts, and the facts are that tens of thousands of people are signing up. Young people are now able to stay on their parents' policies until they are 26. There is no more preexisting condition bar. If a person has a preexisting condition, they can still get insurance. There are so many good things. Women are no longer discriminated against. We used to pay twice as much as men. Being a woman was considered a preexisting condition. Can my colleagues imagine. Really? Because, yes, we can have babies and, yes, we had certain needs. Well, that is over now. We have equal rights in this Affordable Care Act.

So the reason for the shutting down of the government was to stop the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act is now signing up tens of thousands of people. It is saving a lot of our families. If the Republicans want to make improvements in it, that is fine. We are ready to do it. We will sit down with anyone and make this law better—absolutely. But don't stop a law that passed almost 4 years ago and that was upheld by the Supreme Court; and, may I say, there was a big election about it.

Remember what Mitt Romney said:

The first thing I will do when I am your President is to repeal ObamaCare. That is my promise.

And, boy, I believed him. It was a big issue. People decided that wasn't a good enough reason, and they reelected our President not in a small way but in a big way.

So since there is no more reason to shut down the government because the Affordable Care Act can't be stopped—it is funded by a separate stream of funding, not appropriations—we begged the Republicans: Don't shut the government down over this. It is starting. It is happening. We are not going to repeal a law that took—I would say decades—to pass.

So they didn't listen. Now they have stopped talking about the Affordable Care Act, pretty much. Now they have a whole different reason for shutting down the government and bringing us to the brink of default, and that reason is deficits—deficits.

I want to speak a little bit about default because we are hours away from a default—the first time in this Nation's great history. If we don't take action, we will be unable to pay the bills that have been incurred in the past.

It is important to note that we have gone through so many crises in our Nation—tough, tough, tough ones, including civil strife, world wars, the Great Depression. We always followed the Constitution that says, "The validity

of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, shall not be questioned." This is in the Constitution. Yet from the people who say they are constitutionalists, they seem not to read that part, and they are flirting, for the first time, with allowing us to get to the point where we can't pay all of our bills. That is a default.

Some of our colleagues come to the floor, and they say that it is not a default if we pay interest on the bonds. I am an old economics major, but I don't pretend to know everything about economics. But I can tell my colleagues this: The definition of a default in Black's Law Dictionary is "the failure to make a payment when due." It doesn't say the failure to make an interest payment when due. It says, the failure to make a payment. That means to our contractors. That means to our workers. That means to our Social Security recipients. That means to our Medicare recipients.

I have never seen such creative license taken when it comes to the default. A party that says it is fiscally conservative and then says it is not a default when we don't pay our bills as long as we pay China the interest we owe them? They have to be kidding. Take that to a town hall meeting, I say to my friend who represents so many wonderful seniors in the great State of Florida, Senator NELSON, who is on the floor. So we have never gotten to this point.

Mr. NELSON. Would the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I am delighted to yield.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will yield on that point.

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I can yield for as much time as my colleague wants.

Mr. NELSON. Since the Senator so eloquently posed this question, since this Senator has the privilege of being the chairman of the Special Committee on Aging, and since the Senator from California has just pointed out that seniors are at risk, I wish to remind the Senate that on October 23, there is a bill due to be paid of \$12 billion to Social Security recipients—October 23. Shortly thereafter, on November 1, there is another bill due: \$67 billion for Social Security recipients, for Medicare recipients, and for SSI, which is Social Security for low-income seniors. In addition to the default the Senator from California has spoken about—defaulting on interest payments on U.S. Treasury bills—we are talking about default to real people with real needs. This is just a drop in the bucket of the total amount that is coming due.

I thank the Senator for letting me share that information in this discussion.

I might say that the Presiding Officer, the junior Senator from Massachusetts—or now the senior Senator from Massachusetts—is one of the most active and prominent members of the

Special Committee on Aging, and our committee has pointed out statistics such as these over and over.

Mrs. BOXER. I wish to thank my friend, and I hope we can continue to have these conversations. I thank the Presiding Officer for recognizing my friend so he could make his point.

We are, as leader PELOSI said, playing with fire. We are playing with lives.

One of our colleagues, Senator CASEY from Pennsylvania, read the most amazing letter he got from a constituent and he said:

She is so worried about her parents. They are in their 80s, and the fear—just the thought—of maybe not getting a check on time, that is making her parents physically ill.

Why are we doing this? There is no reason to do this. This is a self-inflicted wound. The government shut-down is self-inflicted. Playing with the full faith and credit of the United States of America is a self-inflicted wound.

Here is the thing: We know one of the heroes of the Republican Party and a hero to many Democrats is Ronald Reagan. Let's see what he said. I have it here. When it comes to the debt:

The full consequences of a default, or even the serious prospect of a default, are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and on the value of the dollar in exchange markets. The Nation can ill afford to allow such a result.

That is Ronald Reagan. I was here during most of his presidency. I was over in the House. I think my friend from Florida was as well. Lord knows, we didn't agree with Ronald Reagan on everything. We agreed with him on some things, not all things, and we may have cast a vote or two to say that we object. But no one ever brought down the full faith and credit of the United States. He got 18 increases in the debt ceiling during his presidency—18 over 8 years.

So there are two paths we can take. One path is a road that is a little bit bumpy and curvy and dusty, but at the end of the day it gets us where we want to go: Into a budget conference with our bills paid and our government open to the people. That is the bipartisan road. It is not easy.

I am so proud of Senators REID and MCCONNELL for working on a plan that is something we can accept. No one on either side is thrilled about it, but we can accept it. It gets us out of this mess. That is the road we should take, the bipartisan road that gets us into the conference, that opens the doors of government, and pays our bills.

The other road is the road the House Republicans are taking. That road is straight over the cliff. That is the partisan road, and we will dive down. We are not going to get there that way. We are going to bring a world of hurt on the people.

What did the people do to deserve this? They did not vote the way my Republican friends in the House wanted them to. Sorry, that is what elections are about. I have been disappointed in election outcomes, believe me, more times than I care to admit. That is what elections are about.

Well, once you get here, you have to work across party lines, and even though that road is bumpy and dusty and twisty and windy, and all the rest of it, that is the road that gets us where we have to go. That is the road Leaders REID and MCCONNELL had us on until a few hours ago when all of a sudden that road kind of shut down and the other road—that partisan road—opened right up. I do not know why they are taking us down that road leading us off a cliff, with all the pain and suffering and job loss and economic chaos that awaits if we go down that road. But I honestly think we can get back on that bipartisan path. I do not know exactly how it will come about. How a bill becomes law is sometimes very complicated, but if the House sends us something, but we can work to make it bipartisan, we will be over this. We will be over this. We cannot have a strictly partisan political bill.

I want to share with the Presiding Officer and with my colleagues the fact that Fitch, a credit rating service, has put our creditworthiness “under review for a downgrade,” according to the Associated Press. It means that America's AAA rating is in doubt. Let me say that again. Fitch, a credit rating service, put our creditworthiness “under review for a downgrade,” reports the Associated Press, putting America's AAA rating in doubt.

Mr. NELSON. Just this afternoon.

Mrs. BOXER. Just this afternoon, after the bipartisan plan was stalled here in the Senate and the House went forward with their partisan plan.

What Fitch did is a warning sign. It is a warning sign for businesses in terms of their borrowing costs to expand. It is a warning sign to the job market if there is a lack of expansion by the business community. It is a warning sign that students could be paying higher interest rates to go to college. It is a warning sign for homeowners who could be paying higher rates for their mortgages.

What is going on? We are just getting out of the worst recession since the Great Depression. The Presiding Officer is in the Senate because she fought so hard to get this economy on track, and people in her State said: That is what we need, and she came here. And now this self-inflicted wound just as we are coming out of it, just as we are starting to see progress? Why are we doing this?

I want to talk a little bit about the bill the House is probably going to be voting on soon because it deals with a couple of things that are very problem-

atic. I have already said it is a partisan bill. Speaker BOEHNER did not have a conversation with Leader PELOSI. He just wrote the bill with Republicans only, as opposed to HARRY REID, who wrote our compromise with the Republicans, taking us down that bipartisan road.

My understanding is the House bill does something that is inexplicable to me and many others, both Republicans and Democrats. Listen to this. It says that no President—starting now with this President, and into the future—no President can take steps to avoid default. I do not get it. We all know a default is chaos. Everyone agrees it is terrible, it is bad. Republican and Democratic administrations for decades have taken measures when there is a little stall here or there and they need a few days to move around a bill or two.

I cannot believe it—from a party that said: In case we default, we should prioritize who we pay—they will not allow future administrations to avoid a default and add a couple of days until we face that.

Listen to what Tony Fratto said. He worked in the Bush administration as Assistant Secretary of Public Affairs for Treasury. He said the following:

Restricting Treasury's use of extraordinary measures is like restricting the fire department's use of hoses.

So imagine if you said to a fire department: You can use every tool at your disposal, but you can't use a water hose to put out a fire. They are saying to the Treasury Department: You have to default even if there is an easy way to avoid it for a few days.

What are they thinking? Do they want this administration and others to have an easier path to default? I thought we would all agree we certainly do not ever want to default but certainly give the ability of an administration—Democratic or Republican—to avert a default, if they can. Their language makes no sense.

Then their other rider they have on there—it is my understanding; I could be wrong, but this is what I get from reading what their legislation, I think, is going to be—the other one involves treating congressional employees differently than any other employee in the country who works for a large employer by taking away the employer contribution that these workers have had for more than 50 years.

I do not get it. Why do Republicans want to punish the people who work so hard for them and work so hard for our country? What are they thinking? Why do they want to treat people differently than all other workers who work for large employers?

Honest to God, I do not get it. I do not get it. If they do not like the people who work for them, then get somebody else. But do not punish your staff, who work day and night. And I want to

say, my staff and the Presiding Officer's who are working are working without a paycheck. Well, this is a lovely thing to say to these workers, some of whom earn very little: You are going to be the only people in the country now who cannot get an employer contribution. I do not get it. I really do not.

So here we are: a government shutdown because the Republicans will not accept the fact that a law passed 4 years ago that they do not like, that the Supreme Court upheld—and they did not like that—there was an election over it—and they did not like that—so they stamped their feet and said: We are shutting down the government.

And is there ever pain. I have communities in Los Angeles, one particular one where kids are getting nosebleeds. They are sick. They live near an industrial site, and the Environmental Protection Agency was about to find out what the problem was when they shut down. And those kids do not have an answer.

I had a plane crash at a small airport in Santa Monica that killed four people. We do not know why it happened, but there is no investigation. It had to stop midstream.

I do not have any inspectors on the ground inspecting clean air, clean water, safe drinking water. There are 505 superfund sites where cleanup has been suspended. I know the Presiding Officer has some in her State. These sites are toxic brews. They have arsenic. They have benzene. They have chlorine. They have everything in them that is bad for people to breathe. It is bad if it gets in the drinking water. No inspectors on the ground and no cleanup at 505 superfund sites.

Remember Fukushima? I think everyone knows what Fukushima is. Well, now 92 percent of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff have been furloughed. They have one mission, and I am quoting from their mission: "to ensure the safe use of radioactive materials."

The Army Corps manages 12 million acres of public lands. They host 370 million visitors annually. This is just the time of year when people still—just before we get to winter—can go out there and enjoy the recreation. No. They are closed.

And just think about the mom-and-pop shops that exist around our parks, our Army Corps land, our wildlife refuges. Madam President, 561 refuges—they are all closed because of the shutdown. Hunting season is in full swing.

I already talked about the fact that the National Transportation Safety Board furloughed 380 of its 400 employees, and they have suspended all their pending investigations. I talked about that.

There is another crash they were investigating in San Francisco, the

Asiana Airlines Flight 214. I will tell you, when you stop an investigation like that, it is hard to get right back to it. The problem is, it takes you longer to find the cause of the crash. A lot of times these crashes have clues in them that there may be a part in a certain type of plane that is defective, there may be a problem on the runway—something wrong.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission—another watchdog. In San Diego last week, a 2-year-old child, Annette Estrada, was killed. She was crushed by a falling TV. So they cannot investigate this incident, and maybe some other kids are going to suffer that. It might have been a very defective design.

What does the House do? They are governing by press release: Well, we will open this little sliver of an agency and that one. That is not how you run the greatest Nation on Earth.

Open the government. You said you shut it down because of ObamaCare. ObamaCare is going forward. You want to fix some parts of it. We are ready to talk. There are no winners in this shutdown. It is devastating for our workers. Do you know there are more contract employees than there are Federal employees? There are. Even if you take away the military Federal contract employees—and we hope they are getting paid; we are not positive that all are, but let's say they are—there are more than 2 million contract employees who do not know when the next paycheck is coming.

We sent a bill over to Speaker BOEHNER in the House. Open the government. Just open it. Then we will negotiate all the issues you want to talk about. He would not even allow a vote on that.

We are in a bad place. I have to say, I have lived long enough to know that life does deal us some terrible blows. We know that, each of us. We have each had our tragedies, our challenges, whether they are health challenges or financial challenges or all kinds of challenges. We have enough of those without a self-inflicted wound—two: a government shutdown over here, and a pending default over here, totally unnecessary. It could end in 5 minutes, but still the angst continues, still the anxiety continues, still the uncertainty continues.

I will close with a hopeful note. I laid out the two paths we have: the partisan path to a cliff or the windy, difficult bipartisan path, which the Senate was on until we were pulled off it. I hope and pray that we will get back on that bipartisan path, that we will reopen this government, that we will pay our bills, and this great Nation—this great Nation—can get back to doing what we do best: making sure this American dream is there for everybody, making sure we care about our people, making sure they have access to their government,

and getting us out of this morass we are in for no good reason.

We can do it. The path is there. Let's hope we take that path.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO PALMER DEPAULIS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to celebrate the career of a very dedicated Utah public servant. Palmer DePaulis has served the people of Utah for over 30 years, most recently as the executive director of Utah Department of Human Services.

As executive director, Mr. DePaulis has made great strides in creating safe and permanent homes for vulnerable children and at-risk families. He has instituted a "System of Care" approach for children and families that creates a partnership between children, their families, and caregivers that focuses on an individualized, culturally responsive plan to address a variety of mental health challenges so that children can be kept in the least restrictive, most integrated, and safe setting possible.

Current law directs the majority of Federal dollars to the least desirable outcomes for vulnerable families, namely, removing a child from the home and placing them in foster care.

During the last session of Congress, the Congress passed and the President signed legislation I drafted that permits some States to apply for and receive waivers for certain rules relative to foster care.

In drafting this legislation, I worked closely with Mr. DePaulis and his team to craft policies that would give Utah and other States the flexibility to innovate and try different approaches to improving child welfare systems.

I am pleased that Utah was one of the first States to successfully apply for and be granted a child welfare waiver. Utah's plan is a strategic and forward thinking approach that strives to gain a better understanding of the needs and strengths of children and families that have experienced child

abuse, neglect, and dependency. It acknowledges, as a guiding principle, that, whenever possible, children should remain safely at home. Utah's wavier proposal adopts a holistic framework to provide supportive family services that prevents neglect and abuse and bolsters a family's ability to keep a child safe within the home and preserve intact families when a family's problems can be addressed safely and effectively.

I am confident that the Utah's waiver, instigated by Mr. DePaulis and his team, will result in improved outcomes for children and families.

In addition to his work in the area of child welfare, Mr. DePaulis also oversaw services that have benefited thousands of Utahans. These include, but are not limited to: meals to homebound seniors, treatment for mental health and substance abuse, and services that help individuals with disabilities lead independent and productive lives.

Prior to joining Utah Department of Human Services, Mr. DePaulis served as mayor of Salt Lake City. During his tenure as mayor, Mr. DePaulis made the humane treatment of the homeless one of his signature issues. He helped open family and men's homeless shelters and worked with community partners to highlight the need for a continuum of services to ensure shelter residents had access to medical, transportation, substance abuse, and mental health services.

Throughout his long and distinguished career, Mr. DePaulis has worked to improve the lives of our most vulnerable and forgotten citizens. Utahans and the Nation owe him our gratitude and appreciation.

REMEMBERING ADMIRAL TAZEWELL T. SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I was honored to be at the funeral services at Arlington for ADM Tazewell T. Shepard, Jr., an American patriot, a native of Mobile, AL, a man widely recognized for his character and integrity as well as for courage, intelligence, and professionalism.

Admiral Shepard was born in Mobile, AL, attended Murphy High School, one of Alabama's great high schools, and joined the Navy when World War II began. He married the daughter of Senator John Sparkman and they were partners for 71 years. He received the Navy Cross, the Navy's highest award for heroism during the Battle of Guadalcanal acting with coolness and courage to direct action and to care for casualties.

He was a naval aide to President John F. Kennedy and advised the President during the Bay of Pigs crisis in 1961. He published a book *John F. Kennedy: Man of the Sea*, in 1965.

His quiet and firm character was the quality that stands out in this life well

lived. Former Justice Sandra Day O'Connor spoke at the service and recalled those times of friendship—tennis, bridge, and dancing—enjoyed by their families. His son, Tazewell Shepard III, spoke also and provided insights that revealed the strong values and positive qualities of his father. The service, honored by the presence of a naval detachment, closed with the naval hymn.

Admiral Shepard through the quality of his life set an example of faith, family and patriotism. We extend our sympathy to his fine family and even in this time of loss celebrate his wonderful and productive life.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:58 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3190. An act to provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following joint resolution was read the first time:

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1572. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse States that use State funds to operate National Parks during the Federal Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 666, a bill to prohibit attendance of an animal fighting venture, and for other purposes.

S. 749

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 749, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the 15-year recovery period for qualified leasehold improvement property, qualified restaurant property, and qualified retail improvement property.

S. 1143

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1143, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1551

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1551, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 1555

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1555, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for a delay in the implementation schedule of the reductions in disproportionate share hospital payments, and for other purposes.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO
MEETCOMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND
ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 15, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. room 428A Russell Senate Office building to conduct a hearing entitled “Small Businesses Speak: Surviving the Government Shutdown?”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 15, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST
TIME—H.J. RES. 80

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand that H.J. Res. 80 has been received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 80) making continuing appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the joint resolution will be read for a second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY,
OCTOBER 16, 2013

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Sen-

ate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon on Wednesday, October 16, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, Senators be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 10:08 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 16, 2013, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RETIREMENT OF POLICE OFFICER
JOHN D. COOPER

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Police Officer John D. Cooper as he retires after more than 28 years of law enforcement service, with 25 years of that service to the City of Fairfield.

After serving three years as a Deputy Sheriff with the Santa Clara County Sheriff's Office, he was hired as a police officer with the Fairfield Police Department on March 14, 1988. As an officer, Cooper worked in various capacities that included Patrol, Investigations, Youth Services, School Resources, and Field Training. His high work ethic and dedication to police work was evident and he was promoted to Police Corporal on December 31, 1999. Officer Cooper has a genuine attitude of putting public service before himself and as a trainer of newly hired police officers, he taught them to be public servants as well as police officers.

Some of Officer Cooper's most significant contributions to the Police Department have been his ability to remain calm and communicate well during crisis situations. He has assisted with the investigation of numerous major crimes and high profile cases, and his keen investigative skills have contributed to the successful resolution and conviction of numerous criminals. Officer Cooper has been a good representation of the City of Fairfield and the Fairfield Police Department.

He has been a valued employee and his commitment to the community was evident on a daily basis. Officer Cooper was a loyal representative of the law enforcement community and admired for his hard work, dedication, and positive work ethic.

IN MEMORY OF FRED ESMOND

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Fred Esmond who passed away on October 2, 2013.

Fred Esmond served in the U.S. Army Reserves, was a small business owner, participated in many community organizations, and beginning in 2001 was elected four times to serve as the Mayor of Utica, Illinois. I have no doubt that he will be remembered for his stewardship and love for his community during some of its most trying times, including a devastating tornado and multiple floods.

Mayor Esmond leaves a legacy that will continue to serve the residents of Utica for

years to come. Under his leadership, the town constructed a new village hall, fire station, and numerous community buildings. Additionally, visitors and residents often recognize the beautiful streetscapes lining the realigned Illinois Route 178 and a striking memorial to the victims of a 2004 tornado.

Fred is survived by his wife Sandra; his daughters, Sarah Schweickert and Lisa Esmond; his grandchildren, Addison and Bailey Schweickert; and his three brothers, Jack, William, and Truman. While Fred has passed, his legacy and memory will endure in the hearts and minds of his friends and family.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 16th District of Illinois, I offer my heartfelt condolences to Mayor Esmond's family. The State of Illinois has lost an outstanding citizen and the Illinois River Valley community will miss him dearly.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH
HONOREES

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND SERVICE OF VIVIAN RODRIGUEZ

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the inspiring career of Vivian Rodriguez. Vivian is the President of the Democratic Hispanic Caucus of Florida and the Constituent Field Representative for my office.

She presently holds the position of Vice Chair for the Orange County Democratic Executive Committee and is on the Advisory Board of the Central Florida Community Initiative, an organization acting as a liaison between the Office of the State Attorney for the Ninth Judicial Circuit and the citizens of Orange and Osceola County. Vivian was the Political Director of Hispanic Outreach for Joe Saunders, Florida House Representative for District 49, contributing to the successful election of one of the first openly gay legislators in Tallahassee. She is also on the Board of Directors for Equality Florida, which advocates for equality and justice for the LGBT community.

Vivian retired from the New York City Police Department in August 2004, after completing twenty-one years of honorable service and achieving the highest recognition within the NYPD Detective Bureau, Promotion to First-Grade Detective. She was assigned to various specialized elite units which included the Intelligence Division, Executive Protection Unit, Dignitary Protection Unit, the Organized Crime Control Bureau, Task Force Mobilization Unit, Recruitment Section, and the LGBT Sensitivity Training Program for all incoming NYPD police cadets. Vivian was the President of the Gay Officers Action League and Secretary to the

NYPD Hispanic Society. She has been acknowledged for her dedicated work in public service and has received various accolades within the Hispanic and LGBT community.

Vivian's last assignment in the NYPD was with the Intelligence Liaison Unit. This unit was created after the 9/11 Attacks in New York City, to combat the global international threat of terrorism in the NYC area. Vivian participated in several counter-terrorism operations to detect and deter terrorist reconnaissance and pre-operational activity to protect the city from future terrorist attacks. Upon retirement, Vivian became a consultant with the Department of Homeland Security, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and several other law enforcement agencies instructing on intelligence and terrorism.

Vivian's greatest accomplishment was meeting her life partner Valerie Finello, who continues to support all her endeavors. Her pride and joy is her loving son, Tyler, who has grown into a fine young man.

I am happy to honor Vivian Rodriguez, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her exemplary career in public service and commitment to equality and justice.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF EURIBIADES CERRUD II

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Euribiades Cerrud II for all he has contributed to the city of Orlando.

Euribiades Cerrud II, better known as "Euri," was born in San Juan, Puerto Rico, on January 26, 1972. Euri was born to an immigrant father from Panama and a Puerto Rican mother. His father was the first person in his hometown to graduate from high school and grew up to become a world-class oncologic surgeon. His mother was a pediatrician who dedicated herself to care for impoverished children.

After graduating from high school, Euri moved to Orlando, FL, to complete his education. While taking a course at Valencia Community College, he met the love of his life, Karen N. Cerrud-Santos. After completing his associate's degree, he continued his education at the University of Central Florida. While attending UCF, out of his own monthly allowance, Euri paid for the civil engineering degree of a homeless man. He also shared his apartment, on different occasions, with individuals who could not afford a place to live.

Having developed a great interest in pure mathematics, he attended Rollins College on a full scholarship where he completed a bachelor's degree in Mathematics with minors in humanities, physics, chemistry, and business administration. As part of his thesis, Euri developed an advanced equations system that was converted into an interactive computer program for the estimation of dieting, insulin, and food intake of diabetic patients. The program was eventually donated to the National Institutes of Health and modified to program insulin pumps.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

After completing his mathematics degree, Euri went to New England Law in Boston to study law. He successfully graduated at the top of his class, while having a newborn with his wife, holding a full-time position at the legal department of the Boston Stock Exchange, and volunteering part-time to teach law to gifted students at a charter program in Boston.

Upon his return to Orlando, Euri has been very involved in the community. He served as a board member of Christian Help providing Christmas gifts and dinners to dozens of families in the community and also as board member of the Puerto Rico Chamber of Commerce during three separate terms. Currently, he serves as Vice-Chair of the City of Orlando Civil Service Board, Advisory Board Member to the Hispanic Business Initiative Fund and the UCF Small Business Development Center, Ambassador to the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, member of the editorial board of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce Vision Magazine and Chair of Pack 25 of Cub Scouts Troop 25 at Good Shepherd Catholic School. He is also a lecturer to the Orange County Bar Association's Business Law Section.

I am happy to honor Euri Cerrud, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his contributions to the Hispanic community and to Orlando.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER OF LUIS M. MARTINEZ-ALICEA

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of Luis M. Martinez-Alicea. Mr. Martinez earned a Bachelor's Degree in Communications from the University of the Sacred Heart in Puerto Rico and a Master's Degree in Business Administration from Ana G. Mendez University System, Orlando Campus. During his college years, he worked at the Puerto Rico Department of State as Press Officer.

Mr. Martinez founded Starlight Productions, a nonprofit organization devoted to encouraging talented youth to develop their artistic abilities through training and live musical-theater productions.

In 2000, Mr. Martinez relocated to Orlando to pursue a Master's degree in business. He worked at Walt Disney World and studied Arts Management at the University of Central Florida. Mr. Martinez was also the host of local events, performed as an actor in theater plays, and worked on TV commercials targeted to the Hispanic market. During his personal time off, he served as a volunteer in various community organizations.

Mr. Martinez worked as Marketing Coordinator and Reporter at El Nuevo Dia newspaper. He later served for five years as Director of Marketing & Recruitment at the Ana G. Mendez University System, in which he implemented innovative recruitment and marketing strategies and developed strong community ties to increase corporate branding and diversity.

In January 2012, Mr. Martinez was appointed by Orlando Mayor Buddy Dyer as Director of Multicultural Affairs, an executive position that promotes the engagement of minority communities, businesses and residents with the city of Orlando. In addition, he serves as the Mayor's Hispanic Spokesperson to local Hispanic and Brazilian media and assists Orlando's Economic Development Department.

I am happy to honor Luis M. Martinez-Alicea, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his

many accomplishments and service to the Central Florida community.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF JOHN CORTES

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize John Cortes for his leadership in the Hispanic community and his many years of service to Central Florida. John has been a valuable member of his community and has worked to better the lives of his family, friends, and the community at large in Osceola County.

John Cortes is a retired New York City Corrections Officer who now serves as the First Vice President for the Democratic Hispanic Caucus of Florida. John was born in Brooklyn, New York, and raised in Puerto Rico where he graduated from high school. He attended John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York for two years and graduated from the New York City Department of Corrections Training Academy for Disasters. John has lived in Osceola County for the past 14 years with his loving wife, Caridad Cortes.

John is the Precinct Committeeman for the Osceola County Democratic Executive Committee and serves as the Vice President for the Osceola County Democratic Hispanic Caucus. He is also a current member and former president of the Kissimmee Neighborhood Crime Watch, as well as the former president of the Osceola County Democratic Hispanic Caucus. John served on the Social Service Funding Board for the United Way, and on the Board of Parks and Recreation for Osceola County. John is also a graduate of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) Program, and a graduate of the Kissimmee Police Department Civilian Police Academy in Osceola County.

I am happy to honor John Cortes, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his years of service within Florida's Ninth District.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF JAMES AUFFANT

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize James Auffant for his leadership within the Central Florida community. James currently serves as the Secretary for the Florida Democratic Party.

James was born in New York City and raised in San Juan, Puerto Rico. He attended American University in San Juan and graduated with a BA in Political Science. After graduating from law school, James moved to Orlando in 1977 with his wife, Lillian. James became a member of the Florida Bar in 1978 and has continued to practice law in Orlando since that time.

James worked for the Legal Aid Society of Orange County and for the Office of the Public Defender before going into private practice in 1982. James is very active in the Central Florida community and is a former board member of Valencia Community College. James was on the City of Orlando's Nominating Board, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for Orange County, the Minority Business Board of Orange County, the United Cerebral Palsy Board, and the Community Action Board of Orange County. He also acted as Chair for the Florida Bar's Juvenile Rules Committee and currently serves as a board member of the Apopka Family Learning Center. James serves as the State Committeeman for the Orange County Democratic Executive Committee

and was the founding president of the Hispanic Community Center in Central Florida, Asociación Borinqueña de la Florida Central.

I am happy to honor James Auffant, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his service to the Central Florida community and the state of Florida.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF WANDA RAMOS

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Wanda Ramos for her service to the Central Florida community and for her advocacy on behalf of workers and their families.

Wanda Ramos was born and raised in Puerto Rico and is a dedicated wife and proud mother of a 15 year old son. Mrs. Ramos moved to Orlando in 1999 where she became involved in fighting for workers' rights, empowering new voters, advocating for civil rights, and creating awareness about the importance of parental involvement in education.

While working at a retailer, Mrs. Ramos organized workers to achieve better working conditions and better pay. When the unionizing efforts were discouraged by her employer, Mrs. Ramos still managed to accomplish the implementation of safety standards for a better working environment and better pay for workers.

Mrs. Ramos has been an active member of Jobs With Justice where she eventually earned a place on their Board of Directors. She joined the Labor Council for Latin American Advancement (LCLAA) and served in various capacities and campaigns to empower and elect Latinos in Central Florida.

Through her involvement with the Family Leadership Institute, Mrs. Ramos has traveled to other states to raise awareness of parental involvement in education by speaking to parents, teachers, and administrators. Mrs. Ramos is also a member of the PTSA, SAC, the OCPS Hispanic Advisory Council.

In 2008, she joined the presidential campaign of Barack Obama performing many duties as a volunteer, including giving a speech to introduce Hillary Clinton when she came to Central Florida to campaign for Mr. Obama.

Mrs. Ramos has advocated for women and children through organizations such as Community Legal Services of Mid Florida (CLSMF) and Legal Advocacy Center of Central Florida (LACCF), where she served as a board member for 2 years.

As a talk show host of a radio program at Latina 1580 AM Radio, Mrs. Ramos gave community organizations and elected officials the opportunity to provide information and create awareness about important issues affecting the community.

I am happy to honor Wanda Ramos, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her many accomplishments and her contributions to the Central Florida community.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTION OF CHAD M. BRANDT

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Chad M. Brandt for his contributions to the Central Florida community. Mr. Brandt was born in Melbourne, Florida, in 1970. He is a first generation Cuban-American who has witnessed firsthand the challenges that immigrants face in the United States. He has dedicated his life and career to serve the cause of the immigrants in his community.

Mr. Brandt received a bachelor's degree in Political Science from Florida International University and a law degree from the University of Florida Levin College of Law, both with honors. He is currently a member of the Florida Bar, the American Immigration Lawyers Association, and admitted before the Florida Supreme Court and the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida.

Mr. Brandt is the owner and founder of Brandt Immigration, a law firm specialized in immigration law. He devotes a substantial portion of his immigration practice to deportation defense and representing individuals, families, and businesses during interviews and appearances before immigration officials. Additionally, Mr. Brandt assists clients in obtaining temporary visas and permanent resident status.

Mr. Brandt is also actively involved in his community. He is currently a board member of the statewide and the local chapter of the Hispanic Business Initiative Fund, a non-profit organization dedicated to assisting Hispanic entrepreneurs. He is also a member of the Hispanic Bar Association of Central Florida and the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando. He has lectured on immigration law at the University of Florida Levin College of Law and his articles have been featured in the Orlando Sentinel and Ahora Magazine.

Mr. Brandt currently lives in Orlando, FL, with his wife, Jennifer, and his five children, Chad Jr., Emily, Ethan, Lily, and William.

I am happy to honor Chad Brandt, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his service to the immigrant community in Central Florida.

INTRODUCING THE DEBT LIMIT REFORM ACT

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Debt Limit Reform Act. This bill will reform the statutory limits on our nation's federal debt by providing the President of the United States with explicit authority to raise the debt ceiling without Congressional approval, and by removing intragovernmental accounts from the debt ceiling calculation. As Congress faces an ongoing government shutdown that has left hundreds of thousands of American workers without a paycheck, we are getting ever closer to our nation defaulting on its debt obligations. On October 17th, the debt ceiling is expected to be breached. Democrats and Republicans must come together before then to act or risk a global economic catastrophe. This is exactly where we were just two years ago, and where we will be again in the near future if we do not take any steps to reform the way in which we calculate and consider our nation's debt.

Congress has legislatively limited federal debt for nearly 100 years, from the Second Liberty Bond Act of 1917 to the more recent Budget Control Act of 2011 and subsequent increases. These increases, however, do not address the fact that the current manner in which we determine the debt ceiling is no longer relevant to how we govern today.

We need a new debt limit law—one that takes the modern world into account. Under this bill, the debt ceiling will distinguish between mere accounting techniques and actual debt. No longer will debt owed from one branch of our government to another be considered the same as debt held by foreign governments, banks, pension funds, and other entities. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), of the \$16.699 trillion in outstanding debt subject to limit, roughly \$11.9 trillion is held by the public and about \$4.8 trillion is held by government accounts.

By excluding these government-held accounts from the debt limit calculation—particularly the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) and the Disability Insurance (DI) Trust Funds that constitute the Social Security Trust Funds, Medicare Parts A and B, the Civil Service and Military Retirement Trust Funds, Unemployment Insurance, the Highway Trust Fund, Community Living Assistance Services and Supports (CLASS) Trust Fund, and Airport and Airway Trust Fund—we will have a more accurate view of our actual debt obligations.

These intra-governmental accounts are the means by which the Treasury tracks payouts and obligations to other government entities. They are accounting techniques, not debts. These funds serve to help retired workers and their families, the families of deceased workers, and disabled workers and their families. In addition, they provide inpatient hospital stay and medical insurance benefits; fund programs for civilian and military retirement; provide unemployment benefits to eligible workers who become unemployed through no fault of their own; fund road construction and mass transit projects; provide insurance for long-term services in the case of disability; and fund the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). They need not be considered the same as our government's debt for purposes of calculating the debt ceiling.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when partisan gridlock is having a devastating impact on our nation's economy through a government shutdown and further threatening to destabilize global financial systems, this legislation represents a common sense solution to modernizing the way in which we calculate our nation's debt and increase the debt ceiling. By excluding intragovernmental accounts from the Treasury's debt ceiling equation and authorizing the Executive to alter the ceiling as needed, the Debt Limit Reform Act will help Congress avoid some of the last-minute showdowns that have become all too common in recent years. In this way we can begin to tackle the real challenges facing this country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week September 23, 2013. If I were present, I would have voted on the following:

Rollcall vote No. 484: H.R. 1961, "nay;"

Rollcall vote No. 485: H. Res. 354, "yea;"
Rollcall vote No. 486: H.R. 3095, "yea;"
Rollcall vote No. 487: H.R. 2600, "yea;"
Rollcall vote No. 488: Journal Vote, "yea;"
Rollcall vote No. 489: Grijalva Amendment, "aye;"

Rollcall vote No. 490: Napolitano Amendment, "aye;"

Rollcall vote No. 491: Senate Amendment to H.R. 1412, "yea;"

Rollcall vote No. 492: H.R. 3096, "aye;"

Rollcall vote No. 493: H. Res. 361—Martial Law Authority Rule, "nay;"

Rollcall vote No. 494: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule, "nay;"

Rollcall vote No. 495: H. Res. 366—Rule providing for consideration of both the amendments to the Senate Amendment to H.J. Res. 59, "nay;"

Rollcall vote No. 496: H.R. 2251, "yea;"

Rollcall vote No. 497: Motion to Concur with the Senate Amendment with a House Amendment, Part 1 (Paulsen), "yea;"

Rollcall vote No. 498: Motion to Concur with the Senate Amendment with a House Amendment, Part 2 (Blackburn), "nay;"

Rollcall vote No. 499: H.R. 3210—Pay Our Military Act, "yea;" and

Rollcall vote No. 500: H.R. 2848—Department of State Operations and Embassy Security Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2014, "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 14, I missed a rollcall vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on No. 548.

HONORING JIM MURAKAMI OF SANTA ROSA, CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to posthumously honor and pay tribute to Jim Murakami, a great community leader who dedicated much of his life to advocating for the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, which achieved redress for the 120,000 United States citizens of Japanese descent on the West Coast that were wrongfully incarcerated in internment camps during World War II.

Mr. Murakami was born and raised in Santa Rosa, California. When WWII broke out, Mr. Murakami and his family were first incarcerated in the temporary internment camp in Merced, California and were later moved to the camp at Amache, Colorado.

After Mr. Murakami graduated from high school, he joined the Army and served two years in Germany. After he was discharged, Mr. Murakami returned to his hometown of Santa Rosa, where he raised a family with his wife of 59 years, Margarette, and where he lived until his death in 2012.

Mr. Murakami joined the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) in the early 1950s and quickly rose through the ranks of the organization. He was the president of the local JACL chapter, the first governor of the Northern California-Western Nevada-Pacific District, as well as the national vice president of the organization from 1972–1975 before becoming the national president from 1976–1978.

During his tenure with the JACL, Mr. Murakami worked tirelessly on the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, finally seeing it passed and signed into law by President Reagan in 1988. The Act required a Presidential apology and a symbolic payment to the surviving internees who were subjected to forced relocation.

In addition to his work with the JACL, Mr. Murakami was also a member of the Santa Rosa East Rotary for more than 50 years as well as a permanent member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

He was a regular financial supporter of the Hannah Boys Center, the Sonoma County Museum, and his local fire department.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Murakami was forced to endure dreadful circumstances that most of us have never, nor will ever, experience. In the face of this adversity, Mr. Murakami not only served his country in the Armed Forces when called upon but also worked tirelessly to right the injustice he experienced through his advocacy for the Civil Liberties Act of 1988. Mr. Murakami was a valuable, contributing member of his community, both locally and nationally. It is therefore appropriate that, on this 25th anniversary of the enactment of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, we honor and remember him today for his many contributions.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF MARIA LUYANDA

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Maria Luyanda for her leadership within the Central Florida Hispanic Community.

Maria Luyanda was born in Vega Baja, Puerto Rico. She attended college at Missouri University and completed courses in accounting at Methodist University in Dallas, Texas. She began her career as a teller at Banco Popular de Puerto Rico, where she was recognized for her professionalism and later became assistant manager.

In 1998, Maria was hired by American Airlines Credit Union as manager of the San Juan, Puerto Rico office. During her time at American Airlines, Maria established a loan system to benefit the employees of the Caribbean islands and was soon appointed Regional Director. She was later promoted to Executive Director and became part of the World Association of Credit Unions, as operational adviser. In this position, she had the opportunity to help smaller credit unions organize

their operational capabilities and to experience financial growth.

Maria moved to Orlando, Florida in 1998 and served as the assistant Vice President of Banco Popular. In 2004, she started Luyanda Insurance with her son Jose, a company dedicated to looking for innovative products to satisfy the local market. Maria was also the treasurer and vice president of the Hispanic American Professional and Business Women Association and on the Board of the Hispanic Youth Group of Deltona. Maria currently serves as the President of the Puerto Rican Chamber of Commerce and is on the Advisory Board for Polytechnic University's Orlando Campus.

I am happy to honor Maria Luyanda, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her continued leadership within the Central Florida community.

RECOGNIZING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF ZORAIDA ANDINO RIOS

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the public service of Zoraida Andino Rios. Zoraida was born in East Chicago, Indiana. Her passion for social justice started when she was studying at Saint Joseph's College where she received a Bachelor's Degree in Sociology and Education. As a student, she was the founder of an organization called "Palante" and was the assistant director of a college TV program, "Know Your Community," which informs Latino students about issues affecting the Hispanic community. She is the proud mother of her two children, Carolina Raquel and Gilberto Antonio. Her pride and joy is her granddaughter Analiz Diana Balderas.

In 1979, Zoraida moved to Puerto Rico and worked for several community services companies. In 1986, she returned to Indiana and began advocating for the rights of the Puerto Rican and Latino community. She served as President of Madre Atrevete Muevete Ahora (MAMA) and Secretary of the Latino Historical Society. She was also active with the Northwest Indiana Voter Registration and Education Foundation, United Citizens Organization, and United Farm Workers. Zoraida was the co-founder and President of the National Conference of Puerto Rican Women and received their Lifetime Achievement Award in 2000. She also received the Roberto Clemente Community Service Award from the Northwest Indiana Coordinating Counsel.

After moving to Florida with her family, Zoraida became the founder and President of the National Conference of Puerto Rican Women's local chapter in Orlando. She is also a member of the Asociación Borinqueña and La Casa de Puerto Rico. In 2008, she got involved with various social justice groups and served as Vice President for Frente Unido 436 and Vice President of the National Council of Puerto Rican Rights. She is also involved with the Black, Latino, Puerto Rican Alliance for Justice and is founder and co-director of the Orlando chapter of the National Congress of Puerto Rican Rights. She is currently working on her project "Boricua," a tool to unite the worldwide Puerto Rican community.

I am happy to honor Zoraida Andino Rios, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her public service to the Hispanic community.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF MELISSA MCGUIRE-MANIAU

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize an amazing woman in my community, Melissa McGuire-Maniau.

Melissa McGuire-Maniau was born in Puerto Rico, raised in Orlando and is a veteran of the United States Air Force. For the last eight years Melissa has been proudly married to her husband, a native of Mexico. Together they have three girls.

Melissa has been at the forefront of the fight for comprehensive immigration reform and has helped build a movement in Central Florida for the rights of immigrants. Melissa's journey in the immigrant rights movement started in 2005 when she began to study her husband's immigration case. After living in the United States for over twenty years, her husband was still an undocumented immigrant facing deportation. Seeking legal status and citizenship for her husband was nearly impossible.

On October 5, 2011, Melissa's husband was taken from their home and sent to a private immigrant detention center in South Florida. Having worked as a volunteer with several immigrant rights organizations, Melissa used her experience to fight back. Thanks to the support and collaborative efforts of the community, Melissa's husband was eventually released. Her husband became a legal permanent resident in April 2013.

Over the last several years, Melissa and her family have volunteered with the National Farm Worker Ministry. Melissa is now the Immigration Chair of the Youth and Young Adult Network of the National Farm Worker Ministry, and serves as Vice President of the Board of Directors for the Florida Immigrant Coalition. Melissa is currently in the Pre-Law Program at Rollins College working towards becoming an immigration attorney in order to continue the fight for justice for all immigrant families.

I am happy to honor Melissa McGuire-Maniau, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her service to our country and her community.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF VANESSA HALL FERREIRA

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the courage and commitment of Vanessa Hall Ferreira. Vanessa was born and grew up as the youngest of six in Bridgeport, Connecticut. As a young child, Vanessa grew up in a housing project with her single mother, 4 sisters, and brother. Vanessa was the first in her family to graduate high school. She married her high school sweetheart Alfredo Ferreira in 1971 with whom she has two daughters and three grandsons.

Vanessa began her bakery career in 1983. She got a full time job in the bakery of a grocery store, which she really enjoyed. She moved to another grocery store chain where there were good worker protections and was able to earn a pension and get 100% vested. In 1995, she decided to move the family to Florida.

In 1998, Vanessa got a job at Walmart as a cake decorator. It was a great place to work even though the pay was not much. When she asked for a 75 cent raise, Walmart denied her, saying it was too much. She left to work at a competitor grocery store where she received training, great benefits, and higher wages.

When the store went out of business, Vanessa had no choice but to go back to work at Walmart in 2005. Vanessa and other associates had concerns about scheduling and management's attitude toward the workers. Eventually, the store began to hire temporary workers instead of giving full time work to the current employees.

In 2009, Vanessa discovered the Organization United for Respect at Walmart or OUR Walmart. She became an "Our Walmart" member online but kept her membership private. In 2012, Vanessa went on strike at her store during the week of Black Friday. Vanessa returned back to work after going on strike with a new sense of dignity.

Vanessa became one of the main leaders for Our Walmart in Central Florida. In April 2013, Vanessa was fired from her position with Walmart in retaliation for her activism. She continues to advocate for workers' rights by sharing her own experiences.

I am happy to honor Vanessa Hall Ferreira, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her courage and commitment to workers' rights.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER OF MARCOS VILAR

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the career of Marcos Vilar. Mr. Vilar was born in Ponce, Puerto Rico. He moved to the United States at the age of 14 and has since lived in New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Washington, DC, Chicago, Tampa, and Orlando. He holds a Bachelor's Degree in History from the University of Maryland and a Master's Degree in Education from the University of Illinois, Chicago.

Mr. Vilar worked as a teacher in Chicago, where he also was active in community work. During his tenure at Roberto Community Academy he was best known for working with at risk youth and developing arts and cultural programming into after school activities. He was also advisor for the Student Government body and a leader of the local reform movement at the school.

Mr. Vilar moved to Washington, DC in January of 2002, and there held several national leadership positions including National Field Director for the Que Nada Nos Detenga, voter registration campaign of the Puerto Rico Federal Affairs Administration, Executive Director for America's Families United, National Political Director for SEIU, and National Field Director for Mi Familia Vota Education Fund.

Mr. Vilar's work as Executive Director for America's Families United was fundamental to the development of Catalist, which has become the standard voter file database used by progressive organizations. He was also a founding member of the Catalist Board of Managers.

As Political Director of SEIU, Mr. Vilar focused on improving member databases and was responsible for aggressively growing the COPE Fund, SEIU's Political Action Committee (PAC). During his two year tenure, the PAC doubled its annual income and became the largest PAC in the country.

As National Field Director for Mi Familia Vota Education Fund, Mr. Vilar led efforts to engage Latinos in the 2012 election cycle. He was instrumental in the development and success of the National Latino Civic Engagement Table, a coalition of national organizations working together to increase Latino civic par-

ticipation in key states. In addition he oversaw the opening of Mi Familia Vota Education Fund operations in Texas and Florida in 2011 and 2012.

Vilar moved to Florida in 2012 and served as statewide coordinator for the Alliance for Citizenship, a national immigration reform campaign. He is now working as Statewide Field Director for Florida New Majority.

I am happy to honor Marcos Vilar, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his many accomplishments and contributions to his community.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND SERVICE OF LUIS R. PASTRANA SILVA

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Luis R. Pastrana Silva for his service to our country and to the Hispanic community in Central Florida.

Mr. Pastrana was born in Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico. He holds a B.B.A. from the University of Puerto Rico (UPR), Rio Piedras Campus, an M.B.A. from Farleigh Dickinson University, and a J.D. from the UPR School of Law. Mr. Pastrana honorably served as a commissioned officer in the U.S. Army for 20 years. After his retirement from the Army in 1978, Mr. Pastrana held several positions within the government of Puerto Rico, promoting business and economic development.

In 2001, he moved to Orlando to serve as the Puerto Rico Federal Affairs Administration's Regional Director for Southern States. Since 2003, he has served as Distinguished Professor at the Ana G. Mendez University System in Orlando, FL. He is also a member of the Puerto Rico Bar, the American Bar Association, and the Hispanic National Bar Association.

Mr. Pastrana has been a leader in the Puerto Rican community in Central Florida and a champion for business development. He has published two autobiographies and one research book on the U.S. Constitution. He is happily married to Mareitssa Griggs, a college professor, and together they have five children and five grandchildren.

I am happy to honor Luis R. Pastrana Silva, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his service to our country and to the Hispanic community.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF LOVE OF JUANITA GARCÍA PERAZA

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month to recognize the life and legacy of Juanita García Peraza, founder of the Congregación Mita Church.

Juanita García Peraza was born on June 24, 1897, in Hatillo, Puerto Rico. She came from a distinguished family, and was known for her moral and spiritual values, her love for the poor, and her sensitivity toward the pain of others. In the late 1930's, when Puerto Rico and the U.S. were experiencing a great economic crisis, Juanita became ill and was bed-ridden with gastroenteritis. While confined with the illness, Juanita promised the Lord that if He healed her, she would serve Him for the rest of her days. She was healed. She then abandoned her social position and fortune, and traveled the countryside visiting the poor and the needy to preach the good news.

In 1940, in the town of Arecibo, Puerto Rico, Juanita founded the Congregación Mita Church with a message of love, freedom, and

unity. In 1947, the Church was established in the capital city of San Juan, in the Hato Rey sector. She performed missionary work, visiting prisons and hospitals and helping reform many alcoholics and drug addicts. In addition to her spiritual work, Juanita carried out extraordinary social work in the community. She developed credit unions and corporations that provide employment and economic opportunities to members of the church. She established Bible schools, known as the "Consejero," to instruct, counsel, and guide children in their integral development. She founded music academies to benefit children and adolescents by encouraging their development in the arts. Also, she established the Ministry of Guards to watch over the church's properties and the surrounding neighborhoods.

Likewise, Juanita established the Ministry of Preachers and Deacons who perform social work wherever the congregation is established. She envisioned the creation of a shelter for the elderly and a school for the children and youth of the community, both of which became a reality a few years after she passed away. Under her leadership, her work spread to New York, Chicago, and Washington, DC, as well as Santo Domingo and Santiago de los Caballeros in the Dominican Republic.

Juanita initiated a new era for women. At a time when women were not allowed to officiate in church and faced discrimination, she removed barriers and cleared the way for women to express themselves openly. Juanita allowed women equal participation in the church, including leadership roles. Despite being assailed, slandered, and misinterpreted, she pushed ahead bravely, leaving behind a legacy of love in the hearts of those who knew her.

In 1978, the Universidad Hispano Americana recognized Juanita for her extraordinary work, and awarded her the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Management Honoris Causae. A public elementary school in one of the communities where she served was also named in her honor.

I am happy to honor Juanita García Peraza, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for all her hard work, courage, and dedication.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,747,411,584,091.53. We've added \$6,120,534,535,178.45 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING CECILIA CASSIDY

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the outstanding contributions of Cecilia Cassidy and to commemorate her retirement after 21 years of service to the community of Rosslyn.

As executive director of Rosslyn Renaissance, Ms. Cassidy was crucial in growing the member-based organization from a small core of volunteers to a respected business organization. Rosslyn Renaissance eventually merged with the Arlington Business Improvement District, BID, in 2012, and the majority of the programs Ms. Cassidy created while at Renaissance were implemented at the BID.

In 2003, Ms. Cassidy worked with property owners, the business community, the County Manager's Office and Arlington Economic Development to help create the Rosslyn Business Improvement District, BID. The first BID in Northern Virginia, Rosslyn BID was formed to enhance development and growth through highlighting the uniqueness and strengths of Arlington's Rosslyn neighborhood.

Her leadership as executive director of the BID paved the way for an influx of residential, retail, and dining offerings, which have transformed Rosslyn into a vibrant, dynamic, and more livable community. Today Rosslyn is a more walkable and drivable community; home to a number of award-winning living spaces.

Ms. Cassidy was instrumental in bringing Artisphere to Rosslyn. In order to make Arlington Counties' vision for Artisphere possible, BID pledged \$1 million in start-up revenue and \$300,000 annually for the life of the center. The state-of-the-art cultural center cemented Rosslyn as the cultural capital of Arlington.

Under the leadership of Ms. Cassidy, the Rosslyn BID garnered a number of awards including three from the International Downtown Association, one for urban placemaking for Central Space, and one in marketing for ROSSLYN magazine.

Ms. Cassidy has said that one of her proudest accomplishments as executive director of the BID was working with local partners to provide services for the homeless. Rosslyn BID is one of the only BIDs in the nation to provide homeless services.

A TRIBUTE TO WELCOME
WILSON, SR.**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Welcome Wilson, Sr., who was named chairman of University of Houston's "Drive to Tier One" initiative. The University of Houston is on track for Tier One status. Mr. Wilson is a member of the Board of Regents at the University of Houston System. He was also inducted into the Texas Business Hall of Fame in 2010, served in the executive office

of President John F. Kennedy, was Houston chairman for the March of Dimes, and graduated first in his class from the Naval Officers School.

Wilson will work to mobilize the community and alumni organization in support of the Tier One initiative. Elevating the University of Houston to one the Nation's elite research institutions would attract high-technology businesses seeking to form partnerships with universities and boost the economy of Houston and its surrounding area. Adding another top-tier university in Texas would also allow lower-income students to attend high-quality schools closer to home for less money.

Great universities are built by great communities. Mr. Wilson is a leader who represents our community with distinction and honor. On behalf of all residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, it's an honor to recognize the appointment of Welcome Wilson, Sr., and I support Mr. Wilson and the University of Houston in their endeavors to achieve Tier One status.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TULSI GABBARD

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, on October 9, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote Nos. 536 and 537. Had I been present I would have voted:

Rollcall No. 536: "no."—On Motion to Table the Motion to Appeal the Ruling of the Chair.

Rollcall No. 537: "no."—On Passage.

FOURTH U.S. POW DELEGATION TO
JAPAN, OCTOBER 13-21, 2013**HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor veterans from America's greatest generation and thank the Government of Japan for recognizing the sacrifices of these men. On Sunday, October 13, seven former members or widows of former members of the U.S. Army, U.S. Army Air Corps, and U.S. Marines who fought in the Pacific Theater of World War II—and who were once prisoners of war of Imperial Japan—will travel to Japan as guests of the Japanese government. Marking an act of historic reconciliation and remembrance, this is the fourth delegation of U.S. POWs to visit Japan through this program.

Their first trip to Japan was on aging freighters called "Hellships," where the men were loaded into suffocating holds with little space, water, food, or sanitation. The conditions in which they were held are unimaginable. At the POW camps in the Philippines, Japan and China, they suffered unmerciful abuse aggravated by the lack of food, medical care, clothing, and appropriate housing. Each POW also became a slave laborer at the mines, factories, and docks of some of Japan's largest

companies. In the end, nearly 40 percent of the American POWs held by Japan perished; compared to two percent of those in Nazi Germany's POW camps. The POWs of this delegation slaved for Mitsubishi, Nippon Express, Sumitomo, Nisshin Flour, Hitachi, Dowa Holdings, and JFE Holdings.

In September 2010, the Japanese government delivered to the first American POW delegation an official, Cabinet-approved apology for the damage and suffering these men endured. Although the Japanese government had hosted POWs from the wartime Allies of the United States since the late 1990s, the 2010 trip was the first trip to Japan for American POWs. It was also the first official apology to any prisoners of war held by Japan.

I know that the American POWs fought hard for this recognition. Dr. Lester Tenney of California, a former POW who mined coal for Mitsui, was instrumental in persuading the Government of Japan to offer the apology and initiate the trips of reconciliation. He says he is "honored to have had the opportunity of assisting the U.S. State Department and the Japanese Embassy in arranging this year's POW Visitation Program. Like the years past, the visit will no doubt yield many memories while at the same time erase many bad experiences that left its mark on the POWs. This year, for the first time, Japan's Minister of Foreign Affairs has allowed three widows of former POWs to participate in the program and visit the sites of their husbands' Japanese prison camps located in various cities in Japan."

I thank the POWs for their persistent pursuit of justice, and commend the U.S. State Department for helping them. I also appreciate the willingness of the Japanese government to pursue an historic and meaningful apology. It is my hope that the POW Visitation Program continues to expand, and that it will be a healing mechanism for the POWs, their families and communities.

Now, it is time for the many Japanese companies that used POWs for slave labor during World War II to follow the example of their government by offering an apology and supporting programs for lasting remembrance and reconciliation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish these men a fulfilling trip to Japan, and I hope that their trip contributes to securing the historic peace between the U.S. and our important ally Japan.

FOURTH U.S. POW DELEGATION TO JAPAN, OCTOBER 13-21, 2013

Phillip W. Coon, 94, is a full blood Muscogee Creek who grew up in Oklahoma. After graduating from the Haskell Institute (today's Haskell Indian Nations University) in Lawrence, Kansas, he enlisted in the U.S. Army on September 29, 1941. He was assigned to the 31st Infantry Regiment and sent immediately to the Philippines Islands aboard the USAT *Willard A. Holbrook* arriving on October 23, 1941. At Fort McKinley he trained as a .30 caliber machine gunner (M1919 Browning). He fought on Bataan Peninsula against the invading Japanese forces and was surrendered on April 9. Forced on the infamous 65-mile Bataan Death March, he was subjected to capricious cruelty and abuse, denied water, food, rest and protection from the sun. Nearly all on the March had surrendered sick and

malnourished causing thousands to die before they reached their destination of Camp O'Donnell. Coon credits his survival to God, or as he said, "We ran out of food, ammunition and men, but we didn't run out of prayer." His first POW Camp was Camp O'Donnell where he worked burial detail. For the next two years, he was held at Cabanatuan, Camp Lipa-Batangas, Camp Murphy-Rizal, and Bilibid. On October 1, 1944, he was shipped via Hong Kong on the Hellship *Hokusen Maru* to Taiwan where he was held briefly at the Inrin Temporary POW Camp. From Taiwan he was sent to Moji, Japan, via the Hellship *Melbourne Maru* arriving January 23, 1945. He was then shipped north to Sendai and became a slave laborer mining cooper for Fujita Gumi Kosaka Kozan (today's Dowa Holdings Co. Ltd.) at the Sendai-#8B Kosaka POW Camp. After his liberation in September 1945, he returned to the U.S. and was discharged from service as a Corporal on June 24, 1946. He returned home to work as Union Painter doing high-scaffold work. Helen, his wife of 67 years, died this spring. Mr. Coon lives with his son, Michael, a Vietnam vet who works with DAV Creek County Chapter #9 as a Service Officer helping veterans with their disability claims. Six members of the Muscogee Creek Nation became prisoners of Japan on the Philippines: five from Corregidor and Mr. Coon who was on Bataan. POW#Unknown

Lora Cummins, 87, is the widow of Ferron E. Cummins (1917–1990). She lives in San Antonio, Texas. Mr. Cummins grew up in New Mexico where he graduated in 1938 from Tyler Commercial College in Texas and went to work as a bookkeeper for the First National Bank in Hagerman, New Mexico (today's First American Bank). In November 1940, he enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Corps and had his Basic Training at Brooks and Kelly Fields near San Antonio, Texas. He was assigned to the V Interceptor Command, 24th Pursuit Group, 34th Pursuit Squadron at Hamilton Field, California. In November 1941, Cummins was transferred to the Philippine Islands aboard the USS *Coolidge*. He arrived on November 20 and was assigned to Nichols Field. When the Japanese invaded the Philippines on December 8, he was sent to Agaloma Point, Bataan to fight with the 71st Infantry joining men from all branches of the Armed Services. He was surrendered on April 9, 1942 and forced on the infamous 65-mile Bataan Death March on April 10, 1942 from Mariveles to Camp O'Donnell arriving on April 21, 1942. From Camp O'Donnell, he was moved to Cabanatuan, then Bilibid. At these camps he survived sunstroke, dysentery, malaria, dengue fever, wet and dry beriberi, yellow jaundice, and blindness. In August 1944, he was shipped to Moji, Japan, aboard the Hellship *Noto Maru*. He was taken to Hiroshima and became a slave stevedore for Hitachi Shipyard (today's Hitachi Zosen Corporation) at Mukaishima [Mukaishima] Hiroshima Sub-camp #4. A Japanese elementary school in Mukaishima today honors the memory of the men of this camp. On August 6, 1945, he felt the air warm and watched a three-mile high mushroom cloud rise above Hiroshima from the atomic bomb. He was officially liberated September 14, 1945. He returned to Lake Arthur, New Mexico where he remained in the

Air Force and married the girl down the street, Lora Mae Lane. Upon retirement, he owned a laundry and vending machine business. In 1967, the family moved to San Antonio, Texas where he worked for SEARS. He and Lora had one child, Glenda, and were married 43 years. Lora was a civilian employee of the Air Force. He passed away on March 26, 1990 of a heart attack just days after returning from his second trip to the Philippines with his wife, daughter, son-in-law, and grandson, Ferron. Mr. Cummins is buried at Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery in San Antonio, Texas. POW# 115

Robert B. Heer, 92, lives in Sequim, Washington. He grew up in Iowa and joined the U.S. Army Air Corps in June 1940 becoming a carpenter with the 30th Bombardment Squadron, 19th Bomb Group (Heavy), V Bomber Command stationed at March Field, California. He was stationed at Kirtland Field in Albuquerque, New Mexico, before being ordered to the Philippine Islands in October 1941. He arrived on October 23, 1941 aboard USAT *Willard A. Holbrook* and was sent to Clark Field. On December 29, 1941, the 30th Bombardment Squadron was evacuated to Mindanao and he was sent to the Del Monte Airfield. He was surrendered on May 10 and sent to Camp Casisang, about five kilometers southwest of Malaybalay, Mindanao. On September 6, 1942, the Generals and Colonels were removed from Camp Casisang and sent to Formosa (Taiwan). Heer served as an orderly to Brig. General Joseph P. Vachon, the former C.O. of the Philippine Army's 101st Division on Mindanao, with whom Bob Heer was sent to Karenko POW Camp via the freighter *Suzuya Maru*. At Karenko he wrote a message to his family that the Japanese broadcast to the U.S. over shortwave radio. In May 1943, he was shipped to Heito POW Camp to clear and work in sugar cane fields. He remained there nearly a year before being moved to Taihoku POW Camp #6 where he slaved at building a memorial park for Japanese soldiers and a man-made lake for the irrigation of rice fields. In early 1945, he was shipped to Japan, first to the port of Moji on Kyushu and then north to Hokkaido. There he was first a slave stevedore for the Hakodate Port Transportation Company at Hakodate 2-D POW. In late May 1945, he was moved north to become a slave laborer mining coal for Sumitomo Mining (today's Sumitomo Metal Mining Co. Ltd.) at Hakodate #2 Akihiro POW Camp. He was liberated in early September 1945, when American Army records clerks arrived and told them the war was over. After liberation, Heer remembers eating well and gaining 40 pounds in Japan, making friends with post-war civilians there. "I was giving food to the Japanese," he said, even eating dinner with one family who invited him in after he gave them matches and soap, which was in short supply. On April 20, 1946, Heer was honorably discharged from the Air Corps at Camp Beale (Beale A.F.B.) in California. He used the GI Bill to earn a degree in photography from the Fred Archer School of Photography in Los Angeles, California. Missing friends and the military life, he returned to active duty with the Air Force in 1950, retiring in 1966 as a Technical Sergeant. In retirement he has worked as an amateur historian of

American POWs of Japan and embarked on a "third career" as a house husband. He has been married to Karen Harper since 1989, and has four children from two previous marriages. POW# 330

Esther Jennings, 90, is the widow of Clinton S. Jennings (1919–2004). She lives in San Francisco, California. Mr. Jennings, a California native, served in the Civilian Conservation Corps before enlisting in the U.S. Army in 1941. He was sent to the Philippine Islands the same year aboard the USS *Republic* (AP-33). He was stationed on Corregidor to join Battery "K" 59th Coast Artillery Regiment where he helped man fixed 60" and 30" mobile seacoast searchlights. Surrendered on May 6, 1942, he was sent to a series of POW camps on the Philippines: Bongabong, Cabanatuan, Lipa-Batangas, and Bilibid. In July 1944, he was herded along with 1,600 other American POWs aboard the Hellship *Nissyo Marti* to be shipped to Japan. The nightmarish two-week voyage to Moji, Japan included an attack by an American submarine wolfpack on the unmarked transport. Jennings was first held in Fukuoka-23-Keisen as slave laborer mining coal for Meiji Mining [Meiji Kogyo] Hirayama Mine (The company was dissolved in 1969, but its exploration and research division became independent as Meiji Consultant Co., Ltd. in 1965, and still exists). He was then transferred to Fukuoka #9B, located near the town of Miyata (now the city of Miyawaka), again to be a slave laborer mining coal, but for Kaijima Coal Mining Onoura Mine (the company no longer exists). After the war, he spent 25 years in the Army working in finance. He retired in 1965 and worked in public finance at the Bank of America retiring again in 1985. Jennings was a dedicated volunteer: he spent 27 years at KQED; 24 years at the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco; and 20 years for the San Francisco Opera Guild where he enjoyed being a supernumerary. He was a member of American Defenders of Bataan & Corregidor; American Ex-Prisoners of War; Philippine Scouts Heritage Society; American Legion; San Francisco History Association; VFW; Military Order of the Purple Heart; Past President of Golden Gate Chapter #18 of National Sojourners; Native Sons of the Golden West; Guadalupe Parlor; The Great War Society; Past Master of Masonic Lodge San Francisco #120; Scottish Rite, Shriner; President of the National Assn. of Civilian Conservation Corps Alumni; The Retired Officers Association and the Reserve Officers Association. He was married to Esther Bloom for 34 years and had three children from a prior marriage. He succumbed to cancer on October 28, 2004. Mr. Jennings is buried at Hills of Eternity, Colma, California. POW# Unknown

Erwin R. Johnson, 91, divides his time between Wynantskill, New York, outside of Albany and Lacombe, Louisiana. He grew up in New Orleans, Louisiana, and enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Corps in September 1940. He was assigned to the 48th Materiel Squadron, 27th Bombardment Group (Light), V Bomber Command where he was trained as a mechanic for A-20 fighter planes. He was transferred to the Philippine Islands aboard the USS *President Coolidge* in November 1941, arriving on November 20th and was deployed

to Fort McKinley south of Manila. When Japanese forces attacked the Philippine Islands in December 1941, though not trained as an infantryman, Johnson was issued a rifle and ordered to defend against the Japanese advance. He and all American and Filipino troops on the Bataan Peninsula were surrendered on April 9, 1942. Immediately, he was forced on the infamous 65-mile Bataan Death March to Camp O'Donnell. He recalls many horrific events during the march; maybe the worst was a Japanese guard bayoneting to death a Filipino mother and her baby for trying to pass food to the starving, sick POWs. At Camp O'Donnell he volunteered for work duty building bridges and other projects. Later that year, he was transferred to Cabanatuan where he volunteered for work details outside of the Camp. He was among 500 other American POWs shipped from the tropical Philippines to the freezing Mukden, China (today's Shenyang) in October 1942 aboard Mitsubishi's Hellship *Tottori Maru* via Formosa and Korea to Manchukuo (Manchuria). None of the men had winter clothing. Johnson was housed at the Hoten POW Camp and became a slave laborer at MKK (Manshu Kosaku Kikai or Manchouko Kibitsu Kaishi, which some researchers believe was owned by Mitsubishi and known as Manchuria Mitsubishi Machine Tool Company, Ltd.). The camp was liberated in August 1945 by Russian and OSS forces. Discharged in June 1946, he used the GI bill to obtain a mechanical engineering degree from Tulane University. He worked for a number of technology manufacturing companies in Southern California including North American Aviation (today's Boeing) and eventually returned to Louisiana, retiring from the Port of New Orleans in 1993. In retirement, he and his wife Margaret traveled throughout the United States and were active in a number of veterans and POW organizations. Margaret, his wife of 53 years, passed away in 2010. Together they raised five boys. In 2011, he married Ann Wilbur Lampins whose brother, Staff Sgt Charles S. Wilbur, was also a member of the U.S. Army Air Corps. He was with the 28th Materiel Squadron, 20th Air Base Group, Far East Air Force in the Philippines. He too became a prisoner of Imperial Japan and was also shipped to Mukden. He died of pneumonia soon after arrival on December 28, 1942. The Johnsons are active members of the Mukden POW Survivors group and other veterans' organizations. POW # 277

Marjean McGrew, 87, is the widow of Alfred Curtis McGrew (1922–2008). She lives in San Diego, California. Mr. McGrew grew up in Columbus, Ohio. After high school and briefly working with the Civilian Conservation Corps, he enlisted in the U.S. Army at Fort Hayes. In January 1941, his unit sailed to the Philippine Islands aboard the USS *Republic* (AP–33). He took Basic Training at the 92nd Garage on Corregidor and was assigned to Battery "D" (Denver) 60th Coast Artillery (A.A.). He was transferred to Battery "H" (Hartford) 60th, Coast Artillery (A.A.) at Herring Field, Middleside and was taken prisoner there on

May 6, 1942, with the surrender of Corregidor and the Philippines. He was held in the following POW camps: 92nd Garage, Bilibid, Cabanatuan 2 and 1; Camp O'Donnell, Nichols Field. In August 1944, he was shipped to Moji, Japan aboard the Hellship *Noto Maru*. In Japan, McGrew became a slave stevedore for Nippon Express (still in operation) at Omori Tokyo Base Camp; then a slave stevedore for Nisshin Flour Milling Dispatched Camp (Tokyo 24–D) (today's Nisshin Seifun Group); and finally at Suwa Branch Camp (Tokyo 6–B) he was a slave laborer for Nippon Steel Tube & Mining Company (today's JFE Holdings). He was liberated in Yokohama on September 6, 1945. He later became an Honorary Member and friend of the U.S. Army 503rd Parachute Regiment Combat Team (RCT) who liberated Corregidor from the Japanese in 1945, and the 4th Marine Regiment who had defended it. After returning to Columbus, he met and married Marjean Herres of Bellefontaine, Ohio (the love of his life for 59 years). They moved to San Diego to be nearer the ocean and raise their two children, Vicki and Steve. He retired from Control Data Corporation after 27 years when the manufacturing division left San Diego.

In retirement, McGrew traveled back to Corregidor many times to collect photos, documents, and data from those who served on Corregidor. During his many trips back, he sat in the ruins of Corregidor thinking of the great times and the bad times as well as the many young friends he lost. As a long-time amateur historian, he assisted many families and friends in their search for information on their loved ones serving and/or captured on Corregidor. McGrew's approach to life was to use humor as a base for survival and survive he did several times in his life. For fun, he enjoyed scuba diving, golfing, table tennis, camping, and traveling with his wife around the U.S. in their R.V. Mrs. McGrew was a nurse and an avid folk dancer. He succumbed to cancer on January 27, 2008, surrounded by his loving children and his wife. Mr. McGrew is buried at Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery, Point Loma, California. POW# Unknown

Marvin A. Roslansky, 91, lives with his wife Josephine in Mesa, Arizona. Mr. Roslansky grew up in Minnesota and enlisted in the Marine Corps in the spring of 1941. He was sent to Guam in September 1941. He was one of 153 Marines assigned to defend Guam, a U.S. territory administered by the U.S. Navy in the Pacific. As a member of the Insular Patrol Unit, he fought in the brief defense of the island (December 8–9, 1941) and was captured by invading Japanese forces. On January 10, 1942, the American prisoners of the Guam garrison including five nurses and a civilian mother and child were shipped to prison camps in Japan aboard the MS *Argentina Maru*, what was Mitsui's OSK Line's fastest ship. Arriving in Japan on January 16, 1942, he was taken to Shikoku and imprisoned at the Zentsuji POW Camp (Zentsuji was originally built to house German prisoners of the Japanese in World War I). The camp was on

an island about 400 miles west of Tokyo. He spent the rest of the war there as a slave stevedore for Nippon Express (still in operation) working 12-hour days at the Sakaide Rail Yards and the Port of Takamatsu. He was liberated September 27, 1945. After the war, he lived in Racine, Wisconsin where he owned an auto parts business. Retired in 1981, he volunteered at the Clement J. Zablocki VA Medical Center in Milwaukee as well as doing veterans service work for the DAV, the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, and the Milwaukee Barb Wire, East Valley, and Prairieland Minnesota Chapters of AXPOW. With his first wife, Iva, he raised four daughters and three sons. He married Josephine Plourde in 2010. POW# Unknown

CONGRATULATING THE MINNESOTA LYNX

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Minnesota Lynx for winning their second WNBA title in three years.

The Lynx entered the playoffs with the WNBA's best record, 26–8, and a starting lineup that boasted four all-stars and three gold medalists. They were undefeated through all seven post-season games, sweeping the Seattle Storm, Phoenix Mercury and the Atlanta Dream, to win their second title.

The Lynx's starting lineup, Seimone Augustus, Maya Moore, Lindsay Whalen, Rebekkah Brunson, and Janel McCarville, was unstoppable. Their balanced attack was a demonstration of smart and selfless teamwork as crisp passes found the open teammate. In the final game versus the Dream, all five starters scored in the double digits.

Finals MVP Maya Moore led the league in post-season points per game. Seimone Augustus put on a show of defensive and offensive prowess, guarding some of the best in the league and still averaging 17 points per game. Lindsay Whalen organized her team's potent offensive attack and Rebekkah Brunson, now all-time WNBA leader in rebounds, was tremendous on both sides of the court. Janel McCarville's defense was outstanding and her through-the-legs pass to Brunson was one of the series' great moments. That excellence extended to the players coming off the bench, especially Monica Wright who scored 20 points and had five rebounds, three assists and three steals in game one against the Dream.

Lynx Coach Cheryl Reeve asked that the talk of repeat championships wait until January. Due respect to Coach Reeve, I look forward to watching the Lynx take the court to defend their title next year.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, October 16, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARPER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 16, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GREGG HARPER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

TIME TO DEAL WITH BUDGET MATTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, now, after 16 days, one remembers the gleeful Republicans pouring out of the House Chamber on the early morning of October 1 so excited that they got the shutdown, the tool they would use to end the Affordable Care Act. Well, it has now collapsed in disarray on the eve of a far more serious deadline: flirting with the default on our national debt.

I am embarrassed for my Republican colleagues who cannot figure out what they want as they tie themselves into knots, refusing to put a simple, clean continuing resolution on the floor that would end this madness, I guess because they fear all the Democrats and many Republicans would approve it, ending this sad chapter.

It is fascinating what a destructive minority and rudderless Republican House leadership can do, inflicting damage in so many ways. This all would have been unimaginable in nor-

mal times. I tried to explain it on the air yesterday to a BBC reporter. I felt foolish and embarrassed. It is inexplicable.

It is time to stop negotiating the terms of the release of the American people and their economy. There is a simple answer, and it is not necessarily calling the Republican bluff on the shutdown and debt ceiling. The answer is to encourage the Republicans to try and pass their own spending bills. Don't insulate them any longer from the specifics.

With the Ryan budget, Republicans are on a glide path to 1962 spending levels; but for an America half a century later, with 150 million more people and three times the number of senior citizens, the math doesn't work for most of us, and it appears that it doesn't work for the Republicans either. Why else would they have stopped the consideration of their own spending bills not even halfway through the process? Remember, we still have pending the Transportation-HUD spending bill that was abruptly halted more than 2 months ago, last summer. It is still pending. It could be brought to the floor at any time.

Let us stop tolerating wildly unrealistic political antics, and dive into budget mechanics. Let them try and pass the Interior spending bill, which they were afraid to even take to the full committee, let alone pass the Health and Human Services bill. Let us get into specifics and stop the hostage-taking. No one should be allowed to weaponize the process of governance, especially people unwilling or unable to do their own job.

The President should use his bully pulpit to spotlight their refusal to act and his alternatives. By all means, let us look at the looming Social Security cut that is going to occur 20 years from now. How much do we want to cut of future benefits for people who are increasingly struggling in retirement and who already get less than most other rich countries?

Let us deal with the long-term costs of our military, with hugely expensive, outdated, unnecessary surplus nuclear weapons. Let us help the military deal with health and pension costs that greatly concern the military leadership because they know they are not sustainable.

My Republican colleagues cannot have it both ways: attacking the President for including the chained CPI in his own budget proposal as an assault on senior citizens, as alleged by my

friend and colleague GREG WALDEN, the head of the Republican Campaign Committee in the House, when that is actually what many of my Republican friends want; attacking the President and Democrats for having obtained \$700 billion in Medicare savings without cutting payments to seniors and then making that into a campaign issue in 2012, and then claiming the President and Democrats don't want to deal with entitlements. How hypocritical.

Let us stop the hostage-taking and deal with specifics. We can resolve these matters in, actually, a matter of months if the American public and the Congress are forced to confront the realities of fantasy budgets and political slogans. The American people deserve better. Now it is time to give that to them.

REPUBLICAN SHUTDOWN HAS BEEN A DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican government shutdown has been a disaster. A lot of people all across this country have been hurt. Hopefully, the press reports that I am reading this morning are true and that, by the end of the day, this House of Representatives will support a Senate compromise that will reopen our government and will avoid our defaulting on our debt. So, I hope that in a bipartisan way, before this day is out, we can come together and do that.

This shutdown and this threat of default has made this Chamber look ridiculous. People of every political persuasion are disappointed in the behavior, especially of some elements of this House that have driven us to this shutdown and threatened a default of our Nation for the first time in history.

END HUNGER NOW

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a few minutes here to speak about another aspect of this shutdown and, indeed, some of the policies that we have approved of here in this House of Representatives, policies that have adversely impacted most, especially the poor and the hungry and the vulnerable.

We have 50 million people in the United States of America who are hungry; 17 million are children. This shutdown and this sequester and the farm bill that this House of Representatives approved goes after the very programs

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

that provide so many of our needy people in this country food. That is it, nothing else but food.

We have a hunger problem in the United States of America, and we all should be ashamed of that. This shutdown, coupled with the sequester, has threatened programs like WIC—the Women, Infants, and Children program. It has gone after the SNAP program, which used to be known as food stamps, threatening the amount that people get to be able to put food on their tables. It has threatened funding for food banks. We have had food banks all across this country that have shut down because of the sequester and also because of what this shutdown has done.

We are a much better country than that. I know that the majority of people in this Chamber, deep down, care about the most vulnerable, but we haven't acted that way. There is a pattern in this House of Representatives and this Republican-led Congress that has diminished the plight of poor people, that has trivialized the need for people to be able to put food on their tables for their families and for their children.

We passed a farm bill in the Congress here that cuts food stamps by \$40 billion. That would mean 3.8 million people who currently rely on this benefit would be thrown off the program. We would literally be taking food away from families who need it. It would throw hundreds of thousands of children off the free breakfast and lunch program at school. That cut would result in over 170,000 veterans being thrown off that program. Veterans—men and women who have served our country overseas in battle, who are having trouble finding a job, getting stability in their lives, who need this program to be able to put food on their tables for themselves and their families—we are going to throw them off the program. That is just not right. That is just not right.

The farm bill is going to go to conference, and my hope is that we can come to some sort of a bipartisan agreement to reverse kind of the negative aspects of what the House has done. We can do much better. We can do much better. We need to do much better.

Mr. Speaker, it is not fashionable in this House of Representatives to worry about the poor, I guess maybe because they don't have super PACs; they don't donate to our campaigns; they don't have big lobbies here in Washington. But if government stands for anything, we need to stand for those people. Donald Trump doesn't need us, doesn't need government; but some returning veteran who cannot find a job, or some single mother who is trying to raise her kids and doesn't have enough to put food on the table, or some unemployed man who has worked all of his

life and all of a sudden because of this lousy economy has found himself without a job and is trying to support his family, they need us, and we need to be there for them. That should not be a controversial or radical idea; yet, in this House of Representatives, it has been. So, from the shutdown to the sequester to the farm bill, over and over and over again, we have targeted the most vulnerable.

Mr. Speaker, we need to reverse this trend. When this is all over with, I hope we can come together in a bipartisan way and actually talk about hunger; and I hope that the White House will come forward and embrace a White House conference on food and nutrition so we can have some leadership at the national level to come up with a plan to end hunger and to end poverty in this country.

TIME TO END SHUTDOWN AND GO TO WORK ON LONG-TERM PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it is a rather important day today. Sometime today or in the next 24 hours, the United States Treasury will run out of its ability to borrow money, that is, to roll over its debt, to pay all of the obligations that the United States Government has.

I guess, even this morning, we remain the world's biggest economy. We certainly remain the oldest democracy; although, that seems to be somewhat in doubt here on the floor of the House of Representatives where we don't operate as a democracy. We really operate more as a dictatorship, or at least as an oligarchy, in which one or two or a handful of people makes the decision for the majority of the House.

It is a very, very, very important moment that this Nation moves towards, the moment in which it, for the first time in its history, would default on its payments, default on its debt. We have already seen the effects of this. Banks all around the world are selling, that is, getting out of America's short-term obligations or those obligations, bonds, that are due now or in the next week or so. So they are shedding American debt. They are running away from the world's reserve currency.

Why?

Because this House, the House of Representatives, the people's House, is being jerked around, led around by a small contingent of folks who is not thinking clearly, who is not willing to understand the import, the importance, of the soundness of the American dollar, the importance of the full faith and credit of this Nation, of the 200-plus years of history where this House, where this government, where

the people of America have always stood behind its obligations. But that group of individuals who is unwilling to be rational, who is the Tea Party faction of the Republican Party, seems to want to take this Nation into a new era, an era in which the world cannot count on the United States of America.

We are also in the 16th day of the shutdown of the United States Government in which the United States Government is only partially operating; in which the national parks, with the exception of just three, are not open; where the Fish and Wildlife Service's refuges are not available to the public, where much of the government is not operating. We are in the 16th day. Why? Why are we in this situation?

When it started 16 days ago, it was to end the Affordable Health Care Act, and then it was to modify it, and then it was to change it, and then it was to delay it, and now it is not even on the agenda.

So why are we still shut down?

There is no reason that is being presented other than what you might see in a preschool class with some kid who is too tired and is down on the floor, throwing a tantrum, screaming and yelling and trying to stop everything. Kid, get your blanket. Get your bottle and take a nap.

We don't need tantrums around here, but apparently that is the only reason the government continues to be shut down, because some 40 or 50 Members of the Tea Party caucus of the Republican Party are throwing a tantrum, led by Senator CRUZ.

We don't need tantrums; we need cooperation; we need to work together. We have got serious problems. The shutdown has created even more serious problems and, as we run up to the debt crisis, yet one more problem, because 40 or 50 people are throwing a tantrum.

This is the House of Representatives, 435 of us elected to represent the people of America, to do right by them, to do right by this Nation's economy, by the working men and women. Even those who are laid off because of the shutdown want to work.

It is time for us to end this. It is time for us to go to work on the long-term problems.

WHY WE MUST DEFUND OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, when the President and the Democratic-controlled House and Senate forced ObamaCare into law without a single Republican vote, my constituents wrote and called my office, telling me they didn't want a government takeover of health care. They expressed many concerns, including losing a health care plan they liked, higher costs, overbearing regulations that

would prevent businesses and their owners' ability to hire workers, and the government making health care decisions for citizens, just to name a few.

My constituents' concerns proved true. The ObamaCare Web site has been up for 2 weeks or more, and for those who were able to get the Web site to work, the reports have proved disappointing and anything but affordable: rate hikes of 260 percent, \$12,600 deductibles, copays up to 40 percent, and zero competition. Perhaps that is why, according to the Daily Mail, on October 11, in the first week, only 51,000 people completed ObamaCare applications.

My constituents continue to write me about their concerns with this bad law, and today, I would like to read a letter from one of my constituents, Lee Stanley. Mr. Stanley is a small business owner from Atlanta, Texas, who is facing difficult decisions due to ObamaCare. Mr. Stanley wrote to my office as follows:

Dear Congressman Hall, I don't know if you are getting any input from small business owners like us regarding ObamaCare. We are really in a dilemma here at Guard-Line.

We found that there are items that we can manufacture here at the same cost as we currently import from Mexico, China, and Pakistan. We would like to bring these jobs back here, but looming in the background is ObamaCare. We employ 85 people in our Atlanta facility. We compete in a world market with distributors or importers that maybe have 15 to 30 employees, and they fall below the 50 employees and, therefore, do not have to pay the \$2,000 penalty for not providing health insurance.

Our industry business model does not provide for employee benefits as it is mostly a minimum-wage industry with profit margins very low.

The situation we are in is that we would have to pay \$170,000 in penalties under ObamaCare. This is another example of the government picking the winners and the losers, and we begin to show up here totally as the losers. There is no way I can be competitive if I have to raise my prices to cover the \$170,000.

Here are my options:

One, don't pay the penalty;

Two, raise my prices and go out of business—85 people lose their jobs;

Three, lay off 15 to 35 employees to get under 50 in order to not pay the penalty, and move more production out of this country;

Four, reduce 35 jobs to part-time, under 30 hours a week, and move more production out of this country.

As you can see from the above options, there is really not a good one. We are having to run our business in a way that does not make very much business sense as we have to always keep in mind the effects of ObamaCare. We are in a position that we can add more jobs here in the USA, and are being penalized for doing that. This country will never be able to completely recover with restrictions on business like that. I am sure we are not the only employer in this situation. I don't know what we can do except express our concerns to our representatives.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents, I will continue to fight to

defund as much of this bad law as possible. ObamaCare remains widely, completely unpopular across the country for good reason—it is hurting jobs, hurting pocketbooks of already struggling Americans, and preventing people from making their own health care decisions.

The American people deserve better. Responsible health care reform should do better, that offers true health, job, financial, and personal security.

WORK TOGETHER ON BUDGET MATTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 17 days ago, I came to the House floor to talk about how disappointed I was that a topic of such importance, the medical device tax repeal or delay, was being reduced to the level of political squabbling over whether we are going to continue the function of the government, but here we go again. We are here again to vote on that same policy 17 days later, but we have further delved into the realm of pettiness because the Republican leadership continues to insist that our economy's future should be tied to whether Members of Congress, Cabinet members, the President, and our staffs should have the same health care insurance that other Federal employees receive.

I am surprised. Are we really going to keep the United States Government shut down and threaten the full faith and credit of our country based on whether Members of Congress, our staffs, and the President and Cabinet get the same health care that thousands of other Federal employees get? It is bordering on pettiness. It sounds so silly to be able to deal with this.

I was fortunate enough. I worked 23 years at a company at which they not only subsidized my health insurance, but they paid for my family's. Governments all over the country do that. The State of Texas, where I am proud to be from, pays for health insurance for State employees. The City of Houston has a health insurance plan for their employees that they help pay for. Harris County does it. All governments do that. Frankly, I represent a lot of petrochemical refineries and plants. Exxon, Shell, the ones who are serving our area, all of them have "subsidies," as the Republicans call it, for the health care for their employees; and yet, on the floor of the House, we think it is a dirty word.

Our goal with the Affordable Care Act was to have everyone in the country have access to quality health care, not just because you got to work for the government or work for an Exxon or a Shell, which are great companies—everyone. So that was the goal of it. If

you look at the national exchanges, if we ever get the computers fixed, we will see that. People will have the option to be able to have the same options that we have as Members of Congress or as Federal employees or that I had in the private business that I helped manage. That is what we are talking about.

But to put that in a continuing resolution to open up the government and to make it that you have to vote for this or we are not going to pay the TSA, who screens us when we go into the airport—they are working, but they are worried about getting their paychecks; so is the military; so are a lot of folks. But to make that the end-all, the be-all—I can't believe our forefathers and our veterans sacrificed for our country to make sure we have this freedom—to lower it to the level of we are not going to vote for this unless we can take away the President's health care or the Cabinet officials' or the Members of Congress'.

Our constituents expect us to act more responsibly. We should be ashamed of what this House of Representatives has come to over the last number of months, because we need to talk about making sure our country continues to grow. What is so sad is that, last week, some of us were briefed that every week of the government shutdown costs 0.3 percent of our gross domestic product. We want jobs, but here we are, 2 weeks and going on 3 weeks into the shutdown, and we are adding to that unemployment because of what the Federal Government is doing.

Again, we should be embarrassed at what the House of Representatives is doing. Let us pass a continuing resolution. Let us pay our debts that this House of Representatives has voted for. Every appropriations bill, every dime of that \$17 trillion passed this House of Representatives. Why would we not want to pay those debts? That is like my saying in Texas, Oh, I don't want to pay my house note. Well, maybe they will not come after me the first month, but under Texas law, in 90 days, you are going to get your house sold from under you if you don't pay your debts.

The Federal Government at various times has not paid its debts, one by technical glitch in 1979, but the last time we didn't pay our debts was when the British army burned the Treasury. I would hope this stance we have now is not compared to the British army burning our Treasury.

We need to pass a continuing resolution, deal with our budget, and make sure we don't hurt the full faith and credit of our country.

FUNDING FOR IMPACT AID SHOULD NEVER BE THREATENED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent Texas' 25th District, home to Fort Hood, the Army's premier installation to train and deploy heavy forces, and one of the largest military installations in the world and the largest in America.

Fort Hood ranks highest in terms of future capability and can support and sustain more than 50,000 soldiers and their families. The communities surrounding Fort Hood provide outstanding support and resources to these men and women, especially to the school districts, which are responsible for educating the children of our troops and for the education of our kids in the future. For example, 50 percent of all students in Killeen's Independent School District are military kids. That is over 20,000 students, and they are still growing. Nearby, in Copperas Cove Independent School District, well over 8,000 students have a parent in the military.

This is why funding for Impact Aid should never be threatened, not even at a time when Washington is at a stalemate. These students should have access to the best and the brightest educational opportunities our Nation can provide. Our men and women in uniform should not have to worry about their children's education when they are facing potential deployment.

Mr. Speaker, being a part of a military family is not easy. It requires more sacrifice than most of us can fathom. I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers of Congress to make good on our commitment to provide for our military and their families as we move forward.

In God we trust.

MOVING TOWARD A PLACE AMERICA SHOULD NOT BE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we are now on the precipice, moving toward a place that America should not be. I stood on this floor a few days ago and said, Mr. Speaker, we are facing a crisis; and for some, the argument is we haven't seen the market take a fall.

□ 1030

Let me suggest that we, as custodians of this great Nation—Members of the United States Congress—are like parents. Therefore, I ask any parent who is listening how long do they wait before they see a toddler fall, or do they leap toward that toddler so that they know the strength of that parent is always there.

We have an important challenge today. The headline of this newspaper says:

Senate Leaders See Deal on the Horizon.

And so I make a plea today, Mr. Speaker, that our Republicans, how-

ever distracted they may be, join Democrats so that the Senate bill will be on the desk of our President today before midnight. We are parents holding onto America.

I remind my friends of the words of Abraham Lincoln in his first inaugural address:

We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection.

We are close to breaking those bonds of affection because we have thrown the American people into a downward spiral. I hope that Members of Congress will join me on H. Res. 375 in which I have this House go on record to never, ever again tie a nongermane legislative matter into the budgeting process: ObamaCare.

The reasons are many. Oh, there is much talk about the challenges we are having with the technological infrastructure. I met with almost 40 members of navigators in my area. I will tell you, when I left the meeting, they were smiling and they were encouraged; they were ready to move forward. They know there are technological glitches, and we will fix those; but they also know there are stories that are important, such as "ObamaCare Saved My Family from Financial Ruin," by Janine Reid:

House Speaker Boehner and his Tea Party friends shut down the U.S. Government because of people like me. I am the mother of an insurance hog, someone who could have blown through his lifetime limit of health insurance by the time he was 14. My son has managed to survive despite seemingly insurmountable challenges, and he wears his pre-existing condition like a Super Bowl ring. Mason, now 16, was probably born with his brain tumor.

It goes on to talk about, We discovered it 6 years ago through biopsies. Over and over again, he has had any number of surgeries until the point that he reached where he was reaching his lifetime caps. But yet Mason came up toward the Affordable Care Act, which lifted his lifetime caps. He is a young man now who plays basketball and argues with his siblings. ObamaCare saved Mason's life and will allow Mason to go forward.

Join in H. Res. 375, never again to be mired in the opposition of a legislative initiative that can go through regular order to be able to, in essence, stop and shut down the government.

This default, which can occur, which we shouldn't play with, some people are talking about it can be 2 weeks from now or we will pay the bondholders so other folk won't suffer. Watch my words: interest rates and mortgages go up; access to small loans, business loans will not be able to survive, and interest rates on credit cards. Working America will literally crumble before us.

I hope that we will take the words of Chaplain Black, a dear friend of all of ours and mine:

Gracious God, we praise You that although we have merely a feeble hold on You, that You have a mighty grasp on us. Use Your mighty hands to lead our lawmakers to Your desired destination, making them instruments of truth and justice.

Mr. Speaker, there is a rum maker in Pittsburgh who was just getting his business together. After 2 years of work, he had lined up everything. He was ready to produce legally good rum in Pittsburgh, Maggie's Farm Rum. He was shut down because he could not get ATF, Alcohol and Tobacco, to come forward and be able to help him.

Mr. Speaker, the impact is egregious and horrific, and what I would just simply say to you is don't listen to those who are saying it is going to be okay. We have lost \$22 billion already. I am asking—I am pleading—to put the Senate bill on the floor, to waive the rules and vote on this. Put it on the President's desk tonight. Don't let Fitch, S&P and others send us downhill. This is a great country. This is a great Nation, and we deserve to show America that we care for them.

SHUTDOWN AND DEFAULT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, we are now 16 days into a government shutdown and standing on the precipice of defaulting on our debt. Families around the country are worrying if they will be able to pay their water bills, but the Members' gym has stayed open during the government shutdown so my colleagues can live rent free in their offices and use the gym to shower and shave.

One of my colleagues who is using his office as a Holiday Inn has nearly 43,000 households on SNAP in his district. These people don't have the option of curling up in a government building or getting dinner at a congressional reception to cut costs, but my colleague does. The only inconvenience for him is that his office doesn't have a kitchen, so he stocks his office annex with a crock pot, an electric griddle, a microwave, a toaster, and a refrigerator. He told CBS News:

You can put some frozen chicken in with some bouillon, some vegetables. Let it simmer all day, and you are ready to rock and roll.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. economy is not ready to rock and roll as long as Congress refuses to pay the government's bills. American small businesses are not ready to rock and roll when the markets worry that we will default and not pay the bills that we have already incurred. The American people are not ready to rock and roll when they don't know when the government will reopen to provide them with the services that they have already paid for but are not receiving.

The House of Representatives is not a campsite. It is embarrassing that Americans have been kicked out of Yosemite and national parks across the country; yet Members sleep in their offices that taxpayers foot the bill for.

As bad as this government shutdown is, however, the debate over the debt ceiling is taking this dysfunction nuclear. A default would bring on an economic catastrophe that would cost Americans who have been prudent with their money, paying their debts and investing in their 401(k)s, billions of dollars in lost value in their investments, in their homes, in their jobs, and in increased lending rates.

Every American in this country knows that every Member of the House of Representatives makes four times the amount of money than they do. We are paid to come up with solutions for the American people, not to sabotage their 401(k)s.

This is what Warren Buffett said last week about trying to use the debt ceiling as a political ploy:

It should be like nuclear bombs, basically too horrible to use.

In military terms, it is known as MAD, mutually assured destruction. Some on the other side of the aisle seem intent on pushing the button and sending our economy into a nuclear winter. Debt ceiling deniers have now emerged, espousing the belief that the debt ceiling is a figment of our imagination, that it is a part of a liberal agenda to get them to the negotiating table: We are not going to default, there is no default. Or: We shouldn't accept this as the date beyond which we can't go without what they call default. We can go a long time. We can go indefinitely without hitting default, says another.

Mr. Speaker, a reckless faction of your party is not only holding your caucus hostage; it is holding the American people and the global economy hostage. Calling the dealings with this faction as "negotiating" is absurd. The reality is there is no negotiating with this reckless faction, which seems bent on the destruction of the American economy and the full faith and credit of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, these Members who are sleeping in their offices should be thinking of all of the Americans who will be sleeping in the streets if this reckless Republican faction gets its way.

THE EXTEND NOT CUT SNAP BENEFITS ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to rise and address my colleagues.

On November 1, households participating in the Supplemental Nutrition

Assistance Program, popularly referred to as SNAP, will see their monthly benefits sharply reduced. The temporary benefit boost provided for in the 2009 American Reinvestment and Recovery Act is scheduled to expire next month, leaving many Americans unsure of how they will put food on the table. The November 1 cut will exacerbate the problem of hunger in our Nation and make it much harder for millions of Americans—fathers, mothers, children, veterans, and Active Duty military even—to provide for their loved ones.

The benefit increase passed in the depths of the Great Recession has provided Americans, both directly and indirectly, with substantial benefits. Low-income families who face unemployment and underemployment are provided a critical way to bridge the financial barriers they face. Americans who are employed in adequate-paying jobs are able to remain so because of the boost to the economy; \$9 is added to the GDP for every \$5 in SNAP benefits that the program provides. These cuts will come at a moment when Americans are ill prepared to afford them. The loss of SNAP will not just mean empty tables for Thanksgiving for millions. It will mean, as well, a weaker economy, now even as the effects of our prolonged shutdown and debt ceiling brinksmanship are beginning to erode economic progress. This cut in benefits will simply push the American economy into a vicious cycle which we simply cannot afford at this time.

So I am urging my colleagues to avoid exacerbating the effects of this government shutdown and the potential default of government debts, and I am calling on them to support my bill, H.R. 3108, the Extend Not Cut SNAP Benefits Act, which provides for a 1-year extension of the 13 percent benefits increase contained in the ARRA through the 2014 fiscal year.

I am proud to proclaim 43 cosponsors so far.

In 2011, SNAP lifted 4.7 million Americans above the poverty line, including 2.1 million children. Without an extension of the 2009 Recovery Act's temporary boost to SNAP, our economy will be the worse, and our children will face a hunger they do not deserve to confront alone. So I urge my colleagues to continue the support of H.R. 3108 and ensure that Americans are not cut off at the worst possible time.

Rep. Bordallo, Madeleine Z. [GU]—9/18/2013
Rep. Brown, Corrine [FL-5]—9/18/2013
Rep. Capuano, Michael E. [MA-7]—9/27/2013
Rep. Cicilline, David N. [RI-1]—9/20/2013
Rep. Clarke, Yvette D. [NY-9]—9/18/2013
Rep. Clay, Wm. Lacy [MO-1]—9/18/2013
Rep. Cohen, Steve [TN-9]—9/20/2013
Rep. Connolly, Gerald E. [VA-11]—9/18/2013
Rep. Davis, Danny K. [IL-7]—10/3/2013
Rep. Doyle, Michael F. [PA-14]—9/20/2013
Rep. Ellison, Keith [MN-5]—9/18/2013
Rep. Fudge, Marcia L. [OH-11]—9/18/2013

Rep. Green, Al [TX-9]—10/8/2013
Rep. Green, Gene [TX-29]—9/18/2013
Rep. Grijalva, Raúl M. [AZ-3]—9/18/2013
Rep. Honda, Michael M. [CA-17]—9/20/2013
Rep. Huffman, Jared [CA-2]—9/20/2013
Rep. Jackson Lee, Sheila [TX-18]—9/18/2013
Rep. Johnson, Eddie Bernice [TX-30]—9/18/2013
Rep. Langevin, James R. [RI-2]—9/20/2013
Rep. Lee, Barbara [CA-13]—9/17/2013
Rep. Lewis, John [GA-5]—9/18/2013
Rep. McGovern, James P. [MA-2]—9/18/2013
Rep. Moore, Gwen [WI-4]—9/18/2013
Rep. Nadler, Jerrold [NY-1]—9/18/2013
Rep. Norton, Eleanor Holmes [DC]—9/18/2013
Rep. Pingree, Chellie [ME-1]—9/18/2013
Rep. Pocan, Mark [WI-2]—10/8/2013
Rep. Rangel, Charles B. [NY-13]—9/18/2013
Rep. Rush, Bobby L. [IL-1]—9/18/2013
Rep. Schakowsky, Janice D. [IL-9]—9/27/2013
Rep. Serrano, José E. [NY-15]—9/18/2013
Rep. Shea-Porter, Carol [NH-1]—10/3/2013
Rep. Slaughter, Louise McIntosh [NY-25]—9/27/2013
Rep. Smith, Adam [WA-9]—9/20/2013
Rep. Takano, Mark [CA-41]—10/8/2013
Rep. Thompson, Bennie G. [MS-2]—10/8/2013
Rep. Titus, Dina [NV-1]—9/18/2013
Rep. Vargas, Juan [CA-51]—9/18/2013
Rep. Vela, Filemon [TX-34]—10/10/2013
Rep. Waters, Maxine [CA-43]—9/20/2013
Rep. Welch, Peter [VT]—10/4/2013
Rep. Wilson, Frederica S. [FL-24]—10/8/2013

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 43 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Kurt Gerhard, St. Patrick's Episcopal Church, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Sovereign Lord, who binds all people of every nation together as one people, in this era of our country when we are defined by our differences and these differences cause a great chasm, filled with distrust, to exist between Members of this House and between the branches of this Republic, provide the wisdom to approach this session of the 113th United States Congress with a hermeneutic of generosity toward the motives of those with a differing philosophy of government.

Open the hearts of the men and women elected to represent the American people so that fruitful conversations and compromises will allow this august body to serve the common good.

Help us be mindful of our unity, and bless this country and all nations and

people now and forever. This we ask in Your Holy Name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

AMERICA DESERVES A DELAY IN OBAMACARE

(Mr. BROUN of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, America is at a crossroads. We have a decision to make. Do we continue down the path of more government, more spending, more taxes, and more borrowing; or do we stand up and fight for the ideals promoted by those who founded our Nation and drafted our Constitution?

Make no mistake about it, the current government shutdown and the looming debt crisis is the result of this administration and this Senate's refusal to respect and honor the will of the American people. We must stand up for our principles that lead to pros-

perity for all Americans. Less government, less spending, and the simple idea that delaying ObamaCare for 1 year is fair for all Americans and is worth fighting for.

I urge our House leadership and my colleagues to stand strong and to have what many of my Senate colleagues do not: the courage to oppose any deal that does not defund and delay ObamaCare for all Americans now.

DEFAULT WOULD HAVE PROFOUND IMPACT

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, if Congress does not meet its responsibilities, tomorrow the United States Treasury will have \$31 billion in revenues and \$52 billion in obligations. At that point, the United States would default, with a profound impact on the global markets, which are structured on the premise that U.S. Treasury bonds are the safest asset in the world. The stock market will tank, and interest rates will spike.

Earlier this year, House Republicans passed a budget that spent \$800 billion more than it took in. The logical consequence of that is to raise the debt ceiling. For the other side to use America's national credit as leverage is shameful, as shameful as Members protesting the closure of the World War II Memorial when they are the ones who voted to close it.

Austerity and uncertainty kill economic growth. There is not an example in human history where an economy has grown itself out of a recession through austerity. Moving from crisis to crisis, as Congress has done in the last 3 years, has cost the American economy 900,000 jobs.

Enough. Reject austerity. End uncertainty and open the government, and pass a debt limit bill.

OBAMACARE NOT READY FOR PRIME TIME

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last night I hosted a teletown hall with constituents across South Carolina's Second Congressional District. Apart from the vast majority calling for the President and Democrats in the Senate to negotiate with House Republicans to end the shutdown, an overwhelming number of constituents expressed concern about the administration's disastrous ObamaCare roll-out.

During its first week, 9.47 million Americans visited the government Web site, but only 36,000 were able to com-

plete the enrollment due to glitches. Former White House press secretary Robert Gibbs has stated this is "excruciatingly embarrassing for the White House," and he hopes "they fire some people that were in charge of making sure this thing was supposed to work."

Secretary Kathleen Sebelius has failed, spending hundreds of millions of dollars. House Republicans have warned that the unaffordable, unsustainable health care law is not ready. The President, himself, has admitted this by delaying key components. Congress must continue to work to replace it with a plan to preserve the doctor-patient relationship.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

NO MORE DAMAGING TACTICS

(Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has put this country through a spectacle these past few months; and it was a spectacle that was based on the proposition that it was legitimate to actually have a discussion about whether we had to pay our bills.

Mercifully, we are on the threshold of a bipartisan agreement whereby, number one, the Affordable Care Act will be the law of the land, and the debate in the future is not about its repeal; it is about improving it. It is about facing the challenges of implementation. Number two, we are repudiating as legitimate tactics to get your way, by any faction—it could be Democrats in the future—the use of tactics that do damage, threatening to default on our obligations and shutting down the government and inflicting pain on innocent people.

So this struggle has damaged the institution, but the principles that were at stake are now resolved: one, the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land; two, you cannot use the tactic of shutdown or the tactic of default as a way to get your way on your agenda.

EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENT SPENDING

(Mr. FARENTHOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we have a problem in the United States of America; that is, we spend too much. Nobody on my side of the aisle says let's not pay our bills; but we do say, just like every family does when their credit card bill comes and it is a little higher than they expect, well, let's see how we can maybe save some money. Cut up the credit cards and maybe find a way to bring in some more money.

Mr. Speaker, we can bring in more money with economic growth and economic development. Curtailing things that are killing economic development, like the President's health care plan and excessive regulation, must be stopped. We have to stop spending, and we have to increase our revenue by growing our economy.

MERCY FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, over the past 16 days, many of us have risen to this floor and pleaded with our friends on the other side of the aisle and asked for mercy, not mercy for our individual selves as Members of Congress, but mercy for the American people, for the 800,000 over the past 16 days who have lost their jobs in furloughs, for the \$300 million a day that this Nation has lost. This is the very answer to those who are suggesting that we are spending too much money, Mr. Speaker: we have lost money.

But today I come humbly to plead with my friends to do as the Chaplain mentioned this morning, to have a generosity of spirit and recognize that we can come together. Let the voices of common sense recognize that States like Mississippi, Louisiana, Arizona, South Dakota, Missouri, Texas, New Mexico, Montana, Georgia, New York, and Wyoming—States that represent so many—are losing so much because they get the most money from this Nation.

Then let us recognize Juanita Davis with little Tu'Nita, 10 days old, who is fearful that her WIC money, Women, Infant, and Children money, in the State of Texas is running out. I am pleading that we come together with common sense and generosity of spirit and put this bill on the President's desk.

SPINNING GOP WHEEL OF MISFORTUNE

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, once again the GOP has threatened the full faith and credit of the United States. Rejecting all warnings from top economists and business leaders, some of my Republican colleagues have actually claimed that default would be good for our economy; but the truth is, when you spin the GOP wheel of misfortune, everyone loses.

How would a GOP default that deprives seniors of Social Security checks be good for our economy? How would a GOP default that pits foreign investors against America's disabled veterans be good for our country? How

could ruining the U.S. Treasury bond status as the world's safest asset and hiking interest rates on American families be good for our economy? How could stopping payments for the doctors and nurses who care for Medicare beneficiaries be good for our economy?

Mr. Speaker, the answer is that it can't be. The Treasury can't pick and choose which commitments to honor, nor should it have to.

When you spin the GOP wheel of misfortune, there are only losers. Americans are disgusted when reckless games are played with our economic future. Be responsible, finally. Today, vote to reopen the government and prevent a default.

PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE PLAN IS BROKEN

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the President's health care plan is broken. Let me read from some of the letters and communications my office is getting from around my district.

Mike and Pat in Queen Anne's County write:

Mr. Harris, my daughter's health care premium just rose \$648 a year thanks to the Affordable Care Act. Don't you or other Republicans give up the fight.

Cindy from Talbot County writes:

I have just discovered that I can't keep the medical insurance I have had for many years as it no longer exists thanks to ObamaCare. Even though I am 58 years old, I must pay for maternity benefits and pediatric dentistry when I have no child under 19. I get an increased deductible and a premium increase of \$143 a month. What a mess that needs to be fixed and in a hurry.

Finally, Lorraine from Queen Anne's County writes that, in tears, she called our office. She was told by her insurer that her premium was just increased \$256 a month. Her total payment that she and her husband now are going to pay is \$956 a month, and her insurer told her that it went up because of ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, the President's health care plan is broken.

JUST HOURS REMAIN UNTIL NATION DEFAULTS

(Mr. BARBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you on this, the 16th day of the shutdown, with just hours remaining until our Nation defaults. The only way to end this crisis is for Members on both sides of the aisle to come together and take bipartisan action today. We need to do our job, and we must act responsibly. The Senate has a

bipartisan plan, and we should take it up immediately.

At home and across the Nation, the people we represent are facing harsh consequences: from the couple being denied a loan for their first home, to the Head Start kids whose school doors are shut, to the businesses with lost sales because national parks are closed, to the Border Patrol agent who can't pay his mortgage because his full paycheck hasn't come.

Mr. Speaker, we must vote for commonsense solutions. We must end this shutdown. We must restore faith in the United States of America, and we must restore faith in this, the people's House.

□ 1215

OBAMACARE

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we are all getting calls in our offices as to the impact of ObamaCare on average Americans. Here is an example from just this morning:

A female, aged 23, making below the D.C. poverty level per year. She currently pays \$94 a month for her health care insurance. She went on the ObamaCare Web site just to find out that it would cost her \$250 a month, with a \$6,000 deductible.

Folks, the impact of ObamaCare on average Americans is why ObamaCare should be a part of this spending-and-debt debate here in Washington.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a sense of cautious optimism that we are nearing the end of this financial crisis. Our colleagues in the Senate are showing all of us that we can have disagreements on the issues and still work together to find common ground to tackle the challenges facing our Nation.

After so many weeks of this painful and unnecessary Federal Government shutdown, I urge all of my colleagues in the House to come together to support the commonsense, bipartisan Reid-McConnell proposal emerging from the Senate.

The past few weeks have taken away valuable time and attention from the many challenges facing our country. Once we reopen the government and avoid default, I hope that all of us will redirect our energies toward building consensus on solutions for comprehensive immigration reform, rebuilding our roads, bridges and ports, growing our economy, reducing our debt in a responsible way, and, most urgently, promoting job creation.

I hope every Member of this House will commit themselves to getting back to the work we were sent here to do and delivering real results for our constituents.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, it is day 16, and I am cautiously optimistic that the shutdown ends today and that we begin to restore the full faith and credit of our Nation.

Let's get this done. First, let's open the government today. Second, let's pay our bills and make sure that the world knows America always pays its bills. Most importantly, now is the time for us to come together and put a real budget together, a budget that brings Democrats and Republicans together, the best ideas out of both parties, and really begins to deal with the debt. We need a budget that begins to strengthen Social Security and Medicare for today's seniors, but also the next generation of seniors, and a budget that begins to create jobs and restores the middle class in America.

Let's work together as Democrats and Republicans to put the American people first. We now have that opportunity.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the basic concept of fairness.

In July, the Obama administration announced that it would be providing Big Business a 1-year reprieve from having to comply with ObamaCare. The White House indicated that this decision was made to give employers time to adjust to what the Federal Government was about to impose on them: cover your employees with plans that have been blessed by Washington, or be fined.

It was a stunning move, a move some have said was an admission that either ObamaCare wasn't ready for prime time or that it was a political calculation that employers offloading their employees' health insurance would not be rewarded in the 2014 elections. The other possibility is that delaying the employer mandate was simply the fair thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the President that if the delay is good enough for Big Business, wouldn't it also be fair to delay the individual mandate that every American must comply with, or be fined?

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. NOLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, the time is long overdue for us to put an end to this government shutdown and the tremendously harmful effects it has had on the people in our great Nation.

We need to get behind the Senate's reasonable, bipartisan plan that has been put together to open up our government, pay our bills, and put an end to this shutdown.

Failure, by the way, means that 5 million disabled veterans won't receive their benefits in November. Failure means that 10 million Americans won't receive their Social Security checks on October 23, and 26 million more people will not get their Social Security checks on November 1. Failure means \$36,000 in additional interest on an average home loan and an additional \$1,000 on an average student loan. Failure means hundreds of thousands of public employees won't get paid, with the businesses and the jobs and the people they serve being at enormous risk.

Mr. Speaker, the simple truth is that we need to end this government shutdown and stop the harm and damage it is causing.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it appears a negotiated proposal that is bipartisan will come to a vote before this House today to end the government shutdown and avert a debt default. The American people surely are looking for reassurance that their government will offer them the security and dependability that they expect.

Our citizens expect a Nation that is confident and certain, not unsteady and uncertain. With the expectation that this compromise from the Senate will now be brought before the House, the Dow today already is up 200 points. That is what America wants—a growing economy, job creation here at home, a government run efficiently as part of a larger whole in which we all have a stake. As our Nation grows itself out of the deepest recession in modern history, the least any Member can do is do no harm.

A working bipartisan majority here in this House holds the power to govern this Nation. All it needs is the will. Frankly, the world depends on the certainty of the U.S. dollar. Let's get back to regular order. America's challenge is to grow our economy and the jobs that go with it.

Mr. Speaker, let's vote to end the shutdown today, pay our bills, and get America back to work for the American people. It is overtime.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, while I hope today is the last day of the senseless government shutdown, I want to share a part of a letter from one of my constituents, Lindsay Smith, a medical student and 2nd lieutenant in the Air Force's Health Professions Scholarship Program.

She writes:

On October 15, I woke up anxious. I took a shower, ate breakfast, and right before I left for class, I held my breath and checked my bank account—no deposit.

I am not getting paid during this ridiculous government shutdown game of chicken. Today, I got to call my electric and cell phone providers to ask for an extension of my mid-month bills. Ensuring I eat has become the most pressing issue in my life.

I wish more than anything that I could share my story with those Members of Congress who are keeping this stupid shutdown charade going. The Affordable Care Act has passed all three levels of government. That's how democracy works.

Because our elected representatives couldn't think about the big picture and in light of the Republican Party agenda to block anything and everything coming out of the Oval Office, thousands of Federal employees and non-Active Duty military members are having to make the choice between eating and paying bills.

The pettiness is messing up people's lives, the people who support and defend you. You should be endlessly ashamed of yourselves.

Thank you, Lieutenant Smith, for letting us know and for reminding us of the impact of our actions on real lives.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, in New Hampshire and across our country, we continue to see how congressional dysfunction is damaging our economy.

The other day, I had a telephone town hall to talk with my constituents about how to end this gridlock. I spoke with Nelson in Columbia, New Hampshire, a veteran who fought for our freedom in World War II. All he asked is that Republicans and Democrats stop fighting with each other.

If we do not end this shutdown soon, on November 1, veterans like Nelson will not receive over \$6 billion in pension, education, and other benefits they have earned. If we do not act now, we will fail to pay our bills and will default on all of our obligations. This is obviously unacceptable to the American people and to our economy.

Every day this shutdown continues is a day that Congress does not focus on growing the economy, fostering job creation, and expanding opportunity for the middle class.

It is long past time for Republicans and Democrats to come together, and

that is why I am proud to be a founding member of United Solutions, a group of new Members who is working together and will vote today to reopen our government, pay our bills, and move our country forward.

PROTEIN SCIENCES

(Ms. ESTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this shutdown is hurting families and businesses in my district and across the country. It must end.

Protein Sciences in Meriden is a prime example of the many cutting-edge businesses driving economic development in central Connecticut. Their mission is of critical importance to the entire Nation. For the last 30 years, they have been developing and producing lifesaving vaccines to treat and prevent a variety of diseases.

The FDA previously approved Protein Sciences' Flublok vaccine for 18- to 49-year-olds, calling it a "landmark in influenza vaccine history." But with FDA officials and employees now on furlough, Protein Sciences can't get approval for their revolutionary flu vaccine for Americans 50 years and older, increasing the chance that the vaccine won't be available for next year's flu season. The FDA and Protein Sciences can't fulfill their mission of saving lives because of the irresponsible shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, let's come together to end this shutdown today to give businesses in all of our districts certainty and to ensure that businesses like Protein Sciences can get back to their work of keeping our families healthy and of saving lives.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member on the Joint Economic Committee, I would like to call your attention to this recent report. It is subtitled, "Ten Ways the Shutdown is Hurting the Economy."

Its findings are rather sobering.

The report makes it clear that the shutdown acts as a serious drag on our economy. Economists have testified before the committee that 3 or 4 weeks of a shutdown would reduce the country's gross domestic product by 1.4 percentage points. We are now entering the third week.

The shutdown harms not only Federal workers, but also the private sector. If it persists, it will reduce tourism revenue, cause contractors to lay off employees; the housing market will

suffer, and public health services will feel its effects. The shutdown hurts everyone, from vulnerable mothers and children to ranchers, farmers, and agricultural exporters.

We are close to ending this crisis, and as the JEC points out in this report, it could not end faster. It is hurting our economy.

TIME FOR SOLUTIONS

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, \$17 trillion is our national debt. \$800 billion is how much we spend more than we take in. We pay \$280 billion a year just on interest payments on the money that we borrow. Those are the real numbers, and that is why House Republicans have spent much of these past 2 weeks talking about debt, deficits, and Federal spending.

House Republicans know what is driving America's debt. It is our reckless spending by legislators here in Washington. The American people know this, too. A recent Bloomberg poll found that 61 percent of Americans think it is right to include spending cuts with a debt limit increase.

This is not just a Republican problem. Vice President JOE BIDEN, while serving in the Senate, protested against adding to America's debt without "taking positive steps to slow its growth."

Mr. Speaker, that is what this debate has been about, and we will continue to work hard to make that happen.

□ 1230

WE MUST STAY OUR COURSE

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, Day 16 of the shutdown; 1 day to the debt limit deadline. The question is: Are we close to a resolution?

We have to stay the course. On October 5, by a unanimous vote of 407-0 in this House, we passed retroactive pay for all Federal workers. On October 8, by a unanimous vote of 420-0 in this House, we passed pay for the essential workers. The Federal workers will be paid, so the people cannot be forced to suffer anymore. That is just common sense.

Mr. Speaker, we must keep our course on the resolution, on the default. An example in Hawaii: 217,678 seniors and disabled workers rely on Medicare. What would happen to them if a default were to occur?

We must stay our course, Mr. Speaker. We must have a resolution. We must vote for the people of this great Nation.

DAY 16 OF THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, day 16 of the Republican government shutdown: children across the country are being turned away from Head Start educational services; our small businesses are seeing a loss in demand for their services; and local economies are suffering. Americans are finding it harder to finance the purchase of a new home, placing a damper on the housing market, a cornerstone of our national economy. In New York, alone, 50,000 workers are furloughed, holding back on purchases that will help stimulate our local economy.

Now we approach another deadline and the possible default of the Federal debt. Allowing this to happen will be the height of Republican irresponsibility, causing havoc in our capital markets and costing American jobs.

All of this could end today if our colleagues would simply allow a vote. Stop playing political games. We need to reopen the government and pay the bills Congress previously authorized.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have seen enough. The time for talk is over. Let's vote to end this today.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS CENTERED IN COLOMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-66)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia declared in Executive

Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, is to continue in effect beyond October 21, 2013.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on October 21, 1995, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The actions of significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States and to cause an extreme level of violence, corruption, and harm in the United States and abroad. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12978 with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia.

BARACK OBAMA,
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 16, 2013.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2120

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 16, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 16, 2013 at 8:59 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 2775.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 3080, WATER RESOURCES RE- FORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure have until 5 p.m. on Monday,

October 21, 2013, to file a report to accompany H.R. 3080.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDER- ATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2775, NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 2775, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments; that the Senate amendments and the motion be considered as read; that the motion be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Reserving the right to object, Madam Speaker, I wanted to advise my colleagues that we support this request on this side of the aisle.

With that, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the bill, (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments.

The Clerk designated the Senate amendments.

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

The following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise

appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

DIVISION A—CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113-6), except section 735.

(2) The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division B of Public Law 113-6).

(3) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013 (division C of Public Law 113-6).

(4) The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113-6).

(5) The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division E of Public Law 113-6).

(6) The Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6).

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by—

(A) sections 140(b) or 141(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 (Public Law 112-175); or

(B) the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for: (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2013 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2013 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section

101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) January 15, 2014.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2014 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this joint resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2013 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwith-

standing section 10 of Public Law 91-672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Each amount incorporated by reference in this joint resolution that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.

(b) Of the amounts made available by section 101 for "Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses" for the cost associated with continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act, \$273,000,000 is provided to meet the terms of section 251(b)(2)(B)(ii)(III) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, and \$469,639,000 is additional new budget authority specified for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(B) of such Act.

(c) Section 5 of Public Law 113-6 shall apply to amounts designated in subsection (a) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 115. (a) Employees furloughed as a result of any lapse in appropriations which begins on or about October 1, 2013, shall be compensated at their standard rate of compensation, for the period of such lapse in appropriations, as soon as practicable after such lapse in appropriations ends.

(b) For purposes of this section, "employee" means:

- (1) a federal employee;
- (2) an employee of the District of Columbia Courts;
- (3) an employee of the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia; or
- (4) a District of Columbia Government employee.

(c) All obligations incurred in anticipation of the appropriations made and authority granted by this joint resolution for the purposes of maintaining the essential level of activity to protect life and property and bringing about orderly termination of Government functions, and for purposes as otherwise authorized by law, are hereby ratified and approved if otherwise in accord with the provisions of this joint resolution.

SEC. 116. (a) If a State (or another Federal grantee) used State funds (or the grantee's non-Federal funds) to continue carrying out a Federal program or furloughed State employees (or the grantee's employees) whose compensation is advanced or reimbursed in whole or in part by the Federal Government—

(1) such furloughed employees shall be compensated at their standard rate of compensation for such period;

(2) the State (or such other grantee) shall be reimbursed for expenses that would have been paid by the Federal Government during such period had appropriations been available, including the cost of compensating such furloughed employees, together with interest thereon calculated under section 6503(d) of title 31, United States Code; and

(3) the State (or such other grantee) may use funds available to the State (or the grantee) under such Federal program to reimburse such

State (or the grantee), together with interest thereon calculated under section 6503(d) of title 31, United States Code.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "State" and the term "grantee" shall have the meaning as such term is defined under the applicable Federal program under subsection (a). In addition, "to continue carrying out a Federal program" means the continued performance by a State or other Federal grantee, during the period of a lapse in appropriations, of a Federal program that the State or such other grantee had been carrying out prior to the period of the lapse in appropriations.

(c) The authority under this section applies with respect to any period in fiscal year 2014 (not limited to periods beginning or ending after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution) during which there occurs a lapse in appropriations with respect to any department or agency of the Federal Government which, but for such lapse in appropriations, would have paid, or made reimbursement relating to, any of the expenses referred to in this section with respect to the program involved. Payments and reimbursements under this authority shall be made only to the extent and in amounts provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

SEC. 117. Expenditures made pursuant to the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113-39) shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization provided in this joint resolution.

SEC. 118. For the purposes of this joint resolution, the time covered by this joint resolution shall be considered to have begun on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 119. Section 3003 of division G of Public Law 113-6 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting "fiscal year 2014" for "fiscal year 2013" each place it appears.

SEC. 120. Section 408 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736b) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for "December 31, 2012".

SEC. 121. Amounts made available under section 101 for "Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction" may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch schedules for the Joint Polar Satellite System and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite system.

SEC. 122. The authority provided by sections 1205 and 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) shall continue in effect, notwithstanding subsection (h) of section 1206, through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 123. Section 3(a)(6) of Public Law 100-676 is amended by striking both occurrences of "\$775,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof, "\$2,918,000,000".

SEC. 124. Section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for "October 1, 2012".

SEC. 125. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for "The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Salaries and Expenses" at a rate of operations of \$4,820,181,000: Provided, That notwithstanding section 302 of Division C, of Public Law 112-74 as continued by Public Law 113-6, not to exceed \$25,000,000 shall be available for transfer between accounts to maintain minimum operating levels.

SEC. 126. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Defender Services” at a rate for operations of \$1,012,000,000.

SEC. 127. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading “District of Columbia Funds” for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2786 (113th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under “District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses” as included in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request Act of 2013 (D.C. Act 20-127), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 128. Section 302 of the Universal Service Anti-deficiency Temporary Suspension Act is amended by striking “December 31, 2013”, each place it appears and inserting “January 15, 2014”.

SEC. 129. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for the “Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board” at a rate for operations of \$3,100,000.

SEC. 130. For the period covered by this joint resolution, section 550(b) of Public Law 109-295 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “October 4, 2013”.

SEC. 131. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109-295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 132. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 133. (a) Any amounts made available pursuant to section 101 for “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses”, “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology”, “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Air and Marine Operations”, and “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses” shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to respectively—

(1) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the last proviso under the heading “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses” in division D of Public Law 113-6;

(2) sustain border security operations, including sustaining the operation of Tethered Aero-stat Radar Systems;

(3) sustain necessary Air and Marine operations; and

(4) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the sixth proviso under the heading “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses” in division D of Public Law 113-6.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 134. Section 810 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6809) shall be applied by substituting “11 years” for “10 years”.

SEC. 135. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for “Department of the

Interior—Department-wide Programs—Wildland Fire Management”, there is appropriated \$36,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: Provided, That of the funds provided, \$15,000,000 is for burned area rehabilitation: Provided further, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of the Interior notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: Provided further, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 136. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for “Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management”, there is appropriated \$600,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: Provided, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of Agriculture notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: Provided further, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 137. The authority provided by section 347 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105-277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 138. (a) The authority provided by subsection (m)(3) of section 8162 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106-79), as amended, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

(b) For the period covered by this joint resolution, the authority provided by the provisos under the heading “Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—Capital Construction” in division E of Public Law 112-74 shall not be in effect.

SEC. 139. Activities authorized under part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (except for activities authorized in section 403(b)) shall continue through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2013, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 140. Notwithstanding section 101, the matter under the heading “Department of Labor—Mine Safety and Health Administration—Salaries and Expenses” in division F of Public Law 112-74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting “is authorized to collect and retain up to \$2,499,000” for “may retain up to \$1,499,000”.

SEC. 141. The first proviso under the heading “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Low Income Home Energy Assistance” in division F of Public Law 112-74 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting “2014” for “2012”.

SEC. 142. Amounts provided by section 101 for “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance” may be obligated up to a rate for operations necessary to main-

tain program operations at the level provided in fiscal year 2013, as necessary to accommodate increased demand.

SEC. 143. During the period covered by this joint resolution, amounts provided under section 101 for “Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” may be obligated at a rate necessary to assure timely execution of planned advanced research and development contracts pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act, to remain available until expended, for expenses necessary to support advanced research and development pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-7e) and other administrative expenses of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority.

SEC. 144. Subsection (b) of section 163 of Public Law 111-242, as amended, is further amended by striking “2013-2014” and inserting “2015-2016”.

SEC. 145. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, there is appropriated for payment to Bonnie Englehardt Lautenberg, widow of Frank R. Lautenberg, late a Senator from New Jersey, \$174,000.

SEC. 146. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no adjustment shall be made under section 610(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31) (relating to cost of living adjustments for Members of Congress) during fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 147. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration” at a rate for operations of \$2,455,490,000.

SEC. 148. The authority provided by the penultimate proviso under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Rental Assistance Demonstration” in division C of Public Law 112-55 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 149. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Transportation—Federal Aviation Administration—Operations”, at a rate for operations of \$9,248,418,000.

SEC. 150. Section 601(e)(1)(B) of division B of Public Law 110-432 shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) for “4 years after such date”.

SEC. 151. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Maritime Administration—Maritime Security Program”, at a rate for operations of \$186,000,000.

SEC. 152. Section 44302 of title 49, United States Code, is amended in paragraph (f) by deleting “September 30, 2013, and may extend through December 31, 2013” and inserting “the date specified in section 106(3) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014” in lieu thereof.

SEC. 153. Section 44303 of title 49, United States Code, is amended in paragraph (b) by deleting “December 31, 2013” and inserting “the date specified in section 106(3) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014” in lieu thereof.

SEC. 154. Section 44310 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by deleting “December 31, 2013” and inserting “the date specified in section 106(3) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014” in lieu thereof.

SEC. 155. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation may obligate not more than \$450,000,000 of the amounts made available to carry out section 125 of title 23, United States Code, under chapter 9 of title X of division A of the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2; 127 Stat. 34) under the heading “EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM” under the heading “FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS” under the heading “FEDERAL HIGHWAY

ADMINISTRATION” for emergency relief projects in the State of Colorado arising from damage caused by flooding events in that State in calendar year 2013: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 156. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, any reference in this division to “this joint resolution” shall be deemed a reference to “this Act”.

SEC. 157. Fourteen days after the Department of Homeland Security submits a report or expenditure plan required under this division to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Secretary shall submit a copy of that report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

DIVISION B—OTHER MATTERS

VERIFICATION OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME AND OTHER QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE PROVISION OF ACA PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES

SEC. 1001. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) shall ensure that American Health Benefit Exchanges verify that individuals applying for premium tax credits under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and reductions in cost-sharing under section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18071) are eligible for such credits and cost sharing reductions consistent with the requirements of section 1411 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 18081), and, prior to making such credits and reductions available, the Secretary shall certify to the Congress that the Exchanges verify such eligibility consistent with the requirements of such Act.

(b) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—Not later than January 1, 2014, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress that details the procedures employed by American Health Benefit Exchanges to verify eligibility for credits and cost-sharing reductions described in subsection (a).

(c) REPORT BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Not later than July 1, 2014, the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Congress a report regarding the effectiveness of the procedures and safeguards provided under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act for preventing the submission of inaccurate or fraudulent information by applicants for enrollment in a qualified health plan offered through an American Health Benefit Exchange.

DEFAULT PREVENTION

SEC. 1002. (a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Default Prevention Act of 2013”.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 3 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President may submit to Congress a written certification that absent a suspension of the limit under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of the Treasury would be unable to issue debt to meet existing commitments.

(c) SUSPENSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply for the period beginning on the date on which the President submits to Congress a certification under subsection (b) and ending on February 7, 2014.

(2) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS ISSUED DURING SUSPENSION PERIOD.—Effective February 8, 2014, the limitation in section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, as increased by section 3101A of such title and sec-

tion 2 of the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013 (31 U.S.C. 3101 note), is increased to the extent that—

(A) the face amount of obligations issued under chapter 31 of such title and the face amount of obligations whose principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States Government (except guaranteed obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury) outstanding on February 8, 2014, exceeds

(B) the face amount of such obligations outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act. An obligation shall not be taken into account under subparagraph (A) unless the issuance of such obligation was necessary to fund a commitment incurred by the Federal Government that required payment before February 8, 2014.

(d) DISAPPROVAL.—If there is enacted into law within 22 calendar days after Congress receives a written certification by the President under subsection (b) a joint resolution disapproving the President’s exercise of authority to suspend the debt ceiling under subsection (e), effective on the date of enactment of the joint resolution, subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) SUSPENSION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply for the period beginning on the date on which the President submits to Congress a certification under subsection (b) and ending on the date of enactment of the joint resolution pursuant to section 1002(e) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS ISSUED DURING SUSPENSION PERIOD.—Effective on the day after the date of enactment of the joint resolution pursuant to section 1002(e) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014, the limitation in section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, as increased by section 3101A of such title and section 2 of the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013 (31 U.S.C. 3101 note), is increased to the extent that—

“(A) the face amount of obligations issued under chapter 31 of such title and the face amount of obligations whose principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States Government (except guaranteed obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury) outstanding on the day after the date of enactment of the joint resolution pursuant to section 1002(e) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014, exceeds

“(B) the face amount of such obligations outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act. An obligation shall not be taken into account under subparagraph (A) unless the issuance of such obligation was necessary to fund a commitment incurred by the Federal Government that required payment before the day after the date of enactment of the joint resolution pursuant to section 1002(e) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014.”.

(e) DISAPPROVAL PROCESS.—

(1) CONTENTS OF JOINT RESOLUTION.—For the purpose of this subsection, the term “joint resolution” means only a joint resolution—

(A) disapproving the President’s exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit that is introduced within 14 calendar days after the date on which the President submits to Congress the certification under subsection (b);

(B) which does not have a preamble;

(C) the title of which is only as follows: “Joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President’s exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as submitted under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 on _____” (with the blank containing the date of such submission); and

(D) the matter after the resolving clause of which is only as follows: “That Congress disapproves of the President’s exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as exercised pursuant

to the certification under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014.”.

(2) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution is referred shall report it to the House of Representatives without amendment not later than 5 calendar days after the date of introduction of a joint resolution described in paragraph (1). If a committee fails to report the joint resolution within that period, the committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate calendar.

(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After each committee authorized to consider a joint resolution reports it to the House of Representatives or has been discharged from its consideration, it shall be in order, not later than the sixth day after introduction of a joint resolution under paragraph (1), to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House of Representatives. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House of Representatives has disposed of a motion to proceed on a joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(3) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE IN SENATE.—

(A) RECONVENING.—Upon receipt of a certification under subsection (b), if the Senate would otherwise be adjourned, the majority leader of the Senate, after consultation with the minority leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate that, pursuant to this subsection, the Senate shall convene not later than the thirtieth calendar day after receipt of such certification.

(B) PLACEMENT ON CALENDAR.—Upon introduction in the Senate, the joint resolution shall be immediately placed on the calendar.

(C) FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time during the period beginning on the day after the date on which Congress receives a certification under subsection (b) and ending on the 6th day after the date of introduction of a joint resolution under paragraph (1) (even if a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

(ii) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration of the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall

be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(iii) **VOTE ON PASSAGE.**—If the Senate has voted to proceed to a joint resolution, the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall occur immediately following the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

(iv) **RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.**—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution shall be decided without debate.

(4) **AMENDMENT NOT IN ORDER.**—A joint resolution of disapproval considered pursuant to this subsection shall not be subject to amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

(5) **COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If, before passing the joint resolution, one House receives from the other a joint resolution—

(i) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(ii) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House, except that the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

(B) **TREATMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.**—If the Senate fails to introduce or consider a joint resolution under this subsection, the joint resolution of the House of Representatives shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this subsection.

(C) **TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.**—If, following passage of the joint resolution in the Senate, the Senate then receives the companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

(D) **CONSIDERATION AFTER PASSAGE.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If Congress passes a joint resolution, the period beginning on the date the President is presented with the joint resolution and ending on the date the President signs, allows to become law without his signature, or vetoes and returns the joint resolution (but excluding days when either House is not in session) shall be disregarded in computing the calendar day period described in subsection (d).

(ii) **DEBATE ON A VETO MESSAGE.**—Debate on a veto message in the Senate under this subsection shall be 1 hour equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

(6) **RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.**—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

This Act may be cited as the “Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014”.

Amend the title so as to read: “An Act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.”.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

MR. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Rogers of Kentucky moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 2775.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2775.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today to present H.R. 2775. This legislation will raise the Nation's debt ceiling to avoid default, reopen the doors of the Federal Government, and end this unfortunate shutdown.

The legislation before us is Senate amendments to H.R. 2775. The Senate has just passed this bill, and now it is up to the House to send it to the President for his signature. It is the product of a final agreement between Republicans and Democrats to help put us back on stable ground with an open government and without the threat of default as we look to find a long-term comprehensive solution to our multitude of fiscal problems.

First and foremost, it provides critical funding for operating the Federal Government at the current annual rate of \$986 billion through January 15 of next year to end the government shutdown.

The resolution includes a limited number of noncontroversial or technical changes called “anomalies.” Many have already been passed by the House and the Senate. A few are new, such as provisions to ensure the smooth reopening of the government, to provide due compensation for Federal employees and other funding for shutdown costs, to provide funding for the FAA to continue current operations without interruption, and so on. These have been included to prevent irrevocable harm to vital government programs, to continue critical services, and to ensure good governance.

To be clear, Madam Speaker, the CR portion of this resolution is virtually clean and is essentially identical to the legislation I introduced in the House in early September.

Secondly, this legislation will increase the debt limit until February 7 of next year. By extending our borrowing ability, these amendments will avoid the damage a default would cause to our recovering economy, to businesses large and small, and to our people who desperately need a stable economy and continued job growth.

Lastly, the resolution before us will help protect against fraud and abuse by requiring income verifications for individuals seeking subsidies under the ObamaCare act.

Essentially, this bill before us tonight allows us to move on. It deals with the Nation's immediate short-term problem and allows time for Congress to address the broader picture: what the real drivers of our debt are, how we can keep from reaching the debt limit in the future, and how we avoid staggering from fiscal crisis to fiscal crisis.

□ 2130

After 2 long weeks, it is time to end the government shutdown. It is time to take the threat of default off the table. It is time to restore some sanity to this place. To do this, we have all got to give a little.

Clearly no one on either side has received everything they wanted, but I believe that now we all should act for the greater needs of our Nation. If we want to get anywhere, we must be willing to negotiate, and we should be willing to put partisanship aside and govern for the greater good.

The House must realize it is just one-half of one-third of this government and that no laws can be made without the consent of the Senate and the President, just as they can't enact laws without us. We must also acknowledge the profligate spending and borrowing that is driving us into unsustainable debt and hurting this Nation and the people who call it home.

I am optimistic that once this resolution is passed, the House and the Senate will come together in a budget conference to work out our broad fiscal and budgetary challenges.

It is my hope that a common, topline discretionary number for fiscal year 2014 will be established that will allow Congress to enact full-year appropriations bills and avoid shutdowns like this in the future; and it is also my hope that Congress can address head-on the problem of unsustainable growth in our mandatory and entitlement programs and work to reform our overly complicated growth-stifling Tax Code.

The resolution before us will buy us some time to accomplish this must-do list, and it will ensure that our people have access to the critical government

services they rely on in the meantime. We must take actions that will help restore the people's confidence in their elected officials and in the economic future of this Nation. We must.

The sooner we pass this resolution, the sooner we can move on to the many tasks before us that the people have sent us here to work on.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, 15 days after the shutdown began, the House is finally considering a bill to reopen the government and avoid the economic calamity that could have ensued if the United States defaulted on its debt. Frankly, it is disappointing that Republicans have dangerously put our economy and American families at such great risk. 800,000 Federal workers have been furloughed. Families that depend on critical services—from disaster aid to nutrition assistance—have been left in the cold. Billions in economic activity have been lost. Fitch Ratings placed the United States, the United States of America, on “rating watch negative” due to political brinkmanship.

Despite clear opposition from the American people, many Republicans, it is hard to believe, are still poised to oppose this short-term bill tonight to reopen government, pay America's bills, and negotiate a reasonable budget agreement for 2014.

Congress, let's remember, has already enacted \$2.5 trillion in deficit reduction measures since 2010. Looming across-the-board sequester cuts threaten all our priorities, from job creation to Head Start to military readiness and everything in between. For example, if we do not act before January 15, defense spending will be cut by approximately \$20 billion below 2013 levels, and we could jeopardize up to 1.6 million American jobs over the next year.

Madam Speaker, we cannot meet these serious challenges without a spirit of bipartisanship and a commitment to working together in good faith.

I urge the majority to learn the lesson of this irresponsible shutdown: do not allow the fringe in your party, those disconnected from reality whose sole goal is obstruction, to continue to dictate the agenda of this House.

No Member of this esteemed body should ever again threaten the full faith and credit of the United States of America or shut down the government to advance a reckless ideological agenda. I strongly support this bill tonight with hope that my colleagues in the majority will work in a bipartisan way to avoid a repeat of this tragic episode when the funding and debt ceiling and deadlines in this bill are reached in the new year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT),

a very hardworking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight in support of the Senate compromise legislation being considered to end this unnecessary government shutdown and futile exercise in brinkmanship. This legislation reopens the government and prevents a catastrophic default and credit downgrade that would spur another recession.

I am genuinely pleased that the cooler heads have finally prevailed. However, it is very disappointing that we are in this situation, that after more than 2 weeks of a government shutdown and on the eve of a default on our government's obligations, we have finally reached an agreement.

This legislation must be supported, but it should not be celebrated, no high-fives or spiking the football. It is a temporary government funding bill and a short-term debt limit increase. It is not a win for anyone, particularly the institution of Congress or the Presidency, for that matter.

The bill represents the conclusion of a difficult period, from which I hope that many can draw important lessons. I hope that this sad episode will result in a newfound commitment and intensity for the governing majority in Congress to make the difficult decisions that must be made to keep the government functioning while addressing the many problems facing our country, including the budget deficit, the Nation's out-of-control debt, and the many challenges presented by the health care law, or ObamaCare.

For many months and particularly throughout the last 2 weeks, I have worked tirelessly with colleagues from both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers to find an agreement to break the impasse.

I particularly want to thank Representative RON KIND, Senators SUSAN COLLINS and JOE MANCHIN, and the many other Members who participated in the many discussions. I believe these conversations have laid a strong foundation that we can build on to arrive at agreements on many of the major issues that need to be addressed in this country.

I urge my colleagues not only to vote in favor of this legislation tonight but to join with those of us who share an affirmative obligation to govern and who seek bipartisan solutions to the challenges facing our great Nation.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge expedited passage of this legislation. I join with the chairman and the ranking member of my committee, and I agree with every word that has been stated by the majority chairman and the ranking member.

This is critically important. This Monday, I was in a foreign country. I was in the State of Israel. I met with the President and with a whole group of brain researchers from around the world. They had difficulty understanding, given our Nation's leadership on so many critical issues, that we could be in a paralyzed situation.

So I am happy that the Senate has acted in such an overwhelming way on this matter, with some 81 bipartisan votes. And I would urge the House to act—and I know we will—to restore our government, to pay our bills, and to get on with our responsibilities as the most powerful Nation in the world, the wealthiest country in the world. We can pay our bills, and we can conduct the affairs of government in a way that gains us respect around the world rather than befuddlement.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE, a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in support of this bipartisan budget deal. By voting in favor of this bill tonight, we will finally shut down this awful government shutdown.

While I am pleased that common sense and cooler heads have finally prevailed, make no mistake, this unnecessary shutdown has caused real pain for millions of innocent families. Never again should the American people be taken hostage to a political agenda. This is wholly unacceptable, and these tactics must be rejected once and for all.

Now, I hope that tomorrow people can begin to put their lives back together, go back to work, and provide the government services that our veterans and our seniors and our children so deserve.

While I am pleased that this deal will reopen the government and pay our bills, much more work needs to be done. The temporary spending level of \$986 billion keeps sequester level cuts in place that are hurting our economy, children, seniors, workers, and communities across this Nation. So I hope that as we move forward, we will understand that we need to protect vital programs that make for a functioning government so everyone can have the opportunity to climb, strive, and reap the rewards and security of the American Dream.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the former chairman of the Financial Services Committee of the House.

Mr. BACHUS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, for one night, let us talk about what is good for this country and not about the other party because it is going to take both parties to solve our problems.

As chairman emeritus of the Financial Services Committee, I am very aware of the direct connection between a strong dollar and a vibrant economy so necessary to create jobs, and that is what we need for America—jobs.

The U.S. dollar is the reserve currency of the world. Globally, the dollar and U.S. Treasuries are two of the most preferred safe haven investments. Their reserve status has been a benefit and blessing to all of us economically. It has traditionally brought this country good jobs and a higher standard of living.

However, the dollar is under attack today. Out-of-control spending, unless addressed, will become more and more of a threat to a strong dollar and our currency. It will continue to erode our economy and cost jobs.

However, two wrongs don't make a right. A default would further weaken the dollar, destroy jobs, and be a self-inflicted wound I am not willing to deliver. Therefore, I will be voting "yes" on this bipartisan agreement, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member LOWEY for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Senate's bipartisan compromise to end the government shutdown, reopen the government, avert a debt default, and pay our bills to spur economic growth and job creation in this country.

This compromise today is what the American people expect of us. They are tired of the partisan bickering and the economic uncertainty that the deadlock has created. The biggest challenge facing our country is creating growth to help to balance the budget. We can start by coming together on a budget agreement.

So let's restore regular order. Let the Budget Committee go back to work. Let the Ways and Means Committee go back to work. Let the Appropriations Committee go back to work under regular order, not just continuing resolutions. And let us move our bills in regular order and not govern from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis.

I will vote for this this evening. It is the best we could get under the circumstances, but it is far less than we are capable of.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, I will strongly support this bill tonight because it not only opens our government but it enables us to meet our obligations in a proper way.

But if we walk away from this tonight without having learned a lesson, this would have all been a futile exercise. The lesson that we have to learn is that we can become obsessed with one issue and close down a government over one issue.

□ 2145

When a bill becomes a law and gets signed by a President, gets judged on and approved by the Supreme Court, that is the law of the land. We have to abide by that. We should in no way continue to act as if things really didn't happen—only what is happening now happened.

Secondly, we need to understand that there are no winners or losers tonight. The real losers are only the American people, who had to put up with this situation for these past weeks. If we go away tonight not learning that lesson—that we cannot allow that to happen again—it would have been a waste of time.

So I hope that we move ahead on the budget commission, that we move ahead on that conference, and that we move ahead in a joint way, in a two-party system, to work on behalf of the American people.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentlelady.

Madam Speaker, this vote has been portrayed as an opportunity for new spending. The difficulty with that argument is that this is really an argument about paying our bills and for debts incurred.

This vote tonight is a vote about paying for the war in Iraq, which I opposed, but still believe it has to be paid for.

The former majority leader of this House said at a critical moment that having a tax cut in a time of war was patriotic. You know what is patriotic? Paying for those veterans hospitals, whether you were for the war or against the war.

Those wars were put on the credit card. It is our responsibility to pay for them. That is what this debate is about tonight—not the opportunity for new expenditure and not a debate over social program spending in the future. It is simply a vote to pay for bills that have been currently incurred.

To have shut this government down was not only wrongful, but that decent people across this country were hurt by this irresponsible manner of conduct in this House remains reprehensible.

Tonight, we are going to have a chance to vote to reopen this government and repay our bills.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise to support this very needed legislation.

Let me make a point here. There is a very important part of this legislation which sets up the budget commission. I would just like to make an appeal to that commission to not only get to us a good budget by December 15, but take some time to see how we can get some mechanisms in place to prevent us from ever again shutting down the Federal Government.

We take a solemn oath here to defend the Federal Government, to support the Federal Government, to uphold the Federal Government. We must honor that. Maybe we can do mandatory arbitration in its place. But we have got some smart people in this place. We hurt too many people when we shut down the Federal Government.

Hopefully, we can put the MITCH MCCONNELL rule in place. God bless that Senator from Kentucky, and the courage that he had to step forward in a bipartisan way so that we can put that mechanism in place so that we will never again put our good faith and credit at risk in this country.

Finally, let us, Democrats and Republicans, work together, beginning tonight, and pass this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure.

It is a sign that the U.S. Government cannot pay its own bills. It is a sign that we depend on financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our Government's reckless fiscal policy. Money that we have borrowed from the Social Security trust fund, borrowed from China, borrowed from Japan, borrowed from American taxpayers.

The rising debt is a hidden domestic enemy. Robbing our cities and States of critical investments in infrastructure like bridges, ports, and levees; robbing our families and our children of critical investments in education and health care reform; robbing our seniors of retirement and health security they have counted on.

Every dollar we pay in interest is a dollar that is not going to investment in America's priorities.

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices onto the backs of our children and our grandchildren. Americans deserve better.

Driving up our national debt is irresponsible. It's unpatriotic.

These are the words of Senator Barack Obama in 2006 and in 2008.

Madam Speaker, what was irresponsible and unpatriotic is all of a sudden responsible conduct? I think not.

We should be talking about cutting spending before we start raising America's debt ceiling.

And that's just the way it is.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the distinguished leader from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and for her great leadership as our ranking member on the Appropriations Committee. I also thank her for bringing us together this evening.

Madam Speaker, we have been, all along, 200 House Democratic Members strong, in support of the Republican number that we are voting on today.

Tonight, the unnecessary shutdown America has been enduring for 16 days comes to an end. Thank you, Speaker BOEHNER, for finally allowing a majority of House Members to reopen government and avoid a default that would have clearly wreaked havoc on our economic credibility and the stability of our country.

It is equally clear that the shutdown has already shaken some pillars of our economic security and growth. It has jeopardized our credit rating and slowed our GDP growth by 0.6 percent. It has eroded consumer and investor confidence in our economy, while taking \$24 billion out of our economy.

My colleagues, do you think that your recklessness was worth \$24 billion to our economy? This recklessness is a luxury the American people cannot afford.

Tomorrow, we can finally begin what Democrats have been waiting for 7 months to do. Tomorrow, we can go to the negotiating table to debate a budget to create jobs, jobs, jobs—that four-letter word—expand the economy, strengthen the middle class, and reduce the deficit in a meaningful way.

Tomorrow, we must stop governing from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis and start working to find solutions so that we never again see a day when the government has been shut down and the full faith and credit of the United States of America has been called into question.

For that reason, I urge a “yes” vote on this bill, and not just on its merits, because as we know, this number is too low. Even the chairman of the committee has said it is an unrealistic and ill-conceived number and must be brought to an end. This number, if left in effect, would cost us hundreds of thousands of jobs in the months ahead, in the next year. Hundreds of thousands of jobs. Again, a number that is a luxury this country cannot afford.

So if the Republican number is key to reopening the doors of government and restoring confidence in our economy, Democrats are willing to accept this resolution tonight. As I said, not because of its merits. We do so because a vote “yes” on this bill will take us, hopefully, down a path to grow the economy, promote the prosperity of every American who is willing to work hard, play by the rules, and to achieve the American Dream.

So with those qualifications as to what we are voting for tonight, the number doesn't meet the needs of the American people. The length of time that the debt ceiling is extended is not long enough. Apparently, that is the best we can do. I commend Senator REID for working in a bipartisan way to send us this bill tonight so we can bring this sadness to an end, and how it has affected so many people.

I do not come here to pin a rose on this legislation. It does not have that respect. But it does have my support as a means to an end.

With that, I urge a “yes” vote.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, might I inquire of my colleague if she has further speakers and is prepared to yield back?

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, after two weeks of anguish, the American people can finally breathe a sigh of relief. Thanks to bipartisan efforts in the Senate, my Democratic colleagues and I stand ready to support the responsible legislation before us and bring this self-inflicted crisis to an end.

From the efforts of the Minority Leader PELOSI to the work of the minority on the Rules Committee, House Democrats have been committed to finding a responsible resolution to the GOP's crisis.

When it was apparent that Democrats would not be able to stop the House Majority from shutting down the government, the Minority Leader and House Democrats began making extraordinary efforts to achieve a swift and responsible end to the Majority's shameful example of legislative malfeasance.

For example, during Rules Debates on both October 2nd and October 4th, I came to the floor and proposed a way to bring an immediate end to the government shutdown. Each time not a single member of the Majority voted for the proposal. In addition, House Democrats launched a discharge petition to force a vote on the clean Senate Continuing Resolution—an effort that the Majority also refused to support.

Fortunately, House Democrats were not alone in seeking a responsible and bipartisan solution to the crisis. With the proposal being offered today, the leadership in the Senate—both the Majority and the Minority leaders—have demonstrated how to legislate for the American People.

We also owe a debt of gratitude to the talented and intelligent women from both sides of the aisle who have shown us that when the going gets tough, you can always count on women to come together and get to work.

Madam Speaker, we have a lot to do in the days and months ahead. As we speak, there is an outbreak of antibiotic-resistant *Salmonella* that is threatening public health. Unfortunately, this outbreak of antibiotic-resistant bacteria surely won't be the last. There is a bill, H.R. 1150, that deserves an immediate vote in Congress so that we can stop the overuse of antibiotics in agriculture and ad-

dress the growing threat of antibiotic-resistant disease.

Furthermore, there is an urgent need in our country to rebuild our infrastructure, create millions of jobs and fix our schools so that our nation remains a global superpower in the century to come.

We must not fool ourselves. The self-inflicted wound that the GOP inflicted upon this nation has done real damage to millions of Americans and to our role in the world.

Just last night, the Chinese government declared that it was time for the world to “de-Americanise,” and governments around the world have taken note of the shameful display that has occurred in this chamber over the last two weeks.

It is my sincere hope that this has been the last time our economy and our democracy will be subjected to such reckless and irresponsible governing. It is imperative that in the days to come the Majority finally allows bipartisanship and responsible governance to take hold in the House of Representatives. It is time to sit down together and start solving the most urgent issues of our time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, throughout my political career, I have always tried to work with my colleagues—no matter the party—to get things done for my constituents in San Diego.

This week, however, it is hard to point to anything we did to help the American people.

As we move past this episode, commentators will inevitably try to decide who looked strong, and who looked weak, who is up in the polls and who is down, who blinked and who stood firm. But Mr. Speaker we need to move past such talk.

Because make no mistake, there were no winners this week. Only losers.

Thousands of hard working American families who rely on government aid programs, federal employees who were furloughed, and kids just hoping to visit a national park all were hurt this week for no real reason at all.

In fact, in my city of San Diego alone, it is estimated we lost \$7 million a week during the shutdown. \$7 million. Imagine the investments in our schools, roads, and small businesses that we could have made with that money.

Madam Speaker we can't keep hurting ourselves. We have many important things to do to put Americans back to work and strengthen the middle class to be playing these sorts of games.

The American economy is on the road to recovery, but we keep getting in its way, as we barely avert one manmade disaster after another. For once, let's bring stability to the markets, rather than continually manufacturing uncertainty.

In the next few weeks we will have an opportunity to come together and once and for all, put these battles behind us. We understand that agreeing on a budget will not be easy. But that doesn't mean we should stop talking and wait until the last minute to figure out what to do.

Instead, let's start working today on finding a balanced approach to solving our budget problems. We can do this, but only if we stop playing games and get to work as soon as possible.

Madam Speaker, Americans are sick and tired of watching the show we put on this

week, and I am sick and tired of being a part of it. Most of all, I am sick and tired that people here in the Majority think they can routinely use my friends and neighbors back home in San Diego as pawns in some larger political game.

Let's agree to never again embrace such a reckless approach to governing that does nothing but cause needless pain to the American people. Let's agree to never again make up problems, when we have actual ones to solve. Let's agree to discuss our differences rather than resent each other for them.

That's what American democracy is all about, that's what it has always been about.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, today, the House is finally, at the 11th hour, voting to reopen the government and avert a financial disaster by avoiding a default on our debt. The bill keeps the government open until January 15, 2014, and raises the debt ceiling until February 7, 2014. This is a stopgap measure, and my fear is that we will face another manufactured crisis again a few months. We should have never gotten to this point, the majority should have never caved to the vocal minority in the House.

This bill ends an unnecessary, self-induced crisis. It fails to end sequestration's painful cuts in government services. It fails to invest in creating new jobs. It follows costly weeks of government shutdown and unnerving the financial world. It sets up the alarming prospect of new confrontations over the budget and the debt ceiling early next year.

Ever since this phony crisis began, a majority of the Congress—Democrats and Republicans alike—have sought to reopen the government. Yet Republican leaders, out of misguided deference to the reckless ideologues in their ranks, refused to allow a vote on clean legislation to reopen the government.

Today that finally changed. The Speaker allowed the majority of House members to work their will, and as a result, our government has reopened and the U.S. can resume paying her debts, as we have for centuries. My hope is that, in the months ahead, Speaker BOEHNER will follow today's precedent and allow votes on other pressing issues, such as job creation and immigration reform, that Democrats and Republicans can agree on.

The alternative would be to continue to follow the extreme minority who shut down the government for no apparent reason, with no clear idea of what they hoped to win.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, many of us have fond memories of the classic 1950s James Dean movie "Rebel Without a Cause." Who can forget Dean's tragic Jim Stark—who, in rebelling against his parents, the police, and other like-minded "conformists", spends the film putting his friends in harm's way as he tries proving his worth to the town tough guys. Jim gets in a switchblade fight. He nearly drives off a cliff during a game of chicken. In the end, his friend Plato is killed after Jim leads his friends to an abandoned house where they live in their own fantasy world where they don't have to justify themselves to anyone.

As we finally bring to end this reckless government shutdown, I must say that this plot feels eerily familiar. It would seem many in the House of Representatives, in their inchoate re-

bellion, would have rather driven our Nation and the economy off a cliff than sit down and talk like grown-ups. Even former Republican governor Tim Pawlenty recognized this troubling behavior and said that the actions of his fellow Republicans in dealing with the debt ceiling reminded him of a group of rebellious teenagers—out for a night on the town—pulling quote, a "dine-and-dash."

These rebels without a cause paralyzed our government and wreaked havoc on Virginia's economy. It is estimated that the shutdown has cost Virginia's economy more than \$200 million a day. That's \$1 billion a week. I heard from community bankers that could not process loan applications because the IRS was shuttered. The SBA could not issue new loans, choking off small businesses ability to grow and create jobs.

The last time political brinksmanship from the House Majority brought us to the verge of default in August 2011, it resulted in a historic downgrading of the nation's credit and a loss of \$2.4 trillion in household wealth. Many of our region's business leaders and every Chamber of Commerce in Northern Virginia warned of the risks of default and demanded Congress pass a clean CR.

In case anyone still believed these rebels might actually have a cause, one only need review the constantly changing demands they made over the past two weeks. First, they demanded we defund the Affordable Care Act, then delay the Affordable Care Act, then repeal the medical-device tax. Then as a precondition for the Nation paying its bills on time they demanded we build the Keystone Pipeline, expand offshore drilling, repeal Dodd-Frank, enact tort-reform, and repeal the Public Health trust fund.

I am not sure even the House Majority knows why they have spent the past few weeks driving us toward the cliff. I think many of my colleagues have convinced themselves they are Jim Stark—rebels, lashing out, ready to prove the world wrong, and more comfortable holed up in a house living a fantasy where they don't have to play by the rules. There is no doubt that Virginians have grown tired of these reckless antics and these repeated games of chicken. It's a relief that the adults in the room finally stepped in to reopen the government, raise the debt ceiling, and restore sanity. I was pleased to work in a bipartisan fashion with some in the Virginia delegation and other pragmatic Members to get this done.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank you and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for the opportunity to speak in support of the Senate Amendments to H.R. 2775 which:

Reopens the government;

Averts a catastrophic default that would risk the full faith and credit of the United States; and

Clears the way for the House and Senate to appoint conferees to start the budget negotiations that Democrats have called for since April.

The government shutdown has lasted 16 days making the beginning of fiscal year 2014 an extremely difficult time for Federal employees and the people they serve. It has also imposed tremendous hardship on the dedicated employees of the House of Representatives

as well as for each Member of the House of Representatives.

The bipartisan Senate compromise would: Extend the continuing resolution through January 15;

Suspend the debt limit through February 7, with congressional disapproval process;

Require certification by HHS that there is income verification for those applying for premium tax credits under the Affordable Care Act, a provision supported by the administration;

Allow for the appointment of budget conferees, who will report to Congress by December 13.

Madam Speaker, this should not have taken 16 days to accomplish.

Federal workers are our Nation's greatest resource because they provide the know-how and expertise to meet the needs of this great Nation.

Madam Speaker, I consider all of our Federal workers as essential, not just the 1.3 million who are designated as such.

A healthy Federal government does not function as dismembered parts but as a single unit. The plot by the Republican majority to pass funding for only those agencies the public might miss immediately following the self imposed shutdown while leaving others to languish was wrong.

The Congress has learned a very costly lesson for the American Taxpayer. The 16 day shutdown has cost taxpayers \$24 billion dollars.

The 14th Amendment provides that "The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payments of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned."

Some scholars have suggested that this provision empowers a President to take appropriate action to prevent default. I agree with President Obama that this is a question that requires much thought and reflection. The important thing is that we must never ever risk defaulting on the public debt and injury to the full faith and credit of the United States.

There are also the events over the last 16 days that made it clear that we need the Nation's Federal agency workforce:

Foodborne illness outbreak that sickened hundreds in several States not being addressed;

An unexpected blizzard was reported to have killed 5 percent of the cattle in the State of South Dakota;

The nearly dozen transportation accidents that were not investigated.

I urge all members of the Rules Committee to vote in support of this bipartisan effort before us.

Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the Senate Amendments to H.R. 2775 which:

Reopens the government;

Averts a catastrophic default that would risk the full faith and credit of the United States; and

Clears the way for the House and Senate to appoint conferees to start the budget negotiations that Democrats have called for since April.

I would like to thank the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate for their stewardship in crafting a resolution to this crisis.

The Government shutdown has lasted 16 days, making the beginning of fiscal year 2014 an extremely difficult time for Federal employees and the people they serve. It has also imposed tremendous hardship on the dedicated employees of the House of Representatives as well as for each Member of the House of Representatives.

Because of the circumstances that led to the budget impasse, I introduced H. Res. 375, a bill expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should refrain from conditioning the resolution of fiscal and budgetary disputes on the taking of action relating to non-germane legislative matters.

I invite members from both sides of the aisle to become a sponsor of H. Res. 375 as a way to make amends to the American people and assuring through its passage that Congress will not place the Nation in the situation we found ourselves in ever again for the reasons that this budget impasse occurred.

Madam Speaker, this is an extraordinary time to be in America.

We have seen the Legislative and Executive Branches of our government and the constitutional balance that the framers of the Constitution intended regarding matters related to public purse tested.

It is extraordinary when a matter that should be dealt with in the regular order of the business of the House and Senate becomes a matter so grave that a broad and diverse coalition call on Members of this body to do what we were elected to do—manage the business of the people through cooperation and compromise.

I have heard from the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the NAACP, United States Conference of Mayors, the National Education Association and the Coalition on Human Needs, each calling for the passage of the Senate bipartisan budget compromise.

The bipartisan Senate compromise would:

Extend the continuing resolution through January 15;

Suspend the debt limit through February 7, with congressional disapproval process;

Require certification by HHS that there is income verification for those applying for premium tax credits under the Affordable Care Act, a provision supported by the Administration;

The appointment of budget conferees, who will report to Congress by December 13.

Madam Speaker, I would like to request unanimous consent to place into the RECORD an editorial that was published in "The Hill."

Federal workers are our Nation's greatest resource because they provide the know-how and expertise to meet the needs of this great Nation.

The Federal government for many may have been a faceless nameless entity, but these last two weeks have taught us that they are people who have specific skill sets that cannot be replaced or ignored.

Madam Speaker, I consider all of our Federal workers as essential, not just the 1.3 million who are designated as such.

This fact was made apparent by what the American people experienced over the last 16 days the:

National Park Service,
Veterans Affairs,
Department of Defense,
Men and women of the armed services,
CDC,
HHS,
NASA, and

FDA, are only 10 of the hundreds of essential agencies, not including the thousands of essential offices that comprise the Federal government.

A healthy Federal government does not function as dismembered parts but as a single unit. The plot by the Republican majority to pass funding for only those agencies the public might miss immediately following the self-imposed shutdown while leaving others to languish was wrong.

The Congress has learned a very costly lesson for the American taxpayer. The 16 day shutdown has cost taxpayers \$24 billion.

I want the American people to know that I do understand what the cost of that education has been to them both in hard earned dollars that were withheld or forgone due to the cascading economic impact of the shutdown on small and mid-sized businesses as well as the personal costs in worry and frustration at watching the events of the last three weeks unfold.

These costs should not be forgotten, such as the:

Additional pain caused to the grieving families of our Nation's fallen heroes;

Delay in Veterans' benefits and services;

Trips of a lifetime that did not happen;

Wedding plans interrupted or cancelled;

U.S. astronauts on the International Space Station without Houston Mission Control at full staff capacity; and

Hundreds of thousands of Federal workers and their families put out of work, and over a million more working without pay.

There are also the events over the last 16 days that made it clear that we need the Nation's Federal agency workforce:

Foodborne illness outbreak that sickened hundreds in several states not being addressed;

An unexpected blizzard was reported to have killed 5 percent of the cattle in the state of South Dakota;

The nearly dozen transportation accidents that were not investigated.

I urge all Members of the House of Representatives to join me in voting in support of this bipartisan effort before us.

[From The Hill, Sept. 16, 2013]

LET'S UNIFY AROUND COMMONSENSE SOLUTIONS TO REOPEN THE GOVERNMENT AND AVOID DEFAULT

(By Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee)

The objective of the misguided and irresponsible strategy of the Republicans in the House to shut down the government was to kill Obamacare. That strategy failed miserably. But it succeeded spectacularly in inflicting injury on the American people. And the collateral damage of this irresponsible and callous decision mounts every day.

Having shut down the government for more than two weeks, House Republicans, dominated by their extremist Tea Party faction, now seem determined to shut down the American economy by continuing their reckless strategy of proposing at the 11th hour ir-

responsible and unacceptable conditions for raising the debt ceiling and preserving America's hard won and well-earned reputation as the most credit worthy nation in the history of the world.

The credit-worthiness of the United States is the engine pulling the train of the American economy. Inspired by their Tea Party element, House Republicans have hijacked the train and are hurtling it toward the cliff. They are willing to take it over the fiscal cliff and destroy the lives of everyone on board unless the president and the Senate agree to their ransom demand to throw Obamacare from the train.

The behavior of House Republicans is worse than reckless and irresponsible; it is unpatriotic. No one who really loves America would risk the catastrophe that will befall Americans if the United States defaults on its debt. And to risk such a calamity just to prevent 22 million Americans from receiving affordable health care and the peace of mind it brings to them and their families is unconscionable.

House Republicans claim that they only want negotiations with the president and Senate. This is disingenuous. The Senate requested a conference with the House to resolve their budgetary difference six months ago and has renewed that request 19 times. Those repeated requests were repeatedly rejected by the House Republicans, who refused even to appoint conferees to negotiate with the Senate.

The Republican leadership of the House has proven time and again that it is incapable of governing in a responsible manner. Instead of passing legislation to create jobs and completing its work on the appropriations bills needed to fund the government, House Republicans have neglected their duties and wasted time on their futile obsession with defunding, delaying, and impeding the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

Every landmark social insurance program in our history has experienced growing pains and the Affordable Care Act is no exception. Seniors initially were reluctant to enroll in Medicare when it was rolled out in 1965. The same was true ten short years ago with respect to the prescription drug benefit of Medicare Part D.

The proper way to address any problems with the Affordable Care Act is to work together to fix them—to mend the law, not end the law. And it certainly makes no sense to shut down the government and take the economy over the cliff if the unreasonable demand of a minority to repeal the Affordable Care Act is not met.

Not for the first time Democrats and Republicans in the Senate have worked together and reached a compromise agreement to avoid default. Under the terms of this bipartisan agreement, funds will be provided to reopen and operate the federal government until January 15, 2014 and the debt ceiling would be raised to enable the Treasury to pay its bills through February 7, 2014.

Additionally, the agreement provides for the creation of a bicameral select budget committee that is required to meet and report its recommendations by December 13, 2013. Finally, the agreement reaffirms existing legislation strengthening the income verification requirements of the Affordable Care Act and delays the imposition of the reinsurance fee provision.

This is not a perfect agreement but no compromise ever is. Democratic members of Congress prefer a permanent reopening of the government, a much longer extension of

the debt ceiling, and have little enthusiasm for another “super-committee” like the one that failed in 2011 and ushered in the disastrous period of sequestration. Senate Republicans have different preferences. But the important thing is that the parties took a responsible view of the matter and were able to bridge their differences to reach an agreement that reopens and funds the government and avoid an unprecedented and calamitous default on the national debt.

The responsible course for House Republicans to take is to follow the lead of their Senate counterparts and bring the proposal to the floor for a vote without delay. But instead of taking that action and bringing this crisis to an end, House Republicans, egged on by their Tea Party faction and its darling, Senator Ted Cruz, seem intent on sabotaging the carefully crafted Senate plan by attaching to it provisions which eliminate health insurance for lawmakers and government officials and delays for two years the imposition of the medical device tax that offsets the cost of the Affordable Care Act.

These poison pills have previously been considered and rejected by the Senate and the President and have no chance of becoming law. Their only purpose is to needlessly and recklessly bring our nation closer to the brink of default. And to compound the damage resulting from their reckless act, House Republicans also are seeking to add a provision that will prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from taking any “extraordinary measures” necessary to stave off default after the February 7, 2014 extension date. The only plausible inference to be drawn from the insistence on this provision is that its proponents wish to see the worse come to pass. The provision is akin to prohibiting a person whose house is on fire from borrowing her neighbor’s water hose to put it out.

In 1789, Alexander Hamilton, the nation’s first and greatest Treasury Secretary, understood that the path to American prosperity and greatness lay in its creditworthiness which provided the affordable access to capital needed to fund internal improvements and economic growth. The nation’s creditworthiness was one of its most important national assets and according to Hamilton, “the proper funding of the present debt, will render it a national blessing.” But to maintain this blessing, or to “render public credit immortal,” it is necessary that “the creation of debt should always be accompanied with the means of extinguishment.”

In other words, to retain and enjoy the prosperity that flows from good credit, it is necessary for a nation to pay its bills.

That is why the Republican leadership of the House should bring to the floor immediately for a vote the responsible and bipartisan agreement reached by Senate Democrats and Republicans to reopen the government and raise the debt limit.

Nothing else would do more to send the message to the American people that their elected representatives in Congress care more about addressing issues of importance to them than advancing the narrow partisan agenda of Tea Party extremists whose supporters disrespect the nation’s Commander in Chief and proudly display Confederate flags in front of the White House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the motion will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 285, nays 144, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 550]

YEAS—285

Andrews	Doyle	Lee (CA)
Bachus	Duckworth	Levin
Barber	Edwards	Lewis
Barletta	Ellison	Lipinski
Barrow (GA)	Engel	LoBiondo
Bass	Enyart	Loeb
Beatty	Eshoo	Lofgren
Becerra	Esty	Lowenthal
Benishek	Farr	Lowe
Bera (CA)	Fattah	Lujan Grisham
Billirakis	Fitzpatrick	(NM)
Bishop (GA)	Fortenberry	Lujan, Ben Ray
Bishop (NY)	Foster	(NM)
Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	Lynch
Boehner	Frelinghuysen	Maffei
Bonamici	Fudge	Maloney,
Boustany	Gabbard	Carolyn
Brady (PA)	Gallo	Maloney, Sean
Braley (IA)	Garamendi	Matheson
Brooks (IN)	Garcia	Matsui
Brown (FL)	Gardner	McCarthy (CA)
Brownley (CA)	Gerlach	McCollum
Buchanan	Gibson	McDermott
Bustos	Grayson	McGovern
Butterfield	Green, Al	McHenry
Calvert	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Camp	Griffin (AR)	McKeon
Cantor	Grijalva	McKinley
Capito	Grimm	McMorris
Capps	Guthrie	Rodgers
Capuano	Gutiérrez	McNerney
Cárdenas	Hahn	Meehan
Carney	Hanabusa	Meeks
Carson (IN)	Hanna	Meng
Cartwright	Harper	Michaud
Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Miller, Gary
Castro (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Miller, George
Chu	Heck (NV)	Moore
Cicilline	Heck (WA)	Moran
Clarke	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (FL)
Clay	Higgins	Murphy (PA)
Cleaver	Himes	Nadler
Clyburn	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Coble	Holt	Neal
Coffman	Honda	Negrete McLeod
Cohen	Horsford	Nolan
Cole	Hoyer	Nunes
Connolly	Huffman	O'Rourke
Conyers	Israel	Owens
Cook	Issa	Pallone
Cooper	Jackson Lee	Pascarella
Costa	Jeffries	Pastor (AZ)
Cotton	Jenkins	Paulsen
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Cramer	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Crawford	Joyce	Perlmutter
Crenshaw	Kaptur	Peters (CA)
Crowley	Keating	Peters (MI)
Cuellar	Kelly (IL)	Peterson
Cummings	Kelly (PA)	Pingree (ME)
Daines	Kennedy	Pittenger
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Pocan
Davis, Danny	Kilmer	Polis
Davis, Rodney	Kind	Price (NC)
DeFazio	King (NY)	Quigley
DeGette	Kinziger (IL)	Rahall
Delaney	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
DeLauro	Kline	Reichert
DeBene	Kuster	Ribble
Dent	Lance	Richmond
Deutch	Langevin	Rigell
Diaz-Balart	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Rogers (MI)
Doggett	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam	Shuster	Valadao
Roybal-Allard	Simpson	Van Hollen
Ruiz	Sinema	Vargas
Runyan	Sires	Veasey
Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Vela
Ryan (OH)	Smith (NE)	Velázquez
Sánchez, Linda	Smith (NJ)	Visclosky
T.	Smith (WA)	Walz
Sanchez, Loretta	Speier	Wasserman
Sarbanes	Stivers	Schultz
Schakowsky	Swalwell (CA)	Waters
Schiff	Takano	Watt
Schneider	Terry	Waxman
Schock	Thompson (CA)	Webster (FL)
Schrader	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Schwartz	Thompson (PA)	Whitfield
Scott (VA)	Tiberi	Wilson (FL)
Scott, David	Tierney	Wittman
Serrano	Tipton	Wolf
Sewell (AL)	Titus	Womack
Shea-Porter	Tonko	Yarmuth
Sherman	Tsongas	Young (AK)
Shimkus	Upton	Young (IN)

NAYS—144

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Perry
Amash	Graves (MO)	Petri
Amodei	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Bachmann	Hall	Poe (TX)
Barr	Harris	Pompeo
Barton	Hartzler	Posey
Bentivolio	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Radel
Black	Hudson	Reed
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Renacci
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Roby
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Campbell	Jones	Rooney
Carter	Jordan	Ross
Cassidy	King (IA)	Rothfus
Chabot	Kingston	Royce
Chaffetz	Labrador	Ryan (WI)
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Salmon
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Sanford
Conaway	Lankford	Scalise
Culberson	Latta	Schweikert
Denham	Long	Scott, Austin
DeSantis	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Duffy	Lummis	Smith (MO)
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Southerland
Ellmers	Massie	Stewart
Farenthold	McCauley	Stockman
Fincher	McClintock	Stutzman
Fleischmann	Meadows	Thornberry
Fleming	Messer	Turner
Flores	Mica	Wagner
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Fox	Miller (MI)	Walden
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Walorski
Garrett	Mulvaney	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Neugebauer	West
Gingrey (GA)	Noem	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Nugent	Williams
Goodlatte	Nunnelee	Wilson (SC)
Gosar	Olson	Woodall
Gowdy	Palazzo	Yoder
Granger	Pearce	Yoho

NOT VOTING—3

McCarthy (NY) Rush Young (FL)

□ 2218

Mrs. ROBY and Messrs. DESJARLAIS and YOHIO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

□ 2230

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. CON. RES. 8, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 25, as adopted by the House; adopted such concurrent resolution, as amended; insisted on its amendment; and requested a conference with the Senate thereon; and during the remainder of the 113th Congress, it shall not be in order to offer a motion under clause 7(c) of rule XXII with respect to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 8

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 and 2015 through 2023.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Social Security.

Sec. 103. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses.

Sec. 104. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the Senate.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 301. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to replace sequestration.

Sec. 302. Deficit-neutral reserve funds to promote employment and job growth.

Sec. 303. Deficit-neutral reserve funds to assist working families and children.

Sec. 304. Deficit-neutral reserve funds for early childhood education.

Sec. 305. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax relief.

Sec. 306. Reserve fund for tax reform.

Sec. 307. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to invest in clean energy and preserve the environment.

Sec. 308. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for investments in America's infrastructure.

Sec. 309. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's servicemembers and veterans.

Sec. 310. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for higher education.

Sec. 311. Deficit-neutral reserve funds for health care.

Sec. 312. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for investments in our Nation's counties and schools.

Sec. 313. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for a farm bill.

Sec. 314. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for investments in water infrastructure and resources.

Sec. 315. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for pension reform.

Sec. 316. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for housing finance reform.

Sec. 317. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for national security.

Sec. 318. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for overseas contingency operations.

Sec. 319. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for terrorism risk insurance.

Sec. 320. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for postal reform.

Sec. 321. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for Government reform and efficiency.

Sec. 322. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve Federal benefit processing.

Sec. 323. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation to improve voter registration and the voting experience in Federal elections.

Sec. 324. Deficit-reduction reserve fund to promote corporate tax fairness.

Sec. 325. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for improving Federal forest management.

Sec. 326. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for financial transparency.

Sec. 327. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote manufacturing in the United States.

Sec. 328. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for report elimination or modification.

Sec. 329. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the minimum wage.

Sec. 330. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve health outcomes and lower costs for children in Medicaid.

Sec. 331. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve Federal workforce development, job training, and reemployment programs.

Sec. 332. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for repeal of medical device tax.

Sec. 333. Deficit-neutral reserve fund prohibiting Medicare vouchers.

Sec. 334. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for equal pay for equal work.

Sec. 335. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to women's health care.

Sec. 336. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to require State-wide budget neutrality in the calculation of the Medicare hospital wage index floor.

Sec. 337. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the promotion of investment and job growth in United States manufacturing, oil and gas production, and refining sectors.

Sec. 338. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow States to enforce State and local use tax laws.

Sec. 339. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the definition of full-time employee.

Sec. 340. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the labeling of genetically engineered fish.

Sec. 341. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the families of America's servicemembers and veterans.

Sec. 342. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to establishing a biennial budget and appropriations process.

Sec. 343. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the repeal or reduction of the estate tax.

Sec. 344. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for disabled veterans and their survivors.

Sec. 345. Deficit reduction fund for no budget, no OMB pay.

Sec. 346. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating hardrock mining reform.

Sec. 347. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to end "too big to fail" subsidies or funding advantage for wall street mega-banks (over \$500,000,000,000 in total assets).

Sec. 348. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to authorizing children eligible for health care under laws administered by Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain such eligibility until age 26.

Sec. 349. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for State and local law enforcement.

Sec. 350. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to establish a national network for manufacturing innovation.

Sec. 351. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to ensure that any carbon emissions standards must be cost effective, based on the best available science, and benefit low-income and middle class families.

Sec. 352. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to address the eligibility criteria for certain unlawful immigrant individuals with respect to certain health insurance plans.

Sec. 353. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure no financial institution is above the law regardless of size.

Sec. 354. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to helping homeowners and small businesses mitigate against flood loss.

Sec. 355. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to restore family health care flexibility by repealing the health savings account and flexible spending account restrictions in the health care law.

Sec. 356. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for BARDA and the BioShield Special Reserve Fund.

Sec. 357. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for postal reform.

Sec. 358. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to broaden the effects of the sequester, including allowing Members of Congress to donate a portion of their salaries to charity or to the Department of the Treasury during sequestration.

Sec. 359. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure the Bureau of Land Management collaborates with western states to prevent the listing of the sage-grouse.

Sec. 360. Deficit-Reduction Reserve Fund for Eminent Domain Abuse Prevention.

Sec. 361. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for export promotion.

Sec. 362. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the prohibition on funding of the Medium Extended Air Defense System.

Sec. 363. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to increase the capacity of agencies to ensure effective contract management and contract oversight.

Sec. 364. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for investments in air traffic control services.

Sec. 365. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to address prescription drug abuse in the United States.

Sec. 366. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to support rural schools and districts.

Sec. 367. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to strengthen enforcement of free trade agreement provisions relating to textile and apparel articles.

Sec. 368. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to assist low-income seniors.

Sec. 369. Reserve fund to end offshore tax abuses by large corporations.

Sec. 370. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure that domestic energy sources can meet emissions rules.

Sec. 371. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to increasing funding for the inland waterways system.

Sec. 372. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for achieving full auditability of the financial statements of the Department of Defense by 2017.

Sec. 373. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to sanctions with respect to Iran.

Sec. 374. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent restrictions to public access to fishing downstream of dams owned by the Corps of Engineers.

Sec. 375. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to address the disproportionate regulatory burdens on community banks.

Sec. 376. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to authorize provision of per diem payments for provision of services to dependents of homeless veterans under laws administered by Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 377. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to support programs related to the nuclear missions of the Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Sec. 378. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to phase-in any changes to individual or corporate tax systems.

Sec. 379. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to increases in aid for tribal education programs.

Sec. 380. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to expedite exports from the United States.

Sec. 381. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to supporting the reauthorization of the payments in lieu of taxes program at levels roughly equivalent to property tax revenues lost due to the presence of Federal land.

Sec. 382. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure that the United States will not negotiate or support treaties that violate Americans' Second Amendment rights under the Constitution of the United States.

Sec. 383. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to increase funding for Federal investments in biomedical research.

Sec. 384. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to uphold Second Amendment rights and prevent the United States from entering into the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 401. Discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2013 and 2014, program integrity initiatives, and other adjustments.

Sec. 402. Point of order against advance appropriations.

Sec. 403. Adjustments for sequestration or sequestration replacement.

Sec. 404. Senate point of order against provisions of appropriations legislation that constitute changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund.

Sec. 405. Supermajority enforcement.

Sec. 406. Prohibiting the use of guarantee fees as an offset.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

Sec. 411. Oversight of Government performance.

Sec. 412. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.

Sec. 413. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Sec. 414. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.

Sec. 415. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

Sec. 416. Congressional budget office estimates.

TITLE V—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 501. To require transparent reporting on the ongoing costs to taxpayers of Obamacare.

Sec. 502. To require fuller reporting on possible costs to taxpayers of Obamacare.

Sec. 503. To require fuller reporting on possible costs to taxpayers of any budget submitted by the President.

Sec. 504. Sense of Senate on underutilized facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and their potential use.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2023:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,038,311,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$2,290,932,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$2,646,592,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$2,833,891,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,973,673,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,111,061,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,245,117,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,400,144,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,592,212,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,800,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,991,775,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$0,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$20,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$40,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$55,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$70,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$82,110,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$95,881,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$115,534,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$135,203,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$149,801,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$159,630,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$3,054,195,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$2,963,749,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$3,046,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$3,211,506,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$3,386,445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,568,528,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,779,446,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,973,331,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$4,136,110,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,350,282,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,492,138,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,956,295,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$2,997,884,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$3,082,375,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$3,240,376,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$3,382,809,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,542,197,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,749,797,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,926,818,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$4,103,496,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,323,224,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,451,446,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$917,984,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$706,952,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$435,783,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$406,486,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$409,137,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$431,136,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$504,680,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$526,674,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$511,283,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$522,724,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$459,672,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$17,113,638,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$18,008,333,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$18,626,857,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$19,222,298,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$19,871,057,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$20,558,744,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$21,312,959,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$22,094,877,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$22,863,179,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$23,634,787,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$24,364,925,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$12,274,763,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$13,059,985,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$13,588,003,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$14,081,252,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$14,574,683,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$15,081,187,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,669,625,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,297,499,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$16,929,319,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$17,600,005,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$18,229,414,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$669,920,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$731,717,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$766,392,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$812,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$861,554,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$908,130,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$951,691,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$994,855,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$1,038,909,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$1,083,586,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,129,163,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$634,822,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$711,355,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$756,949,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$805,969,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$856,933,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$907,679,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$962,040,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$1,022,374,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$1,086,431,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$1,154,554,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,227,009,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,643,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,658,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,782,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,801,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,966,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,941,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,174,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,144,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,390,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,358,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,617,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,584,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,844,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,810,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,070,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,036,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,301,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,266,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,541,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,505,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,789,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,751,000,000.

SEC. 103. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$255,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$255,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$262,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$262,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$272,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$272,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$284,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$283,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$295,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$294,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$308,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$307,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$319,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$318,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$332,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$331,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$345,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$344,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$357,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$356,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$371,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$370,000,000.

SEC. 104. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
 Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$648,215,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$658,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$560,243,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$599,643,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$567,553,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$575,701,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$575,019,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$575,203,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$582,648,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$573,557,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$590,411,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$574,884,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$598,867,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$587,226,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$607,454,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$595,192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$616,137,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$603,369,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$625,569,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$617,186,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$636,480,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$621,603,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
 Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$58,425,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,716,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,883,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,508,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,367,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,830,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,521,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,580,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,666,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,792,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,831,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,157,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,004,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,707,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,194,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,729,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,898,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,801,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$54,417,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,209,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,664,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$52,212,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,154,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,949,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,426,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,301,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,022,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,019,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,553,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,749,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,229,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,508,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,962,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,264,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,655,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,030,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,408,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,795,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,073,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,590,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,851,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,396,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,643,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,243,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,122,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,465,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,270,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,061,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,078,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,185,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,563,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,822,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,489,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,105,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,622,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,316,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,803,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,538,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,875,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,696,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,862,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,072,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,913,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,150,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,682,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,019,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,121,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,872,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,165,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,055,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,394,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,681,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,245,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,014,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,036,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,112,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,596,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,435,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,174,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,074,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,331,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,862,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,759,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,703,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,373,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,777,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,550,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,136,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,180,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,717,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,283,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,780,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,289,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,613,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,087,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,908,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,301,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,379,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,878,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,588,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,116,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,105,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,626,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,421,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,959,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-30,498,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-24,504,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,201,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,408,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,733,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-2,394,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,112,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-4,110,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,827,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-5,624,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,224,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-3,938,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,885,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-6,483,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,984,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-6,238,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,099,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-981,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,226,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-2,004,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,334,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-3,032,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$100,501,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$93,656,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,556,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$94,621,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,419,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$95,092,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$89,319,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$95,855,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,186,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$96,577,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$91,115,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$96,478,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$91,977,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$97,757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$93,143,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$99,308,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$94,330,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$101,593,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$95,586,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$103,395,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$96,864,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$105,364,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,911,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,409,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,995,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,779,500,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,362,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,033,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,808,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,233,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,360,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,216,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,442,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,660,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,610,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,831,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,212,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,873,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,828,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,154,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,461,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,487,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,098,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,953,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$77,536,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$82,279,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,349,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$86,546,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$89,537,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$96,269,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$106,927,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$98,922,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$117,961,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$111,494,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$123,744,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$122,679,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$119,139,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$117,997,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$120,411,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$119,806,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$122,546,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$121,459,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$124,565,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$123,422,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$126,825,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$125,845,000,000.

(11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$365,206,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$361,960,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$420,326,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$415,573,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$500,356,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$493,639,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$554,680,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$560,173,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$611,908,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$614,248,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$648,773,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$648,945,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$685,879,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$684,985,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$732,529,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$721,193,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$764,934,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$763,469,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$808,026,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$806,172,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$852,829,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$851,028,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$511,692,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$511,240,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$535,596,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$535,067,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$540,503,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$540,205,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$586,873,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$586,662,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$602,495,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$602,085,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$626,619,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$626,319,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$687,071,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$686,851,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$734,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$734,051,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$782,452,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$782,386,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$855,410,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$855,061,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$883,491,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$883,062,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$544,094,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$542,998,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$530,103,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$526,954,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$528,197,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$524,043,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$537,117,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$536,196,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$536,006,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$531,153,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$538,914,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$529,716,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$565,188,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$560,677,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$578,159,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$573,775,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$592,348,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$587,965,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$611,644,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$612,070,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$619,422,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$614,921,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,803,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$52,883,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,506,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,616,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,233,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,308,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,369,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,407,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,691,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,691,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,005,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,005,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,421,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,421,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,954,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,954,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,474,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,474,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$54,235,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,235,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,441,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,441,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$140,646,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$138,860,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$145,488,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$145,254,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$150,218,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$149,672,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$162,493,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$161,876,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$161,405,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$160,549,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$159,902,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$159,031,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$171,529,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$170,622,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,188,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$175,286,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$180,118,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$179,169,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,846,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$190,875,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$188,517,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$187,433,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,094,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,120,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,526,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,476,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,912,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,937,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,665,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,940,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,090,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,751,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,405,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,708,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,959,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,672,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,153,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,840,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,246,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,695,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,066,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,218,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,564,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,263,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,616,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,527,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,258,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,540,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,995,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,616,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,640,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,247,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,497,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,039,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,377,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,724,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,210,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,520,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,089,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,437,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,996,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,353,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,304,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$331,271,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$331,271,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$342,703,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$342,703,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$370,274,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$370,274,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$419,485,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$419,485,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$506,103,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$506,103,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$608,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$608,623,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$683,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$683,623,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$752,067,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$752,067,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$806,870,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$806,870,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$859,077,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$859,077,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$905,971,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$905,971,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$99,868,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,853,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,869,500,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,233,500,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,469,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,941,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$-35,734,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,211,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$-42,592,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-20,253,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$-51,675,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-36,471,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$-61,088,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-48,910,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$-68,207,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-61,194,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$-76,108,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-70,697,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$-84,378,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-80,463,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$-92,680,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-89,556,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$-76,489,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-76,489,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$-75,946,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-75,946,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$-80,864,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-80,864,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$-86,391,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-86,391,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$-90,137,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-90,137,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$-90,503,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-90,503,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$-97,574,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-97,574,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$-98,916,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-98,916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$-103,177,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-103,177,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$-105,117,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-105,117,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$-108,885,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-108,885,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

Not later than October 1, 2013, the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws, bills, or resolutions within its jurisdiction to increase the total level of revenues by \$975,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REPLACE SEQUESTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that amend section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) or section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-240) to repeal or revise the enforcement procedures established under those sections, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. For purposes of determining deficit-neutrality under this section, the Chairman may include the estimated effects of any amendment or amendments to the discretionary spending limits in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)).

SEC. 302. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS TO PROMOTE EMPLOYMENT AND JOB GROWTH.

(a) EMPLOYMENT AND JOB GROWTH.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to employment and job growth, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide assistance to small businesses, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide assistance to the unemployed, or improve the unemployment compensation program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(d) TRADE AND INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to trade, including Trade Adjustment Assistance programs, trade enforcement, (including requiring timely and time-limited investigations into the evasion of antidumping and countervailing duties), or international agreements for economic assistance, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the def-

icit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 303. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS TO ASSIST WORKING FAMILIES AND CHILDREN.

(a) INCOME SUPPORT.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG), the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, child support enforcement programs, or other assistance to working families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) HOUSING ASSISTANCE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to housing assistance, which may include working family rental assistance, or assistance provided through the Housing Trust Fund, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) CHILD WELFARE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to child welfare programs, which may include the Federal foster care payment system, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 304. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.

(a) PRE-KINDERGARTEN.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to a pre-kindergarten program or programs to serve low-income children, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) CHILD CARE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to child care assistance for working families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years

2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) **HOME VISITING.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to a home visiting program or programs serving low-income mothers-to-be and low-income families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 305. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TAX RELIEF.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide tax relief, including extensions of expiring tax relief or refundable tax relief, relief that supports innovation by United States enterprises, relief for low and middle income families or relief that expands the ability of startup companies to benefit from the credit for research and experimentation expenses, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that the provisions in such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 306. RESERVE FUND FOR TAX REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure a sustainable revenue base that leads to a fairer, more progressive, and more efficient tax system than currently exists, and to a more competitive business environment for United States enterprises, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that the provisions in such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 307. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INVEST IN CLEAN ENERGY AND PRESERVE THE ENVIRONMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to—

- (1) the reduction of our Nation's dependence on imported energy and the investment of receipts from domestic energy production;
- (2) energy conservation and renewable energy development, or new or existing approaches to clean energy financing;
- (3) the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program;
- (4) low-income weatherization and energy efficiency retrofit programs;
- (5) Federal programs for land and water conservation and acquisition;
- (6) greenhouse gas emissions levels;
- (7) the preservation, restoration, or protection of the Nation's public lands, oceans, coastal areas, or aquatic ecosystems;

(8) agreements between the United States and jurisdictions of the former Trust Territory;

(9) wildland fire management activities;

(10) the restructure of the nuclear waste program; or

(11) to provide assistance for fishery disasters declared by the Secretary of Commerce during 2012; by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide for Federal investment in the infrastructure of the United States, which may include projects for transportation, housing, energy, water, telecommunications, including promoting investments in broadband infrastructure to expedite deployment of broadband to rural areas, or financing through tax credit bonds, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 309. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to—

- (1) eligibility for both military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation (current receipt);
- (2) the reduction or elimination of the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and Veterans' Dependency and Indemnity Compensation;
- (3) the improvement of disability benefits or the process of evaluating and adjudicating benefit claims for members of the Armed Forces or veterans;
- (4) the infrastructure needs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including constructing or leasing space, to include leases of major medical facilities, and maintenance of Department facilities;
- (5) supporting the transition of servicemembers to the civilian workforce, including by expanding or improving education, job training, and workforce development benefits, or other programs for servicemembers or veterans, which may include streamlining the process associated with Federal and State credentialing requirements; or
- (6) supporting additional efforts to increase access to health care for veterans in rural areas through telehealth and other programs that reduce the need for such veterans to travel long distances to a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 310. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that make higher education more accessible and affordable, which may include legislation to increase college enrollment and completion rates for low-income students, standardize financial aid award letters, or promote college savings, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 311. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS FOR HEALTH CARE.

(a) **PHYSICIAN REIMBURSEMENT.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that increase payments made under, or permanently reform or replace, the Medicare Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) formula, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that the provisions in such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) **EXTENSION OF EXPIRING HEALTH CARE POLICIES.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that extend expiring Medicare, Medicaid, or other health provisions, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) **HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that promote improvements to health care delivery systems, which may include changes that increase care quality, encourage efficiency, focus on chronic illness, or improve care coordination, improve overall population health, promote health equity or reduce health disparities, and that improve the fiscal sustainability of health care spending over the long term, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(d) **THERAPY CAPS.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that protect access to outpatient therapy services (including physical therapy, occupational therapy, and speech-language pathology services)

through measures such as repealing or increasing the current outpatient therapy caps, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(e) **DRUG SAFETY.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to drug safety, which may include legislation that permits the safe importation of prescription drugs approved by the Food and Drug Administration from a specified list of countries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 312. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN OUR NATION'S COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that make changes to or provide for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-393) or make changes to chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the “Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1976”), or both, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 313. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR A FARM BILL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide for the reauthorization of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 Stat. 1651) or prior Acts, authorize similar or related programs, provide for revenue changes, or any combination of the purposes under this section, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 314. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN WATER INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to water infrastructure programs or make changes to the collection and expenditure of the Harbor Maintenance Tax (subchapter A of chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the pe-

riod of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 315. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PENSION REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports to strengthen and reform the pension system, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 316. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HOUSING FINANCE REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that promote appropriate access to mortgage credit for individuals and families or examine the role of government in the secondary mortgage market, which may include legislation to restructure government-sponsored enterprises, or provide for mortgage refinancing opportunities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 317. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR NATIONAL SECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that support Department of Defense auditability and acquisition reform efforts, which may include legislation that limits the use of incremental funding, or that promotes affordability or appropriate contract choice, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 318. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the support of Overseas Contingency Operations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 319. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that make changes to or provide for

the reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (Public Law 107-297; 116 Stat. 2322), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 320. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR POSTAL REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports to strengthen and reform the United States Postal Service, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 321. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR GOVERNMENT REFORM AND EFFICIENCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings through the use of performance data or scientifically rigorous evaluation methodologies for the elimination, consolidation, or reform of Federal programs, agencies, offices, and initiatives, or the sale of Federal property, or the reduction of duplicative Federal financial literacy programs, or the reduction of duplicative Federal housing assistance programs or the reduction of duplicative Federal grant programs within the Department of Justice, or the reduction of duplicative Federal unmanned aircraft programs, or the reduction of duplicative Federal science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs or the reduction of duplicative Federal economic development programs or the reduction of duplicative Federal support for entrepreneurs programs, or the reduction of duplicative preparedness grants by the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the reduction of duplicative Federal green building programs, or the reduction of duplicative Federal diesel emissions programs, or the reduction of duplicative early learning child care programs, or the reduction of duplicative domestic food assistance programs, or the reduction of duplicative teacher quality programs, or the reduction of duplicative food safety programs, or the reduction of duplicative Defense language and cultural training programs, or the reduction of duplicative nuclear nonproliferation programs, or reduce improper payments, and reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 322. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE FEDERAL BENEFIT PROCESSING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to business process changes at the Office of Personnel Management, which may include processing times for Federal employee benefits or other efficiencies or operational changes, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 323. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE VOTER REGISTRATION AND THE VOTING EXPERIENCE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the improvement of voter registration and the voting experience in Federal elections, which may include funding measures or other measures addressing voter registration or election reform, by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 324. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE CORPORATE TAX FAIRNESS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to corporate income taxes, which may include measures addressing loopholes used by large profitable corporations that pay no Federal income tax and use such savings to reduce the deficit. The Chairman may also make adjustment to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 325. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR IMPROVING FEDERAL FOREST MANAGEMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to the management of Federal forest lands, which may include—

- (1) the increase of timber production within sustainable levels;
 - (2) the protection of communities from wildfires, or the enhancement of forest resilience to insects or disease; or
 - (3) the improvement, protection, or restoration of watersheds and forest ecosystems;
- by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 326. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates,

and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports to increase the transparency of financial and performance information for Federal agencies, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 327. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE MANUFACTURING IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to investment in the manufacturing sector of the United States, which may include educational or research and development initiatives, public-private partnerships, or other programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 328. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR REPORT ELIMINATION OR MODIFICATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings through the elimination, modification, or the reduction in frequency of congressionally mandated reports from Federal agencies, and reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 329. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE MINIMUM WAGE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to income inequality, which may include an increase in the minimum wage, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 330. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE HEALTH OUTCOMES AND LOWER COSTS FOR CHILDREN IN MEDICAID.

(a) **PROTECTING MEDICAID FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that preserve Medicaid's role in protecting children's health care, by the amounts provided in such legislation for

those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) **MEDICALLY COMPLEX CHILDREN.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that improve the health outcomes and lowers costs for medically complex children in Medicaid, which may include creating or expanding integrated delivery models or improving care coordination, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) **ORAL HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN WITH MEDICAID COVERAGE.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that improve the oral health outcomes for children covered by Medicaid, including legislation that may allow for risk-based disease prevention and comprehensive, coordinated chronic disease treatment approaches, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 331. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE FEDERAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, JOB TRAINING, AND REEMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would ensure effective administration, reduce inefficient overlap, improve access, and enhance outcomes of Federal workforce development, youth and adult job training, and reemployment programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REPEAL OF MEDICAL DEVICE TAX.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the House and the Senate, motions, or conference reports related to innovation, high quality manufacturing jobs, and economic growth, including the repeal of the 2.3 percent excise tax on medical device manufacturers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 333. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND PROHIBITING MEDICARE VOUCHERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to access for Medicare beneficiaries, which may include legislation that provides beneficiary protections from voucher payments, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 334. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to efforts to ensure equal pay policies and practices, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 335. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to women's access to health care, which may include the protection of basic primary and preventative health care, family planning and birth control, or employer-provided contraceptive coverage for women's health care, by the amounts provided in such legislation for these purposes, provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 336. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REQUIRE STATE-WIDE BUDGET NEUTRALITY IN THE CALCULATION OF THE MEDICARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FLOOR.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would adjust Medicare outlays, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 337. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE PROMOTION OF INVESTMENT AND JOB GROWTH IN UNITED STATES MANUFACTURING, OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION, AND REFINING SECTORS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may result in strong growth in manufacturing, oil and gas production, and

refining sectors of the economy through the approval and construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 338. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ALLOW STATES TO ENFORCE STATE AND LOCAL USE TAX LAWS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of any committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to allowing States to enforce State and local use taxes already owed under State law on remote sales by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023 and provided that such legislation may include requirements that States recognize the value of small businesses to the United States economy by exempting the remote sales of business inputs from sales and use taxes.

SEC. 339. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DEFINITION OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to employer penalties in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which may include restoring a sensible definition of "full-time employee", provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 340. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE LABELING OF GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FISH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the labeling of genetically engineered fish, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 341. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE FAMILIES OF AMERICA'S SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to support for the families of members of the Armed Forces and veterans, including—

- (1) expanding educational opportunities;
- (2) providing increased access to job training and placement services;
- (3) tracking and reporting on suicides of family members of members of the Armed Forces;

- (4) ensuring access to high-quality and affordable healthcare; or
- (5) improving military housing;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 342. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A BIENNIAL BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing a biennial budget and appropriations process, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 343. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE REPEAL OR REDUCTION OF THE ESTATE TAX.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the repeal or reduction of the estate tax, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 344. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DISABLED VETERANS AND THEIR SURVIVORS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to protecting the benefits of disabled veterans and their survivors, which may not include a chained CPI, by the amounts provided in that legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 345. DEFICIT REDUCTION FUND FOR NO BUDGET, NO OMB PAY.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget shall reduce allocations, pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, equal to amounts withheld pursuant to one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to the federal budget process, which may include prohibiting paying the salaries of either the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the OMB Deputy Director, or the OMB Deputy Director for Management, or all three officials, for the period of time after which the President fails to submit a budget, pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, and until the day the President submits a budget to Congress.

SEC. 346. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING HARDROCK MINING REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal land management, which may include provisions relating to budget deficit reduction, establishment of a reclamation fund, imposition of a locatable mineral royalty, revenue sharing with States, and improvements to the permitting process, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 347. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO END "TOO BIG TO FAIL" SUBSIDIES OR FUNDING ADVANTAGE FOR WALL STREET MEGA-BANKS (OVER \$500,000,000,000 IN TOTAL ASSETS).

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to any subsidies or funding advantage relative to other competitors received by bank holding companies with over \$500,000,000,000 in total assets, which may include elimination of any subsidies or funding advantage relative to other competitors resulting from the perception of Federal assistance to prevent receivership, or any subsidies or funding advantage relative to other competitors resulting from the perception of Federal assistance to facilitate exit from receivership, or to realign market incentives to protect the taxpayer, except in the case of Federal assistance provided in response to a natural disaster, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 348. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AUTHORIZING CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR HEALTH CARE UNDER LAWS ADMINISTERED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO RETAIN SUCH ELIGIBILITY UNTIL AGE 26.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to authorizing children who are eligible to receive health care furnished under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain such eligibility until age 26, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 349. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution

by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report to support State and local law enforcement, which may include investing in State formula grants, to aid State and local law enforcement and criminal justice systems in implementing innovative, evidence-based approaches to crime prevention and control, including strategies such as specialty courts, multi-jurisdictional task forces, technology improvement, and information sharing systems, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 350. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to accelerating the development and deployment of advanced manufacturing technologies, advancing competitiveness, improving the speed and infrastructure with which small- and medium-sized enterprises and supply chains commercialize new processes and technologies, and informing industry-driven education and training, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 351. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURE THAT ANY CARBON EMISSIONS STANDARDS MUST BE COST EFFECTIVE, BASED ON THE BEST AVAILABLE SCIENCE, AND BENEFIT LOW-INCOME AND MIDDLE CLASS FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to carbon emission standards, that any such standards must be cost effective, based on best available science and benefit low-income and middle class families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR CERTAIN UNLAWFUL IMMIGRANT INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to limiting undocumented immigrants from qualifying for federally subsidized health insurance coverage, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 353. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE NO FINANCIAL INSTITUTION IS ABOVE THE LAW REGARDLESS OF SIZE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to criminal liability of a financial institution operating in the United States, which may include measures to address the criminal prosecution of a large financial institution operating in the United States or executives of a large financial institution operating in the United States, including for wrongdoing relating to money laundering or violation of sanctions laws, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 354. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HELPING HOMEOWNERS AND SMALL BUSINESSES MITIGATE AGAINST FLOOD LOSS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing better coordination among flood mitigation programs to meet the unmet mitigation needs of homeowners and small businesses, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 355. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE FAMILY HEALTH CARE FLEXIBILITY BY REPEALING THE HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNT AND FLEXIBLE SPENDING ACCOUNT RESTRICTIONS IN THE HEALTH CARE LAW.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that restore families' health care flexibility, which may include repealing tax increases on tax-advantaged accounts in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; Stat. 119), without raising revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 356. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR BARDA AND THE BIOSHIELD SPECIAL RESERVE FUND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may provide for full funding for the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority under section 319L of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-

7e) and the Special Reserve Fund under Section 319-F2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-6b) without raising new revenue by the amounts provided in such authorizing legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 357. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR POSTAL REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the United States Postal Service, which may include measures addressing the nonprofit postal discount for State and national political committees, and use such savings to reduce the deficit. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 358. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO BROADEN THE EFFECTS OF THE SEQUESTER, INCLUDING ALLOWING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO DONATE A PORTION OF THEIR SALARIES TO CHARITY OR TO THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY DURING SEQUESTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that are related to broadening the impact of the sequester, which may include allowing Members of Congress to donate 20 percent of their salaries to charity or to the Department of the Treasury if the enforcement procedures established under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 go into, or remain in effect, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 359. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT COLLABORATES WITH WESTERN STATES TO PREVENT THE LISTING OF THE SAGE-GROUSE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would improve the management of public land and natural resources, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 360. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE PREVENTION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget shall reduce allocations, pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, equal to amounts with-

held pursuant to one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to federal economic development assistance, which may include amendments to the eligibility of a State or local government to receive benefits, including restricting benefits when eminent domain has been used to take private property and transfer it to another private use, and reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 361. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXPORT PROMOTION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to promoting exports, which may include providing the President with trade promotion authority, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 362. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE PROHIBITION ON FUNDING OF THE MEDIUM EXTENDED AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting use of funds for defense programs not authorized by law, which may include the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS), without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 363. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE THE CAPACITY OF AGENCIES TO ENSURE EFFECTIVE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AND CONTRACT OVERSIGHT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would increase the capacity of Federal agencies to ensure effective contract management and contract oversight, including efforts such as additional personnel and training for Inspectors General at each agency, new reporting requirements for agencies to track their responses to and actions taken in response to Inspector General recommendations, urging the President to appoint permanent Inspectors General at agencies where there is currently a vacancy, and any other effort to ensure accountability from contractors and increase the capacity of Inspectors General to rout out waste, fraud, and abuse in all government contracting efforts, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided

that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 364. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SERVICES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal investment in civil air traffic control services, which may include air traffic management at airport towers across the United States or at facilities of the Federal Aviation Administration, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 365. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS PRESCRIPTION DRUG ABUSE IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to addressing prescription drug abuse, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 366. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT RURAL SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the establishment of the Office of Rural Education Policy within the Department of Education, which could include a clearinghouse for information related to the challenges of rural schools and districts or providing technical assistance within the Department of Education on rules and regulations that impact rural schools and districts, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 367. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN ENFORCEMENT OF FREE TRADE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS RELATING TO TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to strengthening the enforcement of provisions of free trade agreements that relate to textile and apparel articles, which may include increased training with respect to, and monitoring and verification of, textile and apparel articles, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 368. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ASSIST LOW-INCOME SENIORS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Older Americans Act of 1965, which may include congregate and home-delivered meals programs, or other assistance to low-income seniors, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 369. RESERVE FUND TO END OFFSHORE TAX ABUSES BY LARGE CORPORATIONS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to corporate income taxes, which may include measures to end offshore tax abuses used by large corporations, or measures providing for comprehensive tax reform that ensures a revenue structure that is more efficient, leads to a more competitive business environment, and may result in additional rate or deficit reductions, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 370. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THAT DOMESTIC ENERGY SOURCES CAN MEET EMISSIONS RULES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that are related to the research, development, and demonstration necessary for domestically abundant energy sources and current energy technologies to comply with present and future greenhouse gas emissions rules while still remaining economically competitive, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 371. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR THE INLAND WATERWAYS SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding the inland waterways system, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 372. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ACHIEVING FULL AUDITABILITY OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BY 2017.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to achieving full auditability of the financial statements Department of Defense by 2017, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 373. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO IRAN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Iran, which may include efforts to clarify that the clearance and settlement of euro-denominated transactions through European Union financial institutions may not result in the evasion of or otherwise undermine the impact of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran by the United States and the European Union (including provisions designed to strictly limit the access of the Government of Iran to its foreign exchange reserves and the facilitation of transactions on behalf of sanctioned entities), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 374. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT RESTRICTIONS TO PUBLIC ACCESS TO FISHING DOWNSTREAM OF DAMS OWNED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the Corps of Engineers from restricting public access to waters downstream of a Corps of Engineers dam, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 375. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS THE DISPROPORTIONATE REGULATORY BURDENS ON COMMUNITY BANKS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to alleviating disproportionate regulatory burdens on community banks, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 376. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO AUTHORIZE PROVISION OF PER DIEM PAYMENTS FOR PROVISION OF SERVICES TO DEPENDENTS OF HOMELESS VETERANS UNDER LAWS ADMINISTERED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between both Houses, motions, or conference reports related to care, services, or benefits for homeless veterans, which may include providing per diem payments for the furnishing of care for dependents of homeless veterans, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 377. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT PROGRAMS RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR MISSIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that support programs related to the nuclear missions of the Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 378. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PHASE-IN ANY CHANGES TO INDIVIDUAL OR CORPORATE TAX SYSTEMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to the phase-in of any changes to the individual or corporate tax systems, including any changes to individual or corporate income tax exclusions, exemptions, deductions, or credits, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 379. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASES IN AID FOR TRIBAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increases in aid for tribal education programs, including the Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Career and Technical Institutions Program administered by the Department of Education, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through

2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 380. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO EXPEDITE EXPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to promoting the export of goods, including manufactured goods, from the United States through reform of environmental laws, which may include the regulation of greenhouse gas emissions produced outside the United States by goods exported from the United States, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 381. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES PROGRAM AT LEVELS ROUGHLY EQUIVALENT TO PROPERTY TAX REVENUES LOST DUE TO THE PRESENCE OF FEDERAL LAND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to that make changes to or provide for the reauthorization of the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program at levels roughly equivalent to lost tax revenues due to the presence of Federal land without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 382. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL NOT NEGOTIATE OR SUPPORT TREATIES THAT VIOLATE AMERICANS' SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to the implementation of treaties, including upholding the constitutional rights of citizens of the United States when treaties are negotiated, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 383. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR FEDERAL INVESTMENTS IN BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to Federal investments in biomedical research, by the amounts pro-

vided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 384. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO UPHOLD SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND PREVENT THE UNITED STATES FROM ENTERING INTO THE UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to upholding Second Amendment rights, which shall include preventing the United States from entering into the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 401. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2013 AND 2014, PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) SENATE POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this resolution, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or joint resolution) that would cause the discretionary spending limits in this section to be exceeded.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—This subsection may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(b) SENATE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the Senate and as used in this section, the term “discretionary spending limit” means—

(1) for fiscal year 2013—

(A) for the security category, \$684,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

(B) for the nonsecurity category, \$359,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

(2) for fiscal year 2014—

(A) for the revised security category, \$497,352,000,000 in budget authority; and

(B) for the revised nonsecurity category, \$469,023,000,000 in budget authority;

as adjusted in conformance with the adjustment procedures in this resolution.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After a bill or joint resolution relating to any matter described in paragraph (2) or (3) is placed on the calendar, or upon the offering of an amendment or motion thereto, or the laying down of an amendment between the Houses or a conference report thereon—

(A) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the discre-

tionary spending limits, budgetary aggregates, and allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, by the amount of new budget authority in that measure for that purpose and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(B) following any adjustment under subparagraph (A), the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(2) MATTERS DESCRIBED.—Matters referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) EMERGENCY REQUIREMENTS.—Measures making appropriations in a fiscal year for emergency requirements (and so designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(B) DISABILITY REVIEWS AND REDETERMINATIONS.—Measures making appropriations in a fiscal year for continuing disability reviews and redeterminations (consistent with section 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(C) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE.—Measures making appropriations in a fiscal year for health care fraud and abuse control (consistent with section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(D) DISASTER RELIEF.—Measures making appropriations for disaster relief (and so designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(3) ADJUSTMENTS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—

(A) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the discretionary spending limits, allocations to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and aggregates for one or more—

(i) bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or passed by the House of Representatives;

(ii) joint resolutions or amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(iii) amendments between the Houses received from the House of Representatives or Senate amendments offered by the authority of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; or

(iv) conference reports;

making appropriations for overseas contingency operations by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes (and so designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985), up to the amounts specified in subparagraph (B).

(B) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are—

(i) for fiscal year 2013, \$99,670,000,000 in budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom); and

(ii) for fiscal year 2014, \$50,000,000,000 in budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “nonsecurity category” means all discretionary appropriations not included in the security category;

(2) the term “revised nonsecurity category” means all discretionary appropriations other than in budget function 050;

(3) the term “revised security category” means discretionary appropriations in budget function 050; and

(4) the term “security category” means discretionary appropriations associated with

agency budgets for the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the National Nuclear Security Administration, the intelligence community management account (95-0401-0-1-054), and all budget accounts in budget function 150 (international affairs).

SEC. 402. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2014 or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2015.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2015 and 2016 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each year;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 402 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) shall no longer apply.

SEC. 403. ADJUSTMENTS FOR SEQUESTRATION OR SEQUESTRATION REPLACEMENT.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS UNDER CURRENT LAW.—If the enforcement procedures established under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 go into, or remain in effect, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such enforcement.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS IF AMENDED.—If a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the adjustments to discretionary spending limits under section 251(b) of that Act, or the enforcement procedures established under section 251A of that Act or section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

SEC. 404. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS AFFECTING THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider any appropriations legislation, including any amendment thereto, motion in relation thereto, or conference report thereon, that includes any provision or provisions affecting the Crime Victims Fund (as established by section 1402 of Public Law 98-473 (42 U.S.C. 10601)) which constitutes a change in a mandatory program that would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) were they included in legislation other than appropriations legislation. A point of order pursuant to this section shall be raised against such provision or provisions as described in subsections (d) and (e).

(b) DETERMINATION.—The determination of whether a provision is subject to a point of order pursuant to this section shall be made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) GENERAL POINT OF ORDER.—It shall be in order for a Senator to raise a single point of order that several provisions of a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report violate this section. The Presiding Officer may sustain the point of order as to some or all of the provisions against which the Senator raised the point of order. If the Presiding Officer so sustains the point of order as to some of the provisions (including

provisions of an amendment, motion, or conference report) against which the Senator raised the point of order, then only those provisions (including provision of an amendment, motion, or conference report) against which the Presiding Officer sustains the point of order shall be deemed stricken pursuant to this section. Before the Presiding Officer rules on such a point of order, any Senator may move to waive such a point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions against which the point of order was raised. Such a motion to waive is amendable in accordance with rules and precedents of the Senate. After the Presiding Officer rules on such a point of order, any Senator may appeal the ruling of the Presiding Officer on such a point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions on which the Presiding Officer ruled.

(e) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or amendment shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

SEC. 405. SUPERMAJORITY ENFORCEMENT.

Section 425(a)(1) and (2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be subject to the waiver and appeal requirements of subsections (c)(2) and (d)(3) of section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 406. PROHIBITING THE USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that increases in guarantee fees charged by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac shall not be used to offset provisions that increase the deficit.

(b) BUDGETARY RULE.—In the Senate, for purposes of determining budgetary impacts to evaluate points of order under this resolution and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this resolution, any previous resolution, and any subsequent budget resolution, provisions contained in any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that increases any guarantee fees of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac shall not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues contained in such legislation.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 411. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse, or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list and the annual report to reduce program duplication. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their

jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committees on the Budget.

SEC. 412. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committees on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

SEC. 413. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 414. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 415. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

SEC. 416. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

(a) REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES.—In the case of any legislative provision to which this section applies, the Congressional Budget Office, with the assistance of the Joint Committee on Taxation, shall prepare, to the extent practicable, as a supplement to the cost estimate for legislation affecting revenues, an estimate of the revenue changes in connection with such provi-

sion that incorporates the macroeconomic effects of the policy being analyzed. Any macroeconomic impact statement under the preceding sentence shall be accompanied by a written statement fully disclosing the economic, technical, and behavioral assumptions that were made in producing—

(1) such estimate; and

(2) the conventional estimate in connection with such provision.

(b) LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS TO WHICH THIS SECTION APPLIES.—This section shall apply to any legislative provision—

(1) which proposes a change or changes to law that the Congressional Budget Office determines, pursuant to a conventional fiscal estimate, has a revenue impact in excess of \$5,000,000,000 in any fiscal year; or

(2) with respect to which the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget of either the Senate or the House of Representatives has requested an estimate described in subsection (a).

TITLE V—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 501. TO REQUIRE TRANSPARENT REPORTING ON THE ONGOING COSTS TO TAXPAYERS OF OBAMACARE.

When the Congressional Budget Office releases its annual Update to the Budget and Economic Outlook, the Congressional Budget Office shall report changes in direct spending and revenue associated with the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152), including the net impact on deficit, both with on-budget and off-budget effects. The information shall be similar to that provided in Table 2 of the Congressional Budget Office's March 20, 2010 estimate of the budgetary effects of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), as passed by the Senate.

SEC. 502. TO REQUIRE FULLER REPORTING ON POSSIBLE COSTS TO TAXPAYERS OF OBAMACARE.

When the Congressional Budget Office releases its annual update to the Budget and Economic Outlook, the Congressional Budget Office shall provide an analysis of the budgetary effects of 30 percent, 50 percent, and 100 percent of Americans losing employer sponsored health insurance and accessing coverage through Federal or State exchanges.

SEC. 503. TO REQUIRE FULLER REPORTING ON POSSIBLE COSTS TO TAXPAYERS OF ANY BUDGET SUBMITTED BY THE PRESIDENT.

When the Congressional Budget Office submits its report to Congress relating to a budget submitted by the President for a fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, such report shall contain—

(1) an estimate of the pro rata cost for taxpayers who will file individual income tax returns for taxable years ending during such fiscal year of any deficit that would result from the budget; and

(2) an analysis of the budgetary effects described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 504. SENSE OF SENATE ON UNDERUTILIZED FACILITIES OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AND THEIR POTENTIAL USE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is the ninth largest real property holder of the Federal Government, with more than 124,000 acres and more than 4,900 buildings and other structures with a replacement value of more than \$30,000,000,000.

(2) The annual operation and maintenance costs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have increased steadily, and, as of 2012, the Administration has more than \$2,300,000,000 in annual deferred maintenance costs.

(3) According to Office of Inspector General (OIG) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Administration continues to retain real property that is underutilized, does not have identified future mission uses, or is duplicative of other assets in its real property inventory.

(4) The Office of Inspector General, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), and Congress have identified the aging and duplicative infrastructure of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as a high priority and longstanding management challenge.

(5) In the NASA Authorization Act of 2010, Congress directed the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to examine its real property assets and downsize to fit current and future missions and expected funding levels, paying particular attention to identifying and removing unneeded or duplicative infrastructure.

(6) The Office of Inspector General found at least 33 facilities, including wind tunnels, test stands, airfields, and launch infrastructure, that were underutilized or for which National Aeronautics and Space Administration managers could not identify a future mission use and that the need for these facilities have declined in recent years as a result of changes in the mission focus of the Administration, the condition and obsolescence of some facilities, and the advent of alternative testing methods.

(7) The Office of Inspector General found that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has taken steps to minimize the costs of continuing to maintain some of these facilities by placing them in an inactive state or leasing them to other parties.

(8) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has a series of initiatives underway that, in the judgment of the Office of Inspector General, are "positive steps towards 'rightsizing' its real property footprint", and the Office of Inspector General has concluded that "it is imperative that NASA move forward aggressively with its infrastructure reduction efforts".

(9) Existing and emerging United States commercial launch and exploration capabilities are providing cargo transportation to the International Space Station and offer the potential for providing crew support, access to the International Space Station, and missions to low Earth orbit while the National Aeronautics and Space Administration focuses its efforts on heavy-lift capabilities and deep space missions.

(10) National Aeronautics and Space Administration facilities and property that are underutilized, duplicative, or no longer needed for Administration requirements could be utilized by commercial users and State and local entities, resulting in savings for the Administration and a reduction in the burden of the Federal Government to fund space operations.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this concurrent resolution assume—

(1) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should move forward with plans to reduce its infrastructure and, to the greatest extent practicable, make property available for lease to a government or private tenant or report the property to the General Services Administration (GSA) for sale or transfer to another entity;

(2) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should pursue opportunities for streamlined sale or lease of property and facilities, including for exclusive use, to a private entity, or expedited conveyance or transfer to a State or political subdivision, municipality, instrumentality of a State, or Department of Transportation-licensed launch site operators for the promotion of commercial or scientific space activity and for developing and operating space launch facilities; and

(3) leasing or transferring underutilized facilities and properties to commercial space entities or State or local governments will reduce operation and maintenance costs for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, save money for the Federal Government, and promote commercial space and the exploration goals of the Administration and the United States.

Passed the Senate March 23 (legislative day, March 22), 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on Senate Concurrent Resolution 8: Messrs. RYAN of Wisconsin, COLE, PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. BLACK, Messrs. VAN HOLLEN, CLYBURN, and Mrs. LOWEY.

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NEED FOR CONTINUED AVAILABILITY OF RELIGIOUS SERVICES TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 58) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations, with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

(1) Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the Department of Defense determined that some contractor clergy, like other Department of Defense contractors, were unable to perform their contractual duties during the current lapse in appropriations;

Whereas this determination may have impacted the ability of members of the Armed Forces and their families to worship and participate in religious activities;

Whereas military chaplains on active duty, like all military personnel on active duty, continue to perform their duties during the current lapse in appropriations;

Whereas the Department continues to analyze its authorities under the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113-39) with respect to contractors; and

Whereas the Pay Our Military Act appropriates such sums as are necessary to pay contractors of the Department whom the Secretary of Defense determines are providing support to

members of the Armed Forces: Now, therefore, be it

(2) On page 2, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 3, line 2, and insert the following:

(1) finds that the provision and availability of religious services and clergy is important to the morale and wellbeing of many members of the Armed Forces and their families; and

(2) hopes the Secretary of Defense is able to determine that contractor clergy provide necessary support to military personnel, and would therefore be covered under the appropriations made available under the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113-39).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate, and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 1151 of title II, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following individuals to the Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center:

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH).

The Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

□ 2245

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged concurrent resolution:

S. CON. RES. 24

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Wednesday, October 16, 2013, through Friday, October 25, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, October 28, 2013, or such other time on

that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Wednesday, October 16, 2013, through Monday, October 21, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this current resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 22, 2013, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Passed the Senate October 16, 2013.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for October 14 on account of personal business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 24, 113th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 22, 2013, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3311. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Kurt A. Cichowski, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3312. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Kathleen M. Gainey, United States Air Force, and her advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3313. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Dana K. Chipman, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3314. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Redesignation of Connecticut Portion of the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut Nonattainment Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual and 2006 24-Hour Standards for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R01-OAR-2013-0020; FRL-9901-11-Region 1] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3315. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [DE104-1103; FRL-9900-05-Region 3] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3316. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Adoption of Control Techniques Guidelines for Miscellaneous Metal and Plastic Parts which Includes Pleasure Craft Coating Operations [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-006; FRL-9901-20-Region 3] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3317. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Dayton-Springfield Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0596; FRL-9901-09-Region 5] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3318. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; States of Michigan and Minnesota; Regional Haze [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0954 and EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0037; FRL-9901-31-Region 5] September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3319. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-47, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3320. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-43, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3321. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-158, "Extension of Time to Dispose of Hine Junior High School Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3322. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-159, "Fire and Emergency Medical Services Major Changes Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3323. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-160, "School Transit Subsidy Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3324. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-183, "Chief Financial Officer Compensation Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3325. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-184, "CCNV Task Force Temporary Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3326. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-185, "Income Tax Secured Bond Authorization Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3327. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2013 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals through the 3rd Quarter Fiscal Year 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2072. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs; with an amendment (Rept. 113-245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:
H.R. 3295. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate contributing factors to disparities in breast cancer treatment through the development of a uniform set of consensus-based breast cancer treatment performance measures for a 6-year quality reporting system and value-based purchasing system under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLEGO:
H.R. 3296. A bill to authorize the United States Department of Treasury to prioritize certain payments in the event that the debt limit is reached; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:
H.R. 3297. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to au-

thorize the use of funds for the inclusion in domestic violence education programs of information on legal rights available to teenage victims of dating violence; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROSS:
H.R. 3298. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a deduction for amounts contributed to disaster savings accounts to help defray the cost of preparing their homes to withstand a disaster; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS:
H.R. 3299. A bill to amend section 340A of the Public Health Service Act to protect the privacy of personally identifiable information in relation to enrollment activities of health insurance exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:
H.R. 3295.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GALLEGO:
H.R. 3296.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8:

POWERS OF CONGRESS CLAUSE 18
The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:
H.R. 3297.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8

By Mr. ROSS:
H.R. 3298.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROSS:
H.R. 3299.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3—to regulate commerce among the several states

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 25: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 60: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 366: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 494: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 685: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 713: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 724: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 725: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 792: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 846: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 855: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 911: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 942: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 963: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1074: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1094: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. PAL-
LONE.

H.R. 1125: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1146: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1180: Mr. WALZ, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1217: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1240: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. SCHNEI-
DER.

H.R. 1318: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POCAN, and
Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1351: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1354: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1429: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1461: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1462: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 1473: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 1528: Mr. CRENSHAW and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1599: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1666: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 1708: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 1726: Mr. COSTA and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1731: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of
New Mexico, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. ROS-
LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1755: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1779: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1780: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1812: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1877: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 1986: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1991: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2001: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BROWN
of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 2027: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2084: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2101: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2213: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2305: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. HANNA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 2315: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 2368: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 2430: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS of
Florida, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2485: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2512: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2607: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 2662: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2663: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 2734: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2767: Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. HARTZLER,
Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COLLINS of New York,
Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. SAM
JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2790: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2807: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2818: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 2847: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2856: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 2866: Mr. JONES, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2902: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2914: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2919: Mr. DAINES and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2932: Ms. CHU, Mr. LATTA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2955: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2989: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 3013: Mr. HARPER and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 3077: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 3097: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 3103: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3111: Mr. BARBER and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 3133: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CARTER, and
Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 3143: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 3163: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PINGREE of
Maine, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New
Mexico, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3179: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. HECK of
Nevada.

H.R. 3183: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 3188: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 3218: Mr. STOCKMAN and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3279: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 3285: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.J. Res. 20: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. LATTA.

H.J. Res. 64: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CHAFFETZ,
Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. COL-
LINS of New York, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.J. Res. 94: Mr. OLSON.

H. Con. Res. 46: Mr. COFFMAN.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE of Cali-
fornia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. CHU.

H. Res. 326: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H. Res. 365: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. CHU, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KILDEE, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 5 by Mr. VAN HOLLEN on House Resolution 372: Nancy Pelosi, Hakeem S. Jeffries, John Lewis, Brian Higgins, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Michael E. Capuano, Donald M. Payne Jr., Grace F. Napolitano, Kyrsten Sinema, Bruce L. Braley, and Peter J. Visclosky.

SENATE—Wednesday, October 16, 2013

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we are grateful that You are gracious and merciful, slow to anger, abounding in steadfast love.

Lord, we see a faint light at the end of a long dark tunnel. Thank You for lawmakers who understand that when everyone loses, America loses. We are grateful also for Senators who know that before they are Democrat, Republican or Independent, they are Americans. As they remember their accountability to You and to history, empower them to keep our Nation strong, staying true to their oath to defend our Constitution against external and internal foes. Lord, keep them from making any decision that will seem reckless in the sober light of hindsight.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 211.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 211, S. 1569, a bill to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following the remarks of the Republican leader and me the Senate will be in a period of morning business where Senators will be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each—or at least be in a situation where people can speak up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. President, I am going to wait until Senator McCONNELL gets to the floor, so I will not give any long remarks here. In fact, I won't give any

long remarks at any time, but I do have a few things to say.

RECOGNITION OF THE SENATE CHAPLAIN

While we are waiting for Senator McCONNELL, I want to take this opportunity to say this. Admiral Black has, for me, during this long period of crisis we have had in the country, been a voice of stability and a voice of inspiration. I am being very selfish in saying me, because it has been so for the entire Senate and for the country. His heartfelt prayers are so timely and so sensitive to the needs of our country and the need we all have to call upon our spirituality to get us through periods of difficulty.

I can speak for the entire Senate when I say how much we admire and respect this good man, who is a counselor and as much a leader in the Senate as anyone who serves in this body.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the eyes of the world have been on Washington all this week—and that is a gross understatement—and while they witnessed a great deal of political discord, today they will also see Congress reach a historic bipartisan agreement and avoid a default on the Nation's bills.

The compromise we reached will provide our economy with the stability it desperately needs. It is never easy for two sides to reach consensus. Sometimes it is harder than others. This time it was really hard. After weeks spent facing off across a partisan divide that often seemed too wide to cross, our country came to the brink of disaster. But in the end, political adversaries set aside their differences and disagreements to prevent that disaster.

I thank the Republican leader for his diligent efforts to reach this important agreement. The Republican leader's cooperation was essential to reach an accord to pass both Chambers of Congress and also be signed by President Obama.

As part of our agreement, in order to ensure Congress continues the work of setting this country on a path of fiscal sustainability, this legislation instructs leaders to name conferees to a budget conference committee that will set our country on a long-term path to fiscal sustainability. I know some say

that is going to be hard. What we do is hard here, and this is really hard, but I think we can get it done. The committee members selected must have open minds, be willing to exert every option no matter how painful to their own political ideas and even their own political parties. This conference committee, led by Chairman MURRAY and Chairman RYAN—which will produce its negotiated budget resolution in December—is the appropriate place to discuss our different views and the best way to chart a course for economic growth.

This legislation also funds the government through January 15 and averts default through February 7, during which time we can work toward a long-term budget agreement that prevents these frequent crises. Perhaps most importantly, this legislation ends a standoff that ground the work of Washington to a halt this fall.

This is not a time for pointing fingers or blame. This is a time of reconciliation. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of this great Capitol to pass this remarkable agreement which will protect the long-term health of our economy, avert a default on our Nation's debt, and allow us to set a foundation for economic expansion.

What we have done is sent a message to Americans from every one of our 50 States, but in addition to that, the citizens of every country and the world, that the United States lives up to its obligations. Now Congress must return to its most important job—fostering economic growth and protecting middle-class families.

I appreciate through all of this the steady hand of President Obama to help guide us to this conclusion. I am optimistic that the spirit of compromise which has taken root in the Senate over the last 2 days will endure.

I do know this: Senator McCONNELL and I have sat in very serious discussions the last few days, and we are going to do everything we can to change the atmosphere in the Senate and accomplish what needs to be done for our country.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

SHUTDOWN RESOLUTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, this has been a long, challenging few weeks for Congress and for the country. It is my hope that today we can put some of those most urgent issues behind us.

After yesterday's events the majority leader and I began a series of conversations about a way to get the government reopened and to prevent default. I am confident we will be able to do both of those things later today.

Crucially, I am also confident we will be able to announce that we are protecting the government's spending reductions that both parties agreed to under the Budget Control Act and that the President signed into law. That has been a top priority for me and for my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle throughout this debate, and it has been worth the effort. Some have suggested that we break that promise as part of this agreement. Some have said that Washington needs to spend more, that we need to raise taxes, that we need to just tax our way to prosperity and balance. But what the BCA showed is that Washington actually can cut spending, and because of this law, that is just what we have done. For the first time since the Korean war—for the first time in 50 years—government spending has declined for 2 years in a row. And we are not going back on this agreement.

There is a lot more we need to do to get our Nation's fiscal house in order. Hopefully, once we have gotten past the drama of the moment, we can get to work on it. But for now, let's not understate the importance of the Budget Control Act or the importance of the fight to preserve it. This legislation is the largest spending reduction bill of the last quarter century and the largest deficit reduction bill since 1981 that didn't include a tax hike. Preserving this law is critically important to the future of our country.

Throughout this debate, the public has rightly focused on ObamaCare—for good reason. This law is ravaging our economy, killing jobs, driving up premiums, and driving people off the health care plans they have and like in droves. Its disastrous rollout is a sign of even worse things to come. The refusal to delay it reflects the kind of stubborn, ideological obsession that will do untold damage to our country, and Republicans remain determined to repeal this terrible law. But for today, the relief we hope for is to reopen the government, avoid default, and protect the historic cuts we achieved under the Budget Control Act. This is far less than many of us had hoped for, frankly, but it is far better than what some had sought. Now it is time for Republicans to unite behind other crucial goals.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

Under the previous order, Senators are permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I had not intended to speak right now. I know the leaders are working on trying to get the process clear so we can move this legislation forward. But I would like to mention a few of my colleagues who really helped in this process.

We had a number of Democrats and Republicans who met together and talked to try to come to a resolution on a package we wanted to present to the leaders. In fact, the structure of what the two leaders have agreed on is very similar to what we had proposed to them.

I see some of my colleagues here today who were instrumental. I see the Senator from Alaska, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and I know Senator AYOTTE is here, as well as Senator FLAKE, who happens to be in the Chamber right now, and Senator KIRK, Senator JOHANNES, Senator MCCAIN, and, of course, Senator COLLINS. Senator COLLINS really led and spearheaded the effort, and she deserves a lot of credit for getting us together and helping to move the ball down the field.

I hadn't planned on controlling the floor right now or even talking about this very much, but since we have the opportunity—I know on our side of the aisle Senators MANCHIN, KLOBUCHAR, KING, DONNELLY, HEITKAMP, and SHAHEEN all played a critical role. Again, this had not been planned by anyone; it just looks as though we have a little bit of time.

If it is agreeable, I would like to yield to one of my colleagues to say a word about the agreement we reached or that we were working on to try to present to the leaders and just really say thank you to Senator COLLINS and thank you for all 14 of us. It turns out we had seven Republicans, six Democrats, and one Independent. Basically what we tried to do is come up with a sensible framework the leaders could use to get us to where we are today. Again, they didn't accept every single thing we wanted, but the framework was good, and certainly it was great to see everyone work together.

Before I turn it over to the Senator from Arizona, I wish to thank him because he was great and very instrumental in moving this ball down the court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I think it is obvious we are seeing the end of this agonizing odyssey this body has been put through but, far more importantly, the American people have been put through. It is one of the more shameful chapters I have seen in the years I have spent here in the Senate.

But I wish to say that if there is a good outcome, it is the fact that 14 of us were able to join together—Republican and Democrat. Leadership, I must fully admit, was provided primarily by women in the Senate. I won't comment further on that.

Seriously, 14 of us got together and came up with a plan after very spirited discussion. I think that plan was probably better than the one we are going to act on today. But the fact is that this group of 14 people is committed to staying together to address other issues of importance and to tell the American people that there are at least 14 of us—and there are many others who wanted to join that group and who are welcomed to join that group—we are not going to let this kind of partisanship cripple this body and injure the American people.

I am proud to have worked with Members from both sides of the aisle. This isn't the last crisis we are going to go through, but I think we have the framework for the kind of bipartisanship the American people need and want. So I thank them. I look forward to working with them in the future. I also enjoyed the spirited discussions we had.

I wish to thank especially my friend from Maine, who enriched me with a small side wager we made during the course of this discussion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Arizona—he brought a very experienced voice to our group—and especially I thank Senator COLLINS for bringing this group together. I think it shows what courage is going to be in the next year in this Chamber and in the Congress. It is not going to be just standing here by yourself making a speech with no one there. Courage is going to be whether you are willing to stand next to someone you do not always agree with for the betterment of this country.

This was very close to another default—to seeing what we saw in 2011 with the Dow down 2000 points, household wealth down over \$2 trillion. That cannot happen again. Thanks to our leader Senator REID, thanks to his work with Senator MCCONNELL, we averted it this time. I think you will find a strong bipartisan vote in the Senate for this compromise, for this idea of paying our bills, opening the government again, and making sure we have a reasonable time period to work out a solution long term. That is our challenge.

Yes, we have averted this crisis, but we need to stop having these crises. We need to actually come up with a long-term solution in a balanced way that brings down our debt while at the same time doing it in a way that will not start another financial crisis.

I thank my colleagues for their amazing work, for their good humor during a very difficult time, and for the fact that we are finally moving forward and ending the brinkmanship.

I see my friend the Senator from Alaska is here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I join my colleague Senator PRYOR. I don't think any of us had planned to do anything coordinated at this point in time. I came to the floor and was anticipating the announcement from both leaders. But I see so many of our colleagues who have been working on this proposal with Senator COLLINS from Maine. She has truly been remarkable in her persistence and insistence that we continue this effort to work collegially, to work collaboratively on these very difficult issues that we have been facing these past several weeks.

I thank Senator COLLINS for her leadership most particularly, but we all know, if you are trying to move the ball, just one person, you don't get anywhere. We do a lot of sports analogies around here. Honestly, I am tired of the sports analogies. But what I do appreciate is that as a Senate we cannot work together as individuals and expect to accomplish the work that is needed, not only for my constituents in Alaska but around the country. Regardless of who is in the majority or who is in the minority, in order to make it work for the country we have to be working together.

As difficult as all this has been in the past several weeks, what I found encouraging is there has been a nucleus of folks who would come together as the need arose, or perhaps just for a little moral support, and continued the effort to try to find common ground. We went from a small group to a group of six on each side to a group of seven on each side. I think with every passing day we had more colleagues who were interested in helping and participating to try to find that common ground. As we noted, the agreement that has been reached by our respective leaderships, while it is not what our working group came up with, there are certain elements of it that we had helped to shepherd.

But this should not be about who claims authorship, who puts their name behind it. What this should be about is whether we can get the government open again, we can get focused on dealing with our fiscal issues, dealing with the fact that we are up against the debt ceiling perhaps tomorrow. Our reality is in front of us right now.

Getting caught up with whether it is the Senate that should make this happen or the House that makes this happen, whether it is Leader REID or Minority Leader MCCONNELL, that is not what the public cares about. The news that is coming out today is that there is a deal. There is a deal. That deal should give America hope.

But it does not get us out of the mess we are in. I think we are at pretty low approval ratings. It is going to take a while for us to rebuild any credibility.

But I think the effort to rebuild credibility begins when we honestly and earnestly roll up our sleeves, tackle the big problems, recognize we have to do it together rather than to retreat into our respective corners and just hope that we can get it right without talking to one another.

I again thank Senator COLLINS for her leadership on this issue. I thank all my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle and the Republican side of the aisle for coming to this point. I am most hopeful we will see it quickly resolved today so the country can breathe easily and sleep a little better tonight.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I thank Senator COLLINS, who helped lead our group, Senator PRYOR, Senator MANCHIN, and so many others who helped lead our group as well. This was not Democrats and Republicans, this was Americans who were sent here to serve our country.

I am blessed to come from the State of Indiana. They gave me this great honor to serve. I know precisely why they sent me here, which is to do the work of the Nation, to protect our Nation, to not worry about Republican or Democrat, but to do what is right.

I take that charge very seriously. That is why I am working with my colleagues to see if there is a way we can help bring an agreement closer, bring an agreement together that protects our credit ratings, that protects our financial situation, and that protects our country. I was very lucky to be part of such an extraordinary group of partners in this effort. I thank all of them.

As the Senator from Alaska was saying, we have a lot of work to do, as all Senators know. We stand ready, on whatever front our Nation needs us, to do that kind of work. That is not Democrat work, that is not Republican work, but that is American work, to move our Nation and our country forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, later today the Senate is likely to consider legislation that would reopen government, avert the default, and put us on a long-term path to come up with a plan to deal with our unsustainable \$17 trillion national debt by reopening the long overdue budget negotiations. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support the plan that has been put forth by our two leaders, Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL.

I am pleased that elements of the compromise that the two leaders have worked out have been taken from a plan that was developed by 14 Senators who have worked very hard, on both sides of the aisle, 7 Democrats—actu-

ally 6 Democrats and 1 Independent, the Senator from Maine—and 7 Republicans, who have come together in good faith and have worked very hard over the last 2 weeks to put together a compromise plan, a compromise plan that I have to say I actually prefer to that which we will vote on later today.

But elements of our plan have been incorporated into the plan the two leaders have presented for our consideration. This was truly a collaborative effort. I want to make sure that all of my colleagues who worked so hard on it receive the kudos they deserve for being willing to do what this body does too rarely, and that is for both sides to get together, come out of our partisan corners, stop fighting, and start legislating.

This great country deserves a Congress that can govern, and that was the unifying theme of our group. On October 5, a Saturday, when we were in session and the shutdown was in its early days, I was sitting in my Senate office, watching the floor debate. I was disheartened by what I heard because what I heard were partisan speeches from both sides of the aisle and no one offering a path forward. I decided then and there to chart out, to outline a possible plan to end this impasse, and I marched over to the Senate floor and gave a speech in which I urged my colleagues to work together.

Virtually immediately I heard from colleagues on both sides of the aisle who wanted to be part of that effort and who have worked night and day to try to come up with a plan, a plan that I believe helped lay the foundation for the ultimate compromise reached by our two leaders.

Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator AYOTTE were the first two Members to call me. I know my colleagues are tired of hearing about the women in the Senate, but the fact is they were the first two to contact me. Senator JOE MANCHIN was the first person on the Democratic side to call and say: Count me in. I want to work on this as well. Senator PRYOR and Senator KING were also very early on, and Senator MCCAIN endorsed the proposal of our working together and the outlines of this plan. Senator JOHANNIS was such a thoughtful addition to our group. AMY KLOBUCHAR was there for every meeting. Senator KIRK, Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP, Senator JEFF FLAKE, Senator JOE DONNELLY, Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN—it was a wonderful group of people, united by our determination to demonstrate that we could compromise, we could govern, we could bring an end to this impasse and do it in a way that was worthy of this great country and our constituents.

We worked together over and over. There were a lot of tough decisions to be made, a lot of lengthy negotiations. We came up with a plan which we presented to our two leaders, Senator REID

and Senator MCCONNELL. Not all elements of our plan were incorporated by the leaders, but I think they would say they built on our work and did, indeed, take some of our provisions verbatim. I continue to believe our plan was a great path forward, but I am pleased that it paved the way to what I hope will be a solution to the impasse we have been facing, that has been so unfair to the American people and has hurt so many people.

I think it is important for us to remember that the damage goes beyond the hundreds of thousands of furloughed Federal workers, furloughed through no fault of their own. It goes beyond the damage to the private sector employees who lost business because of the closure of our parks.

It goes beyond the damage to our disabled veterans who have had to wait for their claims to be handled. It goes beyond the anxiety of many who are dependent on very important Federal programs, the most vulnerable in our society. It goes beyond the impact on our national defense, although we were able to mitigate that to some extent. It goes to something far more fundamental, and that is whether the people of this country can have confidence in our ability to put aside partisan politics and act as patriots committed to doing what is right for our Nation.

I thank the 13 Senators who joined me and worked so hard and did just that—they left their partisanship at the door and negotiated as real patriots who care about America. I thank them all. It has been a great pleasure to work with each and every one of them. All of them contributed so much to the bipartisan plan we presented, and I am glad it has helped to bring us to what I hope is an end to a very unfortunate chapter in America's history.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I am very proud to be a part of a group who truly put their country first. I have been here probably a shorter period of time than most of my colleagues—not quite 3 years. I think people know I have been a little bit frustrated at times, if not quite frustrated. I heard stories about how the Senate used to work and that when the going got tough, the Senators really got going. I have not seen much of that in the last 3 years.

We had a dichotomy of Senators—ANGUS KING, my dear friend, who is an Independent from Maine, seven Republicans led by Senator COLLINS, and our Democratic colleagues—come together and play off each other's strengths. They did not play off of their egos at all.

Two weeks ago I could not believe the self-inflicted pain this Congress put upon the people of America by shutting down the government—also coming on

the brink of a financial calamity, if you will, and not being able to pay our bills. I have watched businesses and individuals get into financial problems before. Financial problems can come in many different ways, but basically you have early warnings and can step in front of that so you can restructure your spending, restructure your habits, and get yourself whole again—it takes a while—or you can wait until it hits you, and then you have to foreclose or go bankrupt, and it is almost impossible to get yourself out of it.

This was really congressional-made. There may be times when we have pressures put upon us as a country where we will have to do extraordinary work to keep ourselves afloat, but this is not one, and it should not be made because of political dysfunction.

I saw our colleagues playing off of the strengths each person brought to the group, and it got stronger and stronger each day. We faced the shutdown that we thought was absolutely ridiculous and unnecessary and should never have happened, and then we were looking at facing a financial meltdown, if you will, the insolvency of our country, and that could not be tolerated.

As each person played off the other to try to help make this come together—I think Senator COLLINS explained it so well—we were able to have a piece of agreed-upon legislation that had a tremendous framework and good template that was presented to leadership here in the Senate. I applaud both of our leaders, Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL, for taking that constructively and working with it. They worked together to try to make the best possible piece of legislation, and we encourage our colleagues in the House to accept that legislation.

I am hopeful for a large vote in the Senate. I am very much hopeful for that. I am hopeful that our colleagues in the House will accept that in the spirit of a bipartisan agreement we worked on. When we were doing this, we considered the House and what would be acceptable and palatable, but, more importantly, we took into consideration the American people and what they wanted us to do and why they sent us here.

In the spirit of the Senate, I am proud to see the Senate rise to the occasion and work the way I heard it used to work. I was able to experience that in the last 2 weeks, and I am proud to have been a part of that.

I thank all of my colleagues on the Republican side in both the Senate and the House. This is truly a time when America rose to show its best. Now we have to make sure we complete this.

During the negotiation we found out why we could not get to a budget conference. This bill will have a mandatory budget conference that has to report back and go back to some regular order. That was important for all of us

to agree on. Everybody said there will be some criticism because of the short time period. We have a better framework than we have ever had in order to fix and repair the damage that has been done and address the uncertainty that will be lurking if we don't do something.

I am very pleased and proud. I thank Senator COLLINS, Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator PRYOR, Senator KING, and Senator HEITKAMP, and everybody who has worked so hard to make this happen. Again, I am proud to be a part of an extraordinary group of people who put the country before themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Madam President, 5 days ago I wondered why I came to the Senate. I had the same belief the American people had: This is a place which is no longer functioning, stuck in gridlock and not able to get anything done.

Then an amazing thing happened. Under the leadership of some strong and senior Members, a group came together to have a broader discussion. We called the discussion plan B. This discussion presented ideas that would, in fact, find their way toward compromise. Under the strong leadership of Senator COLLINS, as well as the great Senator from Alaska LISA MURKOWSKI, we were able to bring people together and begin those discussions. They started the dialog that I really think had an opportunity to present a template for a resolution.

Today we are doing something the American people have waited for us to do for the last 16 days. We are doing what is responsible and opening the government, extending the debt limit, and doing regular order. No more special committees, no more supercommittees or pinning our hopes on a Bowles-Simpson or Rivlin commission—we are going to make this body function again.

I think we have a lot of great hope that our chairman PATTY MURRAY and ranking member, Senator SESSIONS from Alabama, will meet with their House counterparts in principled negotiations and discussions that will once again tell the American people we are serious about doing their bidding and their business.

The proof now is in the pudding. We have taken what little confidence the American public had in this institution and the institution of the U.S. Congress and once again shook it. It is time that we bring that confidence back. There is no better time than fulfilling the promise and commitment of this agreement today and getting back to regular order.

I thank all of my colleagues—Senator MANCHIN, Senator ANGUS KING from Maine, MARK PRYOR from Arkansas, who was instrumental in getting me to run for the Senate. I occasionally remind him of that. MARK and I

were attorneys general together. There have been so many great opportunities to have conversations across the aisle that I think bore fruit today and will continue to flourish, thrive, and provide opportunity for more bipartisan compromise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Madam President, Winston Churchill once famously observed that Americans will always do the right thing only after they have tried everything else. I think the last 2 weeks demonstrates the wisdom of that observation.

I join my colleagues in congratulating, first, the leaders for putting aside their substantial differences and partisan divide to meet together over the last 2 or 3 days and hammer out an agreement that is not going to be acceptable or exciting to anyone but will put America back together in terms of our government functioning, avoiding the threat of default, and allowing us to move forward with the Nation's problems.

My first congratulation is to Senator HARRY REID and Senator MITCH MCCONNELL for coming together as they have in the last 24 hours.

I also have to acknowledge the leadership of my senior colleague from Maine, SUSAN COLLINS. I happened to be presiding when she made her speech last Saturday, and it was really her initiative to stand, take a risk, and say: Let's try to work something out. She outlined the beginning of a framework which was then fleshed out over the last 10 days in discussions among the group we have been talking about.

I was interviewed recently on the radio and somebody asked: Don't you think Senator COLLINS may be subject to some criticism from some corner or another about her role in all of this? I paused for a minute, and I said: That is what leadership is. It is the willingness to bear criticism and stick your neck out. As my dad used to say, it is like the turtle crossing the road—the only way the turtle can cross the road is to stick his neck out. And that is what we are trying to do on behalf of the American people.

Senator PATTY MURRAY is not on the floor right now, but I am so glad we are entering into a process where she and her colleagues on the Budget Committee will be able to work with Congressman RYAN and try to really solve some of these issues that have been plaguing us so severely. We are doing it, as we should, in the proper process. I am delighted that Senator MURRAY is now going to step into this role, which is one of the most important we have had in recent years, and we will be able to work toward a resolution.

This is an important and perhaps historic compromise where Congress was really looking into the abyss. Congress

was really proving that it could not function and that our system could not function in the divided politics of America today. It now appears that our leaders have pulled us back from that abyss and given us an opportunity—not a guarantee but an opportunity to continue the discussions that started with this terrible shutdown. It will give us the opportunity to try to bring our country together and resolve the problems we face.

It is a shame we have spent so much time doing what I think is the obvious—run the government and pay our bills. Now that we seem to have passed through this moment, we can move forward into the long-term challenges of our budget, the challenges facing our people, and our ability to solve problems so we can prove once again that this wonderful Constitution that has been bequeathed to us can still function, produce results, and govern this country.

Abraham Lincoln said we can't escape history. This morning the Chaplain's prayer talked about being accountable to history, and that, indeed, is what we are doing in this body. I hope that history will judge today as a moment—and the beginning—of a new era of cooperation and civility and problem-solving. This is not about the loss of our differences or the papering over of legitimate arguments of principle but the ability to try to work together, to talk to each other, respect one another, and listen to one another. Those are the essential qualities of leadership that I believe we are seeing demonstrated here today, and I hope it is a beginning.

I congratulate and thank all of my colleagues but especially the two leaders for getting us to this moment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I would like to say a few more words.

When the Democratic leader pointed at me to say something a few moments ago, we were not really prepared for that. We talked about coming to the floor later. I am so glad Senator COLLINS is on the floor now. She really deserves a lion's share of the credit for pulling this together. I am sorry we had no notice on that.

Some have kind of joked about the process and the women of the Senate. The truth is that women in the Senate is a good thing, and we see leadership. We are all glad they allowed us to tag along so we could see how it is done. Isn't that right?

It was a great experience for us to work together. I know it will be a Reid-McConnell product at the end of the day, and that is great. That is really what we wanted it to be. We talked about, in one of our first meetings, how we understood that we would be the plan B. The problem was there wasn't

really a plan A. We would be the plan B, so that if we could help move things along, that would be beneficial and constructive. And I think it was. I think the fact that the leaders knew we were working and trying to do some problem solving helped to move the process along. I know it wasn't always a pretty process, but we tried.

I think what this is all about today is a victory for bipartisanship. When we look at all the talk shows and listen to all the talking heads and do all that stuff, they never mention this. But the truth is the only way to get work done is by doing it in a bipartisan way. It doesn't really matter if we are in the Senate or on the local school board. If we want to get something done, we have to work with the other people in the room. We may not always agree with them. Maybe that is not who a particular individual would have elected, but that is who was elected.

I think that is really one of the lessons today; that is, if we work together, we can solve these problems. That starts by putting the rhetoric aside, putting the party labels aside, sitting down, and listening to the other side. We had to do a lot of listening because sometimes people have different views. They come at issues from different angles. They have different backgrounds to bring to the table. Nonetheless, we have to do a lot of listening.

I hope today is a big loss for blame game politics. From my standpoint, when I turn on the television and I see people here on this floor or on the floor down the hall or having press conferences and it is just blame, blame, blame, to me that is dead end politics. That is one of those situations where some people put on a red jersey and some people put on a blue jersey. We shouldn't do that. To me that is how we have ended up where we have, with shutting down the government and with running the risk of breaching the debt ceiling.

We should never allow that to happen. That is what is wrong with Washington. We need to work together to get things done.

We have always said—I think all 14 of us who were in this group, the Collins group, who worked together—we said we can do this if cooler heads prevail, and that is what happened. We were so delighted and pleased to be a part of it. I wish to thank the two leaders for their leadership and for encouraging us to, behind the scenes, move forward and get this done, and we definitely appreciate that.

The truth is we have a lot more work to do. We have a lot of work to do. There is a lot of work in this city that has been left undone, and Congress is largely responsible. If we can work together and if we can do what we did today, if we can drop the rhetoric, if we can roll up our sleeves, just as they do

in Maine and in Arkansas and in other places around the country—people in this country know that governing is hard work, but that is why they sent us here. That is why we run for these jobs. We run for these jobs so that we can make the hard decisions, so that we can make the big decisions. That is what the American people are starving for. They want us to work together. I know it is the last day before we have some terrible consequences to the economy, but that is what people want. They wish we would have done it a lot sooner than we did, but nonetheless that is what they want.

I hope and pray that, in this body, we will continue to work together and we will be problem solvers and that we will get work done. The legislative process is not always pretty, and we understand that. But work will get done at the end of the day, and we will reach those bipartisan agreements that will make this country proud.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much, Madam President.

I am not part of this group of 14, I believe it is, but I wish to thank them. I know a little bit about how hard it is to try to pull something together in an emerging situation, and they have done it. I see SUSAN and AMY and LISA here on the floor, three Senators who played a major role in this effort. I wish to thank them for taking the time, having the courage, and putting forward the ideas they did. I also wish to thank the leaders, Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL, because I think their coming together essentially averted what I saw as a potential catastrophe.

Although there is many a slip between the cup and the lip, I think we are in the home stretch. I think what we see is both a continuing resolution and the debt limit being extended, albeit not for long. Coming over here somebody stopped me and said: Well, we will be right back here in 3 or 4 months. Our challenge is to make that not so.

I also wish to thank Senator CRUZ, with whom I have had occasions to tangle, but he has said that he will not stand in the way of the vote. To me that is very important, because nobody knows what really will happen if we do not pass the debt ceiling in a timely way. In a way it is a big lesson in itself: Let us not go there again, and let us use this 3- to 4-month period in a wise and willing way to sit down, as the group of 14 did, and work out issues before we are right back from where we came.

I think another part of the agreement that is very good is that it allows the Budget Committee to go ahead and conference. Senator MURRAY sits next to me. After her 20 attempts to move this body to conference, all of which

failed, it looks as though now it will happen. Here is what that means. That means we will have a budget for next year, from which the appropriations allocations will be drawn very quickly, and then our bills can be brought into conformance. I happen to chair one of the appropriations subcommittees, and that is the committee that includes the modernization of our warheads, the Department of Energy, as well as the Army Corp of Engineers. Beginning tomorrow, seven big labs were going to begin to shut down: Los Alamos, Sandia, Lawrence Livermore, Lawrence Berkeley; as well as our nuclear program reactors were being shut down and put in safe conditions. Thirty thousand contract employees were going to lose their work, and the contract says they cannot be reimbursed for any day that is not worked. So that presented a particular special situation.

In the time I have been here, the Senate has become a very different body, and maybe now is not a bad time to say that. We used to be able to do much more along the lines of what the group of 14 has done. But I think scar tissue has built up in this house. I think it has built up in this house for one reason, and that is the prodigious use of cloture—a significant change because a majority body has been turned into a supermajority body. What do I mean by that? What I mean by that is everything, albeit but the simplest thing, has to have 60 votes. We had a clean debt resolution and cloture, and we did not have 60 votes even to debate the issue on the floor.

That has never been what the history of this body has shown. It has never been one of the reasons why I wanted to join this body. I have always felt that this body was sort of the prime of political officeholders—not the bottom but the top—and has always shown a willingness as to how this democratic process can work, by people sitting down together, understanding that our two-party system demands compromise to be able to make any progress at all. What I have found is that is less and less available to those of us who want to problem solve, who want to sit down and work out issues.

So I look forward to more efforts such as this effort that just took place, and I would very much like to join this esteemed new group of Senators for the future, because we cannot be here again in 4 months.

I was surprised—and I don't quite know what to do about it—but what I find is that people in the House too, who have come here with a very small number of votes, believe they so know what is best for this Nation, above anybody else, they are willing to do whatever they need to do to get their way. That is just not the way these bodies have traditionally worked. Now, that hasn't worked so far.

I think what is before us, which is a very simple 3-, 4-month advance of a continuing resolution, of the debt limit, verification of income, and the ability of the Budget Committee to go back to work, really signals that this next 3 to 4 months are so important to do what we need to do to restore comity to this body and the other body. Just think if we can find points of agreement in 3 to 4 months and then go ahead and regularly extend the debt limit for its full length of time, do away with the continuing resolution. It has been 3 or 4 years with no budget, and it has to stop.

So I am hopeful, with the leadership that now appears to have come together between Senator HARRY REID and Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, that these months can really be dedicated to a bringing together of both sides around problem solving. All I can do is pledge myself to do my utmost to help us get there. So this is just one step on the road.

Again, there is many a slip between the cup and the lip. So I hope this is going to pass this body today, pass the House, and that we go out with a resoluteness to come back another day and work together to solve what are some very major problems before us.

So thank you very much. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Thank you, Madam President.

I am very happy to be able to come to the floor this afternoon to join those who have already spoken to commend the fact that we have finally come to an agreement, it appears, that will end this government shutdown, that will allow the country to pay its bills, and that will, hopefully, address some of the uncertainty and harm that has come to families, to businesses, and to this economy over the last several weeks.

I wish to thank and applaud the leadership of Majority Leader REID and Republican Leader MCCONNELL for being able to come together to reach this agreement. I also wish to commend the many people who have come to the floor this afternoon, led by Senator COLLINS, who have been working over the last week to try to come up with some ideas to provide a framework for an agreement. I was especially appreciative to be part of that group of 14 of us, along with Senator COLLINS—and I think her leadership was very important—along with Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator PRYOR, and the many people who have come to the floor, in providing some impetus for people to work together and to move forward on an agreement that could finally end this shutdown. I certainly appreciated the comments of Senator PRYOR when he talked about the need for us to work together, to listen to each other, and

to put aside the blame game and address the many challenges facing this country. That is clearly where we need to go next, and I certainly hope we will all in this Chamber recommit ourselves to doing that.

We need to pass this compromise quickly so we can end the shutdown's negative effects on our economy. We need to move forward and think about how we can get some agreement long term in the future, and I think the bipartisan efforts that have been shown over the last week will be very important to doing that.

The fact is, while the agreement is good news, we know the agreement is only short term and that we are going to have to figure out a way to address keeping the government open, address paying the Nation's bills, address coming up with a long-term budget agreement, and we do not have a whole lot of time to do that.

I hope people will understand the very real impacts I have been hearing in my office, I know Senator COLLINS has been hearing that as well, and people throughout this body have been hearing from people across the country about what the impact has been.

Yesterday I participated in a Small Business Committee hearing to hear the impacts of the shutdown on small businesses across the country, and I appreciate the leadership of Senator LANDRIEU in organizing that hearing. It gave a voice to many of the small businesses, to many of the people across this country who have been suffering as a result of the shutdown. I thought it would be helpful to share a few of those stories as a reminder that as happy as I am that we have reached agreement, we have a lot of work to do in the future to make sure this does not happen again.

One of the people we heard from yesterday was New Hampshire community banker Chuck Withee. He is the president of Provident Bank. They have four locations in New Hampshire. He told me that small businesses, as we know, "are the backbone" of what they do at his community bank. He said the "shutdown has had a material and profound effect on many small businesses in the Southern New Hampshire region" because of the shutdown of the SBA loan programs.

We all know how critical access to capital is to making sure businesses can operate. Chuck testified that Provident Bank has 12 loans that are stalled right now. They are just waiting for the SBA to open. They have a total of \$2.7 million in small business loans—that is at just one small bank—that are currently on hold because of this crisis.

Sadly, according to Chuck, the consequences of this holdup may be permanent for some of those businesses:

There are purchase and sale agreements hanging in the balance, that may lapse and

have to be renegotiated. . . . The small business owner may also lose credibility and the ability to negotiate similar contracts in the future.

He went on to say the numbers do not really include the dozens of applications for loans that would have come through the door but did not because of the shutdown.

He also talked about a new program that Provident was just about to launch before the shutdown, a program that would focus on microloans for very small businesses—those businesses that usually have borrowing needs of between \$10,000 and \$100,000 that would have been able to get loans as part of this program. Because of the shutdown, the bank had not continued that program. He indicated they hope to roll it out as soon as the government is operating again. But clearly there are businesses that have been hurt in the interim.

We heard from people across the country at that hearing yesterday, from another SBA lender, Sally Robertson, who pointed out that one of the borrowers she is working with has posted a \$149,000 deposit on a new project—that if they cannot close in a timely fashion, they are going to lose that deposit.

We heard from some small businesses with Federal contracts. They have their contracts on hold, so they have had to dip into their cash reserves or furlough workers.

We also heard from a representative from the tourism industry who pointed out that travel and tourism in this country is losing \$152 million a day during this government shutdown.

I know everybody here has heard stories such as that from their home States. I am sure the Presiding Officer has heard those kinds of stories from the State of Wisconsin.

Hopefully, we will reopen the government, we will pass this agreement today, we will be able to get those small businesses up and running again, we will be able to provide some certainty for those Federal contracts, we will be able to bring back to work those furloughed workers and make sure they get backpay. But the challenge is that we cannot let this happen again.

I am hopeful—because we have a budget conference committee going forward—there will be a process by which we can put in place a longer term budget agreement so we are not facing another shutdown in January, right after the holiday season. We do not want people to think they cannot spend money during this holiday season because there is going to be another government shutdown or because the country might think about again defaulting on its debts in early February.

As Chuck Withee from Provident Bank said yesterday: Small businesses

will remain uncertain. They could face higher borrowing costs if Congress comes close to the brink yet again. It is an admonition I am certainly going to take to heart, and I hope all of us will.

Again, I thank everybody who has helped in reaching an agreement today. Hopefully, this will be approved by both Houses of Congress, we will get the government open, we will pay the country's bills, and we will not let it happen again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, this country has gone through over 2 weeks of very difficult times. It is extremely distressful that approximately 1 million Federal employees have not received a paycheck. These Federal employees have gone 3 years without a raise, they have been furloughed because of sequestration, and now they have been sent home, in many cases without any pay. Similar to every other working American, these are people who are worried as to how they are going to pay their mortgages, how they are going to pay their car loans, how they are going to pay their college loans, and they are extremely anxious.

But it is not only the 1 million or so Federal employees who are hurting. Obviously, it is the tens of millions of Americans who are in enormous anxiety about whether they are going to get the Federal benefits they are entitled to and the Federal services they need.

I am talking now, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, about Vietnam veterans who have written to me from Vermont and elsewhere who are worried that they may not get their veterans' disability benefits. Think about that. People who have put their lives on the line for this country, were wounded in action, and they are sitting at home wondering whether they are going to get a check, which they desperately need in order to keep their family going.

I am talking now about people on Social Security who are wondering that if this government actually defaults for the first time in our history—does not pay our bills—that they may not get a Social Security check. Millions and millions of seniors depend on that Social Security check in order to pay their bills and to maintain a very minimal standard of living.

I am talking about moms who today are walking their kids into the Head Start Program and then going off to work, and they are worried about what happens if their Head Start Program is shut down. What does that mean to their child? What does it mean to them? How do they get to work? Who is going to take care of their kid? Are they going to lose their job?

So what has happened in the last few weeks has brought a whole lot of anxiety and pain to tens and tens of millions of Americans. Why? Because over in the House we had a handful of right-wing extremists who decided they were going to hold hostage the American Government unless they were able to defund ObamaCare. That was last week. Then more recently, they were going to hold the government hostage unless we made major cuts in Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. That was a few days ago.

So I think what has happened has been incredibly unfortunate for our country. The damage done in terms of our position in the international community will take many years to overcome. What do you think the international community—people in Latin America, people in Europe, people in Asia—believes when they see the United States, the largest economy on Earth, presumably the leader of the free world, government is shut down and this country is debating whether we pay our bills? How does the President of the United States go to the United Nations, go to the world community, and say: Listen. There is an international crisis. You need to follow our lead. And we are the country that cannot even pay its bills or is threatening not to pay its bills for the last couple weeks and has shut down the entire U.S. Government.

So the damage already done by right-wing extremism is irreparable. I think people's confidence in the U.S. Government has been shattered. I am thinking about kids in Wisconsin or kids in Vermont who are now looking at the U.S. Government as some kind of joke, where maybe at some point they were thinking of running for office, getting involved in the political process, and now they say: It is not something I want to do. That is very sad.

I intend to vote for the agreement hammered out by the majority leader and the minority leader. But I wish to make something very clear. If anybody thinks this sequestration budget is a good thing for America, they are very mistaken.

As I understand it, sequestration will be extended until January 15, and we do not know what happens after that. Presumably that is going to be based on negotiations. But according to the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, if, in fact—and I will do everything in my power to see that does not happen—but if the \$988 billion sequestration budget were to go throughout this year, it would cost us some 900,000 jobs.

I have heard many of my Republican friends—and perhaps some Democrats—making the point, and an important point, that we have to do something about the budget deficit and we have to do something about our national debt. I agree with that. I am proud that along with other Members, we have cut

the deficit in half from \$1.4 trillion to \$700 billion. Anyone who does not think that is progress is very wrong. Cutting the budget deficit in half is significant progress.

But let me make a point that is not made terribly often on this floor. Yes, the deficit is a serious problem. Yes, we have to work on it. But every poll I have seen—and in my discussions with people in Vermont—they say: Yes, the deficit is a serious problem. Do something about it. But let me tell you, Senator SANDERS, what is a more serious problem; that is, that the middle class of this country is disappearing. Median family income is lower today than it was 24 years ago. Real unemployment is close to 14 percent. Youth unemployment is somewhere around 20 percent. African-American youth unemployment is somewhere around 40 percent.

The people of America are saying do something about the economy. Make sure that when my kid graduates high school, there will be a job available for him or her. Do something about the high cost of college education because I do not want my son or daughter to be leaving school \$25,000 or 50,000 in debt. Make sure, they tell me, that you do not cut Social Security because Social Security is one of the few bedrocks remaining to protect some of the most vulnerable people in this country. Make sure you do not voucherize Medicare, as the Ryan budget in the House proposed, ending Medicare as we know it and giving senior citizens an \$8,000 check, and when they get diagnosed with cancer, good luck to them, because that \$8,000 will last 2 or 3 days. Make sure you do not slash Medicaid.

The important point that has to be made is deficit reduction is an issue, but the more important issue the American people want us to resolve is to create the millions and millions of jobs this country desperately needs. The sequester budget we are voting on today moves us in exactly the wrong direction.

If that budget were to go on for a year—right now it is scheduled to end January 15. But if that would go on for a year, it would cost us 900,000 jobs rather than growing the many millions of jobs we currently need.

Let me again raise an issue many of my colleagues do not talk about, but I think the American people understand. At a time when we have more income and wealth inequality in this country than since the 1920s, what morality demands, and, in fact, what good economics demands, is you do not balance the budget on the backs of the elderly, the children, working families, the poor. But I do not hear much of that discussion here.

If you have a situation in America where the top 1 percent owns 38 percent of the wealth, and the bottom 60 percent owns 2.3 percent of the wealth,

who should have to experience austerity? Should we go to working families who in many cases have seen a decline in their income and say: Guess what. We are going to have to balance the budget on your backs. We are going to have to cut Medicare, cut Medicaid, cut nutrition programs, cut the ability of our kids to go to college, because we need to balance the budget. Guess what. The rich and the powerful have too many lobbyists here, so we are going to have to cut programs that impact you.

I know many people in the Senate want to move in that direction. I do not. Not only do we have an obscene, unfair distribution of wealth, it is as bad when we talk about income inequality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER has seen the same studies I have seen which talk about how in the last few years 95 percent of all new income generated in this country went to the top 1 percent—95 percent of all new income went to the top 1 percent, while tens of millions of other Americans saw a decline in their income.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 10 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. I think if the Presiding Officer had a discussion at some diner in Wisconsin or I did the same in Vermont, and talked to people and said: Look, the wealthiest people are becoming much richer; the middle class is declining; poverty is at an all-time high, how do you think we should deal with deficit reduction? Do you think we should be cutting programs for the elderly, working families, the children, the sick, or the poor, or maybe do we ask the wealthiest people in this country to start paying their fair share of taxes?

Maybe—I know this is a terribly radical idea. Today one out of four major corporations pays zero in Federal income tax, because a lot of these multinational corporations are stashing their money in the Cayman Islands and in Bermuda and in other tax havens. I know it is a very radical idea. I guess I am an extremist to think maybe it is more important for corporate America, which is enjoying record-breaking profits—one out of four major corporations pays nothing in Federal incomes taxes—maybe we might want to ask them to pay something in taxes so we do not cut Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, education and nutrition programs.

I think what goes on around here is our sense of reality is distorted because surrounding this building are not working families—they are too busy back home trying to maintain their

family. Not children. We have the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world. They are not here. But all of the lobbyists from the billionaire organizations and for corporate America are here, telling us what we should be doing.

Well, I think maybe the time is long overdue that we stood for the working families of this country, for the children, and for the elderly, and not move for deficit reduction on the backs of the most vulnerable people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I have come to the floor a number of times during this government shutdown to say how absurd this has been for the American people, that we have found ourselves where we are, to have the government shut down, and those who brought forward a strategy to defund ObamaCare—the exchanges have opened anyway. That is why I never supported this strategy, because I did not think it was smart for the country, or achievable.

We have been coming up against the debt ceiling issue, so I come to the floor today, after having come to the floor on several occasions, expressing my concerns and frustration.

I thank our leader MITCH MCCONNELL and the majority leader HARRY REID for coming together around an agreement ending the shutdown, to address the debt ceiling, even if on a short-term basis, so we can get out of the hole we are in, and start to deal with the big-picture problems facing the Nation.

Around this, I was very heartened that a bipartisan group of Senators came together to solve this problem, led by Senator COLLINS from Maine, and seven Republicans and seven Democrats. Let me say among the 7 Democrats was my colleague from New Hampshire Senator SHAHEEN, who I see in the Chamber. If the Chair would recognize Senator SHAHEEN, I want to thank her, because what we have been able to do in New Hampshire is that she and I, even though we come from opposite sides of the aisle, have been able to find ways to work together on behalf of our State and on behalf of the country.

She was in this group of seven Senators as a Democrat, I was there as a Republican, both representing the State of New Hampshire, ready with an agreement to solve this crisis. So I want to recognize my colleague and thank her for being part of a group that wanted to solve these problems for the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I very much appreciate my fellow Senator from New Hampshire Ms. AYOTTE for her remarks. I would echo those.

She and I have both been to the floor over the past few weeks to talk about the devastating impacts of this government shutdown. It has been an unnecessary hardship—a very real hardship—placed on so many New Hampshire families, so many New Hampshire businesses, and the challenges it meant for the economy of our State and for the Nation.

I ask my colleague if it would be important, as we think about going forward and trying to deal longer term with the need to come up with a budget for this country, the need to address paying our bills in the long term, if this kind of bipartisanship we tried to exhibit for New Hampshire would be important for all of us to think about as we try to solve those challenges long term and also for us to try to reassure the people of New Hampshire that I believe we are going to be working together to try and do that, and hopefully everyone else here will do the same?

Ms. AYOTTE. Let me say to my colleague from New Hampshire, the senior Senator from New Hampshire, I agree with that. We cannot go through this again. It is incumbent on all of us to work together even though we come from different parties so that we do not go from crisis to crisis in managing this Nation.

I do hope with this agreement we are able to come to a longer term budget for the Nation, a longer term fiscal agreement for the Nation to address our \$17 trillion debt, to address the challenges facing our economy, to work together to show people we can solve problems on behalf of this country, and that we can make sure we are not continuing to go from crisis to crisis as we represent New Hampshire and this Nation.

I know both of us joined that group because we had had it with what was happening here and we were ready to solve the problems together.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I thank my friend and colleague from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I want to continue to thank the Senators on both sides of the aisle. We were working together with our leadership. I mentioned this was an effort led by Senator COLLINS, Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska, Senator MCCAIN, Senator JOHANNES, Senator KIRK, Senator FLAKE, on the Republican side of the aisle, and on the Democratic side of the aisle, Senator MANCHIN, Senator BEGICH, Senator PRYOR, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator DONNELLY, Senator HEITKAMP, and we were even tripartisan because we had Senator KING with us as well in these efforts.

I think what we demonstrated is we can come together as a core group. When things break down here, there are many of us who desire to solve the problems facing the Nation. We know

we cannot do it with one party alone. It took two parties to get us \$17 trillion in debt; it is going to take two to get us out of this hole. Just like this fiscal crisis, it takes two parties to get us out and solve the Nation's problems. I think that is what we learned from this experience. I want to thank those who have worked so hard on it.

Let me say: I am blessed to be a mother. My children just turned 6 and 9 years old during this whole crisis situation. It has been hard to get home during this time. My family is still in New Hampshire. I still live in New Hampshire. My daughter Kate asked me: Mom, why can't you just get the government open? What is wrong? Well, why can't you get this solved?

It is a such a commonsense question that I got from her and from our son Jacob. Think about the lessons we try to teach our children. Are we not always trying to teach them that when they get into a conflict, you have to work it out? That, yes, you do not get to get everything your way, that it is not always your way.

Well, those are the lessons I think all of us, regardless if we are Republicans, Democrats, Independents, try to teach our children. So I found myself in a hard position here where she is asking me the tough question. I had to say to her: You are right, Kate, we have to work together; otherwise, we are not going to get this solved.

Even though I feel very strongly about my principles, I know my Democratic colleagues do also. What kind of lesson am I showing if I cannot help get this resolved? That is why I was proud to be part of a bipartisan agreement.

Let me bring us back to why we got into this government shutdown for a moment, because the other thing, being a mother of two children, when something goes wrong, I always ask my children when they make a mistake: What did you learn from this? What was the lesson you learned from the mistake?

I did not believe the defunding ObamaCare strategy was going to succeed from the beginning, not because I am not a strong opponent of ObamaCare. I absolutely am. But the fact of the matter was that the government shut down and the exchanges opened anyway. Yet the government was shut down, and we put all of those people who were worried about whether they were going to get their paychecks, veterans worried about what is going to happen—we can go on and on. I have heard the impact in my State.

By the way, all the flaws those of us believe that do exist in ObamaCare were all overshadowed by the fact that the government was shut down.

I do want to fix this law. I want to repeal it. I want to replace it with commonsense reform. But this was not a strategy to make that happen.

I guess I would ask the question that I ask to my children: What did we learn from all of this? What we learned is this was not a successful strategy from the beginning. That, yes, you can be against ObamaCare, as I am. I am for repealing it and replacing it. But shutting down the government was not a smart strategy and not the right direction. I hope we never do this again. I hope we learned our lessons. I ask my children to do that, I am going to ask myself to do it, and I am going to ask others to do it.

Let's move forward. Let's work together. Let's find ways—as we get to January when the funding for the government expires again, and February, let's take on the big challenges facing this Nation, the \$17 trillion in debt.

Let's get a budget for the Nation. Let's move forward from here, learn our lessons, work together, and get it done for the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. I wish to speak about the issue at hand.

Thank the good Lord we are finally having, as the Good Book says, people who will come let us reason together.

I am so grateful, for the hundreds of thousands of people who have been directly hurt by this shutdown. I am very grateful we will avoid a default that would not only hurt the people of this country but would irreparably damage the financial foundation of this Nation. This should have never happened in the first place.

We have heard the two previous Senators, one a Democrat and one a Republican, say the same—it shouldn't have happened in the first place. One doesn't hold the country hostage and disrupt people's lives to get their particular agenda done, particularly when they are dealing with an existing law that has been upheld as constitutional by the Supreme Court. But that is exactly what has happened.

We are in a situation in the politics of this country where narrow, certain special interests claim their position is the only position and have it reflected in Congress so that the political ideology of a narrow, small group of extremists can direct the affairs of the Congress. This group, especially in the House, can cause the trauma and the turmoil we have been through.

We apparently have an agreement. I assume we are going to vote on it in the Senate, and it should pass overwhelmingly sometime today. Then the question is will it be put in front of the entire House so Republicans and Democrats alike can vote for this and get us over this immediate potential crisis.

December, January, and February are the deadlines set in the agreement we will pass today. The first challenge will be for the Budget Committee—a conference committee from the Senate meeting with a conference committee

from the House—to hammer out the differences between the two budgets, as there are substantial differences. We will have our first test shortly when the conference committee is named and goes to work. We will see whether they can start bridging some of those differences.

Simultaneously, there are going to be many Senators meeting to talk about what has been referred to as the grand bargain, which could be under the umbrella of what the budget conference committee does. Since the Budget Committee is talking about top-line numbers of appropriations and the details are left to the individual committees, there need to be many good-will negotiations with respect to each other in order to build consensus. We have not seen a great deal of that around here, but we are starting to see glimmers of it today.

The great test is going to come in the next couple of months by the deadline of December 13 and then, of course, January 15. I don't think anybody with common sense would want to approach this by not getting an agreement before January 15. That is when this next tranche of severe budget cuts, spending cuts across the board, including half of those spending cuts in defense, expires. We have heard defense official after defense official tell us that this is not good for the security of this country.

Hopefully the Budget Committee can achieve an agreement in conference committee that will avoid that sequester. If all of that is done and the wheels are set in motion about the fleshing out of a Budget Committee agreement—for example, tax reform done in the Finance Committee in the Senate and done in the Ways and Means Committee in the House, tax reform such as getting rid of a lot of the loopholes, producing revenue, utilizing, for example, some of the revenue to lower tax rates, some of the revenue to pay down and lower the deficit, and some of that revenue to replace the sequester that is going to have such negative effects on the common security of this country. If all of that is done by January 15, then we won't have a problem February 7, which is the time the artificial, statutorily imposed debt ceiling expires, because that crisis of potential default will have been absolved by virtue of agreements prior to that.

That is a lot of good will that is going to have to take place in the next few months. That is a lot of mutual consideration and respect that is going to have to reign, instead of much of what we have seen here the past few weeks.

I am grateful we have this agreement and that in the next 2 days it can be wrapped up and default can be avoided. I am hopeful, albeit cautious, that we can avoid this again, with good public policy.

I close by saying that a public office is a public trust. We, as public officials,

ought to recognize that our responsibility is to represent all of the people, not only some of the narrow interests represented in this country. If we will approach these next 2 days and then the next several months representing and recognizing that a public office is a public trust, then we can get it done. That is my hope, my prayer, and why I am very grateful we have come to this point.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. HEINRICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, we are obviously pleased that our Senate leaders, Senators MCCONNELL and REID, have negotiated a bipartisan way to end this crisis. This agreement will open government, will allow us to honor our bills, and it sets up a mechanism, using the regular order of the Senate, to resolve the budget impasse and to hopefully negotiate a budget for this country.

The good news is that in passing this compromise agreement we will end this self-inflicted harm on our country that has been caused by the government shutdown and the threatened failure for us to honor the obligations of this country. Make no mistake about it. We have harmed our country. The shutdown, which started on October 1, has hurt America's economy. The threatened default on our obligations has hurt America's creditworthiness reputation. Consumer confidence has been damaged.

Consumer confidence is important. That is where people are willing to go out and buy or travel or go to restaurants. As a result of the uncertainty caused by this self-inflicted crisis, consumer confidence has fallen dramatically. That has an impact on so many businesses in our communities—so many businesses. Many small businesses have been hurt very badly.

This morning I joined Senator BOXER in bringing some small business owners here to demonstrate the harm that was done. We heard from the operator of Blackwater Paddle and Pedal Adventures, located on the eastern shore of Maryland near the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge. That refuge, as you know, is closed. This company has two locations, one in the very historic part of our State where Harriet Tubman conducted her Underground Railroad, which is right next to the Blackwater Wildlife Refuge. So this is a place people want to go, but they also want to go into the refuge for many reasons. Some get permits to hunt,

some fish, some bird watch, some ride bikes, some like to look at the eagles, of which we have an incredible display there. But the fact Blackwater was closed meant this small business owner lost a lot of revenue. She related exactly how much money it was. She said: On Saturdays, I was doing about \$1,500, and that went down to about \$150.

That is life and death for this small business owner. That is what this shutdown has meant. We can multiply that by hundreds of thousands of small businesses across this country that have been harmed dramatically as a result of the shutdown. All that added together means our economy has been dragged down.

We had a hearing yesterday of the Small Business Committee on which I serve. Senator LANDRIEU conducted the hearing. We had a roundtable with about 8 or 10 people. Some were small business owners, giving very similar stories as to what we heard about Blackwater Paddle and Pedal Adventures. Some represented financial groups that did SBA loans, and they gave specific examples of how the SBA loans could not be processed.

What does that mean? They gave an example of a company located right near me in Owings Mills, MD. They had a loan that was ready to be closed but was not closed. That person is in the process of buying equipment that might have to be foreclosed if they do not get the SBA loan, and they will lose their deposit. The one near my house was opening a new motel-hotel. That could be delayed or jeopardized as a result of this.

We had all types of examples given, putting real faces on those who have been harmed as a result of this shutdown.

Our economy has suffered dramatically. The private contractors who rely upon Federal payments in order to pay their workers laid off thousands of private contract employees in my State and throughout our country. Businesses had to lay off additional people, major damage to our economy.

I take this floor many times to talk about our Federal workforce. I am honored to represent a large number of Federal employees, consisting of about 10 percent of the workforce in the State of Maryland. Over 100,000 of these workers were put on furlough. They had to go through the anxiety of not knowing whether they could pay their bills. We hurt American families and we hurt our economy.

So what do we need to do? How do we move forward? First and foremost, we have to get this agreement to the President and signed as quickly as possible. Every day hurts our economy. I hope we can figure out a way to get it done today and to the President today and signed today and get our economy back on track.

Next we have to deal with the economic problems we have. This agreement gives us a little breathing space. It sets up a way we pay our bills, we keep government open, and we negotiate. But we are going to have to negotiate an agreement. What this country needs more than anything is predictability. We can't keep leapfrogging from crisis to crisis. That is not governing. We have to govern. The American people expect us to govern. They expect us to work out our problems. They do not want to hear the House is under one party and the Senate is under another party and it is tough for us to work these things out. They expect us to get the job done. They expect us to govern, and governing means we need to negotiate a budget that covers more than just a couple of months, but that takes us through the end of the next fiscal year. That is what we need to do. That will put us on a glide-path for economic growth.

Shutting down the Federal Government and teetering on the edge of default killed middle-class jobs, cost our Nation billions of dollars, harmed our economic competitiveness, and severely damaged consumer confidence. We can't go through that again. It worries me that in 1990 we said we wouldn't go through this again—and we did. So we need to establish the right legacy, and that means starting now, with Democrats and Republicans working together on a budget that makes sense for our country. We need to seize this opportunity to bring long-term stability and predictability to our economy.

The world needs to know America is open for business. One of the most damaging editorials I saw during this shutdown appeared in the state newspaper in China on October 13. It read:

It is perhaps a good time for the befuddled world to start considering building a deAmericanized world.

We need to let the world know that America is open for business and that we have got our house in order and we are not going to continue to govern from crisis to crisis. We need to get that done.

What we need to do is negotiate a budget that makes sense for this country. Get this agreement done, get government open, pay our bills, but then negotiate a budget that allows for economic growth.

The very first thing we need to negotiate? Getting rid of sequestration. Sequestration is mindless across-the-board cuts. It says every priority in government is equally important. That is not true. If you have a problem with your family budget, you don't cut every spending item exactly the same percentage. You will make sure you have shelter for your family, make sure you have food on the table, maybe you will postpone a vacation or something, but everything is not the same

priority. Sequestration says everything is the same priority. We need to get rid of sequestration and we need to do that in the context of this budget negotiation.

Yes, we want to make sure we have long-term financial stability and that we pay our bills. I was proud to be part of a Congress that actually balanced the budget when President Clinton was President. I know there are tough decisions. But we know how to do it.

We need to make sure we invest in job growth. We need more jobs in America. So, yes, we need to invest in transportation and roads and transit systems. We need water infrastructure to modernize our water systems in this country to allow for economic growth. We need to invest in education. We need to invest in research—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. I thank my colleague from Virginia for that extra time.

We need to end sequestration, we need to invest in job growth, and we need to have a balance between revenue and spending so we have a way in which America can continue to grow.

We need to deal with our Federal workforce. Shutting down the Federal Government was a punch in the gut to Federal workers and contractors. Make no mistake about it. This agreement intends to hold our Federal workers harmless as far as pay, and more particularly it brings them back to work to do the essential work of these agencies.

I have talked before about the important work done by many of these Federal agencies—the Environmental Protection Agency, protecting our public health, protecting our environment; the Small Business Administration, processing loans for small businesses; the National Institutes of Health, doing ground-breaking research to make the next great discovery for America; NIST, working to give us technology so that we are competitive; the FDA's food safety programs; and the list goes on and on and on.

The bottom line is we need to work together. We not only need to open the government and pay our bills, but we need an agreement for a responsible budget that will give us predictability, job growth, and economic competitiveness to meet the world's global economy. I hope we will take advantage of the time this agreement gives us to put our country first and do what is right with America's future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his voice throughout

this debate. He and I and a number of other colleagues realized early on this self-inflicted crisis of putting our workforce in jeopardy was bad policy, bad politics, and bad for our country. I am very glad that the resolution it looks like we are approaching is going to make sure our Federal workforce gets back to work and to the job of helping America, and they are going to get compensated for it. But I would add that it is not going to make everybody whole.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, may I ask my colleague to yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I thank my friend from Virginia for yielding.

Through the Chair, I thank Senator WARNER for his help in making sure we do what is right for our Federal workforce. They suffered through furloughs because of sequestration, furloughs because of a government shutdown, freezes in their pay, attacks on their retirement, attacks on their health benefits, and they are asked to do more with fewer people because of freezes in hiring. Yes, we will try to hold them harmless as far as this furlough is concerned, but we have to make sure we attract the very best in public service because of the critical work they do. I thank the Senator very much for his help.

Mr. WARNER. I agree with the Senator from Maryland.

I was in the private sector longer than the public sector, and I have run companies. I have never seen a management style which would say to the workforce, "We are going to ask you to do more with less money" and then treat them as poorly as they have been treated repeatedly by some of the attacks the Senator from Maryland has laid out.

I wish to take a moment, as a number of my colleagues have, to state that it looks as if this self-inflicted political crisis may be finally coming to an end.

To paraphrase Charles Dickens, in a way, it may be the best of times and the worst of times.

In a certain sense, it may be the best of times because over the last couple of days we have seen the leaders of the Senate, Leader REID and Leader MCCONNELL, basically say: Let's put away some of the disputes and end this crisis. So I compliment their work and all the bipartisan efforts that have been going on to put this to an end. So in a certain sense perhaps it is the best of times. Yes, we are about to finally do our job. We are about to actually reopen the government and put our workforce back to work, and by a whisker we are avoiding default and the financial calamity which would ensue if we continued down that path.

But it is also the worst of times in that once again we took this conversa-

tion to the eleventh hour. We have inflicted damage on our economy and our reputation. And due not to a Republican or Democratic skirmish but really due to a small group of "our way or the highway" crowd, we have violated the first principle of governing or medicine, which says: First, do no harm.

Unfortunately, the actions of this self-inflicted crisis have done harm even if we reopen the government and avoid default. Economist Mark Zandi has estimated that the cost to our economy is at least \$20 billion. Reopening the government and avoiding default isn't going to erase the \$20 billion hit to an economy that has been struggling.

I wish those who advocated for this shutdown, who advocated for this brinkmanship would be willing to come down and explain to folks in my State or, for that matter, in their States—if you happen to be a government contractor and if some of your workforce was deemed essential, they may actually get paid, but for the portion of your workforce deemed nonessential, chances are they won't be paid. One company in Virginia with 5,500 people—30 percent of its workforce was deemed nonessential. The company has tried to pay those people through this period. Some will be paid, some will not. Those individuals, those families will not recover. I would like to have somebody come down and explain what all this was for in terms of the hurt in their personal lives.

I would like for some of the folks who advocated these tactics to come and explain to a restaurant owner in Hampton, VA—where the workforce at NASA Langley, which was 3,500 strong, was reduced through this furlough to 7 people—with the lost receipts for the restaurant over the last 2 weeks, how their tactics somehow improved the fortunes of that private sector business.

I would like for those who advocated that it was smart politics to shut down the government and take us to the verge of default to explain to the motel owner on Skyline Drive in Virginia who lost a couple of weekends of the peak fall foliage season and won't see any of those dollars come back, how it was in their best interest to shut down.

It is not just in Virginia. It is Yosemite in California and national parks in Texas. I would be anxious for some of those who advocated these tactics to explain to those private sector business owners who won't see those dollars come back. They are not going to get recouped.

I would like those who come to this floor and talk about trying to get rid of our debt and deficit and the burdens on the taxpayer to explain how these tactics of shutting down the government and bringing our Nation to the verge of default helps the American taxpayer. The American taxpayer comes out a giant loser from these tactics.

The Federal Government workforce rightfully is going to be repaid, so there is no savings there. As a matter of fact, the cost of starting and stopping any enterprise is enormous. Anyone who has run any kind of business understands that.

So I hope those who have advocated these tactics will come down and explain to the American taxpayers how this created a bigger deficit and explain why this made sense.

I would like for those who advocated these tactics to come down and not just talk to the American people but talk to the world and say how this helped America's national reputation.

America has been ranked by the credit agencies as the most secure credit in the world. That is why, when there are crises around the world, investors buy dollars. It gets into sophisticated finance, but it means everything we do in America is a little bit cheaper because we are viewed—to paraphrase a company term—like the rock.

We have gone through two of these self-inflicted crises. The last two or three of these crises brought us close to the fiscal cliff or close to default, and the last time cost us a downgrade from one of the rating agencies. We saw yesterday the second rating agency, Fitch, put us on negative outlook. As a former Governor of the State of Virginia, where we kept our triple-A bond rating, you don't get back your reputation overnight by saying: Oops. Never mind.

We will be paying the price for these kinds of tactics for months or maybe years to come.

I would like those who advocated these tactics to come down and answer the kinds of headlines we saw in the Financial Times and Wall Street Journal where countries that may or may not be that friendly to us—China and Russia and others around the world—were saying: We need to move away from an American-centered economy around the world, a dollar-centered economy around the world—how this hit to our reputation was somehow in the best interest of our country.

I am glad Leader REID and Leader MCCONNELL worked out what appears to be at least a short-term solution. I am glad many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle tried to find common ground. It appears we will reopen the government. It appears we will avoid defaulting and going into uncharted territory where we, candidly, don't really know how bad it could have been.

But before we celebrate too much, let's recognize that the reports are true as far as what the avoidance of this catastrophe will mean. It means we have 90 days before the government runs out of money again. We have 113 days until the debt ceiling might have to be raised again.

So my first hope as we move forward is that those who practiced the tactics

of shutdown and threatening default will say: Never again will we put the full faith and credit of the United States of America at risk. Never again will we shut down our government, hurt our Federal workforce, hurt taxpayers, and hurt private businesses simply because we didn't get what we wanted in a political dispute.

I hope as well in the coming weeks we will recognize that the people who work for the United States of America, our Federal workers, deserve better; that when we come on the floor of this Senate or the other body and have our policy debates, we don't criticize the workforce the way it was repeatedly criticized; that we recognize that when we want to take a pound of flesh out of some program, we don't start with the Federal workforce because in the tight budget times we will face for the foreseeable future, we are going to have to ask that workforce to do more with less resources. Again, as somebody who has been in business longer than I have been in government, management 101 says that if you want your workforce to do better and do more with less, you start by acknowledging their challenges and rewarding them, not simply bashing them, not simply leaving this overhang of future furloughs or the kind of uncertainty that still seems to be around this place.

The second thing I hope we will go forward on is recognizing that sequestration was set up to be so stupid that no rational group of people would ever let it happen. Well, we have let it happen now for about 8 months so far. As challenging as it has been over the last 8 months, in this next fiscal year, which started on October 1, it is going to get exponentially worse.

I understand the concerns of my colleagues on the other side and my concern as well that we have to find a way to cut back on some of our spending. But there are smarter ways to do it than sequestration. So in this ensuing period, I hope we are able to work through that.

I do believe we need to take these next 90 days—or an even shorter period if we need a report back from the Budget Committee by mid-December—and recognize that this constant—every 3 months, every 6 months—manufactured budget crisis does our country no good.

If both sides will enter this next phase of negotiations with a little more sobriety, a little less willingness to call out each other by name, and actually recognize that we do have to get our balance sheet in order—if we want to avoid a repeat in January and February of these last couple of weeks—we have seen the damage we have done to our country—we are going to have to roll up our sleeves and recognize that we are going to have to deal with our entitlements. That means folks on my side of the aisle are going to have to

think about how we preserve Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid in a way that is affordable over the long haul. My friends on the other side of the aisle will have to realize what kind of government we want and what kind of government we are going to be willing to pay for.

As somebody who has spent the last 4 years combing through these numbers repeatedly, I don't think we can pay for the level of government the American people have expected with our existing Tax Code, so we are going to have to find ways to close down some of these loopholes, make our Tax Code more pro-growth, but at the same time generate more revenue than we currently have.

It is never over until it is over, as I have found in the Senate, but my hope and prayer is that we will not do any more damage; that we will put a halt to this hemorrhaging of the \$20 billion we have already inflicted on our economy; that we will say to that motel owner that we are not going to be willing to shut down a national park again come January; that we will say to that restaurant worker outside the Federal facility: You are going to be able to predict that the Federal Government isn't going to be laid off willy-nilly; that we will say to our Federal workforce we are going to ask you to do more with less, but we are going to support you in a way we have not done to date; that we will say to the American taxpayer we are not going to deepen the deficit by taking irrational actions by shutting down government; and we will say to the world that once again you can count on the United States of America to pay its bills in an orderly and regular fashion, and never again will we put the full faith and credit of America in jeopardy.

I hope and pray we will use this period to actually put a fix in place. The incremental amount of additional revenues needed to be changed or the incremental amount of changes that need to be made to our entitlement programs are relatively small and can be phased in over a period of a decade or more. I agree with the Senator from Maryland that we also have to invest. But I cannot help but think the best jobs program we can have for an economy that is anxious and ready to recover is to make sure that we in Washington do not create and manufacture another political crisis that puts that recovery in jeopardy.

It is the best of times and the worst of times. I hope we celebrate that we have done our job and avoided this calamity, but let's make sure we never do this again. Let's make sure we take the 90 days before the next CR expires and the 113 days before the debt ceiling comes and really get our fiscal House in order and make sure we give the American public the confidence they need to move forward.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I rise to say a few words to applaud the Senate bipartisan leadership for the ongoing negotiation to do what the American public wants us to do, to reopen our government, affirm the fiscal soundness of the United States, and finally begin a true dialog of a budget conference to find a path forward for 2014.

This is what America wants us to do. They want us to work together in the Senate—Democrats and Republicans. They want the Senate and the House to work together. They want us to stop the foolish shutdown that has needlessly hurt individuals, our communities, our economy, and our prestige. Now is the time to do that and then begin the repair work that is ahead.

The deal that has been worked on by Senator Reid, Senator McConnell, and others is a bipartisan deal. As the Presiding Officer knows, that is necessary. The American public has provided a divided Congress—one House with a Democratic majority and one House with a Republican majority. If we are to get over this short-term hump—and indeed, if we are to get over the next hump through a budget negotiation—it is not going to be just one side dictating the terms. Those who thought they would shut down the government and dictate terms were wrong. Those who thought they could threaten default on the debt and dictate terms were wrong. When the American public has put one party in control of each House, the only way to find an agreement and come forward is for people to listen to each other and find compromise.

Again, we are not there yet. We hope we will be voting later in the day, but I think it is appropriate to say we appreciate the leadership of Senator Reid and Senator McConnell and finding—in a very challenging time—a path forward to do what is right for the country. We encourage those efforts and look forward to being on the floor later today to have a vote and send the appropriate signal, that the U.S. Government is open and the full faith and credit of this wonderful Nation stands unblemished.

If we do that today, the real work, in some ways, now begins. This whole exercise in brinkmanship could have been avoided if Congress had, in March, done what we in the Senate have been asking them to do and started a budget conference.

I have spoken about this many times on the floor—probably with a little bit

of extra passion because I serve on the Budget Committee. Being on the Budget Committee has been an education for this naive freshman Senator. After working with others to pass a budget at 5 a.m. in the morning on March 23, I sort of believed that somehow government 101 would next say we would then take the Senate budget and the House budget—that indeed were very different documents—and put them immediately into a conference where we could find a compromise and move forward. That is what was contemplated by the 1974 Budget Act under which Congress operates.

What was odd is that after we did all of that work to pass the budget again and again and again, an effort to begin a budget conference was blocked. That was surprising. We would not be in a shutdown if we had done it in March. Nevertheless, we are at a place where we are going to fix the brinkmanship and then engage in the kind of dialog between the House and Senate so we can move forward.

Again, if there is to be a deal—and budget deals have proven to be elusive in this body in recent years—make no mistake. It is going to have to be a bipartisan deal. I feel very strongly about some issues, but the deal will certainly not be to my liking in all particulars. The House may feel strongly about some issues. They can't expect a deal that will be—in all particulars—to their liking. A divided government means we have to listen to each other, negotiate, find common ground, and that is what the American public has sent us to do.

In conclusion, I am proud of the Senate budget. What a budget conference will be is essentially an opportunity for each House to put their best document on the table and say: This is a budget that will be good for America. Having worked with my colleagues on the Senate Budget Committee in January, February, and March, I am proud of the budget we have passed.

I have done a lot of budgets. I did many budgets as a city councilman and a mayor in Richmond. I worked on budgets as the Governor of Virginia. We won some awards in our State for our fiscal acumen, and I think I know something about budgets.

What I know about the Senate budget and believe very strongly is this: If that Senate budget were to be put in place today, without changing one comma, without changing one apostrophe, it would be good for the Nation. The Senate budget we passed—fully aware there would be a conference, fully aware there would be negotiation and compromise—nevertheless, the Senate budget we passed does a lot of good. It is a budget that is focused primarily on economic growth—growing our economy, adding jobs. The best anti-deficit strategy is a growing economy. In putting our budget together,

we focused on issues such as infrastructure and educational investments that would help grow the economy.

We focused on the protection of key services, recognizing we have to deal with expense items. There are key services Americans depend on, so we reject the across-the-board, slash-and-burn of the sequester and instead find targeted ways where we can find savings that would nevertheless protect key services. The budget expresses a willingness to reform—to reform the way we spend, to reform programs such as Medicare, where cost growth has been so significant, to reform Defense spending in smart ways that will keep our Nation safe, as well as, yes, to reform tax policy, the tax expenditures, which is the polite way of saying loopholes, deductions, credits, exemptions—all of those tax expenditures that turn our revenue collection system into a kind of swiss cheese. We need to do tax reforms as well. If we are going to reform on the spending side, we need to reform tax expenditures as well.

Finally, the Senate budget offers us a path forward to credibly reduce the deficit and to replace the foolish, non-strategic, across-the-board sequester cuts that have harmed Virginia and have harmed the Nation. That is not to say there will not be cuts. But if we are going to have cuts, they should be done with a strategic sense. Any CEO, any Governor would say that cuts should be strategic rather than across the board.

So I am very proud of our Senate budget, and I look forward to having an intense dialogue between Senate and House Members where we put the two budgets on the table, where finally a conference can begin, where the American public can see the different choices the House and Senate make, and thereby be educated about the choices. I think that if we sit in a conference and we have the two budgets on the table, folks will see the many virtues of the Senate approach. But all Senators involved in those discussions—and we don't know yet who they will be—as proud as they are, as proud as I am about the Senate budget—we will have to go into this with the full knowledge that we will not find the kind of deal going forward without being willing to listen, dialogue, and compromise.

I will conclude by saying it seems as though compromise is sort of a dirty word these days. Yet we have to reflect back that our very form of government depends upon it. The three branches, the checks and balances between the branches, assume a degree of dialogue and compromise. The legislative branch itself, with two Houses—it would have been easier with one—but with two Houses, on matters such as these, the need to get bills and legislation and budgets through both Houses requires compromise.

So I am glad we are finally entering that stage of a true budget conference—an opportunity to dialogue and compromise, which we should have done last spring. We can enter into it with pride that the Senate budget is a strong document that will help the economy, but also enter into it fully realizing that this short-term deal is not going to be solved by a House or a Senate plan that just had the support of one party. It had to get solved with a bipartisan deal that originated, thankfully, in the Senate. We will have to be willing, in order to find a long-term budget solution, to bring that same spirit to the table.

With that, Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent to speak for such time as I consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I come to the floor today with both a great deal of energy and a sense of relief—relief that it appears we have reached a bipartisan agreement to reopen the government, pay America's bills, and give us a path forward to deal with the ability to negotiate on some of our long-term fiscal challenges.

I come with a sense of energy because I think it shows that when there is a will, we find a way. This needs to be a sensible approach. I have a sense of optimism that this spirit of compromise that produced this new agreement will continue in the Senate as we work together.

I am so relieved we are going to extend the debt limit, at least to February 7, 2014. During this entire debate over the last several days, I was so apprehensive that America would become a deadbeat nation.

I was appalled, like so many Americans, that the families of four of our soldiers who had fallen in the line of duty were not going to get their death benefit. The wonderful Fisher family, who has been so kind and so generous to our veterans, paid that. This is the United States of America. We have a duty to our military. We have a duty to our military families. We were not going to be able to do that. That is just one example.

I was concerned about our T-bills, our famous Treasury bills, that have been not only part of the fiscal underpinning of the global economy, but also have given confidence to modest and conservative investors: Well, I will invest in T-bills because nothing will ever happen to our government.

I was concerned that our T-bills would go the way of junk bonds. So now, because we have extended the debt limit, we have agreed to pay the bills on debt we have already incurred. This is an excellent way of moving forward.

I also am pleased we are going to have, as part of this agreement, the re-opening of the entire government. This means our government will be on a continuing funding resolution until January 15, 2014. This will enable us to set the framework for what our funding will be for the rest of the fiscal year.

Why are we in a shutdown of our Federal Government? The Presiding Officer is a member of the Appropriations Committee. I chair that committee. That is the committee that actually puts money in the Federal checkbook for the entire fiscal year. However, we are not wild spenders. We have a cap placed on us. That comes from the Budget Committee.

The Budget Committee sets the budget for the entire Federal Government. It sets what the cap should be on discretionary spending, which is the Appropriations Committee, on mandatory spending, which are programs that must be funded, whether it is Social Security, Medicare, veterans' benefits, and others that no matter what, they are to be funded. Then they also set what revenue we should have and where we should get it. The Budget Committee is absolutely crucial for us to do our work.

I am pleased there has been a commitment from the leaders to appoint conferees on the budget resolution so the Budget Committee can do its work and give back to we appropriators no later than December 16 what our cap is for spending for the entire fiscal year. If we can do that, we appropriators can do our job. I will say more about what appropriations are.

This is going to be a very tight schedule. The Budget Committee has been unable to meet because six Senators used their parliamentary tools to block the Budget Committee meeting, even though the Senate passed a budget with over 70 votes on March 23. We have wasted 6 months and we don't want to waste the next 6 weeks.

I am pleased there appears to be the ability for the Budget Committee to meet in conference with the House of Representatives. That means the chair of the Senate Budget Committee, Senator PATTY MURRAY, and the ranking member or vice chairman, Senator JEFF SESSIONS of Alabama, will meet with PAUL RYAN, the Republican chairman in the House Budget Committee, and CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, another Marylander and a very able ranking member.

I wish them well because we need to know how much discretionary spending we are going to have, we need to be able to look at mandatory spending,

and we need to look at revenues. If we can pass this agreement reached by our leadership on both sides of the aisle, Democratic leader Senator REID, and Republican leader Senator MCCONNELL, we can, within hours, reopen our government and pay our bills.

These are our constitutional responsibilities. The American people deserve a government that works as hard as they do. We need to put our Federal Government and our Federal employees back to work. This agreement does that. It says to the American taxpayer and to the entire world, America is not a deadbeat nation. We can work together to enact bipartisan, fiscally responsible legislation to keep our government going. There is no doubt that we have significant fiscal challenges ahead of us.

As we prepare to vote, I would encourage all of us to take stock of what has happened in the Senate the past several days. It is time we take stock of where we are and what it means. The crisis we have just lived through might be very good for TV ratings, but it is lousy for credit ratings. It is good for TV ratings because the Nation was gripped by what they saw. They couldn't believe it. I was in the Senate working, and I couldn't believe it either; that we could not in a straightforward way come to grips with the fact that we needed to reopen government, but we were being held back by those who wanted to defund ObamaCare.

This crisis of the U.S. Government and the fear that the U.S. Government might not pay its bills has created a crisis of confidence. As we work on implementing the deal we are promoting, we also have to work to ensure that we rebuild the confidence of the American people and those who depend on and look to the U.S. Government, those that are treasured allies and emerging nations to whom we would say be a democracy and be like us. We have to use our time not only to get our fiscal act together, but we have to restore the confidence in our ability to govern.

America is a middle-of-the-road nation. We need an environment where the middle speaks, where the middle class now speaks and says: Please represent me, meet our national security needs, make public investments in physical infrastructure and in human infrastructure such as education and access to higher education. Please make public investments in research and development that will create new ideas for the new jobs in the new economy of the 21st century. This is what they want us to be able to do.

For those of us in this great institution called the Senate and the other side of the Capitol, the House of Representatives, we have to be middle-of-the-roads. It is the middle, maybe a little to the center left or to the center right, but we have to be in the middle.

Middle-of-the-roads are the ones who helped bring us to this deal.

I wish to thank those who put forth some other ideas during this debate, Senator COLLINS, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and the so-called group of 12. They had some very interesting ideas. As we go forward on implementing the deal, we ought to consider some of them. They helped create a climate and a tone where people showed they wanted to be pragmatic and also wanted to be patriotic, which is to make sure that the esteem of the U.S. Government continues to take hold both among our own people and around the world.

I wish to be sure we all work together. I fear the middle-of-the-road legislator could be an endangered species. I hope not. I hope the middle-of-the-roads don't become roadkill. We can show now it is not only the deal that has been made, but we must vote on the bill, pass the bill, and then we need to implement it.

America and its government cannot go from one crisis to another. We cannot govern by crisis. We cannot govern by one party or the other extorting it from the other—my way or I will shut it down. We have to show that we are a deliberative body. We have to show we are a nation of laws and rules, not of people, personalities, and pundits. We need to demonstrate that.

I compliment those who have been voices of moderation and voices for creating the climate to bring us to this point.

I also wish to thank our leadership for being willing to step to the plate and be leaders. I would also like to thank Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL for the leadership and statesmanship they possess.

We are on the brink of brinkmanship. We had enough of gamesmanship, and they stepped forward to show us what statesmanship is. I wish to thank them for what they did.

I chair the Appropriations Committee. I am not a solo act. I have 12 wonderful subcommittee chairmen who are eager and itching to go to work. I have an outstanding Republican conservative as my vice chairman, Senator SHELBY of Alabama. We want to work. We want to work together and we want to work with civility, mutual respect, and get the job done.

I say to my friends on the other side of the dome, we want to govern. We want to govern wisely. We want to govern efficiently, and we want to govern respectfully.

I say to my colleagues on my side who have elected me the chair of this committee, they may count on me to do my best.

I say to those on the other side of the aisle, they may count on me to continue to run an inclusive committee of discussion, open debate, amendments, so we can move our process forward. Everybody feels included. Everybody

has their say. Everybody has their day. At the end of the day though, we will vote.

To my colleagues on the other side of the dome, let us work together. We have shown in the past we know how to talk to each other, we know how to listen to each other, and we can get the job done. I believe America wants us to get on with the job. Americans want to be able to have a government they can count on. Americans want to be able to have a government that works as hard as they do. They want to have a Congress that acts in the interests of the Nation, of the next generation, and not of the next election.

I am ready to vote for the agreement reached by our leadership, go to work, and do everything I can to make sure we follow the middle of the road—that sensible center—and to make sure the American middle class has their day and their say.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today on a day when we are ever hopeful that we will be able to complete legislation tonight that will remove the threat of a default as well as to open the government and to allow us to go forward now with negotiations on short-term budget issues for the next year and even beyond. I am confident that will happen, that we will be able to complete most or all of the work tonight.

In a larger sense, the reason it is vitally important we get this agreement effectuated is because there are an awful lot of people out there hurting, and hurting for several reasons. We have had a recovering economy, but job growth hasn't moved fast enough. We still have, by way of example in Pennsylvania, over ½ million people out of work—at last count, 501,000 Pennsylvanians out of work. The percentage number really doesn't tell you much. It has been hovering around 7½ percent or a little higher for a long while, but more than ½ million people out of work is devastating.

As the Presiding Officer knows, his State of Ohio and Pennsylvania have a lot of similarities in terms of our workforce. When I go across Pennsylvania, we have sometimes the biggest urban areas, such as Philadelphia, still having high unemployment numbers, and sometimes very small counties having an equally high percentage of people out of work. My home area of northeastern Pennsylvania has still far too many people out of work.

So when you add a tough economy still for a lot of people, plus the impact of the indiscriminate, across-the-board cuts by way of sequestration—which I believe is bad public policy, and we will talk more about that later, and it will be the subject of greater debate than it has been—and, thirdly, you add the impact of the shutdown, and, finally, you add this time of coming perilously close to a default, it has been, for all those reasons, a difficult period for the country and a very difficult period for those who are trying to make ends meet every day.

We have a chance in the next couple of hours to vote in a manner that will lift some of that anxiety, some of that worry. I was here this past weekend on the floor talking about a letter I had received from a woman in northeastern Pennsylvania. She talked about her circumstance and her husband's circumstance as a result of the government shutdown, but then she talked about her parents, ages 85 and 83. Here is what she said about her parents:

... they should not have this uncertainty. These should be their golden years. It breaks my heart to hear my mother saying she can't sleep and has a stomachache from the worry about where our country is headed. Middle and low income families cannot afford another economic downturn. We are just barely recovering from the last one.

That letter that came from northeastern Pennsylvania I think spoke for people across our State and across our country as to what people have been living through, trying to recover from the recession of several years ago and then being hit with a government shutdown and then our coming to the brink of default.

For all those reasons, we hope the work that is done today with the compromise agreement Majority Leader REID and Republican Leader MCCONNELL have entered into becomes the consensus not only here in the Senate but in the House as well. No legislation can remove all of the anxiety and the worry people have, but certainly it will provide some measure of relief for families.

We had another story that came to us yesterday of a family in Pennsylvania, led by the mother of the family. Kelly Brown is her name. She has four children, and the children's ages are 17, 14, and she has two 9-year-old twins. This story was in the Pottstown Mercury, Tuesday, October 15. Kelly's story is emblematic of the impact of the shutdown—just the shutdown itself—and what that did to her.

Kelly is in an apartment in southeastern Pennsylvania with her four children. She was moving along the path to getting a mortgage and being able to move into a house kind of one county over, not too far from where she was living. In the first couple paragraphs of the story, it says:

Then the government shutdown froze her mortgage. And over the weekend, the home's

seller notified Brown that she couldn't wait any longer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this story dated October 15 of this year entitled "Gov't shutdown could leave single mom, kids, homeless."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mercury, Oct. 15, 2013]

GOV'T SHUTDOWN COULD LEAVE SINGLE MOM, KIDS, HOMELESS
(By Frank Otto)

BOYERTOWN.—Kelly Brown was all set. With a pre-approved mortgage through the U.S. Department of Agriculture, she had an agreement on a house in Boyertown where she could move with the four children for whom she has full custody.

Currently in an apartment, it would be the first house Brown, 44, would have since she lost her home in a divorce settlement seven years ago.

Then the government shutdown froze her mortgage. And over the weekend, the home's seller notified Brown she couldn't wait any longer.

"Three weeks ago we were celebrating getting my first house," Brown said. "And now we're here."

With the agreement in place before the shutdown, Brown and her own real estate agent, Jack Dolan, of Keller Williams, began putting money into the home through appraisals, deposits and improvements such as the removal of asbestos.

"We thought, of course the government won't shut down," Brown said.

As September ended, the shutdown did indeed occur, which put the pre-approved mortgage through the Department of Agriculture on hold.

Brown continued forward hoping the shutdown wouldn't affect her move out of her apartment in Upper Frederick, where she'd given notice prior to the shutdown.

She'll have to be out of the apartment she shared with her sons, Oliver, 17, Noah, 14, and 9-year-old twins Duncan and Isabella, by Nov. 2.

The settlement on the home in Boyertown was scheduled for Oct. 25.

"We were moving ahead 'thinking the shutdown is going to end. The shutdown is going to end,'" Brown said.

Then, with the mortgage still frozen and no clear resolution to the shutdown in sight, the seller notified Brown through Zuber Realty, their Realtor, that they couldn't wait any longer and were going to move ahead with attempting to sell the house to someone else.

"Over the weekend, they said they would no longer give us any time," Brown said. "They said they'd sell the house to somebody else, knowing all the money we had already paid and it was through no fault of my own."

Richard A. Zuber, owner of Zuber Realty, said the seller couldn't hold the house out any longer without getting a return on the property.

Zuber said the decision rested with the seller, who intends to stay open to selling to Brown if no buyer is found once the shutdown ends.

"We definitely have sympathy because it's not their fault," Zuber said. "This all hangs on the federal government."

Brown said Dolan suggested attempting to rent the house until the shutdown was over but the seller was not in favor of that.

At this point, Brown is concerned that she might not have a place to live with her family come Nov. 2. She has no relatives in the area and now has to brainstorm.

"I work for the (Montgomery County) Office of Children and Youth as a caseworker," Brown said. "It's kind of ironic because this is what I do. I help families that have neglect or abuse of children and help them with services to find housing."

An additional concern is that her son, Oliver, is applying to colleges now and expecting acceptance letters.

"What's going to happen with that?" she said. "Where are we going to have a mailbox?"

Serving as a classroom aide in the Pottstown School District while she got her master's degree to become a social worker, Brown said she's "devastated" after all the work she put in.

"We were finally at that point where we could do it," Brown said.

Mr. CASEY. My office is working with Kelly now to see if we can't be helpful. But the point is she should never have had to go through that anxiety and worry, and risk not being able to move into that house that she had a chance to move into.

That is what real life is. Real life is trying to complete a mortgage application and moving along to go from an apartment to a home with your four children and being stopped because of a shutdown here. And in the case of the earlier letter I referred to, it is a daughter talking about her parents and the worry they have, and the literally sleepless nights and pain and anxiety because of what is happening or not happening here in Washington.

We hope and pray on days such as this that the actions taken will lift some of that anxiety and provide a measure—and maybe it will only be a very small measure—of comfort and what we hope will be some degree of stability.

I think once we get past this period, we can get back to the work the American people expect us to focus on, which is—if I could put this in a sound bite, what I hear from people in Pennsylvania saying they hope I will do as one of their representatives—that we will work together to create jobs or work together to help the middle class, work together to move the economy forward, or some variation of that, and that is what we hope to get to.

As important as it is to begin the process of talking about and negotiating on a budget for the next year and on the longer term fiscal question, it is very important for both parties to get back to the focus of building a stronger middle class and building a stronger economy.

You don't have to go very far or read the paper for many days to find evidence that the middle class has never been more under siege, never been more undermined or weakened over time than the middle class is today. On September 19 of this year, in *The New York Times*, there was a graph—I won't

put the graph in the record but I will summarize it very briefly—of all kinds of data that indicated what has happened to the middle class in the last generation. The headline over the description of the graphs was "standing still," with a big question mark. The point it makes is that the middle class is virtually where it was many years ago, if not further behind.

I am quoting from some of that summary where it says:

The costs of maintaining a middle-class life-style have increased.

Then in the middle of the page there is a graph that talks about the middle 20 percent of the country—basically what most would describe as the middle class. And in that 20 percent you can tell, just from a little more than a generation—this graph goes from 1967 to 2012—that the share of total income of that middle 20 percent of the country has gone from 17.1 percent to 14.8. That is a substantial erosion of income for the middle class. That is a problem and a challenge we should work on in the days ahead, in addition to working on our budget.

I will make one final point about what we should do on the other side of this important work we are going to do today to complete this agreement and to lift the threat of default and to make sure we open the government and move to negotiations.

On July 20 of this year there was a long piece in *The New York Times* about not just the middle class but also about other measures of how we are doing as a country. Two data points jumped out at me and, frankly, would outrage anyone reading it. They listed the top 20 countries that are our peers. This category was the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, so-called OECD countries—in other words, the 20 countries in the world that are most similar to the United States by way of economies and, to a certain extent, by population. So we are compared to our peers. That is the measurement. If you look at the top 20, under two categories—infant mortality and child poverty—the United States of America ranks 17th in both out of 20. And 17th, obviously, is right near the bottom. Instead of being in the top 3 or top 5 or even the top 10, the United States, when it comes to child poverty and infant mortality, is ranked No. 17 in the world out of 20.

So as we move to focusing on the middle class and focusing on job creation strategies, and even focusing on budgets and whatever else people want to debate and negotiate about around here, I hope we will all feel challenged by the admonition that we cannot lose sight of what is happening to our children. This is the most powerful country in the world. Our economy may not be demonstrating it right now, but we are and we will be, and we can never say we are doing the job we must do if

we are not focused on the needs and the challenges faced by our families, especially the most vulnerable member of any family—a child. Infant mortality and child poverty are two indicators where this country is far, far behind, and we all need to do more on those issues.

We are happy we are moving to a resolution of this long nightmare the country has lived through and these families have lived through, but even on the other side we have some major challenges that should be a summons to our conscience to do something about them, and I hope our actions and our work can be commensurate with the challenges faced by families and especially the challenges faced by our children.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I join my colleague from Pennsylvania in expressing relief and optimism that, finally, it looks as though we are rid of the wasteful and useless government shutdown we have been put through for the past 2 weeks; that it looks as though we are rid of the dangerous threat of American default that we have faced for the last few days; and let's hope that together we are also rid of the malicious spirit that led us down this evil path in the first place.

A colleague the other day on the Senate floor used the analogy of a fire in an airplane's cockpit distracting the pilots from flying the aircraft where it needed to go as they had to put out the fire.

That is kind of what we have been through these past 2 weeks. I hope we will have no more of our own countrymen lighting fires in the cockpit just to try to get their way. We need as a nation to get our heads up, fly the plane, and ready ourselves for the weather ahead.

The last 2 weeks have been wasted in this useless artificial crisis and has distracted us from real crises, real problems, undeniable problems—things which the Speaker of the House can't make go away by finally allowing a vote but which will require us to work together to solve them. None is more significant to our children than what our carbon pollution is doing to the Earth's atmosphere and oceans. It is not enough just to put out the fire in the cockpit. We have to wake up to the real problems ahead and around us.

I know the Presiding Officer from Ohio is a keen enthusiast and student of history. I recently saw part of "The Dust Bowl," Ken Burns' documentary series. The Dust Bowl calamity was an economic disaster and a human disaster, but it was also described in the show as having been an economic disaster and a human disaster because it was first and foremost an environmental disaster—indeed, one of the two

or three most devastating environmental disasters in the United States.

The Dust Bowl happened, creating such disaster for so many good, hard-working families, because, simply put, we messed with Mother Nature. To plant wheat, we tore up the deep-rooted buffalo grass which had protected the prairies for generations. We ignored the cycles of drought which were the Great Plains' history. The result was tragedy and destruction.

There are obvious parallels from the Dust Bowl experience to where we are now on carbon pollution. Most obviously, lesson No. 1, you mess with Mother Nature at your peril. And are we ever messing with Mother Nature. We just broke through 400 parts per million of CO₂ in the atmosphere after at least 800,000 years—which is longer than homo sapiens have been a species—in the range between 170 and 300. Our whole species has come to the success we have seen on this planet in a safe window of 170 to 300 parts per million of CO₂ in the atmosphere, and we have now broken out of it. And it is not just 400, it is 400 and climbing.

Let's move from our atmosphere to our oceans. Our oceans are acidifying at the fastest rate ever recorded. We have to go millions of years back into the geologic record to find anything comparable. When we go there, what else do we find when we look back to those points in the ancient geologic record? It isn't pretty. In fact, it is downright ominous.

The second lesson is that the cause of such a calamity can be a perfectly normal activity, just at the wrong scale. Look at the Dust Bowl. There is nothing wrong with plowing. Plowing the Earth is probably the single most valuable action humankind has ever learned to do. Plowing is essential to farming. Yet it was that ordinary activity—plowing—which brought on the Dust Bowl and the vast human tragedy that ensued because it was at the wrong scale.

Similarly, there is nothing inherently wrong with burning fossil fuels. We do it when we drive to the market, and we call it up when we flip on the light switch. Yet burning fossil fuels at too great a scale is leading us to the brink of a new disaster.

What changes and makes it no longer perfectly normal and OK is when we know the consequences of the scale of our activity. Once we know the consequences we are causing, that activity is no longer so benign and responsibility cannot be so easily shrugged off. If only the farmers at their plows had listened to the warnings of the cattlemen and Native Americans and not put every corner of every farm to the plow.

There is a third parallel, which is that there is a lot of lying done when there is money to be made. In the Dust Bowl, land dealers and speculators told farm families that plowing the prairies

would make more rain fall. Rain follows the plow, they were told. They had nothing to worry about. And the land speculators sold, and they sold a pack of lies. The race to plow created more speculators and more hucksters and more lies.

Today we have the deniers—a sophisticated, well-honed apparatus of institutions and strategies designed to spread lies, designed to sow doubt, designed to delay action. Today it is done on a scale that makes the Dust Bowl hucksters look like piddling amateurs. It is funded by giant corporations such as ExxonMobil and Koch Industries. It uses the slickest Madison Avenue strategies. It maintains a stable of pet scientists willing to be trotted out and to recite from the polluters' playbook. It operates through a network of false front organizations designed to look more independent and credible than their funders are and designed to hide the money flow.

When history looks back and this story is fully told, I believe this apparatus of lies will take its place beside great American scandals such as Teapot Dome and Watergate. But for now it churns merrily on its way, cranking out the propaganda.

Regrettably, this apparatus has captured large segments of the Republican Party and silenced others. The polluters have maneuvered the question of carbon pollution right into the middle of the Republican Party's culture wars. The fossil fuel industry must be really chortling at having pulled off that fete. But it does not bode well for the Republican Party. Lies are ultimately revealed. The choice to make bedfellows of the polluters will soon enough be very damaging to the Republican Party. For the polluters, they have played the Republican Party for suckers, and they will grin all the way to the bank. They won't care.

The last parallel is the lesson that when you are messing big-time with Mother Nature, things can go precipitously wrong. Mother Nature can turn on you very suddenly. Wheat farming on the plains was a bonanza, with bumper crops year after year. Families who had never owned land, who had never before had a place to call their own, saw golden futures as far as the eye could see as the wheat ripened. And within just a few years the devastation was complete and families' dreams were shattered. The Dust Bowl came on fast.

There is a phrase—"a fool's paradise." It is called a fool's paradise because it looks like paradise for a while if you don't look ahead and take the precautions to protect paradise and fend off calamity. Not looking ahead is what gets you to the "fool" part.

Young people are looking ahead. Voters under 35, by a ratio of 66 to 27—more than 2 to 1—say that climate change is a problem we need to address.

And when asked about climate deniers, 74 percent of Independent young voters said they would describe climate deniers as ignorant, out of touch, or crazy. For self-identified Republican young voters under 35, 53 percent identify climate deniers as ignorant, out of touch, or crazy.

I ask unanimous consent to conclude in 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. So I ask my Republican friends, how is climate denial a winning strategy when 53 percent of your own young voters think it is ignorant, out of touch, or crazy? How is that looking ahead? We in Congress get elected to look ahead. We don't get elected to put our heads in the sand. We certainly don't get elected to parrot the lies of the special interests.

Well, we are not looking ahead. We are sound asleep here in Congress. We are having a snooze while nature's alarms are ringing all around us. It is time for Congress to wake up. We have a duty. We need to wake up to our duty.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, it now appears that at some point this evening we will reach the end of the latest Washington-manufactured crisis of the month. But, unfortunately, the real crisis facing the country remains, and that real crisis is the growing sense among our people that we are losing the American dream.

Why do people feel this way? Because more than 4 million Americans have been out of work for 6 months or more, because millions more find themselves stuck in jobs that do not pay enough for them to live the way they are used to, and while their paychecks aren't growing, their bills are. Ask the young couples and single parents how much they are spending every month to provide childcare for their children. Ask the students, young Americans who are stuck with thousands of dollars in student loans they are now struggling to pay.

This is the real crisis facing America; that our status as a land of opportunity seems to be eroding and that so many of our political leaders seem oblivious to it. And now, as we emerge from this latest standoff, we have done nothing to address it.

There were two issues at play in this showdown. The press coverage mixes them together, but there are two distinct and separate issues, and they should be examined that way.

It started with ObamaCare—a law that was sold to people as something that would help them get affordable health insurance. But that is not what it is going to be. We have all heard the news of what a fiasco the rollout of the exchanges has been. But as bad as the

rollout of the exchanges and the Web site has been, we need to realize that was supposed to be the easy part. The most difficult and disruptive parts of that law are yet to come.

In the months to come, a new insurance fee—a new tax on hard-working Americans—will be added to insurance policies. People will be required to give up existing coverage they are happy with if it doesn't meet the standards created by ObamaCare. And if they don't buy the insurance, they eventually will have to pay a tax that goes up to \$695 a year or 2.5 percent of their income. Employers with more than 50 full-time employees will be required to offer a certain type of coverage to their employees. So many of them are moving people to part-time work. And full time, by the way, is no longer defined as 40 hours; it is now 30 hours. So many employers are moving employees to under 30 hours a week.

Today, for many Americans, ObamaCare is just a Web site that doesn't work, but in the months to come this law is going to hurt millions of people. It is going to cost them hours at work and maybe even their job. It is going to cost them the insurance they have now and are happy with. It is going to force them to leave their existing doctor. It is going to raise rates for people who buy insurance for themselves.

What do we tell these people who are being hurt by this law? To deal with it because it is the law of the land? Is it not our job to fight for them? Is it not our job to be their voice and to protect them from the harmful effects of this law? That is why I continue to believe we should not waste a single penny more of taxpayer money on this damaging law.

One of the most important powers and responsibilities that we have as Members of Congress is the power of the purse. It is under our Constitution, which gives the Congress the power to decide what to spend money on and what not to spend taxpayer money on.

I know of no one in my party who supported shutting down the government. On the contrary, we argued that we should fund the entire government except for one thing, ObamaCare. In fact, the House of Representatives passed a law that did just that.

But the Democrats took the position that either we fund ObamaCare or we fund nothing at all. They took the position that funding ObamaCare was more important than funding the government. They were willing to put our country through this government shutdown just to save their pet project. Within days of the showdown, by the way, a second issue was added, the Federal debt limit. The press portrays the debt limit as simply a law that allows us to pay our bills, and therefore they fall for the argument that failing to raise the debt limit equals a default on

our debt. But the debt limit is a lot more than simply permission to pay our bills.

Every year, our government is spending more money than it takes in, a lot more money than it takes in. As the years go by, that annual deficit adds up to what we call the national debt. It is growing at an alarming rate. The debt limit is a law that limits the amount of money the government can have as debt at any single time. But we depend on borrowed money to pay our bills. So if we do not raise it again, eventually we will not have enough money to pay all of our bills. That should scare us.

Reaching the debt limit is like this. When the bank calls on you to collect the monthly mortgage payment, if you don't pay them, your home is going to be taken away, your credit is going to be ruined, and your ability to borrow money in the future is going to be hurt. But what if, because you don't make enough money, the only way to pay your mortgage is by using your credit card? You can't do that forever, but you also can figure out what other expenses to cut so you don't have to keep using your credit card to keep paying the mortgage. That is what real people in the real world do.

But that is not what we are asked to do here. They are asking us to just pay the bill and keep using the credit card and let tomorrow worry about tomorrow. We cannot do that forever because at some point even the credit card is going to stop working.

Yet that is what has happened here again. So the debt will keep growing. With each passing year, we will get closer to the day that we face a real debt crisis—not one caused because the Congress cannot pass a bill, but one caused because no one will lend us money anymore.

That is how we arrived at the point we find ourselves today. We have a President and a majority in the Senate that would rather face a default before seriously dealing with the debt. We have a President and a majority in this Senate that would rather shut down the government before they would shut down ObamaCare or even make any meaningful changes to it.

Tonight the government will be reopened and the debt limit will be lifted, but our real problems are still here. In the months and years to come they are only going to get bigger and harder to solve. For those of us who realize this, who clearly understand that the direction in which we are headed threatens the American dream and all of the things that make our country special, this is the time to reflect on the way forward. Because if we do not figure out how to change course around here, if we do not figure out the way to change the course our Nation is on, we will forever be known as the generation that ushered in America's decline.

History is not going to distinguish between Republicans and Democrats. It

will judge us all harshly for our failure to act. To avoid this fate we must once and for all begin to address the national debt, not with accounting gimmicks but with real and measurable steps. It does not have to be solved in one sweeping measure, but we must begin the work of moving toward a sustainable level of spending. This will take time because we are still saddled by too many leaders unwilling to address the issue in a meaningful way.

Let's do what we can while they are still here, and at the same time let's work to replace these irresponsible leaders on the left with leaders who will finally step up and save our Nation from the real debt crisis that awaits us.

As for ObamaCare, it too will be harshly judged by history. That is why I am personally so disappointed that we were not able to achieve any meaningful changes to it. But this fight is not over. It has only just begun. In the months to come, millions of Americans will begin to confront the costs and the consequences of this law. It will be the reason why they are now working part-time. It will be the reason why they lost the insurance they used to have. It will be the reason why they cannot see the doctor they have been seeing for all these years. It will be the reason why their insurance premiums have gone through the roof.

We have been warning people about this for years, and we have done everything we could to keep this harm from reaching our people. But now ObamaCare is going to start hurting real people in real ways, and when it does this there is going to be a mad scramble in this town to fix it or get rid of it.

This has happened before. In June of 1988, Congress passed a bill called the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act. It promised new medical benefits for the elderly, a cap on hospital and doctor bills, and it provided prescription medicine. Then the true cost of the program began to reach the American people and, as seniors began to learn the true cost of this new program, it fueled a revolt.

At first, the politicians minimized it. They minimized the protests, and they refused to make any changes to it at all. But before long, the onslaught of calls and mail to congressional offices became so much it was impossible to ignore. Before long, Congress was in full retreat, and by 1989 it was fully replaced.

For ObamaCare the day of reckoning is also coming. In the last few days I have been startled by the number of people who have told me they are ready to give up. They are ready to give up on the idea that we can make a difference. They are ready to give up on the idea that things will ever get better. But we cannot give up on America, and we cannot give up on the American

dream. We cannot give up, because where are we going to go? If this country declines, if we lose what makes it special, what is going to replace it? So no matter how long it takes, no matter how many disappointments lie ahead, we must never give up, and we must never accept that this life today is the new normal.

For those around the world who look at the events of the last few days and weeks as evidence that America's best days are behind her, you don't understand our people. Our politics does not define our country. We are a unique people, a collection of men and women with sharply different views, with different backgrounds and beliefs. We share a free society, and everyone has a right to express their views, to argue and battle and debate.

Sometimes our differences bring us to points of great conflict, when the Nation appears on the verge of being ripped apart at the seams. Yet for over 200 years we have been held together because, while we are divided by many things, we are united by a powerful and timeless idea.

Before I describe that idea I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute to conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. For over 200 years we have been held together because, while we are divided by many things, we are united by a powerful and timeless idea, the idea that every single person has the God-given right to determine the course of their own life, the God-given right to go as far as our talent and our work will take us. So we argue about the best way to achieve that, and we have a tendency to put off difficult decisions before we absolutely have to make them.

But we have faced greater tests before. We have not always rushed to meet the challenge, but in the end we have never failed to do so. And let there be no doubt that we will do so again. The day is coming when our people will realize that the time has arrived once again to confront the challenges before us. The day is coming when our people will do what must be done to keep the American dream alive. I know it is hard to see right now, but we are one day closer to the moment when Americans will do what we have always done. We will confront and solve the challenges of our time, and we will make any sacrifice and undertake any task to make sure that we leave for our children what Americans of yesterday left for us: The single greatest nation in the history of the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am optimistic that soon we will be able to

enact legislation to reopen our government and affirm the world's longstanding confidence in our financial stability and system of democracy. The current situation is an unfortunate by-product of our sometimes discordant form of government which at this time happens to be divided between our two parties.

Despite the challenges of recent weeks, I hope this experience demonstrates to the Senate, to the other body, and to the administration, that the Nation is best served when we work together. If we allow our current hardships to pass, only to immediately entrench and get ready for the next crisis, we will be wasting an opportunity to extract a positive outcome from these last, difficult weeks.

Under the rules of the Senate, individual Senators are provided with significant power to shape the activity of this body. That is the way the Senate was designed to operate, and it has served this body and the country well. Recognizing that the rights entrusted to each of us can be powerful, we must be judicious in their application. We must always remember that each of us was elected by the people. If we work in cooperation, and even opposition, with a sense of realism and respect for ourselves and our institution, I believe this body can function effectively.

In getting past our current fiscal stalemates, I hope that we can next achieve a long-term agreement that will reduce our debt through structural changes to government spending. As a part of that process, we must talk seriously about the President's health care law, its serious flaws and its impact on families and businesses. I have consistently opposed this law, and one of my goals is seeing that it is repealed, delayed or made voluntary. Achieving that goal may take longer than we would prefer because we are in the minority, but the law's declining popularity should give Senators from both parties reason to reevaluate it.

As part of a sustainable budget plan, I hope we can reach a long-term agreement on a farm bill to provide producers and consumers with certainty and to preserve the security Americans enjoy by our ability to generate, independently, food and fiber for ourselves and for the world.

The farm bill this body adopted earlier this year would help accomplish those goals and save \$23 billion over the next 5 years.

If we can achieve a responsible budget agreement for fiscal year 2014 and beyond, I am confident the Appropriations Committee can produce bipartisan bills to fund the government in a responsible manner. I hope all Members have begun to recognize that our inability to act on individual appropriations bills has reduced each Senator's opportunity to help shape Federal programs and has eliminated a

principal means of overseeing the executive branch.

The Appropriations Committee has long been able to produce bills that reflect input from all Members, reflecting their different needs and their different priorities. The committee has continued to do so since passage of the Budget Control Act, which will have the effect of cutting—reducing spending by more than \$2 trillion from discretionary accounts over the next 10 years. It is the only significant deficit reduction legislation enacted in recent memory. I supported that act, as did a majority of Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Now we have given ourselves another opportunity to make broader budget reforms. It will be of benefit to the legislative branch and the people who elected us if we can establish a budget framework that will enable us to deal in a more transparent manner with all legislation, including appropriations bills and reform measures to simplify our Tax Code.

I am pleased that we seem close to resolving the current impasse, and I hope that over the coming weeks we can devote ourselves to thoughtful and productive deliberations on the budget.

It is important that we act to restore the confidence of the American people in the Senate. We must take real steps to strengthen our Nation's fiscal foundation so our economy can grow, and American families and businesses can prosper.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there has been a lot of debate on the floor of the Senate about ObamaCare, which is also called the Affordable Care Act. It passed about 3½ years ago. Why did we do this? Why did we enact this law? It wasn't easy and it took months to achieve. The goal was quite simple: We wanted to make sure 40 to 50 million uninsured Americans would have a chance to have health insurance.

That is a worthy goal because even uninsured people get sick. If you don't have health insurance and get sick and show up at the hospital, they will take care of you, but then when you can't pay the bill, they transfer that obligation to everyone else. It is estimated we spend about \$1,000 a year in health insurance premiums to cover the care of uninsured people. Not only do these people without insurance live without the peace of mind of having protection when they get sick, the rest of us with health insurance pay for it. That is not

right. In a society such as ours, we should accept responsibility to not only have health insurance but to make it available for everyone.

When we took a look at the health insurance market, here is what we found. There were parts of health insurance that were just plain wrong.

Imagine someone in your family has a preexisting condition. It is not uncommon. Think of the possibilities. There are only a few that come to mind: asthma, diabetes, cancer survivor, women. It turned out that if you had issues such as those in your background, you could be discriminated against and people would not sell you health insurance. ObamaCare eliminated discrimination based on preexisting conditions. When the Republicans come to the floor and say they want to repeal ObamaCare, they are repealing that protection for families who have a child or a member of the family with a preexisting condition. That is what they are saying.

ObamaCare also said that if you have a limit on your policy of how much it will pay in any given year, that is stricken. Why would we do that? Because you never know what could happen. Tomorrow morning a doctor's diagnosis or an accident could result in hundreds of thousands of dollars of medical bills that you could pay because there was a limit on your protection. That limitation was stricken by ObamaCare. Those who want to eliminate ObamaCare would allow the insurance companies to put those restrictions in again.

What about parents who have children fresh out of college and looking for a job? Some of them will be lucky and will get a job with health care benefits. Some won't be so lucky. They may get a job without any benefits or they may not get a job. With ObamaCare, we kept those kids—your sons and daughters—on your family health insurance plan up to age 26. Those who want to eliminate ObamaCare want to eliminate that opportunity for American families to give their kids health care protection while they are looking for a job.

We also basically said that senior citizens under Medicare should not pay out of pocket over \$1,000 a year for their prescription drugs. We closed the so-called doughnut hole. Eventually they will not be paying out-of-pocket. We are reducing the financial obligation of seniors to reach into savings accounts for the medicine they need to stay strong, healthy, and independent.

Those who want to abolish ObamaCare—and we heard it a minute or two ago from the Senator from Florida on the Republican side of the aisle, as well as the junior Senator from Texas—are basically saying to seniors: Pay more out of pocket for prescription drugs.

I don't think that is right.

What we are offering with insurance exchanges across America now in 50 States is the same opportunity for uninsured people that Members of Congress have today. Members of Congress are under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, which covers 8 million Federal employees and their families. That means we have an open enrollment period every year, and we can choose—my wife and I—from nine different policies in the State of Illinois. We take the one we want, and we have good coverage. It is not the most expensive or the best, but it is good coverage. We get to shop. It is hard for many Members of Congress to remember or believe that most Americans never have that luxury. They can't shop for health insurance. Some of them are denied any health insurance. Some work for an employer who says "take it or leave it," and some just can't afford to buy anything. The insurance exchanges offer the opportunity for the 40 to 50 million uninsured and those buying in the private insurance market to go shopping for the best policy for themselves and their families.

Competition and shopping in a marketplace is what Americans are looking for, and that is what the Republicans want to close down. They want to close that down. Some would say: Obviously, there is a Republican plan for health insurance. The Republican plan for health insurance—this blank piece of paper. They have no plan. They have no ideas. They are just opposed to ObamaCare, and that is why they initially shut down this government. They wanted to defund ObamaCare.

Two interesting things happened after they made that announcement:

The marketplaces came online and ran into serious problems. They are currently restructuring them because they were not prepared for the overwhelming response to these insurance marketplaces. I am sorry they weren't. I don't know who is responsible for it, but we need to know. In the meantime, we have the insurance marketplaces up and running.

The second thing that happened as the marketplaces went online—after the Republicans announced they wanted to defund ObamaCare and therefore shut down the government—was the popularity of ObamaCare increased. People across America said: Finally. This is a good idea. Those of us who have access to the marketplace can finally go shopping for health insurance.

Exactly the opposite of what the Republicans thought would happen happened. The American people are open and more receptive to the idea of going to these marketplaces if they don't have health insurance or if they have health insurance they can't afford. The health insurance marketplace is open for business, and people across the Nation have started shopping for it. Many

people have waited for years, even decades.

I came to the floor when the junior Senator from Texas was holding the floor for 21 hours and asked him to consider the case of a young—I call her young—lady I met in Illinois named Judy. She is a housekeeper in a motel that I stay in in southern Illinois. She is in her early sixties, worked every day of her life, never had health insurance not even for one day of her life, and she now has diabetes and she is worried. We got some local doctors to see her and give her some recommendations and try to help her, but she has never had health insurance.

I asked Senator CRUZ from Texas: What are we going to do with Judy? If she doesn't have this marketplace where she can go for health insurance for the first time in her life, what is going to happen to her?

He said to me: She needs to get a better job.

Well, it is easy for us to say that, but this poor woman has worked hard all of her life. There is not a lazy bone in her body. She is doing the very best she can. Senators ought to realize that some people—even working as hard as they can—cannot get health insurance unless ObamaCare goes through.

Sixteen States and the District of Columbia have created their own exchanges. Those State-operated exchanges have opened fairly smoothly.

California had 7,700 applications for health insurance on the first day.

Kentucky is a great success story for ObamaCare. More than 5,000 people or families enrolled for health care and there were 10,000 completed applications on the first day. I understand that the number of people who have now enrolled for health care is closer to 10,000. Think about that. There are 10,000 families in the State of Kentucky who now have a chance to get health care. Those who want to defund it and close it down are closing down their opportunity to have protection for their families.

New Mexico is partnering with the Federal Government for individual and family coverage, but it is operating the shop exchange, which allows small businesses to find group coverage for their employees. In the first couple of days, 428 different employers in New Mexico signed up for coverage. They got a better deal in the competitive marketplace than they could find in the private sector beforehand. Republicans want to shut down that opportunity for these businesses. It doesn't make sense.

The Federal Government is managing the marketplace in 34 States, including my home State of Illinois. By Friday of last week there had been 8.6 million unique visitors to the Federal exchange Web sites.

What we are finding across America is that people have been waiting for

this chance. I met a lawyer who contacted the insurance exchanges and found that for his business—a small business—it cut the premiums they are going to pay annually by one-third. Six out of every ten people who sign up for health insurance under the ObamaCare insurance exchanges will pay less than \$100 a month in premiums. For less than what many of them are paying for cable TV, they will have health insurance coverage they can afford.

When the other side starts talking about closing down ObamaCare and can't come up with any replacement whatsoever, I think we ought to stop and ask whether that is in the best interest of a better America. If you or someone in your family has ever lived with a serious illness and no health insurance, you will never, ever forget it. I have been there. You will never, ever forget it. We ought to offer every American family a chance to get affordable, quality health insurance for the first time in their lives.

The second issue, which relates to this and which I find hard to believe, after trying to defund ObamaCare by closing down the government, they started on a new approach. Senator VITTER of Louisiana had an amendment that would restrict—at least in terms of costs—the availability of health insurance for some Federal employees who work here on Capitol Hill and Members of Congress. I think that is totally unfair, and it troubles me that the Republicans have gone from defunding ObamaCare to defunding the health insurance of their own staff employees. These are hard-working people in my office, and I bet they are hard-working in every Senate and House office. They stay late, answer the phones, and try to help people who are struggling with redtape. When a family is facing difficulties and can't afford a lawyer, our people try to help them out with government agencies as best they can. They answer the mail, they answer the phones, and they answer emails. The notion that we are going to limit or restrict their health insurance is absolutely unacceptable and unfair. These people deserve good health insurance just as every American does.

When Senator VITTER comes to the floor with his amendment which would dramatically increase the cost of their health insurance, it is fundamentally unfair. It is mean. It is small. It is beneath our dignity. We ought to stand behind our employees whom we hire to represent us across the United States of America. If we do, we will defeat this Vitter amendment if it ever comes back for consideration.

ObamaCare has started—and there have been some bumps in the road, that is for sure—and now that we have these marketplaces open, people are going to see what opportunities are available to them. As most people know, Members of Congress and many

of their staff members are going to be covered with the same insurance, as everyone is buying in the insurance marketplace. Not all congressional staff members are involved, but many will be. Members of Congress will all be directed to the insurance exchange if that is what they choose to buy for their families. I am prepared to do just that. I think it will be quality health insurance, which is what every American deserves.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senator DURBIN, the assistant majority leader, for his speech. One of the privileges of this job, as the Senator from Connecticut knows, is the learning experience, if you will, of sitting in the Presiding Officer's chair and listening to Senators speak. We hear a whole range of talks, a whole range of discussions, from a whole range of talents in this body. Sometimes we hear Senators with great charisma delivering very impressive political speeches and appealing to patriotism, and other times we hear Senators who just focus on the substance and the importance of an issue, bringing us down to Earth about what really matters. The speech of Senator DURBIN was exactly that regarding what this health care law means.

We can talk about repealing ObamaCare, and that sounds good to some crowds back home. But think of the tens of millions of Americans who will now have health insurance in Connecticut and in Ohio and Illinois and all over this country, through Medicaid, through joining the exchanges—so many of them have full-time jobs and have never had insurance.

I spoke to a woman in Youngstown who was speaking at a townhall meeting. She said, I am 63 years old, I work two jobs, I have never had insurance. This was before we passed ObamaCare. She said, I just want to stay alive for the next year and a half so I can be on Medicare and have insurance. Imagine that a person's goal in life is to stay alive so they can have health insurance.

This new law, as it is beginning to take effect, as people started signing up 3 weeks ago, means people such as the woman in Youngstown will have insurance—maybe Medicaid or maybe exchanges or some financial assistance. It may mean the \$7,000 tax that Senator DURBIN talked about, the \$7,000 that all of us pay as a result of those who go to a hospital and can't afford to pay, get treatment, get care, and somebody has to pay for it and it is spread around to those with insurance.

It means in my State about 100,000 people who are in their late teens and twenties are now able to sign on to their parents' health plan. It means close to a million seniors in Ohio have

already gotten preventive care such as osteoporosis testing, diabetes, whatever preventive treatment, with no costs, no copays, no deductibles. It means all of that. It means more of our premium dollars will go to health care, not to executive salaries, not to marketing, not to insurance company profits. All of that is good news.

While it may not sound as exciting as speaking to a Lincoln Day dinner or people at a political rally holding Confederate flags, we do know what it is going to mean to millions of Americans who may not be going to those rallies but who have worked hard all of their lives and are rewarded for it.

I wish to make a couple of comments about how important the news is today that we can finally reopen the government. America is going to honor its debts and pay its bills as we have every day, every week, every month, every year for more than two centuries. We are finally going to do the right thing, and that is good news to people from Gallipolis to Chillicothe to Toledo and all over my State.

It means that after this vote is done this evening in the Senate, and I hope later in the House of Representatives, the President will sign this law to pay our bills and reopen the government.

It means we need to focus on what matters in this country. What matters in this country is jobs, and that means investing in infrastructure, whether that infrastructure is Sinclair Community College in Dayton or Owens Community College in Toledo, or whether that infrastructure is a water and sewer system in Napoleon or Bowling Green, or whether that infrastructure is a health care clinic in Zanesville, or a whole host of things that matter long term to the future of this country.

I was speaking to Senator COONS from Delaware earlier today about the importance of manufacturing. We are working with a number of our colleagues on bipartisan legislation which focuses on manufacturing and infrastructure. Twenty years ago, thirty years ago in this country—these numbers are not precise but estimated—about 25 percent of our GDP was manufacturing. Manufacturing was about 25 percent of our GDP. Financial services was less than 15 percent of our GDP. That has reversed in this country.

We know what it means to cities such as Springfield and Mansfield and Lima in my State where manufacturing jobs have shut down far too often and those jobs have gone overseas. We still give tax breaks in this country, believe it or not, to companies that outsource, that shut down and move overseas. So a company that shuts down in Ravenna or shuts down in Portsmouth and moves to China gets tax incentives to do that. That has to stop. We have to work on that.

We can support a whole host of legislation I have been working on with

Senators BLUNT and COLLINS and GRAMHAM and SESSIONS and BURR to deal with the issue of the Chinese gaming the currency system. That will mean literally hundreds of thousands of jobs in this country that can return or that will not be lost because they are gaming the currency system.

On job training, the so-called SECTORS Act will match up skills locally determined by workforce investment boards and community colleges and local businesses and local labor unions with the needs of those businesses—match up the job skills with the needs of those businesses.

Last, with Senator BLUNT, I am working on a national network manufacturing proposal that will help companies and universities and technology come together in a way that can spur industries regionally in this country. We know that, for instance, glass in Toledo—the fact that Toledo has been, for decades, a major glass manufacturing center—not just providing a lot of jobs in a variety of different kinds of glass, including everything from plate glass to windshields to drinking glasses, but it also evolved into the job-creating industry of solar panels. We know how that can work. This will be a partnership between Senator BLUNT and myself and others, as well as with the administration, on how, in fact, we can help with manufacturing and continue to lead the world the way we have for the lifetime of myself as well as the lifetime of the Presiding Officer.

We know what we have to do today to pay our bills and reopen the government. We know what we need to do in the weeks and months ahead. I look forward to working on those issues with my colleagues.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, since the government shutdown about 16 days ago, I have been coming to the floor of the Senate to express my chagrin at this manufactured crisis. Then, of course, the second manufactured crisis, the crisis of perhaps doing the unthinkable: a default, where we would become a nation that did not pay our bills for the first time in our history. I think history is going to analyze this period of time in our Nation's governance and will not look fondly upon what has happened here.

Just this morning, I held a press conference, as I am chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, to talk about what is happening across the country in this shutdown—superfund sites, more than 500 not being

cleaned up. We had businesspeople there, small businesspeople who have their businesses near wildlife refuges. This is the season where people go hunting and fishing and spend their dollars to help support the tourist industry in our great Nation. In many States tourism is No. 1, 2, or 3. In my State, California, it is the No. 3 industry. So when a park closes down or the Army Corps recreation land closes down or the refuges close down, this is not just sad because that is not the right thing to do for the environment, it is sad because many people rely on those beautiful areas being open to the public.

We need to keep the doors of the government open to the people. This is a government of, by, and for the people. Our government should never be closed. That does not mean we are going to agree on every law or every regulation or every single thing that happens in government. We are always going to have disagreements.

I have said here quite often, I have served with five Presidents—three Republican Presidents, two Democratic Presidents. I am a Democrat, and there were many times I did not agree with my President, whether he was a Republican or a Democrat. But I knew there were ways to win the day. You have to stick to your principles and fight the battles and do everything you can to win the moment, to change the law, to change the way a law is enforced, to write a new law, to repeal an old law, but you do it within the framework of governance, not within the framework of chaos. There is never a reason—never a reason—to threaten to close the government. There is never a reason to threaten to default on our debt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article that just hit now from Business Insider be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Business Insider, Oct. 16, 2013]

S&P: THE SHUTDOWN TOOK \$24 BILLION OUT OF THE U.S. ECONOMY
(By Steven Perlberg)

The S&P has cut the annualized U.S. growth view closer to 2% from 3%, Bloomberg is reporting. The ratings agency—which recognizes the Senate deal will be approved—says that the shutdown has taken \$24 billion out of the economy and cut 0.6% off of yearly fourth quarter GDP growth.

“If people are afraid that the government policy brinkmanship will resurface again, and with it the risk of another shutdown or worse, they’ll remain afraid to open up their checkbooks. That points to another Humbug holiday season,” S&P wrote in a release.

They also said the impact of the debt ceiling is getting worse by the day for the U.S. economy.

Here’s the full release:

NEW YORK (STANDARD & POOR'S) OCT. 16, 2013.—The U.S. government has been shut down for more than two weeks. Earlier today, Senate leadership crafted an agree-

ment to end the shutdown and avert a debt default. However, the deal needs to be voted on by both chambers of Congress.

We believe that to date, the shutdown has shaved at least 0.6% off of annualized fourth-quarter 2013 GDP growth, or taken \$24 billion out of the economy. However, the closer we get to breaching the debt ceiling, the higher we expect the economic impact to be.

In the summer of 2011, as we approached the last debt ceiling standoff, consumer confidence plummeted and hit a 31-year low in August when the debt ceiling issue came to a head. Given that this round of debt-ceiling negotiations is occurring after two-plus weeks of a government shutdown, the total impact on the economy will likely be even more severe.

While we believe the Senate deal will be passed and the debt ceiling will be raised, the impact of a default by the U.S. government on its debts would be devastating for markets and the economy and worse than the collapse of Lehman Brothers in 2008.

Should a default occur, the resulting sudden, unplanned contraction of current spending could see government spending cut by about 4% of annualized GDP. That would put the economy in a recession and wipeout much of the economic progress made by the recovery from the Great Recession.

As we’ve said, we expect the Senate deal to be approved. However, the current chatter coming out of Washington suggests that any continuing resolution will be a temporary one, with an early 2014 timeframe for the next set of Washington deadlines. The short turnaround for politicians to negotiate some sort of lasting deal will likely weigh on consumer confidence, especially among government workers that were furloughed. If people are afraid that the government policy brinkmanship will resurface again, and with it the risk of another shutdown or worse, they’ll remain afraid to open up their checkbooks. That points to another Humbug holiday season.

The bottom line is the government shutdown has hurt the U.S. economy. In September, we expected 3% annualized growth in the fourth quarter because we thought politicians would have learned from 2011 and taken steps to avoid things like a government shutdown and the possibility of a sovereign default. Since our forecast didn’t hold, we now have to lower our fourth-quarter growth estimate to closer to 2%.

Standard & Poor's Ratings Services, part of McGraw Hill Financial (NYSE: MHI), is the world's leading provider of independent credit risk research and benchmarks. We publish more than a million credit ratings on debt issued by sovereign, municipal, corporate and financial sector entities. With over 1,400 credit analysts in 23 countries, and more than 150 years' experience of assessing credit risk, we offer a unique combination of global coverage and local insight. Our research and opinions about relative credit risk provide market participants with information and independent benchmarks that help to support the growth of transparent, liquid debt markets worldwide.

Mrs. BOXER. Here is what has happened because of this 16-day shutdown. Here is what has happened because that shutdown was paired with a flirtation with a default.

The S&P has cut the annualized U.S. growth view closer to 2% from 3%. . . .

That is a percentage point off growth. This is what Bloomberg is reporting.

The ratings agency—which recognizes the Senate deal will be approved—

So this is after they recognize the deal will be approved. And thank God it looks as though it will be.

says that the shutdown has taken—

Mr. President, hear this:

\$24 billion out of the economy and cut 0.6% off of yearly fourth quarter GDP growth.

This is what is so important, and I hope everyone within the sound of my voice hears this:

“If people are afraid that the government policy brinkmanship will resurface again, and with it the risk of another shutdown or worse, they’ll—

The people will—

remain afraid to open up their checkbooks. That points to another Humbug holiday season,” S&P wrote in a release.

They also said the impact of the debt ceiling is getting worse by the day for the U.S. economy.

There is a full release, and I have put that in the RECORD.

To speak in layman’s terms, what the economists are saying is this shutdown and this flirtation with a default has taken a huge bite out of our economy—a huge bite. Why did we face it? Because some folks do not like the health care reform act.

It is their total right not to like it. It is their total right not to love it. It is their total right to try and change it. That is all their total right. But you cannot shut down the government and stamp your feet and say: Because I don’t like this and I don’t like who is President, I am shutting down the government.

Now here is the good news—and it is good news: Bipartisanship here in the Senate is leading America out of this painful, partisan, self-inflicted crisis. As someone from the largest State in the Union, I can tell you, relief does not even begin to describe how I feel. I am also grateful—grateful—to the two leaders who came together, the Democratic leader and the Republican leader of the Senate, both who have had many disagreements and will continue to in the future about the proper road ahead, but when history called them, they were there. They were able to set aside their differences and reach an agreement to open up this government, to pay our bills, and to set out a path to negotiation on all those differences that we know we have between the two parties—very legitimate differences.

I think what we learned, as we read the S&P comments here, is that this has to end, this brinkmanship has to end. We have to say as Americans: You do not have to shut the government down. You do not have to threaten to default. That is not the way we should proceed. It is too painful for this Nation. It is too costly. Mr. President, \$24 billion—that is what S&P puts on it. That is what is taken out of the economy. That does not even include what it costs us as a Federal Government to

shut down, to reopen, to start again. But bipartisanship here in the Senate is leading the way forward.

We always are told: If you do not know history, you are doomed to repeat it. That is the reason why I have tried—and many others have on, frankly, both sides—to come down here and talk about the mess we have been in.

I would like to say if you are walking down the street and it is a pretty nice day, and you feel good, and the Sun is a little bit behind the clouds but looks as if it is going to come out, you have a few problems at work you have to work on, you have a couple of kids you are worried about, you are thinking about how you are going to go on that next vacation, but you feel pretty good and optimistic—you have problems but everything is manageable—why would you hit yourself in the head with a brick at that very moment? That is really what this self-inflicted wound on our Nation has been about.

Yes, we have our problems. Yes, we are coming out of the worst recession since the Great Depression. Yes, we have to deal with deficits, debts, with education, with the environment, with climate change. We can go on and on. Yes, America has its issues. Of course, we have. But we do not need self-inflicted wounds. We have enough issues that are critical, including world peace and Iran’s nuclear ambitions and Syria’s chemical weapons. I serve on the Foreign Relations Committee. Everything has taken a back seat to this situation.

Now I am very happy. I learned that the House is planning—assuming this all goes well tonight and everybody votes to open up this government and pay our bills—that the House is going to take up the Water Resources Development Act next week. That is a bill that passed here by more than 80 votes. It is critical. It addresses flood control. It addresses dredging of our ports. It has a recreation piece. It has a lot of important policy in it to help move our Nation forward. Most important, 500,000 jobs depend on our passing WRDA.

So from what I have read, that WRDA bill is going to come forward, and I am very pleased. Then we will take our bills to conference. That is the way we do things here.

We resolve our differences in a conference. I feel Chairman SHUSTER and I can do that with our colleagues. We will have a vote on something that creates jobs and moves us forward. In the meantime, we have been mired for 2 weeks in a government shutdown and a frightening inching up to the default date. It has taken the wind out of our sails, the winds out of America’s sails. It has taken our energy. All of us are very, shall I say, we are still even a little anxious until this is done.

It has been a couple of weeks of anxiety, of great difficulty. Here we are.

What about the people out there who have suffered, who have worked without a paycheck—worked without a paycheck—policemen, firemen, all of our workers still working without paychecks.

We are on the verge of correcting that in moments. I can only say I am very thankful to our two leaders. I am very thankful to the bipartisan team. I do not want to start naming names because I am fearful I will forget some. But I know Senator MCCAIN was part of it, Senator COLLINS, Senator DONNELLY, Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator HEITKAMP. I know I am leaving people out which I did not want to do. I think Senator JOHANNES was part of the team, Senator FLAKE, Senator MANCHIN, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator KIRK. I am ever so grateful. I just thought of Senators AYOTTE and MURKOWSKI. I think that may cover it—Senator KING—doing this by memory. They got together when things looked grim. They said the Senate is going to lead. I am so grateful to them because even as things faltered, they were still at it, still working.

Senator PRYOR was part of that group. They did not give up. To me, that is so important. We need to talk to each other. We need to work together. How did we get 80-some votes for a WRDA bill? It was bipartisan. How did we get all of those votes we had last time for the highway bill? It was bipartisan. We worked hard. As chairman of that EPW Committee, the things we get done are all bipartisan.

When we get into our corners it is not good. When we try to use as leverage the very government itself or the debt ceiling itself, it does not work. In closing, I am going to say again what this article says from S&P:

If people are afraid that the government policy brinkmanship will resurface again, and with it the risk of another shut down or worse, they’ll remain afraid to open up their checkbooks. That points to another Humbug holiday season.

Meaning the Christmas season, which is so critical to our economy. We need to learn from this sad history of the last few weeks; that, yes, we will have our disagreements. That is the greatness of our Nation; that we do have the freedom of thought, we do have different political parties, we do have different ways of looking at issues. It is fine, but do not ever shut down the government, do not ever play games with the full faith and credit of America. Let’s get to the negotiating table and we will be just fine. We will work out those differences.

The last thought is elections have consequences. This is where we battle it out. In the next one we are going to battle this out. That is important. We never said it would be smooth sailing, but we have to keep the government open and we have to pay our bills. I hope that is what we learned.

I am looking forward to the next hour and a half or so. Maybe we will be voting a little sooner. I thank the Presiding Officer for his leadership in all of this darkness of time.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Sometimes in the Senate we deal with numbers that are a little too big for constituents and even for us to fathom. One number we throw around in Connecticut is the number \$50 billion. That is the amount of money we need over the next 20 years to make the necessary improvements along our rail line in order to keep it in a good state of repair, never mind to do the expansions we so badly need to get our economy back and running in Connecticut. It is only basically to do all of the repair work that we need to keep trains running safely from Boston to Washington, DC. We need \$50 billion to get that done.

I give you that number because what we have learned today is that S&P estimates that the cost of this 2-week shutdown to the U.S. Government is \$24 billion, half of what the northeastern States need to maintain in state of good repair the most important rail line to the Nation for the next decade.

In 2 weeks we lost \$24 billion to this economy. This is the same amount of money that it took to do the Big Dig in Boston and half the money that we need to do important improvements along the longest, biggest, most important stretch of rail line in this country—for nothing, for absolutely nothing.

We are hopefully going to consent on a path forward shortly that will allow us to vote on a bill that essentially represents the same offer that has been on the table to both Republicans and Democrats for 2 weeks. This is to reopen the government and to operate until January of next year and to extend the debt ceiling until February of next year.

Of course, the cost is not only in the short-term, not only about all of that money we lost, but \$2 billion of that was lost money to the Treasury of the United States. It is also what we lose every single day that we continue forward on this theory that it is somehow best to run this country by manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis.

As the chairman of the European Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have been able to hear on a daily and weekly basis European impressions of this country

from the outside. They look at this Nation with envy because they see the demographic trends which allow this country to stay relatively young compared to the rest of the world. They see relative economic growth compared to countries in Europe and throughout the industrialized world. They see us on a pathway to energy independence, whereby we are not going to be reliant on oil from the Middle East. We will be able to produce, whether it will be gas or renewables, at home.

They look at our country with wonder because they see all of these trend lines running in favor of the United States, essentially leapfrogging, catapulting the rest of the world with respect to the global recovery. The only thing stopping us from that inevitability, that global economic rebirth for the United States, is government by crisis.

Mark Zandi came to the Joint Economic Committee. He is a bipartisan economist. He has advised Senator McCain and criticized both parties. He says the same thing. He says the only thing stopping a robust recovery in this Nation is the fact that we essentially write budgets and extend debt ceilings for 2, 3, 4 months at a time.

I come to the floor because my only hope, my only vision of a paper-thin silver lining to this fiasco over the past 2 weeks is that the American public has just said definitively that they don't want this to be the way the government runs any longer. If there is one message to this handful of conservatives, mostly in the House of Representatives but a few in the Senate that have caused this shutdown, the message is very simple. They are not going to be able to advance their ideological aims—in this case trying to end, repeal or delay the health care bill—by shutting down the government and threatening default on American debt.

President Obama and our majority leader had to draw a line. They had to draw a line because that is what the American public was demanding, that we put an end to this governance by crisis. If there is a silver lining, it is hopefully—even though we are only extending the continuing resolution and the debt ceiling for a matter of months—that we won't go through this catastrophe again because the American public has said enough is enough.

They know what we should know in the Senate. There is enormous room for compromise moving forward.

Today a group of Senators held a meeting on delivery system reform. There were 18 Senators who came to this meeting to hear a presentation by the Bipartisan Policy Center on a bipartisan proposal to save over \$500 billion to the U.S. Treasury simply by reordering the rules of how we run Medicare, not by trimming benefits, not by requiring more in taxes, simply by re-

ordering the way we pay for health care. It was a proposal backed by everyone from Bill Frist to Tom Daschle, and it suggests there is so much room for agreement between Republicans and Democrats if we just decide to set policy for years rather than for months.

I know we walk away from this with a sense of both outrage and hopefulness that we can maybe figure out a way to come together. Although this is my first year in the Senate, I have been in this place for 6 years, between the House and this body—but this feels like “Groundhog Day” in the sense that every time we find our way through one of these crises, we all say to each other: This is the last time. We all lock arms and say: Isn't it great that we found bipartisan agreement, and now we can use this momentum moving forward to avoid this kind of crisis in the future. I have seen this play before. It seems within days or weeks we just fall back to our old habits of digging trenches and fighting each other more than we talk to each other and again governing by crisis.

I think this time is different, just because the depth of the dysfunction was different than ever before, the cries of the American public were greater than ever before. But we should remember, as this report from the Bipartisan Policy Center on delivery system reform tells us, there is still enormous room for the two parties to set out goals we agree on. If we push aside the most strident extremist voices that largely come from the tea party caucus of the House of Representatives, there is so much we can do.

As my European friends remind me on an almost daily basis, the only factor stopping the American economy from powering forward and becoming once again a giant of manufacturing, of global financial services, and of innovation—the only thing stopping us from that leapfrog forward—is figuring out that governance by crisis holds us back.

We made the promise to each other before that when we get through one of these crises it will be our last. I commend our leaders—I commend Leader Reid and Senator Murray—for setting up a process for the rest of this year where we can come to some resolution on a budget that sets policy for years rather than for months. This time, though, the promise we have made to each other has to stick. It is the only way forward for this place, and it is the only way forward for an economy that is just waiting to be unshackled and to conquer the world again.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, here we are again: Another unnecessary crisis; a proposal that maintains the status quo; very little time to read and evaluate the bill. In fact, we still don't have a final version of the text. No time to explain it to our constituents.

This is Washington at its worst. It is exactly the kind of thing the American people are fed up with and exactly why several colleagues and I began this effort to delay and defund ObamaCare back in July.

It appears this particular fight will end much the same way ObamaCare began: in a last-minute deal, negotiated in back rooms, then forced on Congress and on the American people.

The Washington establishment can't bring itself to believe this is why Congress's approval rating is so low—because Washington doesn't listen to the American people. It ignores them. And when the American people can no longer be ignored, the administration shuts down national parks, blocks veterans from going to their own memorials, uses the IRS to target certain groups, and holds hostage critical funding for cancer research, low-income women and children, veterans' health benefits, border security, and our National Guard. It is shameful how Washington treats the American people, and the people are right to be upset about it.

The media keeps asking, was it worth it? My answer is it is always worth it to do the right thing. Fighting against an abusive government in defense of protecting the individual rights and freedoms of the American people is always the right thing.

Some say we shouldn't have fought because we couldn't win. But this country wasn't built by fighting only when victory was absolutely certain. In fact, some of the most important victories in our history were the result of fighting battles against significant odds. And even if victory seemed difficult or impossible, that wouldn't excuse me or anyone else from doing the right thing. Avoiding difficult battles, after all, is how we ended up in this kind of mess—a government with \$17 trillion in debt which we add to at a rate close to \$1 trillion a year, out-of-control spending, a broken entitlement system, a Tax Code no one understands—all because Washington is willing to act only when there is guaranteed political gain. When the avoidance of political risk becomes our dominant motivation, only the Washington establishment wins the American people lose.

Furthermore, in Washington, victories are rarely immediate and very few end up being permanent. ObamaCare wasn't enacted overnight

and it won't be repealed overnight. We must remind the American people of the harmful effects of this law at every opportunity if we are ever going to see it repealed. We have repeatedly warned the American people will be shocked when they realize the way the President has misled the American people about ObamaCare.

The embarrassing rollout of the exchanges doesn't even begin to scratch the surface. Every day brings a new story of a family whose deductible has doubled or a married couple who can't keep the plan they have or a business that can no longer provide health insurance for its employees or workers who are seeing their hours cut or losing their jobs altogether.

The realization that the administration has either been dishonest or incompetent—or perhaps a combination of both—is just starting to dawn on the American people. Even the President's friends in the media are watching this slow-rolling train wreck and are demanding the President do something to stop it. The Chicago Tribune, the President's own hometown newspaper, puts it this way:

Last spring, President Barack Obama said, "there will still be, you know, glitches and bumps" in the rollout of the new system. But what we're seeing now is no glitch or bump. There is a growing mountain of evidence that Obamacare has fundamental problems in design and implementation.

The Tribune goes on to say:

We encouraged a one-year delay in the law. We recognize that's not going to happen. Obamacare is here. It's time, though, for the Obama administration to level with Americans about what's happening here. It's time to stop blaming Republicans and start talking about what needs to change.

So it is interesting to see that the Chicago Tribune, the President's own hometown paper, is calling to a significant degree for exactly what I have been calling for since July—for a 1-year halt, a 1-year delay, a 1-year timeout to protect the American people from the harmful effects of this law, a law the President himself has acknowledged isn't ready for prime time, a law the President himself has indicated he is not willing to follow as was written. Incidentally, this again was exactly what we were arguing for all the way back in July and it now appears that the President's hometown paper was with us.

Almost everyone but the President seems to recognize this law is going to be terrible for the American people. It is costing jobs. It is hurting families. It is making people's health care situation worse, and it won't solve the problems in our broken health care system. And let me be clear. There will be very real consequences for people in both parties as a result of the implementation of this law.

Today Washington has the upper hand, but the American people will always have the last word. This is not

over. We have an obligation to fight for the American people, and I do not intend to let the American people down.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I wish to describe the damaging impacts that the Federal Government shutdown is having on the nine treaty tribes in my home State of South Dakota and across Indian Country. It is my hope that today we can come to solution to this crisis, but I think it is important for my colleagues to understand the impact the shutdown has had so that we can avoid making the same mistakes in the future.

Across the Nation, the Federal Government shutdown is imposing numerous hardships for our citizens, tribal nations, and low-income individuals. Some of the poorest counties in the United States are located within South Dakota reservation borders. Federal assistance payments to the poorest of the poor have been halted for these tribal members needing aid to feed their families and heat their homes.

Any negative changes to Native American program funding will have widespread effects. As the House Republicans continue to prevent the Federal Government from opening, doors will continue to be shut for those needing the most help.

Last week, I met with President Bryan Brewer of the Oglala Sioux Tribe, located on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. Federal and tribal employees living on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, where the general unemployment rate is already at 80 percent, are being furloughed or have had their work hours cut in half. This funding lapse almost forced the tribe's Department of Corrections to close, allowing prisoners to be freed. The tribe was given approval to use alternate funding sources; however, they do not know if those funding sources will be replenished when the shutdown ends.

Yesterday, the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation was also forced to close the Emergency Youth Shelter Program that provides a temporary home for 30 tribal youth due to the lapse of Federal funding. The tribe is actively looking for alternate bed space.

I recently heard of a story of a single parent on the Lake Traverse Reservation. The mother recently lost her 3-month-old child and was in need of aid to provide a proper funeral for her child. The Bureau of Indian Affairs provides burial assistance to eligible tribal members; however, due to the shutdown, the Bureau had to turn away the young grieving mother.

Last week, I took to the floor to speak on the significant impact a snow storm had on South Dakota communities. The snowstorm has also served a blow to tribal communities. Chad Morgan, a young Cheyenne River Sioux Tribal rancher, lost 90 percent of his cattle herd and is not able to report his loss to the Farm Service Agency.

Tribes also have spent significant funding to clear roadways of snow for tribal members needing dialysis treatment.

The Rosebud Sioux Tribe also reported to me that the Low Income Heat and Energy Assistance Program has been put on hold. Nearly 75 percent of Rosebud Sioux tribal families rely on this vital funding to heat their homes, especially now that winter snows have started.

Our tribes are facing major setbacks and are forced to find ways to fund programs that have already seen drawbacks due to the budget sequestration cuts.

Tribal communities cannot afford to have the Federal Government shutdown continue. Asking tribes to rob Peter to pay Paul is not a healthy way to run a government. Tribes across Indian Country are continuing to make strides in economic development and self-sufficiency. The United States, however, has a treaty and trust responsibility to our tribes and tribal members. Congress needs to act quickly today in order for the Federal Government to meet these responsibilities and to meet the needs of tribal nations across Indian Country.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, now, more than 2 weeks into the government shutdown and at the brink of default, we are acutely aware of what happens when politicians turn their backs on public policy and, instead, advance partisanship over service to the American people.

Let's be clear about this government shutdown. It is a self-imposed crisis manufactured by a small group of hard-line conservatives in the House of Representatives over their opposition to the Affordable Care Act. A dedicated group of public servants, Democrat and Republican, here in the Senate have worked frantically over the past 2½ weeks to find agreement in spite of the obstruction of an extreme minority who put their own ideology above the good of their constituents and the Nation.

Last week, I held a hearing in the Senate Commerce Committee about the impacts of the government shutdown to the public and the U.S. economy. We heard firsthand stories about the damage and disruption caused by the shutdown on our families, our businesses, our government, and our standing in the world.

The message we heard—loud and clear—was that the longer this shutdown continues, the worse things will get. It has never been more apparent just how important the countless services, provided by the Federal Government, are to the economic security of millions of families and the Nation.

In West Virginia, we are keenly aware that the Mine Safety and Health Administration personnel are not able to conduct regular reviews of mine safety. Four miners have died across

this country during the shutdown. I am not saying that these accidents would not have happened if the government's doors had been open over the past 3 weeks, but I do believe that we owe it to the hard-working men and women who work in our Nation's mines to make sure that as long as they are on the clock, the government's safety experts are as well.

The shutdown is causing problems above ground too. Federal investments in research and development, for example, have long helped spur innovation in the United States. Just because House Republicans have shuttered the research arm of our government does not mean that overseas competitors such as China are pausing their research as well. Unfortunately, these vital government services are in the spotlight because they are currently not in existence, quite frankly.

To further demonstrate the real-life consequences of the shutdown, I released a report during the hearing that provided a snapshot of the impacts of the government shutdown on the public and the U.S. economy.

Because of the shutdown, experts from the Department of Transportation and the National Transportation Safety Board cannot monitor our highways, railroads, and pipeline networks and study how to make them safer. Scientists and technical experts at NASA, the National Science Foundation, and Department of Defense aren't performing basic research and engineering that private aerospace and technology companies need for commercial success.

Consumer Product Safety Commission officials cannot monitor our ports and stop hazardous products from entering our stores. I am particularly concerned about keeping dangerous imported products off of store shelves and out of the hands of our children, especially with the holiday season approaching.

The fights we continue to have over paying our bills and funding vital government services are a distraction. Congress is no longer doing big things that support families and our communities. It is no longer acting as one body, for the people, but instead as factions pitted bitterly against each other.

I fear that people have lost confidence in their government and confidence in their future. I fear they are asking whether government can even make a difference in their lives anymore.

Last week's hearing in the Commerce Committee proved beyond a shadow of a doubt this shutdown is doing great harm to our country. Sadly, it was totally avoidable. As we move towards an apparent bipartisan agreement that will reopen the government and avoid default, I hope those who so recklessly drove us toward financial catastrophe have learned their lesson.

In a matter of months, we will again have to address questions related to funding the government and the debt limit. The conservative fringe in the House and the so-called leadership there that was held hostage by their threats can force us to repeat these last 3 weeks or they can learn from this great mistake and shift their focus to the larger issues facing our Nation. We may disagree on the best prescription for these ills, but I look forward to participating in a fair and honest debate.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that I be allowed to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DETAINING TERRORISTS

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, in the words of Yogi Berra, "It's déjà vu all over again." It seems as though every several months this administration manages to repeat the same disturbing pattern of treating captured foreign terrorists first and foremost as ordinary criminals.

Over the past 10 days we have watched this pattern play out with the capture and all-too-brief interrogation of Abu Anas al-Libi, one of the alleged coconspirators behind the 1998 bombings of the U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania that killed hundreds of innocent people, including 12 Americans.

Instead of sitting in a cell at Guantanamo Bay where he could be fully interrogated for all the intelligence he likely has from his decades-long association with Al Qaeda terrorists, including a long association with Osama bin Laden, al-Libi is now enjoying the protections of our criminal justice system. Yesterday in the Southern District of New York, he had his initial appearance in Federal court, where he entered a plea of not guilty to the pending indictment. He now has a court-appointed lawyer at his disposal.

From all indications, any interrogation of al-Libi has ended, at least for the time being. If past terrorist cases are any guide, it will take weeks or months of plea negotiations and bargaining with this terrorist before we can even think about once again conducting an intelligence interrogation, and we may never have that opportunity again with this now criminal defendant.

We all remember the case of Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, the 2009 Christmas Day Underwear Bomber, who tried to detonate a suicide bomb in an airplane over the skies of Detroit. Shortly

after being taken into custody, Abdulmutallab was read his Miranda warnings, and it took 5 long weeks of plea negotiations before we would again have the opportunity to interrogate him.

Why does this matter? Why do so many of my colleagues and I continually come to this Senate floor to raise this issue? The answer is simple: We have been down this road before of treating terrorists as if they were criminals, sacrificing intelligence for the sake of criminal charges and Miranda rights.

The results on September 11, 2001, were predictable and disastrous. We lost numerous chances to gather intelligence that could have been used to neutralize future threats. We were in a reactive mode, reacting to but not preventing the 1993 World Trade Center bombing, the 2000 attack on the USS Cole, and the 1998 embassy bombings, the same attack involving al-Libi.

It took the reality of the 9/11 attacks to get this trend reversed. Prevention became the norm as criminal and intelligence investigators came together to use all lawful means, including criminal prosecution, to counter the threat of international terrorism.

No one is saying criminal prosecution should not be one tool, but it seems as though now we either just kill terrorists by using drones or give them Miranda warnings. Dead terrorists don't talk and terrorists with lawyers always want something in return if they are going to talk. We cannot defeat Al Qaeda, and its growing affiliates, if we don't first have good intelligence on their leadership, intent, networks, and capabilities.

As we have seen in Benghazi, and more recently in Kenya, Al Qaeda and its affiliates continue to carry out terrorist attacks against the United States and its interests. Suspected terrorists were captured in London over the weekend, and we face growing threats in Syria, Libya, and across the globe. Al-Libi, as a long-time member of Al Qaeda and close confidant of bin Laden, undoubtedly has valuable intelligence that could be used to foil future plots.

To defeat these terrorists and keep this country and our allies safe demands clear leadership and sound policies from the President. Unfortunately, in this area, we have neither. In the 5 years since this administration summarily dismantled the CIA's detention and interrogation program and ordered the closure of Guantanamo Bay, we still cannot get vital intelligence interrogations prioritized over criminal prosecutions.

Since 2009, we have been asking basic questions of senior administration officials, such as, if we captured Al Qaeda leader Ayman al-Zawahiri, where would he go? The only firm answer that has been given is that Guantanamo Bay is off the table.

In the capture of al-Libi, it appears as though this administration has finally settled on its own detention policy. In 2011, al-Shabaab leader Ahmed Abdulkadir Warsame was captured while returning to Somalia from Yemen where he was acting as an intermediary between al-Shabaab and Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. Because of this administration's perennial resistance to placing more detainees at Guantanamo Bay, Warsame was instead held on a U.S. Navy vessel for 2 months and interrogated by the High Value Detainee Interrogation Group, or the HIG. Predictably, he was then Mirandized and brought to Federal court.

Those who thought the shipboard detention of Warsame was an anomaly, a one-time necessity, have now been proven wrong. Rather than hold detainees at the first-rate facility at Guantanamo Bay that is run by dedicated military personnel who treat the detainees there very humanely, this administration has, with the detention of al-Libi, made it clear that it prefers to use our naval warships as floating prisons. I can't imagine that this is what those who so strongly advocated for the closure of Guantanamo had in mind as a replacement facility.

Over the past week or so some people have raised the point that the restrictions on the fiscal year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act on the administration's ability to transfer detainees from Guantanamo Bay to the United States for trial justified the administration's unwillingness to place any new terrorists there. That argument simply does not withstand scrutiny in the case of al-Libi.

First, those restrictions applied most recently only to fiscal year 2013 and so are no longer in place. Second, as with Warsame, Abdulmutallab, and other terrorists, we cannot even reach the question of where al-Libi may be tried, whether in a Federal court or in a military commission at Guantanamo Bay, because this administration will not even consider designating him as an enemy combatant for interrogation purposes.

If the administration would be willing—in just one case—to allow a full intelligence interrogation at Guantanamo Bay of a high-valued target without Miranda and without rushing to criminal charges, I would welcome the opportunity to work with this administration to ensure that there are no statutory obstacles to the appropriate future prosecution of a terrorist. If this administration also wants to suggest a better—nonfloating—option to Guantanamo Bay outside the United States, I am happy to listen.

But so far they have been unwilling to do that despite their public claims that all options are on the table when it comes to handling terrorists such as al-Libi. They have been unwilling to

make it clear that intelligence collection is the first priority; that long-term detention for intelligence purposes is appropriate and necessary; and that all intelligence value of any suspected terrorist will be exhausted before any discussion of potential charges.

Instead, the short-lived, onship interrogation of Abu Anas al-Libi demonstrates that this administration has once again chosen to gamble with our national security for the sake of safeguarding a criminal prosecution. They are taking the gamble that plea negotiations will be quick and effective and that any intelligence could have been gained in the meantime will not be lost. This is a risk none of us should be willing to take.

It is time that we stop needlessly giving this advantage to terrorists. Our intelligence professionals need real-time, actionable intelligence about Al Qaeda and its activities, and the best place to get that is often from captured terrorists without Miranda warnings, defense attorneys or initial appearances in court.

Getting a conviction and lengthy sentence of an avowed terrorist can be a worthy goal, but ultimately that conviction will mean nothing if Americans are harmed because we threw away the opportunity to get intelligence when we needed it most. It is time to end this dangerous pattern and put all lawful options for handling Al Qaeda terrorists back on the table.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the deal that the Senate is getting ready to vote on. This is a terrible deal. This deal embodies everything about the Washington establishment that frustrates the American people. This deal kicks the can down the road. It allows yet more debt, more deficits, more spending, and it does absolutely nothing to provide relief for the millions of Americans who are hurting because of ObamaCare.

To all the young people who are coming out of school right now and can't find a job because of ObamaCare, this deal does nothing for them. To all of the single moms who are struggling and being forced into part-time work, trying to feed their kids on 29 hours a week because of ObamaCare, this deal does nothing for them. To all of the hard-working families who are getting massive premium increases from their health insurance companies right now and trying to figure out how they are going to make ends meet with health insurance costs going up 200 to 300 percent because of ObamaCare, this deal does nothing for them. To all of the seniors and all the people with disabilities who are getting notifications in the mail right now telling them they

are losing their health insurance because of ObamaCare, this deal does nothing for them.

This fight was always about the American people who are hurting because of ObamaCare, and unfortunately today the Senate is saying: You don't have a voice in Washington.

This is a terrible deal. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

None of us should be surprised that when the Senate votes, this deal is going to pass, and it is going to pass by a big margin. None of us should be surprised, but the outcome could have been different.

I ask the Presiding Officer to imagine a different world. We saw in the last 2 months millions of Americans rise up, sign a national petition, light up the phones to the Capitol, and speak up against the enormous harms ObamaCare is visiting upon them. We saw the House of Representatives stand with courage and listen to the American people.

I ask the Presiding Officer to imagine a world in which Senate Republicans united to support House Republicans. Imagine that one piece being different from what we saw. Imagine, after the House Republicans stood together with the American people, if all 46 Senate Republicans had stood together and said: We are united against the train wreck that is ObamaCare. We are united with the American people that if President Obama is going to give an exemption for big business and for Members of Congress, the American people deserve that very same exemption.

I want you to imagine if Senate Republicans stood together and simply supported House Republicans and the American people. I want the Presiding Officer to imagine what would have happened if all 46 Senate Republicans had united and gone together and said: The House of Representatives has passed a bill funding the VA. We should fund the VA.

The majority leader of the Senate refused to allow the Senate to even vote to fund the VA. I want you to imagine all 46 Senate Republicans, if we had stood together and simply supported the House Republicans in saying the House of Representatives has voted to reopen our national parks, to reopen our war memorials, and the majority leader of the Senate refused to allow the Senate to even vote.

I want my colleagues to imagine simply that Senate Republicans stood together and said: We support the House Republicans in standing with the American people. If that had happened, I believe this result would have been very different.

It is heartbreaking to the American people that Senate Republicans divided as they did and decided to direct their criticism, direct their attention, direct their cannon fire at House Republicans

and at those standing with the American people. Yet, at the same time, to the millions of Americans who rose up in the last couple of months, I want to give a word of encouragement—a word of encouragement about the path forward.

A couple of months ago the Washington establishment scoffed at the notion that the American people might rise up. That was viewed as silly, parochial, couldn't happen. A couple of months ago the Washington establishment scoffed at the notion that the House of Representatives would stand strong saying: We should fund every bit of the Federal Government, but we shouldn't fund ObamaCare. Yet what we have seen in the last 2 months has been extraordinary. Millions of Americans are speaking in overwhelming numbers saying ObamaCare isn't working. The unions are jumping ship. Democratic Members of the Senate and the House went to the President and said: We want to be exempted from ObamaCare. This law isn't working. And it is worth reflecting on how extraordinary it is to see the American people rise up in such incredible numbers and to see the House of Representatives engage in what I consider to be a profile in courage, standing with the American people.

Now, a path forward—the way we are going to stop ObamaCare, the way we are going to stop the suffering, the harms being visited on millions of Americans—is the path we have seen these past couple of months—the American people rising up. The answers are not going to come from Washington. Washington is broken. But the answers are going to come from the American people.

So today I am encouraged. I am encouraged by the millions of Americans who want to get back to our free market principles, get back to the Constitution, and stop this train wreck of a law that is the biggest job killer in this country, that is hurting people all across the country. It is sad that today the Senate is telling people all across this country who are struggling, who are trying to provide for their kids, and who are getting notifications in the mail that their health care has been dropped—maybe a person has an elderly parent and that health care policy is providing for the family. Maybe people have children facing debilitating diseases. Yet they are getting a notification in the mail that their health insurance has been dropped because of ObamaCare. It is sad that the Senate says we will do nothing to answer their plight. We created their plight, but we will do nothing. It is sad that when we have James Hoffa, the president of the Teamsters, saying ObamaCare is destroying the health care of millions of working men and women in this country and the families who depend upon them, that the Senate says: We are

closed for business. The Washington establishment has exempted itself, so the problems, the suffering of working America is not the concern of the Washington establishment. That is sad.

But at the same time, I am optimistic. I am inspired by the millions of Americans who have risen. And if the American people continue to rise up, I am confident that in time the Senate will follow the lead of the House of Representatives and listen to the American people. That is our job. That is our responsibility.

This is a terrible deal today. It is a terrible deal for the American people. At the same time, the path forward—if the American people continue to rise up, we are going to turn this around. We are going to restore jobs. We are going to restore economic growth. We are going to restore the ability of people who are struggling to climb the economic ladder and to achieve the American dream, and we are going to stop the No. 1 job killer in this country; that is, ObamaCare.

I rise in opposition to this deal that doesn't serve the best interests of the men and women each of us represent.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

MR. SCHUMER. I know the hour is getting late. The passage of this bill is nigh, and so I will be brief, but I wish to make a few points.

First, this is hardly a day of exultation and happiness. The sad truth is that we have ended just where we started. When we began several weeks ago, our goal was simple: Open the government, pay our bills, and then let's negotiate. The proposal that will be before us shortly does just that and no more. We open the government. We pay our bills. Then we can sit down and negotiate. But along the way, many people have been hurt. Millions of people didn't get paychecks. The economy has been dented, and the civility in Washington—whatever was left of it—evaporated. So to say this is a good day because one party might be doing better than another—no. It is a day that is, in a certain sense, grim. We have finally achieved our goal—the same place where we started—but at a cost. It never should have been this way.

Second, I wish to salute two of our leaders. I salute our Democratic leader and my dear friend HARRY REID. From the beginning he was stalwart. He led with his strength. He said that we cannot govern in a way where any faction says: Unless we get our way, we will hurt the American people by closing down the government, by letting us default. He said: We cannot stand for that any longer. We have had enough of that in Washington, and we are not going to bend to that type of awful politics.

He stood firm. He stood strong. He didn't waiver. Tonight we are passing the bill that he sought and we sought 3 weeks ago.

I would also like to salute the Republican leader Senator MCCONNELL. We all know he has a difficult political situation. We all know it would have been easier for him to duck. We all know that when it became clear the House of Representatives was so tied in a knot that it couldn't function, it couldn't pass any bill, Leader MCCONNELL stepped up for the good of the Nation and showed courage. He deserves our thanks as well.

Finally, I will make one more point. If there is a silver lining that can come out of this gray cloud, it is that perhaps, moving forward, the politics of brinkmanship, of confrontation has reached its peak in this body and in this country.

We have seen that a small faction in either House, when it says "my way or no way," when it says "I am going to do such hurt to innocent people that you will have to succumb to me"—we saw they failed, hopefully with large bipartisan votes, certainly in this Chamber and perhaps in the other. And we have seen that many on both sides of the aisle have come together and said: We are not going to go along with this type of politics, from wherever it comes.

Perhaps when January 15 and February 7 come about, we will not see a repeat of what we have seen these last few weeks because it has been repudiated by the vast majority in this body and in the other body and certainly by the American people, a very small percentage of whom supported the politics of brinkmanship—the reckless, irresponsible politics of brinkmanship that some have exercised over the last few weeks.

So that would be the silver lining in this cloud, that we can go back to the old way of legislating where we sit down, we talk over our differences, we negotiate, and we come to a conclusion for the good of America, the way the Founding Fathers envisioned it. They did not envision what happened here in the last 3 weeks, and it was not America's finest moment. But out of this great darkness can come some light—the desire on both sides of the aisle, of the majority of both parties to say: Enough brinkmanship. Let's sit down, let's negotiate, and let's move forward so this great country will be led by its government instead of pulled down by its government. That is my fervent wish.

After these last 3 weeks we are ending where we started, unfortunately, and people have been hurt as that happened. But perhaps the lessons of the last 3 weeks will sink in amongst us all and we will not see a repeat of what has happened.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—

H. CON. RES. 25

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am pleased we have reached an agreement that will reopen the government and allow us to pay our bills and provide a path forward now for bipartisan budget negotiations. As part of this bipartisan deal, I will once again tonight ask unanimous consent to begin a bipartisan budget conference.

The budgets that passed the Senate and the House 6 months ago are very different. Nobody thinks it is going to be easy to get to a deal. But I know I would not have fought so hard for so long to begin bipartisan negotiations if I did not think we could find some common ground and work something out.

I do not think there is anyone in Congress who wants to put the country through the last few weeks again, and I am hopeful we can now work together in a budget conference to end these constant crises and work now toward a balanced and bipartisan deal that the American people expect and deserve.

So I tonight ask unanimous consent that if the Senate passes H.R. 2775, as amended, the Senate then proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment at the desk, which is the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution agreed to by the Senate, be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the motion for the Senate to insist on its amendment be agreed to; that the Senate request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with a ratio of 12 Democrats and 10 Republicans; that the conferees be instructed to report back a conference report by December 13, 2013; that if the Senate receives from the House a request to go to conference on S. Con. Res. 8, the agreement be modified so that the Senate agree to the request to go to conference on S. Con. Res. 8, with the remaining provisions related to the conference remaining in effect; further, that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report with respect to H. Con. Res. 25 or S. Con. Res. 8 if it includes reconciliation instructions to raise the debt limit; and that all of the above occur with no intervening action or debate; finally, that H. Con. Res. 25, as amend-

ed, and agreed to, be held at the desk until a message is received from the House relative to H.R. 2775, and if the House fails to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2775, this agreement be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2775

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 193, H.R. 2775; that the substitute amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; that a cloture motion on the bill, as amended, which is at the desk then be read; that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived; that no other amendments, points of order or motions be in order to the bill; that the Senate then proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill, as amended; that if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be yielded back, and the bill, as amended, be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended; that if the bill, as amended, is passed, a title amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; finally, that if cloture is not invoked, the action above with respect to the amendment to the bill be vitiated and the bill be returned to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2775, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, Amendment No. 2004 is agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move

to bring to a close debate on H.R. 2775, as amended.

Harry Reid, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Barbara Boxer, Patrick J. Leahy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Debbie Stabenow, Michael F. Bennet, John D. Rockefeller IV, Jon Tester, Jack Reed, Mark R. Warner, Tim Kaine, Benjamin L. Cardin, Charles E. Schumer, Christopher A. Coons.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on H.R. 2775, as amended, should be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 218 Leg.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Fischer	Merkley
Ayotte	Flake	Mikulski
Baldwin	Franken	Moran
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Baucus	Graham	Murphy
Begich	Hagan	Murray
Bennet	Harkin	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hatch	Portman
Blunt	Heinrich	Pryor
Boozman	Heitkamp	Reed
Boxer	Hirono	Reid
Brown	Hoeben	Rockefeller
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Scott
Casey	King	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kirk	Stabenow
Chiesa	Klobuchar	Tester
Coats	Landrieu	Thune
Coburn	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Cochran	Levin	Udall (NM)
Collins	Manchin	Warner
Coons	Markey	Warren
Corker	McCain	Whitehouse
Donnelly	McCaskill	Wicker
Durbin	McConnell	Wyden
Feinstein	Menendez	

NAYS—16

Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Crapo	Lee	Shelby
Cruz	Paul	Toomey
Enzi	Risch	Vitter
Grassley	Roberts	
Heller	Rubio	

NOT VOTING—1

Inhofe

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, cloture having been invoked, all time is yielded back.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the bill, as amended, having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. CORKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 219 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Alexander	Fischer	Menendez
Ayotte	Flake	Merkley
Baldwin	Franken	Mikulski
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Moran
Baucus	Graham	Murkowski
Begich	Hagan	Murphy
Bennet	Harkin	Murray
Blumenthal	Hatch	Nelson
Blunt	Heinrich	Portman
Boozman	Heitkamp	Pryor
Boxer	Hirono	Reed
Brown	Hoeben	Reid
Burr	Isakson	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Johanns	Sanders
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kirk	Stabenow
Chiesa	Klobuchar	Tester
Coats	Landrieu	Thune
Cochran	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Collins	Levin	Udall (NM)
Coons	Manchin	Warner
Corker	Markey	Warren
Donnelly	McCain	Whitehouse
Durbin	McCaskill	Wicker
Feinstein	McConnell	Wyden

NAYS—18

Coburn	Heller	Rubio
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Crapo	Lee	Sessions
Cruz	Paul	Shelby
Enzi	Risch	Toomey
Grassley	Roberts	Vitter

NOT VOTING—1

Inhofe

The bill (H.R. 2775), as amended, was passed.

The amendment (No. 2005) was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title to read: "An Act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes."

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ESTABLISHING THE BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 25, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, amendment No. 2006 is agreed to, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table; H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, is agreed to; the motion to reconsider is

considered made and laid upon the table, and the Senate insists on its amendment, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, conferees are instructed to report back by December 13, 2013, and the Chair is authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The amendment (No. 2006) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF RICHARD F. GRIFFIN, JR., TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 344.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of four years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Brian Schatz, Barbara Boxer, Carl Levin, Bill Nelson, Jeff Merkley, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Debbie Stabenow, Mark R. Warner, Tammy Baldwin, Jeanne Shaheen, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Mark Udall, Tom Udall, Michael F. Bennet, Amy Klobuchar, Elizabeth Warren, Ron Wyden.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived and that the Senate now resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business and that Senators be allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING JANET HINOSTROZA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a courageous Ecuadoran journalist who has been recognized by the Committee to Protect Journalists International Press.

Janet Hinostroza has anchored the investigative news show "30 Plus" for the past decade and hosted the news program "La Mañana de 24 Horas," both on the private Ecuadoran television channel Teleamazonas. She also hosts a radio program on 98.1 FM Mundo and is the local correspondent for Univision, while managing a production company specializing in journalistic programming and audiovisual products.

Ms. Hinostroza has attracted the wrath of the Ecuadoran authorities for reporting on such important issues as human and arms trafficking, the Ecuadoran police, corruption, and extrajudicial killings. She recently investigated a scandal involving a loan by a state-owned bank to a businessman who defaulted. I am informed that her reporting uncovered irregularities in the loan and connected the businessman to the then-head of Ecuador's central bank, who was President Rafael Correa's cousin. As a result, she received anonymous phone calls threatening her safety and she had to temporarily leave her television news program.

Teleamazonas, like many Ecuadoran news outlets that engage in reporting critical of the government, is regularly targeted with harassment by official censors. Ms. Hinostroza's program is required to designate regular time slots, legally reserved for reporting official information in times of crisis, to present presidential rebuttals to her reports, contrary to Ecuador's broadcast laws.

In recognition of Ms. Hinostroza's brave and important work and commitment to fighting for a free press, next month the Committee to Protect Journalists will award Ms. Hinostroza the International Award for Freedom of the Press.

Unfortunately, the harassment of Ms. Hinostroza is only one example of a steady deterioration of democratic principles in Ecuador. It is the respon-

sibility of democratic governments to foster an environment of pluralism, and nothing is more basic to that than public access to information from a free press. Instead, the Ecuadoran Government has carried out a relentless assault on the media, and recently it went a step further by restricting the autonomy of nongovernmental organizations.

A decree adopted in June creates burdensome new procedures for nongovernmental organizations, both Ecuadoran and international, to obtain legal status to operate in the country. Like a free press, civil society plays a crucial oversight role in any democratic society. The Ecuadoran decree is similar to what we have seen in other countries whose repressive governments are using laws and decrees to silence their critics.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a recent report by Human Rights Watch about the Correa government's latest efforts to consolidate power and silence its critics be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Human Rights Watch, Aug. 12, 2013]

ECUADOR: CLAMPDOWN ON CIVIL SOCIETY

(WASHINGTON, DC).—Ecuador should revoke a presidential decree that grants far-reaching powers to the government to oversee and dissolve nongovernmental organizations, Human Rights Watch said today.

On June 4, 2013, President Rafael Correa adopted a decree that creates new procedures for Ecuadoran nongovernmental organizations to obtain legal status and requires international organizations to undergo a screening process to seek permission to work in Ecuador. The decree also grants the government broad powers to intervene in groups' operations. It gives the government authority, for example, to dissolve Ecuadoran groups for "compromis[ing] public peace."

"The Correa administration has damaged free speech, expending a lot of its energy focusing on the media, and now it's trying to trample on independent groups," said Jose Miguel Vivanco, Americas director at Human Rights Watch. "Officials can now essentially decide what groups may say or do, seriously undermining their role as a check on the government."

Correa presented a draft proposal of a similar decree in December 2010, but it was shelved after criticism from local and international groups.

Under the decree, the authorities are creating an electronic Unified System of Information of Social Groups, which would store documentation from organizations. Ecuadoran organizations are required to file a series of documents to obtain legal status and approval of their by-laws. Groups have one year from the publication of the decree on June 20 to present the required paperwork.

Government officials from ministries related to the work done by the group—for example, the Health Ministry if the group works on health-related topics—review the documentation and have the authority to grant or deny the group legal status. Once they obtain legal status, groups must inform

authorities when they select directors and a legal representative and if they add or remove members. They must also provide the government with information about projects with international funding, and get government authorization to revise their by-laws.

The decree limits groups' ability to choose who can be a member or participant, undermining their right to free assembly, Human Rights Watch said. The decree imposes on Ecuadoran groups an obligation to respect the "right" of anyone who "due to their place of residency or having a specific labor, institutional, union, occupational, or professional qualification directly related to the objective or nature and/or purposes of the organization, is interested in participating in it." Groups with certain territorial coverage or those that are "the only ones in their location" may not reject people with a "legitimate interest" in participating.

The government officials who grant a group legal status have broad monitoring powers to make sure that it only carries out "authorized" work. Officials may dissolve a group if they consider the organization is "mov[ing] away from the objectives for which it was created," or if it is involved in activities that "compromise public peace" or "interfere with public policies that undermine national or external security of the state."

International groups seeking to work in Ecuador must request permission from the Technical Secretariat of International Cooperation, providing information on the "purposes and work they wish to carry out in the country." They have to provide documents that "demonstrate [their] legal existence," including their by-laws in Spanish. The government will then ask Ecuadoran embassies and consulates in countries where the international group operates for information about the "legality, solvency, and seriousness" of the organization. Based on this information, it will decide whether to sign an agreement with the international group to authorize it to work in Ecuador.

The decree also imposes vaguely defined prohibitions on international groups—for instance, they are not allowed to conduct activities that "undermine security and public peace." It also allows government officials to monitor a group's activities "to ensure the true fulfillment of its obligations" and to revoke the international agreement if they decide the group violates it.

On August 7, a lower court judge rejected a constitutional challenge filed by Fundamedios, an organization that monitors freedom of expression, against the decree. The group has filed an appeal, which remains pending before the courts.

Under international law, however, as part of their duty to promote and protect human rights, governments must ensure that human rights defenders are allowed to pursue their activities without reprisals, threats, intimidation, harassment, discrimination, or unnecessary legal obstacles. The Inter-American Court of Human Rights held in 2003 that "[r]espect for human rights in a democratic state depends largely on human rights defenders enjoying effective and adequate guarantees so as to freely go about their activities, and it is advisable to pay special attention to those actions that limit or hinder the work of human rights defenders."

The rights to freedom of expression and association may be subject to limitations, but the limitations must adhere to strict standards so that they do not improperly impede the exercise of those rights. Any restrictions

should be “prescribed by law, necessary in a democratic society, and proportionate to the aim pursued” and should not “harm the principles of pluralism, tolerance and broadmindedness.”

Article 16 of the American Convention on Human Rights states that the right of freedom of association “shall be subject only to such restrictions established by law as may be necessary in a democratic society, in the interest of national security, public safety or public order, or to protect public health or morals or the rights and freedoms of others.”

In 2012, the UN special rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association has called on countries to ensure that these rights “are enjoyed by everyone and any registered or unregistered entities” and that no one is subject to “harassment, persecution, intimidation or reprisals” for exercising them. Moreover, the rapporteur has stated that, “[s]uspension or involuntary dissolution of associations should be sanctioned by an impartial and independent court in case of a clear and imminent danger resulting in a flagrant violation of domestic laws, in compliance with international human rights law.”

“Instead of adopting reasonable measures to facilitate the work of nongovernmental organizations, the Correa administration is following the lead of countries such as Russia, Bahrain, Uganda, and Venezuela, which have imposed unjustified restrictions that violate fundamental rights and limit spaces that are critical to democratic society,” Vivanco said.

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE FUNDING

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a bill I introduced last week to provide forward funding appropriations for the Indian Health Service. The IHS is charged with delivering health services to American Indians and Alaska Natives as part of our Federal trust responsibility, and I believe that forward funding the IHS is the right thing to do, just like Congress forward funds our VA as part of our obligation to our veterans.

The budget uncertainty we have put our tribal health providers in is shameful. We may not be able to ensure our Nation’s indigenous children will receive their immunizations. We might not be able to ensure our elders will be able to receive the care they need. We cannot guarantee basic medical services will be provided, including prenatal and dental for our first Americans, who rely on funding from the Indian Health Service. The situation is disgraceful, and the health statistics of our first Americans reflect that.

Without Federal funding for fiscal year 14, HHS has determined that those receiving care from the Indian Health Service will continue to receive clinical care, but for tribes that operate their own health programs, payments will not be transferred. Yet, just like the Indian Health Service, our tribal health providers must keep providing care. The budget uncertainty we have imposed on those delivering health services is unconscionable.

As I mentioned previously, my bill to forward fund the Indian Health Service makes sense because the IHS is charged with delivering health services to American Indians and Alaska Natives, as promised by the United States for the removal of Indians from their lands. The United States calls this obligation the Federal trust responsibility. This is not a relationship based on race—but a legal and political relationship defined by treaties, Executive orders, the U.S. Constitution, statutes, and Supreme Court decisions.

Health care services are either delivered by the Indian Health Service or by tribal health providers themselves operating under Indian Self-Determination Act agreements. Delayed funding means health care providers cannot budget with certainty, recruit health professionals, retain health professionals, adequately deliver services, nor manage facility maintenance and construction efforts. Late funding for tribal health programs has significantly hampered the delivery of health services for American Indians and Alaska Natives.

Let me take this opportunity to remind you of the health status of our Nation’s first peoples. For too long in our Nation’s history, American Indians and Alaska Natives have experienced severe health disparities compared to other Americans as a result of the poor economic and social conditions. According to the Indian Health Service, American Indians and Alaska Natives die at higher rates compared to other Americans from many causes: alcoholism is 522 percent higher, diabetes is 182 percent higher, unintentional injuries is 138 percent higher, homicide is 83 percent higher, and suicide is 74 percent higher.

We must recognize the historical traumas that played a role in these percentages, including the removal of lands, forced relocation and assimilation of Native communities, new diseases introduced, deaths experienced, and the loss of indigenous cultures. These are wounds that have been internalized and manifest themselves in high rates of alcoholism and substance abuse, driving the statistics of domestic violence, sexual assault, and suicide. And this sadness is passed down from one generation to the next.

Our tribes are working to break this cycle. Under the Federal policy of Indian self-determination we have empowered tribes to address the needs of their tribal members. Yet whether it be the denial of full operational support costs for Indian programs or the ceasing of payment under a government shutdown, we are failing on that promise.

Just as this Nation has made a promise to its veterans for the delivery of health care, we cannot forget the promise made to American Indians and Alaska Natives. In 2010, Congress for-

ward funded the VA. Veterans groups, alarmed by the impact of delayed funding and concerned about the VA’s ability to plan and manage its resources, demanded forward funding. Let me tell you our tribal health providers have those same concerns. Our tribal health providers have demanded that Congress forward fund IHS appropriations so they may better manage the health funds for American Indians and Alaska Natives, and I think we should do so.

The present government shutdown demonstrates why this is so important: we have compromised the delivery of health services for our first Americans, especially those who receive care from tribally administered hospitals. Forward funding would allow Indian health programs to more be more effectively managed and improve health outcomes for our first Americans. Tribal administrators would know how many physicians and nurses they could hire without wondering if funding for positions would be available. They would also be able to manage clinics without the uncertainty of shutting them down.

I am proud to introduce this bill to forward fund IHS, and I hope my colleagues support this effort.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT BENJAMIN C. EDINGER, USMC

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life and service of Sgt. Benjamin C. Edinger, USMC, on the occasion of the dedication of a city trail in the city of Green Bay, in my home State of Wisconsin.

On Saturday, October 19, 2013, a portion of the Westside Trail in Green Bay will be named in honor of Sgt. Benjamin C. Edinger. Sergeant Edinger grew up in Green Bay, riding his bike across the city and playing ball in the city parks. He graduated in 1999 from West High School, and joined the Marine Corps in 2000.

Sergeant Edinger began his career in the Marine Corps as a small computer systems specialist, later passing through rigorous trials to join Marine Corps Force Reconnaissance, the Marine Corps’ most elite unit. He was part of the initial invasion of Iraq, and was on his second tour of duty in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom with the 2nd Force Reconnaissance Company. Sergeant Edinger participated in 61 combat missions as a gunner. On November 14, 2004, in Al Anbar Province, he suffered shrapnel wounds as a result of enemy combat. He later died from his injuries on November 23, 2004.

Sergeant Edinger is remembered by his family, friends, and fellow marines as a kind and considerate person, and a tough and courageous marine.

I am proud that Sergeant Edinger will be honored with this trail dedication in the city he called home, and in the State and country he loved and served.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

BOYS & GIRLS CLUB

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, today I wish to mark an important birthday in my hometown of Springfield, MO. This year the Boys & Girls Club of Springfield celebrates its 75th year of operations. These 75 years have been marked by dedication and service to the young people of Springfield and the surrounding area. The club's commitment has helped shape the community, mold business and civic leaders of tomorrow, and made a lasting impact on the region.

Through the Boys & Girls Club, young people of all backgrounds have a place to build relationships and grow as individuals. With adults from their own community, these children foster relationships not only with each other but also with a set of great role models committed to making each day better for every child.

The Boys & Girls Club of Springfield got its start in 1938 while the country was still in a depression. Mrs. Jennie Lincoln got the idea to launch the group from her husband, Judge A.W. Lincoln, who discussed the need for an organization to serve youngsters with special problems. Without hesitation, the Springfield community joined the effort. The Commercial Street Business Men's Club agreed to the free use of the basement of their building at 219 East Commercial as the first headquarters—they even provided utilities for free. This basement became home to the North Side Boys Club for 11 years. Even as the Depression continued, Mrs. Lincoln enlisted her friends to create the Boys Club Women's Auxiliary to raise funds for programs and essential expenses for the Boys Club. Today, the auxiliary continues to be an important arm of the Boys & Girls Clubs of Springfield, raising thousands of dollars each year for scholarships.

The original Girls Club was established in 1963 by the Community Service League, now known as the Junior League. The Girls Club flourished under the direction of Genevieve Kynion, who served as the group's executive director for 21 years. In 1991, the Boys & Girls Clubs merged.

The Boys & Girls Club of Springfield owes its lasting success to many people—from volunteers, to employees to various charitable and community organizations that have extended financial support. The club continues to grow today, offering multiple locations to provide services to its 600 after school attendees. The club's generosity extends beyond afterschool activities as they serve more than 100,000 meals each year.

Today, many of those kids who spent their early years at the Boys & Girls Clubs are elected leaders, champions of commerce, church elders and business

leaders. Their careers are varied but distinguished with alumni ranging from former U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft to famed actor Brad Pitt. The Boys & Girls Club continues to positively influence the city of Springfield in immeasurable ways. I look forward to seeing its ongoing success as the Boys & Girls Club continues to promote their motto that every child can truly "be great!"

2 NOT 1

• Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, on Friday, October 19, 2013, the 2 Not 1 Annual Fatherhood Conference is being held in Louisville, KY.

The motto of the non-profit is "Changing the Lives of Children, One Father at a Time!" The group's purpose is to educate low-income individuals and communities on the subject of fatherhood and the barriers that impede the successful interaction of father and child.

Shawn Gardner, the President and Founder of 2 Not 1, has put together the conference which is expected to be a big success. Private groups such as 2 Not 1 are doing some excellent work to help disadvantaged kids.

I have been provided the names of the winners to be announced at the event and want to recognize these individuals for their good work. The following people are receiving awards on Friday night:

Ebony O'Rea, Female Supporter of Fatherhood;

John Marshal, Community Dad; and

Mike Warner, Father of the Year.

The mission of the group is to promote the safety and wellbeing of children by implementing strategies to keep fathers involved and families together. Cheers to those receiving awards and to all the good people working to improve the lives of kids who are missing male guidance in their lives.

I share the belief that fathers matter in the lives of their children and am encouraged that this organization is helping to strengthen families by equipping fathers with parenting strategies.

I am grateful to be a parent of three sons. My own family life is pretty challenging right now as I work hard to serve our Nation in Washington and fly home on the weekends to spend time with the boys or answer homework questions over the phone.

We know that life is not perfect, and that some children will still grow up without fathers. Sometimes, our best efforts fall short but with persistence, determination, and grace toward one another, we can make a huge difference in the lives of children by mentoring fathers.

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 12978 WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS CENTERED IN COLOMBIA—PM 22

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of The United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, is to continue in effect beyond October 21, 2013.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on October 21, 1995, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The actions of significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States and to cause an extreme level of violence, corruption, and harm in the United States and abroad. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12978 with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 16, 2013.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:05 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes, further, that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the aforementioned bill.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2775. An act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. BEGICH).

At 11:27 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Messrs. RYAN of Wisconsin, COLE, PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. BLACK, Messrs. VAN HOLLEN, CLYBURN, and Mrs. LOWEY as managers of the conference on the part of the House.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURE HELD AT THE DESK

The following measure was ordered held at the desk, pursuant to the order of October 16, 2013:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1573. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of temporary compensation to a surviving spouse of a veteran upon the death of the veteran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1574. A bill to amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes to integrate the employment, training, and related services from di-

verse Federal sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1575. A bill to correct inconsistencies in the definitions relating to Native Americans in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. RISCIO):

S. Res. 269. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on United States policy regarding possession of enrichment and reprocessing capabilities by the Islamic Republic of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 270. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World Polio Day and commending the international community and others for their efforts to prevent and eradicate polio; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. Res. 271. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that United States military assistance for Cambodia should be suspended until an independent and credible investigation occurs into the July 28, 2013, parliamentary elections, and election reforms are being implemented by the Government of Cambodia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ENZI, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. Res. 272. A resolution designating the week beginning October 20, 2013, as "National Character Counts Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. Res. 273. A resolution designating October 26, 2013, as "Day of the Deployed"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 274. A resolution supporting Lights On Afterschool, a national celebration of afterschool programs held on October 17, 2013; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID:

S. Con. Res. 24. A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 429

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to enable concrete ma-

sonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 621

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 621, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to make any substance containing hydrocodone a schedule II drug.

S. 842

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 842, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1500

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to declare the November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas, a terrorist attack, and to ensure that the victims of the attack and their families receive the same honors and benefits as those Americans who have been killed or wounded in a combat zone overseas and their families.

S. 1531

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1531, a bill to amend the

Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the types of wines taxed as hard cider.

S. 1535

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1535, a bill to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, and for other purposes.

S. 1572

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 1572, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse States that use State funds to operate National Parks during the Federal Government shutdown, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 269—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON UNITED STATES POLICY REGARDING POSSESSION OF ENRICHMENT AND REPROCESSING CAPABILITIES BY THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.:

S. RES. 269

Whereas diplomats from the Islamic Republic of Iran, the European Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, China, and Russia continue to discuss the Government of Iran's illicit nuclear weapons program;

Whereas President of Iran Hasan Rouhani has in the past bragged about his success in buying time for Iran to make nuclear advances;

Whereas Iranian Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei, who retains control over Iran's nuclear program, recently claimed that Iran did not desire nuclear weapons but said that if Iran "intended to possess nuclear weapons, no power could stop us";

Whereas the Government of Iran continues to expand Iran's nuclear and missile programs in violation of multiple United Nations Security Council resolutions;

Whereas the Government of Iran has a decades-long track record of cheating on and violating commitments regarding its nuclear program and has used more than 10 years of diplomatic negotiations to buy more time to expand its nuclear weapons program;

Whereas Iran remains the world's number one exporter of terrorism and as recently as 2011 was plotting to assassinate a foreign official on United States soil;

Whereas, over the last three decades, the Government of Iran and its terrorist proxies have been responsible for the deaths of Americans;

Whereas the Government of Iran and its terrorist proxies continue to provide military and financial support to the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria, aiding his regime's mass killing of civilians;

Whereas the Government of Iran continues to sow instability in its region and to threat-

en its neighbors, including United States allies such as Israel;

Whereas the Government of Iran denies its people their fundamental freedoms, including freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, and freedom of conscience;

Whereas international and United States sanctions imposed on Iran have assisted in bringing Iran to the negotiating table;

Whereas other countries, such as North Korea, have used diplomatic talks regarding their nuclear programs to allow time for the development of nuclear weapons;

Whereas, based on the Government of Iran's stockpile of low enriched uranium and its plan to continue installing advanced centrifuges, the Government of Iran could agree to suspend all enrichment above 3.5 percent and still be in a position to produce weapons-grade uranium without detection by the middle of next year;

Whereas, if the Government of Iran starts up its heavy water reactor in Arak, it could establish an alternate pathway to a nuclear weapon, producing enough plutonium each year for one or two nuclear weapons;

Whereas 19 other nations currently access peaceful nuclear energy without any enrichment or reprocessing activities on their soil; and

Whereas the Government of Iran could likewise achieve access to peaceful nuclear energy without enrichment or reprocessing activities on its own soil: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) it shall be the policy of the United States that the Government of Iran will not be allowed to develop a nuclear weapon and that all instruments of United States power and influence remain on the table to prevent this outcome;

(2) the Government of Iran does not have an absolute or inherent right to enrichment and reprocessing technologies under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Washington, London, and Moscow July 1, 1968, and entered into force March 5, 1970 (commonly known as the "Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty");

(3) relief of sanctions related to Iran's nuclear program imposed upon Iran by the United States should only be provided once Iran has completely abandoned its nuclear weapons program, including any enrichment or reprocessing capability, and has provided complete transparency to the International Atomic Energy Agency regarding its work on weaponization of a nuclear device; and

(4) until the Government of Iran has taken the actions set forth in paragraph (3), Congress should move to pass a new round of additional sanctions without delay.

SENATE RESOLUTION 270—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF WORLD POLIO DAY AND COMMENDING THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY AND OTHERS FOR THEIR EFFORTS TO PREVENT AND ERADICATE POLIO

Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 270

Whereas October 24 of each year is recognized internationally as World Polio Day;

Whereas polio is a highly infectious disease that primarily affects children and for which there is no known cure;

Whereas polio can leave survivors permanently disabled from muscle paralysis of the limbs and occasionally leads to a particularly difficult death through paralysis of respiratory muscles;

Whereas polio was once one of the most dreaded diseases in the United States, killing thousands of people annually in the late 19th and early 20th centuries and leaving thousands more with permanent disabilities, including the 32nd President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt;

Whereas severe polio outbreaks in the 1940s and 1950s caused panic in the United States, as parents kept children indoors, public health officials quarantined infected individuals, and the Federal Government restricted commerce and travel;

Whereas 1952 was the peak of the polio epidemic in the United States, with more than 57,000 people affected, 21,000 of whom were paralyzed and 3,000 of whom died;

Whereas safe and effective polio vaccines, including the inactivated polio vaccine (commonly known as "IPV"), developed in 1952 by Jonas Salk, and the oral polio vaccine (commonly known as "OPV"), developed in 1957 by Albert Sabin, rendered polio preventable and contributed to the rapid decline of the incidence of polio in the United States;

Whereas, although the United States has been free from polio since 1979, this preventable disease still needlessly lays victim to children and adults in several countries where challenges, such as active conflict and lack of infrastructure, impede access to vaccines;

Whereas the Federal Government is the leading public sector donor to the Global Polio Eradication Initiative and provides technical and operational leadership to this global effort through the work of the Centers for Disease Control and the United States Agency for International Development;

Whereas the eradication of polio is the highest priority of Rotary International, a global association founded in 1905 in Chicago, Illinois, that is now headquartered in Evanston, Illinois, and has more than 1,200,000 members in more than 170 countries;

Whereas Rotary International and its members (commonly known as "Rotarians") have contributed more than \$1,000,000,000 to, and volunteered countless hours in, the global fight against polio;

Whereas Rotary International, the World Health Organization, the United States Government, the United Nations Children's Fund (commonly known as "UNICEF"), the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and the United Nations Foundation have joined together with national governments to successfully reduce cases of polio by more than 99 percent since 1988, from more than 350,000 reported cases in 1988 to 223 reported cases in 2012;

Whereas polio was recently eliminated in India and is now endemic only in Nigeria, Pakistan, and Afghanistan;

Whereas terrorist and militant groups continue to target and murder health care workers who seek to save the lives of children;

Whereas the sanctity and neutrality of health care workers must be respected, as these workers deliver the most basic of life-saving interventions to children and communities;

Whereas the recent polio outbreak in the Horn of Africa, comprising Somalia, Ethiopia, and Kenya, continues to result in new cases of the disease, exacerbating the protracted humanitarian crisis in the region and highlighting the urgent need to finally eradicate polio before progress is lost;

Whereas countries around the world are placing an unprecedented emphasis on polio eradication, including by implementing Emergency Action Plans to boost vaccination coverage in Nigeria, Pakistan, and Afghanistan;

Whereas the Global Polio Eradication Initiative has developed the Polio Eradication and Endgame Strategic Plan 2013-2018 (referred to in this preamble as the "Endgame Strategy") to capitalize on the opportunity to eradicate all polio disease;

Whereas the Endgame Strategy also outlines a legacy planning process to ensure that lessons learned in the effort to eradicate polio, as well as the assets and infrastructure built in support of that effort, are transitioned to benefit other development goals and global health priorities, including the continued delivery of health services to the most vulnerable children in the world;

Whereas the global effort to eradicate polio is the largest internationally coordinated public health effort in history, with a network of over 20,000,000 volunteers worldwide; and

Whereas the eradication of polio is imminently achievable and will be a victory shared by all of humanity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of World Polio Day;

(2) commends the international community and others for their efforts in vaccinating children around the world against polio and for the tremendous strides made toward eradicating the disease;

(3) encourages and supports the international community of governments and nongovernmental organizations in remaining committed to the eradication of polio;

(4) condemns the deplorable actions of terrorist and militant groups that murder innocent health care workers who are striving to save the lives of children around the world;

(5) urges the international community of governments to strengthen the support and security protection of health care workers who risk their lives to provide polio vaccinations; and

(6) encourages continued commitment and funding by the United States Government and international donors to the global effort to rid the world of polio.

SENATE RESOLUTION 271—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT UNITED STATES MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR CAMBODIA SHOULD BE SUSPENDED UNTIL AN INDEPENDENT AND CREDIBLE INVESTIGATION OCCURS INTO THE JULY 28, 2013, PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS, AND ELECTION REFORMS ARE BEING IMPLEMENTED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CAMBODIA

Mr. GRAHAM submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 271

Whereas independent domestic and international organizations have raised serious concerns regarding the integrity of the parliamentary elections held in Cambodia on July 28, 2013;

Whereas, according to Human Rights Watch, "the Cambodian government-controlled National Election Committee (NEC) has failed to address credible allegations of voter fraud and other irregularities or systematic unfairness in the election process";

Whereas opposition Cambodia National Rescue Party (CNRP) leader Sam Rainsy noted in an October 7, 2013, Cambodia Daily op-ed article that the inaugural meeting of the newly formed government was boycotted by 55 CNRP-elected parliamentarians as a result of the refusal of the ruling Cambodian People's Party to address "shocking election irregularities" that allegedly denied CNRP additional parliamentary seats;

Whereas United Nations' Special Rapporteur for Human Rights in Cambodia Surya P. Subedi noted that "it is critical for the new National Assembly to be represented by the two key parties, for the National Assembly to be truly representative of the whole of the Cambodian people and for it to be concluded that the right to vote was effectively exercised on 28 July";

Whereas in a September 23, 2013, statement, the United States Embassy in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, called for "a transparent review of irregularities in the July 28 national elections which would help efforts to assess and address flaws in the electoral process and give the Cambodian people greater confidence in the electoral system";

Whereas the CNRP boycott calls into question the legitimacy of the Cambodian National Assembly and government; and

Whereas the policy of the Administration of a strategic rebalance toward the Asia Pacific Region should include support for democracy, human rights, and justice in Cambodia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States should suspend military assistance for Cambodia until—

(1) an independent and credible investigation occurs into the July 28, 2013, parliamentary elections in Cambodia, and any recommendations arising out of such investigation are fully implemented; and

(2) the Government of Cambodia, in consultation with civil society and political parties in Cambodia, is implementing election reforms to prevent incidents of fraud and abuse in subsequent national and local elections in Cambodia.

SENATE RESOLUTION 272—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING OCTOBER 20, 2013, AS "NATIONAL CHARACTER COUNTS WEEK"

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ENZI, and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 272

Whereas the well-being of the United States requires that the young people of the United States become an involved, caring citizenry of good character;

Whereas the character education of children has become more urgent, as violence by and against youth increasingly threatens the physical and psychological well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas, more than ever, children need strong and constructive guidance from their families and their communities, including schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, and civic groups;

Whereas the character of a nation is only as strong as the character of its individual citizens;

Whereas the public good is advanced when young people are taught the importance of good character and the positive effects that good character can have in personal relationships, in school, and in the workplace;

Whereas scholars and educators agree that people do not automatically develop good character and that, therefore, conscientious efforts must be made by institutions and individuals that influence youth to help young people develop the essential traits and characteristics that comprise good character;

Whereas, although character development is, first and foremost, an obligation of families, the efforts of faith communities, schools, and youth, civic, and human service organizations also play an important role in fostering and promoting good character;

Whereas Congress encourages students, teachers, parents, youth, and community leaders to recognize the importance of character education in preparing young people to play a role in determining the future of the United States;

Whereas effective character education is based on core ethical values, which form the foundation of a democratic society;

Whereas examples of character are trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, citizenship, and honesty;

Whereas elements of character transcend cultural, religious, and socioeconomic differences;

Whereas the character and conduct of our youth reflect the character and conduct of society, and, therefore, every adult has the responsibility to teach and model ethical values and every social institution has the responsibility to promote the development of good character;

Whereas Congress encourages individuals and organizations, especially those that have an interest in the education and training of the young people of the United States, to adopt the elements of character as intrinsic to the well-being of individuals, communities, and society;

Whereas many schools in the United States recognize the need, and have taken steps, to integrate the values of their communities into their teaching activities; and

Whereas the establishment of "National Character Counts Week", during which individuals, families, schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, civic groups, and other organizations focus on character education, is of great benefit to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning October 20, 2013, as "National Character Counts Week"; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States and interested groups—

(A) to embrace the elements of character identified by local schools and communities, such as trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship; and

(B) to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 273—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 26, 2013, AS "DAY OF THE DEPLOYED"

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr.

TESTER, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 273

Whereas more than 2,500,000 individuals serve as members of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas several hundred thousand members of the Armed Forces rotate each year through deployments to over 150 countries in every region of the world;

Whereas more than 2,300,000 members of the Armed Forces have deployed to the area of operations of the United States Central Command since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks;

Whereas the United States is kept strong and free by the loyal military personnel from the active, National Guard, and Reserve components, who protect the precious heritage of the country through their positive declaration and actions;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces serving at home and abroad have courageously answered the call to duty to defend the ideals of the United States and to preserve peace and freedom around the world;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces personify the virtues of patriotism, service, duty, courage, and sacrifice;

Whereas the families of members of the Armed Forces make important and significant sacrifices for the United States;

Whereas the Senate designated October 26 as "Day of the Deployed" in 2011 and 2012; and

Whereas all 50 States designated October 26 as "Day of the Deployed" in 2012: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 26, 2013, as "Day of the Deployed";

(2) honors the deployed members of the United States Armed Forces and their families;

(3) calls on the people of the United States to reflect on the service of those members of the Armed Forces, wherever they serve, past, present, and future; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to observe Day of the Deployed with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 274—SUPPORTING LIGHTS ON AFTERSCHOOL, A NATIONAL CELEBRATION OF AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAMS HELD ON OCTOBER 17, 2013

Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 274

Whereas more than 28,000,000 children in the United States have parents who work outside the home and approximately 15,100,000 children in the United States have no place to go after school;

Whereas high-quality programs that expand learning opportunities for children, such as afterschool, before-school, summer, and expanded learning programs, provide safe, challenging, engaging, and fun learning experiences that help children and youth develop social, emotional, physical, cultural, and academic skills;

Whereas high-quality afterschool programs and high-quality expanded learning programs provide students with hands-on, engaging lessons that are aligned with the school day;

Whereas high-quality afterschool programs complement regular and expanded school days, and support working families by ensuring that the children of those families are safe and productive during the hours parents are working;

Whereas high-quality afterschool programs engage families, schools, and diverse community partners in advancing the well-being of children and youth in the United States;

Whereas high-quality afterschool programs that partner with high-quality community-based organizations build stronger communities by integrating the school with the larger community;

Whereas Lights On Afterschool, a national celebration of afterschool, before-school, summer, and expanded learning programs held on October 17, 2013, highlights the critical importance of these high-quality programs in the lives of children, their families, and their communities; and

Whereas nearly 2 in 5 afterschool programs report that their budgets are in worse condition today than at the height of the recession in 2008, and more than 3 in 5 afterschool programs report that their level of funding is lower than it was 3 years ago, making it difficult for afterschool programs across the United States to keep their doors open and their lights on: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports Lights On Afterschool, a national celebration of afterschool programs held on October 17, 2013.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24—PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. REID submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 24

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Wednesday, October 16, 2013, through Friday, October 25, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, October 28, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any recess pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Wednesday, October 16, 2013, through Monday, October 21, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 22, 2013, or until the time of any recess pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at

such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2004. Mr. REID (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2775, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

SA 2005. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2775, *supra*.

SA 2006. Mrs. MURRAY proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 25, establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2004. Mr. REID (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2775, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

The following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

DIVISION A—CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113-6), except section 735.

(2) The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division B of Public Law 113-6).

(3) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013 (division C of Public Law 113-6).

(4) The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113-6).

(5) The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division E of Public Law 113-6).

(6) The Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6).

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by—

(A) sections 140(b) or 141(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 (Public Law 112-175); or

(B) the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for: (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2013 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2013 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) January 15, 2014.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section

106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2014 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this joint resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2013, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2013 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Each amount incorporated by reference in this joint resolution that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.

(b) Of the amounts made available by section 101 for "Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses" for the cost associated with continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act, \$273,000,000 is provided to meet the terms of section 251(b)(2)(B)(ii)(III) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, and \$469,639,000 is additional new budget author-

ity specified for purposes of section 251(b)(2)(B) of such Act.

(c) Section 5 of Public Law 113-6 shall apply to amounts designated in subsection (a) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 115. (a) Employees furloughed as a result of any lapse in appropriations which begins on or about October 1, 2013, shall be compensated at their standard rate of compensation, for the period of such lapse in appropriations, as soon as practicable after such lapse in appropriations ends.

(b) For purposes of this section, "employee" means:

(1) a federal employee;

(2) an employee of the District of Columbia Courts;

(3) an employee of the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia; or

(4) a District of Columbia Government employee.

(c) All obligations incurred in anticipation of the appropriations made and authority granted by this joint resolution for the purposes of maintaining the essential level of activity to protect life and property and bringing about orderly termination of Government functions, and for purposes as otherwise authorized by law, are hereby ratified and approved if otherwise in accord with the provisions of this joint resolution.

SEC. 116. (a) If a State (or another Federal grantee) used State funds (or the grantee's non-Federal funds) to continue carrying out a Federal program or furloughed State employees (or the grantee's employees) whose compensation is advanced or reimbursed in whole or in part by the Federal Government—

(1) such furloughed employees shall be compensated at their standard rate of compensation for such period;

(2) the State (or such other grantee) shall be reimbursed for expenses that would have been paid by the Federal Government during such period had appropriations been available, including the cost of compensating such furloughed employees, together with interest thereon calculated under section 6503(d) of title 31, United States Code; and

(3) the State (or such other grantee) may use funds available to the State (or the grantee) under such Federal program to reimburse such State (or the grantee), together with interest thereon calculated under section 6503(d) of title 31, United States Code.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "State" and the term "grantee" shall have the meaning as such term is defined under the applicable Federal program under subsection (a). In addition, "to continue carrying out a Federal program" means the continued performance by a State or other Federal grantee, during the period of a lapse in appropriations, of a Federal program that the State or such other grantee had been carrying out prior to the period of the lapse in appropriations.

(c) The authority under this section applies with respect to any period in fiscal year 2014 (not limited to periods beginning or ending after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution) during which there occurs a lapse in appropriations with respect to any department or agency of the Federal Government which, but for such lapse in appropriations, would have paid, or made reimbursement relating to, any of the expenses referred to in this section with respect to the program involved. Payments and reimbursements under this authority shall be made only to the extent and in amounts provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

SEC. 117. Expenditures made pursuant to the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113-39) shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization provided in this joint resolution.

SEC. 118. For the purposes of this joint resolution, the time covered by this joint resolution shall be considered to have begun on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 119. Section 3003 of division G of Public Law 113-6 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting “fiscal year 2014” for “fiscal year 2013” each place it appears.

SEC. 120. Section 408 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736b) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “December 31, 2012”.

SEC. 121. Amounts made available under section 101 for “Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction” may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch schedules for the Joint Polar Satellite System and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite system.

SEC. 122. The authority provided by sections 1205 and 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) shall continue in effect, notwithstanding subsection (h) of section 1206, through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 123. Section 3(a)(6) of Public Law 100-676 is amended by striking both occurrences of “\$775,000,000” and inserting in lieu thereof, “\$2,918,000,000”.

SEC. 124. Section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “October 1, 2012”.

SEC. 125. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Salaries and Expenses” at a rate of operations of \$4,820,181,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 302 of Division C, of Public Law 112-74 as continued by Public Law 113-6, not to exceed \$25,000,000 shall be available for transfer between accounts to maintain minimum operating levels.

SEC. 126. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Defender Services” at a rate for operations of \$1,012,000,000.

SEC. 127. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading “District of Columbia Funds” for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2786 (113th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under “District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses” as included in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request Act of 2013 (D.C. Act 20-127), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 128. Section 302 of the Universal Service Anti-deficiency Temporary Suspension Act is amended by striking “December 31, 2013”, each place it appears and inserting “January 15, 2014”.

SEC. 129. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for the “Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board” at a rate for operations of \$3,100,000.

SEC. 130. For the period covered by this joint resolution, section 550(b) of Public Law 109-295 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “October 4, 2013”.

SEC. 131. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109-295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 132. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 133. (a) Any amounts made available pursuant to section 101 for “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses”, “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology”, “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Air and Marine Operations”, and “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses” shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to respectively—

(1) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the last proviso under the heading “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses” in division D of Public Law 113-6;

(2) sustain border security operations, including sustaining the operation of Tethered Aerostat Radar Systems;

(3) sustain necessary Air and Marine operations; and

(4) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2013, and comply with the sixth proviso under the heading “Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses” in division D of Public Law 113-6.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 134. Section 810 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6809) shall be applied by substituting “11 years” for “10 years”.

SEC. 135. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for “Department of the Interior—Department-wide Programs—Wildland Fire Management”, there is appropriated \$36,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided*, That of the funds provided, \$15,000,000 is for burned area rehabilitation: *Provided further*, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of the Interior notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further*, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 136. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for “Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management”, there is appropriated

\$600,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided*, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of Agriculture notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further*, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression.

SEC. 137. The authority provided by section 347 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105-277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 138. (a) The authority provided by subsection (m)(3) of section 8162 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106-79), as amended, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

(b) For the period covered by this joint resolution, the authority provided by the provisos under the heading “Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—Capital Construction” in division E of Public Law 112-74 shall not be in effect.

SEC. 139. Activities authorized under part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (except for activities authorized in section 403(b)) shall continue through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2013, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 140. Notwithstanding section 101, the matter under the heading “Department of Labor—Mine Safety and Health Administration—Salaries and Expenses” in division F of Public Law 112-74 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this joint resolution by substituting “is authorized to collect and retain up to \$2,499,000” for “may retain up to \$1,499,000”.

SEC. 141. The first proviso under the heading “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Low Income Home Energy Assistance” in division F of Public Law 112-74 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting “2014” for “2012”.

SEC. 142. Amounts provided by section 101 for “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance” may be obligated up to a rate for operations necessary to maintain program operations at the level provided in fiscal year 2013, as necessary to accommodate increased demand.

SEC. 143. During the period covered by this joint resolution, amounts provided under section 101 for “Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” may be obligated at a rate necessary to assure timely execution of planned advanced research and development contracts pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act, to remain available until expended, for expenses necessary to support advanced research and development pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health

Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-7e) and other administrative expenses of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority.

SEC. 144. Subsection (b) of section 163 of Public Law 111-242, as amended, is further amended by striking “2013-2014” and inserting “2015-2016”.

SEC. 145. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, there is appropriated for payment to Bonnie Englehardt Lautenberg, widow of Frank R. Lautenberg, late a Senator from New Jersey, \$174,000.

SEC. 146. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no adjustment shall be made under section 610(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31) (relating to cost of living adjustments for Members of Congress) during fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 147. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration” at a rate for operations of \$2,455,490,000.

SEC. 148. The authority provided by the penultimate proviso under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Rental Assistance Demonstration” in division C of Public Law 112-55 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 149. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Transportation—Federal Aviation Administration—Operations”, at a rate for operations of \$9,248,418,000.

SEC. 150. Section 601(e)(1)(B) of division B of Public Law 110-432 shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) for “4 years after such date”.

SEC. 151. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Maritime Administration—Maritime Security Program”, at a rate for operations of \$186,000,000.

SEC. 152. Section 44302 of title 49, United States Code, is amended in paragraph (f) by deleting “September 30, 2013, and may extend through December 31, 2013” and inserting “the date specified in section 106(3) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014” in lieu thereof.

SEC. 153. Section 44303 of title 49, United States Code, is amended in paragraph (b) by deleting “December 31, 2013” and inserting “the date specified in section 106(3) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014” in lieu thereof.

SEC. 154. Section 44310 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by deleting “December 31, 2013” and inserting “the date specified in section 106(3) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014” in lieu thereof.

SEC. 155. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation may obligate not more than \$450,000,000 of the amounts made available to carry out section 125 of title 23, United States Code, under chapter 9 of title X of division A of the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2; 127 Stat. 34) under the heading “EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM” under the heading “FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS” under the heading “FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION” for emergency relief projects in the State of Colorado arising from damage caused by flooding events in that State in calendar year 2013: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 156. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, any reference in this di-

vision to “this joint resolution” shall be deemed a reference to “this Act”.

SEC. 157. Fourteen days after the Department of Homeland Security submits a report or expenditure plan required under this division to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Secretary shall submit a copy of that report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

DIVISION B—OTHER MATTERS

VERIFICATION OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME AND OTHER QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE PROVISION OF ACA PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES

SEC. 1001. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) shall ensure that American Health Benefit Exchanges verify that individuals applying for premium tax credits under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and reductions in cost-sharing under section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18071) are eligible for such credits and cost sharing reductions consistent with the requirements of section 1411 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 18081), and, prior to making such credits and reductions available, the Secretary shall certify to the Congress that the Exchanges verify such eligibility consistent with the requirements of such Act.

(b) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—Not later than January 1, 2014, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress that details the procedures employed by American Health Benefit Exchanges to verify eligibility for credits and cost-sharing reductions described in subsection (a).

(c) REPORT BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Not later than July 1, 2014, the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Congress a report regarding the effectiveness of the procedures and safeguards provided under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act for preventing the submission of inaccurate or fraudulent information by applicants for enrollment in a qualified health plan offered through an American Health Benefit Exchange.

DEFAULT PREVENTION

SEC. 1002. (a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Default Prevention Act of 2013”.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 3 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President may submit to Congress a written certification that absent a suspension of the limit under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of the Treasury would be unable to issue debt to meet existing commitments.

(c) SUSPENSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply for the period beginning on the date on which the President submits to Congress a certification under subsection (b) and ending on February 7, 2014.

(2) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS ISSUED DURING SUSPENSION PERIOD.—Effective February 8, 2014, the limitation in section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, as increased by section 3101A of such title and section 2 of the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013 (31 U.S.C. 3101 note), is increased to the extent that—

(A) the face amount of obligations issued under chapter 31 of such title and the face

amount of obligations whose principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States Government (except guaranteed obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury) outstanding on February 8, 2014, exceeds

(B) the face amount of such obligations outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act.

An obligation shall not be taken into account under subparagraph (A) unless the issuance of such obligation was necessary to fund a commitment incurred by the Federal Government that required payment before February 8, 2014.

(d) DISAPPROVAL.—If there is enacted into law within 22 calendar days after Congress receives a written certification by the President under subsection (b) a joint resolution disapproving the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt ceiling under subsection (e), effective on the date of enactment of the joint resolution, subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) SUSPENSION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply for the period beginning on the date on which the President submits to Congress a certification under subsection (b) and ending on the date of enactment of the joint resolution pursuant to section 1002(e) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS ISSUED DURING SUSPENSION PERIOD.—Effective on the day after the date of enactment of the joint resolution pursuant to section 1002(e) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014, the limitation in section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, as increased by section 3101A of such title and section 2 of the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013 (31 U.S.C. 3101 note), is increased to the extent that—

“(A) the face amount of obligations issued under chapter 31 of such title and the face amount of obligations whose principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States Government (except guaranteed obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury) outstanding on the day after the date of enactment of the joint resolution pursuant to section 1002(e) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014, exceeds

“(B) the face amount of such obligations outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act.

An obligation shall not be taken into account under subparagraph (A) unless the issuance of such obligation was necessary to fund a commitment incurred by the Federal Government that required payment before the day after the date of enactment of the joint resolution pursuant to section 1002(e) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014.”.

(e) DISAPPROVAL PROCESS.—

(1) CONTENTS OF JOINT RESOLUTION.—For the purpose of this subsection, the term “joint resolution” means only a joint resolution—

(A) disapproving the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit that is introduced within 14 calendar days after the date on which the President submits to Congress the certification under subsection (b);

(B) which does not have a preamble;

(C) the title of which is only as follows: “Joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as submitted under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 on _____” (with the blank containing the date of such submission); and

(D) the matter after the resolving clause of which is only as follows: "That Congress disapproves of the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as exercised pursuant to the certification under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014."

(2) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution is referred shall report it to the House of Representatives without amendment not later than 5 calendar days after the date of introduction of a joint resolution described in paragraph (1). If a committee fails to report the joint resolution within that period, the committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate calendar.

(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After each committee authorized to consider a joint resolution reports it to the House of Representatives or has been discharged from its consideration, it shall be in order, not later than the sixth day after introduction of a joint resolution under paragraph (1), to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House of Representatives. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House of Representatives has disposed of a motion to proceed on a joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(3) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE IN SENATE.—

(A) RECONVENING.—Upon receipt of a certification under subsection (b), if the Senate would otherwise be adjourned, the majority leader of the Senate, after consultation with the minority leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate that, pursuant to this subsection, the Senate shall convene not later than the thirteenth calendar day after receipt of such certification.

(B) PLACEMENT ON CALENDAR.—Upon introduction in the Senate, the joint resolution shall be immediately placed on the calendar.

(C) FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time during the period beginning on the day after the date on which Congress receives a certification under subsection (b) and ending on the 6th day after the date of introduction of a joint resolution under paragraph (1) (even if a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint

resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

(ii) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration of the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(iii) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—If the Senate has voted to proceed to a joint resolution, the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall occur immediately following the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

(iv) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution shall be decided without debate.

(4) AMENDMENT NOT IN ORDER.—A joint resolution of disapproval considered pursuant to this subsection shall not be subject to amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

(5) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If, before passing the joint resolution, one House receives from the other a joint resolution—

(i) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(ii) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House, except that the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

(B) TREATMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.—If the Senate fails to introduce or consider a joint resolution under this subsection, the joint resolution of the House of Representatives shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this subsection.

(C) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, following passage of the joint resolution in the Senate, the Senate then receives the companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

(D) CONSIDERATION AFTER PASSAGE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If Congress passes a joint resolution, the period beginning on the date the President is presented with the joint resolution and ending on the date the President signs, allows to become law without his signature, or vetoes and returns the joint resolution (but excluding days when either House is not in session) shall be disregarded in computing the calendar day period described in subsection (d).

(ii) DEBATE ON A VETO MESSAGE.—Debate on a veto message in the Senate under this subsection shall be 1 hour equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

(6) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution, and it supersedes other

rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

This Act may be cited as the "Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014".

SA 2005. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2775, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title to read: "An Act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes."

SA 2006. Mrs. MURRAY proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 25, establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause, and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 and 2015 through 2023.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Social Security.
Sec. 103. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses.

Sec. 104. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the Senate.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 301. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to replace sequestration.

Sec. 302. Deficit-neutral reserve funds to promote employment and job growth.

Sec. 303. Deficit-neutral reserve funds to assist working families and children.

Sec. 304. Deficit-neutral reserve funds for early childhood education.

Sec. 305. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax relief.

Sec. 306. Reserve fund for tax reform.

Sec. 307. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to invest in clean energy and preserve the environment.

Sec. 308. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for investments in America's infrastructure.

Sec. 309. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's servicemembers and veterans.

Sec. 310. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for higher education.

Sec. 311. Deficit-neutral reserve funds for health care.

Sec. 312. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for investments in our Nation's counties and schools.

- Sec. 313. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for a farm bill.
- Sec. 314. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for investments in water infrastructure and resources.
- Sec. 315. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for pension reform.
- Sec. 316. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for housing finance reform.
- Sec. 317. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for national security.
- Sec. 318. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for overseas contingency operations.
- Sec. 319. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for terrorism risk insurance.
- Sec. 320. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for postal reform.
- Sec. 321. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for Government reform and efficiency.
- Sec. 322. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve Federal benefit processing.
- Sec. 323. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation to improve voter registration and the voting experience in Federal elections.
- Sec. 324. Deficit-reduction reserve fund to promote corporate tax fairness.
- Sec. 325. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for improving Federal forest management.
- Sec. 326. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for financial transparency.
- Sec. 327. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote manufacturing in the United States.
- Sec. 328. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for report elimination or modification.
- Sec. 329. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the minimum wage.
- Sec. 330. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve health outcomes and lower costs for children in Medicaid.
- Sec. 331. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve Federal workforce development, job training, and reemployment programs.
- Sec. 332. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for repeal of medical device tax.
- Sec. 333. Deficit-neutral reserve fund prohibiting Medicare vouchers.
- Sec. 334. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for equal pay for equal work.
- Sec. 335. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to women's health care.
- Sec. 336. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to require State-wide budget neutrality in the calculation of the Medicare hospital wage index floor.
- Sec. 337. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the promotion of investment and job growth in United States manufacturing, oil and gas production, and refining sectors.
- Sec. 338. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow States to enforce State and local use tax laws.
- Sec. 339. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the definition of full-time employee.
- Sec. 340. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the labeling of genetically engineered fish.
- Sec. 341. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the families of America's servicemembers and veterans.
- Sec. 342. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to establishing a biennial budget and appropriations process.
- Sec. 343. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the repeal or reduction of the estate tax.
- Sec. 344. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for disabled veterans and their survivors.
- Sec. 345. Deficit reduction fund for no budget, no OMB pay.
- Sec. 346. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating hardrock mining reform.
- Sec. 347. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to end "too big to fail" subsidies or funding advantage for wall street mega-banks (over \$500,000,000,000 in total assets).
- Sec. 348. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to authorizing children eligible for health care under laws administered by Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain such eligibility until age 26.
- Sec. 349. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for State and local law enforcement.
- Sec. 350. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to establish a national network for manufacturing innovation.
- Sec. 351. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to ensure that any carbon emissions standards must be cost effective, based on the best available science, and benefit low-income and middle class families.
- Sec. 352. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to address the eligibility criteria for certain unlawful immigrant individuals with respect to certain health insurance plans.
- Sec. 353. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure no financial institution is above the law regardless of size.
- Sec. 354. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to helping homeowners and small businesses mitigate against flood loss.
- Sec. 355. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to restore family health care flexibility by repealing the health savings account and flexible spending account restrictions in the health care law.
- Sec. 356. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for BARDA and the BioShield Special Reserve Fund.
- Sec. 357. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for postal reform.
- Sec. 358. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to broaden the effects of the sequester, including allowing Members of Congress to donate a portion of their salaries to charity or to the Department of the Treasury during sequestration.
- Sec. 359. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure the Bureau of Land Management collaborates with western states to prevent the listing of the sage-grouse.
- Sec. 360. Deficit-Reduction Reserve Fund for Eminent Domain Abuse Prevention.
- Sec. 361. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for export promotion.
- Sec. 362. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the prohibition on funding of the Medium Extended Air Defense System.
- Sec. 363. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to increase the capacity of agencies to ensure effective contract management and contract oversight.
- Sec. 364. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for investments in air traffic control services.
- Sec. 365. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to address prescription drug abuse in the United States.
- Sec. 366. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to support rural schools and districts.
- Sec. 367. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to strengthen enforcement of free trade agreement provisions relating to textile and apparel articles.
- Sec. 368. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to assist low-income seniors.
- Sec. 369. Reserve fund to end offshore tax abuses by large corporations.
- Sec. 370. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure that domestic energy sources can meet emissions rules.
- Sec. 371. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to increasing funding for the inland waterways system.
- Sec. 372. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for achieving full auditability of the financial statements of the Department of Defense by 2017.
- Sec. 373. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to sanctions with respect to Iran.
- Sec. 374. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent restrictions to public access to fishing downstream of dams owned by the Corps of Engineers.
- Sec. 375. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to address the disproportionate regulatory burdens on community banks.
- Sec. 376. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to authorize provision of per diem payments for provision of services to dependents of homeless veterans under laws administered by Secretary of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 377. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to support programs related to the nuclear missions of the Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration.
- Sec. 378. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to phase-in any changes to individual or corporate tax systems.
- Sec. 379. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to increases in aid for tribal education programs.
- Sec. 380. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to expedite exports from the United States.
- Sec. 381. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to supporting the reauthorization of the payments in lieu of taxes program at levels roughly equivalent to property tax revenues lost due to the presence of Federal land.
- Sec. 382. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure that the United States will not negotiate or support treaties that violate Americans' Second Amendment rights under the Constitution of the United States.
- Sec. 383. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to increase funding for Federal investments in biomedical research.
- Sec. 384. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to uphold Second Amendment rights and prevent the United States from entering into the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

- Sec. 401. Discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2013 and 2014, program integrity initiatives, and other adjustments.
- Sec. 402. Point of order against advance appropriations.
- Sec. 403. Adjustments for sequestration or sequestration replacement.
- Sec. 404. Senate point of order against provisions of appropriations legislation that constitute changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund.
- Sec. 405. Supermajority enforcement.
- Sec. 406. Prohibiting the use of guarantee fees as an offset.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

- Sec. 411. Oversight of Government performance.
- Sec. 412. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
- Sec. 413. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
- Sec. 414. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
- Sec. 415. Exercise of rulemaking powers.
- Sec. 416. Congressional budget office estimates.

TITLE V—OTHER MATTERS

- Sec. 501. To require transparent reporting on the ongoing costs to taxpayers of Obamacare.
- Sec. 502. To require fuller reporting on possible costs to taxpayers of Obamacare.
- Sec. 503. To require fuller reporting on possible costs to taxpayers of any budget submitted by the President.
- Sec. 504. Sense of Senate on underutilized facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and their potential use.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2023:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,038,311,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$2,290,932,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$2,646,592,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$2,833,891,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,973,673,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,111,061,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,245,117,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,400,144,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,592,212,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,800,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,991,775,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$0,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$20,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$40,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$55,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$70,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$82,110,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$95,881,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$115,534,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$135,203,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$149,801,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$159,630,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$3,054,195,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$2,963,749,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$3,046,506,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$3,211,506,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$3,386,445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,568,528,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,779,446,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,973,331,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$4,136,110,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,350,282,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,492,138,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,956,295,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$2,997,884,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$3,082,375,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$3,240,376,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$3,382,809,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,542,197,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,749,797,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,926,818,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$4,103,496,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,323,224,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,451,446,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$917,984,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$706,952,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$435,783,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$406,486,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$409,137,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$431,136,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$504,680,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$526,674,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$511,283,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$522,724,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$459,672,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$17,113,638,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$18,008,333,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$18,626,857,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$19,222,298,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$19,871,057,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$20,558,744,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$21,312,959,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$22,094,877,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$22,863,179,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$23,634,787,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$24,364,925,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$12,274,763,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$13,059,985,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$13,588,003,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$14,081,252,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$14,574,683,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$15,081,187,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,669,625,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,297,499,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$16,929,319,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$17,600,005,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$18,229,414,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) **SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.**—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$669,920,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$731,717,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$766,392,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016: \$812,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$861,554,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$908,130,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$951,691,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$994,855,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$1,038,909,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$1,083,586,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,129,163,000,000.

(b) **SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$634,822,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$711,355,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$756,949,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$805,969,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$856,933,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$907,679,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$962,040,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$1,022,374,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$1,086,431,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$1,154,554,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,227,009,000,000.

(c) **SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,643,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,658,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,782,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,801,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,966,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,941,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,174,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,144,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,390,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,358,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,617,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,584,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,844,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,810,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,070,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,036,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,301,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,266,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,541,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,505,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,789,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,751,000,000.

SEC. 103. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$255,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$255,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$262,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$262,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$272,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$272,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$284,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$283,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$295,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$294,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$308,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$307,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$319,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$318,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$332,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$331,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$345,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$344,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$357,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$356,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$371,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$370,000,000.

SEC. 104. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$648,215,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$658,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

- (A) New budget authority, \$560,243,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$599,643,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority, \$567,553,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$575,701,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$575,019,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$575,203,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$582,648,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$573,557,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$590,411,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$574,884,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$598,867,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$587,226,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$607,454,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$595,192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$616,137,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$603,369,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$625,569,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$617,186,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$636,480,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$621,603,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$58,425,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$48,716,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

- (A) New budget authority, \$47,883,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$47,508,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority, \$46,367,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$46,830,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$47,521,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$46,580,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$48,666,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$46,792,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$49,831,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$47,157,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$51,004,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$47,707,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$52,194,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,729,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$52,898,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$49,801,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$54,417,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$51,209,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$55,664,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$52,212,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$29,154,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$28,949,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

- (A) New budget authority, \$29,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$29,426,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority, \$30,301,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$30,022,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$31,019,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$30,553,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$31,749,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$31,229,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$32,508,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$31,962,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$33,264,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$32,655,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$34,030,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$33,408,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$34,795,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$34,073,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$35,590,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$34,851,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$36,396,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$35,643,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,243,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$9,122,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,465,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,270,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,061,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,078,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,185,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$3,563,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,309,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$3,822,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,489,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,105,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,622,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,316,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,803,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,538,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,875,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,696,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,862,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,072,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,913,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$44,150,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$41,682,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

- (A) New budget authority, \$43,019,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,121,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority, \$42,872,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,165,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$44,055,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$44,394,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$45,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$45,681,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$47,245,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$47,014,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$48,036,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$48,112,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$49,596,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$49,435,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$50,174,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$50,074,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$51,331,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$50,862,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$52,759,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$51,703,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,373,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$28,777,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,550,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$21,136,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,180,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,717,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,283,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,780,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,289,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,613,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,087,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,908,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,301,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,379,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,878,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,588,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,116,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$21,105,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,626,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$21,421,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,959,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$ - 30,498,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$ - 24,504,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,201,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,408,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority, \$10,733,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$ - 2,394,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,112,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$ - 4,110,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,827,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$ - 5,624,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$14,224,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$ - 3,938,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,885,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$—6,483,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,984,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$—6,238,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,099,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$—981,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,226,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$—2,004,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,334,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$—3,032,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$100,501,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$93,656,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,556,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$94,621,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,419,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$95,092,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$89,319,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$95,855,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,186,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$96,577,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$91,115,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$96,478,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$91,977,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$97,757,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$93,143,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$99,308,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$94,330,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$101,593,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$95,586,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$103,395,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$96,864,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$105,364,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,911,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,409,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,995,500,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,779,500,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,362,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,033,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,808,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,233,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,360,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,216,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,442,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,660,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,610,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,831,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,212,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,873,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,828,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,154,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,461,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,487,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,098,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,953,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$77,536,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$82,279,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,349,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$86,546,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$89,537,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$96,269,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$106,927,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$98,922,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$117,961,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$111,494,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$123,744,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$122,679,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$119,139,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$117,997,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$120,411,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$119,806,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$122,546,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$121,459,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$124,565,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$123,422,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$126,825,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$125,845,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$365,206,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$361,960,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$420,326,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$415,573,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$500,356,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$493,639,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$554,680,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$560,173,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$611,908,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$614,248,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$648,773,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$648,945,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$685,879,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$684,985,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$732,529,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$721,193,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$764,934,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$763,469,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$808,026,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$806,172,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$852,829,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$851,028,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$511,692,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$511,240,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$535,596,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$535,067,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$540,503,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$540,205,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$586,873,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$586,662,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$602,495,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$602,085,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$626,619,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$626,319,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$687,071,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$686,851,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$734,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$734,051,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$782,452,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$782,386,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$855,410,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$855,061,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$883,491,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$883,062,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$544,094,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$542,998,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$530,103,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$526,954,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$528,197,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$524,043,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$537,117,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$536,196,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$536,006,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$531,153,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$538,914,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$529,716,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$565,188,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$560,677,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$578,159,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$573,775,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$592,348,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$587,965,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$611,644,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$612,070,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$619,422,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$614,921,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,803,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$52,883,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,506,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,616,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,233,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,308,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,369,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,407,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,691,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,691,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,005,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,005,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,421,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,421,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,954,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,954,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,474,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,474,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$54,235,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,235,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,441,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$58,441,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$140,646,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$138,860,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$145,488,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$145,254,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$150,218,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$149,672,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$162,493,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$161,876,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$161,405,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$160,549,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$159,902,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$159,031,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$171,529,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$170,622,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,188,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$175,286,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$180,118,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$179,169,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,846,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$190,875,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$188,517,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$187,433,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,094,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,120,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,526,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,476,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,912,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,937,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,665,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,940,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,090,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,751,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,405,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,708,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,959,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,672,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,153,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,840,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,246,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,695,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,066,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,218,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,564,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,263,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,616,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,527,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,258,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,540,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,995,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,616,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,640,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,247,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,497,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,039,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,377,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,724,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,210,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,520,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,089,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,437,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,996,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,353,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,304,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$331,271,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$331,271,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$342,703,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$342,703,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$370,274,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$370,274,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$419,485,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$419,485,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$506,103,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$506,103,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$608,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$608,623,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$683,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$683,623,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$752,067,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$752,067,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$806,870,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$806,870,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$859,077,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$859,077,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$905,971,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$905,971,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$99,868,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,853,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,869,500,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,233,500,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,469,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,941,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-35,734,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,211,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-42,592,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-20,253,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-51,675,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-36,471,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-61,088,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-48,910,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-68,207,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-61,194,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-76,108,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-70,697,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-84,378,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-80,463,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-92,680,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-89,556,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-76,489,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-76,489,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-75,946,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-75,946,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-80,864,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-80,864,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-86,391,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-86,391,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-90,137,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-90,137,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-90,503,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-90,503,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-97,574,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-97,574,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-98,916,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-98,916,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-103,177,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-103,177,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-105,117,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-105,117,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$-108,885,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$-108,885,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

Not later than October 1, 2013, the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws, bills, or resolutions within its jurisdiction to increase the total level of revenues by \$975,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REPLACE SEQUESTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that amend section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) or section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-240) to repeal or revise the enforcement procedures established under those sections, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. For purposes of determining deficit-neutrality under this section, the Chairman may include the estimated effects of any amendment or amendments to the discretionary spending limits in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)).

SEC. 302. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS TO PROMOTE EMPLOYMENT AND JOB GROWTH.

(a) EMPLOYMENT AND JOB GROWTH.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution

for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to employment and job growth, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) **SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide assistance to small businesses, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) **UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide assistance to the unemployed, or improve the unemployment compensation program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(d) **TRADE AND INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to trade, including Trade Adjustment Assistance programs, trade enforcement, (including requiring timely and time-limited investigations into the evasion of antidumping and countervailing duties), or international agreements for economic assistance, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 303. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS TO ASSIST WORKING FAMILIES AND CHILDREN.

(a) **INCOME SUPPORT.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG), the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, child support enforcement programs, or other assistance to working families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) **HOUSING ASSISTANCE.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to

housing assistance, which may include working family rental assistance, or assistance provided through the Housing Trust Fund, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) **CHILD WELFARE.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to child welfare programs, which may include the Federal foster care payment system, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 304. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.

(a) **PRE-KINDERGARTEN.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to a pre-kindergarten program or programs to serve low-income children, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) **CHILD CARE.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to child care assistance for working families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) **HOME VISITING.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to a home visiting program or programs serving low-income mothers-to-be and low-income families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 305. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TAX RELIEF.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide tax relief, including extensions of expiring tax relief or refundable tax relief, relief that supports innovation by United States enterprises, relief for low and middle income families or relief that ex-

pands the ability of startup companies to benefit from the credit for research and experimentation expenses, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that the provisions in such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 306. RESERVE FUND FOR TAX REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure a sustainable revenue base that leads to a fairer, more progressive, and more efficient tax system than currently exists, and to a more competitive business environment for United States enterprises, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that the provisions in such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 307. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INVEST IN CLEAN ENERGY AND PRESERVE THE ENVIRONMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to—

- (1) the reduction of our Nation's dependence on imported energy and the investment of receipts from domestic energy production;
- (2) energy conservation and renewable energy development, or new or existing approaches to clean energy financing;
- (3) the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program;
- (4) low-income weatherization and energy efficiency retrofit programs;
- (5) Federal programs for land and water conservation and acquisition;
- (6) greenhouse gas emissions levels;
- (7) the preservation, restoration, or protection of the Nation's public lands, oceans, coastal areas, or aquatic ecosystems;
- (8) agreements between the United States and jurisdictions of the former Trust Territory;
- (9) wildland fire management activities;
- (10) the restructure of the nuclear waste program; or
- (11) to provide assistance for fishery disasters declared by the Secretary of Commerce during 2012;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide for Federal investment in the infrastructure of the United States, which may include projects for transportation, housing, energy, water, telecommunications, including promoting investments in

broadband infrastructure to expedite deployment of broadband to rural areas, or financing through tax credit bonds, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 309. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to—

(1) eligibility for both military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation (concurrent receipt);

(2) the reduction or elimination of the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and Veterans' Dependency and Indemnity Compensation;

(3) the improvement of disability benefits or the process of evaluating and adjudicating benefit claims for members of the Armed Forces or veterans;

(4) the infrastructure needs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including constructing or leasing space, to include leases of major medical facilities, and maintenance of Department facilities;

(5) supporting the transition of servicemembers to the civilian workforce, including by expanding or improving education, job training, and workforce development benefits, or other programs for servicemembers or veterans, which may include streamlining the process associated with Federal and State credentialing requirements; or

(6) supporting additional efforts to increase access to health care for veterans in rural areas through telehealth and other programs that reduce the need for such veterans to travel long distances to a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 310. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that make higher education more accessible and affordable, which may include legislation to increase college enrollment and completion rates for low-income students, standardize financial aid award letters, or promote college savings, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 311. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS FOR HEALTH CARE.

(a) **PHYSICIAN REIMBURSEMENT.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments,

motions, or conference reports that increase payments made under, or permanently reform or replace, the Medicare Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) formula, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that the provisions in such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) **EXTENSION OF EXPIRING HEALTH CARE POLICIES.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that extend expiring Medicare, Medicaid, or other health provisions, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) **HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that promote improvements to health care delivery systems, which may include changes that increase care quality, encourage efficiency, focus on chronic illness, or improve care coordination, improve overall population health, promote health equity or reduce health disparities, and that improve the fiscal sustainability of health care spending over the long term, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(d) **THERAPY CAPS.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that protect access to outpatient therapy services (including physical therapy, occupational therapy, and speech-language pathology services) through measures such as repealing or increasing the current outpatient therapy caps, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(e) **DRUG SAFETY.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to drug safety, which may include legislation that permits the safe importation of prescription drugs approved by the Food and Drug Administration from a specified list of countries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 312. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN OUR NATION'S COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that make changes to or provide for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-393) or make changes to chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the "Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1976"), or both, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 313. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR A FARM BILL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide for the reauthorization of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 Stat. 1651) or prior Acts, authorize similar or related programs, provide for revenue changes, or any combination of the purposes under this section, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 314. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN WATER INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to water infrastructure programs or make changes to the collection and expenditure of the Harbor Maintenance Tax (subchapter A of chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 315. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PENSION REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports to strengthen and reform the pension system, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 316. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HOUSING FINANCE REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference

reports that promote appropriate access to mortgage credit for individuals and families or examine the role of government in the secondary mortgage market, which may include legislation to restructure government-sponsored enterprises, or provide for mortgage refinance opportunities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 317. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR NATIONAL SECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that support Department of Defense auditability and acquisition reform efforts, which may include legislation that limits the use of incremental funding, or that promotes affordability or appropriate contract choice, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 318. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the support of Overseas Contingency Operations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 319. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that make changes to or provide for the reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (Public Law 107-297; 116 Stat. 2322), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 320. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR POSTAL REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports to strengthen and reform the United States Postal Service, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 321. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR GOVERNMENT REFORM AND EFFICIENCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings through the use of performance data or scientifically rigorous evaluation methodologies for the elimination, consolidation, or reform of Federal programs, agencies, offices, and initiatives, or the sale of Federal property, or the reduction of duplicative Federal financial literacy programs, or the reduction of duplicative Federal housing assistance programs or the reduction of duplicative Federal grant programs within the Department of Justice, or the reduction of duplicative Federal unmanned aircraft programs, or the reduction of duplicative Federal science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs or the reduction of duplicative Federal economic development programs or the reduction of duplicative Federal support for entrepreneurs programs, or the reduction of duplicative preparedness grants by the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the reduction of duplicative Federal green building programs, or the reduction of duplicative Federal diesel emissions programs, or the reduction of duplicative early learning child care programs, or the reduction of duplicative domestic food assistance programs, or the reduction of duplicative teacher quality programs, or the reduction of duplicative food safety programs, or the reduction of duplicative Defense language and cultural training programs, or the reduction of duplicative nuclear nonproliferation programs, or reduce improper payments, and reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 322. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE FEDERAL BENEFIT PROCESSING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to business process changes at the Office of Personnel Management, which may include processing times for Federal employee benefits or other efficiencies or operational changes, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 323. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE VOTER REGISTRATION AND THE VOTING EXPERIENCE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the improvement of voter registration and the voting ex-

perience in Federal elections, which may include funding measures or other measures addressing voter registration or election reform, by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 324. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE CORPORATE TAX FAIRNESS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to corporate income taxes, which may include measures addressing loopholes used by large profitable corporations that pay no Federal income tax and use such savings to reduce the deficit. The Chairman may also make adjustment to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 325. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR IMPROVING FEDERAL FOREST MANAGEMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to the management of Federal forest lands, which may include—

(1) the increase of timber production within sustainable levels;

(2) the protection of communities from wildfires, or the enhancement of forest resilience to insects or disease; or

(3) the improvement, protection, or restoration of watersheds and forest ecosystems;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 326. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports to increase the transparency of financial and performance information for Federal agencies, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 327. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE MANUFACTURING IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to investment in the manufacturing sector of the United States, which may include educational or research and development initiatives, public-private partnerships, or other programs, by the amounts

provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 328. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR REPORT ELIMINATION OR MODIFICATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings through the elimination, modification, or the reduction in frequency of congressionally mandated reports from Federal agencies, and reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 329. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE MINIMUM WAGE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to income inequality, which may include an increase in the minimum wage, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 330. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE HEALTH OUTCOMES AND LOWER COSTS FOR CHILDREN IN MEDICAID.

(a) **PROTECTING MEDICAID FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that preserve Medicaid's role in protecting children's health care, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) **MEDICALLY COMPLEX CHILDREN.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that improve the health outcomes and lowers costs for medically complex children in Medicaid, which may include creating or expanding integrated delivery models or improving care coordination, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) **ORAL HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN WITH MEDICAID COVERAGE.**—The Chairman of the

Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that improve the oral health outcomes for children covered by Medicaid, including legislation that may allow for risk-based disease prevention and comprehensive, coordinated chronic disease treatment approaches, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 331. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE FEDERAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, JOB TRAINING, AND REEMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would ensure effective administration, reduce inefficient overlap, improve access, and enhance outcomes of Federal workforce development, youth and adult job training, and reemployment programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REPEAL OF MEDICAL DEVICE TAX.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the House and the Senate, motions, or conference reports related to innovation, high quality manufacturing jobs, and economic growth, including the repeal of the 2.3 percent excise tax on medical device manufacturers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 333. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND PROHIBITING MEDICARE VOUCHERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to access for Medicare beneficiaries, which may include legislation that provides beneficiary protections from voucher payments, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 334. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to efforts to ensure equal pay policies

and practices, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 335. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to women's access to health care, which may include the protection of basic primary and preventative health care, family planning and birth control, or employer-provided contraceptive coverage for women's health care, by the amounts provided in such legislation for these purposes, provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 336. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REQUIRE STATE-WIDE BUDGET NEUTRALITY IN THE CALCULATION OF THE MEDICARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FLOOR.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would adjust Medicare outlays, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 337. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE PROMOTION OF INVESTMENT AND JOB GROWTH IN UNITED STATES MANUFACTURING, OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION, AND REFINING SECTORS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may result in strong growth in manufacturing, oil and gas production, and refining sectors of the economy through the approval and construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 338. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ALLOW STATES TO ENFORCE STATE AND LOCAL USE TAX LAWS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of any committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to allowing States to enforce State and local use taxes already owed under State law on remote sales by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023 and provided that such legislation may include requirements that

States recognize the value of small businesses to the United States economy by exempting the remote sales of business inputs from sales and use taxes.

SEC. 339. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DEFINITION OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to employer penalties in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which may include restoring a sensible definition of “full-time employee”, provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 340. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE LABELING OF GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FISH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to the labeling of genetically engineered fish, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 341. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE FAMILIES OF AMERICA'S SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to support for the families of members of the Armed Forces and veterans, including—

- (1) expanding educational opportunities;
- (2) providing increased access to job training and placement services;
- (3) tracking and reporting on suicides of family members of members of the Armed Forces;
- (4) ensuring access to high-quality and affordable healthcare; or
- (5) improving military housing;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 342. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A BIENNIAL BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing a biennial budget and appropriations process, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 343. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE REPEAL OR REDUCTION OF THE ESTATE TAX.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to the repeal or reduction of the estate tax, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 344. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DISABLED VETERANS AND THEIR SURVIVORS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to protecting the benefits of disabled veterans and their survivors, which may not include a chained CPI, by the amounts provided in that legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 345. DEFICIT REDUCTION FUND FOR NO BUDGET, NO OMB PAY.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget shall reduce allocations, pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, equal to amounts withheld pursuant to one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the federal budget process, which may include prohibiting paying the salaries of either the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the OMB Deputy Director, or the OMB Deputy Director for Management, or all three officials, for the period of time after which the President fails to submit a budget, pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, and until the day the President submits a budget to Congress.

SEC. 346. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HARDROCK MINING REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal land management, which may include provisions relating to budget deficit reduction, establishment of a reclamation fund, imposition of a locatable mineral royalty, revenue sharing with States, and improvements to the permitting process, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 347. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO END “TOO BIG TO FAIL” SUBSIDIES OR FUNDING ADVANTAGE FOR WALL STREET MEGA-BANKS (OVER \$500,000,000,000 IN TOTAL ASSETS).

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and

other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to any subsidies or funding advantage relative to other competitors received by bank holding companies with over \$500,000,000,000 in total assets, which may include elimination of any subsidies or funding advantage relative to other competitors resulting from the perception of Federal assistance to prevent receivership, or any subsidies or funding advantage relative to other competitors resulting from the perception of Federal assistance to facilitate exit from receivership, or to realign market incentives to protect the taxpayer, except in the case of Federal assistance provided in response to a natural disaster, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 348. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AUTHORIZING CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR HEALTH CARE UNDER LAWS ADMINISTERED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO RETAIN SUCH ELIGIBILITY UNTIL AGE 26.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to authorizing children who are eligible to receive health care furnished under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain such eligibility until age 26, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 349. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report to support State and local law enforcement, which may include investing in State formula grants, to aid State and local law enforcement and criminal justice systems in implementing innovative, evidence-based approaches to crime prevention and control, including strategies such as specialty courts, multi-jurisdictional task forces, technology improvement, and information sharing systems, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 350. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to accelerating the development and deployment of advanced manufacturing technologies, advancing competitiveness, improving the speed and infrastructure with which small- and medium-sized enterprises and supply chains commercialize

new processes and technologies, and informing industry-driven education and training, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 351. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURE THAT ANY CARBON EMISSIONS STANDARDS MUST BE COST EFFECTIVE, BASED ON THE BEST AVAILABLE SCIENCE, AND BENEFIT LOW-INCOME AND MIDDLE CLASS FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to carbon emission standards, that any such standards must be cost effective, based on best available science and benefit low-income and middle class families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR CERTAIN UNLAWFUL IMMIGRANT INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to limiting undocumented immigrants from qualifying for federally subsidized health insurance coverage, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 353. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE NO FINANCIAL INSTITUTION IS ABOVE THE LAW REGARDLESS OF SIZE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to criminal liability of a financial institution operating in the United States, which may include measures to address the criminal prosecution of a large financial institution operating in the United States or executives of a large financial institution operating in the United States, including for wrongdoing relating to money laundering or violation of sanctions laws, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 354. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HELPING HOMEOWNERS AND SMALL BUSINESSES MITIGATE AGAINST FLOOD LOSS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates,

and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing better coordination among flood mitigation programs to meet the unmet mitigation needs of homeowners and small businesses, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 355. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE FAMILY HEALTH CARE FLEXIBILITY BY REPEALING THE HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNT AND FLEXIBLE SPENDING ACCOUNT RESTRICTIONS IN THE HEALTH CARE LAW.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that restore families' health care flexibility, which may include repealing tax increases on tax-advantaged accounts in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; Stat. 119), without raising revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 356. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR BARDA AND THE BIOSHIELD SPECIAL RESERVE FUND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may provide for full funding for the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority under section 319L of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-7e) and the Special Reserve Fund under Section 319-F2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-6b) without raising new revenue by the amounts provided in such authorizing legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 357. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR POSTAL REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the United States Postal Service, which may include measures addressing the nonprofit postal discount for State and national political committees, and use such savings to reduce the deficit. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 358. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO BROADEN THE EFFECTS OF THE SEQUESTER, INCLUDING ALLOWING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO DONATE A PORTION OF THEIR SALARIES TO CHARITY OR TO THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY DURING SEQUESTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that are related to broadening the impact of the sequester, which may include allowing Members of Congress to donate 20 percent of their salaries to charity or to the Department of the Treasury if the enforcement procedures established under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 go into, or remain in effect, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 359. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT COLLABORATES WITH WESTERN STATES TO PREVENT THE LISTING OF THE SAGE-GROUSE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that would improve the management of public land and natural resources, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 360. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE PREVENTION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget shall reduce allocations, pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, equal to amounts withheld pursuant to one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to federal economic development assistance, which may include amendments to the eligibility of a State or local government to receive benefits, including restricting benefits when eminent domain has been used to take private property and transfer it to another private use, and reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 361. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXPORT PROMOTION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to promoting exports, which may include providing the President with trade promotion authority, by the

amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 362. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE PROHIBITION ON FUNDING OF THE MEDIUM EXTENDED AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting use of funds for defense programs not authorized by law, which may include the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS), without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 363. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE THE CAPACITY OF AGENCIES TO ENSURE EFFECTIVE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AND CONTRACT OVERSIGHT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would increase the capacity of Federal agencies to ensure effective contract management and contract oversight, including efforts such as additional personnel and training for Inspectors General at each agency, new reporting requirements for agencies to track their responses to and actions taken in response to Inspector General recommendations, urging the President to appoint permanent Inspectors General at agencies where there is currently a vacancy, and any other effort to ensure accountability from contractors and increase the capacity of Inspectors General to rout out waste, fraud, and abuse in all government contracting efforts, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 364. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SERVICES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal investment in civil air traffic control services, which may include air traffic management at airport towers across the United States or at facilities of the Federal Aviation Administration, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 365. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS PRESCRIPTION DRUG ABUSE IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to addressing prescription drug abuse, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 366. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT RURAL SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the establishment of the Office of Rural Education Policy within the Department of Education, which could include a clearinghouse for information related to the challenges of rural schools and districts or providing technical assistance within the Department of Education on rules and regulations that impact rural schools and districts, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 367. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN ENFORCEMENT OF FREE TRADE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS RELATING TO TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to strengthening the enforcement of provisions of free trade agreements that relate to textile and apparel articles, which may include increased training with respect to, and monitoring and verification of, textile and apparel articles, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 368. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ASSIST LOW-INCOME SENIORS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Older Americans Act of 1965, which may include congregate and home-delivered meals programs, or other assistance to low-income seniors, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 369. RESERVE FUND TO END OFFSHORE TAX ABUSES BY LARGE CORPORATIONS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports

related to corporate income taxes, which may include measures to end offshore tax abuses used by large corporations, or measures providing for comprehensive tax reform that ensures a revenue structure that is more efficient, leads to a more competitive business environment, and may result in additional rate or deficit reductions, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 370. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THAT DOMESTIC ENERGY SOURCES CAN MEET EMISSIONS RULES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that are related to the research, development, and demonstration necessary for domestically abundant energy sources and current energy technologies to comply with present and future greenhouse gas emissions rules while still remaining economically competitive, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 371. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR THE INLAND WATERWAYS SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding the inland waterways system, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 372. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ACHIEVING FULL AUDITABILITY OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BY 2017.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to achieving full auditability of the financial statements Department of Defense by 2017, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 373. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO IRAN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Iran, which may include efforts to clarify that the clearance and settlement

of euro-denominated transactions through European Union financial institutions may not result in the evasion of or otherwise undermine the impact of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran by the United States and the European Union (including provisions designed to strictly limit the access of the Government of Iran to its foreign exchange reserves and the facilitation of transactions on behalf of sanctioned entities), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 374. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT RESTRICTIONS TO PUBLIC ACCESS TO FISHING DOWNSTREAM OF DAMS OWNED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the Corps of Engineers from restricting public access to waters downstream of a Corps of Engineers dam, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 375. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS THE DISPROPORTIONATE REGULATORY BURDENS ON COMMUNITY BANKS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to alleviating disproportionate regulatory burdens on community banks, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 376. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO AUTHORIZE PROVISION OF PER DIEM PAYMENTS FOR PROVISION OF SERVICES TO DEPENDENTS OF HOMELESS VETERANS UNDER LAWS ADMINISTERED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to care, services, or benefits for homeless veterans, which may include providing per diem payments for the furnishing of care for dependents of homeless veterans, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 377. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT PROGRAMS RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR MISSIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that support programs related to the nuclear missions of the Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 378. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PHASE-IN ANY CHANGES TO INDIVIDUAL OR CORPORATE TAX SYSTEMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to the phase-in of any changes to the individual or corporate tax systems, including any changes to individual or corporate income tax exclusions, exemptions, deductions, or credits, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 379. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASES IN AID FOR TRIBAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to increases in aid for tribal education programs, including the Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Career and Technical Institutions Program administered by the Department of Education, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 380. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO EXPEDITE EXPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to promoting the export of goods, including manufactured goods, from the United States through reform of environmental laws, which may include the regulation of greenhouse gas emissions produced outside the United States by goods exported from the United States, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 381. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES PROGRAM AT LEVELS ROUGHLY EQUIVALENT TO PROPERTY TAX REVENUES LOST DUE TO THE PRESENCE OF FEDERAL LAND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to that make changes to or provide for the reauthorization of the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program at levels roughly equivalent to lost tax revenues due to the presence of Federal land without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 382. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL NOT NEGOTIATE OR SUPPORT TREATIES THAT VIOLATE AMERICANS' SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to the implementation of treaties, including upholding the constitutional rights of citizens of the United States when treaties are negotiated, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 383. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR FEDERAL INVESTMENTS IN BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to Federal investments in biomedical research, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 384. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO UPHOLD SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND PREVENT THE UNITED STATES FROM ENTERING INTO THE UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to upholding Second Amendment rights, which shall include preventing the United States from entering into the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty, by the amounts provided in such legislation for

those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 401. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2013 AND 2014, PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) SENATE POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this resolution, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or joint resolution) that would cause the discretionary spending limits in this section to be exceeded.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—This subsection may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(b) SENATE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the Senate and as used in this section, the term “discretionary spending limit” means—

(1) for fiscal year 2013—

(A) for the security category, \$684,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

(B) for the nonsecurity category, \$359,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

(2) for fiscal year 2014—

(A) for the revised security category, \$497,352,000,000 in budget authority; and

(B) for the revised nonsecurity category, \$469,023,000,000 in budget authority; as adjusted in conformance with the adjustment procedures in this resolution.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After a bill or joint resolution relating to any matter described in paragraph (2) or (3) is placed on the calendar, or upon the offering of an amendment or motion thereto, or the laying down of an amendment between the Houses or a conference report thereon—

(A) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the discretionary spending limits, budgetary aggregates, and allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, by the amount of new budget authority in that measure for that purpose and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(B) following any adjustment under subparagraph (A), the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(2) MATTERS DESCRIBED.—Matters referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) EMERGENCY REQUIREMENTS.—Measures making appropriations in a fiscal year for emergency requirements (and so designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(B) DISABILITY REVIEWS AND REDETERMINATIONS.—Measures making appropriations in a

fiscal year for continuing disability reviews and redeterminations (consistent with section 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(C) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE.—Measures making appropriations in a fiscal year for health care fraud and abuse control (consistent with section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(D) DISASTER RELIEF.—Measures making appropriations for disaster relief (and so designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(3) ADJUSTMENTS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—

(A) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the discretionary spending limits, allocations to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and aggregates for one or more—

(i) bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or passed by the House of Representatives;

(ii) joint resolutions or amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(iii) amendments between the Houses received from the House of Representatives or Senate amendments offered by the authority of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; or

(iv) conference reports;

making appropriations for overseas contingency operations by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes (and so designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985), up to the amounts specified in subparagraph (B).

(B) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are—

(i) for fiscal year 2013, \$99,670,000,000 in budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom); and

(ii) for fiscal year 2014, \$50,000,000,000 in budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “nonsecurity category” means all discretionary appropriations not included in the security category;

(2) the term “revised nonsecurity category” means all discretionary appropriations other than in budget function 050;

(3) the term “revised security category” means discretionary appropriations in budget function 050; and

(4) the term “security category” means discretionary appropriations associated with agency budgets for the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the National Nuclear Security Administration, the intelligence community management account (95-0401-0-1-054), and all budget accounts in budget function 150 (international affairs).

SEC. 402. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 that first becomes available for any

fiscal year after 2014 or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2015.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2015 and 2016 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each year;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 402 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) shall no longer apply.

SEC. 403. ADJUSTMENTS FOR SEQUESTRATION OR SEQUESTRATION REPLACEMENT.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS UNDER CURRENT LAW.—If the enforcement procedures established under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 go into, or remain in effect, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such enforcement.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS IF AMENDED.—If a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the

adjustments to discretionary spending limits under section 251(b) of that Act, or the enforcement procedures established under section 251A of that Act or section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

SEC. 404. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS AFFECTING THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider any appropriations legislation, including any amendment thereto, motion in relation thereto, or conference report thereon, that includes any provision or provisions affecting the Crime Victims Fund (as established by section 1402 of Public Law 98-473 (42 U.S.C. 10601)) which constitutes a change in a mandatory program that would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) were they included in legislation other than appropriations legislation. A point of order pursuant to this section shall be raised against such provision or provisions as described in subsections (d) and (e).

(b) **DETERMINATION.**—The determination of whether a provision is subject to a point of order pursuant to this section shall be made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) **GENERAL POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall be in order for a Senator to raise a single point of order that several provisions of a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report violate this section. The Presiding Officer may sustain the point of order as to some or all of the provisions against which the Senator raised the point of order. If the Presiding Officer so sustains the point of order as to some of the provisions (including provisions of an amendment, motion, or conference report) against which the Senator raised the point of order, then only those provisions (including provision of an amendment, motion, or conference report) against which the Presiding Officer sustains the point of order shall be deemed stricken pursuant to this section. Before the Presiding Officer rules on such a point of order, any Senator may move to waive such a point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions against which the point of order was raised. Such a motion to waive is amendable in accordance with rules and precedents of the Senate. After the Presiding Officer rules on such a point of order, any Senator may appeal the ruling of the Presiding Officer on such a point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions on which the Presiding Officer ruled.

(e) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report

on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or amendment shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

SEC. 405. SUPERMAJORITY ENFORCEMENT.

Section 425(a)(1) and (2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be subject to the waiver and appeal requirements of subsections (c)(2) and (d)(3) of section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 406. PROHIBITING THE USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to ensure that increases in guarantee fees charged by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac shall not be used to offset provisions that increase the deficit.

(b) **BUDGETARY RULE.**—In the Senate, for purposes of determining budgetary impacts to evaluate points of order under this resolution and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this resolution, any previous resolution, and any subsequent budget resolution, provisions contained in any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that increases any guarantee fees of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac shall not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues contained in such legislation.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 411. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse, or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list and the annual report to reduce program duplication. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committees on the Budget.

SEC. 412. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committees on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

SEC. 413. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 414. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 415. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

SEC. 416. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

(a) **REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES.**—In the case of any legislative provision to which this section applies, the Congressional Budget Office, with the assistance of the Joint Committee on Taxation, shall prepare, to the extent practicable, as a supplement to the cost estimate for legislation affecting revenues, an estimate of the revenue changes in connection with such provision that incorporates the macroeconomic effects of the policy being analyzed. Any macroeconomic impact statement under the preceding sentence shall be accompanied by a written statement fully disclosing the economic, technical, and behavioral assumptions that were made in producing—

(1) such estimate; and

(2) the conventional estimate in connection with such provision.

(b) **LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS TO WHICH THIS SECTION APPLIES.**—This section shall apply to any legislative provision—

(1) which proposes a change or changes to law that the Congressional Budget Office determines, pursuant to a conventional fiscal estimate, has a revenue impact in excess of \$5,000,000,000 in any fiscal year; or

(2) with respect to which the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget of either the Senate or the House of Representatives has requested an estimate described in subsection (a).

TITLE V—OTHER MATTERS**SEC. 501. TO REQUIRE TRANSPARENT REPORTING ON THE ONGOING COSTS TO TAXPAYERS OF OBAMACARE.**

When the Congressional Budget Office releases its annual Update to the Budget and Economic Outlook, the Congressional Budget Office shall report changes in direct spending and revenue associated with the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152), including the net impact on deficit, both with on-budget and off-budget effects. The information shall be similar to that provided in Table 2 of the Congressional Budget Office's March 20, 2010 estimate of the budgetary effects of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), as passed by the Senate.

SEC. 502. TO REQUIRE FULLER REPORTING ON POSSIBLE COSTS TO TAXPAYERS OF OBAMACARE.

When the Congressional Budget Office releases its annual update to the Budget and Economic Outlook, the Congressional Budget Office shall provide an analysis of the budgetary effects of 30 percent, 50 percent, and 100 percent of Americans losing employer sponsored health insurance and accessing coverage through Federal or State exchanges.

SEC. 503. TO REQUIRE FULLER REPORTING ON POSSIBLE COSTS TO TAXPAYERS OF ANY BUDGET SUBMITTED BY THE PRESIDENT.

When the Congressional Budget Office submits its report to Congress relating to a budget submitted by the President for a fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, such report shall contain—

(1) an estimate of the pro rata cost for taxpayers who will file individual income tax returns for taxable years ending during such fiscal year of any deficit that would result from the budget; and

(2) an analysis of the budgetary effects described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 504. SENSE OF SENATE ON UNDERUTILIZED FACILITIES OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AND THEIR POTENTIAL USE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is the ninth largest real property holder of the Federal Government, with more than 124,000 acres and more than 4,900 buildings and other structures with a replacement value of more than \$30,000,000,000.

(2) The annual operation and maintenance costs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have increased steadily, and, as of 2012, the Administration has more than \$2,300,000,000 in annual deferred maintenance costs.

(3) According to Office of Inspector General (OIG) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Administration continues to retain real property that is underutilized, does not have identified future mission uses, or is duplicative of other assets in its real property inventory.

(4) The Office of Inspector General, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), and Congress have identified the aging and duplicative infrastructure of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as a high priority and longstanding management challenge.

(5) In the NASA Authorization Act of 2010, Congress directed the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to examine its

real property assets and downsize to fit current and future missions and expected funding levels, paying particular attention to identifying and removing unneeded or duplicative infrastructure.

(6) The Office of Inspector General found at least 33 facilities, including wind tunnels, test stands, airfields, and launch infrastructure, that were underutilized or for which National Aeronautics and Space Administration managers could not identify a future mission use and that the need for these facilities have declined in recent years as a result of changes in the mission focus of the Administration, the condition and obsolescence of some facilities, and the advent of alternative testing methods.

(7) The Office of Inspector General found that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has taken steps to minimize the costs of continuing to maintain some of these facilities by placing them in an inactive state or leasing them to other parties.

(8) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has a series of initiatives underway that, in the judgment of the Office of Inspector General, are "positive steps towards 'rightsizing' its real property footprint", and the Office of Inspector General has concluded that "it is imperative that NASA move forward aggressively with its infrastructure reduction efforts".

(9) Existing and emerging United States commercial launch and exploration capabilities are providing cargo transportation to the International Space Station and offer the potential for providing crew support, access to the International Space Station, and missions to low Earth orbit while the National Aeronautics and Space Administration focuses its efforts on heavy-lift capabilities and deep space missions.

(10) National Aeronautics and Space Administration facilities and property that are underutilized, duplicative, or no longer needed for Administration requirements could be utilized by commercial users and State and local entities, resulting in savings for the Administration and a reduction in the burden of the Federal Government to fund space operations.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this concurrent resolution assume—

(1) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should move forward with plans to reduce its infrastructure and, to the greatest extent practicable, make property available for lease to a government or private tenant or report the property to the General Services Administration (GSA) for sale or transfer to another entity;

(2) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should pursue opportunities for streamlined sale or lease of property and facilities, including for exclusive use, to a private entity, or expedited conveyance or transfer to a State or political subdivision, municipality, instrumentality of a State, or Department of Transportation-licensed launch site operators for the promotion of commercial or scientific space activity and for developing and operating space launch facilities; and

(3) leasing or transferring underutilized facilities and properties to commercial space entities or State or local governments will reduce operation and maintenance costs for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, save money for the Federal Government, and promote commercial space and the exploration goals of the Administration and the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 16, 2013, at 5:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

Mr. Reid. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar No. 248, 331, 332, 333, 342, 345, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 360, 363, 364, 365, 366, 368, 369, 370, 373, 374, 375, and 376; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Stephen Woolman Preston, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Ranee Ramaswamy, of Minnesota, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2018.

Rick Lowe, of Texas, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2018.

Olga Viso, of Minnesota, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Nisha Desai Biswal, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

Roberto R. Herencia, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Gregory Dainard Winfree, of New York, to be Administrator of the Research and Innovative Technology Administration, Department of Transportation.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Christopher A. Hart, of Colorado, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2017.

Deborah A. P. Hersman, of Virginia, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term of two years.

Deborah A. P. Hersman, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Transportation

Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2018.

THE JUDICIARY

Kevin A. Ohlson, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces for the term of fifteen years to expire on the date prescribed by law.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Zachary Thomas Fardon, of Illinois, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois for the term of four years.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

Carol Waller Pope, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years expiring July 1, 2014.

Ernest W. Dubester, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years expiring July 29, 2017.

Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years expiring July 1, 2015.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Steven Eaton Bunnell, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Julia Friffield, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs).

Caroline Kennedy, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Beth F. Cobert, of California, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Scott S. Dahl, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Sylvia I. Garcia, of Michigan, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Transportation.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Bradley Crowell, of Nevada, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs.)

NATIONAL CONSUMER COOPERATIVE BANK

Andrea Levere, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank for a term of three years.

CONFIRMATION OF ZACH FARDON

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate has just confirmed Zach Fardon to serve as the next U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois.

Mr. Fardon is going to be an outstanding U.S. Attorney. He has a superb résumé. He served for six years as an Assistant U.S. Attorney in Chicago, where he worked on one of the highest-profile prosecutions in our state's history, the prosecution of Governor George Ryan. He also served for several years as a First Assistant U.S. Attorney in Nashville, which was the number 2 position in that office. Additionally, he has experience working as a public defender in Nashville, which has given him perspective from both sides of the courtroom.

It is hard to imagine a more bipartisan nominee. Senator MARK KIRK and

I worked together every step of the way in identifying our next U.S. Attorney. We established a blue-ribbon, bipartisan screening committee to evaluate candidates for this job. Our screening committee highly recommended Mr. Fardon, and Senator KIRK and I agree that Mr. Fardon is an outstanding pick.

Former U.S. Attorney Patrick Fitzgerald, the man whose shoes Mr. Fardon will fill, agrees that he is up to the task. When Mr. Fardon was nominated, Pat Fitzgerald said "Zach is a wonderful person, a great lawyer and a natural leader."

I want to commend and thank Gary Shapiro, who has served as Acting U.S. Attorney for over a year, for his service and his excellent work. He has been a tremendous asset to the Northern District of Illinois. But it is important to get Senate-confirmed leadership in place in this office, and I believe Zach Fardon will do an outstanding job.

Now that the Senate has confirmed Mr. Fardon, he can get to work addressing the urgent problems of gang and gun crime in the Northern District of Illinois. I have talked with Mr. Fardon about the need for the U.S. Attorney's office to take a leading role in this fight, and he agrees.

I am glad that the Senate has taken this step today, and I wish Mr. Fardon well as he takes on this new role. I look forward to working with him.

NOMINATION DISCHARGED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the commerce committee be discharged from further consideration of PN799, Michael P. O'Rielly, and that the nomination be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The nomination is discharged. The nomination is placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the following nomination under the Privileged section of the Executive Calendar: PN131; that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements be printed in the Record; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

Michael Wayne Hail, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation for a term expiring December 10, 2017.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration en bloc of the following resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 272, S. Res. 273, and S. Res. 274.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table on each of these three matters, with no intervening action or debate on any of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to S. Con. Res. 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24), providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 24

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Wednesday, October 16, 2013, through Friday, October 25, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, October 28, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first;

and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Wednesday, October 16, 2013, through Monday, October 21, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 22, 2013, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.J. RES. 80

Mr. REID. Mr. President, H.J. Res. 80, to my understanding, is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The clerk will read the joint resolution by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 80) making continuing appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment or recess of the Senate from Wednesday, October 16, through Monday, October 28, the majority leader and Senators KAINE and ROCKEFELLER be authorized to sign bills or joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the upcoming recess or adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses or by order of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro

tempore, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 1151, as amended, appoints the following individual to the Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center: The Honorable MARTIN HEINRICH of New Mexico, vice the Honorable CARL LEVIN of Michigan.

Mr. REID. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:54 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 11:16 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MURPHY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, October 16, Senator BEGICH be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:16 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 11:34 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES— S. CON. RES. 8

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate, having received a message from the House with respect to S. Con. Res. 8, agrees to the request for a conference, and the chair appoints Senators MURRAY, WYDEN, NELSON, STABENOW, SANDERS, WHITEHOUSE, WARNER, MERKLEY, COONS, BALDWIN, KAINE, KING, SESSIONS, GRASSLEY, ENZI, CRAPO, GRAHAM, PORTMAN, TOOMEY, JOHNSON of Wisconsin, AYOTTE, and WICKER as conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2013, THROUGH MONDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2013

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn and convene for pro forma sessions only with no business conducted on the following dates and times and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Thursday, October 17, at 12:15 p.m.; Monday, October 21, at 1:30 p.m.; and Thursday, October 24 at 12 noon; that the Senate adjourn on Thursday, October 24, until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, October 28, 2013, unless the Senate receives a message from the House that it has adopted S. Con. Res. 24, the adjournment resolution; that if the Senate receives such a message, the Senate adjourn until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, October 28, 2013; that on Monday, following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 4:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; that following morning business the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 344, Richard Griffin, Jr., to be General Counsel of the NLRB, with up to 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form prior to the cloture vote with respect to the Griffin nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, the next rollcall vote will be at 5:30 p.m. on Monday October 28.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT
UNTIL THURSDAY, OCTOBER 17,
2013, AT 12:15 P.M.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:36 p.m., conditionally adjourned until Thursday, October 17, 2013, at 12:15 p.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination by unanimous consent and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*MICHAEL P. O'RIELLY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2014.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 16, 2013:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

STEPHEN WOOLMAN PRESTON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

RANEE RAMASWAMY, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2018.

RICK LOWE, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2018.

OLGA VISO, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

NISHA DESAI BISWAL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR SOUTH ASIAN AFFAIRS.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

ROBERTO R. HERENCIA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2015.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

GREGORY DAINARD WINFREE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE RESEARCH AND INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

CHRISTOPHER A. HART, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2017.

DEBORAH A. P. HERSMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS.

DEBORAH A. P. HERSMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2018.

THE JUDICIARY

KEVIN A. OHLSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS TO EXPIRE ON THE DATE PRESCRIBED BY LAW.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ZACHARY THOMAS FARDON, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

CAROL WALLER POPE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JULY 1, 2014.

ERNEST W. DUBESTER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JULY 29, 2017.

PATRICK PIZZELLA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JULY 1, 2015.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

STEVEN EATON BUNNELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JULIA FRIFIELD, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS).
CAROLINE KENNEDY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO JAPAN.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

BETH F. COBERT, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR MANAGEMENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

SCOTT S. DAHL, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

SYLVIA I. GARCIA, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

BRADLEY CROWELL, OF NEVADA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (CONGRESSIONAL AND INTER-GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS).

NATIONAL CONSUMER COOPERATIVE BANK

ANDREA LEVERE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL CONSUMER COOPERATIVE BANK FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS.

HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

MICHAEL WAYNE HALL, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 10, 2017.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING JENELL SULLIVAN

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jenell Sullivan for her outstanding dedication and service to the State of Ohio.

Jenell has proudly served the Republican Caucus in the Ohio House of Representatives for over 25 years. She consistently displays high ethics and standards in her job and acts as a role model and counselor for her fellow colleagues. One of Jenell's outstanding achievements has been managing the Page Program, where she has developed many of our young professionals into the leaders they are today. Additionally, Jenell has served as a Fiscal Assistant in the Administrative Office, and she administered the Employee of the Quarter and Take Our Children to Work Day Programs.

I am extremely honored to play a small role in recognizing the career of such a well-respected and appreciated public servant. It is only fitting that her friends and colleagues recognize Jenell's impact on the Ohio House by naming a new award after her: The Jenell Sullivan Page of Distinction Award. This prestigious award will honor pages who meet the highest quality standards that Jenell has displayed throughout her tenure in the Ohio House.

On behalf of the citizens of Ohio's 12th Congressional District, I thank Jenell Sullivan for her spirit and unrelenting service to our community.

HONORING THE LIFE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF DR. J. EUGENE GRIGSBY, JR.

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and contributions of the legendary Phoenix artist, community activist, and my personal friend, J. Eugene Grigsby, Jr. He passed from this life on June 9, 2013 and will be remembered at a memorial service on October 19th at the Unitarian Universalist Congregation of Phoenix. Dr. Grigsby was an African American artist recognized nationally and internationally as one of America's premier art educators. He was a friend and supporter who spent his life painting, educating, and working as a tireless advocate for community based art programs and social justice.

Dr. Grigsby served on the faculty of Arizona State University (ASU) for 22 years, from

1966–1988. Prior to accepting that post, he had a long history in the Phoenix public school system. He was recruited to Phoenix in 1946 to establish an Art Department at the segregated Carver High School, which closed following the 1954 Brown vs. Board of Education landmark decision. Dr. Grigsby then went to Phoenix Union High School where he again taught Art and served as Chair of the Art Department. He would often let his students pile into his old blue station wagon and take them on field trips to Native American reservations, galleries and even to the home of Frank Lloyd Wright.

Jefferson Eugene Grigsby, Jr., was born in Greensboro, NC, on October 17, 1918. His family settled in Charlotte, NC, when he was 12 years old. Upon graduation from Morehouse College in Atlanta, GA, in 1938, Eugene attended the American Artists School in New York City. Thereafter, Eugene graduated with a Master's degree in Art Education from Ohio State University in 1940.

While teaching at Bethune-Cookman College in Daytona Beach, he met and married Rosalyn Thomasena Marshall. In 1942, Eugene volunteered for service in World War II, serving in the European Theater under the 3rd Army's General George Patton. In 1963, Dr. Grigsby received his Ph.D. from New York University.

In 1966, he was awarded the National Gallery of Art's 25th Anniversary Medallion of Merit and in 1992 was inducted into the Arizona History Makers the first year the award was presented. Dr. Grigsby was a prominent member of the National Art Education Association and was a co-founder of its Committee on Multicultural Concerns—which established the J. Eugene Grigsby, Jr. Award for Service to Education in his honor.

Dr. Grigsby also served on numerous boards and professional organizations in the Phoenix community; including, the Arizona Art Education Association; President, Booker T. Washington Child Development Center; Founder and Chair, Coalition of Black Artists and Others for the Arts (COBA); Chair, ABC/Az-Artists of the Black Community; Arizona Opportunities Industrialization Center; Neighborhood Housing Services of Phoenix; the Garfield Neighborhood Association; and the ASU Performing Arts Board.

Eugene Grigsby's art can be seen in private and public collections around the world, including the Library of Congress, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Phoenix Art Museum, and Arizona State University. In December 2012, Phoenix Mayor Greg Stanton presented the inaugural Mayor's Arts Award for outstanding visual artist to Dr. Grigsby. After his death, the Award was named in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honored to have known Eugene Grigsby and to have had some of his artwork hang in my congressional district office. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing his many contributions to Phoenix

and the global community. We have lost a great artist, teacher, mentor, community activist, and friend. I extend my condolences to his siblings, his sons, his extended family and to all in the Phoenix arts community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, on October 14, 2013, I missed three recorded votes on the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 547, "yea" on rollcall 548, and "nay" on rollcall 549.

HONORING BILL ROSENDAHL

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Bill Rosendahl, a tireless advocate for the City of Los Angeles and a deserving recipient of the Valley Democrats United Badge of Courage Award.

From 2005 until 2013, Bill was a public servant in the City of Los Angeles and demonstrated an unwavering commitment to the priorities of the city and its people.

Bill has always been a champion of the issues that matter most in his community. Serving the areas of Pacific Palisades, Playa Del Rey, Playa Vista, Venice, Mar Vista, Brentwood, Del Rey, West Los Angeles and Westchester, he has been instrumental in providing affordable housing, supporting neighborhood empowerment initiatives, finding innovative solutions to remedy the city's traffic problems, and was always a champion of government transparency.

During his term as District 11 Councilmember, Bill always ensured that he pushed for projects and investments that truly helped the communities he served. In Del Rey, he helped to restore the USPS mail delivery service to Mar Vista Gardens and worked with Caltrans to address residents' concerns with highway widening plans. In West Los Angeles, Bill's commitment to keep kids out of gangs resulted in the establishment of a youth intervention program at Stoner Recreation Center. Bill also supported a community-friendly modernization of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX).

As a veteran himself, Bill has advocated for and championed numerous projects that serve veterans in the region. Most notably, he supported the construction of the Fisher House in

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Brentwood to serve families of wounded veterans. Bill also took on the challenge of providing sustainable housing and resources for the thousands of homeless veterans.

During the course of his career, Bill has helped his constituency with the installation of countless stop signs and traffic signals and the repavement of dozens of roads and streets. Additionally, he oversaw the completion of several large city projects and secured funding to help the city and residents of Los Angeles.

His career and life have always been centered on the ideals of positive change for Los Angeles. As the first openly gay man elected to the Los Angeles City Council, he serves as an inspiration to others and has set an important precedent for other gay leaders to run for office.

I have personally known Bill for many years and I can say that he is an individual who exemplifies compassion, optimism and dedication to public service. His leadership and charisma have created a needed forum for public dialogue and community exchange for which Angelinos will be forever grateful.

Valley Democrats United is honoring Bill for his "conviction, courage, and integrity" as an advocate for the homeless, tenants, LGBT rights, and innovative transit solutions. He is also being recognized for his public service and for empowering people through the media. I am pleased to join with the Valley Democrats United in honoring, my friend, Bill Rosendahl.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF BEULAH FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the 75th anniversary of Beulah First Baptist Church and its service to the Northwest Florida community.

Beulah First Baptist Church is the second oldest church in Fort Walton Beach, Florida. Originally known as the First Community Church and then later as the Colored Community Baptist Church, Beulah First Baptist's founding began when its first members were inspired by the desire to learn and heed the Lord's Word. Beginning in 1938, its service to its congregation grew from Bible Study and adult veterans classes held in member homes to an expanded Bible Study and Sunday Church School under the leadership of Reverend O.R. Robinson in 1943. Both the Bible Study and the Sunday Church School are still active today.

Throughout its 75 years, Beulah First Baptist Church has been blessed with the leadership of nine pastors, including: Reverends W. Garrett (1938); H. McNeil (1938); O.R. Robinson (1943); E.W. Thomson (1945); Fitzchew (1952); A.D. Bell, Sr. (1953); David Savage (1969); Matthew Payne, Jr. (1970); and Scotie L. Thippen (1981 to present).

A true testament to God's work through His people, the Church has experienced much

growth over the years, particularly in 1988. This year not only marked the Church's Golden Anniversary, but also a year of many firsts: the Church formed the Women's Fellowship Luncheon, the Church Banquet, and the Intermediate Women's Prayer Breakfast. Additionally, the Church began contributing ten percent of its tithes and offering to local and foreign missions. In recent years, the Church established a singles ministry in 1993 and a Children's Church in 1994. In 1998, Beulah Christian Academy opened its doors as did the Mission Outreach Ministry and the McGriff Office Facility in 2005.

Since its founding, members of Beulah First Baptist Church have helped build God's Kingdom here on earth through their outreach to the citizens of Fort Walton Beach and the surrounding area, and I would like to thank them for their service to Northwest Florida.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it gives me great pleasure to commemorate the 75th anniversary of Beulah First Baptist Church. My wife Vicki joins me in wishing the Church all the best for continued success. May the Spirit of the Lord continue to bless this Church and its congregation.

TRIBUTE TO HARDEEVILLE-RIDGELAND MIDDLE SCHOOL INCENTIVE PROGRAM

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an innovative program taking place to incentivize students at a Jasper County, South Carolina middle school. Hardeeville-Ridgeland Middle School is in a rural, persistent poverty county where more than 20 percent of its population has lived below the poverty line for the last 30 years. Eighty-eight percent of the students who attend Hardeeville-Ridgeland Middle School qualify for free or reduced lunch. Yet the Jasper County School Superintendent Vashti Washington is working hard to encourage students in this school to focus on their academics raise their self esteem and dream of better of futures.

I am pleased the James E. Clyburn Research and Scholarship Foundation is underwriting the cost of Dr. Washington's program to provide school letters and pins to students at Hardeeville-Ridgeland Middle who meet certain criteria established by the school. Students will be awarded letters and pins for certain levels of achievements in the classroom, on PASS tests, and several other extra-curricular activities, just as many schools do for athletics. These letters and pins are intended to set up healthy competition among students and to recognize and incentivize their achievements and performances.

I want to highlight four of the students who have demonstrated the drive and dedication needed to earn this recognition. All four of these students have received "exemplary" in at least four areas of PASS testing, which assesses the knowledge of students in the core academic areas of writing, English, math, science, and social studies.

Amber Crosby is an eighth grader who scored exemplary in all five areas of the PASS test. She is an award-winning artist who attended a Visual Arts Summer Academy, and she is also working on her first novel. She is on the principal's honor roll and attributes much of her success to the values instilled in her by her parents who taught her the importance of her diverse heritage, which includes Polish, Russian, Irish, British and Native American descendants. Amber aspires to be an artist or work in veterinary medicine.

Lorena Escobar is an eighth grader from Hardeeville who takes her academics very seriously. An honor roll student, she is currently enrolled in Algebra I Honors, English I Honors and Spanish I. She enjoys drawing and music, and spending time with her parents and her younger sister. Lorena is passionate about eliminating bullying.

Kaleb Frazier is a seventh grade honors student. His favorite subjects are writing and math. He is also very athletic and plays linebacker for the school football team. In his spare time he writes rap music and spends time with his family. Kaleb hopes one day to be an attorney or a computer engineer.

Cynthia Simental-Parra is a seventh grade student from Hardeeville. She loves math and history and describes herself as "artsy." She enjoys singing, drawing and sewing, and is a member of band and chorus. She is also active in track and soccer. Cynthia would like to become a singer, but if that doesn't work out she would consider running for President of the United States.

These are just four of the outstanding students that will be recognized with a school letter from Hardeeville-Ridgeland Middle. It is my sincere hope that they will continue to be wonderful examples to their classmates and that they encourage others to earn their letters as well.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my great appreciation to Superintendent Washington for implementing this visionary program at Hardeeville-Ridgeland Middle School. It is my hope that through such positive reinforcement these and other students will work hard and attain their dreams.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to have it noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I was not able to be in Washington on October 14, 2013 for votes because of events in the district.

If I had been here, I would have voted as follows:

On the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair, roll No. 547, I would have voted "no."

On the passage of H.J. Res. 80, roll No. 548, I would have voted "no."

On agreeing to the Grayson amendment, roll No. 549, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING MIKKI BELVEDERE

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Coconut Creek Commissioner and Vice Mayor, Mikki Belvedere. Mikki's professional achievements and volunteer work have touched countless individuals and organizations throughout our community, and I want to recognize her for her amazing record of service in South Florida.

Mikki has been a visible fixture in South Florida business community for over three decades, having served as President of Belvedere Insurance and Financial Services since 1980. She is also a board member for the Saw Grass Association for Insurance and Financial Advisors. In addition to her successful career in finance, Mikki has been actively involved in local government and was elected to the Coconut Creek Commission as Vice Mayor, where she will serve until 2017. Her record of public and political service extends into her Wynmoor Village and Coconut Creek community, where she serves as President and Program Chair of the Wynmoor Democratic Club and is a member of the Wynmoor Hurricane Emergency Network. Mikki is also a member of the Women's Club of Coconut Creek. Adding to her track record, Mikki chairs several boards in the area, including the Environmental Board of Coconut Creek, the Affordable Housing Committee, and the Coconut Creek Planning and Zoning Board.

In addition to her private sector career and public service, Mikki has dedicated a generous portion of her time to South Florida's Jewish community. Mikki serves as Board Member and Trustee of the Liberal Jewish Temple, where she has helped 10 women become Bat-Mitzvah. She is the founder of the Hebrew Movie Club, and is currently the President of the Yiddish Club in Township. She currently holds membership with the National Council of Jewish Women, Hadassah, Holocaust Survivors' Club, and the Sisterhood of the Beth Shalom Temple, among many others.

I join today with Mikki's family, including her three daughters, five grandchildren and one great grandchild, in honoring Mikki's incredible contributions to our community. I wish her many more years of success in all of her future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR.
HOWARD JACOBSON**HON. JIM COSTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Dr. Howard Jacobson, who passed away on October 9, 2013 at the age of 88. Howard was an incredible man who loved his family and dedicated his life to strengthening the relationship between the public and its media.

Born on August 22, 1925 in Worcester, Massachusetts, Howard learned the value of

hard work through selling ice boxes in his father's appliance store. He went on to earn his undergraduate degree at the University of New Mexico, then his graduate degree at the Missouri School of Journalism. Following graduation, Howard worked as a stringer for the Associated Press during World War II and later began a 36-year career as a teaching professor at the University of Bridgeport.

Between his time as a professor and Chair of the Journalism Department at the University of Bridgeport and a professor at Columbia University, Howard encouraged students to expand beyond their traditional means of communication to reach new audiences. His students thrived in this interactive environment that culminated in the circulation of a community newspaper that focused on local issues. Howard reveled in the special relationship between communities and their news, and he passed this enthusiasm onto his students. Testimonies from former students emphasize that Howard always took the time to focus on each and every student, and that his guidance, largely influenced by study of the behavioral sciences, continues to have a powerful impact on their careers today.

Outside of the classroom, Howard participated on the New England Cable Advisory Council for 30 years. He also founded the first Center for the Development for Community Media, which built on the lessons he taught in the classroom. Through the Center, Howard experimented with different means of communicating with the public in the urban media environment and encouraged his students to do the same. Finally, he co-authored several books that focused on the intersection of mass communications theory and technology, and how that connection would shape the future of journalism. All of Howard's work reinforced his belief that the public access to news depended on fiercely protecting first amendment rights and making the most of all available means of dissemination.

Howard leaves behind his wife, Dr. Dana Raphael, and his children Brett, Seth, and Jessa. Full of love and memories, Howard and Dana recently celebrated 60 wonderful years of marriage.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to the life of Howard Jacobson, a beloved husband, father, professor, journalist, and friend.

CONGRATULATING DR. ELIAS A.
ZERHOUNI**HON. LOIS FRANKEL**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Elias A. Zerhouni of Fort Lauderdale for his induction into the National Academy of Engineering, an honor he received for his outstanding work on new MRI methods and his national leadership in translational medical research.

Dr. Zerhouni is a prolific researcher and scientist, and his long career illustrates his passion for public service and saving lives.

His story exemplifies the American dream: he came to this country almost 40 years ago from a small village in Algeria, with only \$369 in his pocket. Having graduated from medical school in Algeria, he started as a radiology resident at Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine and rose to the position of Executive Vice Dean of the School of Medicine and the Chair of the Radiology and Radiological Sciences Department at Johns Hopkins University Hospital. After leaving Johns Hopkins, he served as the 15th Director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), a position he held from 2002–2008.

His research has led to major advances in CAT Scan and MRI technology. These developments include innovative imaging methods used to diagnose cancer, cardiovascular disease, and pulmonary disease. His accomplishments also include authoring over 200 publications, holding eight patents, and co-founding five companies.

In honor of his induction into the National Academy of Engineering and all his important contributions to public health, I am pleased to recognize Dr. Zerhouni and to thank him for his service to our country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on October 7, 2013, I missed rollcall vote Nos. 527 and 528 for district business. Had I been present I would have voted "no" on both.

HONORING ED HAMM, JR. ON RECEIVING THE HOMETOWN HERO AWARD FROM THE MODERN WOODMEN OF AMERICA

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend, Ed Hamm, Jr. of East Millinocket, Maine, on receiving the Hometown Hero award from the Modern Woodmen of America.

The Hometown Hero award is given to individuals and groups who selflessly commit themselves to their communities, asking for nothing in return. As a coach, business owner, and member of several recreational and fraternal organizations, Ed is truly a renaissance man when it comes to community engagement, and to those who know Ed, it is no mystery why he has been selected to receive this award.

Few people can claim involvement in as many different aspects of their community as Ed. He has served as a basketball coach at the Junior Varsity, Junior High School and Pee Wee levels, including traveling all-star teams. He is also a member of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Shriners International, the Masonic Society, and the East

Millinocket Recreation Committee. Perhaps most famously, Ed owned and operated the Hamlet Motel, later known as the Hamlet Pub, from 1976 to 2011. The Hamlet served as a home base and meeting point for many in the community, especially the athletes of Schenck High School who frequently enjoyed meals there before major competitions. The Hamlet's slogan, "you are a stranger here but once," truly exemplifies Ed's attitude towards those in his community.

On Thursday, October 17, 2013, at Medway Middle School, Ed Hamm, Jr. will be recognized for his extraordinary record in community service during a dinner and awards ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in recognizing East Millinocket's Hometown Hero, Ed Hamm, Jr., for his outstanding community service.

RECOGNIZING THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST PENTECOSTAL CHURCH OF PENSACOLA

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the 80th anniversary of the First Pentecostal Church of Pensacola and its service to Florida's Gulf Coast.

The First Pentecostal Church of Pensacola traces its roots back to the Great Depression and its founder, Pastor David Lamar "D.L." Welch, who preached and established churches across the Nation from California to Florida. His travels eventually brought him to Pensacola in 1933, where he erected a tent revival on "O" Street between Strong and DeSoto Streets and baptized 75 members of the Northwest Florida community.

Pastor Welch served the church for two years before embarking again on the evangelistic trail. Reverend Oliver Fauss took over as Pastor until Pastor Welch's return in 1939. In addition to serving the church, Brother Welch played an active role in the community as a District Superintendent and a member of the Florida District Board, as well as, the Chaplain of the Florida Senate under Florida Governor Fuller Warren.

Brother Welch and his wife of seventy years, the former Lottie Mae Holloway, brought up their children in the Pentecostal faith. Their son Paul eventually became Pastor in 1975. Brother Paul, with the help of his wife, Sister Shirley, oversaw the construction of the church and helped expand it into what it has become today.

In 1999, Brian Kinsey was elected Pastor of the First Pentecostal Church and in 2007, Senior Pastor of the church. Today, he and his wife, Lanette, continue to inspire those around them and are committed to bettering the local community.

Throughout its eighty year history, the First Pentecostal Church of Pensacola has held on to the strong, moral framework and religious convictions of its original founders. The church continues to share the word of God with His people. I would like to thank its members and

pastoral leadership for their service to North-west Florida.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it gives me great pleasure to commemorate the 80th anniversary of First Pentecostal Church of Pensacola. My wife Vicki joins me in wishing the members of the church all the best for continued success. May the Spirit of the Lord continue to bless them.

WORLD FOOD DAY RECOGNITION

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to on behalf of millions of children and families worldwide in danger of starvation.

Each year, malnourishment accounts for almost half of the 6.9 million deaths among children under the age of five. The first 1,000 days between the start of a woman's pregnancy and her child's second birthday are critical to the long term survival of these children. As we recognize World Food Day today, we must do more to support ending maternal and child malnutrition.

That's why I introduced H. Res. 254 with my colleague, Representative MARIO DIAZ-BALART. This resolution raises awareness of the critical 1,000-day window and encourages relevant federal agencies to better coordinate and track nutrition outcomes.

As a mother, it pains me to think of a child dying because he or she doesn't have enough food to eat, especially when our planet produces enough food to feed every man, woman, and child.

I urge my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring H. Res. 254 and give a voice to the millions of vulnerable and hungry children around the world.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS BY THE FOLKS OF THE EATON COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION AND THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 2013 ALVIN WHITFIELD COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARDS

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to recognize the contributions made to Mid-Michigan by the folks of the Eaton County Parks and Recreation Commission and to recognize their recipients of the 2013 Alvin Whitfield Community Service Awards.

The Eaton County Parks and Recreation Commission has provided quality recreational activities to the citizens of Eaton County, Michigan since 1970, and are enabled by the help of many individuals, service clubs, and businesses.

The Parks Commission recently acknowledged the service of key contributors by awarding them with the Alvin Whitfield Com-

munity Service Award. These individuals exemplify the spirit of service displayed by Alvin Whitfield, a long time Parks Commissioner who has served Eaton County for many years. I am pleased to join the Parks Commission in recognizing the awardees:

Shelli Smith, Jill Sambour, Christine Heverly and Patrick Sustrich for their outstanding volunteer service and commitment to improving the quality of life in Eaton County;

Jill Russell, Joe Bristol, Chuck Pantera, John Haneski and Rob Piercefield for their leadership role in support of Parks programs, special events and projects;

Aric Prudden, Jeff Smith, Wayne Curtis, Pat Harrington and Sherriff Tom Reich for their energy and leadership in sponsoring and administering unique participatory events to serve children of all ages;

And Valerie Glesnes-Anderson, Julie Powers, Terry VanDoren, Gerald Jaloszynski and Willis Bennett for providing valuable technical assistance, advice and financial support for the operation and management of the Parks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Alvin Whitfield 2013 Community Service Award nominees and thank them for their efforts that have greatly benefited Eaton County.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HONEY MILLER

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues, Congresswoman GRACE MENG and Congressman STEVE ISRAEL, to commemorate the life and service of Honey Miller. Ms. Miller passed away in her 95th year.

Honey Miller was a loyal and proud Democrat who dedicated her life to strengthening the party and serving her community. Honey began her distinguished career by working on Democratic Leader Louis Wallach's campaign for the State Assembly. When recalling the experience and her introduction to politics, she once said, "a neighbor asked me to help out on the campaign and I never got out of it."

She went on to work with the Queens Borough President's office for 17 years and then as a Coordinator for Community Board 11. She was promoted to Deputy Director of Community Boards for the Queens Borough and served as Chair of the Women's Division of the New York State Democratic Party for two years.

In 1972, she was elected as a Democratic Party official as the Queens Democratic District leader for the 24th Assembly District, where she was consistently reelected until her retirement in 2011. Honey was a tireless public servant for the Democratic Party in Queens. As District Leader she was responsible for selecting candidates, working closely with the Queens County Democratic Organization, and strengthening the Democratic Party. Honey founded the Eleanor Roosevelt Democratic Club to increase the Democratic Party's involvement in the community.

Mr. Speaker, Honey was an indispensable asset to Queens. She's been described by others as the "bedrock of the Democratic Party" and the "grand dame of northeast Queens politics." With a career that spanned four decades, she truly exemplified the meaning of a public servant.

The legacy that she leaves not only reflects her love for the Democratic Party, but also the admiration she had for the residents of Queens.

Mr. Speaker, for her service to the people of New York and devotion to her family and friends, we ask all of our colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in honoring Honey Miller.

HONORING VIRGINIA GALLUP
LARSEN, M. ED., M.A./CAGS

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the outstanding contributions made by Virginia Gallup Larsen, M. Ed., M.A./CAGS in improving the lives of children and families across the City of Alexandria and the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Ms. Larsen is a 17-year resident of Arlington and a Nationally Certified School Psychologist with 20 years of experience working with diverse populations in the Washington, DC, metropolitan region. She was recently named 2013 Virginia School Psychologist of the Year by the National Association of School Psychologists. Ms. Larsen is the first school psychologist from the City of Alexandria, where she is in her 13th year with Alexandria City Public Schools.

Ms. Larsen's wide area of expertise allows her to offer a host of comprehensive services to a diverse student population. Areas of expertise include: conducting psychological and educational evaluations, functional behavior assessments, pre-referral intervention consultations, and treatment assessments. She is deeply admired by her colleagues and the families she works with for her dedication and expertise.

After personally observing persistent problems caused by bullying, Ms. Larsen responded by securing a grant to implement the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. She launched the program in a single school before advocating for its expansion to serve all Alexandria's students. She is now a bullying and violence prevention consultant across the Alexandria school system, providing dozens of free bullying prevention workshops.

Ms. Larsen, in conjunction with physical education teacher Kathy Chmura, worked to establish the Run for Fun program at James K. Polk Elementary School to address the problem of childhood obesity. The program creates an enjoyable physical activity that encourages children to establish healthy lifestyles, set personal goals, increase stamina, and form friendships outside of school.

Ms. Larsen directed and managed the Alexandria City division of the National High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area research project,

where she facilitated the treatment component of an intensive outpatient treatment program. She provided therapy to clients and served as a program link to more and less restrictive services.

I am deeply proud of the lasting contributions made by Virginia Gallup Larsen, along with the other hard-working and dedicated Alexandria City Public Schools employees. She is representative of what those working in this under recognized, yet truly essential profession, should strive to attain.

HONORING THE VETERANS OF THE
OCTOBER 16, 2013 EASTERN IOWA
HONOR FLIGHT

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, today, over eighty Iowa veterans of World War II and the Korean War have traveled to our nation's capital. Together, they will visit the monuments that were built in their honor by a grateful nation. At a time of great division in our capital, our veterans of the World War II and Korean War generations remind us not only of the best of our great nation but also the unity with which our nation responded to great challenges.

For many of these heroes, today will be the first time they will see the National World War II Memorial and the Korean War Veterans Memorial. I am humbled to have the opportunity to personally thank these heroes on behalf of every Iowan I represent for their service to our nation and to pay tribute to the incredible sacrifice they made for our country.

We owe these heroes a debt of gratitude and the Honor Flight demonstrates that we will never forget the debt we owe those who have worn our nation's uniform. Our World War II and Korean War veterans rose to defend not just our nation, but the freedoms, democracy, and values that make our country the greatest nation on earth. They did so as one people and one country.

The sheer magnitude of what the Greatest Generation accomplished, not just in war but in the peace that followed, continues to inspire us today. Their generation and our country did not seek to be tested but when called upon to do so, they defended and then rebuilt our nation to make it even stronger. Their patriotism, service, and sacrifice not only defined their generation—they stand as a testament to the fortitude of our nation and the American people. Their legacy endures today.

I am tremendously proud to welcome the Eastern Iowa Honor Flight and Iowa's veterans of the Second World War and the Korean War to our nation's capital today. On behalf of every Iowan I represent, I thank them for their service to our country.

RECOGNIZING WOODLAWN CEMETERY AND CELEBRATING CLEAN-UP OUR HISTORY DAY AT WOODLAWN CEMETERY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the historic Woodlawn Cemetery and in celebrating Clean-up our History Day at Woodlawn Cemetery in the District of Columbia on Saturday, October 19, 2013, at 10 a.m.

Woodlawn Cemetery is the final resting place for many prominent African Americans, among them, Blanche K. Bruce, the first African American U.S. Senator; Mercer Langston, the first African American President of Virginia State University, the first dean of Howard University Law School and the first African American Member of Congress from the State of Virginia; and John Willis Menard, the first African American elected to Congress. There are 36,000 African Americans buried at Woodlawn, including ordinary citizens but also many of the most distinguished African Americans of the 19th and the early 20th centuries.

Located in Southeast Washington, DC, Woodlawn Cemetery, for good reasons, has been on both the District of Columbia's Inventory of Historic Sites and the National Register of Historic Places since the early 1990s. The daily operations of the cemetery are entrusted to the Woodlawn Cemetery Perpetual Care Association, but most who work with the association as volunteers have loved ones buried there. The main focus of the association is to preserve the cemetery and to raise funds to renovate and restore prominence to this sacred site.

This treasured site needs our help in the same way that a congressional resolution aided in getting assistance from citizens and from volunteers from the armed forces for the Congressional Cemetery two decades ago. The Woodlawn Cemetery Perpetual Care Association, along with DC National Guard volunteers, has developed a cleanup plan to restore this historic site. On Saturday, October 19, 2013, we will celebrate the first Clean-up our History Day at Woodlawn Cemetery, 3900 Benning Road, SE, at 10 a.m. Joining us for the clean-up will be Yvette Alexander, Ward 7 Councilmember; Major General Errol R. Schwartz, Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard; Lonnie Bunch, Founding Director of the National Museum of African American History and Culture; Dr. Vincent Hill, University of the District of Columbia Mortuary Science Program Director; and supporting organizations and residents from all over the city.

I ask the House to join me as we recognize the volunteers from the District of Columbia National Guard, Woodlawn Cemetery Perpetual Care Association, and families of loved ones interred at Woodlawn for their participation in the kickoff of the cleanup of historic Woodlawn Cemetery as we begin an effort to restore the cemetery to its rightful place on the historical map for the benefit of families, historians, scholars and visitors, and cast light on

one of the most important periods in African American history.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF MR. ANTHONY J. DELMONTE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life and legacy of Mr. Anthony J. Delmonte, who passed away on October 12, 2013 at the age of 88.

A resident of the Town of Orchard Park, he and his brothers built many of their homes and worked at the New York Central Railroad for twenty years. In 1963, Mr. Delmonte began working for Bethlehem Steel where he was employed for nineteen years. In addition, he helped build and operate the Burmon Inn, owned by his brother John, and owned and operated the Round-Up Hot Dog Stand in Lackawanna.

Mr. Delmonte was a proud American, who honorably served his nation. Immediately after graduating from Lackawanna High School in 1941, he served as Private First Class for the United States Marine Corps in World War II. His Marine unit was deployed to Nagasaki, Japan shortly after the atomic bomb was dropped in 1945. Mr. Delmonte was honorably discharged in 1946.

Mr. Delmonte was an active member of his community. He was involved in Orchard Park politics for many years. He was also President of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart Senior Citizens and a member of the Buffalo Raceway Horseman's Association.

Mr. Delmonte was a devoted, loving family man. He leaves behind his wife of sixty-three years, Ethel, two children, Anthony and Denise, grandchildren, Lisa and Samantha, and great-grandchildren Jeffrey and Giada.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in expressing our deepest condolences to the family of the late Anthony J. Delmonte, and join with me in honoring his life and legacy.

HONORING CHRIS LOWERY

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chris Lowery of Batesville, Indiana on being selected by Governor Mike Pence to chair the Indiana Region 9 Works Council.

Chris has worked at Hillenbrand, Inc. for 19 years, currently as the Director of Public Policy and Engagement. A graduate of Indiana University, Chris previously was the Executive Director of the Association of Indiana Counties as well as an aide to former Indiana Governor Robert Orr and Senator Dan Quayle. Chris has also dedicated his time to education serving on the Batesville Community School Corporation's Board of Trustees as President and founding the Batesville Community Education Foundation.

Chris' leadership in business and education will greatly benefit Hoosiers as he serves as Chair of the Indiana Region 9 Works Council. The Indiana Works Council, created by Governor Pence, is responsible for submitting evaluations of the career, technical and vocational education opportunities that will be used to better prepare high school students for entering the workforce.

I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in congratulating Chris Lowery on having been selected to serve the State of Indiana as Chair of the Indiana Region 9 Works Council.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,747,370,534,090.62. We've added \$6,120,493,485,177.54 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.1 trillion in debt our Nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR FLIGHT OF
OREGON

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 50 World War II veterans from Oregon who will be visiting their memorial this Saturday in Washington, DC through Honor Flight of Oregon. On behalf of a grateful State and country, we welcome these heroes to the Nation's Capital.

The veterans on this flight from Oregon are as follows: Kenneth W. Jacobsen, U.S. Army Air Force; Raymond Smith, U.S. Army Air Force; Virgil E. Trick, U.S. Army Air Force; Charles Williamson, U.S. Army Air Force; Victor H. Banke, U.S. Army; David G. Blattner, U.S. Army; Merle L. Brandsrud, U.S. Army; Gerald J. Broadhurst, U.S. Army; Homer P. Farley, U.S. Army; Donald P. Hancock, U.S. Army; Donald E. Hill, U.S. Army; Arnold J. Jensen, U.S. Army; Ralph E. Johnson, U.S. Army; Jack P. Mills, U.S. Army; William E. Thompson, U.S. Army; William C. Upham, U.S. Army; William A. Vorisek, U.S. Army; Loyd A. Wiltermoor, U.S. Army; Vincent R. Gersch, U.S. Marines; Richard R. Harlow, U.S. Marines; Edward L. Killeen, U.S. Marines; Robert J. Klink, U.S. Marines; Robert J. Pattock, U.S. Marines; Benjamin Asquith, Jr., U.S. Navy; Bruce Bennett, U.S. Navy; Louis W. Boesel, U.S. Navy; Eugene S. Clift, U.S. Navy; Rodney L. Downey, U.S. Navy; John B. Dowty, U.S. Navy; Warren J. Dunn, U.S. Navy; Joyce L. Evans, U.S. Navy; Ross H. Flintjer, U.S. Navy; Victor B. Fryer, U.S. Navy;

Leonard S. Gisler, U.S. Navy; B. Bruce Huffman, U.S. Navy; Robert L. Jensen, U.S. Navy; Howard D. Kyle, U.S. Navy; Arthur E. Mosher, U.S. Navy; Theodore M. Phillips, U.S. Navy; Richard B. Royse, U.S. Navy; Willard G. Scott, U.S. Navy; Glenndon L. Stam, U.S. Navy; Raymond L. Tompkins, U.S. Navy; Richard H. Wemhoener, U.S. Navy; Charles R. Westerberg, U.S. Navy; Robert C. White, U.S. Navy; Frank L. Woodrum, U.S. Navy; Henry C. Zweigart, U.S. Navy; Richard W. Miller, U.S. Navy Reserves; Cherri P. Gregory, U.S. Navy—WAVES.

These 50 heroes join more than 98,000 veterans from across the country who, since 2005, have journeyed from their home States to Washington, DC to reflect at the memorials built in honor of our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, each of us is humbled by the courage of these soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who put themselves in harm's way for our country and way of life. As a nation, we can never fully repay the debt of gratitude owed to them for their honor, commitment, and sacrifice in defense of the freedoms we have today.

My colleagues, please join me in thanking these veterans and the volunteers of Honor Flight of Oregon for their exemplary dedication and service to this great country. I especially want to recognize and thank Gail Yakopatz for her tireless work as president of Honor Flight of Oregon.

HONORING THE GRAND OPENING
OF THE FRESNO VETERANS
HOME OF CALIFORNIA

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and congratulate the Central California Veterans Home Support Foundation and the California Department of Veterans Affairs (CalVet) upon the grand opening of the California Veterans Home in Fresno. This veterans' home is not simply a brick and mortar building. This home is a promise we have made to the veterans of the San Joaquin Valley, and at long last we are keeping our promise.

Veterans in the San Joaquin Valley face great challenges every day. Tragically, more than 600 veterans in Fresno and Madera Counties go to sleep every night without a roof over their head. Guided by the belief that no man or woman who wore the uniform of the United States military should ever experience the scourge of homelessness, we set a goal of building a home to serve the needs of the veterans in the San Joaquin Valley.

Over the years, I have worked closely with the Central California Veterans Home Foundation (CCVHF), local veteran Charlie Waters and countless other volunteers and veteran advocates to plan, strategize, obtain funds and jump hurdles to be where we are today. Throughout the years, I have had many conversations with the United States Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to keep the funding in place for this home and with Cal Vet to break ground and begin construction.

This gorgeous home at 2811 West California Avenue is located in my 16th Congressional District in Southwest Fresno and is a 300 bed facility with state-of-the-art design and architecture. The facility is bringing employment to people in the Central Valley and security to our veterans who desire to live out the rest of their life with great honor and pride.

In May 2010 we were all at the future site of the home breaking ground on this beautiful piece of property. We shoveled dirt and we anxiously looked forward to this day with a great desire to quickly help the many veterans who would benefit from this home. However as we celebrate this grand occasion, we should pause to remember three dedicated veteran leaders from the foundation who were with us from the beginning and have since passed away. During the fight for the home, we lost George Sinopoli in 2006, Charles "Chuck" Parnell just a few months after we broke ground in 2010, and Bill Dietzel earlier this year. These great veterans worked closely with me and fought the great fight for this home. Their hard work and dedication will not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, the opening of the California Veterans Home in Fresno is truly a long-awaited and special event. I rise today to commend and congratulate CalVet, the VA, the Central California Veterans Home Foundation and all the organizations and individuals that have made this the opening possible. I invite my colleagues to join in wishing the home and its future residents great success.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF TEÓFILO "AARÓN" VARGAS SEÍN

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the life and service of Teófilo "Aarón" Vargas Seín, Spiritual Leader and President of the church Congregación Mita, Inc.

Aarón was born on October 23, 1921 in Hatillo, Puerto Rico. Before his birth, his mother, Concepción Seín, suffered from a difficult pregnancy. She promised God that if he would grant her a good delivery and a healthy child, she would dedicate him entirely to His service. Later, her only son was born, healthy and strong, and she named him Teófilo, which means, "Loved by God."

Teófilo and his parents were part of the first group of eleven members who alongside Juanita García Peraza "Mita" founded the Congregación Mita Church in Arecibo, Puerto Rico. He began his Ministry at the age of 15 and Mita later changed his name to Aarón. Aarón managed the administration of the church's assets and was also the first preacher, the senior guard, and the lead percussionist of the church's band.

In 1970, when Juanita García Peraza passed away, Aarón accepted the leadership of the Congregation. Under his direction, there

has been great expansion of Mita's work in Puerto Rico and in the United States, including New York, Florida, Texas, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Illinois, and North Carolina. Internationally, the church is established in Spain, the Dominican Republic, Canada, Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Panama, El Salvador, and Mexico. In Florida, there are congregations in Orlando, Ocala, Miami, and Tampa.

In addition to the spiritual work carried out by Aarón, under his leadership, the church carries out many other social missions. Aarón founded several institutions and entities to provide assistance to members and non-members in every location where the church is established, including Orlando, FL. Among them are: the Colegio Congregación Mita, an elementary through high school established in Puerto Rico; El Paraíso Nursing Home, a center for seniors who are unable to care for themselves; and the Office for Counseling and Social Work.

I am happy to honor Teófilo "Aarón" Vargas Seín, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his dedication to the service of others.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MAURICE FERRE

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Maurice Ferre, a great Floridian.

Maurice A. Ferre was born on June 23, 1935, in Ponce, Puerto Rico. He was the son of businessman José Ferré and the nephew of the legendary Luis Ferre, Puerto Rico's Governor and recipient of the Presidential Medal of Honor.

Mr. Ferre served in the Florida House of Representatives from 1967–68 where he was a strong voice for Hispanics and helped create an ever-lasting legacy as a pioneer for the middle class. Maurice Ferre is the highly regarded former Mayor of Miami, where he was elected to six terms serving from 1973–1985. As Mayor, he led Miami through some of its most tumultuous and prosperous times. As the first Puerto Rican born mayor of a U.S. city and the first Hispanic Mayor of Miami, he helped build a world class city and international destination.

From 1993 to 1996, Mr. Ferre was Vice-Chairman of the Dade County Board of Commissioners. He has been active in national political campaigns and was a member of several presidential advisory boards.

Mr. Ferre is currently a Fellow at Princeton University and is writing a book about Hispanic contributions to American culture. Mr. Ferre is one of the driving forces behind the international-domestic, or "intermestic," dialogue, attempting to reach a consensus regarding Puerto Rico's political status from an "international" as well as "domestic" point of view.

I am happy to honor Maurice Ferre, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his visionary leadership and his contributions to the state of Florida and the United States.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ALEX RIVERA

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the important contributions of Alex Rivera, a Walmart worker who has made huge sacrifices to help working families in Central Florida. Alex Rivera is a 30-year-old former Walmart worker. He is married with two children, Leah and Alexa.

Alex began working for Walmart in Orlando, Florida, on October 28, 2008. It was only part time, but he was very excited to be working for a major company that promised its employees a great future. He began working in the grocery department for \$7.50 an hour. He was happy the first year and learned a lot. His wife also worked at Walmart part time as a Customer Service Manager. During his first evaluation he received a \$.50 cent raise and was eventually offered a full-time position.

When Walmart began to drastically cut workers' hours, Alex found it hard to provide for his family. He picked up a second job at a local 7–11 and had to work 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. at Walmart and then 9 p.m. to 6 a.m. at his second job. His increased hours conflicted with his Walmart schedule, and his manager told him his Walmart job came first.

Alex and his wife had to apply for food stamps and Medicaid due to the low pay and limited hours offered at Walmart. Alex began searching online for other workers that shared these same difficulties. He found OUR Walmart and was connected with OUR Walmart leaders. Alex became a member of OUR Walmart and participated in an event at his store in July 2012.

He began organizing in the store and educating workers on their rights. Management spoke to him and told Alex he was not allowed to do this. Alex felt he was being harassed for his organizing efforts.

In September 2012, Walmart fired Alex in retaliation for his activism. Since then, Alex continues to stand up for Walmart workers. He knows the struggles workers face and wants to ensure that Walmart makes the positive changes needed for current and future workers.

I am happy to honor Alex Rivera, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his sacrifice on behalf of those workers who still struggle for their rights.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF THE BORIQUEÑEERS

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the 65th Infantry Regiment of the Third Division in the United States Army, "the Boriqueñeers." This all-volunteer Puerto Rican unit was nicknamed "the Borinqueñeers," from the name Borinquen given to Puerto Rico by its original inhabitants, the Taino Indians.

Puerto Ricans have fought for the United States as far back as the American Revolution. When Puerto Rico became a U.S. Territory after the 1898 Treaty of Paris, a military governor was appointed and soon the United States Army established itself in San Juan. The first body of native troops was authorized in 1898 and on June 30, 1901, the Porto Rico Provisional Regiment of Infantry was organized.

After their return from duty in Panama in March 1919, the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry was renamed "the 65th Infantry Regiment." During this period, the first Puerto Rican to graduate from the United States Military Academy at West Point, Major Luis R. Esteves, was sent to Camp Las Casas to train Puerto Rican officers.

Over 62,000 Puerto Ricans joined the military during World War II, and over 43,000 Puerto Ricans served in the Korean War. Perhaps the Borinqueñeers most noteworthy moment was during the Korean War. In August,

1950, the Borinqueneers landed in the port city of Pusan on the southeastern tip of Korea. They were sent into action immediately and joined U.S. forces holding a perimeter against the Communist North Korean invaders. The Borinqueneers played an active role in the U.S. breakout and drive to the north.

While in Korea, the Borinqueneers served in nine separate military campaigns, with hundreds of men giving their lives to serve their country. Once back home, the regiment won four Distinguished Service Crosses, 125 Silver Stars, and was awarded the Presidential Unit Citations and the Greek Gold Medal for Bravery.

Yet, while the Third Division received a presidential citation, the 65th Infantry Regiment did not, and none of its members were awarded the Medal of Honor. In 2013, two bills have been introduced, in the House of Representatives, that would confer the Congressional Gold Medal on the 65th Infantry Regiment.

I am happy to honor the 65th Infantry Regiment, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for its historic service to our nation.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS
OF ROBERTO CLEMENTE

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage month, to recognize Roberto Clemente for his outstanding athletic achievements and humanitarian contributions.

As the first Puerto Rican to achieve baseball stardom, Clemente worked hard at the game. In his 18 seasons with the Pittsburgh Pirates, "The Great One" proved to be an all-around outstanding player, winning four National League batting titles and leading National League outfielders in assists for four seasons. He was awarded 12 Gold Gloves, selected as the 1966 National League MVP, and named the 1971 World Series MVP. Clemente was also the 11th Major League player to record 3,000 hits.

Clemente's accomplishments raised him to stardom, yet he never forgot his heritage and the prejudice he had faced. He fought for the recognition of his fellow Latino ballplayers, becoming a union leader for the baseball players association and speaking out about civil injustices. He was also involved in many community outreach programs to help inner city kids in Pittsburgh, and in the off season, he held free baseball clinics for kids in his home town.

Clemente began managing a Puerto Rican all-star team in Managua, Nicaragua. When an earthquake struck, he began organizing aid and supplies. He died at the age of 37 in a plane crash delivering relief supplies to Nicaragua. Roberto Clemente was posthumously presented the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Roberto Clemente Walker Congressional Gold Medal, and the first Presidential Citizen's Medal. Each year, Major League Baseball gives out the Roberto Clemente Award to a player that demonstrates the humanitarian spirit embodied by Roberto Clemente.

I am happy to honor Roberto Clemente, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his achievements on and off the baseball field.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF SONIA SOTOMAYOR

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the achievements of the first Latina Supreme Court Justice, Sonia Sotomayor.

Justice Sotomayor graduated summa cum laude from Princeton University in 1976. While she was at Princeton she received the Pyne Prize, the highest academic award given to an undergraduate at the University. She continued on to Yale Law School where she was the editor of the Yale Law Journal. Sotomayor graduated from Yale Law School in 1979 and passed the bar in 1980. She immediately began working as the Assistant District Attorney in Manhattan.

In 1984, Sotomayor entered private practice, making partner in 1988 at a firm that specialized in intellectual property litigation. While working at the firm she also served on the board of the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund, the New York City Campaign Finance Board, and the State of New York Mortgage Agency.

Her pro bono work at the agencies caught the attention of New York Senator Moynihan who recommended her for a seat on the New York district court. In 1992, President George H.W. Bush nominated her for a seat on the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York and she was unanimously confirmed by the Senate. In June of 1997, President Clinton nominated Sotomayor for a seat on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and she was confirmed to that seat in 1998. While serving in the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, Sotomayor began teaching as an adjunct professor of law at New York University and Columbia Law School, while also serving on the Board of Trustees for Princeton University.

On May 26, 2009, President Obama nominated Sonia Sotomayor for appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court. Her confirmation by the Senate in August of 2009 made Sonia Sotomayor the first Latina Supreme Court Justice.

As our country continues to become more diverse, Justice Sotomayor serves as a powerful role model for women and Latinos in the U.S. I am happy to honor Sonia Sotomayor, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her many outstanding achievements.

HONORING THE HISTORIC CONTRIBUTIONS OF JUAN
PONCE DE LEON

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the extraordinary life of Juan Ponce de Leon, Spanish explorer, first Governor of Puerto Rico and discoverer of the great state of Florida.

Ponce de Leon grew up in a small provincial town in Spain. Seeking adventure, he became a member of Christopher Columbus' second voyage to the New World. During that expedition, Ponce de Leon rose quickly in prominence and was soon commissioned by the Spanish King as the First Governor of the newly discovered Puerto Rico. As Governor, he helped to nurture the new and growing island that is now home to so many hard-working Americans.

The adventurous spirit of Ponce de Leon did not die with his appointment as Governor to Puerto Rico. In 1513 he set out on what was to be his most important journey. Traveling with a crew of 200, Ponce de Leon arrived at and named Florida on April 2, 1513. As he continued his journey, Ponce de Leon became the first European to have extensive contact and knowledge of the Floridian peninsula and

discovered many of the sights and wonders that Floridians treasure to this day. The discoveries and numerous accomplishments of Ponce de Leon laid the foundation for both my great state of Florida as well as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

I am pleased to honor Juan Ponce de Leon, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his historic contributions to the state of Florida.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF RITA MORENO

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the inspiring career and numerous accomplishments of Rita Moreno.

Rita Moreno has broken new ground for Latinos in the field of entertainment throughout her career. In 1961, she became the Hispanic actress to win the Oscar for Best Supporting Actress for her role in the movie *West Side Story*. Ms. Moreno is also one of only eleven entertainers in Hollywood to have received all four major entertainment honors: Emmy, Oscar, Tony and Grammy awards.

In addition to film, stage, television and concert commitments, Ms. Moreno fills her spare time by lecturing to various organizations and university audiences on such topics as *The Value of Diversity to our Culture*, *The Power of Language*, and *A History of the Arts in Film, TV and Theatre*. She is also involved with a number of civic and charitable organizations.

Ms. Moreno has served on The National Endowment for the Arts and as a Commissioner on The President's Commission on White House Fellowships. She has also served as a member of The President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities.

In June 2004, Ms. Moreno was awarded The Presidential Medal of Freedom by President George W. Bush. In 2007, Ms. Moreno was inducted into the California Hall of Fame by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger. In 2010, she was awarded The National Medal of Arts by President Obama, as well as the Here I Stand Award for activism in the arts, and the Hispanic Organization of Latin Actresses (HOLA) Lifetime Achievement Award.

I am happy to honor Rita Moreno, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her numerous contributions to the performing arts.

IN RECOGNITION OF MISS AUBURN
TARA JONES

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to honor a special young lady in my district, Tara Jones, who is serving as Miss Auburn at Auburn University.

Miss Jones grew up in Kennesaw, Georgia and was crowned as Miss Auburn in February 2013. She ran her campaign on a platform for clean water for third-world nations and was elected to serve in this position by the student body. Tara also had fun with her campaign by doing the "Harlem Shake" to help spread her message. Jones is in her senior year.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating Tara Jones being named Miss Auburn. Her dedication to those less fortunate should be

an example to us all, and I am honored today to help pay recognition to it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, 2013, I missed rollcall vote Nos. 531 and 532. I was organizing voters on immigration reform. Had I been present I would have voted "no" on both.

TRIBUTE TO DONALD G. "IKE" MCLEESE

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a tremendous leader in South Carolina's capital city as he prepares to step down as president and CEO of the Greater Columbia Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce. Donald G. "Ike" McLeese has led the Columbia Chamber for 19 years, and has done a remarkable job encouraging cooperation among business, civic, and governmental leaders. His service is greatly appreciated and will be sorely missed.

Ike McLeese is a native of Anderson, South Carolina and earned an associate's degree from Anderson University in 1964 and a bachelor's degree in political science from the University of South Carolina in 1967.

He began his career in the political arena working on the staff of the venerable U.S. Senator Fritz Hollings. I got to know Ike when we were both young men working for South Carolina Governor John West in the early 1970s. He was the governor's Commissioner of Narcotics and Controlled Substances, and was one of the youngest commissioners in the State's history, and I was the first African American to serve as an aide to a sitting South Carolina governor. We were idealists hoping to make our mark on the world, and I am pleased to say that Ike did just that.

As a government insider, his knowledge was in demand. After the West administration ended he served as vice president for Marketing and Government Relations for the architectural and engineering firm LBC&W. Ike then worked for two Columbia public relations firms: Cook & Ruef, Inc. and Newman Saylor & Gregory, and ran political campaigns locally and around the country.

In September 1994, he was tapped to lead the Greater Columbia Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce. At the time, the chamber was \$3.2 million in debt. He turned the organization around and made it a vital part of the capital city's power structure.

Ike played a key role in protecting Fort Jackson, McEntire Air National Guard Base and Shaw Air Force Base from the base realignment taking place in Congress, and instead helped those bases grow as other mili-

tary installations were closing. He cites those successes as his proudest professional accomplishments.

He has shared his expertise as a lecturer at the University of South Carolina's College of Journalism and Mass Communications and at the Strom Thurmond Institute of Government at Clemson University. He is also a recipient of the Order of the Palmetto, from two different governors, which is the highest civilian honor that can be awarded by the State of South Carolina.

Ike is married to the lovely Sue Smith Curran. They have a blended family of five children and four grandchildren. Having spent his entire career in Columbia, he is also a die-hard Southeastern Conference (SEC) sports fan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in recognizing the extraordinary contributions of Ike McLeese. I, like so many others in the greater Columbia, South Carolina area, are proud to call him a friend. He has dedicated his career to serving this community and our state's capital is a much better place because of his service. I wish him well as he steps down from the chamber's helm, but know that his pride and passion of and for South Carolina and Columbia will allow him to continue being a powerful force in Columbia.

INTRODUCTION OF H. RES. 327, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT THE UNITED STATES SHOULD VOTE AGAINST CHINA REGAINING UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL (UNHRC) MEMBERSHIP AND ENCOURAGE OTHER MEMBERS TO VOTE AGAINST ITS ELECTION, AND ENCOURAGE ANOTHER MEMBER TO STAND FOR ELECTION AS AN ALTERNATE CANDIDATE FROM THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks regarding ongoing human rights and religious freedom abuses in China, and my related resolution, House Resolution 327.

China's suppression of its people's rights is an atrocious affair. With the recent change in leadership, some had held hope that there would be progress, but it seems that the new premier, Xi Jinping, has continued to take things in the other direction—suppression of religious and ethnic minorities is getting worse, the right to free speech is being eroded, and more people are being subjected to harsh treatment by their government.

China's claim that economic modernization would lead to increased protection of civil liberties has not proven true. Economic advances seem to come at the cost of those who are most vulnerable. Rather than securing liberty for its people, China has continued to vastly fund programs that serve to monitor and harass civilians.

There are many people who have been fighting to obtain for China the level of freedom we enjoy in the United States and other countries around the world. These are people who I believe many Americans identify with, because we can empathize with those who are beaten down in noble, selfless struggles for dignity and liberty.

Wang Bingzhang struggled to find a path towards freedom in China—a burden that I'm sure was overwhelming at times. His advocacy and his message ultimately cost him what he was fighting for—freedom. Dr. Wang was abducted in 2002, along with his colleagues, in Vietnam and taken back to China, where he faced a secret trial. In a one day trial, in which no evidence or witnesses were presented, Dr. Wang was sentenced to life imprisonment in solitary confinement on charges of espionage and terrorism. His physical and mental health has deteriorated to the point where continued imprisonment is inhumane. This case has begun to attract more international recognition.

Li Huanjun, whom I had the pleasure of meeting, was arrested on July 12, 2013, on "suspicion of gathering a crowd to disturb social order." Ms. Li is a housing rights activist who advocates against the forced evictions that are occurring in China. She lost her home in just this manner as community leaders decided to sell her home to developers without consulting her. Her arrest is worrying, because many of the people who are arrested for protesting this kind of state action are subject to torture, beatings, and harsh sentences for alleged crimes. She is a mother whose fate is yet to be seen.

Though the previous two activists are not mentioned in the legislation, they are both activists for whom I have advocated. The specific cases and people mentioned in the legislation are equally important. The persecution of individuals and entire groups of people in China is staggering, and much of this abuse is covered in H. Res. 327.

Uyghurs in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region are facing increased pressure and persecution from Beijing. Hundreds of people have also been arrested in Xinjiang for spreading "online rumors," and for expressing dissatisfaction with the Chinese government. Chinese authorities claim that they grant wide-ranging freedoms to people in this region, but religious persecution, suppression of dissent, and monitoring and harassment prove otherwise.

Mongolians continue to face harsh government oppression, as well. An example is Mr. Hada, who served a 15 year prison sentence for "subversion," who continues to face detention after his release from prison, and whose wife and son have recently "disappeared". Dissidents are not the only ones who face persecution—their families are often targeted by authorities, as well. Inner Mongolia continues to struggle to keep a grasp on their culture and language while Beijing attempts to erode it. As a result of Chinese expansion into Inner Mongolia, the land and ecosystem is deteriorating—the Mongolian culture and way of life is in danger of deteriorating with it.

The oppression of Tibetans has caused concern around the world. In acts of desperation, many Tibetan monks have self-immolated. They want greater religious freedom,

and the return from exile of Tibetan spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama. But, Beijing continues to maintain strict control over the Tibetan Autonomous Region, even going as far as maintaining police presence in monasteries. Tenzin Delek Rinpoche, who was sentenced to death in 2002, along with his assistant who was almost immediately executed, but had his sentence commuted to life imprisonment after human rights groups and experts claimed he did not receive a fair trial and that he faced harsh treatment in detention.

Falun Gong practitioners have also faced serious persecution from Chinese authorities. China's efforts to eradicate this religion can be particularly severe. Long imprisonment, torture, and inhumane treatment of practitioners can often lead to death. The adherence to a belief system in China, like Falun Gong, is often a dangerous attribute. Many Falun Gong practitioners are often subject to the China's "Reeducation Through Labor" program, black prisons, and arbitrary detention. Hundreds of thousands of people are sentenced to serve time in these "Reeducation Through Labor" prisons.

The list of human rights abuses, violations, and religious and ethnic persecution is almost innumerable. During China's previous membership on the Council, they greatly expanded their "Weiwen" program, used to monitor and harass civilians. This program is currently being funded at higher levels than their national defense budget. Many of the most famous cases of violations occurred while China sat as a member on the Council. Liu Xiaobo was arrested in 2009 on charges of "inciting subversion of state power," and was sentenced to 11 years in prison. He was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2010, making him the only Nobel Peace Prize winner in prison. His wife, Liu Xia, continues to face harassment is currently under house arrest.

For these reasons, the United States government and our representative in the United Nations should vote against China regaining membership on the United Nations Human Rights Council. This Council was designed to help protect people from the kinds of persecution that they suffer at the hands of the Chinese government. The effort to keep China off of the Council has a strong coalition, including Tibetans, Uyghurs, Mongols, Han Chinese, Christians, Muslims, and Falun Gong, along with many human rights lawyers and advocates.

I would urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join in this effort by cosponsoring H. Res. 327 to keep China off of the United Nations Human Rights Council and encourage another suitably qualified member from the Asia-Pacific region to stand for election as an alternate candidate.

IN HONOR OF NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, once again, this year, we observe National Hispanic

Heritage Month from September 1 to October 15 and celebrate the rich history, culture and contributions of American citizens whose ancestors came from Spain, Mexico, the Caribbean, and Central and South America. The observation began in 1968 as Hispanic Heritage Week under President Lyndon Johnson and was expanded by President Ronald Reagan twenty years later as a month-long celebration and enacted into law August 17, 1988. Our leaders, then and now, recognize this nation was founded and built through the hard work and sacrifices of immigrants from around the world and so we honor Hispanic-Americans whose past and future contributions have added to the strength and endurance of American society. The shared goal of a prosperous, greater America is further enhanced by their ongoing participation and recognized during National Hispanic Heritage Month.

SUPPORT OF FARMINGTON AREA REPUBLICANS

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Farmington Area Republicans of Michigan, who like so many organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are visionary individuals who un-

derstand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American organization.

HONORING JAY KAPITZ

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Jay Kapitz, who will be honored by the Los Angeles Democratic Party as a 2013 Eleanor and Franklin Roosevelt Democrat of the Year.

Jay is a community activist who possesses a vested interest in the social, economic and political well-being of Ventura County. He has always gone above the call of duty to explain the political nuances that will impact our community.

His insight and knowledge about the political process are invaluable. As a community volunteer, member of the Ventura County Democratic Party Communications Committee, and Election Strategy Chair of the Democratic Club of the Conejo Valley, Jay is a committed advocate of progressive issues and has long supported the priorities of the Democratic Party.

Jay has always taken his passion, charisma, and expertise in political organizing into the community. As a champion for environmental sustainability, he was involved in raising awareness over the Santa Susana Field Laboratory superfund site clean-up and Ventura County's Save Open-Space and Agricultural Resources (SOAR) initiative in the Conejo Valley. He is dedicated to the protection of open space and stands against further development of the hillsides around Oak Park, the Conejo Valley and all of Ventura County.

For being an exemplary grassroots activist who is consistently on the frontline for Democratic candidates and important statewide propositions, I extend my sincere congratulations and join the Los Angeles Democratic Party in honoring Jay Kapitz.

SUPPORT OF THE WESTERN WASHTENAW TEA PARTY

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Western Washtenaw Tea Party of Michigan, who like so many grassroots organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise

them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American grassroots organization.

TRIBUTE TO PEYTON ROBERTSON

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Peyton Robertson, who is America's 2013 Top Young Scientist in the "Discovery Education 3M Young Scientist Challenge."

Peyton, a 5th grade student, created an innovative sandbag designed that is reusable and easy to transport. After seeing the destruction caused by Hurricane Sandy and from experiencing hurricanes in South Florida, Peyton wanted to help protect folks in Florida.

This is not the first time that Peyton has worked to improve the lives of those around him with inventions. When he discovered that the golf balls he loved to hit didn't go as far when they were cold, he created a golf ball warmer. Peyton also invented retractable training wheels to help his sister learn how to ride a bike. When he grows up, Peyton would like to be an inventor, scientist, or engineer.

Peyton, congratulations again on being named America's Top Young Scientist for 2013. Your innovative spirit and desire to improve the world is an inspiration to us all!

SUPPORT OF THE WAYNE COUNTY CAMPAIGN FOR LIBERTY

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Wayne County Campaign for Liberty of the Great State of Michigan who like so many grassroots organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; Wayne County's Campaign for Liberty promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Constitutional Republic that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number of the state; a Constitutional Republic that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are a visionary group of individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and the Blessings of individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American grassroots organization.

IN HONOR OF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE RICHARD A. SCHELL

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 25th year that United States District Judge

Richard A. Schell has served with distinction on the Federal bench of the Eastern District of Texas. It is a privilege to recognize and pay tribute to him, along with members of the Eastern District of Texas Bar Association who will honor him at their 17th Annual Eastern District Bench Bar Conference October 30, November 1 in Plano, Texas.

Judge Schell was nominated by President Ronald Reagan on April 13, 1988, to a seat vacated by the late Judge William M. Steger. He was confirmed by the Senate on May 27, 1988, and received his commission on June 6, 1988. Judge Schell served as Chief Judge of the Eastern District from 1994 2001 and also served on the U.S. Judicial Conference Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules as well as the Board of the Federal Judges Association. During his tenure as Chief Judge he also supported the effort to create the Eastern District of Texas Bar Association, which today is recognized as one of the preeminent Federal bar associations in the United States.

A native Texan, Judge Schell was raised in a family whose community involvement in Plano, Texas, stretches back over 130 years. His maternal great-grandfather served as mayor of Plano, and his paternal grandfather was the longest serving mayor in the City's history, serving more than 16 years. His father was the longest appointed official in Plano's history, serving as its representative on the North Texas Municipal Water District for 45 years.

Judge Schell received his Bachelor of Arts Degree from Southern Methodist University in 1972 and his Juris Doctorate from SMU's School of Law in 1975. He served as an instructor at the Law School from 1975-1976, then became Assistant District Attorney for Collin County in 1976. He practiced law in the private sector in McKinney from 1977-1982, then returned to public service as Judge, Collin County Court-at-Law, from 1982-1986. From 1986-1988 he presided as Judge of Collin County's 219th District Court before assuming the bench as U.S. District Judge. Since 2010 he also has served as a Visiting Professor at SMU's Dedman School of Law, which awarded him the Distinguished Alumni Award for Judicial Service in 2005. His law clerks and staff have established a programmatic endowment at the law school in his honor.

During his tenure on the bench, Judge Schell presided over the Norplant MDL, several complex civil matters and a number of environmental issues. He is currently responsible for the continued oversight and enforcement of a consent decree that resolved a class action between the State of Texas and children who receive Medicaid benefits. As Resident Judge in Plano with a higher-than-average docket, Judge Schell spent 683 hours in the courtroom in the past year alone. This is 247 percent above the circuit median and 243 percent above the circuit average. Judge Schell is universally recognized for his excellent judicial temperament, work ethic, integrity, and fairness.

Judge Schell has the support of a wonderful family—his wife, Janice, and sons Christopher and Ben. Christopher serves as the Legislative Director in my Washington, DC office, while attending law school in the evening at American University. Ben previously worked on the

Space Subcommittee of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology during my tenure as Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is fortunate to have a Judge with as much integrity and commitment to justice as Judge Schell possesses. I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to this outstanding American and esteemed United States District Judge, Richard A. Schell, for his 25 years of distinguished service on behalf of our Nation.

SUPPORT OF THE OAKLAND COUNTY CAMPAIGN FOR LIBERTY

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Oakland County Campaign for Liberty of the Great State of Michigan who like so many grassroots organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; Oakland County's Campaign for Liberty promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Constitutional Republic that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number of the state; a Constitutional Republic that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are a visionary group of individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and the Blessings of individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American grassroots organization.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the sixteenth day of the federal government shutdown to submit for the RECORD a satire sent to me by my constituent, Donna Rusinski of Huntington, New York. Donna's satire perfectly portrays the current state of affairs in our nation's capital and I am pleased I can share her short story with you today.

So, imagine that the company you work for held a poll, and asked everyone if they thought it would be a good idea to put a soda machine in the break room. The poll came back, and the majority of your colleagues said "Yes," indicating that they would like a soda machine. Some said no, but the majority said yes. So, a week later, there's a soda machine.

Now imagine that Bill in accounting voted against the soda machine. He has a strong hatred for caffeinated soft drinks, thinks they are bad for you, whatever. He campaigns throughout the office to get the machine removed.

Well, management decides "OK, we'll ask again" and again, the majority of people say "Yes, let's keep the soda machine."

Bill continues to campaign, and management continues to ask the employees, and every time, the answer is in favor of the soda machine. This happens, let's say 35 times. Eventually, Bill says "OK, I'm not processing payroll anymore until the soda machine is removed," so nobody will get paid unless management removes the machine.

What should we do?

Answer: Fire Bill and get someone who will do the darn job.

Bonus: Bill tells everyone that he was willing to "Negotiate," to come to a solution where everyone got their payroll checks, but only so long as that negotiation capitulated to his demand to remove the soda machine.

Bill is a dope.

BRIGHTON TEA PARTY OF LIVINGSTON COUNTY, MICHIGAN

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Brighton Tea Party of Livingston County, Michigan, who like so many grassroots organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious, and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a democracy that seeks equality in liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a constitutional republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to give this testimony in support of a truly American grassroots organization.

IN TRIBUTE TO JOHN W. OLSEN

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to a friend, a leader, and a living legend in Connecticut politics and the labor movement, John W. Olsen. After 25 years at the helm of the Connecticut AFL-CIO, John retired as President on September 25. John leaves a deep and enduring mark on the State of Connecticut after a quarter century of extraordinary leadership and dedication.

A plumber by trade, John joined the Plumbers and Pipefitters union 44 years ago. He served as President of the United Association of Plumbers, Pipefitters and Steamfitters, Local 133, and a former Secretary-Treasurer of the Connecticut State Building and Construction Trades Council.

In 1988, at the age of 38, John was elected President of the Connecticut AFL-CIO, representing 220,000 union members across the state. His 25 years as President of the AFL-CIO represents the longest tenure in the federation's history.

John provided the leading public voice for organized labor for 25 years. He also presided over—and kept united—a diverse union umbrella in Connecticut. During an era where friction grew nationally between industrial and service unions and ruptured decades-old alliances, John's assiduous and fair leadership kept Connecticut's unions unified and strong and maintained labor's collective potency to advocate on behalf of working families in our state.

In the political arena, John has been a force on the national, state, and local level for four

decades. He pulled an upset to win a contest to become Chairman of the State Democratic Party from 2000 to 2002. He served as a member of the Democratic State Central Committee from 1982 to 1995, as Co-Chair of the State Central Platform Committee, and on the Democratic National Committee since 1996. Even in the Town of Clinton in my Congressional District, John served one term as Chair and one as Treasurer and on his hometown Democratic Town Committee.

I will always be grateful for John's support and counsel for my three campaigns as a challenger, in unsuccessful efforts for Lieutenant Governor and the U.S. House in 1998 and 2002, respectively, and for my successful effort for the House in 2006. John loved an underdog, and there was never a more fierce or loyal ally to have at your side for a political fight.

John's remarkable legacy at the center of Connecticut's political and policy debate for a quarter of century is a story of keen instincts, dogged determination, and ardent honesty. John's fidelity was never to his ego or personal standing but always to the cause and a positive outcome. His service will be missed, but I have no doubts that he will be as active in his "retirement" as he was during his sterling career.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my colleagues in the Connecticut delegation, John's wife Janeen, three children, Amy, Elizabeth and Christopher, and grandson, Hunter, to honor a true Connecticut patriot, John Olsen.

SUPPORT OF THE RIVER CITY PATRIOTS OF GRAND RAPIDS

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the River City Patriots of Grand Rapids, Michigan who like so many grassroots organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; River City Patriots promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in

big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Constitutional Republic that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number of the state; a Constitutional Republic that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and the Blessings individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American grassroots organization.

HONORING LORI DEMERSSEMAN

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, Today, I rise to recognize Lori DeMersseman, who will be honored by the Los Angeles Democratic Party as a 2013 Eleanor and Franklin Roosevelt Democrat of the Year.

Lori is a political leader whose tireless efforts can be seen in her important contribution to our community. As a founder and the current President of the Democratic Singles of Ventura County, Lori created an organization for like-minded individuals who are passionate about the economic, social and environmental issues facing our nation. The DSVCL is a welcoming club for individuals to volunteer and socialize with other Democrats while participating in the political process.

Lori has always been engaged in improving our community. She is a committed advocate for equality and has long supported the priorities of the Democratic Party.

For being an exemplary grassroots activist who is consistently helping Democratic candidates and important statewide propositions, I extend my sincere congratulations and join the Los Angeles Democratic Party in honoring Lori DeMersseman.

SUPPORT OF BLOOMFIELD REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CLUB

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bloomfield Republican Women's Club of Michigan, who like so many grassroots organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assem-

ble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Constitutional Republic that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Constitutional Republic that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American organization.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF LORIE GRINNAN

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a dear friend of mine, Lorie Grinnan, on her retirement as the County Commissioner of Precinct 2 in Rockwall County. Lorie has served as Commissioner for eight years, and was the first woman to be re-elected to that position. During that time, she has been dedicated to serving the community of Rockwall, TX.

I have known Lorie for many years, and her commitment to implementing sound policies that benefit the citizens of Rockwall County is unparalleled. She has served in public office for 17 years, and during that time has undertaken many projects from transportation to emergency services.

Besides serving as County Commissioner, Lorie was also a member of the Rockwall Independent School District Board for nine years, and served as a member of the Juvenile Services Board as Commissioner and

school board member. She also currently presides as the president of the Emergency Services Board. In addition to her roles as a public servant, she is a member of many community organizations including the Rockwall Noon Rotary, First United Methodist Church, Chamber of Congress, and city councils of Rockwall, Heath, Rowlett, and McLendon-Chisolm.

Some of her active projects as County Commissioner include a \$100 million road bond, infrastructure improvements to various roads in the area, and work to maintain quick ambulance response time despite construction.

Among one of her greatest undertakings was spearheading the Veterans Advisory Committee to help oversee the construction of the Veterans Memorial. Over 2,000 citizens attended the opening ceremony which was held on November 11, 2011.

Commissioner Grinnan, as well as her husband Jeff, and their two children Nicholas and Kimberley, all attended Texas A&M University. Kimberley is also seeking a law degree from Texas Tech University.

Upon her retirement, Lorie will leave behind a distinguished legacy and her influence will be felt throughout Rockwall County for many years to come. I ask my colleagues to join me today in congratulating Lorie Grinnan, and wishing her the best of luck on her future opportunities.

**SUPPORT OF THE BIRMINGHAM
REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CLUB**

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Birmingham Republican Women's Club of Michigan, who like so many organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the ex-

tension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American organization.

**HONORING MY FRIEND AND HERO,
MRS. JEAN CLELAND**

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend and hero, Mrs. Jean Cleland, who passed away on September 9th, 2013. Jean Cleland was the happiest, most gallant and giving hands-on social justice advocate I have encountered. Jean was committed to all aspects of her life from advocating for social justice, to her family, and her faith.

She was a devoted and loving wife, mother and grandmother to her 6 children and 3 grandchildren. The Cleland home was open to all the neighborhood children where they enjoyed playing on a zip line 30 years ago and had frequent backyard barbecues. She and her husband Robert refused to get a television in their home until the mid-60s because they felt time was better spent reading, playing and enjoying family time together. Jean and Bob were happily married for 65 years at the time of his death in 2010.

A role model and friend, Jean worked at the North Shore Senior Center as a Case Manager and Director of Community Education for 35 years, until early 2013. In the '50s and '60s Jean became one of the founders of the Wilmette Human Relations Committee and the North Shore Summer Project. Those programs were essential for ending north suburban housing discrimination. The North Shore Summer Project organized Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s 1965 speech on the Winnetka Village Green, and Jean had the honor of pinning an "Equal Housing" button on Dr. King's lapel the day he gave that famous speech to more than 8,000 people. Jean often said it was the highlight of her life.

As a strong and independent family, Jean and Robert belonged to Wilmette's First Congregational Church, United Church of Christ, for 54 years. They were leaders in opposing the Vietnam War and the Iraq War, and persistent voices for peace and nuclear disarmament. Jean was a firm believer in justice and the notion that justice is intentional; she once said that "Justice doesn't happen accidentally, it takes hard work and strong beliefs."

Jean was the Chair of the Wilmette Housing Commission and effectively advocated for three low-income senior buildings in the village. Jean concentrated her volunteer efforts around open housing for more than 60 years. Jean was also a founding board member of the North Shore Interfaith Council, now called Open Communities and served on its board for over 30 years.

A committed and hard working citizen, Jean not only gave back to her community, she served as a powerful and compassionate advocate beyond its borders. I am honored to call her a dear friend and to be among the legions of people, young and old, who relied on her as a role model and example for living a meaningful and giving life. Her work has made this world a better place for countless people, and her name will live on in the hearts and minds of those she helped. May she Rest in Peace.

**A TRIBUTE TO ALVISO ADOBE
COMMUNITY PARK**

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the fifth anniversary of the opening of Alviso Adobe Community Park in Pleasanton, California.

A collaborative historical project between the City of Pleasanton and the Museum on Main, Alviso Adobe Community Park is home to the Alviso Adobe, the first adobe building in the Amador Valley and a California Historical Landmark.

The park serves as a valuable resource for students and visitors interested in the economic, social and political life in California from the establishment of the Bear Flag Republic, through the Mexican-American War, the Gold Rush, and the granting of statehood.

A re-creation of the historic Meadowlark Dairy milking barn and bunk house now features indoor interpretive displays that tell the story of California from its earliest Native American beginnings.

Demonstration areas give visitors a hands-on experience in the activities of the past, such as making adobe bricks, ice cream, and learning how plants were used by the Ohlone people. The park grounds also have been carefully landscaped with native plants and fruit and nut trees amidst ancient Heritage oak trees and a seasonal creek.

I again join with the community of Pleasanton in congratulating Alviso Adobe Community Park on five years of celebrating our rich history. I look forward to the park serving as a valuable education resource for many more years to come.

THE BIRMINGHAM BLOOMFIELD
REPUBLICAN CLUB

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Birmingham Bloomfield Republicans of Michigan, who like so many organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish

costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the va-

lidity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American organization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 22, 2013

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 22, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF DENHAM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Almighty God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the people's House returns, we give You thanks for those most responsible for the resolutions reached this past week and for the reopening of government, which has meant so much to the families of those who have chosen to serve their Nation by their work in government.

As all return, the Capitol is in mourning for the loss of two men of the House, former Speaker Tom Foley and Representative BILL YOUNG. Both men, a Democrat and a Republican, were known to be giants in the people's House, and their passing has deprived our Nation of experience and wisdom in Congress at a time when it is needed.

Bless all the Members with wisdom in good measure—pressed down, shaken together, and running over—that the legacy of these great legislators might be carried on for the benefit of all.

May all that is done here in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

THE PRESIDENT MUST ANSWER THIS QUESTION

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the President has some very serious questions to answer.

Will he tax the American people if they cannot or choose not to buy health insurance from a Web site that doesn't work?

Will he insist upon penalizing them for withholding their personal information from a government database already rife with privacy concerns?

Will he continue to demand patience, blame technical glitches, and dismiss legitimate concerns from the American public while ObamaCare's broken launch dominates headlines?

Will he give lenience to those in his administration who are responsible for these failures?

It is true that ObamaCare's individual marketplace launched just 3 weeks ago; but 3 weeks or not, the American people would like some assurance. If government can't get its act together administering health insurance, will Americans get taxed for opting out?

The fair answer is certainly "no." I hope President Obama agrees.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Republican government shutdown is over, and the threat of the default has been averted for now; but no one is relieved.

The crisis should never have happened. The shutdown really hurt our economy. Standard & Poor's estimated that it cost the country \$24 billion, and there is something even worse: each threat of shutdown and default slows economic growth by sowing uncertainty, dampens consumer confidence, and cuts jobs and income.

The Wall Street Journal today ran an article this morning titled, "A Confidence Shutdown." Reporter Gerald Seib wrote:

Washington's misadventures have extracted a historically high toll on America's confidence.

"A historically high toll," he wrote. How high? At no other time did consumer confidence plummet as far as it did in the Republican shutdown except for prior to the 2003 war in Iraq and the 1990 Persian Gulf war.

The American people don't want a government that is shut down; they want a government that is on their side.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 17, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 17, 2013 at 11:48 a.m.:

That the Senate disagree to House amendment. S. Con. Res. 8.

That the Senate agree to conference requested by the House;

That the Senate appointed conferees.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Wednesday, October 16, 2013:

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

H.R. 2775, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-68)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, October 17, 2013.

The Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014, I hereby certify that absent a suspension of the limit under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of the Treasury would be unable to issue debt to meet existing commitments.

Sincerely,

BARACK OBAMA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The communication is referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the passing of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the whole number of the House is 431.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP) at 5 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

PAUL BROWN UNITED STATES
COURTHOUSE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 185) to designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the "Paul Brown United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 185

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "Paul Brown United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Paul Brown United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 185.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 185 would designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the Paul Brown United States Courthouse.

During World War II, Judge Paul Brown enlisted in the United States Navy. In 1950, he graduated from the University of Texas School of Law and started a law practice in Sherman, Texas. In 1953, he served as an assistant United States attorney for the Eastern District of Texas and later as the United States attorney. In 1985, he was appointed by President Ronald Reagan to serve as district judge for the Eastern District of Texas. He served as a district judge and then as a senior district judge until his death in 2012.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) for his leadership on this legislation.

I think it is fitting to honor the service of Judge Brown to this Nation by naming this courthouse after him. I support passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 185, which designates the United States courthouse in Sherman, Texas, as the Paul Brown United States Courthouse.

Judge Brown was a highly respected member not only of the Federal judicial community but also in the Sherman, Texas, community. After serving in the U.S. Navy in World War II, he returned to Texas to continue his education and received his law degree from the University of Texas Law School in 1950. In 1953, Mr. Speaker, he was appointed as an assistant United States attorney for the Eastern District of Texas.

In 1959, President Eisenhower appointed Judge Brown as the United States attorney in the Eastern District, where he served until 1961. He returned to private practice in Sherman from 1961 to 1985 and enjoyed a reputation as an outstanding civil litigation lawyer. President Reagan later nominated him to become a Federal judge in the Eastern District of Texas in 1985.

Judge Brown presided over cases that involved bank and savings and loan failures of the 1980s and early 1990s, as well as many intellectual property and patent cases. Judge Brown was also a prominent member of the community, serving as a board member of Medical Plaza Hospital, president of the Sherman School Board, and president of the Optimist Club of Sherman.

Judge Brown assumed senior status in April 2001 and later died in 2006 after 21 years of distinguished service on the Federal bench. This designation is a fitting tribute to his career as a veteran and respected jurist.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting H.R. 185.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of H.R. 185, as has been stated, a bill designating the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the Paul Brown United States Courthouse.

Judge Brown was an outstanding Federal judge who passed away on November 26, 2012, after 21 years of very distinguished service. Judge Brown was my good friend, a respected judge, and beloved member of the Sherman, Texas, community.

Judge Brown represented the finest qualities of jurisprudence. Hanging on his wall in the Sherman Federal Courthouse were Socrates' four qualities for a good judge: to hear courteously; to answer wisely; to consider soberly; and to decide impartially. Judge Brown embodied all of these qualities, and he dispensed justice accordingly. He was highly regarded, well-respected, and was a role model for many.

Judge Brown was the youngest of a family of six raised on a farm in Pottsboro, Texas. He graduated from Denison High School and, although underage, he was able to get his parents' consent to join the United States Navy

when World War II broke out. He served on a minesweeper in both the Atlantic and Pacific theaters and as a part of the occupation forces in Japan. He was discharged as an electrician's mate 2nd class in June 1946.

He returned to his studies and received a law degree in 1950 from the University of Texas before being recalled to Active Duty in the Korean war. He saw combat aboard a minesweeper which was sunk by mines. He received an honorable discharge in December 1951.

Judge Brown worked as an assistant U.S. attorney in Texarkana under U.S. attorney William Steger, who would become his mentor, good friend, and eventually fellow colleague on the bench. He served as assistant U.S. attorney from 1953 to 1959, and then followed in Judge Steger's footsteps as U.S. district attorney from 1959 to 1961.

While in Texarkana, he met and married Frances Morehead, and the two returned home to Sherman, where he practiced law for a number of years. In 1985, Senator Phil Gramm recommended him to President Reagan for a new judge's position created by the Eastern District of Texas, and he was confirmed that year. He held court in Beaumont, Paris, Sherman, and Texarkana, and as the caseload grew, he eventually presided over the Sherman courthouse exclusively.

Premier cases over the years included intellectual property, patent cases, and criminal cases precipitated by the bank and savings and loan failures of the 1980s and 1990s. In recent years, he noted the increase in drug cases and expressed his regret that in spite of all the efforts that have been made to prosecute drug dealers, the Nation is not making much progress in curtailing the use of drugs. No matter what type of cases came before him, Judge Brown always enjoyed the work and ran an efficient and orderly courtroom. His personal ethics and judicial integrity were remarkable, and his reputation for punctuality is legendary.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of a great American, outstanding public servant, and respected jurist. This bill has the support of the Federal judges in the Eastern District, and I ask for your support of H.R. 185, to designate the United States courthouse in Sherman, Texas, the Paul Brown United States Courthouse.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today in support of H.R. 185 in this 113th United States Congress, being brought before us by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. HALL, which will honor an esteemed gentleman from Sherman, Texas, the Honorable Paul Brown.

Judge Paul Brown was a great Texan and a Great American, having served his country with valor in the U.S. Navy in both World War II and in Korea.

Judge Brown was a civic leader, having served Texas and the United States as Assistant United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas. He was nominated by President Eisenhower to serve as U.S. Attorney in Tyler, Texas, and he served his state well on his appointment by President Reagan as Eastern District Judge, where he finished his career after twenty one years of service as a Senior Judge.

His devotion to his community and his faith guided him, as he remained engaged with local, state, and legal initiatives throughout his life.

Judge Brown's life and record of distinguished service to our country and to Texas serves as a textbook example of what it means to have been a member of The Greatest Generation. His long and distinguished service in the courtroom serves as a template for all officers of the court, and his commitment to his family and his community provides a brilliant illustration for all Texans and Americans about what it means to serve one's fellow man.

This courthouse we are naming today will remind us of Judge Brown's loyalty to his country, his community, and to The Great State of Texas, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 185.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROTECTING STUDENTS FROM SEXUAL AND VIOLENT PREDATORS ACT

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2083) to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require criminal background checks for school employees, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2083

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act".

SEC. 2. BACKGROUND CHECKS.

(a) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, each State educational agency that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) shall have in effect policies and procedures that—

(1) require that a criminal background check be conducted for each school employee that includes—

(A) a search of the State criminal registry or repository of the State in which the school employee resides;

(B) a search of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases of the State in which the school employee resides;

(C) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System; and

(D) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under section 19 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16919);

(2) prohibit the employment of a school employee as a school employee if such employee—

(A) refuses to consent to a criminal background check under paragraph (1);

(B) makes a false statement in connection with such criminal background check;

(C) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

(i) homicide;

(ii) child abuse or neglect;

(iii) a crime against children, including child pornography;

(iv) spousal abuse;

(v) a crime involving rape or sexual assault;

(vi) kidnapping;

(vii) arson; or

(viii) physical assault, battery, or a drug-related offense, committed on or after the date that is 5 years before the date of such employee's criminal background check under paragraph (1); or

(D) has been convicted of any other crime that is a violent or sexual crime against a minor;

(3) require that each criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) be periodically repeated or updated in accordance with State law or the policies of local educational agencies served by the State educational agency;

(4) upon request, provide each school employee who has had a criminal background check under paragraph (1) with a copy of the results of the criminal background check;

(5) provide for a timely process by which a school employee may appeal, but which does not permit the employee to be employed as a school employee during such appeal, the results of a criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) which prohibit the employee from being employed as a school employee under paragraph (2) to—

(A) challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information produced by such criminal background check; and

(B) establish or reestablish eligibility to be hired or reinstated as a school employee by demonstrating that the information is materially inaccurate or incomplete, and has been corrected;

(6) ensure that such policies and procedures are published on the website of the State educational agency and the website of each local educational agency served by the State educational agency; and

(7) allow a local educational agency to share the results of a school employee's criminal background check recently conducted under paragraph (1) with another local educational agency that is considering such school employee for employment as a school employee.

(b) TRANSFER PROHIBITION.—A local educational agency or State educational agency that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) may not knowingly transfer or facilitate the transfer of any school

employee if the agency knows, or has substantive reason to believe, that such employee engaged in sexual misconduct with an elementary school or secondary school student.

(c) FEES FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

(1) CHARGING OF FEES.—The Attorney General, State Attorney General, or other State law enforcement official may charge reasonable fees for conducting a criminal background check under subsection (a)(1).

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS.—A local educational agency or State educational agency may use administrative funds received under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) to pay any reasonable fees charged for conducting such criminal background check.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The terms “elementary school”, “secondary school”, “local educational agency”, “State”, and “State educational agency” have the meanings given the terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(2) SCHOOL EMPLOYEE.—The term “school employee” means—

(A) an employee of, or a person seeking employment with, a local educational agency or State educational agency, and who, as a result of such employment, has (or will have) a job duty that results in unsupervised access to elementary school or secondary school students; or

(B) any person, or an employee of any person, who has a contract or agreement to provide services with an elementary school or secondary school, local educational agency, or State educational agency, and such person or employee, as a result of such contract or agreement, has a job duty that results in unsupervised access to elementary school or secondary school students.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2083.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2083, the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act.

A report released by the Government Accountability Office in December 2010 examined 15 cases where individuals with histories of sexual misconduct were hired or retained as teachers, support staff, volunteers, and contractors. In 11 of these 15 cases, those individuals had previously targeted children.

Despite the fact that States have varying policies intended to protect children from sexual predators in schools, the GAO determined the policies were largely inconsistent and insufficient. According to the report,

States don't consistently perform pre-employment background checks, and when they do conduct these checks, they are not always fingerprinted or connected to the national criminal database.

There is widespread agreement on both sides of this aisle that more must be done to protect students. We have worked with our colleagues to advance legislation that will ensure that every school employee—from the cafeteria workers, Mr. Speaker, to the administrators, to the janitors, to the teachers, principals, and librarians—that everyone is subject to a complete background check that includes the FBI fingerprint identification system and the National Sex Offender Registry.

Today, we have an opportunity to finish the fight by sending this bill, the Protecting Students From Sexual and Violent Predators Act, to the Senate.

H.R. 2083 will require States that receive funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to have policies and practices in place that ensure each school employee is subject to a complete national criminal background check. Mr. Speaker, a similar provision was offered by two of my colleagues and good friends, both from Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. MEEHAN. That provision was included in the House-passed Student Success Act from last month.

□ 1715

The Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act is common-sense legislation that will help ensure students in schools across the country are safe from sexual criminals. So all that being said, Mr. Speaker, I simply urge at this time my colleagues to support H.R. 2083.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Mr. ROKITA for presenting the bill and Mr. FITZPATRICK for his work on the legislation. I appreciate their assistance.

Mr. Speaker, when parents send their children to school each morning, they expect them to come home safe from harm. Day in and day out, millions of teachers, staff, and administrators do their utmost—sometimes in downright heroic ways—to put their students' safety first. But despite these efforts, there remains a steady stream of stories from across the country involving students who have been abused by someone in a position of trust in their schools.

Just this past summer, a music teacher in a Silver Spring, Maryland, elementary school was found to have sexually abused 15 minors over an 8-year period.

In my home State of California, a teacher was convicted of throwing a 5-year-old boy with a disability onto a

classroom floor and kicking him and was transferred to another school for the following year, but was not fired due to legal limitations. The superintendent of the school district acknowledged that police were not informed after that horrible incident. To make matters worse, even after her conviction, this person was allowed to keep a desk job through the rest of the school year, still had her credentials, and could simply move to a new school to teach, putting more children at risk.

We should be doing everything we can to prevent these abuses. A very fundamental place to start is to not employ predators in our schools in the first place.

After I requested an investigation in 2010, the Government Accountability Office uncovered a wide range of cases in numerous States of convicted sex offenders who had previously targeted children, working in schools side by side with children. In some cases, these schools had unknowingly hired sex offenders. This happened because State laws are inconsistent in how they require schools to conduct background checks of their employees and what types of crimes are covered.

In other cases, the Government Accountability Office found that districts knowingly passed on a potential predator and abuser to another school or school district, allowing the offender to resign instead of reporting him. Although every State requires some background checks, the checks are not always thorough. GAO found that some States only require checks for licensed teachers, but not other employees. And some States don't require criminal history checks for contractors at public schools.

The GAO also found that at least half of the States lack any rules to ensure that child abuse allegations are not suppressed by school officials, and only a few States require schools to conduct recurring background checks on employees.

The significant differences in the ways schools screen prospective employees lead to gaps in student protection, but a child's safety shouldn't depend on the State in which they reside. A patchwork of State laws fails to protect all children, and that simply is not good enough. We need minimum national standards to keep children safe from sexual predators and other violent adults.

That is why I am proud to be the author of the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act, along with my cosponsors.

This bill closes the loopholes. It would create consistency across States in background-check policy, requiring public schools to conduct comprehensive background checks for any employee or applicant for employment with unsupervised access to children, using State criminal and child abuse

registries and the FBI's fingerprint database, as well as to periodically update these checks.

Contractors in public schools with unsupervised access to students are also subject to these same background checks under this bill. It would prohibit school districts from hiring or retaining anyone who has been convicted of certain violent crimes, including crimes against children, crimes involving rape or sexual assault, or child pornography.

Schools must be places where faculty and students can focus on teaching and learning, without fear of emotional or physical harm. Keeping students safe requires a coordinated effort from teachers, principals, superintendents, community partners, and parents. The vast majority of school staff is trustworthy and works hard every day to support students' learning needs. I honor and respect their work, which is so central to the success of this Nation.

The criminal background checks required in H.R. 2083 are essential to ensuring that schools and school districts are doing everything they can to protect children.

Mr. Speaker, keeping children safe isn't a partisan issue; it is a moral obligation. And that is why I am pleased to see the strong bipartisan support from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this legislation. I want to thank the cosponsors in particular: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WILSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. COHEN.

Working with Chairman KLINE's and Mr. ROKITA's staff, we clarified several provisions from the original bill that I introduced in May, including that States must periodically repeat or update background checks on employees, based on State and local policy that is publicly transparent; school districts may share background check results with each other for the same employee; and school employees could appeal the results of a background check if it is inaccurate or incomplete and establish their employment eligibility if the check was corrected.

This bill is only as good as the quality of the background checks, and I will work with my colleagues to address issues related to ensuring that the checks are complete and accurate. Congressman ELLISON and Congressman BOBBY SCOTT have introduced legislation that seeks to support this goal, and I will work with them and others on these important worker protections if the bill moves forward in the Senate.

I want to thank again Chairman KLINE for working with us on sensible solutions that will protect children across the country. I also want to thank the respective staffs for their diligence and thoughtfulness in helping us to develop and move this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROKITA, and I rise in strong support of the legislation on the floor today. This bill, if passed by the House and Senate and signed by the President, will go a long way toward protecting students in our Nation's schools. I thank the ranking member, Mr. MILLER, for bringing this bill up today and for bringing to light an issue that is compromising student safety throughout our country.

H.R. 2083, the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act of 2013, will ensure consistent and comprehensive school employee background checks in all States. The bill also includes language from a bill that I introduced, the Jeremy Bell Act. This piece of the larger bill blocks Federal funding to schools that knowingly hire or transfer teachers involved in sexual misconduct.

The Jeremy Bell Act is named after a 12-year-old West Virginia elementary school student who was sexually abused and murdered by his principal, a man that had a long record of sexual misconduct, but who was allowed to transfer and leave schools without punishment and without informing new districts.

In a 2010 Government Accountability Office investigations report, it was found that inconsistent State laws regarding background checks facilitated the hiring and transferring of sexual predators in our schools. If, by cutting off funds to schools that knowingly "pass the trash," we can save one student from Jeremy's fate, then this bill has succeeded. Overall, this bipartisan bill includes student safety measures, including requiring background checks for school employees, a commonsense method to better protect our children in their schools.

In testimony submitted at a field hearing I held in Philadelphia last Congress, Roy Bell, Jeremy's father, expressed his outrage and his sadness that our education system had failed to protect the life and innocence of his 12-year-old son. Unfortunately, Jeremy's father passed away this weekend. It is on his behalf and on behalf of all parents and students that I will continue to work to pass legislation that protects our students.

Today, I ask my colleagues to consider this legislation and its impact on families across our Nation. Mr. Speaker, I encourage quick passage of H.R. 2083 by both Chambers and for it to be signed into law by the President. I thank the chairman and Mr. MILLER for their work on this bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for his comments and for his support of this legislation.

I had a couple more speakers who were supposedly coming to the floor, but at this time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to recognize that all of us who are parents or Members of Congress, no matter what walk of life we may travel in, want to make sure that our children are safe, are well taken care of, and that the people who care for them at their schools are qualified to do so and don't present a danger to them.

At the same time, I think it is important that we recognize that when we put barriers to employment that are lifetime bans, that are not sensitive to certain realities as relates to people overcoming criminal backgrounds, and when we put prophylactic rules that don't account for particular offenses in a nuanced way, we do run the risk of doing a good thing, but doing too much of a thing, and thereby leading to some unexpected and unwanted results.

I have had the privilege of talking to Ranking Member MILLER about some concerns I have about the bill before us today. I think that the concerns are well within Mr. MILLER's frame of mind, and he and I have talked and he has indicated to me that he is willing to work with me to refine the bill to the degree that we can ensure the protection and safety of our children in school, but at the same time make sure that we don't set up precedents that create unwarranted and unnecessary barriers to employment.

At this time I don't think I need to go into the details of each of those. Suffice it to say that if the gentleman would agree that we did talk and we are going to work together on refining the bill as best we can, I would appreciate that.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I would say that I spoke to you this morning, and we will obviously continue to work with you. We have tried to draw the line at serious felony violent crimes that people have participated in with respect to the ban. In terms of drug arrests or whatever, there is a 5-year window that we have

started, and we will be glad to continue that conversation.

Mr. ELLISON. Thank you very much.

I also just want to point out that we have talked about inaccurate information, and it is important that we make sure that the records that we are using are the right records and accurate records.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. If the gentleman will continue to yield, that is why an appeals process is included in this legislation.

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Today's debate has only underscored again the importance of moving forward with this sensible and responsible legislation. Not only will the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act ensure all school employees undergo a complete background check; it will also help States implement policies and practices that prohibit the hiring of anyone who refuses to consent to a background check, makes a false statement in connection with the check, or has been convicted of a violent or sexual crime against a child.

There is absolutely no reason we shouldn't all stand united in support of this critical legislation. So once again, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2083.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, in 2010, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that some school districts had unknowingly hired sex offenders due to inconsistent state laws that do not require comprehensive background checks for all adults who have contact with children in schools. In other cases, the GAO found that districts knowingly passed a potential predator to another school district by allowing the offender to resign instead of reporting him. Significant differences in the ways schools screen prospective employees lead to gaps in student protection. A child's safety should not depend on where that child resides.

The 2010 GAO report investigated a number of cases across the country, including one in my home state of New York. In this case, a public school employed a maintenance worker for five months until the results of a criminal history check conducted after he had already reported to work revealed that he had been convicted of raping a 21-year-old woman at knifepoint behind a school.

In 1982, the offender had been sentenced to 12 to 25 years in prison and classified as a level 3 sex offender, meaning that the offender is at high risk for repeat offenses and is a threat to public safety. In 2008, the school hired him "conditionally," meaning he was allowed to report to work prior to the completion of a state criminal history check. School officials told GAO investigators they do not always perform these checks prior to employ-

ment because they considered the process both cost and time prohibitive.

The school fired the offender in November 2008 when the state criminal history check was completed; within two years he was incarcerated for failure to comply with sex offender registration requirements. The Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act would have prevented this potentially disastrous hiring from ever taking place thanks to its prohibition of hiring or retaining anyone who has been convicted of certain violent crimes, including crimes against children, crimes involving rape or sexual assault and child pornography.

In many of the cases GAO investigated, previously convicted sex offenders working in schools eventually used their access to children in school to once again commit crimes against children. Although the New York maintenance worker was terminated after five months and did not abuse children in the school during that time, there is no acceptable amount of time for our children to be exposed to such horrific risk.

Children have the right to a safe school environment where they can learn and thrive. There is so much more that this body must do to ensure this right—most importantly the enactment of legislation to prevent gun violence—but passage of the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act is a necessary step towards securing students' safety in school.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus and a proud co-sponsor of the legislation, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2083, the "Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act."

I support this legislation because it is a focused and targeted measure which ensures student safety in public schools against violent adults by implementing full background checks.

A deficiency in background checks for screening prospective employees poses a threat to the safety of children in schools.

Inconsistent state laws and regulations that do not require comprehensive background checks for all adults who have contact with children in schools has led to some districts unknowingly hiring offenders.

This is unacceptable. As a nation, we owe it to our kids and to ourselves to prevent our children from being exposed to an unsafe learning environment.

This legislation directly affects the communities I represent as 21% of all paroled sex offenders in Texas reside in Harris County. Failure to screen those we permit to interact with our children in schools allows violent or sexual predators the opportunity to abuse our children.

We have a responsibility to protect children and ensure them a safe, healthy learning environment.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2083 seeks to reduce the inconsistencies in state laws and regulations by requiring comprehensive background checks for all adults who have contact with children in schools.

The bill makes clear that best practices for reducing the prevalence of sexual and violent

predators must include prohibiting public schools from hiring or retaining anyone who has been convicted of certain violent crimes.

Additionally, the bill requires periodic updating of background checks for all current employees, and ensuring that schools report to local law enforcement when offenders apply for a position.

Approximately 1.8 million adolescents in the United States have been victims of sexual assault. Risks posed by predators on campus put children at risk and are barriers to their academic and social growth and development.

Students have a right to feel safe, and parents have a right to expect that the individuals they entrust their children with will protect them from physical harm.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas, which I am proud to represent, understand the value and importance of a safe environment for students to learn and grow.

So do I. That is why I strongly support H.R. 2083. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

[From the Huffington Post, June 3, 2013]

KELLY ANN GARCIA ALLEGEDLY HAD SEX, WENT TO SEX SHOP WITH STUDENT SHE CLAIMED TO BE MENTORING

(By Steven Hoffer)

An English teacher in Texas is accused of having sex with a pupil she claimed to be mentoring.

Kelly Ann Garcia, 29, appeared in court on Thursday to face charges surrounding her alleged sexual relationship with a 16-year-old Hastings High School student, KHOU reports.

Police say Garcia would meet the victim after school dismissal, despite not being her assigned teacher.

On March 21, Garcia allegedly took the victim to Starbucks and revealed an erotic dream she had about her. One week later, the Houston-area teacher texted the teen to say that she had broken up with her boyfriend. The following day, the pair met and "kissed passionately," according to the New York Daily News.

The intimacy of the alleged relationship escalated over the following weeks. On one day, authorities say Garcia took the student to a sex shop.

"The allegation is that they did in fact drive to a store and purchase a sex toy and drive back to the defendant's apartment where they engaged in sex," said prosecutor Markay Stroud, according to KHOU.

The student bragged to classmates about her alleged sexual encounters, which led another student to notify school administrators, according to reports.

"She seemed nice at the time. She said she wanted to mentor my daughter, and I took her for her word. Now I'm just not as trusting in people," the teen's mother told KHOU last week.

Garcia is charged with sex assault of a child and indecency with a child, according to CBS Houston.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2083, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require State educational agencies that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to have in effect policies and procedures on background checks for school employees."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1730

PROMOTING ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP FOR CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE ACT

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3205) to reauthorize and restructure the adoption incentives grant program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3205

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—ADOPTION INCENTIVES GRANT PROGRAM

Sec. 101. Extension of program through fiscal year 2016.

Sec. 102. Improvements to award structure.

Sec. 103. Renaming of program.

Sec. 104. Limitation on use of incentive payments.

Sec. 105. Increase in period for which incentive payments are available for expenditure.

Sec. 106. State report on calculation and use of savings resulting from the phase-out of eligibility requirements for adoption assistance; requirement to spend 20 percent of savings on post-adoption services.

Sec. 107. Preservation of eligibility for kinship guardianship assistance payments with a successor guardian.

Sec. 108. Effective dates.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF FAMILY CONNECTION GRANT PROGRAM

Sec. 201. Extension of family connection grant program.

TITLE III—UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Sec. 301. Improving the collection of unemployment insurance overpayments through tax refund offset.

TITLE I—ADOPTION INCENTIVES GRANT PROGRAM

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF PROGRAM THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2016.

Section 473A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(5), by striking "2008 through 2012" and inserting "2013 through 2015"; and

(2) in each of paragraphs (1)(D) and (2) of subsection (h), by striking "2013" and inserting "2016".

SEC. 102. IMPROVEMENTS TO AWARD STRUCTURE.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARD.—Section 473A(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively.

(b) DATA REQUIREMENTS.—Section 473A(c)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking "NUMBERS OF ADOPTIONS" and inserting "RATES OF ADOPTIONS AND GUARDIANSHIPS"; and

(2) by striking "the numbers" and all that follows through "section," and inserting "each of the rates required to be determined under this section with respect to a State and a fiscal year,".

(c) AWARD AMOUNT.—Section 473A(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "paragraphs (2) and (3)" and inserting "paragraph (2)"; and

(B) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (C) and inserting the following:

"(A) \$2,000, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

"(i) the number of foster child adoptions in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

"(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

"(I) the base rate of foster child adoptions for the State for the fiscal year; and

"(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year;

"(B) \$4,000, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

"(i) the number of pre-adolescent child adoptions in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

"(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

"(I) the base rate of pre-adolescent child adoptions for the State for the fiscal year; and

"(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year who have attained 9 years of age but not 14 years of age; and

"(C) \$8,000, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

"(i) the number of older child adoptions in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

"(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

"(I) the base rate of older child adoptions for the State for the fiscal year; and

"(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year who have attained 14 years of age; and

"(D) \$1,000, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

"(i) the number of foster child guardianships in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

"(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

"(I) the base rate of foster child guardianships for the State for the fiscal year; and

"(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year.";

(2) by striking paragraph (3).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—Section 473A(g) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(g)) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (8) and inserting the following:

"(1) FOSTER CHILD ADOPTION RATE.—The term 'foster child adoption rate' means, with

respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

"(A) the number of foster child adoptions finalized in the State during the fiscal year; by

"(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year.

"(2) BASE RATE OF FOSTER CHILD ADOPTIONS.—The term 'base rate of foster child adoptions' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

"(A) the foster child adoption rate for the State for fiscal year 2007; or

"(B) the foster child adoption rate for the State for the then preceding fiscal year.

"(3) FOSTER CHILD ADOPTION.—The term 'foster child adoption' means the final adoption of a child who, at the time of adoptive placement, was in foster care under the supervision of the State.

"(4) PRE-ADOLESCENT CHILD ADOPTION RATE.—The term 'pre-adolescent child adoption rate' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

"(A) the number of pre-adolescent child adoptions finalized in the State during the fiscal year; by

"(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year, who have attained 9 years of age but not 14 years of age.

"(5) BASE RATE OF PRE-ADOLESCENT CHILD ADOPTIONS.—The term 'base rate of pre-adolescent child adoptions' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

"(A) the pre-adolescent child adoption rate for the State for fiscal year 2007; or

"(B) the pre-adolescent child adoption rate for the State for the then preceding fiscal year.

"(6) PRE-ADOLESCENT CHILD ADOPTION.—The term 'pre-adolescent child adoption' means the final adoption of a child who has attained 9 years of age but not 14 years of age if—

"(A) at the time of the adoptive placement, the child was in foster care under the supervision of the State; or

"(B) an adoption assistance agreement was in effect under section 473 with respect to the child.

"(7) OLDER CHILD ADOPTION RATE.—The term 'older child adoption rate' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

"(A) the number of older child adoptions finalized in the State during the fiscal year; by

"(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year, who have attained 14 years of age.

"(8) BASE RATE OF OLDER CHILD ADOPTIONS.—The term 'base rate of older child adoptions' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

"(A) the older child adoption rate for the State for fiscal year 2007; or

"(B) the older child adoption rate for the State for the then preceding fiscal year.

"(9) OLDER CHILD ADOPTION.—The term 'older child adoption' means the final adoption of a child who has attained 14 years of age if—

"(A) at the time of the adoptive placement, the child was in foster care under the supervision of the State; or

"(B) an adoption assistance agreement was in effect under section 473 with respect to the child.

"(10) FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP RATE.—The term 'foster child guardianship rate'

means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

“(A) the number of foster child guardianships occurring in the State during the fiscal year; by

“(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year.

“(11) **BASE RATE OF FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIPS.**—The term ‘base rate of foster child guardianships’ means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

“(A) the foster child guardianship rate for the State for fiscal year 2007; or

“(B) the foster child guardianship rate for the State for the then preceding fiscal year.

“(12) **FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP.**—The term ‘foster child guardianship’ means, with respect to a State, the exit of a child from foster care under the responsibility of the State to live with a legal guardian, if the State has reported to the Secretary—

“(A) that the State agency has determined that—

“(i) the child has been removed from his or her home pursuant to a voluntary placement agreement or as a result of a judicial determination to the effect that continuation in the home would be contrary to the welfare of the child;

“(ii) being returned home or adopted are not appropriate permanency options for the child;

“(iii) the child demonstrates a strong attachment to the prospective legal guardian, and the prospective legal guardian has a strong commitment to caring permanently for the child; and

“(iv) if the child has attained 14 years of age, the child has been consulted regarding the legal guardianship arrangement; or

“(B) the alternative procedures used by the State to determine that legal guardianship is the appropriate option for the child.”.

SEC. 103. RENAMING OF PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The section heading of section 473A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 473A. ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Section 473A of such Act is amended in each of subsections (a), (d)(1), (d)(2)(A), and (d)(2)(B) (42 U.S.C. 673b(a), (d)(1), (d)(2)(A), and (d)(2)(B)) by inserting “and legal guardianship” after “adoption” each place it appears.

(2) The heading of section 473A(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(d)) is amended by inserting “AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP” after “ADOPTION”.

SEC. 104. LIMITATION ON USE OF INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.

Section 473A(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(f)) is amended in the 1st sentence by inserting “, and shall use the amount to supplement, and not supplant, any Federal or non-Federal funds used to provide any service under part B or E” before the period.

SEC. 105. INCREASE IN PERIOD FOR WHICH INCENTIVE PAYMENTS ARE AVAILABLE FOR EXPENDITURE.

Section 473A(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(e)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “24-MONTH” and inserting “36-MONTH”; and

(2) by striking “24-month” and inserting “36-month”.

SEC. 106. STATE REPORT ON CALCULATION AND USE OF SAVINGS RESULTING FROM THE PHASE-OUT OF ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR ADOPTION ASSISTANCE; REQUIREMENT TO SPEND 20 PERCENT OF SAVINGS ON POST-ADOPTION SERVICES.

Section 473(a)(8) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673(a)(8)) is amended to read as follows:

“(8)(A) A State shall calculate the savings (if any) resulting from the application of paragraph (2)(A)(ii) to all applicable children for a fiscal year, using a methodology specified by the Secretary or an alternate methodology proposed by the State and approved by the Secretary.

“(B) A State shall annually report to the Secretary—

“(i) the methodology used to make the calculation described in subparagraph (A), without regard to whether any savings are found;

“(ii) the amount of any savings referred to in subparagraph (A); and

“(iii) how any such savings are spent, accounting for and reporting the spending separately from any other spending reported to the Secretary under part B or E.

“(C) The Secretary shall make all information reported pursuant to subparagraph (B) available on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services in a location easily accessible to the public.

“(D) A State shall spend an amount equal to the amount of the savings (if any) in State expenditures under this part resulting from the application of paragraph (2)(A)(ii) to all applicable children for a fiscal year, to provide to children of families any service that may be provided under this part or part B, and shall spend not less than 20 percent of any such savings on post-adoption services. Any such spending shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, any Federal or non-Federal funds used to provide any service under part B or E.”.

SEC. 107. PRESERVATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR KINSHIP GUARDIANSHIP ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS WITH A SUCCESSOR GUARDIAN.

Section 473(d)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673(d)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **ELIGIBILITY NOT AFFECTED BY REPLACEMENT OF GUARDIAN WITH A SUCCESSOR GUARDIAN.**—In the event of the death or incapacity of the relative guardian, the eligibility of a child for a kinship guardianship assistance payment under this subsection shall not be affected by reason of the replacement of the relative guardian with a successor legal guardian named in the kinship guardianship assistance agreement referred to in paragraph (1) (including in any amendment to the agreement), notwithstanding subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and section 471(a)(28).”.

SEC. 108. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

(b) **RESTRUCTURING AND RENAMING OF PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendments made by sections 102 and 103 shall take effect on October 1, 2014, subject to paragraph (2).

(2) **TRANSITION RULE.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total amount payable to a State under section 473A of the Social Security Act for fiscal year 2014 shall be an amount equal to ½ of the sum of—

(A) the total amount that would be payable to the State under such section for fiscal year 2014 if the amendments made by section 102 of this Act had not taken effect; and

(B) the total amount that would be payable to the State under such section for fiscal year 2014 in the absence of this paragraph.

(c) **PRESERVATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR KINSHIP GUARDIANSHIP ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS WITH A SUCCESSOR GUARDIAN.**—The amendment made by section 107 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF FAMILY CONNECTION GRANT PROGRAM

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF FAMILY CONNECTION GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 427(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 627(h)) is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2016”.

TITLE III—UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

SEC. 301. IMPROVING THE COLLECTION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE OVERPAYMENTS THROUGH TAX REFUND OFFSET.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 303 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 503) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) In the case of a covered unemployment compensation debt (as defined under section 6402(f)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that remains uncollected as of the date that is 2 years after the date when such debt was first incurred, the State to which such debt is owed shall take action to recover such debt under section 6402(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to urge support for H.R. 3205, the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act.

Obviously, I look old enough to be a grandfather, and I am a proud grandfather of six. Two of my grandchildren are adopted grandchildren. I was a foster grandfather. My daughter and her husband were foster parents for a while, and they ended up finding two children that they really wanted to include as part of their family.

These two children today are 9 and 10, and soon to be 10 and 11 here in the next few months. They were 3 months old when they came into the house as foster kids and now are adopted and a part of not only my daughter and her husband's family, but a part of the entire family. The Reichert household has been blessed with their presence,

and they have a hope for a successful future with a loving family. This is what this bill is all about, to encourage parents across this country to adopt foster children.

I also had the opportunity, as the sheriff in King County and as a detective in King County, to watch from a very close view of what foster homes looked like. As I walked into those homes as a police officer and as a detective, I questioned how some of these places could even be foster homes. There were foster kids running away from home and ending up on the street and not having a place to call their own, not having a place where they could go to have Thanksgiving, to have Christmas, bouncing from one foster home to the next, not knowing who to call Mom or Dad. We have got to fix that. We need to encourage parents across this country to adopt our foster children, to give them that opportunity.

The other good thing about this bill is it is bipartisan. In fact, I can't think of a more important or more bipartisan topic than promoting adoption for our children. That is why we are here today. This is an area where both parties have worked together to improve outcomes for children, and it has been working.

In the 10 years from 1987 through 1997, the number of children in foster care rose dramatically, climbing from 300,000 to 537,000. That surge in foster care caseloads is one of the reasons Congress, led by current Ways and Means Chairman DAVE CAMP, passed the Adoption and Safe Families Act in 1997. That law was designed to ensure more foster children were quickly adopted when they couldn't return and live safely with their parents.

The Adoption Incentives program, created as a part of that law, was one key measure to encourage more adoptions of children from foster care. In short, it rewards States if they increase the number of children living in foster care for adoptive homes. It worked. Since the passage of the Adoption and Safe Families Act, foster care caseloads have fallen dramatically. After peaking at 567,000 in 1999, foster care caseloads have fallen almost 30 percent. At the same time, adoptions from foster care increased in the late nineties and remained much higher than before the 1997 law's passage.

Today, we are here to support H.R. 3205, the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care, which will build upon the successes of the Adoption Incentives program. This legislation extends that program and improves the way we reward States that help more children leave foster care for loving, adoptive homes.

First, it improves the formulas behind these awards to make sure that even as foster care caseloads continue

to come down, States continue to get awards for moving children into adoptive homes.

Second, it continues to promote the type of adoptions that have proven hardest to achieve by adding a special award for the adoption of teenage children. We should never give up on trying to find lifelong homes for these children, and this legislation steps up the incentives for States to do just that.

Third, we add a new award for guardianship, which is an important development in the child welfare world that is allowing thousands of children to leave foster care and live safely with relatives. This bill also requires States to focus funds on post-adoption services, which help children and families after adoptions have been finalized.

Finally, the bill would extend for 3 years the Family Connection Grant program that is focused on helping children in foster care reconnect with family members. Because funding for that program needs to be offset, we included a commonsense pay-for, which builds on a current procedure for recovering overpayments of unemployment insurance benefits. Under current law, States may offset Federal income tax refunds to collect these overpayments, and two-thirds of States do that today. This legislation would require all States to use this procedure, which will increase overpayment recovery and results in this legislation reducing the deficit by \$24 million over the next 10 years.

As chairman of the Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee with jurisdiction over this program, I am pleased to report that the process behind developing this bill has been totally bipartisan and open. First, we held a subcommittee hearing in February featuring nonpartisan experts on adoption and child welfare. We then worked together with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to develop draft legislation, which was made publicly available in early August. We then worked together to incorporate that public feedback, improving in many ways the legislation that Chairman CAMP and I and Ranking Members LEVIN and DOGGETT introduced on September 27.

I want to thank the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. DOGGETT, who joins me on the floor this evening, as well as Chairman CAMP and Ranking Member LEVIN, for their support of this legislation and for their help throughout this development. This will move us a step forward and closer to ensuring that more children living in the United States live in permanent, loving homes, and receive the support they deserve.

I invite all Members to join us in supporting this important bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Thank you, Chairman REICHERT and Chairman CAMP.

Mr. Speaker, abused and neglected children in the foster care system are among the most vulnerable children in our communities. These children have the same needs, desires, and dreams as all young people. They need a safe and loving home. They want and deserve the opportunity to learn, to grow, and to fully experience life. A successful adoption provides foster children with these necessities and gives them the opportunity to achieve their full God-given potential.

Investing in the success of our foster children is not only good for them; but in so many communities, it is the difference between those young people becoming a community asset and a community liability. It is about reducing future unemployment, homelessness, teen pregnancy, and incarceration.

This bill contributes to our continuing efforts to address these issues and to provide permanent homes for abused and neglected children. I am pleased that Mr. LEVIN and I could work with Chairman CAMP and Chairman REICHERT to develop this bipartisan legislation to not only extend some important programs, but to make a number of positive changes. Mr. REICHERT has outlined some of these. I would add attention to a provision that I authored to help ensure that children don't lose assistance simply because their guardian dies.

As a longtime member of the Congressional Coalition of Adoption and a member of the Foster Youth Caucus, I am pleased that we could take these steps in the right direction on a bipartisan basis to help these young people. The legislation both continues and improves the incentives now provided to the States when they increase the rate at which foster children, who cannot return home, find an adoptive family. These new incentives will now be even more focused on the promotion of adoption of older foster children, who are sometimes a bit more difficult to place and who have found difficulty in securing a permanent home.

Additionally, for the first time, the bill will reward States for helping youth leave foster care to live with a permanent legal guardian. Recognizing the importance of maintaining the link between family and children in foster care, the legislation also extends a relatively new, but expiring, program known as the Family Connection Grants. These grants go out on a competitive basis to local organizations and State agencies to support various approaches for improving connections between foster families and their children, including linking grandparents to supports and services when they become the primary caregivers for children who would otherwise be in foster care.

Another provision that I care about greatly is strengthening of the requirement that adoption funding be spent on promoting adoption rather than being diverted to other purposes. Most notably, this legislation requires States to fully reinvest the funds into post-adoption services and other child welfare activities when these amounts were made available by an increase in Federal funding for adoption support.

In total, this legislation will continue the progress we have made over the last 15 years in moving foster children into permanent homes. In my home State of Texas, San Antonio has been viewed as a particular model of success for adoption. Each month, Bexar County hosts an adoption day event that allows families to complete their adoptions in a single day. These are proceedings that have allowed children to have shorter stays in foster care and to move more quickly into stable homes. Judges in Bexar County understand that they are responsible for getting children who experience abuse and neglect into a safe foster environment and are responsible for placing that child with a permanent family if it does not become safe for the child to return home.

These improvements in the local adoption system have been encouraged and utilized by important local child advocates like District Judge Peter Sakai and CASA San Antonio. They have allowed for faster and more efficient placement of foster youth into permanent families.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this bipartisan effort, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee for yielding and for his leadership on this very important issue.

I rise in support of this legislation, which is designed to encourage the adoption of more children from foster care.

I spent much of my career promoting adoption of children by loving parents because every child deserves a loving and safe home. As an attorney in private practice, I worked with parents and children in the foster care system. Those sorts of experiences provided much of the background for changes in landmark adoption legislation I and my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee crafted in 1997 called the Adoption and Safe Families Act. That legislation streamlined the adoption process to help more children in foster care quickly move into permanent adoptive homes. It also for the first time offered incentives to States to

safely increase the number of children adopted from foster care.

It worked. In the decade following that legislation, the number of U.S. children adopted from foster care increased by 71 percent. In the years since, adoptions have continued to remain higher even as the foster care caseload started to decline.

□ 1745

Overall, almost 300 children have been adopted as a result of the increases in adoptions since 1997. One study even estimated that the Federal Government saved \$1 billion over 8 years by ensuring children were adopted instead of remaining in foster care.

That is the successful incentive program this legislation extends and updates. We add a new award for States that increase adoptions of older children, who are the hardest to adopt and have the worst outcomes if they “emancipate” from foster care without a family to call their own. We also add a new award for increases in guardianship, when family members step up to care for their nieces and nephews, grandsons and granddaughters. And this bill ensures States maintain their commitment to post-adoption and related services so that children may truly have a family forever.

I note that this legislation is fully paid for by a simple and real reform requiring States to reduce Federal income tax refunds when someone wrongly gets an overpayment for unemployment benefits. Those savings not only cover the cost of this legislation, but reduce the deficit by \$24 million over the next 10 years. That is a win-win for children, for families, and for taxpayers alike.

The bottom line is this: children in foster care deserve a place to call home, not just for a few months or years, but for good. We have already seen great progress in increasing adoptions since the Adoption Incentives program was created in 1997, and it is our hope that we can continue this progress with this bill.

I thank my colleagues who joined me in introducing this legislation: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. REICHERT of Washington State, and Mr. DOGGETT of Texas. They are all leaders on this issue in the committee and this House, and I value their help in developing and advancing this legislation.

I would also like to recognize the public comment we received in crafting this bill. A draft bill was posted on the Ways and Means Committee Web site in August, and the public was given a month to provide their thoughts on how to ensure more children are adopted. The bill we are considering today incorporates many of those suggestions, and we are grateful for the public's comments and their participation in this process.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join us in supporting this bill in the

House, and I hope the Senate will act as soon as they can so we can continue to move even more children from foster care into permanent, loving homes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, surely no Member of the House has expressed more interest in this subject than the founder of the Foster Youth Caucus, our colleague from California (Ms. BASS), to whom I yield 3 minutes.

Ms. BASS. Thank you, Ranking Member DOGGETT.

I rise today in support of the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act.

First, I would like to commend Chairman CAMP and Chairman REICHERT and Ranking Members LEVIN and DOGGETT for their great work on this legislation and their ongoing commitment to our Nation's foster youth. As the cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth and the Congressional Caucus on Adoption, I sincerely appreciate your leadership and partnership on this issue.

Since 1997, when the Adoption Incentives legislation became law, we have seen a significant reduction of the number of kids in foster care and, more importantly, an increased number of kids in forever families; yet there are still over 400,000 children in our Nation's child welfare system, many awaiting the stability and love of a permanent family.

Unfortunately, studies show that foster youth, especially those who “age out,” are much more likely to experience poverty, unemployment, homelessness, incarceration, and compromised health after they leave foster care. Each year, nearly 30,000 teenagers age out of foster care without a permanent family. We know that this is unfair and unacceptable. We must strengthen policies that help to find forever families for our Nation's foster children, especially our older youth.

I would like to focus my remarks on one of the noteworthy aspects of the bill—the enhanced support for legal guardianship. By making this investment, we will ultimately help more kids find permanent families, often with relatives.

Today's foster care system looks much different than the child welfare system of previous decades. While children continue to be placed in foster homes with strangers or in group homes, more than half are placed with a relative caregiver, a grandmother, aunt, uncle, or older sibling. In fact, in my district in Los Angeles, relative caregivers are the largest foster care providers. Research shows that foster placement with relatives is good for children. They often allow children to stay in their schools, receive continued support from their community and culture, and feel connected to families that continue to love them.

Despite the importance of relative caregivers, they face unique obstacles.

Becoming a caregiver changes lives in every way—physically, emotionally, and financially. Stable middle class families or seniors who live on their life savings are often pushed to the brink of poverty because they have accepted the unexpected financial burden of caring for a child. As a Nation, we should take the extra steps needed to support family members that heroically step up to care for children in times of need.

Additionally, I strongly support the Family Connection Grants reauthorized in this bill. These grants help to strengthen families, support kinship care, and prevent youth from entering or reentering foster care.

Before my time in elected office, I was honored to advocate for kinship and guardianship resources alongside relative caregivers at the Community Coalition's Kinship in Action program. Today, I am greatly encouraged that the bill before us encourages permanent families of all kinds, supporting both adoption and guardianship throughout the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, nearly 3,000 Hoosier children are currently eligible for adoption while living in foster care. Now, I know all of us can agree that these children and the over 100,000 children in the United States eligible for adoption deserve a stable, permanent, and loving home. While there is no doubt our foster care programs provide an essential service, I strongly believe, as a proud father of four young children and as someone who used to provide free legal services to those wanting to adopt, that there can be no substitute for the care a loving family can provide.

Whether it is living with a family member or being adopted into a new family, we must do everything in our powers to see that children everywhere receive the best upbringing possible. This legislation represents a step forward in finding these children caring and supportive homes. By extending the Adoption Incentives program, we effectively encourage and incentivize States to help adopt more children out of foster care so these children can lead happy, healthy, and successful lives.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the managers of this bill, the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Texas, my colleague from, we would say on the floor, the great State of Texas.

This is a very important measure that I have had an opportunity to engage in. A couple of years back—I

would say more years than I would like to remember—former Congressman Mike Andrews and myself were co-chairs of the Foster Grandparents Program in Houston, and it drew me to the importance of both foster care and adoption.

I have also spent some time with Senator MARY LANDRIEU, who, as many know, is a very strong advocate of the idea of adoption and legal guardianship for children in foster care.

One of the new phenomenons that we are seeing more and more is the phenomenon of aging out for foster care children; and so I rise today to support H.R. 3205 and compliment the co-chairs of the Foster Care Caucus, of which I am a member, Congresswoman BASS and cochair MARINO, and really ask my colleagues to support this important initiative. I am very proud to cosponsor this legislation; and as a cochair and founder of the Congressional Children's Caucus, now almost 20 years, I would like to say I strongly support it.

The more times that we can say something positive about children in a bipartisan way on the floor of the House, the more of a national statement and commitment is seen by those who are in the various venues in our States and county government and city government who work every day to protect our children. Foster care serves our children and families in a temporary placement by providing suitable, permanent living. Most children are placed in foster care temporarily due to parental abuse and neglect.

In Harris County, my county in Texas, 2,388 children were taken into protective custody in 2011. The average number of children in foster care each month in Harris County is 5,300. 2,440 children in Child Protective Service custody were placed in permanent living in Harris County in 2011.

This is the right direction to go. As of September 30, 2012, 1,740 children in the Houston region are still waiting to be adopted; and, on average, children stay in the system for almost 3 years before either being reunited with their families or adopted.

What a wonderful statement to know that there are families or adults that love you. Many times, those adoptions are amongst family members. Many times, the grandparents take the children. Let's thank them, because that was the program I was involved in, to give R and R, rest, to the grandparents who foster care for many, many children.

Frequent moves, different schools, our children need loving care. They need stability. Many times these foster parents provide that kind of stability. Many foster children have been separated not only from their parents, but from their siblings, and this can be very detrimental socially, emotionally, and psychologically.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. So this legislation, which reauthorizes and restructures the Adoption Incentives Grant Program, will help enhance, cultivate, and advance the foster care system by making it a program that is beneficial.

Mr. Speaker, I was not able to come to the floor for H.R. 2083. I also, as a cochair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, focusing on the abuse of children, want to salute and support the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act and ask this floor to support both of these initiatives, because when we speak for children, we speak for America.

I hope that we will also see, soon, antibullying and prevention legislation on the floor, Mr. Speaker, to make that public statement.

I thank the gentleman for his yielding, and I want to salute Little Audrey's in Houston for the work they have done for the children in Houston, Texas. Thank you, Alma, very much for the work you have done.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Adoption and Foster Care Caucuses and as Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3205, the "Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act."

I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this bill because it promotes adoption, protects children and provides grant funding for the foster care system.

Foster care serves our children and families as a temporary placement until a suitable permanent living arrangement is made that best fits the child.

Most children are placed in foster care temporarily due to parental abuse or neglect. In Harris County, 2,388 children were taken into protective custody in 2011. The average number of children in foster care each month in Harris County is 5,300.

In addition, 2,440 children in Children's Protective Service (CPS) custody were placed in a permanent living arrangement in Harris County in 2011. With court approval, 28.3 percent of the children were returned to their own families, 26.5 percent were placed with relatives, and 34.4 percent were placed in adoptive homes.

As of September 31, 2012, 1,740 children in the Houston Region are still waiting to be adopted (1,503 in Harris County).

On average, children stay in the system for almost three years before either being reunited with their families or adopted. Children have on average three different foster care placements.

Frequent moves in and out of the homes of strangers can be profoundly unsettling and quite difficult for children, and it is not uncommon to hear of children who have been in 20 or 30 different homes during their time in foster care.

Many foster children have been separated not only from their parents, but from their siblings, which can be very detrimental to a child socially, emotionally and psychologically.

Many children in foster care unfortunately have to undergo multiple placement changes

several times while in foster care due to a wide range of factors such as licensing standards violations, court rulings, behavioral issues, or changes in the foster home or facility.

In my home city of Houston, CPS does a remarkable job increase in providing placement options that will better match the needs of each individual child that goes through the foster care system.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3205 reauthorizes and restructures the adoption incentives grant program. These grant funds will help enhance, cultivate, and advance the foster care system by making it a program that is beneficial while effectively serving children. These resources will give children in foster care the opportunity to flourish in whatever living placement they are given.

Adoption is more than just a legal process, it is an emotional, social and psychological process in which children who have been removed from their biological parents become full and permanent legal members of another family. Adoption has many facets and touches people in different ways.

This bill promotes adoption and will help ensure that people who are willing and able to serve will have the necessary information and means to become legal guardians of foster children in need of placement.

Mr. Speaker, children are our hope for a better tomorrow, but it is up to us to promote adoption so that children may have legal guardians who will properly care for them and help them know the joy and security that comes with being a member of a loving family.

For these reasons, I strongly support H.R. 3205. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, hopefully the Senate will respond to our strong show of bipartisan support by moving this legislation this year.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD letters of support for this legislation from Christian Heritage, Center for Family Finding and Youth Connectedness, Seneca Family of Agencies, The Donaldson Adoption Institute, Hillside Family of Agencies, and Voice for Adoption.

I want to echo the words of Mr. DOGGETT. I hope the Senate does act on this.

There are three things that I would like to just highlight as we wrap up this evening's discussion on foster care, three things that this bill does: one, it cuts the deficit; two, amazingly, in this time of partisanship, this is a true bipartisan moment that we all ought to stop, pause, and take recognition of.

This is about children. It cuts the deficit, and this is one that we can all come together and support. Why? Because it is for our kids. It is for the kids across America who need a home.

I mentioned two of my grandchildren who are foster children, were foster children, are now adopted, but they

were even more special. They were drug-addicted babies, crack cocaine, heroin, and meth, and these kids today have a home.

As a grandparent, standing on the sidelines of a soccer game watching Emma and Briar play soccer, knowing where they came from, the moms lived on the streets, drug-addicted moms, these kids have hope. They have a future. When the game is over, they run to the sidelines and they yell, "Papa." It is the greatest feeling in the world.

We owe that kind of life to every foster child.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CHRISTIAN HERITAGE,
September 30, 2013.

Chairman DAVE CAMP,
House of Representatives,
Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: I am writing in support of the Fostering Connections Grants that support Family Finding research and the Adoptions Incentives program.

Kevin Campbell, founder of Family Finding; the State of Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services; and Christian Heritage, a nonprofit, faith-based organization, have been working together in a collaborative effort to find permanency for children who have been languishing in Nebraska's foster care system.

The principles of Family Finding are: 1. Every child has a family and they CAN be found; 2. Loneliness can be devastating, even dangerous, and is experienced by most children; 3. A meaningful connection to family helps a child develop a sense of belonging; and 4. The single factor most closely associated with positive outcomes for children is meaningful, lifelong connections to family.

Mr. Campbell began working with the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services and Christian Heritage in April of this year. We have already learned the following: 1. Families for Nebraska's children in foster care are larger than we had initially believed. 2. More family members are willing to offer relationships of support than previously believed. 3. More fathers are willing to come forward and offer support to their children than originally anticipated, and 4. Family members have been willing to make offers of legal permanency EVEN for youth with the most complex needs.

How effective are the Family Finding services in Nebraska? To date, 100 percent of the children whose cases have completed Phase Three (of six phases) now have a Lifetime Network of Unconditional Support consisting of five or more family members, and 82 percent of the children who have completed Phase Three have at least one person identified who is willing to provide permanency. This program is tremendously successful and we urge your support of continued funding for the Fostering Connections grants

Respectfully yours,

GREGG NICKLAS,
Co-CEO.

FAMILY FINDING,
Oakland, CA, September 30, 2013.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OFFICE,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVE CAMP AND HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: I am writing to lend my support to the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guard-

ianship for Children in Foster Care Act, which would reauthorize the existing program as well as provide more resources and flexibility for states working toward improved permanency for children in the foster care system.

As I outlined in my recommendations to the United States Senate Committee on Finance in April, the Adoption Incentive Grants and other fiscal rewards have clearly increased the number of adoptions from and reduced the number of children in foster care. This suggests that incentives made available to states that reward results have significant impact. A focus on adoption rates will incentivize states to work toward adoptions and legal guardianships in an environment of declining foster care caseloads.

Extending the Family Connection Grants is also a critical component of the Act. Family Connections Grants are currently supporting the development of innovative practice models which incorporate Family Finding with trauma-informed practices—models that attend to grief and the multiple losses that children experience by entering and remaining in care, and other key family involvement strategies such as Family Group Decision Making and Safety Organized Practice—to better serve children in foster care. These investments serve as incubators which promote innovation and are necessary to advance practice, as current funding does not allow for or support such experiments. As Brian Samuels, Commissioner of the Administration on Children, Youth and Families, stated, two of the primary keys to attaining safety, permanence and well-being for children and youth in foster care are the promotion of healthy relationships and the prioritization of kinship care. The Family Finding approach squarely targets and successfully achieves these goals.

In my work across the county providing training, consultation, and technical assistance to local child welfare agencies, statewide child welfare entities, and private, nonprofit organizations, I am convinced that there is urgent need to continue to invest in innovations in practice that respond to the continued growth in the presence of older adolescents in the out-of-home care system as well as the increase in the number of youth aging out of care. Significant progress in learning has come about through the original discretionary grants. This is not the time to stop our efforts on behalf of these youth and families.

Thank you for considering reauthorizing the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act. Every day that a child is in care is a crisis for that child, and legislative efforts that work toward reducing length of time in care, improving adoption and legal guardianship rates, and connecting children and youth to family members are of utmost importance.

Sincerely,

KEVIN A. CAMPBELL,
Founder, Center for Family
Finding and Youth Permanency.

SENECA,
Oakland, CA, September 30, 2013.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OFFICE,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVE CAMP AND HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: I am pleased to provide this letter in support of the Promoting Adoption and Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act. We believe this bill is an important step in continuing progress toward ensuring

every child grows up with a committed and loving family and we value the leadership the Committee has shown in pursuing this goal.

Seneca Family of Agencies was founded in 1985 with a dedication to providing unconditional care to the most struggling youth served by California's child welfare system. Recognizing that far too many youth with significant mental health challenges were growing up in institutional settings lacking any connection to their family and communities, Seneca was formed to provide youth with the consistent and caring therapeutic environments and relationships that promote their healing from histories of dramatic trauma and loss. Each year our agency serves thousands of children and families, with the mission to help children and families succeed through their most difficult times.

As our agency and both state and federal policy have evolved, our practice of unconditional care has grown to include many of the services that are supported with the Promoting Adoption and Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act, including post-adoption support services and Family Finding efforts. Most recently, our agency has been the recipient of a federal Family Connections Grant to provide integrated Family Finding and Family Group Decision Making services in collaboration with the San Francisco Human Service Agency. This grant has been an integral component of efforts to further promote stable and permanent placements of youth with parents and relatives system-wide. Still in the early stages of implementation, the project has already elicited important lessons on how to effectively embed permanency-focused services within large public systems of care. These lessons have influenced practice within our agency and San Francisco County more broadly. Dissemination of this information to the national human service community has already begun. Projects funded by the Family Connections grants, such as these, have important potential to test innovative practices and influence the national community with practices that promote permanency and youth wellbeing.

We appreciate the value the Committee on Ways and Means has placed on supporting the wellbeing and stability of foster youth. The Promoting Adoption and Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act encourages the alignment of resources with widely embraced values and goals that every child deserves to be loved and cared for by safe and stable families and we are pleased to offer our support of this important bill.

Sincerely,

KEN BERRICK,
CEO/President,
Seneca Family of Agencies.

THE DONALDSON ADOPTION INSTITUTE,
New York, NY, September 30, 2013.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

HON. MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: The Donaldson Adoption Institute is delighted to support the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act (H.R. 3205). The Adoption Institute is an independent, non-partisan policy and education nonprofit organization that conducts research and analysis in order to improve federal and state adoption-related laws, policies and practices. Our "Keeping the Promise" initiative, for instance, aims to expand an essential tool to enable children in foster care to join, and re-

main in, permanent, safe and loving families: adoption support and preservation services.

The Adoption Institute is pleased that H.R. 3205 reauthorizes the Adoption Incentives program through FY2016, restructures awards to incentivize increasing adoptions of pre-adolescent and older children, and establishes a new award for increases in the rate of children leaving foster care for legal guardianship. We also applaud the mandate that states report savings resulting from the adoption assistance-income eligibility de-link and reinvestments in child welfare, as well as spend a minimum of 20 percent of savings on post-adoption services for children adopted from care.

We appreciate the Committee's bipartisan efforts, solicitation of expert testimony, and consideration of comments on the August draft proposal that it notes "informed several changes made to the bipartisan legislation introduced." We also are glad to see that the House schedule indicates that the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act may be considered this week on the House Floor.

We are communicating the Institute's support of H.R. 3205 to our stakeholders and asking them to contact their Members for their support as well.

Thank you for your leadership; it is truly a testament to the Committee's commitment to the over 100,000 children still waiting in temporary care for permanent families. Please feel free to contact us if you would like additional information.

Sincerely,

ADAM PERTMAN,
Executive Director,
Donaldson Adoption Institute.
RUTH MCROY,
Board Member,
Senior Research Fellow.

HILLSIDE,
Rochester, NY, October 7, 2013.

Hon. DAVE CAMP, Chairman,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. SANDER LEVIN, Ranking Member,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. DAVE REICHERT, Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT, Ranking Member,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES CAMP, LEVIN, REICHERT, DOGGETT: Hillside Family of Agencies is pleased to extend our support and appreciation to members of the Ways and Means Committee for your recent bipartisan bill, the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act (H.R. 3205). Thank you for your joint effort to reauthorize and improve the federal Adoption Incentives Program. The Committee has a long history of bipartisan leadership on child welfare issues and we commend you for your continued work on behalf of vulnerable children and families.

Hillside Family of Agencies is a leading provider of child welfare, mental health, youth development, juvenile justice, special education, and developmental disabilities services, including more than 120 services to children and families at more than 40 locations across Western and Central New York and in Prince George's County, Maryland.

In the United States today, more than 102,000 children in foster care are waiting to be adopted. At the same time, thousands of families across the country are willing to open their hearts and homes to adopt children from the child welfare system. Hillside Family of Agencies works to bring children

and families together through our Adoption and Family Finding efforts. We operate under the philosophy that all children deserve permanency and that each child has the right and potential to have a safe, loving, forever family. We are committed to building collaborative relationships with families, professionals, and communities to create a sense of urgency in providing permanency so that every child is able to know and grow within a family of their own.

The long term success of families who adopt this nation's waiting children is dependent upon their ability to meet the needs of those who have experienced prior abuse and/or neglect. Families must have access to community resources that enable them to meet the significant emotional and behavioral challenges that children who have suffered from early and repeated trauma often bring to their families. For this reason, Hillside Family of Agencies has been a strong advocate for increased investments into permanency efforts children and youth in foster care, and for accessible, comprehensive post adoption services for all adoptive families. We have had considerable experience and success in finding adoptive families for children in foster care and in supporting those families when funding is available for post adoption services.

Hillside Family of Agencies is especially grateful for the Committee's recent actions to: Reauthorize the program and include a greater emphasis on adoption rate increases; Establish a greater incentive for states who increase permanency for older youth in foster care; Establish, for the first time, an incentive for increased guardianship placements; Require HHS and states to calculate savings from the Title IV-E adoption assistance "de-link;" resulting from the Fostering Connections Act of 2008; Require not less than 20 percent of states adoption assistance "de-link" savings be invested into post adoption services; Extension of the Family Connection Grants.

We appreciate the process that the Committee undertook over the past several months to identify potential areas of improvement, both through the holding of oversight hearings and the solicitation of public feedback on the draft proposal that was shared in August 2013. We applaud your work to incorporate improvements suggested by thoughtful and concerned stakeholders.

Adoption is permanent, irrevocable, and lifelong. Hillside Family of Agencies is committed to supporting families and keeping them intact throughout their lifetimes. On behalf of the children and families we serve, we thank you.

Sincerely,

DENNIS RICHARDSON,
President and CEO,
Hillside Family of Agencies.

VOICE FOR ADOPTION,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.
Hon. DAVE CAMP, Chairman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. DAVE REICHERT, Chairman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. SANDER LEVIN, Ranking Member,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT, Ranking Member,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES CAMP, LEVIN, REICHERT, DOGGETT: Voice for Adoption (VFA) is pleased to extend our support and

appreciation to members of the Ways and Means Committee for your recent bipartisan bill, the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act (H.R. 3205). Thank you for your joint effort to reauthorize and improve the federal Adoption Incentives Program. This Committee has a long history of bipartisan leadership on child welfare issues and we commend you for your continued work on behalf of vulnerable children and families.

VFA is an advocacy organization whose mission is to raise awareness of the needs of the 102,000 children in foster care who are waiting to be adopted and the families that adopt from public child welfare. We believe that every child deserves a family; as a nation we must ensure that children's safety and permanency is always paramount. Secondly, we must ensure that families who commit to loving and raising children who have experienced prior abuse and/or neglect are equipped to meet the significant emotional and behavioral needs that their children can sometimes present. For these reasons, VFA has been a strong advocate for both, increased investments into permanency—especially for the longest waiting children and older youth in foster care—and for greater post-adoption services.

VFA's members are especially grateful for the Committees recent actions to: Reauthorize the program and include a greater emphasis on adoption rate increases; Establish a greater incentive for states who increase permanency for older youth in foster care; Establish, for the first time, an incentive for increased guardianship placements; Require HHS and states to calculate savings resulting from the title IV-E adoption assistance "de-link", resulting from the Fostering Connections Act of 2008; Require not less than 20 percent of states adoption assistance "de-link" savings be invested into post-adoption services; Extension of the Family Connections Grants.

We would also like to thank you for the process that the Committee took over the past several months to hear about ways that this program could be improved, both through holding oversight hearings and soliciting public feedback on the draft proposal that was shared in August 2013. We applaud your work to incorporate improvements suggested by stakeholders and we look forward to working with you going forward.

Sincerely,

NICOLE DOBBINS,
Executive Director.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3205.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Suspending the rules and passing:

H.R. 185, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3205, by the yeas and nays; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PAUL BROWN UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 185) to designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the "Paul Brown United States Courthouse," on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 551]

YEAS—402

Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bentivoglio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)

Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Crenshaw
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot

Chaffetz
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar

Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries

Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
McMorris-Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan

Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmuter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry

Thompson (CA) Vela
 Thompson (MS) Velázquez
 Thompson (PA) Visclosky
 Thornberry Wagner
 Tiberi Walberg
 Tierney Walden
 Tipton Walorski
 Titus Walz
 Tonko Wasserman
 Tsongas Schultz
 Turner Waters
 Upton Watt
 Valadao Waxman
 Vargas Weber (TX)
 Veasey Webster (FL)

NAYS—1

Sanford

NOT VOTING—27

Aderholt Gingrey (GA)
 Blumenauer Graves (MO)
 Broun (GA) Grijalva
 Calvert Grimm
 Campbell Hanna
 Cárdenas Herrera Beutler
 Cicilline Rush
 Davis, Danny Shimkus
 Fincher Marino
 McCarthy (NY) Wilson (SC)

□ 1856

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP FOR CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3205) to reauthorize and restructure the adoption incentives grant program, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 552]

YEAS—402

Amash Boustany
 Amodei Brady (PA)
 Andrews Brady (TX)
 Bachmann Brady (IA)
 Bachus Bridenstine
 Barber Brooks (AL)
 Barletta Brooks (IN)
 Barr Brown (FL)
 Barrow (GA) Brownley (CA)
 Barton Buchanan
 Bass Buchshon
 Beatty Burgess
 Becerra Bustos
 Benishek Butterfield
 Bentivolio Camp
 Bera (CA) Cantor
 Bilirakis Capito
 Bishop (GA) Capps
 Bishop (NY) Capuano
 Bishop (UT) Carney
 Black Carson (IN)
 Blackburn Carter
 Bonamici Cartwright

Welch
 Westrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)
 Nugent
 Palazzo
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Roybal-Allard
 Rush
 Shimkus
 Van Hollen
 Wilson (SC)
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Daines
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foy
 Frankel (FL)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Guthrie
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hall
 Hanabusa
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Hensarling
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holding
 Holt
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huffman
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Kuster
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loebsack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNerney
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Radel
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Roby
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Royce
 Ruiz
 Runyan
 Ruppersberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Speier
 Stewart

Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Westrup
 Vela
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—28

Aderholt
 Blumenauer
 Broun (GA)
 Calvert
 Campbell
 Cárdenas
 Cicilline
 Davis, Danny
 Fincher
 Gingrey (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Hanna
 Herrera Beutler
 Honda
 Marino
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul
 Nugent
 Palazzo
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Roybal-Allard
 Rush
 Shimkus
 Van Hollen
 Wilson (SC)

□ 1906

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 275, noes 116, answered "present" 2, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

AYES—275

Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barrow (GA)
 Barton
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bentivolio
 Bera (CA)
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bonamici
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchanan
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Camp
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chu
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cohen
 Cole
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Conyers
 Cook
 Cooper
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Daines
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Rodney
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DelBene
 Dent
 DesJarlais

Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Grayson
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latta

Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Maloney
Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell

Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stutzman
Takano
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IN)

Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matheson
McDermott
McGovern
Meng
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nolan
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Renacci
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sires
Smith (MO)
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gohmert

Owens

NOT VOTING—37

Aderholt
Amodei
Blumenauer
Broun (GA)
Calvert
Campbell
Cardenas
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Davis, Danny
DeLauro
Eshoo
Fincher

Gingrey (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Grimm
Hanna
Herrera Beutler
Honda
Jeffries
Kelly (PA)
Marino
McCarthy (NY)
Nugent
Palazzo

Pearce
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Schock
Schweikert
Shimkus
Simpson
Van Hollen
Wilson (SC)

□ 1915

Mr. BARBER and Ms. LEE of California changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY, FORMER SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 383

In the House of Representatives, U.S., October 22, 2013:

Resolved, That the House has learned with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Thomas S. Foley, former Member of the House for 15 terms and Speaker of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred First, One Hundred Second and One Hundred Third Congresses.

Resolved, That in the death of the Honorable Thomas S. Foley the United States and the State of Washington have lost a valued and eminent public servant and citizen.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG, A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 384

In the House of Representatives, U.S., October 22, 2013:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable C.W. Bill Young, a Representative from the State of Florida.

Resolved, That a committee of such Members of the House as the Speaker may designate, together with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of applicable accounts of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 2248

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 2248, a bill originally introduced by Representative MARKEY of Massachusetts, for the purposes of adding co-sponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

C.W. BILL YOUNG DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass

NOES—116

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Benishek
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Clarke
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Costa
Cotton
Crowley
DeFazio
Denham
DeSantis
Duckworth

Ellison
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Foxy
Fudge
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Holding

Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Israel
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
LoBiondo
Lynch
Maffei

the bill (H.R. 3302) to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Bay Pines, Florida, as the "C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3302

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. NAME OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER, BAY PINES, FLORIDA.

The Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Bay Pines, Florida, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the "C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center". Any reference to such medical center in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material they may have on H.R. 3302.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today is bittersweet as we mark both the passing of a congressional stalwart, Chairman C.W. BILL YOUNG, and pay a fitting tribute by naming the Bay Pines Veterans Medical Center in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, while the raw numbers themselves may speak volumes for his dedication to America, it is his personal qualities that I admire the most. When I came to Congress in 2001, BILL YOUNG was one of the first Members that welcomed me here. It was on this floor, in this Chamber, that BILL YOUNG introduced me to the Members of this House the night I was sworn in. Since then, I came to regard him not only as a mentor or a colleague but, more importantly, a personal friend.

Chairman YOUNG served the 13th District of Florida and the people of the United States for over 42 years. He was the senior member of the Florida congressional delegation and was the senior Republican in both the House and in the Senate. Counting his years in the Florida Legislature, BILL YOUNG served over 50 years in public service and worked with eight Presidents.

BILL will be most remembered for his devotion to America's defense and es-

pecially to the men and the women in the Armed Forces. Having served in uniform for 15 years as a member of the National Guard and Reserves, BILL was the go-to guy on defense issues here in the House. He dedicated his legislative and personal energies to improve the quality of life for the men and the women who serve; and, as a result, those who wear the uniform and face our foes have improved base housing, better medical care, increased pay, and the best equipment.

Members know BILL best for his work as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee from 1999 to 2005, and he continued to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense until the time of his passing. But BILL YOUNG was much more than a defense expert. He had also been a leading advocate for increased medical research.

BILL worked to double Federal medical research funding and funding to increase immunization rates for preschoolers, to improve public health programs, and to find cures for Parkinson's and Alzheimer's diseases. Just one example, the C.W. Bill Young Marrow Donor Recruitment and Research program registry lists more than 9 million volunteer donors for patients with leukemia and other life-threatening diseases. That simple list has provided the gift of life to more than 50,000 individuals.

To completely describe the contributions of a man who served in this body for over 42 years would take hours. So with that, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the entire Florida delegation and all those who knew and served with him in this House and in the other body, I offer our most sincere condolences to his wife, Beverly, and his sons Rob, Billy, and Patrick. He was your husband and father. To us, BILL was a friend we will miss dearly.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One of my favorite songs is "May the Work I've Done Speak for Me."

I rise today to pay tribute to Chairman BILL YOUNG, whose passing we mourn and whose dedication to American servicemembers is well known to his fellow Floridians, as well as to all who serve in this House.

Taking care of our Nation's men and women in uniform was his passion. He often called them "kids" because he cared for them as deeply as if they were his family.

Chairman YOUNG was an officer and a gentleman. He served for 9 years in the American National Guard. During his decades in Congress, he and his wife, Beverly, regularly visited the hospitalized combat troops in Florida and here at Bethesda. They helped arrange travel for military family members, or those who were having trouble paying

the bills. Here in the House, at the Appropriations Committee, and in any other ways he could find, he was tireless in his work on behalf of servicemembers, veterans, and their families.

I worked with him when we were trying to finish the new courthouse in Orlando. This was just after the Oklahoma City bombing and all the new security requirements that were added to protect the buildings and the people in them.

The project was \$19 million over budget, but the chairman came to what must have been the longest town hall meeting held here in the Capitol. Everyone had to say the chairman was a gentleman as always and wanted what was best for the people of Florida, regardless of party.

This was the case also when it came to funding for research. Chairman YOUNG knew how important cutting-edge research is and made it a priority to find the funding to help future generations of Americans.

Every year, BILL YOUNG was a keynote speaker at the Memorial Day program in Bay Pines. He initially worked with President Gerald Ford and the Appropriations Committee in 1976 to replace the original hospital building. At one point, he went so far as to personally show the President where the building was and how badly it was leaking. He was very proud of the new hospital, which opened in 1983. He was thrilled when they named the road encircling it Bill Young Road.

The VA Medical Center at Bay Pines has many services to completely serve today's veterans. There are all the health services that any hospital would provide; but, in addition, there are services for caregivers, dental services, extended care and services for seniors, along with programs that help homeless veterans.

□ 1930

In addition, the women veterans healthcare program at Bay Pines focuses on wellness education, preventive health care, disease management, and care for the emotional well-being of women veterans.

Today, we will go one step further in honoring the man who made the VA Medical Center at Bay Pines a reality. Today, we take the step of naming the whole facility after BILL YOUNG. It is a most appropriate tribute—to name the center whose mission it is to coordinate the care for wounded men and women who serve in their life and that was their mission.

Mr. Speaker, as we say good-bye to our friend and colleague Chairman BILL YOUNG, with this bill we can honor his service in the way I know he would appreciate most deeply—having his name associated daily and directly with the highest level of care for our military veterans.

I want to thank Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman MILLER for

bringing it before us today, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the dean of our delegation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased that the gentleman from Florida, Chairman MILLER, has given me some time; and I am so pleased to support his bill that he has gotten the entire Florida delegation, working in a bipartisan manner, to honor this good man and warm friend, Congressman BILL YOUNG.

BILL was a true patriot and a tenacious public servant, dedicating his life to his constituents in Pinellas County.

As you heard from some of our previous speakers, his accomplishments are so varied and many: creating a national bone marrow registry; improving the quality of life for Active Duty personnel, our National Guard, our Reserves, our veterans; protecting thousands of jobs in his area; preserving MacDill Air Force Base; improving Florida's environment. These are just some of BILL's many accomplishments.

BILL was always willing to lend a helping hand to members of our entire State delegation with projects that were important in our local community. For example, he helped me to find the funds to dredge the Miami River, to protect Homestead Air Reserve Base after it was devastated by Hurricane Andrew.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. But, more importantly, he was the consummate gentleman. He was principled. He was honest, maintaining civility with his colleagues, a trait that we no longer honor as we should. BILL was an example for all of us here in Congress. It was my privilege and my high honor to serve with him. What a great privilege.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

BILL YOUNG was my friend. BILL YOUNG was a gentleman in every sense of the word. BILL YOUNG was an example for us all. I will have the privilege of speaking on Thursday, at his request, at his funeral. BILL and I served on the Appropriations Committee for 23 years together; then I left when I became majority leader.

BILL YOUNG was, as I said, a gentleman who cared about each and every individual in this House. More than that, he cared for each and every per-

son who served in uniform in our Armed Forces; and he and Beverly displayed that, as Congressman MILLER has said, on a weekly, daily basis.

I am a Democrat; BILL was a Republican. It didn't make any difference. He was an American, I was an American, and we served our country together. No one served it better than BILL YOUNG. He chose to see our differences as slight and our common purpose as great. He always chose civility over partisanship.

He was a skilled legislator on behalf of the people of Pinellas County, Florida, on behalf of Florida, on behalf of his country, on behalf of the members of the Armed Forces and the defense of this country. He was a champion of our men and women in uniform, veterans and their families, all of whom, wherever they lived, he viewed as his constituents. This bill to rename the VA Hospital in Bay Pines, Florida, which I am proud to cosponsor, is a fitting tribute to his devotion to our veterans and our troops.

Though he represented Florida longer than any Member of this House in history, BILL was originally from a hard-scrabble coal mining town in Pennsylvania. It was there he learned many lessons about the hardships facing working families and the need to ensure that opportunities would be within their reach, and he never forgot that.

He was a great Member of this body, a very powerful Member of this body, an extraordinary, influential American. But to all of us, he was BILL; to all those he came in contact with, he was BILL. He was a person who understood the needs, the fears, the aspirations, the hopes of his people and the people of our country.

My thoughts are with Beverly, with BILL YOUNG's family, and with the people of Florida's 13th District. This House has lost a great Member.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, it is absolutely fitting that we take this step and name our veterans hospital on the west coast of Florida after a great American, a patriot, a hero for our veterans—BILL YOUNG.

Probably more than anyone in the House of Representatives or Congress, I have known BILL YOUNG, I think, longer. He and I were both aides to the first Republican Congressman since the Civil War, Bill Kramer. He was an aide before I was, but we met and worked together more than 40 years ago.

So I rise tonight not only as a colleague, but as a personal friend and political ally of a great human being, someone who put his heart and soul into his position, who loved our servicemen and -women, and his great legacy will be all he has done to honor their memory.

Tonight, we honor his memory with renaming Bay Pines veterans hospital for BILL YOUNG, my friend.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of the legislation before us this evening to rename the Bay Pines Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Florida the C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center. I am honored to join over 200 of my House colleagues as an original cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation, a great tribute to one of our dearest colleagues.

Indeed, BILL YOUNG will be forever known as one of the strongest supporters of our military and veterans in the history of this Congress. His staunch and unyielding support of our military and our veterans is legendary.

Likewise, he was a true champion for his district, and a fount of knowledge about the chronicles of the U.S. House of Representatives.

BILL YOUNG will be missed in Washington, as well as in Florida. He, along with the late Congressman Jack Murtha, were not only great friends and mentors to me, but their wives, Beverly and Joyce, were also friends and mentors to my wife, Vivian.

Chairman Murtha and Chairman YOUNG were neither Democrat nor Republican when it came to our national defense. Regardless of which was the chairman or ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee, the men and women of America's military would be taken care of. I am proud to have served as a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense under both of these great leaders.

With BILL YOUNG's death, the Nation has truly lost one of the few remaining statesmen. Our thoughts and prayers are with Beverly and the entire family. Congress and our Nation have lost one of its greatest statesmen. I have lost a dear friend and a mentor.

While we could use every word in every language spoken by mankind, we would not have enough words combined to adequately thank BILL YOUNG for his service. But I am pleased to join my colleagues in passing this resolution to rename the Bay Pines Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Florida the C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

It has been said that you make your living by what you get; you make your life by what you give. BILL YOUNG gave so much to so many for so long. He will be greatly missed.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia alluded to over 200 cosponsors. I would announce to the House tonight that we had 379 original cosponsors of this piece of legislation.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the vice

chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, whose district abutted Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

379 cosponsors, what a testament. What a wonderful man. What a great man.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support this legislation. Over the past five decades, Chairman YOUNG selflessly served Florida and the Tampa Bay area, leading many initiatives to promote economic growth, create jobs, of which his contributions to the military and veterans in particular are immeasurable.

In the 1970s, the chairman played a significant role in winning critical funding for the Bay Pines Veterans Affairs Medical Center, which allows the facilities to support almost 100,000, Mr. Speaker, of our heroes in our area today. With this funding, Bay Pines was able to increase the size of its campus, replace the hospital, and now offers a wide variety of services to these veterans in their backyard because of Chairman YOUNG.

Chairman YOUNG has left behind a rich legacy in support of our heroes, especially those in the Tampa Bay area. By renaming this important facility in his honor, we will provide a lasting monument to remember a great friend, Chairman BILL YOUNG.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), whose district butts up to Congressman BILL YOUNG's district.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding the time and for her dedication to the Nation's veterans as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of designating the Bay Pines VA Medical Center in Pinellas County, Florida, the Congressman C.W. Bill Young VA Medical Center. I am very proud to cosponsor this bill, and I would like to thank Chairman MILLER of Florida, Congresswoman BROWN, and all of our colleagues for honoring BILL YOUNG with such a designation.

I have been fortunate to serve alongside BILL YOUNG for the 7 years that I have been here. Seven out of the 43 years that Mr. YOUNG served in the Congress, we represented St. Petersburg and the Tampa Bay area together. And I know I speak for my predecessors, Jim Davis and Sam Gibbons, who also passed last year, when I say that Congressman BILL YOUNG was a gentleman and an outstanding partner for the interests of the Tampa Bay area and the State of Florida.

It is very appropriate that we honor BILL YOUNG by naming the Bay Pines VA Medical Center after him. He was a fixture at the Bay Pines Veterans Day and Memorial Day ceremonies every year. But more importantly, he was a fixture when there was no ceremony,

when he would visit wounded soldiers in the hospital or at their homes, when there was no fanfare, and he just determined that it was just his desire to ensure that the servicemembers and their families received the care that they deserved and that they had earned.

□ 1945

Many facilities at the MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa are state of the art due to Mr. YOUNG's extra attention. I am very grateful for the help he provided to me when MacDill and the soldiers and civilians who worked there were in need. For example, in the past year, he boosted our efforts in "MacDill Means Mobility" when we tried to expand the mission at the base. When I brought to his attention that the Department of Defense was not assisting former servicemembers and their families who qualified for Medicaid health services, he helped cut through the red tape.

Many also will point to his expansive earmarks and great legacy in the Tampa Bay area in a variety of ways: our drinking water reservoir is the Bill Young Reservoir; medical research initiatives at the University of South Florida; programs at St. Petersburg College; programs at Eckerd College. We are so proud that Mr. YOUNG initiated the national bone marrow donor program at All Children's Hospital in St. Petersburg.

It was decades ago, through Congressman YOUNG's leadership, that the Bay Pines VA Medical Center in St. Petersburg was created. Bay Pines is now the fourth-largest veterans hospital in the country. It serves veterans all across west central Florida and employs many talented caregivers.

So it is a fitting tribute to this remarkable American to name the Bay Pines VA Medical Center in his honor, and I am proud to cosponsor the resolution. Congressman YOUNG was a model statesman. His kindness, sincerity, and dogged advocacy for our Nation's men and women in uniform and veterans will be missed.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank Chairman MILLER for bringing this important piece of legislation forward. We literally could be here days speaking about the many accomplishments of Chairman YOUNG, and those days would not suffice.

I got a chance to work with him on the Appropriations Committee. I will tell you that so many times I went to him for advice, for help. BILL YOUNG was one of those people that you always went to when you needed help, when you needed advice. He was such a wise man.

As I just said, since we would never have enough time to talk about all of

his great accomplishments—and you have heard not only about his accomplishments but just the fact that he was an incredibly honorable, caring, wise—"statesman" is the word that comes to mind.

Since my time is limited, I just want to echo something that I heard. I am not quite sure, Mr. Speaker, who said it. But somewhere I once read that "to be a great man, you first have to be a good man." If there is anybody that that phrase reminds me of, it is BILL YOUNG.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), and I would like to thank Chairman MILLER—we have worked together. I thank the gentleman so very much. I want to acknowledge as well the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Mrs. LOWEY. Thank you for allowing me to share with you this evening my comments, appreciation, and respect that I have for BILL YOUNG.

First of all, I would like to say what everyone else has said. What a great American. What a great patriot. What a great public servant.

BILL, may you rest in peace.

Congressman YOUNG, Chairman YOUNG was on the floor of the House just a few weeks before he passed. I think that is important to note, that he was working every single day to make America better. He loved soldiers and veterans. He loved their families. It is highly appropriate for him to have his name so honored as a named veterans hospital.

I want to say that it is particularly important to note that Congressman YOUNG was able to speak to kings and queens and generals and people of high places. But he was best when he was talking to everyday people, to the soldiers that he loved.

He came from humble beginnings. Starting with his mother, a single parent, losing his home early in life, living in a hunting camp. You would think that he would not be the generous-hearted person that he is today. But he was really what America is all about, the American Dream.

I remember his commitment to our soldiers and his easy ability to work across the aisle as someone who advocated for soldiers suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder. I want to let his family know how dedicated he was to providing extra resources to the thousands upon thousands of soldiers who returned from Iraq and Afghanistan who needed extra help with post-traumatic stress disorder.

He was very kind to those of us who were concerned about breast cancer and women in the United States military who may have experienced breast cancer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from Florida.

He has worked with me over the last two sessions, Mr. Speaker, in providing extra funding for post-traumatic stress disorder to a center that is in Houston, Texas, but also dealing with additional research on triple-negative breast cancer that might have an impact not only on the military population of women but also with women around the Nation. BILL was like that, if I might. Congressman BILL YOUNG, Chairman BILL YOUNG was like that, always extending, always sharing.

He has a special place in my heart because my late mother is from St. Petersburg, Florida. But I would say that he should have a special place in the hearts of all Americans because if you ever want to see exemplified a grand and stately gentleman who had nothing in his heart but the love and respect and admiration for this Nation, it was our dear friend, the Honorable BILL YOUNG.

To his family, I say to them, we love him, and we extend our deepest sympathies. Thank you, my dear friend. You have served well. I hope that you will rest well.

May God bless him, and God bless his family.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. I thank Chairman MILLER for this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the chorus of people remembering our friend from Florida, BILL YOUNG, the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee of Appropriations.

Chairman YOUNG, as you know, spent five decades of his life in this Chamber fighting for a better America for both his constituents and our country. As the dean of the Republican Conference, he was a leader and of counsel to colleagues young or old, Republican or Democrat.

Mr. Speaker, I am the newest member of the Defense Subcommittee of Appropriations. I was fortunate to receive his mentorship. I learned from his fearless, unparalleled support of our troops and our veterans, and I admired his outspoken and unwavering commitment to what was in their best interest. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran myself of over 30 years, I was also a beneficiary of his incredible support of those who wear the uniform.

While his presence will be forever missed, the Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center will serve as a small and fitting reminder that this institution, our men and women in uniform, and America are undoubtedly better off because of BILL YOUNG. I am proud to support it.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, could you please tell me how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman has 10½ minutes remaining.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thank the Speaker.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill.

For more than 40 years, BILL YOUNG served his district and this institution with integrity and honor after having served our country in the Army National Guard for nearly a decade.

As chairman of the Appropriations Committee, his leadership and advocacy for our men and women in uniform and our veterans was unsurpassed. In a time when political culture too often devolves into hostility, and "compromise" is a dirty word, BILL YOUNG was always a gentleman who consistently reached across the aisle.

He would share with me his visits with his dear wife, Beverly, to wounded warriors to bring them comfort. How happy those visits made him.

It was such a pleasure to serve with him, and he will be truly missed. Renaming this VA facility in his memory is a tribute to his legacy.

You will be missed, my dear friend. Rest in peace, God bless you, and God bless America.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and am prepared to close.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank Chairman MILLER for organizing this tribute to Chairman YOUNG.

In closing, I often say when you are born, you get a birth certificate; and when you die, you are going to get a death certificate; and that little dash in between is what you have done to make this a better place.

I don't know anyone who has done more than Chairman BILL YOUNG. It has just been my honor having had the opportunity to serve with him. His leadership for the Florida delegation—I mean, we have gone through some tough times. But I can tell you, he has always been a gentleman.

When I first began, I said that one of my favorite sayings is to let the work I have done speak for me. Clearly he has done his work, and as Paul said, he has fought a good fight, and he has kept the faith. He has done his job. It has been left up to us to continue his great work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to thank all the Members on both sides of the aisle for their kind words they have said of our friend from Florida, BILL YOUNG. I sincerely hope that the words give Beverly, Rob,

Billy, and Patrick some measure of consolation.

While we will no longer have BILL's personal and wise counsel to go to, that beautiful veterans medical center will bear his name. It will give witness—witness to his many years of service to America and her defenders.

I want to thank my good friend from Florida (Ms. BROWN) for her help in bringing this bill to the floor and the over 375 cosponsors that we have brought on this piece of legislation.

I respectfully ask all Members to join us in supporting this piece of legislation, H.R. 3302, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I heard from my friend, former Congressman Norm Dicks, today, and he asked me to submit this statement on his behalf. He had the privilege of serving with Chairman BILL YOUNG for over thirty years on the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee, and said this about him:

Chairman Young did more for the men and women in the armed forces than anyone in Congress. Bill and Beverly made weekly trips to Bethesda and Walter Reed to see our wounded warriors and offered personal help to their families. Bill Young believed in bipartisanship; the Defense Subcommittee almost always reported the Defense Appropriation bill with all Members, Democrats and Republicans, in full support. Bill was a great American, a great leader, and a great friend and he will be truly missed.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker I rise today in honor of CHARLES WILLIAM YOUNG, better known to his colleagues and constituents as BILL. I am deeply saddened Congressman YOUNG, a man who put all others before himself, has passed—he will be sorely missed.

Although I only had the pleasure of working with BILL for a short time, I benefitted greatly from his leadership and the strong example of service to the United States and Florida that he set. Congressman YOUNG leaves behind a long history of dedicated service to his constituents and the veterans of America.

BILL saw the nation through, some of her most tumultuous times, and throughout all of it—he worked tirelessly to make sure our nation's veterans were taken care of. He was a constant fixture at VA medical centers in Florida and in the Washington, D.C. area always making sure the veterans were receiving the best possible care.

I proudly join my colleagues in renaming the Bay Pines VA Medical Center the C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center as a small token of the nation's gratitude for his dedicated service.

I urge my colleagues to pass this small gesture of our gratitude without objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3302.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICA'S BUDGETARY ISSUES

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, plain and simple, the shutdown stalemate was unacceptable. The impasse should have been resolved weeks before October 1 when the House began passing funding bills through regular order. I argued that the strategy of defunding the health care law would not succeed, considering most of its programs are funded through mandatory spending. I did, however, believe that forcing the debate was necessary in order for Congress to actually start dealing with the challenges we face.

The President's health care law is, without a doubt, one of those challenges, Mr. Speaker. The law was sold as a way to lower insurance costs and expand access. But in reality, it is reducing access, breaking the budget, and harming consumers.

We forced the Senate to join us in addressing our larger budgetary issues—including debt and deficits—which undoubtedly will lead us back to a discussion of this flawed health care law.

This debate would never have taken place if Senate Leader REID had his way. Considering the ongoing failures with the ObamaCare exchange, it is certainly a debate we will now be able to have. The American people deserve as much.

□ 2000

FINDING MIDDLE GROUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this presentation. We had one of those very important moments to recognize the long service of one of our colleagues.

As we listen to those eulogies, I think all of us should be reminded of the awesome responsibilities that we share here in the House of Representatives. BILL YOUNG, obviously, felt those responsibilities deeply. He carried them out for an extraordinary length of time—43 years. We are thankful for his service, for his memory, and also for what he has taught us about perseverance and steadfastness and also, as you can tell from the various eulogies, about working across the aisle.

Working across the aisle and finding the middle ground is what I want to spend some time on tonight.

Like my 434 colleagues, when we finished voting last Thursday, we all left this Chamber, I think, in a rather somber mood, realizing that 16 days had passed and our government was shut

down and there was the likelihood of damage to America and Americans.

When we got home, I suspect all of us—and I know this certainly was my case—were confronted by our constituents. They were not happy. In fact, they were angry. They were angry that their government—the government of the strongest, most powerful Nation in the world—wasn't operating because its legislative body had failed. And we had failed to find the common ground; we had failed to protect this Nation and Americans.

It was a grand debate over the Affordable Health Care Act, then it morphed into some other kind of concerns, and ultimately wound up somewhere about the deficit and about the default. At the end of that process, I don't think Americans really much cared what the debate was about. What they cared about was the very nature of our government and whether it would be able to operate.

It was a heavy toll. It was a heavy toll on our Nation. It is estimated it was well over a \$24 billion hit to the economy; and I know in my own district, there was a tremendous hit. As I got off the plane here in Washington, D.C., as I was returning today from California, at the airport, ready to fly back to California, was the chancellor of the University of California-Davis. She caught me as I got off the plane, and she expressed her deep concern for the university and its operations.

Research projects that were under way simply stopped.

Sitting next to me on the airplane coming out was a woman who was running a health and nutrition program for the U.S. Department of Agriculture that was associated with the University of California-Davis. It was shut down for 16 days, and just the enormous challenge of shutting down and starting back up, the loss of efficiency and the lost research that took place.

Those kinds of problems are repeated throughout my district. At Travis and Beale Air Force bases, over a thousand civilian employees were furloughed. In Lake County, the county family service center which provides support for victims of child abuse, domestic abuse, and rape had to reduce its services.

As I mentioned, the University of California and the U.S. Department of Agriculture weren't able to operate. Farmers who needed to get loans at the service center couldn't get them—right in the middle of the harvest season. Companies that needed licenses from the Department of Commerce to export advanced technology had all of their orders on hold; and, undoubtedly, some of them were lost.

In the far north of California, the wildlife refuges were closed during the opening of the duck season and also the antelope and deer season. In my own district in Dixon, an annual "stand down" for struggling veterans had to

scramble for money to cover the Department of Labor loan that was not made available. The Small Business Administration was unable to approve business loans.

The entire economy of the United States lost over \$24 billion. The economic growth of the Nation probably lost as much as half a percentage point. And for what?

It is hard to even begin to describe what the argument was all about over the Affordable Care Act—an act that is now providing health care services to over 4 million young men and women who are able to stay on their families' health insurance, for seniors who are getting preventive health care services. It goes on and on.

But here we are, once again. We got past all of that. Where do we go tomorrow?

Well, tomorrow we begin once again the struggle to define this government's future and, really, to define the future of America. I am going to spend a few moments talking about that struggle because on January 15 there will be yet one more crisis point—a focal point upon which the issues of government will be leveraged one way or the other.

We have seen five such crisis points in the last 3 years, and each one a crisis building up to a point where the American economy doesn't know what to expect and therefore does not make the critical investments, does not attempt to grow, because they don't know what the economic and political future will be.

We are going to endure that not just once in the next 3 months, but twice. January 15 will be the first opportunity for the next crisis—a crisis that will be about opening government or not. Because, once again, it will be a funding crisis. Will we be able to appropriate the money to operate the Federal Government? Less than a month later, on February 7, there will be one additional debt crisis. Once again, a default cliff will be reached.

And so the American economy, like a racehorse at a gate, hearing the trumpet, looking for the gate to open, ready to get out there and charge down the track, the American economy will face once again that gate slamming shut on it. Even as it wants to grow, even as that great American racehorse economy wants to head down the track, that gate has the potential of slamming shut. The uncertainty will be there once again.

We have got to end these fiscal crises. It is in the interest of Democrats and Republicans to end these manufactured crises and to put in place a long-term, stable policy that allows this government to make the critical investments to grow the economy, to put in place a tax policy that is sensible and long range and helps to balance the budget, that makes the necessary cuts

to those programs that are not essential, and maintains and even enhances those that are essential.

Let me put up on the board just for a moment some of the numbers that we are dealing with over the next couple of months. I don't say this is the best chart. It is actually a bit confusing, but I think we need to try to understand the numbers.

This number, \$1.203 trillion, was what President Obama suggested be the Federal budget for the year 2014. Back in 2010, the actual amount was \$1.188 trillion. That is what we actually budgeted and spent that year. That was 2010. So there was some growth that the President recommended for the Federal budget.

What actually happened was quite different. What actually happened is down here in these lower numbers.

This year, the House Republican budget, otherwise known as the Ryan budget, called for \$1.095 trillion, which is significantly under the President's budget. In 2011, the debt crisis came up once again and the August 2011 compromise said that we would spend \$1.066 trillion in the 2014 budget. The Senate actually said we would spend \$1.058 billion.

What did we actually do? What we actually did last week was to authorize an expenditure of \$986 billion—a huge difference of some \$217 billion less than recommended by the President.

What does this number mean? This number means that across this Nation vital programs in the military, vital programs in education, in health care, in agriculture, and in every activity of the government, except those of Medicare, Social Security and Medicaid, were substantially reduced. That put an enormous drag on the economy. So not only was the economy faced with a 16-day shutdown, but it was also faced with a shallow and less robust Federal Government, laying off people all across this Nation. For the University of California at Davis, it meant that \$40 million of research programs were not funded. Simply stopped.

This kind of effect on the Nation's budget or the Nation's economic activity is going to continue. And in the year ahead, economists predict that it will continue to cause a slowdown in the growth of the economy, lowering tax revenues, actually increasing the deficit, and creating higher unemployment—or at least not reducing the unemployment rate in this Nation.

We need to change that. We need to set in place a different policy. And here is where I want to go with this discussion. What is it that we really need to do to grow the American economy, to make sure all of the rungs on the economic ladder are in place and providing the opportunity for every American to have a decent job?

Hardworking Americans want to go to work. They want to have a job where

they can support their family, where they can meet their own personal and family needs and participate in their communities in a meaningful way with a good, middle class job. There are ways that we can do that. One of them is what we call the Make It In America agenda.

The Make It In America agenda involves seven different policies, such as international trade policies. Instead of giving away our jobs to some foreign country, making sure that our trade programs actually encourage economic growth at home, not encourage economic growth in China. Also, that there be a tax policy that ends unnecessary tax loopholes and rebates for those companies that are profitable. For example, of the top 20 American corporations, about half of them pay little or no corporate income tax. The tax system is set up in such a way that they are able to avoid their fair share of the cost of government.

□ 2015

So we need to make sure that the tax policies of the United States are wise, that they support economic growth, that they don't provide unnecessary tax breaks and loopholes to those individuals and corporations that don't need them. I will give you one example of such a huge tax loophole:

The five biggest oil companies in America together receive somewhere between \$4 billion and \$5 billion in reduced taxes every year. This is the most profitable industry in the world. Why are they getting subsidies? Why are we subsidizing them? Why is the American taxpayer subsidizing the most profitable industry in the world, the oil industry? This is just one example of tax subsidies, tax breaks, that ought to be removed and seriously looked at. We could significantly increase the revenue to the Federal Government by eliminating these unnecessary, unwise, and quite foolish tax breaks and subsidies that many corporations and some individuals receive.

Energy policy is extremely important. We need a wise energy policy. Right now, the United States is in the midst of an energy boom. It is reducing the cost of energy. All across this Nation, we are seeing the effect of this in the coal industry as natural gas is replacing coal-fired power plants, reducing greenhouse gas emissions. All of that is a very, very good thing. Also, we need to continue to move towards sustainable energy, the green energy systems—wind, solar, hydroelectric, geothermal—and other kinds of sustainable energy policies.

I am going to skip down here to research because this is where we have a real opportunity to tie together the research agenda with the energy agenda. An example:

We know that most of the oil that is produced in the United States and is

imported is used for the transportation industry.

Recently, the Transportation Department provided a grant to the University of California at Davis to do some research on sustainable transportation. The world's top scientists have concluded that there really is such a thing as climate change and that it poses a very serious threat to humanity. The most recent report came out less than a month ago and concluded that we are in for some very serious troubles ahead unless we are able to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, particularly carbon dioxide, a good deal of which comes from the transportation industry.

The good news is that we as the American public, through this government, can rise to the challenge, and communities, like the one I represent in Davis, California, are leading the way. The University of California at Davis has received a cutting-edge research grant for the research into transportation systems that are sustainable and that are not relying as much or at all on the carbon fuels, gasoline and diesel. So what are they—plug-in hybrids? Alternative fuels such as advanced biofuels, hydrogen fueling infrastructure and many other kinds of transportation—batteries and the like—are going to be part of this research.

The Department of Transportation asked the University of California at Davis to lead the National Center for Sustainable Transportation. This new consortium will consult policymakers as they implement real-world strategies to address climate change and other threats. In other words, by combining research and energy, we can move away from the dependence upon oil, particularly foreign oil, reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. So, as you go through this Make It In America agenda, certainly energy policy will be coupled with the research agenda.

Another part of this is labor. Is labor ready to accept the kinds of challenges that we are going to find in the new, modern manufacturing sector?

We need to invest in labor so that we have a well-educated labor force, and we need to invest in the reeducation of those men and women who have lost their jobs. Just two decades ago, we had nearly 20 million Americans in the manufacturing sector. Today, it is probably closer to 11 million. That means some 9 million Americans who once had jobs in the manufacturing sector are no longer employed in that sector. They need to be reeducated either in advanced manufacturing technologies or in other sectors.

The labor force is constantly evolving, and one of the roles of the Federal Government through the Department of Education and the Department of Labor and Commerce is to provide that reeducation necessary as one of the old manufacturing technologies moves,

dies out and as new ones come along so that the labor force is able to move into those new jobs. So you see the combination of education and labor. These things work together.

On the educational side, it has been shown many, many times that an education really needs to start prekindergarten; yet one of the effects of sequestration, together with the government shutdown, was a significant reduction in prekindergarten education. In my district, some 6,000 young people were unable to participate in the Head Start program, not just for 16 days but for the many days out ahead, so they will enter kindergarten substantially behind their peers, providing an anchor to the economy as they move through their educational process, quite possibly becoming one of the high majority or the high percentage of students who drops out of high school.

As you move down this Make It In America agenda, we come down to one that is a fundamental investment, and that is the infrastructure system. We have a very high unemployment rate. There is no doubt about it. One of the ways to immediately employ Americans is to build the foundation for economic growth. These are all part of the foundation for economic growth. This is the concrete and steel when we talk about infrastructure. These are the roads, the airports, the railroads, the mass transportation systems, the sanitation systems, the water systems. So infrastructure becomes a critical part of any of the efforts that we need to make to rebuild America, to provide the foundation and to put Americans back to work.

There is some very interesting research that has come out of this, and here is a piece of it: for every dollar invested in infrastructure, \$1.57 is pumped back into the economy.

So if, for example, the Federal Government were to undertake the robust infrastructure program that the President put forth a year ago and reiterated in his State of the Union speech this last February and if we passed legislation, as he wanted, to put \$50 billion additional into the infrastructure program, the economy would not only be spending the dollar; it would be getting back \$1.57 for every one of those \$50 billion that the President wanted to put into America's infrastructure. Men and women would be working; the economy would begin to move forward more rapidly; and we would begin to see the kind of economic growth that this Nation needs to have, that the men and women who are unemployed or those who are seeking better jobs would want to have, and we would be laying the foundation for future economic growth.

We must keep this in mind. There are several things that could be done in this regard. One of them you just heard about during the brief interruption

when the Rules Committee came here to put before this House tomorrow and in the days ahead the Water Resources Development Act. This used to be biennial legislation that Congress would pass every 2 years to put in place the water, resources, the development of levees, transportation systems, such as the locks and the rivers and the channels, the ports, other kinds of water transportation systems. You had water; you had sanitation systems; you had levees. All of these critically important infrastructure projects are in the Water Resources Development Act.

It has been 5 years since there has been a Water Resources Development Act, but we have a chance now to push forward in this House of Representatives in the next few days an extremely important infrastructure piece of legislation. The good news is there is a good chance we will do it. The bad news is it is inadequately funded. There is not sufficient money in that program to actually build the kinds of things that we must have.

So what are we going to do?

One of the solutions was again proposed by the President in his infrastructure program that he presented to Congress, which has really not been acted on yet—an infrastructure bank, a bank that has been in existence in Europe for almost 30 years now. It is a public-private partnership in which the government invests money and in which private investors can also invest. That money would then be available for those kinds of infrastructure projects that are cash flow projects—for example, a sanitation system, a toll road, a toll bridge, an airport, a water system. All of these kinds of infrastructures have fees associated with them, so there is a cash flow that is generated sufficient to pay off the loan that is made available through the infrastructure bank.

Such a program has been introduced here in the House of Representatives since at least the early 1990s. It doesn't exist—it has never been passed—although, every year, one or another Member of the House of Representatives has tried. I know Congresswoman ROSA DELAUNO has introduced this for at least the last 15 years, but it has never been acted upon. You have to wonder why.

This seems to me to be eminently wise that we would create an infrastructure bank. The Federal Government can borrow money today. A 10-year note is just over, I think, 2.6 percent. That is really cheap money. Borrow that money. Put it in this bank. Loan it out at 2.8 percent to various cities, counties, water systems, and build the infrastructure. That is cheap money. It gives us a chance to get the economy growing, to employ people, to build the foundation for economic growth, and to raise taxes, not by increasing the tax rate but by people

paying taxes because they are now working. What a novel idea—people who work pay taxes just as we ought to be doing. So these are a couple of ideas about how we can move the economy forward.

There is another piece of this Make It In America agenda, and it is this: H.R. 1524. I like this piece of legislation. It is one I have introduced. What it basically says is: if we are going to build those clean energy projects—the wind, the solar, the advanced fuel, the hydrogen systems—all of which are subsidized by your tax money, then your tax money must be spent on American-made: American-made wind turbines, American-made solar panels. Let's Make It In America.

Why should we spend your tax money to buy steel from China to build the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge?

I am sure your answer would be we shouldn't, but we did—6,000 new jobs in China, zero in America. It was supposed to be 10 percent cheaper. It turned out to be 10 percent more expensive because there were flaws in the steel; the welds were not satisfactory. No, no. That is American taxpayer money. That American taxpayer money should have been used to buy American-made steel and to create a new, high-tech steel mill not in China, which is what happened, but, rather, in America. We ought to be buying American. We ought to be using our tax money to buy American-made goods and services, and that is exactly what this bill does. This is part of the Make It In America agenda.

I am going to show you one other little picture here. Normally, our trains don't run upside down, so let me make it right-side up:

This is an electric locomotive—brand new, made in Sacramento, California, by Siemens, the German manufacturing company, which is one of the world's biggest manufacturing companies. Why in the world are they making electric locomotives for Amtrak in Sacramento? Why are they doing that?

□ 2030

For years, Siemens has had a light-rail trolley manufacturing plant in Sacramento. In the American Recovery Act—the stimulus bill—there was some \$600 million for the purchase of 80 locomotives to replace the aging locomotives on the east coast Amtrak lines. Added to that \$600 million was a sentence that said, this money had to be spent only on American-made locomotives.

Siemens looked at that and goes: Hmmm, we can make locomotives in America—and they did, in Sacramento, California. Probably a couple of thousand jobs, suppliers from all over the Nation providing the parts—the electrical systems and the rest—for this locomotive, made in America, with American taxpayer money, because

someone in the stimulus bill added a sentence to an appropriation and said, this money must be spent on American-made locomotives.

We can do that with every one of our expenditures—or at least many of our expenditures—using your taxpayer money on American-made goods and services, a very, very wise thing to do, which, incidentally, was first suggested by George Washington and Alexander Hamilton. So if you want to go back to the Founding Fathers, use some of their ideas where they said—Alexander Hamilton in a report to George Washington said that the Federal Government should use its purchasing power to support American industry—buy American, Make It In America, use American taxpayer money on American-made goods and services. Not a bad idea. We need to pass that kind of legislation here.

I am going to take just a few more moments and talk about one of the great challenges that we have. I am going to start with this man who seemed to understand what it took to rebuild and to move the American economy and society forward. This is actually on one of the monuments at the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial here in Washington, D.C. When I took my grandchildren down there not too long ago, I read this to them and explained to them why this was important during the Great Depression, and why it is important today.

Roosevelt said during the height of the depression that “The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.” The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, but rather it is we provide enough for those who have too little.

Most of us have an image of the Great Depression—the food lines, the hungry, the unemployed. America has gone through something not as desperate, but nearly so—the Great Recession, beginning in 2008. Millions of Americans lost their jobs—well over 8, maybe as many as 10 million. Even more lost their homes, and there was a lot of hurt upon our land.

We have been working now since 2008 to restore the American economy. The stimulus bill was one such way—the proposals of the President—to rebuild the American infrastructure, to educate our kids, and a host of other things, what he called the American Jobs Program—incidentally, not taken up by our colleagues here in the House of Representatives on the majority side. Nonetheless, he recommended different ways to address this fundamental issue.

How do we provide enough for those who have too little? How are we doing? How is America doing on meeting the challenge that Franklin Roosevelt laid

out? The answer is seen in this chart and the answer is: not well at all. We are miserably failing to meet the challenge that Franklin Delano Roosevelt laid out during the Great Depression.

Here is what it is: of the economic growth from 2009 to 2012, the fraction of the growth that went to the top 1 percent—this is the new wealth that was generated by the American economy, the growth in the economy, the wealth, the growth in the economy—the top 1 percent got 95 percent of all of that wealth that was generated. The 99 percenters—99 percent of the American people—got to share 5 percent of the wealth that was generated by the economy.

This is a great tragedy. This is an unparalleled tragedy in the American economy. This is not just a 3-year period; this has actually been happening—not at the same horrible distribution that you see here—but it has actually been a phenomenon that has been going on in the American economy where the rich get richer and the great majority of Americans are standing still.

When I am not in my district and I hear people talk about their lives, they are talking about the fact that they are literally standing still economically. Poll after poll indicates that the American public knows and understands this. When asked how they are doing, they basically say they are just treading water, they are not moving forward, they are just doing the very best they can to hang on, to keep their nose above the water, to not go under.

We have to address this phenomenon. This doesn't happen because of the weather, it doesn't happen because of God or some other mysterious force. This happens because of policy, policy that this Congress, together with the Senate and even the Supreme Court and the President, put in place, a policy that is skewing the nature of the American economy in such a way as to add great wealth to those who already have great wealth and little to those who have very little.

We need to adopt policies to change this. On the floor of the House of Representatives, there should be a piece of legislation to raise the minimum wage. \$10 is a bare minimum. California—my home State—did that, raised the minimum wage to \$10 and then a couple of steps will go on in the future, a couple of higher steps. That is good, that is good for everyone, even those businesses small and large that are going to pay that higher wage. What it does is to share the wealth that is generated by this economy, providing those at the bottom, those hardworking men and women that are at the bottom, the opportunity to sustain their families, to sustain their livelihood. That is but one.

If we make those critical investments that create economic growth,

particularly education and job training, and put in place the programs that enhance manufacturing, we will see this begin to change, and we will see the 99 percenters begin to take their fair share of the wealth that they are generating. It is the men and women that toil, wherever they may be—in the Federal Government, in the State governments, in the manufacturing, in the fields of America—wherever they may be, those are the men and women that are creating wealth. I understand capital. It has a role in this, but capital and labor together. What we are seeing here is the men and women that toil are not getting the wealth that they helped to create.

This is a challenge. Tax policy is part of it. Policy such as minimum wage, the role of the labor unions putting pressure on the system so that the men and women that are working in those businesses are able to share more of that wealth. They are all part of this system, and we need to pay attention to it here on the floor.

So let's keep in mind the 99 percenters, who in the years 2009 to 2012 received 5 percent of the total wealth generated by the largest economy in the world—the American economy. Public policy means a lot.

Over the next several days, this Congress is going to deal with some profoundly important questions. The question of the role of the Federal Government—will we have another sequestration debacle on January 15? We could. The current sequestration, which the military is saying is a disaster for them, the education community, the research community, the transportation community, the health, the social welfare community, all say the sequestration is an unmitigated disaster.

They know, and the American public will soon know, that on January 15 the second shoe will fall and another \$105 billion will be taken out of the economy beginning on January 15 unless this House of Representatives and the Senate, together with the President, come up with a viable alternative, one in which the growth of the economy can be assured, in which the continued austerity programs which are holding back an incredibly powerful resource called the American economy are put aside, and we put in place those policies that create economic growth. We have an enormous challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3080, WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida (during the Special Order of Mr. GARAMENDI), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-251) on

the resolution (H. Res. 385) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3080) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HONORING GERARD L. LAROCHE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADEL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the United States loses several hundred of our greatest, those heroes of the Greatest Generation, every day. I speak of the World War II veterans whose valor, courage, and sacrifice stopped the evil shadow of the swastika from falling across the whole of humanity.

One of those heroes we lost recently was Gerard L. LaRoche, a World War II veteran of D-Day and the Battle of the Bulge, Mr. Speaker. He was a Harvard-trained linguist who continued to serve his country after the war at the National Security Agency for many years.

Gerard went home to be with his savior on October 6. He was 93 years old.

Gerard was a Renaissance man. He was a translator, a language teacher, and a professor at several universities and colleges, a choral director, and a calligrapher. He was also a talented draftsman, Mr. Speaker, a violinist, a photographer, a recording engineer, and a furniture maker.

Gerard was born of French-Canadian parents in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1920, the oldest of eight children and the son of a noted calligrapher and schoolteacher who encouraged his artistic talents.

Mr. Speaker, in 1933, at age 13, Gerard entered the seminary of the Marist Order but left at 21 to study at Boston College, where he received his bachelor's degree and his master's.

□ 2045

He specialized in the study of romance languages, and then the outbreak of World War II came and interrupted his studies. He enlisted in the Army and served with the 2nd Armored Division, where he was at Normandy on D-Day Plus Six, and at the Battle of the Bulge. His ability to speak many forms of French soon landed him as an aide to help U.S. military brass communicate with the Belgians and the French. Through all this, he found time to make sketches of the villages, cities, and countryside in England and in Europe. He eventually continued his studies until he received his masters from Harvard in romance philology.

While stationed in the southwest of England, he met his future wife, his be-

loved Joyce Latchem, at a village dance just weeks before D-Day. They were married on October 18, 1947.

And now, Mr. Speaker, for a time at least, Gerard has left behind his best friend and loyal wife, Joyce; his daughter, Marianne; two sons, Jerome and David; six grandchildren and 10 great-grandchildren. But they shall all meet again and gather together some day.

Mr. Speaker, Gerard LaRoche was a godly man, a devoted patriot and willing soldier, a committed husband, father, and friend. This national treasure will be missed, and we, his fellow Americans, are forever grateful to this noble champion of human freedom.

God bless Gerard.

OBAMACARE ORIGINATION CLAUSE

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to change subjects and talk about sometimes it is the water on the inside of a ship that sinks it rather than the water on the outside. Mr. Speaker, right now we have water on the inside of our ship because sometimes the Constitution itself is being ignored by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, in 2012, the Supreme Court narrowly and specifically upheld the individual mandate at the heart of ObamaCare under Congress' general taxing power. The Court noted specifically:

Even if the taxing power enables Congress to impose a tax on not obtaining health insurance, any tax must still comply with other requirements in the Constitution.

In short, Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare was upheld as a tax. The Supreme Court did not and has not yet considered a challenge to the Affordable Care Act's taxing provisions on the grounds that it violated the origination clause in the United States Constitution, and it most certainly did exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, the origination clause is found in article I, section 7, of the Constitution and states:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

In creating ObamaCare, Senator HARRY REID took an entirely unrelated bill, H.R. 3590 containing just 714 words that did not raise taxes, and then stripped it of everything but its bill number. He then put the 400,000-word ObamaCare that raised taxes in 17 different places in this empty-shell bill. Through this bit of legislative trickery, Mr. REID claims that ObamaCare originated in the House, when in fact every last provision of ObamaCare, including the largest tax increase in American history, all came from the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this sort of procedure absolutely ignores and vacates the Founders' intent, and it renders the origination clause of our Constitution completely meaningless. If it is allowed to stand, the origination clause in the Constitution is a dead letter.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a small or marginal issue. The principle behind

the origination clause was the moral justification for our entire War of Independence. Its importance was expressed through the Virginia House of Burgesses, the Stamp Act of Congress, and the First Continental Congress, all of which petitioned the Crown and Parliament in England for redress of their tax grievances. It was with these realities in mind that the origination clause of our Constitution was written; and without it at the core of the Great Compromise of 1787, the 13 original States would never have agreed to ratify the Constitution.

When our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution, they knew it was vital for the power to raise and levy taxes to originate in the people's House, whose Members are closest to the electorate with 2-year terms, rather than the Senate, whose Members sit unchallenged for 6-year terms and do not proportionally represent the American population, and already enjoy their own unique and separate Senate powers intentionally divided by the Framers between the two Chambers.

If we as Members of Congress, who took a solemn oath to defend and protect the Constitution, including its origination clause, fail to assert this right and responsibility as the immediate representatives of the people and those most accountable to them, we dishonor the Founders' memory and fundamentally abrogate our sworn oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States from all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Mr. Speaker, this fall, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit will hear an appeal in the case *Sissel v. HHS* as to whether ObamaCare violates the origination clause of the Constitution. I urge my colleagues to sign on to H. Res. 153 and to join me in an amicus brief that I will be filing with the court, along with 31 other Members of Congress currently, and this brief expresses our collective conviction that the passage of ObamaCare was and is unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare was the largest tax increase in American history. The United States Supreme Court specifically and officially ruled it a tax. Consequently, under NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID, the House and the Senate in passing it in the manner they did categorically violated the origination clause without which the U.S. Constitution never would have been born in the first place.

It is now the duty of the judiciary to strike down ObamaCare as a clear violation of the origination clause. The failure to do so is an abrogation of their judicial oath to the Constitution and undermines their relevance as an institution.

It would also allow the Obama administration to blow yet another huge hole in the constitutional fabric of this noble Republic.

Mr. Speaker, Daniel Webster said it this way:

Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution and the Republic for which it stands, for miracles do not cluster, and what has happened once in 6,000 years may never happen again. So hold on to the Constitution for if the American Constitution should fall, there will be anarchy throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the court will take those words seriously; and I hope when they hear ObamaCare, they will do the right thing: they will simply read the origination clause and understand that if they let the President blow through this, if we walk away from this, we simply undermine our credibility and our oath and we render a critical part of the Constitution that was vital to this Republic ever coming into existence, we render that part of the Constitution, as I said earlier, a dead letter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I guess it all comes down to making sure we understand as a people that the Constitution was put here to protect three basic rights: the right to live; the right to be free; and the right to own property. And, hopefully, that will allow us to pursue our dreams in the best way we know how; but none of those things can occur if our national security is significantly undermined or threatened; and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is today so let me shift gears one more time.

SECURITY THREAT OF NUCLEAR ARMED IRAN

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the greatest security threat in the world today is that of a nuclear-armed Iran. And now, Iran is once again the news of the moment. As talks have begun between the United States and Iran, American leaders given the charge to protect America's national security must not be charmed by wolves in sheep's clothing.

When innocent civilians in Syria were mercilessly attacked by chemical weapons, the Obama administration was caught on its heels in a foreign policy quandary. America was reminded again that the United States must always be vigilant and embrace an international relations framework which enables proactive engagement rather than merely reactionary, crisis response.

I desperately hope these discussions will proceed in the context of the grave reality the human family will face if nuclear weapons fall into the hands of jihadists in Iran.

Mr. Speaker, to use the slightly altered words of our Secretary of State: in a world of terrorists and extremists, we ignore these risks at our peril. We simply cannot afford to have nuclear weapons become the IED or car bomb of tomorrow. Neither our country, nor our conscience can bear the cost of inaction. An action that will reinforce the prohibition against illegal nuclear weapons is an authorization of military force in Iran. We are talking about ac-

tions that will degrade Iran's capacity to use these weapons and ensure that they do not proliferate. With this authorization, the President will simply have the power to make sure the United States of America means what we say.

Now, I can't say actually unquote, Mr. Speaker, because those words were changed just slightly. Actually, these are indeed the essential words of Secretary Kerry's recent justification for attacking Bashar al Assad's regime. However, when he said "Syria," I inserted "Iran." And whenever he said "chemical weapons," I inserted "nuclear weapons." Mr. Speaker, if this is a line of reasoning the administration chooses to stand behind, then we simply cannot refute the parallel argument related to a nuclear Iran, which poses an exponential greater national security threat to the United States than chemical weapons in Syria.

Secretary Kerry asserted Mr. Obama "means what he says." But, Mr. Speaker, if the world truly believed that this President means what he says, the chemical weapons crisis in Syria would never have occurred in the first place. Secretary Kerry said of the crisis in Syria that North Korea and Iran were closely watching our actions. Well, I don't disagree with him, Mr. Speaker, but the converse is actually far more true: Syria has been closely watching Mr. Obama's inaction toward North Korea and Iran since he became President. And, consequently, Assad felt he could use chemical weapons on innocent men, women, and children with impunity. The entire world now sees the U.S. under this President as all talk.

Mr. Speaker, our critical diplomatic policies must be backed by our unmovable will to back them up by all means necessary.

The popular concession this week is to embrace Iranian openness and regard their willingness to negotiate. But, Mr. Speaker, we know IAEA declarations have gone unanswered by this regime and diplomatic efforts, including 10 rounds of negotiations since 2011, and they have borne no fruit. Decades have passed without a single concession coming from the world's leading sponsor of terror. In 2005, we saw North Korea, another rogue nation, petition for talks without ending their nuclear weapons program, and demanding U.S. concessions. How did they hold up their end of the bargain, Mr. Speaker? They have conducted three flagrant nuclear weapons tests. This, in spite of the fact that North Korea has been sanctioned virtually into starvation for nearly half a century.

Iran is closer than ever and racing toward a full nuclear weapons capability. The Iranian Government's intentions, actions, and capacity to develop nuclear weapons capability and sponsor international terrorism are

terrifyingly clear. The time to regain our credibility with both our allies and foes alike in this region is now, before the situation devolves into a Syria-like situation, where we are frantically searching for solutions after the crisis has already begun.

To that end, I have introduced the U.S.-Iran Nuclear Negotiations Act. This act will strengthen the United States negotiating position in the upcoming talks with Iran. It will also outline congressional priorities in any nuclear negotiations with Iran. A bad deal with Iran which does not definitively prevent a nuclear weapons capable Iran is worse than no deal at all.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I will just say this about a nuclear Iran. I understand that there are great challenges; but whatever the cost, whatever the cost to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran may be, it will pale in insignificance compared to the cost to our children and the entire human family of allowing the jihadist regime in Iran to gain nuclear weapons.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2100

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize the point being made by my friend, Mr. FRANKS from Arizona, about the origination clause. I have been talking about this for 3½ years of when the Senate took a House bill that provided a tax credit for first-time home buyers who were in the military or veterans, took out every single word and took that short little bill and expanded that by thousands of pages—my copy was around 2,500 pages—it had nothing to do with military or veteran home buyers. It had nothing to do with that. They inserted health care. We have found out since it is costing more; and if you like your doctor, you're going to lose your doctor, and if you like your insurance policy, there is a good chance you may lose it. Fortunately, not everybody is losing their doctor, but the promises have been badly broken. It turns out those people, including the head of this administration, were just flat wrong when they said, If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor; if you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance.

For example, there is a story here from Kaiser Health News from Anna Gorman and Julie Appleby, dated October 21. I won't read all three pages, but this is what it points out:

Health plans are sending hundreds of thousands of cancellation letters to people who

buy their own coverage, frustrating some consumers who want to keep what they have and forcing others to buy more costly policies.

The main reason insurers offer is that the policies fall short of what the Affordable Care Act requires starting January 1.

On further it says:

But the cancellation notices, which began arriving in August, have shocked many consumers in light of President Barack Obama's promise that people could keep their plans if they liked them.

"I don't feel like I need to change, but I have to," said Jeff Learned, a television editor in Los Angeles, who must find a new plan for his teenage daughter, who has a health condition that has required multiple surgeries.

He liked his policy. She had a pre-existing condition. Now, because of ObamaCare, he has lost the insurance for him and his daughter, and he is going to have to find another plan, which will likely cost much more.

The article goes on and says:

An estimated 14 million people purchase their own coverage because they don't get it through their jobs. Calls to insurers in several States showed that many have sent notices.

Florida Blue, for example, is terminating about 300,000 policies, about 80 percent of its individual policies in the State. Kaiser Permanente in California has sent notices to 160,000 people—about half of its individual business in the State. Insurer Highmark in Pittsburgh is dropping about 20 percent of its individual market customers, while Independence Blue Cross, the major insurer in Philadelphia, is dropping about 45 percent.

The article further down talks about other notices and says:

Blue Shield of California sent roughly 119,000 cancellation notices out in mid-September, about 60 percent of its individual business. About two-thirds of those policyholders will see rate increases in their new policies, said spokesman Steve Shivinsky.

The President, Jay Carney, this administration, Senators who quoted this, Democrats, leaders here in the House, owe millions of people an apology. They owe an apology to those who they told that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor, and people that were told that if you like your policy, you can keep it.

I know that our President has traveled the world apologizing for things he did not do that were done in prior generations, prior times in this country; but I think in order to keep credibility in this country, it is important that instead of apologizing for things you had nothing to do with, it is important to apologize when people trust you and you make promises and those promises turn out to be totally false.

I understand that the President's spokesman may have indicated today that they may need to suspend the individual mandate. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that after HARRY REID and the President refused to suspend the individual mandate—that was the third compromise we proposed before the shutdown. They said, Absolutely not,

under no circumstances. Their actions made it very clear that they were saying, We are willing to shut this government down. We have already worked out the purchase and rental and the use of barricades to keep World War II veterans in wheelchairs from getting to see things they want to see. We have worked out barricades for the Martin Luther King, Jr., memorial, that so many come to Washington to see. We worked out barricades across the entire Lincoln Memorial plaza.

When I asked one park ranger the second day of the shutdown, how many they normally have out there, she said four. Actually, I've been there all hours of the day and night. I rarely see more than one or two in the area; yet I was shown a photograph that had mounted police, most of them on horseback in the picture, with a few of them standing around. It looked like there were at least 16 mounted police there to try to enforce the barricades at the World War II Memorial, which would violate the existing law that says in the event of a shutdown, you are not supposed to spend more money than you were before. Yet this administration, in order to make the hurt be felt across the country by veterans, by people who had their one-time vacation planned for a national park, this administration and HARRY REID were willing to shut down the government, rather than just suspend the mandate that individuals have to buy this insurance. Now they have got to buy it in the next few months. They have got to buy it. By their actions, they were saying, We are willing to shut the government down for over 2 weeks to keep from suspending that mandate to individuals. Yes, the President already issued what should be an illegal order saying that he was not going to enforce the mandate for Big Business under ObamaCare.

So this side of the aisle repeatedly said, Look, if you are going to suspend the mandate for Big Business—businesses with over 50 employees—then why not just agree to suspend for a year, the same amount of time you are giving to Big Business, do that for the individuals? Then, as the shutdown continued, we saw what a disaster, what a train wreck it was. The Democrats that called it a train wreck, a nightmare, they were exactly right. It was playing out in front of us, and still HARRY REID and this President said, We don't care. We are not suspending the individual mandate. We are forcing individuals to do what we are not making businesses do. Even though it is in the law required for businesses to do it, that seemed like a pretty easy ask.

That was where we were in the negotiations, right before the last bill we passed about an hour after midnight on October 1, which I saw as basically capitulation. All right, all right, HARRY REID, Mr. President, we are not de-

manding that you suspend the individual mandate as you have done for Big Business, but here are our conferees, negotiators. It is what the Constitution anticipates, and it is what the law and the rules require.

HARRY REID, again, by his actions said, We would rather shut this down. We would rather have mounted police out there in the face of our veterans. And as we saw when veterans ultimately took barricades to the White House, we saw, for the first time in my memory, officers of the Federal Government in uniform who were supposed to protect Americans' rights, instead for the first time in my memory, being used, the first time in my lifetime that I can remember, to take away Americans' and specifically veterans' rights that they fought for for all Americans.

It is almost unthinkable. It is like a bad dream, the Federal Government hiring officers to take away Americans' rights. How far is this administration willing to go to make Americans hurt, to get the money they want? How ironic that leaders in this administration, going to the top, would use the term "extortion." Extortion is when you do some action threatening someone with action if you don't give them all the money that they demand. I always thought when Jay Carney said that Congress is putting a gun to their heads to be paid for doing their job, that that didn't make sense because this is exactly the other way around.

Some of our Democratic friends are very good at taking action that is offensive to most Americans and then blaming their opponents for doing what actually they are doing when their opponents weren't even doing what was alleged. That is basically what we saw here, people saying Republicans in the House were using extortion. Hardly. The Constitution of the United States gives the Congress the purse strings, control over the money. What this administration said by their actions and made very clear is, We will harm World War II veterans, Korean veterans, Vietnam veterans; we will harm veterans by preventing them from getting to the cemetery in Normandy, being able to pull over and take a picture of Mount Rushmore, trying to take advantage of the Claude Moore farm that operates off of individual expenditures; they would put up barricades at a World War II Memorial that was built entirely with private funds that has a trust fund of millions of dollars that is used for operating expenses; they would go out of their way to spend more extra money just to make Americans' lives more difficult and unpleasant, all the while saying, We will never agree to suspend the individual mandate, the requirement that individuals buy a certain level of insurance or be fined the minimum of either \$95 or 1 percent of their income tax, whichever is lower.

One of these days some of the fact-checking people will actually admit

that I have been right and they have been wrong. Even with subsidies, people that make 133 percent of the poverty level are projected to come out of pocket potentially thousands of dollars, one, two, three—one projection that I had read before I talked about this ran \$3,000 even after the subsidies.

□ 2115

And so, you know, all the mainstream media that is doing everything they can to protect the President, some are coming around and realizing: Wait a minute; there were a lot of things that weren't true. And I appreciate NBC making some of these stories the stories they should be.

But it is appalling what is happening to Americans, what is happening to the health insurance they once had. It is time for real reform. And as I have said from this podium, going back 3, 3½ years, a bill that starts out as a fraud is not likely to get better. And when you take a House bill, because of the origination clause, article I, section 7, all bills that raise revenue must originate in the House.

Now, it could and had been considered that ObamaCare was not a revenue-raising bill. But when Chief Justice John Roberts did the unthinkable and rewrote legislation that clearly defined itself as a penalty and rewrote that as a tax—even though at page 15 he made clear that it was a penalty; it wasn't a tax. It was penalizing people for not doing an act. So under the anti-injunction statute, it was clearly a penalty, not a tax. But then to save it, he had to actually do the unthinkable and say further in the opinion, actually, it is a tax, not a penalty.

Well, once he defined it as a tax, in order to rule it constitutional, then, clearly, that is a bill that raises revenue. Clearly, article I, section 7 kicks in, and a bill to raise revenue, which is what taxes do, must originate in the House.

I have heard people say, who have not done the legal research, well, the Supreme Court has decided many times that you don't have to have precisely the same bill when the Senate strikes language in the House bill and puts other language in it and sends it back, then it still originated in the House. Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you that when you strike every single word of a bill, including the title about it being a tax credit for first-time home buyers in the Armed Forces or veterans, you even strike the title and substitute therein about a 2,500-page bill that is all about the government running health care, about getting health care records controlled by Washington, about creating navigators to get your personal information—which, actually, we have been told is just a dream for identity thieves because of how much information will be accessible, be stolen by hackers—you

put all of that stuff in there, dictating about what has to be put in vending machines, notices that have to be put, requirements for restaurants—I think there is a requirement for restaurants, they may have to have a place specifically for nursing mothers—you put all of those in there, including issues—and I love the fact that women nurse babies. I think it is one the greatest gifts God gave, but that has nothing to do with a tax credit for first-time home buyers in the military or veterans, so, clearly, that bill did not originate in the House. It originated in the Senate. When the only thing that is left of the bill that originated in the House is a number, like 3590, that is not a bill that originates in the House. It originated in the Senate.

And since we now know after the Supreme Court opinion that Chief Justice Roberts rewrote the law, which the Constitution simply does not allow, but the Supreme Court did it anyway—there are checks and balances. Congress could check the Supreme Court when they act unconstitutionally like that themselves. But he rewrote it to call it a tax after he called it a penalty, so that means it had to originate in the Senate. It did not originate in the House.

And what limited case law there is indicates it absolutely must be germane to the underlying bill, and that is not germane. There is no way that is germane to first-time home buyers. It is about the government controlling people's health care. It sets up a panel that will decide: Do you get a pacemaker or do you not get a pacemaker? You are too old for a pacemaker. You are going to die early because we are not going to let you have a pacemaker. Are you going to get the surgery you need?

You know, like people in England, Canada, others, again, I have had a number of people from England and Canada go, you know: Where are we going to go now when we need immediate treatment when you screw up the greatest health care system in the world?

It certainly needed reform. But what people need to understand is you can look at the entire history, recorded history of mankind, going back to the very beginning, when we knew what mankind was doing, and some medical historians say it was around 1900, 1910, 1912, maybe it was during World War I, 1916, '17, '18, maybe it was during the great influenza outbreak and protocols were established, but somewhere around that time, about 100 years ago, it has been said that for the first time in the entire human history you had a better chance of getting well than of getting worse after seeing a doctor. When you consider that just in 100 years this country has been at the forefront of saving lives, enhancing lives, improving quality of life, making in-

credible breakthroughs in medicine and health care—reforms were needed, but not the government taking it over and making it run like the Post Office, not the government taking it over and making it run like the Department of Education or Energy or Interior, that slows everything down, because when somebody needs heart surgery, they don't need the government in the process of slowing things down.

It is incredible what has been inflicted upon man by man, and the ObamaCare law is inflicting massive cost increases for most Americans, higher deductibles, running many doctors out of health care. It is time that this administration, if Jay Carney is willing to now say, after the President and HARRY REID shut down the government for over 2 weeks over a little temper tantrum that they did not want to suspend the individual mandate, that is what we were down to, and then after that, okay, just produce conferees—we have got ours; we will get an agreement hopefully by morning so most Americans will never even know the government was shut down—refused to even have conferees to work it out before morning because before that they weren't going to suspend the individual mandate. They would rather shut down the government indefinitely than allow individuals to have the same break that they gave to Big Business. I am a fan of Big Business as long as they treat people fairly and right. Most do.

But now to say, well, we may suspend the individual mandate, it means all the suffering this administration inflicted upon our veterans, on people on vacation, people that needed Federal services and didn't get them, on those whose loved ones were killed in Afghanistan, and this administration, though we gave them the power to pay the death benefits, wouldn't even do that, played games with their death benefits while they were grieving. This administration was willing to do all that, knowing we are probably going to have to do what the Republicans were asking anyway, but we will try to get—we know the mainstream media will blame it 100 percent on the Republicans. We know that is going to happen. They will give us cover, and so we can refuse something as reasonable as just suspending the individual mandate for a year, something as reasonable as just appointing conferees and working it out before morning. We can refuse to do those things because the mainstream media, MSNBC, CNN, they will give us cover, they will deceive the American public about who is at fault.

And I am wondering, if this administration goes about suspending the individual mandate that would have prevented there ever being a shutdown in the first place, which was the next to last thing we did before we just capitulated and said, all right, appoint conferees, if they are willing to do that

now, I still have hope that even CNN will have to recognize that it was the President and HARRY REID that shut the government down, that inflicted pain and suffering upon the American people who needed Federal services for something that they were agreeable to do anyway.

We will see. But then again, this is the same administration who weaponized the IRS to go after conservatives. Here is a story from today at Watchdog.org, by Kenric Ward, "IRS pays illegal immigrants \$4.2 billion while stalling Tea Parties."

It says:

On January 19, 2007, file photo, the U.S. Border Patrol detains a large group of suspected immigrants at the Arizona-Mexico border in Sasabe, Arizona.

While harrying and stalling Tea Party groups seeking nonprofit status, the Internal Revenue Service mailed \$4.2 billion in child credit checks to undocumented immigrants.

Critics say midlevel IRS bureaucrats continue to abuse the Additional Child Tax Credit program by dispensing \$1,000 checks to families in this country illegally.

"The law needs clarification that undocumented immigrants are not eligible," Senator Charles Grassley, Republican of Iowa, told Watchdog.org in a statement.

To make Congress' intent clear—that only legal U.S. residents are entitled to the Additional Child Tax Credits—Grassley cosponsored a clarifying amendment with Senator Mike Enzi, Republican from Wyoming.

"Unfortunately, the majority leader, Harry Reid, Democrat from Nevada, cut off debate, so we weren't given the chance to offer our amendment," said Grassley, the top Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee.

So all the while—and I spoke to another Tea Party group this weekend, different races, all ages, even kids, very, very senior people, both genders, people from all walks of life were there, and out of hundreds of people at that event, there was only one who got more benefits from the government than he paid in.

□ 2130

That is the common thread I see with the vast majority of Tea Party people. They pay income tax. Those who identify with the Tea Party are a majority of those paying income tax, the 53 percent, 52 percent, whatever it is. They ought to be able to say something without being called all kinds of criminal names, without being slandered and libeled. They just want fairness, and they are not seeing it.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the shutdown and that this administration was willing to make the American people—World War II veterans and so many others—suffer, the survivors of the loved ones who died in Afghanistan, make them suffer, when all they had to do was suspend the individual mandate for a year—and they are talking about doing it anyway—the American people ought to be furious.

Like I say, I still hold onto that hope that springs eternal in the human

breast that even the mainstream media will figure out who was actually at fault for the shutdown, when Republicans submitted compromise after compromise after compromise that included things the administration may do anyway. If we are going to get this country turned around, America is going to have to wake up to who is causing the problems and who isn't.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of an illness in the family.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of an illness in the family.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 23 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. HONDA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 23 on account of the death of a close family friend.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker on Wednesday, October 16, 2013:

H.R. 2775. An act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that an October 16, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2775. Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order and pursuant to House Resolution 383 and House Resolution 384, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 23, 2013, at 10 a.m., for morning-hour debate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable Thomas S. Foley and the late Honorable C.W. BILL YOUNG.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3328. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting designation for Funding for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism so designated by the Congress in section of 114(a) of the CR; (H. Doc. No. 113—67); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3329. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's "Major" final rule — Supervision and Regulation Assessments for Bank Holding Companies and Savings and Loan Holding Companies with Total Consolidated Assets of \$50 Billion or More and Nonbank Financial Companies Supervised by the Federal Reserve [Docket No.: R-1457, Regulation TT] (RIN: 7100-AD-95) received October 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3330. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's "Major" final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule [Docket No.: R-1442; Regulations H, Q, and Y] (RIN: 7100-AD 87) received October 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3331. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Norwegian Air Shuttle ASA (Norwegian Air Shuttle) of Fornebu, Norway, pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3332. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report summarizing the FDA's activities since the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act was enacted in 2009; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3333. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Utah; Maintenance Plan for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard for Salt Lake County and Davis County [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0958; FRL-9786-3] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3334. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirement for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0451; FRL-9901-22-Region 3] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3335. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation

of Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of California; PM10; Redesignation of Sacramento to Attainment; Approval of PM10 Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for Sacramento [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0887; FRL-9901-29-Region 9] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3336. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky; Stage II Requirements for Enterprise Holdings, Inc. at Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport in Boone County [EPA-R08-OAR-2013-0271; FRL-9901-23-Region 4] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3337. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP); Emergency Orders [EPA-R06-OAR-2006-0600; FRL-9901-30-Region 6] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3338. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Prevention of Significant Deterioration Requirements for PM2.5 Increments and Major and Minor Source Baseline Dates; Colorado [EPA-R08-OAR-2009-0810; FRL-9901-04-Region 8] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3339. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Louisiana: Final Authorization of State-initiated Changes and Incorporation by Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R06-2013-0027; FRL-9819-8] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3340. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for California [OAR-2004-0091; FRL-9831-2] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3341. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision of Air Quality Implementation Plan; California; Placer County Air Pollution Control District and Feather River Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0064; FRL-9833-1] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3342. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-

OAR-2013-0508; FRL-9900-96-Region 9] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3343. A letter from the Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergency Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3344. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 09-13 informing of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding with NATO Alliance Ground Surveillance Programme; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3345. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Notification of the intention to exercise the authority under Section 552(c)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to authorize the drawdown to the Supreme Military Council (SMC) of the Free Syrian Army (FSA); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3346. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3347. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3348. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3349. A letter from the Executive Officer, District of Columbia Courts, transmitting modifications to the Jury Plan of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3350. A letter from the Archivist, National Archives, transmitting Archives' FY 2013 Commercial Activities Inventory and Inherently Governmental Inventory, as required by the FAIR Act and OMB Circular A-76; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3351. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's budget request for fiscal year 2015, in accordance with Section 7(f) of the Railroad Retirement Act; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Ways and Means, and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on October 16, 2013 the following report was filed on October 21, 2013]

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3080. A bill to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-246, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

[Filed October 22, 2013]

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1443. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recognize tinnitus as a mandatory condition for research and treatment by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 623. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, with an amendment (Rept. 113-248, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1963. A bill to amend the Water Conservation and Utilization Act to authorize the development of non-Federal hydropower and issuance of leases of power privileges at projects constructed pursuant to the authority of the Water Conservation and Utilization Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2463. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States (Rept. 113-250, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 385. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3080) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-251). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following action occurred on October 21, 2013]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on the Budget, Ways and Means, and Natural Resources discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3080 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

[The following action occurred on October 22, 2013]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 623 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2463 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 3300. A bill to reauthorize the programs and activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. VELA, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 3301. A bill to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RADEL, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARBER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. BARTON, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COTTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON,

Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENYART, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. FARETHOLD, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOWDY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HALL, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KLINE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATTI, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LONG, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LOWEY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MESSER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NUNES, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PALONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr.

PETERS of Michigan, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REED, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SALMON, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SIRE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. YODER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 3302. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Bay Pines, Florida, as the "C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, considered and passed.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia):

H.R. 3303. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for regulating medical software, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COOK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENYART, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr.

KILMER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOEBBACH, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. MENG, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RIGELL, Mrs. ROBY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. BARBER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H.R. 3304. A bill to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor to Bennie G. Adkins and Donald P. Sloat of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam Conflict and to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to certain other veterans who were previously recommended for award of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ENYART, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 3305. A bill to improve the circulation of \$1 coins, to remove barriers to the circulation of such coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3306. A bill to promote and expand the application of telehealth under Medicare and other Federal health care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3307. A bill to authorize microenterprise assistance for renewable energy projects in developing countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 3308. A bill to require a Federal agency to include language in certain educational and advertising materials indicating that such materials are produced and disseminated at taxpayer expense; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.J. Res. 97. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to applying laws equally to the citizens of the United States and the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. GRIMM):

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the execution-style murders of United States citizens Ylli, Agron, and Mehmet Bytyqi in the Republic of Serbia in July 1999; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 383. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House on the death of the

Honorable Thomas S. Foley, former Member of the House for 15 terms and Speaker of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred First, One Hundred Second and One Hundred Third Congresses; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H. Res. 384. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House on the death of the Honorable C.W. Bill Young, a Representative from the State of Florida; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H. Res. 386. A resolution recognizing the religious and historical significance of the festival of Diwali; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MENG, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOGETT, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. VELA, Ms. CHU, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. HAHN, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. BASS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. ESTY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JENKINS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Res. 387. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding sexually exploited and trafficked girls in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. POCAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WATT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ENYART, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BASS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H. Res. 388. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives supporting Federal employees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 3300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 (relating to interstate compacts).

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 3301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 3302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United States Constitution, Article I Section 8

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 3303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 3304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

The Congress shall have the power "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 3305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, ("The Congress shall have power to... coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.")

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 3306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 3308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article I, Section 9—No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.J. Res. 97.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution.

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. MICHAUD and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 94: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 274: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 292: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 366: Mr. PERRY, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. SIREs.
H.R. 411: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 435: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 494: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 495: Mr. COHEN and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 503: Mr. GALLEG0.
H.R. 541: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 562: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 679: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 685: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 713: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 715: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 721: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 724: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 763: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 787: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 920: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 921: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 940: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 996: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1008: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 1019: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1020: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SIREs, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1037: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1083: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1091: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 1094: Ms. BASS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SIREs, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1149: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 1250: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1309: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1318: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1321: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1339: Mr. HONDA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1362: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1418: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 1500: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1515: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1518: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 1521: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 1523: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 1553: Mr. RADEL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SCALISE, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1630: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1665: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1666: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1701: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 1761: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 1779: Mr. POLIS and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1795: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1796: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1801: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1812: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1821: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1845: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1852: Mr. TONKO, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1861: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1869: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1910: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1984: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 1999: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2026: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2029: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2053: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 2073: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2083: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2123: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2134: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 2174: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 2194: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2195: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2249: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2274: Mr. FINCHER and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2310: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2311: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2330: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2350: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2376: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 2377: Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 2415: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 2429: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2480: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2485: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2504: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETRI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2575: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2662: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2692: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2697: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SABLON, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2702: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2725: Mr. RADEL, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2750: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2772: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2822: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2839: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PETERSON, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2846: Mr. COTTON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 2856: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2863: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2866: Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LONG, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2874: Mr. POLIS and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2894: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2902: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2903: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 2908: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 2920: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2939: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2959: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 2962: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2998: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 3040: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 3050: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 3077: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 3086: Mr. COBLE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 3108: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HOLT, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 3121: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 3135: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3143: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3146: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 3154: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 3165: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 3169: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 3179: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 3205: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. JENKINS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 3209: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 3211: Mr. MCENRY.
H.R. 3229: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3278: Mr. WOLF, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3286: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. COFFMAN.
H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. SIMPSON.
H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. GARDNER.
H. Con. Res. 60: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 72: Mr. HOLT and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H. Res. 131: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H. Res. 254: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H. Res. 284: Mr. LONG, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H. Res. 329: Mr. ROSKAM.

H. Res. 359: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. PETERSON.

H. Res. 365: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. GARCIA, and Ms. TSONGAS.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

The amendment to be offered by Representative SHUSTER, or a designee, to H.R. 3080, does not contain any congressional ear-

marks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3205, the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE
LIFE OF NATHAN S. GOODWIN

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Nathan S. Goodwin, of Glendale, Wisconsin, who passed away peacefully on October 5, 2013 at the age of 93.

Nathan Goodwin proudly served his country as an Army Warrant Officer in the Pacific during World War II. He returned to Wisconsin after the war where he raised four children with his wife of 64 years, Eleanor (nee Siegman). He was President of Temple Beth El's Men's Club and devoted his free time to fishing, gin rummy and poker.

Nathan Goodwin loved his family deeply and is survived by his beloved wife Eleanor, his children Jack (Patricia) Goodwin, Alan (Claudia) Goodwin and Julie (Michael) Walker. He was predeceased by his son Richard (the late Susanne) Goodwin. He was the fond brother of the late Adeline (the late Max) Nelson and loving grandfather of Stefanie Goodwin, Jordan (Christine) Goodwin; Hannah Goodwin, Emily Goodwin; Molly Walker and Nora Walker. I'm proud to have his granddaughter Erica Goodwin as part of my Washington, D.C. congressional staff.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and accomplishments of Nathan S. Goodwin, and join me in extending our condolences to the entire Goodwin family. Their loss is also a loss to our nation of a good and decent man who lived an exemplary life as a citizen, a patriot, a husband, a father and a grandfather.

RECOGNIZING THE RECIPIENTS OF
THE 2013 NIAGARA STREET AREA
BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL
ASSOCIATION ANNUAL DINNER
AWARDS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding recipients of the 2013 Niagara Street Area Business and Professional Association.

The Niagara Street Area Business and Professional Association is an association of business and professional men and women living in, owning or operating a business or service in the Niagara Street Community. They are dedicated to improving and aiding in the development of the community. The members of the Association work together to make Niagara Street a progressive and serving commu-

nity of which one can be proud. This year's awardees embody these noble values.

The recipients of the 2013 Niagara Street Area Business and Professional Association Awards are the Zajac Funeral Home, Inc., Marsha (Koban) Frost, Norma Higgs, Bob Anderson, Niagara Street School, Nick D'Agostino, Rev. Kevin Dobbs and Don King.

Each of these impressive individuals has made significant contributions in various career and community endeavors. I am proud to see such dedicated, hard-working individuals be recognized tonight, and applaud their efforts to better our community.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me the opportunity to recognize the recipients of the 2013 Niagara Street Area Business and Professional Association Awards, and those who work tirelessly for this valuable organization. Their achievements are commendable and their devotion to our community is inspiring. I wish each and every one of them the best in all their future endeavors.

IN SUPPORT OF THE GREATER
WEST BLOOMFIELD REPUBLICAN
CLUB

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Greater West Bloomfield Republican Club of Michigan, who like so many organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws an morality contradict each other.

They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American organization.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on October 14, 2013, I missed the following rollcall votes: number 547, to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair; number 548, passage of H.J. Res. 80; and number 549, on agreeing to the Grayson amendment to the title. Had I voted, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote number 547, "nay" on rollcall vote number 548, and "aye" on rollcall vote number 549.

HONORING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAINT PETER THE APOSTLE CHURCH

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Saint Peter the Apostle Church, located in Parsippany, Morris County, New Jersey, which is celebrating its 75th anniversary.

Saint Peter the Apostle Church has been serving the growing Catholic community of the Lake Parsippany and Lake Hiawatha areas since its beginning on June 29, 1938. Bishop Thomas McLaughlin, the church's founder, along with Father Philip J. Coyne, the church's first pastor, began Saint Peter the Apostle Church's momentous progression. Initially in 1938, the church borrowed space from the Lake Hiawatha Fire Station to host mass. In September of 1939, Father Coyne and Bishop McLaughlin signed the contracts to begin construction of the facility that would house Saint Peter the Apostle Church for nearly 50 years.

Reverend James P. Smith's arrival as pastor in 1941 was yet but another key moment

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

in the church's history. In tandem with the Archdiocese of Paterson's Bishop James A. McNulty, Father Smith coordinated a \$450,000 project to construct a new convent, school, and auditorium in March of 1959. Later that year the school opened its doors to its first body of students ranging from kindergarten to fourth grade. Under the supervision of Sister Mary Mueller, OP, the principal, Saint Peter the Apostle School received Middle State accreditation, one of the school's most notable accomplishments.

June 8, 1965 marked the start of another expansion within the church and it began with the appointment of Reverend William F. Wanerka as pastor. The church's pastoral family grew once again in the 1980s with the addition of Reverend George Dimler and Reverend David Richardson as the first permanent deacons. However, it was not until the addition of Monsignor Flanagan on June 15, 1985 when the church and the school underwent its largest transformation to date.

The first few years of Monsignor Flanagan's tenure witnessed the rapidly increasing church community outgrow the original facility built in 1939 and 1940. As the church community grew in those few years, Monsignor Flanagan supervised numerous workers and volunteers to plan and construct a new, larger church capable of accommodating up to 1,000 people. Opening on February 20, 1988 the new and improved facility was capable of hosting programs like their new Sunday Gospel Program for children. This new facility gave the parish the ability to serve even more members of the Parsippany community.

Unfortunately, the increase in church members did not bring an increase in Saint Peter the Apostle School enrollment. However, rather than close the school and relinquish their ability to provide an education for those students that remained, the Saint Peter the Apostle School merged with Saint Christopher School, another parish in Parsippany. The new school, All Saint Academy, now serves the children of three Parsippany churches, Saint Peter the Apostle, Saint Christopher, and Saint Ann. The merger has allowed the Saint Peter the Apostle Church to serve an even larger number of children within the Parsippany area for many years to come.

Saint Peter the Apostle Church has provided an invaluable and meaningful service for the people of Parsippany and will continue to do so with the continued support of the members of the parish and of the community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating Saint Peter the Apostle Church as they celebrate their 75th anniversary.

IN MEMORY OF TARA HOWARD
KNAUFF

HON. KEVIN BRADY
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tara Howard Knauff, who I had the privilege of knowing during her tenure at KTRH NewsRadio in Houston. Tara was a

small town girl from rural upstate New York who dreamed of making a difference. We Texans were blessed that for many crucial years, she brought her talents and passion to make a difference in the Lone Star State.

Tara got her start in broadcast journalism at Utica College of Syracuse University and honed her talents at WGY, WHAM, and WSYR before packing up her horse and making the move to Texas.

While at KTRH, Tara was a newsroom leader who reported, anchored, edited, and rose to the position of assistant news director. When Tara returned to New York, she took her talents to a national stage at ABC NewsRadio. A leader in the ABC newsroom, friends and co-workers all seem to use the same words to describe Tara: "mentor," "hard worker," "inspirational," and so much more.

Tara, who adopted so many young journalists, found her own happiness with a partner who waged a heroic battle against cancer with her day in and day out.

Just last May, Tara married retired Major General Robert "Bob" Knauff, a former commander of the New York Air National Guard and fighter pilot. When she told her friends about him, she wanted them all to "Google" him to see how amazing he is. After giving so much to his country, Bob gave Tara his undivided attention, support, and love during her long battle with cancer.

While Tara lost her battle this week, her spirit lives on in the hundreds of broadcast journalists around the Nation that she encouraged every day. Today, so many of her protégées are vowing to continue her legacy and make their Tara proud.

Tara leaves behind a beloved family, including her soul mate Bob Knauff, her sister Deborah, brother Merritt, and sister-in-law Lynne, and many nieces and nephews, Damaris, Devin Brianna, Laura, and Mick.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF MRS. HELEN SONDEL AS SHE
CELEBRATES HER 100TH BIRTH-
DAY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Helen Sondel as she celebrates her 100th birthday on October 31st, 2013.

Born in Poland in 1913, Helen made the journey to the United States at the age of thirteen. Due to the poor health of her mother, Helen bravely made the journey alone. Once she arrived in America, she was reunited with her father.

Determined to begin a new life in the United States, Helen made her way to Buffalo, New York. She enrolled in the Buffalo Public School System, seizing her opportunity to obtain an education.

During World War II, Helen channeled her indefatigable spirit into supporting the war effort at home. She worked in the Bell Aircraft Factory, which produced fighter planes, including the first supersonic aircraft, the Bell X-1.

She married the love of her life, Anthony Sondel on May 20, 1933. After nearly seven years of marriage, the couple adopted their beloved son David from the Father Baker infant home. Helen's family has grown to include six grandchildren and eleven great-grandchildren, who she loves dearly.

Helen is a faithful member of the St. John Baptist church in Kenmore. She enjoys staying active by gardening, playing cards, shopping, and spending time with her family.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to celebrate Helen Sondel's 100th birthday, her generous spirit, and her boundless love for her family and friends. Thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize the legacy of this outstanding woman. I wish Helen and her family all the best for their many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO DANNY HENRY
POULOS, JR.

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Danny H. Poulos of Council Bluffs, Iowa who passed away on October 4th following a yearlong struggle with glioblastoma, a terminal form of brain cancer.

Danny was born on December 30th, 1970 to his parents Dan and Kathy and grew up with his siblings Helen and George. After graduating from Abraham Lincoln High School, Danny went on to earn a degree in construction management from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Upon obtaining his degree, Danny married his wife Julie and together they had three children—Danny III, Sylvia, and Bobby.

Danny will fondly be remembered for his invaluable contributions to the family business, Pizza King, which has been a part of his family for decades. Throughout the years, Danny became the face of Pizza King, often mentoring those around him and ushering the restaurant towards countless awards for service, atmosphere, food and more.

While the contributions to his business and neighbors have defined his role in the community, Danny would be the first to tell you that his family was always his number one priority. Danny is survived by his wife, parents, children, siblings and numerous extended family members that will never forget his incredible love and dedication.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Poulos was a one-of-a-kind Iowan who truly embodied the work ethic and family values our state is renowned for. In his passing, we are reminded of his creative mind, loving heart, and fighting spirit which will be deeply missed. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in offering the Poulos family my prayers and deepest sympathies during this extraordinarily difficult time.

IN RECOGNITION OF CRAIG AND
MARC KIELBURGER

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the tireless work and dedication of Craig and Marc Kielburger on behalf of the world's children.

Craig and Marc Kielburger co-founded Free the Children in the mid-1990s when Craig, at the age of 12, organized several of his classmates after being inspired by the story of a young Pakistani child labor activist.

Over the span of 18 years, Free the Children has expanded to have a global impact, using a holistic approach to work on some of the developing world's most challenging issues. Since 1995, the organization has contributed to the construction of more than 650 schools that serve approximately 55,000 children around the world. Free the Children has also provided 1,000,000 people with clean water, health care and sanitation services, and has assisted 30,000 women achieve economic sufficiency. Today, Free the Children has a presence in 45 countries, and Craig, Marc and their team have successfully recruited 2 million volunteers under the age of 18 to give back to their peers around the globe.

After many successful years of growing Free the Children, Craig and Marc launched Me to We, an organization focused on promoting sustainable business and consumer practices. This unique operation taps into the power of the market, teaching and encouraging young consumers to make socially conscious choices each time they spend money. The organization coordinates numerous volunteer trips abroad each year, and more than \$5 million raised by Me to We has been reinvested in Free the Children since 2009.

Craig and Marc Kielburger have dedicated nearly their entire lives to educating and empowering young people. The impact of their work has spread far beyond Free the Children and Me to We—indeed, Craig's and Marc's programs are equipping today's youth with the tools they need to become responsible global citizens and forward-thinking leaders. I am pleased and honored to recognize Craig and Marc Kielburger for their accomplishments and unflagging effort to making the world a better place.

RECOGNIZING NORWOOD "WOODY"
OLMSTED ON HIS RETIREMENT
FROM FEDERAL SERVICE

HON. MADELINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Norwood "Woody" Olmsted on the occasion of his retirement, after 31 years of service with the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) Office of Legislative Affairs, and legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). His retirement was effective on June 28, 2013.

Before Woody began his extensive career as a federal civilian employee, he spent 18 years as a high school music teacher. He later worked with the INS as an Immigration Inspector in Maine. He was subsequently transferred to the Los Angeles International Airport where he continued as an Immigration Inspector until he was promoted to an Immigration Examiner position at the Los Angeles District Office. He moved to Washington, D.C., in 1988, to work in the INS Office of Congressional Relations, now the USCIS Office of Legislative Affairs. During this time, Woody shared his knowledge and expertise on immigration laws and regulations with Congressional staff and helped resolve many urgent and high-profile inquiries. His dedication to his work earned him numerous awards and recognitions, and he remains well-regarded among Members of Congress and Congressional staffers.

Woody is married to Emily Duenas Olmsted from Guam; both are active and longtime members of the Guam Society of America in Washington, D.C.

For his service to our country, I extend a very sincere un Dangkulo na Si Yu'os Ma'ase. I wish Woody and his wife, Emily, the very best as they transition to the next stage of their life and enjoy a long and happy retirement together.

HONORING MIKE WICKERSHAM

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mike Wickersham of Winchester, Indiana on being selected by Governor Mike Pence to chair the Indiana Region 6 Works Council.

Mike is President of Wick's Pies, Inc., which has produced pies and pie shells for more than 50 years in Winchester. He serves his community as a member on the Randolph County Economic Development Board, the Region 6 Local Elected Officials Executive Council, the Randolph County YMCA, and as a Randolph County Commissioner.

Mike's civic leadership and business experience will be an asset for Hoosiers as he serves as Chair of the Indiana Region 6 Works Council. The Indiana Works Councils, created by Governor Pence, are responsible for submitting evaluations of the career, technical and vocational education opportunities that will be used to better prepare high school students for entering the workforce.

I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in congratulating Mike Wickersham on having been selected to serve the State of Indiana as Chair of the Indiana Region 6 Works Council.

ACKNOWLEDGING CAROL HADLEY

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge Carol Hadley, President of the California Federation of Republican Women 2012–2013. Carol is an energetic and tireless leader for the Republican Party, its elected officials, and conservative principles and ideals. She has performed an exemplary service for her party and the California Federation of Republican Women over the years, and her term as President will be coming to an end this year.

Carol grew up in Manassa, Colorado. She attended Eastern New Mexico University and also, Eastern Oregon University where she obtained a Bachelor of Science degree. Carol found a partner in life when she married Jerry Hadley, and he has been supportive in her endeavors ever since. Mrs. Hadley has been active in the Republican Party for numerous years, holding many local and state positions within the organization before being elected President in 2012.

Carol has been an outstanding advocate all across the state of California promoting the objectives of the CFRW. Through her efforts, she has let the charge to: "Promote an informed public through education and activity; increase the effectiveness of women in the cause of good government; influence legislation and maintain a CFRW presence in State government in accordance with CFRW goals; promote a wider knowledge of the principles and policies of the Republican Party; Encourage active citizenship; cooperate with the California Republican Party and the County Central Committees for the election of Republican Nominees; facilitate cooperation among Federated Republican Women's Unit Clubs; and foster loyalty to Republican candidates in all elections including nonpartisan elections."

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating with the California Federation of Republican Women as they honor Carol Hadley and her leadership. Congratulations, I wish Carol every success in her continued endeavors in support of our nation, its freedom and its history.

CONGRATULATING BETH HARWELL

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, there's an old quote that reminds us women hold up half the sky. I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to honor one woman who holds up half the Tennessee sky and all the State House. I congratulate State Representative Beth Harwell as she receives the Joe and Honey Rodgers Leadership Award.

Unanimously elected as Tennessee's first female Speaker of the House in 2011, Beth Harwell began her elected service in the state's 96th General Assembly. Receiving the Rodgers Leadership Award as the 2013 Christian Civic Leader of the Year, Speaker Harwell

is recognized for her work in areas such as preventing child abuse, lowering unemployment, and reforming welfare.

Citizens have a divine obligation to serve their communities. I am grateful for organizations like The Operation Andrew Group and United 4 Hope as they offer their time, talents, and treasures to the Middle Tennessee area. Along with her husband Sam and children Allie, Sam, and Tucker, I congratulate Speaker Harwell and I ask my colleagues to join with me in celebrating Speaker Harwell's good work, her dedication to serving the least among us, and her leadership in Tennessee.

**SIGNIFICANCE OF NATIONAL
LATINO HIV/AIDS DAY**

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the physical, emotional, and psychological toll of HIV/AIDS is overwhelming, and contributes to family stress, community breakdown, and lost work productivity. HIV/AIDS has taken a devastating toll on minority populations, particularly the Latino community, which is why promoting National Latino AIDS Awareness Day is so important.

This year's theme is "Hispanics United to End AIDS," highlighting the progress made toward combating the deadly virus and encouraging members of the Hispanic community to work together to ensure they have adequate resources and opportunities for healthier and brighter futures.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Latinos represented 16 percent of the U.S. population but accounted for 20 percent of the new HIV infections and 19 percent of people living with HIV infection. As of 2011, Latinos make up 31.9 percent of New Yorkers living with HIV/AIDS. Knowing one's HIV infection status by getting tested is critical for seeking early medical treatment and intervention. This also helps prevent unknowingly transmitting the infection to other individuals.

Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND and I authored a bill, Communities United with Religious Leaders to Eliminate (CURE) HIV/AIDS Act, which will expand educational HIV/AIDS activities, develop policies for providing culturally relevant and sensitive treatment to individuals with HIV/AIDS, and incentivize payments to healthcare providers to implement HIV/AIDS testing. HIV/AIDS cannot conquer our communities. Let's keep fighting to eradicate this dreadful disease.

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. DINA TITUS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the people of the Republic of China (Taiwan) as they celebrate as their National Day this week.

I am proud to consider myself a friend of the Republic of China and value the relationship between our two nations, which over the last century, has resulted in strong relationship focused on our cultural and economic ties. I visited Taiwan as a state legislator and often welcome its representatives to District One.

With the recent expansion of the Visa Waiver Program to include the Republic of China, the United States in general and Las Vegas particularly are excited about hosting even more visitors from Taiwan.

Moreover, I would also like to see Taiwan join the International Civil Aviation Organization soon. Taiwan's participation in this important organization will promote global aviation safety and security while strengthening ICAO as an institution.

The United States and Taiwan continue to share a close friendship and important economic relationship, and I congratulate the people of Taiwan on the occasion of their National Day.

**IN SUPPORT OF THE TROY/
CLAWSON REPUBLICAN FORUM**

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Troy/Clawson Republican Forum of Michigan, who like so many organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens' rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The

roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American organization.

**HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE
OF DELFINA TYQUIENGCO
AGUIGUI**

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Delfina Tyquiengco Aguigui, a devoted educator and public servant on Guam. She was born in the village of Merizo on December 1, 1921 to Ignacio Babauta Aguigui and Buevenida Tyquiengco Aguigui. She passed away on September 21, 2013 at the age of 91.

Delfina dedicated herself to educating Guam's youth. Upon graduating from Syracuse University in New York, she returned to Guam as a teacher within the Guam public school system. She went on to become the principal of George Washington High School in Mangilao, Associate Superintendent for Secondary Education, and then the Deputy Director of the Guam Department of Education. In these capacities, she worked to improve the quality of education for Guam's public school students. She was also a member of the University of Guam faculty where she was responsible for student housing.

Delfina also worked to improve the federal-territorial relationship between the United States and Guam. In 1975, she was appointed to the 13th Guam Legislature's Political Status Commission, which worked to educate the people of Guam on the need to review Guam's political relationship with the U.S. This Commission organized the first formal plebiscite, which was held in September of 1976, where the people of Guam expressed their desire to improve Guam's political relationship with the U.S. In 1976 Delfina was also appointed the Executive Director of the Guam American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and organized local festivities to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the American Revolution.

Delfina will be missed by all who knew her. I extend my sincere condolences to her family, friends, and loved ones. I join the people of Guam in honoring her for her many contributions to our island and people.

**HONORING WALTER CRENSHAW,
JR., LONGEST LIVING MEMBER
OF THE TUSKEGEE AIRMEN**

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true American Hero.

This weekend, Walter Crenshaw, Jr. will celebrate his 104th birthday. As the longest living member of the Tuskegee Airmen, he has led a remarkable life.

In October 1942, Walter Crenshaw was inducted into the United States Army Air Corps, ultimately attaining the rank of Sergeant. Sergeant Crenshaw was stationed at Tuskegee Army Air Field (TAAF) in Tuskegee, Alabama from 1942 through 1944. He served as the Administrative Assistant to the Provost Marshal during the initial training for the 99th Pursuit Squadron's training period as well as the 332nd Fighter's Squadron. An additional 500 cadets would follow during his service. Sergeant Crenshaw was responsible for the induction and background work on each cadet. As a result, he came to know each man personally.

The Tuskegee Airmen broke through racial, military and political barriers to become the first African American military aviators in the United States Armed Forces. Sergeant Crenshaw was among the men to successfully join this courageous group of men. He has been since honored for his service, receiving the Congressional Medal of Honor and the Harriet Tubman Living Legends Award, and his profile is a permanent part of the exhibit, "Tuskegee Airmen, Men in Flight" at the California African American Museum in Los Angeles.

After leaving the service, he and his wife lived in Detroit while he served for 22 years as the Head of Shipping Clerk for Railway Express.

They retired to Santa Monica in 1977, where Mr. Crenshaw kept active with photography and taking classes at Santa Monica College. At least four days a week, he would bike to the Santa Monica Pier to fish. Now, he currently resides in the Veterans Home of California in West Los Angeles on the VA Medical Center Campus. His many interests include Jazz, particularly Duke Ellington, watching baseball games, and attending the First A.M.E. Church in Los Angeles. The Crenshaw family now spans four generations.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Sergeant Crenshaw, an American treasure, and wishing him a healthy and joyous 104th birthday.

IN RECOGNITION OF MALALA
YOSAFZAI

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Malala Yosafzai, who today was awarded the European Parliament's Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought.

I join our European counterparts in honoring Malala's tremendous bravery in the face of repeated and unconscionable threats, including an assassination attempt last year, when she was shot by Taliban gunmen while returning home from school.

Malala's courageous advocacy for the rights of girls to have the same education as boys inspires us all.

Throughout our history, Americans have understood the importance of education. Put

simply, we are a stronger, healthier, and more prosperous nation because we have made quality primary and secondary education available to all our children.

The same is not true in other parts of the world, especially in societies torn apart by conflict, violent extremism, and poverty. There are tens of millions of girls out of school around the world, and women make up nearly two thirds—almost 500 million—of the world's illiterate adults. In her address to the United Nations, Malala reminded the world of the power of education to combat ignorance, intolerance, and violent extremism by promoting human dignity and creating undreamed-of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I join Malala in her call on the world's leaders to ensure that all children—girls and boys alike—have access to a quality education. By working with our international partners to achieve this goal, we can help families around the world lift themselves out of dire poverty and, in so doing, make the world a safer and more prosperous place.

RECOGNIZING THE 2013 SAFEST
HOSPITAL IN ILLINOIS

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize OSF St. James-John W. Albrecht Medical Center in Pontiac, Illinois for being named the Safest Hospital in Illinois by Consumer Reports magazine.

Like many Americans, I am concerned about the increasing cost of healthcare in the United States. With healthcare spending by patients on the rise, it is critical to find ways to ensure healthcare remains accessible and affordable. OSF St. James is a leader in this regard. By striving to provide safe treatment to patients on a daily basis, they reduce the frequency of readmitted patients which in turn reduces the added cost of additional procedures and care. The City of Pontiac and the surrounding area can take pride in their local hospital for the quality of care it provides to family, friends, and neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 16th District of Illinois, I wish to express our appreciation of the staff at OSF St. James-John W. Albrecht Medical Center for their diligent work and commitment to providing safe healthcare to their patients.

IN MEMORY OF COLONEL PHILIP
A. BOSSERT, USAF (RET.)

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Colonel Philip Bossert of the United States Air Force. Colonel Bossert bravely, and peacefully, embarked on his final journey after a valiant battle against glioblastoma, an aggressive form of brain cancer.

A decorated veteran of 4 wars, Colonel Bossert honorably served his country for more than three decades.

Phil graduated from the U.S. Air Force Academy in 1982, and was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the USAF. During the ensuing years he received a Masters of Arts in Economics, magna cum laude, from Old Dominion University; a Masters of Military Art and Science from U.S. Army CGSC; a Master of Public Administration, summa cum laude, Auburn University; and a Master of Arts in Strategic Studies from the Air War College.

From 1983 through 1987 he served as a CT-39B aircraft commander and C-21A instructor pilot out of Langley AFB in Virginia. From 1987 through 1991, he was a C-141B instructor pilot and wing combat plans officer at McGuire AFB in New Jersey. In 1991, Phil had assignments in Colorado, Kansas, and Illinois, and by 2000 he was a Lieutenant Colonel and Commander of the 821st Air Mobility Squadron out of McGuire AFB.

Shortly after 9/11, Phil was deployed to Bagram Air Base outside of Kabul, Afghanistan. At one point, he was the highest ranking officer at the air base between December 2001 and February 2002. After Afghanistan, Phil became the Chief of Training and Exercises for the NATO Interim Deployable Air Operations Center at Ramstein Air Base in Germany. He was bumped to full bird Colonel in 2004, at which time he became Commander of the USAF Air Mobility Operations Control Center, also at Ramstein Air Base in Germany. This put him in charge of the entire C-141 fleet for Europe and the Middle East.

Among his many awards and decorations are the following: the Legion of Merit, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Air Force Commendation Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, Air Force Outstanding Unit Medal, Air Force Organizational Medal, the Combat Readiness Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Southwest Asia Service Medal, and the Kuwaiti Liberation Medal (Saudi Arabia & Kuwait).

Phil summed up his time in uniform by saying that "I will be at peace with myself knowing that I did my job during the longest war in American history." Then, after 28 years of dedicated service to our great nation, Phil decided to retire in 2010 and enter the private sector.

Instead of pursuing a career in academia, Phil again was serving our country as a private citizen, offering up leadership training to the Afghan military. He was assigned to the NATO training mission at Camp Eggers, in the Green Zone in Kabul, and taught 30 senior Afghan officers how to develop a three-year, \$15 billion defense budget.

Phil had a focus and a drive in him that was unparalleled. He was relentless. He was detail oriented. His rich understanding of global affairs was perfectly complimented by an unquenchable thirst for knowledge.

Aside from the aforementioned masters' degrees, he had also served on the faculties of the Air Force Academy and the University of Houston, and was a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Phil published 97 articles, book reviews, and editorials on various topics.

He also published two books, and was currently in the process of working on his third about his three deployments to Afghanistan.

Phil had a no-nonsense outlook on life. In his words, "[stuff] happens and it's out of our control. You just have to live your life to the fullest and have no regrets."

Colonel Bossert epitomized the American ethos of hard work, dedication, and strength of body, mind, and spirit. He devoted his life to the service of others, and I would have been honored to have had the privilege of knowing him better.

Colonel Philip A. Bossert, USAF (Ret.) was 54. He was a hero.

RECOGNIZING THE CLINIC OF PHOENIXVILLE, CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate The Clinic of Phoenixville, Chester County, Pennsylvania on reaching the incredible milestone of having provided medical care amounting to over 100,000 visits.

Founded in 2001, The Clinic began as the dream of Dr. Lorna B. Stuart and the Reverend Marie Z. Swayze to create a medical center that would provide comprehensive health care to the uninsured. Operating with a donation of \$200,000 from an anonymous donor, The Clinic collaborated with St. Peter's Episcopal Church to establish a home for The Clinic in the former Rectory of the Church. Additional money was raised to furnish and complete the medical facility and St. Peter's generously allowed the Rectory to be leased for one dollar a year for The Clinic's first ten years of operation. The daily work and caring dedication of the 11 professional staff members and over 115 volunteers have allowed The Clinic to serve the medical needs of so many individuals throughout its history.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of having provided medical care amounting to over 100,000 visits, I ask that my colleagues join me today in recognizing The Clinic of Phoenixville, Chester County, Pennsylvania, and its continuing mission to provide comprehensive medical services to the uninsured of Phoenixville and the surrounding communities.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from September 30–October 16, 2013. If I were present, I would have voted on the following: September 30th: rollcall No. 501—Ordering Previous Question on H. Res. 367, "nay"; rollcall No. 502—Agreeing to the Resolution H. Res. 367, "nay"; rollcall No. 503—Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 1438, "yea"; rollcall No. 504—

Receding from the House Amendments, Concurring in the Senate Amendment with Amendment on H.J. Res. 59, "nay."

October 1st: rollcall No. 505—Agreeing to the Resolution—H. Res. 368, "nay"; rollcall No. 506—Suspend the Rules and Pass H.J. Res. 72, "nay"; rollcall No. 507—Suspend the Rules and Pass H.J. Res. 71, "nay"; rollcall No. 508—Suspend the Rules and Pass H.J. Res. 70, "nay."

October 2nd: rollcall No. 509—Ordering Previous Question on the Rule H. Res. 370, "nay"; rollcall No. 510—Agreeing to the Resolution—H. Res. 370, "nay"; rollcall No. 511—Approving the Journal, "nay"; rollcall No. 512—Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair on H.J. Res. 70, "nay"; rollcall No. 513—On Passage—H.J. Res. 70, "nay"; rollcall No. 514—On Passage—H.J. Res. 73, "nay."

October 3rd: rollcall No. 515—Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair on H.R. 3230, "nay"; rollcall No. 516—On Passage—H.R. 3230, "nay"; rollcall No. 517—Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair on H.J. Res. 72, "nay"; rollcall No. 518—On Passage—H.J. Res. 72, "nay."

October 4th: rollcall No. 519—Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 371, "nay"; rollcall No. 520—Agreeing to the Resolution—H.J. Res. 77, "nay"; rollcall No. 521—Tables the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair on H.J. Res. 85, "nay"; rollcall No. 522—On Passage of H.J. Res. 85, "nay"; rollcall No. 523—Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair on H.J. Res. 75, "nay"; rollcall No. 524—On Passage—H.J. Res. 75, "nay."

October 5th: rollcall No. 525—On Passage—H.R. 3223, "yea"; rollcall No. 526—Suspend the Rules and Pass H. Con. Res. 58, "yea."

October 7th: rollcall No. 527—Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair on H.J. Res. 77, "nay"; rollcall No. 528—On Passage—H.J. Res. 77, "nay"; rollcall No. 529—Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair on H.J. Res. 77, "nay"; rollcall No. 530—On Passage—H.J. Res. 84, "nay"; rollcall No. 531—Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule on H. Res. 373, "nay"; rollcall No. 532—on Agreeing to the Resolution—H.J. Res. 373, "nay"; rollcall No. 533—Table Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair on H.R. 3273, "nay"; rollcall No. 534—On Passage H.R. 3273, "nay"; rollcall No. 535—On Passage—H.J. Res. 89, "yea."

October 9th: rollcall No. 536—Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair on H.J. Res. 89, "nay"; rollcall No. 537—On Passage H.J. Res. 90, "nay"; rollcall No. 538—Suspend the Rules and Pass H.J. Res. 91, "yea."

October 10th: rollcall No. 539—Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair on H.J. Res. 79, "nay"; rollcall No. 540—On Passage H.J. Res. 79, "nay."

October 11th: rollcall No. 541—Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair on H.J. Res. 76, "nay"; rollcall No. 542—On Passage—H.J. Res. 76—"nay"; rollcall No. 543—Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 380, "nay"; rollcall No. 544—Agreeing to the Resolution—H.J. Res. 380—"nay."

October 12th: rollcall No. 545—Agreeing to the Resolution—H.J. Res. 378, "yea"; rollcall No. 546—On Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 2642, "yea."

October 14th: rollcall No. 547—Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair on H.J. Res. 80, "nay"; rollcall No. 548—On Passage of H.J. Res. 80, "nay"; rollcall No. 549—Agreeing to the Grayson (FL) Amendment to the title, "yea."

October 16th: rollcall No. 550—Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendments—H.R. 2775, "yea."

HONORING REV. GRIFFIN DAVIS, SR. ON THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF HILL TOP MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rev. Griffin Davis, Sr. on the occasion of the 48th anniversary of his ministry. He is the longtime pastor of Hill Top Missionary Baptist Church in Riviera Beach, Florida.

Rev. Davis is widely known as a compassionate person who will always go out of his way to help the less fortunate among us. He truly embodies the words of Jesus, who said, "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works." Rev. Davis' lifetime of good works is well known among people of faith in the Riviera Beach community.

The city and its residents know that they can count on him for support whenever there is a need for civic improvements, and in every effort to assist the poor and disabled—especially senior citizens and children. Rev. Davis' moving words touch countless lives each Sunday, but his sermons make up only a small part of the many good deeds that he continues to perform each and every single day. As he approaches a half century of serving God and all his children, I am pleased to join his family, his friends, and everyone in the community in honoring him.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. Davis is one of the finest people that I have had the privilege to know, and I wish him continued success in his life and ministry for many more years to come. He is a selfless individual who has given so much to his community, and I am extremely humbled to not only represent him in Congress, but also to call him my dear friend.

RECOGNIZING ROANOKE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ON ITS 75TH ANNI- VERSARY

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Roanoke Electric Cooperative that recently celebrated its 75th anniversary delivering affordable electricity to rural eastern North Carolina. The Cooperative is headquartered in my Congressional District in Aulander, North Carolina and serves seven of the 24 counties I represent.

The Cooperative grew out of the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) created by President Franklin Roosevelt. REA's goal was to foster the construction of electric distribution lines so that rural areas of the country could avail themselves of the great benefits of electricity.

Roanoke Electric Cooperative was chartered on September 30, 1938 and construction began immediately. By the middle of 1939, the 56 miles of electric distribution lines that had been constructed went live and provided electricity to 317 individual locations in rural North Carolina.

Before the Cooperative existed, Americans living in rural areas began their day at sunrise and ended it at sunset. Every task—be it simple or complex—had to be done manually. Washing and drying clothes, farm work, cooking, cleaning, and even accessing water took time and effort that had been drastically reduced in urban areas due to the existence of electricity.

Struck by the glaring inequity between rural and urban areas, then-Nebraska Senator George Norris said "I had seen first-hand the grim drudgery and grind which had been the common lot of eight generations of American farm women. I knew what it was to take care of the farm chores by the flickering, undependable light of the lantern in the cold rains of the fall and the icy winds of winter. Those rural women were conscious of the great gap between their lives and the lives of those women whom by birth or choice lived in towns and cities with electricity in their homes."

Now Roanoke Electric Cooperative has more than 2,000 miles of electric distribution lines and serves nearly 15,000 individual locations in its seven county footprint. The Cooperative is led by Curtis Wynn who serves as its President and CEO. Mr. Wynn is the first African American in the nation to serve an electric cooperative in that capacity. Under his visionary leadership, Roanoke Electric Cooperative has been recognized by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA) and has received the Community Service Network Award on two separate occasions. Mr. Wynn also serves on the Board of Directors for NRECA.

Mr. Speaker, Roanoke Electric Cooperative has proudly and effectively served my constituents in rural eastern North Carolina for 75 years. I offer my sincere congratulations to Mr. Wynn and his team and ask that my colleagues join me in sending best wishes to Roanoke Electric Cooperative as it continues to be a vital and integral part of the lives of families and businesses in eastern North Carolina.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ERMA CRAVEIRO TROWE

HON. JIM COSTA
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Erma Jeremias Craveiro Trowe who passed away on October 13, 2013 at the age of 96. Her character exemplified the very best of what our nation has to offer—she

was thoughtful, generous, and possessed a strong work ethic.

Erma was a Central Valley native. She was born to Antonio and Francisca Jeremias on January 8, 1917 at Summit Lake near Fresno, California. The Jeremias's were Portuguese immigrants, and they managed a farm in Fresno County. When times were tough during the Great Depression, Erma and her seven siblings worked alongside their parents to help sustain the family farm. Erma attended California State University, Fresno, formerly known as Fresno State College and was one of the first in her family to graduate from college.

Erma married Joe Craveiro in 1938. They had four children: Audrey, Jerry, Bob, and Thomas. Joe and Erma raised their children in the Kearney Park area. Erma stayed active in the community, and was a supporter of Houghton-Kearney School, St. Patrick's Church in Kerman, and numerous Portuguese fraternal organizations. Joe and Erma also operated a dairy and grew alfalfa, cotton, and sugar beets.

When Joe passed away, Erma pursued a teaching career. She began at Madison Grammar School then went to Ahwahnee Middle School, and eventually settled at St. Anthony's School, where she taught fifth grade for many years. Teaching young people was very rewarding for Erma, and her students felt fortunate to have her as a teacher. Erma always found joy in the learning process. She loved languages and studied Portuguese, Spanish, Russian, and French. Her curiosity about the world and different cultures led her to travel to Africa, Europe, and Asia.

Aside from her commitments to her family, career, and the ranch, Erma had a lifelong involvement in various community activities. She was a member of the Fig Garden Women's Club, served as a Cub Scout Mother, and volunteered on the Parents Teacher's Association (PTA). Erma was also instrumental in the development of the Houghton-Kearney Elementary School.

Erma married William Trowe in 1981, and he passed away seven short years later. However, her faith in God never wavered. She believed that God has a plan for all of us, and His presence can be felt in each of our lives.

Erma was a very dear friend to the Costa family. She was one of my mother's greatest confidantes, and my sister, Bette, and I could always depend on her to be there for us in times of need.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the life of Erma Jeremias Craveiro Trowe. She is admired by all who had the pleasure of knowing her, and she will be remembered for her warm and loving heart.

SUPPORT OF THE NORTH OAK- LAND COUNTY REPUBLICAN CLUB

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the North Oakland County Re-

publican Club of Michigan, who like so many organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American organization.

RECOGNIZING AUDREY WEINER

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to recognize an outstanding leader in the field of aging and long-term services and supports. Audrey Weiner is the outgoing chair of LeadingAge, and I congratulate her on what she and her organization have accomplished during her two-year term.

LeadingAge members and affiliates touch the lives of 4 million individuals, families, employees and volunteers every day. The LeadingAge community includes 6,000 not-for-profit organizations in the United States, 39 state partners, hundreds of businesses, research partners, consumer organizations, foundations and a broad global network of aging services organizations that reach over 30 countries. The work of LeadingAge is focused on advocacy, education, and applied research. The organization promotes a full range

of aging services, including adult day, home health, hospice, community-based services, PACE, senior housing, assisted living residences, continuing care communities, and nursing homes as well as technology solutions and person-centered practices that support the overall health and wellbeing of seniors, children, and those with special needs.

LeadingAge's leadership imperatives—strengthening not-for-profit leadership, engaging consumers, expanding long-term services and supports, financing options, innovation and technology and developing workforce talent—have shaped the organization's agenda throughout Audrey Weiner's service as LeadingAge's chair. She has overseen LeadingAge member task forces working on policies to advance these goals on behalf of people who need long-term services and supports.

In addition to her leadership of LeadingAge, Ms. Weiner has worked extensively with elders and their families facing the need for long-term services and supports. She heads one of the largest and oldest faith-based, not-for-profit long-term services and supports organizations in the country. Jewish Home Lifecare, located in New York City, provides a full array of long-term services and supports to thousands of people every year. These services include skilled nursing, short-stay rehabilitation, home care services, telehealth, geriatric care management, adult day services, informational resources for family caregivers and affordable senior housing. The integration and high quality of long-term services and supports achieved by Jewish Home Lifecare help individuals and families facing the enormous challenges of long-term disability.

I hope my colleagues will join me in commending Audrey Weiner for her long-standing service to America's older adults, her advocacy to make long-term services and support affordable and her commitment to ensure all seniors have a place to call home.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF ST. GEORGE ANTIOCHIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the occasion of St. George Orthodox Church of Troy's Centennial to congratulate Reverend Joseph Antypas and the congregation on this great milestone in the celebration of their faith.

The Greater Detroit community is a region that mirrors the United States, both in the cultural diversity of its residents and their commitment to the American values of equality and freedom. A century ago, newly arrived Orthodox Christian immigrants from Lebanon and Syria came to the Greater Detroit to share in the American Dream, an opportunity for their families to freely observe their faith and access their full potential. When they arrived, they joined the American work force and began the hard work necessary to secure a

brighter future for their children. As an important part of establishing their community and families in their new homeland, they founded the St. George Parish of the Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America in 1913. Just a short time later, the parishioners of St. George laid the cornerstone for their church in Detroit.

Named in honor of the Great Martyr George, a staunch defender of the Antiochian Orthodox Christian faith, the Church has been an integral part of the community, allowing its members to continue their traditions and pass them along to future generations. Over the course of its existence, the sanctuary of St. George has called several different sites in the Greater Detroit area home in an effort by its leaders to house an ever expanding congregation. As the congregation has prospered, it has undertaken many different outreach initiatives, designed to support new congregation members and the broader Southeast Michigan community.

Under its current leader, Reverend Joseph Antypas, the congregation of St. George has continued to thrive and moved its current home in Troy in 1994. In 2005, to better serve the community, the leaders of St. George oversaw the construction of a youth education and activities center that will allow younger church members to fully explore and develop their abilities. Furthermore, the Church has been instrumental to its members' continued welfare as our nation has faced the challenges of a difficult economy. It is a testament to the strength of the congregation of St. George that its members will also be celebrating the burning of the mortgage for its current home in Troy while they are celebrating its centennial.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to again congratulate Reverend Antypas, as well as the other leaders, and congregation of St. George Orthodox Church on achieving this great milestone in their community and in the celebration of their faith. I know St. George will continue to serve its members and community well and I wish its leaders and congregation success in their future endeavors.

SOUTH NASHVILLE ALL-STARS

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, Tennessee is home to many young talents. Whether in the music, technology, health care, or artistic communities, America's youth find success. I'm please today to rise and add one more group to the list of outstanding young talent: baseball players.

The South Nashville All-Stars headed earned their place in the World Series with a 5-3 win over Henrico, VA in the southeast region final. While they did not leave the Series with the title, they returned home to Middle Tennessee to fans, friends, and family all proud of their outstanding accomplishments.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in celebrating the hard work, perseverance, and dedication of: Austin Kasick #14, Ben Pickman #32, Blake Kirchenbauer #3, Blake Money

#15, Brice Russell #23, Christopher McElvain #7, Connor Smith #13, Knox Preston #24, Robert Hassell #9, Tanner Morgan #1, Trae McLemore #21, and Zane Denton #25.

I join with their friends, parents, coaches, and supporters in celebrating their wonderful season.

IN SUPPORT OF OAKLAND COUNTY YOUNG REPUBLICANS

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Oakland County Young Republicans of Michigan, who like so many organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American organization.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHOWCHILLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Chowchilla Elementary School District as they celebrate their 100-year anniversary. Chowchilla Elementary School District is comprised of four elementary schools and one middle school: Stephens Elementary, Fuller Elementary, Reagan Elementary, Fairmead Elementary, and Wilson Middle. For the past 100 years, Chowchilla Elementary School District has provided students with an excellent education that promotes high academic performance, personal responsibility, and respect for oneself and others.

In 1913, Chowchilla Grammar School was built. Several years later, due to the growing community, two additional classroom wings were added to the building. In 1949, numerous additions were made to the school, including a new office, restrooms and classrooms. Today, this building is now Stephens Elementary School.

In 1949, Merle L. Fuller Elementary School was established. Ronald Reagan Elementary School was completed in 2008 due to the land that was granted to Chowchilla Elementary School District in 2003 from C&R Holdings, LTD. Over a hundred years ago, students at Fairmead Elementary School were taught in a large warehouse in Fairmead, California. In 1913, a school building was completed, and in 1964, Fairmead Elementary School joined the Chowchilla Elementary School District. Wilson Grammar School was constructed in 1920, but was burned down years later. It was rebuilt in 1940, and is currently the location of Wilson Middle School.

The Chowchilla Elementary School District serves a diverse group of students. Every school district has its own challenges, but the administrators and teachers at Chowchilla Elementary School District are dedicated to providing their students with a quality education.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Chowchilla Elementary School District during their 100-year anniversary. We must thank all the administrators, faculty, and staff that provide students in the Central Valley with a quality education.

90 YEARS OF GEORGETOWN,
TEXAS NOON LIONS CLUB

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate 90 years of extraordinary service by the Georgetown, TX Noon Lions Club. Throughout their history, the Club has helped where help is needed—in their own communities and around the world—with unmatched integrity and energy.

Founded in 1923, the Georgetown Noon Lions Club has made a real difference in Cen-

tral Texas. They've provided generous scholarships to deserving high school seniors. Through the Kid Sight team, they've promoted eyesight health for hundreds through regular vision screening events. The Club's philanthropy has directly benefited the Boys and Girls Club as well as the Texas Lions Camp.

When the Georgetown Noon Lions Club gets involved, problems get smaller and communities get better. The Club continues to fulfill the inspiring personal code of Lions Club founder Melvin Jones, "You can't get very far until you start doing something for somebody else."

The Georgetown Noon Lions Club's commitment to service reflects the best values of Central Texas. I applaud their work and wish them well on their 90th birthday and for many years to come.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER OF MARITZA REYES

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the accomplishments and career of Maritza Reyes. Mrs. Reyes has done invaluable work as a legal professional and a Latina leader in Central Florida.

Mrs. Reyes is currently an Associate Professor of Law at Florida A&M University College of Law. Mrs. Reyes grew up in Florida. She earned a B.S. in Accounting magna cum laude from Florida Atlantic University, a J.D. summa cum laude from Nova Southeastern University Shepard Broad Law Center, and an LL.M. from the Harvard Law School. She currently serves on the Board of Advisors of the Harvard Latino Law Review. Professor Reyes teaches Civil Procedure, Evidence, Immigration Law, Advanced Topics in Immigration Law, Latinos and the Law, and Professional Responsibility. She also serves as faculty advisor to the Hispanic American Law Students Association. Her areas of research and writing include immigration law and policy, ethics, evidence, federal courts, and Latinos and the law. Professor Reyes is admitted to practice in Florida, as well as before the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, and the United States District Courts for the Southern and Middle Districts of Florida.

Prior to joining academia, Mrs. Reyes worked in the commercial and international litigation groups of Holland & Knight LLP, was employed as a career law clerk and staff attorney in the federal courts, and served as a certified legal intern in the United States Attorneys' Office where she prepared briefs that were filed in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. She has provided pro bono and volunteer services individually and through the Florida Immigrant Advocacy Center, Lawyers for Children America, the Florida Democratic Lawyers Council and Children First. Prior to attending law school, Professor

Reyes worked for Fortune 100 and Fortune 500 companies as well as small businesses.

Mrs. Reyes believes in the importance of education as a means to improve individual lives and society in general. At Harvard, Mrs. Reyes served as General Editor of the Harvard Latino Law Review and as External Affairs Coordinator of La Alianza. She held a Harvard Law School Post-Graduate Research Fellowship from 2008 to 2011 and was awarded a Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute Graduate Scholarship. Mrs. Reyes attended Nova law school on a full-tuition merit scholarship as a Goodwin Scholar, served as Articles Editor of the Nova Law Review, won a Best Brief Award in the Moot Court First Year Appellate Writing Competition and earned membership in the Moot Court Honor Society. She received a Public Interest Pro Bono Award, the Student Bar Association Academic Achievement Award, the National Association of Women Lawyers Outstanding Law Student Award and recognition in Who's Who: American Law Students (2000 ed.). During her undergraduate accounting studies, she was inducted into the Beta Alpha Psi, Phi Kappa Phi and Beta Gamma Sigma Honor Societies.

I am happy to honor Maritza Reyes, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her accomplishments and commitment to education, public service, and equality for all Hispanics in Central Florida and nationwide.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF
MAGDA IVETTE TORRES

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the public service of Magda Ivette Torres within the Hispanic community in Central Florida. She currently serves as a news analyst and journalist for both WPRD 1440 AM radio and En Agenda News Analysis Talk Show.

Born in Mayagüez, Puerto Rico, Magda Ivette has more than 24 years of combined professional experience in journalism (print, radio, and television), public relations, law, government, teaching, and community affairs. Her work experience began after she graduated from the University of Texas at Arlington and she obtained her law degree from the Catholic University Law School in Ponce, Puerto Rico. Magda Ivette has worked for WOLE-TV, WLEO-AM, WISO-AM, WEUC-FM, the City of Ponce, La Perla del Sur Newspaper, EFE News Agency, Inter American University, legal aide at the Senate of Puerto Rico, Browning Ferris Industries, and Intel Puerto Rico. She also worked as a communication consultant for The Puerto Rico Bar Association.

Magda has worked within the Central Florida community to ensure that Hispanic voters are informed and exercise their ability to vote. Since 2003, she has hosted the "En Agenda" talk show, a daily news analysis program. Magda has dedicated the majority of her show to analyzing state, local, national, and international news. Magda Ivette collaborates with different organizations and public service institutions to inform her audience about their services and provide solutions to community problems. She regularly writes and assists Hispanics in communicating with courts and government entities. She also assists those with special needs so that they receive appropriate medical care, food, and shelter.

I am happy to honor Magda Ivette Torres, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her dedication to civic engagement and service to the Hispanic community.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF ROSINÍN RODRIGUEZ PEREZ

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Rosinín Rodríguez Perez for her outstanding service to the community.

Rosinín was born in Guayama, Puerto Rico on October 18th, 1937. Her parents were Heriberto Rodríguez and Isabel Pérez. Rosinín Rodríguez is currently the Spiritual Leader and Vice-President of Congregación Mita Inc., the only church founded in Puerto Rico that has expanded nationally to 11 states and internationally to 10 countries in Latin America and Europe.

Rosinín holds a Bachelors degree in Social Sciences with a concentration in Psychology and Sociology from the University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras Campus, where she also completed graduate courses in Counseling and Education. Upon graduation, Rosinín worked as a middle school teacher in Bayamon, Puerto Rico, where she taught Spanish and Social Studies. She later worked as a Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor helping students finish their vocational education. She also worked for the Social Security Administration in the division of disability determination and later joined the Puerto Rico Department of Education's Youth Opportunity Center. From 1965 to 1971 she worked as a Career Counselor for the Puerto Rico Department of Labor.

Rosinín joined the Congregación Mita Church in 1962 and lived in the Pastoral House with Juanita García Peraza "Mita," founder of the church. After Juanita García Peraza passed away, Rosinín continued working alongside Teófilo Vargas Seín "Aaron," current President of the church and Spiritual Leader. She was a key contributor to the expansion of the church in Puerto Rico and the United States. In Florida, the church has congregations in Orlando, Ocala, Miami, and Tampa.

Rosinín has distinguished herself by her great moral and spiritual values, hard work, and commitment to the service of others. Rosinín has been the founding member of several church institutions. Among them are: Colegio Congregación Mita, a school in Puerto Rico, where Rosinín served as its first administrator; El Paraíso Nursing Home, an institution that cares for seniors who are unable to care for themselves due to their physical and/or emotional conditions; and the Office for Counseling and Social Work. This institution provides professional services by certified social workers, psychologists, gerontologists, in matters such as drug addiction, alcoholism, domestic violence, family and marriage relations, physical and/or mental health problems, employment, and housing. These services are available free of charge to members and non-members of the church in all the states and countries where the church has been established, including Orlando, FL.

I am happy to honor Rosinín Rodríguez Perez, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her extraordinary contributions to the Congregación Mita Church and the communities the church serves in the United States and around the World.

RECOGNIZING THE COMMUNITY SERVICE OF ROMUALD JOSE LEYDON

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the career of Romuald Jose Leydon.

Mr. Leydon was born in New York City on August 9, 1965 to Puerto Rican parents. At his third birthday, he was officially adopted by his Irish stepfather and received his last name Leydon. He moved to Puerto Rico in 1973, when he was eight years old. Raised in both the Puerto Rican and Irish cultures, Leydon committed himself to working for his community and helping it grow.

Mr. Leydon graduated from Margarita Janer Palacios High School in Guaynabo, Puerto Rico where he completed a course of Marketing and Distribution in 1984. He joined the Seminary Bethsaida Inc. in Worcester, Massachusetts in 1990 where he studied Leadership and Theology. He finished his bachelor's and master's degree in 2010 and his doctoral degree in 2012.

Mr. Leydon worked from 1995 to 2000 as a Church Administrator at Bethsaida Inc. He moved to Osceola County, Florida in 2003 where he worked as a Chief Financial Officer at Tones Distribution Group for five years. From 2009 to 2010 he was the President of Operations in Ameriwalk Inc., where he organized various events for non-profit organizations. He is currently the Dean and Professor of Theology at the Christian School Renewal.

Mr. Leydon is involved with the Christian community and strongly supports the Food Pantry "Pan de Vida" at the Renewal Church in the Buenaventura Lakes community in Kissimmee, FL. Mr. Leydon has been married to his wife, Ivette Reyes, for over 25 years and enjoys spending time with his son and three grandchildren.

I am happy to honor Romuald Jose Leydon, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his selfless service to the community in Florida's Ninth Congressional District.

RECOGNIZING THE LEADERSHIP OF TIRSO MORENO

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tirso Moreno, a leader and advocate of farmworkers and immigrants in the 9th Congressional District in the State of Florida. He has fought to provide farmworkers with a living wage, adequate housing, safe working conditions, and educational opportunities.

Tirso was born in Tamaulipas, Mexico, near the Texas border. At a young age he learned to pick corn and cotton on the family's farm. In 1971, at the age of 17, he emigrated to the United States with his family to do farm work. For 11 years, he and his wife worked as migrant workers, harvesting oranges, grapefruits, and lemons in Florida from November to May, and apples in Michigan from June to October.

In 1976, Tirso joined the United Farm Workers (UFW) union and from 1979 to 1982, he served on the negotiation committee for the collective bargaining agreement between the UFW and Coca Cola/Minute Maid. In 1982, Tirso became the lead organizer for the Farmworker Project of the Office for Farmworker Ministry in Apopka, Florida.

In 1983, Tirso and the Notre Dame Sisters founded the Farmworker Association of Florida of which Tirso is currently the General Coordinator. Under his leadership, the Association expanded in 1992 from a small local group to

a statewide organization with more than 10,000 members. FWA now has four offices throughout Florida, a staff of 25, and a membership of more than 4,000 Latino, Haitian, and African-American families. FWA provides educational programs, legal assistance, a worker-owned credit union, and a food cooperative.

Tirso is also a co-founder and board member of the Farmworker Health and Safety Institute, and serves on the boards of several other organizations such as the Southern Partners Fund, the Domestic Fair Trade Association, the National Immigrant Farming Initiative, and the Rural Coalition. He has worked to establish international cooperation with immigrants and farmworkers on both sides of the Mexico/United States border. Tirso advocated on farmworkers' behalf in national and international meetings such as the Via Campesina North America and International Gatherings, United States Social Forums, World Social Forums, and the United Nations World Conference Against Racism.

I am happy to honor Tirso Moreno, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his outstanding leadership on behalf of immigrants and farmworkers in my district and throughout the country.

HONORING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF SHEYLA ASENCIOS

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize the civic accomplishments of Sheyla Asencios within the Central Florida community. Ms. Asencios currently serves as the Florida Democratic Party Central Florida Hispanic Media and Outreach Coordinator.

After immigrating to the United States from Peru at the age of three, Ms. Asencios was raised in Kissimmee, Florida. Early in her journalistic career, Ms. Asencios worked as a news reporter and magazine writer for the Valencia College weekly newspaper, The Valencia Source and college magazine, Caffeinated. She soon rose to the position of managing editor for The Source, while also working as an intern for Orlando's major newspaper, the Orlando Sentinel and the television news station NBC's WESH 2 News. As a journalist, she sought to uncover the truth and report on under-represented groups, students, and the Latino community in Osceola and Orange Counties.

Upon graduation from the University of Florida, Ms. Asencios began devoting much of her time to public service. She became a Juvenile Drug Court and Teen Court volunteer in Orange, Osceola, and Alachua counties and worked as a legal and development assistant at the Legal Aid Society of the Orange County Bar Association (OCBA). Her ability to foster relationships and her background in public service led to her becoming the OCBA's youngest staff member when she was hired as Marketing Manager. She became the program manager of the bar association's community outreach program, Leadership Law. After only two years of managing the program, Leadership Law won the 2012 LexisNexis Community and Educational Outreach Award, placing the OCBA in the national spotlight. By its second year, the program's financial sponsors nearly doubled, benefiting the OCBA and its sister affiliates.

This past fall, Ms. Asencios took an active role in the 2012 elections, working for State Senator Darren Soto's successful campaign in District 14. Sheyla also volunteers for the Legal Aid Society of the OCBA and is a freelance journalist for South Florida's major metropolitan newspaper, the Miami Herald.

I am happy to honor Sheyla Asencios, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her dedication to serving the Central Florida community.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP OF VIVIANA MARGARITA JANER

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Viviana Margarita Janer for her service and leadership within her community in Florida's Ninth District.

Viviana was born in Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico and raised in New York City. She has a Bachelor of Business Administration with a major in Public Accounting and an MBA with academic honors. She currently serves as the Treasurer for the Democratic Hispanic Caucus of Florida.

Viviana has over 20 years of experience in the business world, and currently works as a Senior Manager of Internal Audit at a major Hospitality company. She was a volunteer for President Obama's reelection campaign and acted as a Neighborhood Team Leader holding weekly events within her community. Viviana also had the great honor of introducing President Obama in front of a crowd of 3,000 in her hometown of Kissimmee.

Viviana has volunteered for organizations such as the Destiny Foundation, the Second Harvest Food Bank, Give the Kids the World, Pine Hills YMCA, and the Central Florida Breadbasket. She has also been an advocate for countless social issues and has campaigned for other candidates, including Senator ED MARKEY. Vivian is a member of the Osceola County Commission Affordable Housing Advisory Committee, as well as an active member of the Progressive Democrats of America, the Democratic Executive Committee, and the Democrats of Celebration. She is also a founding member of Organizing for Action.

I am happy to honor Viviana Margarita Janer, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her outstanding public service to the Central Florida community.

REMEMBERING MR. ROBERT GREINER

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Robert "Bob" Greiner of Victorville, CA, who passed away October 17th, 2013 after leaving what will be a lasting impression on the members of the Victor Valley community.

During the Korean War, Bob was drafted into the Army and eventually served as part of the Military Police. Bob's service to his country did not stop there. After leaving the Army, Bob opened car dealerships where, he became a well known face around the town.

During the recession and throughout the closure of George Air Force Base, he provided

work to those in need. Bob's service to his country and community is a legacy that will not soon be forgotten.

Today, I join with the Town of Victorville and the whole country in remembering this great soldier, community leader, father, and husband. My thoughts and prayers go out to his wife, Mrs. Greiner, and all the friends and family of this extraordinary man.

IN SUPPORT OF THE REPUBLICAN LIBERTY CAUCUS

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Republican Liberty Caucus who like so many grass-root organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; the Republican Liberty Caucus promotes the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Constitutional Republic that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number of the state; a Constitutional Republic that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are a visionary group of individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and the Blessings of individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of the Republican Liberty Caucus, a truly American grass-roots organization.

RECOGNIZING OF ONE ACCORD MINISTRY

HON. DAVID P. ROE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks today to commend Of One Accord Ministry of Hawkins and Hancock Counties for their 25 years of service to East Tennessee.

Of One Accord Ministry began humbly in 1988 in the home of Sheldon Livesay, founder and director of the organization. Livesay's desire to give back to the people of East Tennessee led to the creation of this organization, which began with the aim of meeting the needs of low-income families in the First District of Tennessee and has since expanded to include a free medical clinic, a drug recovery program, and several international humanitarian missions.

This year marks the 25th year of operation for Of One Accord Ministry. In its time, this organization has served over 833,000 East Tennesseans with the distribution of approximately 11 million pounds of food, 21,600 winter coats, and 900 pairs of eyeglasses. In addition, Of One Accord Ministry has served countless others internationally with over 1 million meals around the globe.

Of One Accord Ministry has dedicated itself to improving the lives of low-income families in both Appalachia and around the world and I sincerely thank them for all that they do for the Volunteer State.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,075,230,597,788.39. We've added \$6,448,353,548,875.31 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING DARIUS ASSEMI

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Darius Assemi as he is honored with the Fresno State Alumni Association's Top Dog Distinguished Alumnus Award. Darius is well deserving of this award as he has contributed so much to the City of Fresno and our entire Central Valley.

Darius immigrated to the United States from Iran almost 40 years ago. He graduated with

honors from California State University, Fresno in 1983 with a degree in Civil Engineering. After graduation, he served as vice president of Granville Homes up until 2009 when he became president. Granville Homes is a local business that is family-owned and operated.

Fresno has benefitted in so many ways from the efforts made by Darius. Granville's developments are spread throughout the city. They provide housing to individuals of all ages, ethnicities, and socio-economic backgrounds. For over 30 years, Darius has stood behind Granville's mission "to improve the well-being of people in our community" and promote "positive change in the lives of people in the Central Valley." For the past eight years, Darius has hosted a "Home of Hope" fundraiser. Participants buy one hundred dollar raffle tickets with the possibility of winning a new home. All of the proceeds from the raffle tickets are donated to local non-profits around the Central Valley. Since 2006, over 2.4 million dollars has been raised. The donations provide shelter, healthcare, education, and food to thousands of individuals.

Darius plays a big role in the city's effort to revitalize downtown Fresno. Granville has completed four housing projects downtown, and two more projects are in the works. As a result, over 500 individuals have moved to the area. Residents are making contributions to downtown Fresno that will have a lasting impact on the city's entire economy.

In addition to his work at Granville Homes, Darius is the chair of American Medical Overseas Relief (AMOR). AMOR is a non-profit organization that is improving the health of thousands of women and children in Afghanistan. In 2009, the Afshar Hospital in Kabul, Afghanistan was built due to funding from AMOR. The 100 bed hospital serves more than 3,500 patients a month.

Darius also sits on several other boards including the California Transportation Commission, the California Health Sciences University, the Islamic Cultural Center of Fresno, and the Fresno Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to recognize Darius Assemi for his commitment to ensuring that the City of Fresno continues to prosper and thrive.

CALLING FOR JUSTICE FOR THE
BYTYQI BROTHERS

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a concurrent resolution calling upon the government of Serbia to bring to justice those responsible for the murders of Ylli, Agron and Mehmet Bytyqi in July 1999. The resolution also calls on our government to do what it can to encourage and assist a successful prosecution of the case. I want to thank my fellow colleague from New York, Mr. GRIMM, for co-sponsoring this resolution.

The three Bytyqi brothers were American citizens. Their ethnic Albanian family emigrated to the United States from Kosovo, and

some family members reside in my district on Long Island. During the Kosovo conflict which prompted the NATO air campaign against Serbia, the brothers traveled to the region to fight. Remaining in Kosovo after a cease fire agreement ended the conflict, the three young men escorted an ethnic Romani neighbor and his family from Kosovo to Serbian controlled territory, where they would be safer. Accidentally straying across the border, they were detained by police in southern Serbia and then sentenced for illegally entering the country. When released from prison, they were not set free but taken to a Ministry of Interior special forces training camp where they were executed and buried in a mass grave with the bodies of dozens of ethnic Albanians from Kosovo.

To be clear, the Bytyqi brothers were not sentenced for any crime other than illegal entry. They were not afforded an opportunity to defend themselves in a court of law. They were not given a fair and public trial. They were shot, in cold blood, by a paramilitary unit working under the Ministry of Interior.

In 1999, Serbia was under the rule of Slobodan Milosevic, whose regime fomented ethnic hatred and was responsible for some of the worst atrocities in Europe since World War II. Today, Serbia is a very different place, moving forward in its democratic development, improving relations with its neighbors and advancing on its path toward European integration. In doing so, it has worked to prosecute many of the crimes committed in the Milosevic era. It is unfortunate, however, that those responsible for the murders of the Bytyqi brothers continue to elude justice.

Our government should do everything it can to ensure the successful prosecution of those responsible for the murders of U.S. citizens abroad. It should provide resources as needed, and it should make it clear to the authorities in Belgrade that inaction does have repercussions on bilateral relations. This resolution encourages just that. The resolution will also hopefully convey to the Serbian authorities the concerns of the U.S. Congress, and it is my hope they will respond by removing any protection given to the perpetrators of this crime and prosecuting them in a court of law. Hopefully, Serbia's political leaders will not only recognize the seriousness which we attach to this case but also understand that it is in Serbia's interest to let justice work to sever the ties with the Milosevic past that have held the country back from a Europe where it otherwise belongs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution and its passage in this Congress.

HONORING DOTTIE BERGER
MACKINNON

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of an outstanding leader of the Tampa Bay community, Dottie Berger MacKinnon. Her tireless crusade

to better the lives of neglected and abused children is an inspiration to the Tampa Bay community and to this great nation.

Among Mrs. Berger MacKinnon's numerous accomplishments is her work in founding charities that support needy children. In 1992, Mrs. Berger MacKinnon led a community effort to found Joshua House, a kid's shelter in the Tampa Bay area which now handles children ages 7 to 17 who have been removed from their homes. Never tiring of making a positive difference, Mrs. Berger MacKinnon worked to found Kid's Charity of Tampa Bay in 2006. Kid's Charity also manages A Kid's Place, a 60-bed emergency shelter for children waiting to be placed with a foster family. Mrs. Berger MacKinnon's visionary leadership resulted in raising \$5 million for A Kid's Place to build an amazing facility that now has helped more than 700 abused, abandoned and neglected children.

A native of Kentucky, Berger MacKinnon had an early passion for politics that led her to move at age 15 to live with an aunt on the outskirts of Washington. She later moved to Tampa where she earned a B.A. in political science in 1984 from the University of South Florida. She joined the Gulf Coast Division for the Children's Home Society of Florida in 1985 where she served as one of its State Board members.

Mrs. Berger MacKinnon won a seat on the Hillsborough County Commission in 1994 and went on to become chairman from 1996 to 1997. On the Commission, she continued to fight for abused and neglected children. Mrs. Berger MacKinnon served on the Hillsborough County Hospital Authority, as well as three terms on Tampa General Hospital's governing board. Here, she was instrumental in its transformation into a not-for-profit institution. Mrs. Berger MacKinnon was inducted into the Hillsborough County Women's Hall of Fame earlier this year.

Mrs. Berger MacKinnon was diagnosed with breast cancer in 1999 and unfortunately passed away this October. Through her brave battle with cancer, Mrs. Berger MacKinnon was an inspiration to others who are fighting this devastating disease. To carry on her tenacious spirit and honor her legacy, I introduced the Eliminating Disparities in Breast Cancer Treatment Act. This Act will help ensure greater access to cancer treatment for women across the Nation. Mr. Speaker, today on behalf of the many people who have been inspired by her diligent efforts and for the thousands of children whose lives are forever bettered by her never-ending generosity, we salute and thank Dottie Berger MacKinnon.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF
FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF
HAMPTON

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a legacy of faith in Virginia's Third Congressional District. This year, First Baptist Church of Hampton is celebrating

its 150th anniversary, and I would like to take a moment to reflect on the history of this esteemed institution and its contributions to the greater Hampton Roads community.

The history of many African American churches in existence today developed from a small band of worshippers who sat in the "designated section" of a white church. In this respect, First Baptist Church of Hampton is no exception and was borne out of worshippers at the Hampton Baptist Church located a short distance away from the present church site. With Reverend Zechariah Evans as its first pastor, First Baptist Church of Hampton came into its own and built its own building to house services.

The Church continued to grow and prosper, but in September 1944, a catastrophic fire destroyed the church building. Members of the community and sister churches rallied to support First Baptist Church. With generous support from the Hampton Baptist Church and other supporters in the community, the sanctuary was restored and the facility was improved and expanded.

Over the years the Church grew in its capacity, its membership, and its mission. Community outreach became an integral part of the work of the Church. The accomplishments of First Baptist Church of Hampton are far too many to list, but among them are the founding of the People's Building and Loan Association under Reverend Richard Spiller and the organization of the Big Brothers of America in Hampton under the leadership of Reverend Seymour J. Gaines.

On July 6, 2006, First Baptist Church officially elected Reverend Dr. Richard W. Willis, Sr. as its tenth and current pastor and he has continued to lead the church in its strong tradition, dedicated to fellowship and social action.

Over the years, the First Baptist community has continued to grow and flourish. The church now offers programs to increase healthy living through its Health Ministry program, hosts voter registration drives, provides housing for the homeless through "A Night's Welcome," and remains steadfast in providing for the least of these, through its efforts in meal service and food distribution.

As First Baptist Church of Hampton gathers to celebrate this historic milestone, the church can truly remember its past, celebrate its present, and focus on its future as "[a] place on the harbor where haven meets heaven." I would like to congratulate Reverend Willis and all of the members of First Baptist Church of Hampton on the occasion of its 150th Anniversary. I wish them many more years of dedicated service to the community.

IN SUPPORT OF THE WILLOW RUN TEA PARTY CAUCUS

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Willow Run Tea Party Caucus of Ann Arbor, Michigan who like so many grass-root organizations throughout our country have diligently educated our citizens on

various public issues facing us today. Exercising their Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and in many cases petition their government for a redress of grievances in support of the restoration of liberty, not in restricting it; shrinking our bloated government, not expanding it; who want to reduce taxes, not raise them; abolish costly government programs, not create them; expose the abuses and oppressions of tyrannical dictates; and promote the freedom and independence of our citizens, not the interference of government in their lives; and observe the limited, enumerated powers of our Constitution, not ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, these truly American patriots of every cultural, religious and ethnic background have found a common cause in fighting back today's proliferating big government rules and regulations imposed by costly bloated government bureaucracies who are accountable to no one at the expense of individual rights.

They are God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans who desire nothing more than to rein in big government's tendency toward excessive coercion and the insidious spread of government overreach. They question when the validity of laws and morality contradict each other. They desire nothing more than the extension of individual freedom in a Democracy that attaches all possible value to citizens rather than making each citizen a mere agent, a mere number; a Democracy that seeks equality in Liberty rather than in restraint and servitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great political awakening taking place in our country today. The roots of which are solid stock and American made, they are visionary individuals who understand the moral foundations of a Constitutional Republic, the benefits of free markets, and individual liberty. May they continue to strive valiantly and dare greatly.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few short minutes to give this testimony in support of a truly American grass-roots organization.

RECOGNIZING JERRY TARKANIAN

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jerry Tarkanian or "Tark the Shark," for being inducted into the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame. Nationwide, Jerry is most recognized for his achievements as the basketball coach for University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), but in California's 16th Congressional District, we know Jerry as California State University, Fresno's (Fresno State) spirited and energetic former head basketball coach. Fresno State is Jerry's alma mater, and the community is very proud to say so.

Jerry was born in Euclid, Ohio, and is the son of Armenian immigrants. He moved halfway across the country to get an education and play basketball. In 1955, he graduated from Fresno State, and later earned his mas-

ter's degree in Educational Management from the University of Redlands.

Jerry began his coaching career at San Joaquin Memorial High School in Fresno. He then went on to coach high school basketball in Southern California, and then coached at Riverside City College from 1961–1966 and Pasadena City College from 1966–1968. Jerry was successful at the city college level, and brought four consecutive teams to the California Junior College Championships.

Jerry coached his first Division I team at California State University, Long Beach from 1968–1973. As a coach during the late 60's, he defied some of the social norms of the time by becoming one of the first coaches to start more than three African-American players. He is also one of the first coaches to recognize the advantages of coaching junior college athletes. Jerry took a personal interest in his players and wanted them to succeed on and off the court. He reached out to young men who lived in inner-cities and normally would not have access to a higher education.

In 1973, Jerry moved to Nevada to become head coach at UNLV. During his tenure, he made four Final Four appearances, and in 1990 won the NCAA Division I National Championship. For many years to come, Jerry would be recognized as the individual who turned around the basketball program at UNLV and made it into a winning program. When his career ended at UNLV, Jerry returned to Fresno and coached at his alma mater from 1995–2002. For six years in a row, his teams had 20-win seasons.

Jerry coached 42 players who were drafted by the NBA, including 12 first-round selections. Some of his most notable players include: Larry Johnson, Stacey Augmon, Armen Gilliam, and Sidney Green. He also coached Roscoe and Clifton Pondexter also known as the Pondexter brothers who were a powerhouse at San Joaquin Memorial and have since left a legacy at the high school.

Due to the efforts made by Jerry and the "Stadium Builders" in the mid 1990's, The Savemart Center was built. For years, there had been discussions regarding an on-campus arena at Fresno State, but it was not made into a reality until Jerry began his successful coaching career at the university. When he finished his coaching career, Jerry worked as the Senior Development Consultant for the Savemart Center.

Jerry is appreciated by individuals throughout our nation, but he is especially treasured in Fresno, California. Central Valley residents take pride in Fresno State, and it was an honor to have Jerry leading our Bulldogs on the basketball court.

Jerry is married to Lois Tarkanian and they have four children and 11 grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to recognize Coach Jerry Tarkanian as he is recognized for all of the contributions that he has made to the game of basketball.

RECOGNIZING THE EIGHTEENTH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE MILLION
MAN MARCH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I remember eighteen years ago today, watching hundreds of thousands of Black men flood the National Mall in Washington, DC to promote unity and family values that would instill a sense of pride and personal responsibility in the community. Since that uplifting day, I am pleased to say that the Black community has made great strides in achieving the goals of the Million Man March, and honor that effort as we continue to strive for social and economic progress for all.

It was most inspiring to hear many prominent leaders encourage and empower husbands, fathers and sons all across the nation to "go back home" and reclaim prosperity and success for their lives, families and communities. Following the March, an impressive 1.7 million Black men registered to vote and many became more active in promoting civil rights. Since then, we have a larger middle class, more college graduates, and more Blacks are holding political offices. Our two-term President Barack Obama is a testament to how far we have come.

While I am proud of what the Black community has accomplished, there is much more to be done. Blacks still face crippling obstacles that make it difficult for them to remain in or join the middle class. At 12.6 percent, the unemployment rate for Black men and women is disproportionately higher than that of the overall population. In addition, the median wealth of Black households is 20 times less than that of non-Hispanic whites. Blacks are still trapped by poverty in urban neighborhoods plagued by drugs, crime and violence.

As we commemorate the 18th Anniversary of the Million Man March, the words and ideas conveyed on October 16, 1995, must continue to resonate among leaders and activists today. As a nation we look not at our differences, but at what we can do to uplift our communities and come together to take pride in all we have accomplished as we improve income equality, equal opportunity and the realization of the American Dream for everyone.

LAWRENCEBURG BABE RUTH
BASEBALL TEAM SOUTHEAST
REGIONAL CHAMPIONS

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Seventh Congressional District is home to many young talents. Whether in the music, technology, health care, or artistic communities, America's youth find success. I'm please today to rise and add one more group to the list of outstanding young talent: baseball players.

Led by coach David Weathers, the young men from Lawrenceburg left Babe Ruth Baseball League 13-year-old World Series as the Southeast Regional Champions. Dedicated to athletics, sportsmanship, and the great sport of baseball, these 13 young men represented Lawrenceburg, Tennessee, and the Southeast Region with great pride.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in celebrating the hard work, perseverance, and dedication of Ben Stagg, #43; Bradley Huckaba, #6; Clay Gambel, #9; Jacob Hallmark, #7; Jacob James, #10; Jacob Laws, #23; Jett Beasley, #1; Kendall Franklin, #88; Koltar Houser, #14; Lance Pope, #4; Ryan Weathers, #25; Sam Crane, #5 and Sawyer Turnbow, #18.

I join with their friends, parents, coaches, and supporters in celebrating their wonderful season.

AMERICAN HERO GETS A HOME: IN
HONOR OF MARINE SERGEANT
KEN KALISH

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true American patriot on a day worth remembering. Today, the Dallas Builders Association joined Operation Finally Home, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization, on their mission to honor and serve our wounded and disabled veterans and their fam-

ilies as they transition from combat to civilian life. Their mission today is to present Marine Sergeant Ken Kalish with the keys to a mortgage free, custom-built home in Grand Prairie, Texas as a way to thank him for his honorable sacrifice and selfless service to our country.

Sergeant Ken Kalish, born on December 11, 1988 in Independence, Missouri, grew up understanding the core of what it means to be an American. Seeing his grandfather serve as an Army Ranger and his dad in the U.S. Navy, Ken always knew one day he would follow his family's legacy and join the ranks to serve his county. After graduating from Hutch High in 2007, he enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps and reported shortly after to Camp Pendleton for boot camp.

After completing the necessary training, he joined the Combat Engineering battalion to serve overseas in Iraq. Following his first tour of duty, Ken returned stateside and trained as a dog handler to seek out IED (improvised explosive devices), also commonly referred to as "roadside bombs." Specifically, Ken trained a black Labrador retriever named Flynn, and in October of 2010, Ken and Flynn deployed to Afghanistan to detect these destructive mine-like devices. With only 30 short days left on his second tour, Ken stepped on an IED a few moments after loading Flynn into the accompanying vehicle. Ken was severely wounded in the explosion.

Despite the difficulty, Ken refuses to allow his injuries to define his present and his future. In his words, "there's no point in being sad over this" but instead focus on "what I have to do next." His resiliency of spirit, unending courage, and commitment to service over self make 24-year-old Ken a patriot and a hero. Men like Ken embody the best of America. He stands as a shining example to us all, and we owe him and his family our deepest gratitude.

Ken, thank you for your sacrifice to preserve and protect the freedoms we enjoy each and every day. Without your willingness to serve, we would not have the privilege to call America the land of the free and home of the brave. This newly built home could not go to anyone more deserving.

God Bless you and I salute you.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, October 23, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEWART).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 23, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS STEWART to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BEIRUT BOMBING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor today in remembrance of the bombing of the United States Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, 30 years ago.

On October 23, 1983, at approximately 6:20 in the morning, a truck packed with explosives broke security and detonated outside of the barracks, killing 241 Americans and wounding 128 more.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is appropriate that, on the 30th anniversary of this act of terrorism, we recognize the sacrifice of the individuals who lost life and limb, and join with the families and friends of the victims in mourning their loss.

Furthermore, I believe that we should learn from the example of America's leader at the time of the bombing, President Ronald Reagan. President Reagan appreciated the sacrifice made by our servicemembers and was deeply pained by the loss of life.

While many other Presidents would have continued sacrificing young men

and women for the sake of the mission in Lebanon, President Reagan acknowledged his mistake. I would like to take a moment to read a statement he made regarding the bombing:

Perhaps we didn't appreciate fully enough the depth of the hatred and the complexity of the problems that made the Middle East such a jungle. Perhaps the idea of a suicide car bomber committing mass murder to gain instant entry to Paradise was so foreign to our own values and consciousness that it did not create in us the concern for the marines' safety that it should have.

In the weeks immediately after the bombing, I believed the last thing we should do was to turn tail and leave. Yet the irrationality of Middle East politics forced us to rethink our policy. If there would be some rethinking of policy before our men die, we would be a lot better off. If that policy had changed toward more of a neutral position and neutrality, those 241 marines would be alive today.

I have read these quotes from President Reagan to honor the sacrifice of the 241 marines and their families. They did not die in vain, but gave their lives to bring peace to a troubled area.

The leaders of our country must learn from tragedies like Beirut that our men and women in uniform are very precious. Our foreign policy must be formed with a better understanding of the commitment and purpose in a mission before we risk the life of one single American.

I believe sincerely that this was the point President Reagan was making as he remarked with remorse on the bombing of the marine barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, on October 23 of 1983.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to represent Camp Lejeune Marine Base and other bases in eastern North Carolina, and I have visited the Beirut memorial many times to look at the names, certainly people I never knew and probably would not have known.

But the point is that our foreign policy continues today in Afghanistan. We have had six Americans killed in the last week. In the bill that passed recently to raise the debt ceiling, there was \$30 billion for Karzai, who is a crook.

I do not understand this Congress, why we continue to sacrifice our young men and women, and why we continue to send money that we do not have to a foreign dictator and we cut programs for children and seniors who want to have a meal.

With that, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I honor the 241 who died by saying I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. And

Dear God, I ask You to continue to bless America.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is news to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle that you don't win every battle around here. The place is tough, and occasionally you get knocked down. The measure of a man or woman in Congress, or anywhere for that matter, is what do you after.

We all witnessed a political show-down over the past several weeks, and now it is time to put it behind us. I challenge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to step up and show the country what you are made of, and let us actually legislate on behalf of the American people.

I have heard a lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say things like, We don't trust that President; we can't work with this President.

So, Mr. Speaker, does this apply to everything?

Will there be no legislation until there is a different President in 2017?

Well, that doesn't sound very realistic.

On my side of the aisle, they are already saying, oh, those Republicans, they are hard-liners; they will not compromise on anything. And when someone does reach across the aisle to say, hey, let's work on an issue together, what do we get?

Hey, why are you helping them?

I have heard it. When I stood with DAVID VALADAO in California, or PAUL RYAN in Chicago to say immigration reform is an objective we can reach in a bipartisan manner, I heard from the Democrats: stop working with them, we're trying to defeat them. We want to take the House back.

Look, I get it. There are millions of dollars to be raised by partisan bickering. Your side raised a ton of money off the past battle, and my side has too.

The fact is that if two of us get into a shouting match, it is news; and if it gets bad, it will be shown on every channel. But if two of us reach an agreement on something, it's not news.

You know, bipartisanship is something that is much lauded here, but it is infrequently applauded and rarely rewarded.

But here is the thing. The only way we actually get anything done is to put

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

aside the shouting matches and work together. I want immigration reform to pass; and even though I think almost every single Democrat agrees with me, it is still not enough because there are only 201 of us.

We don't run the Rules Committee or set the agenda. The Republicans are the majority in the House, so I know I have to work with the other side.

On your side, you say you don't like what the Senate passed. Let's not just respond with nothing. Let's craft a House response and put our own proposal on the table.

Those on the other side of the aisle say they don't trust the President and can't work with him. Well, okay. Fine. Then work with your colleagues on this side of the aisle.

You know, there are 435 of us. We need 218 votes to pass a bill, and the President doesn't get a vote.

The truth is that even during the shutdown, many on your side of the aisle have been drafting proposals that many of us on this side of the aisle are willing to work with you on. The question is whether the work on a bipartisan basis will be allowed to flourish.

I want to spend the rest of this Congress working with whoever wants to join, in either party, to get immigration reform done.

Your side needs a little time to recover from the last fight? I get that. But with 1,100 deportations every day, we can't wait forever. The kids who are losing their moms are not going to wait for you or for me. The husbands and the fathers who die in the desert because their wives and kids live here don't have any more time to give.

But you probably ask, LUIS, after the battle over health care and budget, how can two parties ever work together?

But, you know, that is exactly what I thought in 1996: How can we work together?

I was here 17 years ago. In 1996, it was Speaker Gingrich who shut down the government. But after that, let's remember what happened. We passed a series of major bipartisan bills on difficult policy issues.

Welfare reform was crafted, in part, by a very conservative House, and signed by a very liberal President Clinton. He had vetoed the bill twice before but, after the shutdown, reached an agreement with the Republican majority.

The Kennedy-Kassenbaum bill was historic, bipartisan legislation on health care, and we passed it after the shutdown. We can do the same if politicians in both parties are committed to accomplishments over campaign talking points. We can pass immigration reform this year.

We all know that immigration reform is immensely popular with voters in both parties who want a political solution to fixing our broken immigra-

tion system. Diverse constituencies back immigration reform, like labor unions and business owners and evangelical leaders and Catholic bishops and leaders across the political spectrum.

Don't think of it as working with President Obama if it makes it easier for you. Think of it as doing your job. Think of it as working on behalf of the American people, not for an Obama solution, not for a Tea Party solution, but for an American solution.

POLITICAL DOUBLE STANDARD AT WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, if you missed this past Sunday morning TV talking heads shows, you missed the political double standard at work. Time and again, the hosts of the afore-said programs referred to the recent "Republican government shutdown."

Wait a minute. Republican government shutdown?

There were two advocacy groups to this affair: one, President Obama and the Democratic administration and, two, the Republicans.

So it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that a more accurate description would be the Republicans, President Obama and the Democrat administration and the government shutdown.

The Republicans, in spite of the President's adamant refusal to negotiate, requested a 1-year delay for the controversial health care proposal. The President rejected that proposal but, considering the reviews surrounding his health care proposal, which are, at best, dismal, it was an offer the President should have embraced.

All of us, in and out of the political arena, should dismiss the application of the double standard that oftentimes is used in this town, and we should encourage objectivity to prevail over subjectivity; and, in so doing, our country will become the beneficiary of good government, of fair government. Good government finally will be promoted in the end, and we will all benefit therefrom.

THE NATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today the House begins consideration of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, which includes in the title the word "reform" but would represent a huge step backwards.

This legislation would have significant impact on the way the Army

Corps of Engineers conducts projects that are critical to the Nation's environmental and economic health. I have long worked to help the Corps be a better partner which, in times past, has proved troublesome.

It was my pleasure to work with the head of the Corps previously, General Robert Flowers, and his staff to change the way the Corps does business. Otherwise, we can waste a lot of money and inflict unnecessary environmental damage.

One of the ways the Corps meets its environmental responsibilities is by compliance with the National and Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, signed into law on New Year's Day in 1970 by President Richard Nixon.

Earlier this year, Glen Bowman, an official with the Georgia Department of Transportation, shared with Georgia legislators President Nixon's observation that clean air, clean water, open space should be the birthright of every American. Through our years of past carelessness, we have incurred a debt to nature that is now being called.

Mr. Bowman told the legislators that 43 years later the price tag is even higher, some problems remain, and daunting challenges loom, but that NEPA's impact is unquestionable. It remains the Nation's guiding environmental star.

He observes that environmental needs and protecting the environment are not mutually exclusive, and it is important to work together to achieve those objectives.

□ 1015

Sadly, for me, the most critical element in a bill that I would like to support is the damage to the NEPA process. Placing an artificial time limit of 150 days, restricting the internal activities of the agencies, giving them limited time to move the process along, interfering with the chain of command, cutting out the public from the process, and forcing a shorter time for litigation is unnecessary. It is ill-advised, and it is not going to solve the problem. Project delays are not a result of the NEPA process. There are billions of dollars of projects that are already approved and ready to go—\$60 billion by some estimates. The problem is that Congress has not adequately funded the Corps.

I will be offering an amendment with the gentleman from Oregon, Congressman DEFAZIO, that simply suspends this ill-advised amendment to NEPA, seriously compromising it and the public process, until the project backlog disappears in order to move forward with the already approved projects. Ironically, this bill would add to the backlog while it truncates the NEPA process.

NEPA protects community values. It can often result in alternatives that are even less costly as well as less damaging to the environment. Before we

rush to implement ill-advised changes under the guise of reform, let's get rid of the backlog of already approved projects first and be able to work through the consequences.

Forcing more projects that will be ill-considered will make them less worthy of funding. For agencies that are chronically underfunded and are facing further budget cuts, imposing artificial time limits on an already overwhelming backlog is not a prescription for more development projects being completed and better performance. It is a prescription for sloppy work, ill-advised approvals, and more litigation when we should be concentrating on getting the job done. It will make it harder to serve the public and get the financial support to build vital projects.

I urge my colleagues to support the DeFazio-Blumenauer amendment to reduce the backlog of projects ready to go before complicating and weakening environmental protections and the public's right to participate.

I now would like to enter into the RECORD the comments of Mr. Glenn Bowman from the Georgia Department of Transportation.

NEPA IS THE GUIDE STAR

(By Glenn Bowman)

Shortly after signing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) into law on New Year's Day in 1970, President Richard Nixon discussed it in his State of the Union Address:

"The great question . . . is shall we make peace with nature and begin to make reparations for the damage we have done to our air, our land and our water? . . . Clean air, clean water, open spaces—these should once again be the birthright of every American. . . . The price tag is high. Through our years of past carelessness, we have incurred a debt to nature. Now that debt is being called."

Now, 43 years later, that price tag is even higher. Some old problems remain, and daunting new challenges loom. Still, NEPA's impact is unquestionable; it remains the nation's environmental guide star.

At Georgia's Department of Transportation—the entity responsible for more earth work in this state than any other—NEPA has a huge impact on planning, designing and building transportation infrastructure. Virtually everything we do begins with "complying with the NEPA process."

We must:

Protect water quality, air quality, endangered plant and animal species and their habitats, migratory birds, wetlands, streams, rivers, harbors, flood plains, farmlands and the soil itself;

Preserve historic and culturally significant buildings and places;

Save archaeologically significant resources;

Guard against noise pollution;

Make certain native peoples and the disadvantaged are treated equitably;

Mitigate for unavoidable impacts, and always engage the public in our decision-making process.

This requires a considerable investment in time, staff and money. Making a project NEPA-compliant sometimes requires re-routing; re-locating cemeteries and historic structures; and archaeological "digs" to re-

cover important artifacts. We create or improve wetlands and streams to mitigate for like areas that need to be altered. We work with affected residents to help offset impacts to their neighborhoods and lives.

Recently, the need to study areas of North Georgia for the presence of the endangered Indiana and gray bats has garnered attention. Such examination simply is part of a process we are required by law to undertake for numerous plant and animal species, be they cuddly or creepy.

With as many as 700 projects ongoing at any time, not everyone is always going to be satisfied. But our foremost mission is to help make those 700 projects realities; keep motorists safe and moving, and grow that network as Georgia grows.

Meeting our transportation needs and protecting our environment are not mutually exclusive objectives; doing both does not have to be a contentious, adversarial struggle. Working together—internally, with partner agencies, businesses, local governments and citizens—we can repay our debt to nature, have a world-class transportation system, and preserve the beauty and many wonders of Georgia for generations to come.

AMERICA'S OUT-OF-CONTROL SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, in just a few short months, we will again find ourselves debating how to not shut down the Federal Government. Our Nation's fiscal woes are not temporary. In fact, they have plagued us for many years, and we have got to stop trying to solve these problems with temporary solutions.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we are now \$17 trillion in debt, and our government continues to spend and spend and spend. Last Thursday, our Nation's debt jumped \$328 billion in just 1 day. This surpassed the previous high set 2 years ago by over \$100 billion. It is time Congress breaks this pattern. We do not want to be a Nation drowning in debt but, rather, one of economic leadership throughout the world, pro-growth policies.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot borrow 40 cents of every dollar we spend. It is simply not the way to run a government, a business, or a family budget. Yet the Federal Government continues to borrow without addressing what got us here in the first place, which is out-of-control spending.

Mr. Speaker, the deal agreed to last week didn't do a single thing to cut spending or tackle the real drivers of our debt; and if we do not change this, we will never get ourselves out of the fiscal rut but, instead, find ourselves repeating history over and over and over again, governing and spending by continuing resolutions. Rather than passing temporary spending bills and short-term extensions to the debt ceiling, we should be working to pass all 12 appropriation bills and a real budget.

This doesn't need to be a deal at the eleventh hour. If we go through a regular budgetary process, we will most certainly find areas to eliminate wasteful spending, shore up entitlement spending, and achieve comprehensive tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is already spending too much, and ObamaCare will only make things worse. It is estimated that ObamaCare will increase taxes over \$1 trillion and add \$6 trillion to the deficit. Putting aside the countless policy issues associated with ObamaCare, the law, from a purely numerical economic standpoint, is a prime example of out-of-control spending. Overall, ObamaCare is expected to increase health care spending by \$621 billion over the next 10 years. We cannot afford this. Our children cannot afford this, and the economy will crumble underneath it.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are frustrated with seeing their elected officials in Washington sit on either side of the wall and refuse to make real spending cuts. It is time to sit down and have a conversation about how we get our fiscal house in order and get our spending addiction under control. We cannot continue to jeopardize our economy and our Nation's future by spending more than we take in.

CONGRATULATING THE BOSTON RED SOX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, while typically I would address the House on much more serious subjects, today it is a slightly lighter subject that I am here to address. Much to my regret, I am here standing before you to congratulate my dear friend and classmate from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and his Boston Red Sox on their American League Championship Series win over my beloved Detroit Tigers. And in accordance with our agreement, today I am wearing the gentleman's rather unsightly Boston Red Sox tie, which is painful to say the least.

Although the Tigers did not make it to the World Series this year, I do want to say how proud I am of our players, of our team, of our State, and specifically of Jim Leyland, who, after two World Series, four American League Championship Series, and 8 years as our manager, announced his retirement this week.

Jim, I am sure I speak for all Michiganders and all baseball fans in saying that we are proud to have you retire as a Detroit Tiger.

To Michigan, and specifically to Detroit, the Tigers have always meant more than just baseball. Year after year, their perseverance and grit, even through really tough times for both

the team and for the city, that perseverance has been emblematic of the determination and resilience of Detroiters and Michiganders. Tigers baseball has provided hope and instilled a sense of pride in a city and State that has surely seen its share of difficulties. Their performance and their wins have certainly not erased the challenges that we face, but it has given the community and our State a lift.

Like the team, Detroit and Michigan have always had hope for the next season. I love my Detroit Tigers and appreciate all they mean to the great State of Michigan.

And to Jim Leyland and our amazing team, bless you, boys.

So, today, regrettably but sincerely, I salute my colleague from Massachusetts and his winning team, the Boston Red Sox. I had hoped for a different outcome, but, nonetheless, a win is a win.

JOE, congratulations to you and to the Red Sox.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

WHEN PROPAGANDA TRUMPS REALITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has gone through 18 government shutdowns in the last 37 years. Fifteen of those 18 shutdowns occurred when Democrats controlled the House. In those 15 shutdowns, the Democrats demanded increased abortion services and labor and environmental policy concessions.

Perhaps the reason we don't remember those shutdowns as vividly is because, in those days, Presidents negotiated around the clock to resolve the disputes that caused them and did everything that they could to minimize the public's inconvenience and suffering.

This time was different. This time, the President refused to negotiate, and he took unprecedented steps to amplify the pain and suffering that the public endured. A senior administration official told *The Wall Street Journal*, "We are winning . . . It doesn't really matter to us how long the shutdown lasts because what matters is the end result." A park ranger said, "We've been told to make life as difficult as we can for people. It's disgusting."

This administration barricaded open-air venues like the World War II Memorial for Honor Flights by World War II veterans, yet it opened The National Mall for an amnesty rally by illegal immigrants. It closed simple parking lots and roadside turnouts that merely offered passers-by distant views of

Mount Rushmore and Yosemite. It ordered businesses to close just because they leased land from the Federal Government. It even tried to close the ocean to Florida fishermen. These measures had never been taken in prior shutdowns, and they often cost more than simply leaving these venues open.

A constituent of mine in Hume, California, wrote, "To get to my place of residence and work, I have to travel through the Big Stump entrance station of Kings Canyon National Park on Highway 180. Currently, the entire roadway is barricaded, and it appears as though the Park Service is attempting to prevent anyone from traveling to or through the national park. I was in the area 17 years ago as a young adult during the last government shutdown, and this type of thing didn't happen. Sure, the facilities at the visitor centers were closed, but the land was still accessible."

Now, why would the administration do this? Why would it deliberately order our public servants to "make life as difficult as possible for people"? They told us why—because they were winning politically.

On October 2, House Republicans, joined by 23 Democrats, passed H.J. Res. 70 to open the national parks, but the bill was killed in the Senate. Why? Well, they told us why. They were winning politically.

When Republican Governor Jan Brewer stepped forward to use State funds to staff the Grand Canyon National Park—as Arizona had done in previous shutdowns—she was stonewalled by the administration for 10 days. Why? Well, they told us why. They were winning politically.

Now what was the outrageous Republican demand the Democrats refused even to discuss during the 16-day shutdown while they ordered our public servants to make life as difficult as possible for people? Well, on September 30, with the deadline just hours away, House Republicans had dropped all conditions to fund the entire government with one substantive exception: delay the individual mandate that forces people to buy policies against their will. Democrats summarily rejected this proposal and, for 16 days, refused to negotiate on this single point while literally accusing Republicans of sedition.

Then, this past Monday, the President's press secretary made this stunning admission: the administration may, itself, seek to delay the individual mandate by dropping the penalty for noncompliance. They have got to be kidding.

For the 16 days of the shutdown, the only substantive dispute was the Republican plea to delay the individual mandate for the millions of Americans who couldn't find or afford ObamaCare policies. Doing so would have ended the impasse instantly. During those 16

days, it was clear to everyone that the exchanges weren't working. Yet for 16 days, the President and congressional Democrats refused even to discuss the matter while they turned their formidable propaganda machine to the task of winning politically. Then, just 4 days after Republicans capitulated on all points, including dropping our single substantive request to delay the individual mandate, the administration is now, itself, considering delaying the individual mandate.

Mr. Speaker, these facts speak for themselves and need no embellishment from me. John Adams once observed, "Facts are stubborn things." As passions cool and reason resumes its rightful place in the Nation's discourse, these facts will speak eloquently and stubbornly of what happens when politics trump policy and propaganda trumps reality.

JPMORGAN CHASE SETTLEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. The greatest power a banker has is to create money. Banks can also abuse that awesome power. And it seems like the bigger the banks are the more they abuse that power. Let me relate a vivid example:

It was over 5 years ago that America was hit with the great Wall Street-induced recession. Five years later, those banks are still paying our people—their customers—almost nothing if customers have deposits or certificates of deposit with those institutions. That is harming seniors across this country. That is harming people who are trying to make a go of it. It is harming investors. Meanwhile, banks continue to post huge profits, especially the very biggest ones that are market controllers—for example, JPMorgan Chase, just in the last year, took \$21 billion in profit; Wells Fargo, \$19 billion; Goldman Sachs, \$7.5 billion in profits; Citigroup, \$7.5 billion; Bank of America, \$4 billion—while Americans continue to struggle to make ends meet and recuperate from that Great Recession.

Now, it has been reported this week that JPMorgan Chase will agree to a \$13 billion settlement of the civil suit filed by the United States Department of Justice and the Federal Housing Finance Agency in order to resolve several investigations into their fraudulent mortgage securities business. One question I have with that \$13 billion: Are they actually going to pay it, or is JPMorgan Chase going to use it as a deduction on their taxes as a business expense or some other tax dodge that their accountants and lawyers figure out?

□ 1030

From September 7, 2005, through September 19, 2007, JPMorgan and its affiliates knowingly misrepresented the

value and quality of their mortgage bonds that it sold to the Federal Housing Finance Agency. The result of their actions are reverberating still throughout our economy, as foreclosure rates in places like Ohio continue to go up. They are still above the national average. In August, foreclosure starts in Ohio were up 44 percent from the previous month, for a total that month of 9,542 foreclosure filings. Tens of thousands of people are being affected from coast to coast.

Minority neighborhoods were especially harmed by the financial crisis. A report by the Urban Institute estimates the loss of home equity in African American households as a result of the foreclosure crisis is at \$194 billion. All the wealth that was accumulated since World War II vaporized. They were hit very hard.

Hispanic communities lost \$177 billion in home equity during the same time period. Awesome.

Although a settlement has been reached in this particular case, this should not be the end of the investigation into Wall Street banks because JPMorgan and their brethren have proven to be repeat offenders. Criminal charges should be pursued, not just civil.

This settlement is just one of many recent penalties that JP has had to pay. In June 2011, JPMorgan had to pay \$153 million in penalties to the Securities and Exchange Commission for misleading investors about a collateralized debt obligation. In August 2012, the bank had to pay \$1.2 billion for what it had done to conspire with VISA and MasterCard to set the price of credit card and debit interchange fees.

In July of this year, JPMorgan had to pay \$410 million in penalties and repayments to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for revealing that the bank had been manipulating the California and Midwest electricity markets from September 2010 to November 2012. JPMorgan Chase had to pay a \$100 million fine for reckless conduct and market manipulation in connection with its 2012 London Whale trading scandal.

The question I have: Can they deduct any of these penalties from the taxes they pay, or are they really paying back in full those penalties to the government of the United States free and clear to pay back the American people for their criminal behavior?

In the past 3 years, JPMorgan has posted year-after-year record profits, driven by their stock prices. Last year, the firm made \$21.3 billion. Therefore, with this recent settlement, it would be about only half of their most recent profits. For a frame of reference, there are only seven Dow Jones Industrial Average companies that made more than \$13 billion profits last year.

We can say to ourselves, would these fines, if they were really paid, do any

harm to JPMorgan? Think about this. They have \$87 billion in reserves and their total assets are valued, by their own accounts, at over \$2.25 trillion. That is a "wow," by any account.

The result of all of this misbehavior is many Americans have lost all of their accumulated equity.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to restore prudent banking. I ask my colleagues to sign on to H.R. 129, the Return To Prudent Banking Act of 2013. Let's restore the Glass-Steagall Act and the value of our money.

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, for months, President Obama promised he would initiate long-overdue negotiations on issues from health care to tax and regulatory reform, all factors holding back economic growth. But he linked this pledge to Congress reopening the government and raising the debt limit.

His promise to address the critical drivers of our economy is why last week I voted to end the budget impasse and tentatively agree to cooperate with the President. With the government reopened, it is time for those promises that he made to be upheld and for negotiations to begin.

Our economy is still way too weak. Let's look at the facts:

Ninety-seven percent of all the jobs created in America this past year have been part time;

Millions of our workers are seeing their hours cut;

Participation in the workforce is at an all-time low the last 35 years, with 90 million adults sitting on the sidelines.

Our neighbors and our friends are struggling and are uncomfortable about their future. Our latest college graduates can't find jobs, and millions more of our country's youth have quit searching for employment. It is time to reduce the uncertainty and help these families.

The House has already passed dozens of bills to help grow the economy, including tax reform, limiting excessive regulations, debt reduction, and yes, reforming ObamaCare.

The President has repeatedly said he is willing to negotiate on all of these economic issues. As recently as October 3, he stated:

I'm happy to negotiate with you on anything. I don't think any one party has a monopoly on wisdom.

Then, on October 8, the President said:

Serious negotiations could proceed around every item in the budget.

He then went on to say that negotiation would not be limited just to the budget. He said:

I will sit down and work with anyone of any party, not only to talk about the budget . . . about ways to improve the health care system . . . and about ways that we can shrink our long-term deficits.

Congress has now upheld its end of the bargain. The American people can now judge whether the President will uphold his.

In the next 90 days, let's demonstrate that Congress can indeed work in a bipartisan fashion and tackle our most serious problems now: a weak economy, a growing national debt, and a health care law that isn't ready for implementation.

It is important to note that the House took steps necessary to initiate negotiation. Therefore, in fairness, the President and the Senate need to come to the table. History will record whether the President fulfills his repeated pledges and addresses these barriers to America's economic exceptionalism.

Last week, many of us in the Chamber extended a hand of bipartisan cooperation to the President. But as President Reagan once said:

Trust, but verify.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an important provision that I worked hard on with a bipartisan group of Illinois Senators and House Members to have included in the new Water Resources Reform and Development Act. This bill, also known as WRRDA, is a vital piece of legislation that Congress will consider later today.

Our provision would help improve the Nation's water infrastructure, including the aging locks and dams along the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers, through public-private partnerships that would expedite projects and save taxpayers money. It comes from a House and Senate, Democrat and Republican bill called the Water Infrastructure Now Public Private-Partnership Act.

I was proud to introduce this bill earlier this year with Senators DURBIN and KIRK and Representative RODNEY DAVIS, all proudly of Illinois. Our provision would help clear a \$60 billion backlog in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers projects that will take decades to complete without outside investment. It does this by creating a pilot program to explore agreements between the Army Corps of Engineers and private entities as alternatives to traditional financing, planning, design, and construction models.

The Mississippi and Illinois Rivers are absolutely critical to the economic well-being of my region in Illinois, the entire Midwest, and the United States and the world. These locks and dams were built during the administration of

□ 1045

Franklin Roosevelt and are now close to 80 years old. This is why action must be taken to expand and modernize the locks and dams that help transport our goods and products worldwide.

By encouraging public-private partnerships, our bipartisan effort will help make the movement of the high-quality goods of our region, whether they be from any of the numerous farmers and manufacturers that call Illinois home, more swift, efficient, and safe.

To put this in perspective, the Mississippi River is the world's largest navigable inland waterway. Just on the Mississippi River alone, 60 percent—well over half—of the Nation's agricultural goods are transported. It is absolutely critical to American commerce and the smooth movement of goods that this is made as efficient as possible.

Our bill fits perfectly into that equation, and it is good for the taxpayer, the farmer, and industry. I am very proud of that.

In addition to our efforts to improve our Nation's locks and dams, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act also contains many provisions that will boost local economies across our country. The WRRDA bill will lead to upgraded water transportation systems and offer vulnerable communities better protection against flooding, which is very important to the region that I represent. It will promote America's competitiveness, prosperity, and economic growth for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress to work with those I don't always agree with and who don't always agree with me, but as a way to find commonsense, reasonable solutions to create jobs and lay the foundation for a stronger middle class.

I was proud that the WRRDA bill passed out of the House Transportation Committee on a bipartisan, unanimous basis. I give a great deal of credit to Transportation Committee Chairman BILL SHUSTER, Ranking Member NICK RAHALL, Subcommittee Chairman BOB GIBBS, Subcommittee Ranking Member TIM BISHOP, and all of my colleagues on the committee for their hard work over the last year. It is truly an example of congressional Republicans and Democrats working together, and I hope it is something that we will see a lot more of.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important job-creating bill when it comes to the floor later today.

FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY: THE BATTLE RESUMES IN 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Benjamin Franklin once advised:

When you run in debt, you give to another power over your liberty.

Washington is in an epic political battle that controls America's destiny for decades to come. The fight is between those who are financially responsible and have the understanding and backbone needed to prevent an American bankruptcy, and those who do not.

Last week, mainstream news media pundits declared a great win for Democrats and President Obama when the Federal Government reopened and the debt ceiling was raised. To the contrary, and for reasons I will explain, last week was a major loss for the American people.

America's economy suffers from a \$17 trillion debt—the worse in history—and 5 years of deficits averaging more than a trillion dollars per year. Again, the worst in history.

During the past 5 years, the Federal Government borrowed 30 percent of its spending. How many families and businesses can avoid bankruptcy if, year after year, 30 percent of their spending is borrowed money? Not many, and not for long. Yet that is exactly what our country, America, is doing.

Economic principles don't care if you are a family, a business, or a country. If you borrow more money than you can pay back, you go bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, America has been warned.

President Obama's Comptroller General Dodaro warns America's finances are on an "unsustainable path." Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mike Mullen warns that our greatest national security threat is not Iran, al Qaeda, China, or Russia; it is our debt burden that undermines our ability to pay for America's national defense and thus risks our national security.

Detroit and Stockton bankruptcies mean retirees may lose their pensions. Greece, another debtor nation, has a 27 percent unemployment rate—worse than any year in America's Great Depression.

There are good and bad ways to fund the Federal Government and raise the debt ceiling. Last week, Washington chose the worst way by not fixing the underlying problems: deficits and debt. Instead, Washington again kicked the can down the road, forcing America to revisit government funding issues in January and the debt ceiling issues in February, with one major difference: America will be financially weaker and less able to face the problem because we will be burdened by another half-trillion dollars in debt.

Mr. Speaker, another half-trillion dollars in debt. I wonder why you didn't hear that from the media pundits.

What did America get for another half-trillion dollars in debt? Not one penny in spending cuts, not a single economic policy that creates jobs and grows our economy, and nothing that fixes our deficit and debt problem.

What Washington did last week is akin to a sick patient going to the emergency room and getting pain-killing drugs that help the patient feel good, yet do nothing to cure the disease that ultimately kills the patient. In the real world, that is medical malpractice. Similarly, Washington's refusal last week to cure our deficit and debt disease was governing malpractice.

Mr. Speaker, America enjoys prosperity today because past generations sacrificed to make us who we are. We have the same obligation to our descendants.

President George Washington once advised Congress:

No pecuniary consideration is more urgent than the regular redemption and discharge of the public debt. On none can delay be more injurious.

George Washington gave prudent advice in 1793. It is prudent advice now. Washington must cut out-of-control spending and balance the budget before America's debt burden spirals out of control and is so great that we cannot recover. Failure risks a bankruptcy that will destroy the America it took our ancestors generations—centuries—to build.

Mr. Speaker, the fight for America resumes in January on properly funding the government and in February on properly raising the debt ceiling. Ours is a fight America must win. Congress and the White House must rise to the challenge and be financially responsible when funding the government and raising the debt ceiling. America's future as a great Nation and a world power depends on it.

IN HONOR OF LUIS FERRE ON THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS PASSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, Monday marked the 10th anniversary of the passing of Luis Ferre. I rise this morning to pay tribute to this giant of a man whom The New York Times called the "dominant force in the politics, economy and culture of Puerto Rico" for much of the 20th century.

In a real sense, Don Luis personified his beloved Puerto Rico, embodying both its progress and its struggles. He was born in Ponce in 1904, a few years after Puerto Rico became a U.S. territory; was a teenager when island residents were granted American citizenship in 1917; served as a delegate to the convention that drafted Puerto Rico's local constitution in the early 1950s; was elected as the island's governor in 1968; served as a member of the Puerto Rico Senate, including as its president,

in the late 1970s and early 1980s; and remained engaged in public life as a revered elder statesman well beyond his formal retirement from politics.

Don Luis lived to age 99, but it was the fullness of his life, not its length, that is so remarkable. Trained as an engineer at MIT and as a classical pianist at the New England Conservatory of Music, Ferre was a true renaissance man. He loved ideas, intellectual debate and culture, founding the renowned Ponce Museum of Art; but he was also at home in the practical world of business, taking a small company and transforming it into one of Puerto Rico's most successful conglomerates. He published a newspaper, now called *El Nuevo Día*, which is run by his grandchildren, and has the largest circulation of any periodical on the island. Don Luis was also a committed philanthropist, who took to heart the biblical axiom: to whom much is given, much is expected.

In 1991, Ferre was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian honor, by President George H.W. Bush, who called Ferre "a public servant of the first order" and an "extraordinary leader in the life of Puerto Rico."

On a personal level, Ferre refuted the notion that great men are seldom good men. Like any effective leader, he was tough when he needed to be, but he was also kind, warm and generous, inspiring affection and loyalty as well as respect. Don Luis was a gentleman through and through. He was "old school" in the best sense of the term.

Few, if any, Puerto Ricans have accomplished as much in their lives as Don Luis or have left behind such a lasting legacy. A proud Republican and founder of the local New Progressive Party, Ferre did not live to see his goal of statehood for Puerto Rico realized, but he encouraged and mentored a new generation of leaders who understand that Puerto Rico's "colonial status," as Don Luis called it, deprives island residents of political and civil rights, hinders their economic progress and harms their quality of life. As I and other pro-statehood advocates work to perfect Puerto Rico's union with the U.S., we are guided by Don Luis' example and draw strength from his memory.

Ferre once described himself as revolutionary in his ideas, liberal in his objectives, and conservative in his methods. Thanks to Don Luis and others, statehood is no longer a revolutionary idea. It has become the predominant force in Puerto Rico politics while support for the status quo continues to decline and support for separate nationhood remains slight.

Last November, a clear majority of voters in Puerto Rico rejected territory status, and more voters expressed a preference for statehood than for any other status option. I wish Don Luis

had been alive to witness this historic event. When Puerto Rico does become a state, as I know it will, we will look back upon Luis Ferre's life and say that this man, as much as any other man, was responsible for this crowning achievement.

ACCELERATING THE END OF BREAST CANCER ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, October is National Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

It is estimated that almost 40,000 women in the United States will die of breast cancer this year. Those are mothers, sisters, grandmothers, wives, daughters. We will miss them, and it shouldn't be. Thousands of men will be diagnosed with breast cancer as well.

Breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths among women in the United States. Globally, breast cancer accounts for one-quarter of all cancers suffered by women. Every family probably in this Chamber today and across America has been touched in its life by somebody who has had breast cancer, and I am certainly no exception. My mother-in-law, Ruth Eskew Capito, died tragically at age 51—diagnosed with breast cancer. I never knew her as a mother-in-law, and my children never got to enjoy the pleasures of having her as their grandmother. The emptiness and the hurt never go away.

With the efforts of many dedicated to fighting breast cancer, we are making some progress—but limited progress—in stopping premature deaths caused by this terrible disease. In 1991, an average of 119 women in the United States died of breast cancer each day. Today, more than 20 years later, an average of 108 women will die of the disease each day. So between the years of 2000 and 2009, the cancer mortality rate for women has declined by 1.9 percent annually.

We must accelerate the progress we are making in finding new lifesaving treatments for breast cancer. That is why I, along with a bipartisan group of cosponsors, introduced H.R. 1830, the Accelerating the End of Breast Cancer Act. The Accelerating the End of Breast Cancer Act sets a national goal of ending deaths from the disease by 2020. This bill would establish a commission that would direct Federal and private sector resources towards the promising treatments aimed at stopping metastasis, or the spread of breast cancer, to other parts of the body.

The legislation is not designed to spend more taxpayers' dollars. In fact, the bill does not authorize any new Federal spending. Instead, it is designed to direct our existing research dollars in the most efficient way pos-

sible. The Accelerating the End of Breast Cancer Act will not duplicate the efforts of existing government agencies and programs. It will, instead, provide a vital check and balance and will help ensure our limited research dollars are funding the most promising science in the area of breast cancer research. In working in this way and in building on the decades of Federal investment and achievement in breast cancer research, we can move forward to end breast cancer and learn how to prevent the disease within the next decade.

So far, there are 172 House Members from both parties and all ideologies who have cosponsored this legislation. I invite my colleagues today, in this month of October—National Breast Cancer Awareness Month—who have not yet cosponsored, to join us in a cosponsorship. I look forward to working with Members on both sides of the aisle to spur the development of new lifesaving treatments for those with breast cancer. The hope to end breast cancer can become a reality. Let's join together to make that happen.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my concerns about provisions in the Water Resources Reform and Development Act that put communities, taxpayers and the environment at risk by undermining the National Environmental Policy Act.

NEPA reviews have been useful for identifying potentially costly problems with water projects, allowing changes to save taxpayer dollars and avoid delays. This bill contains so-called "streamlining" provisions based on the flawed notion that NEPA is causing project delays; but studies have shown that other factors, like insufficient funding for the Corps, are the cause of delays. The bill limits public participation in the decision-making process, which will deny the Corps the benefit of public and expert input.

I ask the chairman to work, as this bill moves forward, to ensure that the bill does not degrade the NEPA process. I also hope that the chairman will work with me to provide the Corps the authority to perform ecosystem restoration work on lands owned by other Federal agencies, which is needed to complete important projects such as the South San Francisco Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project. I tried to offer a simple amendment to the Water Resources Reform and Development Act today, but the Rules Committee did not make my amendment in order.

Currently, the Army Corps of Engineers has the authority to use construction funds to perform flood protection work on lands owned by other

Federal agencies, but the Corps does not have the legal authority to use construction funds to perform ecosystem restoration work on lands owned by other Federal agencies. In 2013, we all believe that good flood protection projects must incorporate ecosystem restoration, and the Corps has the ability to do integrated projects like this everywhere else except on lands owned by another Federal agency. This poses a significant hurdle in the case of the South San Francisco Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, which seeks to return the San Francisco Bay to its natural state and provide flood protection and wetlands restoration.

In this case, the State of California and the United States Government, through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, own the land on which the project will be performed even though most of the funding to buy the land came from the State and non-Federal interests. The Corps has told the local partners that it does not have the legal authority to perform the ecosystem restoration aspects of this work on lands owned by the Fish and Wildlife Service and that it needs Congress to provide that authority. My amendment simply sought to fix this situation by granting the Corps that authority so it could pursue this joint flood protection and ecosystem restoration project.

I ask Chairmen SHUSTER and GIBBS and Ranking Members RAHALL and BISHOP to work with me as this bill goes to conference with the Senate in order to provide the Corps with the authority it needs to carry out this project and projects for which it has already been authorized to perform feasibility studies.

A TRIBUTE TO A TEXAS LEGEND, BUM PHILLIPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Houston, Texas, lost an icon last week, Bum Phillips.

Bum coached the Houston Oilers in their heyday, 1975 through 1980.

□ 1100

Twice during that tenure, they came within one game of going to the Super Bowl.

Bum was loved because he was more than a football coach. He was a true Texan who happened to be a football coach—a Houston, Texas, football coach.

Bum understood the rivalry between Dallas, Texas, and Houston, Texas. He said:

The Dallas Cowboys may be America's team, but the Houston Oilers are Texas' team.

He knew football was just a game.
As he said:

Winning is only half of it. Having fun is the other half.

And he had fun.

In 1977, the Oilers drafted a star running back from Texas, Earl Campbell, a Heisman Trophy winner, a University of Texas graduate, a Longhorn from Tyler, Texas. In their first practice, Earl finished dead last in the mile run of the whole team. A reporter asked Bum if he was worried about Earl, could he perform in the NFL. Bum dead-panned:

When it's first and a mile, I won't give it to him.

He loved his players, nobody more so than Earl Campbell. Bum showed his love for Earl by saying:

I don't know if Earl is in a class by himself, but I do know that when that class gets together, it sure don't take long to call the roll.

Love ya, Blue; love ya, Bum. Thanks for the memories. God has a small class waiting for you in Heaven, and, yes, it won't take long to take the roll.

God bless Bum Phillips.

SUSTAINING THE ARAB SPRING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, when a Tunisian fruit vendor set himself on fire nearly 3 years ago to protest his lack of economic opportunity and maltreatment at the hands of local police, his desperate act touched off a political revolution that has convulsed the Arab world from the Maghreb to the Gulf.

First in Tunisia and then in Egypt, popular protests toppled long-serving autocrats while Libyan dictator Muammar Qadhafi was ousted by NATO-backed rebels. Elsewhere, from Bahrain to Syria, regimes have proven more resilient and, in several cases, willing to use extreme levels of violence to maintain their survival.

So, in the waning months of the third year of what has been dubbed the "Arab Spring," the future of a large swath of the global community remains uncertain. With Egypt under military control and Syria ablaze, it is not surprising that many here in the United States and elsewhere in the West view each new development with concern that an already volatile region could spiral completely out of control.

The situation in Syria is undoubtedly grim and Egypt faces a prolonged period of instability, but the news is not uniformly bad. In Tunisia, the Islamist government, headed by the Ennahda Party, has acceded to opposition demands that it hand over power to a caretaker government and schedule new elections.

Tiny Tunisia could again show its larger neighbors that a democratic transition—even an extended one of several intermediate steps—is possible in a region buffeted by the crosscur-

rents of religion, tribalism, and authoritarianism, and fueled by a huge demographic bulge of young people who are better educated and more connected to the world than their parents but who lack jobs and hope.

But even if Tunisia's next government is more reflective of the desires of the Tunisian people and is able to attack the problems that have retarded the country's progress, the pace of change will be slower than many Tunisians will desire. Entrenched interests and institutions connected to the ancien regime, what Egyptians have dubbed the "deep state," will conspire to stand in the way of a brighter future for Tunisia's people and slow the pace of change throughout the region.

Around the world, but especially here in Washington, the regional developments have fostered unease as events on the ground have proven less than amenable to external "management." The power of entrenched interests was more than offset by the early strength of Islamist parties in Tunisia and Egypt, giving rise to the fear of secular autocracies being supplanted by theocratically-oriented governments that would embrace the principle of "one man, one vote, one time."

This fear of an Islamist takeover has had two main effects in the first years of the Arab transition. The first is that it served to inhibit the American response for fear of strengthening the Islamists' hold or provoking a popular backlash. The other has been to drive a wedge between the United States and the Gulf Arab monarchs, who have been the most resistant to change and accommodation and understand fully the implications for their rule.

But change will be hard to resist. The same forces that swept aside Egypt's Mubarak and Tunisia's Ben Ali are at work throughout the region. The United States needs to craft policies that acknowledge the centrality of that fact, as well as the reality that this is a process that will play itself out over a generation and perhaps longer. We need to build mechanisms capable of supporting a transition in the Arab world in three dimensions: political, economic, and civil society.

Next week, I will discuss how the U.S. can help foster these three pillars of democratic development in a way that can be sustained without requiring an outsized share of our limited resources. In the weeks to come, I will be sharing a few more detailed thoughts on the struggles going on in Egypt, Tunisia, Syria, Iran, and elsewhere in this critical and dangerous part of the world.

The yearning for freedom is a universal one, but getting there has never been easy. The Egyptians, Syrians, Tunisians, and others have taken the first step towards taking their societies back. We must stand ready to help, and we must be prepared for a long and uneven journey.

THE WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I come from the great State of Michigan, also known as the Great Lakes State, and I have lived my entire life along the shores of this national treasure. For those of us in Michigan and the other Great Lakes States, the Great Lakes are not just a source of much of our drinking water or a place that we go to enjoy their natural beauty or recreational opportunities or where so many work and make a living; they are central to our very identity. That is why I have made the protection of the Great Lakes a principal advocacy during all of the years that I have been in public service.

The Great Lakes actually represent fully one-fifth of the freshwater drinking supply on the entire planet. They provide the drinking water supply to tens of millions in our Nation and millions more in Canada as well. They are also vital to our economy. Over 160 million tons of commercial cargo is shipped on the Great Lakes. This commerce supports over 227,000 jobs and contributes over \$33 billion to the economy.

The recreational aspect of the Great Lakes also builds our economy. Recreational boating on the Great Lakes supports over 100,000 jobs and \$16 billion in economic activity. The secondary effect of all of that means an additional 244,000 jobs and \$19 billion in additional economic activity. Of course, that includes boat manufacturers, marinas, charter operators, and other businesses as well. So, a healthy Great Lakes system is not only important to our economy in Michigan or the Great Lakes States, it is important for the entire Nation.

Today, unfortunately, the use of those waters is threatened by our inability to maintain our ports, our channels, and our harbors. A decade—we have had actually a decade—of below normal water levels and very limited or uncoordinated Federal funding for harbor dredging and infrastructure repair has dramatically curtailed shipping, and it has made, actually, some of our recreational harbors almost inaccessible. In fact, this year, many of our recreational harbors were really in crises as low water levels made the need for dredging vital to the economic survival of so many communities.

We as a Nation, Mr. Speaker, must recognize the importance of the Great Lakes and give this natural wonder the properly coordinated support that it needs. That is why I have joined with several of my Michigan colleagues—BILL HUIZENGA and DAN BENISHEK—to introduce the Great Lakes Navigation System Sustainability Act. Our legisla-

tion is supported by the Great Lakes Maritime Task Force, the Great Lakes Metro Chambers of Commerce, the Lakes Carriers Association, the American Great Lakes Port Association, the Great Lakes Small Harbors Coalition, the National Marine Manufacturers Association, the United States Great Lakes Shipping Association, and the Great Lakes Commission, as well as the Great Lakes Governors Association.

I am very pleased that the chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, BILL SHUSTER, worked with us to include important provisions of that legislation in the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, also known as WRRDA, which we will be voting on in this House later on today.

The most important of these provisions will establish the Great Lakes Navigational System and require the Army Corps of Engineers to look at the Great Lakes system in its entirety rather than looking at it port by port when they are thinking about dredging and maintenance. This would really end the practice of pitting one port in the Great Lakes against another, and, instead, it focuses on the interdependence of all of them.

The WRRDA bill also helps recognize our recreational harbors by providing 10 percent of all the funds authorized by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to be directed to recreational harbors. This type of funding will allow recreational harbors across the Great Lakes to have another opportunity for needed dredging support, places like Port Huron, Lexington, Port Sanilac, Harbor Beach, Port Austin, Sebewaing, and many others—those are just in my district—but there are so many others throughout the entire basin as well.

Mr. Speaker, if you travel to the State of Michigan and visit the shores of the Great Lakes, you will find the magnificence of what we call “pure Michigan.” But, as possessive as those of us from Michigan are of the Great Lakes, we also recognize that they are “pure American,” so this incredible natural wonder deserves the recognition and protection from our entire Nation. Today, we can take a very important step forward in the protection of the Great Lakes, our magnificent Great Lakes, by passing the WRRDA bill.

I certainly urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

THE WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to submit for the RECORD a summary of the transcript of the bipartisan briefing I re-

cently hosted along with my good friend from the great State of Florida, TREY RADEL, on the crucial environmental issues facing our waterways in Florida. During a time of the most discouraging examples of partisan gridlock, we were able to come together with many people on both sides of the aisle to work toward solutions to the ongoing crisis in our waterways.

There is no denying that an environmental crisis is taking place up and down the Indian River Lagoon. Record-breaking rainfall, out-of-date engineering, and urban and agricultural runoff are all damaging our waterways. To bring attention to this important matter, we invited community members who have been directly impacted by the water so polluted with bacteria and toxic algae that health officials told people to avoid contact with the water. In an area where the economy depends on water for our local livelihood, this pollution is having devastating effects.

Members of our community took great lengths to make their voices heard in Congress. Many flew up here, others fundraised to take a bus, using money out of their own pocket to make sure that Washington heard how they have been directly impacted by polluted and toxic waterways.

Despite the government shutdown and the inability of any Federal agency officials to attend, we were pleased to see so many engaged constituents in the room with us as we spoke to many Members who have important leadership roles in the House itself—the Appropriations Committee, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and many among the Florida delegation.

At the briefing, we not only discussed the problems but the solutions, both short-term and long-term, that can only come from a mutual understanding of the problem and cooperation of local, State, and Federal entities. Solutions such as completing Everglades restoration projects like the Indian River Lagoon-South project and funding the completion of C-44 components of this project as soon as possible to grant relief to the already battered St. Lucie Estuary are critical. We must also fight for quick and effective repairs to the Herbert Hoover Dike that will allow for the safe retention of more water in Lake Okeechobee.

There was also broad agreement on the importance of passing WRRDA so we can move forward with Everglades restoration efforts that will benefit all of our communities. Additionally, WRRDA will streamline processes so ongoing and future projects can advance more efficiently and expeditiously.

□ 1115

It has been almost 7 years since the last water resource bill was authorized, stalling progress on local environmental projects, so I am beyond

pleased to see the House take up this important bill today.

After passing WRRDA, we need to continue to pressure for the chief support for the Central Everglades Planning Project so that these important projects can move forward as well. In the current no-spending climate in Congress, it is difficult to fight for funding for these critical projects to address the pollution impacting our local waterways, but there is a difference between smart investments and wasteful spending, which is something I have been working hard to tackle these past 10 months.

Infrastructure and environmental projects are not only crucial to improve the health of our waterways but to provide a 3 to 1 return on investment. Furthermore, funding for Everglades projects is equally matched by the State so they, too, have skin in the game, highlighting the importance of cooperation across all levels of government to work towards real solutions to address the challenges facing our waterways.

Mr. Speaker, these issues are simply too important to ignore. That is why I am here today with this bottle of polluted water behind me to show the severity of this ongoing crisis. I remain focused on this issue of great concern to our community, our environment, our economy, and our entire way of life. No one person can make all these things happen. It takes advocacy and action at all levels of government. To that end, I will include a summary of this briefing to be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to educate all Members of Congress on this important issue and the role we all play in addressing it.

OBAMACARE EXCHANGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the failures taking place with the launch of the ObamaCare exchange through healthcare.gov. Since October 1, this Web site has been plagued with delays, errors, and fundamental flaws in the Web site design. This prompted USA Today to call it an "inexcusable mess" and "nightmare." In addition to the technological failure, the Web site leaves Americans open to exposure of privacy information. Buried in the source code of healthcare.gov, a paragraph reads:

You have no reasonable expectation of privacy regarding any data stored on this information system. At any time, the government may monitor, intercept, search, and seize any data stored on this information system. Any data stored on this information system may be disclosed or used for any lawful government purpose.

Consumer Reports states:

It's not worth the hassle, at least not for now. Stay away from healthcare.gov for at least another month if you can.

This is not reassuring for Americans entering personal, medical, and financial information onto a government Web site, especially when Congress is still reviewing the IRS for gross mismanagement in collecting private individual information.

John McAfee, founder of McAfee Antivirus, emphasized last Wednesday:

Millions of Americans could have their identities stolen as a result of signing up for ObamaCare.

Despite these major malfunctions and structural defects, the administration still has penalties in place for individuals that don't obtain coverage.

Mr. Speaker, this is not acceptable.

Prior to October 1, my colleagues and I emphasized the inability of the Department of Health and Human Services to implement these exchanges. Therefore, if an individual does not wish to subject themselves to the risk of identity theft, they should be allowed to make that decision without the consequence of fines forced by the Federal Government. That is why I am working on legislation right now to ensure that Americans are not being punished for failing to buy a health care plan from a dysfunctional system.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press reported that, to date, only 476,000 people have enrolled. Mind you, that is 476,000 Americans that are left open to identity theft. I would like to point out that this is out of 36 States enrolled in the Federally-Facilitated Marketplace—36 States. At one point, healthcare.gov posted error messages in at least 24 of those 36 States.

Further, according to the USASpending.gov, over \$600 million of taxpayer dollars have been spent setting up these failed exchanges. Mr. Speaker, this is an insult to the American taxpayers.

CGI Group, one of the main contractors for healthcare.gov, reported that the site's design was changed about a month before its debut to prevent users from comparing prices without registering for an account. Why would the administration agree to remove the price comparison option when the President has promised the country affordable health care? It is because, for some, health care rates may become simply unaffordable.

The administration announced they would provide a new "shop and browse" feature to the Web site. However, this new feature is not giving consumers the real price. In some cases, people could end up paying double what they see on the Web site. For example, CBS News ran the numbers for a 48-year-old woman in Charlotte, North Carolina, who is ineligible for subsidies. According to healthcare.gov, she would pay \$231 a month, but the actual plan on the Blue Cross and Blue Shield North

Carolina Web site costs \$360 a month. This is more than a 50 percent increase. The difference: Blue Cross and Blue Shield requests your birth date before providing more accurate estimates, further proving the point that monopolies are problematic as well, especially in North Carolina.

Hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars are being spent on a system that does not work. Therefore, there is one question we must all ask ourselves: Is the Affordable Care Act really affordable?

CONSEQUENCES OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important before we move into the weeks ahead that we take a minute and ask ourselves what happened last week during the shutdown? What were the consequences of the shutdown? What did the shutdown mean to Americans? It is important to pause and ask, What really happened? Because as the days roll by, people are going to just move on to the next thing.

Let's be clear: this irresponsible shutdown cost the economy \$24 billion in lost economic output, or about 0.6 percent of annualized growth, according to Standard & Poor's. That is \$24 billion of people not making purchases that they had planned to because they thought they had better hold on to their money because they didn't know what was going to happen. That is \$24 billion of businesses that did business with people who were Federal employees who didn't have their check or didn't know if they were going to have it.

I mean, the untold damage that the Republican majority in the House did to this economy is a shameful thing, and they did it for one reason and one reason only: to deny millions of Americans affordable health care. Now, I think that it is important to mark this moment and to be very clear about what happened and the losses we incurred. This economy lost 120,000 jobs, according to the Council of Economic Advisers; 120,000 jobs because of lower demand, because of a number of things. A number of people were losing their livelihood because of the shutdown, again, because the majority in the House sees fit to deny millions of Americans affordable health care.

Now, in the days to come now that the shutdown is over, there is no question they will try to amp up and build up the bugs in the computer system, but thousands of people are getting health care and signing up right now. The news is actually good, and there has never been a system that is new that didn't have problems. In fact, my friends on the Republican side of the

aisle, I invite them to go back to Medicare part D, the prescription drug benefit in which they said that Big Pharma didn't have to compete for prices, they just could demand the price and we had to pay it, the one that created the doughnut hole. In the beginning, there were all kinds of glitches associated with that system.

So, yes, we are working out bugs, but they are being worked out, and there are thousands of people every day who are getting the health care access they never would have had and insurance reform that they never would have had if the Republicans would have had their way.

Also, I just want to make clear that people should know that there were individual stories that occurred that people should never forget. Hundreds of people were furloughed, and thousands more didn't know if they were going to get paid in the month of October. Consider the anxiety that the Republican majority needlessly inflicted on American families, and inflicted it on public employees who serve our country every single day to the best of their ability. People seeking new Social Security cards in Minneapolis found the office closed. That is my district. People saying, Wait a minute, I need a new Social Security card and can't get one because of the Republican shutdown—that was wrong.

The Veterans Administration offices were understaffed, and school trips were canceled because national parks were closed. It was galling to me that as the Republicans shut down the national monuments, they had the audacity, the unmitigated gall, to go to the World War II Memorial and act like somebody shut that memorial down other than them. It is amazing.

I can tell you that this moment, these last 2 weeks that we saw, shouldn't be forgotten. They should be remembered.

I want to thank the 87 sensible Republicans who voted with the Democrats in order to reopen the government, and I just want to let everyone know that we can debate things here. We can try to improve the Affordable Care Act. We can talk about parts that could be better, and we can make it better. I encourage us to do that.

But can we not shut down the government and do damage to the American economy just so we can score a political point and deny health care to thousands of people, perhaps millions of people? Can we work out our differences in the normal course of legislating?

The Republicans know how to change the Affordable Care Act. They even know how to legitimately try to get rid of it through the 45 ways that they offered legislation to destroy or defund or delay ObamaCare. They have done it before, but this time, they didn't go through the normal course. They shut

down the government and threatened default, and that was wrong.

I just want people to remember what happened. Maybe we can avoid it in the months ahead, and I certainly hope you will.

OBAMACARE IS DISASTROUS LAW FOR AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to actually agree with President Obama that his signature health care law is indeed much more than a Web site riddled with technical glitches. Just ask any hardworking family in the Second District of Missouri who have seen their premiums skyrocket, wages decreased, insurance coverage canceled of late, and hours cut back at work. The simple truth is the President's Web site is just a sign of what is to come: ObamaCare is a disastrous law for the American people.

One of the most valuable lessons that I have learned over the last 9 months as a new Member of Congress is that more government is never the answer to the problems facing our Nation. ObamaCare makes the real problem of health care costs worse. ObamaCare has made offering health care for small business worse. ObamaCare raises premiums, destroys the doctor-patient relationship, and makes the quality of our health care worse.

When President Obama promised the American people in 2009: "If you like your health care plan, you can keep it," well, we now know that this claim was a blatant falsehood.

Time and time again, the President has only offered broken promises to the American people. President Obama recently spoke in the Rose Garden about who is benefiting from government-run health care; yet he failed to talk about the millions of Americans who are suffering from it.

I would like to take a moment to talk about a small business owner from Missouri's Second District who is facing the harsh realities of ObamaCare. Jenn is the owner of Cotton Babies, a small business that makes high-quality diapers for consumers all over the world. As a result of ObamaCare, her premiums are projected to double, not only putting her livelihood in jeopardy, but her employees' as well. Now Jenn is facing a difficult business decision regarding the employment opportunities and the price of her products going forward.

□ 1130

Jenn wrote to me recently and said:

We can't afford the change in health care premiums. We manufacture in the USA. We collectively cause the employment of thousands all over the United States. Hundreds of

small retailers depend on my brands for revenue. We make American-made cloth diaper brands that help families who literally choose between diapers and food.

Jenn later went on to say:

I believe in affordable health care. I believe in taking care of the needy. We provide great health care insurance to our staff. We pay for 70 percent of the premium for the staff members and their entire family. We operate on microscopic margins and have valued taking care of our employees over taking a profit. I simply don't know how we, as a small business, are going to be able to shoulder the load with these changes.

Madam Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, this is just one of the many examples of real people being hurt by ObamaCare. It is time we realize that no matter how many tech experts President Obama hires to fix his \$600 million-plus taxpayer-paid Web site, it will never stop ObamaCare from hurting the American people.

As your Representative, I will never stop fighting until ObamaCare is replaced with free market-based solutions that expand access without destroying our economy and lowering the quality of care.

THE WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a member of the House Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition to express my strong opposition to provisions in the bill before us today that will vastly limit public input and curtail opportunities to save taxpayers money.

The provisions I am speaking about in the WRRDA bill aim to decrease delays and help move projects forward, which sounds great in theory. Who doesn't want to remove bureaucrat red tape? But in reality, what the bill does won't actually fix the problem that holds up so many Army Corps projects.

This bill would strictly limit the environmental review process that has proven time and again to save taxpayer dollars. The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works has even testified about this fact before the United States Senate. The real reason for projects being delayed is simply that the Congress authorizes around \$20 billion worth of projects but then only appropriates the funds to cover just \$1 billion in projects.

So let's not try to place all the blame on the environmental review process, a review process that has time and time again saved taxpayer dollars, preserved historic sites, and protected endangered species, all while producing better projects with more public support.

I appreciate the bipartisan work that Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL have done to put together

this bill. This is an important piece of legislation that we consider in this House today.

Once the bill has passed in the House, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as we conference with the Senate to improve these provisions that will limit public input, increase taxpayer costs, and harm the environment.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, October is a time to highlight the corrosive effects that domestic violence has on our country and to remind our fellow citizens of the work that still needs to be done to reduce and, indeed, eliminate violence against women and girls.

Earlier this year, I was proud to support the bipartisan efforts to pass the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. One of the new provisions included in this bill will open up funding for organizations that provide employment placement and training programs for domestic violence victims.

I would like to highlight the work of Second Chance Employment Services, the first and only nonprofit in the United States that focuses exclusively on empowering women by helping them find stable jobs. Dr. Ludy Green is the founder of Second Chance, and this organization and many others like it promote financial security for at-risk women. I believe that employment is a key component needed to break the cycle of violence that plagues too many women in too many homes in too many neighborhoods.

I acknowledge the work that Ludy and so many do each and every day to make a positive difference in the lives of women, and I will continue to support their work. We must all do everything possible to reduce domestic violence in America, as well as to end the human trafficking of vulnerable girls and young women. Sexual trafficking is modern-day slavery, and this scourge, along with domestic violence, must be eradicated before further harm is done in our communities, our Nation, and worldwide.

Madam Speaker, young girls and women deserve better. We must do better.

THE IMPACT OF OUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I want to visit with my colleagues this

morning for a few minutes about the impact of our Federal Government and what it is doing to our country's future and to future generations. That is something that has been foremost in my mind this week.

This week, our family has welcomed a new baby. Georgia K. Graham was born in New York City at 2:25 Monday morning. So as we have welcomed her, as we think about her future, one of the things we are discussing is: What kind of America will she have to grow up in? How solvent will we be? Will we still be the country that celebrates the American Dream? Will we be the country that focuses on opportunity, that looks to entrepreneurs and innovators to create a better day, not only for America, but for the entire world?

This is also the time, Madam Speaker, as we look at what has happened with our Nation's budget, with our Nation's spending, that we look at the long-term effects of so many of the programs and entitlements that are placed before us. One of those is a program that is commonly known as ObamaCare, and some of my colleagues say: Why is it that we talk about ObamaCare in conjunction with the budget? I would like to remind my colleagues it is because it is a very expensive program. And I have a chart that shows what has happened with the cost of that program since the law was passed and now as we are focusing on implementation.

You will see we were told this was to be a program that would run about \$900 billion over a 10-year period of time. It was to be access to health care insurance for those that did not have that access. But when we look at the chart that reflects the Congressional Budget Office's findings—this is a chart that was prepared on the Senate side—what we see is the cost estimate over that same 10-year period of time from when the law was passed. Remember, we had to pass it in order to read it and find out what was in it? From when it was passed, there at \$900 billion, to today, as we look at the implementation of ObamaCare, it has become a \$2.6 trillion-over-10-year program. It is a tripling of costs, and we don't even have it out of the starting gates yet. This is why we are looking at the total cost of health care.

In the Budget Committee, as we look at the long-term outlook for our Nation and the implications that our budget will have on the private sector, on hardworking taxpayers, what we find with the cost of health care is that those programs are expected to double in their impact on the budget. We have to remember that every single dollar the Federal Government has comes out of the pocket of taxpayers, men and women who go to work every day and earn that dollar and then have to send more and more of that dollar to the Federal Government.

As we look at the challenges that face this Nation, we focus on what we will spend, how we will use that money, and we think about the children, the grandchildren that we have and their future and the impact our spending habits today will have on their tomorrows.

THE CONSTITUTION AND OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Madam Speaker, in 1776, with only 1,458 words, our Founding Fathers declared our Nation's independence from an overreaching government that had limited individual freedom. A year later, in 1787, with 4,543 words, our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution that established our representative democracy, protecting individual rights, and set in places roles for states' rights and a limited Federal Government based on enumerated powers.

Fast-forward to 2010, from 1776 to 2010, and the President and Democratic-controlled House and Senate established ObamaCare without a single Republican vote. This government takeover of health care is so overreaching. The law contains 381,517 words. That is over 83 times as many words as the Constitution, which only had 4,543 words.

In addition to the law, the administration has published 109 regulations to implement the law, regulations not voted on by the Congress, which contain a massive 11,588,500 words, according to ENSnews.com. According to Forbes, the average adult reads about 300 words a minute. That means it would take the average person 38,628 minutes just to read the regulations. If someone read 8 hours a day, it would take them 80 days to read all of the regulations, let alone understand them.

We are just beginning to see the negative consequences of this Federal outreach in all Americans' health care decisions. My constituents remain adamantly opposed to ObamaCare. They continue to write and call my offices, asking me to destroy as much of this law as possible because it is raising premiums, copays, and deductibles. Many small business owners also tell me they have stopped hiring workers and are in the difficult position of cutting hours or employees due to the uncertainty with the law and its regulations.

In closing, let me just say that we will continue to see the negative impacts of ObamaCare as more of this law is implemented in the coming months. The President needs to recognize how harmful the health care law is and help us craft better and more responsible health care reform.

IN MEMORY OF U.S. ARMY SPECIALIST PAT TINNELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, today I stand to recognize the memory of U.S. Army Specialist Pat Tinnell, and to say thank you to all those involved in creating the Pat Tinnell sports complex in Lake Havasu City, Arizona. The world-class skate and bike park, which is nearly the size of a football field, is dedicated to the 25-year-old American hero, Pat Tinnell, who loved his family, his community, and BMX bike riding.

Pat volunteered to serve our Nation and gave his life in Iraq in April of 2006, protecting the freedoms we hold dear.

□ 1145

A special thank you to those who made this park a reality through countless fundraising events. Everyone in the community deserves a thank you, including Lake Havasu City Mayor Mark Nexsen and those who served on the Memorial Sports Park committee and gave of their time and talent, national figures like skateboarding legend Tony Hawk, BMX rider and philanthropist Rob Dydrik, and Joe Ciaglia from California Skate Parks, who designed this beautiful facility.

Finally, thank you to the family and loved ones of Pat Tinnell and young Colin Sasseen, who both lost their lives all too soon. I hope this park serves as a reminder that your sons' memories will not be forgotten.

Today's youth are our greatest asset as a Nation. It is the youth who will continue to lead this Nation in the coming years, serve in our Armed Forces, fight fires, be teachers, doctors, and maybe you will even be our next BMX superstar, have a show on MTV, and make your mark in philanthropy.

Leadership comes in all forms. In fact, Rob Dydrik said that his success was the American Dream. The American Dream looks a lot like work, and work results in success.

It is my hope that the memories of Pat and Colin are honored by all those who visit the park.

Thank you and God bless.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Compassionate and merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Give the Members of this House strength, fortitude, and patience. Fill their hearts with charity, their minds with understanding, their wills with courage to do the right thing for all of America.

In the work to be done in the weeks to come, may they rise together to accomplish what is best for our great Nation.

Just as we remembered yesterday the passing of two former Members of the people's House, Tom Foley and Bill Young, we pray today for the Honorable Major Owens. We thank You for the service he rendered to his constituents and to our Nation and ask Your blessing upon those who mourn his passing.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CRAWFORD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

A WEB SITE IS THE LEAST OF OBAMACARE'S PROBLEMS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, President Obama made some big promises with regard to ObamaCare: if you like your doctor, you can keep them; same if you are happy with your insurance. Somehow, even with new taxes and thousands of pages of regulations, government would be able to mandate universal coverage and simultaneously save everyone money. That is not panning out in America.

North Carolinians tell me their policies are being canceled and their prices are set to double. Experts are even advising some Americans to find a way to lower their incomes to help pay for ObamaCare. For one family in California, if they don't find a way to earn \$2,000 less, they will pay \$15,000 for health care. If they make less money, they pay just over \$1,000.

It is easy to blame technical glitches for ObamaCare's problems. It is harder to own up to the costly consequences of forcing a one-size-fits-all health care prescription onto one-sixth of the American economy.

As President Obama presses forward with ObamaCare, a broken Web site is certainly the least of his problems.

JOBS

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the folks in my Arizona district have seen enough of the partisan nonsense in Washington. The distractions here help no one, but jobs do, and that is why we have to stay focused on economic development.

In my district, those opportunities include strengthening our infrastructure:

At the Grand Canyon, the trans-canyon pipeline is in desperate need of repair, and the Canyon's maintenance backlog continues to grow;

In the White Mountains, we can revive the timber industry by building on the momentum of the Eagar sawmill and the Fort Apache Timber Company;

And with a new contractor onboard, it is time to shift the Four Forest Restoration Initiative into high gear and help our forests.

Projects like these create jobs and improve the quality of life for folks in rural Arizona. I urge my colleagues to work together on commonsense efforts to create jobs.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT JOSHUA BOWDEN OF VILLA RICA, GEORGIA

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in August, the explosive ordnance disposal community lost one of its best and brightest. Staff Sergeant Joshua Bowden of Villa Rica, Georgia, was killed in action on August 31, 2013, at the age of 28, while serving his country in Afghanistan.

Staff Sergeant Bowden joined the United States Army in 2005 and was on his second deployment to Afghanistan. His awards included the Joint Service Commendation Medal with Valor, Purple Heart, Joint Defense Meritorious Service Medal, NATO Medal, Combat Action Badge, Senior Explosive Ordnance Disposal Badge, Parachutist Badge, and the Air Assault Badge.

As cochairman of the House EOD Caucus, along with Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, I was honored to meet Staff Sergeant Bowden in 2011 during our caucus' first annual EOD Day on the Hill. The purpose of this event was to educate Members and staff about the critical mission EOD forces play in defending American interests, both at home and abroad. Staff Sergeant Bowden was a patriot who was willing to put himself in the line of fire to defend our country's way of life, and I am proud to have met him.

In September, Staff Sergeant Bowden was laid to rest at Arlington National Cemetery. It is important that we regularly take time to reflect on the sacrifices made by our Nation's servicemen and -women and the veterans who preceded them.

I am honored to have met Staff Sergeant Joshua Bowden, and my thoughts and prayers are with his friends and family.

DELAY THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE

(Mr. BARROW of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, since October 1, millions of Americans have attempted to access Healthcare.gov to try to learn about the health insurance coverage they are required to buy; and every day, we are learning more and more about the problems they are facing. Folks are frustrated, and rightfully so.

I am proud to be part of a bipartisan effort to reform the law by repealing the mandate that employers provide coverage they can't afford and the mandate that individuals buy insurance on their own.

Earlier this year, the administration delayed the employer mandate because businesses across the country just weren't ready, but not the individual

mandate. At the very least, our constituents deserve the same relief that the businesses got.

This isn't about pointing fingers. This is about providing some relief to the folks we represent who are facing serious uncertainty because they are being forced to buy something that is just not ready.

I urge my colleagues and the administration to delay the individual mandate. It is not only the right thing to do, it is the only practical thing to do.

HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS SPENT ON HEALTHCARE.GOV

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a great concern over the lack of accountability and transparency we continue to see from the President and his administration as they scramble to fix the problems in the health care exchange and their Web site platform.

Mr. Speaker, we have walked through the tragedy of Benghazi, the abuse of the IRS, the lack of real commitment from the Attorney General. Mr. Speaker, this isn't right. We need a government that is transparent, that is willing to tell the truth to the American people.

Three weeks after the rollout of these exchanges, the administration finally has come to Capitol Hill, but they are coming, Mr. Speaker, only to speak to House Democrats. Now figure that out. Where is the transparency there?

The American people deserve to know the truth of what happened with the \$400 million that was spent on a Web site to try to enlist people to join this health care exchange. The American people are being left on the hook for a Web site that cost hundreds of millions of dollars, and they deserve better.

ROLLING ALONG

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is always good to have a number of good news stories for my colleagues and the American people, and I am delighted to have a good news story, which is that the Affordable Care Act is rolling along. I recognize that the most important aspect of this law is that Americans, like Kendall Brown in Oklahoma City, are having their lives changed in front of their eyes.

She writes to the President that she has Crohn's disease and she has already benefited from the Affordable Care Act by being able to stay on her parents' insurance, but now she is able to en-

roll. And she wrote in this letter that as individuals are debating to delay the individual mandate—she said:

Mr. President, if they do it, then this is the last letter that you will receive from me because I will be dead by the time I am 27 years old.

So the good news is, my friends, enroll. You can use 1-800-318-2596—30,000 calls and only 20 seconds in wait time. You can use the navigators. You can use the outreach efforts. You can even get on the Web and be educated. 1-800-318-2596.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. BENISHEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to recognize the fact that October is Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

In my home State of Michigan, breast cancer is currently the second leading cause of cancer deaths for women, and it is the most frequently diagnosed cancer for women in Michigan.

I served as a doctor for 30 years in northern Michigan. I am all too familiar with how devastating breast cancer is for patients and their friends and their loved ones. Thankfully, early detection rates have increased and mortality rates have decreased nationwide.

This is partially due to the hard work of the doctors, nurses, and medical professionals who are involved in diagnosing and treating this illness and in coming up with innovative new treatment options. This improvement is also due to the fundraising, outreach, and public awareness efforts of the groups like the Michigan Breast Cancer Coalition and the National Breast Cancer Foundation.

However, there is still much work left to be done. I urge all of my colleagues and all of my constituents to raise awareness of breast cancer and to take the steps necessary in order to detect this terrible disease. I encourage all women to be sure they are up to date on their mammograms.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Ms. BONAMICI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, Congress must act without delay to provide certainty to employers, keep families together, and ensure that all children raised here in America have access to affordable higher education.

Less than a decade ago, it might have been impossible to imagine that so many businesses, farmworkers, labor leaders, educators, and even politicians would come together to support comprehensive reform of our broken immigration system, a system that no

longer reflects our values or national interests.

The American public has reached consensus, as has the United States Senate. It is time for Members of the House to put aside their differences and pass a bill that grows the economy, creates a modernized immigration system, enhances our security, and creates an achievable path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.

I encourage the leadership to bring comprehensive, commonsense, and compassionate immigration reform legislation to the House floor this fall. Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today's much-anticipated and greatly needed water resources bill will allow our Nation to develop and maintain our economically vital ports and waterways and will support flood protection and environmental restoration efforts.

As a water-centered State, Florida is uniquely impacted by the Water Resources Reform and Development Act. We have 16 seaports which contributed \$96.6 billion to the economy last year, and our maritime cargo industry supports more than 680,000 jobs.

Florida has invested millions in our ports in preparation for the expansion of the Panama Canal, and this bill before us today is a complement to Florida's investment in world-class maritime infrastructure. Without this bill, Florida and, indeed, our Nation, as a whole, are at risk of losing jobs to nearby foreign ports and their ready or soon-to-be ready deep draft harbors.

Simply put, this bipartisan water resources bill will create good American jobs and will grow local economies. Let's pass it, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1215

JOBS

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, last week, Congress finally took action to end a painful, unnecessary government shutdown that cost our economy \$24 billion, forced hundreds of thousands of Federal workers to stay home, and brought us to the brink of defaulting on the full faith and credit of the United States.

While the hardworking men and women I serve in Rhode Island's First District are relieved that Congress finally did its job, they want all of us to get back to work on addressing the ur-

gent challenges facing our Nation—creating jobs, strengthening the economy, fixing our broken immigration system, repairing our crumbling infrastructure, and finding responsible ways to reduce the Federal debt.

Like all Americans, Rhode Islanders want their elected officials to get beyond the political battles of the moment and work together on implementing effective policies and innovative solutions that will put our country on the right track and get Americans back to work.

Over the past several years, the House has voted over and over again on bills that would repeal ObamaCare, restrict reproductive freedom for women, weaken critical environmental standards, and limit collective bargaining rights for workers, even though there is no chance these divisive proposals would ever be signed into law. It is time now to get things done.

Each of us should commit to abandoning the partisan rhetoric and working as colleagues to overcome the challenges facing our country and those we have the privilege to represent here in the Congress.

OBAMACARE AFFECTING GEORGIANS

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, now that ObamaCare has had 23 days of what has been a disastrous rollout and hundreds of thousands of Americans are getting health insurance cancellation notices, I want to give you a couple of examples of what is happening in Georgia.

In our State, the news is not good. One constituent tells me:

Not only are premiums higher, but we have to pay more out of pocket. We will end up spending about \$500 to \$600 a year on durable medical supplies that have always been covered 100 percent. That does not help the middle class.

Another shared the news that he recently learned from his employer:

My premiums are going up over \$1,200 a year, my deductible is going up by over \$1,000 a year, and my out-of-pocket maximum will move from \$3,500 to \$6,500.

That is more than a house payment for many Georgians, Mr. Speaker.

These are hardworking, middle class families in my district who were promised by the President that if they like their insurance, they could keep their current health plans. Now these plans are more expensive and my constituents have less coverage. This is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

Contrary to the President's promises, ObamaCare is driving up costs, threatening jobs, and kicking Georgians out of the plans they like and were promised they could keep.

REMEMBERING FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAJOR OWENS

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, this week, New York City lost a Brooklyn original and our Nation lost a tireless champion for the powerless.

Representative Major Owens' district included parts of my current district, and I can attest firsthand that he was beloved throughout Brooklyn.

A librarian before entering politics, service to community was simply part of who he was—and that is reflected by his accomplishments. His work led to the creation of the YouthBuild initiative at HUD, which, to this day, creates opportunity for thousands of disadvantaged youth through construction in low-income communities.

Major will also be remembered for his work on the Americans with Disabilities Act. Always a voice for the voiceless, he shepherded that historic bill to enactment, creating a more just society for millions of Americans.

He is, perhaps, the only Member of Congress known for composing rap lyrics. Performing at open mic sessions, he spoke to the issues of our time, addressing peace, war, poverty, and social justice through the power of hip-hop.

Mr. Speaker, those of us in New York and Brooklyn today mourn the loss of a neighbor, while our Nation honors the passing of its public servant.

I hope all my colleagues join me in paying tribute to and remembering our friend and former colleague, Major Owens.

OPEN ACCESS WEEK

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of greater accessibility to taxpayer-funded research.

This week is Open Access Week in America, and I am proud to be a lead cosponsor of the Fair Access to Science and Technology Research Act, better known as FASTR.

Access to scientific research maximizes research investments and improves the quality of science while assuring transparency and efficient use of tax dollars. Simply put, taxpayers should not have to pay for taxpayer-funded research over and over again.

Policies like FASTR have been a tremendous success already at the National Institutes of Health, and some of the best research institutions in America, like my alma mater, the University of Kansas, have helped lead the charge by instituting open access policies of their own.

Now it is time to make open access the law of the land for all publicly

funded research. I urge my colleagues to make a real impact on the quality of science and lifesaving research conducted in America, and urge them to cosponsor and support the Fair Access to Science and Technology Research Act.

NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Domestic Violence Awareness Month, an opportunity to stand with the millions of victims who have suffered in silent fear in their own homes.

Approximately three women are killed each day as a result of domestic violence, according to the National Network to End Domestic Violence. While our country has made enormous strides in combating domestic violence, gaps in Federal law leave millions vulnerable. In this Nation, one in six women will find themselves a victim of stalking in their lifetime. Many of these encounters turn violent and, tragically, women are hurt or killed by their stalkers because of a glaring loophole in Federal law.

Under current law, convicted stalkers of "intimate partners" are prohibited from possessing firearms, but women who have had no romantic relationship with their stalker are left unprotected.

I have introduced the Protecting Victims of Stalking Act, legislation that would address this glaring loophole and prevent stalkers under restraining orders from purchasing firearms. I hope you will join me in this effort to reaffirm our commitment to protecting the victims of domestic violence.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE LANDSBERRY

(Mr. AMODEI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, Mike Landsberry, a math teacher at Sparks Middle School, passed away just about 50 hours ago. He was 45 years old, an Alabama native, high school athlete, coach, husband, brother, dad, marine, Nevada Air Guard senior master sergeant, and a friend.

Mike Landsberry observed the horror of an active shooter at his school Monday morning, and simply moved without hesitation, instinctively, into harm's way to protect others. In so doing, Mike made the ultimate sacrifice in service to the end to his students, his school, and his community.

Coach, you humble us all with your warrior spirit and compassion. They will be your lasting legacy. Thank you for your service, and may you rest in peace.

HONORING STEPHEN ADUBATO, SR.

(Mr. SIRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Stephen Adubato, Sr., the founder of the North Ward Center and an inspiring figure of the Newark, New Jersey, community. To recognize Mr. Adubato's achievements and contributions, a statue of him reading to two young children will be placed on the main campus of the North Ward Center.

Mr. Adubato began his career in education and as a teacher in Newark, and went on to develop the North Ward Center in 1970, a group of five institutions designed to provide educational, cultural, and meaningful social services to low- and moderate-income families in the area.

From its humble beginnings as a small preschool, the center now includes an adult medical daycare, business training center, as well as the Robert Treat Academy, a charter school that has received national recognition and the honor of being named a Blue Ribbon School.

Since the founding of the center, Stephen Adubato, Sr., has continually worked to improve the quality of life for everyone in the community, from young to senior citizens. Mr. Adubato has been honored by numerous organizations and institutions, such as Kean University and the Thurgood Marshall College Fund, for his contributions and dedication to education.

Today, I recognize the accomplishments of Stephen Adubato, Sr., and thank him for his continued dedication to the residents of Newark, particularly the North Ward.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the legislation to be considered on the floor this afternoon, H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment, ruled in order and to be considered en bloc, addresses an issue very important to my district in northeast Indiana, as well as other similarly situated districts around the country.

I am proud to represent Fort Wayne, Indiana's second-largest city, which has more than 10 miles of levees that protect residents and businesses. In response to recent Army Corps of Engineers guidelines requiring levee revegetation, local governments across the country affected by this policy have made their voices heard. Unfortunately, this unnecessary policy will

cost taxpayers in my district millions of dollars.

My amendment saves the city of Fort Wayne \$25 million and makes levee safety the highest priority while allowing the Army Corps of Engineers to fully examine the guidelines study authorized in the underlying bill.

I thank Chairman SHUSTER for his assistance and look forward to further pursuing solutions to this issue.

POWER OF THE PURSE

(Mr. CLEAVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, later today, the WRRDA bill will come before this body. I intend to vote against it. The reason is that there are 23 earmarks in it. I support all of those projects, but I don't have an earmark in it—and I want one.

I am not one of those people who is going to pretend to the public, as many of us have, that earmarks cost the budget any more money than they do. They do not. We go around and talk about the "bridge to nowhere." There is a bridge. It is called the Gravina Island Bridge.

The worse thing about this is that, constitutionally, we have the power of the purse. We have given it to the administration. So they put 23 projects out here and said, Well, they used to be earmarks. That is like cutting off the tail of an alligator and putting some little ears on him and saying, It used to be a dog.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is wrong. The public needs to understand that this earmark business is damaging the Constitution because it is our job to spend the purse.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage my colleagues to support today's jobs bill, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, because it is not an earmark. It authorizes—not appropriates—money for 23 projects identified by the Corps of Engineers as important. They are important for a number of reasons, not the least of which is their primary purpose is the movement of goods and services into the global marketplace, which creates wealth and jobs for Americans.

Further, it authorizes projects that are important to flood protection in flood-prone areas like the Red River Valley of the North, in my area. In addition to that, the real reforms that are impressive are things like it de-authorizes old projects to the tune of \$12 billion worth. Furthermore, it gives

more leverage and flexibility for the use of non-Federal funds, which is, I think, the very thing that the taxpayers of this State are looking for—the type of flexibility that allows local governments and local communities to do the right thing for themselves.

OXI DAY

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 73 years ago, as countries across Europe were falling to Hitler's forces, an emissary from Mussolini arrived in Athens to demand the Greeks surrender and allow the Axis forces to occupy that country. In response, the Greeks courageously replied, "oxi," or "no."

The Axis forces quickly descended on Greece, but they failed to anticipate the courage of the Hellenic people, who led a passionate resistance in defense of their freedom and their beloved country. On the island of Crete, for example, with only broomsticks and plowshares as weapons, women and children held the Germans at bay for 10 days, breaking the back of the assault.

The story of this bravery has largely been overlooked in the history books, but the Greek refusal to surrender proved to be one of the most decisive moments in the war. As Winston Churchill said:

If there had not been the virtue and courage of the Greeks, we do not know what the outcome of World War II would have been.

On August 28, Greeks around the world celebrate Oxi Day to honor the great legacy of the Greek people and share with the world the story of their bravery. I commend them and say, "Happy Oxi Day."

□ 1230

THE OBAMACARE WEB SITE— BROKEN AND CAN'T BE FIXED

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if you go into a restaurant and you order two eggs over medium with sausage and toast and if the server brings you two eggs scrambled with bacon and a muffin, you have got two choices. You either eat what you have got or you send it back, and you start over—double the cost, double the time.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what has happened with Healthcare.gov, the ObamaCare Web site. It doesn't work. These are not glitches. It is broken and it can't be fixed.

The President needs to own up to this. He needs to reimburse the American people for the over-\$400 million that has been spent; he needs to hold those in his administration account-

able who misled him and the American people; and he needs to give the American people a break on this individual mandate until the Web site does work.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we recognize the final days of Domestic Violence Awareness Month, I ask Congress to pass legislation that helps put an end to domestic violence.

This issue impacts Americans of all backgrounds regardless of age, race, religion, or economic status. One victim of domestic violence is too many; but the heartbreaking reality is that, in this country, three women are killed daily by intimate partners. Young women are at a greater risk to be victims of domestic violence. Four out of every 10 teen girls know people their ages who have been abused by a boyfriend.

Last week, I introduced H.R. 3297, the Teen Dating Violence Education Act, which is to protect teenage victims of domestic violence. My bill helps provide schools offering domestic violence inclusion programs with the resources to inform students of their legal rights as they relate to dating violence.

Our teens deserve to be empowered with the knowledge to create a safe and secure environment free of domestic violence. Ending teen domestic violence now is a good first step towards preventing future domestic violence among adults. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 3297.

THE TRAIN WRECK OF OBAMACARE CONTINUES

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the train wreck of ObamaCare continues.

In 2007, before he was elected President, the President said that family policy prices would go down \$2,500 per family. That was the promise. In 2009, the President promised that, if you liked your policy, you would get to keep it.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the President is going to say to Charles from northern Baltimore County, who wrote me yesterday and said:

I just received my cancellation letter from Blue Cross regarding my family's insurance policy. My \$697-a-month Health Savings Account qualified policy is no longer compliant. To have a similar product in an ObamaCare-compliant plan, my premium will increase nearly 40 percent and will have a \$7,000 deductible. Yikes. So much for, "if you like your policy, you will get to keep it."

Charles and his family are not getting a \$2,500 cut in their premium.

They are getting a \$3,300 increase in their premium. Their deductible is going up to \$7,000 a year. Mr. Speaker, they like their plan, but they don't get to keep it.

The train wreck continues.

FOOD DAY, OCTOBER 24

(Ms. PINGREE of Maine asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, October 24, is Food Day, a nationwide movement to promote healthy, affordable and sustainably produced food; and next week, Congress will begin the process of reconciling the House and Senate farm bills.

I know this is a big job, but I want to urge my colleagues to work to come up with a farm bill that promotes healthy, affordable and sustainably produced food.

Without exception, everywhere I go and every group I talk to—from bankers to teachers unions and from veterans to college students—people nod their heads when I talk about locally grown, sustainable food. People want to know where their food comes from, and they want to see the farmers in their communities succeed. There is nothing more fundamental than food, and it is time we got serious about creating a food system that works for everyone—for families, for farmers, and for our local communities.

If we are going to change our food system, Congress must take this historic opportunity to reform agriculture policy by producing a farm bill that re-invests in our local economies.

DOMESTIC GAS PRODUCTION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, according to a Federal report issued yesterday by the Energy Information Administration, natural gas being produced in the Marcellus shale region is growing faster than expected. Production has now reached 12 billion cubic feet a day. That is six times the production rate of 2009. The vast majority of production is coming from Pennsylvania, including the areas of the State that I represent, along with West Virginia.

To put this in perspective, the Marcellus alone produces more natural gas than Saudi Arabia. If the Marcellus were its own country, production would rank third in the world after Russia and the rest of the United States. This has led to record low gas prices. It is the reason companies are moving manufacturing back to the United States. It is why consumers have more money in their pockets after paying their bills. Also, Mr. Speaker,

data released Monday by the EIA indicates that carbon-related emissions dropped by 3.8 percent from 2011 to 2012—to their lowest levels since 1994.

Mr. Speaker, domestic gas production is helping create a stronger American economy. It is helping us improve the environment. It is helping America remain competitive.

A BALANCED AND REASONABLE FISCAL PLAN

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the President was right last week when he said that nobody won after last week's political spectacle—instead, it was America that lost—but I am glad that we finally came together and reopened the government.

If we had followed the Republican plan, we would only have funded 17 percent of the entire Federal Government. Such haphazard funding is really a recipe for a long-term, manmade disaster—a colossal failure to invest adequately in our Nation's future.

So, in the next few weeks, we will have an opportunity to come together and, once and for all, put these funding battles behind us. We all understand that agreeing on a budget will not be easy, but that doesn't mean we should wait until the last minute to start talking to one another. Let's get back to work now and start the process of figuring out how we can agree on a balanced and reasonable fiscal plan that puts middle class American families first and the American Dream back in reach.

THE LIFE OF RUBY SESSION

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of a truly remarkable woman, Ruby Session, who passed away earlier this month.

In 1985, Ms. Session's son, Timothy Cole—a veteran, a student at Texas Tech University and a Black man—was wrongfully convicted of the rape of a woman in Lubbock County and was sentenced to 25 years in prison. He died there of an asthma attack while incarcerated. In 2009, DNA evidence proved that Tim Cole was wrongfully convicted; and in 2010 he received the first posthumous pardon in Texas history.

Ms. Session fought for justice for her son, but throughout all of that, she still fought for justice for everyone in the State who had been wrongfully convicted. Thanks to her efforts, Texas now has additional safeguards to prevent wrongful convictions and to provide restitution to former prisoners who have been exonerated of their crimes.

I am honored to have known Ms. Session and to have supported her pursuit of justice while I served in the Texas Legislature. Her spirit lives on in her reforms and in the many individuals whose lives she has touched.

A GREAT LEADER HAS PASSED

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I became aware of the death of a great United States Congressman, Bill Young, from Florida.

Mr. Young was the senior Republican Member, who served in this House since 1970. He was a gentle soul, congenial, friendly—always nice to me. I asked him to join with me in the Tourette Syndrome Caucus, and he did. He was one of the founding members. He was a leader in seeking funds for biomedical research, which doubled during the time in which he was the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He understood earmarks were the responsibility of this Congress, and he fought for them and supported them.

He was close friends with John Murtha, and I was proud to serve and to know both of them. Both men were in the military reserve, and both men towards the end of their careers recognized that war was wrong in places where they had previously been for it—John Murtha in Iraq, and, in 2012, Mr. Young said that it is time to get out of Afghanistan.

A great leader has passed. His funeral will be tomorrow in the State of Florida. I was proud to know him. This country was fortunate to have him serve in this body.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 62

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 62.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 385 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 385

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3080) to pro-

vide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

SEC. 2. (a) In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-24. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1245

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my good friend and colleague, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill.

House Resolution 385 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, the first WRRDA bill since 2007. The rule makes 24 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee in order, half of which are sponsored by my colleagues across the aisle, and it provides for robust debate in the House of Representatives.

The underlying bill was marked up by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which reported the bill favorably with unanimous bipartisan support. The bill before us today garnered that support because of four reasons: this bill reforms the Federal bureaucracy; this bill is fiscally responsible; this bill strengthens accountability; and this bill creates jobs.

Mr. Speaker, talk to anyone around the country that relies on the Army Corps of Engineers; talk with anyone that depends on our water infrastructure, water resources and so forth; talk to anyone who wants to develop a new water resource infrastructure; talk to anyone who ships in or out of our harbors or ports. Maybe you have the opportunity to talk with our shipping companies, or maybe with the women and men who work on our tugboats and barges, or maybe with the farmer who needs to get his corn to the right markets, or maybe the manufacturer who needs to ship her product or his product to a foreign customer, or maybe the port director who is trying to get America prepared for the economic opportunities that will come with the larger ships coming through the Panama Canal. Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues spoke with these men and women, they would hear the same refrain: our bureaucracy delays American investment; our bureaucracy costs American jobs; and our bureaucracy helps America's foreign competitors.

The approval process of our critical water infrastructure takes years too

long, and sometimes well over a decade. One project that my friend from Florida is familiar with is a project in Port Everglades, which has been studied for nearly two decades. Some bureaucrats have spent their entire career studying this one project. The study of the project of Port Everglades is a prime example of Washington bureaucracy crushing America's jobs and America's future.

This bill before us today does away with these delays: it sets hard deadlines on the time and cost of the studies; it consolidates or eliminates duplicative studies; it requires concurrent project review by multiple agencies; and it puts our projects on a path to construction.

Mr. Speaker, this bill reforms Federal bureaucracy, but it also is fiscally responsible. We all know that our Nation spends too much, our Nation oftentimes spends money haphazardly without a plan and without restraint. This bill does not.

Chairman SHUSTER is committed to restraining spending and is committed to managing American taxpayer dollars wisely. This bill is proof of that. This bill restrains spending. I commend Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for actually making the tough choices necessary to get our budget in order.

Mr. Speaker, when was the last time an infrastructure bill was brought to the House floor and it cut more than it spent? The bill before us today does just that: it deauthorizes \$12 billion of old, inactive projects; it pays for the new projects by canceling old projects; and it sunsets the construction of new projects in order to prevent future backlogs. Mr. Speaker, this bill reforms Federal bureaucracy, is fiscally responsible, and it strengthens accountability.

Many of our constituents, when they hear us talk about infrastructure, remember the days of pork barrel spending. Many of our colleagues might remember the 1939 movie about a newly appointed Senator who goes to Washington running head-on into a political machine built on earmarks and pork barrel spending. "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington" is a dramatic rendering of how most infrastructure bills were put together in the past. In fact, the bill that was debated in the movie was a water resource bill, and the filibuster was over an earmark in that bill. This bill ends that earmark process.

The bill before us today strengthens accountability for the American people. Gone are the days of inserting earmarks at the last minute. Gone are the days of creating new pet projects. Gone are the days of wasting taxpayer money on pork barrel spending. Mr. Speaker, this bill contains no earmarks.

It also establishes a new, transparent process for future bills that will ensure

that taxpayer dollars are spent on necessary projects. It will prioritize our spending and provide strong Congressional oversight. This bill reforms Federal bureaucracy, is fiscally responsible, strengthens accountability, and creates jobs.

The key to creating American jobs is expanding our economy. American producers must be able to get their products to the world market. This push to sell to the world is a high-stakes competition that America must win. Our farmers are being pressured by our neighbors in South America. Our manufacturers are being pressured by both European and Asian countries. Our energy producers are being pressured by many foreign countries in all corners of the globe. Investing in our infrastructure will boost trade, increase American competitiveness, and position our country for economic growth. These advancements will put America to work.

While construction workers will immediately be put to work on these projects, every single American job that depends on our transportation infrastructure will benefit from this bill. Our economy will grow, our producers will compete with the world, and American jobs will be created.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to see why this bill garnered unanimous bipartisan support from the members of the committee and why it deserves to be passed here. This bill reforms Federal bureaucracy; this bill is fiscally responsible; this bill strengthens accountability; and this bill creates jobs.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill. Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member RAHALL, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure have provided us with a unanimously supported bipartisan bill that will move our Nation forward.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today and agree with everything that my good friend and colleague from Florida said—everything that he said—with the exception of the fact that I am opposed to the rule. While I may support the underlying legislation, the rule blocks over 70 amendments, many of which were germane to the bill. This kind of rule is not conducive to an open process.

The bill, though far from perfect, is long overdue. There is a lot of go-nowhere, do-nothing talk about creating jobs here on the Hill, but this bill, like the highway bill and the farm bill, will actually create jobs.

The bill also reinforces a point that I have been making for some time, and that is: repairing our Nation's aging infrastructure, including our water infrastructure, is the best jobs program out there. The resulting economic benefits will ripple from our ports to Main Street America as badly needed jobs across a wide range of industries. For example, every dollar spent on Everglades restoration, like the ones authorized here, is returned fourfold by stimulating related industries like tourism, construction, and retail.

Despite these undeniable benefits, it has been 7 years since the last WRRDA bill. That is 7 years of productivity lost. But if you think 7 years is a long time, try waiting 17 years, as my colleague Mr. WEBSTER pointed out. That is how long Port Everglades has been waiting for a Chief's Report from the Army Corps to deepen its channels in anticipation of the new Panama Canal standards. At long last, the report is due shortly, yet this bill fails to authorize the pending project. While much of the blame for the delay falls outside of this Chamber, Congress can and should do right by the port.

Mr. Speaker, the port has already waited its turn. With the new Panama Canal expansion becoming operational in 2015, any further delay for such a vital piece of our Nation's infrastructure will be too late.

I do understand that tough choices have to be made. The way I see it, the Army Corps' lengthy review process is in part to blame for the backlog of projects. Though this bill contains some partisan measures addressing this issue, the Corps has already begun testing its own way of increasing the speed of review.

One of these successful tests was the pilot program for the Central Everglades Planning Project, yet that project is not included in this bill either, despite the Chief's report for CEPP being anticipated within a few months. This new approach, when coupled with a more frequent WRRDA bill, could help eliminate the massive backlog of projects that has forced Congress to make these tough decisions.

When we look what CEPP actually does, the urgency for authorization is even more obvious. CEPP will help end the discharges of polluted water from Lake Okeechobee that have been devastating Florida communities for years. The water is choked green with algae and killing wildlife, tourism, fishing, and oyster industries, particularly in the Indian River area of our State.

The people of Florida can't wait for another WRRDA bill to roll around. The streamlined successful pilot program is infinitely more preferable than the streamlining of environmental review contained in this bill.

My friends across the aisle seem oddly opposed sometimes to having

fresh water and clean air, attacking NEPA and environmental regulations at every opportunity, including otherwise inappropriate vehicles like this bill. But I understand that no one is happy all the time.

I do have grave reservations about some of the policies in the bill and hope that we can work them out through the legislative process. There is no need for Congress to make the waters rougher than they already are. Let's continue to do our work constituents sent us here to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, nearly one-third of our economy depends on international trade, and 99 percent of that trade passes through our Nation's ports. Since transportation accounts for as much as 10 percent of the cost of the products we buy, it is so very critically important that our ports and waterways run efficiently and are properly maintained.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, which is a part of the critical role laid out to Congress by our Founding Fathers in regulating interstate commerce. With this bill we can reform the Army Corps of Engineers' management of important infrastructure projects and reduce their project backlog in order to create the conditions for a much stronger American economy. Mr. Speaker, this bill does that, and that is why I am proud to support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my good friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me first of all begin by opposing the rule. This House is becoming much too closed. I would remind my Republican colleagues of the promises they made when they took over this place. They promised a more open and more transparent House of Representatives. What we have seen is closed and restricted rules time and time and time again. There is no reason why this can't be an open rule. So I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against the rule.

Secondly, with regard to the underlying bill, it is my intention to support the underlying bill, but I do have serious reservations. The proponents of this bill talk about the streamlining provisions that are in this bill that somehow streamline the environmental review process and that somehow the environmental review process causes delays.

I would remind my colleagues that the facts are clear that delays are

caused by funding that doesn't correspond to the demand. The last WRRDA bill authorized over \$23 billion in new projects, and since that time appropriations have been at \$1.5 billion per year. The Ryan budget, which my Republican colleagues seem to love so much, will cut that by another third. Add to that sequestration and all the other budget cuts that my colleagues are proposing here, it is lack of money, not environmental reviews, that is causing the delays.

Further, environmental reviews are really the only way voters have any say about the Federal projects in their community.

□ 1300

We need a WRRDA bill, but we don't need to sacrifice the environmental review process or a process that allows our constituents to have a say on how projects proceed. I hope when this bill moves to conference committee with the Senate, we can fix some of these, I think, egregious problems with the bill with regard to the environmental review process.

We do need a WRRDA bill, and we also need a transportation bill. I would hope my colleagues on the other side could convince the Tea Party members to allow that to come to the floor because we have an aging infrastructure, not only in terms of water projects but in terms of highways, roads, and bridges. I could go on and on and on.

If we get this right, we can create some jobs. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule, and support the underlying bill.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 3080.

This bill provides commonsense reforms to the construction of water infrastructure projects, which will help facilitate commerce and get this country back to work, and it does so without earmarks. It also addresses our regulatory framework amidst commonsense solutions that we can use.

Article I of the Constitution clearly spells out that the Federal Government has a role in regulating commerce, and when we talk about building ports and dams, these are the types of projects that the Federal Government can and should undertake, which will allow the private sector to thrive, as well as encouraging private sector participation.

I want to thank the chairman and the committee for their work on this bill, which also advances the cause of the Savannah Harbor expansion project, which is one of the many projects that can move forward under this bill. The Savannah Harbor deepening will allow the State of Georgia to begin construction on this much-needed project. When it is completed, consumers and businesses all across the

country will benefit from the imports and exports that flow through Savannah.

The bill also provides residents across the country with a framework that advances long-term economic growth opportunities by expanding and improving our sources of water supply.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the dean of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say thanks to my good friend from Florida for yielding me this time.

I urge that the rule be rejected. There is no reason why we can't have an opportunity to amend this legislation to address some of its failures. As the author of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, I was proud to usher in a new era of environmental and wildlife conservation. Moreover, NEPA passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support, by a vote of 372-15. A similar vote took place in the Senate. During the debate on NEPA, I noted:

Mankind is playing an extremely dangerous game with his environment. We have not yet learned that we must consider the natural environment as a whole and to assess its quality continuously if we really wish to make strides in improving, preserving, and protecting it.

NEPA has a very simple promise: look before leaping. The law ensures that Federal agencies weigh the environmental consequences of development projects before they are undertaken. This bill puts its finger in the eye of that particular approach. I worry that the provisions included in the bill before us today will lead us down a path going back to those days of impunity and disregard for the well-being and concerns of the public, where actions were taken without any full appreciation or understanding of the environmental impact of that.

That was the reason NEPA was passed, so that we would know what we were doing, and so that we would have a fair opportunity for people to participate in the judgments by having these decisions made in an open and a transparent fashion. Now perhaps changes are needed, and perhaps an update, if you will. We cannot say that this legislation does that. However, before we make changes, we need to have some comprehensive hearings in the committee of jurisdiction. I note that the committee that brings this legislation to the floor is not necessarily the committee of jurisdiction.

This is a proposal which is disregarding one of the things which was said by President Nixon when he signed it. He said that this was going to stop the decay of the environment. We are renewing that decay.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for the inclusion of the provisions in the bill to help expedite environmental reviews and for the language that was requested by myself and Congressman FARENTHOLD which would help increase private investment in our Nation's ports and expedite the completion of large critical projects.

One important project that is authorized in this bill is the deepening of the Sabine-Neches Waterway. I have been working on the authorization of this project since I was elected in 2004. My predecessors, Nick Lampson and Jack Brooks, worked on this project. Mr. WEBER, who now represents this area, has been working on this project. In fact, the original Chief's Report for the Sabine-Neches Waterway was authorized to begin in 1997, 16 years ago. That was three Presidents ago. It was in the last century.

Since that time, all four of my kids have finished high school, graduated from college, gotten married, and have given me 10 grandkids. The United States has fought two major wars. Sixteen years to do an authorization on a Federal project—something is wrong with this picture, Mr. Speaker.

This project was supposed to cost \$300 million. Today, if it is authorized, it will be \$1.1 billion. That is a 287 percent increase, and we still haven't moved any dirt. There is something wrong with this picture, Mr. Speaker.

That is why this WRRDA bill is so important. It makes critical structural improvements to the way the Corps of Engineers does business so we can end these absurd delays. It shouldn't take 20 years to complete a project, and I'm talking about authorization just to approve a project, like the Sabine-Neches Waterway.

The Sabine-Neches Waterway is critical to America's energy and national security. It was first authorized at 40 feet. This WRRDA bill will make the depth 48 feet, permitting deeper draft vessels to come through. Right now, tankers that come up the Sabine-Neches Waterway can't be full because they drag bottom. They have to offload part of their fuel before they come up the waterway. That is why this is important to the United States.

It is also vital to the United States military. The Sabine-Neches Waterway, actually is the home of the largest commercial military out-load port in America, and it is the second-largest military port in the world. The channel is home to two designated military strategic seaports: Beaumont and Port Arthur, Texas.

Additionally, 20 to 30 percent of the Nation's commercial jet fuel and a significant majority and classified amount of our military's jet fuel is produced on the Sabine-Neches Waterway.

This is the energy corridor of the United States. Refineries line this en-

tire waterway. Delays by the Corps of Engineers have cost millions of dollars, all because they cannot make up their mind to approve the project.

Mr. Speaker, pick a horse and ride it. Either approve the project or deny the project, but make up your mind. These delays are absurd.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, while not a perfect bill, I will be voting for it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, better known as WRRDA.

As a member of the California Delegation, I am particularly supportive of reauthorizing WRRDA, which is such a critical bill for our state.

Although this bill was intended to be reauthorized every two years, it has been six years since the last Water Resources Development Act (WRRDA) was signed into law.

After examining the provisions included in this legislation, I am encouraged by provisions like Section 124 which helps our state by requiring a comprehensive review of the Corps of Engineers' policy guidelines on vegetation management for levees.

I am hopeful that this provision will help eliminate some of the challenges that local governments and flood control agencies face because of current vegetation removal policy.

Additionally, provisions like the one outlined in Section 130 mandate that a report be issued on the practices, priorities, and authorized purposes at Corps of Engineers reservoirs in arid regions and their effect on water supply during times of drought.

This is a good start to begin addressing the need and ability for local water agencies to be able to store more water in their dams for water replenishment.

Although we do not have the ideal reauthorization bill of WRRDA in front of us, I believe this to be a good start to once again focus on the importance of water supply and management.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), my good friend and a former member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan WRRDA bill. I want to commend Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL, along with Chairman Gibbs and Ranking Member BISHOP. I would also like to thank Senator BOXER for leading the Senate in passing its WRRDA bill earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, my district of Sacramento is the most at-risk metropolitan area for major flooding, as it lies at

the confluence of two great rivers: the American and the Sacramento. We have a lot at risk. We waited too long for this bill, and we need Congress to act.

Since the last WRRDA in 2007, a number of key flood protection investments have been carefully studied by the Army Corps of Engineers. One such project that has been thoroughly studied by the Corps of Engineers and holds a Chief's Report is the Natomas Levee Improvement Project. Levee deficiencies were found in the area in 2008, and it was remapped by FEMA in 2008. The Corps of Engineers put the level of protection at 1 in 33 years, a third of the national standard. Since then, costly flood insurance has become mandatory.

The area to be protected by the project is home to over 100,000 people, two interstate highways, and an international airport. It is heavily urbanized, and home to dozens of schools and hundreds of small businesses. If a levee broke, the damage would be similar to that experienced in New Orleans.

To fully underscore the importance of this project, my constituents have voluntarily voted twice to pay their local share. Despite the significant local investment, work remains uncompleted. The project needs congressional authorization.

Mr. Speaker, we must pass this bill. We must establish a conference committee with the Senate, and we must work to ensure WRRDA becomes law this year. It is too important for our Nation, and I look forward to working in a bipartisan way to ensure that.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3080, as well as a bipartisan amendment that we will have on the floor later today. This bill works to address our Nation's competitiveness and increasing economic growth by maintaining our infrastructure in a sensible manner.

Our amendment that we will offer today will work to address the challenges that invasive species present to our country today. As the cochair of the Invasive Species Caucus and the only Member who has the privilege to represent three of the five Great Lakes, I am honored to speak on the floor today about the threat that these species bring to our natural environment. They also represent a huge economic cost to each of our districts. It costs over \$100 million a year in the Great Lakes alone to have these invasive species fought and controlled.

Mr. Speaker, our amendment is simple. It does not authorize any new funds or create new programs. Simply put, it helps address the invasive species issue by requiring the GAO to

complete a comprehensive report on Federal spending for the operations and cost of invasive species. Why is this important? A report that takes into account all species nationwide will allow Congress to identify both gaps and duplicative efforts in the future. By beginning with a comprehensive report, we can effectively target areas for improvement in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge your support and all Members' support for this bill and our amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to tell us the time remaining for both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 19½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) who is the cochair of the PORTS Caucus, of which I am a proud member.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the underlying bill, and as my colleague said, as a founder and co-chair, along with my friend, TED POE, of the Congressional PORTS Caucus, I am happy that today the House has this opportunity to pass a water resources bill that will provide long-needed investment to our Nation's ports and create jobs. Our ports and waterways have been waiting for over 6 years for a new water bill. It is time to end their wait.

One of the things I came to Congress to do was to fight for the full use of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and to ensure that we address the expanded use needs of ports like the Port of Los Angeles and the Port of Long Beach that see so much commerce but so little of this harbor maintenance funding.

Do I wish that we would have been able to be more aggressive in this bill? Of course—but the bill we have before us is a huge step in the right direction. Congress, I think, is finally recognizing that our ports aren't just gateways; they are engines of growth, of prosperity, and of jobs. Passing this legislation would be a big victory for our ports, a strong signal that this House recognizes the critical importance of our ports to our economic health.

I am going to be voting for this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1315

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend on the Rules Committee for yielding.

This is a big bill for Georgia. It is a big bill for all of America. Mr. Speaker, it is so often that we hear about con-

flict in this body. We all know that jobs are important to absolutely everyone's constituency; and when we all know that 99 percent of our imports and exports travel through our ports, it is easy to come together and get excited about doing things that matter.

We have got the Panama Canal opening for newer and wider and bigger ships, but my own home port in Savannah is not ready, through no fault of our own. We began that process back in the 1990s to begin to expand the Port of Savannah, and it has taken 15 years to get through that permitting process. This bill says: Who benefits from that? Whose constituency is it that benefits from jobs being slowed or delayed for 15 years? No one's does. So we are able to come together and say let's do it; let's do it right, but let's do it in an efficient manner.

Three years is what we have given, 36 months, to study each and every aspect in the permitting process, and to do those things concurrently. Today, Mr. Speaker, as you know, you have to do one study first and then a second one and then a third one and then a fourth one, and you can't start the next one until the first one is finished. Today we say, if we know we have six studies to do, let's do them simultaneously. Let's go ahead and get all the work done. We all benefit from that, Mr. Speaker.

The reforms in this bill go into those projects that are authorized, Mr. Speaker, that represent spending on our books that we know we are not going to do. We say that if we have any new projects we are interested in doing, let's take those old projects off that are no longer a priority for America. Let's set our priorities. We know we have to spend money in this government, but we ought to spend it on the best projects, not the least of these; and this bill recognizes, in a budget-neutral way, a way to authorize those projects that are most important to us while we are moving those that are the least.

Mr. Speaker, I live in a county that relies on a Corps of Engineers' lake. Working with the Corps of Engineers in partnership is critical to my community for our drinking water, for our recreation, for our economy. The Corps has been a good partner, but the Corps is often hamstrung by the laws that this Congress has put in place and by the implementation of those laws by administrations, both Republican and Democrat.

Mr. Speaker, this bill reclaims to this House, for both sides of the aisle, the authority to direct the projects of the Corps of Engineers. We direct these not through earmarks, Mr. Speaker, but by recognizing that constitutional responsibility that we have to our constituents back home to decide where those dollars are spent, how those projects are prioritized. Rather than punting on that issue, this bill reserves

those powers rightfully to this House and to this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not everything that I would like for it to be. Candidly, in 3 years of serving in this Congress, I have yet to see a bill that is everything that I would like for it to be. What I know is that this bill is a step in the right direction, a step that we can take and a step that we must take.

I thank my friend from Florida for his leadership on the issue, for his leadership on the Rules Committee, and for yielding me the time today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL), my friend.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, we are a country of interdependent States that share prosperity, challenges, and resources, united with a goal of a healthy economy supported by quality infrastructure.

At times, though, inequities in the collection and distribution of Federal resources create such an imbalance that one region is put at a distinct disadvantage. This is the case for California, which collects nearly one-third of the Nation's harbor maintenance taxes but receives less than 7 percent of the expenditures for port projects.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO's amendment, had it been allowed to come to this floor, would have brought a measure of equity to this stark imbalance. I believe this was a missed opportunity for our Nation's ports.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to Mr. SOUTHERLAND, my fellow Floridian and good friend.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me today.

Today I rise in support of this rule for the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, and I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN). She understands how important this bill is, as do I.

Make no mistake, this is a jobs bill. We are going to be able to take advantage of economic opportunities because of this piece of legislation. I am proud to serve as a member of the Transportation Committee. That this bill passed unanimously out of committee is something that I think needs to be noted.

This legislation enhances the Army Corps of Engineers' ability to develop and support America's port and waterway infrastructure, and it does so with full spending offsets and zero earmarks. That is the kind of common-sense reform I believe the American people expect and deserve.

This bill places hard caps on the time and cost of studies, eliminates duplications and delays, places a 3-year cap on those studies and caps in dollar amounts of \$3 million. It expands the role of public-private partnerships in water infrastructure and makes significant changes to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund so that monies that are collected for harbor maintenance are more fully utilized for their design purpose. I know it is a novel idea that those monies collected for the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund would be there, and this bill addresses that.

Perhaps most importantly to the people of my district, this bill begins a critically important conversation that began at the committee level on the impact of the decreased water flows down the ACF River system and into the Apalachicola Bay. The Apalachicola Bay is a natural treasure, producing 90 percent of Florida's oyster harvest and 10 percent of the Nation's oyster harvest. The oystermen, small businesses, and hardworking families who depend on this bay have seen their livelihoods put at risk.

I am pleased that Chairman SHUSTER and the ranking member have worked in good faith to begin this dialogue with me. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, as well as the underlying bill, which provides critical support to Florida's 15 deep-water ports and allows us to be fully prepared for the economic opportuni-

ties as a result of the Panama Canal expansion.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), my good friend and fellow Helsinki Commission member.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HASTINGS for this time.

As the cochairman of the Congressional Waterways Caucus, I do support many of the provisions of this bill, but I am concerned that it has no language to reauthorize expiring coastal protection projects.

Our beaches are the economic engines and environmental treasures that protect our coasts from storms and create jobs for our community. In fact, when you talk about return on tax dollars, the beaches can't be beat. For every \$1 spent by the Federal Government on beach renourishment, \$320 is returned in revenue. I know of no other Federal program that gives that kind of return.

When we think about the inclusion of coastal renourishment projects, there are over 50 that will be expiring if this is not addressed. We have found at Carolina and Kure Beach in North Carolina, and as many of our colleagues all over the Nation have found, a few thousand dollars on the frontside saves millions of dollars on the backside after a vicious storm like Sandy, Katrina, Fran, or Hugo. The list goes on.

It is imperative that the WRRDA language contain the reauthorization of these projects that are already in progress; otherwise, we lose these investments, and that is not a good use of taxpayer money. These are investments that ultimately create jobs and save money.

EXPIRING COASTAL NOURISHMENT PROJECTS

Member	State	Project	End Year
Rep. Mike McIntyre	NC	Carolina Beach and Vicinity	2014
Rep. Bill Young	FL	Pinellas County—Treasure Island Segment	2019
Rep. Lois Frankel	FL	Broward County—Segment II	2020
Rep. Patrick Murphy	FL	Fort Pierce Beach St. Lucie	2020
Rep. John Carney	DE	Delaware Coast Protection, Indian River Inlet	2021
Rep. Jack Kingston	GA	Tybee Island	2023
Rep. Alcee Hastings	FL	Broward County—Segment III	2025
Rep. Debbie Wasserman-Schultz	FL	Dade County—Bal Harbour	2025
Rep. Timothy Bishop	NY	Westhampton	2027
Rep. Corrine Brown	FL	Duval County	2028
Rep. C.W. Bill Young	FL	Pinellas County—Long Key Segment	2030
Rep. Debbie Wasserman-Schultz	FL	Dade County—Sunny Isles	2030
Rep. Trey Radel	FL	Lee County—Captiva Island Segment	2038
Rep. Theodore Deutch	FL	Palm Beach County—North Boca Raton Segment	2038
Vacant	MA	Revere Beach	2041
Rep. Frank LoBiondo	NJ	Cape May City (Cape May Inlet to Lower Tower)	2041
Rep. Mike McIntyre	NC	Wrightsville Beach	2041
Rep. Marcy Kaptur	OH	Presque Island	2042
Rep. Marshall "Mark" Sanford	SC	Folly Beach	2043
Rep. Vern Buchanan	FL	Manatee County	2043
Rep. Lois Frankel	FL	Palm Beach County—Delray Beach Segment	2043
Rep. Richard Nugent	FL	Pinellas County—Sand Key Segment	2043
Rep. Rosa DeLauro	CT	Prospect Beach	2043
Rep. Frank LoBiondo	NJ	Ocean City—Great Egg Harbor Inlet and Peck	2043
Rep. Luke Messer	IN	Indiana Shoreline	2044

EXPIRING COASTAL NOURISHMENT PROJECTS—Continued

Member	State	Project	End Year
Rep. Patrick Murphy	FL	Martin County	2045
Rep. Lois Frankel	FL	Palm Beach—Jupiter/Carlin	2045
Rep. Hakeem Jeffries	NY	Coney Island	2045
Rep. Gregory Meeks	NY	East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet Sestic	2045
Rep. Frank Pallone Jr.	NJ	Sea Bright—Manasquan: Monmouth Beach (F	2045
Rep. Tom Rice	SC	Myrtle Beach	2046
Rep. Frank Pallone Jr.	NJ	Sea Bright—Manasquan: Sea Bright (Reach 1)	2046
Rep. Lois Frankel	FL	Palm Beach—Ocean Ridge Segment	2047
Rep. Vern Buchanan	FL	Sarasota County—Venice Segment	2047
Rep. Christopher "Chris" Smith	NJ	Sea Bright—Manasquan: Belmar to Manasqui	2047
Rep. Mike McIntyre	NC	Kure Beach	2047
Rep. Frank Pallone Jr.	NJ	Sea Bright—Manasquan: Long Branch (Reach	2048
Rep. Scott Rigell	VA	Sandbridge	2048
Rep. Steve Southerland	FL	Panama City Beaches	2050
Rep. Frank Pallone Jr.	NJ	Sea Bright—Manasquan: Asbury to Avon	2050
Rep. Mike McIntyre	NC	Ocean Isle, Brunswick County Beaches	2050

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. WEBSTER from Florida.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. WRRDA is commonsense legislation that permits the Army Corps of Engineers to eliminate costly and duplicative projects, caps the time and costs of studies, consolidates and accelerates environmental analyses, and stimulates the U.S. economy through increased competitiveness in the global market and through job reaction.

In my home State of Florida, our 15 ports have contributed over \$96 billion to the State's economy and, perhaps most importantly, employs hundreds of thousands of individuals. Within my district, we have two inland ports in particular, Ocala and Lake City, which are uniquely positioned to import and export products quickly to Florida, the southeast, and to America's heartland. Encouraging infrastructure projects such as these spur job creation. In today's economy, we cannot afford to neglect these opportunities.

We have, today, the opportunity to demonstrate that Congress can work towards the best interest of our country. So I urge my colleagues in the House to take swift action in voting to approve WRRDA and get our country back on the path to save infrastructure, global competitiveness, economic stability, and job creation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

I rise in support of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act because it is essential for our economy and it addresses flood control and water management issues important to my district.

Waterways and ports support more than 27,000 jobs in Connecticut, but Congress hasn't passed a WRRDA bill since 2007. We can't wait another 6 years to ensure that our inland waterways and seaports remain the greatest in the world.

I do have concerns about provisions meant to streamline environmental reviews, but this bill is the result of bipartisan cooperation, something all too rare in Washington these days; and as a cosponsor, I am proud to say that this bill reflects the bipartisan action that my constituents expect from Congress. That is why I am so grateful to my friend from Pennsylvania, Chairman SHUSTER, as well as Ranking Member RAHALL and Representative BISHOP for their responsible bipartisan leadership on this effort.

If you are concerned about the economy, public safety, or the lack of funding for our water infrastructure, pass WRRDA today.

I rise in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, because it is essential for our economy, and it addresses flood control and water management issues that are important to my district.

This past May, I led officials from the Army Corps of Engineers' New England Office on a tour of my district.

We met with constituents in Torrington, CT, where the city is bound by old restrictions on levee vegetation that are both costly AND harmful to the environment. This bill is a good first step to provide them relief.

We met with city leaders in Meriden, CT, about a downtown flood control project that is vital for economic development.

They need a partner in Washington, as do communities across America, and that means they need Congress to pass water resources legislation on a regular basis.

Waterways and ports support more than 27,000 jobs in Connecticut, but Congress hasn't passed a WRDA bill since 2007.

We can't wait another 6 years to ensure our inland waterways and seaports remain the greatest commercial water transportation system in the world.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I'm also proud to say this bill reflects the kind of bipartisan cooperation my constituents expect from Congress.

This is not a perfect bill.

I am particularly concerned about provisions meant to streamline environmental reviews.

But this bill is the result of bipartisan negotiations, something that is all too rare in Washington these days. Despite our disagreements, we have worked together to advance our national interest.

That is why I am so thankful for my friend from Pennsylvania, Chairman SHUSTER, as well as Ranking Member RAHALL and Rep-

resentative BISHOP, for their responsible bipartisan leadership.

If you are concerned about the economy, public safety, or environmentally friendly reforms for Corps policy: pass this bill today, so that we can turn our focus to the critical lack of funding for our water infrastructure.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify one thing, and that is the chairman and the ranking member did everything they could to stay within the guidelines and the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and they did that. They did not vary in any way over into the Clean Water Act or anything else. So nothing in this bill is changing any of the standards; all it is doing is allowing parallel tracks. That is it. So the project mentioned by Mr. WOODALL, which is 15 years, and the project in Mr. HASTINGS' area, which is 17 years, would only be done sooner, not by circumventing any environmental requirement, but through the parallel tracks.

I now yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in 1733, when General Oglethorpe sailed up the Savannah River, I have been told the river was 12 feet deep. We have been playing in the mud down there ever since. Today, it is 42 feet deep, but 42 feet isn't enough for the large Panamax ships that will soon start coming through the expanded Panama Canal. If we are to stay competitive, we have to deepen the river.

There are 352,000 jobs in Georgia related to import/export and the Port of Savannah. In fact, the cost-benefit analysis of this investment is a dollar spent gives us a \$5.50 return. In these tough economic times, that is why this legislation is so important.

□ 1330

Furthermore, it is basically a reauthorization necessitated by bureaucratic delays. The original authority to deepen the Savannah River was in 1999. It took 13 years and \$41 million worth of study to finally get four Federal agencies to approve it. During that period of time, China built a port, from start to finish, which is bigger than the Port of Savannah.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to be competitive as a Nation, we have to do better

than this. Today's legislation accelerates the approval process by alleviating unnecessary government delays.

This legislation is common sense; it is pro-jobs and pro-America; and I urge its passage.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am privileged to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, and I rise in support for a very good reason. This bill helps create jobs, good jobs, family-wage jobs. And it is not just jobs in construction from the infrastructure projects. It is jobs throughout the shipping and transportation sectors.

I happen to represent a district that contains a number of ports, including the Port of Olympia and parts of the Port of Tacoma. And activities at the Port of Tacoma alone are related to 113,000 jobs in Washington State; but there are more jobs to be found there, and around the country, if we act now.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a healthy economy requires a healthy environment, and I hope that the final bill that is reported out of the conference committee does not get caught in the false premise of having to choose just one.

However, I think this bill is a good, bipartisan start, and I urge its passage.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no more presenters and I am prepared to close. Therefore, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, this reauthorization is long overdue. There is no better way to put people back to work and stimulate our economy than to invest in our Nation's infrastructure.

In my home, the 10th District of Illinois, there are \$235 million in projects that are waiting to get under way. The multiplier effect that these projects will have in our communities cannot be overstated.

This bill makes a number of reforms that will benefit the communities in Illinois that I represent. It will, for the first time, recognize the Great Lakes Navigation System as the single system that it is. It will ensure that a portion of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is dedicated to small harbors like the one I represent in Waukegan.

This bill is not perfect. I certainly have objections to some of the environmental streamlining provisions. That said, this bill is a great example of the progress that can be made when both sides come to the table and find common ground.

I believe there is still more to be done to safeguard our environment in the underlying bill, and I look forward to working with the chairman and ranking member as this bill moves through the conference to ensure that adequate environmental protections are maintained in the final measure.

I thank the gentleman and look forward to passing this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today generally in support of the reauthorization of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, but I do want to express a couple of concerns that I have.

One is this discussion about reforms that I think really put in jeopardy what it is that we are trying to do, both in terms of developing our water resources and also protecting our environment.

I am concerned about the streamlining under the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA. It doesn't slow down projects. In fact, it ensures that the general public, State and local government officials, and industry have a seat at the table when Federal agencies make decisions that impact our communities.

Indeed, I am offering an amendment, along with my colleagues, Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. DEFAZIO, that would restore our confidence in the system to make sure that we are really protecting our environment.

My other concern, Mr. Speaker, is an amendment that is going to be offered, the Young and Petri amendment, that would, in fact, go back to the private sector for services instead of leaving that to the decision of the Army Corps of Engineers.

I look forward to further working on these issues.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged that we have today before us a bipartisan bill that will help improve our Nation's waterways and infrastructure and create jobs.

However, I do agree that this bill is imperfect, and I am dismayed that this bill includes provisions that will undermine our environmental protections and reduce the ability for public input. In that regard, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. DINGELL.

What is left out is an environmental review process that avoids pitfalls and saves taxpayers money by allowing the Army Corps of Engineers to understand where problems may exist with their proposals.

The bill also misses an opportunity to encourage the Corps to use natural

infrastructure in its flood control projects. In order to better address future extreme weather, safeguard our neighborhoods, and improve wildlife habitat, nonstructural alternatives to Corps projects should be considered as viable options.

Project delays are overwhelmingly due to funding issues or changes to the project, not environmental review. I urge my colleagues to fix these shortcomings in the conference committee process.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time.

Environmental review isn't a problem; it is a good thing. Including citizens in projects and how they affect our communities and their voices is important. Protecting water quality in natural areas that drive local economies is important. Saving tax dollars is important.

And yet, unfortunately, in the minds of some, environmental review is a problem that needs to be streamlined. I don't call these environmental review streamlines something good. I say that they are just weakening a good process that allows people to be involved and participate.

I think weakening the National Environmental Protection Act is shortsighted, misguided; and I oppose those particular provisions.

While there are merits in this bill, there also are problems, and weakening environmental review is chief among them. I am very disappointed those provisions are included in this bill.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to point out, again, no environmental law has been changed, none. Nothing has been weakened. Nothing has been shortchanged. Nothing has been slowed down.

The only thing that has happened is those studies, instead of being done in a linear path, one after another, are done simultaneously. It doesn't weaken anything. It doesn't undo anything. What it does do is speed up the process, which is very, very needed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida.

Despite some merits in the WRRDA bills that the Republicans have proposed, they fail to address the number one reason why Corps of Engineers projects are delayed, a serious lack of Federal funding. The bill before us perpetuates a myth that the problem is

environmental review of engineering projects and not inadequate funding.

In my congressional District, the Green Brook project has been funded at \$11 million per year. If this funding level continues, it will take more than 30 years to complete the project, which will eventually protect several flood-prone communities frequently at risk from extreme weather, and save lives. Until then, the Green Brook residents remain under threat.

Now, every water resource project has effects on the environment and should have good environmental review. Streamlining environmental review will not save money or expedite construction. Limiting the national environmental review limits public participation, prevents identification of potentially costly problems, project-stopping problems.

Environmental review is not something to be tolerated. It is something to be welcomed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, distinguished Member from Florida, I rise in support of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation. It is a good example of bipartisanship and cooperation and common sense, as opposed to some of the politics that have dominated this Chamber.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, I was pleased to have had a part in several bipartisan provisions beneficial to the economy, to the environment, and to conservation.

We are creating jobs and stimulating the business economy with this legislation. We are putting a stop to raids on the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. We are expanding the definition of invasive species, now limited to plant life, to include animal life species like zebra mussels and Asian carp, and we are closing the lock and dam at St. Anthony Falls to prevent the spread of Asian carp through the precious lakes and rivers of northern Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, by passing this bill, the Congress demonstrates that we are still capable of achieving reasonable, bipartisan solutions that solve problems and get things done here in this country.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) to discuss our proposal if we defeat the previous question.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank my colleague from Florida for yielding time to me.

My amendment is very simple. It authorizes the Corps projects to receive a final Chief's Report up to 1 year following the enactment of the bill.

Let's be clear: under the present arbitrary deadline, critical Corps of Engineer projects throughout the United States will have to wait for years. This is the second Corps project that we have done in 14 years.

Now, my colleague from Florida keeps saying that there is no change. There is a change in this project, in that, in this particular bill, this is the first time that Members did not have up to 2 years to get their Chief's Report in.

The Chief's Report is long, it takes time, it is economically and environmentally justified, and it has to indicate it is a benefit to the entire country.

Now, let me say one thing about this amendment. It does not change anything in the current bill. It pays the same way other projects are paid for. It is what we have always done.

Authorizing these additional projects would generate billions of dollars in economic activity, create hundreds and thousands of well-paying jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise once again, Mr. Speaker, to discuss an environmental catastrophe taking place in my district. While I strongly support the underlying bill, without the amendment, it would force my constituents and residents from Florida to wait at least another 2 years for projects critical for our environment and our economy.

The Central Everglades Planning Project, critical to the deteriorating health of the waterways in my district, is nearly ready to go.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the distinguished gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. The project will safely move more water south of Lake Okeechobee, instead of forcing polluted fresh water into brackish rivers to the east and west, causing immeasurable damage to our environment and our local economy.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and support the commonsense, bipartisan Brown-Frankel-Crenshaw-Posey amendment that would allow the Army Corps to complete its work on authorizing several important projects that are in the final stages of approval.

□ 1345

I spoke on the floor earlier today about the importance of acting now on initiatives that will help address the environmental crisis occurring in our area. Today we have that chance. My constituents and our waterways cannot wait.

Defeat the previous question and support the Brown amendment.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If we defeat the previous question, we can bring up this amendment right now.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida, the manager, for yielding the time. He knows how important this whole bill is to the Texas gulf region.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that there are many things we would like to fix in this bill, but I know that there are many Texans who are waiting for this bill to pass; and I was delighted to work with the Texas delegation to strengthen the bill by encouraging non-Federal entities to invest in their harbor maintenance and step in when the Army Corps of Engineers cannot. I am also delighted that we have addressed the question of dredging, and we should do it even better.

I thank the Rules Committee for consenting to my amendment that deals with consultation, with stakeholders and water districts, local city, county government. I know my local governments are waiting to have the Army Corps of Engineers actually listen to them as well as Historically Black Colleges and minority institutions.

I am also looking forward to making sure that the \$20 billion in projects in the DeFazio amendment is included and not rejected.

And finally, I hope that we can work together, Mr. Speaker, on ensuring minority- and women-owned businesses and the billions of dollars that are used by the Army Corps of Engineers are actually getting the opportunity to work. I ask my colleagues to recognize the importance of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for bringing this important legislation to the House floor. Smart investments in water infrastructure are critical to the Nation's economic well-being. Water infrastructure is vital to my home State of Texas.

For example, waterways and ports support 207,970 Texas jobs. Additionally, it generates \$34 billion dollars in economic activity to the Texas economy. As the Representative of the 18th Congressional District, which is adjacent to the Port of Houston, I understand how critically important it is to make smart investments to create jobs and keep our economy growing.

Texas's commercial deepwater ports connect 152,000 miles of rail, 460,000 miles of pipelines, and 45,000 miles of interstate highways. In addition, the State of Texas has 11 deepwater ports, but hurricane damage and age threaten their ability to handle the next generation of post-Panama vessels.

Mr. Speaker, over half of Texas port facilities require maintenance to fully accommodate the next generation of maritime shipping vessels. Without these investments, Texas and the Nation will be at a competitive disadvantage in the global economy. That is why I support H.R. 3080.

I also want to thank the Rules Committee for making in order my amendment. This amendment provides that in making recommendations pursuant to Section 118 of the Act, the Secretary shall consult with key stakeholders, including State, county, and city governments, and, where applicable, State and local water districts, and in the case of recommendations concerning projects that substantially affect underrepresented communities the Secretary shall also consult with historically Black colleges and universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and other minority-serving institutions.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, it is an essential tool in our desire to improve the lives of low income and minority communities as well as the environment at large.

I am sure we will never forget the critical impact from Hurricane Sandy that crippled the Northeast area from Massachusetts to North Carolina. And not long before Hurricane Sandy, as we were working to learn how to prevent another Hurricane Katrina that crippled the great City of New Orleans. Our nation was still healing from Hurricane Ike and Hurricane Rita which crippled Houston, Texas.

As my colleagues are aware, a healthy environment sustains a productive and healthy community which fosters personal and economic growth. This highlights the importance of not only giving greater attention to our underserved communities but also how we can help our citizens by educating them on the areas in which they live. That is why my amendment requires the Secretary of the Army to consult with key stakeholders, including State, county, and city governments, and, where applicable, State and local water districts, and in the case of recommendations concerning projects that substantially affect underrepresented communities.

I regret that the Rules Committee did not make in order my amendment that directs the Secretary of the Army to encourage the participation of minority- and women-owned businesses in such projects and requires the GAO to submit a report to Congress within 2 years on the participation of minority- and women-owned businesses in such projects.

I recognize the value of a diverse supplier base and its impact on the community and population at large. Therefore, I will continue to work directly with the Secretary of the Army to establish an opportunity for Minority and Women Owned Businesses to participate on specific projects and to ensure that the United States Army Corp of Engineers continues to creatively seek new supplier sources, particularly among minority and women owned businesses, to fulfill the business opportunities at a number of Ports throughout our great nation.

Lastly, I appreciate the Committee making in order an amendment cosponsored with Congressman DEFAZIO of Oregon that conditions the application of Section 103 of the bill on a reduction in the backlog of Corps of Engineers projects to less than \$20 billion in construction costs. This amendment highlights the fact that it is a lack of funding not the environmental review process that has led to a backlog of authorized projects that are not being constructed. We have spent enough energy arguing over the budget and the National Environmental Policy (NEPA) streamlining, but

not enough time in making the hard decisions and investments that are going to create economic growth and create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3080 is not a perfect bill. But no compromise legislation ever is. But this bill is a good start and merits my support.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill used to be known as the Water Resources Development Act. Now it is called the Water Resources Reform and Development Act. While it is with many of these new reforms that I take issue, I look forward to working with my friends on the other side of the aisle to make sure that we are here in 2 years to again update our water resources and infrastructure, hopefully a bill with less ill-advised reforms.

Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, I am going to offer an amendment to allow for the inclusion of the bipartisan Brown amendment, which would authorize projects that receive a final Chief of Engineers' Report up to 1 year following the enactment of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for ample and open debate and makes in order amendments from both sides of the aisle. Further, it advances a bill that was reported out of the committee with unanimous bipartisan support.

This bill is good for American workers, is good for American producers, and is good for American shippers. As my friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) knows, this bill is also good for the State of Florida.

Florida has 18 public seaports. These seaports are critical components to our economy. They are responsible for supporting more than half a million Florida jobs and for generating \$66 billion in total economic value. The activity of these seaports contributed \$1.7 billion to Florida's State and local budgets. Furthermore, this bill advances key ecosystem restoration projects in the Florida Everglades and supports the economic development that the Everglades provides in our State.

I thank Chairman SHUSTER for working with me and other Florida Members to ensure that the State is well positioned to move forward. Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL and my colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

have given us a bipartisan product that reforms the Federal bureaucracy, is fiscally responsible, strengthens accountability, and creates jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I say to my colleagues in the House, if you support reforming the Federal bureaucracy, if you are looking to manage our spending, if you are looking to increase transparency while investing in our infrastructure, and if you are looking to create American jobs, support this bill. Vote for the rule. Vote for the bill. Move the country forward.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 385 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 6 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative BROWN of Florida or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 6. The amendment referred to in section 5 is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO THE RULES COMMITTEE PRINT
FOR H.R. 3080 OFFERED BY MS. BROWN OF
FLORIDA

Page 162, before line 1, insert the following:

SEC. 402. **CONDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any project for water resources development, conservation, or other purposes for which a favorable final report of the Chief of Engineers is completed during the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plan, and subject to the conditions, described in the final report of the Chief.

(b) OFFSET.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall revise the report submitted under section 301 to identify further projects and separable elements that in the aggregate have an estimated Federal cost to complete (as of the date of the report) that is equal to the total cost of all projects authorized under subsection (a).

Page 139, line 4, insert "or any revision of the report," after "this subsection."

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the

control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 194, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 554]

YEAS—225

Amash	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Amodei	Griffin (AR)	Pitts
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Poe (TX)
Bachus	Grimm	Pompeo
Barletta	Guthrie	Price (GA)
Barr	Hall	Radel
Barton	Hanna	Reed
Benishek	Harper	Reichert
Bentivoglio	Harris	Renacci
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Rice (SC)
Black	Heck (NV)	Rigell
Blackburn	Hensarling	Roby
Boustany	Holding	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Rokita
Buchanan	Hurt	Rooney
Bucshon	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Jenkins	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Cantor	Jones	Royce
Capito	Jordan	Runyan
Carter	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Chabot	King (IA)	Sanford
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Scalise
Coble	Kingston	Schock
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Cole	Kline	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Sessions
Conaway	Lamborn	Shimkus
Cook	Lance	Shuster
Costa	Lankford	Simpson
Cotton	Latham	Smith (MO)
Cramer	Latta	Smith (NE)
Crawford	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Creshaw	Long	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Lucas	Southerland
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Lummis	Stivers
Denham	Marchant	Stockman
Dent	Marino	Stutzman
DeSantis	Massie	Terry
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Thornberry
Duffy	McClintock	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Turner
Eilmers	McKinley	Upton
Farenthold	McMorris	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Wagner
Fleischmann	Meadows	Walberg
Fleming	Meehan	Walden
Flores	Messer	Walorski
Forbes	Mica	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Fox	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Whitfield
Gardner	Mulvaney	Williams
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Wittman
Gibbs	Noem	Wolf
Gibson	Nunes	Womack
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Woodall
Gohmert	Olson	Yoder
Goodlatte	Owens	Yoho
Gosar	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Pearce	Young (IN)
Granger	Perry	
Graves (GA)	Petri	

NAYS—194

Andrews	Brownley (CA)	Clay
Barber	Bustos	Cleaver
Barrow (GA)	Butterfield	Clyburn
Bass	Capps	Cohen
Beatty	Capuano	Connolly
Becerra	Cardenas	Conyers
Bera (CA)	Carney	Cooper
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Courtney
Bishop (NY)	Cartwright	Crowley
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Cummings
Brady (PA)	Chu	Davis (CA)
Braley (IA)	Cicilline	DeFazio
Brown (FL)	Clarke	DeGette

Delaney	Langevin	Price (NC)
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Quigley
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Rahall
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Rangel
Dingell	Levin	Richmond
Doggett	Lewis	Ruiz
Doyle	Lipinski	Ruppersberger
Edwards	Loeb sack	Ryan (OH)
Ellison	Loftgren	Sánchez, Linda
Engel	Lowenthal	T.
Enyart	Lowey	Sanchez, Loretta
Eshoo	Lujan Grisham	Sarbanes
Esty	(NM)	Schakowsky
Farr	Lujan, Ben Ray	Schiff
Fattah	(NM)	Schneider
Foster	Lynch	Schrader
Frankel (FL)	Maffei	Schwartz
Fudge	Maloney,	Scott (VA)
Gabbard	Carolyn	Scott, David
Gallego	Maloney, Sean	Serrano
Garamendi	Matheson	Sewell (AL)
Garcia	Matsui	Shea-Porter
Grayson	McCollum	Sherman
Green, Al	McDermott	Sinema
Green, Gene	McGovern	Sires
Grijalva	McIntyre	Slaughter
Gutierrez	McNerney	Smith (WA)
Hahn	Meeks	Speier
Hanabusa	Meng	Swalwell (CA)
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Takano
Heck (WA)	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)
Higgins	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Himes	Moran	
Hinojosa	Murphy (FL)	
Holt	Nadler	
Honda	Napolitano	
Horsford	Neal	
Hoyer	Negrete McLeod	
Huffman	Nolan	
Israel	O'Rourke	
Jackson Lee	Pallone	
Jeffries	Pascarell	
Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	
Johnson, E. B.	Payne	
Kaptur	Pelosi	
Keating	Perlmutter	
Kelly (IL)	Peters (CA)	
Kennedy	Peters (MI)	
Kildee	Peterson	
Kilmer	Pingree (ME)	
Kind	Pocan	
Kirkpatrick	Polis	
Kuster	Posey	

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt	Fincher	Palazzo
Campbell	Herrera Beutler	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Danny	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Duckworth	Nugent	

□ 1415

Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. BARBER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. GRANGER changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 271, noes 147, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 555]

AYES—271

Amash	Bachmann	Barber
Amodei	Bachus	Barletta

Barr
Barton
Benishkek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buchshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Galleo
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry

Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—147

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty

Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici

Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps

Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman

Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildeer
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebbsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matheson
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moran
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne

Pelosi
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt
Campbell
Davis, Danny
Duckworth

Fincher
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, George

Nugent
Palazzo
Roybal-Allard
Rush

□ 1423

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 554: On ordering the previous question—providing for consideration of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

On rollcall No. 555: On agreeing to the resolution—providing for consideration of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extra-neous material on H.R. 3080.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 385 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in

the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3080.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1426

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3080) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, with Mr. FORTENBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will submit for the RECORD an exchange of letters between the Committee on Budget, the Committee on Natural Resources, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud today that we are considering one of my highest priorities as the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee—H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013, or WRRDA.

WRRDA is the most policy- and reform-focused legislation of its kind in the last two decades. The new name reflects the landmark reforms. We have added an “R,” for Water Resources Reform and Development Act, because of the number of reforms that we have in here. It is the most fiscally responsible WRRDA in history, and there are no earmarks. It does not cede our constitutional congressional authority to the executive branch. We made sure that we maintained that. We have worked together in a bipartisan way on this bill since day one, developing this bill with input from Members and stakeholders through listening sessions, roundtables and hearings.

I want to thank my partners and original cosponsors, Ranking Member RAHALL, Water Subcommittee Chairman BOB GIBBS, and also Water Subcommittee Ranking Member TIM BISHOP, for their work on this piece of legislation.

I want to thank all of the members of the committee and all of the staff members for their hard work and desire to work together on this important infrastructure and reform legislation.

I am also proud that WRRDA has received more than 70 letters of support

from stakeholders, a list of which I will submit for the RECORD.

This bill was passed out of committee on September 19 on a voice vote. It is about strengthening our infrastructure so that we can remain competitive.

□ 1430

It is about economic growth. It is about trade. It is about jobs, not just the jobs that will be created when we are dredging ports and rebuilding locks and dams, but the jobs that will help our manufacturers when they manufacture their products and send them into the world markets, making sure they get there in a competitive way. Also, making sure that those products coming into our ports and harbors are getting onto the shelves of our local stores, allowing the consumers to buy these products at a lower cost, allowing them to keep more of their hard-earned dollars.

Congress has not enacted a WRRDA since 2007 and we can't afford to delay. Without improvement, our water transportation system becomes obsolete every day and we become less competitive. If we cannot compete, we lose jobs to those who can.

Our bill cuts red tape, reforms the bureaucracy, accelerates project delivery. It sets hard deadlines on the time and cost of studies. It also consolidates or eliminates unnecessary studies and requires concurrent reviews. And our bill streamlines environmental reviews. I want to repeat, it streamlines them; doesn't eliminate them, but streamlines them.

Our bill is also fiscally responsible. This WRRDA bill deauthorizes \$12 billion of old, inactive projects that were authorized prior to this current law and fully offsets new authorizations. In addition, it sunsets new authorizations to prevent future backlogs at the Corps of Engineers.

This WRRDA has no earmarks. Our bill establishes a new, transparent process for future bills to review and prioritize water resources development activities, with strong constitutional oversight and without handing over our constitutional authority to the executive branch. I want to repeat that. I think it is very important that this body, that Congress, holds on to its constitutional authority and not give it over to the executive branch, as we have done for decades.

We have been recognized by leading outside watchdog groups for having a bill with no earmarks and for keeping congressional oversight without ceding that authority to the Corps. I am extremely proud of the accomplishments, and we should all be.

WRRDA breaks down barriers that hold back the development of our water resources infrastructure. It maximizes the ability of non-Federal interests to contribute their own funds to move studies and projects forward.

It also expands the ability of non-Federal interests to contribute funds to expedite the evaluation and processing of permits, and it establishes a public-private partnership program in water infrastructure. With the leadership of RODNEY DAVIS, that is in this WRRDA legislation.

This bill improves our ability to compete by authorizing needed investments in America's ports. As I mentioned, this is a jobs bill, not just construction jobs to improve our ports, but to help our manufacturers and to help Americans be able to keep more of their hard-earned dollars.

Our bill supports our underserved and emerging ports to also help them become more competitive. It reforms and preserves the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and the Inland Waterways Trust Fund to better ensure those fees collected from users for these systems are utilized for their intended purposes.

These are all important and necessary reforms, but at its heart WRRDA ensures that we don't lose sight of the importance of strong infrastructure and keeping us competitive in the world. Our bill supports our water transportation network to make sure that it provides the foundation for job growth and fosters a more robust economy.

I ask all Members of the House, Republicans and Democrats, to join me in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 27, 2013.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, I am writing concerning H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013 (WRRDA), which was marked-up by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on September 19, 2013.

In order to expedite House consideration of H.R. 3080, the Committee on the Budget will forgo action on the bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3080, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013 (WRRDA), which was ordered to be reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on September 19, 2013. I appreciate your willingness to support expediting floor consideration of this legislation.

I acknowledge that by forgoing action on this legislation, the Committee on the Budget will not in any way be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I will include our letters on H.R. 3080 in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2013.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to review the relevant provisions of the text of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. As you are aware, the bill was primarily referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, while the Committee on Natural Resources received an additional referral.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner, and, accordingly, I agree to discharge H.R. 3080 from further consideration by the Committee on Natural Resources. I do so with the understanding that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, the Committee on Natural Resources reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should become necessary.

I ask that you insert a copy of our exchange of letters into the bill report filed by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, as well as in the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you for your courtesy in this matter and I look forward to continued cooperation between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013 (WRRDA), which was ordered to be reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on September 19, 2013. I appreciate your willingness to support expediting the consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

I acknowledge that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. In addition, I recognize that the Committee on Natural Resources reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I will include our letters on H.R. 3080 in the bill report filed by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, as well as in the Congressional

Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 17, 2013.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, I am writing concerning H.R. 3080, the "Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013," which may be scheduled for floor consideration as early as next week.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Code 1986. Section 201 of this bill amends the Internal Revenue Code by modifying the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund expenditure authority. However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3080, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 18, 2013.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013 (WRRDA), which was ordered to be reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on September 19, 2013. I appreciate your willingness to support expediting the consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

I acknowledge that by forgoing action on this bill, the Committee on Ways and Means will not in any way be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I will include our letters on H.R. 3080 in the bill report filed by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, as well as in the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

LETTERS OF SUPPORT FOR WRRDA H.R. 3080

American Association of Port Authorities; American Association of Port Authorities; American Coal Ash Association; American Concrete Pavement Association; American Concrete Pipe Association; American Concrete Pumping Association; American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association; American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association; American Council of Engineering Companies; American Council of Engineering Companies; American Farm Bureau Federation; Amer-

ican Iron and Steel Institute; American Road and Transportation Builders Association.

American Society of Civil Engineers; American Society of Civil Engineers; American Society of Concrete Contractors; American Soybean Association; American Waterways Operators; America's Infrastructure Alliance; Associated Equipment Distributors; Associated Equipment Distributors; Association of Equipment Manufacturers; Associated General Contractors of America.

Build Up Greater Cleveland; California State Assembly; CH2M Hill; City of Sacramento; City of West Sacramento; Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute; County of Santa Barbara; The Everglades Foundation; The Everglades Trust; The Fertilizer Institute; Friends of the North Natomas Library; Georgia Ports Authority; Geosynthetic Materials Association; Greater Cleveland Partnership; Great Lakes Commission; Great Lakes Maritime Task Force; Great Lakes Metro Chambers Coalition.

Interlocking Concrete Pavement Institute; International Union of Operating Engineers; International Union of Operating Engineers; International Union of Painters and Allied Trades; Laborers International Union of North America; Lake Carriers' Association; Mason Contractors Association of America; NACE International—The Corrosion Society; National Asphalt Pavement Association; National Association of Counties; National Association of Flood and Stormwater Management Agencies; National Association of Home Builders; National Association of Manufacturers; National Association of Manufacturers—Key Vote; National Association of Waterfront Employers.

National Conference of State Legislatures; National Concrete Masonry Association; National Construction Alliance II; National Precast Concrete Association; National Ready Mixed Concrete Association; National Ready Mixed Concrete Association; National Slag Association; National Society of Professional Engineers; National Stone, Sand, and Gravel Association; National Utility Contractors Association; National Waterways Conference, Inc.; North America's Building Trades Unions; Pennsylvania Farm Bureau; Portland Cement Association; Portland Cement Association.

Port of Corpus Christi; Port of Pittsburgh Commission; Precast/Prestressed Concrete Institute; RAMP—Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund Fairness Coalition; Reclamation District No. 17; Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency; Sacramento Regional Builders Exchange; Slag Cement Association; Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency; Texas Transportation Commission; Transportation Construction Coalition; Transportation Trades Department; AFL-CIO Trenton Corporation; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; U.S. Chamber of Commerce—Key Vote; U.S. Chamber of Commerce—Multi-Industry Letter; Water Resources Coalition; Water Resources Coalition; Waterways Association of Pittsburgh; Waterways Council, Inc.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise today in support of H.R. 1380, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. I commend Chairman SHUSTER, the subcommittee chairman, Mr. GIBBS, and our ranking member, Mr. BISHOP, for the superb bipartisan way in which this legislation and the whole process has been handled.

This legislation does provide important direction to the Army Corps of

Engineers to meet its mission objectives and reform their planning and construction processes while also investing in our water transportation infrastructure and creating jobs.

It has been 6 long years since we have passed Corps of Engineers water resources legislation. While Congress has had its back turned on our water infrastructure, Mother Nature has not been complacent. Since passage of the last WRRDA in 2007, the Nation has been challenged with floods, hurricanes, and droughts. Our aging locks, dams, and ports have too often been neglected. This bill before us today stops the "finger in the dike" solutions to our water infrastructure challenges and instead invests in these corridors of commerce.

It should be pointed out that H.R. 3080 is not your traditional type of WRRDA. It does not contain Member-directed projects, the traditional earmarks, but at least the bill does take a step forward in reclaiming our constitutional authority.

It is clear that in today's challenging fiscal times we have to find innovative ways to get water projects funded and completed. The pending measure identifies the role of non-Federal sponsors in supporting and moving projects ahead. It provides a process to address the \$60 billion construction backlog—that is with a "B," billion—and addresses initial reform to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund program.

At its core, though, as the chairman has stated, this is a jobs bill. The investments contained in H.R. 3080 mean jobs in our maritime economy, as larger container ships will be able to call at our deepened ports to offload their cargo while filling their decks with American exports. It creates jobs moving commodities from farms, coal mines, and steel mills more efficiently down the inland waterways that crisscross our Nation. These investments also help protect our flood-prone complainants so that homes and businesses remain safe when the rivers unexpectedly rise.

I would like to thank, again, all members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on both sides of the aisle: Chairman SHUSTER, Subcommittee Chairman GIBBS, and especially our ranking member on our side of the aisle, Representative TIM BISHOP, who has worked very hard on this legislation and knows its intricacies very well. Their hard work and dedication has developed a collaborative and bipartisan bill of which we all can be proud. I hope it is a model for future pieces of legislation. It certainly should be a model for this entire Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support the pending measure.

Without maintaining our waterways and harbors the Nation's ability to meet the global challenges for trade and commerce will be severely restricted. The only way to protect our

citizens and avoid falling behind global trade competition is to invest in our water resources and infrastructure by passing H.R. 3080 today.

As I mentioned, this is not the bill that I would have written. But I would add that this is not the exact bill that Chairman SHUSTER would have written either had he acted alone. He chose instead to bring before the House a bill that received unanimous support in our Committee. As a result, many of the provisions in H.R. 3080 are likely to eventually feel the weight of law instead of serving as just another exercise in rhetoric on the House floor.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, someone who has great responsibility in crafting this legislation.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, now is the time for the Congress to reengage in the development of the Nation's water resources and play a bigger role in prioritizing projects and activities carried out by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Congress cannot abdicate its constitutional responsibility in determining what projects should go forward and should reassert its constitutional authority.

H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013, is one of the most policy- and reform-focused pieces of legislation related to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

H.R. 3080 is a bipartisan bill that was developed by working across the aisle to achieve a common goal of investing in America's future.

H.R. 3080 contains no earmarks, cuts Federal red tape, streamlines the project delivery process, and strengthens our water transportation networks to promote competitiveness, prosperity, and economic growth.

H.R. 3080 is a jobs bill. \$1.4 trillion worth of goods associated with 30 million jobs in international trade are impacted. Thousands of jobs are created and supported by the construction and maintenance of our waterways and locks and dams.

This bill is fiscally responsible by more than fully offsetting new project authorizations with deauthorizations of old, inactive projects.

This bill establishes a path forward for enacting a WRRDA bill every 2 years without conceding any congressional authority to the executive branch.

This committee held numerous listening sessions, public roundtables, and official hearings in developing the legislation. We have heard from the public, industry, stakeholders, and from our colleagues in Congress while developing this legislation and have incorporated their ideas into H.R. 3080.

Just because a study is costly, complex, and long does not necessarily

mean it is a better project. In fact, a large, costly project with so many additions that never gets funded is a benefit to no one.

In what used to take the Army Corps 3 to 5 years to do a study has now become the norm for the Corps to take 10, 12, or even 15 years to produce a study. It is no wonder it is taking so much time, since the Corps has to review, in detail, many different alternatives.

In one case, a Chief's Report was sent to the Congress last year. The study for the project was authorized in 1999. The original purpose of the project was for navigation improvements. But when the Chief's Report was delivered to the Congress last year, the total project cost was \$650 million, but only \$250 million was for the actual construction of the navigation improvements. The rest of the project costs, almost \$400 million, are attributed to environmental enhancements, not just environmental mitigation.

In another case, the Corps of Engineers delivered to Congress a Chief's Report for which there is no non-Federal cost-share partner. That study took 7 years to develop, but since there is no non-Federal sponsor, why should Congress authorize the project? The funding spent on that study could have been spent more wisely on projects where there are non-Federal sponsors and local support.

Too often, we allow Federal agencies, including the Army Corps of Engineers, to literally study these projects to death. H.R. 3080 accelerates the Corps of Engineers study delivery process by limiting studies to 3 years and \$3 million. In addition, we accelerate the study delivery process by requiring concurrent reviews at the district-, division-, and headquarters-level personnel.

Ultimately, the Federal taxpayer is on the hook for these studies and for the length of time it takes to carry them out. The Corps reviews far too many alternatives and then sends to Congress a project request that far exceeds, in scope and costs, what was initially intended.

Too often, non-Federal interests and their contributions are forced to sit on the sidelines while our international competitors race past us. H.R. 3080 empowers non-Federal interests and ensures projects will be completed faster and cheaper with local support.

Too often, resources from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are diverted to other activities unrelated to keeping the U.S. ports competitive in a global marketplace. H.R. 3080 creates the incentive to spend the funds for their intended purpose in a manner that all ports agree upon.

One of the most important elements of this legislation is that it ensures the legislative branch engages in the Water Resources Development Act process at least once every Congress.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBS. I appreciate Messrs. SHUSTER, RAHALL, and BISHOP's bipartisan support. By working together, we can accomplish solid goals to get this done. I urge the reforms pass.

I want to thank my subcommittee staff—Geoff Bowman, John Anderson, Jon Pallow—and my personal staff—Corry Marshall and Joe Price—for their efforts.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am very proud and happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), our superb, super-superb ranking member.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. This critical, bipartisan legislation allows Congress to renew its commitment to our Nation's water infrastructure for the first time since 2007.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman GIBBS for the open and inclusive process with which the committee drafted WRRDA. I would also like to express my gratitude to the chairman and to Ranking Member RAHALL for their leadership in returning the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to its long-standing traditions of bipartisanship and collaboration.

H.R. 3080 is not a perfect bill. It is not the bill that either side of the aisle would have drafted on its own. However, it represents a bipartisan effort based on valuable input from Members and stakeholders, constructive negotiation, and mutual respect. This ought to serve as a model for how this Congress conducts the American people's business.

This bill is about many things, but most importantly, it is about job creation, not just good construction jobs that will come with the authorization of Chief's Reports contained in the bill, but also the jobs that rely on a robust network of large and small ports and inland waterways to move goods throughout the United States.

H.R. 3080 also provides some relief from the challenges facing the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund by setting targets so that a greater amount of fund proceeds are used for their intended purposes—harbor maintenance. The bill also provides for the maintenance of our Nation's small ports.

However, we Members must be vigilant that the changes proposed in this bill do not further erode the ability of the Corps to carry out construction projects, such as those necessary to meet the post-Panamax vessels that will come once the Panama Canal expansion is complete.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased at the progress we have made together on improving water infrastructure in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3080.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire as to how much time is remaining on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 20¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from West Virginia has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), vice chairman of the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and also the chair of the 21st Century Freight Transportation.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I first want to say that I rise in strong support of this bipartisan jobs and infrastructure legislation, and I would like to commend Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman GIBBS and Ranking Members RAHALL and BISHOP for working together to bring this very important bill to the floor today.

This is one of the most fiscally responsible infrastructure bills that this Congress has ever seen. I think it is fair to say that in my 25 years of service in this body that I have one of the most fiscally conservative voting records possible, so I am proud to support this type of legislation.

□ 1445

Every day tons of goods are transported across our waterways. Without basic infrastructure in place, much of these goods would be transported on our already overly congested highways. According to the National Waterways Foundation, a 15-barge tow can transport the same amount of goods as 1,050 tractor-trailer trucks. Moving goods on the water is also the most fuel efficient and environmentally sound method of transportation.

In addition, this legislation streamlines project delivery, potentially saving the Federal Government and our taxpayers billions of dollars.

While I would never support a project that is harmful to the environment, I do not think we should drag these projects out for years and years and spend megamillions of dollars on studies and drive up these costs to ridiculous levels. This legislation sets hard timelines and caps costs for studies that have to be completed for infrastructure projects.

Because H.R. 3080 removes so much red tape and bureaucracy, it helps us complete these projects in a timely and cost-effective manner. This bill, as I said, is a fiscally responsible one. Not only does it not contain any earmarks, as has been mentioned, it deauthorizes \$12 billion worth of inactive projects that are no longer needed or feasible, which offsets all of the new authorizations made in this legislation.

This bill also authorizes the important flood control projects that we need to prevent natural disasters. We saw what can happen when Katrina hit New Orleans a few years ago. That disaster caused an estimated \$150 billion in damage, according to USA Today. We need to make smart investments today so we are not foolishly spending billions of dollars after a disaster strikes.

I urge my colleagues to support this very conservative and reasonable legislation.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the ranking member on our freight panel.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is far from perfect, but it is a good step forward. I have concerns about the environmental streamlining sections. There are commonsense things we could do to advance projects more efficiently, but limiting public input is not one of them. The best way to expedite projects is to ensure there is agreement among stakeholders and to identify potential problems early, which is one of the main benefits of the NEPA process. The real obstacle is lack of adequate funding.

I am pleased the bill increases the amount that can be spent out of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and expands the eligibility for use of these funds.

The bill also requires the Corps to make specific project recommendations as part of the study funded in the Sandy supplemental appropriations bill on reducing the risk of flood and storm damage along the North Atlantic coast. This is an important provision, but we should do much more.

We are still not doing enough to prepare for climate change, rising sea levels, and extreme weather events. Whether or not you believe these events are linked to global warming, the fact is that extreme weather events are happening more often, and we would be fools not to respond to that fact. It has been 7 years since Congress last passed a WRDA bill. We are long overdue in reauthorizing these critical infrastructure projects.

This bill is a bipartisan compromise, and I will support it with the hope that we can improve it as it moves through the process.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 3080. This legislation is the only fiscally responsible and reform-focused water resources and development bill to ever be considered by this House. This bill, as the chairman has pointed out, contains no earmarks, places us on a path of a more limited role for the Federal Govern-

ment in water infrastructure development, and lays the groundwork for private sector and State level oversight.

H.R. 3080 promotes public-private partnerships and expands the ability of the private sector to contribute necessary funds to expedite and move projects forward. It also places a strict time limit on the amount of time and money that the Federal Government is allowed to spend on feasibility studies. It took the Federal Government 10 years to complete a study on how to fix Jacksonville's Mile Point navigation problem and allow for greater cargo movement. That project is slated to create 3,500 jobs.

The Port Everglades channel dredging study took 17 years and cost upwards of \$10 million to complete. Project study delays like these are unacceptable, and have far-reaching negative economic consequences.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3080 and want to express my appreciation to the committee leadership, both the chairmen and ranking members of both the full committee and the subcommittee. As the senior Texan on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I applaud the chairmen and ranking members for their leadership in advancing this legislation to this point.

While I ultimately support the passage of this bill, I am concerned about the streamlining provisions of this bill. If properly funded, necessary projects can be completed with appropriate environmental considerations and public participation. I am discouraged that the environmental protections are being weakened under this guise.

Within this bill, I supported language to increase commercial navigation capabilities for the Texas ports and waterways. With the expansion of the Panama Canal, these improvements would allow for an increased role in global trade and interstate commerce.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) of 2013. As the Senior Texan on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and cosponsor of this legislation, I am glad to once again be addressing water resources legislation on the House Floor. Such legislation has not been passed by this esteemed Body since 2007, when I served as Chairwoman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee that helped craft and usher the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007 into law over a presidential veto. With this background, I understand the challenge of composing and advancing such legislation to this point. I applaud the leadership demonstrated by the Chairman and Ranking Members of both the Full Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the

Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee for bringing this bill to the Floor today.

While I ultimately support the passage of this legislation, I am concerned about the weakening of environmental protections and the ability of the public to participate in that process as a result of the streamlining provisions of this bill. The Army Corps of Engineers project construction backlog and astronomical figure it carries demonstrates that project efficiency must be improved. I understand the desire to expedite Army Corps of Engineers study and project completions, yet do not believe that the environmental safeguards such as the National Environmental Policy Act are the cause of those delays. If properly funded, necessary projects can be completed with appropriate environmental considerations. I am discouraged that environmental protections are being weakened under this guise.

As Co-Chair of the Texas Maritime Caucus, I have supported language in this bill to increase commercial navigation capabilities for Texas' ports and waterways. I am excited about Texas' ports and the role that they play in cultivating the Texas economy, the National economy, and the global economy. With expansive coastlines, established intermodal infrastructure, and strategically beneficial location, maritime commerce has a bright future in Texas. Moreover, the American economy has a brighter future because of Texas' transportation investments and capabilities.

I am glad to have worked in a bipartisan fashion to include language in this legislation for an assessment of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. This assessment will be a valuable tool for the State of Texas to determine its current and future operation and maintenance needs for navigation improvements to the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, allowing it to be utilized more efficiently and productively in maritime commerce.

Further, I supported the inclusion of projects at the Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas and at Freeport Harbor, Texas—both of which are authorized in this legislation. The Sabine-Neches Waterway project will contribute to the economic effectiveness of commercial navigation in a system of navigation channels in the Sabine-Neches estuary of Texas and Louisiana. The Freeport Harbor project provides for a deep-draft waterway from the Gulf of Mexico to the City of Freeport through the original mouth of the Brazos River. It will contribute to the economic efficiency of commercial navigation in the region and will significantly improve Freeport Harbor's ability to compete in international maritime commerce.

These projects will help bring nearly a billion dollars of Federal funds to Texas' ports and waterways. In turn, these improvements will be a boon for Texas' economy and the National economy. Further, with the expansion of the Panama Canal, these improvements will allow Texas' ports to play an increased role in the global economy. The increased economic benefit and movement of goods will be felt throughout Texas, including in my home district in Dallas, home to two Class One rail lines, an intermodal facility, numerous interstate highways, and a strong consumer marketplace.

It is my hope that the passage of this legislation will revive the biannual WRDA author-

ization schedule. Monitoring the streamlining provisions of this bill, as well as assessing the expenditures of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund will be ripe for reconsideration during the next Congress—as will many other issues. It is my belief that the overall objectives and purposes of water resources legislation are vital to America and should be considered on a bi-annual basis. The importance of this bill should not be lost in politics.

In closing, I want to once again thank the Chairman and Ranking Members of both the Full Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee for their leadership in advancing this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank our committee chair, Mr. SHUSTER, and the ranking member, Mr. RAHALL, from my State of West Virginia. I rise in very strong support of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, or WRRDA.

West Virginia is in the Ohio River Basin, where coal makes up 59 percent of the shipped tonnage. Waterways and ports support 9,900 local jobs and directly contribute \$1.6 billion to the West Virginia economy. Domestic power plants rely on our rivers to maintain a steady supply of coal, and our country's coal exports have nearly doubled in the last 4 years. Efficient and effective water transportation has never been more important to West Virginia's economy. Projects like the Marmet Lock and Dam in my district demonstrate the importance of these projects.

I am especially pleased that this WRRDA bill takes steps to preserve the Inland Waterways Trust Fund so we can reduce the \$8 billion backlog of construction projects on our rivers. This will create jobs and spur growth.

WRRDA's passage today will be a significant victory for West Virginia jobs, for American jobs, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3080, and I thank the chairmen and the ranking members on both the committee and subcommittee. I especially thank the chairmen and ranking members for supporting provisions requested that will help the State of California.

Section 131 requires the Army Corps of Engineers to review and report on improving water supply options at Corps dams in arid regions such as California.

Section 135 allows the Corps to use Federal funds to prevent and manage aquatic invasive species on Corps projects, including quagga mussels, shore crab, and foreign algae, not only

a major California problem but a problem for many rivers and dams. They are very costly. This section will allow the Corps to assist our local agencies in combating invasive species.

Section 125 requires the Corps to re-issue regulations regarding levee vegetation and incorporate regional characteristics and levee performance.

Some of the water agencies are complaining that the Corps may be a little heavyhanded, not looking at good science when requiring removal of trees and bushes from our levees, and it would require the Corps to work with local agencies to solve the problem in a regionally appropriate and scientifically proven way.

Section 106 and 109 provide more flexibility for local agencies to sponsor Corps projects. That means accept funding.

Section 201 allows for expanded use of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

We are asking for an "aye" vote on this bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina, Governor SANFORD.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the chairman. I thank him and the other members of the committee for their work on this important bill, because it is certainly about cost. I mean, you can't do anything efficiently if you have got a 15-year permitting process.

It is certainly about competition. We are in a competition for jobs, capital, and way of life, and our ability to get product in and out depends on a vital and healthy infrastructure system. Ports like Charleston ultimately are not State ports, not regional ports, but ultimately national ports given how important, for instance, port depth will be.

But I think ultimately there is a much bigger consideration, which is a constitutional question on the balance of power. To me, what this bill fundamentally is about is reclaiming some authority that has been ceded to the executive branch that is fundamental to the overall balance of power that is so important to conservatives across this Congress, or across this Nation. Ultimately, that consideration, I think, employs even far greater weight than the cost of infrastructure and components that are important as well.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), a valued member of our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding.

I rise today in strong support and as a cosponsor of WRRDA. This bill shows that the T&I Committee is working together, finding areas of agreement, building consensus, and, yes, compromising in order to get things done for

the American people. I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for demonstrating how Congress should operate in constructing a bill that rebuilds America and creates jobs.

Earlier this year, Congressman WHITFIELD and I issued H.R. 1149 to fix our inland waterways, and WRRDA incorporates a number of WAVE 4 provisions, including project delivery process reforms, project prioritization, development of a 20-year capital investment plan, and Olmsted project reform.

In addition, this bill contains important provisions to stop the movement of Asian carp to the Great Lakes, and I urge support of Representative MCCOLLUM's amendment that I am cosponsoring which would strengthen these provisions.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I'd like to begin by commending Chairmen SHUSTER and GIBBS and Ranking Members RAHALL and BISHOP for their efforts on H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013 (WRRDA). As a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and as a co-sponsor, I rise in support of this bi-partisan legislation.

It's important to recognize that in the current political climate, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is working together to find areas of agreement, build consensus, and yes, compromise in order to get things done on behalf of the American people.

This is exactly what they sent us here to do; it's what they expect this Congress to do.

Today's Big Four agreement exemplifies this commitment to working together. And it is indicative of Chairman SHUSTER's and Ranking Member RAHALL's leadership style on the Committee. I'm hopeful that we will continue to work in a bi-partisan manner as we turn to the rail and highways & transit reauthorizations in the future.

I'd like to thank the Big Four for working with me to include several important provisions in this legislation, including language to deauthorize Dime Pier in Chicago, IL and deauthorize Lucas-Berg Pit in Worth, IL.

Dime Pier, which is located just south of Navy Pier in Chicago, is almost 100 years old and is no longer used for the purposes of navigation. WRRDA would formally deauthorize the pier, effectively allowing the City to redevelop that area of the lakefront.

Lucas-Berg Pit is a former gravel pit, located in my district, acquired by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago and designated by the Army Corps in the 1970s as a site for the placement of dredged materials from the Cal-Sag Channel. For a variety of reasons, including its proximity to the community, the site simply isn't suitable for the placement of these materials. WRRDA recognizes this reality and deauthorizes the use of the site.

I'm also pleased that WRRDA contains a number of provisions included in H.R. 1149, the Waterways Are Vital for the Economy, Energy, Efficiency, and Environment Act of 2013 (WAVE4), which Mr. WHITFIELD and I introduced earlier this year.

In particular, Title II of WRRDA includes project delivery process reforms, project prioritization, the development of a 20-year Corps capital investment plan with the Inland Waterways Users Board, and a modification to the cost sharing requirement on the Olmsted Lock and Dam project—items all addressed by WAVE4.

The Olmsted Lock and Dam cost sharing modification provision, Section 216 of the bill, is especially important. Unfortunately, Olmsted is significantly over budget and behind schedule, currently consuming most of the revenue out of the Inland Waterway Trust Fund. This has prevented virtually any other major project in the system from moving forward. Section 216 of the bill increases the federal share of the project, thus allowing more revenue in the Trust Fund to flow to other projects while Olmsted moves to completion.

I would also like to thank Ms. MCCOLLUM for offering an amendment—which I am cosponsoring—to prevent the spread of Asian carp. The Great Lakes provide an estimated 7 billion dollars of fishing activity to the region each year, activity that would be damaged by the spread of Asian carp. We must take immediate action to preserve the Great Lakes environment and all of the economic activity—from fishing and recreation to shipping and transportation—that helps make the Midwest economy strong. Under this amendment, federal agencies would partner with state and local governments to provide expertise and advice on best practices for eliminating Asian carp through activities like contract fishing and pesticide application.

While this bill is critically important, like all legislation it is not perfect. For example, one important provision currently not included in the legislation is the increased revenue necessary for the Inland Waterway Trust Fund. Given the legitimate needs and the condition of the network, industry is supportive of a user-fee increase. My legislation, WAVE 4, proposes a 6 cents-per-gallon increase, and I am hopeful Congress can address this issue in the coming months.

I would like to close by again thanking Chairmen SHUSTER and GIBBS and Ranking Members RAHALL and BISHOP for their hard work on WRRDA this year. This bill is based on compromise and collaboration, and accordingly I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman GIBBS and Mr. RAHALL and Mr. BISHOP for bringing this important legislation to the floor, and I also want to thank their staff.

This innovative legislation is vitally important to the economic well-being of our country because we have to have a strong inland waterway system in order to be competitive in the global marketplace.

Setting a priority for inland waterway projects, reforming the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' project delivery methods, and freeing up money in the Inland Waterway Trust Fund for these

projects is vitally important, and that is what this legislation does.

I also want to thank the committee for including some of the WAVE 4 language used to improve the inland waterway system. That bill was introduced in the House and in the Senate. Some of the provisions are in here.

I also want to thank the committee for including language supporting our Nation's small ports and harbors; also for their commitment to repair the aging levees that shield many of our local communities from devastating floods, hurricanes, and other disasters. I also want to thank the committee for making sure that our freedom to fish is protected.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, this bill is extremely important, and I urge support of the bill.

There is much in it to like; there are a few things that I think we ought to tweak as we move along. The levee vegetation issue is addressed. It should be modified slightly. There will be an effort to do that later.

The crediting issue is still out and about. It should be modified. It is extremely important to allow projects to move forward with local money, so I urge some modification in that.

Ports are absolutely critically important. There is great progress made in this and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund being used for its intended purpose. I commend all involved in that.

The Chief's Report issue has been significantly improved. I want to thank the chairman and others for bringing back to this Congress the power that the Constitution gives it. The Chief's Report issue is there. I would recommend that we modify it slightly to give a little bit more leeway on when and where a Chief's Report is.

All in all, it is a great bill. Congratulations, and thanks to all who were involved in writing it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Committee Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL, as well as Subcommittee Chairman GIBBS and Ranking Member BISHOP for their hard work in putting together a bill that all of us can support. There are many good things in the bill and a few things that still need some work.

The Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) is a vitally important bill to my constituents in the 3rd District of California. The levee projects that are authorized will provide life-saving protection for residents throughout California's flood prone Central Valley, while other construction projects will help to rebuild our crumbling water infrastructure and create jobs. The improvements to revitalize our ports and waterways will bolster business development and ensure that products grown and manufactured in the United States will continue to be exported around the world.

I commend Committee leadership for finding a way to authorize much needed projects without violating the earmark ban. The Natomas Levee Improvement Project will be authorized when this bill becomes law, resulting in increased flood protection for thousands of residents in the Sacramento area. However, there is more we could do. There are approximately 15 projects that have Chief's Reports in the pipeline. They aren't yet completed, but should be in the next several months. I urge an expansion of the authorization to include those projects that will have completed Chief's Reports by the end of the Fiscal Year so that important projects like the one in the Sutter Basin can begin work without wondering when we might get around to passing another WRDA bill.

Much needed language was included to instruct the Corps to revise its regulations regarding levee vegetation. Each part of the country is different and it is vital that the Corps have the flexibility to make determinations based on the individual community and what is needed to provide the most protection. As the bill moves forward in the process, I urge my colleagues to be open to discussing changes to the crediting provisions. Crediting is critical to ensure timely investments in public infrastructure and encourage local communities to start sooner than later to respond to flood threats. One slight change I would like to see would be to move the milestone earlier as to when a non-federal sponsor of a project could begin receiving credit. This does not obligate additional federal funds, nor does it guarantee a non-federal sponsor will receive credit. It merely lets local communities begin to address risks to the public safety as soon as possible.

The Committee has taken strides to reform the way money in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) is spent. Over the next several years, more funding will be funneled back to our ports to ensure those paying into the fund actually receive the dollars back to maintain the infrastructure. Again, more can be done to make sure California gets a fair shake. Most of our ports are donors to the fund, but get little back. The world is only getting smaller and we must do all that we can to ensure American products can get out of our country and into the global market. All of our ports are important to international trade and all should get adequate funding to be the best they can be.

This bill is a milestone in a divided Congress and represents compromise in an era of partisanship. A vote for this bill today is a vote for jobs and for our economy, two things we can all support.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

□ 1500

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this water resources bill, and I commend the chairman of the full committee, the ranking member, and the entire Transportation Committee for this bill.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a bill that is a step in the right direction. I

represent Chattanooga, Tennessee. We have all heard of the Chattanooga Choo Choo, but there is another place called the Chickamauga Lock in Chattanooga. This bill basically does something that I have been working on so hard since I have been in Congress. It is a step in the right direction to finally work towards funding the Chickamauga Lock.

What it does, basically, is it reforms the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. This is a trust fund right now that is fundamentally broken. Why? Because what it does is it sends all of the money to one particular lock project and starves out all of the other lock projects in the system, including Chickamauga. This bill is a great step in the right direction because it basically works to fund it. In addition to that, it is a good bill because it restores, unlike the Senate bill, the power to the Congress, in determining the funding of these locks.

Let me end by saying this. Our waterways transportation fund is critically important to this Nation, not as Democrats and Republicans, but as Americans. I know in my home city of Chattanooga, this lock, which is stopped in construction, needs to have construction started again. These are American jobs. These are American exports. These are American goods. This is a bill that is a step in the right direction for a great America.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), who has worked very hard on this legislation and does a superb job of representing her ports in southern Florida.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of this bill, and I want to thank the chairman and ranking members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for extraordinary leadership in bringing this bipartisan and very important bill to the floor.

Transportation moves our economy, and our waterways play a vital role. This bill is about jobs for America, and as a Floridian, I am pleased to support this legislation that promotes our ports and protects our most precious wetlands, the Everglades.

Today's proposal will allow Florida's east coast ports in Miami, Fort Lauderdale, and Jacksonville to advance in preparation for the widening of the Panama Canal. Accommodation of larger and heavier loaded post-Panamax freight ships is expected to create tens of thousands of jobs with a multibillion-dollar impact to Florida's economy.

Today's bill also authorizes important projects that help restore Florida's most important watershed, the Everglades, with a four-to-one return on every dollar spent.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. This restoration means improving water quality for millions of people, protecting our natural habitat, increasing property values, expanding recreational opportunities, and boosting tourism for Florida. As this bill progresses, I hope we can work together to extend the period of authorization, as in years past.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very good bipartisan bill. It is good for Florida, and it is good for our country. I urge its support.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 13¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013.

Among many other vital water projects in Texas, this bill authorizes funding for the deepening of the Sabine-Neches, where 100 million tons of cargo transit annually. The Sabine-Neches Waterway is a major economic contributor to both Texas and America, providing \$106 billion in revenue for our Nation's economy.

America's aging infrastructure is a threat to a healthy national economy. Thirteen million jobs rely on water infrastructure, and it is up to Congress to ensure that America's ports, waterways, and water systems remain the very best in the world.

I applaud Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for their diligence, and also my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for their tremendous work.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and thank her for her tremendous input and help on this legislation as we developed the bill.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the 2013 Water Resources Reform and Development Act.

Our Nation's infrastructure is critical to a thriving economy. In Florida alone, civil works projects improve navigation at our many ports, assist with flood control, restore the Everglades ecosystem, and help protect our pristine beaches, which are central to our \$65-billion-a-year tourism industry. Yet Congress has, unfortunately, passed only one WRRDA bill in the last 13 years, so this legislation is certainly long overdue and much needed. I am grateful for the committee's leadership in championing this effort.

WRDA 2000 launched the visionary Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, or CERP. This 30-year Federal-State partnership is the largest environmental restoration project in our Nation's history. After much delay, projects are now underway. This bill authorizes four additional much-needed components.

One of those is the Broward Water Preserve, located in my congressional district. This project will help capture, store, and distribute surface water runoff from the Everglades and assist with flood protection and groundwater recharge.

I am also pleased the manager's amendment will allow non-Federal sponsors to prefund projects prior to authorization, and I appreciate Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL's flexibility that this amendment affords my community. This will assist Port Everglades, a major economic engine in south Florida.

Port Everglades generates nearly \$26 billion a year in economic activity, but needs to be deepened from 42 feet to 48 feet to allow it to be competitive in attracting deeper draft cargo ships in the post-Panama Canal expansion market.

The Army Corps, after considerable urging from the Florida delegation, is close to completing a long-delayed dredge study to make this happen. Despite years of intense efforts, the final study is not yet ready for authorization by this bill.

Again, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for their commitment to returning to a more regular WRRDA process. We simply cannot wait another 6 or 7 years to authorize the next step of public infrastructure projects. We need to start the next WRRDA bill in a timely fashion.

In Florida alone, there are four critical projects almost ready for authorization, including Port Everglades, two other Florida ports projects, and the Central Everglades Planning Project. All four of these initiatives are critical to our State and should not have to wait many years to receive authorization simply because of either Congress' or the Army Corps' delay.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill that will focus on our ability to create jobs and make sure we can move our economy forward.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill. Kentucky's Fourth District is home to 276 miles of the Ohio River and three locks and dams. As such, we are willing hosts to millions of tons of interstate commerce.

Pursuant to our Constitution, there is a Federal role in transportation and

infrastructure. Transportation is one of the few things that Congress actually should spend money on. In fact, the constitutionality of this issue was settled two centuries ago during our Nation's infancy, in 1824, with the landmark Supreme Court decision ruling in *Gibbons v. Ogden*. A congressional precedent for maintaining national infrastructure was established with the Rivers and Harbors Act of that same year. As long as our country has been in existence, transportation has been a priority, especially waterborne transportation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. CHAKA FATTAH, a very powerful member of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and I want to first thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member RAHALL, and TIM BISHOP for their hard work. The committee has developed a product that is worthy of House support, and I rise in support of it.

We are almost at the 80th anniversary of the Mississippi River Control Council. We have seen a lot of progress in my part of the country in terms of waterways. I like the work that the committee has done on the Harbor Maintenance Fund.

I serve on the Energy and Water Appropriations Committee, as the ranking member has indicated. The Army Corps has taken some hits on this matter. Really, it is the responsibility of Congress to put us in a position to move forward. Some of the delays that have been occasioned by the environmental assessment have been much too long, and I think that the committee's efforts to shorten that is good. I have some concerns about limitations on dollars, but I know that, as this bill goes forward, it will be perfected even more.

So I rise in support, and I hope that many Members of the House will find it within their purview to support this important legislation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my honor to yield 30 seconds to the majority leader of the House, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman from Pennsylvania for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor as I rise in support of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013.

Mr. Chair, our economy remains weak, and many working families are struggling. Many are having a hard time paying their bills, and others are struggling to find work. The American people deserve an efficient, effective, and accountable government that is focused on finding bipartisan solutions that will reignite our economy so those

who are looking for a job are able to find one. The legislation before us today will provide a big step in that direction.

This is a fiscally responsible bill that will create jobs and ensure that America remains competitive in the global economy. It will encourage investing in our national water transportation networks, while cutting red tape and streamlining the infrastructure project delivery process.

Our waterways and ports support over \$1.4 trillion worth of goods each year, and over the next few decades our trade volume is expected to grow exponentially. Every State in this country and millions of hardworking American families depend on the many parts of our waterway infrastructure to be strong economic arteries.

Other countries around the world have been investing in their commercial infrastructure to improve their standing in the global marketplace and so that they can gain a competitive edge. As a result, improving and strengthening our ports and inland waterways is not just an economic desire, it is an economic necessity.

This bill authorizes the Army Corps of Engineers to develop, maintain, and build important development projects, streamlines redundant environmental reviews, and establishes a transparent process for future activities with strong congressional oversight—and it does so without any earmarks. This is a commonsense bill that should garner bipartisan support because it will help revitalize our waterways, our ports, and our economy. The American people are counting on their elected leaders to restore trust in our government and faith in our economy, and this bill is an important part of achieving that goal.

Again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman SHUSTER, and the rest of the members on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on both sides of the aisle for their hard work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, this is how Congress ought to work with one another, all 435 of us. I don't mean that 435 are going to vote for the bill, but we have worked together on this bill.

And I want to congratulate the chairman, Mr. SHUSTER, whose father would be proud of him and would have acted in the same way, working together to make things happen for America in a bipartisan way. So I congratulate Mr. SHUSTER, Congressman SHUSTER, brother SHUSTER.

I also want to congratulate NICK JOE RAHALL from West Virginia, who has been such an expert on the areas of

building America and growing our economy.

□ 1515

I want to thank also Dr. TIM BISHOP, TIM BISHOP from Long Island, who has worked so hard on this particular piece of legislation.

As I have said many times, Mr. Chairman, from this floor, Congress has a responsibility to take bipartisan action to boost our economic competitiveness in a way that will create jobs. This bill has the potential and, in my opinion, will do exactly that.

While the bill is not perfect—none of them are—by investing in our Nation's infrastructure, including ports and waterways, as this bill does, we can lay the groundwork for a more efficient delivery system for American-made products to reach markets in our country and overseas.

Promoting and increasing U.S. exports is a core component of the House Democrats and, I might say, a bipartisan Make It in America plan for jobs and competitiveness.

I hope Democrats and Republicans can work together in a bipartisan way, as Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL have done with this bill, to move additional pieces of Make It in America legislation to the floor so we can further promote exports, pursue a national manufacturing strategy, encourage the return of innovation and jobs from overseas, and secure a skilled workforce for the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, I will support this bill today for what it does to create jobs and improve our waterborne transportation; but I hope that, as the House and Senate develop a final bill, the conferees will look closely at the environmental review provisions to make certain that we can strike an appropriate balance between expediting projects, while understanding their impact on the environment.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to work with us to make sure that our efforts to provide certainty account for the size and complexity of some WRRDA projects.

If we can continue to act in a bipartisan way, as I know Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. RAHALL will do, we can send a message that Congress is ready to move forward and help more of our people make it in America.

I hope we can tap into the spirit of cooperation by scheduling consideration of a comprehensive immigration reform legislation which, like this bill, has support from both sides of the aisle, from business, from labor, from religions groups, and from leading nonprofits. That is a challenge I think that we can meet this year.

Again, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

SHUSTER), who has worked hard in a focused and bipartisan way to bring this day to fruition, and I congratulate him.

I thank Mr. RAHALL, my good friend, who has worked so diligently over so many years to make sure that people can make it in America, and that America invests in itself.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the whip for his kind words.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act.

I am privileged to represent Rome, New York, where nearly 2 centuries ago, our Nation embarked on its first major transportation project, the Erie Canal.

This bill before us creates jobs by updating and reauthorizing water infrastructure projects. It reforms the outdated process that allows projects to be approved by the Army Corps of Engineers.

This legislation cuts \$12 billion from a backlog of outdated projects. It is fiscally responsible and doesn't include a single earmark, a much-needed departure from past water resources development bills.

By passing WRRDA, we facilitate trade, keep products moving across America, and create jobs in our communities. Congress has an opportunity before it today to help America do what it does best: compete. We should seize it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a member of the committee.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this WRRDA bill. The bill provides the much-needed oversight of the Army Corps of Engineers, streamlines the environmental review process, and consolidates duplicative analyses of projects that have delayed important infrastructure improvements, sometimes for as long as 15 years. These types of delays have cost our economy billions of dollars and have put the United States at a competitive disadvantage.

I am also pleased that this bill will provide additional funding for smaller ports, like in Mount Vernon, Indiana. The Mount Vernon Port has several businesses headquartered on its property and is vitally important to the economy of southwest Indiana. A functioning water transportation system is critical for their success now and in the future.

I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member RAHALL, Subcommittee Chairman GIBBS, and Subcommittee Ranking Member BISHOP for

working together on this important piece of legislation that makes government work better for our taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Thank you very much, Chairman SHUSTER.

I rise today as well in support of this bill because it is a jobs bill, and it is not just a jobs bill because the government spends money to create jobs. It is a jobs bill because it builds infrastructure that we need in this country to remain competitive and get our goods to market throughout the world.

Having grown up in Corpus Christi, Texas, served by the Port of Corpus Christi, a deepwater port on the Intra-coastal Waterway, I know the needs and how important it is to have ports and waterways that are here to serve our Nation.

That is one of the reasons I am working with my colleague from across the aisle, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, and a variety of other Texas Members to support the Texas Port Conference to raise awareness of how critical ports and waterways are to the jobs throughout this Nation.

I urge my colleagues to get behind this jobs bill to get America back to work.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer my thanks to Chairman SHUSTER and also to Subcommittee Chairman BOB GIBBS. They have done a wonderful job with this bill. It is a bipartisan bill.

I rise today as a cosponsor and a proud supporter of WRRDA. I like to actually call it WRRDA, since we have got the extra R. Reform matters; and in this bill it shows that we can move things forward and we can make a difference.

But I have got to tell you, Mr. Chairman, it is good to be back here governing this week and focusing on commonsense policies like this one here today.

Why is WRRDA critical?

Because our waterways provide a cost-effective, fuel-efficient way to move our goods, and we must maintain and support U.S. infrastructure.

I come from a district that borders the Mississippi and is blessed with productive farmland; 81 percent of our U.S. ag exports are waterborne, and with trade expected to double by 2021, we must rebuild our capacity.

With a \$60 billion water project backlog, I believe this program provides a solution to move projects forward; and, again, I am proud to support and cosponsor this bill. I look forward to helping this committee advance this important legislation through this process and have this bill signed into law by the President.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, may I have the time remaining on both sides, please.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia has 11½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for his leadership in bringing the WRRDA bill to the floor.

I wanted to talk specifically about the Morganza to the Gulf project. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been down to Terrebonne and Lafourche Parish and seen this project that is so vital, not only for hurricane protection, but also for protecting the infrastructure that produces 30 percent of our Nation's oil and gas, a lot of the energy infrastructure for our country.

I know the process that has been set up in this bill allows for Chief's Reports, once they move forward, to then go to the committee for hearing. The Chief's Report for this project wasn't completed until after the last hearing that your committee had.

I just wanted to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania to see if there was going to be another committee hearing in the near future to take up new projects that have gotten Chief's Reports since that time, and to see if Morganza to the Gulf would be one of the projects that we could have on that list.

Mr. SHUSTER. I would like to engage in a colloquy, but first, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to stress that the Morganza to the Gulf project is of immense importance to Louisiana's coastal restoration and protection efforts. It protects both fragile wetlands from hurricane surge and also is environmentally sound.

The Corps estimates it will prevent an estimated \$1 billion in flood-related damages annually and protect over 53,000 structures. The Corps supports this project. Their own analysis indicates it will provide over \$300 million in annual economic benefit.

It has been under study for the last two decades, was previously authorized

in 2000 and 2007; and as Mr. SCALISE notes, recently a completed Chief's Report was filed which stated the project is economically justified, environmentally sound and acceptable, and of sound engineering.

That said, there is this problem with the late filing of the Chief's Report. We do need this project authorized, and I ask that the legislation be passed and that it go to conference, where Mr. SCALISE, Mr. VITTER, and I can all work with the chairman on this.

I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to please hold these hearings and to review all projects that have received a Chief's Report.

Mr. SHUSTER. I reserve my answer until I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) for a colloquy.

The CHAIR. The gentlemen from Louisiana's time have expired.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. CAPUANO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is the exact situation for Boston. We have our Chief's Report. It was 2 weeks past the deadline, and I know that we have already spoken. I know that you are more than willing to help us do what we need to do, and I appreciate that. I am just here to say thank you.

Mr. SHUSTER. I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, like everybody else here today, let me thank you for your leadership, not only on this bill, but on the overall Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. It is truly bipartisan.

Secondly, I want to talk about the flood-control project impacting residents of my district that I have been working on for more than a decade.

The Chief's Report is in: Orestimba Creek and San Joaquin River Basin near the city of Newman, located in my district. The Army Corps has officially endorsed the authorization of a plan for flood-risk management by constructing a levee along the city of Newman's northwestern perimeter known as the Chevron Levee.

This project is a local partnership with the city of Newman and the County of Stanislaus and was initiated over a decade ago.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DENHAM. Without construction of this levee, the people of Newman and the surrounding area will be at continual risk of flooding resulting from the overflow of Orestimba Creek. In association with the construction of the levee, the city of Newman will develop and implement an advance warning system.

Mr. Chairman, included in this legislation we are considering today are several Chief's Reports that were received in time for the committee to review. I ask that your commitment to working with me to ensure the Chief's Report on Orestimba can be reviewed in this process.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman, and all of my colleagues. At this point I would like to respond to them, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One of the key principles in developing WRRDA was increasing transparency, accountability and congressional oversight without ceding constitutional congressional responsibility to the executive branch.

WRRDA authorizes 23 vital water resources projects that have completed the technical review by the Corps of Engineers and have been recommended by the Corps of Engineers.

The committee held a full committee hearing to review all the pending Chief's Reports on June 5, 2013. My position has been clear. In order to maintain our constitutional congressional authority, Congress must review the Chief's Reports and specifically authorize them. We cannot hand over our authority to the administration and the Corps of Engineers to self-authorize.

Chief's Reports have been finalized on the three reports that the gentleman has questioned and will be reviewed and considered by the committee as we continue to work through WRRDA.

To provide strong congressional oversight, I commit to holding a hearing at the appropriate time in the process so that the very important issues are fully considered and have the opportunity to be addressed.

With that, I thank the gentlemen for engaging in colloquy, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), a very valuable member of our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee who has had tremendous input on this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member, and I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman, as well as the subcommittee chair and ranking member.

This is a recognition of the extraordinary importance of Federal investment in the infrastructure of the United States of America to engage in both domestic and international commerce. Sometimes that seems to be lacking around here. We seem to lump everything the Federal Government does into one big pot, and if you have got something you don't like, it kind of all gets associated together.

This is a program that will be paid for out of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. Yes, there is a trust fund—sort of, kind of. It has got \$7 billion of theoretical balance in it. Unfortunately, our friends on the Appropriations Committee have seen fit to spend that \$7 billion on other things because it is not a real trust fund.

This legislation will begin to move us back toward utilizing those dedicated tax dollars in a dedicated way to maintaining the port and maritime infrastructure of the United States of America. I mean, here we are today, the Corps of Engineers has stopped dredging all small ports. I will tell you what; that is kind of a disaster in my State, and it is a disaster all around the country.

I have one port where they have to take the boats out of the water onto a dock, and they are having trouble even now getting into that port at high tide to get the boats up onto the dock. I have other channel entrances that are shoaling and becoming dangerous. We are going to lose lives because the Corps doesn't have the money to do the work. We have jetties that are failing. If we fix them now, \$10 million, \$15 million; if they go totally a failure, \$50 million. Now, what sense does that make? But we are the United States of America. We can't afford to do the \$10 million to \$15 million now. We have dams and locks that are failing. Are we going to wait until they fail or are we going to do the repairs now?

This bill begins to move us in the direction of doing the repairs that are needed to better move commerce, people, and goods in this country. It is long, long overdue. And this bill has a 10 percent set-aside which will be dedicated to the small ports.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. This year, I had to get my State to partner with the Federal Government so the Federal Government would bring the four dredges with the Corps crews down to dredge my small ports, paid for by the State of Oregon. My State doesn't have a lot of money, but we partnered and we did that. There are innovative solutions that will work, too. But long term, we need the full investment. We need the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund dollars to be spent on needed harbor maintenance.

As I mentioned earlier, I have a jetty at Coos Bay that is failing. We could fix it now for less or a lot more later. We have a jetty on the Columbia River that is failing. We can fix it now for less or a lot more later. That is repeated all around the country.

And I am glad to see today the bipartisan work here and the agreement on the critical infrastructure role that only the Federal Government can play

using funds raised federally on imports into the United States of America, a tariff that is placed on those that is dedicated to these functions. It is a paid-for program. We need it now.

I congratulate Members for their good work.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDING). The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the distinguished Policy Committee chairman.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring up my support for this bill but also to be able to talk about the limited funds that the Corps of Engineers have. They have very limited funds because the United States of America obviously has limited funds, what we actually receive from the taxpayers.

There is a study within this bill itself that is being proposed that looks at the low-priority projects and the things that are not within the core mission of the Corps of Engineers. That study doesn't need to be a study to nowhere. It does need to be a study to look at the low-priority inventory and then just go in a drawer and say, Gosh, we have low-priority inventory that we can't afford to maintain that sits closed and a local municipality can't open it. So we need to be able to establish the next step on that.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the gentleman.

I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on it. I agree with him. We need to move forward to get these properties off the Corps' books, so we will continue to work with the gentleman to make sure we expedite this and make sure the Corps is eliminating things that are not important to their mission.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to another gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER). This particular gentleman is a member of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee and has been a leader on that committee in discussions about financing this Nation's infrastructure, whether it be water port infrastructure or highway infrastructure, and I commend him for that leadership.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, I feel like I am just a member of the T&I Alumni Association. I deeply cherish the time that I spent on the committee, on the Water Resources Subcommittee, and I appreciate the hard work that the committee has moving forward, trying to find some areas of agreement in a

sometimes fractured House and focus on the big picture: What is going to put America in the best position going forward?

I am going to have an amendment coming forward talking a little bit about some of the backlog and some of the NEPA efforts, but one of the fundamental problems we have now is that we are not providing the resources to move the projects forward. There is a backlog of \$60 billion, and there are opportunities here to add to it. The point we want to focus on is being able to deal meaningfully with it so we don't have projects that go stale, that are outmoded, that are past their shelf life.

Another thing that I hope to be able to work with the committee on in the future deals with the principles and guidelines for the Corps that were established in 1983. This was a project of mine for years on the committee. We finally updated them, but they have been stalled by some hold, I think, through the appropriations process that have stymied them, so they are not going forward.

These principles and guidelines, if they were adopted in 1983, were clearly in the process in the mid-seventies. We have learned a lot over the course of almost 40 years; and I am hopeful that we can focus on the big picture, get the resources that are necessary to do the job right and then be able to have the flexibility to make sure that the Corps has up-to-date tools to do its jobs better.

I look forward to further debate. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and the hard work that the committee has done.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, I am here to support H.R. 3080 and to compliment the ranking member and the chairman for the work they have done on this valuable bill. I support it because it creates jobs and deauthorizes \$12 billion in backlogged projects that are outdated and do not have construction funds obligated.

I do want to point out that there are some issues with the text of the bill that my constituents have brought to my attention. For example, one dam in the Second District of New Mexico is awaiting approval from the D.C. Corps of Engineers office but likely will not get approval until January, with a projected contract awarded in March 2014. I have been assured by the chairman and committee staff that the deauthorization language will not target projects like this one, projects that are in a study, design, or reevaluation phase.

I thank the chairman of the Transportation Committee for his efforts to pass this vital infrastructure bill and for ensuring that the cuts are targeted toward wasteful and unnecessary

projects, not those that impact public safety and our economic well-being.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico and am committed to working with him.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), a very valued member of our committee.

Ms. TITUS. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member of this important committee for their work on this bill, and I would also like to thank my colleague from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for his leadership as part of this bill in addressing the enormous challenges that invasive species present to our country's waters.

In southern Nevada—you think of that as a desert, but there is a lot of water there—the spread of the quagga mussels is a growing threat to Lake Mead, which contributes nearly \$1 billion to the local economy and supplies 90 percent of southern Nevada's water supply. The spread of quagga mussels in this critical reservoir has led to expensive countermeasures by the Bureau of Reclamation, which is spending nearly \$1 million a year to prevent quaggas from infiltrating the Boulder Dam intakes. The Southern Nevada Water Authority was also forced to redesign the water intake 3 project, which is currently underway, to prevent quagga mussels from growing there as well. If unchecked, the mussels can clog the intakes to prevent water from reaching the residents and the visitors to southern Nevada. Likewise, Lake Tahoe, which borders Nevada and California, is on the edge of waterways where quagga mussels have been found and are taking hold. Should quagga mussels establish colonies in Lake Tahoe, the annual impact would be over \$22 million a year.

The amendment that is part of this bill would direct the GAO to examine the current efforts to address the spread of invasives and to help develop a long-term strategy. So I would urge my colleagues to not only support the bill, but also the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I want to thank Chairmen SHUSTER and GIBBS, and Ranking Members RAHALL and BISHOP for their hard work on this legislation. I also want to thank them for accepting the Nolan Amendment during Committee Markup that expands the use of the Noxious Weed program to cover aquatic invasives providing an additional tool to address the growing threat of invasive species to our environment and our economy. I want to thank my colleague from California, Mr. THOMPSON, for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support our Amendment.

The amendment itself is simple, but the underlying issue it addresses is complicated and critical because aquatic invasives impact communities across the country, including Las Vegas. In Southern Nevada we are facing

enormous challenges with the spread of Quagga Mussels into our local waters, in particular, Lake Mead. Lake Mead is a crown jewel of the National Park Service system welcoming 8 million visitors every year, and contributing up to \$1 billion to the local and regional economy.

In addition to the recreational opportunities from boating and fishing, Lake Mead is also essential to the vitality of Las Vegas and Southern Nevada, providing 90% of our water. The spread of Quagga mussels in this critical reservoir has led to expensive countermeasures by the Bureau of Reclamation, which is spending nearly \$1 million a year to prevent Quaggas from infiltrating the Boulder Dam intakes. In addition to countermeasures to prevent mussel infestation in Las Vegas' water intakes number 1 and 2 in Lake Mead, the Southern Nevada Water Authority has had to change the design of the water intake 3 project, currently underway, to prevent Quagga colonies from growing there as well. If unchecked, the mussels can clog the intakes, preventing water from reaching residents and visitors in Southern Nevada.

In addition to impacts in Southern Nevada, I am concerned about the mussels spreading to other parts of our country. Lake Tahoe, which borders Nevada and California, is on the edge of the waterways where Quagga mussels have taken hold. According to a 2009 Army Corps analysis, should Quaggas establish colonies in Lake Tahoe, the annual economic impact would be \$22 million.

These are issues we cannot afford to ignore.

Our amendment directs the GAO to examine the current state of efforts to address the spread of invasives, and to develop a long-term strategy to address this growing concern.

Again I urge my colleagues to support our amendment.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield Chairman SHUSTER an additional 2 minutes of my time for him to control.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, as we conclude this debate, I want to once again commend Chairman SHUSTER, Subcommittee Chairman Gibbs, and our ranking member, Mr. BISHOP of New York, for the tremendous effort that has been made to bring this legislation where it is today.

It started out with Chairman SHUSTER's leadership early on in this Congress at the Member level. It spread to the staff level, and it has continued every day. It has been a transparent process and a process in which we have been in communication with one another. And as I said in the very beginning, I hope this will be a signal of how this committee will bring future pieces of legislation to the floor, and I just hope that it will be a signal to the entire Congress how we should be working closer together in a bipartisan fashion.

This legislation has a wide array of supporters. I have a list here of some

five pages of labor, industry, and business supporters that have written members of our committee in strong support of the pending legislation. They include: the American Coal Ash Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Association of Home Builders, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Friends from labor, including carpenters, transportation trades, AFL-CIO, Laborers' International, and many other labor organizations have come together in support of this legislation.

And as I summarize and conclude my comments, I want to quote the president of the Transportation Trades Department of the AFL-CIO, Mr. Ed Wytkind. He wrote members of our committee:

Real investment in harbor maintenance is vital to the health of an industry that supports 500,000 jobs, plays a critical role in expanding U.S. exports, and is the gateway to international trade and humanitarian aid. H.R. 3080 will help improve our maritime infrastructure and keep pace with our international competitors, and will also create thousands of good-paying construction and maritime jobs during what remains a slow economic recovery. I urge you to vote in favor of this important legislation.

I will conclude by again thanking Chairman SHUSTER for his superb leadership and join with all my colleagues in urging passage of this vital piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the Chair, and I yield myself the remaining time.

I also thank members from the other side of the aisle, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and their staff for all their hard work and for working together to produce a bipartisan bill, a bill that is full of policy, full of reform, a bill that is fiscally responsible and, I must say, is the most fiscally responsible WRRDA in the history of WRRDA. There are no earmarks, but we made sure that we did not cede any of our constitutional congressional authority to the executive branch, which I believe is very important for this body and for the Congress.

As I have said, we have worked together in a bipartisan fashion in talking to the stakeholders at roundtables and in hearings and coming up with a piece of legislation, and I am very proud we have it on the floor today.

Again, our thanks to Ranking Member RAHALL, Ranking Member BISHOP, and the entire staff on the minority for working with us so closely.

Also, I would like to thank our staff for the long hours that they have put in, and my counterpart, Subcommittee Chairman GIBBS, for his efforts and his

staff member Joe Price who worked so hard and also John Anderson, Geoff Bowman, Jonathan Pawlow, and Tracy Zea from the Water Resources Subcommittee.

And in the front office, starting with the leadership of Chris Bertram, the staff director, and a special thanks to the deputy staff director and my longtime staff member Steve Martinko for ramrodding this through the committee—I appreciate his support—Beth Spivey, Matt Sturges, Jim Tymon, Jennifer Hall, Clare Doherty, Jim Billimoria, Justin Harclerode, Michael Marinaccio, Caryn Moore, Denny Wirtz, and Keith Hall. All of these folks put in so many hours to make sure that we have on the floor here today a very good product, one that I am proud to stand behind, and I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of H.R. 3080.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013, and to commend committee Chairman SHUSTER and ranking member RAHALL, as well as subcommittee chairman GIBBS and ranking member TIM BISHOP, for their efforts in crafting and bringing to the floor this very important water infrastructure bill.

Mr. Chair, according to the American Association of Port Authorities, U.S. seaports move 99.4% of the country's overseas cargo by volume. Every one of the 50 states relies on seaports for imports and exports, totaling some \$3.8 billion worth of goods moving through U.S. seaports each day. And our ports support the employment of more than 13 million Americans.

As the Representative from the 8th Congressional District of Massachusetts, I represent the Port of Boston. In fact, my District Office is actually located on a pier within the industrial port.

Observing the day to day operations of the Port, and also being a Member of the Congressional Ports Caucus, I know firsthand that ports and waterways are vital to our economic prosperity.

For instance, the Port of Boston generates \$2.4 billion in economic benefits annually and 34,000 jobs are connected to port activities. With the expected 2015 completion of the Panama Canal expansion project, those numbers should only increase as larger container ships utilize our ports on both coasts.

Mr. Chair, the Boston Harbor Navigation Improvement Project, recently recommended and approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, will allow the Port of Boston to keep pace with what lies ahead and with our global competitors.

I look forward to working with the authors of this bill to move this important project forward.

Mr. Chair, we all have a stake in the success of our ports and waterways and need to more frequently address our critical water infrastructure and flood control projects. That is why I also applaud the authors for including in the bill a Sense of Congress that we consider a water resources bill no less than every two years.

Getting this bill to the floor required making difficult choices. I want to again thank its authors for their efforts.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, a bipartisan bill that is an important step toward creating good jobs here at home and growing our economy while improving our waterways infrastructure and addressing significant risks to public safety.

The House WRRDA bill makes crucial investments in ports and waterways and is an important vehicle to improve our nation's flood protection systems. Maintaining and investing in these resources is essential to economic prosperity and public safety both because there are a substantial number of jobs linked to waterways and ports and because flood damage poses a serious risk to the livelihoods and economies of communities across the country.

Although I am voting in favor of this bill and believe that passage of it is critical, I am deeply concerned by misguided environmental streamlining provisions in the bill that ultimately will weaken the National Environmental Protection Act. Although the major reason for the Army Corps of Engineers' project delay is a backlog in projects and a lack of funding for those projects, the troublesome provisions in this bill instead purport to address that issue by unwisely undermining the effectiveness of NEPA reviews through unreasonable time restrictions and limitations on the quality of information available to both reviewing agencies and the public. In addition, the bill undermines the integrity of several other foundational environmental laws, including the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. Ultimately, these provisions will weaken environmental protections and undermine other elements in the bill that are designed to improve efficiency. It is critical that concerns over these provisions be addressed in the conference committee on this bill so that we can ensure final passage of a bill that create jobs, improves our waterways infrastructures, and protects the environment.

Once again, I urge support for WRRDA and look forward to working with my colleagues to improve the bill further to secure final passage of a bill that helps create jobs across the country in an environmentally responsible way.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I strongly support the Water Resources, Reform, and Development Act. WRDA is an important bill for my area. We have critical flood control projects and our Port of Houston, which is the largest port for foreign tonnage in the country, is an economic engine for the entire region.

I prefer the Senate language in some ways, especially the funding for dredging at our ports. But, the bill in front of us represents the hard work of both sides of the T&I committee and I appreciate the leadership that they have shown on this issue and I look forward to supporting it.

I am pleased that Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL included language in the managers amendment that my colleagues and I from the Houston area requested regarding assumption of maintenance. This lan-

guage is important because we want to incentivize entities like Ports to take on some of the responsibilities for deepening and widening channels and other projects, but we have to make sure that the federal government lives up to their responsibility to assume the maintenance. I want to make sure that the language that was included is the best way to accomplish this and I look forward to working with the Army Corps of Engineers, the Port of Houston, and our committee leadership to make any necessary changes and I am pleased that they are working with us toward achieving our policy intent.

I support this bill and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 3080, the "Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013," better known as "WRRDA." This legislation is long overdue, and although it is a good down-payment, this body needs to take far more drastic steps to repair and replace our nation's aging and increasingly uncompetitive water infrastructure—which will require more than \$1 trillion in investment over the next couple of decades.

Americans across the country will benefit commercially and economically from the improvements to infrastructure and the jobs provided by those projects. The competitive benefits and the economic jolt provided by WRRDA is an important investment in our future. It means that manufacturers can ship more cheaply and more quickly, and can more easily return jobs to our shores than if they had to struggle to bring their goods to the market. It also means that well-trained and hard-working men and women will go back to work, which will provide needed inertia to an economy that has been heavily battered by the last few weeks of brinksmanship.

I will be supporting this bill because I believe that our current infrastructure backlog is desperately in need of legislative action. However, I have a number of misgivings about this bill, which I hope my colleagues will address during a conference between the chambers. Though my concerns are many, I can sum them up simply: H.R. 3080 does not do enough to eliminate the infrastructure deficit or to ensure that we do so in the most responsible way.

One problem I have is that H.R. 3080 makes across the board cuts to previously authorized projects—\$12 billion out of a roughly \$60 billion backlog. This "Sequester" style cut is a bad legislative approach. The solution to a problem often requires a more deft touch than simply lopping off whatever portion seems right. Americans are already fed up with this sort of austerity from the across the board cuts that went into effect at the beginning of 2013, which has wreaked havoc upon important programs and on the American economy. I urge my colleagues to make their decisions based on a more thorough review of the merits of individual projects, instead of just demanding \$12 billion in cuts and turning the scissors over to the Army Corps of Engineers.

Another problem I have lies with the "streamlining approach" found in this legislation which does little to actually eliminate the delays that keep important projects in limbo. I am especially concerned about the portions of

H.R. 3080 which dramatically alter the environmental safeguards built into existing law. One of those changes, which would cut the time that communities have to review final agency approval of water infrastructure projects from six years to 150 days—a cut of nearly 95 percent—could undermine the rights of citizens to hold their government accountable for the impact that projects may have on their community. However, even after the environmental review process is completed, these projects still face potentially endless delays because of how the appropriations process leads to grossly inadequate funding levels. That is why I support and I urge my colleagues to support the DeFazio Amendment, which will require the tremendous backlog of projects to be reduced before the environmental safeguards are touched.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3080, because although its flaws are many, it will put the shovel in the ground to dig us out of the ditch we are in. Americans are passing trillions in debt—in the form of outdated roads and water resources—on to the next generation. This may not be everything we need, but it is a good start.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, a water resources bill in 2013 is critical to the success of America, and crucial to our economic growth and job creation. The last water resources bill was signed into law six years ago, making this one long overdue. I would like to thank Mr. SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for their leadership in moving this legislation forward.

American international trade accounts for more than one quarter of our Gross Domestic Product. More than 99 percent of our overseas trade moves through America's seaports. Cargo moving through our seaports is responsible for more than 13 million American jobs and generates in excess of \$200 billion annually in federal, state, and local tax revenues. We need to keep America's economic recovery moving forward by ensuring that when American workers make products, we can efficiently move them through our ports to overseas markets.

To that end, I hope my colleagues across the aisle will support the WRRDA bill so that our navigation channels and ports are operating at their optimal levels. Of all U.S. overseas exports, 99.4 percent are waterborne and go through ports.

For America to remain on top the global economy, we need to be competitive internationally so that global consumers increasingly purchase American-made goods.

This bill takes an important first step in addressing an issue of key concern to not only the Port of Houston and Galveston in Texas, but to all of our nations' ports, the collection and use of the federal Harbor Maintenance Tax. The WRRDA bill also includes numerous reforms to help meet the maritime transportation needs of our nation today and in the future.

America's public ports and their private sector partners plan to invest more than \$46 billion in seaport infrastructure in the next five years. It is important that we pass this historic legislation by investing in America's transportation infrastructure. Maintaining America's link to the global marketplace by creating and

maintaining modern and efficient seaport and waterway infrastructure will provide significant benefits to our nation's economic vitality, job growth, and international competitiveness, as well as create sizable tax revenues from cargo and trade activities.

Ports serve as America's gateway to the global economy. The nation's economic prosperity rests on the ability of containerized and bulk cargo arriving unimpeded at U.S. ports to support the "just in time" delivery system that underpins the manufacturing and retail sectors.

According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), ports, waterways, and vessels are part of an economic engine handling more than \$700 billion in merchandise annually, according to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and an attack on this system could have a widespread impact on global shipping, international trade, and the global economy. The Port of Houston houses approximately 100 steamship lines offering services that link Houston with 1,053 ports in 203 countries. It is also home to a \$15 billion petrochemical complex, the largest in the nation and second largest worldwide.

As a result, it is an ideal port for examining security practices in the maritime environment. At the Port of Houston, and other ports across the country, balancing security concerns with the need to facilitate the free flow of people and commerce remains an ongoing challenge for both the public and private sectors.

Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member RAHALL, Chairman GIBBS and Ranking Member BISHOP in working with the Texas Delegation on behalf of our constituents to strengthen the bill by encouraging non-federal entities to invest in their harbor maintenance and step in when the Army Corps of Engineers cannot.

This legislative provision particularly benefits ports like the Port of Houston which have invested substantial amounts of their own funds to complete critical infrastructure in order to provide for safe navigation of larger vessels, and to assure its terminals remain competitive in the world market. This success complements my efforts to secure necessary funding for harbor dredging in the FY 2014 Energy and Water Appropriations Act.

Furthermore, I would like to thank the Committee leadership for supporting the Jackson Lee Amendment #9 on the roster and including the amendment En Bloc. This amendment provides that in making recommendations pursuant to Section 118 of the Act, the Secretary shall consult with key stakeholders, including State, county, and city governments, and, where applicable, State and local water districts, and in the case of recommendations concerning projects that substantially affect underrepresented communities the Secretary shall also consult with historically Black colleges and universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and other minority-serving institutions.

Mr. Chair, as you are aware, it is an essential tool in our desire to improve the lives of low income and minority communities as well as the environment at large.

I am sure we will never forget the critical impact from Hurricane Sandy that crippled the Northeast area from Massachusetts to North

Carolina. And not long before Hurricane Sandy, as we were working to learn how to prevent another Hurricane Katrina that crippled the great City of New Orleans. Our nation was still healing from Hurricane Ike and Hurricane Rita which crippled Houston, Texas.

Thereby highlighting the importance of not only giving greater attention to our underserved communities but also how we can help our citizens by educating them on the areas in which they live. As my colleagues are aware, a healthy environment sustains a productive and healthy community which fosters personal and economic growth.

Consulting with key stakeholders, including State, county, and city governments, and, where applicable, State and local water districts, and in the case of recommendations concerning projects that substantially affect underrepresented communities the Secretary shall also consult with historically Black colleges and universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and other minority-serving institutions is imperative to protecting sustainability and growth of the community and environment.

The coordination with the aforementioned groups is vital to ensuring that economically disadvantaged and minority groups are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environment and the continued preservation of their communities as we look to environmental and socioeconomic resources located within the project area and the general locations of the alternatives under consideration. Further, any issues of concern regarding the potential environmental or socioeconomic impacts of the project, including any issues that may substantially delay or prevent an agency from granting a permit or other approval that is needed for the project study.

Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of our rivers and harbors of the United States, and how citizens can improve their surroundings.

I want to also acknowledge and recognize Congressman DEFAZIO of Oregon for offering an amendment, in which I cosponsored that conditions the application of Section 103 of the bill on a reduction in the backlog of Corps of Engineers projects to less than \$20 billion in construction costs. This amendment highlights the fact that it is a lack of funding not the environmental review process that has led to a backlog of authorized projects that are not being constructed. We have spent enough energy arguing over the budget and the National Environmental Policy (NEPA) streamlining, but not enough time in making the hard decisions and investments that are going to create economic growth and create jobs. I urge Congress to support Rep. DEFAZIO's amendment #2.

Mr. Chair, I believe the WRRDA bill would have been stronger with the inclusion of an amendment I offered to the Rules Committee that directs the Secretary of the Army to encourage the participation of minority- and women-owned businesses in such projects and requires the GAO to submit a report to Congress within 2 years on the participation of minority- and women-owned businesses in such projects.

I recognize the value of a diverse supplier base and its impact on the community and

population at large. Therefore, I will work directly with the Secretary of the Army to establish an opportunity for Minority and Women Owned Businesses to work directly with the United States Army and the United States Corp of Engineers on specific projects that will ensure that the United States Army and the United States Corp of Engineers continues to creatively seek new supplier sources to fulfill the business opportunities at a number of Ports throughout our great nation and that minority and women owned businesses are given the opportunity to compete for these specific project business opportunities.

In closing, it is important to note that since the establishment of our Nation, our inland waterways and seaports have linked America directly to the global economy. This remains true today. Goods from all over the world reach our store shelves after arriving here through our ports, and products grown and made in the U.S.A. get to market overseas using our water transportation network.

The importance of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers mission to maintain our port and waterways infrastructure will only increase with time. Expansion of the Panama Canal is expected to be completed in 2014, allowing more and larger ships to call on America's ports. Our trade volume is expected to double within a decade, and to double again by 2030. We have to be ready for this expected growth in order to remain globally competitive.

The economic benefits of the Corps' mission are not limited to navigation and commerce. Levees, dams, reservoirs, and other measures within the Corps' mission scope provide flood protection for homes and businesses, protecting property and life.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3080.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of passage of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act today, although I have serious concerns with the changes to public and environmental review made in the bill.

This long-overdue authorization of Army Corps projects is critical to continue infrastructure maintenance and construction and environmental restoration in our nation's waterways. In my home state of Maryland, the Corps' work is essential for the operations of the Port of Baltimore, which supports thousands of jobs. Additionally, its environmental protection and oyster recovery work bolsters our efforts to restore the Chesapeake Bay.

However, I am deeply concerned that the bill goes too far in its attempts to expedite project review. While we all support prompt analysis of federal projects, the NEPA process is critical to ensuring that proposed projects are cost-effective, environmentally sound, and in the best interest of the surrounding communities. Corps projects in particular are often large and complex, with impacts across waterways and ecosystems. We must provide adequate time for public and agency review and comment to avoid lasting environmental damage and costly litigation.

While I will vote today to move this bill forward, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the conference process to preserve a robust review and oversight process for all proposed projects.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, maintaining and investing in our national water infrastructure is an important responsibility of Congress. Critical to our coastal and inland communities alike, these resources keep our national transportation networks running and our economy growing. The Water Resources Development Act protects our neighborhoods from floods, provides for environmental restoration and protection, and helps keep commerce moving, all while ensuring community engagement, access, and transparency in project decision making. Regrettably, the bill before us erodes many of the safeguards designed to protect the very lives and communities impacted by these projects. Despite the enormous benefits of passing a water resources bill into law, we should not do so at the cost of decades-old protections for our states, cities and towns. If we weaken the laws that require us to evaluate the full range of options for projects and alternatives, we may undermine the success of future projects, endangering their fiscal soundness and environmental stewardship.

In Rhode Island, the Army Corps of Engineers has worked diligently to protect our coastlines, stem shoreline erosion, institute flood protections and improve inland navigation. Over the past 50 years, most of the navigation work on Rhode Island's waterways has been constructed by the Army Corps. Since the passage of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), these projects rightfully went through rigorous review and solicited comments from affected communities, businesses and governments.

For more than four decades laws like NEPA have contributed to cleaner water, cleaner air, and a safer and healthier environment. Their authors recognized that healthy communities beget healthy economies, passing these bills into law with strong bipartisan support. In fact, Congress has been a greater hindrance to the advancement of Army Corps projects than environmental review. While the last WRDA bill passed by Congress in 2007 authorized the construction of projects costing more than \$22 billion, Congress appropriated just \$1.5 billion for the Corps' construction budget last year.

The NEPA process informs federal decisions and provides a critical check to communities on federal planning. In many cases, NEPA offers the only opportunity for the public to have a say in federal actions that may have profound impacts on their health, safety, livelihood, and wellbeing. It has saved money, time, vital resources, historical sites, endangered species, and public lands, while ensuring public disclosure and engagement.

I hope my colleagues will join me in working to prevent any degradation of the NEPA process going forward. Without such action, we are set on a path to undermine public input into the federal decision-making process, increase taxpayer costs, and harm the environment.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my frustration. For many of us, the 2007 WRDA bill included the authorization for critical projects in our districts. Since the passage of that bill, the Army Corps of Engineers have begun interpreting the language and technical errors came to light.

Last night, through the Rules process, I attempted to right 2 exact wrongs by making

technical corrections to the specific language in the 2007 WRDA bill with 2 precise amendments at no additional cost to the American taxpayer.

One of my amendments would have made a necessary technical change to the language of the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Feasibility Study to include the entire city of Delcambre, LA. As the study perimeters are currently written, they include only areas within 3 particular Parishes. However, there is one community, the city of Delcambre, LA that is divided by the Vermilion Parish line with half of the city and its structures in Vermilion, thus covered by the study, and the other half in Iberia Parish, not covered in the study. As the Corps began to move forward with study implementation, they made the decision to essentially cut the community, and structures, in half. This is not a sensible approach to ensuring a community's protection from hurricane destruction.

The second amendment would make a technical change to the Acadiana Gulf of Mexico Access Channel (AGMAC) an existing project, in order to reduce costs and improve the beneficial use of dredge material.

AGMAC was designed to allow for more efficient marine access from the Port of Iberia and other Acadiana Ports to the Gulf of Mexico by enlarging the existing channel to a project depth of twenty feet. Congress authorized the AGMAC project in the 2007 WRDA bill.

My amendment would propose removing the entire phrase related to Incidental Storm Surge Protection from the 2007 WRDA description of the project. The original authorization amount of the project in 2007 was \$131 million, the current cost of the project is \$310 million. The main reason for the radical difference in cost estimates, is the Incidental Storm Surge Protection language that was inserted at the request of one specific group. My amendment would remove this specific provision, with the understanding from the Corps of Engineers in New Orleans, that this change would allow the Corps to maintain the authorized spending level for this project, and most importantly, permit this suspended project to move forward.

Unfortunately due to an improper overreach back in 2007, a critical project has been on hold. This amendment would stimulate job creation, and the Acadiana economy by more than \$50 million a year, has been delayed and now is the time to get it back on track.

Millions of federal and state dollars have already been invested in performing feasibility studies to ensure that the AGMAC project was worthy of authorization. With the change proposed in my amendment, we can ensure that these dollars are not wasted, but instead that this critical project is completed.

It is important to note that CBO found both of these amendments to be budget neutral. The amendment maintains the authorized spending level for both projects found in the WRDA 2007. There is NO additional cost to the American taxpayers. Instead these changes would a.) ensure that an entire town, not just half, is better prepared when the next hurricane hits the Gulf Coast, and b.) restore consistency when determining the use of dredge material from a navigation project.

Mr. Chair, I understand why we have a rules process. I understand why we no longer have earmarks. However it is inefficient and irresponsible to stop an amendment that makes a necessary, technical, budget neutral language change. I look forward to working with the Chairman to devise a simple and time efficient strategy forward to fix these problems.

The Corps will continue to interpret legislative language the way it sees fit. If it is to the detriment of our constituents, is it expected that I will shrug that off and not fight that mistake? That's not what the people of South Louisiana elected me to do here in Washington.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 3080—the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. I would like to commend Chairman SHUSTER for his continued willingness to work with all Members to ensure that this bill is a truly bipartisan product.

For the first time since 2007, this House will have the opportunity to debate legislation that authorizes our critical water infrastructure. I believe that this bill represents the proper reform that will implement deadlines, increase transparency at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and take offline \$12 billion in projects that have been inactive for a number of years.

Mr. Chair, while these overall reforms are beneficial, there are two specific aspects of this bill that are important to the State of Georgia—as well as the entire Southeast region. First and foremost, this legislation authorizes the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project (SHEP) to deepen the port from 42 feet to 47 feet. For a number of years, this important regional project has been delayed by a statutory oversight in a previous WRDA bill. However, H.R. 3080 will finally provide the State of Georgia the ability to commit the \$201 million of the state share that has already been set aside.

SHEP benefits both the State of Georgia and the country as a whole. It has been estimated that for every dollar invested in deepening the port, \$5.50 would be generated for the country while providing savings of \$174 million on shipping annually. Furthermore, the Army Corps' own General Re-evaluation stated that SHEP will create 11,554 jobs, over \$551 million in labor income, and a gross regional value of over \$794 million. With the upcoming expansion of the Panama Canal, SHEP will only help maintain a competitive edge for deep water ports in the Southeast.

Mr. Chair, there is another aspect of WRRDA for which I commend the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee for its work. Unfortunately, in the version of WRDA passed by the Senate in May of this year, there were attempts made by our colleagues in the other body to undermine the longstanding issue among Georgia, Alabama, and Florida regarding water usage in both the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint (ACF) Basin and the Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa (ACT) Basin. This WRRDA bill is no place to interfere with ongoing negotiations, and I believe that this legislation's silence on this issue is the correct approach.

For these important reasons, I support H.R. 3080.

□ 1545

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-24. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3080

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definition of Secretary.

TITLE I—PROGRAM REFORMS AND STREAMLINING

Sec. 101. Vertical integration and acceleration of studies.

Sec. 102. Expediting the evaluation and processing of permits.

Sec. 103. Environmental streamlining.

Sec. 104. Consolidation of studies.

Sec. 105. Removal of duplicative analyses.

Sec. 106. Expediting approval of modifications and alterations of projects by non-Federal interests.

Sec. 107. Construction of projects by non-Federal interests.

Sec. 108. Contributions by non-Federal interests.

Sec. 109. Contributions by non-Federal interests for management of Corps of Engineers inland navigation facilities.

Sec. 110. Additional contributions by non-Federal interests.

Sec. 111. Clarification of impacts to other Federal facilities.

Sec. 112. Clarification of previously authorized work.

Sec. 113. Tribal partnership program.

Sec. 114. Technical corrections.

Sec. 115. Water infrastructure public-private partnership pilot program.

Sec. 116. Annual report to Congress.

Sec. 117. Actions to be taken in conjunction with the President's annual budget submission to Congress.

Sec. 118. Hurricane and storm damage reduction study.

Sec. 119. Non-Federal plans to provide additional flood risk reduction.

Sec. 120. Review of emergency response authorities.

Sec. 121. Emergency communication of risk.

Sec. 122. Improvements to the National Dam Safety Program Act.

Sec. 123. Restricted areas at Corps of Engineers dams.

Sec. 124. Levee safety.

Sec. 125. Vegetation on levees.

Sec. 126. Reduction of Federal costs.

Sec. 127. Advanced modeling technologies.

Sec. 128. Enhanced use of electronic commerce in Federal procurement.

Sec. 129. Corrosion prevention.

Sec. 130. Resilient construction and use of innovative materials.

Sec. 131. Assessment of water supply in arid regions.

Sec. 132. River basin commissions.

Sec. 133. Sense of Congress regarding water resources development bills.

Sec. 134. Donald G. Waldon Lock and Dam.

Sec. 135. Aquatic invasive species.

Sec. 136. Recreational access.

Sec. 137. Territories of the United States.

Sec. 138. Sense of Congress regarding interstate water agreements and compacts.

TITLE II—NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS

Subtitle A—Ports

Sec. 201. Expanded use of Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

Sec. 202. Assessment and prioritization of operation and maintenance.

Sec. 203. Preserving United States harbors.

Sec. 204. Consolidation of deep draft navigation expertise.

Sec. 205. Disposal sites.

Subtitle B—Inland Waterways

Sec. 211. Definitions.

Sec. 212. Project delivery process reforms.

Sec. 213. Efficiency of revenue collection.

Sec. 214. Inland waterways revenue studies.

Sec. 215. Inland waterways stakeholder roundtable.

Sec. 216. Preserving the Inland Waterway Trust Fund.

Sec. 217. Public comment on lock operations.

Sec. 218. Assessment of operation and maintenance needs of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

Sec. 219. Upper Mississippi River protection.

Sec. 220. Corps of Engineers lock and dam energy development.

TITLE III—DEAUTHORIZATIONS AND BACKLOG PREVENTION

Sec. 301. Deauthorization of inactive projects.

Sec. 302. Review of Corps of Engineers assets.

Sec. 303. Backlog prevention.

Sec. 304. Deauthorizations.

Sec. 305. Land conveyances.

TITLE IV—WATER RESOURCES INFRASTRUCTURE

Sec. 401. Authorization of final feasibility studies.

Sec. 402. Project modifications.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

In this Act, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Army.

TITLE I—PROGRAM REFORMS AND STREAMLINING

SEC. 101. VERTICAL INTEGRATION AND ACCELERATION OF STUDIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—To the extent practicable, a feasibility study initiated by the Secretary, after the date of enactment of this Act, under section 905(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282(a)) shall—

(1) result in the completion of a final feasibility report not later than 3 years after the date of initiation;

(2) have a maximum Federal cost of \$3,000,000; and

(3) ensure that personnel from the district, division, and headquarters levels of the Corps of Engineers concurrently conduct the review required under that section.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—If the Secretary determines that a feasibility study described in subsection (a) will not be conducted in accordance with subsection (a), the Secretary, not later than 30 days after the date of making the determination, shall—

(1) prepare an updated feasibility study schedule and cost estimate;

(2) notify the non-Federal feasibility cost sharing partner that the feasibility study has been delayed; and

(3) provide written notice to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate as to the reasons the requirements of subsection (a) are not attainable.

(c) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORIZATION.**—A feasibility study for which the Secretary has issued a determination under subsection (b) is not authorized after the last day of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the determination if the Secretary has not completed the study on or before such last day.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that describes—

(1) the status of the implementation of this section, including a description of each feasibility study subject to the requirements of this section;

(2) the amount of time taken to complete each such feasibility study; and

(3) any recommendations for additional authority necessary to support efforts to expedite the feasibility study process, including an analysis of whether the limitation established by subsection (a)(2) needs to be adjusted to address the impacts of inflation.

(e) **REVIEWS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the initiation of a study described in subsection (a) for a project, the Secretary shall—

(1) take all steps necessary to initiate the federally mandated reviews that the Secretary is required to complete as part of the study, including environmental reviews;

(2) convene a meeting of all Federal, tribal, and State agencies identified under section 2045(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2348(d)), as amended by this Act, and that may be required by law to conduct or issue a review, analysis, or opinion on or to make a determination concerning a permit or license for the study;

(3) provide the agencies referred to in paragraph (2) with all relevant information related to the scope and potential impacts of the project, including environmental impacts; and

(4) take all steps necessary to provide information that will enable required reviews and analyses related to the project to be conducted by other agencies in a thorough and timely manner.

SEC. 102. EXPEDITING THE EVALUATION AND PROCESSING OF PERMITS.

Section 214 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “or public-utility company (as defined in section 1262 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16451))” after “non-Federal public entity”;

(B) by inserting “or company” after “that entity”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: “To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that expediting the evaluation of a permit through the use of funds accepted and expended under this section does not adversely affect the timeline for evaluation (in the Corps district in which the project or activity is located) of permits under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army of other entities that have not contributed funds under this section.”; and

(2) by striking subsection (e).

SEC. 103. ENVIRONMENTAL STREAMLINING.

(a) **DECLARATION OF POLICY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Congress declares that—

(A) the benefits of water resources projects are important to the Nation’s economy and environment;

(B) it is in the national interest to expedite the delivery of water resources projects;

(C) it is in the national interest for Federal and State agencies, local governments, Indian tribes, and other entities involved in water resources projects—

(i) to accelerate study completion and project delivery and to reduce costs; and

(ii) to ensure that the planning, design, engineering, construction, and funding of water resources projects is done in an efficient and effective manner, promoting accountability for public investments and encouraging greater local and private sector involvement in project financing and delivery while addressing public safety and protecting the environment; and

(D) delay in the delivery of water resources studies and projects—

(i) increases project costs, flood risks, and local and Federal expenditures for emergency management and recovery;

(ii) harms the economy of the United States; and

(iii) impedes the shipment of goods for the conduct of commerce.

(2) **POLICY.**—Given the declarations set forth in paragraph (1), it is the policy of the United States that—

(A) recommendations to Congress regarding such projects should be accelerated by coordinated and efficient environmental reviews and cooperative efforts to quickly resolve disputes during the development of water resources projects;

(B) the Secretary shall have the lead role among Federal agencies in facilitating the environmental review process for water resources projects;

(C) each Federal agency shall cooperate with the Secretary to expedite the environmental review process for water resources projects;

(D) programmatic approaches shall be used if applicable to reduce the need for project-by-project reviews and decisions by Federal agencies;

(E) the Secretary shall identify opportunities for non-Federal sponsors to assume responsibilities of the Secretary if such responsibilities can be assumed in a manner that protects public health and safety, the environment, and public participation; and

(F) the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall identify and promote the deployment of innovations aimed at reducing the time and money required to deliver water resources projects while protecting the environment.

(b) **STREAMLINED PROJECT DELIVERY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2045 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2348) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 2045. STREAMLINED PROJECT DELIVERY.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the following definitions apply:

“(1) **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.**—The term ‘environmental impact statement’ means the detailed statement of environmental impacts required to be prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(2) **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘environmental review process’ means the process of preparing an environmental impact statement, environmental assessment, categorical exclusion, or other document under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) for a project study.

“(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘environmental review process’ includes the process for and completion of any environmental permit, approval, review, or study required for a project study under any Federal law other than the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(3) **FEDERAL JURISDICTIONAL AGENCY.**—The term ‘Federal jurisdictional agency’ means a Federal agency with jurisdiction over a review, analysis, opinion, statement, permit, license, or other approval or decision required for a project study under applicable Federal laws, including regulations.

“(4) **PROJECT.**—The term ‘project’ means a Corps of Engineers water resources project.

“(5) **PROJECT SPONSOR.**—The term ‘project sponsor’ means the non-Federal interest as defined in section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b).

“(6) **PROJECT STUDY.**—The term ‘project study’ means a feasibility study for a project carried out pursuant to section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282).

“(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—The procedures in this section are applicable to all project studies initiated after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013 and for which an environmental impact statement is prepared under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and may be applied, to the extent determined appropriate by the Secretary, to other project studies initiated after such date of enactment and for which an environmental review process document is prepared under such Act.

“(c) **LEAD AGENCIES.**—

“(1) **FEDERAL LEAD AGENCY.**—The Corps of Engineers shall be the Federal lead agency in the environmental review process for a project study.

“(2) **NON-FEDERAL PROJECT SPONSOR AS JOINT LEAD AGENCY.**—At the discretion of the Secretary and subject to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), a non-Federal project sponsor that is an agency defined in subsection (a)—

“(A) may serve as a joint lead agency with the Corps of Engineers for purposes of preparing any environmental review process document under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

“(B) may assist in the preparation of any such environmental review process document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 if the Secretary provides guidance in the preparation process, participates in preparing the document, independently evaluates that document, and approves and adopts the document before the Secretary takes any subsequent action or makes any approval based on that document.

“(3) **ADOPTION AND USE OF DOCUMENTS.**—Any environmental review process document prepared in accordance with this subsection shall be adopted and used by any Federal agency in making any approval of a project subject to this section as the document required to be completed under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to the same extent that the Federal agency may adopt or use a document prepared by another Federal agency under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(4) **ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITY OF FEDERAL LEAD AGENCY.**—With respect to the environmental review process for any project, the Federal lead agency shall have authority and responsibility—

“(A) to take such actions as are necessary and proper, within the authority of the Federal lead agency, to facilitate the expeditious resolution of the environmental review process for the project study; and

“(B) to prepare or ensure that any required environmental impact statement or other document for a project study required to be completed under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) is completed in accordance with this section and applicable Federal law.

“(d) PARTICIPATING AND COOPERATING AGENCIES.—

“(1) IDENTIFICATION.—The Federal lead agency shall identify, as early as practicable in the environmental review process for a project study, any Federal or State agency, local government, or Indian tribe that may—

“(A) have jurisdiction over the project;

“(B) be required by law to conduct or issue a review, analysis, opinion, or statement for the project study; or

“(C) be required to make a determination on issuing a permit, license, or other approval or decision for the project study.

“(2) INVITATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal lead agency shall invite any such agency identified under paragraph (1) to become a participating or cooperating agency in the environmental review process for the project study.

“(B) DEADLINE.—An invitation to participate issued under subparagraph (A) shall establish a deadline by which a response to the invitation shall be submitted, which may be extended by the Federal lead agency for good cause.

“(3) FEDERAL COOPERATING AGENCY.—Any Federal agency that is invited by the Federal lead agency to participate in the environmental review process for a project study shall be designated as a cooperating agency by the Federal lead agency unless the invited agency informs the Federal lead agency, in writing, by the deadline specified in the invitation that the invited agency—

“(A) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the project;

“(B) has no expertise or information relevant to the project study; and

“(C) does not intend to submit comments on the project study.

“(4) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—

“(A) REQUIREMENT.—A participating or cooperating agency shall comply with the requirements of this section and any schedule established under this section.

“(B) IMPLICATION.—Designation under this subsection shall not imply that the participating or cooperating agency—

“(i) supports a proposed project; or

“(ii) has any jurisdiction over, or special expertise with respect to evaluation of, the project.

“(5) CONCURRENT REVIEWS.—Each participating or cooperating agency shall—

“(A) carry out the obligations of that agency under other applicable law concurrently and in conjunction with the required environmental review process unless doing so would prevent such agency from conducting needed analysis or otherwise carrying out their obligations under those other laws; and

“(B) formulate and implement administrative, policy, and procedural mechanisms to enable the agency to ensure completion of the environmental review process in a timely, coordinated, and environmentally responsible manner.

“(e) PROGRAMMATIC COMPLIANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue guidance regarding the use of programmatic approaches to carry out the environmental review process that—

“(A) eliminates repetitive discussions of the same issues;

“(B) focuses on the actual issues ripe for analyses at each level of review;

“(C) establishes a formal process for coordinating with participating and cooperating agencies, including the creation of a list of all data

that is needed to carry out the environmental review process; and

“(D) complies with—

“(i) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

“(ii) all other applicable laws.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(A) as the first step in drafting guidance under that paragraph, consult with relevant Federal and State agencies, local governments, Indian tribes, and the public on the use and scope of the programmatic approaches;

“(B) emphasize the importance of collaboration among relevant Federal agencies, State agencies, local governments, and Indian tribes in undertaking programmatic reviews, especially with respect to reviews with a broad geographical scope;

“(C) ensure that the programmatic reviews—

“(i) promote transparency, including of the analyses and data used in the environmental review process, the treatment of any deferred issues raised by a Federal or State agency, local government, Indian tribe, or the public, and the temporal and special scales to be used to analyze those issues;

“(ii) use accurate and timely information in the environmental review process, including—

“(I) criteria for determining the general duration of the usefulness of the review; and

“(II) the timeline for updating any out-of-date review;

“(iii) describe—

“(I) the relationship between programmatic analysis and future tiered analysis; and

“(II) the role of the public in the creation of future tiered analysis; and

“(iv) are available to other relevant Federal and State agencies, local governments, Indian tribes, and the public;

“(D) allow not less than 60 days of public notice and comment on any proposed guidance; and

“(E) address any comments received under subparagraph (D).

“(f) COORDINATED REVIEWS.—

“(1) COORDINATION PLAN.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Federal lead agency, after consultation with each participating and cooperating agency and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable, shall establish a plan for coordinating public and agency participation in and comment on the environmental review process for a project study.

“(B) INCORPORATION.—In developing the plan established under subparagraph (A), the Federal lead agency shall take under consideration the scheduling requirements under section 101 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013.

“(2) SCHEDULE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal lead agency, after consultation with each participating and cooperating agency and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable, shall establish, as part of the coordination plan established in paragraph (1)(A), a schedule for completion of the environmental review process for the project study. In developing the schedule, the Federal lead agency shall take under consideration the scheduling requirements under section 101 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013.

“(B) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In establishing the schedule, the Federal lead agency shall consider factors such as—

“(i) the responsibilities of participating and cooperating agencies under applicable laws;

“(ii) the resources available to the participating and cooperating agencies and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable;

“(iii) the overall size and complexity of the project;

“(iv) the overall schedule for and cost of the project; and

“(v) the sensitivity of the natural and historic resources that may be affected by the project.

“(C) CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER TIME PERIODS.—A schedule under subparagraph (A) shall be consistent with any other relevant time periods established under Federal law.

“(D) MODIFICATION.—The Federal lead agency may—

“(i) lengthen a schedule established under subparagraph (A) for good cause; or

“(ii) shorten a schedule only with the concurrence of the affected participating and cooperating agencies and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable.

“(E) DISSEMINATION.—A copy of a schedule established under subparagraph (A) shall be—

“(i) provided to each participating and cooperating agency and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable; and

“(ii) made available to the public.

“(3) COMMENT DEADLINES.—The Federal lead agency shall establish the following deadlines for comment during the environmental review process for a project study:

“(A) DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.—For comments by agencies and the public on a draft environmental impact statement, a period of not more than 60 days after such document is made publicly available, unless—

“(i) a different deadline is established by agreement of the Federal lead agency, all participating and cooperating agencies, and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable; or

“(ii) the deadline is extended by the Federal lead agency for good cause.

“(B) OTHER COMMENT PERIODS.—For all other comment periods established by the Federal lead agency for agency or public comments in the environmental review process, a period of not more than 30 days after the date on which the materials for which comment is requested are made available, unless—

“(i) a different deadline is established by agreement of the Federal lead agency, all participating and cooperating agencies, and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable; or

“(ii) the deadline is extended by the Federal lead agency for good cause.

“(4) DEADLINES FOR DECISIONS UNDER OTHER LAWS.—

“(A) PRIOR APPROVAL DEADLINE.—If a participating or cooperating agency is required to make a determination regarding or otherwise approve or disapprove the project study prior to the record of decision or finding of no significant impact, such participating or cooperating agency shall make such determination or approval not later than 30 days after the Federal lead agency publishes notice of the availability of a final environmental impact statement or other final environmental document, or not later than such other date that is otherwise required by law, whichever occurs first.

“(B) OTHER DEADLINES.—With regard to any determination or approval of a participating or cooperating agency that is not subject to subparagraph (A), each participating or cooperating agency shall make any required determination or otherwise approve or disapprove the project study not later than 90 days after the date that the Federal lead agency approves the record of decision or finding of no significant impact for the project study, or not later than such other date that is otherwise required by law, whichever occurs first.

“(C) RECORD CLOSED.—In the event that any participating or cooperating agency fails to make a determination or approve or disapprove

the project study within the applicable deadline described in subparagraph (A), the Federal lead agency may close the record and find the record sufficient for the project study as it relates to such agency determination or approval.

“(g) **ISSUE IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION.**—

“(1) **COOPERATION.**—The Federal lead agency and participating and cooperating agencies shall work cooperatively in accordance with this section to identify and resolve issues that may delay completion of the environmental review process or result in the denial of any approval required for the project study under applicable laws.

“(2) **FEDERAL LEAD AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal lead agency shall make information available to the participating and cooperating agencies as early as practicable in the environmental review process regarding the environmental and socioeconomic resources located within the project area and the general locations of the alternatives under consideration.

“(B) **DATA SOURCES.**—Such information under subparagraph (A) may be based on existing data sources, including geographic information systems mapping.

“(3) **PARTICIPATING AND COOPERATING AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.**—Based on information received from the Federal lead agency, participating and cooperating agencies shall identify, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding the potential environmental or socioeconomic impacts of the project, including any issues that may substantially delay or prevent an agency from granting a permit or other approval that is needed for the project study.

“(4) **ACCELERATED ISSUE RESOLUTION AND ELEVATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon the request of a participating or cooperating agency or non-Federal project sponsor, the Secretary shall convene an issue resolution meeting with the relevant participating and cooperating agencies and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable, to resolve issues that may—

“(i) delay completion of the environmental review process; or

“(ii) result in denial of any approval required for the project study under applicable laws.

“(B) **MEETING DATE.**—A meeting requested under this paragraph shall be held not later than 21 days after the date on which the Secretary receives the request for the meeting, unless the Secretary determines that there is good cause to extend that deadline.

“(C) **NOTIFICATION.**—Upon receipt of a request for a meeting under this paragraph, the Secretary shall notify all relevant participating and cooperating agencies of the request, including the issue to be resolved and the date for the meeting.

“(D) **ELEVATION OF ISSUE RESOLUTION.**—If a resolution cannot be achieved within 30 days after a meeting under this paragraph and a determination is made by the Secretary that all information necessary to resolve the issue has been obtained, the Secretary shall forward the dispute to the heads of the relevant agencies for resolution.

“(E) **CONVENTION BY SECRETARY.**—The Secretary may convene an issue resolution meeting under this subsection at any time, at the discretion of the Secretary, regardless of whether a meeting is requested under subparagraph (A).

“(h) **STREAMLINED DOCUMENTATION AND DECISIONMAKING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal lead agency in the environmental review process for a project study, in order to reduce paperwork and expedite decisionmaking, shall prepare a condensed final environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(2) **CONDENSED FORMAT.**—A condensed final environmental impact statement for a project study in the environmental review process shall consist only of—

“(A) an incorporation by reference of the draft environmental impact statement;

“(B) any updates to specific pages or sections of the draft environmental impact statement as appropriate; and

“(C) responses to comments on the draft environmental impact statement and copies of the comments.

“(3) **TIMING OF DECISION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in conducting the environmental review process for a project study, the Federal lead agency shall combine a final environmental impact statement and a record of decision for the project study into a single document if—

“(A) the alternative approved in the record of decision is either a preferred alternative identified in the draft environmental impact statement or is a modification of such preferred alternative developed in response to comments on the draft environmental impact statement; and

“(B) the Federal lead agency has a written commitment from parties responsible for implementation of the measures applicable to the approved alternative that are identified in the final environmental impact statement that they will implement those measures.

“(i) **LIMITATIONS.**—Nothing in this section shall preempt or interfere with—

“(1) any practice of seeking, considering, or responding to public comment; or

“(2) any power, jurisdiction, responsibility, or authority that a Federal or State agency, local government, Indian tribe, or non-Federal project sponsor has with respect to carrying out a project study or any other provision of law applicable to a project.

“(j) **TIMING OF CLAIMS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a claim arising under Federal law seeking judicial review of a permit, license, or other approval issued by a Federal agency for a project study shall be barred unless it is filed not later than 150 days after publication of a notice in the Federal Register announcing that the permit, license, or other approval is final pursuant to the law under which the agency action is taken, unless a shorter time is specified in the Federal law which allows judicial review. Nothing in this subsection shall create a right to judicial review or place any limit on filing a claim that a person has violated the terms of a permit, license, or other approval.

“(2) **NEW INFORMATION.**—The Secretary shall consider new information received after the close of a comment period if the information satisfies the requirements for a supplemental environmental impact statement under title 40, Code of Federal Regulations. The preparation of a supplemental environmental impact statement or other environmental document when required by this section shall be considered a separate final agency action and the deadline for filing a claim for judicial review of such action shall be 150 days after the date of publication of a notice in the Federal Register announcing such action.

“(k) **CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall—

“(A) survey the use by the Corps of Engineers of categorical exclusions in projects;

“(B) publish a review of the survey that includes a description of—

“(i) the types of actions that were categorically excluded or may be the basis for developing a new categorical exclusion; and

“(ii) any requests previously received by the Secretary for new categorical exclusions; and

“(C) solicit requests from other Federal agencies and non-Federal project sponsors for new categorical exclusions.

“(2) **NEW CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, if the Secretary identifies, based on the review under paragraph (1), a category of activities that merit establishing a categorical exclusion not in existence on the day before the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall publish a notice of proposed rulemaking to propose that new categorical exclusion, to the extent that the categorical exclusion meets the criteria for a categorical exclusion under section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulation).

“(l) **IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE.**—The Secretary shall prepare guidance documents that describe the processes that the Secretary will use to implement this section.”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents contained in section 1(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2045 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 2045. Streamlined project delivery.”

(c) **CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION IN EMERGENCIES.**—For the repair, reconstruction, or rehabilitation of a water resources project that is in operation or under construction when damaged by an event or incident that results in a declaration by the President of a major disaster or emergency pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Secretary shall treat such repair, reconstruction, or rehabilitation activity as a class of action categorically excluded from the requirements relating to environmental assessments or environmental impact statements under section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, if such repair or reconstruction activity is in the same location with the same capacity, dimensions, and design as the original water resources project as before the declaration described in this section.

SEC. 104. CONSOLIDATION OF STUDIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **REPEAL.**—Section 905(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282(b)) is repealed.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 905(a)(1) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2282(a)(1)) is amended by striking “perform a reconnaissance study and”.

(b) **CONTENTS OF FEASIBILITY REPORTS.**—Section 905(a)(2) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2282(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “A feasibility report shall include a preliminary analysis of the Federal interest and the costs, benefits, and environmental impacts of the project.”

(c) **APPLICABILITY.**—The Secretary shall continue to carry out a study for which a reconnaissance level investigation has been initiated before the date of enactment of this Act as if this section, including the amendments made by this section, had not been enacted.

SEC. 105. REMOVAL OF DUPLICATIVE ANALYSES.

Section 911 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2288) is repealed.

SEC. 106. EXPEDITING APPROVAL OF MODIFICATIONS AND ALTERATIONS OF PROJECTS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, after providing notice and an opportunity for comment, shall establish a process for the review of section 14 applications in a timely and consistent manner.

(b) **SECTION 14 APPLICATION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “section 14 application” means an application submitted by an applicant to the Secretary requesting permission for the temporary occupation or use of a public work, or the alteration or permanent occupation or use of a public work, under section 14 of the Act entitled “An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain

public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1899 (commonly known as the "Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899") (33 U.S.C. 408).

(c) **BENCHMARK GOALS.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT OF BENCHMARK GOALS.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(A) establish benchmark goals for determining the amount of time it should take the Secretary to determine whether a section 14 application is complete;

(B) establish benchmark goals for determining the amount of time it should take the Secretary to approve or disapprove a section 14 application; and

(C) to the extent practicable, use such benchmark goals to make a decision on section 14 applications in a timely and consistent manner.

(2) **BENCHMARK GOALS.**—

(A) **BENCHMARK GOALS FOR DETERMINING WHETHER SECTION 14 APPLICATIONS ARE COMPLETE.**—To the extent practicable, the benchmark goals established under paragraph (1) shall provide that—

(i) the Secretary reach a decision on whether a section 14 application is complete not later than 15 days after the date of receipt of the application; and

(ii) if the Secretary determines that a section 14 application is not complete, the Secretary promptly notify the applicant of the specific information that is missing or the analysis that is needed to complete the application.

(B) **BENCHMARK GOALS FOR REVIEWING COMPLETED APPLICATIONS.**—To the extent practicable, the benchmark goals established under paragraph (1) shall provide that—

(i) the Secretary generally approve or disapprove a completed section 14 application not later than 45 days after the date of receipt of the completed application; and

(ii) in a case in which the Secretary determines that additional time is needed to review a completed section 14 application due to the type, size, cost, complexity, or impacts of the actions proposed in the application, the Secretary approve or disapprove the application not later than 180 days after the date of receipt of the completed application.

(3) **NOTICE.**—In any case in which the Secretary determines that it will take the Secretary more than 45 days to review a completed section 14 application, the Secretary shall—

(A) provide written notification to the applicant; and

(B) include in the written notice a best estimate of the Secretary as to the amount of time required for completion of the review.

(d) **FAILURE TO ACHIEVE BENCHMARK GOALS.**—In any case in which the Secretary fails make a decision on a section 14 application in accordance with the process established under this section, the Secretary shall provide written notice to the applicant, including a detailed description of—

(1) why the Secretary failed to make a decision in accordance with such process;

(2) the additional actions required before the Secretary will issue a decision; and

(3) the amount of time the Secretary will require to issue a decision.

(e) **NOTIFICATION.**—

(1) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary shall provide a copy of any written notice provided under subsection (d) to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(2) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall maintain a publicly available database, including on the Internet, on—

(A) all section 14 applications received by the Secretary; and

(B) the current status of such applications.

SEC. 107. CONSTRUCTION OF PROJECTS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.

(a) **CONSTRUCTION OF WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.**—Section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 701b-13) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking "FLOOD CONTROL" and inserting "WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT"; and

(2) by striking "flood control" each place it appears and inserting "water resources development".

(b) **COMPLETION OF STUDIES AND DESIGN ACTIVITIES.**—Section 211(c) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 701b-13(c)) is amended by striking "date of the enactment of this Act" and inserting "date of enactment of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013".

(c) **AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT IMPROVEMENTS.**—Section 211(d)(1) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 701b-13(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A)(i) and inserting the following:

"(i) IN GENERAL.—A non-Federal interest may carry out construction for which studies and design documents are prepared under subsection (b) only if—

"(I) the Secretary approves the project for construction; and

"(II) the project is specifically authorized by Congress."; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

"(B) STUDIES AND DESIGN ACTIVITIES UNDER SUBSECTION (c).—Any non-Federal interest that has received from the Secretary under subsection (c) a favorable recommendation to carry out a water resources development project, or separable element thereof, based on the results of completed studies and design documents for the project or element may carry out the project or element if—

"(i) a final environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) has been filed for the project or element; and

"(ii) the project is specifically authorized by Congress.".

(d) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—Section 211(e) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 701b-13(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B) by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) if the project is specifically authorized by Congress."; and

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (B) and redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively; and

(B) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking "At the request" and inserting "In accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), at the request"; and

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", or toward the non-Federal share of any other authorized water resources development study or project of such non-Federal interest".

(e) **OTHER MATTERS.**—Section 211 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 701b-13) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION PROJECTS.**—Whenever a non-Federal interest constructs improvements to a harbor or inland harbor, the Secretary shall be responsible for maintenance in accordance with section 101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(b)) if—

"(1) the Secretary determines, before construction, that the improvements, or separable elements thereof, are economically justified and environmentally acceptable;

"(2) the Secretary certifies that the project is constructed in accordance with applicable permits and the appropriate engineering and design standards;

"(3) the Secretary does not find that the project, or separable element thereof, is no longer economically justified or environmentally acceptable; and

"(4) the project is specifically authorized by Congress.

"(i) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—All laws and regulations that would apply to the Secretary if the Secretary were carrying out a project shall apply to the non-Federal interest carrying out a project under this section.

"(j) **NOTIFICATION OF COMMITTEES.**—The Secretary shall notify in writing the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate prior to initiation of negotiations with a non-Federal interest regarding the utilization of the authorities under this section.".

(f) **REPEALS.**—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2232).

(2) Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 426i-1) and the item relating to that section in the table of contents contained in section 1(b) of that Act.

(3) Section 404 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2232 note; 104 Stat. 4646) and the item relating to that section in the table of contents contained in section 1(b) of that Act.

SEC. 108. CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h), is amended—

(1) by striking "from States and political subdivisions thereof," and inserting "from a non-Federal interest (as defined in section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b))";

(2) by striking ", which includes planning and design";

(3) by inserting ", including a project for navigation on the inland waterways," after "study or project";

(4) by striking "by States and political subdivisions thereof," and inserting "by a non-Federal interest";

(5) by striking "": Provided further, That the term 'States' means the several States, the District of Columbia, the commonwealths, territories, and possessions of the United States, and Federally recognized Indian tribes"; and

(6) by inserting "": And provided further, That the term 'work' means the planning, design, or construction of an authorized water resources development study or project, or the repair, restoration, or replacement of an authorized water resources development project that has been damaged by an event or incident that results in a declaration by the President of a major disaster or emergency pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)" after "contributing interests".

(b) **NOTIFICATION FOR CONTRIBUTED FUNDS.**—Prior to the initiation of negotiations for accepting contributed funds under section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h), the Secretary shall provide written notice to the Committee on

Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(c) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.**—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) Section 111(b) of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (125 Stat. 858).

(2) Section 4 of the Act entitled “An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes”, approved March 4, 1915 (33 U.S.C. 560).

SEC. 109. CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS FOR MANAGEMENT OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS INLAND NAVIGATION FACILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 225 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2328) is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and heading and inserting the following:

“SEC. 225. CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS FOR MANAGEMENT OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS FACILITIES.”;

(2) in subsection (a) by striking “managing recreation facilities” and inserting “operating, maintaining, and managing inland navigational facilities, recreational facilities,”; and

(3) in subsection (b) by striking “and management of recreation facilities” and inserting “, maintenance, and management of inland navigation facilities, recreational facilities.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents contained in section 1(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 is amended by striking the item relating to section 225 and inserting the following:

“225. Contributions by non-Federal interests for management of Corps of Engineers facilities.”.

SEC. 110. ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.

Section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280) is amended—

(1) by striking “In order to insure” and inserting “(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to insure”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.**—Notwithstanding subsection (a), in accordance with section 5 of the Act entitled ‘An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes’, approved June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h), the Secretary may accept funds from a non-Federal interest for any authorized water resources development project that has exceeded its maximum cost under subsection (a), and use such funds to carry out such project, if the use of such funds does not increase the Federal share of the cost of such project.”.

SEC. 111. CLARIFICATION OF IMPACTS TO OTHER FEDERAL FACILITIES.

In any case where the modification or construction of a water resources development project carried out by the Secretary adversely impacts other Federal facilities, the Secretary may accept from other Federal agencies such funds as may be necessary to address the adverse impact, including by removing, relocating, or reconstructing such facilities.

SEC. 112. CLARIFICATION OF PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED WORK.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may carry out measures to improve fish species habitat within the boundaries and downstream of a water resources project constructed by the Secretary that includes a fish hatchery if the Secretary—

(1) has been explicitly authorized to compensate for fish losses associated with the project; and

(2) determines that the measures are—

(A) feasible;

(B) consistent with authorized project purposes and the fish hatchery; and

(C) in the public interest.

(b) **COST SHARING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the non-Federal interest shall contribute 35 percent of the total cost of carrying out activities under this section, including the costs relating to the provision or acquisition of required land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations.

(2) **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.**—The non-Federal interest shall contribute 100 percent of the costs of operation, maintenance, replacement, repair, and rehabilitation of the measures carried out under this section.

SEC. 113. TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(B)—

(A) by striking “The ability” and inserting the following:

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The ability”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) **DETERMINATION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013, the Secretary shall issue guidance on the procedures described in clause (i).”; and

(2) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) **RESTRICTIONS.**—The Secretary is authorized to carry out activities under this section in fiscal years 2014 through 2023.”.

(b) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH INDIAN TRIBES.**—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with an Indian tribe (or a designated representative of an Indian tribe) to carry out authorized activities of the Corps of Engineers to protect fish, wildlife, water quality, and cultural resources.

SEC. 114. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) **LIMITATION; STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.**—Section 221(a)(4)(E) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(a)(4)(E)) is amended by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) **LIMITATION.**—In any case in which a specific provision of law provides for a non-Federal interest to receive credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of a study for, or construction or operation and maintenance of, a water resources project, the Secretary shall apply—

“(I) the specific provision of law instead of this paragraph; or

“(II) at the request of the non-Federal interest, the specific provision of law and such provisions of this paragraph as the non-Federal interest may request.

“(iii) **STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to affect the applicability of subparagraph (C).”.

(b) **WATER RESOURCES PROJECT DEFINED.**—Section 221(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)) is amended—

(1) by moving paragraphs (1) and (2) and the matter following paragraph (2) 2 ems to the right;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(3) by striking “(b) **DEFINITION**” and all that follows through “The term” and inserting the following:

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—

“(1) **NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.**—The term”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **WATER RESOURCES PROJECT.**—The term ‘water resources project’ includes projects studied, reviewed, designed, constructed, operated and maintained, or otherwise subject to Federal participation under the authority of the civil

works program of the Secretary of the Army for the purposes of navigation, flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, hurricane and storm damage reduction, water supply, recreation, hydroelectric power, fish and wildlife conservation, water quality, environmental infrastructure, resource protection and development, and related purposes.”.

(c) **CORRECTION.**—Section 221(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(c)) is amended by striking “enforceable” and inserting “enforceable”.

(d) **FEDERAL ALLOCATION.**—Section 2008(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2340(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “This subsection shall apply without regard to whether the original partnership agreement was entered into before, on, or after the date of enactment of this subsection.”.

(e) **IN-KIND CREDIT.**—Section 221(a)(4)(C) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(a)(4)(C)) is amended by striking “In any case” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:

“(i) **CONSTRUCTION.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—In any case in which the non-Federal interest is to receive credit under subparagraph (A) for the cost of construction carried out by the non-Federal interest before execution of a partnership agreement and that construction has not been carried out as of the date of enactment of this clause, the Secretary and the non-Federal interest shall enter into an agreement under which the non-Federal interest shall carry out such work and shall do so prior to the non-Federal interest initiating construction or issuing a written notice to proceed for the construction.

“(II) **ELIGIBILITY.**—Construction that is carried out after the execution of an agreement under subclause (I) and any design activities that are required for that construction, even if the design activity is carried out prior to the execution of the agreement, shall be eligible for credit.

“(ii) **PLANNING.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—In any case in which the non-Federal interest is to receive credit under subparagraph (A) for the cost of planning carried out by the non-Federal interest before execution of a feasibility cost sharing agreement, the Secretary and the non-Federal interest shall enter into an agreement under which the non-Federal interest shall carry out such planning and shall do so prior to the non-Federal interest initiating that planning.

“(II) **ELIGIBILITY.**—Planning that is carried out by the non-Federal interest after the execution of an agreement under subclause (I) shall be eligible for credit.”.

SEC. 115. WATER INFRASTRUCTURE PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a pilot program to evaluate the cost effectiveness and project delivery efficiency of allowing non-Federal interests to carry out authorized water resources development projects for coastal harbor improvement, channel improvement, inland navigation, flood damage reduction, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and hurricane and storm damage reduction.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the pilot program established under subsection (a) are—

(1) to identify cost-saving project delivery alternatives that reduce the backlog of authorized Corps of Engineers projects; and

(2) to evaluate the technical, financial, and organizational benefits of allowing a non-Federal interest to carry out and manage the design or construction (or both) of 1 or more of such projects.

(c) **SUBSEQUENT APPROPRIATIONS.**—Any activity undertaken under this section is authorized only to the extent specifically provided for in subsequent appropriations Acts.

(d) **ADMINISTRATION.**—In carrying out the pilot program established under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) identify for inclusion in the program at least 15 projects that are authorized for construction for coastal harbor improvement, channel improvement, inland navigation, flood damage reduction, or hurricane and storm damage reduction;

(2) notify in writing the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate of each project identified under paragraph (1);

(3) in consultation with the non-Federal interest associated with each project identified under paragraph (1), develop a detailed project management plan for the project that outlines the scope, financing, budget, design, and construction resource requirements necessary for the non-Federal interest to execute the project, or a separable element of the project;

(4) at the request of the non-Federal interest associated with each project identified under paragraph (1), enter into a project partnership agreement with the non-Federal interest under which the non-Federal interest is provided full project management control for the financing, design, or construction (or any combination thereof) of the project, or a separable element of the project, in accordance with plans approved by the Secretary;

(5) following execution of a project partnership agreement under paragraph (4) and completion of all work under the agreement, issue payment, in accordance with subsection (g), to the relevant non-Federal interest for that work; and

(6) regularly monitor and audit each project carried out under the program to ensure that all activities related to the project are carried out in compliance with plans approved by the Secretary and that construction costs are reasonable.

(e) **SELECTION CRITERIA.**—In identifying projects under subsection (d)(1), the Secretary shall consider the extent to which the project—

(1) is significant to the economy of the United States;

(2) leverages Federal investment by encouraging non-Federal contributions to the project;

(3) employs innovative project delivery and cost-saving methods;

(4) received Federal funds in the past and experienced delays or missed scheduled deadlines;

(5) has unobligated Corps of Engineers funding balances; and

(6) has not received Federal funding for recapitalization and modernization since the project was authorized.

(f) **DETAILED PROJECT SCHEDULE.**—Not later than 180 days after entering into a project partnership agreement under subsection (d)(4), a non-Federal interest, to the maximum extent practicable, shall submit to the Secretary a detailed project schedule for the relevant project, based on estimated funding levels, that specifies deadlines for each milestone with respect to the project.

(g) **PAYMENT.**—Payment to the non-Federal interest for work completed pursuant to a project partnership agreement under subsection (d)(4) may be made from—

(1) if applicable, the balance of the unobligated amounts appropriated for the project;

(2) other amounts appropriated to the Corps of Engineers, except that the total amount transferred to the non-Federal interest may not exceed the estimate of the Federal share of the cost of construction, including any required design; and

(3) revenue generated by the project.

(h) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—At the request of a non-Federal interest participating in the pilot

program established under subsection (a), the Secretary may provide to the non-Federal interest, if the non-Federal interest contracts with and compensates the Secretary, technical assistance with respect to—

(1) a study, engineering activity, or design activity related to a project carried out by the non-Federal interest under the program; and

(2) obtaining permits necessary for such a project.

(i) **IDENTIFICATION OF IMPEDIMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall—

(A) except as provided in paragraph (2), identify any procedural requirements under the authority of the Secretary that impede greater use of public-private partnerships and private investment in water resources development projects;

(B) develop and implement, on a project-by-project basis, procedures and approaches that—

(i) address such impediments; and

(ii) protect the public interest and any public investment in water resources development projects that involve public-private partnerships or private investment in water resources development projects; and

(C) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, issue rules to carry out the procedures and approaches developed under subparagraph (B).

(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to allow the Secretary to waive any requirement under—

(A) sections 3141 through 3148 and sections 3701 through 3708 of title 40, United States Code;

(B) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); or

(C) any other provision of Federal law.

(j) **PUBLIC BENEFIT STUDIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before entering into a project partnership agreement under subsection (d)(4), the Secretary shall conduct an assessment of whether, and provide justification in writing to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate that, the proposed agreement provides better public and financial benefits than a similar transaction using public funding or financing.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—An assessment under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be completed in a period of not more than 90 days;

(B) take into consideration any supporting materials and data submitted by the relevant non-Federal interest and other stakeholders; and

(C) determine whether the proposed project partnership agreement is in the public interest by determining whether the agreement will provide public and financial benefits, including expedited project delivery and savings for taxpayers.

(k) **NON-FEDERAL FUNDING.**—A project carried out under the pilot program established under subsection (a) may consist of the non-Federal interest financing the non-Federal share of the project.

(l) **APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL LAW.**—Any provision of Federal law that would apply to the Secretary if the Secretary were carrying out a project shall apply to a non-Federal interest carrying out a project under this section.

(m) **COST SHARE.**—Nothing in this section affects a cost-sharing requirement under Federal law that is applicable to a project carried out under the pilot program established under subsection (a).

(n) **REPORT.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and

Public Works of the Senate a report describing the results of the pilot program established under subsection (a), including any recommendations of the Secretary concerning whether the program or any component of the program should be implemented on a national basis.

(o) **NON-FEDERAL INTEREST DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “non-Federal interest” includes non-Federal government entities and private entities.

SEC. 116. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than February 1 of each year, the Secretary shall develop and submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate an annual report, to be entitled “Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development”, that identifies the following:

(1) **FEASIBILITY REPORTS.**—Each feasibility report that meets the criteria established in subsection (c)(1)(A).

(2) **PROPOSED FEASIBILITY STUDIES.**—Any proposed feasibility study submitted to the Secretary by a non-Federal interest pursuant to subsection (b) that meets the criteria established in subsection (c)(1)(A).

(3) **PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS.**—Any proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project or feasibility study that meets the criteria established in subsection (c)(1)(A) that—

(A) is submitted to the Secretary by a non-Federal interest pursuant to subsection (b); or

(B) is identified by the Secretary for authorization.

(b) **REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS.**—

(1) **PUBLICATION.**—Not later than May 1 of each year, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a notice requesting proposals from non-Federal interests for proposed feasibility studies and proposed modifications to authorized water resources development projects and feasibility studies to be included in the annual report.

(2) **DEADLINE FOR REQUESTS.**—The Secretary shall include in each notice required by this subsection a requirement that non-Federal interests submit to the Secretary any proposals described in paragraph (1) by not later than 120 days after the date of publication of the notice in the Federal Register in order for such proposals to be considered for inclusion in the annual report.

(3) **NOTIFICATION.**—On the date of publication of each notice required by this subsection, the Secretary shall—

(A) make the notice publicly available, including on the Internet; and

(B) provide written notification of such publication to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(c) **CONTENTS.**—

(1) **FEASIBILITY REPORTS, PROPOSED FEASIBILITY STUDIES, AND PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS.**—

(A) **CRITERIA FOR INCLUSION IN REPORT.**—The Secretary shall include in the annual report only those feasibility reports, proposed feasibility studies, and proposed modifications to authorized water resources development projects and feasibility studies that—

(i) are related to the missions and authorities of the Corps of Engineers;

(ii) require specific authorization by Congress in law or otherwise;

(iii) are not authorized by Congress;

(iv) have not been included in any previous annual report; and

(v) if authorized, could be carried out by the Corps of Engineers.

(B) **DESCRIPTION OF BENEFITS.**—For each proposed feasibility study and proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project or feasibility study included in the annual report, the Secretary shall describe the potential benefit of the proposed feasibility study or modification, including, to the extent applicable, whether the water resources development project that is the subject of the proposed feasibility study, or the proposed modification, will—

- (i) reduce risks to human life or public safety or property;
- (ii) benefit the national economy;
- (iii) stimulate the creation of jobs;
- (iv) reduce the need for future disaster relief;
- (v) promote the development and delivery of domestic energy resources;
- (vi) improve the competitiveness of United States exports;
- (vii) improve water-related transportation for interstate or international commerce;
- (viii) restore or protect, or mitigate the impacts of a water resources development project on, the environment; or
- (ix) promote the use of cost-effective and sustainable solutions to water resources challenges.

(2) **TRANSPARENCY.**—The Secretary shall include in the annual report, for each feasibility report, proposed feasibility study, and proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project or feasibility study included under paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) the name of the associated non-Federal interest, including the name of any non-Federal interest that has contributed, or is expected to contribute, a non-Federal share of the cost of—

- (i) the feasibility report;
 - (ii) the proposed feasibility study;
 - (iii) the authorized feasibility study for which the modification is proposed; or
 - (iv) construction of—
- (I) the water resources development project that is the subject of—

- (aa) the feasibility report;
 - (bb) the proposed feasibility study; or
 - (cc) the authorized feasibility study for which a modification is proposed; or
- (II) the proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project;

(B) a letter or statement of support for the feasibility report, proposed feasibility study, or proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project or feasibility study from each associated non-Federal interest;

(C) the purpose of the feasibility report, proposed feasibility study, or proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project or feasibility study;

(D) an estimate of the Federal, non-Federal, and total costs of—

- (i) the proposed feasibility study, or proposed modification to an authorized feasibility study; and

(ii) construction of—

(I) the water resources development project that is the subject of—

- (aa) the feasibility report; or
- (bb) the authorized feasibility study for which a modification is proposed, with respect to the change in costs resulting from such modification; or

(II) the proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project; and

(E) an estimate, to the extent practicable, of the monetary and nonmonetary benefits of—

(i) the water resources development project that is the subject of—

- (I) the feasibility report;
- (II) the proposed feasibility study; or
- (III) the authorized feasibility study for which a modification is proposed, with respect to the benefits of such modification; or

(ii) the proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project.

(3) **CERTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall include in the annual report a certification stating that each feasibility report, proposed feasibility study, and proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project or feasibility study included in the annual report meets the criteria in paragraph (1)(A).

(4) **APPENDIX.**—The Secretary shall include in the annual report an appendix listing the proposals submitted under subsection (b) that were not included in the annual report under paragraph (1)(A) and a description of why the Secretary determined that those proposals did not meet the criteria for inclusion under such paragraph.

(d) **SPECIAL RULE FOR INITIAL ANNUAL REPORT.**—Notwithstanding any other deadlines required by this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register a notice required by subsection (b)(1);

(2) include in such notice a requirement that non-Federal interests submit to the Secretary any proposals described in subsection (b)(1) by not later than 90 days after the date of publication of such notice in the Federal Register in order for such proposals to be considered for inclusion in the first annual report developed by the Secretary under this section; and

(3) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, submit an annual report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(e) **PUBLICATION.**—Upon submission of the annual report to Congress, the Secretary shall make the annual report publicly available, including through publication on the Internet.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—The term “annual report” means the report required by subsection (a).

(2) **FEASIBILITY REPORT.**—The term “feasibility report” means a final feasibility report developed under section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282), and includes—

(A) a report described in section 105(d)(2) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2215(d)(2)); and

(B) where applicable, any associated report of the Chief of Engineers.

(3) **FEASIBILITY STUDY.**—The term “feasibility study” has the meaning given that term in section 105 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215).

(4) **NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.**—The term “non-Federal interest” has the meaning given that term in section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b).

SEC. 117. ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.

(a) **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN PRESIDENT'S BUDGET.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For each fiscal year, as part of the President's annual budget submission to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the President shall—

(A) identify and recommend Corps of Engineers construction projects for which Congress should provide funding at the full level authorized for the project; and

(B) provide an explanation of the process used by the President in making the recommendations.

(2) **COVERED PERIOD.**—The President shall make recommendations under paragraph (1) for the fiscal year for which the budget submission is prepared and each of the succeeding 4 fiscal years.

(3) **BASIS FOR MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS.**—The President shall base recommendations

under paragraph (1) on the assumption that \$2,000,000,000 will be appropriated for Corps of Engineers construction projects for each fiscal year.

(b) **MISSOURI RIVER BASIN.**—To assist in the prioritization of Federal activities carried out related to the project for mitigation of fish and wildlife losses, Missouri River Bank Stabilization and Navigation Project, Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, and Nebraska, authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4143), and in conjunction with the President's submission to Congress of a budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that provides—

(1) an inventory of all Federal actions taken and a prioritization of all Federal actions planned in furtherance of the project, including an inventory of lands owned, acquired, or directly controlled by the Federal Government, and lands enrolled in federally assisted conservation programs;

(2) a description of the specific Federal actions proposed for the upcoming fiscal year in furtherance of the project;

(3) an assessment of the progress made in furtherance of the project, including a description of how each of the actions identified under paragraph (1) have impacted such progress; and

(4) an assessment of additional actions necessary to achieve the results of the project.

SEC. 118. HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY.

As part of the study for flood and storm damage reduction related to natural disasters to be carried out by the Secretary under title II of division A of the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013, under the heading “Department of the Army—Corps of Engineers—Civil—Investigations” (127 Stat. 5), the Secretary shall make specific project recommendations. The Secretary may include those recommendations in the report entitled “Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development”, developed in accordance with this Act.

SEC. 119. NON-FEDERAL PLANS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FLOOD RISK REDUCTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If requested by a non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall carry out a locally preferred plan that provides a higher level of protection than a flood risk management project authorized under this Act if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the plan is technically feasible and environmentally acceptable; and

(2) the benefits of the plan exceed the costs of the plan.

(b) **NON-FEDERAL COSTS.**—If the Secretary carries out a locally preferred plan under subsection (a), the cost attributable to the higher level of protection provided under the plan shall be paid by the non-Federal interest.

SEC. 120. REVIEW OF EMERGENCY RESPONSE AUTHORITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall undertake a review of implementation of section 5 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes”, approved August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n), to evaluate the alternatives available to the Secretary to ensure—

(1) the safety of affected communities to future flooding and storm events;

(2) the resiliency of water resources development projects to future flooding and storm events;

(3) the long-term cost effectiveness of water resources development projects that provide flood control and hurricane and storm damage reduction benefits; and

(4) the policy goals and objectives that have been outlined by the President as a response to

recent extreme weather events, including Hurricane Sandy, that relate to preparing for future floods are met.

(b) **SCOPE OF REVIEW.**—In carrying out the review, the Secretary shall—

(1) review the historical precedents and implementation of section 5 of such Act, including those actions undertaken by the Secretary, over time, under that section—

(A) to repair or restore a project; and

(B) to increase the level of protection for a damaged project to address future conditions;

(2) evaluate the difference between adopting, as an appropriate standard under section 5 of such Act, the repair or restoration of a project to pre-flood or pre-storm levels and the repair or restoration of a project to a design level of protection, including an assessment for each standard of—

(A) the implications on populations at risk of flooding or damage;

(B) the implications on probability of loss of life;

(C) the implications on property values at risk of flooding or damage;

(D) the implications on probability of increased property damage and associated costs;

(E) the implications on local and regional economies; and

(F) the estimated total cost and estimated cost savings;

(3) incorporate the science on expected rates of sea-level rise and extreme weather events; and

(4) incorporate the work completed by the Hurricane Sandy Rebuilding Task Force, established by Executive Order 13632 (December 7, 2012).

(c) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the review.

SEC. 121. EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION OF RISK.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In any river basin where the Secretary carries out flood risk management activities subject to an annual operating plan, the Secretary shall establish procedures for providing the public and affected governments, including Indian tribes, in the river basin with—

(1) timely information regarding expected water levels;

(2) advice regarding appropriate preparedness actions;

(3) technical assistance; and

(4) any other information or assistance determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(b) **PROCEDURES.**—The Secretary shall utilize the procedures only when precipitation or runoff exceeds those calculations considered as the lowest risk to life and property contemplated by the annual operating plan.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) **AFFECTED GOVERNMENT.**—The term “affected government” means a State, local, or tribal government with jurisdiction over an area that will be affected by a flood.

(2) **ANNUAL OPERATING PLAN.**—The term “annual operating plan” means a plan prepared by the Secretary that describes potential water condition scenarios for a river basin for a year.

SEC. 122. IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM ACT.

(a) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467 et seq.) is amended by striking “Director” each place it appears and inserting “Administrator”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 2(3) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 467(3)) is amended in the paragraph heading by striking “DIRECTOR” and inserting “ADMINISTRATOR”.

(b) **INSPECTION OF DAMS.**—Section 3(b)(1) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 467a(b)(1)) is amended by striking “or maintenance” and inserting “maintenance, condition, or provision for emergency operations”.

(c) **NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.**—

(1) **OBJECTIVES.**—Section 8(c)(4) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 467f(c)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

“(4) develop and implement a comprehensive dam safety hazard education and public awareness initiative to assist the public in mitigating against, preparing for, responding to, and recovering from dam incidents;”.

(2) **BOARD.**—Section 8(f)(4) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 467f(f)(4)) is amended by inserting “, representatives from nongovernmental organizations,” after “State agencies”.

SEC. 123. RESTRICTED AREAS AT CORPS OF ENGINEERS DAMS.

Section 2 of the Freedom to Fish Act (Public Law 113-13; 127 Stat. 449) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1) by striking “until the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act”;

(2) in the heading of subsection (c) by inserting “OR MODIFIED” after “NEW”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “new or modified” after “establishes any”; and

(B) in paragraph (3) by striking “until the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “until the Secretary has complied with the provisions of this subsection”.

SEC. 124. LEVEE SAFETY.

Section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-16) is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) **LEVEE SAFETY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—At the request of a State or political subdivision thereof, and in consultation with that State and appropriate non-Federal interests, the Secretary may provide technical assistance to a State to—

“(A) encourage effective State or local programs intended to ensure levee safety to protect human life and property;

“(B) assist the State or political subdivision in establishing and carrying out a levee safety program; or

“(C) improve an existing State or local levee safety program.

“(2) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of technical assistance provided under this subsection shall be—

“(A) to ensure that human lives and property that are protected by new and existing levees are safe;

“(B) to encourage the use of appropriate engineering policies and procedures for levee site investigation, design, construction, operation and maintenance, and emergency preparedness;

“(C) to encourage effective levee safety programs in a State;

“(D) to develop and support public education and awareness projects to increase public acceptance and support of levee safety programs;

“(E) to build public awareness of the residual risks associated with living in levee protected areas; and

“(F) to develop technical assistance materials, seminars, and guidelines to improve the security of levees in the United States.

“(3) **FEDERAL GUIDELINES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary, in consultation with States and non-Federal interests, shall establish Federal guidelines relating to levee safety.

“(B) **INCORPORATION OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES.**—The guidelines established under subparagraph (A) shall encompass, to the maximum

extent practicable, activities and practices carried out by appropriate Federal agencies.

“(C) **INCORPORATION OF STATE AND LOCAL ACTIVITIES.**—The guidelines established under subparagraph (A) shall encompass, to the maximum extent practicable—

“(i) the activities and practices carried out by States, local governments, and the private sector to safely build, regulate, operate, and maintain levees; and

“(ii) Federal activities that facilitate State efforts to develop and implement effective State programs for the safety of levees, including levee inspection, levee rehabilitation, locally developed flood plain management, and public education and training programs.

“(D) **REVIEW.**—The Secretary shall allow States and non-Federal interests, including appropriate stakeholders, to review and comment on the guidelines established under subparagraph (A) before the guidelines are made final.

“(4) **ASSISTANCE FOR STATE LEVEE SAFETY PROGRAMS.**—

“(A) **ELIGIBILITY.**—To be eligible for technical assistance under this subsection, a State shall—

“(i) be in the process of establishing or have in effect a State levee safety program under which a State levee safety agency, in accordance with State law, carries out the guidelines established under paragraph (3); and

“(ii) allocate sufficient funds in the budget of that State to carry out such State levee safety program.

“(B) **WORK PLANS.**—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with each State receiving technical assistance under this subsection to develop a work plan necessary for the State levee safety program of that State to reach a level of program performance that meets the guidelines established under paragraph (3).

“(C) **INSPECTION PROGRAMS.**—The Secretary shall work with States receiving technical assistance under this subsection to develop State technical guidelines for levee inspection programs that—

“(i) address hazard classifications and technically based frameworks for levee assessment; and

“(ii) are incorporated into State levee safety programs.

“(D) **MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.**—Technical assistance may not be provided to a State under this subsection during a fiscal year unless the State enters into an agreement with the Secretary to ensure that the State will maintain during that fiscal year aggregate expenditures for programs to ensure levee safety that are at or above the average annual level of such expenditures for the State for the 2 fiscal years preceding that fiscal year.”.

SEC. 125. VEGETATION ON LEVEES.

(a) **REVIEW.**—The Secretary of the Army, in accordance with subsection (c), shall undertake a comprehensive review of the Corps of Engineers policy guidelines on vegetation management for levees (in this section referred to as the “guidelines”). The Secretary shall commence the review upon the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **FACTORS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In conducting the review, the Secretary shall examine the guidelines in view of—

(A) the varied interests and responsibilities in managing flood risks, including the need to provide the greatest levee safety benefit with limited resources;

(B) preserving, protecting, and enhancing natural resources, including the potential benefit that vegetation on levees can have in providing habitat for species of concern;

(C) protecting the rights of Indian tribes pursuant to treaties and statutes;

(D) determining how vegetation impacts the performance of a levee or levee system during a storm or flood event; and

(E) such other factors as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) **REGIONAL AND WATERSHED CONSIDERATIONS.**—In conducting the review, the Secretary shall specifically consider factors that promote and allow for consideration of potential variances from national guidelines on a regional or watershed basis. Such factors may include regional or watershed soil conditions, hydrologic factors, vegetation patterns and characteristics, environmental resources, levee performance history, institutional considerations, and other relevant factors. The scope of a variance approved by the Secretary may include an exemption to national guidelines where appropriate.

(c) **COOPERATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The review shall be undertaken in cooperation with interested Federal agencies and in consultation with interested representatives of State and local governments, Indian tribes, appropriate nongovernmental organizations, and the public.

(2) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Corps of Engineers Regional Integration Teams, representing districts, divisions, and headquarters, in consultation with State and Federal resources agencies, and with participation by local agencies, shall recommend to the Secretary vegetation management policies for levees that conform with State and Federal laws and other applicable requirements.

(d) **REVISION OF GUIDELINES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—During the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) provide the public 30 days to review and comment on the guidelines;

(B) revise the guidelines based on consideration of the results of the public review; and

(C) submit to Congress a report that contains a summary of the activities of the Secretary and a description of the findings of the Secretary under this section.

(2) **CONTENT; INCORPORATION INTO MANUAL.**—The revised guidelines shall—

(A) provide a practical process for approving regional or watershed variances from the national guidelines, reflecting due consideration of measures to maximize public safety benefits with limited resources, levee performance, regional climatic and hydrologic variations, environmental quality, implementation challenges, and allocation of responsibilities; and

(B) be incorporated into the manual proposed under section 5(c) of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes”, approved August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n(c)).

(e) **CONTINUATION OF WORK.**—Concurrent with completion of the requirements of this section, the Secretary shall proceed without interruption or delay with those ongoing or programmed projects and studies, or elements of projects or studies, that are not directly related to vegetation variance policy.

SEC. 126. REDUCTION OF FEDERAL COSTS.

Section 204(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **REDUCING COSTS.**—To reduce or avoid Federal costs, the Secretary shall consider the beneficial use of dredged material in a manner that contributes to the maintenance of sediment resources in the nearby coastal system.”.

SEC. 127. ADVANCED MODELING TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—To the greatest extent practicable, the Secretary shall encourage and incorporate advanced modeling technologies, including 3-dimensional digital modeling, for activities related to water resources development projects and studies.

(b) **ACTIVITIES.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary, to the greatest extent practicable, shall—

(1) compile information related to advanced modeling technologies, including industry best practices with respect to the use of the technologies;

(2) disseminate to non-Federal interests the information described in paragraph (1); and

(3) promote the use of advanced modeling technologies.

(c) **ADVANCED MODELING TECHNOLOGY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “advanced modeling technology” means an available or developing technology, including 3-dimensional digital modeling, that can expedite project delivery for or improve the evaluation of water resources development projects that receive Federal funding by—

(1) accelerating and improving the environmental review process;

(2) increasing effective public participation;

(3) enhancing the detail and accuracy of project designs;

(4) increasing safety;

(5) accelerating construction and reducing construction costs; or

(6) otherwise achieving such purposes.

SEC. 128. ENHANCED USE OF ELECTRONIC COMMERCE IN FEDERAL PROCUREMENT.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the Secretary's actions to carry out section 2301 of title 41, United States Code, regarding the use of electronic commerce in Federal procurement.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include, with respect to the 2 fiscal years most recently ended before the fiscal year in which the report is submitted—

(1) an identification of the number, type, and dollar value of procurement solicitations with respect to which the public was permitted to respond to the solicitation electronically, which shall differentiate between solicitations that allowed full or partial electronic submission;

(2) an analysis of the information provided under paragraph (1) and actions that could be taken by the Secretary to refine and improve the use of electronic submission for procurement solicitation responses;

(3) an analysis of the potential benefits of and obstacles to implementing fuller use of electronic submission for procurement solicitation responses, including with respect to cost savings, error reduction, paperwork reduction, increased bidder participation, and competition, and expanded use of electronic bid data collection for cost-effective contract management and timely reporting; and

(4) an analysis of the options and technologies available to facilitate expanded implementation of electronic submission for procurement solicitation responses and the suitability of each option and technology for contracts of various types and sizes.

SEC. 129. CORROSION PREVENTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—To the greatest extent practicable, the Secretary shall encourage and incorporate corrosion prevention activities at water resources development projects.

(b) **ACTIVITIES.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary, to the greatest extent practicable, shall ensure that contractors performing work for water resources development projects—

(1) use best practices to carry out corrosion prevention activities in the field;

(2) use industry recognized standards and corrosion mitigation and prevention methods when—

(A) determining protective coatings;

(B) selecting materials; and

(C) determining methods of cathodic protection, design, and engineering for corrosion prevention;

(3) use certified coating application specialists and cathodic protection technicians and engineers;

(4) use best practices in environmental protection to prevent environmental degradation, and to ensure careful handling of all hazardous materials;

(5) demonstrate a history of employing industry-certified inspectors to ensure adherence to best practices and standards; and

(6) demonstrate a history of compliance with applicable requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

(c) **CORROSION PREVENTION ACTIVITIES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “corrosion prevention activities” means—

(1) the application and inspection of protective coatings for complex work involving steel and cementitious structures, including structures that will be exposed in immersion;

(2) the installation, testing, and inspection of cathodic protection systems; and

(3) any other activities related to corrosion prevention the Secretary determines appropriate.

SEC. 130. RESILIENT CONSTRUCTION AND USE OF INNOVATIVE MATERIALS.

The Secretary, to the extent practicable, shall encourage the use of durable, resilient, and sustainable materials and practices, including the use of geosynthetic materials, advanced composites, and innovative technologies, in carrying out the activities of the Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 131. ASSESSMENT OF WATER SUPPLY IN ARID REGIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct an assessment of the management practices, priorities, and authorized purposes at Corps of Engineers reservoirs in arid regions to determine the effects of such practices, priorities, and purposes on water supply during periods of drought.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the assessment.

SEC. 132. RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS.

Section 5019 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1201) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) **REPORT.**—After each fiscal year, if the Secretary did not allocate funds in accordance with subsection (b), the Secretary, in conjunction with the President's next submission to Congress of a budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, shall submit to Congress a report that describes—

“(1) the reasons why the Secretary did not allocate funds in accordance with subsection (b) during that fiscal year; and

“(2) the impact, on the jurisdiction of each Commission specified in subsection (b), of not allocating the funds, including with respect to—

“(A) water supply allocation;

“(B) water quality protection;

“(C) regulatory review and permitting;

“(D) water conservation;

“(E) watershed planning;

“(F) drought management;

“(G) flood loss reduction;

“(H) recreation; and

“(I) energy development.”.

SEC. 133. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT BILLS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) Between 1986 and 2000, a water resources development bill was typically enacted every 2 years.

(2) Since 2000, only 1 water resources development bill has been enacted.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that, because the missions of the Corps of Engineers are unique and benefit all individuals in the United States and because water resources development projects are critical to maintaining economic prosperity, national security, and environmental protection, Congress should consider a water resources development bill not less than once every Congress.

SEC. 134. DONALD G. WALDON LOCK AND DAM.

It is the sense of Congress that, at an appropriate time and in accordance with the rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate, to recognize the contributions of Donald G. Waldon, whose selfless determination and tireless work, while serving as administrator of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway for 21 years, contributed greatly to the realization and success of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Development Compact, that the lock and dam located at mile 357.5 on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway should be known and designated as the “Donald G. Waldon Lock and Dam”.

SEC. 135. AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES.

Section 104(a) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610(a)) is amended by inserting “and aquatic invasive species” after “noxious aquatic plant growths”.

SEC. 136. RECREATIONAL ACCESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may not prohibit the use of a floating cabin on waters under the jurisdiction of the Secretary if—

(1) the floating cabin is in compliance regulations for recreational vessels issued under chapter 43 of title 46, United States Code, and section 312 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1322); and

(2) the Secretary has authorized the use of recreational vessels on such waters.

(b) **FLOATING CABIN DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “floating cabin” means a vessel, as defined in section 3 of title 1, United States Code, with overnight accommodations.

SEC. 137. TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 1156 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2310) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary shall waive” and inserting “(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall waive”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.**—The Secretary shall adjust the dollar amount specified in subsection (a) for inflation for the period beginning on November 17, 1986, and ending on the date of enactment of this subsection.”.

SEC. 138. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING INTERSTATE WATER AGREEMENTS AND COMPACTS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) States and local interests have primary responsibility for developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes.

(2) The Federal Government cooperates with States and local interests in developing water supplies through the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal water resources development projects.

(3) Interstate water disputes are most properly addressed through interstate water agreements or compacts that take into consideration the concerns of all affected States.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress and the Secretary should urge States to reach agreement on interstate water agreements and compacts;

(2) at the request of the Governor of a State, the Secretary should facilitate and assist in the development of an interstate water agreement or compact;

(3) Congress should provide prompt consideration of interstate water agreements and compacts; and

(4) the Secretary should adopt policies and implement procedures for the operation of reservoirs of the Corps of Engineers that are consistent with interstate water agreements and compacts.

TITLE II—NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS

Subtitle A—Ports

SEC. 201. EXPANDED USE OF HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For any fiscal year in which target appropriations described in subsection (b) are met, the Secretary may use up to 5 percent of the total amount made available to the Secretary from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for the eligible operations and maintenance costs described in section 210(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238(a)(2)) for that fiscal year for expanded uses of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

(b) **TARGET APPROPRIATIONS.**—For purposes of this section, target appropriations are met for a fiscal year if the total amount made available to the Secretary from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for that fiscal year equals or exceeds, as determined by the Secretary, the following:

(1) For fiscal year 2014, 65 percent of the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received in fiscal year 2013.

(2) For fiscal year 2015, 67 percent of the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received in fiscal year 2014.

(3) For fiscal year 2016, 69 percent of the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received in fiscal year 2015.

(4) For fiscal year 2017, 71 percent of the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received in fiscal year 2016.

(5) For fiscal year 2018, 73 percent of the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received in fiscal year 2017.

(6) For fiscal year 2019, 75 percent of the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received in fiscal year 2018.

(7) For fiscal year 2020, and each fiscal year thereafter, 80 percent of total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received in the previous fiscal year.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) **ELIGIBLE HARBORS AND INLAND HARBORS DEFINED.**—The term “eligible harbor or inland harbor” means a harbor or inland harbor that, historically, as determined by the Secretary—

(A) generates an amount of harbor maintenance taxes; that exceeds

(B) the value of work carried out for the harbor or inland harbor using amounts from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

(2) **EXPANDED USES.**—The term “expanded uses” means the following activities performed for an eligible harbor or inland harbor:

(A) The maintenance dredging of a berth in a harbor that is accessible to a Federal navigation project and that benefits commercial navigation at the harbor.

(B) The maintenance dredging and disposal of legacy-contaminated sediment, and sediment unsuitable for open water disposal, if—

(i) such dredging and disposal benefits commercial navigation at the harbor; and

(ii) such sediment—

(I) is located in and affects the maintenance of a Federal navigation project; or

(II) is located in a berth that is accessible to a Federal navigation project.

(3) **TOTAL AMOUNT OF HARBOR MAINTENANCE TAXES RECEIVED.**—The term “total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received” means, with respect to a fiscal year, the aggregate of amounts appropriated, transferred, or credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund under section 9505(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of

1986 for that fiscal year as set forth in the current year estimate provided in the President's budget request for the subsequent fiscal year, submitted pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

(d) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 9505(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “(as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996)”.

(e) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that any increase in harbor maintenance programs described in this section shall result from an overall increase in appropriations for the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers and not from similar reductions in the appropriations for other programs, projects, and activities carried out by the Corps of Engineers for other authorized purposes.

SEC. 202. ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITIZATION OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

(a) **ASSESSMENT.**—Section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **ASSESSMENT OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE NEEDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary shall assess the operation and maintenance needs of the harbors referred to in subsection (a)(2).

“(2) **TYPES OF HARBORS.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall assess the operation and maintenance needs of the harbors used for—

“(A) commercial navigation;

“(B) commercial fishing;

“(C) subsistence, including utilization by Indian tribes (as such term is defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)) for subsistence and ceremonial purposes;

“(D) use as a harbor of refuge;

“(E) transportation of persons;

“(F) purposes relating to domestic energy production, including the fabrication, servicing, or supply of domestic offshore energy production facilities;

“(G) activities of the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating;

“(H) public health and safety related equipment for responding to coastal and inland emergencies;

“(I) recreation purposes; and

“(J) any other authorized purpose.

“(3) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—For fiscal year 2015, and biennially thereafter, in conjunction with the President's annual budget submission to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that, with respect to harbors referred to in subsection (a)(2)—

“(A) identifies the operation and maintenance costs associated with the harbors, including those costs required to achieve and maintain the authorized length, width, and depth for the harbors, on a project-by-project basis;

“(B) identifies the amount of funding requested in the President's budget for the operation and maintenance costs associated with the harbors, on a project-by-project basis;

“(C) identifies the unmet operation and maintenance needs associated with the harbors, on a project-by-project basis; and

“(D) identifies the harbors for which the President will allocate funding over the next 5 fiscal years for operation and maintenance activities, on a project-by-project basis, including the amounts to be allocated for such purposes.”.

(b) **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EMERGENCY HARBOR PROJECTS.**—Section 210 of such Act

(33 U.S.C. 2238) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EMERGING HARBOR PROJECTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall make expenditures to pay for operation and maintenance costs of the harbors referred to in subsection (a)(2), including expenditures of funds appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, based on an equitable allocation of funds among all such harbors, regardless of the size or tonnage throughput of the harbor.

“(2) CRITERIA.—In determining the equitable allocation of funds under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(A) utilize the information obtained in the assessment conducted under subsection (c);

“(B) consider the national and regional significance of harbor operation and maintenance; and

“(C) not make such allocation based solely on the tonnage transiting through a harbor.

“(3) EMERGING HARBORS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in making expenditures described in paragraph (1) for each of fiscal years 2015 and 2016, the Secretary shall allocate not less than 10 percent of the total amount of the expenditures to pay for operation and maintenance costs of emerging harbors.

“(B) EMERGING HARBOR DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘emerging harbor’ means a harbor referred to in subsection (a)(2) that transits less than 1,000,000 tons of commerce annually.

“(4) EMERGENCY EXPENDITURES.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit the Secretary from making an expenditure to pay for the operation and maintenance costs of a specific harbor, including the transfer of funding from the operation and maintenance of a separate project, if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that the action is necessary to address the navigation needs of a harbor where safe navigation has been severely restricted due to an unforeseen event; and

“(B) the Secretary provides advance notice and information on the need for the action to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

“(5) MANAGEMENT OF GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION SYSTEM.—To sustain effective and efficient operation and maintenance of the Great Lakes Navigation System, including any navigation feature in the Great Lakes that is a Federal responsibility with respect to operation and maintenance, the Secretary shall manage and allocate funding for all of the individually authorized projects in the Great Lakes Navigation System as components of a single, comprehensive system, recognizing the interdependence of the projects.”.

SEC. 203. PRESERVING UNITED STATES HARBORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into an agreement with a non-Federal interest, at the request of the non-Federal interest, under which the Secretary agrees to maintain a navigation project for a harbor or inland harbor (in this section referred to as a ‘federally authorized harbor’) in accordance with section 101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(b)).

(b) REPORT BY NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to enter into an agreement under subsection (a) with respect to a federally authorized harbor, a non-Federal interest shall submit to the Secretary a report justifying economic investment in maintenance of the harbor.

(2) JUSTIFICATION OF INVESTMENT.—A report submitted under paragraph (1) may justify economic investment in the maintenance of a federally authorized harbor based on—

(A) projected economic benefits, including transportation savings and job creation; and

(B) other factors, including navigation safety, national security, and sustainability of subsistence harbors.

(3) TERMINATION OF CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—An agreement entered into under subsection (a) with respect to a federally authorized harbor shall contain terms to allow the Secretary to terminate the agreement if the Secretary determines that Federal economic investment in maintaining the harbor is no longer justified.

(c) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to preclude the operation and maintenance of a federally authorized harbor under section 101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(b)).

SEC. 204. CONSOLIDATION OF DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION EXPERTISE.

Section 2033(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2282a(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION PLANNING CENTER OF EXPERTISE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall consolidate deep draft navigation expertise within the Corps of Engineers into a deep draft navigation planning center of expertise.

“(B) LIST.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the consolidation required under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a list of personnel, including the grade levels and expertise of the personnel, assigned to the center described in subparagraph (A).”.

SEC. 205. DISPOSAL SITES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in accordance with subsections (b) and (c) and with the concurrence of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, is authorized to reopen the Cape Arundel Disposal Site (in this section referred to as the ‘Site’) as an alternative dredged material disposal site under section 103(b) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1413(b)).

(b) DEADLINE.—The Site may remain open under subsection (a) until the earlier of—

(1) the date on which the Site does not have any remaining disposal capacity;

(2) the date on which an environmental impact statement designating an alternative dredged material disposal site for southern Maine has been completed; or

(3) the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The use of the Site as a dredged material disposal site under subsection (a) shall be subject to the conditions that—

(1) conditions at the Site remain suitable for the continued use of the Site as a dredged material disposal site; and

(2) the Site not be used for the disposal of more than 80,000 cubic yards from any single dredging project.

Subtitle B—Inland Waterways

SEC. 211. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle, the following definitions apply:

(1) INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND.—The term ‘Inland Waterways Trust Fund’ means the Inland Waterways Trust Fund established by section 9506(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) QUALIFYING PROJECT.—The term ‘qualifying project’ means any construction or major

rehabilitation project for navigation infrastructure of the inland and intracoastal waterways that is—

(A) authorized before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) not completed on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(C) funded at least in part from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

SEC. 212. PROJECT DELIVERY PROCESS REFORMS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFYING PROJECTS.—With respect to each qualifying project, the Secretary shall require—

(1) for each project manager, that—

(A) the project manager have formal project management training and certification; and

(B) the project manager be assigned from among personnel certified by the Chief of Engineers; and

(2) for an applicable cost estimation, that—

(A) the Secretary utilize a risk-based cost estimate with a confidence level of at least 80 percent; and

(B) the cost estimate be implemented—

(i) for a qualifying project that requires an increase in the authorized amount in accordance with section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280), during the preparation of a post-authorization change report or other similar decision document;

(ii) for a qualifying project for which the first construction contract has not been awarded, prior to the award of the first construction contract;

(iii) for a qualifying project without a completed feasibility report in accordance with section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282), prior to the completion of such a report; and

(iv) for a qualifying project with a completed feasibility report in accordance with section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282) that has not yet been authorized, during design for the qualifying project.

(b) ADDITIONAL PROJECT DELIVERY PROCESS REFORMS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) establish a system to identify and apply on a continuing basis best management practices from prior or ongoing qualifying projects to improve the likelihood of on-time and on-budget completion of qualifying projects;

(2) evaluate early contractor involvement acquisition procedures to improve on-time and on-budget project delivery performance; and

(3) implement any additional measures that the Secretary determines will achieve the purposes of this subtitle, including—

(A) the implementation of applicable practices and procedures developed pursuant to management by the Secretary of an applicable military construction program;

(B) the development and use of a portfolio of standard designs for inland navigation locks;

(C) the use of full-funding contracts or formulation of a revised continuing contracts clause; and

(D) the establishment of procedures for recommending new project construction starts using a capital projects business model.

(c) PILOT PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may carry out pilot projects to evaluate processes and procedures for the study, design, and construction of qualifying projects.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—At a minimum, the Secretary shall carry out pilot projects under this subsection to evaluate—

(A) early contractor involvement in the development of features and components;

(B) an appropriate use of continuing contracts for the construction of features and components; and

(C) applicable principles, procedures, and processes used for military construction projects.

(d) **INLAND WATERWAYS USER BOARD.**—Section 302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2251) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) **DUTIES OF USERS BOARD.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Users Board shall meet not less frequently than semiannually to develop and make recommendations to the Secretary and Congress regarding the inland waterways and inland harbors of the United States.

“(2) **ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS.**—For commercial navigation features and components of the inland waterways and inland harbors of the United States, the Users Board shall provide—

“(A) prior to the development of the budget proposal of the President for a given fiscal year, advice and recommendations to the Secretary regarding construction and rehabilitation priorities and spending levels;

“(B) advice and recommendations to Congress regarding any completed feasibility report in accordance with section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282) relating to those features and components;

“(C) advice and recommendations to Congress regarding an increase in the authorized cost of those features and components;

“(D) not later than 60 days after the date of the submission of the budget proposal of the President to Congress, advice and recommendations to Congress regarding construction and rehabilitation priorities and spending levels; and

“(E) advice and recommendations on the development of a long-term capital investment program in accordance with subsection (d).

“(3) **PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAMS.**—The chairperson of the Users Board shall appoint a representative of the Users Board to serve as an informal advisor to the project development team for a qualifying project or the study or design of a commercial navigation feature or component of the inland waterways and inland harbors of the United States.

“(4) **INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT.**—Any advice or recommendation made by the Users Board to the Secretary shall reflect the independent judgment of the Users Board.”;

(2) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) **DUTIES OF SECRETARY.**—The Secretary shall—

“(1) communicate not less than once each quarter to the Users Board the status of the study, design, or construction of all commercial navigation features or components of the inland waterways or inland harbors of the United States; and

“(2) submit to the Users Board a courtesy copy of all completed feasibility reports relating to a commercial navigation feature or component of the inland waterways or inland harbors of the United States.

“(d) **CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary, in coordination with the Users Board, shall develop and submit to Congress a report describing a 20-year program for making capital investments on the inland and intracoastal waterways based on the application of objective, national project selection prioritization criteria.

“(2) **CONSIDERATION.**—In developing the program under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall take into consideration the 20-year capital investment strategy contained in the Inland Marine Transportation System (IMTS) Capital Projects Business Model, Final Report published on April 13, 2010, as approved by the Users Board.

“(3) **CRITERIA.**—In developing the plan and prioritization criteria under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that investments made under the 20-year program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) are made in all geographical areas of the inland waterways system; and

“(B) ensure efficient funding of inland waterways projects.

“(4) **STRATEGIC REVIEW AND UPDATE.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and not less frequently than once every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary, in coordination with the Users Board, shall—

“(A) submit to Congress a strategic review of the 20-year program in effect under this subsection, which shall identify and explain any changes to the project-specific recommendations contained in the previous 20-year program (including any changes to the prioritization criteria used to develop the updated recommendations); and

“(B) make revisions to the program, as appropriate.

“(e) **PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLANS.**—The chairperson of the Users Board and the project development team member appointed by the chairperson under subsection (b)(3) may sign the project management plan for the qualifying project or the study or design of a commercial navigation feature or component of the inland waterways and inland harbors of the United States.

“(f) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The Users Board shall be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, other than section 14, and, with the consent of the appropriate agency head, the Users Board may use the facilities and services of any Federal agency. For the purposes of complying with such Act, the members of the Users Board shall not be considered special Government employees (as defined in section 202 of title 18, United States Code). Non-Federal members of the Users Board while engaged in the performance of their duties away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.”.

SEC. 213. EFFICIENCY OF REVENUE COLLECTION.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare a report on the efficiency of collecting the fuel tax for the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, which shall include—

(1) an evaluation of whether current methods of collection of the fuel tax result in full compliance with requirements of the law;

(2) whether alternative methods of collection would result in increased revenues into the Inland Waterways Trust Fund; and

(3) an evaluation of alternative collection options.

SEC. 214. INLAND WATERWAYS REVENUE STUDIES.

(a) **INLAND WATERWAYS CONSTRUCTION BONDS STUDY.**—

(1) **STUDY.**—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall conduct a study on the feasibility of authorizing the issuance of federally tax-exempt bonds secured against the available proceeds, including projected annual receipts, in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund established by section 9506(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—In carrying out the study, the Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury shall examine the implications of issuing such bonds, including the potential revenues that could be generated and the projected net cost to the Treasury, including loss of potential revenue.

(3) **CONSULTATION.**—In carrying out the study, the Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury, at a minimum, shall consult with—

(A) representatives of the Inland Waterway Users Board established by section 302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2251);

(B) representatives of the commodities and bulk cargos that are currently shipped for commercial purposes on the segments of the inland and intracoastal waterways listed in section 206 of the Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 1978 (33 U.S.C. 1804);

(C) representatives of other users of locks and dams on the inland and intracoastal waterways, including persons owning, operating, using, or otherwise benefitting from—

(i) hydropower generation facilities;

(ii) electric utilities that rely on the waterways for cooling of existing electricity generation facilities;

(iii) municipal and industrial water supply;

(iv) recreation;

(v) irrigation water supply; or

(vi) flood damage reduction;

(D) other stakeholders associated with the inland and intracoastal waterways, as identified by the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury; and

(E) the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, including the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(4) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a joint report on the results of the study to—

(A) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Environment and Public Works, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(b) **POTENTIAL FEES FOR BENEFICIARIES AND USERS OF INLAND AND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAYS INFRASTRUCTURE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on potential user fees and revenues from other sources that could be collected to generate additional revenues for the Inland Waterways Trust Fund established by section 9506(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) **SCOPE OF STUDY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall evaluate an array of potential user fees and other revenues options that, when combined with funds generated by section 4042 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, are sufficient to support one-half of annual construction expenditure levels of \$380,000,000 for the authorized purposes of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

(B) **POTENTIAL REVENUE OPTIONS FOR STUDY.**—In carrying out the study, the Secretary, at a minimum, shall evaluate potential user fees and other revenue options identified in—

(i) the report of the Congressional Budget Office entitled “Paying for Highways, Airways, and Waterways: How Can Users Be Charged?”, dated May 1, 1992;

(ii) the draft bill submitted by the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) to Congress entitled the “Lock User Fee Act of 2008”, dated April 4, 2008;

(iii) the Inland Marine Transportation System (IMTS) Capital Projects Business Model, Final Report, published on April 12, 2010, as approved by the Inland Waterways Users Board established by section 302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2251); and

(iv) the draft bill submitted by the President to Congress entitled the “Inland Waterways Capital Investment Act of 2011”, dated September 2011.

(3) **CONDUCT OF STUDY.**—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall—

(A) take into consideration whether the potential user fees and revenues from other sources—

(i) are equitably associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of inland and intracoastal waterway infrastructure, including locks, dams, and navigation channels; and

(ii) can be efficiently collected;

(B) consult with, at a minimum—

(i) representatives of the Inland Waterways Users Board; and

(ii) representatives of other nonnavigation beneficiaries of inland and intracoastal waterway infrastructure, including persons benefiting from—

(I) municipal water supply;

(II) hydropower;

(III) recreation;

(IV) industrial water supply;

(V) flood damage reduction;

(VI) agricultural water supply;

(VII) environmental restoration;

(VIII) local and regional economic development; or

(IX) local real estate interests; and

(iii) representatives of other interests, as identified by the Secretary; and

(C) provide the opportunity for public hearings in each of the geographic regions that contain segments of the inland and intracoastal waterways listed in section 206 of the Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 1978 (33 U.S.C. 1804).

(4) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report on the results of the study to—

(A) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Environment and Public Works, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 215. INLAND WATERWAYS STAKEHOLDER ROUNDTABLE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct an inland waterways stakeholder roundtable to provide for a review and evaluation of alternative approaches—

(1) to address the financial needs of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund; and

(2) to support the water infrastructure needs of the Inland Waterways System.

(b) **SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 45 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to Congress the report required by section 214(b), the Secretary shall select individuals to be invited to participate in the stakeholder roundtable.

(2) **COMPOSITION.**—The individuals selected under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) representatives of affected shippers and suppliers;

(B) representatives of State and Federal water managers; and

(C) other interested persons with direct knowledge of the Inland Waterways System.

(c) **FRAMEWORK AND AGENDA.**—The Secretary shall work with a group of the individuals selected under subsection (b) to develop the framework and agenda for the stakeholder roundtable.

(d) **CONDUCT OF STAKEHOLDER ROUNDTABLE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to Congress the report required by section 214(b), the Secretary shall conduct the stakeholder roundtable.

(2) **ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED.**—The stakeholder roundtable shall provide for the review and evaluation described in subsection (a) and shall include the following:

(A) An evaluation of alternatives that have been developed to address funding options for the Inland Waterways System.

(B) An evaluation of the funding status of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

(C) Prioritization of the ongoing and projected water infrastructure needs of the Inland Waterways System.

(D) Identification of a process forward for meeting such needs, with timeline for addressing the funding challenges for the inland waterways trust system.

(e) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to Congress the report required by section 214(b), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that contains—

(1) a summary of the stakeholder roundtable, including areas of concurrence on funding approaches and areas of disagreement in meeting funding needs; and

(2) recommendations developed by the Secretary for logical next steps to address the issues discussed at the stakeholder roundtable.

SEC. 216. PRESERVING THE INLAND WATERWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) **OLMSTED PROJECT REFORM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 102(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2212(a)), for each fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, 25 percent of the cost of construction for the Olmsted Project shall be paid from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

(2) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection the term “Olmsted Project” means the project for navigation, Lower Ohio River, Locks 52 and 53, Illinois and Kentucky, authorized by section 3(a)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013).

(3) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the appropriation for the Olmsted project should be not less than \$150,000,000 for each fiscal year until construction of the project is completed.

(4) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate regarding the lessons learned from the experience of planning and constructing the Olmsted Project and how such lessons might apply to future inland waterway studies and projects.

(b) **ANNUAL REPORT ON PROGRESS AND COSTS.**—For any inland waterways project that the Secretary carries out that has an estimated total cost of \$500,000,000 or more, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional committees referred to in subsection (a)(4) an annual financial plan for the project. The plan shall be based on detailed annual estimates of the cost to complete the remaining elements of the project and on reasonable assumptions, as determined by the Secretary, of any future increases of the cost to complete the project.

SEC. 217. PUBLIC COMMENT ON LOCK OPERATIONS.

At least 90 days before carrying out a proposed modification to the operation of a lock at a project for navigation on the inland waterways, the Secretary shall—

(1) provide notice of the proposed modification in the Federal Register; and

(2) accept public comments on the proposed modification.

SEC. 218. ASSESSMENT OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE NEEDS OF THE ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY AND THE GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary

shall assess the operation and maintenance needs of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

(b) **TYPES OF ACTIVITIES.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall assess the operation and maintenance needs of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway as used for the following purposes:

(1) Commercial navigation.

(2) Commercial fishing.

(3) Subsistence, including utilization by Indian tribes (as such term is defined by section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)) for subsistence and ceremonial purposes.

(4) Use as ingress and egress to harbors of refuge.

(5) Transportation of persons.

(6) Purposes relating to domestic energy production, including fabrication, servicing, and supply of domestic offshore energy production facilities.

(7) Activities of the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

(8) Public health and safety related equipment for responding to coastal and inland emergencies.

(9) Recreation purposes.

(10) Any other authorized purpose.

(c) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—For fiscal year 2015, and biennially thereafter, in conjunction with the President's annual budget submission to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that, with respect to the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway—

(1) identifies the operation and maintenance costs required to achieve the authorized length, width, and depth;

(2) identifies the amount of funding requested in the President's budget for operation and maintenance costs; and

(3) identifies the unmet operation and maintenance needs of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

SEC. 219. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER PROTECTION.

(a) **ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on the impact of closing the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam on the economy and the environment, including an assessment of the annual average tonnage moving through the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam during the preceding 5 years.

(b) **MANDATORY CLOSURE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall close the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam if the Secretary determines pursuant to the study conducted under subsection (a), or based on other appropriate information made available to the Secretary, that the annual average tonnage moving through the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam during the preceding 5 years was not more than 1,500,000 tons.

(c) **EMERGENCY OPERATIONS.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to prevent the Secretary from carrying out emergency lock operations necessary to mitigate flood damage.

(d) **UPPER ST. ANTHONY FALLS LOCK AND DAM DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam” means the lock and dam located on Mississippi River Mile 853.9 in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

SEC. 220. CORPS OF ENGINEERS LOCK AND DAM ENERGY DEVELOPMENT.

Section 1117 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4236) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1117. W.D. MAYO LOCK AND DAM.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma may—

“(1) design and construct one or more hydroelectric generating facilities at the W.D. Mayo Lock and Dam on the Arkansas River, Oklahoma; and

“(2) market the electricity generated from any such facility.

“(b) **PRECONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(1) **PERMITS.**—Before the date on which construction of a hydroelectric generating facility begins under subsection (a), the Cherokee Nation shall obtain any permit required under Federal or State law, except that the Cherokee Nation shall be exempt from licensing requirements that may otherwise apply to construction, operation, or maintenance of the facility under the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.).

“(2) **REVIEW OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS.**—The Cherokee Nation may initiate the design or construction of a hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a) only after the Secretary reviews and approves the plans and specifications for the design and construction.

“(c) **PAYMENT OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION COSTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may accept funds offered by the Cherokee Nation and use such funds to carry out the design and construction of a hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a).

“(2) **ALLOCATION OF COSTS.**—The Cherokee Nation shall—

“(A) bear all costs associated with the design and construction of a hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a); and

“(B) provide any funds necessary for the design and construction to the Secretary prior to the Secretary initiating any activities related to the design and construction.

“(d) **ASSUMPTION OF LIABILITY.**—The Cherokee Nation shall—

“(1) hold all title to a hydroelectric generating facility constructed under subsection (a) and may, subject to the approval of the Secretary, assign such title to a third party;

“(2) be solely responsible for—

“(A) the operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation of the facility; and

“(B) the marketing of the electricity generated by the facility; and

“(3) release and indemnify the United States from any claims, causes of action, or liabilities that may arise out of any activity undertaken to carry out this section.

“(e) **ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE.**—The Secretary may provide technical and construction management assistance requested by the Cherokee Nation relating to the design and construction of a hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a).

“(f) **THIRD PARTY AGREEMENTS.**—The Cherokee Nation may enter into agreements with the Secretary or a third party that the Cherokee Nation or the Secretary determines are necessary to carry out this section.”.

TITLE III—DEAUTHORIZATIONS AND BACKLOG PREVENTION

SEC. 301. DEAUTHORIZATION OF INACTIVE PROJECTS.

(a) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to identify \$12,000,000,000 in water resources development projects authorized by Congress that are no longer viable for construction due to—

(A) a lack of local support;

(B) a lack of available Federal or non-Federal resources; or

(C) an authorizing purpose that is no longer relevant or feasible;

(2) to create an expedited and definitive process to deauthorize water resources development

projects that are no longer viable for construction; and

(3) to allow the continued authorization of water resources development projects that are viable for construction.

(b) **DEAUTHORIZATION OF PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BEFORE WRDA 2007.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and shall publish in the Federal Register, a report that lists each authorized water resources development project, or separable element of a project, authorized for construction before November 8, 2007—

(A) for which—

(i) construction was not initiated before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) construction was initiated before the date of enactment of this Act, but for which no funds, Federal or non-Federal, were obligated for construction of the project or separable element during the 5-year period ending on July 1, 2013; and

(B) that is identified in accordance with paragraph (3).

(2) **SPECIAL RULE FOR ONGOING CONSTRUCTION.**—A project or separable element shall not be listed pursuant to paragraph (1)(A)(ii) if the project or separable element is being constructed as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) **IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall identify in the report submitted under paragraph (1) projects and separable elements that—

(i) meet the requirements described in subparagraph (A) of that paragraph; and

(ii) in the aggregate have an estimated Federal cost to complete (as of the date of the report) that is at least \$12,000,000,000.

(B) **SEQUENCING OF PROJECTS.**—In identifying projects and separable elements under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall identify projects and separable elements according to the order in which the projects and separable elements were authorized, beginning with the earliest authorized projects and separable elements and ending upon the aggregate estimated Federal cost to complete for the projects and separable elements identified satisfying the requirement under subparagraph (A)(ii).

(4) **CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD; DEAUTHORIZATION.**—After the expiration of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the submission of the report under this subsection, any project or separable element identified in that report is hereby deauthorized, unless during such period the non-Federal interest for the project or separable element provides, under Federal law, all funds necessary to complete the project or separable element.

(c) **TREATMENT OF PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.**—For purposes of this section, if an authorized water resources development project or separable element has been modified in an Act of Congress, the date of the authorization of the project or separable element shall be deemed to be the date of the most recent such modification.

SEC. 302. REVIEW OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS ASSETS.

(a) **ASSESSMENT AND INVENTORY.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct an assessment of all properties under the control of the Corps of Engineers and develop an inventory of the properties that are not needed for the missions of the Corps of Engineers.

(b) **CRITERIA.**—In conducting the assessment and developing the inventory under subsection (a), the Secretary shall use the following criteria:

(1) The extent to which the property aligns with the current missions of the Corps of Engineers.

(2) The economic impact of the property on existing communities in the vicinity of the property.

(3) The extent to which the utilization rate for the property is being maximized and is consistent with nongovernmental industry standards for the given function or operation.

(4) The extent to which the reduction or elimination of the property could reduce operation and maintenance costs of the Corps of Engineers.

(5) The extent to which the reduction or elimination of the property could reduce energy consumption by the Corps of Engineers.

(c) **NOTIFICATION.**—As soon as practicable following completion of the inventory of properties under subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide the inventory to the Administrator of General Services.

(d) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the notification under subsection (c), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report containing the findings of the Secretary with respect to the assessment and inventory required under subsection (a).

SEC. 303. BACKLOG PREVENTION.

(a) **PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A water resources development project, or separable element of such a project, authorized for construction by this Act shall not be authorized after the last day of the 7-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act unless during that period funds have been obligated for construction of such project.

(2) **IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECTS.**—Not later than 60 days after the expiration of the 7-year period referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that identifies the projects deauthorized under paragraph (1).

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 60 days after the expiration of the 12-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that contains—

(1) a list of any water resources development projects authorized by this Act for which construction has not been completed during that period;

(2) a description of the reasons the projects were not completed; and

(3) a schedule for the completion of the projects based on expected levels of appropriations.

SEC. 304. DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The following projects are not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act:

(1) **WALNUT CREEK (PACHECO CREEK), CALIFORNIA.**—The portions of the project for flood protection on Walnut Creek, California, constructed under section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-645; 74 Stat. 488), consisting of the Walnut Creek project from Sta 0+00 to Sta 142+00 and the upstream extent of the Walnut Creek project along Pacheco Creek from Sta 0+00 to Sta 73+50.

(2) **WALNUT CREEK (SAN RAMON CREEK), CALIFORNIA.**—The portion of the project for flood protection on Walnut Creek, California, constructed under section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-645; 74 Stat. 488), consisting of the culvert constructed by the Department of the Army on San Ramon Creek from Sta 4+27 to Sta 14+27.

(3) **HILLSBOROUGH (HILLSBORO) BAY AND RIVER, FLORIDA.**—Those portions of the project for navigation, Hillsborough (Hillsboro) Bay and River, Florida, authorized by the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1126; chapter 425), that extend on either side of the Hillsborough River from the Kennedy Boulevard bridge to the mouth of the river that cause the existing channel to exceed 100 feet in width.

(4) **KAHULUI WASTEWATER RECLAMATION FACILITY, MAUI, HAWAII.**—The project carried out pursuant to the authority provided by section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r) to provide shoreline protection for the Kahului Wastewater Reclamation Facility, located on the Island of Maui in the State of Hawaii.

(5) **CHICAGO HARBOR, ILLINOIS.**—The portion of the project for navigation, Chicago Harbor, Illinois, authorized by the first section of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1129; chapter 425), and the first section of the Act of March 2, 1919 (40 Stat. 1283; chapter 95), and described as follows:

(A) Beginning at the southwest corner of Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago sluice gate that abuts the north wall of the Chicago River Lock.

(B) Thence running north for approximately 290 feet.

(C) Thence running east approximately 1,000 feet.

(D) Thence running south approximately 290 feet.

(E) Thence running west approximately 1,000 feet to the point of origin.

(6) **LUCAS-BERG PIT, ILLINOIS WATERWAY AND GRANT CALUMET RIVER, ILLINOIS.**—The portion of the project for navigation, Illinois Waterway and Grand Calumet River, Illinois, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes”, approved July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 636; chapter 596), that consists of the Lucas-Berg Pit confined disposal facility, Illinois.

(7) **ROCKLAND HARBOR, MAINE.**—The portion of the project for navigation, Rockland Harbor, Maine, authorized by the Act entitled “An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes”, approved June 3, 1896 (29 Stat. 202), and described as follows:

(A) Beginning at the point in the 14-foot turning basin limit with coordinates N162,927.61, E826,210.16.

(B) Thence running north 45 degrees 45 minutes 15.6 seconds east 287.45 feet to a point N163,128.18, E826,416.08.

(C) Thence running south 13 degrees 17 minutes 53.3 seconds east 129.11 feet to a point N163,002.53, E826,445.77.

(D) Thence running south 45 degrees 45 minutes 18.4 seconds west 221.05 feet to a point N162,848.30, E826,287.42.

(E) Thence running north 44 degrees 14 minutes 59.5 seconds west 110.73 feet to the point of origin.

(8) **CORSICA RIVER, QUEEN ANNE’S COUNTY, MARYLAND.**—The portion of the project for improving the Corsica River, Maryland, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled “An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes”, approved July 25, 1912 (37 Stat. 205), and described as follows: Approximately 2,000 feet of the eastern section of the project channel extending from—

(A) centerline station 0+000 (coordinates N506350.60, E1575013.60); to

(B) station 2+000 (coordinates N508012.39, E1574720.18).

(9) **GLOUCESTER HARBOR AND ANNISQUAM RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.**—The portions of the project for navigation, Gloucester Harbor and Annisquam River, Massachusetts, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes”, approved of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 12; chapter 19), consisting of an 8-foot anchorage area in Lobster Cove, and described as follows:

(A) Beginning at a bend along the easterly limit of the existing project, N3063230.31, E878283.77, thence running northwesterly about 339 feet to a point, N3063478.86, E878053.83, thence running northwesterly about 281 feet to a bend on the easterly limit of the existing project, N3063731.88, E877932.54, thence running southeasterly about 612 feet along the easterly limit of the existing project to the point of origin.

(B) Beginning at a bend along the easterly limit of the existing project, N3064065.80, E878031.45, thence running northwesterly about 621 feet to a point, N3064687.05, E878031.13, thence running southwesterly about 122 feet to a point, N3064686.98, E877908.85, thence running southeasterly about 624 feet to a point, N3064063.31, E877909.17, thence running southwesterly about 512 feet to a point, N3063684.73, E877564.56, thence running about 741 feet to a point along the westerly limit of the existing project, N3063273.98, E876947.77, thence running northeasterly about 533 feet to a bend along the westerly limit of the existing project, N3063585.62, E877380.63, thence running about 147 feet northeasterly to a bend along the westerly limit of the project, N3063671.29, E877499.63, thence running northeasterly about 233 feet to a bend along the westerly limit of the existing project, N3063840.60, E877660.29, thence running about 339 feet northeasterly to a bend along the westerly limit of the existing project, N3064120.34, E877852.55, thence running about 573 feet to a bend along the westerly limit of the existing project, N3064692.98, E877865.04, thence running about 113 feet to a bend along the northerly limit of the existing project, N3064739.51, E877968.31, thence running 145 feet southeasterly to a bend along the northerly limit of the existing project, N3064711.19, E878110.69, thence running about 650 feet along the easterly limit of the existing project to the point of origin.

(10) **IPSWICH RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.**—The portion of the project for navigation, Ipswich River, Massachusetts, authorized by the first section of the Act of August 5, 1886 (24 Stat. 317, chapter 929) consisting of a 4-foot channel located at the entrance to the inner harbor at Ipswich Harbor, and described as follows:

(A) Lying northwesterly of a line commencing at N3,074,938.09, E837,154.87.

(B) Thence running easterly approximately 60 feet to a point with coordinates N3,074,972.62, E837,203.93.

(11) **EAST FORK OF TRINITY RIVER, TEXAS.**—The portion of the project for flood protection on the East Fork of the Trinity River, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1185), that consists of the 2 levees identified as Kaufman County Levees K5E and K5W.

(12) **BURNHAM CANAL, WISCONSIN.**—The portion of the project for navigation, Milwaukee Harbor Project, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, known as the Burnham Canal, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled “An Act for the protection of commerce on Lake Michigan”, approved March 3, 1843 (5 Stat. 619; chapter 85), and described as follows:

(A) Beginning at channel point #415a N381768.648, E2524554.836, a distance of about 170.58 feet.

(B) Thence running south 53 degrees 43 minutes 41 seconds west to channel point #417 N381667.728, E2524417.311, a distance of about 35.01 feet.

(C) Thence running south 34 degrees 10 minutes 40 seconds west to channel point #501 N381638.761, E2524397.639, a distance of about 139.25 feet.

(D) Thence running south 34 degrees 10 minutes 48 seconds west to channel point #503 N381523.557, E2524319.406, a distance of about 235.98 feet.

(E) Thence running south 32 degrees 59 minutes 13 seconds west to channel point #505 N381325.615, E2524190.925, a distance of about 431.29 feet.

(F) Thence running south 32 degrees 36 minutes 05 seconds west to channel point #509 N380962.276, E2523958.547, a distance of about 614.52 feet.

(G) Thence running south 89 degrees 05 minutes 00 seconds west to channel point #511 N380952.445, E2523344.107, a distance of about 74.68 feet.

(H) Thence running north 89 degrees 04 minutes 59 seconds west to channel point #512 N381027.13, E2523342.91, a distance of about 533.84 feet.

(I) Thence running north 89 degrees 05 minutes 00 seconds east to channel point #510 N381035.67, E2523876.69, a distance of about 47.86 feet.

(J) Thence running north 61 degrees 02 minutes 07 seconds east to channel point #508 N381058.84, E2523918.56, a distance of about 308.55 feet.

(K) Thence running north 36 degrees 15 minutes 29 seconds east to channel point #506 N381307.65, E2524101.05, a distance of about 199.98 feet.

(L) Thence running north 32 degrees 59 minutes 12 seconds east to channel point #504 N381475.40, E2524209.93, a distance of about 195.14 feet.

(M) Thence running north 26 degrees 17 minutes 22 seconds east to channel point #502 N381650.36, E2524296.36, a distance of about 81.82 feet.

(N) Thence running north 88 degrees 51 minutes 05 seconds west to channel point #419 N381732.17, E2524294.72, a distance of about 262.65 feet.

(O) Thence running north 82 degrees 01 minutes 02 seconds east to channel point #415a, the point of origin.

(13) **MANITOWOC HARBOR, WISCONSIN.**—The portion of the project for navigation, Manitowoc River, Manitowoc, Wisconsin, authorized by the Act of August 30, 1852 (10 Stat. 58; chapter 104), and described as follows: The triangular area bound by—

(A) 44.09893383N and 087.66854912W;

(B) 44.09900535N and 087.66864372W; and

(C) 44.09857884N and 087.66913123W.

(b) **SEWARD WATERFRONT, SEWARD, ALASKA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the portion of the project for navigation, Seward Harbor, Alaska, identified as Tract H, Seward Original Townsite, Waterfront Park Replat, Plat No 2012-4, Seward Recording District, shall not be subject to navigation servitude beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **ENTRY BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.**—The Federal Government may enter upon the property referred to in paragraph (1) to carry out any required operation and maintenance of the general navigation features of the project referred to in paragraph (1).

(c) **PORT OF HOOD RIVER, OREGON.**—

(1) **EXTINGUISHMENT OF PORTIONS OF EXISTING FLOWAGE EASEMENT.**—With respect to the properties described in paragraph (2), beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the flowage easement identified as Tract 1200E-6 on the

Easement Deed recorded as Instrument No. 740320 is extinguished above elevation 79.39 feet (NGVD 29), the ordinary high water line.

(2) **AFFECTED PROPERTIES.**—The properties described in this paragraph, as recorded in Hood River County, Oregon, are as follows:

(A) Instrument Number 2010-1235.

(B) Instrument Number 2010-02366.

(C) Instrument Number 2010-02367.

(D) Parcel 2 of Partition Plat 2011-12P.

(E) Parcel 1 of Partition Plat 2005-26P.

(3) **EXTINGUISHMENT OF FLOWAGE EASEMENT.**—With respect to the properties described in paragraph (2), the flowage easement is extinguished if the elevation of the property is above the standard project flood elevation.

(4) **FEDERAL LIABILITIES.**—The United States shall not be liable for any injury caused by the extinguishment of the easement under this subsection.

(5) **NO EFFECT ON OTHER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this subsection affects the remaining rights and interests of the Corps of Engineers for authorized project purposes.

SEC. 305. LAND CONVEYANCES.

(a) **TULSA PORT OF CATOOSA, ROGERS COUNTY, OKLAHOMA LAND EXCHANGE.**—

(1) **LAND EXCHANGE.**—On conveyance by the Tulsa Port of Catoosa to the United States of all right, title, and interest in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to the Tulsa Port of Catoosa all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection, the following definitions apply:

(A) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 87 acres of land situated in Rogers County, Oklahoma, contained within United States Tracts 413 and 427 and acquired for the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas Navigation System.

(B) **NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “non-Federal land” means the approximately 34 acres of land situated in Rogers County, Oklahoma, and

owned by the Tulsa Port of Catoosa that lie immediately south and east of the Federal land.

(3) **SPECIFIC CONDITIONS.**—

(A) **DEEDS.**—

(i) **DEED TO NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—The Secretary may only accept conveyance of the non-Federal land by warranty deed, as determined acceptable by the Secretary.

(ii) **DEED TO FEDERAL LAND.**—The Secretary shall convey the Federal land to the Tulsa Port of Catoosa by quitclaim deed and subject to any reservations, terms, and conditions the Secretary determines necessary to—

(I) allow the United States to operate and maintain the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System; and

(II) protect the interests of the United States.

(iii) **CASH PAYMENT.**—If the appraised fair market value of the Federal land, as determined by the Secretary, exceeds the appraised fair market value of the non-Federal land, as determined by the Secretary, the Tulsa Port of Catoosa shall make a cash payment to the United States reflecting the difference in the appraised fair market values.

(b) **CITY OF ASOTIN, WASHINGTON.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall convey to the city of Asotin, Asotin County, Washington, without monetary consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3).

(2) **REVERSION.**—If the land transferred under this subsection ceases at any time to be used for a public purpose, the land shall revert to the United States.

(3) **DESCRIPTION.**—The land to be conveyed to the city of Asotin, Washington, under this subsection are—

(A) the public ball fields designated as Tracts 1503, 1605, 1607, 1609, 1611, 1613, 1615, 1620, 1623, 1624, 1625, 1626, and 1631; and

(B) other leased areas designated as Tracts 1506, 1522, 1523, 1524, 1525, 1526, 1527, 1529, 1530, 1531, and 1563.

(c) **GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.**—

(1) **SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—The exact acreage and the legal description of any real property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(2) **APPLICABILITY OF PROPERTY SCREENING PROVISIONS.**—Section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to any conveyance under this section.

(3) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary may require that any conveyance under this section be subject to such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(4) **COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall be responsible for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with the conveyance.

(5) **LIABILITY.**—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall hold the United States harmless from any liability with respect to activities carried out, on or after the date of the conveyance, on the real property conveyed. The United States shall remain responsible for any liability with respect to activities carried out, before such date, on the real property conveyed.

TITLE IV—WATER RESOURCES INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZATION OF FINAL FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

The following final feasibility studies for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plan, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports designated in this section:

(1) **NAVIGATION.**—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Federal Cost	E. Estimated Non-Federal Cost
1. TX, LA	Sabine Neches Waterway, Southeast Texas and Southwest Louisiana.	July 22, 2011	\$779,399,000	\$359,227,000
2. FL	Jacksonville Harbor-Milepoint	April 30, 2012	\$27,804,000	\$9,122,000
3. GA	Savannah Harbor Expansion Project	Aug. 17, 2012	\$461,000,000	\$201,000,000
4. TX	Freeport Harbor	Jan. 7, 2013	\$121,132,000	\$116,342,000
5. FL	Canaveral Harbor (Sect 203 Sponsor Report)	Feb. 25, 2013	\$28,652,000	\$11,588,000

(2) **FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT.**—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Federal Cost	E. Estimated Non-Federal Cost
1. KS	Topeka	Aug. 24, 2009	\$15,494,000	\$8,343,000
2. CA	American River Watershed, Common Features Project, Natomas Basin.	Dec. 30, 2010	\$943,300,000	\$479,500,000
3. IA	Cedar River, Cedar Rapids	Jan. 27, 2011	\$67,216,000	\$36,194,000
4. MN, ND	Fargo-Moorhead Metro	Dec. 19, 2011	\$801,542,000	\$979,806,000
5. KY	Ohio River Shoreline, Paducah	May 16, 2012	\$12,893,000	\$6,943,000

(3) **HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION.**—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Initial Federal Cost and Estimated Total Federal Cost for Life of Project	E. Estimated Initial Non-Federal Cost and Estimated Total Non-Federal Cost for Life of Project
1. NC	West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet (Topsail Beach).	Sept. 28, 2009	Initial Cost: \$30,557,000 Total Cost: \$132,372,000	Initial Cost: \$17,315,000 Total Cost: \$132,372,000
2. NC	Surf City and North Topsail Beach	Dec. 30, 2010	Initial Cost: \$81,484,000 Total Cost: \$106,182,000	Initial Cost: \$43,900,000 Total Cost: \$106,182,000
3. CA	San Clemente Shoreline	April 5, 2012	Initial Cost: \$7,500,000 Total Cost: \$43,400,000	Initial Cost: \$4,000,000 Total Cost: \$43,400,000

(4) HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Federal Cost	E. Estimated Non-Federal Cost
1. MS	Mississippi Coastal Improvement Program (MSCIP) Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties.	Sept. 15, 2009	\$815,090,000	\$438,890,000

(5) ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Federal Cost	E. Estimated Non-Federal Cost
1. MD	Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island	Aug. 24, 2009	\$1,221,721,000	\$657,849,000
2. FL	Central and Southern Florida Project, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Caloosahatchee River (C-43) West Basin Storage Project, Hendry County.	March 11, 2010	\$297,189,000	\$297,189,000
3. LA	Louisiana Coastal Area	Dec. 30, 2010	\$954,452,000	\$513,936,000
4. MN	Marsh Lake	Dec. 30, 2011	\$6,403,000	\$3,564,000
5. FL	Central and Southern Florida Project, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, C-111 Spreader Canal Western Project.	Jan. 30, 2012	\$88,992,000	\$88,992,000
6. FL	CERP Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetland, Florida	May 2, 2012	\$96,209,000	\$96,209,000
7. FL	Central and Southern Florida Project, Broward County Water Preserve Area.	May 21, 2012	\$433,353,500	\$433,353,500
8. LA	Louisiana Coastal Area-Barataria Basin Barrier	June 22, 2012	\$283,567,000	\$152,690,000
9. NC	Neuse River Basin	April 23, 2013	\$23,253,100	\$12,520,900

SEC. 402. PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.

(a) MIAMI HARBOR, MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, Miami Harbor, Miami-Dade County, Florida, authorized by section 1001(17) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1052), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$152,510,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$92,007,000 and a non-Federal cost of \$60,503,000.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall take effect on November 8, 2007.

(b) LOWER OHIO RIVER, ILLINOIS AND KENTUCKY.—The project for navigation, Lower Ohio River, Locks and Dams 52 and 53, Illinois and Kentucky, authorized by section 3(a)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013), is modified to authorize the Sec-

retary to construct the project at a total cost of \$2,300,000,000, with a first Federal cost of \$2,300,000,000.

(c) LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN (CADY MARSH DITCH), INDIANA.—The project for flood control, Little Calumet River Basin (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4115), and modified by section 127 of Public Law 109–103 (119 Stat. 2259), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$269,988,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$202,800,000 and a non-Federal cost of \$67,188,000.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113–251.

Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GIBBS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–251.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 14, after "company" insert "or natural gas company".

Page 33, after line 20, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . EXPEDITED COMPLETION OF REPORTS.

The Secretary shall—

- (1) expedite the completion of any on-going feasibility study for a project initiated before the date of enactment of this Act; and

- (2) if the Secretary determines that the project is justified in a completed report, proceed directly to preconstruction planning, engineering, and design of the project in accordance with section 910 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4189).

Page 42, after line 23, add the following:

(g) SAVING PROVISION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect any agreement entered into under section 204(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2232(f)) before the date of enactment of this Act.

Page 46, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS PRIOR TO AUTHORIZATION OF FINAL FEASIBILITY REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), a non-Federal interest may carry out a project for which—

- (1) a final feasibility report has been completed; and

- (2) authority for the Secretary to carry out such project has not specifically been authorized by Congress.

(b) CONDITIONS.—The non-Federal interest—

- (1) shall, before carrying out the project, obtain any permit, approval, or authorization required pursuant to Federal or State law; and

- (2) shall carry out the project in accordance with the plan, and subject to the conditions, described in the final feasibility report.

(c) CREDIT, REIMBURSEMENT, AND FUTURE MAINTENANCE.—

(1) ELIGIBILITY FOR CREDIT OR REIMBURSEMENT.—Subject to paragraph (4), and in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), a non-Federal interest may be eligible for credit or reimbursement for the Federal share of any work carried out by the non-Federal interest under this section.

(2) ELIGIBILITY FOR MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION PROJECTS.—Subject to paragraph (4), and in accordance with section 211(h) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 701b-13(h)), whenever a non-Federal interest constructs improvements to a harbor or inland harbor under this section, the Secretary shall be responsible for maintenance of such harbor.

(3) LIMITATION.—Any activities carried out under this section are authorized only to the extent specifically provided for in subsequent appropriations Acts.

(4) IMPLEMENTATION.—Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) shall not apply unless—

- (A) all laws and regulations that would apply to the Secretary if the Secretary were carrying out the project were applied by the non-Federal interest during construction of the project; and

- (B) the project is subsequently specifically authorized by Congress.

(5) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—Absent a specific subsequent authorization by Congress, the non-Federal interest shall not be reimbursed or receive credit for in-kind contributions.

Page 75, after line 12, insert the following:

(3) review and evaluate the historic and potential uses, and economic feasibility for the life of the project, of nonstructural alternatives, including natural features such as dunes, coastal wetlands, floodplains, marshes, and mangroves, to reduce the damage caused by floods, storm surges, winds, and other aspects of extreme weather events, and to increase the resiliency and long-term cost-effectiveness of water resources development projects;

Page 128, beginning on line 13, strike "section 102(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2212(a))" and insert "section 3(a)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013)".

Page 163, strike lines 1 through 8.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan manager's amendment.

In this amendment, we provide clarity related to expediting projects while authorizing the Corps of Engineers to move to pre-construction, planning, engineering, and design activities immediately following a completed feasibility study. This will ensure work will continue without stops and starts in the study process.

We authorize non-Federal interests with the ability to carry out work at their own expense pursuant to an unauthorized yet completed feasibility study if the non-Federal interest agrees to carry out the work subject to any State or Federal permitting departments, and that the non-Federal interests carry out the project in accordance with the feasibility study.

We request that the Corps of Engineers review the uses and economic feasibility of nonstructural alternatives in their review of existing authorities for clearing-out work after a storm event. We have made technical and conforming changes to the bill.

We developed this amendment working closely with Members to address several key issues and to improve upon the underlying bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, although I am not opposed to the amendment, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, Shuster amendment No. 1 provides for the expediting and completion of ongoing feasibility studies and authorizes the Corps

of Engineers to move to pre-construction planning, engineering, and design. It directs the Corps of Engineers to consider nonstructural alternatives in the rebuilding of areas impacted by floods and storms.

I am in support of the amendment, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank Mr. RAHALL for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, am in support of this amendment. I particularly want to thank the chairman for the inclusion of language in this amendment that addresses two issues of concern. One is the inclusion of consideration of nonstructural alternatives in preventing future storm damage. I think that is very important, particularly in the wake of Hurricane Sandy, for those of us that live in the Northeast; also, the language that allows the non-Federal cost-share partner to begin work on issues that are of importance to their locality.

I think these are very important issues to Members on our side, and I thank the chairman for including them.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and the underlying bill.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL and all of the committee for the tremendous work that was done to substantially improve the outlook on the use of the harbor maintenance tax because these moneys were not being used for dredging, as they were intended to be. And this has severely hurt American competitiveness.

If we are going to grow this economy, we have to expand international trade, and we have to have the maritime and port infrastructure to do so. It is essential that these funds are used for the intended purpose.

I also want to point out a couple of concerns I have. There are two issues in the 2007 WRDA bill, authorizations that require technical amendments that pertain to Louisiana authorizations, and I am hopeful that as we go forward on this, the chairman and the subcommittee chairman will work with me to achieve some resolution of this, because it is holding up Army Corps of Engineers projects, and it is something that would be very easy to fix, it is no cost, and adds nothing to the budget. They are purely technical adjustments that need to be made.

So I am hopeful we can work through this as we go forward.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chairman, I certainly support the amendment and the

underlying bill. I wanted to speak to one concern that I had.

Mr. Chair, Congress has consistently limited the authority of the Corps of Engineers and recognized the long-established State water rights to protect federalism. This bill is certainly no exception.

In my State of South Dakota, and in the Upper Missouri Basin, the Corps is planning to charge for water from the Missouri River. This is after the Dakotas gave up hundreds of thousands of acres of farmland during the creation of the dams along the Missouri River, for which we have never been fully compensated.

The issue of the Corps charging for surplus water is a concern for many communities, tribes, and cities up and down the Missouri River. Chairman SHUSTER has assured me that he would work with us into the future to move forward on conferees to resolve this issue and to stop this attempt to take our water. For that, I certainly appreciate the efforts.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. I want to thank the chairman and the committee for their hard work on WRRDA, which I am pleased to support.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment that addresses an issue with the population growth projections of the 1958 Water Supply Act, which are outdated, and many local water districts are now forced to pay substantial principal and interest to the Federal Government on excess water supply.

My amendment allows the Corps and local water districts to collaborate on finding new markets for their excess water storage. Not only does this partnership allow for the best use of shared resources, it also saves the taxpayers millions of dollars.

Again, I want to thank the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the chairman, and the ranking member for their hard work on this bill and for supporting my amendment.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. First, I do want to thank the chairman, the ranking member, and also Representative MCCOLLUM.

Mr. Chairman, our amendment is on the Asian carp. It is a very invasive species that really has a devastating effect on the Upper Mississippi River and the Ohio River Basin. This is a fish that can grow to 70 to 100 pounds. It is a voracious fish that is highly invasive. It can potentially destroy a \$7 billion commercial fishing business industry in the Great Lakes. It also would have a devastating effect on commercial boaters, recreational boaters, and sportsmen.

Again, I want you to understand that the nature of this fish is incredible.

Anytime the surface of the water is disturbed, it leaps out of the water. As I said, it can be 70 to 100 pounds. I know that many of us do boating in the summertime and have little children that boat with us. This is a fish that is so aggressive and so voracious that it can eat sometimes up to four times its own weight.

What does this fish do? It eats everything that other fish eat. If we allow this to come forward, it can be devastating.

This is a great example. I watched the last 3 weeks as both sides tried to get to some type of agreement, and couldn't get there. This is a bipartisan effort, a collective effort, collaborative effort, that allows both the States and the Federal agencies to work together on a solution to a problem that has been in existence and will continue to be in existence until we stop it.

So I want to again thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member RAHALL, and especially Ms. MCCOLLUM as we work together on this piece of legislation. I think it will have a great effect on our ability to keep the Great Lakes, the Upper Mississippi River, and the Ohio River Basin safe.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113-251.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 11, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 12, line 3, and insert the following:

“(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall be effective on the date on which the Secretary certifies to Congress that the cost to construct all water resources development projects that are authorized for construction by the Chief of Engineers by any Act of Congress, but are not completed, is less than \$20,000,000,000 (adjusted for inflation as of the date on which the certification is made).”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would delay the environmental shortcuts in section 103 until the Secretary certifies that the Corps has significantly reduced the backlog of projects that have already been approved, using the current environmental review process—already been approved.

The reason we are doing this is to make the point that this shortcut proc-

ess would undermine environmental protections and critical public participation under NEPA and other conservation laws. Combined with strict timelines and limited funding for feasibility studies, it guarantees the Corps will not have the information it needs to plan major projects with broad environmental impact.

There is no evidence that the public participation environmental review process has caused delay. In the hearings on H.R. 3080, no witness identified a single project where that had been the case. When asked directly about why Corps projects take years to implement, the common answer was: lack of available appropriations at critical times during project development and construction.

The problem is not NEPA. The problem is that this Congress has failed to appropriate enough money to keep up with the projects we authorized. WRDA 2007 authorized \$23 billion in new projects. Few have even been started. The estimated cost of completion of Corps projects currently under construction is another \$20 billion.

In stark contrast, the most recent appropriation of the Corps' construction budget was \$12.2 billion. If the Ryan budget is adopted—well, it was adopted in the House, but not implemented—that number would be even lower, pathetically lower.

Clearly, complying with NEPA and other environmental and public participation requirements is not the reason we have a backlog of projects worth billions of dollars.

Congress should appropriate—and this bill is a start—the funding needed to allow these projects which have already been approved, using all existing environmental review requirements, to be completed before we implement any new shortcuts.

A more thoughtful approach, as we work through this backlog over the next 5, 6, 10, 15 years at the current rate of spending—or 25 or 50 years at Ryan spending—would be to bifurcate the process. If we identified that there was a delay, particularly for repair, rehabilitation, replacement, or minor projects, we could streamline those under the House or Senate provisions, but major projects should still go through a full review so that we don't end up later in endless litigation over those very same projects.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3080 was drafted in a bipartisan fashion. Our environmental streamlining provision in section 103 is a result of compromise.

We have heard from many Members who are supportive of our provisions to

implement what is commonly called the “three by three by three process.” However, in order for the Corps to have the flexibility to fit within the timeframes laid in section 101 of H.R. 3080, accelerating the environmental review process in section 103 of the bill is critical.

The amendment seeks to undermine all environmental streamlining provisions in WRRDA. Regardless of the existence of backlog, streamlining environmental reviews is an essential reform, and I believe will help to reduce backlogs.

Additionally, reforms in WRRDA provide opportunities for non-Federal interests and other private sectors to move projects forward with their own funds, providing incentive for accelerating these project delivery processes regardless of the availability of Federal funding.

So I urge all Members to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman, and what he said is correct in terms of a situation here.

Mr. Chairman, streamlining provisions in this bill provide nothing but an empty promise that projects will be built faster. The empty promise comes with real costs: it will lead to more damaging and costly projects, and it will prevent States, local governments and other stakeholders from making realistic plans for the future.

The Corps currently has an estimated backlog of over 1,000 authorized activities that will take about \$60 billion. The bill before us adds to the backlog. Both the Corps, itself, and the administration have pointed out that these proposed streamlining guidelines may actually slow project development and do not adequately protect communities, taxpayers, and the environment.

The real cause of delay is limited funding, competition for funding amongst the extensive study and project construction backlog, poor project planning that does not focus on national priorities or on identifying the least possible damaging solution to water resource problems. Project studies take the longest when the Corps and Congress insist on pushing outdated, damaging, and extremely costly projects that inconvenience or even harm communities instead of adopting low-impact, modern solutions that could more easily gain broad-based support.

I am all for getting projects done faster, but our infrastructure deficit

slows the economy and puts people in physical danger at worst. We need to address that problem. Undercutting the environmental protections does not address it. It merely complicates it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Is the gentleman from Oregon prepared to close?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I have one more speaker.

Mr. SHUSTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Oregon. I thank the sponsors of this legislation, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and I am delighted, along with Mr. DEFAZIO, to be a cosponsor.

Mr. Chairman, I really just want to emphasize the core values of Mr. DEFAZIO's as to what this amendment represents. The fact is there is a lack of funding. For those of us who are around ports, who are experiencing extreme flooding, there is a lack of funding that the environmental review process has nothing to do with, and it has not led to the backlog of authorized projects that are not being constructed. I support the timely delivery of water resources projects, but I have concerns as to whether the changes made in this bill in the name of streamlining will actually achieve that goal.

So I ask and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, which will make the construction of already authorized projects a priority, which clearly had no problems with the environmental review process, and I would argue the fact that we should be encouraged to make this truly a jobs bill and support the DeFazio amendment.

Mr. Chair, as a cosponsor to Rep. DEFAZIO's amendment, that would delay the application of the environmental “streamlining” provisions in Section 103 until the Secretary certifies that there is sufficient funding to reduce the backlog of authorized Corps projects to less than \$20 billion in construction costs, I ask my colleagues across the aisle to support amendment #2.

This amendment highlights the fact that it is a lack of funding not the environmental review process that has led to a backlog of authorized projects that are not being constructed. We have spent enough energy arguing over the budget and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) streamlining, but not enough time in making the hard decisions and investments that are going to create economic growth and create jobs.

In short, while I strongly support timely delivery of water resources projects, I have concerns as to whether the changes made in this bill in the name of streamlining will actually achieve that goal.

Particularly given the real world funding issues that we face, and I remain very concerned about the impacts these changes will have on the public participation process and the assessment of impacts to the environment.

I urge Members to support Rep. DEFAZIO's amendment which will make the construction of already authorized projects that clearly had no problems with the environmental review process a priority.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LATHAM). The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) to control.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER)?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank you and all of the cosponsors of this amendment for putting this forward.

Mr. Chairman, this would actually delay the so-called “environmental streamlining” provisions in this bill, which would fast-track the critical review process and significantly limit public input. This amendment would also preserve the current review process that helps the Army Corps of Engineers foresee harmful environmental impacts before undertaking any project.

This safe, sustainable infrastructure is not really produced by cutting corners. WRRDA projects have wide-ranging consequences. I have several projects in my district, and I know how complex they can be. It is important to fully understand the effects that these projects will have on public health, on public safety, and on the environment.

History, quite frankly, has shown us that robust environmental reviews are good for the environment, the economy, public safety, and taxpayers. This bipartisan amendment would protect the environment and would really save taxpayer dollars. So I urge a “yea” vote, and I thank the gentleman for his tremendous leadership on this.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the chairman for his generosity, and I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is substantial agreement here in that we need to put more investment into critical water infrastructure projects. This bill begins to do that. We want to do it in the most thoughtful way possible. Some of these projects will alter local or regional environmental resources forever, sometimes to mitigate, sometimes, perhaps, not so much if they are not well thought out. Many of these projects are designed to last for 100 years or more. It certainly would behoove us to spend a little bit of time

fully vetting these projects before we authorize them and move forward.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote on the DeFazio amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the DeFazio/Blumenauer/Jackson Lee/Pingree/Edwards/Bonamici amendment to H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act. Our amendment would delay the so-called environmental streamlining provisions of the bill until the backlog of approved projects is meaningfully reduced. Environmental reviews are essential to the construction of better designed, more cost effective projects that meet important federal priorities like protecting public health and the environment. Unfortunately, the bill as written offers a false promise of expediting projects and reducing the backlog by paring back environmental reviews. The reality is that this will only lead to projects that damage the environment and ultimately cost more in the long run.

This WRRDA bill contains essential authorizations that will invest in our ports, waterways, and flood protection systems. The changes it makes to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund will benefit our nation's small ports and I am cautiously optimistic that we will soon be able to leverage all of the HMTF funds to the benefit of our ports both large and small. It also begins to reduce the project backlog by deauthorizing some older projects that have not yet begun. And even though I am disappointed in the environmental streamlining provisions of the underlying bill, it represents a bipartisan agreement that will keep us moving forward and allow House and Senate negotiators to bring this matter to a speedy resolution.

I urge my colleagues to support the DeFazio/Blumenauer/Jackson Lee/Pingree/Edwards/Bonamici amendment to improve this bill, and to support passage of H.R. 3080.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chair, I would first like to commend the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for working together on this bipartisan legislation. The collaboration between Chairman SCHUSTER, Ranking Member RAHALL and the rest of the committee demonstrates that we can work together to invest in our nation's infrastructure to make the U.S. more competitive and grow the economy. The backlog of unfinished water infrastructure projects and maintenance is hindering economic recovery and hurting small businesses by slowing trade. This bill helps address the backlog by updating critical infrastructure to allow goods to move more efficiently across our nation's waterways, ports and coasts.

However, like most pieces of legislation, this bill is not perfect. Although this bill makes some critical improvements to current law, I continue to be concerned with changes in environmental assessments and public comment periods in the U.S. Army Corps' project approval process. That is why I supported Rep. PETER DEFAZIO's (OR-04) amendment requiring the Army Corps to decrease their backlog of water infrastructure improvements to under \$20 billion before the modified environmental assessment process can go into effect. There

are currently over \$40 billion in projects that have been authorized under the current approval process, but they lack sufficient appropriations to actually complete them. While I understand the need to improve the Army Corps' project approval process, it would be helpful to start addressing the lack of appropriated funds for previously authorized projects.

Although Rep. DEFAZIO's amendment failed, I still supported this legislation because it makes many important improvements to the Great Lakes water infrastructure that will improve transportation and trade as well as protect against invasive species. I will continue to fight for policies that help the Army Corps decrease its backlog of construction and maintenance projects and protect our precious natural resources.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113-251.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. ____ NATIONAL OCEAN POLICY IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the July 19, 2010, Executive Order 13547 that established the “National Policy for the Stewardship of the Ocean, Our Coasts, and the Great Lakes” (in this section referred to as the “National Ocean Policy”) among other things requires Federal implementation of “ecosystem-based management” to achieve a “fundamental shift” in how the United States manages ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources, and the establishment of 9 new governmental “Regional Planning Bodies” and “Coastal and Marine Spatial Plans” in every region of the United States;

(2) Executive Order 13547 created a 54-member National Ocean Council led by the White House Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Science and Technology Policy that includes principal and deputy-level representatives from Federal entities, including the Department of Defense;

(3) Executive Order 13547 requires National Ocean Council members, including the Department of Defense, to take action to implement the National Ocean Policy and participate in Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning to the fullest extent;

(4) the Final Recommendations that were adopted by Executive Order 13547 state that “effective” implementation of the National Ocean Policy will “require clear and easily understood requirements and regulations,

where appropriate, that include enforcement as a critical component”;

(5) despite repeated congressional requests, the National Ocean Council, which is charged with overseeing National Ocean Policy implementation, has still not provided a complete accounting of Federal activities taken and resources expended and allocated in furtherance of National Ocean Policy implementation;

(6) the Corps of Engineers is participating on at least one “Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning Regional Team”; and

(6) the Nation's continued economic and budgetary challenges underscore the necessity for sound, transparent, and practical Federal policies.

(b) PROHIBITION.—None of the programs or actions authorized under this Act may be used to further implementation of the coastal and marine spatial planning and ecosystem-based management components of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547.

(c) STUDY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report detailing all activities engaged in and resources expended in furtherance of Executive Order 13547 since it was issued on July 19, 2010, as well as any fiscal year 2014 budget requests in support of National Ocean Policy implementation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that addresses a burdensome executive order that will have vast impacts on both our ocean and inland economies.

Executive Order 13547 was signed in 2010, and it requires that various bureaucracies essentially zone the ocean and the sources thereof. This means that a drop of rain that falls on your house could be subject to this overreaching policy because that precipitation will ultimately wind up in the ocean. The new policy guidelines under this executive order that were finalized in April of this year have the potential to change permitting criteria and regulatory requirements for a large number of economic sectors, including maritime shipping and inland river transportation.

The Army Corps of Engineers is participating in at least one Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning regional team, requiring resources and staff time outside of their current statutory obligations and outside their current budgetary authority. Since the Corps has not specifically asked for funds for the purpose of implementing Executive Order 13547, then they are raiding existing accounts to fund these activities, thus adding to the current projects backlogs and misusing scarce taxpayer resources.

Furthermore, the Senate WRDA bill includes a funding stream for regional

planning bodies pursuant to the administration's National Ocean Policy, thereby creating a permanent slush fund to bankroll the implementation of their ocean-zoning initiative that has not even received congressional authorization.

My amendment would prohibit the programs or actions authorized under WRRDA from being used to further implement ocean zoning under the executive order, and it further requires that the Secretary of the Army conduct and submit a study to Congress that details all of the activities engaged in and resources expended relating to the executive order and to the National Ocean Policy, as well as relevant FY 2014 budget requests.

I want to thank the T&I Committee for its hard work on the WRRDA bill. I look forward to voting for the WRRDA bill, and I urge the approval of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very destructive to a very good policy that was created by this House by the Committee on Natural Resources when, back in the late nineties, all of the Federal agencies and private sector came to Congress and said, We have a lot of conflicts of the sea. We need to start doing some planning in the ocean, like we have on land, so that we can get jobs done.

We were losing all kinds of equipment to fisheries and mining operations. It was just a huge mess. No Federal agency knew what the other Federal agency was doing. It was all on public lands called the "oceans," and the exploration of the oceans was very underserved.

The underlying bill that this amendment attacks was created by the committee in order to create a commission made up, in fact, of people from Texas for the oil industry. One of the things they said is, Stop that conflict. Let's have smart ocean planning. Let's help use and conserve our finite resources and grow our ocean economy.

This is the way to do it, but this amendment wipes it all back. It goes back to the Dark Ages. It goes back to the flat Earth opinion about ocean planning, which is: don't do it.

The aquaculture industry, which is a \$1.2 billion industry, has said this would be very destructive, that the Flores amendment would be a major setback for our industry. The aquaculture is growing, and we rely on efficient permitting and long-term planning so our industry can grow and prosper.

If the Army Corps of Engineers can't engage in the National Ocean Policy

planning that is geared toward helping our industry, then that is what sets us up for failure.

The North American Submarine Cable Association is opposed to this amendment. They stated that the first and foremost undersea cable operators engage in coastal marine spatial planning. Did you know that undersea cables, not satellites, carry more than 95 percent of the international voice, data and Internet traffic in the United States? They are critical for national security, and they carry civilian and military and U.S. Government traffic.

The Corps is working to improve coastal and sea floor maps and nautical charts, which are critical for navigation, citing offshore energy and recreational boating and fishing. The list goes on and on.

Even in the gentleman's home State of Texas, there are 170,000 people who are employed in the ocean economy. His amendment would destroy their ability to have good planning.

So I urge all of my friends to oppose this amendment, which is opposed by the private sector and public sectors, and it is just not smart thinking.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Flores amendment is, quite frankly, an affront to states' rights. By preventing the Army Corps of Engineers from coordinating ocean and coastal planning with Federal and State partners, it will inhibit the ability of States like Rhode Island, my home State, from managing resources in a way that fits their needs and priorities.

We have long recognized that our ocean resources do not adhere to State boundaries. Accordingly, their management must be regionally based. In the Northeast, our Regional Ocean Council has allowed our States to pool resources and our businesses to have a voice in decision-making. The Flores amendment may inhibit regional efforts, including ongoing Hurricane Sandy recovery and restoration planning to protect against future storm damage.

Put simply, it is an attempt to impose restrictions and requirements on coastal States and districts that will prevent our counties, cities, along with State Governors, from working collaboratively with their Federal partners on projects critical to coastal economies.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FARR. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In 2010, maritime economic activities supported 2.7 million jobs and \$258 billion in GDP. These resources are too important to our economies not to be managed with the best science practices available.

I strongly urge my colleagues to protect the rights of States to manage their own resources and to vote "no" on this misguided amendment.

□ 1615

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, how much time does each side have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. FARR. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I think there is a little misunderstanding here. This is not about a new agency or giving agencies new regulatory authority or direction. I will use a simple example.

We have great prospects for wave energy off the Northwest coast. We had a really great wave period doing research at Oregon State. I have a couple of private companies interested, but there are at least three Federal agencies involved. Simply what this executive order does is require that those agencies coordinate and they don't stovepipe, they don't work in silos. So when the wave developer goes to FERC, FERC will also have in the room NOAA, Marine Fisheries; the Pacific Fisheries Management Council will be involved; the other Federal agencies that have jurisdiction will be involved, and we won't end up going through one process with one agency, getting to the end of that, and then having another agency saying, "Wait a minute. You didn't talk to us."

This just happened with the bridge over the Columbia River to Washington State where the Coast Guard came in very late and said, "Wait a minute. We have height concerns about passage under this bridge." Had it been coordinated terrestrially inland in the same way that the President is imposing for agencies to work in the ocean, we will have a better, more comprehensive process that serves all interests.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, in closing, you have heard a lot of hyperbole about my amendment. My amendment is a simple amendment, and that is to stop an unconstitutional executive order that has been considered four times by Congress, including the 110th Congress and 111th Congress which were controlled by the other side. During none of those Congresses was the

law that is now part of this executive order ever approved by those Congresses. This is the bureaucracy in this chart that has been created unconstitutionally by this executive order. Congress clearly doesn't intend to do that because it has studied this for four Congresses and elected not to.

You also heard that there are shareholders that don't support what I propose to do in this amendment. Unfortunately, that is not true either. We have got everybody from farmers to energy to commercial fisheries to recreational fishing interests that support this amendment and are fully on the side of it.

They have said that stakeholders came to Congress and said there were problems and that they wanted this executive order. That is not true, because we had a hearing in the 112th Congress and the stakeholders, I specifically asked them: Did any of you want the provisions that are included by this executive order? To an entity, they said, no, they didn't care for it.

Also, I would like to say that this amendment has also passed four other times. In the 112th Congress, I added this amendment to the CJS appropriations bill for fiscal year 2013. It passed on a bipartisan basis, 246-174. I offered a similar amendment to the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act that passed by a bipartisan vote of 233-190. I also offered a related amendment to the FY 2014 Energy and Water appropriations bill that passed by a voice vote.

This is a commonsense amendment. We are just saying, A, if Congress hasn't authorized this activity, and, B, if Congress hasn't appropriated any money for this activity, then this activity shouldn't take place. That is what the Constitution calls for. That is what this amendment does.

With that, I would urge approval of the amendment and approval of the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to H. Res. 385, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc consisting of amendment Nos. 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 printed in House Report 113-251, offered by Mr. SHUSTER of Pennsylvania:

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN OF OKLAHOMA

At the end of title I, insert the following:
SEC. ____ . REPORT ON SURFACE ELEVATIONS AT DROUGHT EFFECTED LAKES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) due to the ongoing drought in many parts of the United States, State agencies are finding it difficult to maintain Federal Energy Regulatory Commission-licensed lake levels; and

(2) local agencies should be able to modify licensees when drought conditions arise and persist.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the FERC shall initiate an assessment of the effects of drought conditions on FERC-licensed lakes, which shall include an assessment of—

(A) existing FERC-licensed lakes with stipulated lake levels and rule curves in areas of previous, current and prolonged drought; and

(B) the effect the long-term licenses have on state agencies being able to meet all their obligations, including hydroelectric obligations, water supply downstream, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

(2) REPORT.—FERC shall submit to Congress a report on the assessment carried out under paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Page 72, line 18, insert "In making recommendations pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall consult with key stakeholders, including State, county, and city governments, and, where applicable, State and local water districts, and in the case of recommendations concerning projects that substantially affect communities served by historically Black colleges and universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and other minority-serving institutions, the Secretary shall also consult with such colleges, universities, and institutions." before "The Secretary".

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GRIMM OF NEW YORK

Page 72, line 18, strike "may" and insert "shall".

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 76, after line 13, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent subsections accordingly):

(b) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, shall make the information required under subsection (a) available to the public through widely used and readily available means, including on the Internet.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. STUTZMAN OF INDIANA

Page 86, after line 24, insert the following:
(f) INTERIM RULE.—Until the date on which revisions to the guidelines are adopted under this section, the Secretary shall not require the removal of existing vegetation as a condition or requirement for any approval or funding of a project, or any other action, unless the specific vegetation has been demonstrated to present an unacceptable safety risk.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. PIERLUISI OF PUERTO RICO

Page 95, line 21, strike "and" at the end.
Page 95, after line 21, insert the following:

(2) in subsection (a), as so designated, by inserting "Puerto Rico," before "and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands"; and

Page 95, line 22, strike "(2)" and insert "(3)".

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. COTTON OF ARKANSAS

Page 97, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 1 ____ . FUTURE WATER SUPPLY.

Section 301 of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF 10-YEAR PLANS FOR THE UTILIZATION OF FUTURE STORAGE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection and not later than January 1, 2016, the Secretary may accept from an interested State or local interest a submission of a plan for the utilization of future use water storage under this Act.

"(2) CONTENTS.—A plan submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

"(A) a 10-year timetable for conversion of future use storage to present use; and

"(B) a schedule of actions that the State or local interest agrees to carry out over a 10-year period, in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, to seek new and alternative users of future water storage that is contracted to the State or local interest on the date of enactment of this subsection."

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Page 97, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 1 ____ . CONGRESSIONAL CONSENT FOR NEW PROJECT PURPOSES.

Nothing in this Act authorizes the Secretary to carry out, at a Corps of Engineers dam or reservoir, any project for a purpose not otherwise authorized as of the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM OF MINNESOTA

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 139. MULTIAGENCY EFFORT TO SLOW THE SPREAD OF ASIAN CARP IN THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND OHIO RIVER BASINS AND TRIBUTARIES.

(a) MULTIAGENCY EFFORT TO SLOW THE SPREAD OF ASIAN CARP IN THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI AND OHIO RIVER BASINS AND TRIBUTARIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in coordination with the Chief of Engineers, the Director of the National Park Service, and the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall lead a multiagency effort to slow the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries by providing technical assistance, coordination, best practices, and support to State and local governments in carrying out activities designed to slow, and eventually eliminate, the threat posed by Asian carp.

(2) BEST PRACTICES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the multiagency effort shall apply lessons learned and best practices such as those described in the document prepared by the Asian Carp Working Group entitled "Management and Control Plan for Bighead, Black, Grass, and Silver Carps in the United States" and dated November 2007, and the document prepared by the Asian Carp Regional Coordinating Committee entitled "FY 2012 Asian Carp Control Strategy Framework" and dated February 2012.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31 of each year, the Director of the United

States Fish and Wildlife Service, in coordination with the Chief of Engineers, shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Natural Resources, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the coordinated strategies established and progress made toward the goals of controlling and eliminating Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) any observed changes in the range of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries during the 2-year period preceding submission of the report;

(B) a summary of Federal agency efforts, including cooperative efforts with non-Federal partners, to control the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries;

(C) any research that the Director determines could improve the ability to control the spread of Asian carp;

(D) any quantitative measures that the Director intends to use to document progress in controlling the spread of Asian carp; and

(E) a cross-cut accounting of Federal and non-Federal expenditures to control the spread of Asian carp.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON
OF CALIFORNIA

Page 97, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 1. AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES PREVENTION AND CONTROL.

(a) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an assessment of the Federal costs of, and spending on, aquatic invasive species.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The assessment conducted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) identification of current Federal spending on, and projected future Federal costs of, operation and maintenance related to mitigating the impacts of aquatic invasive species on federally owned or operated facilities;

(2) identification of current Federal spending on aquatic invasive species prevention;

(3) analysis of whether spending identified in paragraph (2) is adequate for the maintenance and protection of services provided by federally owned or operated facilities, based on the current spending and projected future costs identified in paragraph (1); and

(4) review of any other aspect of aquatic invasive species prevention or mitigation determined appropriate by the Comptroller General.

(c) **FINDINGS.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report containing the findings of the assessment conducted under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY
OF CALIFORNIA

Page 102, after line 12, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent subparagraphs accordingly):

“(H) activities of the Secretary of the Navy;

Page 104, line 18, strike “and”.

Page 104, after line 18, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subparagraph accordingly):

“(C) where appropriate, consider national security and military readiness needs in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy; and

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR.
LOWENTHAL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 103, line 7, insert “and the costs for expanded uses (as such term is defined in section 201(c)(2) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013)” after “the harbors”.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY
OF CALIFORNIA

Page 109, after line 23, insert the following:
SEC. 2. HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND STUDY.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **LOW-USE PORT.**—The term “low-use port” means a port at which not more than 1,000,000 tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

(2) **MODERATE-USE PORT.**—The term “moderate-use port” means a port at which more than 1,000,000, but fewer than 10,000,000, tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

(b) **STUDY.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study and submit to Congress a report that—

(1) evaluates the effectiveness of activities funded by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in maximizing economic growth and job creation in the communities surrounding low- and moderate-use ports; and

(2) includes recommendations relating to the use of amounts in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to increase the competitiveness of United States ports relative to Canadian and Mexican ports.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER
OF ILLINOIS

Page 142, line 7, strike “and”.

Page 142, line 9, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 142, after line 9, insert the following:

(4) a 5-year and 10-year projection of construction backlog and any recommendations to Congress regarding how to mitigate current problems and the backlog.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 4 in House Report 113-251 be modified by the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. SHUSTER of Pennsylvania:

At the end of title I, insert the following:
SEC. . REPORT ON SURFACE ELEVATIONS AT DROUGHT EFFECTED LAKES.

(a) **ASSESSMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the FERC, shall initiate an assessment of the effects of drought conditions on lakes managed by the Secretary that are affected by FERC-li-

censed reservoirs, which shall include an assessment of—

(A) lake levels and rule curves in areas of previous, current, and prolonged drought; and

(B) the effect the long-term FERC licenses have on the Secretary’s ability to manage lakes for hydropower generation, navigation, flood protection, water supply, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

(2) **REPORT.**—The Secretary, in coordination with the FERC, shall submit to Congress a report on the assessment carried out under paragraph (1).

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendments en bloc, all of which have been approved by both the majority and the minority. These Members put forth thoughtful amendments, and I am pleased to be able to support moving them all en bloc.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reflects the good work of many Members from both sides of the aisle and, again, reflects a bipartisan process followed by Chairman SHUSTER in assembling this important legislation.

It includes thoughtful language related to control of aquatic invasive species at the bipartisan request of several Members from the Great Lakes area and the west coast, language relating to promoting government efficiency and communicating potential risk of flooding, as well as several important requests for additional information related to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and how Congress can continue to address the backlog of unconstructed Corps projects.

I support the amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. MIKE THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of our bipartisan amendment to require GAO to study the impacts of aquatic invasive species, and I thank the committee leadership for including it in the en bloc agreement.

Aquatic invasives impose a challenge across our great country. Just to take one example, aquatic mussels such as quagga and zebra mussels have cost more than \$5 billion since their introduction in the 1980s. Unfortunately, too often this important problem only receives attention after it is too late. This amendment would be proactive. It would require a timely report to find gaps in current efforts and minimize duplication of activities.

Invasive species are a national problem with significant and expensive local implications. More than ever, we need knowledge and guidance on this issue.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI).

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I support the en bloc amendment, which includes an amendment I filed.

Since 1986, the other U.S. territories have been given partial relief—up to \$200,000—from the local cost-sharing requirements for Army Corps projects. The bill increases this amount to account for inflation. My amendment extends this waiver to the territory of Puerto Rico. There are about 20 authorized flood protection, harbor, and other Army Corps projects pending in Puerto Rico, some of which are stalled due to the constrained ability of the local government to provide its share of project costs.

The two reasons that justified enactment of this waiver for the other territories three decades ago also justify its extension to Puerto Rico today. Puerto Rico is particularly vulnerable to natural disasters like hurricanes and floods. In 2011 alone, there were several federally declared disasters in Puerto Rico, with FEMA assistance totaling \$95 million. In addition, Puerto Rico faces severe economic and fiscal challenges which are in large part due to the fact that, as a territory, Puerto Rico is shortchanged under key Federal programs.

I thank the chairmen and the ranking members for recognizing that critical Army Corps projects in Puerto Rico should not be deferred or deauthorized because of the unique circumstances in the territory.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the ranking member and the chairman for including the Jackson Lee amendment in the en bloc amendments and indicate that this is a bill long overdue. Just to acknowledge, 209,000 jobs, 970 jobs in Texas, \$16.7 billion in direct business, \$14.1 billion in personal income.

My amendment adds to this legislation by providing for the Army Corps of Engineers under section 118 to consult with key stakeholders, including State, county, and city governments where applicable; State and local water districts; and in the case of recommendations concerning projects that substantially affect underrepresented communities, the Secretary shall also consult with Historically

Black Colleges and Universities, tribal colleges and universities, and other minority-serving institutions.

Mr. Chairman, we are all reminded of the tragedy of Hurricane Sandy, of the tragedy of Tropical Storm Allison, Hurricane Rita, Hurricane Ike, and Hurricane Katrina. Universities and communities were impacted. The Army Corps of Engineers will be much better for the idea of being able to engage in those who are directly impacted.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support the amendment and support the underlying bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, with that, I ask my colleagues to support the amendments en bloc, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I support this bill and urge my colleagues to support my amendment to retain Congress's traditional role in authorizing project purposes at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers dams and reservoirs.

Corps dams and reservoirs throughout the Nation provide multiple benefits. Water supplies, hydropower, recreation and flood control are just some of the benefits that were approved by Congress and paid for by beneficiaries such as ratepayers. Some Corps dams also provide year-round cold-water flows for fisheries as part of their operations. In the Pacific Northwest, multi-purpose dams provide the economic backbone for our region. They power communities, small businesses and residential homes and provide water necessary for irrigation, recreation and navigation. These duties have been approved by Congress in some fashion after careful deliberation over the costs, needs and justification for these uses.

I'm proud to have worked with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and the American Public Power Association, which collectively represent almost 90 million electric ratepayers in 49 states, on this amendment. These ratepayers receive emissions-free and renewable hydropower from federal reservoirs throughout our country. These organizations, whose ratepayers pay—with interest—for hydropower and other functions at the Corps of Engineers dams—have been concerned with proposals that would give undue discretion to the agency to change the projects without ratepayer or Congressional oversight and authorization.

I will quote an October 8, 2013 letter from the organizations to illustrate their predicament:

"The ability to change project operations at Corps projects that provide hydropower presents a risk that hydropower generation from these projects could be diminished at the agency's discretion. For many members of NRECA and APPA who rely on the power generated at Corps projects to keep electric rates as low as possible, the loss of hydropower generated at these projects would re-

quire our members to seek more expensive replacement power."

Policies and authorizations that govern the uses of Corps facilities, as authorized by Congress, should not be re-written by un-elected bureaucrats. There are some proposals to allow the Corps to administratively change project purposes and manuals that govern the Corps dams and reservoirs that could undermine congressional intent, erode government accountability, limit public input and create a litigious atmosphere. And, any such changes would have a cascading effect on dams owned by the Bureau of Reclamation and non-federal entities like public utility districts.

Instead of giving courts and bureaucrats more power, Congress needs to reinforce the congressionally-authorized policies that govern these projects. And, if changes need to be made at these facilities, they should be made by Congress in the open, not by the un-elected.

This amendment simply continues our historical role in determining how multiple-use Corps projects are operated. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for including my amendment No. 20, related to the Navy, in the en bloc agreement today.

My amendment is a simple, straight-forward improvement to H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act.

As you know, Section 202 of the underlying bill requires the Army Corps of Engineers to assess the operation and maintenance needs of harbors used for a variety of purposes, including for commercial navigation; for commercial fishing; for transportation of persons; domestic energy production; public health and safety; the activities of the Coast Guard; recreation; and other purposes.

My amendment would add "activities of the Secretary of the Navy" to the list of activities that the Army Corps must consider when assessing the operation and maintenance needs of harbors.

Section 202 of the underlying bill also requires the Army Corps of Engineers to determine an equitable allocation of funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

The bill sets forth criteria, including an assessment of utilization; national and regional significance, and also states that the allocations shall not be based solely on tonnage.

My amendment would add a requirement for the Corps to consider—where appropriate—our national security needs in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy.

My amendment does not alter the delicate balance that the Committee has sought to achieve between small and large harbors. It simply requires that the Corps of Engineers takes into account our naval fleet and our national security needs.

I believe better up-front coordination of our priorities is needed between the Army Corps of Engineers and the Navy because of a situation that has arisen in my Congressional District.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers began dredging Channel Islands Harbor in 1960 because erosion was threatening Navy installations near Port Hueneme and the dredging

provided the sand to replenish what had washed away.

Due to inadequate federal funding for harbor maintenance in 2013, the beach area—that borders along Naval Base Ventura County—received only a fraction of the 1 million cubic yards of sand it typically gets when the Corps dredges the Channel Islands Harbor sand trap.

Now, severe erosion is threatening coastal streets in Port Hueneme, which serve as a critical transportation artery to and from the Naval Base.

The erosion is also threatening military readiness at Naval Base Ventura County.

According to the Navy: “Continued beach erosion creates a potential for mission impacts at Naval Base Ventura County. These impacts include risks to critical Navy facilities and infrastructure; such as ordinance magazines and transportation routes, lab and training buildings, runway lighting, etc.”

Since coming to Congress, I have worked tirelessly with the Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Navy to address these issues.

The Department of the Navy has communicated its clear national security interest to the Corps, and has informed me that the Navy stands ready to provide its legally required share of funds for the project. However, the project remains underfunded.

In the future, as the Army Corps of Engineers prioritizes the use of funds, I believe the Army Corps needs to consider the activities of the navy and our national security needs.

My amendment will require the Corps to take these issues into account when prioritizing the use of funds.

While I continue to work to find funds to address the immediate crisis, it is my hope that better up-front coordination between the Army Corps and the Navy will prevent this issue from occurring again in the future.

Again, I appreciate the Chairman and Ranking Members support for this common-sense improvement to H.R. 3080.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for including my amendment No. 22, related to job creation, in the en bloc agreement today.

My amendment is a simple, straight-forward improvement to H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act.

This important amendment will require the Government Accountability Office to study and report to Congress on the effectiveness of the activities funded by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in maximizing economic growth and job creation in the communities surrounding low- and moderate-use ports.

The GAO will also be required to include recommendations relating to the use of amounts in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to increase the competitiveness of United States ports relative to Canadian and Mexican ports.

Under my amendment, the term “low-use port” means a port at which not more than 1,000,000 tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

The term “moderate-use port” means a port at which more than 1,000,000, but fewer than

10,000,000, tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

I came to Congress to move our nation forward, to create jobs, and to ensure that Ventura County has the resources necessary to succeed.

Like many of my colleagues, I view all of the actions that Congress takes—and all federal programs—through the lens of its potential to create jobs.

That is why I think it is critically important that GAO undertake a comprehensive study of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and help us to maximize the job creation potential of the program and to increase our international competitiveness.

In my district, I am fortunate to represent several ports and harbors, including Channel Islands Harbor, Ventura Harbor, and the Port of Hueneme.

The ports and harbors in my district are critical to our local and regional economy—supporting both small, mid-size, and large businesses, as well as thousands of jobs both directly at the port and indirectly in our community.

In 2012, the Port of Hueneme—which moved approximately 1.3 million tons of cargo—undertook a study of the local and regional economic impact.

The study concluded that 9,448 jobs in the Port Hueneme metropolitan region and the State of California were in some way related to the activity at the Port’s marine terminals. This included 2,277 direct jobs, 2,727 induced jobs, 620 indirect jobs, and 3,824 regional jobs influenced by cargo exported and imported through the Port Hueneme marine terminals.

In fiscal year 2012, marine cargo activity at the Port of Hueneme generated a total of \$723.8 million of total economic activity in the region.

A total of \$50.8 million of state and local tax revenue was generated by maritime activity at the Port’s marine terminals in fiscal year 2012.

In addition, \$12.9 million of state and local taxes were created due to the economic activity of the users of the cargo moving via the marine terminals.

The Port of Hueneme is just one example of how strategic and smart use of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is helping to create jobs and generate economic growth.

Across the nation our ports and harbors are vital economic engines of our economy.

I think it is critically important for Congress to have a thorough report from the GAO on the use of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund across the nation so that we can maximize the use of these taxpayer dollars—supporting businesses and creating jobs.

Again, I appreciate the Chairman and Ranking Members support for this common-sense improvement to H.R. 3080.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

The en bloc amendments, as modified, were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113-251.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. ____ . GEOSPATIAL SURVEYING AND MAPPING.

Section 918 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2292) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 918. GEOSPATIAL SURVEYING AND MAPPING.

“(a) PROCUREMENT OF SURVEYING AND MAPPING SERVICES.—Any surveying or mapping services to be performed in connection with a water resources project which is or has been authorized to be undertaken by the Secretary shall be procured in accordance with chapter 11 of title 40, United States Code.

“(b) GEOSPATIAL SURVEYING AND MAPPING ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out water resources projects, the Secretary shall, wherever practicable, utilize the private sector for commercially available geospatial surveying and mapping activities. The Secretary shall not start or carry on any activity to provide a commercially available geospatial surveying and mapping service that duplicates, competes with, or can be procured from a commercial source.

“(c) GUIDANCE.—

“(1) ISSUANCE.—The Secretary shall issue guidance to encourage entities in the Corps of Engineers to utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, contracting with private sector sources for geospatial surveying and mapping services for water resources projects.

“(A) CONTENTS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall—

“(i) define inherently governmental roles in geospatial surveying and mapping activities, which roles shall include—

“(I) activities so defined in section 5 of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 2384);

“(II) preparation of standards and specifications;

“(III) research of geospatial surveying and mapping instrumentation and procedures that are not commercially available, with prompt technology transfer to the private sector;

“(IV) providing technical guidance, coordination, and administration of geospatial surveying and mapping activities; and

“(V) contracting with private sector sources for geospatial surveying and mapping activities.

“(ii) define commercially available geospatial surveying and mapping activities to include activities described in—

“(I) section 36.601-4(a)(4)(A) of the Engineer Federal Acquisition Regulation; and

“(II) section 467 of title 10, United States Code.

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall develop a process for the oversight and monitoring, on an annual basis, of compliance with the guidance issued under subsection (c).

“(e) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall conduct an assessment of all entities in the Corps of Engineers, including divisions, districts, laboratories, and technical centers, to determine the extent to which each entity is utilizing governmental and private sector sources for

commercially available geospatial surveying and mapping services. In conducting the assessment, the Secretary shall consult with organizations of commercial geospatial surveying and mapping firms.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I suggest respectfully this is a very simple amendment. It is about the intrusion by the Corps into the private sector of mapping. They have been very good in the past about contracting out.

I found out by reports that certain areas of the Corps have bought equipment, they have bought, frankly, a yacht, and they have gotten into the mapping business. In doing so, that is in direct competition to the private sector.

Today, with the scarce amount of money we have for infrastructure, we ought to keep that infrastructure available for, in fact, all the moneys for building and not for getting into the private sector business of mapping. They can still do it. If there isn't a contractor close by or it is not practical, they can still do their own work, but I see the expansion occurring as an invasion into an area that already has plenty of qualified people to do it.

I think this amendment is a very simple amendment. We ought to adopt this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, throughout the development of H.R. 3080, the chairman has taken a measured approach to balancing the desire to encourage additional private sector involvement in the development and execution of Corps projects with maintaining the internal technical capability of the Corps to carry out its vital military and civil works missions.

For decades, this committee has held the belief that maintaining the technical capability of the Corps is critical not only to address the water resources needs of the Nation, but also to maintain the ability of the Corps to serve its other role as critical support our Nation's military.

To maintain this capability, we have strived to maintain critical technical expertise within the Corps, while at the same time recognizing those areas where outside commercial interests can provide a useful role.

In my view, this amendment seeks to push the lever too far towards outsourcing the internal capabilities of the Corps. My understanding is that currently the Corps contracts exten-

sively with the private sector for surveying and mapping services. However, the decision as to when it is appropriate to use their own staff, a public agency, or a private contractor for this work should remain within the Corps' leadership, who understand the needs of specific projects.

For these reasons, I urge opposition to the amendment, and I include letters from the AFGE, the transportation trade, and the IFPTE in opposition to the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2013.

Re Don't bail out bad contractors: oppose the Young-Petri amendment to give all surveying and mapping work to contractors, regardless of high costs or bad performance

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, which represents more than 650,000 federal employees, including in the Corps of Engineers (CoE), I urge you to oppose an amendment to be offered to the Water Resources Development Act (H.R. 3080) by Representatives Don Young (R-AK) and Tom Petri (R-WI) that would prevent the CoE from using lower-cost, higher-performing alternatives to contractors for the performance of surveying and mapping functions.

The Department of Defense (DOD), which spends 60% of all service contract dollars, including a large amount on behalf of CoE, has determined that contractors usually cost more than in-house performance, often by significant amounts. In 2010, then DoD Secretary Robert Gates told The Washington Post “that federal workers cost the government 25 percent less than contractors”. Comptroller Robert Hale acknowledged to a Senate Subcommittee in June that contractors are two to three times more expensive than civilians. In a September House hearing, the Army Chief of Staff echoed Hale's remark.

The Young-Petri amendment would direct the CoE, in carrying out water resources projects, to use contractors for surveying and mapping functions whenever possible and forbid the CoE from starting or performing surveying and mapping functions if they happen to be performed by contractors. At a time when taxpayer dollars are precious, it makes no sense to force CoE to give work to contractors that can better be performed by federal employees.

There has been no determination by the agency, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, let alone any independent third party, that the agency is failing to adequately use contractors for these functions or that its federal sector surveyors and mappers are costly or inadequate. The Young-Petri amendment is simply an attempt by a group of contractors to use political pressure to force the CoE to give them more taxpayer dollars—the worst kind of earmark. The impartial experts at CoE should be responsible for determining how the agency meets its mission, not a self-interested band of contractors. Of course, surveying and mapping contractors want more money, but that doesn't mean they should take it from taxpayers. Enactment of the Young-Petri amendment would be a terrible public policy precedent.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact John Threlkeld (threlj@aige.org) of my staff if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

BETH MOTEN,
Legislative and Political Director.

TTD,

October 23, 2013.

Re Vote NO on the Young-Petri Amendment to WRRDA

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Transportation Trades Department, AFL-CIO (TTD), I ask that you oppose the Young-Petri amendment (#21) to the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013 (WRRDA). While TTD supports the underlying legislation, Young-Petri would unnecessarily require the Army Corps of Engineers to contract with private firms for surveying and mapping services, and jeopardize the jobs of qualified, public service professionals.

This amendment would do nothing to improve the efficiency or flexibility for Corps surveying and mapping responsibilities. In fact, the Corps already contracts extensively with the private sector for these services. The decision as to when it is appropriate to use their own staff, a public agency or a private contractor for this work should remain with the Corps' leadership who understand the needs of specific projects. Should this amendment be adopted, Congress would be creating a special set-aside for the private firms in this industry and tying the hands of the experts and specialists who manage these projects. In addition, the amendment would set a bad precedent and is contrary to recent legal and regulatory efforts to ensure “special consideration” of using federal employees instead of contractors.

WRRDA is an important piece of legislation that will bring much needed investment and reform to our nation's water infrastructure. However, Young-Petri will have a negative effect on the Corps ability to use best judgment and practices when performing critical surveying and mapping duties and it will deal a devastating blow to those professionals who currently perform that work. I urge you to vote no on this amendment and preserve the integrity and bipartisan principles in the underlying bill.

Sincerely,

EDWARD WYTKIND,
President.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS, AFL-CIO & CLC,

Washington, DC, October 23, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As President of the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), I am writing regarding today's House consideration of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2013. As a union representing tens of thousands of workers, including Army Corps of Engineers employees, IFPTE believes that this much needed legislation will not only go a long way toward modernizing and preserving our homeland critical infrastructures, including our ports, inland, and coastal waterways, but it will also create and preserve hundreds of thousands of high quality American jobs.

While IFPTE does support the legislation, we also have serious concerns with an amendment made in order by the Rules Committee. The amendment, sponsored by Representatives Don Young and Tom Petri, would force the Army Corps of Engineers to shift mapping and surveying functions from highly skilled federal workers to more costly contractor provided services.

The Young-Petri amendment is a simple one: It directs the Corps to use contractors for mapping and surveying wherever possible when performing water resources projects. It also prohibits Corps federal employees from undertaking mapping and surveying work, regardless of the quality and cost of the work, if it is already being performed by contractors.

IFPTE believes that all outsourcing should be done only after consideration of the cost versus benefit for the taxpayer. Just because a certain function may be deemed commercial in nature does not mean that it should be contracted out, as this amendment seeks to accomplish. The Army Corps of Engineers nor the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has found that surveying and mapping functions performed by federal workers are inadequate or more costly than contractors. In fact, just this past June Department of Defense (DOD) Comptroller, Robert Hale, testified before the Senate that contractors cost the taxpayer two to three times more than federal employees. Mr. Hale's statement was later reinforced by the Army Chief of Staff at a September House hearing. Forcing these activities to be contracted out absent any proof of cost savings is simply irresponsible.

WRDA is a jobs bill and will go a long way toward the creation and preservation of hundreds of thousands of American jobs. While our union supports the underlying bill, we are not supportive of the Young/Petri amendment. Support the bill, while rejecting the amendment.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions please contact IFPTE Legislative Director, Matt Biggs.

Sincerely,

GREGORY J. JUNEMANN,
President.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. I thank my colleague from Alaska for yielding, and I rise to support the Young amendment. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the amendment.

It is important that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers be encouraged to use the private sector for surveying and mapping services whenever practical. Congress should take steps to end the increasing duplication of and competition with the private sector by the Corps of Engineers. This amendment would allow the Corps to continue to manage mapping and surveying for its projects, but it should rely on the private sector to perform the mapping and surveying services and activities that are commercially available to the maximum extent practical.

At a time when Federal funds for infrastructure, including water resources projects, are limited, the Corps should be increasing its use of the private sector for surveying and mapping, where it makes sense, not wasting tax dollars by competing and duplicating the private sector.

So I encourage the House to adopt the Young amendment to increase the Corps' reliance on the capable and qualified private sector surveying and mapping services wherever practical.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I reluctantly rise in opposition to my good friend from Alaska's amendment.

The Corps of Engineers, like all Federal agencies, is required to follow acquisition and procurement laws. Much of the work of the Corps is in fact contracted out to private sector entities, including much of the hydrographic mapping, which is integral to construction and operation and maintenance.

While I understand and empathize with the sponsor of the amendment, it appears to me to be more of an acquisition and procurement issue. What we do not want is to have one acquisition and procurement law for the Federal Government, and a new or special or additional acquisition or procurement law for the Corps of Engineers.

So again, I reluctantly rise in opposition to my good friend from Alaska's amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I reluctantly respect the gentleman's opinion, but at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Alaska yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Small businesses struggle to stay in business every day, and they should not have to compete against their government, on top of all of the other challenges they face. In fact, sometimes I think we should pin a medal on anybody who is able to survive today in small businesses. Yet every day in almost every congressional district, big government agencies are competing with small businesses.

When the White House Conference on Small Business met in 1995, it listed unfair government competition with small businesses as one of the top issues. This is not a new problem. In fact, since the Eisenhower administration in 1955, it became official U.S. policy that:

The Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels.

This is a service that can easily be provided by private small businesses, and we should support that. This amendment would simply require the Army Corps to take advantage of the private mapping and surveying services that are available instead of competing with them.

I believe this is a very reasonable and responsible amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I join Chairman SHUSTER in opposing this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, the Corps has been good, but they

are expanding. They just spent money, instead of on solving a problem, on a UAV, and they spent \$2.3 million on a yacht. There is no reason for that, Mr. Chairman; there is no reason.

This doesn't keep them from surveying, it doesn't keep them from contracting, but I don't want them to expand this program. We have another government agency, and we are trying to save money and we are going to allow them to expand it. I know how these agencies go. They will start buying more and more and they will expand and say, We don't have to contract anymore. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, you know that is true. I have watched these agencies. As chairman of this committee, I watched them and tried to stop them. This is not the time to spend money foolishly. We have the contractors out there. Let's use them where they are available. Let's not let them build a machine within the Corps of Engineers themselves. Keep that in mind. You ought to adopt this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 113-251.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 139. ANNUAL OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE BUDGET.

The Secretary shall include operation and maintenance costs associated with sand transfer plants in the annual operations and maintenance budget of the Corps of Engineers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would help to maintain beaches and the integrity of our shipping channels around the country.

Sand transfer plants are vital for beach renourishment, as well as to fight erosion and shoaling in navigation channels. These inlets are often the lifeblood of the communities they serve. When shoaling of the channels makes navigation dangerous, it is the people and businesses that suffer.

The Army Corps of Engineers is already spending money to dredge these channels. By reducing the need to dredge so often, my amendment allows

for more efficient allocation of Federal dollars. Furthermore, additional Corps resources are then freed up for other uses.

This amendment does not authorize or appropriate any funds. It merely allows the sand transfer plants to participate in the process and gives the Corps flexibility in prioritizing its funding. It applies to all sand transfer plants, those that are in existence and those not yet in existence. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, typically the Corps of Engineers carries out studies and projects that are cost-shared with non-Federal sponsors.

Sand transfer facilities that are associated with beach nourishment projects are traditionally a non-Federal responsibility. This amendment would require the Corps of Engineers to assume the operation and maintenance costs of these facilities. This would put more funding requirements on the Federal taxpayer for this type of work. It is clear that the Corps' budget will not be increased substantially to cover these additional requirements.

One of the key goals of H.R. 3080 is to empower non-Federal interests to take a larger role in carrying out water resources projects. This amendment is not financially responsible since it would place an additional burden on the Corps of Engineers without recognizing the fiscal restraints the Corps is already under, so I urge all Members to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to commend Chairman SHUSTER for restoring the bipartisan nature to our committee, and I want to thank Congressmen RAHALL, BISHOP, and GIBBS for their work on this bill. I also want to thank the Corps of Engineers for their hard work. They have been underfunded and overworked, but they have always been there for the American people. The work they did during Hurricane Katrina and, most recently, Hurricane Sandy should be commended by Congress.

We are already failing to prepare our ports for post-Panamax ships and are falling behind in our international competition. Ports throughout Asia, Europe, South America, and the Caribbean all have ports with depths of 50 feet.

I agree that we need to fully reauthorize WRDA every 2 years, but I

don't believe many people are confident that will happen. In fact, it took 7 years since reauthorization of the last WRDA bill.

I went to a preliminary review on the Chief's Report, and the Army Corps made clear that they don't pick winners and losers, but that is what we are doing here in Congress.

This is a fairness issue for the State of Florida. I hope that as we move toward conference, we must engage the House, the Senate, and the White House to ensure that the State of Florida is not left behind. As this bill continues to move through the process, we need to work together to make sure that we treat every State fairly and don't arbitrarily leave any critical infrastructure projects behind.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for this committee. I think they have done extraordinary work on behalf of all of us here in Congress, operating with fiscal restraint and able to produce a bipartisan product. Toward that end, most of all I respect Chairman SHUSTER, but I firmly disagree with his assessment of this particular measure.

There is one transfer plant that is located in an area that I serve, and that is in Lake Worth, Florida. It is the Lake Worth Inlet. There is one in California, one in New Jersey, and one in Bethany Beach on the Indian River Inlet. Additionally, this amendment would just apply whenever the Corps builds additional sand transfer plants.

There is no money that is involved. The money that the Corps of Engineers would save is immense, and I don't for the life of me understand why there would be opposition to that. I will have a lot more to say over the course of time regarding how the Corps conducts its operations, but I have lived for 21 years with many of their successes and a hell of a lot of their failures.

Toward that end, in this particular instance, I am trying to help them to save something and to be able to do the things that are necessary to allow for navigation of these waters that are critical to the areas that they serve.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. BENTIVOLIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 113-251.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, line 12, strike "\$12,000,000,000" and insert "\$35,000,000,000".

Page 137, beginning line 1, strike "AUTHORIZED BEFORE WRDA 2007".

Page 137, line 12, strike "November 8, 2007" and insert "the date of enactment of this Act".

Page 138, line 14, strike "\$12,000,000,000" and insert "\$35,000,000,000".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Chairman BILL SHUSTER, and other members of the committee and their staff for working so hard on this bill.

There are many good reforms in this legislation, and I applaud their efforts. However, while this bill initially deauthorizes \$12 billion in old and inactive projects, most of those savings are simply moved to other projects.

□ 1645

Offsetting costs is always good, but we can do better. We should be looking for real savings and clearing out the backlog for the American people. While the bill sunsets some new authorizations to help curtail the backlog problem, much more needs to be done about the current backlog.

I am a former teacher. When educators teach the basics of our system of government, we say "the legislature creates the law and controls the purse." The fact of the matter is, Congress has not been in control of its purse for quite a while, and these outdated, backlogged projects, some almost 50 years old, prove just that. Simply put, there is just too much spending with little to no oversight or accountability. It needs to stop.

Many of these projects were earmarks in previous water resources bills. There was not sufficient follow-up to make sure they were completed on time and under budget. For example, the 2007 bill had approximately \$8 billion in additional projects and earmarks thrown in during conference.

If these projects and this money are important and necessary, then what has Congress been doing all these years to ensure these much-needed projects and funds were being completed? By

this body's own action—or inaction—it has shown over and over that either these projects aren't important as some claim or that Congress is spending money on improvements without much thought.

Every dollar we waste is a dollar that could be spent to help the American people and a dollar we wouldn't need to borrow against our children's and grandchildren's future. If these projects aren't important enough for us to ensure their completion on time and within budget, then we probably shouldn't have authorized it in the first place.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, throughout the process of developing this water resources bill, Chairman SHUSTER has done a remarkable job of maintaining a balance between addressing future water resource needs of the Nation and coming to terms with those legacy projects and studies of the Corps of Engineers that may have languished over the decades. Unfortunately, the pending amendment would upset that balance, and it seeks to deauthorize a massive amount of projects that I would suggest continue to have strong local, congressional, and potentially administrative support.

While addressing the unconstructed backlog is an important issue, I urge opposition to this amendment that seeks to wipe away much of the good work of this body over the decades simply to make a point on fiscal conservatism. We all want to address the debt. It is a worthy goal. I agree with the gentleman's comments about passing that debt on to our children and grandchildren, but I suggest this is not the proper manner in which we are fair to our entire country and to the future infrastructure of this Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan permitting me to speak on this.

My friend from West Virginia made a very important point, that under this bill, if it is approved, we are going to extend the backlog to something like \$72 million. There are many people who support these various projects, and that is part of the problem.

Simply authorizing is not somehow free. It costs money to be able to move them into the production stage. We have billions of dollars that are ready for construction that are languishing, and because we are not adequately funding year in and year out, we have an amazing number of projects with a shelf life that has expired.

I commend what the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from West Virginia have done with the committee, trying to do a deeper dive, trying to fine-tune, trying to make some real progress here. The problem is we have a legacy where, for decades, that same care and consideration was not exercised, where there are a lot of projects that really are not cost effective, that really are no longer state of the art.

I think by moving forward to clear the decks of a little more of the backlog, not diverting—because the Corps and Congress have to contend with people that think just because it has been authorized they are entitled to have the project go forward. I can understand that if it stays on the books, but that is a distortion of where we are now. We are not adequately funding what this bill needs to do.

Unless and until we do a little more aggressive pruning, we are just going to continue to add to the backlog, and we are going to continue to have some projects that will get moved along sometimes for political reasons even though they are not the best projects. The more that we can help the committee move forward, prune it down, tailor it, focus it, we are all going to be better off.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to Chairman SHUSTER.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan wanting to be fiscally responsible. That is what we tried to do in this bill.

All of the new authorizations in WRRDA were more than fully offset by deauthorizations, and WRRDA seeks to deauthorize its old, inactive projects which have not begun construction or have not received any funds, Federal or non-Federal, in the last 5 years. This approach cuts waste and reduces the backlog of projects that are unlikely to move forward.

Such a significant increase in the deauthorization target could have unforeseen consequences, and I believe it would effectively deauthorize viable projects—projects that are almost ready to go, projects that have non-Federal money committed to them—and impact the ability to move these forward, these important water resources and infrastructure improvements that are ready to move that have non-Federal dollars in place.

We also put in this bill a sunset law, that if any new authorizations do not move in 7 years, they will automatically be deauthorized. It will continue to push down on that backlog. I certainly would be open in the next

WRRDA bill for additional deauthorizations to make sure we continue to reduce that backlog.

I reluctantly urge all Members to oppose this amendment.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Chairman, our Nation is facing a fiscal crisis and Americans are sick of how much money Congress wastes. The fact that there is between \$60 billion and \$80 billion in old, inactive projects and backlog means something is wrong. It took less than a decade for the United States to go to the Moon. How could it possibly take decades to build a dam? Hoover Dam was built in 5 years.

If we aren't going to do these projects right and on time, we shouldn't be doing them at all. We need to prioritize and follow through on projects that are important. It is not radical to clear out old and back-dated projects.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me pick up on something that Chairman SHUSTER just said. He said that if we were to take the approach that is advocated by this amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, we would run the risk of deauthorizing projects that are very vital. Let me give you an example of one that would be in that category.

The Fire Island to Montauk Point Reformulation Study, a study that comprises the 83 easternmost miles of coastline of Long Island, 70 miles of which is in my district, which was first authorized in the 1960s, it has crept along primarily because it has not had adequate funding either for studies and certainly not for construction.

Hurricane Sandy proved just how valuable and just how important the work that has been contemplated by the Fire Island to Montauk Point Reformulation Study has been and would have been. If it were not for the Sandy supplemental funding, we still wouldn't be in a position to fund the vitally important construction projects associated with FIMP; but FIMP is the kind of project that would fall victim to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan were it to be approved.

So I join the ranking member and the chairman in urging opposition to the amendment.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. JONES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 113–251.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 44, line 3, strike “that has been damaged” and all that follows before the closing quotation marks on line 7.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, Uncle Sam has largely stopped funding maintenance of federally authorized shallow draft inlet projects. There are over a dozen of these projects in the district that I represent in North Carolina. These are critical to the local economy. To fill the gap, the State of North Carolina is stepping up to pay for dredging these waterways. My concern is that section 108 of the bill may be interpreted to allow States to only pay for maintenance of projects damaged by disasters.

Does the chairman share my belief that States should be allowed to contribute funds to any of the Federal projects, not just those damaged by disasters? And will he agree to work in conference to perfect the bill's language to meet our shared intent?

Mr. SHUSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and I thank you for raising this issue.

We will be happy to try to work with you as we go through conference to look into what you are talking about and making sure we do what is right for the country in moving forward.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for that. I want to thank you and the ranking member for the outstanding job you and your staffs have done on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 113-251.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 95, after line 15, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 137. NATIONAL WATER-BASED FREIGHT POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of the United States to improve the condition and

performance of the national water-based freight network to ensure that such network provides the foundation for the United States to compete in the global economy and achieve each goal described in subsection (b).

(b) GOALS.—The goals of the national water-based freight policy are—

(1) to invest in infrastructure improvements and to implement operational improvements that—

(A) strengthen the contribution of the national water-based freight network to the economic competitiveness of the United States;

(B) reduce congestion; and

(C) increase productivity, particularly for domestic industries and businesses that create high-value jobs;

(2) to improve the safety, security, and resilience of water-based freight transportation;

(3) to improve the state of good repair of the national water-based freight network;

(4) to use advanced technology to improve the safety and efficiency of the national water-based freight network;

(5) to incorporate concepts of performance, innovation, competition, and accountability into the operation and maintenance of the national water-based freight network;

(6) to improve the economic efficiency of the national water-based freight network; and

(7) to reduce the environmental impacts of freight movement on the national water-based freight network.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL WATER-BASED FREIGHT NETWORK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a national water-based freight network in accordance with this section to assist States in strategically directing resources toward improved system performance to achieve efficient movement of freight on inland waterways, canals, ports, and harbors, and related freight intermodal connectors.

(2) NETWORK COMPONENTS.—The national water-based freight network shall consist of the primary water-based freight network, as designated by the Secretary under subsection (d) as most critical to the movement of water-based freight.

(d) DESIGNATION OF PRIMARY WATER-BASED FREIGHT NETWORK.—

(1) INITIAL DESIGNATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall designate a primary water-based freight network based on an inventory of national water-based freight volume and in consultation with stakeholders, including system users, transportation providers, and States.

(2) FACTORS FOR DESIGNATION.—In designating the primary water-based freight network, the Secretary shall consider—

(A) the origins and destinations of water-based freight movement in the United States;

(B) the total tonnage and value of water-based freight moved across United States bodies of water;

(C) the average annual water-based freight traffic on United States bodies of water;

(D) maritime ports of entry;

(E) access to energy exploration, development, installation, or production areas;

(F) population centers; and

(G) network connectivity.

(3) REDESIGNATION.—On the date that is 10 years after the initial designation of the primary water-based freight network, and every 10 years thereafter, using the factors described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall redesignate the primary water-based freight network.

(e) NATIONAL WATER-BASED FREIGHT STRATEGIC PLAN.—

(1) INITIAL DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with State departments of transportation and other appropriate public and private transportation stakeholders, shall develop and post on a public Web site a national water-based freight strategic plan that shall include—

(A) an assessment of the condition and performance of the national water-based freight network;

(B) an identification of bottlenecks on the national water-based freight network that create significant freight congestion problems, based on a quantitative methodology developed by the Secretary, and, to the maximum extent practicable, an estimate of the cost of addressing each bottleneck and any operational improvements that could be implemented;

(C) forecasts of water-based freight volumes for the 20-year period beginning with the year during which the plan is issued;

(D) an identification of major trade gateways and national water-based freight corridors that connect major population centers, trade gateways, and other major water-based freight generators for current and forecasted traffic and water-based freight volumes, the identification of which shall be revised, as appropriate, in subsequent plans;

(E) an assessment of statutory, regulatory, technological, institutional, financial, and other barriers to improved water-based freight transportation performance (including opportunities for overcoming the barriers);

(F) an identification of routes providing access to energy exploration, development, installation, or production areas;

(G) an identification of best practices for improving the performance of the national water-based freight network;

(H) an identification of best practices for mitigating the impacts of water-based freight movement on communities;

(I) an identification of a process for addressing multistate projects and encouraging jurisdictions to collaborate; and

(J) an identification of strategies to improve freight intermodal connectivity.

(2) UPDATES.—Not later than 5 years after the date of completion of the first national water-based freight strategic plan under paragraph (1), and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall update and post on a public Web site a revised national water-based freight strategic plan.

(f) WATER-BASED FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS AND PERFORMANCE REPORTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary shall prepare a report that contains a description of the conditions and performance of the national water-based freight network in the United States.

(g) TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT DATA AND PLANNING TOOLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall—

(A) begin the development of new tools or improve existing tools to support an outcome-oriented, performance-based approach to evaluating proposed water-based freight-related projects, including—

(i) methodologies for systematic analysis of benefits and costs;

(ii) tools for ensuring that the evaluation of water-based freight-related projects and

other transportation projects considers safety, economic competitiveness, environmental sustainability, and system condition in the project selection process; and

(iii) other elements to assist in effective transportation planning;

(B) identify water-based transportation-related model data elements to support a broad range of evaluation methods and techniques to assist in making water-based transportation investment decisions; and

(C) at a minimum, in consultation with other relevant Federal agencies, consider any improvements to existing water-based freight flow data collection efforts that could reduce identified water-based freight data gaps and deficiencies and help improve forecasts of water-based freight transportation demand.

(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with Federal, State, and other stakeholders to develop, improve, and implement tools and data collection under paragraph (1).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, America's inland waterways move more than half a billion tons of cargo worth more than \$150 billion annually, and more than 2.3 billion tons of cargo a year move through American seaports. Commercial activity on our inland waterways supports more than 13 million jobs in the United States and is crucial to our economic prosperity. America depends on the strength of its inland waterways to support businesses and consumers across the country.

My amendment will establish a national water-based freight policy. It requires the Secretary of the Army to designate a primary water-based freight network and develop a strategic plan to assess and improve performance. It also improves data collection methods so that the Army Corps of Engineers and policymakers have better information on how to improve the system going forward.

Although the recent surface transportation reauthorization established a national freight policy, that legislation did not incorporate ports, harbors, and inland waterways into the national freight network. As ranking member of the Small Business Committee, I have heard agriculture and rural groups speak time and time again about the importance of establishing a strategy for our inland waterways. This bill recognizes the critical importance of ports, harbors, canals, and inland waterways to our economic competitiveness and develops a comprehensive approach to identify and address their problems.

Unfortunately, our inland waterways are buckling under the pressure of our growing transportation needs. In many

areas, the inland waterways system has not been updated since the 1950s; more than half of the locks are over 50 years old; 90 percent of the locks and dams on the U.S. inland waterways system experienced some type of unscheduled delay in 2009.

□ 1700

There is an average of 52 service interruptions a day throughout the system. These delays prevent goods from getting to markets, driving up costs and hurting the businesses that depend on our waterways.

Addressing these issues will take time and careful planning. Projects to repair and replace aging locks and dredge channels can take decades to approve and complete. By identifying key waterways, critical bottlenecks and major trade gateways, my amendment can guide the revitalization of our inland waterways in the most effective way possible.

Thinking strategically about our inland waterway system can lead to outsized returns in the future. The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates that modest investments will protect \$700 billion in gross domestic product and 738,000 jobs in 2020; but in order for these investments to have their desired impacts, they must be properly targeted.

My amendment will help to funnel resources to the most beneficial projects available so that we can achieve a good return on investment on American taxpayers' money.

America's inland waterways, ports, and harbors are critical tools in ensuring that all markets, foreign and domestic, are open to American goods. Establishing a national network and policy for our waterways will help us grow our economy, spur job creation, and ensure that taxpayer money is put to good use.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise with great respect for the gentlelady from New York and agree with her that our ports, our inland waterway system are in bad shape. But we are in times that are fiscally restrained, and we have got to try to do our best to move these forward under these fiscal restraints, and that is what we think we are doing in this WRRDA bill, moving forward in a way that we can be positive but not break the bank.

The freight network is critical to the Nation's economic security and to our Nation's national security.

I have several concerns with this amendment. First, the amendment gives very broad authority to the administration when creating this freight

network. In H.R. 3080, we intended to continue the role of Congress in authorizing Corps of Engineer activities.

Unfortunately, this amendment would undermine one of the key principles of this bill, giving away more of our authority to the administration.

Second, I believe the amendment would significantly increase bureaucracy.

Finally, this amendment requires the designation of a primary freight network that prioritizes projects near population centers and major trade gateways which, of course, are extremely important to the health of this Nation's economy. To someone from Los Angeles and New York City, that seems like a good idea.

Those of us from the interior of the country and rural parts of the country have concerns that this would leave a gaping hole in the freight transportation system. If you are from Coos Bay, Oregon, or Duluth, Minnesota, or Altoona, Pennsylvania, under this amendment you may not be considered part of that primary freight network.

But I assure you, those two ports, and hundreds of others, are integral to the regional economies and the Nation's economic well-being.

So I urge a "no" vote on this, but certainly respect what the gentlelady from New York is trying to do.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee stated that this amendment gives broad authority to the administration, but it is the same authority that we gave to the administration in the provision created for highways in the surface transportation bill, MAP-21.

This amendment is modeled exactly on that provision, so what is good for the goose is good for the gander, right?

So I do not understand your logic. I do not understand your argument.

But let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that this is going to benefit metropolitan areas. We held hearing after hearing in the Small Business Committee regarding this issue, and this issue was brought up to my attention by small agricultural interests from rural areas that were concerned that waterways, particularly those in rural areas, were being ignored.

The truth of the matter is that this amendment will ensure that rural areas are given a greater voice.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentlelady for pointing that out; but I would also point out that it was the chairman of the Senate Committee who I believe put that provision in there. So in that case, once again, she was the goose and I was the gander. I may have not agreed, but we were in a conference committee on that.

But again, I am very, very concerned about giving away more and more authority to the executive branch; and

again, that is one of the key principles of this bill that I think all 435 Members of this body and all 100 Members of the Senate ought to be in lockstep, making sure we don't continue to give away our constitutional authority to the executive branch. We have done far too much of that already.

But, again, I respect the gentlelady from New York and what she is attempting to do. But at this point I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 113–251.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. ____ . CALCULATION OF BENEFITS AND COSTS FOR FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION AND HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A feasibility study conducted by the Secretary for a project for flood damage reduction or hurricane and storm damage reduction shall include, as part of the calculation of benefits and costs—

(1) a calculation of the anticipated reduction in flood or hurricane damage to public and private property and infrastructure resulting from the completion of the proposed project;

(2) a calculation of the anticipated direct and indirect economic benefits resulting from the completion of the proposed project, including such benefits from any potential reductions in national and regional economic volatility, disruptions, and losses; and

(3) a calculation of the anticipated benefits to public safety, including protection of evacuation routes, resulting from the completion of the proposed project.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to any feasibility study for a project for flood damage reduction or hurricane and storm damage reduction that has not been completed before the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, let me start with congratulating both the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for including commonsense reforms in this WRRDA bill of this Congress; and with those commonsense reforms, I have just one to add.

Right now, when the Corps of Engineers does their cost-benefit analysis,

they only look at the brick and mortar of the property that they are looking to protect. Well, that just doesn't make sense when we are talking about things that affect our economy.

For example, you can't just look at the bricks and mortars of the Port of New York. The Port of New York pays about \$3.7 billion in taxes to the Federal Government every year. So if you only looked at the cost of the port, to rebuild the Port of New York, you would certainly miss the billions and billions of dollars' worth of impact.

There is an example in Louisiana where the port is thinking about building a levee. It includes not only the port, but it also includes our refineries, where we know that if those residents are forced to evacuate, like in Isaac, the cost of gas went up 7 cents around the country for 5 days. So you can't just look at the cost of those homes, when we know that that keeps the price of gas down and would affect the national economy.

So this is just one more of those commonsense reforms, Mr. Chairman; and I would hope that we look at this and make sure that everyone who has a port understands that the value of the port is not in the bricks and mortar, but in the goods and services that come through in the commodities.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what both gentlemen from Louisiana are trying to do with this. But the Corps of Engineers projects undergo rigorous economic and environmental reviews.

In carrying out the economic analysis for flood damage reduction projects, the Corps of Engineers review many factors to determine whether a project is economically justified. In other words, in order for the Corps of Engineers to carry a flood damage reduction project, the economic benefits have to outweigh the cost of constructing a project.

Unfortunately, this amendment would change that. The Corps currently is required to look at the national impact to the economy. So, for instance, the Port of New Orleans, it is extremely important to the Nation; the Port of Newark, New Jersey, extremely important to the Nation.

But in this amendment, what it will take is it will reduce it down to the regional impact to the economy and, again, that is what is important, that the Corps continues to look at a national perspective on how those projects impact nationally, not just regionally.

So I reluctantly, at this point, urge all Members to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New Orleans, Mr. RICHMOND, for bringing this amendment forward; and, of course, what we are trying to do is just put an additional reform in place to make sure that when a cost-benefit analysis is done, it truly reflects the value of those projects, especially as we are talking about flood protection and hurricane reduction projects, in many cases, where local governments are doing a lot of the work themselves to protect not only people and communities, but also vital energy infrastructure.

Of course, having the value of that infrastructure, as my colleague from New Orleans pointed out, even when we see a storm enter the Gulf of Mexico, and as rigs in the gulf are evacuated, we see immediate increases in the price of gasoline all across the country.

So we ought to be encouraging those local communities to be building up and strengthening their flood protection, whether it is coastal restoration, where our State of Louisiana has actually dedicated the lion's share of all of the offshore oil revenues our State will ultimately start getting in 2017, to make sure that that money is dedicated to restoring our coast, literally, where you have the State putting hundreds of millions of dollars of its own money where its mouth is to protect those resources.

But just as locals are doing that work, as the Corps is evaluating larger projects, Federal projects that would also protect that vital infrastructure, it is important that that calculation be made because, ultimately, if there is a storm or damage and that work is not done, then the economy will suffer. We have seen it suffer across the Nation.

I do want to mention, Mr. Chairman, that the American Petroleum Institute has come out in support of this amendment. It is a strong bipartisan amendment, and we appreciate the support of API; and, obviously, they understand the national importance of having this kind of reform in the bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I really, really—I mean, I really reluctantly oppose this amendment. Some concerns have been raised about how the changes proposed in this amendment would affect the current process by which the Corps calculates future costs and benefits of potential projects.

The committee may need some additional time to better understand how these changes would be implemented

and what the impact to project development would be. So, therefore, I really, really reluctantly oppose this amendment.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, also what we included in here, which I think is very important, and all of my colleagues should understand, is that when the Corps right now would evaluate a farm, they would just look at rebuilding the farmhouse, as opposed to the fact that you have millions and millions or hundreds of acres that produce goods every day for the Nation.

So we don't want the Corps to just look at brick and mortar when, for example, you may have an interstate smack dab in the area that they are thinking about protecting, and that interstate may be an evacuation route. It may be Interstate 10, which our goods and services come down.

All we are saying is that the Corps should use common sense when they do their cost-benefit analysis and not just look at bricks and mortar because, to do a true economic impact or a cost-benefit analysis, you have to get into the complexities of what the building, what the area has to offer.

So we would say that our refineries, our Port of South Louisiana, our Port of New Orleans are those types of things that you absolutely must protect, and you have to factor in the fact that they send billions and billions of dollars to the Federal Government every year in taxes.

So we would not just lose the bricks and mortar, but the Federal Government would lose billions and billions of dollars. And we are saying to the Corps of Engineers that they should take that into account when they are doing their cost-benefit analysis.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would just urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I share the ranking member's reluctance to oppose this because my two friends from Louisiana have been formidable opponents on many occasions that I have come up on the short end.

But in this case, I disagree respectfully with my colleagues that the Corps does look at the national implications, and there is no doubt that the gulf coast is the major producing region of energy in this country, so it should be; and it is in the Corps' calculation when they are looking at hurricane damage to the gulf coast, what the impact is to the Nation.

So, again, I reluctantly oppose this amendment at this time because I just don't believe this is something that to regionalize it is going to be beneficial to the Nation as whole.

So with that, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1715

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 113-251.

Mr. GARDNER. I rise to offer the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. . OFFICE OF WATER STORAGE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall designate a team to serve as the Office of Water Storage (in this section referred to as the "Office") which shall serve as the principal point of contact for any person carrying out a project to construct a water storage facility that requires the acquisition of a Federal permit or the satisfaction of other Federal requirements.

(b) ADMINISTRATOR.—The Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall designate an individual to serve as the head of the Office.

(c) PURPOSE.—The Office shall—

(1) serve as an initial point of contact for any person carrying out a project to construct a water storage facility that requires the acquisition of a Federal permit or the satisfaction of other Federal requirements;

(2) act as a liaison between such persons and appropriate Federal departments and agencies, including the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of the Interior, with respect to such projects to facilitate the acquisition of necessary permits and the satisfaction of all other requirements;

(3) ensure that, with respect to such projects, necessary Federal permits are acquired and all other Federal requirements are satisfied before construction begins; and

(4) coordinate with appropriate Federal departments and agencies to streamline the Federal approval process with respect to such projects, including by limiting the duration of such process to not more than 365 days in each case in which each Governor of a State associated with the project has provided notice to the Office of that Governor's approval of the project.

(d) TIMING REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to a project to construct a water storage facility, any Federal permit or other Federal requirement necessary to be acquired or satisfied for purposes of such project shall be deemed to be acquired or satisfied if—

(1) each Governor of a State associated with the project has provided notice to the

Office of that Governor's approval of the project; and

(2) a determination with respect to approval of the permit or satisfaction of the requirement was not made during the 365-day period beginning on the date on which an application for the permit or an inquiry regarding the satisfaction of the requirement was submitted to the relevant Federal department or agency.

(e) NOTICE OF PERMIT APPLICATIONS.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Interior shall each provide notice to the Administrator of the Office upon the receipt of an application for a permit relating to a water storage facility.

(f) WATER STORAGE FACILITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term "water storage facility" means any facility constructed by a person that is equipped to store at least 5,000 acre-feet of water for later use for any purpose, including dams, tanks, covered and uncovered reservoirs, water towers, and artificial water bodies.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, and I express my intention to withdraw this amendment at the end of my statement.

This amendment authorizes the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to designate a team to serve as the Office of Water Storage. The office is tasked with coordinating every agency involved in the approval of water storage permits, including the EPA, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of the Interior. Once initial applications are submitted to the Office of Water Storage, the office must, upon notification of the Governor, approve or deny a permit within 365 days.

The amendment does not circumvent environmental laws but merely sets a time frame for an initial up-or-down decision to move forward, and the Congressional Budget Office stated that this amendment contains no direct spending. The amendment would seek to streamline the process for desperately needed water storage infrastructure, particularly in the western United States.

Economic development to agriculture job creation is directly correlated to each individual State's ability to deliver and store water. We can no longer rest on our current water storage infrastructure to meet the demands of both our agricultural and municipal water needs.

In Colorado alone, by the year 2050, we will need an additional 1 million acre-feet of water to meet the needs of agriculture, industry, and our growing cities. Without that water, we will see a buy-up and dry-up of agricultural land and the destruction of our economy.

To approve of these projects that have been tied up for decades in permitting battles, we need to rethink the Federal Government's role in water storage and redefine the various missions that agencies at the Federal level are charged with in these permitting decisions.

The Federal Government has created a litany of regulations and bureaucratic red tape that inhibit local communities and States from building new reservoirs and new water storage systems, and the result, as I said, will be a buy-up and dry-up of agricultural land if we fail to move forward with these permitting projects.

The amendment puts control back in the hands of local water users, back in the hands of local governments, back in the hands of the Governor of the State, and away from the bureaucracy of Washington, D.C.

I would like to continue to work on this issue with Chairman SHUSTER. I appreciate his leadership, and I certainly would love to continue working on this with the chairman.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Colorado for yielding.

I understand your great passion for solving the water problems. We saw what has happened after the massive fires in Colorado and the inability to stop the flooding from occurring because the ground cover was stripped away by those terrible fires, and I understand the need for Colorado, in the future, having that water storage for your economic development to ensure that agriculture remains an important part of the economy in Colorado.

So I thank the gentleman for raising the issue. I am committed to continuing to work with you, as we have in the past, to try to address these water issues as we move forward.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the chairman for his leadership on issues of national infrastructure.

And with that, I withdraw my amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113-251 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. FLORES of Texas.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. RICHMOND of Louisiana.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 236, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 556]

AYES—183

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cieilline
Kildee
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod

Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buchson
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Castor (FL)
Davis, Danny
Duckworth
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
Langevin
McCarthy (NY)

□ 1752

Messrs. PITTENGER, SMITH of Missouri, BACHUS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. RIGELL, NUNNELEE, and GARY G. MILLER of California changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr.

NOES—236

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta

MORAN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall vote No. 556, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COOK was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF SACRIFICE OF SERVICEMEMBERS OF FIRST BATTALION, EIGHTH MARINES KILLED IN BEIRUT

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in honor of 241 servicemembers who were killed 30 years ago in the attacks by Hezbollah against the U.S. Marine compound in Beirut.

I was not stationed in Beirut during the attack, but this was my former battalion, the First Battalion, Eighth Marines. Until 9/11, this was the deadliest terrorist attack against Americans in our Nation's history; and in many ways, it was the beginning of the war on terror that we are still fighting today.

Mr. Chairman, I now ask my colleagues to rise and observe a moment of silence in honor of the sacrifice of 241 Americans—220 marines, 18 sailors, and three soldiers—who were lost 30 years ago today.

The Acting CHAIR. Will all Members present please rise for a moment of silence.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 193, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 557]

AYES—225

Aderholt	Black	Cantor
Amash	Blackburn	Capito
Amodei	Boustany	Carter
Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Cassidy
Bachus	Bridenstine	Chabot
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Chaffetz
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Coble
Barrow (GA)	Broun (GA)	Coffman
Barton	Buchanan	Cole
Benishek	Bucshon	Collins (GA)
Bentivolio	Burgess	Collins (NY)
Bilirakis	Calvert	Conaway
Bishop (UT)	Camp	Cook

Costa	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Cotton	Jones	Roe (TN)
Cramer	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Crawford	Joyce	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (MI)
Cuellar	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Kingston	Rokita
Daines	Kinzinger (IL)	Rooney
Davis, Rodney	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen
Denham	Labrador	Roskam
Dent	LaMalfa	Ross
DeSantis	Lamborn	Rothfus
DesJarlais	Lance	Royce
Diaz-Balart	Lankford	Runyan
Duffy	Latta	Ryan (WI)
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Salmon
Duncan (TN)	Long	Sanford
Ellmers	Lucas	Scalise
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Schock
Fleischmann	Lummis	Schweikert
Fleming	Marchant	Scott, Austin
Flores	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Forbes	Massie	Sessions
Fortenberry	Matheson	Shimkus
Fox	McCarthy (CA)	Simpson
Franks (AZ)	McCauley	Smith (MO)
Frelinghuysen	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Gallego	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Gardner	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Garrett	McKinley	Southerland
Gibson	Meadows	Stewart
Gingrey (GA)	Meehan	Stivers
Gohmert	Messer	Stockman
Goodlatte	Mica	Stutzman
Gosar	Miller (FL)	Terry
Gowdy	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Granger	Miller, Gary	Thornberry
Graves (GA)	Mullin	Tiberi
Graves (MO)	Mulvaney	Tipton
Green, Gene	Murphy (PA)	Turner
Griffin (AR)	Neugebauer	Upton
Griffith (VA)	Noem	Valadao
Grimm	Nunes	Vela
Guthrie	Nunnelee	Wagner
Hall	Olson	Walberg
Hanna	Palazzo	Walden
Harper	Paulsen	Walorski
Harris	Pearce	Weber (TX)
Hartzler	Perry	Webster (FL)
Hastings (WA)	Pittenger	Wenstrup
Heck (NV)	Pitts	Westmoreland
Hensarling	Poe (TX)	Whitfield
Holding	Pompeo	Williams
Hudson	Posey	Wilson (SC)
Huelskamp	Price (GA)	Wittman
Huizenga (MI)	Radel	Wolf
Hultgren	Reed	Womack
Hunter	Reichert	Woodall
Hurt	Renacci	Yoder
Issa	Ribble	Yoho
Jenkins	Rice (SC)	Young (AK)
Johnson (OH)	Rigell	Young (IN)

NOES—193

Andrews	Conyers	Grayson
Barber	Cooper	Green, Al
Bass	Courtney	Grijalva
Beatty	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Becerra	Cummings	Hahn
Bera (CA)	Davis (CA)	Hanabusa
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Heck (WA)
Blumenauer	Delaney	Higgins
Bonamici	DeLauro	Himes
Brady (PA)	DelBene	Hinojosa
Braley (IA)	Deutch	Holt
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Honda
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Horsford
Bustos	Doyle	Hoyer
Butterfield	Edwards	Huffman
Capps	Ellison	Israel
Capuano	Engel	Jackson Lee
Cárdenas	Enyart	Jeffries
Carney	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Carson (IN)	Esty	Johnson, E. B.
Cartwright	Farr	Kaptur
Castro (TX)	Fattah	Keating
Chu	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (IL)
Cicilline	Foster	Kennedy
Clarke	Frankel (FL)	Kildee
Clay	Fudge	Kilmer
Cleaver	Gabbard	Kind
Cobb	Garamendi	King (NY)
Cohen	Garcia	Kirkpatrick
Connolly	Gerlach	Kuster

Langevin	Napolitano	Schwartz
Larsen (WA)	Neal	Scott (VA)
Larson (CT)	Negrete McLeod	Scott, David
Latham	Nolan	Serrano
Lee (CA)	O'Rourke	Sewell (AL)
Levin	Owens	Shea-Porter
Lewis	Pallone	Sherman
Lipinski	Pascarella	Shuster
Loebbeck	Pastor (AZ)	Sinema
Lofgren	Payne	Sires
Lowenthal	Pelosi	Slaughter
Lowe	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)
Lujan Grisham	Peters (CA)	Speier
(NM)	Peters (MI)	Swalwell (CA)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Peterson	Takano
(NM)	Petri	Thompson (CA)
Lynch	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (MS)
Maffei	Pocan	Tierney
Maloney,	Polis	Titus
Carolyn	Price (NC)	Tonko
Maloney, Sean	Quigley	Tsongas
Matsui	Rahall	Van Hollen
McCollum	Rangel	Vargas
McDermott	Richmond	Veasey
McGovern	Ruiz	Velázquez
McIntyre	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Walz
Meeks	Sanchez, Linda	Wasserman
Meng	T.	Schultz
Michaud	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters
Miller, George	Sarbanes	Watt
Moore	Schakowsky	Waxman
Moran	Schiff	Welch
Murphy (FL)	Schneider	Wilson (FL)
Nadler	Schrader	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Campbell	Gibbs	Nugent
Castor (FL)	Herrera Beutler	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Danny	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Duckworth	McMorris	
Fincher	Rodgers	

□ 1800

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 287, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 558]

AYES—133

Andrews	Clarke	Edwards
Bass	Clay	Ellison
Beatty	Cleaver	Engel
Becerra	Clyburn	Fattah
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Frankel (FL)
Brown (FL)	Connolly	Fudge
Butterfield	Conyers	Gabbard
Capps	Cooper	Garamendi
Capuano	Costa	Garcia
Cárdenas	Crowley	Grayson
Carney	Cummings	Green, Al
Carson (IN)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Cartwright	Deutch	Grijalva
Castro (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Gutiérrez
Cicilline	Doggett	Hahn

Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Meng
Moore

NOES—287

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro

Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz

Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascarell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)

Campbell
Castor (FL)
Davis, Danny
Duckworth

NOT VOTING—10

Fincher
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Nugent

□ 1806

Mr. LAMALFA changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. HOLT changed his voted from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 183, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 559]

AYES—237

Aderholt
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera (CA)

Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)

Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland

Roybal-Allard
Rush

Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Delaney
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Edwards
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Farenthold
Fattah
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Higgins

Himes
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Long
Lowenthal
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McIntyre
McKinley
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo

NOES—183

DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)

Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (IN)

Kingston Miller (MI) Schiff
 Kirkpatrick Miller, Gary Schrader
 Kline Miller, George Sensenbrenner
 Labrador Mulvaney Serrano
 Lance Murphy (PA) Sessions
 Langevin Napolitano Shuster
 Larsen (WA) Negrete McLeod Simpson
 Latham Noem Slaughter
 Latta Nolan Smith (MO)
 Levin Pastor (AZ) Smith (NJ)
 Lewis Paulsen Smith (WA)
 Lipinski Pearce Southerland
 LoBiondo Perry Stutzman
 Loebsock Peters (CA) Terry
 Lofgren Peters (MI) Thompson (CA)
 Lowey Peterson Thompson (PA)
 Lucas Petri Tiberi
 Luetkemeyer Pingree (ME) Tierney
 Lujan Grisham Pittenger Titus
 (NM) Pocan Upton
 Luján, Ben Ray Price (NC) Vargas
 (NM) Rahall Velázquez
 Maffei Reichert Visclosky
 Marino Renacci Wagner
 Massie Ribble Walberg
 McCollum Rice (SC) Walden
 McDermott Rogers (KY) Walorski
 McGovern Rogers (MI) Walz
 McHenry Rohrabacher Webster (FL)
 McKeon Rokita Wenstrup
 McMorris Rooney Williams
 Rodgers Ross Wilson (SC)
 McNerney Runyan Wittman
 Meadows Ryan (WI) Wolf
 Messer Sanford Woodall
 Michaud Sarbanes Yoho
 Miller (FL) Schakowsky Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell Fincher Roybal-Allard
 Castor (FL) Herrera Beutler Rush
 Davis, Danny McCarthy (NY)
 Duckworth Nugent

□ 1812

Messrs. COTTON, CARSON of Indiana, COURTNEY, and Mrs. ROBY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1815

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATHAM, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3080) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 385, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 3, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 560]

YEAS—417

Aderholt Conaway Gohmert
 Amash Connolly Goodlatte
 Amodei Conyers Gosar
 Andrews Cook Gowdy
 Bachmann Cooper Granger
 Bachus Costa Graves (GA)
 Barber Cotton Graves (MO)
 Barletta Courtney Grayson
 Barr Cramer Green, Al
 Barrow (GA) Crawford Green, Gene
 Barton Crenshaw Griffin (AR)
 Bass Crowley Griffith (VA)
 Beatty Cuellar Grijalva
 Becerra Culberson Grimm
 Benishek Cummings Guthrie
 Bentivoglio Daines Gutiérrez
 Bera (CA) Davis (CA) Hahn
 Bilirakis Davis, Rodney Hall
 Bishop (GA) DeFazio Hanabusa
 Bishop (NY) DeGette Hanna
 Bishop (UT) Delaney Harper
 Black DeLauro Harris
 Blackburn DelBene Hartzler
 Blumenauer Denham Hastings (FL)
 Bonamici Dent Hastings (WA)
 Boustany DeSantis Heck (NV)
 Brady (PA) DesJarlais Heck (WA)
 Brady (TX) Deutch Hensarling
 Braley (IA) Diaz-Balart Higgins
 Bridenstine Dingell Himes
 Brooks (AL) Doggett Hinojosa
 Brooks (IN) Doyle Holding
 Broun (GA) Duffy Holt
 Brown (FL) Duncan (SC) Honda
 Brownley (CA) Duncan (TN) Horsford
 Buchanan Edwards Hoyer
 Bucshon Ellison Hudson
 Burgess Ellmers Huelskamp
 Bustos Engel Huffman
 Butterfield Enyart Huizenga (MI)
 Calvert Eshoo Hultgren
 Camp Esty Hunter
 Cantor Farenthold Hurt
 Capito Farr Israel
 Capps Fattah Issa
 Capuano Fitzpatrick Jackson Lee
 Cárdenas Fleischmann Jeffries
 Carney Fleming Jenkins
 Carson (IN) Flores Johnson (GA)
 Carter Forbes Johnson (OH)
 Cartwright Fortenberry Johnson, E. B.
 Cassidy Foster Johnson, Sam
 Castro (TX) Pox Jordan
 Chabot Frankel (FL) Joyce
 Chaffetz Franks (AZ) Kaptur
 Chu Frelinghuysen Keating
 Cicilline Fudge Kelly (IL)
 Clarke Gabbard Kelly (PA)
 Clay Gallego Kennedy
 Cleaver Garamendi Kildee
 Clyburn Garcia Kilmer
 Coble Gardner Kind
 Coffman Garrett King (IA)
 Cohen Gerlach King (NY)
 Cole Gibbs Kingston
 Collins (GA) Gibson Kinzinger (IL)
 Collins (NY) Gingrey (GA) Kirkpatrick

Kline Noem Scott, Austin
 Kuster Nolan Scott, David
 Labrador Nunes Serrano
 LaMalfa Nunnelee Sessions
 Lamborn O'Rourke Sewell (AL)
 Lance Olson Shea-Porter
 Langevin Owens Sherman
 Lankford Palazzo Shimkus
 Larsen (WA) Pallone Shuster
 Larson (CT) Pascrell Simpson
 Latham Pastor (AZ) Sinema
 Latta Paulsen Sires
 Lee (CA) Payne Slaughter
 Levin Pearce Smith (MO)
 Lewis Pelosi Smith (NE)
 Lipinski Perlmutter Smith (NJ)
 LoBiondo Perry Smith (TX)
 Loebsock Peters (CA) Smith (WA)
 Lofgren Peters (MI) Southerland
 Long Petri Speier
 Lowenthal Pingree (ME) Stewart
 Lowey Pittenger Stivers
 Lucas Pitts Stockman
 Luetkemeyer Pocan Stutzman
 Lujan Grisham Poe (TX) Swallow (CA)
 (NM) Polis Takano
 Luján, Ben Ray Pompeo Terry
 (NM) Posey Thompson (CA)
 Lummis Price (GA) Thompson (MS)
 Lynch Price (NC) Thompson (PA)
 Maffei Quigley Thornberry
 Maloney, Radel Tiberi
 Carolyn Rahall Tierney
 Maloney, Sean Rangel Tipton
 Marchant Reed Titus
 Marino Reichert Tonko
 Massie Renacci Tsongas
 Matheson Ribble Turner
 Matsui Rice (SC) Upton
 McCarthy (CA) Richmond Valadao
 McCaul Rigell Van Hollen
 McClintock Roby Vargas
 McCollum Roe (TN) Veasey
 McDermott Rogers (AL) Vela
 McGovern Rogers (KY) Velázquez
 McHenry Rogers (MI) Visclosky
 McIntyre Rohrabacher Wagner
 McKeon Rokita Walberg
 McKinley Rooney Walden
 McMorris Ros-Lehtinen Walorski
 Rodgers Roskam Walz
 McNerney Ross Wasserman
 Meadows Rothfus Schultz
 Meehan Royce Waters
 Meeks Ruiz Watt
 Meng Waxman
 Messer Ruppersberger Weber (TX)
 Mica Ryan (OH) Webster (FL)
 Michaud Ryan (WI) Welch
 Miller (FL) Salmon Wenstrup
 Miller (MI) Sánchez, Linda Westmoreland
 Miller, Gary T. Whitfield
 Miller, George Sanchez, Loretta Williams
 Moore Sanford Wilson (FL)
 Moran Sarbanes Wilson (SC)
 Mullin Scalise Wittman
 Mulvaney Schakowsky Wolf
 Murphy (FL) Schiff Womack
 Murphy (PA) Schneider Woodall
 Nadler Schock Yarmuth
 Napolitano Schrader Yoder
 Neal Schwartz Yoho
 Negrete McLeod Schweikert Young (AK)
 Neugebauer Scott (VA) Young (IN)

NAYS—3

Jones Peterson Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell Fincher Roybal-Allard
 Castor (FL) Herrera Beutler Rush
 Davis, Danny McCarthy (NY)
 Duckworth Nugent

□ 1822

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put *de novo*.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, for the purpose of informing us of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected Wednesday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business Friday. In addition, the House will consider two bipartisan bills from the Financial Services Committee: H.R. 992, the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act, authored by Representative RANDY HULTGREN; and H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act, sponsored by Representative ANN WAGNER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate that information.

I would simply observe, Mr. Speaker, and then I will have a couple of questions of the majority leader, but last week we did something that was, I think, critically important, and we did it in a bipartisan fashion: we made sure that the government was open, and we made sure that America pays its bills.

Today, in an overwhelming bipartisan fashion, we passed the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, which will, as I heard the majority leader saying and I said as well, be helpful in growing our economy, growing jobs, and investing in America's growth.

I would simply observe that there are other things, Mr. Speaker, that I think we can act on in a bipartisan fashion as well and be successful in seeing enacted, which would make a real difference on behalf of our country.

I would therefore, Mr. Speaker, ask the majority leader whether or not there is any thought about bringing to the floor before the end of the year the immigration bill, and I will yield to my friend for the purpose of a response.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and would

respond by saying that I think the gentleman knows that both the Speaker and I have said that we are not going to consider the Senate bill because we object to the Senate bill, although we do want to make some progress in reforming our broken immigration system, and there are plenty of bipartisan efforts underway and in discussion between Members on both sides of the aisle to try and address what is broken about our immigration system. The committees are still working on this issue, and I expect us to move forward this year in trying to address reform and what is broken about our system.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information, Mr. Speaker, and I would say of course the Senate has passed a bill in an overwhelming bipartisan fashion, an immigration bill, and if in fact we bring an immigration bill to the floor, whether I vote for it or not, and we move that bill through the House, that will give us an opportunity to do what my Republican friends, Mr. Speaker, have been talking about—negotiating, sitting down, talking, going to conference. I think that will be a step forward.

We are on this side of the aisle very, very strongly in favor of moving immigration reform. We are obviously hopeful that the budget conference that has been convened will reach an agreement. We hope it will reach an agreement, frankly, before Thanksgiving so we will not again have to address on a crisis basis either the keeping of government open and funding of government for the balance of the fiscal year, but also ensuring that we do not have another time when we come very close to not approving the payment of our bills by what ought to be the most creditworthy nation on Earth, and I think it is the most creditworthy nation on Earth, so I am pleased to hear that information.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the majority leader whether or not he has any information which might lead us to having some confidence that we might have progress on the conference on the farm bill.

I yield to my friend, the majority leader.

□ 1830

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, the conference committee has been appointed, it is meeting, and we anticipate a productive discussion on the farm bill and the reforms that the House voted on in all parts of the bill. We hopefully look forward to resolution on the differences between the Senate so that we can produce yet another bill that can be signed into law.

I would just underscore the fact, Mr. Speaker, that talks and negotiations are, yes, the way to go about trying to accomplish more for the American people.

Along those lines, it is about trying to focus on the things and the beliefs that we have in common and not allowing those things that we disagree on to get in the way. If that spirit of negotiation is adopted by both sides, I believe there could be progress on the farm bill as well as other issues.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. CANTOR and I are in absolute agreement. If both sides take that attitude, then we can make some progress. Hopefully, that will be the case.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader has said, I said, HAL ROGERS of the Appropriations Committee has said, and others have said that the sequester will not work, that the sequester will, in fact, undermine the ability of America to invest in its growth and its opportunities and its ability to compete globally so that we can create jobs here in America. The majority leader has made an observation, Mr. Speaker, that he didn't think the sequester was the way to go. I share that view, and I share very strongly the view of Mr. ROGERS that, in fact, the sequester could not be implemented in a way that was consistent with the interests of our country.

I want to ask the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, focusing on what we can agree on and not what we disagree on, whether or not he shares my view that one of the conference's objectives should be replacing the sequester with a formula that gets us to a place where we are bringing down our expenditures and at the same time making sure that we protect the mandatory expenditures that Mr. RYAN talks about and others talk about to make sure that our most vulnerable in America are protected and that we do so, frankly, before Thanksgiving, Mr. Speaker.

I am urging the majority leader to hopefully take that course so that we do not once again confront a crisis prior to Christmas when we are scheduled to adjourn for the Christmas and Hanukkah holidays, but also to preclude coming into the first of January with a deadline confronting us and disrupting the confidence of our people and, frankly, the people around the world.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I agree with the gentleman that it is desirable. I look at it as a priority that we allow for the appropriations process to begin again, but that will require us to arrive at an agreement on what that top line number is, as the gentleman knows as a former appropriator.

We have said and maintained all along on the majority side of the aisle that the sequester is not the best way to go about achieving spending reductions, and I have said continuously that we would like to exchange for sequester mandatory savings and put

that into law in exchange for the sequester. There are items in the President's budget that we agree on as well. That goes to my point, Mr. Speaker, of working and focusing on things that we have in common, things that we believe in in common, and leaving aside those things that we disagree on.

The main item that we disagree on in these discussions has been higher taxes. The Republicans and the majority in the House do not believe we ought to raise taxes, and we will not go about raising taxes in exchange for sequester relief. What we want to do instead is to allow for sequester relief and put into law mandatory savings that, in the long run, will exceed the kind of spending reductions that are in the sequester. They are smarter reductions. They make more sense and will allow us to provide, as the gentleman said, for the needs of those who are most wanting in our society. It will also allow for the defense of our country and will put us on to a path of fiscal stability.

Mr. Speaker, it takes us focusing and limiting our discussions to those things we have in common. I believe that is the best way forward.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, we have two bills: the Senate bill, which was passed some 6 months ago, and the House bill, which was passed about 6 months ago. We have been hoping to go to conference during those past 6 months. That hasn't happened. We are now going to conference. That is a positive step forward. My belief is that the conference will discuss both the Senate bill and its priorities and the House bill and its priorities, and we will come to a resolution, hopefully, on a compromise so that we can get from where we are to where we need to be.

I am not going to get into a debate at this point in time. At some point in time that will be appropriate with the gentleman. We seem to have this road a lot, but the fact of the matter is we ought to look at those who have made recommendations, worked on this to figure out how we can get from where we are to where we need to be.

Without going further into the specifics, as we talk about next week, let me ask the gentleman if he can give our Members some view of his thoughts on scheduling and subject matters for consideration for the balance of the year. I know we talked about a couple of items, and I know Members are interested in what their planning should be for the balance of the year, which is coming up pretty soon.

I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As we just discussed, we expect there to be a farm bill conference report that we will consider here in the House. We will also look to consider items dealing

with our domestic energy supply and the ability for us to maximize the indigenous assets and resources we have here to increase our competitiveness as a country for investment, for job opportunity, and to increase the standard of living for all of working middle class Americans as well as all Americans.

I would also say to the gentleman that if the Senate acts in time, we look forward to a conference report on the National Defense Authorization Act as well as various provisions that expire at the end of the year. Obviously, we have SGR and other things that will expire that we will have to take time to deal with.

Obviously, we maintain our focus on the rollout of ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, and our committees will be hard at work trying to understand exactly what is going on with the sign-up on these exchanges and to once again assert that it is only fair that all Americans are treated equally and fairly under this law, as is expected under every other law.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

He is going to find out, I am sure, over the next few weeks the overwhelming interest that Americans are displaying in getting health care opportunities and access to an affordable, quality health care.

I yield back the balance of my time.

--- **HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW**

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of January 3, 2013, regarding morning-hour debate not apply tomorrow, and when the House adjourns on Thursday, October 24, 2013, it adjourn to meet on Monday, October 28, 2013, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

--- **SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS**

(Mr. WAXMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to address the important issue of climate change.

EPA reported some good news today: carbon pollution from power plants has dropped 10 percent from 2010 to 2012. Some of this drop was due to fuel switching from coal to natural gas, which is less polluting; some was due to increased energy efficiency; and some was due to growth in clean, renewable sources of electricity like wind and solar.

Our challenge is to continue these reductions. Market forces alone will not be enough. The Energy Department says that carbon pollution has crept up this year as coal prices fell and usage increased. That is why we need the new regulations proposed by EPA to limit carbon pollution from new power plants, and that is why we need limits on pollution from existing power plants.

The history of the Clean Air Act has shown us we can have both a strong economy and clean air. Our health, our environment, and our economic prosperity depend on developing the clean energy technologies of the future.

--- **IN TRIBUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAJOR OWENS**

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to our former colleague, Congressman Major Owens of Brooklyn, New York.

Major and I were elected in the class of 1998 and had the joy of serving together for several decades. He was a fighter for learning and perhaps the first librarian ever elected to the Congress of the United States. He came from Brooklyn, far from where I lived, but his predecessor, Shirley Chisholm, was the only Member of Congress that in our first campaign came to campaign for me. I shall never forget that.

Major was a social critic, and he was a voice from a Brooklyn that I only imagined as a child with the Brooklyn Dodgers. With the old Ebbets Field torn down, the Dodgers moved to Los Angeles, and baseball changed forever from a human institution where the players came from that region to an enterprise where they were traded like chattel.

Major understood the difference, and the work that he did here, whether it was fighting for learning, fighting for libraries, fighting for jobs in America, for the training of workers, he handled in a very measured way. He had a poetic sense about him when he came to the floor many times in the evening and delivered some of his handwritten lines. Through his work both in Brooklyn and for our country, he helped to build a better America, and he left us a better place for his service.

I wish to extend to his family and to his former constituents the deep sympathy of the people of Ohio. He was an honest man and an honorable man, and it was a great privilege to serve with him those many years which seem just like yesterday.

--- **MANAGING THE GLOBAL ECONOMY**

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I had the preeminent privilege of talking to the Honorable Barney Frank just recently, the former chairperson of the Financial Services Committee. He called to my attention a speech made by the Honorable MAXINE WATERS, who is now the ranking member of the committee.

This speech was a keynote speech at the launch of the Global Financial Governance and Impact Report. This is a very insightful message accorded by the Honorable MAXINE WATERS. It is, in fact, a critique of the World Bank, the IMF. She goes into the global sovereign debt restructuring issue, and she talks also about the problem of growing inequality.

I would invite anyone who is interested in learning more about what I call the "Waters Worldview," to peruse this document.

Chairman Frank was eminently correct when he suggested that this might become a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I will place it in the RECORD tonight.

CONG. MAXINE WATERS KEYNOTE SPEECH AT THE LAUNCH OF THE "GLOBAL FINANCIAL GOVERNANCE AND IMPACT REPORT" BY THE NEW RULES FOR GLOBAL FINANCIAL COALITION

INTRODUCTION

I'm very honored to be invited here today by the New Rules for Global Finance coalition to talk about governance of the international economy and the role of the world's major economic institutions in helping to shape and manage the global financial system.

First, I'd like to say that I very much welcome this report by the New Rules coalition and the contribution it makes in calling attention to one of the most challenging issues we face today—how do we manage the global economy and how do we make our existing international institutions more effective in helping to preserve global stability and promote sustainable growth in a way that is broadly shared?

In a world of sovereign states, the underlying challenge to effective global economic governance originates from the absence of a single global entity responsible for overseeing the system and establishing the rules necessary for its operation.

The core infrastructure of the global economy will need to be based—in my view—on effective national rules coupled with increased international cooperation among nations, both through informal channels and through established multilateral institutions.

GLOBAL ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS

Given the importance of our global economic institutions in these efforts—and the fact that these institutions have no system of direct democratic accountability—it is all the more important that there be confidence in their governance—and that they be transparent and accountable.

Particular attention should be paid to the effectiveness of their policies and the impact they have on developing countries.

Any examination of these institutions should first acknowledge how much progress

they've made in many areas over the past 20 years—in large part due to pressure from civil society and individual governments. This is particularly the case with regard to the Bretton Woods institutions. Whatever deficiencies people might identify or perceive, one thing the international financial institutions cannot be accused of is being indifferent to pressure or impervious to change.

Having said that, I believe the first set of governance reforms we need at the Bretton Woods institutions is a more effective voice for developing countries. These countries now represent a much larger proportion of world economic activity than when the World Bank and the IMF were created in 1944.

Voice and representation reforms are imperative in order to re-establish the credibility of the Bank and the Fund as truly international institutions contributing to growth with equity and stability for all countries.

WORLD BANK

I believe it is very much in our interest that the World Bank—as the world's premier development institution—remains strong, credible and effective.

One of the important contributions the Bank has made to the vitality of development efforts is its emphasis on good governance—its commitment to democratic values and inclusive, participatory decision-making.

Inspection Panel

In fact, twenty years ago the Bank became the standard-bearer for democratic accountability at the multilateral development institutions by establishing the Inspection Panel. This marked a very important advance in the governance of international institutions.

By creating an independent forum through which ordinary citizens who felt disadvantaged by Bank projects could submit their complaints and see them addressed—the Bank gave voice and standing to affected people. For the first time, an international organization provided a means through which individual citizens could hold the Bank accountable to its own standards.

Today, the Inspection Panel continues to contribute in important ways to project quality and improved development outcomes.

Racial Discrimination

But the World Bank can only be effective in conveying a message of good governance if it is seen as having good governance itself. There must be a belief that its own governance conforms to the standards that it demands of others—including standards relating to the choice of personnel and due process.

One of the Bank's most important assets is its human capital. It has created one of the most talented and qualified bureaucracies around the world. But the Bank has some serious work to do to ensure that its processes for hiring, retaining and promoting staff are free from discrimination. It must also ensure that staff have access to a justice system that they can trust will be fair and impartial. This is an issue that I will continue to follow very closely.

DOING BUSINESS REPORT

Another area where I'm optimistic we'll see permanent change is in the World Bank's annual "Doing Business" report, which ranks countries according to their attractiveness to business.

Several years ago, the Financial Services Committee learned that the "Doing Business" report included a labor index—the "Employing Workers Indicator"—which downgraded countries in the rankings for any and all labor protections. This included factors such as having a minimum wage, maximum working hours, vacation days, or maternity leave. It was clear this had to change.

Another area of concern in the Report was its "Paying Taxes" indicator—which gave countries a higher rating based on how close to zero their corporate tax rates were. In effect, this meant that the World Bank's guidance to developing countries was to gut labor protections and shift the funding of all government functions to workers and households. Of course, this would make it more difficult to fund social safety net programs, build a middle class, or empower workers. This was odd advice for an organization supposedly devoted to ending poverty.

International labor groups such as the AFL-CIO, the International Trade Union Confederation, and the ILO all tried in vain to convince, shame, or bully the World Bank into eliminating the "Employing Workers" index.

After our Committee held a hearing on the subject several years ago, we made it clear to the World Bank that its funding could be very, very slow in moving forward through the committee until this problem was resolved. The outcome was that in 2009, the World Bank suspended the "Employing Workers Indicator" from the "Doing Business" rankings—and it created a working group to develop a new indicator to measure countries' adherence to core labor standards.

I'm confident that the anti-worker aspects of the Report will soon be permanently abolished altogether. Not doing so would greatly undermine the Bank's legitimacy and its relevance in the fight against global poverty.

International Monetary Fund

With regard to the IMF, I first want to thank Ms. LaGarde for her willingness to engage with me directly on issues that have been of particular importance to me. And I want to commend her leadership in focusing as much time and energy as she did on the country of Jamaica when the world was otherwise so focused on the turmoil in Europe.

I believe the IMF has a very legitimate and indispensable function in the global economy—in monitoring the world's economies and responding to countries facing balance-of-payment crises.

One mark of the vitality of an institution, in my view, is its ability to admit when it was wrong, to say that it had misjudged some things and made mistakes. The IMF has done that, and I think that adds to its legitimacy. For example, after the East Asian financial crisis in the late '90s, the IMF admitted that it was wrong in imposing too much austerity, which exacerbated debt crises.

Over the past decade, the IMF has tried to pay more attention to the social aspects of its programs, including by protecting social safety nets and vulnerable parts of society.

Last December, the IMF marked an end in the era of finance by reversing its long-held opposition to capital controls. The Fund announced a new official institutional view acknowledging that controls on volatile flows of capital around the globe can play an important role in helping to preserve the stability of the international financial system.

Moreover, when Congress authorized an IMF quota increase in 2009, which included a limited amount of gold sales, the IMF agreed

to use a portion of the proceeds to help the poorest countries. This included the elimination of interest payments on its loans to the poorest countries for five years.

Labor Market Issues at the IMF

However, there are areas where I believe the IMF needs to do a better job. First, it's clear that the Fund doesn't always strike the right balance between austerity and growth, which has had some very negative consequences. Second, I believe the IMF should stick to what it knows best: macroeconomic issues that bear most directly on balance-of-payment questions. For example, it's difficult to understand why monetary economists at the IMF should intervene in a country's labor market policies, particularly when they encourage labor market flexibility measures. Labor market flexibility is nothing more than a euphemism for measures that make it easier for firms to fire workers and dilute the power of unions to negotiate on behalf of workers. I understand that the IMF has recently recommended a number of these policies in Europe and elsewhere. The IMF should not be re-writing the social compact in countries that recasts the balance of power between labor and capital.

Global Sovereign Debt Restructuring Mechanism

On a positive note, I'd like to add my very strong support for recent work at the IMF, and elsewhere, to study and encourage a more efficient approach to sovereign debt restructuring.

The issue of sovereign debt is back at the center of economic policy debate. This is a result not only of the global crisis, but also because of recent court rulings that would give greater leverage to vulture funds, which could undermine future debt restructuring efforts.

I favor an approach that would establish a formal, institutionalized, and politically recognized procedure for restructuring the debt of bankrupt sovereigns. It would extend legal protections to both the sovereigns and creditors involved.

Under certain conditions, an international sovereign debt restructuring mechanism could allow for the orderly and swift resolution of debt crises in ways that would not only make crises less costly but would also encourage sovereign debtors and creditors to act more responsibly in normal times.

There are a couple of principles that I think should underlie such a mechanism. For example, odious debt should be written off. This would include, for example, the kind of debt the Congo had as a result of Mobutu borrowing, or Ethiopia, which was given loans that paid for arms that went to Mengistu. Also, when loans were made with advice from international lenders—advice that was wrong and led to projects that were poorly designed—the lenders should bear some of the risk for bad lending.

In any event, the recent court rulings allowing vulture funds to interfere with Argentina's ability to make payments to creditors that had accepted a debt restructuring have caused widespread concern. Both the World Bank and the IMF have noted that this will encourage holdouts and discourage creditor participation in future sovereign debt workouts, which could pose a very real threat to global financial stability.

THE PROBLEM OF GROWING INEQUALITY

This brings me to what I think is one of the central problems with the way we have approached international economic policy, through our trade agreements and through the policies of the international financial institutions.

I believe our international economic policy has been too one-sided—too focused on elevating the interests and mobility of capital over all other considerations. This was based on the misguided belief that unfettered markets would not only create wealth and stability, but would also solve almost all social problems through a trickle down of benefits to others in society.

But this isn't what has happened.

Over the past 30 years, we have seen a growing increase in inequality in the U.S. and in other advanced and some emerging market countries. This was the case even during periods of sustained growth. In fact, today the United States has the highest level of inequality of any advanced industrial country.

Although some degree of inequality is necessary for the function of a market economy, since it creates incentives to work hard and take risks, here in America and elsewhere, we have more much more inequality than is necessary for efficiency.

Left entirely to its own, the market system will produce more inequality than is economically necessary. And excessive inequality not only undermines social and political cohesion, it has also been shown to have negative effects on growth.

World Bank research has shown that growth alone is not sufficient in reducing poverty. You also have to pay attention to how the benefits of growth are distributed, so that its benefits are broadly shared. Recent research at the IMF has shown that inequality can also undermine growth, because it weakens demand and depresses consumption.

Now, I believe in capitalism. I recognize the power of capitalism to create wealth, and I believe markets are the main engines of wealth creation in our country and elsewhere.

But in order to be truly supportive of the free market, I believe you must also be supportive of government. This is because we need to have an appropriate set of public policies in place to reign in the excesses of the market, to help maintain stability, and to ensure that the benefits of capitalism are broadly shared.

In fact, one of the most important lessons we have learned from the recent financial crisis is that markets must be deeply embedded in systems of governance. The idea that markets are self-correcting has received a mortal blow. Markets require other social and public institutions to support them. They rely on courts, legal frameworks, and regulators to set and enforce rules. They depend on the stabilizing functions that central banks and countercyclical fiscal policy provide. They also need the political buy-in that redistributive taxation, safety nets, and social insurance help generate.

And all of this is true of global markets as well.

What I'm saying is this: free markets and government are not opposites, they are complements. And if you don't want to believe me about the importance of government to the free market system—well, maybe you will believe the markets.

In Congress, one of the biggest supporters of the IMF and the World Bank has been the US Chamber of Commerce. They understand the need for effective public intervention when countries are facing an economic crisis. Business has also been the biggest supporter of the U.S. Export-Import Bank, another government function. Finally, last week, after the Republicans shut the government down, business deployed an army of

lobbyist to Capitol Hill to stress the importance of getting the government back up and running again.

IN CLOSING

As I conclude my remarks, it occurs to me that perhaps this might not have been the most appropriate audience to hear my views on the importance of governance and the necessary and mutually reinforcing roles of government and markets.

I think perhaps the House Republicans in Congress would have benefited more from this message than anyone else.

Their insistence on shutting down the government—coupled with their apparent willingness to allow our government to default on its debt—reveal just how reckless and dangerously dysfunctional the Republican Party has become.

Their actions show not only a contempt for government, but also an indifference to markets and the importance of stability. Taken together, the Republicans have shown the country just how profoundly misguided their understanding is of the role and responsibilities of elected officials in a representative Democracy.

□ 1845

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

Ms. SLAUGHTER, New York

Mr. MCINTYRE, North Carolina

Mr. COHEN, Tennessee

THE OBAMACARE DEBACLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, as the ObamaCare debacle continues to unfold, there is more and more that is absolutely staggering that is now coming out. People in America need to understand who shut the government down September 30, October 1.

The House of Representatives had voted out, first, a bill to completely defund ObamaCare because we could tell—many of us have read it. I read it before I voted “no.” I could see it was a disaster waiting to happen, that real Americans would be really hurt. So we offered a compromise.

All right. This obviously, pursuant to notice by Democrats themselves, was a train wreck, nightmare. It was not ready for prime time. So we actually gave Democrats in the Senate and in the House that pushed it through without a single Republican vote, and the President himself, an easy out because that is, if you really want to get something done, unless it is ObamaCare

that you want—that America knows is going to be harmful and totally against, or at least over half are against.

Unless you are going to do something like that that is really totalitarian and against the will of the American people, it is good, a Chinese proverb notes, to give adversaries a way out.

We gave a way out for Democrats in the House and the Senate that passed ObamaCare without Republicans. We gave a way out for President Obama. We said, okay, here is a compromise that ought to be an easy agreement. You know, we will give you money that you are demanding, with a gun to our heads, namely, the shutdown, and all we ask is that you do the right thing for America and suspend the implementation of ObamaCare for a year. Clearly, it is not ready now.

HARRY REID, maybe he consulted with the President, surely he did before refusing to let that go anywhere.

So we did what people are not supposed to do in a negotiation, continue to compromise against themselves. I didn't think it was a good idea. We should have waited for the Senate to vote on something, something. Do something, because being in a legislative body requires more than just saying no, no, no, no, which the majority leader in the Senate did.

Nonetheless, our Republican leadership decided we would compromise against ourselves—yet again. All right, if you don't want to suspend the whole thing for a year, at least do for individuals in America what you are doing for Big Business. Big Business, basically, as set forward in ObamaCare, was any-body with more than 50 employees.

And yet, again, HARRY REID and the President were a “no” on the compromise that would have just suspended, legally suspended, the mandate forced upon individuals that they are going to pay higher taxes, a fine of \$95 or 1 percent of their income, going up to 2 percent.

But that was going to be implemented, they were going to be penalized, or as Chief Justice Roberts rewrote the ObamaCare bill and called it a tax after he called it nothing but a penalty. So Americans were going to get hammered. We could see that.

At least, we implored the Senate and the President, give individual Americans the same break you have now, basically, illegally given to Big Business by saying yeah, the law says that, but we are just not going to enforce it for a year.

Why not do that for individuals in America if you will do it for Big Business? Why not? It's the fair thing to do.

Once again, it gives a legislative opponent a way out. It gives you a back door to say, well, okay, we are caving in. We are going to allow the individual mandate to be suspended for a year, like we, like the President did, legislating from the executive office.

But, again, the answer was no. And in response to Majority Leader REID's no and the President's no, the President, of course, had called people to the White House later on, after the shutdown, and made clear to the leaders of the House and Senate, you know, I wanted to make clear to you I am not negotiating. Give me my money. Raise my debt ceiling, and then maybe we will negotiate.

Later on, in essence, it was give me my money. Raise the debt ceiling. You will be amazed at what I will be willing to negotiate once you give me everything I want.

So it was indicated yesterday, by the administration, you know, gee, there is a possibility we may have to delay the individual mandate. And in an article today from Jim Wizner, the title of the article, “ObamaCare Mandate May Be Delayed. Official says deadline to have insurance could be postponed.”

The article says, the Obama administration may gave Americans extra time to sign up for health insurance under the Affordable Care Act, postponing when penalties for failing to buy coverage will go into effect, Market Watch has learned.

Further down, it says, the administration declined to say whether people who purchase health insurance late in the enrollment period, say, on March 31, would be exempt from a penalty, even if their policy doesn't kick in until April or May; nor would the Department give a specific date by which people would need to buy coverage to escape a fine.

The HHS, or Health and Human Services, official, however, indicated that the administration may extend the deadline beyond February 15: we are exploring options currently, and will issue guidance at a later date.

The article at marketwatch.com goes on to say the potential extension comes as the Federal health exchanges are under fire for ongoing technological problems that are making it difficult for some people to enroll. The Obama administration has so far resisted GOP pleas to delay the requirement that individuals purchase insurance next year, but has lately expressed frustration with the technical difficulties. Those problems, perhaps the elephant in the room during deadline discussions, may influence a decision to provide an enrollment grace period to avoid fines.

There is another problem that the penalty policy or, as rewritten by our Chief Justice, the tax policy, may be in flux. While Health and Human Services referred Market Watch's previous inquiries about the fine and the deadline to avoid it to the Treasury, a spokesperson there referred a request Wednesday back to Health and Human Services, suggesting that the health officials are now the ones writing new rules for the law.

For this administration, for Democrats in any part of this body or at the White House to even consider out loud suspending for 1 year the individual mandate is absolutely outrageous, and it exposes, clearly exposes that there were games being played in Congress, and it wasn't by Republicans.

It exposes that people knew there were problems with ObamaCare, with the Web sites. They knew that Americans were going to have a nightmare, and were having a nightmare in even trying to get online and review different policies, and they didn't care, just as, obviously, there were people in this administration who could have changed the policy.

They didn't care about the veterans. They can say now, oh, yeah, we had a policy that World War II vets were going to get in, or people that were utilizing their First Amendment rights.

Well, I was there the first day. There wasn't any mention of that. Those barricades were connected across in front of the World War II Memorial, across in front of the Lincoln Memorial, across in front of the Martin Luther King Memorial. There were barricades, for heavens sake, on the road that just made a loop around the Iwo Jima monument, the U.S. Marine Corps Memorial.

They were out to make things as difficult as possible. Apparently, at least as early as Thursday, before the shutdown the following Tuesday, plans were being made to gather barricades. There was an indication at one point some of them may have been rented.

We still haven't gotten to the bottom of where they all came from, where all the cones came from to interrupt people's lives around the country, as this administration sought to make it as difficult as possible on Americans. As one park ranger indicated, it was disgusting, the park ranger is reported to have said, but we have been ordered to make things as difficult for people as we can. Well, they were doing a good job.

So, for them, anyone in this administration, anyone down the hall, anyone in Congress to now think about, gee, maybe we should suspend the individual mandate, is an outrage. It tells you that there were people in Congress and there were a lot of people down Pennsylvania Avenue who had no consideration for the American people.

They were out to score political points. They didn't care. They wanted people to hurt and to suffer so maybe they could win the majority in the House next year, and the American people began to see through this.

When the next-to-last compromise of a compromise continuing against ourselves was to suspend the individual mandate for a year, there was no excuse for rejecting that.

□ 1900

The Senate should have at least voted that through. What an incredible

turn of events for this administration now to say, Yes, we are thinking about suspending the individual mandate. You have got to be kidding me.

Nothing could make it more clear to the American people that games were played with the shutdown—and it wasn't by Republicans who kept compromising against ourselves, but it was with the people who kept saying, No, no, no.

Then the last thing we did the night before things really shut down was to say, Okay, under the law, the rules, here are our conferees. You appoint your conferees, and we will have this worked out hopefully by morning before people even realize there has been a shutdown. And once again, the answer was, No, no, no. Obviously people in the majority at the other end of the hall wanted the government shut down.

And I would expect that in the future, if someone were looking for a modern day Marie Antoinette, who reportedly, in response to the suffering of the people in France, had said, "Let them eat cake." So out of touch with the suffering of the people, if that were actually said.

Here is an article by Susan Jones, CNSNews.com, and it is dated today:

In an interview with CNN's Dr. Sanjay Gupta Tuesday night, Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius said she won't be enrolling in the problem-plagued health insurance system that she was charged to implement.

And this is the quote that the Secretary of Health and Human Services told to CNN's Dr. Sanjay Gupta. This is the person who is charged with implementing ObamaCare. This is the person who is charged with overseeing ObamaCare. This is the person who has been given—by an overreaching, oppressive ObamaCare bill, she has been given the power over people's lives, over their health care. There is nothing more personal than that.

This person who will have so much control, if she is still in office at full implementation, says this:

I have created an account on the site.

Talking about the ObamaCare site.

I have not tried signing up because I have insurance.

Mr. Speaker, you had insurance. I had insurance. We had the same policy that every Federal worker in America had the chance to have. There were a number of different policies you could choose from in the Federal employee handbook, the "Federal employee cafeteria plan," as they call it, a number of different insurance policies with private insurance. We had insurance just like Secretary Sebelius has now. The difference is that this bill, this oppressive, government-controlled ObamaCare business, took our health care insurance away.

There has been a lot of confusion in America about whether or not Members of Congress are under ObamaCare.

We are. As of December 31, we will have lost our insurance.

I had a health savings account. I wasn't totally thrilled with it. It doesn't work like it should. There are some glitches that needed to be worked out, but I had a choice. I could choose to have a higher deductible, as I have, and a health savings account that I would manage, but Secretary Sebelius had authority to take that away, and she did.

So she says, Gee, I have insurance. Well, so did I. So did all of us in here. Mr. Speaker, so did you. But an oppressive, overreaching Congress took it away. And those Americans were promised over and over and over, if you like your insurance, you can keep it. That promise has now been broken millions of times to Americans. People were told, if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. That promise has been broken probably millions of times to Americans.

The arrogance when millions and millions of Americans are having their insurance taken away from them, having to get different insurance, having to pay higher deductibles, having to pay higher amounts for their insurance, the arrogance to come back and say, I am not going to get insurance under ObamaCare. I already have insurance, that takes a lot of unmitigated gall. You might as well say, Let them eat cake. I have got my insurance. Let them eat cake.

Maybe people want a different Health and Human Services Secretary as a result of the horrendous job that was done in preparing this rollout, but I would think the head of Health and Human Services, to have this kind of arrogance, should not remain in the position with an attitude like that. It would be like the president of American Airlines refusing to fly on anything but United.

In the real world, people would care so much about their own product, that is what they would use. They would be embarrassed to refuse to use the product they were forcing on others. Airlines aren't forcing their products on us. This is being forced on us. And the one who is in charge of the forcing is too good to have ObamaCare insurance.

Now, the difference was, the Office of Personnel Management had put into the law something that wasn't in the law, and that was that Members of Congress would continue to have the Federal Government, which are the taxpayers, paying for over 70 percent of our monthly health care costs. We pay a little over a third—well, actually, not quite a third—and the government, the taxpayers, pay over two-thirds, so OPM had issued an order that that could continue even though the law didn't provide for it.

I have indicated that I am not going to accept that. Likely, I will be paying a fine unless the individual mandate is suspended for a year.

Just to indicate how bad this rollout is, this is from the Washington Free Beacon, headline, "HHS Finds Two Enrollees for Pro-ObamaCare Ads. Ad claims website is 'very easy to use.'" This is by Elizabeth Harrington. It says:

New advertisements promoting ObamaCare by Health and Human Services claim HealthCare.gov is "very easy to use" despite a flood of reports about glitches and a dearth of users being able to actually access the site and purchase insurance.

President Barack Obama held a press conference on Monday in defense of his health care law, saying it is "not just a Web site," which has been under scrutiny for its disastrous rollout since October 1.

Coverage of the site has been largely negative, with pundits and reporters alike at news outlets from The Washington Post to The New York Times to the Los Angeles Times noting the problems with the Web site.

However, Health and Human Services is out with new ads touting its success.

For heaven's sake, we ought to have a law against the government lying to the American people. We ought to start with a lie like that.

The new ads "feature two individuals who have received media attention for beating the odds to sign up."

"The site was very easy to use, and the customer service representatives were patient and helpful," she said.

The woman was identified online as Deborah Lielasus, 54, a self-employed grant writer, who has written grants for HHS.

Well, how about that. One of the two people in the ads that they were able to find to talk about how wonderful the ObamaCare Web site was happens to write grants for HHS. How about that.

See, back when I was a judge and chief justice, we would call that evidence that could be used to impeach her credibility. Because of that link with Health and Human Services, she has a direct interest in promoting how good things are at Health and Human Services so that she could potentially get favorable treatment. That is what you would call it in a court of law. And in a court of public opinion, reasonable people might be embarrassed that all you can find is somebody who has a pecuniary interest in promoting HHS.

But this article points out:

Her process for enrolling was not as smooth as the ad suggests. According to the Associated Press, Lielasus was only able to create an account from before the Web site crashed on October 2.

"As a grant writer who does a lot of research on Federal Web sites, Deborah Lielasus was impressed by how easy it was to use the new online insurance market that launched Tuesday—until it stopped working," the report said.

"They're telling me the system is down at the moment," Lielasus said.

Lielasus told the Washington Free Beacon that enrolling took several days.

"On the first day, I was only able to register for an account, but 2 or 3 days later, I was able to submit an application and enroll," she said in an email.

Lielasus said her experience with HealthCare.gov was "primarily positive."

"I expected some technology glitches in a rollout of this magnitude, particularly on the first day when the site was flooded with reporters as well as individuals trying to enroll," she said.

Lielaus appears to be one of the few who have successfully enrolled in New Hampshire. An ObamaCare navigator tried to sign up 45 people during the first week, "but she wasn't able to enroll anyone online because of the glitches," according to the Concord Monitor . . . Lielaus said that she does not recall who contacted her to be in the video for HHS, only that, "I believe I was approached for the video to share my personal story."

A second HHS video features Daniel McNaughton, who was the only person able to sign up for health insurance during ObamaCare's first week, the Orlando Sentinel.

McNaughton said in his ad that with HealthCare.gov, it was "pretty easy" to shop for insurance.

"I already had health insurance, but I just wanted to see if I could do a little bit better on the health insurance marketplace, and I did," he said. "Once I was on the site, it was pretty easy for me to compare plans. I was able to pick a much higher quality plan, and because of my income as a student, I only pay about 70 bucks a month for it."

Well, the article goes on, and it says:

On Facebook, McNaughton posted a link to the plan he signed up for, which includes a \$3,000 deductible, which doubles to \$6,000 out-of-network. McNaughton, a 22-year-old male, will have maternity care covered, which is an "essential benefit" mandated by the health care law.

So another great thing, when the Federal Government decides to create a one-size-fits-all, single young men must pay for maternity care for themselves.

□ 1915

Because he only makes \$15,000 a year, McNaughton is eligible for a subsidy and will pay about \$70 per month, according to the Sentinel. He is known as one of the few Floridians who have successfully signed up for ObamaCare. The Miami Herald calls enrollees urban legends.

He is only one of two people found by the Herald, which solicited readers for stories of enrollees in the first weeks after the launch. That's weeks, plural:

Nearly 2 weeks after the Federal Government launched the online Health Insurance Marketplace at HealthCare.gov, individuals who successfully used the choked-up Web site to enroll for a subsidized health insurance plan have reached a status akin to urban legend: everyone has heard of them, but very few people have actually met one.

It is pretty sad, but that is what happens when the Federal Government takes charge of people's personal lives.

Here is an article from National Review Online by Andrew Johnson:

An Iowa City man may have the distinction as the Hawkeye State's first ObamaCare enrollee, but it didn't come easy. Edward Voss, a computer programmer, told the Des Moines Register he had to try more than a hundred times before he was ultimately able to sign into HealthCare.gov.

Voss said he didn't know whether or not he had actually enrolled in a plan until Co-Opportunity Health, one of Iowa's two car-

riers in the exchange, called him on Friday to congratulate him for being its first enrolled customer.

Even though he was eventually successful, Voss criticized the Web site for resembling one from the 1990s, saying it was one of the worst he's seen. He recommended that the administration consider shutting the site down for at least a week in order to address the problems. It's hard to fix things while you're up and running, he said.

That's rather amazing. Over a hundred times to sign up. I guess he probably got maternity care, too, that individual young man.

Here is an article from CNS News dated today—this afternoon—by Ali Meyer. The first line says:

House minority leader Nancy Pelosi, Democrat from California—

Also, the Speaker who helped push through ObamaCare without any Republican input or votes, and who famously said, We'll have to pass it to find out what's in it, this article says she:

—admitted Wednesday that the ObamaCare Web site is beyond glitches, adding that somebody should fix it.

Well, it seems to this person speaking that the somebody that should fix it should be led by the former Speaker, who shoved it through this House without America's support, without any Republican support, and without having any clue what was really in it. That is somebody that ought to work on fixing it.

Another article from National Review Online, by John Fund. Hopefully, he wouldn't mind me calling him a friend:

The no-excuse administration has a whopper of an excuse for ObamaCare. President Obama told the Nation there is no excuse for the disastrous rollout of the health care exchanges that are central on ObamaCare. But that didn't stop Kathleen Sebelius, his Secretary of Health and Health and Human Services and in overall charge of the project, from making excuses in a CNN interview with Dr. Sanjay Gupta yesterday.

She claimed to Gupta that President Obama hadn't been told of any potential problems prior to the launch of the exchanges on October 1—a dereliction of duty any way one defines it.

But there was also this startling explanation of what went wrong at HHS. We talked about having testing going forward, and if we had an ideal situation and could have built a product and, you know, a 5-year period of time, we probably would have taken 5 years, but we didn't have 5 years. And certainly, Americans who rely on health coverage didn't have 5 years for us to wait. We wanted to make sure we made good on this final implementation of the law.

Well, okay, she only had 3½ years since ObamaCare became law in early 2010 to oversee the design of the exchanges and the Web site accompanying them. So now she tells us she needed 5 years:

Bruce Webster, a noted IT consultant to many companies, is stunned that Sebelius thinks that she needed 5 years, but only had 2, as somehow an excuse for this disaster.

That's like Boeing saying, We know the plane crashed, but we needed 4 years to build it and a year to test it, but we only had 2 years. Color me boggled.

Bureaucratic baffle-gab like that was probably behind yesterday's White House announcement that it had, as Bloomberg reported, tapped former Acting Office of Management and Budget Director Jeff Zients to work with the team overseeing repairs to the ObamaCare Web site. Zients was named last month as the director of the National Economic Council, but his arrival there will now be delayed as he takes on his new Sisyphean task.

It is pretty clear that the White House has, as bureaucrats say, minimal confidence in Secretary Sebelius to deliver a functioning health care exchange system. I am told that, for now, her job is safe because firing her would prompt cries from liberals that she was the scapegoat for mistakes made by higher-ups such as her boss, who signed the legislation creating this mess and then failed to hire the proper people to ride herd on its implementation.

It also brings back to mind, through this disastrous rollout of ObamaCare, for which Republicans here in the House, with Speaker BOEHNER leading—he actually did a favor, with our consent, to say, Here's a way out: You want a CR, you want a continuing resolution, you just keep getting the same massive amount of money; you want the debt ceiling raised to who knows what; we'll do that. We'll give you an out on how bad ObamaCare is. Let's suspend it for a year.

When that didn't work—let's suspend the individual mandate. That gives you an out and allows us to postpone some of the harm that is going to come to America from ObamaCare, and they still said, "No." Shut the government down for over 2 weeks, hurting Americans, refusing to provide death penalty benefits to families of fallen warriors in combat, even though they had the power under the bill we passed before the shutdown; making it as uncomfortable and difficult for people as possible, all the while when they were given an out by Republicans to just suspend it for a year. It is an out. It saves grief for America for a year. They wouldn't have it.

Now I know some have said, Well, the problem the administration is in is if they actually postponed ObamaCare for a year, after so many have already lost their insurance, there is no alternative. There is nothing we could do. Gee, what would anybody do? They have lost their insurance.

Well, this is just a suggestion, but I bet we in Congress could get a majority. I can't imagine there wouldn't be friends across the aisle among our Democratic friends who would agree to this, as they see how problematic ObamaCare is for Americans, and knowing that people think Federal employees have had this gold-plated health insurance policy is okay. I had better before I came here. I had better when I was in private practice.

But given where we are, there are private insurance companies that have

provided insurance policies for what is called a cafeteria-style group of choices so every Federal employee in the country, before ObamaCare, could read through the thick handbook and say, Okay, I have studied the different insurance companies, the different plans, the different costs, and this is the one I choose or that's the one I choose.

How about if for the next year, 2 years, give America a break? Let's say any health insurance company that is part of a Federal exchange or a State cafeteria plan or a local government cafeteria plan, we make those available to anybody. If it is a local plan, anybody in that area. If it is in the State, anybody in that State. If it is in the Federal plan, any insurance in that plan or any insurance company that wants to offer the same type coverage for the same price.

Let's offer to every American across the country the same private insurance choices that Federal employees have until ObamaCare kicks in. But let's give them all of the choices that we had up through this year and just say we will suspend ObamaCare.

Yes, Mr. President; yes, HARRY REID; you shut down the government for over 2 weeks to make life difficult for Americans when you didn't have to. We are more interested in helping Americans. So how about a compromise plan that just says, Hey, why don't we let Americans across the country choose from any of the Federal choices we had before ObamaCare, any State choices, local choices, and you can allow employers, since the President is suspending the business mandate, whether there are more than 50 employees, less than 50 employees, let them choose from those. If their employees choose the policy and the employer wants to pay for part or all, let them do that.

Let's give them another year before we force them under the iron hand of the government. Let them choose from any of those, from private insurance companies. Let them make the choices Federal employees had until ObamaCare.

It would still take away the problem of the preexisting condition because the market would be so wide, the people signing up would be so numerous, it could afford to take care of that. If you want to leave people on that are 26, heck, I don't care, 28. Normally, people in their twenties are in good health. So let them stay on.

We offered to agree to a bill like that before ObamaCare ever passed, but the Democrats were so insistent on their way—not the highway, but their way, period—and now 3½ years later we see the consequences.

We ought to have unlimited amounts. If you have got a health savings account under a Federal plan, State plan, local plan, or if your insurance company that provided the employer insur-

ance plan and the employer wants to continue that next year, even though it has already been canceled, if the health insurance company wanted to re-extend that, let that be part of the agreement during the suspension period of ObamaCare.

□ 1930

Let's allow people to put pre-tax dollars—as much as they want to—in Health Savings Accounts with the understanding that, once it is in there, it can't be used for anything but health care. I have a fear there will be people who might accumulate over the years \$80,000, \$100,000—well, I don't care. I will pay a 40, 45 percent penalty in interest. Man, just think. I could have two or three good bass boats for that, but we couldn't allow that because it is too important for people's health. Once that money is in a Health Savings Account, it can't be used for anything but health care. Let's do what Ben Carson suggested, and let's start encouraging young people to have Health Savings Accounts. Let's do that.

Those who are in Medicare and Medicaid can stay there. If they have the wherewithal to sign up under one of the plans—the Federal options—the Federal employees have had until ObamaCare passed, let them do that if they would rather, but still they will be in Medicare and Medicaid. Let's suspend the hurt that is being done to Medicare through ObamaCare. Let's suspend the hurt that is being done to young people. If one is a young man, single, then until such time as we have a pregnant young man in his twenties, let's don't make him pay for maternity care. There is no need for it.

Just when you think it couldn't get much worse—this is from the Washington Free Beacon dated today, this afternoon—then we also find out the NSA spied on 124 billion phone calls in one month, and those are the people who want to run our health care—the Federal Government.

An article from The Washington Times from this afternoon, today:

House Speaker John A. Boehner predicted Wednesday that, by the end of the month, more Americans will have lost their insurance by being kicked off existing health plans than the number that was able to sign up in the flawed online HealthCare.gov Web site, and the early numbers may back him up.

A massive number of people have now gotten their notices that they have lost their insurance or will effective January 1.

Here is an article that is on the Breitbart Web site, but it is talking about a CNN story:

CNN: ObamaCare site doomed. Riddled with security dangers.

This reports that today, on the CNN Money site, there is a terrific story about the problems surrounding the ObamaCare Web site. The story in-

cludes all kinds of new information from a host of experts. Most of the news is flat-out terrible:

A half billion dollar site needs to be rebuilt from scratch. The site has an unwieldy 500 million lines of computer code—it took just 500,000 lines of code to send a rover to Mars—and that code of ObamaCare is riddled with security holes that could result in one of the biggest breaches in American history.

That was quoting from CNN, that article by John Nolte. It is staggering.

State exchange enrollments are mostly Medicaid, not private insurance plans.

This is another story on Breitbart by Dr. Susan Berry:

Defenders of President Obama's signature health reform legislation claim the States that put effort into establishing their own exchanges, mostly Democrat-led, are signing people up successfully for ObamaCare. A new report, however, indicates most of the individuals signing up in these State-run exchanges are enrolling in Medicaid.

Pretty disingenuous.

Then just as you think you can't stand any more about the Federal Government—they are in your bedroom, your bathroom, your kitchen, all into your private lives; they will have your medical records, and they will be giving them to navigators who are not thoroughly vetted so as to keep it secure, and it will be put online where people are saying it is a dream for hackers to steal personal information—and just when you think you can't take anything more in the way of bad news, here is a story from the AP today. It is by Stephen Ohlemacher with the AP:

The headline reads: "700 IRS Contract Workers Owe \$5.4 Million in Back Taxes."

It kind of reminds us of the old Secretary of the Treasury, Timothy Geithner. He signed four different documents, certifying—basically swearing—that if he would be given all of the money as an independent contractor instead of having money withheld, he would certify—he absolutely was swearing—that he would take care of paying his taxes, and he didn't do it until he got nominated to be the Secretary of the Treasury.

As one Treasury employee told me privately—she didn't want to make it public because she didn't want to lose her job—if employees of the IRS were to have done what Timothy Geithner had done in not paying the taxes he swore he would pay, they would be fired on the spot at the IRS. Of course, that was before Lois Lerner and her crew weaponized the IRS so they could go after conservative groups.

Anyway, it is bad news when it comes to ObamaCare; but, Mr. Speaker, like I say, we offered repeatedly to agree—in fact, we didn't just offer. We passed a bill that would allow ObamaCare to be suspended for a year to, if possible, get its act together and give an out to the President. The President and HARRY REID could have said, Well, those Republicans in the House—we didn't want

to do it, but we needed a continuing resolution to keep the government going. We needed the debt ceiling raised, so we went ahead. We had to. They had us over a barrel. We agreed to suspend ObamaCare for a year. Gee, those pesky Republicans made us do it.

That is a political way out that they had, that we gave as Republicans in the House, that we extended as a gift. We passed it as a House bill. We extended it as a gift and gave them an out. That would have given them an extra year to try to get the act together; but, oh, no, they were more interested in scoring political points because they knew the mainstream media would give them cover, that they would blame Republicans 100 percent even though it was 100 percent not Republicans. It was the people who refused to even appoint conferees to try to work it out before the shutdown really took hold. It was the Democrats who refused to agree to just suspend the individual mandate, and the compromise before that was to suspend the bill for a year. They wouldn't even do that.

How sad for the mainstream media that the best question about ObamaCare and the horrendous roll-out of its Web site was not asked by somebody at the ABC, CBS, NBC evening news, but was asked by Jay Leno after finding out that the President said, We are putting our very best people on fixing this Web site. In essence, Jay Leno asked an entirely appropriate question:

Wait a minute. We are talking about our own health care. Why wouldn't you have put our best people on starting the Web site instead of waiting until it crashed so miserably?

The answer is unknown, but the American people deserve an answer.

Are you so intent on having the Federal Government take over people's private lives—their most personal medical secrets—that you would force this horrible health care system upon them?

I am certainly willing. I will bet you we could find a majority in the House, and if HARRY REID would let it come to a vote in the Senate, they would say, Okay. Let's suspend it for a year. Come on. Maybe make it 2 years. During that time, everybody in America—every employer—can either get their insurance back if the insurance companies will do it; and if they want, they can get the private insurance that we used to have as part of our cafeteria plan for every Federal employee in America. Let Americans choose from that. Don't force these ObamaCare exchanges on America. Let them choose like Federal employees have done. Let them choose.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay a brief tribute to a patriotic man who was devoted to the military, devoted to seeing that the military had what it needed, devoted to America. C.W. Bill Young will have his funeral tomorrow in Florida. He was 82 years old. There

have been plenty of tributes written about Bill Young. There will be many more written and many more spoken tomorrow, and I will look forward to hearing those at his funeral, but there is nothing that could be said that could surpass the witness he was to who he was.

I talked to him numerous times. Sometimes I had questions. Sometimes I had points to make. When I had questions, he always had time. He was always honest—completely honest, very sincerely honest. He was a kind, decent, honest man. We miss when we lose a kind, decent, honest man.

Bill Young, you will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today until 4 p.m. on account of an illness in the family.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for October 22 and 23 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 24, 2013, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3352. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Animal Welfare; Retail Pet Stores and Licensing Exemptions [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0003] (RIN: 0579-AD57) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3353. A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Environmental Policy Act: Categorical Exclusions for Soil and Water Restoration Activities (RIN: 0596-AD01) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3354. A letter from the Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations; Income Deductions and Resource Eligibility [FNS-2011-0036] (RIN: 0584-AE05) received September 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3355. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act,

Army Case Number 11-08; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3356. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Air Force Case Number 11-08; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3357. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Captain William R. Merz, United States Navy, to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3358. A letter from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting a report on the impact of the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3359. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a report entitled, "Merger Decisions 2012", in accordance with Section 18(c)(9) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3360. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) Medical Malpractice Program Regulations: Clarification of FTCA Coverage for Services Provided to Non-Health Center Patients (RIN: 0906-AA77) received September 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3361. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, South Coast Air Quality Management District and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0853; FRL-9832-9] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3362. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0468; FRL-9900-74-Region 9] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3363. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, OET, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revision of Part 15 of the Commission's Rules Regarding Operation in the 57-64 GHz Band [ET Docket No.: 07-113; FCC 13-112] [RM-11104] received September 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3364. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-51, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3365. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notice that the Deputy Secretary has issued the required determination to waive certain restrictions on the maintenance of a Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Office; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3366. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department

of State, transmitting a report to Congress on United States Participation in the United Nations in 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3367. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3368. A letter from the President Of The United States, transmitting notification that the emergency declared in Executive Order 13413 with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo is to continue in effect 1 year beyond October 27, 2013; (H. Doc. No. 113—69); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3369. A letter from the Deputy Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Report on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3370. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting a letter regarding a public interest determination to contract with the National Academy of Sciences for a committee of medical experts; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3371. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates October 2013 (Rev. Rul. 2013-21) received September 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3372. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Clarification of Notice 2013-29 [Notice 2013-60] received September 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3373. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Obtaining Final Medicare Secondary Payer Conditional Payment Amounts via Web Portal [CMS-6054-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AR90) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 2850. A bill to require certain procedures in the conduct by the Environmental Protection Agency of its study of the potential impacts of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water resources; with an amendment (Rept. 113-252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COBLE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. HOLDING):

H.R. 3309. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ENYART, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 3310. A bill to provide for additional protections and disclosures to consumers when financial products or services are related to the consumers' military or Federal pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 3311. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with States to allow continued operation of facilities and programs that have been determined to have a direct economic impact on tourism, mining, timber, or general transportation in the State and which would otherwise cease operating, in whole or in part, during a Federal Government shutdown that is the result of a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 3312. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to allow for monthly installment payments for flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to cap the annual cost of flood insurance under that Act, to provide for a ten-year phase-in of premium increases resulting from the enactment of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. GARCIA):

H.R. 3313. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for the benefit of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3314. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit recoupments of separation pay, special separation benefits, and voluntary separation incentive from members of the Armed Forces subsequently receiving retired or retainer pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 3315. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the repair, expansion, and construction, without elevation, of agricultural structures located in special flood hazard zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 3316. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide transparency and require certain standards in the award of Federal grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 3317. A bill to strengthen the Federal statutes designed to deter money laundering and terrorism financing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WALZ, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 3318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the above-the-line deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 3319. A bill to modernize the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 3320. A bill to ensure appropriate coverage of ventricular assist devices under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3321. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require each voter registration agency in a State which requires an individual to present a government-issued photo identification as a

condition of voting in an election for Federal office to provide such an identification without charge upon request to any such individual who does not otherwise possess one, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. CHU, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 3322. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prevent and treat diabetes, to promote and improve the care of individuals with diabetes, and to reduce health disparities, relating to diabetes, within racial and ethnic minority groups, including the African-American, Hispanic American, Asian American, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and American Indian and Alaskan Native communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. BASS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SIRE, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 3323. A bill to realign structures and reallocate resources in the Federal Government, in keeping with the core American belief that families are the best protection for children and the bedrock of any society, to bolster United States diplomacy and assistance targeted at ensuring that every child can grow up in a permanent, safe, nurturing, and loving family, and to strengthen inter-country adoption to the United States and around the world and ensure that it becomes a viable and fully developed option for providing families for children in need, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. FLEMING):

H.R. 3324. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to reduce burdensome paperwork, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 3325. A bill to award grants to improve equality of access to technology-enabled education innovations and understanding of how partnerships of educational agencies and research institutions design and implement such innovations in ways that improve student outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 3326. A bill to provide for an exchange of land between the United States and the Trinity Public Utilities District of Trinity County, California, involving a parcel of National Forest System land in Shasta-Trinity National Forest; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3327. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an extension of the work opportunity tax credit for veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3328. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an extension of

the work opportunity tax credit for certain targeted groups; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 3329. A bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. YODER, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ENYART, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 3330. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal the limitation on the number of veterans authorized to be enrolled in programs of independent living services and assistance administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 3331. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to ensure that persons who form corporations or limited liability companies in the United States disclose the beneficial owners of those corporations or limited liability companies, in order to prevent wrongdoers from exploiting United States corporations and limited liability companies for criminal gain, to assist law enforcement in detecting, preventing, and punishing terrorism, money laundering, and other misconduct involving United States corporations and limited liability companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HOLT, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 3332. A bill to provide safe, fair, and responsible procedures and standards for resolving claims of state secret privilege; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. COOK, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3333. A bill to authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency to award mitigation financial assistance in certain areas affected by wildfires; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 3334. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of certified adult day services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Com-

mittee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 3335. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to update certain procedures applicable to commerce in firearms and remove certain Federal restrictions on interstate firearms transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. SHEAPORTER):

H.R. 3336. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 3337. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of expenses for a stopover of the remains of decedents covered by section 1481 of such title en route to the final destination; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. BARR):

H.J. Res. 98. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to applying laws equally to the citizens of the United States and the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. KLINE):

H. Res. 389. A resolution congratulating the Minnesota Lynx women's basketball team on winning the 2013 Women's National Basketball Association Championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 390. A resolution honoring the lives, work, and sacrifice of Joseph Curseen, Jr., and Thomas Morris, Jr., the two United States Postal Service employees and Washington, DC, natives who died as a result of their contact with anthrax while working at the United States Postal Facility located at 900 Brentwood Road, NE, Washington, DC, during the anthrax attack in the fall of 2001, United States Postal Service employees, who have continued to work diligently in service to the people of the United States notwithstanding the anthrax attacks, as well as the three other Americans who died and the 17 who became ill in the attacks; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 3309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 8 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 3311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 allows Congress "[t]o make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

Article IV, Section 3

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

Article X

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 3313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 3315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which provides that Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 3316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations

made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 3317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause).

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 3320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 3322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 3323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution that the Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 3324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which states The Congress shall have Power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 3325.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 3326.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3327.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3328.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 3329.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 3332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 9 and 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 3333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 3334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

or

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 3335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, Article I Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, and Amendment II of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 3336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 3337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 98.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution lays out the process for amending the Constitution. This joint resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution pursuant to Article V.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HARPER, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 60: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 104: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 139: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 182: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 233: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 272: Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LAN-GEVIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. TSON-GAS.

H.R. 278: Mr. POLIS and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 333: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 411: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 440: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 460: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 519: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 523: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 540: Mr. HIMES and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 543: Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 574: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 685: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 700: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 778: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 792: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 847: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 855: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 863: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 956: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 983: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1149: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1150: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1164: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1173: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1186: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1250: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1281: Mr. WELCH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1317: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1318: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1354: Mr. RADEL and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1427: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1429: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1461: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1462: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1507: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 1509: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1563: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 1566: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1620: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1701: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 1726: Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 1740: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1750: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1775: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1812: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1830: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1837: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1844: Mr. FARR, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1869: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 1905: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 1918: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1920: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1975: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 2030: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2041: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2058: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2134: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2178: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2181: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 2199: Ms. BASS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 2203: Mr. LONG, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HARPER, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. COLE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. McKEON, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2241: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 2259: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2288: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 2298: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2300: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 2302: Mr. COHEN and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2305: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 2309: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. GALLEGU, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 2328: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 2358: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2368: Mr. HOLT and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2415: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 2430: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 2479: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 2482: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2502: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. HIMES, Ms. BASS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2509: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2536: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2543: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 2575: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 2590: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 2619: Ms. BASS, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2655: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 2675: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2689: Mr. HIMES, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2697: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2716: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2737: Mr. NADLER and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2783: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 2801: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 2810: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2818: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2839: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2841: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2851: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2866: Mr. KIND, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2876: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2905: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2909: Mr. HIMES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2914: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2939: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2955: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2959: Mr. FLORES and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2986: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 3040: Mr. KEATING and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 3077: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 3090: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3108: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 3112: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 3121: Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 3143: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3150: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 3154: Mr. BARR, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 3169: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 3178: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 3179: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 3191: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3207: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3211: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 3212: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3218: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 3224: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 3279: Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 3286: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 3297: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.J. Res. 28: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. COOK, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.J. Res. 43: Mr. BARBER and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.J. Res. 56: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. HALL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. UPTON, Ms. FOX, and Mr. CLAY.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. HOLT.

H. Con. Res. 59: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. MATHESON.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. ENYART.

H. Res. 47: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. SARBANES.

H. Res. 72: Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 97: Mr. CLEAVER.

H. Res. 104: Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 208: Mr. HIMES, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 239: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 247: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H. Res. 281: Ms. NORTON, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. GARRETT.

H. Res. 284: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H. Res. 286: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H. Res. 302: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 338: Mr. SARBANES.

H. Res. 348: Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 381: Mr. HIMES.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.J. Res. 62: Mr. HARRIS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING AND COMMENDING THE 165TH AIRLIFT WING OF THE GEORGIA AIR NATIONAL GUARD

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 165th Airlift Wing of the Georgia Air National Guard, marking their tenth anniversary of mobilization for wartime missions.

Since 2003, the 165th Airlift Wing has served in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation New Dawn, with more than 80 percent of the wing's 900 airmen deploying during that time. Over the last ten years, the eight C-130H2 aircraft operated by the wing have seen 11,363 flying hours and 7,441 combat sorties.

When the 165th Airlift Wing was activated for the first time since the Korean War, its unit members responded admirably. Their first unit aircraft dispatched within 72 hours of notification. In 2004, the 165th Airlift Wing was the first C-130 unit to deploy and operate out of Iraq, flying under the famous "Red Tail" markings of the 332nd Air Expeditionary Wing.

In 2005, the 165th Airlift Wing had the solemn honor of supporting the rescue mission of the 16 Navy SEALs and Army Special Operation Aviation Regiment troops whose MH-47D was shot down while attempting to reinforce four SEALs under attack by the Taliban.

The 165th continued its tradition of excellence in 2011 as a part of the 774th Expeditionary Airlift Squadron, during which time the 774th was recognized as the only squadron in the United States Central Command Area of Responsibility tasked at 100 percent. All 15 squadron aircraft flew every day for over 60 days.

In tribute to its outstanding service during wartime mobilizations, I am honored today to recognize the 165th Airlift Wing and its contributions to the United States of America.

102ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE NA- TIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, October 10th marked the 102nd Anniversary of the Wuchang uprising, which led to the establishment of the Republic of China (Taiwan) on January 1, 1912. National Day of the Republic of China marks a significant day for the Taiwanese people as they celebrate each year with parades, fireworks and military regalia. The United States and Taiwan have been for-

tunate to share such a dynamic friendship that I believe will only continue to grow.

As the U.S. seeks to rebalance our comprehensive foreign policy strategy, and we look to pivot to the Asian Pacific region, I feel that National Day deserves an appropriate commemoration from Congress. I believe it is vitally important for the U.S. to continue to bolster Taiwan's efforts as they are one of the most promising democracies in the region. Such stable regional partners should be valued and held in the highest regard.

This significant anniversary also provides an opportunity for this Congress to reflect on the current state of our bilateral relationship with Taiwan and to take proactive steps to enhance it.

As the 10th largest trading partner with the United States, Taiwan's economic importance is continuing to rapidly increase in a growing 21st century global economy. As longstanding friends and allies, I am pleased to add my voice to congratulate Taiwan on this momentous occasion.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH AN- NIVERSARY OF THE BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 100th anniversary of one of my district's finest institutions: the Business and Industry Association of New Hampshire. For one hundred years, the BIA has represented and protected the interests of New Hampshire's business community as the statewide chamber of commerce. Over that time, it has helped to strengthen the Granite State's robust economy, and it has played an essential role in creating and upholding the state's unmatched pro-business climate.

First known as the New Hampshire Manufacturer's Association, the BIA was born in 1913 from the minds of several small business leaders concerned about government legislation and over-regulation of business. Since that time, the Association has grown to represent more than 400 businesses across New Hampshire's strongest industries. Together, those businesses employ more than 86,000 workers across the state's manufacturing, technology, health care, and financial services sectors, among many others, and they contribute more than \$4.5 billion each year to the state economy.

Through the strength of its advocacy, the BIA has helped to shape public policies that encourage businesses to succeed and the community to prosper, now and into the future. On October 23rd, the Association will cele-

brate its 100th anniversary with a dinner and awards ceremony. As New Hampshire business leaders mark this special occasion, I urge all Granite Staters and all Americans to join them in honoring this essential community institution.

CONGRATULATING UNITED NORTH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN ALEX- IS, IL

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate United North Elementary School in Alexis, IL, which has been recognized as a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School and will be honored next month at a ceremony here in Washington.

As the mother of three sons who were educated by our public schools, I know firsthand the importance of a high-quality education and I am proud that students in our community are learning at one of the best schools in the nation. United North Elementary has implemented several programs that identify struggling students early and provide them with individual attention to make sure all students have an opportunity to succeed. They have seen great results in students' math and reading abilities and I am happy they have been recognized for their achievements.

United North also succeeds in involving the whole community in education. Along with regular parent-teacher conferences and an active PTO, the school hosts classroom visits during American Education Week and recently started a Very Special Person Day for students to bring adult visitors to the school.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to congratulate United North Elementary School and Principal Sue Wilson for this remarkable achievement and I thank them for their service to students in our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF YVONNE WRIGHT

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Yvonne Wright, who celebrates her 100th birthday on October 23, 2013.

Yvonne Angelle Vigeant was born on October 23, 1913 in Brookline, Massachusetts. Growing up with twin sister Helene, she graduated from Brookline High School and was working at Boston State Hospital when she met Lewis Wright, who she married in 1935. A

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

twin himself, Lewis and his brother were local entrepreneurs, purchasing English's Dairy and establishing Wright Brothers' Sports Center, the popular Holbrook bowling center and golf driving range. Together, Yvonne and Lewis raised four children, and went on to welcome nine grandchildren, fifteen great-grandchildren, and three great-great-grandchildren.

Mrs. Wright has expressed a lifelong passion for art, having become an accomplished oil painter. She is also well-known in her community as being passionate about the environment, often advocating for greater environmental protections and voicing her opinion in local newspapers. Yvonne loves to spend time with her large family, and is often be found at her grandchildren's soccer games and school events.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Yvonne Wright on her 100th birthday. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing her many more years of health and happiness.

IN HONOR OF WORLD POLIO DAY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the House that in many parts of the world, polio is on the run. What in the past was a worldwide epidemic is now a controlled, limited disease and the potential for total eradication is very real.

One of the groups that has dedicated much of its attention to this problem is our Rotary Clubs. Most of us think of Rotary as being that eclectic group of community volunteers who turn out at charity events or serve at pep rallies for the local high school football team. Their dedication to local goodwill is important, true, but they are actually much more.

In reality, more than 34,000 local Rotary Clubs throughout the world initiate and deliver service projects to address today's challenges, including illiteracy, disease, hunger, poverty, lack of clean water, peace and conflict resolution, and environmental concerns. Back in 1985 Rotary began a mission to eradicate Polio. At that time more than 350,000 children were stricken with Polio every year at a rate of nearly 1,000 people afflicted by the crippling disease every day. Today, the reality is much different. The number of countries which are polio-endemic has been reduced to just three—Afghanistan, Nigeria, and Pakistan. Polio cases have been reduced by 99% to fewer than 700 recorded cases in 2011.

This advancement in health is due to the effort of many governments and charities and even individuals around the world dedicated to public health. But key among them is Rotary which has taken on as one of its central missions a positive initiative to create awareness and to educate the citizens everywhere about the vital importance of eradicating polio worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, on October 24 Rotary Clubs will mark World Polio Day and I commend them on their contribution to the worthy goal of eliminating polio around the globe.

REMEMBERING WALLACE "WALLY" BELL

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to learn of the death of Wally Bell of Austintown, OH in my Congressional district. Wally Bell was a very well known umpire who had risen to the highest level of officiating in the MLB. Wally was another great sports product of the Mahoning Valley. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to all of his friends and family.

I submit the following article that appeared in the New York Daily News on October 15.

[From the Associated Press, Oct. 15, 2013]

MLB UMPIRE WALLY BELL DIES OF APPARENT
HEART ATTACK AT AGE 48

NEW YORK.—Major League Baseball umpire Wally Bell, who worked the NL playoff series between the Pittsburgh Pirates and St. Louis Cardinals that ended last week, has died. He was 48.

The commissioner's office confirmed Bell's death Monday. He died of an apparent heart attack in his home state of Ohio. "All of us at Major League Baseball are in mourning tonight regarding the sudden passing of Wally Bell," Commissioner Bud Selig said in a statement.

"I always enjoyed seeing Wally, who was a terrific umpire and such an impressive young man. On behalf of our 30 clubs, I extend my deepest condolences to Wally's family, fellow umpires and his many friends throughout the game."

Bell became the first active MLB umpire to die since John McSherry passed away of a heart attack on the field in Cincinnati on opening day in 1996.

Bell worked the 2006 World Series and three All-Star games, including this year's event at Citi Field, where he was stationed at first base. A veteran of 21 big league seasons, he had also worked four league championship series and seven division series since joining the major league staff in 1993.

According to Bell's biography on MLB.com, his proudest moment as a big league umpire was returning to the field after having open heart surgery in 1999. "I am deeply saddened and shocked at the loss of umpire Wally Bell," said Joe Torre, MLB executive vice president for baseball operations.

"Umpiring was his life, and he touched so many people within the game of baseball. Aside from being an accomplished, All-Star-caliber umpire, Wally was a loving dad to his two teenage children. I extend my deepest condolences to them, his girlfriend Renee, the rest of his family and his admirers across Major League Baseball."

Bell was 34 and 2½ weeks from leaving for spring training in 1999 when his heart problem was detected. He had quintuple bypass surgery on Feb. 18, 1999, that left him with an 8-inch scar down the middle of his chest. Two of his arteries had been 100 percent blocked. Two more had been 80 percent blocked, another 70 percent. But he returned to work 11 weeks later in San Diego for a game between the Padres and Atlanta Braves. That night, plate umpire Mark Hirschbeck took the first ball out of play, and planned to have all the umps sign it before presenting the souvenir to Bell.

Seven years later, Bell was behind the plate for Game 3 of the World Series between

Detroit and St. Louis at Busch Stadium. During the 2013 regular season, Bell was a member of Tim McClelland's crew.

"Wally was a great umpire, a great partner and a great friend. The umpiring community is deeply saddened by this tragic loss. He will be sorely missed by many," said major league ump Joe West, President of the World Umpires Association.

Bell is survived by his son, Jason, and daughter, Lindsey.

IN TRIBUTE TO HAROLD SHARP

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Harold Sharp for his 44 years and 3 months of dedicated government service. Arizona is in sincere gratitude for the assistance, guidance, and leadership you have provided for the Federal Aviation Administration for so many years.

HONORING KA JOOG

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the organization Ka Joog, and to recognize its contributions to the Somali community of Minnesota through art, education, and political action.

Ka Joog launched in 2007 as an organization with no funding, but with an abundance of energy and dedication. The organizers, led by Mohamed Farah, worked tirelessly to establish an environment where Somali youth could gather and solve problems in their community. Their challenges were abundant—from the language and cultural separation of growing up in a foreign country, to the negative media attention of gang shootings and drug trafficking. The members wanted to help Somali teens "stay away"—the translation of Ka Joog—from "drugs, violence, radicalization and other negative influences, and instead to stay on the right path by attaining higher education and serving and volunteering in their communities."

And in that, they have been phenomenally successful. Last year, Ka Joog was awarded the FBI Director's Community Leadership Award by the FBI's Minneapolis Division, as well as the Ninth Ward's Youth Leader of the Year award. In just six years, Ka Joog has established itself as a political and cultural force in the Twin Cities.

Its programming is diverse and effective. Mentoring groups provide support and guidance to the youngest of the community through workshops, field trips and tutoring. A program called "Invisible Art" fosters discussions through prose, poetry and song, nurturing creativity and effective communication. A summer camp last year provided a new connection to Minnesota's natural environment for disadvantaged Somali youth, many of

whom had never left the Twin Cities. Ka Joog regularly hosts conferences and roundtables on issues affecting the Somali community, gathering local, state, and federal officials to discuss gang violence, job opportunities, education, health and medical disparities, and the prevention of terrorism. Not only does their work solve many problems through discussion, coalition building, and personal engagement, it also demonstrates to youth who feel left out of the political process that they too can accomplish their goals by working hard and working together.

Ka Joog has already helped thousands of Minnesota youth, and it is poised to help even more in the future. On behalf of all Minnesotans, I thank Ka Joog for its public service.

HONORING THERESA M.
DESFOSSÉS ON BEING INDUCTED
INTO THE RV/MANUFACTURED
HOUSING HALL OF FAME

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Theresa M. Desfosses of Scarborough, Maine on being inducted into the RV/Manufactured Housing Hall of Fame.

In August 2013, Theresa Desfosses was inducted into the RV/Manufactured Housing (RV/MH) Hall of Fame, becoming only the fifth member from New England, one of only a few women, and the first Mainer to receive the honor. Inducting its first class in 1972, the RV/MH Hall of Fame was established by the RV/MH Heritage Foundation to recognize individuals that have made a significant, positive impact on the manufactured housing industry.

Throughout her career, Theresa has helped grow and advance the manufactured housing industry on the national and state levels. On the national level, she most recently served on the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Manufactured Housing Consensus Committee, advising the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development on manufactured housing regulations and safety standards. On the state level, Theresa was instrumental in establishing the Manufactured Housing Association of Maine as well as Maine's Manufactured Housing Board, serving on its Board of Directors for many years.

Theresa has not only helped transform the manufactured housing industry, but has also had a direct impact on the lives of her fellow Mainers. As owner of State Manufactured Homes, a third-generation family business, Theresa has provided affordable, accessible homes to more than 700 Maine families. Her tireless work ethic and commitment to Maine have made our state a better place to live.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in recognizing the extraordinary accomplishments of Theresa M. Desfosses and congratulating her on being inducted into the RV/MH Hall of Fame.

IN MEMORY OF JOANN KOOBATIAN

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Foothill High School's choir teacher, JoAnn Koobatian, who sadly passed away on Friday, October 18 after an eight-year battle with a rare form of cancer. She was just 47.

JoAnn, an East Bay native, joined the faculty at Pleasanton's Foothill High School in 1996. She was vital to rebuilding its choir program, which had disappeared from the school's curriculum in the 1980s.

Since reviving the choir program, JoAnn's ability to connect with students made it extremely popular. Because of her dedication and passion for teaching music, she was named Pleasanton's Teacher of the Year for 2011.

Even while battling cancer for many years, JoAnn continued doing what she loved—teaching—and she always encouraged the best from her students.

Her students showed their love and devotion for their beloved teacher by hosting many local fundraisers to help JoAnn and her family pay for her medical expenses. JoAnn's legacy will continue in the lives of the students she touched.

I want to express my deepest condolences to JoAnn's husband Richard and daughter Amanda. JoAnn will be missed dearly. Her life is truly an inspiration to students, faculty, and the entire Foothill community.

CONGRATULATING BRAD WIL-
LIAMS ON HIS SELECTION AS
CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL
APARTMENT ASSOCIATION

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate Brad Williams of Dallas, Texas, on his upcoming installation as chairman of the board of directors for the National Apartment Association (NAA), which will take place on November 8 in Dallas.

Mr. Williams and his work exemplify the spirit of business in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex. He has forty years of experience in property management and, with Lincoln Property Company, manages 50,000 rental units in both Texas and the Midwest. He also has a history of leadership in the rental housing industry. He is a past president of the Apartment Association of Greater Dallas and of the Texas Apartment Association (TAA). He has chaired the Texas and National Legislative Committees; and, for the last three years, he has served as chairman of the NAA's Political Action Committee (NAAPAC). Mr. Williams has also worked as Secretary on the Executive Committee for the NAA.

Rental housing is a crucial and growing industry in Dallas, where almost half of the city's

people live in apartments. Many of these buildings are new and bring construction, innovation, and an economic boost to the area. Nationwide, 35 million people reside in apartments which contribute \$1.1 trillion and 26 million jobs to the economy—from construction and skilled trades to leasing, operations, management, and even to the various businesses that surround residential buildings. To help ensure that rental housing is of a quality worthy of the public, the NAA makes it its mission “to serve the interests of multifamily housing owners, managers, developers and suppliers and maintain a high level of professionalism in the multifamily housing industry to better serve the rental housing needs of the public.” Founded in 1939, the NAA today consists of 170 local and state affiliates, 63,000 members, and 6.8 million homes.

Mr. Williams is a native of Dallas, where he now lives with his wife, Ginny. He is a graduate of Thomas Jefferson High School and received a degree in History from the University of Texas. He earned his Certificate of Real Estate from Southern Methodist University and his designation as a Certified Property Manager from the Institute of Real Estate Management.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating Chairman-elect Brad Williams and wishing him well as he guides the National Apartment Association through the upcoming year.

IN HONOR OF BISHOP DONALD
HILLIARD, JR.

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Bishop Donald Hilliard, Jr. on his 30th Pastoral Anniversary. As Senior Pastor at Cathedral International, Dr. Hilliard continues to provide outstanding spiritual leadership to the Perth Amboy, Asbury Park and Plainfield communities.

Dr. Hilliard received his Bachelor of Arts degree from Eastern College, Master of Divinity degree from Princeton Theological Seminary and Doctor of Ministry degree from the United Theological Seminary. He was ordained in 1978 by the Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc. and was consecrated a bishop in 1995. Dr. Hilliard became the Senior Pastor of Cathedral International at the age of 26.

Under Dr. Hilliard's leadership, the membership of Cathedral International has grown from 125 congregants in 1983 to 6,000 members today. The church is also expected to expand to a fourth location in Cranbury. In addition to leading Cathedral International, Dr. Hilliard is also the Founder and Presiding Bishop of the Covenant Ecumenical Fellowship and Cathedral Assemblies, Inc. and mentors other pastors. He founded and currently serves as CEO of the Cathedral Community Development Corporation, which provides resources and services to the community. He is also a member of many other religious and community organizations, including the NAACP.

Over the years, Dr. Hilliard has been recognized by various organizations for his contributions to the church and community. He has received the New York City Council of Churches' Clergy of the Year Award, the Perth Amboy Chamber of Commerce Executive of the Year Award and the National Conference for Community and Justice Humanitarian Award, among several others.

Dr. Hilliard is the son of Alease Hilliard-Chapman and the late Donald Hilliard, Sr. He is married to Pastor Phyllis Thompson-Hilliard and together they have three daughters.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in celebrating the 30th Pastoral Anniversary of Bishop Donald Hilliard, Jr. His leadership, service and dedication to the church and community are truly deserving of this body's recognition.

RECOGNIZING WALTER MORRIS

HON. PATRICK MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of the first African-American paratrooper to be enlisted in the U.S. Army. Walter Morris, a retired Second Lieutenant who passed away at the age of 92, was the first African-American man accepted for airborne duty in the Army. At a time where segregation existed prevalently in our country, Mr. Morris broke a barrier, setting the precedent for an additional 400 Black paratroopers to serve before the end of World War II.

At the time, then Sergeant Morris led training sessions to mimic parachute practice after duty hours to raise the morale of African-American soldiers. It is the strength, courage, dedication, and camaraderie of Mr. Morris for which I am humbled to honor his life here today.

Mr. Morris was an original member of the Triple Nickels, a battalion later assigned to a secret mission titled Operation Firefly, a maneuver for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture. The Triple Nickels had to minimize the damage from aerial attacks by Japanese balloon bombs over the Pacific Northwest coast. The Army kept this operation secret because they wanted to disguise the fact that the Japanese balloon bombs had actually reached the U.S. coastline.

Mr. Morris's actions paved the way for African-American soldiers to become part of one of the most prestigious departments of the U.S. Army, the 82nd Airborne Division. He co-founded the African-American Cultural Association, an education facility for adults and children. Now in its 34th year, the association is a way to ensure the legacy of the Triple Nickels.

Together with Lt. Morris's two daughters, grandson, and two great-grandsons, we remember the life of an American Hero—someone who stood tall in the face of adversity and in unison with his fellow soldiers and his country.

IN RECOGNITION OF ANNETTE BOWLING

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen and servant of humankind, Mrs. Annette Bowling, Executive Director of the Albany Advocacy Resource Center (ARC). The Albany ARC will honor Mrs. Bowling for her forty years of dedicated service and leadership at their 50th anniversary celebration on Thursday, October 24, 2013 at 6 o'clock in the evening at the Albany Hilton Garden Inn in Albany, Georgia.

The Albany ARC was founded in 1963 to advocate on behalf of persons with disabilities in the Albany, Georgia community. In its fifty years of operation, it has become one of the largest and most successful private provider agencies in the state of Georgia.

Mrs. Bowling began working at the Albany ARC in 1974 after her son was the first child in the state of Florida to undergo open heart surgery. As a single mom, she relied on the support she received from her community to get through this difficult time. This inspired her decision to dedicate her life to helping others and she then embarked on what was to be a long and fulfilling career at the Albany ARC.

Mrs. Bowling's work with the Center since 1974 has made a difference in the lives of many Georgians, and has helped improve the quality and dignity of life for those individuals served by the Albany ARC. When she first arrived in Albany, there were no community services or resources for people with disabilities. Since then, she has passionately directed and advocated for many programs to improve the lives of so many Georgians with disabilities. Truly, any cause to which Annette Bowling's name was attached commandeered respect.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays once said, "He who starts behind in the race of this life, must forever remain behind or run faster than the man in front." Mrs. Bowling has been the driving force behind programs that have helped improve the quality of rehabilitation and disability services for those who need these services to help them to "catch up." She has contributed significantly to the Albany ARC, making it the great community resource that it is today.

In addition to her work with the Albany ARC, Mrs. Bowling has served on many regional and statewide boards of directors, including the ARC of Georgia, Southwest Georgia Area Health Education Center, Southwest Georgia Easter Seals, Community Institute of Phoebe Putney Memorial Hospital, and the Georgia Budget Policy Committee. She also serves as Chairperson of the Division of Rehabilitation Services Council of the Georgia Department of Medical Assistance and has co-chaired the Governor's Blue Ribbon Taskforce on Community Based Services. Her office is filled with hundreds of awards and honors but the trophy that Mrs. Bowling is most proud of is the incarnation of her vision that those with disabilities can be productive members of society.

Mrs. Bowling has accomplished much in her life but none of this would have been possible

without the love and support of her husband of thirty-two years, George, her son and her granddaughter.

Shirley Chisholm once said that, "Service is the rent that we pay for the space that we occupy here on this earth." Mrs. Bowling has certainly paid her rent and paid it well. Winston Churchill said, "We make a living by what we get, but we make a life by what we give." Through every stage of her life, Mrs. Bowling has always given of herself to others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife, Vivian, and the more than 700,000 people of Georgia's Second Congressional District in paying tribute to a phenomenal woman, Mrs. Annette Bowling, and in thanking her for her forty years of dedicated service to the Albany Advocacy Resource Center, to the Albany, Georgia community and to thousands of families with disabilities across our great state of Georgia.

TRIBUTE TO MS. DAWN DAUER

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Dawn Dauer of Cape Girardeau, Missouri for her outstanding accomplishments and contributions to the local community. Ms. Dauer currently works as a Community Bank President for the Bank of Missouri and serves in the Young Bankers Division and on the Government Relations Committee of the Missouri Bankers Association. Outside of work, she is heavily involved in several different community organizations including the Saint Francis Medical Center Foundation Board, the Southeast Missouri State University Foundation Board, the Missouri Innovation Corporation Board of Directors, the Evangel University Alumni Board of Directors, the Old Town Cape Economic Restructuring Committee, the Cape Girardeau Area Chamber of Commerce, and Cape First Church.

Ms. Dauer enjoys being able to mentor students from Evangel University in their career and life decisions. She reaches out to young women who are right out of college or trying to find a career path, and guides them to be the best they can be. Ms. Dauer sees her volunteerism and work in the community as her own form of ministry. I am grateful that we have such caring and hardworking members of the Cape Girardeau community, such as Ms. Dawn Dauer. It is my pleasure to recognize her achievement before the House of Representatives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following remarks regarding my absence from votes which occurred on October 22, 2013. Due to a death in the family

being Rita Miskewicz of Summerville, South Carolina, I was unable to make it to Washington. Listed below is how I would have voted if I had been present.

Roll No. 551—H.R.185, Paul Brown United States Courthouse, “aye”; Roll No. 552—H.R. 3205, Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act, “aye”; Roll No. 553—On approving the journal, “aye.”

HONORING L. GOEBEL PATTON
FOR HIS YEARS OF COMMUNITY
SERVICE TO SOUTHERN ILLINOIS

HON. WILLIAM L. ENYART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring L. Goebel Patton on his 100th Birthday—tomorrow, October 24, and in recognizing his many years of community service in Southern Illinois.

Considered by many as “Mr. Southern Illinois,” Goebel Patton has worn many hats in his 80+ years of service to the people in his region. Educator, administrator, board member, lodge member, church and community leader, mentor—While this is an impressive list, it does not encompass all the roles that Goebel Patton has filled in service to the people of Southern Illinois.

Goebel Patton began his career as an educator at Logan School in West Frankfort, Illinois in 1931, just prior to his 18th birthday. He served as principal of several area elementary and middle schools before serving as Principal and Superintendent at Frankfort Community High School from 1946–1960. Between 1960 and 1970, Patton put his years of experience in education to use as Director of Public and Professional Relations for the Illinois Education Association before returning to Southern Illinois as Superintendent of Frankfort Community School District No. 168, the school district that he was instrumental in forming, from 1970 to 1984.

A member of the Second Baptist Church in West Frankfort for over 75 years, Patton has had the same impact and influence in that congregation as in his community. He was instrumental in constructing two sanctuaries for the church and organized a weekly Men's Prayer Group in 1990.

Patton has served on virtually every community and charitable organization in Franklin County. The list includes: Lions Club, Masonic Lodge, Salvation Army, Franklin-Williamson Human Services, Egyptian Council, Boy Scouts, JALC Foundation, SIU Foundation and the American Cancer Society. As chairman of the fund raising committee, he helped raise \$600,000 for an Aquatics and Activity Center in West Frankfort. A banquet room in the center was named in his honor.

After his 98th birthday, Patton received a six year appointment to the Board of Trustees of a new private college being organized in West Frankfort. When asked about taking on such a lengthy commitment at his age, he repeated one of his favorite quotes for which he is fa-

mous in Southern Illinois—“Community service is the rent we pay for the space we occupy on this earth.”

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing L. Goebel Patton a Happy 100th Birthday and thanking him for a lifetime of community service.

OFFERING A SUMMARY OF THE
CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING ON
FLORIDA WATERWAYS ISSUES

HON. PATRICK MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on October 3rd, we held an historic bipartisan Congressional briefing on issues affecting the St. Lucie and Caloosahatchee waterways, bringing national attention to the issue of toxic waters that have been plaguing the Treasure Coast. For both those who were unable to attend and for those that were there, I hope the following summary of the briefing will be helpful. For more information on the briefing, including a full transcript and video and presentations from panelists, please visit: www.PatrickMurphy.house.gov/IndianRiverLagoon.

COMMUNITY VOICES

It was great to see so many familiar faces from the district who were able to attend our briefing. There was an overwhelming showing of support, with over a hundred community members who came to bring national attention to this pressing issue, leaving us with standing room only. The bus full of dozens of residents that held fundraisers to make the long journey up to Washington, D.C. was unprecedented, and their presence helped demonstrate the gravity of this issue and its impact on the lives of those in the affected communities.

We heard from a variety of community members throughout the briefing including children who told of how their summer was dramatically affected by the pollution in the river, and long-time residents who have seen the problem year after year. We all came together to send many decision makers at the local, state, and federal levels a clear message: This is a serious problem that demands solutions.

PANELIST INPUT

Though because of the government shutdown our federal agency panelists could not attend the briefing, our state and local panelists gave many perspectives and insights into federal, local and state work underway and also discussed what else needs to be done in order to fully address the issue. They included:

Secretary Herschel Vinyard, Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Ernie Barnett, Assistant Executive Director, Everglades Ecosystem Restoration, South Florida Water Management District

Dr. Tom Van Lent, Senior Scientist, Everglades Foundation

Senator Joe Negron, Chair of State Select Committee on the Indian River Lagoon and Lake Okeechobee Basin

Representative Matt Caldwell, Florida House of Representatives—District 79

Representative Heather Fitzenhagen, Florida House of Representatives—District 78

Thomas MacVicar, MacVicar Consulting, Inc.

Mark Perry, Executive Director, Florida Oceanographic Society

Martin County Commissioner Chair Sarah Heard

St. Lucie County Commissioner Frannie Hutchinson

Lee County Commissioner Larry Kiker

Mayor Kevin Ruane, Sanibel, Florida

Todd Bonlarron, Legislative Director, Palm Beach County

Mr. Roland Ottolini, Director, Lee County Division of Natural Resources

Dr. Brian LaPointe, Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institute, Florida Atlantic University

The panelists highlighted many important points and everyone agreed that continuing to fight and urge for funding for existing Army Corps projects is crucial, such as the C-44 Indian River Lagoon Project, Herbert Hoover Dike repairs, and other Everglades restoration projects to provide relief to our imperiled waterways. There was also consensus that provisions in the House Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) will help to move forward on Everglades ecosystem restoration, which has a huge impact on our area. After passing WRRDA, we will continue to pressure the Army Corps to complete the Chief's Report for the Central Everglades Planning Project so that these important projects can move forward as well.

MEMBER ADVOCACY

I also was thankful that over 20 Members of Congress came to learn more about this issue and to hear directly from community members on how these toxic waters have affected them. Below is a list of which Members of Congress attended and some of the comments they made:

Senator BILL NELSON—

“There are way too many nutrients in [the water], and I am sure you have already had the testimony of what happens when there is too many nutrients. It is not only that bottle, but that has been going on for years.”

“We have got to continue the appropriations for the Everglades restoration. We have to keep the fire under the Army Corps of Engineers.”

“My ask of you all would be to keep up the pressure.”

House Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI—

“When PATRICK MURPHY came in with that bottle I was not sure what was going on. When he told me what that water was, it was really shocking.”

“The fact that all of you are here is a tribute to how important the issue is . . . I think your being here and their support for this elevates this to an issue of national significance.”

House Democratic Whip STENY HOYER (who was so moved by the briefing that he visited the district on October 14th to see the problem firsthand)—

“This is a crucially important issue, not just for Florida, but also for our nation. This is an extraordinary resource, and Florida is a resource. I want to thank you for doing those carwashes to come up here. Saying democracy works is a little tough today, but I have been in office for 45 years. Democracy works.”

Democracy works because conscientious people take their time and effort to communicate their concerns."

House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman BILL SHUSTER—

On WRRDA legislation: "We worked very hard in the committee to produce a bipartisan product and went through a number of listening sessions from local stakeholders to industries and companies that have interests in the ports, harbors, waterways, and environmental restoration projects."

"Both Republicans and Democrats both saw the need to make sure we move these projects forward faster and I think anybody that runs any type of organization knows that time is money. So, we get this done faster and we can save money and get these projects closer to completion."

House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Ranking Member NICK RAHALL

House Natural Resources Committee Ranking Member PETER DEFAZIO

Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources and the Environment Ranking Member TIM BISHOP

Co-chair of the Everglades Caucus Rep. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

Co-chair of the Everglades Caucus and the Florida Delegation Rep. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Member Rep. CHERI BUSTOS

Florida Congressional Delegation Members: Rep. CORRINE BROWN; Rep. TED DEUTCH; Rep. LOIS FRANKEL; Rep. JOE GARCIA; Rep. JOHN MICA; Rep. BILL POSEY; Rep. TOM ROONEY; Rep. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ; Rep. DANIEL WEBSTER; Rep. TED YOHO.

Every Member who attended was provided a comprehensive information on this issue, as well as actions Congress can take to help address this problem.

While I was extremely pleased to have a number of my colleagues attend this briefing to hear directly from our community, we have a long and challenging fight ahead of us to get the message to 200 other Members of the House to ensure that Congress continues to fund and authorize projects and initiatives that will help clean the waters of our local rivers and estuaries.

COMMON GOALS

One of the goals of this briefing was to isolate common goals among the many parties and stakeholders in the room. Some of the recurring points many stakeholders agree on that need work on the federal level are:

Continue to advocate to Members of Congress the importance of Everglades restoration funding

The shocking photos provided by local residents depicting this devastation to the ecosystem were on full display to all Members, as well as the presence of so many concerned citizens speaking personally about how these discharges have impacted them and the community. This education aspect of the briefing was crucial. With the 22 Members who attended, they now can help garner support for important measures related to local environmental projects when they come up for a vote, helping us advocate for the passage of the House Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) and including needed funding in the Administration's budget. But our advocacy work isn't done. We still must make

the case that Everglades restoration funding is an important goal that ALL Members of Congress should support.

Funding to complete Everglades restoration projects

Everyone agreed that continuing to fight and urge for funding for existing Army Corps projects is crucial. With the involvement of Congress and federal agency officials, we can work together to prioritize funding for ongoing projects such as the C-44 Indian River Lagoon Project, the Kissimmee River restoration project, and other Everglades restoration projects that once completed will provide relief to our imperiled waterways. In order for the entire system to function better, many key components must be able to function. Completing projects that are already under construction will help us most effectively clean the waterways of southern Florida.

Continued funding to rehabilitate the Herbert Hoover Dike

One of the biggest problems affecting our waterways is that Lake Okeechobee can only retain a specific amount of water safely. That is why the community agrees that the Army Corps must continue its work of rehabilitating the Herbert Hoover Dike to get it to a state where it can contain more water safely. Holding more water in the lake is the most effective method of water retention in the area, and while this will be a long term project, Congress must act to continue to fund the critical work of rehabilitating this vulnerable structure.

Passing the House WRRDA bill

There was also consensus that provisions in the House WRRDA bill will allow state and federal actors to move forward on Everglades ecosystem restoration, which in turn benefits our district. In addition to passing WRRDA, we also need to continue to pressure for the Chief's Report for the Central Everglades Planning Project (CEPP) so that these important projects can move forward as well. While the CEPP Chief's Report isn't scheduled to be complete until 2014, the timing of passing a final WRRDA bill will be crucial.

Urging the Corps to safely reexamine the Lake Okeechobee Release Schedule

Another issue that was discussed is the need for the Army Corps to reevaluate at what level the lake can safely retain water by reassessing the Lake Okeechobee Release Schedule (LORS). I sent a letter to Army Corps officials just prior to the briefing but we must continue to urge them to take this action to reduce these harmful discharges from the lake into the St. Lucie.

Getting federal agencies more involved on the ground

Unfortunately, due to a government shutdown, our federal agency panelists were unable to attend. Although we were still able to have a robust and important conversation, it is vital that these federal agencies become more involved. They each have a role to play, and their engagement can be helpful to addressing the river issue. I will be working with my colleagues who attended the briefing to push for this involvement from agencies such as the Army Corps, NOAA, and Fish and Wildlife, as well as invite these officials to see the damage firsthand so they see the urgent need to move forward with these ongoing projects.

There was also unity on the state moving forward quickly and aggressively with their water quality implementation plans.

MOVING FORWARD

The briefing successfully brought this important issue into the national spotlight. Unfortunately, we are dealing with a Congress that could not even come together to keep the government open, so a fight for funding to address the pollution impacting our local waterways in the current "no spending" climate will be a challenge, but is a challenge we must take on. There is a difference between wasteful spending, something I've been tackling in the past 10 months, and smart investments such as these projects needed to help our local environment, that provide a three-to-one return on investments. While I can't promise that this issue will be solved in the next year or even the next several years, I do promise to do everything I can to move us towards this end. I remain focused on this issue of great concern to our community, our environment, our economy, and our entire way of life.

HONORING MR. KENNETH TILSEN

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Kenneth Tilsen and recognize his contributions to the expansion of liberty and justice inside and outside the courtroom.

Mr. Tilsen measured his success by the number of people he helped, by the body of law he fought to uphold, and by the countless hours he worked to amplify the voices of disadvantaged and oppressed peoples. Born to immigrant parents in 1927, Ken learned compassion and understanding through example. His father founded the first company to build integrated housing in Saint Paul. Ken grew up in St. Paul's most racially diverse neighborhood, and attended integrated Marshall High School. He studied Law at the University of Minnesota, graduating at the top of his class in 1950. After practicing as a managing partner at a major firm in the Twin Cities, Mr. Tilsen left to begin his own private practice, so that he could represent anti-war, anti-draft, and civil rights cases. As his son described, "he wanted to define for himself a better kind of law practice and be a better kind of lawyer." And that is exactly what he did.

Mr. Tilsen's career traces a line through some of the most important social movements of our time. He defended the Minnesota 8, who were accused of raiding Selective Service offices in protest of the draft; he represented the Southern Landowners Alliance of Minnesota in a long battle to protect wilderness and farmland from unneeded power lines; he fought as one of the major attorneys of the Wounded Knee Legal Defense/Offense Committee against FBI and police misconduct, and continued the fight against historical revisionism of that case for decades afterward. He worked for the Venezuelan whistle-blower Rene Hurtado, the University of Minnesota's Afro-American Action Committee, and the protesters from the 2008 Republican National Convention in St. Paul. Many powerful individuals disapproved of his work, and he paid for his activism through years of harassment, and

even questioning by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

But Mr. Tilsen's body of work did not go unnoticed, and he was recognized with awards such as the ACLU Earl Larson Award, the National Lawyers Guild Lifetime Contribution to Social Justice Award, and being named one of "Minnesota's 100 most influential lawyers of all time."

Mr. Tilsen practiced law until 1993, turning then to teaching at the Hamline University School of Law. "Ken loved the law," his son wrote. "He was personally offended when it was twisted to serve the rich and powerful at the expense of normal people trying to live their lives." He used that passion to better the law—to better the state of Minnesota and to better the United States of America. The legacy Mr. Tilsen leaves is a valuable lesson to every citizen: that our government is only as strong as those who are willing to fight for "the little guy."

THE PASSING OF BILLY THOMPSON HARDMAN

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Georgia lost a true champion and advocate for our great State last week. Billy "Bill" Thompson Hardman spent much of his life working to put Georgia on the map as a destination for both domestic and international tourists. His efforts, which spanned decades, helped draw millions to enjoy the wonderful natural and manmade wonders Georgia has to offer.

Bill was born in Colbert, Georgia on June 5, 1926. He served in the U.S. Merchant Marines in World War II, after which he attended Piedmont College and Mercer University.

In 1959, Bill was appointed Georgia's first tourism director, where he served for more than a decade. During his tenure, he built the state's first eight welcome centers, launched a tourism advertising program, conducted the nation's first Governor's Conference on Tourism, and promoted Georgia throughout the U.S., Canada, and Europe. Bill founded Hardman Productions after leaving state government in 1970. His company conducted a variety of events, including travel and RV trade shows.

During this time, Bill was hired to lobby on behalf of the Georgia World Congress Center. He met his goals of raising public support for the Center and ensuring that the Center would be built in Atlanta.

Bill also served as chairman of the Travel Association of America, now the U.S. Travel Association. He served more than 40 years on that association's board, which gave him the distinction of having the longest tenure of any member.

I have tremendous respect and admiration for all Bill did to promote tourism in Georgia and grow that industry into such a meaningful part of our State's economy. My family and I extend our prayers and thoughts to the large family and extensive circle of friends Bill leaves behind. Bill's impact on Georgia will be

felt for generations to come, and we are grateful for his legacy.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF BEATRICE MURPHY

HON. REID J. RIBBLE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the birthday of Beatrice Schaumberg Murphy who is turning 100 years old today. When Beatrice was born in 1913, Woodrow Wilson was President and her life has spanned sixteen presidencies.

She married Frank Murphy on October 28, 1934, and I'm told they celebrated more than 60 wonderful years together. Their marriage produced four sons, Franklin, Marvin, Jerome and David. Beatrice assumed the role of mother, homemaker and involved herself with the family dairy farm. She is also proud of her role as grandma having been blessed with 15 grandchildren and 28 great grandchildren.

Beatrice contributes her excellent quality of life at her age to "being positive, looking forward to things, being satisfied with what I have; which is good family and friends". Beatrice also says, "The ability to make friends is pretty important when you're my age. Many of my old friends aren't around anymore, so I have to keep making new ones!"

That is an outlook on life I hope we can all embrace. It is my honor to recognize this amazing woman on her 100th birthday. Beatrice, Happy Birthday!

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. SHETAL SHAH

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Shetal Shah and his efforts to promote the well-being of our nation's most vulnerable population, our children.

As a neonatologist and researcher, Dr. Shah has made many meaningful contributions to the medical field, notably in the area of vaccination rates. As legislative chairman of District II of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Dr. Shah has been tireless in his advocacy efforts in pursuit of increased access to health care for children and greater funding for pediatric research. His breadth of knowledge has helped to inform policy decisions on both the state and federal level.

I offer my gratitude to Dr. Shah on behalf of myself and on behalf of those who are undoubtedly better off due to his efforts.

RECOGNIZING HONORABLE JEFFREY R. HUGHES FOR 19 YEARS OF SERVICE AS A BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable Judge Jeffrey R. Hughes and his commendable service to Michigan's Western District as a Bankruptcy Judge.

Judge Hughes served Michigan's Western District as a United States Bankruptcy Judge for over 13 years. Further, his service to the state has been a long time commitment, as he has worked for Michigan communities for over 30 years.

Judge Hughes received his Bachelor's in Economics from the University of Michigan in 1977 and his J.D. cum laude from the University of Michigan in 1980 where he was an active member of Phi Beta Kappa. From there he remained in his home state, practicing law for Varnum, Riddering, Schmidt & Howlett LLP for 20 years specializing in bankruptcy law and litigation. Throughout this experience he never forgot his local communities, participating in many community-based programs coordinated through the firm. Also during this time, Judge Hughes was annually recognized in "The Best Lawyers in America" until his appointment to the bench in 2000.

After 13 years of service to the nation and to West Michigan, he retired from Federal employment in September of 2013. Judge Hughes is a regular speaker at seminars, including those sponsored by the Institute for Continuing Legal Education and the American Bankruptcy Institute. In addition, he appears as a guest instructor each semester at Cooley Law School's Grand Rapids campus and has participated in the extern programs offered by Cooley Law School's Michigan campuses and Michigan State University Law School. While Judge Hughes will no longer be a Federal judge, he continues to ardently serve those in Michigan.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Judge Hughes for his service to Michigan and the Western District.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF REGINALD LAWSON, SR.

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Reginald "Reggie" Lawson, Sr., a New Orleans resident who exemplified the true value of citizenship and worked every day to improve his community. Mr. Lawson recently passed away after a battle with cancer. While today I am saddened by his passing, I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Lawson and the inspiration he provided to all those who desire to improve their own corner of the world.

Mr. Lawson grew up in a single-parent household in public housing. He graduated from St. Augustine High School in New Orleans, where he played football and sang in the Glee Club, and was a proud Purple Knight alumnus. After studying at LSUNO and Straight Business School, he became a realtor in 1963. He remained in that trade for the rest of his life and developed a passion for helping those shut out of home ownership.

In 1993, an important event for both Mr. Lawson and the St. Roch neighborhood occurred: Mr. Lawson moved to a house across the street from St. Roch Park. His love for the neighborhood and his desire to improve it led him to found the Faubourg St. Roch Improvement Association in 1995. His hard work and determination made him a key figure and leading force in the drive to improve St. Roch.

Mr. Lawson's effect on the neighborhood can be seen in a wide variety of areas, including the physical improvements to the park, the development of youth sports teams, and the sponsorship of health and housing fairs by the Faubourg St. Roch Improvement Association. However, the best evidence of the great and positive influence he had comes from the testimony of those whose lives he touched. He was known throughout the city as "the face of St. Roch." His hard work and dedication were widely noted and he served as an example of the good that a responsible member of a community can have on the lives of those around them.

I want to join his family, the people of the St. Roch neighborhood, and the city of New Orleans in celebrating the life of an exceptional citizen.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL FRANKLIN E. CHALK, SR.

HON. GREGG HARPER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Colonel Franklin E. Chalk, Commander, 186th Air Refueling Wing, Key Field Air National Guard Base, in Meridian, Mississippi, for his 35 years of faithful service to our country.

A native of Meridian, Mississippi, Colonel Chalk attended Meridian Community College and received an Associate of Arts Degree in Accounting in 1974. After enlisting in the Mississippi Air National Guard and completing Undergraduate Navigator Training, he attended Mississippi State University—Meridian where he received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Accounting in 1984. Colonel Chalk received a Masters of Commercial Aviation from Delta State University on Dec. 14, 2002.

Colonel Chalk received his commission through the Academy of Military Science, Knoxville, Tennessee on Nov. 16, 1978. After commissioning, he attended Undergraduate Navigator Training, Mather Air Force Base, California, which he completed on Nov. 17, 1979. On Dec. 27, 1979, he graduated from Tactical Navigation Training at Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina.

Colonel Chalk served as the 153rd Air Refueling Squadron Detachment Commander

while deployed in support of Operation Phoenix Duke II, Rhein Main Air Base, Germany, flying numerous air refueling missions over former Soviet Bloc countries. He also served as Detachment Commander for Operation Deliberate Forge, Operation Joint Forge, Istres, France and Operation Northern Viking, Keflavik, Iceland. Colonel Chalk was activated Oct. 17, 2001, deploying as Commander, 341 EARS, Incirlik Air Base, Turkey in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. He has served as the Commander of the 478th Expeditionary Operations Squadron, Manta, Ecuador, the 506th Expeditionary Air Refueling Squadron, Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, and Viking South, Bahia Blanca, Argentina in support of the 2005 Summit of the Americas.

His awards and decorations include the Meritorious Service Medal with one device; Air Medal; Aerial Achievement Medal; Air Force Commendation Medal with two devices; Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with two devices; Combat Readiness Medal with two devices; National Defense Service Medal with one device; Kosovo Campaign Medal with two devices; Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal; Global War on Terrorism Service Medal; Armed Forces Service Medal with one device; Humanitarian Service Medal; Air Force Overseas Ribbon Short; Air Force Expeditionary Service Ribbon with Gold Border; Air Force Longevity Service Ribbon with four devices; Armed Forces Reserve Medal with one device; Air Force Training Ribbon; Mississippi Magnolia Cross; Mississippi Magnolia Medal; Mississippi War Medal with one device; Mississippi Emergency Service Medal.

Prior to achieving the position of Commander, Colonel Chalk served as Vice Commander, 186th ARW. Other military assignments include Squadron Navigator, Chief of Standardizations and Evaluations, Training Officer, Air Operations Officer, Squadron Commander, and Operations Group Commander.

As Commander, of the 186th Aerial Refueling Wing, Colonel Chalk distinguished himself by navigating the base through some of the most tumultuous times Key Field Air National Guard Station had seen since its inception in 1939. Due to a realignment of mission in the Base Realignment and Closure Round of 2005, Key Field lost its aerial refueling mission. When the last KC-135 refueling aircraft left in 2011, Key Field performed numerous different missions on behalf of the United States of America on numerous different platforms. Of particular note, Colonel Chalk's leadership in the establishment of the MC-12W Project Liberty program significantly bolstered the Department of Defense intelligence gathering capabilities, directly contributing to the demise of countless enemy combatants and the safe return of American ground forces. Colonel Chalk also oversaw the standup of the C-27J Joint Cargo Aircraft program, and was instrumental in Key Field's designation as the C-27J Flying Training Unit for the United States Air Force. Ultimately in 2012, under Colonel Chalk's command, Key Field, the birthplace of aerial refueling, saw the return of the KC-135R aerial refueling mission.

Since coming to Congress in 2009, I have personally worked with Colonel Chalk to ensure Key Field was home to an enduring flying

mission. I am pleased to say that under his leadership, the base has received that flying mission and is well positioned to play an integral role in the peace and security of this nation for many years to come.

I wish Colonel Franklin E. Chalk Godspeed as he retires and enters this next phase of his life. On behalf of the Congress and the United States of America, I thank Colonel Chalk for his commitment, sacrifice, and contribution to this great nation in protecting it and our way of life.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION
TO REQUIRE THE ADMINIS-
TRATOR OF THE FEDERAL
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
AGENCY TO ALLOW FOR MONTH-
LY INSTALLMENT PAYMENTS
FOR FLOOD INSURANCE UNDER
THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSUR-
ANCE ACT OF 1968, TO CAP THE
ANNUAL COST OF FLOOD INSUR-
ANCE UNDER THAT ACT, TO
PROVIDE FOR A TEN-YEAR
PHASE-IN OF PREMIUM IN-
CREASES RESULTING FROM THE
ENACTMENT OF THE BIGGERT-
WATERS FLOOD INSURANCE RE-
FORM ACT OF 2012, AND FOR
OTHER PURPOSES

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Homeowners Flood Insurance Relief Act of 2013. This legislation seeks to ensure the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) remains affordable for homeowners and sustainable for taxpayers. Homeowners across the country face significantly increased rates as a result of reforms made to address the solvency of the program in 2012. Congress reformed the NFIP in 2012 as part of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012. These reforms required premiums to reflect the cost of coverage to ensure the program was solvent, but rates are increasing so quickly that the reforms may be counterproductive. As the Tampa Tribune recently noted, "For properties in low-lying areas, especially near the coast, annual rates may double or go up tenfold, depending on base flood elevation, exceeding \$20,000 a year in some cases." Congress did not intend to create such significant increases, and they have the potential to harm the program by limiting program participation and freezing the already fragile housing market. The bill would cap a homeowner's premiums to being no more than the appraised value of the structure over the course of a thirty-year mortgage. It also phases-in rate increases over ten years and would allow homeowners to pay premiums on a monthly basis, rather than an annual lump sum. These commonsense changes will ensure that the homeowners stay in the program and any increased premiums do not harm the housing market's recovery. This legislation continues the intent of the NFIP is to protect homeowners from devastating floods while ensuring the program is able to cover its costs.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to move this legislation through Congress.

[From the Tampa Tribune]

**FLOOD INSURANCE RATE HIKES THREATEN
'OLD FLORIDA' COMMUNITIES**

(By Josh Boatwright)

PASS-A-GRILLE.—Many of the beach cottages, motels and storefronts on this barrier island have been here nearly 100 years.

They've endured a series of tropical storms but avoided a direct hit.

While dozens have been razed in recent decades, some replaced by palatial beach homes, Pass-A-Grille's character as a quiet Gulf Coast village has essentially endured.

What residents and merchants fear may wipe out their beloved historic district isn't a catastrophic flood—it's rising flood insurance costs.

"There aren't too many places like this in Florida anymore. We've got all these McMansions and condos," said Bill Thompson, a member of the St. Pete Beach Historic Preservation Board.

"If it [flood insurance reform] goes into effect, we're going to lose our historic properties in Pass-A-Grille. There's just no two ways about it."

For coastal towns that have built a community, and tourism economy, around offering visitors an authentic "Old Florida" experience, unaffordable flood insurance rates could drive shopkeepers out of business and retirees on fixed incomes out of their homes.

Only 20 percent of all policies provided by the National Flood Insurance Program nationwide will see their premiums rise this year as a result of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act. The changes are set to take effect Tuesday, unless Congress acts to stop or delay that from happening.

But as the government removes grandfathered rates for thousands of homes built before modern flood maps, owners of historic properties face a dilemma: raise their floor height above base flood elevation or pay exorbitant premiums.

There's another option Pass-A-Grille residents especially fear, and that's tearing down the old bungalows and replacing them with multimillion-dollar homes built to modern flood standards.

Former St. Pete Beach city commissioner Bev Jackson envisions rows of uniform two- and three-story homes raised above garages such as the Florida Panhandle community that became famous for its uniformity as a set for the 1998 film "The Truman Show."

"We're going to be Seaside," Jackson said.

The full impact of the federal flood insurance reform still remains foggy for many historic districts along Florida's coast.

In St. Augustine, the oldest European settlement in the United States, shops, restaurants and cathedrals built of wood and coquina shell flood frequently when big storms sweep over the nearby Matanzas River.

Rather than raise these aging structures above flood elevation, many property owners are encouraged to take other measures, such as installing dams on their doorways to keep water out, city Planning Director Mark Knight said.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency, which runs the flood insurance program, allows historic districts to avoid regulations meant to make property owners either raise their building heights or rebuild according to current code.

Improvements that increase a property's value by 50 percent or more generally trigger those requirements, but cities can make his-

toric buildings exempt from the rule, as long as nothing is done to compromise their historic characters.

Those rules will still apply under Biggert-Waters, but historic properties won't be exempt from the same rate hikes facing all other older homes.

For properties in low-lying areas, especially near the coast, annual rates may double or go up tenfold, depending on base flood elevation, exceeding \$20,000 a year in some cases.

Because flood coverage is required only for holders of federally backed mortgages, Carl Hollenback says he'll drop his policy on the Seahorse Restaurant in Pass-A-Grille if rates climb as expected under the new law.

"I'll take my chances," said Hollenback, who has paid off his mortgage on the restaurant.

The Seahorse has operated as a restaurant for 75 years at the corner of Eighth Avenue and Pass-A-Grille Way, directly across the street from the Intracoastal Waterway.

In Hollenback's 35 years of ownership, the restaurant has flooded 15 times, being located at one of the lowest points on a narrow stretch of land between the Gulf of Mexico and the intracoastal.

Each time, he wipes down the tile floor, lets the building air out and reopens. He filed one claim when a commercial fryer he had just bought for \$4,500 was ruined; he got back \$2,400.

Many residents are galled by what they see as the unfairness of the national flood program, which has collected about \$16 billion from Floridians in the past 35 years—four times more than what they received back in claims.

Amy Loughery, the longtime owner of the boutique store Bamboozle on Eighth Avenue, says the government encouraged communities such as hers to embrace preservation by becoming part of the National Register of Historic Places. The new law undermines that preservation goal, she said.

"Which is it? We encouraged all these homeowners to keep their smaller properties, keep within the historic guidelines of our community," said Loughery, who has served on the city's preservation board.

"Only now we're going to say, oops, sorry; we're going to rip that rug right out from under you."

Loughery leases her store, a 1930s-era building, and doesn't yet know how much of an increase to expect in her rent in the coming years.

While state and federal grants are available to help homeowners purchase and restore historic properties, there's no assistance available to defray ongoing costs such as maintenance and insurance, said Anne Peery, executive director of the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation.

The changes to the flood insurance law won't impact all Florida towns equally, but preservationists such as Peery worry it will cause more people to shy away from investing in historic properties.

The funky beach cottages in Florida's most famous waterfront town, Key West, will largely be unaffected by Biggert-Waters because most of them were built on high ground and remain above base flood levels, said Diane Silvia, preservation planner for Monroe County.

What will become of the rickety wooden restaurants and shops that have come to characterize Old Florida in towns such as Cedar Key and Apalachicola isn't clear yet.

City leaders in Apalachicola had sought to cap building heights at about two stories to

maintain the quaint character of this waterfront town, which has buildings dating back to the 1830s.

That may be impractical, as most of the town is already below base flood elevation and will need to rise to avoid high premium costs, said Anita Grove of the Apalachicola Bay Chamber of Commerce.

"It's going to take some time to absorb everything that's happening," Grove said.

Bruno Falkenstein has spent years studying FEMA's flood program, which he blames for driving Pass-A-Grille property owners to prefer new construction to restoration.

As a former St. Pete Beach commissioner, Falkenstein urged the city to adopt the exemption that allows owners to improve historic buildings without bringing them up to flood code.

His grandfather moved here after World War II on the recommendation of a fellow soldier who told him that Pass-A-Grille was paradise.

His family owns several properties, including the two-story Hurricane restaurant on Gulf Way.

FEMA, he says, has long used a broad brush to create its flood maps, ignoring the fact that few Pass-A-Grille homes have sustained serious flood damage in the past 100 years.

Flood premiums ought to be based on history. Most properties in his community have clearly stood the test of time, he said.

"When you start looking at the history and you start saying to yourself 'What did they do at the turn of the century? Why was it that they built the homes like they did?'" said Falkenstein.

"The homes themselves, when they were originally built, were elevated. It's almost like the old-timers knew the height where the water was going to come."

HONORING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF POWDER SPRINGS

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, every now and then, we have the opportunity to step back and reflect on our history, our accomplishments and struggles and think about how we want to shape our future. October brings a special opportunity for such reflection, as the City of Powder Springs, in my home district in Georgia, observes its 175th Anniversary. Considering that our nation is only 237 years old that is cause for much celebration.

Few people know that Powder Springs is not the original name of the City. It was first incorporated as the town of Springville in 1838. While settlers first came to the town in search of gold, they quickly discovered the medicinal properties of the seven mineral springs in the area. In the 1850s Springville widely became known as a health resort, and people came from great distances to experience the springs. The mineral water from these springs caused the sand around the springs to turn black, resembling gunpowder, which lead the city to be incorporated as Powder Springs in 1859.

The next several decades were hard on Powder Springs. The Civil War put an end to

the use of the area as a health resort. After the Civil War, a thriving agricultural industry sprung up, but the coming of the boll weevil in the 1920s and the Great Depression devastated the region.

But the hard-working people of Powder Springs never gave up. With a population quickly approaching 16,000, the city is once again prospering. Its beautiful parks, nature trails and recreation centers draw in visitors from afar. The Silver Comet, for example, is a well known 59-mile "rails to trails" multi-use trail that runs through the heart of the City. Residents also have access to over 100 acres of permanently protected green space. I am always amazed at the level of community involvement in Powder Springs, which in part streams from the excellent leadership of Mayor Pat Vaughn, who was the city's first female mayor. My fellow colleagues, I hope you will join me in celebrating this historical milestone and this remarkable city.

HONORING MR. PHILLIP R. ROBERTS ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a devoted public servant, Mr. Phillip R. Roberts, who will be retiring from the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) this month after a distinguished 32-year career in Federal service.

Mr. Speaker, Phil has provided a career full of exceptional leadership and strategic vision that have significantly contributed to safeguarding U.S. national security interests and strengthened our national intelligence and military intelligence capabilities during a challenging period in our nation's history. Throughout his career and in assignments around the globe, Phil has demonstrated an unyielding dedication to duty and an innate ability to inspire enthusiasm and the commitment to serve in those around him.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen firsthand the fruits of Phil's labor in my Congressional District where he was instrumental in the development of the DIA BRAC relocation effort to Charlottesville, VA. Since 2010 Phil has served as the first Chief of DIA's Field Support Activity at Rivanna Station in Charlottesville, working to bring onboard over 800 analysts to the Rivanna Station site to support DIA's Military and Counter-Proliferation Analysis and Scientific & Technical Collection efforts. Phil has worked tirelessly to ensure that DIA has been a good neighbor to the local community forging many important relationships with Charlottesville area governments, charities and institutions such as the University of Virginia.

Prior to his assignment in Charlottesville, Phil served three years as the DIA Chief of Staff. As Chief of Staff, Phil functioned as the Agency's Chief Operating Officer and supervised the Agency's acquisition, financial, human capital, information technology and mission services elements spanning DIA's global footprint of over 150 countries.

Earlier assignments for Mr. Roberts include a tour in London as DIA's Chief Liaison to the United Kingdom and a tour as the Vice Deputy Director for Analysis for DIA where he oversaw over 2,000 military and civilian personnel, providing all-source intelligence analysis to the Combatant Commands including deployed U.S. and allied forces; the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; and the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Roberts has represented the Director, DIA at the NATO Intelligence Board and has also served as the Chief, Operational Support Group, where he was responsible for the production of all-source intelligence on foreign infrastructure and operational environment related issues, in support of deliberate and crisis planning requirements worldwide.

In August 1998, Mr. Roberts became a member of the Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service when he was selected to be the Chief, Office for Counterproliferation Support. In this capacity, he was responsible for the production of all-source intelligence on foreign, nuclear, chemical, and biological warfare programs in support of U.S. counterproliferation efforts. From 1993 to 1998, Mr. Roberts was the Senior Intelligence Officer, Office for Counterproliferation Support.

From 1991 to 1993, Mr. Roberts served as the Director, Office of General Military Intelligence Functional Management. In this capacity, he oversaw program planning and budget execution for approximately \$520 million and over 7,000 personnel. During this period, Mr. Roberts chaired the Council of Intelligence Producers where he played a key role in the largest reallocation of Defense intelligence resources in the post-Cold War period. From 1989 to 1990, as the Special Assistant for Intelligence Production, Directorate for Research, he directed the production of finished intelligence and data base maintenance of over 800 analysts. Prior to 1989, Mr. Roberts served in other supervisory and analytical positions including Chief, North Korean Military Capabilities Branch, and Senior Intelligence Officer, Asia Division.

A career intelligence professional, Mr. Roberts has received the Presidential Rank Award of Meritorious Executive and is a recipient of the Defense Intelligence Agency medals for Exceptional Civilian Service and Meritorious Civilian Service, two Defense Intelligence Agency Director's Awards, and the Director of Central Intelligence Diversity Management Award.

Mr. Speaker, while DIA and the Intelligence Community will be losing a leader who has answered the call of public service at such critical points in our nation's history, I know that Phil will be happy to spend more time with his wife Teresa and children Taylor, Jonathan and Jordan. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful nation and my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives, I thank Phil Roberts and his family for his years of service to our country and wish him the very best in his retirement from the federal government.

HONORING MS. JULIE METZGER

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Julie Metzger of Cape Girardeau, Missouri for her achievements and impact in the community. A graduate of Southeast Missouri State University and St. Louis University, Ms. Metzger now serves as the Director of Case Management and Social Services at Southeast Missouri Hospital. She provides education, support, counseling, crisis intervention, and advocacy to patients and their families during difficult times. She has also published educational materials to help other volunteers and professionals in the social work field. Ms. Metzger also mentors and supervises student interns from a number of local universities. In addition to her social work, Ms. Metzger volunteers for many councils and foundations such as the American Cancer Society, Reach to Recovery, American Academy of Bereavement, the American Case Management Association, the National Association of Social Workers, and the Court Appointed Special Advocates.

Ms. Metzger has managed to achieve so much and help so many people, all the while fighting a battle with breast cancer. Having reached the five-year mark as a cancer survivor, she has used her experience to educate and support other women fighting cancer. Ms. Metzger has provided hope and inspiration for so many women and I truly admire her strength and dedication to helping others.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TULSI GABBARD

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, on October 14, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes Nos. 547-549. Had I been present I would have voted: rollcall No. 547: "no"—On Motion To Table the Motion To Appeal the Ruling of the Chair; rollcall No. 548: "no"—On Passage; rollcall No. 549: "no"—On Agreeing to the Grayson Amendment.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN BILL YOUNG

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of solemnity that I wish to honor the passing and memory of our colleague, Congressman C.W. Bill Young, who passed away on October 18, 2013, at the age of 82.

Congressman Young was the most senior Republican in both houses of Congress and represented the best of public service. He

served in the Florida State Senate for ten years before being elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from the Tampa Bay area in 1970. In his nearly 43 years in Congress, Congressman Young worked hard for the people of his district and was especially tireless in supporting military personnel and their families—both legislatively and personally. He and his wife, Beverly, were known for their countless visits to wounded soldiers. Himself a veteran of the Army National Guard and Reserves, Young was the current chairman of the Defense subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and he had previously chaired that full committee from 1999 to 2005.

With decades of experience, Young naturally became a source of guidance for many of his colleagues. He had a balanced and well-regarded approach to the issues and affairs of Congress, and his personal kindness was known to many. While this moment is significant for the people of the 13th District of Florida and for the House itself, my prayers today are especially with Young's wife, Beverly, their three sons, and all of his loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in honoring and remembering Congressman Young.

A TRIBUTE TO LOIS O'KEEFE

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to give congratulations on the retirement of my District Director, Lois O'Keefe. This is truly a bittersweet moment for me. I have known Lois for over 20 years just before I began my legislative career in the Wisconsin State Assembly. She has been a volunteer, an employee and most importantly a friend.

I am happy that Lois will begin a new journey after having such an illustrious career as a public servant. Lois O'Keefe has been employed by two U.S. Senators, Senators Proxmire and Kohl and a U.S. Congresswoman. The labor movement has also been an important part of her career. She was appointed as the Regional Representative of the Secretary of Labor for the Midwest Region in Chicago. During the Clinton Administration, Lois O'Keefe served under Secretaries Robert Reich and Alexis Herman. She also served as a union organizer for the Service Employees International Union representing workers who cared for the elderly. It is clear she has a passion for government service.

Lois O'Keefe also has a passion for working with youth. She ran the REACH Youth Program at the Milwaukee Private Industry Council and worked with the Milwaukee Job Corps to start an internship program in my district office.

Lois also has lived the reality of many women, juggling work and child care issues to return to school when her four children were young, ages 7–14. She earned both a BA in Political Science and an MA in Industrial and Labor Relations. After nearly 10 years on my staff serving as a caseworker and then District Director, I wish you well my friend.

While you have closed this door, another one is opening for you so that you may pursue life at your own special pace. Lois can now travel the world, which is something that I know she has wanted to do for a long time.

Lois O'Keefe, thank you for your service to the 4th Congressional District.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was absent due to the passing of my close personal friend and was not present for rollcall votes on Tuesday, October 22, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner: H.R. 185—To designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the "Paul Brown United States Courthouse"—"yes"; H.R. 3205—Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act—"yes"; Journal Vote—"yes."

HONORING KEVIN SHANLEY OF GLADSTONE, NEW JERSEY

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Kevin Shanley of Gladstone, New Jersey. Kevin was a fine leader of the Newark Museum whose contributions will long be remembered. Kevin was also a successful businessman, a generous and caring philanthropist and a wonderful father and grandfather.

Kevin served as the Chairman of the Newark Museum for over 25 years. Under his leadership the museum underwent its largest expansion to date with the completion of its North Wing. His work at the museum expanded its mission and brought in objects and ideas that educated and inspired.

Kevin was a generous and caring philanthropist. He served as President and Treasurer of the Victoria Foundation, which assists young children and their families in the Newark community. Kevin also served on the Board of Trustees of New Jersey Futures, as a regent of St. Peter's University in Jersey City and on the boards of many other organizations. He was also a successful businessman working with a number of major companies. There he mentored many of his colleagues who appreciated his sound perspective and high degree of integrity.

Kevin's long devotion to his civic and personal responsibilities will forever be his legacy.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,078,769,687,926.64. We've added \$6,451,892,639,013.54 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on October 22, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and missed three votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 551, rollcall No. 552, and rollcall No. 553.

CRUCIAL NEGOTIATIONS ON HOW TO RESOLVE BUDGET CHALLENGES

HON. DAVID B. MCKINLEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, for months the President repeatedly pledged that he would initiate long overdue negotiations on matters ranging from tax reform to regulatory reform and work with Republicans on the flaws emerging with his health care law. His stipulation was that Congress must first reopen government and raise the debt limit. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, last week I voted to end the budget impasse and tentatively cooperate with the President. While this agreement does not solve our long term challenges, it does allow us to move forward and begin crucial negotiations on how to resolve our budget challenges.

Throughout the fall, President Obama and Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID demanded a blank check and refused to negotiate. This plan is not a blank check. It was forged through negotiations and provides a short term extension for funding at lower spending levels than the Senate wanted. It includes a long overdue conference on a federal budget. The plan also includes a much needed change in the Affordable Care Act to ensure the income of individuals receiving subsidies is verified instead of relying on an honor system.

Most importantly, the plan ensures a host of other negotiations pledged by the President will move forward so we can address our growing debt, improve our economy, and fix the problems with the health care law. President Obama has promised on numerous occasions that once the government was open and

the debt ceiling was raised he would be willing to negotiate "on anything." This includes the budget, economic reforms, entitlement programs, and even the health care law. In the next few months the American public should be keenly aware whether he does what he said he would do. Finally Congress can hold the President accountable for his pledge to negotiate with Congress over these impediments to economic recovery.

Over the past several weeks, conservatives put up a strong fight to stop President Obama's health care law from being fully implemented. After trying to defund the law, delay it for a year, and ensure fairness so that members of Congress don't get special treatment, it became clear that our tactics weren't working and we needed to regroup.

Given that Republicans are a minority in Washington we need to be realistic about what we can achieve. That does not mean we will give up the fight. We just need to be smart about where and when we choose to fight and pick battles we can win.

As we move forward with negotiations over the budget and other issues, we need to focus on ways we can achieve our objectives. We need to seek true reforms that don't just put off hard decisions to the next crisis. The challenges we face—a weak economy, a growing debt, a health care law that isn't working—are too important to just push off into the future.

The next step to overcome these challenges is for the President and Senator Reid to open the negotiations we were promised.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT
GENERAL DARRELL D. JONES

HON. GREGG HARPER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Lieutenant General Darrell D. Jones, Deputy Chief of Staff, Manpower, Personnel, and Services, Headquarters United States Air Force, for his 34 years of faithful service to our country. The Air Force's senior personnel officer, General Jones is responsible for comprehensive plans and policies covering all life cycles of military and civilian personnel management, including military and civilian end strength management, education and training, compensation, resource allocation, and the worldwide United States Air Force services program. Over the course of Lieutenant General Jones' distinguished career, he commanded a squadron, group, two wings and a direct reporting unit. As previous Commander, Air Force District of Washington, and Commander of the Air Force Forces for Joint Forces Headquarters-National Capital Region, he organized, trained and equipped combat forces for aerospace expeditionary forces, homeland operations, civil support, national special security events and ceremonial events. He also provided major command-level support for 60,000 worldwide military and civilian personnel and was the Uniform Code of Military Justice authority for 40,000 Airmen.

General Jones graduated from Mississippi State University's Reserve Officers' Training

Corps Program in 1979. He began his career as a personnel officer at Williams Air Force Base, Arizona in the Consolidated Base Personnel Office. He excelled in a variety of jobs as the Chief of Customer Assistance, Chief of Quality Force, and Chief of Personnel Utilization. Immediately after this assignment, then-Lieutenant Jones reported to Randolph Air Force Base, Texas where he was the Chief of the Assignment Analysis Branch and later the Executive Officer to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel at Headquarters Air Training Command. Then-Captain Jones reported to Washington, District of Columbia as part of the very elite Air Staff Training Program as a personnel adviser and board member of the Secretary of the Air Force Personnel Council.

Then Captain-Jones and later Major-Jones held the first of his many assignments as a leader in our Air Force, becoming the Consolidated Base Personnel Office Chief and Director of Personnel, and Commanding the Mission Support Squadron at McConnell Air Force Base. As a testament of his skills and abilities, he was chosen to attend in-residence professional military education at Air Command and Staff College at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. Upon graduation, he showcased his talent in a variety of joint positions at Headquarters United States European Command, Stuttgart, Germany. He was the Chief of Entitlements, Compensation and Education, followed by Chief of the World War II Commemoration Branch and later Deputy Chief of the World War II Commemoration Division. Now-Lieutenant Colonel Jones was selected to return to Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama as an Air War College Student with a follow-on assignment to Headquarters United States Air Force as the Chief of Force Structure Plans and Policies in the Military Personnel Policy Directorate. Later, he was selected by the Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel as the Chief of the Personnel Issues Team.

Based on his successes and ready for increased responsibilities, now-Colonel Jones took command of the 62nd Support Group at McChord Air Force Base, Washington. He then became the Director of Personnel at Headquarters Pacific Air Forces at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii followed by Commanding the 66th Air Base Wing at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts. Later, he was selected as the Director of Manpower and Personnel at Headquarters United States Central Command at MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.

Then-Brigadier General Jones took command of his second wing, the 37th Training Wing at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, the largest wing in the Air Force at 21,000 people and graduating 60,000 Airmen from basic, technical, international and joint training annually. He followed command to Washington, District of Columbia, where he became the Director of Force Management Policy, Headquarters United States Air Force. In this position, he established force management policies guiding accessions, assignments, evaluations, skills analysis, promotions, readiness, retraining, separations and retirements of the Air Force's human capital. He also oversaw aspects of total force management to include contingency, mobilization, training management, and rated force policy.

Now-Major General Jones with his vast knowledge and experience took command for

a fifth time as the Commander of Air Force District of Washington and Commander of the Air Force Forces for Joint Forces Headquarters-National Capital Region at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland. He was again extremely successful in this position which ultimately led to his most recent assignment as the Deputy Chief of Staff, Manpower, Personnel and Services, Headquarters United States Air Force where he and his team were responsible for comprehensive plans and policies covering all life cycles of military and civilian personnel management, and the delivery of fully-qualified, ready Airmen for the Joint warfighter while also meeting all the needs of our Airmen and their families. He planned, directed and evaluated programs, ensuring a qualified, productive and well-maintained work force of over 180,000 civilian employees. Additionally, he oversaw the execution and programming of the Manpower, Personnel and Services portfolio with an annual \$40.9 billion personnel budget for 660,000 military and civilian total force Airmen.

Under General Jones' leadership, the Air Force implemented sweeping policy changes to enlisted developmental special duty assignments and the Air Force fitness program. He led the Secretary of the Air Force-directed Personnel Readiness Review task force, ensuring our current population is ready to meet the needs of current and future war time requirements. Additionally, he led the Air Force Personnel Center in a historic consolidation with the former Air Force Manpower Agency and Air Force Services Agency, integrating three unique functional areas designed to reduce overhead, achieve efficiencies and maximize customer service. Finally, he guided Air Force senior leadership through the impacts of the Secretary of Defense's General Officer Efficiency Study. He provided critical Congressional interaction to ensure all timelines of the reductions were met. In every instance, General Jones was a steadfast advocate promoting the Air Force's mission, and its over 660,000 Total Force Airmen and their families.

Today, I wish Lieutenant General Darrell "DJ" Jones good luck and Godspeed as he retires and enters this next phase of his life. On behalf of the Congress and the United States of America, I thank General Jones, his wife Holly, their sons, Taylor and Stewart, and daughter-in-law Lindsay for their commitment, sacrifice, and contribution to this great Nation in protecting it and our way of life.

HONORING MARCUS D. WOODS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Marcus D. Woods. Marcus is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 395, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Marcus has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Marcus has been involved with

scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Marcus has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Marcus D. Woods for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING MS. LINDA MCKINNIS

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Linda McKinnis of Cape Girardeau for her charitable work in Southeast Missouri. An event and wedding designer by profession, Ms. McKinnis volunteers her design expertise to a number of local groups. She has provided design services for the United Way of Southeast Missouri, the Southeast Missouri University Booster Club, and La Croix United Methodist Church.

Most notably, Ms. McKinnis founded the International Crisis Aid, Heartland hub dedicated to helping victims of sex trafficking in the United States. She has worked to raise money and spread awareness of the issue of sex trafficking by selling ICA's can tab bracelets. She has inspired many more people to volunteer and advocate on behalf of this important issue. I offer congratulations to Ms. McKinnis on her outstanding achievements and look forward to her future work in the Cape Girardeau community.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TERRORIST ATTACK ON THE MARINE BARRACKS IN BEIRUT, LEBANON

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 30th anniversary of the terrorist attack on the Marine barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, which took the lives of 241 American servicemen, as well as 58 French servicemen in a separate building. It was the deadliest attack on the Marine Corps since Iwo Jima during World War II.

This attack against our country by Hezbollah, which was coordinated with the Iranian regime, marked the first major terrorist attack targeting the U.S. This is the same Iranian regime that continues to sponsor terrorism, develop nuclear weapons and threatens the U.S. and our allies in the Middle East still today.

In some respects it was an opening shot fired in a battle that continues to this day against radical Islamists and terrorist elements bent on the destruction of this country and all that it represents.

I have visited the site of the barracks near the airport. Today, there's nothing left but a

parking lot—not even a memorial or plaque to recognize the lives that were lost. In a cruel twist of history, the airport itself, which the Marines were guarding in 1983, is now controlled by Hezbollah.

However, there are now memorials to the servicemen at the U.S. Embassy in Beirut as well as at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina. This morning, the 30th Beirut Observance Ceremony was held at the memorial at Camp Lejeune.

Today we pause to remember those lost in the attack—to honor them and their family members. We remember their sacrifice and reaffirm our commitment to learn the lessons of the past to prevent such tragedies in the future.

As President Reagan said in a televised address from the Oval Office following the attack, the Americans serving in Beirut, “were not afraid to stand up for their country or, no matter how difficult and slow the journey might be, to give to others that last, best hope of a better future. We cannot and will not dishonor them now and the sacrifices they’ve made by failing to remain as faithful to the cause of freedom and the pursuit of peace as they have been.”

REMEMBERING MR. JOSHUA RABORN

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Mr. Joshua Raborn of Victorville, CA who passed away on October 16, 2013 after a fatal motorcycle accident.

A dedicated public servant, Joshua served in the United States Marine Corps as a Lance Corporal before becoming a firefighter with the United States Forest Service. He held the position of Lead Water Tender Operator on the San Bernardino National Forest, Mountain Ranger District.

Joshua started his career in 2008 as a seasonal firefighter with the Big Bear Hotshots. In 2009, he was admitted into the Wildland Firefighter Apprenticeship Program before entering Basic Academy number 49 and the Advanced Academy in 2010. After converting to full-time in January of 2011, Joshua spent the remainder of his career on the Mountaintop Ranger District as the Lead Water Tender Operator at Deerlick Station number 12 in Hesperia.

In a very special way I would like to extend my most sincere thoughts and prayers to Joshua's wife Kristen, his four kids, and his parents. His work, legacy, and dedication will never be forgotten by all who were fortunate enough to know him.

HONORING ENZO ANTHONY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Enzo Anthony.

Enzo is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 41, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Enzo has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Enzo has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Enzo has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Enzo led a reforestation effort, planting over 900 saplings across four acres at the Circle O Tree Farm and Quail Preserve in Marceline, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Enzo Anthony for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO RIVERSIDE COUNTY'S RECIPIENTS OF OPERATION RECOGNITION

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to a group of individuals—heroes—who are receiving the recognition and honor they deserve for their service to our country. Operation Recognition is operated by the Riverside County Office of Education with assistance from the Riverside County Department of Veterans' Services. The program awards high school diplomas to veterans who missed completing high school due to military service in World War II, the Korean War, or the Vietnam War, or for those who were interned in WWII Japanese-American relocation camps.

A recognition ceremony will be held on November 12, 2013, for the following individuals who received their high school diplomas through Operation Recognition:

Austin Elmer Lee Acord; David M. Barnes; Kenneth James Becker; Raymond Frederick Carter; Robert Dale Cloyd; Michael William Divil; Alan F. Gonsalves; Larry James Lyon; Cruz Martinez; Frank Ramirez Rodriguez; Frank Sandwell; Samson Charles Trevino; and Ruben David Zamora.

Our country owes a debt of gratitude to all the above recipients for their service and sacrifice. I salute all of these individuals and congratulate them on receiving their high school diploma.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING OF RUNAWAY AND FOSTER YOUTH

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in my former life, I was a criminal court judge for 22 years and spent 8 years as a prosecutor in Texas.

Child abusers are the worst criminals in our society.

But too often the justice system ignores the victim.

So Congressman JIM COSTA (D-CA) and I founded the Victims' Rights Caucus.

The VRC is currently focused on combating human trafficking.

This topic is of particular interest to me because my hometown of Houston, Texas is unfortunately a hub for this despicable crime.

Many are not aware that modern day slavery occurs right here in the United States.

The problem is very real, especially amongst vulnerable youth in the child welfare system.

This is Anna's story which Shared Hope International shared with me.

After Anna's family passed away, she was placed in the foster care system at the age of three.

She was shuffled from home to home until age 12 when she was finally adopted by a loving family.

But Anna began hanging out at the corner store without her family knowing.

There, she met a person whom she thought she could trust.

Little did she know that the person she met at the corner store was not actually a friend at all.

One day, when she got into a fight with her parents, she called her "friend" from the store, who promptly picked her up.

Anna didn't know that this call would change her life forever.

Her "friend" was actually a trafficker.

He was violent.

He beat her and sold her body.

The emotional, physical and sexual abuse continued.

He threatened her family's lives if she called the police.

She was told the police would arrest her.

And that's exactly what happened.

The police did arrest her.

She was treated like a criminal, not a victim.

Anna became convinced that her family no longer wanted her.

She felt helpless and scared.

After almost four years of this unspeakable abuse, Anna eventually escaped and was reunited with her family.

Through strength, a resilient spirit, and with the help of her mother, Anna vowed to make a difference one victim at a time.

She now has a ministry for sex trafficking survivors and runs an outreach program for at-risk youth.

Unfortunately, Anna's story is not unique.

The scars from the foster care system stayed with her and made her vulnerable to trafficking.

Many foster youth have experienced neglect, physical, emotional, and/or sexual abuse.

These factors make children more susceptible to trafficking.

The child welfare system has tremendous problems and one major challenge is to not only put a roof over a child's head, but to instill values—like self-worth—in each child.

Child sex predators try to steal the soul of their victim when they are assaulted.

I will soon introduce the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act with Congresswoman MALO-

NEY. The companion will be offered by Senator CORNYN and Senator WYDEN.

This bill will create a grant program to help State and local governments develop and implement comprehensive victim-centered programs.

The bill creates a "Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund" at the Treasury, financed through fines on persons convicted of human trafficking and child exploitation crimes, which can be used to fund support programs for victims of human trafficking.

Criminals will literally pay for their crime and for the system they have created.

Included in the bill are a number of other provisions to ensure victims receive justice and traffickers and buyers are prosecuted.

In this country we have 5000 shelters . . .

For animals, according to the ASPCA.

These shelters are great.

I got my Dalmatians from a shelter.

But we have less than 300 beds for domestic minor sex trafficking victims according to a recent survey by Shared Hope International.

We must have facilities to rescue and restore these victims.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act builds upon the End Sex Trafficking Act, that I have already filed with Congresswoman MALONEY. This bill will help combat human trafficking by targeting the criminals who purchase sexual acts and ensuring they are prosecuted as human traffickers.

This bill goes after the anonymous buyers of child sex slavery.

Target the demand in order to stop the sale of children.

The days of boys being boys are over and the long arm of the law must go after these consumers.

Justice demands it and justice is what we do in this country. And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING THE VETERANS OF HONOR FLIGHT NORTHERN COLORADO

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic veterans of Honor Flight Northern Colorado as they travel to Washington, DC to visit the memorials that stand in our Nation's capital. The members of this 11th Honor Flight Northern Colorado trip include veterans from multiple wars and different generations, linked together by their service to our Nation.

Eighteen years ago, Honor Flight began its mission to fly veterans of World War II to Washington, DC, so that each person who bravely served could experience the monuments and memorials honoring them. Having now expanded to serve veterans from every corner of the country, and conflicts beyond World War II, the Honor Flight program has become a national expression of gratitude to our veterans. Of the 118 veterans on the most recent flight, 40 served in World War II, 75 in Korea, and 3 in Vietnam.

Our gratitude extends well beyond the physical memorials dedicated to those who coura-

geously risked their lives to preserve our inherent rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We know that without the bravery of our veterans, our Nation would not be able to stand as the shining city on the hill for the world to see. Today we honor those who risked their lives to ensure that the United States remains the greatest Nation on earth for generations to come:

Homer Andersen, Ernest Baugh, Norman Bever, William Compton, Alton Cooper, Arthur Cushing, Robert Davis, Harold Dawe, Jr., Richard Doyle, Robert Eldridge, Stewart Fonda, Jr., Donald Forry, Albert Gablehouse, Charles Gebauer, William Hammond, Sidney Hanks, William Hargis, Walter Hayward, Herman Huwa, Reinard Janssen, Donald Larson, Evelyn Lee, John MacQueen, Robert Martin, Isaac Martinez, George Norton, Eugene Olson, Herbert Pugh, Thomas Ramm, Eugene Replogle, William Ripple, Max Rodgers, Loyal Smoke, Glen Springer, Harold Sutton, Donald Steinshouer, Roger Van Thorre, Charles Webb, James Whitley, Lawrence Zuppan, Harry Ahlbrandt, Wallace Akers, Ronald Anderson, Joseph Anello, Filbert Baca, Gilbert Ball, Delbert Black, Keith Bordewyk, Delmar Bonser, Emilio Brito, Dorn Brunner, Charles Cihfield, Marvin Cihfield, Charles Dunfee, Sr., Thomas Eckrich, Verne Einspahr, Virtus Einspahr, Theodore Farwell, Edwin Foss, Robert Frank, Loren Garretson, Scott Goshorn, Earl Graham, Howard Hanson, Fred Hara, Jerry Herring, Bernard Hill, John Holloway, Harold Hoyland, Vealeess Hudspeth, William Hughes, Jimmie Hylton, John Jacobson, Ray Jacoby, Richard Jagggers, Kenneth Jan, Frances Killinger, Jr., Raymond Kosley, Edward Krivonach, William Krupke, Pat Lanphear, Owen Lechele, Clarence Lueb, Robert MacLauchlin, Roquez Martinez, Horacio Masearenas, Edward Minch, Robert Muller, Leonard Peatrowsky, William Phillips, Dean Pope, Charles Pugh, George Pugh, Teddy Putnum, Tommy Richie, Theodore Roos, Leonard Schmidt, Paul Schroeder, Lloyd Seekamp, Robert Sharritt, Richard Sherman, James Sparks, Boyd Stark, Harvey Steward, Joseph Stockert, Richard Stoner, Jr., Leo Thielen, John Toth, John Wachsmann, Benjamin Wagner, Roger Warden, Jr., Robert Weber, Lester Weers, James Weitz, and Russell Zingelman.

TRIBUTE TO MS. TAMEKA KYLES

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Tameka Kyles, a College Access Coordinator for Southeast Missouri State University. Ms. Kyles works to educate and prepare underserved high school students and first generation college students for post-secondary education. She also provides financial literacy services to these students and their families. Another important aspect of Ms. Kyles' service is to reach out to at-risk and low-income students in the area and mentor them in job training. Receiving her Masters of Public Administration from Southeast Missouri

State University, Ms. Kyles is working for a better future for the community's youth. She is also a member of the Gibson Recovery Center Board of Directors and the Cape Central Senior High School A+ Advisory Board. In the past, she has volunteered with the Boys and Girls Club of Cape Girardeau, mentoring young men and women.

Ms. Kyles is especially proud that her job enables her to empower girls and women through education and employment. To further this goal, she co-founded the Sisters' Professional Network, which provides opportunities for professional women to share ideas, network, and enhance each other's personal and professional lives. I am impressed with Ms. Kyles' dedication to the local community and her proactivity in addressing local issues.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 22, I missed a series of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on No. 551 and No. 552 and I would have voted "nay" on No. 553.

RECOGNIZING DANIEL A. SCHWAGER

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee on Ethics, and with and on behalf of my colleague, Representative SANCHEZ, the Ranking Member of the Committee, we rise today so that we may recognize the dedicated service of Daniel A. Schwager to the House of Representatives. Dan has served as the Chief Counsel and Staff Director to the Committee on Ethics during the 112th and 113th Congresses.

Dan has a long and admirable career as a nonpartisan public servant, much of it in the field of government ethics. During his tenure with the Committee, he has continued to demonstrate his commitment to ethics, to public service, and to ensuring that public servants meet the highest ethical standards.

The Committee on Ethics is the only standing committee of the House whose membership is evenly divided between each political party. The Committee includes five members of each party. Also, unlike other committees, the day-to-day work of the Committee on Ethics is conducted by a staff that is nonpartisan by rule. Under House rules, the Committee has the jurisdiction to administer travel, gift, financial disclosure, outside income, and other regulations; advise members and staff; issue advisory opinions; and investigate potential ethics violations. As Chief Counsel and Staff Director, Dan led the Committee's nonpartisan professional staff and helped the Committee fulfill these vital responsibilities to the House and to the American people.

Dan's commitment to integrity and rigorous open-mindedness have been an asset to the Committee in advising the Committee and its Members as they carry out the Committee's important service to the House. His advice and counsel have greatly assisted the Committee as it achieved such milestones aimed at continuing the Committee's commitment to providing excellent customer service to the House community as issuing new privately sponsored travel regulations, updating the Committee's financial disclosure systems and guidance, and launching the Committee's new Web site.

On behalf of a grateful Committee and community, we thank him for his service and wish him and his family all the best in his transition to the next phase of his career.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID P. ROE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for votes on October 22, 2013 because I was undergoing a medical procedure. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes Nos. 551, 552, and 553.

I was also not present for the first series of votes on October 23 because I was travelling to Washington from my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes Nos. 554 and 555.

TRIBUTE TO MAURICE LYONS

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to a dear friend of mine, Chairman Maurice Lyons. Maurice passed away on Wednesday, October 16, 2013. A long time resident of Riverside County, he was a pillar of the community and he will be deeply missed.

Maurice was born January 21, 1950, in Riverside County as one of nine children and raised a Morongo Tribal Member. He grew up on the Morongo Indian Reservation where he would later attend Banning High School. Maurice quickly became involved in the betterment of the Morongo Indian Reservation following his completion of school when he gained a job as a machine operator with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, where he would remain a dedicated employee for over seventeen years.

Maurice's investment back into his community did not stop with his work, as he also became actively involved in public service beginning in 1994. Maurice served as Tribal Housing Commissioner, Chairman of the Morongo Head Start Parent Policy Committee, and Chairman of the Board of the National Indian Child Welfare Association. He was elected Tribal Chairman in July 2001 and faith in his leadership remained for years to come as he was reelected as Chairman in 2003, and again in 2005.

He worked closely with state and federal legislators on Native American and Morongo tribe related issues affecting government and economic development. Through his leadership, he made it a priority to improve the quality of life on the reservation through a betterment of youth programs created to preserve local Indian culture and customs. With a deep commitment to his history and heritage, Maurice kept the Morongo culture alive by encouraging education of youth in language and tradition.

Maurice quickly became a voice for Riverside County. He served on the Riverside National Cemetery's governing board and was instrumental in establishing the MIA-POW monument which has become a fixture in the community. He represented the Morongo tribe with the National Indian Gaming Association, which hosts 70 member states, and with the Tribal Alliance of Sovereign Indian Nations, a regional federation of 13 tribal governments. He was honored by the Council of Energy Resource Tribes for his national leadership in preserving tribal sovereignty.

Maurice was a devoted husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather. He is survived by his wife, Sandra Lyons; children, Tammie Lynn Lyons, Ernest Lewis Lyons, Melissa Renee Lyons, Maurice William Lyons, Joseph Rafael Lyons, Onoalyse Onjaleen Lyons, Joshua Nicholas Bau Lyons, Isabella Rianne Lyons, Kyle Munson, Andre Petkov, Angel Raelyna Gonzales, Erika Gonzales; 13 grandchildren; and two great-grandchildren. On Saturday, October 19, 2013, a Memorial Service honoring Maurice's extraordinary life was held at the Morongo Reservation Community Center.

Maurice will always be remembered for his devotion to family, caring nature and selfless giving. He demonstrated an incredible work ethic, generosity, contributions to the community and love of family, and I can personally attest to Maurice's professionalism and positive attitude. These achievements and qualities are a testament to a life lived well and a legacy that will continue. I extend my condolences to Maurice's family and friends. Although Maurice may be gone, the light and goodness he brought to the world remain and will never be forgotten.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 551, H.R. 185—To designate the "Paul Brown United States Courthouse" in Sherman, Texas, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall No. 552, H.R. 3205—Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall No. 553, on approving the Journal, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

LUMBERTON—THE ALL-AMERICA CITY

HON. MIKE MCINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak on this most important subject of my hometown of Lumberton, North Carolina. Credit.com has used wrong figures and erroneously reported that Lumberton is the "poorest city in America." I strongly urge that the facts be accurately presented and this report be corrected to reflect the current economic situation in Lumberton and Robeson County.

Lumberton's economic, social, historical and cultural strides and values have been honored on the national and state levels.

Twice Lumberton has been chosen as an All-America City because of its clear vision on promoting the positive attributes of diversity. Lumberton has been named a "Main Street City" on the state level, and its Downtown Historic District has been recognized on the national level. Its schools have produced leaders recognized on the national and state levels in areas such as business, banking, literature, athletics, government, law, military, education, religion, health care and the arts.

With its strong sense of purpose, a community filled with people who are willing to roll up their sleeves and work, and its partnership of elected officials, community leaders, businesses, and economic development team, Lumberton will continue to march forward and meet the challenges of the day. However, Lumberton should not have one hand tied behind its back with this inaccurate report, and we urge an immediate correction in this economic indicator.

Like many other small towns and communities, Lumberton has its challenges and obstacles to overcome, but the foundation on which this community was built is strong and solid. Indeed, Lumberton lives up to its motto of "Progressus cum Concordia" or "Progress with Harmony".

Among the many positive economic, social, and geographic attributes Lumberton has includes: ideally situated on I-95 as the halfway point between New York and Miami; over 1600 rooms of hotels and suites; national and state historical attractions; numerous meeting and gathering facilities; a wide variety of restaurants and local entertainment establishments; a nationally-designated black water river voted as one of the top ten natural wonders in North Carolina; a multi-racial community and a workforce committed to helping others and building a better tomorrow; and a strong faith-based community with a broad range of places to worship and a diverse number of ministries, demonstrating positive values of service and commitment.

Mr. Speaker, Lumberton and its elected officials, businesses, community leaders, economic development officials, and citizens are all dismayed at this recent inaccurate article and stand ready to showcase all the positives that Lumberton and Robeson County, North Carolina have to offer. We hope that everyone will come and visit and see first-hand the great

people that live in Lumberton, the purpose in which they are committed to improving their city, and the partnerships they are willing to form to keep moving Lumberton forward. You will be glad you came.

HONORING WALTER L. ANTHONY, IV**HON. SAM GRAVES**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Walter L. Anthony, IV. Walter is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 41, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Walter has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Walter has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Walter has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Walter helped renovate the entrance to Walt Disney Municipal Park in Marceline, Missouri, by constructing an eight foot by 27 foot garden box, filling it and leveling the soil before planting 17 plants, including five knockout rose bushes.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Walter L. Anthony, IV for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING LAKE FOREST CHARTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lake Forest Charter Elementary School, an outstanding school from my district, for being selected as a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School.

Lake Forest Charter is a special school in a special city. After the 2005 disasters of Hurricane Katrina and the levee failures left the school and the area devastated, current CEO Mardele Early, dedicated teachers, and devoted families banded together to rebuild and reopen the school. That effort illustrates vividly the commitment of the faculty and staff and the level of parental involvement that are the foundation of Lake Forest's success.

Lake Forest Charter's Blue Ribbon Schools selection is in the "Exemplary High Performing" category. This award is given to some of the highest performing schools across the nation, and I am proud that Lake Forest is receiving national recognition for the outstanding education it provides to local school children. With more than 80 percent of its students qualifying for free or reduced lunches,

Lake Forest Charter has consistently been one of the top schools in Louisiana. It is one of only two schools in the state that are National Title I Distinguished Schools for Exceptional Performance and repeatedly has had every one of its 4th and 8th graders pass the required statewide tests.

Every child in this nation deserves a quality education and it is schools like Lake Forest Charter Elementary School that bring us closer to making that a reality. I commend the faculty, staff, parents, and students for all their hard work and congratulate them on this prestigious award.

RECOGNIZING 100 YEARS OF ORGANIZATIONAL PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST LATTER-DAY SAINTS AND THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA**HON. JACKIE WALORSKI**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to recognize the organizational partnership between the Church of Jesus Christ Latter-Day Saints and the Boy Scouts of America. This year marks the 100th anniversary of their partnership that enriches the lives of over 300,000 young men each year across the country. I am pleased that Northern Indiana will join the nationwide celebration as the Church of Jesus Christ Latter-Day and the Boy Scouts of America Saints reflect back on a century of achievement and success fostered through this special bond.

There are more than 32 Church of Jesus Christ Latter-Day Saints and Boy Scout of America organizations in the Second District involving all levels of scouting, including Eagle Scouts. Their presence has certainly contributed to strong leadership skills and personal growth for the Boy Scouts, in addition to helping countless others in our communities.

The Church of Jesus Christ Latter-Day Saints and Boy Scouts of America organize a myriad of activities, such as mentoring youth and volunteering in local events. This partnership also reaches out to the less fortunate and host educational outdoor experiences for our communities. As a result, over 1,000 Hoosier Boy Scouts make important strides to enrich their faith and garner lasting leadership skills each year. There is no doubt that these fine young men will be the leaders of tomorrow, finding positive ways to shape our society. It is a privilege to congratulate the Church of Jesus Christ Latter-Day Saints and the Boy Scouts of America as they celebrate 100 years of partnership.

CONGRATULATING RON AND LISA GREENWOOD**HON. JULIA BROWNLEY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in recognition of Ron and Lisa

Greenwood, who will be presented and honored with the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation's Founders Award for their dedication and commitment to the veterans of Ventura County.

As a decorated combat veteran in Vietnam, Ron knows the complexities of those who return from war. His personal experience and struggles with PTSD and social integration challenges allow him to relate to the issues that our returning veterans face. Committed to supporting our veterans, Ron has worked closely with many veterans' advocacy and community groups.

His personal narrative resonates in all aspects of his work. As President at Global Energy & Technology, Inc., Ron continues to give back to the community and to our veterans. He has provided employment opportunities, as well as professional guidance, to many of our returning servicemembers.

Similarly, Lisa Greenwood has also been a tireless advocate in her pursuit of giving back to our veterans and their families. She has worked with the Association of Service Disabled Veterans (ASDV) in Washington, DC. She is currently the National Chair of the Silver Star Women of America, an arm of the Association of Service Disabled Veterans, and has testified before the House Committee on Veterans Affairs.

With an extensive background and service history, Ron and Lisa opened the doors of the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation in 2009. With the Greenwood's vision, the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation has been able to successfully assist returning veterans in reaching their full potential. The Gold Coast Veterans Foundation has given our local heroes the resources to become productive and responsible citizens while helping them to make an easy transition back into their communities.

Their steadfast commitment to Ventura County's veterans has been invaluable and their work and efforts to address the needs of returning veterans are emblematic of their work that the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation accomplishes on a daily basis. The Greenwoods have created an organization that has far reaching impacts on our community.

In 2010, in collaboration with the Ventura County Community Foundation, the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation founded the Ventura County Veterans Fund to specifically facilitate the transition of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans back into our community. Their mission is to provide employment assistance, counseling, education, and housing to all of our returning veterans.

Earlier this year, the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation opened its Veterans Service Center to provide health and human services to Ventura County's veterans. This organization cultivates an open forum for veterans' groups and organizations that serve to develop and care for veterans. Their mission is not only to provide care, but to encourage, inspire, and motivate.

I applaud Ron and Lisa Greenwood for their continued generosity and dedication to serving our brave servicemembers and their families. It is my sincere honor to join the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation in recognizing the outstanding accomplishments and contributions of Ron and Lisa Greenwood, and I commend

them for the difference that they make in the everyday lives of our veterans.

TRIBUTE TO MS. FRANCES GOULD

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Frances Gould of Cape Girardeau, Missouri. Ms. Gould works as the Southeast Region Field Support Manager of the Missouri Division of Family Services, where she oversees adoption, foster care, and interstate placement of children. She is an active member of the Community Caring Council, Southeast Missouri State University Alumni Board of Directors, and Centenary United Methodist Church, among other organizations. Ms. Gould also advises the women of Alpha Delta Pi sorority at Southeast Missouri State University.

Ms. Gould has enjoyed the opportunity to give back to her community and enhance the well-being of women and children. Although there are some heartbreaking stories, she is inspired by the many success stories she has helped create. I believe that Ms. Gould is a positive role model for the women she works with and is an incredible asset to our community.

NORTHMORELAND TOWNSHIP VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Northmoreland Township Volunteer Fire Company of Dallas, Pennsylvania.

Northmoreland Township Volunteer Fire Company was chartered in 1981 in order to provide fire protection to the local community which had long relied on other jurisdictions for this important undertaking. Township supervisors decided that the company would rely solely on fundraising and other sources of income rather than on taxpayer dollars, a decision which still stands to this day.

Today, Northmoreland Township Volunteer Fire Company has over 70 members, including more than 40 volunteers who actively respond to calls. The additional members are responsible for important functions including fundraising, accounting, and other day to day business operations. Since its founding, the company has been active in updating their equipment and training procedures to ensure they are leaders in fire protection. The members of this company continue to risk their own lives to ensure the safety and well-being of the residents of Northmoreland Township.

Mr. Speaker, since 1981 members of the Northmoreland Township Volunteer Fire Company have proudly protected their community from fire and other disasters. Therefore, I commend all those personnel who have faithfully served at this fire house and congratulate

them on the dedication of their newest building addition and acquisition of a new ladder truck.

REMEMBERING MR. MAURICE LYONS

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Maurice Lyons, who passed away October 16, 2013. Mr. Lyons has left those living in the Morongo Basin with a legacy of public service and dedication to community.

Mr. Lyons became well known throughout the Morongo Basin during his 15 years of leadership as chairman of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. Raised on the Morongo Reservation as one of nine children, Lyons entered public service in 1994 as a tribal housing commissioner and chairman of the Morongo Head Start parents committee. Soon after he was elected to the Morongo Tribal Council and was elected Tribal Chairman in 2001, serving a total of three terms.

In addition to his leadership on the Tribal Council, Mr. Lyons established himself as a community leader through his role in developing the Morongo School, a college preparatory academy that opened on the reservation in 2010.

In addition he served as president of the board of directors for National Indian Child Welfare Association and spearheaded a national drive that raised more than \$500,000 toward the cost to build a National American Indian Veterans monument at Riverside National Cemetery.

Today, I join with the Morongo Band of Mission Indians and with the entire Morongo Basin in remembering this extraordinary public leader who served as an inspiration to all those who knew him.

TRIBUTE TO PARAMESHWARAN "RAVI" RAVISHANKER

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Perris, California and greater Riverside County are exceptional. Riverside County has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Parameswaran "Ravi" Ravishanker is one of these individuals. This year, Mr. Ravishanker will end his tenure as the Deputy General Manager of the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) after over 20 years of service.

Under his guidance as Assistant General Manager and Deputy General Manager, Mr. Ravishanker has helped EMWD become an industry leader in water and wastewater management. He is responsible for having helped

EMWD reach a historic water rights settlement with the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, which was signed into law by the President of the United States on July 31, 2008. This settlement has resulted in the recharging of an overdrawn groundwater basin, helping to secure water reliability in the region for future generations.

Mr. Ravishanker has been instrumental in the surface and groundwater basin plans for the Santa Ana Watershed and San Jacinto Watershed, which have a combined population of just fewer than five million people. He helped initiate the implementation of three groundwater desalination facilities, a multipurpose wetlands facility and five wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, Mr. Ravishanker helped develop a water resources management plan that helped maximize state and federal funding opportunities, resulting in a more sustainable water supply portfolio for the District.

Mr. Ravishanker previously served as a United Nations Consultant and the Deputy General Manager of the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority. He has dedicated his career to the water industry and has always worked with a commitment to resource and environmental sustainability.

In light of all Mr. Ravishanker has done for the city of Perris and the greater community, it is only fitting that he be honored for his many years of dedicated service. Mr. Ravishanker's tireless passion for the industry in which he serves has contributed immensely to the betterment of Riverside County and I am proud to call him a fellow community member, American and friend. I commend Mr. Ravishanker for his tireless work with the Eastern Municipal Water District. I know that many are grateful for his service and salute him as he prepares to end his tenure later this year.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF "BLACK HAWK DOWN"

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the veterans of the battle in Mogadishu, Somalia on October 3rd, 1993—commonly referred to now as "Black Hawk Down"—gathered at two different events in Fort Bragg, North Carolina and in Texas at the ranch of Ross Perot, Jr., to observe the 20th anniversary of these events and remember the 18 servicemen who were killed in action.

I submit for the RECORD a statement I received from Lt. Gen. William G. "Jerry" Boykin who was the commander of Delta Force during this battle, which took the lives of 18 men and wounded 73 others.

As Lt. Gen. Boykin notes in the statement, "What came next was hours of fighting between ninety-nine Americans and tens of thousands of the Somali militia, all armed with rifles, grenades, and rocket propelled grenades (RPG) and determined to kill as many Americans as possible. The battle was now a matter of principle. No American would be left behind.

It made no difference that the two pilots were already dead, their bodies would be brought out and returned home with dignity. No man was willing to leave his comrade's body because each man lived by an ethos known as the 'Ranger Creed', which says in the fifth stanza 'I will never leave a fallen comrade to fall into the hands of the enemy . . .'"

BLACK HAWK DOWN TWENTY YEARS LATER
(By Lt. Gen. William G. "Jerry" Boykin)

October 3rd, 1993 was a day when "Uncommon valor was a common virtue," according to John O. Marsh, Jr., the former Secretary of the United States Army. Known to his friends as Jack, Marsh was speaking at a memorial service at the Delta Force facilities at Fort Bragg, North Carolina in November, 1993, just days after the unit had returned from Mogadishu, Somalia, where sixteen of their comrades had died and another 72 had suffered wounds. The battle that Marsh was referring to was later chronicled in the Ridley Scott and Jerry Bruckheimer movie "Black Hawk Down." Last week two key commemoratives occurred in different places which drew the participants of that battle together to honor their fallen comrades. The first was at Ft Bragg, NC on October 3rd where Rangers, Delta Force personnel, aviators from the 1/60th Special Operations Aviation Regiment, and a small number of US Navy and US Air Force warriors gathered on the twentieth anniversary. On the 5th of October, many of the same group, along with family members, attended an event sponsored by Ross Perot Jr at his ranch in Grapevine Texas. Both events were characterized by solemn camaraderie and stories of old team mates who never made it home from that battle. Jack Marsh was right about the valor shown that day in the most intense firefight that US troops had been in since the Viet Nam conflict.

One of the somewhat obscure facts about the "Blackhawk Down" battle is what those men were fighting for. The mission that day was to capture three Somali militiamen who were part of the network of a brutal tribal leader named Mohammad Aided. That mission was accomplished fairly quickly and the task force was preparing to return to their base when a Blackhawk helicopter, call sign Super 61, was shot down in the vicinity of the Bakkarra market. The pilot and co-pilot were killed on impact and trapped in the twisted wreckage. Two other crew members survived the crash along with three of the Delta Force operators, all of which were injured. Every man from the task force was directed to leave their targets and to get to the crash site and to recover the bodies of the dead crewmembers and protect the survivors until they could be evacuated. Some of the injured survivors were evacuated fairly quickly by the quick reactions of courageous helicopter pilots who saw the situation and reacted instantly. After a very tough block-by-block street fight, the task force finally assembled around the crash, only to discover that the bodies of their comrades were hopelessly entangled in the wreckage and would be nearly impossible to remove without tools, which the task force did not have. What came next was hours of fighting between ninety-nine Americans and tens of thousands of the Somali militia, all armed with rifles, grenades, and rocket propelled grenades (RPG) and determined to kill as many Americans as possible. The battle was now a matter of principle. No American would be left behind. It made no difference that the two pilots were already dead, their bodies would be brought out and returned

home with dignity. No man was willing to leave his comrade's body because each man lived by an ethos known as the "Ranger Creed", which says in the fifth stanza "I will never leave a fallen comrade to fall into the hands of the enemy . . ." So the die was cast and it quickly became obvious to all the Americans in Mogadishu that until the necessary tools arrived that would allow the task force to rip the helicopter apart, the battle would continue; and it did, for eighteen hours. Additional casualties were taken by the task force as they stayed and defended the bodies of Cliff Walcott and Donovan Briley. It was not until just before daylight on October 4th that a relief force carrying the necessary equipment was able to reach the surrounded Americans and extract the two bodies. At that point, the entire force fought their way out of the city and back to their base on the airfield in Mogadishu.

While the cost was high, every man knew that he had done what was expected of him and had no regrets. Fighting and sacrificing for a fellow warrior is fundamental to the warrior ethos. These men battled against incredible odds to defend fallen comrades and did so without hesitation or reservation. Honor was preserved but at a price. Given the same dilemma again, it is a sure bet that every man would do the same thing. That is one of the things that makes a man a warrior and America is blessed to have people that know that there are some values for which they will risk everything, including their lives.

HONORING JAY DOUGLAS WEEKS OF LEBANON TOWNSHIP, NEW JERSEY

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of the Honorable Jay Douglas Weeks of Lebanon Township, New Jersey. Jay leaves a long legacy of courage, honor and distinguished public service.

Jay started his life of service by volunteering for the Marines. He was taught to fly and excelled in combat maneuvering and navigation. He mastered fighter jets and bravely served on many important missions. In his professional life, Jay crafted his love of the skies as a pilot for United Airlines.

Jay continued his dedicated public service on the Lebanon Township Committee. There he had a long and accomplished tenure, including serving many terms as Mayor. He also volunteered his time with organizations such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Elks and the Free Masons. He was also a lifelong sportsman and outdoorsman. Jay was a wonderful husband to Matilda and a beloved father, grandfather and great grandfather. Jay's devotion to others and his love of life will be sorely missed.

HONORING MS. CANDICE DAVIS

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Candice Davis of Jackson, Missouri for her outstanding achievements and service to our nation. Ms. Davis served in the United States Navy for nine years as a journalist and public affairs officer. Stationed abroad in Sicily, Bosnia, and Kosovo, she was a news anchor, radio host, and television travel show host. She then spent time in Jacksonville, Florida before reaching her final duty station in Denver, Colorado at the Navy Recruiting District. In this position, Ms. Davis excelled in marketing the Navy to the region and expanding recruitment efforts. She spearheaded efforts to get recruiters more involved in charity and community work.

After being honorably discharged from the Navy, Ms. Davis completed her education at Southeast Missouri State University, graduating Magna Cum Laude. She now works as a media specialist with the Missouri Department of Conservation, encouraging the community to discover the power of nature. She believes that those who participate in outdoor recreation experience less stress and are more confident and that individuals can truly go on to be anything they want to be. This is the message Ms. Davis imparts to interns in her office, in addition to sharing her military stories. I thank Ms. Davis for her service to our nation and I am impressed by her continued work to better our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ASSUMPTION CATHOLIC SCHOOL

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Assumption Catholic School on its 50th Anniversary. Since 1963, Assumption Catholic School has been providing outstanding Catholic education to Perth Amboy and the surrounding communities.

The Ukrainian Catholic Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary began plans to establish a parochial school after encouragement by then Archbishop Metropolitan Constantine Bohachevsky. Construction began in 1960 and the school was opened in 1963. In 2007, its name was changed from Ukrainian Assumption School to Assumption Catholic School.

Since its establishment, Assumption Catholic School has grown considerably. Its first class in 1963 consisted of 25 first and second grade students. Each successive year, a grade level was added to the school and by 1969 the school encompassed kindergarten through eighth grade. A pre-kindergarten program was added in 2002. Nearly 800 students in 44 classes have graduated from Assumption Catholic School since 1970.

Assumption Catholic School has been led by four principals since 1963—Sister Josepha,

Sister Vladimyra, Melanie Lawrence and Michael Szpyhulsky. Sister Josepha and Mrs. Lawrence also taught at the school. Under the leadership of each of these principals, Assumption Catholic School saw continued growth, expansion and technological upgrades. In addition to the dedicated leadership, faculty and staff of the school, Assumption Catholic School is also supported by the Ukrainian Assumption parish and the students' parents who are very active in school activities and benefits.

In 1996, Assumption Catholic School became the first Catholic school in Perth Amboy to receive Middle States Accreditation.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in celebrating the 50th Anniversary of Assumption Catholic School. Its educational excellence is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

CONGRATULATING THE KAYNE ANDERSON CAPITAL ADVISORS FOUNDATION

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in recognition of the Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors Foundation, who will be honored with the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation's General Roger L. Brautigan Leadership Award for their unparalleled commitment to the needs of veterans in Ventura County.

Founded in 2011, Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors Foundation supports numerous organizations that aim to empower and enrich the lives of individuals and community. The Foundation's model of generosity and compassion reflects a new culture of giving that encourages their employees to increase their individual contributions and participation in charitable activities.

Through the support of the Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors Foundation, the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation can continue to provide essential services and funding to countless projects including housing coalitions, courts, memorials and activities that all serve the same mission to better the lives of all veterans and their families in California's central coast.

No one embodies the spirit of this generosity more than Gary Ghazarian, partner at Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors. As a Board Member of the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation, Gary has personified the true meaning of philanthropy and has been a stellar example reflection of the quality of people and work that Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors and its foundation embodies. Because of generous people like Gary and organizations such as the Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors Foundation, the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation has received its largest donation to date.

I commend Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors Foundation and its generous contributors for their selfless work and dedication to Ventura County's veterans. I am pleased to extend my most sincere congratulations on their award and this well-deserved recognition.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INCORPORATION TRANSPARENCY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANT ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act. The bill would require the states to obtain information about the true ownership of the corporation, when incorporation papers are filed with the state.

As some have put it, this bill is a "no-brainer." And it is fairly straightforward: it would require that the person creating the corporation state the "beneficial owner" of the corporation and provide sonic form of identification.

Although this is as straightforward as it sounds, the implications for law enforcement are broad reaching. Criminal organizations are infamous for using shell corporations, both foreign and domestic to open bank accounts, launder money, perpetrate fraud, and finance terrorism. And it isn't difficult for them to do. Virtually no states require people applying to create corporations to provide the identity of the corporate owner. As a result, just about anyone can easily manipulate the system to fund criminal activity.

Here is an example from an investigation in New York by the Manhattan District Attorney. The office announced investigations involving the movement of funds through banks in New York by entities controlled by the Iranian Military. In at least two cases, domestic shell companies were opened. In two different states to further secret Iranian interests. Through a New York shell company, individuals working on behalf of the government of Iran were able to move funds to secret accounts held in offshore jurisdictions. Shockingly, the offshore government was able to give the Manhattan DA more information about the ownership of the New York entity than the state of New York could.

Although the DA does not contend that requiring a declaration of beneficial ownership would have stopped this activity, it would have at least been a piece of evidence to go on. And if the declaration of beneficial ownership had been required but falsified, it would have been an extra tool for law enforcement to shut down the entity and prosecute the perpetrators.

The bill I am introducing today will provide the kind of transparency that law enforcement needs to investigate financial crimes. However, it is narrowly drafted so that it is not overly burdensome on either states or incorporating entities. In fact, most corporations would be exempt from the bill's requirements including companies that are already regulated by federal banking regulators and companies that are over 20 employees and \$10 million in revenue.

This bill is meant to capture beneficial ownership information from companies that are able to escape regulation and oversight through other federal entities.

Senator LEVIN has already introduced a similar bill in the Senate, and President Obama was the lead sponsor when he was a U.S. Senator. The G-8 countries recently pledged to implement incorporation transparency as well.

As Global Witness has stated, "Setting a standard for collecting information about the true owner of a company would level the playing field between the states while preventing terrorists, drug traffickers and kleptocrats from hiding behind corporate secrecy."

The bill is supported by both Global Witness and Global Financial Integrity, as well as numerous law enforcement associations, including the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys, the National Narcotic Officers' Associations Coalition, the United States Marshals Service Association, and the Association of Former ATF Agents.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY WEEK

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the nation's healthcare quality and patient safety professionals who work every day to ensure that our health system delivers high quality, cost-effective and safe care. During National Healthcare Quality Week, October 20 through 26, healthcare facilities nationwide celebrate the efforts of those professionals to improve health care. Healthcare quality and patient safety professionals make a positive contribution to our care by monitoring clinical processes and outcomes, analyzing data to improve systems, and helping to integrate new, evidence-based practices.

I am proud to note that their professional organization, the National Association for Healthcare Quality, NAHQ, is headquartered in Chicago, Illinois and is in my district. Its 5,400 individual members and 100 institutional members bring expertise to healthcare quality in all settings and specialty areas. They are the on-the-ground professionals who are helping healthcare facilities meet Obamacare's focus on improving quality care while reducing costs.

Quality professionals address many issues in the healthcare workplace, including ensuring that a patient's medications are reconciled, healthcare-associated infections are prevented, and the quality of care is continually improved. They strive to assure that the progress their facility makes on these and many other issues are reported in an accurate and transparent manner.

I applaud our health professionals whose job is to ensure that patients receive safe and quality health care and urge my colleagues to do the same.

ON THE 57TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN UPRISING OF 1956—HUNGARY REMAINS A NATION OF PATRIOTS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of the Hungarian freedom fighters who rose up against the communist tyranny that was imposed on their country after World War II. Many men and women died in that uprising—a courageous fight against incredible odds, as the Soviets sent in tanks to restore the puppet regime they installed in 1948.

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman or Co-Chairman of the Helsinki Commission I have been on human rights missions to Hungary many times over the years. One of the things that most impresses me about this country is the deeply admirable patriotism of so many Hungarians. By patriotism I mean something very different from nationalism—whereas nationalists resent and are aggressive toward other countries, patriots love and defend their own country and its best traditions, and allow—invite—other people to love their own countries and traditions.

This summer I visited Hungary on a congressional delegation ably led by my colleague on the Helsinki Commission, Senator ROGER WICKER. We met with Prime Minister Orban and others, and it is in connection with this anniversary and our meeting with Prime Minister that I'd like to place into the record a recent interview Prime Minister Orban gave to the Telegraph.

I commend this to my colleagues as the words of a Prime Minister who thinks seriously and speaks frankly about issues facing his country and Europe as a whole.

VIKTOR ORBAN INTERVIEW: "PATRIOTISM IS A GOOD THING"—THE PRIME MINISTER OF HUNGARY, VIKTOR ORBAN, TELLS THE TELEGRAPH WHY HIS COUNTRY AGREES WITH BRITAIN IN ITS CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE "CREEPING" POWER OF BRUSSELS

(By Charles Moore)

15 OCT 2013

Viktor Orban has just had a good meeting with David Cameron. It was easier than his first with Margaret Thatcher (in 2001). "I am not satisfied with you," were, he recalls, her first words. She was angry that Hungary was not doing more to help protect Nato's soldiers from Serb aggression.

Despite this rebuff, Mr Orban is a Thatcher admirer. His political career began in 1988 when he was one of 37 young students and intellectuals founding a party to attack Communist rule in his country.

"Her role was very important: she was always in favour of freedom, always anti-Communist. She said, 'There is no such thing as society.' I like that remark very much because in European politics people were always talking in artificial sociological language. Social engineering was very popular."

When he attended Lady Thatcher's funeral in April, he was pleased that the Bishop of London explained what she really meant by those famous words. "The funeral was very moving and very British—not tragical, as it would be on the Continent—more of a tribute."

Young Viktor, a clever boy from a country background, won a George Soros scholarship to Oxford to study civic society as seen by liberal political philosophers such as John Locke. He loved the "electrifying dance" of ideas there; but this was the autumn of 1989 and the Berlin Wall was coming down. Here was the chance actually to build a liberal civic society at home. "I said to myself, 'Viktor, what are you doing here?' and I took the occasion of our first free elections in March 1990 to go back."

He became prime minister for the first time in 1998, until 2002, and then, after wilderness years, returned to power with a landslide in 2010. His time in office has been controversial. He has been accused, often by European Union officials, of too much nationalism, of suppressing media freedom, politicising the judiciary and the central bank, and even of stirring up ethnic tensions. Has the great liberal freedom-fighter narrowed? Is there a risk that he could become an authoritarian strongman, the Vladimir Putin of his country?

"The risk is there," Mr Orban rather surprisingly admits, though it is much smaller if Hungary is economically successful. He thinks that circumstances have changed. [Update: The office of the Prime Minister of Hungary has asked the Telegraph to clarify the reference to Vladimir Putin in this interview. Mr Orban intended to assent to there being a risk that he could come to seem like a Putin of Hungary, not actually to become one.]

For 200 years, the "No. 1 motivation" for Hungarians was to catch up with more competitive Westerners. Until the credit crisis, Mr Orban believed that this could only be achieved by the "ever-closer union" of Europe. Now he has his doubts.

The crisis shows that it is not obvious that the EU can do better than independent nations. Unlike the British, he cannot rule out joining the eurozone, because of its centripetal pull for a small country like his, "but I don't urge it. To stand alone on your own feet is more important than ever." Hungary certainly should not join until it reaches 90 per cent of the GDP of those already in, he believes; right now it is in the low sixties.

"As I get older [he is still only 50], I tend to be more sceptical. Values are more important than money. National sovereignty is more and more important in my mind. The question 'Who is governing us?' is the key question."

So he supports David Cameron's efforts to change the European rules: "We shall need a new basic treaty eventually." He wants to join Britain in resisting "the creeping movement of Brussels to eat up national sovereignty".

The old answer that everything Westerners did was better is now "stupid". In the 1980s, the question Hungarians faced was "how to get rid of things"—Communism, state oppression, overregulation. Now that should stop. There are things which should be upheld in the interests of civilisation, not jettisoned: "It would be a sad story to get rid of religious belief, national identity, family and even sexual identity. That's not freedom."

In some schools on the continent, the idea has got about that "children should not be brought up as girls or guys", but to choose their sexual identity later. "Sometimes there is a separate changing room for those who don't know who they are," he exclaims.

What does he say to accusations that he is stirring up old ethnic, territorial passions in

the region? Some blame him for the rise of the fascistic Jobbik party in Hungary. His answer is based on his belief that "Xenophobia is dangerous; but patriotism is a good thing". Ethnic disputes, often about land, are "a part of life in Eastern Europe", he says.

"How do we live with this?" he asks, "The solution is not to lie." Radicals of both left and right get about 15 per cent of the vote between them. That is too high for comfort, but "far away from being a majority".

At the heart of the problem in Europe, Mr Orban believes, is the fact that the Communists were never fully defeated. Communism as an ideology "has no message for our future", but, unlike Nazism, it prevailed for so long (40 years in Hungary's case) that its leaders, who "were not stupid guys" created a culture which maintained their power. They upheld envy "as a perception of life", making people "disagree with the world as it is and try to destroy it".

They also inculcated a belief in "entitlements without any personal effort". In Hungary, Communism brought about what he calls "a learned helplessness", a deliberate destruction of personal responsibility, which crushed the middle class.

We discuss the row here about Ed Miliband and his Marxist father. Without commenting on the Labour situation, Mr Orban says that there is a family tree passing from Communism through "the '68 generation" (such as the former revolutionary, now MEP, Daniel Cohn Bendit) to Brussels bureaucrats and the media today.

"The Communist heritage has a marriage with the radical liberals today. That genealogy exists in Europe." He detects it in the doctrine of European human rights and the attempts by the European Commission to impose cultural and constitutional uniformity on member states.

For conservatives, he goes on, this is difficult, because "we find we must argue, and conservatives generally prefer just to live. We are shy to invest the energy, but we must do so at a European level."

Personally, Viktor Orban is not shy. He is up for the fight. "Boxing is a noble sport," he declares pugnaciously. In the West, politics is often "just a career". For him, he says, it is much more. He remembers the hard times in the late 1980s when Fidesz, his then tiny party, was opposed by the Soviets, by trade unions, militias and the state apparatus. "We were surrounded, and we won. Compare the risk now—it's nothing. It's just a peanut."

REMEMBERING FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAJOR OWENS

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, for more than two decades, Congressman Major Owens served the citizens of Brooklyn, New York in the United States Congress. He was a humble man of great character and dedicated his life to public service. Congressman Owens was an extremely important member of the U.S. House of Representatives, who was an expert in education policy. In Congress, he fought to secure \$100 million in federal funds for historically black colleges and spearheaded efforts to increase federal involvement in reducing high school dropout rates.

Congressman Owens used his position within the halls of Congress and in the community to ensure that every American lived a better life. Congressman Owens provided leadership within the Congressional Black Caucus fighting for the rights of minorities in addition to advocating for workers and the poor and middle class families. Congressman Owens was also an advocate for disabled Americans playing an instrumental role in passing the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 in Congress.

It was an honor to serve with him as a colleague and a privilege to know him as a dear friend. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Maria and his family during this very difficult time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, for medical reasons, I was unable to be in Washington, D.C. for the roll call vote on H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted Aye. I've heard from manufacturers, workers, and farmers in Illinois about the importance of an efficient and modern water transportation system that allows them to move their products to market. Investing in our ports, waterways, and other water infrastructure is key to keeping our economy competitive and creating jobs and much needed economic growth. While not perfect, H.R. 3080 represents true bipartisan compromise that will allow us to move forward with reform that is long overdue.

EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE HOUSE ON THE DEATH AND RECOGNIZING THE EXTRAORDINARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO FLORIDA AND AMERICAN PUBLIC LIFE OF THE HONORABLE C.W. BILL YOUNG

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in proud support, and as an original co-sponsor of H. Res. 384, which expresses the condolences of the House on the death and recognizes the extraordinary contributions to our nation of Congressman C.W. Bill Young of Florida, who died last Friday, October 25, 2013.

I thank the bipartisan leadership of the House and the Chair and Ranking Member of the Veterans Affairs Committee for working together to expedite the consideration of this fitting tribute to one of the most beloved members to serve in this body.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 384 recognizes the extraordinary contributions of Bill Young to public life in Florida and the United States. It is both fitting and proper that the People's House pay this tribute to a pioneering and

path breaking man who devoted his life to serving the people.

Mr. Speaker, this happy moment stands in stark contrast to the sorrowful evening of October 18, 2013, when we learned that our dear friend and colleague, the great Bill Young, had lost his life.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Young was more than a great legislator. He was a good man. Virtually every member who served with Bill has a story about how the gentleman from Florida lent his ear or helping hand to help advance a critical project or further a legislative priority. I am no exception.

Earlier this year, Chairman Young worked with me to win inclusion in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act, of my amendment providing increased funding and support for medical research related to Triple Negative Breast Cancer. Chairman Young also helped me to raise \$10 million in increased funding to support work to assist service members suffering from Post Traumatic Stress Disorders (PTSD). This act of kindness on the part of Bill Young is changing lives in my congressional district, which is home to one of the nation's largest concentrations of veterans suffering from PTSD. Bill's compassion for our veterans and his colleagues knew no limits.

Bill Young was born December 16, 1930 in Harmarville, Pennsylvania. A flood washed away his home at age 6 where he lived with his single mother. An uncle had a hunting camp in Florida, so the family moved there when he was 16. Young dropped out of St. Petersburg High School to support his ill mother, Wilma M. (Hulings). He joined the Army National Guard and served from 1948 to 1957.

In 1960 Young was elected to the Florida Senate, where he served from 1961 to 1970, and was minority leader in that chamber from 1966 to 1970. Until 1963, Young was the only Republican Senator in Florida.

From 1999–2005, Congressman Young served as Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, overseeing the entire federal discretionary budget. In fact, the last time the United States had a balanced federal budget was under his Chairmanship.

Throughout his service on the Appropriations Committee, Young has been dedicated to improving the quality of life of the men and women who serve and who have served in the military. He regularly met with enlisted personnel and officers to assess their needs, and as a result, Congress has invested in improved base housing, better medical care, increased pay, and more modern equipment for the military.

Young has also been a leading advocate for increased biomedical research. During his Chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee, he successfully led the effort in Congress to double federal medical research funding over five years. He has likewise led the fight for federal funding for a variety of medical issues, including an increased immunization rate for preschoolers, improved public health programs nationwide, and cures for Parkinson's and Alzheimer's Diseases.

Throughout his career of public service, Young has been a strong advocate for the needs of Pinellas County. Among other issues, he has worked to ease congestion

along U.S. Highway 19; attract high-tech jobs to St. Petersburg; improve health care for low-income children and families; protect the neighboring MacDill Air Force Base; build a state of the art medical center for veterans at Bay Pines; ensure a steady supply of water for the Tampa Bay area; and offset the effects of erosion on the area's beaches.

For nearly two weeks Young had been hospitalized with back problems that stemmed from a 1970 small plane crash. Despite the circumstances, Congressman Young vowed to beat his illness and battled valiantly until the very last day, when he finished his journey on earth and ascended to the heavens.

Congressman Young was the longest serving Republican member of the House and respected by all who knew him. He served over 50 years in public office and worked with 8 presidents of the United States. His presence will be forever missed and we all mourn his loss and extend our deepest sympathies to his family and friends.

None of us who knew and admired Bill Young will ever forget him or the way he brightened the lives of all the people he served. He was one in a million and he will be deeply missed. He will never be replaced. He was an American original. He was my friend.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for

printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 24, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 29

Time to be announced

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine tackling diseases of aging, focusing on research collaboration.

SD-562

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet

To hold hearings to examine broadband adoption.

SR-253

OCTOBER 30

10 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 1562, to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, S. 1557, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals, S. 1561, to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve provisions relating to the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees, H.R. 2094, to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements), S. 1302, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans, H.R. 2747, to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of

Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title, and the nominations of Michael Keith Yudin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, and James Cole, Jr., of New York, to be General Counsel, both of the Department of Education, and Chai Rachel Feldblum, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and any pending nominations.

SD-430

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 1074, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Easter Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe, S. 1132, to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, S. 161, to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana.

SD-628

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of John B. Owens, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Matthew Frederick Leitman, Judith Ellen Levy, Laurie J. Michelson, and Linda Vivienne Parker, all to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, and Peter Joseph Kadzik, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SD-226

NOVEMBER 7

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the impact of sequestration on the national defense; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217, following the open session.

SD-G50

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, October 24, 2013

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 24, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAC THORNBERRY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Monsignor Stephen Rossetti, St. Luke Institute, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Good and gracious God, Your greatest desire is that we would love each other as You love us. You want us to be one in heart and mind and to treat each other with dignity.

In these days of conflict and division, home and abroad, give us the courage to love each other. Give us the wisdom to value each other. Give us the patience to listen to each other.

We do this only with Your help, with Your Spirit. Be with us now and be with us always. We make this prayer in Your holy Name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until noon, October 28, 2013, for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3374. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Allowability of Legal Costs for Whistleblower Proceedings (DFARS Case 2013-D022) (RIN: 0750-A104) received September 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3375. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Acquisitions in Support of Operations in Afghanistan (DFARS Case 2012-D009) (RIN: 0750-AH98) received September 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3376. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Enhancement of Contractor Employee Whistleblower Protections (DFARS Case 2013-D010) (RIN: 0750-AH97) received September 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3377. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility Rhode Island, Central Falls, City of, Providence County; [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8295] received September 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3378. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; New York: Annsville, Town of, Oneida County; [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8297] received September 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3379. A letter from the Director, Division of Regulations, Legislation, and Interpretation, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Application of the Fair Labor Standards Act to Domestic Service (RIN: 1235-AA05) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3380. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-192, "Commercial Driver's License Tests Amendment Act of

2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3381. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-193, "Tax Lien Compensation and Relief Reporting Temporary Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3382. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-194, "District Real Property Tax Sale Temporary Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3383. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-195, "Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Support Technical Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3384. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-196, "Board of Ethics and Government Accountability Establishment and Comprehensive Ethics Reform Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3385. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-197, "Visitor Parking Pass Preservation Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3386. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-206, "Medical Marijuana Cultivation Center Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3387. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-207, "Elected Attorney General Implementation and Legal Service Establishments Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3388. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-186, "Community Renewable Energy Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3389. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-187, "Smoking Restriction Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3390. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-188, "Bicycle Safety Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3391. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-189, "Personal Property Robbery Prevention Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3392. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-190, "Older Adult

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Driver Safety Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3393. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-191, "Veteran Status Driver's License Designation Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3394. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary — Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf — Adjustment of Service Fees [Docket ID: BSEE-2013-0007; 134E1700D2 EEAA103000 ETIEX0000.PEA000] (RIN: 1014-AA12) received October 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3395. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulations; Areas of the National Park System; Yellowstone National Park; Winter Use [NPS-IMR-YELL-13706] (RIN: 1024-AE15) received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3396. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulatory Reorganization; Administrative Changes to Regulations Due to the Consolidation of the Financial Management Service and the Bureau of the Public Debt into the Bureau of the Fiscal Service (RIN: 1510-AB31) received September 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3397. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determining the Amount of Taxes Paid for Purposes of the Foreign Tax Credit [TD 9634] (RIN: 1545-BK41) received September 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3398. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Uniform Late S Election Relief Revenue Procedure (Revenue Procedure 2013-30) received September 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. ELLMERS (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 3338. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide, because of problems relating to the operation of Exchanges, for a hardship exemption from the individual mandate for months of noncoverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3339. A bill to prohibit the use of funds by the Department of Education relating to multistate academic content standards; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3340. A bill to require use of amounts repaid to the Secretary of the Treasury by

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to reduce the national debt; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3341. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the consideration of costs and benefits during rule making and for the review of existing rules; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3342. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for health insurance coverage for the President through an Exchange in the same manner as for Members of Congress; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

141. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Resolution No. 18 supporting efforts to preserve and protect our freedoms especially preserving the Second Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

142. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Resolution No. 9 supporting an amendment to the Constitution to establish that corporations and unions are not entitled to the same rights and protections as natural persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

143. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Resolution No. 31 urging the Congress to enact legislation to revoke the policy of extending "trusted traveler" status under the Global Entry program to Saudi Arabian travelers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

144. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 urging the President and the Congress to find a comprehensive federal approach to reducing and preventing gun violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

145. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 8 urging the President and the Congress to take a comprehensive and workable approach to solving the nation's historically broken immigration system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

146. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 9 urging the Congress and the President to establish new entrepreneur and STEM-related visa categories for legal immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

147. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3 urging the President and the Congress to take a humane and just approach to solving our nation's broken immigration system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

148. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 7 supporting the Los Angeles Residential Helicopter Noise Relief Act of 2013; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

149. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of West Virginia,

relative to House Resolution No. 21 urging the Congress to protect the Social Security benefits that aid our most vulnerable citizens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 3338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 207: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 366: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 647: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 681: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1020: Mr. YODER and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1094: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1281: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1518: Mr. ROSS, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. BASS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1661: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1696: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1814: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mrs. WAGNER.

October 24, 2013

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE, Vol. 159, Pt. 11

16209

H.R. 2286: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2457: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2663: Ms. JENKINS.

H. Res. 301: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

55. The SPEAKER presented a petition of
Dan Marks, Hilo, HI, relative to a letter re-

garding methods for proposing amendments;
which was referred to the Committee on the
Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING 2013 FOUNDERS
AWARD RECIPIENT KATHERINE
HANLEY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my friend, mentor, and predecessor, Ms. Katherine Hanley, the former Providence District representative and Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, for being honored with the 2013 Founders Award from the Lorton Arts Foundation. Initiated in 2011, the Founders Award honors those who have made a significant impact on the Lorton Arts Foundation and the Workhouse Arts Center.

In 1910, the United States Government purchased 1,155 acres of rural property in southern Fairfax County for the yet to be built Lorton Correctional Facility. Over the next several years, the total acreage increased to more than 3,000 acres. This prison was originally a model of progressive incarceration; the Workhouse and Reformatory were designed to "rehabilitate and reform prisoners through fresh air, good food, and honest work," and programs integrated work, home, education, recreation, health, and religion. In pursuit of this mission to reform instead of purely punish, inmates raised beef and dairy cattle, hogs, poultry, vegetables, and fruit. Industry was a major activity, and the inmates made a variety of products and were trained to become electricians, mechanics, and plumbers. Initially, neither the Workhouse nor the Reformatory had walls, fences, cells, or locks.

In the 1920s and 1930s the original wooden structures were replaced by brick structures. Over the following decades, what had begun as a true reformatory had become an overcrowded, poorly managed facility. In 1995 more than 7,300 inmates were housed at the facility and the District of Columbia lacked the financial resources to continue its operation. The Federal Government assumed financial and administrative control of the prison, and in 1997 and 1998, legislation was passed to close Lorton Prison. The last prisoners were transferred from the facility in 2001.

As Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Kate led the county's effort to acquire and transform the former prison site. In 2002, through a unique collaboration between the Federal Government, Fairfax County, and private organizations, 2,324 acres of the former prison site was sold to Fairfax County. The transfer took place under Kate's leadership, and she, along with Mount Vernon District Supervisor Gerry Hyland, set in motion a comprehensive planning effort with the Laurel Hill Adaptive Reuse Citizens Task Force to create a new vision for the community. This multi-year exercise resulted in a rebirth for the former prison and surrounding community as

South County became one of the fastest growing sections of the county with the construction of thousands of new homes, retail and commercial space, a golf course, and three new schools.

A critical component of the reinvention of the region was the establishment of the Workhouse Arts Center. Established in 2008 by the Lorton Arts Foundation, The Workhouse has become the region's most distinctive cultural arts center, housing artist studios, galleries, a youth arts center, a theatre, and the Metropolitan School of the Arts, all in buildings that once had housed inmates. The Workhouse supports more than 100 professional and emerging artists, providing them affordable studios and galleries in which to exhibit their work. In addition to visual arts, the Workhouse Arts Center is home to performing arts, including theater, film, musical and dance performances. The Education Department offers more than 150 classes and workshops each quarter, in a broad spectrum of art disciplines. The Workhouse has also partnered with my office by creating a professional gallery exhibit of all artwork submitted as entries into the annual Congressional Arts Competition for the 11th District of Virginia.

The transformation of South County and the establishment of the Workhouse Arts Center would not have been possible without Kate's vision, persistence, creativity, and effectiveness. After serving as Chairman from 1995–2003, Kate accepted positions with the Commonwealth of Virginia, first on the Transportation Board and later as Secretary of the Commonwealth. I was honored to continue her work with the Workhouse Arts Center and the Lorton Arts Foundation when I succeeded her as Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating my friend Kate Hanley on receiving the 2013 Founders Award and in thanking her for her leadership and vision that led to the creation of the Lorton Arts Foundation and Workhouse Arts Center, which has become one of the great gems in the National Capital Region.

TRIBUTE TO GORDON AND JILL
MARTENS

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Gordon and Jill Martens of Van Meter, Iowa and to commend them on the momentous occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary.

Mr. and Mrs. Martens have been proud to call Dallas County home for their entire lives. Gordon and Jill both attended Van Meter High

School and began dating after graduation. On October 26th, 1963, Mr. and Mrs. Martens exchanged vows at Booneville United Methodist in Booneville, Iowa and began their lives together.

Together, Gordon, a veteran of the Iowa Air National Guard, and Jill, a Registered Nurse, raised two children, Daniel and Valerie, who have given them five grandchildren. They now reside in Van Meter after building a home in 2007 on the farm where Gordon was raised.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. Martens' lifelong commitments to each other, their family, and their state truly embody the values Iowans are renowned for and it is a great honor to represent them in the United States Congress. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating this wonderful couple on their 50th year of life together and I wish them many more years of happiness in the future.

RECOGNIZING JAMES M. "JIM"
SCOTT ON HIS RETIREMENT
AFTER FOUR DECADES OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague, Rep. JIM MORAN, to recognize and commend James M. "Jim" Scott on the occasion of his retirement after a distinguished career in public service to the residents of Fairfax County and the City of Falls Church. For more than 40 years, Jim has been a passionate advocate for our community on issues such as education, affordable housing, technology, health care, and transportation. He spent 14 years representing the Providence District on the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors and then 22 years representing the 53rd District in the Virginia House of Delegates.

Jim's true public service began in a local classroom, when he was a teacher for Fairfax County Public Schools. He taught at Edison High School among others before leaving the schools to take the lead on Fairfax County's anti-poverty efforts. In 1971, he was elected to the Board of Supervisors representing the Providence District, which encompassed the central part of the county. During his 14-year tenure on the Board, Jim played a central role in drafting the county's Human Rights Ordinance and launching the School Aged Child Care Program, which continues to provide safe, fun, and educational before- and after-school activities for local elementary school children.

During his tenure as Providence Supervisor, Jim took an active role in regional organizations, serving as chairman of the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission, member of

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

the Northern Virginia Planning District Commission (now known as the Northern Virginia Regional Commission), member of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (Metro) Board of Directors, chairman of the Metropolitan Washington Water Resources Planning Board, and president of the Virginia Association of Counties.

He also served on the Board of Directors for the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, which in 1985 recognized Jim with the Elizabeth and David Scull Award, the highest honor for regional service in the National Capital Region. Fairfax County also recognized Jim by creating the James M. Scott Community Spirit Award, which is presented annually as part of Celebrate Fairfax, the summertime fair he helped champion. Jim left the County Board in 1986 to become the director of community affairs for Inova Health System, the region's largest health care provider.

Throughout his career, Jim has served as an invaluable mentor and partner to a number of community leaders, including his successor in the Providence District, Katherine K. "Kate" Hanley, who was later elected chairman of the Board of Supervisors. I too was proud to follow in Jim and Kate's footsteps in Providence District when I first joined the Board in 1994 and then during my tenure as Chairman.

In 1992, Jim was elected to represent the 53rd District, which includes Merrifield and the City of Falls Church, in the Virginia House of Delegates. He won that first race by a single vote, earning him the moniker "Landslide Jim." He stayed true to his local government roots in the General Assembly, introducing legislation allowing cities and counties to implement affordable dwelling unit ordinances to increase the availability of low-cost and workforce housing.

During my tenure in Fairfax, Jim worked closely with us to advance the county's Affordable Housing Initiative and the 10-year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness. Working with the faith, nonprofit, and business communities, we have created a safety net to provide wrap around support services and move people off the streets into stable housing. Thanks to those ongoing efforts, Fairfax was one of the few metropolitan localities to see a decline in its homeless population during the Great Recession. In recognition of his tireless work in this field, Jim was named the Virginia Housing Coalition's Public Official of the Year in 1992, and he was inducted into the AHOME (Affordable Housing Opportunity Means Everyone) Hall of Fame last year.

In addition to those accomplishments, Jim worked closely with the local Northern Virginia business community. He introduced the legislation that created the office of Secretary of Technology in the Commonwealth of Virginia. More recently, he worked with me, Rep. MORAN, and our colleague, Rep. FRANK WOLF, on both federal and state legislation to facilitate the increased use of telework. Our bill, the Telework Enhancement Act, was signed into law in 2010 and federal agencies continue to expand their use of telework and mobile work strategies.

In announcing his intention earlier this year to retire, Jim cited the passage of the bipartisan transportation funding bill by the General Assembly. The long-sought infusion of new

funding for the regional and state transportation network is something Jim and his colleagues have been working on for the past decade.

Mr. Speaker, Jim Scott's commitment to our community will be sorely missed and he leaves behind a legacy that will enrich our community for generations to come. On a personal note, he has been not only a mentor but also a wonderful friend, and I have admired his graciousness and his knack for avoiding the spotlight to focus on getting things done. His career in public service is truly commendable and deserving of our heartfelt gratitude. On behalf of myself and Rep. MORAN, we wish Jim, his wife, Nancy, and their family the best of luck in this well-deserved retirement, and I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in expressing our appreciation for his commitment and service to this community and our nation.

RECOGNIZING THE HUMBOLDT COUNTY FARM BUREAU ON THE OCCASION OF THE CENTENNIAL YEAR

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 2013

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to recognize the Humboldt County Farm Bureau on the occasion of their centennial year.

One hundred years ago, in July of 1913, the Humboldt County Farm Bureau was established as a center for local farmers and ranchers to exchange information and industry practices. The oldest Farm Bureau in the State of California and the second oldest in the nation, it is a membership-based, grass-roots organization dedicated to promoting and preserving agriculture in Humboldt County.

The establishment of the Humboldt County Farm Bureau provided the opportunity to host a Farm Advisor from the University of California, a position that changed many of the agricultural practices and provided scientific research to improve production in the county. With the development of the UC Extension Office also came the 4-H Program, and in both cases Humboldt's were the first in California.

The Farm Bureau is Humboldt County's single largest general agricultural organization representing and supporting all aspects of agriculture from dairy to timber, cattle, produce, oysters, wineries, and the floral industry. A non-profit organization working towards positive solutions to the problems faced by farming and rural communities, it collaborates with other local, county, and state agriculture organizations to promote and protect family farms and develop better methods and practices in farming and management.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Humboldt County Farm Bureau on their centennial anniversary and ask my colleagues and the North Coast community to join me in wishing them all the best for another 100 years.

COMMEMORATING THE 102ND ANNIVERSARY OF TAIWAN'S DOUBLE TEN NATIONAL DAY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Taiwan, it is my pleasure to congratulate Taiwan on the recent 102nd anniversary of its Double Ten National Day.

A vibrant democracy and dynamic economy in Taiwan foster a strengthened society that values the benefits that come with a wide exchange of goods, services, and ideas. America's rebalance to Asia highlights the importance of close diplomatic ties, strengthened economic relationships, and continued engagement with our neighbors in the region. The United States is both an Atlantic and a Pacific nation. We are pleased and proud to have a friend and ally in Taiwan.

Recently, Taiwan pledged to buy 62.5 million bushels of U.S. wheat, committed to developing exchange programs and joint research projects with the Thurgood Marshall College Fund, and declared its strong interest in joining the Trans-Pacific Partnership, once again demonstrating the advantages of strong ties between the United States and Taiwan.

The United States also has demonstrated its commitment to Taiwan. In July, President Obama signed a law which directs the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly. In August, the House Committee of Foreign Affairs passed the Taiwan Policy Act of 2013 which again expresses support for Taiwan and provides for continued political, economic, and security assistance.

It is an honor to serve as co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Taiwan and celebrate the thriving democracy in Taiwan. I ask my colleagues to rise and join me in congratulating Taiwan on this anniversary of its Double Ten National Day.

RECOGNIZING MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, mental health is a core part of our overall wellness. A commitment to a positive state of mental health is an essential part of keeping happy and healthy. I applaud the efforts of our nation's mental health advocates who are working hard to promote National Mental Health Awareness Week. Serious emotional and mental health disorders are real and treatable—and awareness is what makes that treatment possible.

Our need to address mental health affects every family. There are so many individuals deeply in distress who need someone to reach out to them. That is why I am a proud member of the Congressional Mental Health Caucus, a

bi-partisan caucus dedicated to promoting education and awareness of mental health issues. We here in Congress need to do our part to reduce the stigma surrounding those who are suffering, as well as increasing the availability of mental health services to people who need them.

However, real mental health care starts at home. There are tragic losses that may never have occurred, if certain individuals had better resources to improving their mental health. If friends and families were better able to recognize symptoms of mental distress and act to help their loved ones in need, we could prevent certain incidents that cause great harm to the individual and to the society-at-large. The support of one's community can be paramount in helping to improve the mental health of our nation.

I commend the outstanding work of our community organizations in addressing this problem. Organizations such as the Union Settlement Association, and their Johnson Counseling Center have served the Harlem area since 1895 and promote treatment and awareness for New Yorkers suffering from psychological distress. Other groups such as the New York State Coalition for Children's Mental Health Services, the New York Mental Health Assessment Partnership, and the Children's Aid Society can all serve as models to us for the future. I encourage everyone to support such groups' efforts so that they can better serve our communities, and do away with any stigma attached to acknowledging a disorder and seeking help.

COMMEMORATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF INFANT TODDLER FAMILY DAY CARE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 30th Anniversary of Infant Toddler Family Day Care. Founded in 1983 by Phyllis Cassell and Ilene Hoffman, Infant Toddler Family Day Care (ITFDC) is now run by Phyllis's daughter, Wynne Busman. This 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation serves the early education needs of parents and children throughout Northern Virginia. ITFDC connects families with licensed professional early child care educators who provide high quality family child care in private home settings.

This network of caregivers and educators is committed to the principle that learning begins at birth and the understanding that experiences in the first years of a child's life strongly influence their development into productive, well-adjusted adults. The ITFDC model pro-

motes the development of long term relationships between the caregivers and the children in each small, mixed age group, greatly benefiting each child. This environment nurtures the cognitive, emotional, and social skills necessary for school and beyond.

ITFDC has also committed itself to raising the standards of professionalism for the early child care and education workforce. It encourages teachers to pursue the Career Studies Certificate and/or the Child Development Associate credential and provides guidance to those who seek to open their own licensed child care businesses. Some providers in the ITFDC network participate in the USDA Child Care Food Program which helps make sure children in need receive the healthy meals they need to be ready to learn. Finally, through the Navy/Marine Respite Program, ITFDC administers professional respite care services to Navy and Marine Corps families who need critical time to schedule appointments, meet other obligations they have or take a break knowing their children with special medical or behavioral needs are being cared for by trained providers.

ITFDC's longevity is a testament to the effectiveness of its philosophy and its programs, and to its first-rate reputation among parents and educators.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating ITFDC on 30 years of success and thanking the many caregivers who have participated in its programs years for their efforts in caring for our most precious resource.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 2013

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was absent due to the passing of a close friend and was not present for rollcall votes on Wednesday, October 23, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner:

Ordering the Previous Question—H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013: "no."

H. Res. 385, Rule Providing Consideration of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013: "no."

Amendments to H.R. 3080—No. 2. Reps. PETER A. DEFazio, EARL BLUMENAUER, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, et al.: "yes"; No. 3. Rep. BILL FLORES: "no"; #6. Rep. ALCEE L. HASTINGS: "no"; and No. 16. Reps. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND and STEVE SCALISE: "no."

Final Passage of H.R. 3080—The Water Resources Reform and Development Act: "yes."

Journal Vote: "yes."

COMMEMORATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOREAN WAR ARMISTICE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Korean War Armistice and to thank the men and women who served in uniform, as well as commend the members of the Korean War Veterans Association and the National Unification Advisory Council (Washington Chapter) for their efforts on behalf of the veterans of the Korean war and their families.

More than 1.7 million Americans served in Korea during the 3-year war and more than 44,000 never returned home. Racial integration efforts in the U.S. military began during the Korean war, where more than 100,000 African Americans fought in integrated units for the first time. Twenty-one other countries from the United Nations also supplied assistance to the war on the Korean Peninsula. South Korea reported some 373,599 civilian and 137,899 military deaths by the time peace finally came on July 27, 1953. On behalf of the 11th Congressional District of Virginia, I thank the men and women who served honorably in uniform during the Korean war for their service and sacrifice.

The Korean War Veterans Association (KWVA) has dedicated itself to educating Americans about this war and honoring those who served. Two local KWVA chapters have been recognized by the National Unification Advisory Council (Washington Chapter) for their ongoing efforts in these areas. The Northern Virginia Chapter of KWVA (Chapter 100) has been honored for its "Benevolent" program that seeks to help Korean war veterans and their families, as well as for its "Tell America" program that teaches school children about the Korean war. The Col. William E. Weber Chapter (Chapter 142) has earned recognition for its contributions to the upkeep of the Korean War Memorial and its work on the Frederick County Veterans History Project. I congratulate each of these Chapters for receiving these honors.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring all those who served in Korea and in commemorating the 60th anniversary of that war's end. I also commend the National Unification Advisory Council (Washington Chapter) and the Korean War Veterans Association for their efforts on behalf of the veterans of the Korean war, their families, and our community.

SENATE—Monday, October 28, 2013

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we have heard with our own ears and seen with our own eyes Your great power on our behalf. Lord, our ancestors told us about You, how You kept them from disgrace, drove out evil, delivered them from shackles, rescued them from trouble, protected them from hardships, and kept this Nation free. We praise You for using our lawmakers for Your glory. Accept our thanksgiving as we press toward the future, eager to serve Your purposes for our lives in this generation.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 4:30 this afternoon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

At 4:30 p.m. the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., to be general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 4 years. At 5:30 p.m. there will be a cloture vote.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I ask unanimous consent the time until 4 p.m. be for debate only.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UPCOMING WORK PERIOD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I welcome back the President pro tempore. I hope he had a productive week in Vermont, and that all my colleagues enjoyed visiting with constituents at home.

This work period is going to be 4 weeks long. We have a great deal to ac-

complish during this 4-week period and it will go by quickly. We are attempting to work things out so we don't have to work during the holidays for a change. The last several years we have been stuck up to Thanksgiving and right through Christmas on a couple of occasions.

It is obvious Senators aren't making these Monday votes a priority. We have a lot of people not showing up. So everyone should understand, this vote tonight is a very important vote. I am disappointed some Senators aren't going to be here. But in the future the next Mondays we can be expecting a vote or series of votes. I think we have become very complacent and not worrying about the Monday night votes. We will have some votes that may be more meaningful, as this one is.

During this next work period, the only time we will have off will be November 11 for the celebration of Veterans Day. Therefore, if we are going to finish our work in this 4-week period, that means we are going to have to work on Mondays and Fridays. I hope we don't have to work weekends, but we have to get this work done.

(Mr. KAINÉ assumed the Chair.)

SENATOR-ELECT CORY BOOKER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this week we are going to say goodbye to our colleague who was appointed to represent the State of New Jersey after the untimely death of Frank Lautenberg, but we also will welcome a new Member to the Senate, Senator-elect from the State of New Jersey CORY BOOKER. What a remarkable young man he is.

He was a student at Stanford, and to get into Stanford you have to be a very good student. I am impressed with his academic skills, but he was also a tight end for the football team at Stanford, No. 5 in the Nation. They have a great football program. Everyone will meet CORY BOOKER and find that he is a very big man physically.

After graduating with a degree from Stanford in political science, he got his master's degree in sociology from Stanford. He then became a Rhodes Scholar and studied U.S. history at Oxford. He received his law degree from Yale. What an outstanding record: Stanford, a couple of degrees; Rhodes Scholar, Oxford; Yale Law School. That is quite impressive. Then he served on the Newark City Council and was mayor for 2 years, a job that has been noticed all over the country, recognizing the great work he has done.

THE WORK AHEAD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, during this 4-week period we are going to do a number of things, not necessarily in this order, but we are going to consider ENDA, known as the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, which would provide basic protections against workplace discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. We haven't taken this up for a number of years. We tried and failed in the House of Representatives before, but we are going to take it up here again.

We are going to consider a bipartisan bill to make compounding drugs safer. As we will recall, there was a terrible tragedy in the Northeast, where a number of people died as a result of not compounding these products properly. This bipartisan legislation will allow us to have safer compounding drugs and track prescription medicines from factory to the drug store.

We are going to consider job creation legislation that will build on the economic recovery and strengthen middle-class families, and we are going to take up the Defense authorization bill which supports our troops and ensures this Nation does everything in its power to keep America safe from those who would do us harm.

Before we debate any of these matters, we must consider a number of vital Presidential nominations, including several that have been stalled for more than 1 year. One of those is somebody who has been wanting to work in the Defense Department, something vitally important for the Pentagon, and has been held up for 1 year on an unrelated matter. It is too bad, but this has been held up by one Republican Senator. So we are going to move forward and do it very quickly.

It is no secret the Republicans have systemically slow-walked and blocked scores of President Obama's judicial and executive branch nominations. Pending executive nominations wait an average of 5 months. Democrats have broken filibusters of 66 of the President's nominations. Republicans have blocked or delayed more than that with secret holds and procedural holds.

As a Senate, we reached an agreement the first of the year to consider a number of important nominations that have been stalled for months and, in far too many cases, for years. But obstructionism once again has reared its ugly head and we have a backlog now. It is time to move forward without delay and fill those crucial roles.

In the wake of a Republican government shutdown, the Nation is watching for a sign the Senate can function efficiently and normally. It is time to

show the American people how well and how quickly the Senate can work when cooperation is present. Likewise, our colleagues in the House of Representatives owe the American people to stop wasting time on political show votes and start legislating.

I have enough trouble with my schedule, but I just have to briefly comment on the House schedule. They are going to work until noon on Wednesday and then they are taking off the next 10 days. From now until the first of the year, they have scheduled 18 working days. That is all I will say on that.

Our colleagues in the House owe it to the American people to move forward on legislation. On many of the most important issues of the day, the Republican leaders have refused to allow the House of Representatives to be heard. Some are allowed to be heard, but Speaker BOEHNER has a rule that Democrats don't get to participate unless he can first prove there is a majority of the majority to vote on an issue. That is not the way it needs to be.

We are going to have a celebration here tomorrow on the life of Tom Foley. I had the good fortune of serving with him in the House. He came from a real conservative district in the State of Washington. He served for many years. He was the majority leader, he was the Speaker and a fine man. He, similar to the other leaders I served with, O'Neill and Wright, tried to get 218 votes to pass a measure. They didn't try to get 218 from the Democrats. They had plenty of Democrats and could have done that. But everyone was allowed to vote. That is the way it should be now. It is too bad it isn't. What has happened over there is the Republican leadership has refused to allow the whole House of Representatives to work its will.

Immigration reform is one of the most glaring examples of their not allowing the body to run as it used to. Last June the Senate passed a commonsense bipartisan bill to fix the broken illegal immigration system. It would have strengthened our borders, required undocumented people to get right with the law, and put them on a path to citizenship. There are about 11 million people. But for 4 months—120-plus days—the House of Representatives has failed to act on immigration legislation. If we brought up a bill, the Senate bill would pass overwhelmingly. Even many mainstream Republicans believe House Republican leadership should allow a vote on the comprehensive plan to amend the broken immigration system. I repeat, if the whole House were allowed to vote, it would pass.

The House also failed to take up the Senate's bipartisan agricultural jobs bill—the farm bill, as we call it—a bill that cuts the debt by \$23 billion and supports 16 million American jobs. They have also refused to bring up something so common sense.

The Presiding Officer, before coming here, was Governor of the State of Virginia. I am sure the Presiding Officer, as I have, has gone through towns and neighborhoods and seen those little strip malls with all these places for lease. If we passed in Congress, as we have done in the Senate, the so-called Workplace Fairness Act, it would allow these small businesses to get back and rent space allowing it to survive. Think of the advantages online retailers have. They don't have to pay 5 percent, 7 percent of what the others pay. So it is very unfair for these brick-and-mortar places to be left to the mercy of these big online folks.

When we brought up this bill, I got a call from one of the major online organizations. They said: We will support your legislation if you will put a ceiling that we don't have to do anything until there is \$5 million in sales. They want \$5 million in sales and then pay no sales tax—a pretty good deal. We passed—rightfully so—a bipartisan bill. The House will not take this up. It is too bad.

So on these and other issues, it is time for reasonable Republicans to raise their voice in the Senate and of course in the House of Representatives.

There has been a troubling trend over the last 3 years. I have been troubled to watch these so-called mainstream Republicans be marginalized by Members of their own party. It is not the marginal people who are being marginalized. It is the mainstream Republicans. Even more troubling, moderate Republicans have been complicit in allowing this disturbing trend to continue. It is no surprise when tea party extremists force our economy to the brink of disaster when they shut down the government for the sake of ideological stunts. We saw what happened. We weren't surprised that the tea party did this, but I was surprised that the sensible mainstream Republicans didn't speak up—and speak up sooner—and many didn't speak up at all in defense of reason and responsibility.

Think about that. There are 232 Republicans in the House of Representatives. On a vote to open the government after 16 days of being closed and defaulting on the debt, only 85 of the 232 voted to reopen the government and keep us from defaulting on our debt. That is a scary number. So the vast majority of the Republicans in the House wanted to keep the government closed and to default on the debt.

Wow, that is spooky.

As their more radical colleagues drove the nation and the world to the brink of economic collapse, most middle-of-the-road Republicans said nothing and did nothing to stop it, which was certainly a surprise to me. Although I deplore the behavior of the extremists who sparked this month's manufactured crisis—and many of the

crises over the past 3 years—I do not blame only them for holding the United States Government's full faith and credit hostage. I also blame the so-called main stream Republican colleagues who remained silent even as these anarchists among us committed political malpractice. They knew better. They should have known better. They know the consequence of default, and they know the cost of a government shutdown. Yet they allowed members of their own party to take the country down a dangerous road, doing irreparable harm to the country and, I believe, to the Republican Party.

As a conference committee sits down to negotiate a long-term budget agreement and sets a course for fiscal responsibility, reasonable and moderate Republicans, main stream Republicans, must not absent themselves from these discussions. A significant number of radical Republicans have said they would rather risk default than cooperate or compromise with Democrats. Sensible Republicans must not allow these radicals to rule the day.

We, the Democrats, are ready to do the difficult work of finding common ground for the good of our country. We don't expect radical tea party Republicans to join us, but we do hope our mainstream Republican colleagues will find their voices, reclaim their party, and work with Democrats to govern once again.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce the business of the day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 4:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each and with debate only until 4 p.m.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ALAN F. ESTEVEZ TO BE A PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 53.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Alan F. Estevez, of the District of Columbia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Alan F. Estevez, of the District of Columbia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

Harry Reid, Carl Levin, Robert Menendez, Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Christopher A. Coons, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher Murphy, Patty Murray, Tom Harkin, John D. Rockefeller IV, Bill Nelson, Benjamin L. Cardin.

Mr. REID. I ask consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF KATHERINE ARCHULETA TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 307.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Katherine Archuleta, of Colorado, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Katherine Archuleta, of Colorado, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

Harry Reid, Bill Nelson, Barbara A. Mikulski, Patty Murray, Barbara Boxer, Bernard Sanders, Amy Klobuchar, Carl Levin, Thomas R. Carper, Jr., Tim Johnson, Patrick J. Leahy, Max Baucus, Robert Menendez, Richard J. Durbin, John D. Rockefeller IV, Tim Kaine, Mazie Hirono.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF THOMAS EDGAR WHEELER TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 242.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas Edgar Wheeler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Thomas Edgar Wheeler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Debbie Stabenow, Richard J. Durbin, John D. Rockefeller IV, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jon Tester, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mark R. Warner, Patty Murray, Mazie K. Hirono, Angus S. King, Jr., Barbara

Boxer, Jeanne Shaheen, Robert Menendez, Bill Nelson, Richard Blumenthal.

Mr. REID. I ask consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JACOB J. LEW TO BE UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 63.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jacob J. Lew, of New York, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund; United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; United States Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank; United States Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jacob J. Lew, of New York, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund; United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; United States Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank; and United States Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Harry Reid, Robert Menendez, Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard

Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Christopher A. Coons, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher Murphy, Patty Murray, Tom Harkin, Carl Levin, John D. Rockefeller IV, Bill Nelson, Benjamin L. Cardin.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MELVIN L. WATT TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

Mr. REID. Madam President, with your permission I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 209.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Melvin L. Watt, of North Carolina, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Melvin L. Watt, of North Carolina, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

Harry Reid, Tim Johnson, Mark Begich, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Martin Heinrich, Patty Murray, Bernard Sanders, Jeanne Shaheen, Benjamin L. Cardin, Al Franken, Sherrod Brown, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Thomas R. Carper, Sheldon Whitehouse, Bill Nelson, Charles E. Schumer.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF PATRICIA ANN MILLETT TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 327.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Patricia Ann Millett, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Patricia Ann Millett, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, John D. Rockefeller IV, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jon Tester, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mark R. Warner, Patty Murray, Mazie Hirono, Angus S. King, Jr., Barbara Boxer, Jeanne Shaheen, Robert Menendez, Bill Nelson, Debbie Stabenow, Richard Blumenthal.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the cloture vote

scheduled 5:30 p.m. today occur on Tuesday at a time to be determined by me in consultation with Senator McConnell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, so that everyone knows, we have a number of Senators who are not going to be here tonight, five that I know of—Democrats and Republicans. We have a lot of people who went through a lot of trouble to be here for this vote. I want everyone to know that if we continue having votes on Monday—and obviously people think they are not very important so they wind up not coming—they are going to start missing really important votes. I will schedule more than one vote, and it is not right that we have a few people who make it very difficult for everyone.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each and that the time be for debate only until 7 p.m. There will be no roll call votes tonight. I announced that earlier. There will be no roll call votes tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is so noted.

The Senator from Tennessee.

(The remarks of Mr. ALEXANDER pertaining to the introduction of S. 1590 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GRIFFIN NOMINATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, tomorrow, according to the statement made by the majority leader, we will be voting on the nomination of Richard Griffin, Jr. for General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

I will be voting against Mr. Griffin's nomination for general counsel because

I am concerned about the direction of the NLRB as an advocate more than an umpire, and I do not believe his presence as the general counsel will improve that situation.

As the senior Republican on the Labor Committee, working with my friend, the chairman, Senator HARKIN, and with others, what I hope we can do over the next several years is look for a long-term solution for the restructuring of the National Labor Relations Board—one that will ensure that it will operate more as an umpire than as an advocate, whether the President is a Democrat or a Republican.

The Board has become far too politicized under recent administrations. This did not start with the Obama administration, but it has gotten worse with this administration, and it has moved more and more toward the side of union advocacy with such major shifts as ambush elections, micro-unions, and undermining State right-to-work laws.

Swinging back and forth on important labor policy issues does the American working man and woman no good in this time of underemployment and unemployment.

So, later this fall, I will join other Senators in introducing legislation that will restore balance to the National Labor Relations Board—a proposal that will retain the rights of workers and employees, but reduce the swing that occurs from administration to administration based upon who is in power. What we should be striving for is fairness and consistency.

There are exceptions, of course, but as a general proposition, I believe a President should have an up-or-down vote on his nominee, so I intend to vote for cloture. But Mr. Griffin's nomination does not do enough for me to show the promise of moving the Board from advocacy toward umpire and, therefore, I do not intend to vote to confirm his nomination.

I thank the Presiding Officer and I thank Senator HARKIN for his courtesy in allowing me to go first.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, again, I want to thank my colleague and good friend Senator ALEXANDER for a great working relationship on our committee. Obviously, we have differences of views and opinions on matters—that is the nature of legislation and this body—but we have always worked together in a very conciliatory fashion, and open, and working things out. So I appreciate his approach and the fact that the Senator is willing to give us cloture so we can get an up-or-down vote. I understand he has certain reservations about the nominee. I understand that. But, again, I thank my colleague for being willing to get us to the point where we can have an up-or-down vote on Mr. Griffin.

Madam President, tomorrow—we were going to vote today, but the leader came out and announced there was an agreement on both sides to put the vote off until tomorrow to consider the nomination of Mr. Richard Griffin to serve as General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, a very important role as the top prosecutor for violations of this country's labor laws.

Given his depth of experience and knowledge of the act, Mr. Griffin is exceptionally well qualified for this position, and I have no doubt he will do an outstanding job of enforcing our Nation's labor laws for workers, unions, and employers.

In July, we confirmed five new NLRB members, preventing the agency from shutting down, giving it a full slate of members for the first time in a decade. With a fully functional five-member Board and a new Senate-confirmed General Counsel, it is my hope we can provide this important agency with some much-needed certainty, mark a new positive chapter for the NLRB, and finally put an end to the delay and obstruction that has recently become all too familiar every time a new NLRB nominee is appointed. Without relitigating the previous controversies, I think it is fair to say that over the past few years the NLRB has been the target of unnecessary political attacks and obstruction.

What most concerns me about this political game-playing is how it affects the everyday lives of working people across America. These attacks on the Board have had real consequences for real people.

Working Americans need and deserve a fully functioning agency to protect their rights and enforce our Nation's labor laws. That is why over 75 years ago Congress enacted the National Labor Relations Act, guaranteeing American workers the right to form and join a union and to bargain for a better life. For both union and non-union workers alike, the act provides essential protections. It gives workers a voice in the workplace. It allows them to join together and speak up for fair wages, good benefits, and safe working conditions. These rights ensure that the people who do the real work in this country see the benefits when our economy grows and are not mistreated or put at risk on the job.

The National Labor Relations Board is the guardian of these fundamental rights. Workers themselves cannot enforce the National Labor Relations Act. The Board is the only place workers can go if they have been treated unfairly and denied the basic protections the law provides. Thus, the Board plays a vital role in vindicating workers' rights. In the past 10 years, the NLRB has secured opportunities for reinstatement for 22,544 employees who were unjustly fired. It has also recovered more

than \$1 billion on behalf of workers whose rights were violated.

I know many times people think: Well, a lot of these old abuses of workers whom you read about in your history books—well, that is just history and we have gotten over that. Quite frankly, I wish that were the truth. But the fact that in 10 years 22,544 employees were reinstated because they were unjustly fired indicates there are still unfair labor practices being committed by businesses today. And \$1 billion recovered on behalf of workers just in the last 10 years—that is \$1 billion that unscrupulous companies took from their workers without the right to do so, and the NLRB got that money back for workers. Think about that: \$1 billion.

The Board does not just protect the rights of workers and unions; it also provides relief and remedies to our Nation's employers, our businesses. The Board is an employer's only recourse if a union commences a wildcat strike, for example, or refuses to bargain in good faith during negotiations. By preventing labor disputes that could disrupt our economy, the work the Board does is vital to every worker and every business across the Nation.

Further, the NLRB, you have to understand, is divided into two independent sides. There is the Board side, which adjudicates and interprets the law; then there is the General Counsel side, which investigates filed charges, prosecutes violations, and generally supervises the processing of cases. The general counsel position is important because the NLRB receives about 20,000 to 30,000 charges per year from employees, unions, and employers, and it is the primary function of the general counsel to make sure these charges—each charge—are thoroughly investigated and prosecuted if they are determined to have merit.

The general counsel also serves an important role that some of my colleagues may not know about. The attorneys in the General Counsel's Office help facilitate settlements to resolve disputes efficiently. For example, when two unions picketed Walmart in 2012, Walmart filed a claim with the NLRB, and the agency negotiated a settlement. Indeed, settlements are not the exception at the NLRB but the rule, and they are encouraged. In fact, over 90 percent of meritorious unfair labor practice cases are settled by agreement, either through a Board settlement or a private agreement by the two sides.

Now that I have discussed the importance of the NLRB in protecting rights and the role the General Counsel plays at that agency, I want to turn the page and talk about Mr. Griffin, the nominee who is before us now to be the General Counsel, and I want to again indicate why I strongly support his nomination.

Richard Griffin has a wealth of experience as a labor lawyer. He is deeply steeped in labor and employment law. He most recently served as an NLRB board member himself from January 2012 until this past August. Prior to that, Mr. Griffin was general counsel for the International Union of Operating Engineers for more than 17 years. Mr. Griffin actually began his legal career over 30 years ago at the NLRB as a counsel to Board members.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have agreed that Dick Griffin is well qualified to serve as general counsel—indeed, I think his expertise in labor law is difficult to question—but some of my friends on the Republican side continue to oppose his nomination because of an outstanding legal issue that has nothing to do with Mr. Griffin's previous public service, his background, or his ability to function in this new position.

Here is what this is all about: Much has been made about the process by which Mr. Griffin was previously recess appointed to serve as a Board member. The controversy began when the District of Columbia Circuit Court issued a ruling in a case which is called the Noel Canning case that diverged from the decisions of three other courts of appeals—the Second Circuit, the Ninth Circuit, and the Eleventh Circuit—and my friends on the Republican side are questioning the validity of an appointment process that has been in place for over 220 years. And that was the decision in the Noel Canning case. Subsequently, two other appeals courts have addressed this issue. The Supreme Court is set to resolve the legal issue once and for all during this session of the Supreme Court.

Again, to sum it up, we have different circuit courts deciding differently on an appointment process that any President uses to fill recess appointments. This litigation is still pending. The legal question remains unresolved until the Supreme Court decides it. But a number of my colleagues during that period when we had different circuit courts deciding differently on this appointment issue called for Mr. Griffin to resign his position on the Board, even though he had done nothing personally wrong and he had taken an oath of office to fulfill his duties.

I believe that request from my Republican colleagues was unreasonable. There was clear precedent at the Board for Mr. Griffin to continue to serve until the final legal matter was ultimately resolved. When there is a split among the circuit courts of appeals, the NLRB has a longstanding history of waiting until the legal question is resolved by the Supreme Court before they take action, particularly when the issue involves the Board's operability.

The situation that was facing the Board after this Noel Canning case is

directly parallel to a circumstance by the Board a few years ago when the Board only had two members—only had two members. The D.C. Circuit ruled in a case called the Laurel Baye case that the two-member Board lacked a quorum to do business. Even after the D.C. Circuit's decision, the two-member Board, one Republican, one Democrat, continued to hear and issue cases until the Supreme Court ruled on the question.

Not a single Republican Senator called on either one of those two Board members to resign simply because they refused to acquiesce to the decision of the D.C. Circuit. So here is what happened. Mr. Griffin and his fellow recess appointee Sharon Block acted appropriately in following this direct precedent and continuing to serve on the Board until the Supreme Court addressed the validity of their recess appointments.

To argue that Mr. Griffin's decision to uphold his oath of office and follow the Board's prior practice, that somehow that makes him unqualified to now serve as the Board's General Counsel is, quite frankly, a position I think is not only disappointing but I think without substance.

In addition to this questionable objection, Republicans also continue to claim that recent NLRB nominees, including Mr. Griffin, are unacceptable simply because they have worked on behalf of workers or unions and support our system of collective bargaining.

These nominees have been accused of being biased and unfit to serve. But now I want to point out what the law actually says. Keep in mind, when Board members, as well as general counsel, are appointed to the Board and we confirm them, they take an oath of office to uphold the law. So it is kind of interesting to note what the law actually says that they are sworn by oath to uphold.

I have often quoted from the National Labor Relations Act on this point. I will do so again. Here is what the law says, the National Labor Relations Act—the law that Board members and eventually Mr. Griffin, if he is confirmed—and I believe he will be—will take an oath of office to uphold. Here is the law. I will quote it exactly as it is written:

It is declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection.

Those are the exact words. That is what the law says. The purpose and the

policy is to promote collective bargaining, to promote collective bargaining and freedom of association, protecting workers and their rights of self-organization, the designation of representatives of their own choosing. That is what the law says.

I think the fact that Mr. Griffin takes that purpose seriously makes him more qualified, not less qualified, to serve as general counsel. His past career is not cause for concern. Most labor lawyers devote their careers either to representing workers and unions or the management. That is the nature of practicing labor and employment law.

We have confirmed NLRB nominees in the past, some of whom have been union side and some have been management side. We have done so without substantial controversy. The fact that Mr. Griffin happens to come from the union side practice does not make him inherently biased. For years, Republican and Democratic Presidents have appointed promanagement attorneys to fill positions at the NLRB.

There is even the one example of where a Board member came directly from an in-house position at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. But I do not hear anyone on the Republican side accusing those nominees of bias. I guess it is only when you represent labor unions that you are biased, not when you represent the Chamber of Commerce.

I would also like to point out that while I certainly have not agreed with the politics or ideology of every past NLRB nominee, I voted to support Republican nominees, such as Phillip Miscimarra and Harry Johnson, who are on the Board now, not because I agreed with them but because, given their experience and their diverse backgrounds, they were qualified to serve. They were qualified, as is Mr. Griffin, eminently well qualified.

Board members can and do separate their past work as an advocate from their work as a neutral interpreter of the act once they are confirmed. I am absolutely sure Mr. Griffin will do the same if confirmed as General Counsel. I have every confidence that Mr. Griffin will be, in the words of one of the current Board members, not pronoun, not proworker, not promanagement, but pro-act, pro-Labor Relations Act or put maybe more succinctly prolaw, prolaw enforcement.

With this in mind, and for all of the reasons I have mentioned, I urge all of my colleagues, my Republican colleagues, to consider voting for Mr. Griffin because he deserves a strong bipartisan vote.

As I stated earlier, I voted for Republican members. When we had Board members earlier this year, in July if I am not mistaken, in July of this year, Democrats voted for the two Republican nominees, again not because we

agreed with them ideologically, maybe where they were coming from, but they were qualified to serve.

Yet when we have nominees with whom the Republicans are opposed ideologically, even though they are well qualified, Republicans vote no. Think about that. When we have nominees to the National Labor Relations Board, whom the Republicans support, to whom we may be opposed ideologically but they are qualified, we vote for them. Democrats vote for them. When we have nominees to the National Labor Relations Board who are well qualified but whom the Republicans disagree with ideologically, they vote against them—quite a difference.

Now is the time to start breaking that down. It did not used to be this way. It never was this way in the past. If they were qualified under a Republican President, we would support them; a Democratic President, we would support them. We wanted to know what were their qualifications, what were their backgrounds, were they vetted properly—no criminal activity, nothing in their background that would indicate they could not judiciously act openly and fairly.

I am sorry it has gotten to this position now where Republicans feel they have to vote against someone to the National Labor Relations Board simply because that person was a lawyer for a labor union. I voted for NLRB members who were lawyers for businesses. That is fine. I have no problem with that. Why do my Republican colleagues have such a problem voting for someone who was a lawyer for a labor union? Labor unions are legal entities protected by national law, the National Labor Relations Act.

So I hope again that my Republican colleagues will look at Mr. Griffin for who he is, for what he is, for his background, eminently well qualified, has always been fair, has always been judicious—a good lawyer.

Yes, he represents labor unions. But in all of the vetting we had in our committee on Mr. Griffin, we had people from the business side and others who all said he represented labor unions, but he did so fairly. He did that fairly, with competence and with the ability to work out agreements with the other side. What more can you ask?

I am hopeful this vote tomorrow will mark a new beginning for the National Labor Relations Board. We will have a vote on cloture and then we will have an up-or-down vote. So we have 60 votes for cloture to bring it to a close. Then there will be up to 8 hours of debate on the nominee. I do not think we need to take that long. I am hopeful some of my Republican colleagues will vote for Mr. Griffin and start to break this thing down, where if it is someone appointed by a Democratic President, Republicans vote no; if it is someone appointed by a Republican President,

Democrats vote no. That should not be the way it should be, not the way it has been in my lifetime here, in all of my time in the Senate.

I have served with three Republican Presidents in the Senate. They have made nominations to the National Labor Relations Board. I have been on this committee since then. We always supported them. As long as they were qualified and they went through the vetting process and they were qualified, it was fine. The President should have his nominees. We would vote for them.

I am hopeful we will get back to that. I hope we will have a new era, where the agency is no longer haunted by political attacks, political games. It is time, long past time, to allow the NLRB to function as the law intends and let the dedicated public servants who work there do their jobs.

We will have this vote, I am told, tomorrow afternoon on cloture. As I said for the benefit of Senators, we will have up to 8 hours. I do not imagine we will take all of that. We will have up to 8 hours of debate on the nominee. Again, I hope we have a good strong vote on both cloture and on the nominee himself. Mr. Griffin, as I said, is eminently well qualified—eminently well qualified. Nothing in his background would ever indicate that he would be anything less than an outstanding counsel at the National Labor Relations Board.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT M. GREELEY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the important work of Mr. Robert M. Greeley, who is retiring on November 15, 2013, after a long and distinguished career with the United States Capitol Police.

Mr. Greeley joined the Capitol Police in June, 1996, as director of the Security Services Bureau, the most senior civilian security position in the department. Mr. Greeley's team is responsible for the development, operation, and maintenance of the physical and technical security systems needed to counter the threat of terrorism. In this capacity, Mr. Greeley led the management of the multimillion dollar enhancements to the Capitol Complex following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. His expertise in the development and implementation of these security projects and systems

was critical to the long- and short-term protection of the personnel and facilities of the legislative branch.

Prior to joining the Capitol Police, Mr. Greeley spent 14 years as a security engineering officer with the U.S. Department of State's Office of Diplomatic Security and Foreign Missions. In that capacity, Mr. Greeley served overseas with regional responsibilities in Athens, Mexico City, and Prague.

Mr. Greeley proudly served in the United States Air Force as a navigational aids equipment specialist from 1978–1982.

As a former Capitol Police Officer, I appreciate the hard work and dedication of our nation's law enforcement officers, and I still feel a special bond with those who honor the badge by protecting and serving our communities. I, along with my colleagues in the Senate, congratulate Mr. Greeley on his well-earned retirement and wish him well in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING BRIAN MONKS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Brian Monks of Huntington, NY, who graciously donated his time and unique talent to help create the beautiful and historic pen set for the United States Senate.

In 2012, the Office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms began designing a new pen set for use at the Presiding Officer's desk when the Senate is in session. The pen set was to be constructed using historically significant materials, including marble removed from the West Brumidi Corridor of the Senate side of the Capitol during its expansion in 2001, and wood from a 120-year-old mahogany tree that was removed from the Capitol grounds in 2009. The Senate Cabinet Shop crafted the base and the pen holders using these historic materials. When the time came to construct the pens themselves from the same mahogany wood, the Cabinet Shop needed to look for outside assistance.

This is when Mr. Monks stepped forward. He volunteered to expertly hand turn pieces of the historic wood into unique writing instruments for the new Senate Chamber pen set.

Mr. Monks is the vice president of Underwriters Laboratories, and his home in Long Island has housed his wood working hobby for many years. He has earned a reputation as both an accomplished pen maker and a creator of fine hand crafted furnishings. His handiwork on the Presiding Officer's pen set debuted in the Senate in April 2012 and is now on display every time the Senate is in session.

Mr. Monks's fine craftsmanship not only resulted in high quality pens for use by Senators serving as the Presiding Officer, but also contributed to the overall beauty and historical significance of the Presiding Officer's desk in the Senate Chamber.

I join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in saluting Mr. Brian Monks for his artistic excellence, his spirit of volunteerism, and his generous contributions to the history and operations of the United States Senate.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN COLOMBIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to express my thanks to the governments of Colombia, Cuba and Norway, and to the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Reverend Jesse Jackson, for their efforts to secure the release yesterday of American citizen, Kevin Scott Sutay, who was kidnapped by the FARC earlier this year. I hope this is another sign that negotiations to end Colombia's decades long armed conflict are progressing, and that a peace agreement is possible.

I also want to take this opportunity to call attention to the contributions of two courageous Colombian human rights activists, Islena Rey and Father Alejandro Angulo Novoa, and to the challenges they and other human rights defenders face.

On September 9, Colombia's Human Rights Day, both were awarded for their human rights work in a presentation organized by Di logo Inter-Agencial en Colombia, a consortium of international nongovernmental organizations working for human rights in Colombia. This is the second year of the awards, and they were presented during a time of increasing attacks against human rights defenders in that country. The awards are significant not only because they recognize the recipients' contributions, but also because they help to reduce the social stigma that surrounds human rights work in Colombia and many other countries.

Islena Rey, founder of the Meta Civic Committee for Human Rights, was named Defender of the Year for her efforts to bring together and organize community leaders in support of victims of human rights abuses. She works in one of Colombia's most dangerous regions, the Eastern Plains, which has long been plagued by violence spurred by the illegal narcotics trade.

Ms. Rey knows the risks. Four years ago this month, she was shot and seriously wounded while returning from a community meeting. She is also the sole survivor of the original Meta Committee members, who, throughout the 1990s, were systematically assassinated, leaving her to carry out her advocacy work alone. Four years after nearly losing her life, she presses on, conducting investigations, providing support to victims, and working to rebuild the Meta Committee.

In addition to recognizing Islena Rey, the organization presented Father Alejandro Angulo Novoa with the Life

Long Defender award for his contributions to human rights in Colombia over the past 4 decades. Father Alejandro is one of the founders of the Center for Research and Popular Education in Bogotá. He is currently the coordinator of CINEP's human rights database which collects, records, and disseminates information on the most serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law. He has dedicated his life to this work and to supporting the poor and excluded.

The courage and dedication displayed by these two individuals represents just a small fraction of the essential work being done by human rights defenders in Colombia. It is all the more remarkable because, despite some notable progress in investigating, prosecuting and punishing those responsible for heinous crimes, impunity is the norm and Colombia remains a very dangerous place for lawyers, social activists, and journalists who work and report on human rights.

Islena Rey, Father Alejandro, and countless other brave Colombians will continue tending to victims of human rights abuses. They are undeterred by the social stigma they face, or the threats and acts of violence against them and their colleagues. They deserve our respect and our thanks, because the protection of human rights, wherever they are threatened or denied, is everybody's responsibility.

ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PRIVACY ACT 27TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Electronic Communications Privacy Act ECPA, one of the Nation's premiere digital privacy laws, was enacted 27 years ago on October 21. I join the many privacy advocates, technology organizations, legal scholars and other Americans who celebrate this milestone and all that ECPA has come to symbolize about the importance of safeguarding our privacy rights in cyberspace.

When I introduced ECPA with former Republican Senator Charles Mathias in 1986, I said that "the privacy protections in ECPA are designed to protect legitimate law enforcement needs while minimizing intrusions on the privacy of system users as well as the business needs of electronic communications system providers." During the last three decades, ECPA has become the premier law for protecting Americans from unauthorized government intrusions into their private electronic communications.

When Congress enacted ECPA, email was a novelty and no one imagined how prevalent it would become in our daily communication let alone how long it might be stored. But after almost three decades, new technologies—such as the Internet, social networking sites and cloud computing—have changed how

Americans use and store email. Storing documents and other information electronically has become much less expensive and mobile technologies permit users to access stored documents wherever and whenever they choose. As a result, the digital privacy protections put in place 27 years ago have not kept pace with new technologies.

That is why Congress must revitalize the digital privacy protections that were enacted in ECPA. That is also why I am working in a bipartisan manner to update this law to reflect the realities of our time.

In April, the Judiciary Committee favorably reported bipartisan legislation that I authored with Republican Senator MIKE LEE to update ECPA and to bring this law fully into the digital age. Our bipartisan bill updates ECPA to require that the government obtain a search warrant—based upon probable cause—before obtaining the content of our emails and other electronic communications. The commonsense reforms in our bill carefully balance the interests and needs of consumers, the law enforcement community, and our Nation's thriving technology sector. The bill enjoys the support of a diverse coalition of more than 100 privacy, civil liberties, civil rights and technology organizations from across the political spectrum, including the American Civil Liberties Union, the Heritage Foundation, the Center for Democracy and Technology and Americans for Tax Reform. The bill is also the product of careful consultation with many government and private sector stakeholders, including the Departments of Justice, Commerce and State, local law enforcement, and members of the technology and privacy communities. I remain disappointed that a single Republican Senator has objected to the unanimous consent request to pass this bipartisan bill, which overwhelmingly passed the Judiciary Committee.

The privacy reforms in this bill are too important to delay. Like Senator LEE and me, all of the bill's supporters understand that protecting our digital privacy rights is not a Democratic ideal, nor a Republican ideal, but an American ideal that all of us should embrace. As ECPA reaches another milestone, it is important to remember that Americans continue to face threats to their digital privacy. I hope that all Senators will join me in supporting the Electronic Communications Privacy Act Amendments Act and that the Senate will pass this bill without delay.

TRIBUTE TO HEDY RATNER AND CAROL DOUGAL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to thank two exceptional women who have been strong advocates for social justice and for the advancement of

women's business ownership in the State of Illinois, across America, and beyond.

Hedy Ratner and Carol Dougal have recently stepped down after working 27 years as the founders and co-presidents of the Women's Business Development Center, WBDC. The WBDC is the first, and largest, nonprofit organization that provides services to encourage women's business ownership across the United States.

When the WBDC was founded in 1986, less than 10 percent of the businesses in the United States were owned and operated by women. Today, thanks in part to the leadership and encouragement provided by Hedy and Carol, there are over 8.6 million women-owned businesses throughout the country, generating over \$1.3 trillion in revenues this year and employing nearly 7.8 million people.

As a champion for women's economic development, the WBDC has worked to assist tens of thousands of women in entrepreneurial efforts nationwide. From business certifications to financial assistance workshops, the WBDC provides women business owners with the training they need to establish and expand their businesses. By providing women with essential resources to become successful business owners, the WBDC has empowered women and helped them achieve economic independence through entrepreneurship.

Since its founding in 1986, the WBDC has expanded in size and scope from a two-person operation seeking to address the lack of representation of women in the business sector, to a staff of 24 full-time employees and contractors that now influence policies on the federal, State and local levels. The achievements of Hedy and Carol are significant, and the positive role of the WBDC in supporting women's entrepreneurship is evident.

On behalf of the people of Illinois, I thank Hedy and Carol for their 27 dedicated years with the WBDC and congratulate them on their many contributions for women in the business sector. I wish both of them the best as they continue to inspire and provide leadership for women's entrepreneurship in the years to come.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR BIOTECHNOLOGY INFORMATION ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the 25th anniversary of the National Center for Biotechnology Information—NCBI—part of the National Library of Medicine at the National Institutes of Health, America's world-renowned research institution in Bethesda, MD.

The late Senator Claude Pepper, for whom a major building on the NIH campus is named, authored six separate laws creating individual institutes

at NIH. In 1987, while a Member of the House of Representatives and chairman of the Select Committee on Aging's Subcommittee on Health and Long-Term Care, Pepper introduced H.R. 393, the National Biotechnology Information Act, which established the NCBI. At a March 1987 hearing on H.R. 393, Pepper explained that "we are dealing with nothing less than the mystery of human life and the unfolding scroll of knowledge, seeking to penetrate that mystery, which is life itself." He noted that his bill was intended "to facilitate the development of advanced computer and communication systems that will make it possible for the vast expanding knowledge of the gene to be assimilated into a computer system and made available for distribution to researchers and to people generally all over the World."

Soon thereafter, Congress embraced the importance of the biotechnology field, recognized the pressing need to harness the large volume of data emanating from the genetic revolution in science, and endorsed the establishment of NCBI to manage this valuable resource for the benefit of human health. With strong bipartisan support in Congress, Pepper's bill was enacted as part of Senator Ted Kennedy's comprehensive measure, the Health Omnibus Extension Programs of 1988, on November 4, 1988.

Today, biomedical research encompassing genomic and genetic knowledge is a major driver of medical progress. The foresight of Congress in establishing the NCBI, combined with the innovative leadership of Director Dr. David Lipman and the expertise of the agency's dedicated staff, has led to the emergence of an impressive national resource for molecular biology information. In June of this year, Dr. Lipman was honored by the White House with the "Open Science" Champions of Change Award for his work at NCBI. By organizing and integrating genomic data for developing diagnostic and clinical applications, the Center serves as a bridge from research to the medical community. Each day, more than 3 million users access NCBI's 40 interlinked genomic and bibliographic databases and download more than 30 terabytes of data.

I am proud that Congress has continued to support funding for the NCBI over the past 25 years. Recently, by requiring that the results of NIH-funded research be made public through the Center's PubMed Central Database, Congress has opened to everyone the full text of published journal articles that are essential to advancing scientific research and public health.

The biomedical research funded by the NIH provides knowledge essential to combat debilitating diseases, and continuing this research is dependent on the resources and tools that NCBI has developed so successfully for the

benefit of the biomedical community. As NIH Director Francis Collins has noted, we are entering an era of precision medicine in which a patient's genetic makeup may determine the exact treatment that is provided. Surely, the NCBI databases and tools will be needed on the front lines of this new effort.

On the occasion of this 25th anniversary, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Lipman and the outstanding staff of NCBI, who through their skill and vision have built this unique biomedical resource.

TRIBUTE TO DR. CHARLES M. VEST

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, it is my great privilege to rise today to recognize the distinguished career of Dr. Charles M. Vest, a native West Virginian, on his retirement as president of the National Academy of Engineering, NAE. In his time at the NAE, Dr. Vest worked tirelessly to identify and address the most pressing and important challenges facing American engineering, including the declining interest in math and science among our Nation's students and the growing challenges of information flow among government, the private sector, and academia. As NAE president, Dr. Vest was instrumental in urging Congress to pass the America COMPETES Act, which provided a blueprint for investing in critically important scientific and technological pursuits. Dr. Vest also helped craft the Grand Challenges for Engineering, a global initiative that identifies the greatest challenges and opportunities facing engineers today. In this increasingly technology-based and globalized world, Dr. Vest recognized the need for a clear and strong national vision for our engineers and scientists. He provided the dynamic leadership that the NAE required to allow American engineers to compete and thrive in a rapidly evolving world.

A native of Morgantown, WV, Chuck displayed a clever and inquisitive mind from a young age. Growing up under the shadow of Sputnik, he developed a keen interest in electronics and he would constantly tinker with surplus World War II gadgets, such as microphones and resistors. This curiosity led him to West Virginia University where he received a degree in mechanical engineering. Chuck continued his education at the University of Michigan, earning a Ph.D. in mechanical engineering; he remained there for 22 years as a professor, a dean, and university provost.

Dr. Vest has since served as a director of DuPont and IBM. He has held positions on an array of Federal committees and commissions, including the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology and as vice chair of the U.S. Council on Competitiveness. Chuck has authored three

books, received honorary doctoral degrees from 18 universities, and was awarded the 2006 National Medal of Technology and the 2011 Vannevar Bush Award.

Quite possibly, Dr. Vest's most important achievements occurred during his tenure as president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MIT. In his 14 years at the helm of MIT, Dr. Vest proved a worthy advocate of more robust communication and sharing within the science community. Under his extraordinary leadership, MIT launched its OpenCourseWare initiative and cofounded the Alliance for Global Sustainability. As he will readily attest, though, one of Dr. Vest's proudest accomplishments at MIT was in improving the diversity of the university's student body and faculty. Chuck worked tirelessly to ensure that opportunities at MIT were available to anyone with the right mind and work ethic.

In all that he has done and stood for, Chuck has embodied what is best about being a West Virginian and an American. Chuck's passion for helping others—whether as a teacher, an engineer, or a leader—has impacted countless lives and ensured his place among our country's most respected and honored citizens. Dr. Charles M. Vest has long shone as one of West Virginia's brightest stars, and today it gives me great pleasure to commend him—and thank him—for his enormous contributions to the Nation's science, technology, engineering, and mathematics enterprise.

GREENE COUNTY COURTHOUSE CENTENNIAL

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I rise today to honor an important historical date in Greene County, MO, my home county. October 26 was the centennial of the historic Greene County Courthouse—the place where I worked for more than a decade as county clerk.

The current Greene County Courthouse is actually the third built in Greene County. The 20th century courthouse was intended to be a unifying structure for what had developed as two communities prior to the Civil War. Both communities came under one municipal government in 1887, and the new courthouse was to be a structure built between North Springfield and the central business district. Work to find a site was begun in 1904 and concluded with the purchase of a lot on Central Avenue in 1908.

Architect A.N. Torbitt, of Miller, Opel and Torbitt in Jefferson City, MO, was chosen to draft plans for the new structure, and the cornerstone ceremony for the new courthouse was held on July 16, 1910. The impressive new building, built of Greene County Phoenix stone, took nearly 2 years to complete. In March 1912, the courts moved into the new building. Even Spring-

field's city hall took up residence there, where it remained for more than 25 years until its move into the post office a block away.

The historic Greene County Courthouse was and remains important to the economic growth, development and prosperity of Springfield and Greene County. Over the years, the courts expanded to an additional judicial center nearby, but the old courthouse remains the center of Greene County administrative duties. Today, it is occupied by the Greene County commissioner, clerk, recorder of deeds, treasurer, assessor and collector of revenues.

Today, the interior of the 100-year-old courthouse is in great shape, and plans are underway to raise funds to replace the parapet. Past elected officials have worked to improve the building's energy efficiency and maintain its appearance. As a former Greene County clerk and one who has a deep appreciation for the history of Greene County and this grand building, I want to express my pride in the services that are provided in this structure and those county employees who work in it every day. My hope is that the historic Greene County Courthouse has many years of service ahead.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

WILLIAMS-CONE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

• Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am delighted to commend the Williams-Cone Elementary School of Topsham, ME, on being named a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School of Excellence. This year, Williams-Cone was one of only 236 public schools across the country to receive this prestigious recognition of high accomplishment by the U.S. Department of Education.

Created in 1982, the Blue Ribbon Schools Program honors public and private schools that are either academically superior in their States or that demonstrate significant gains in student achievement. The schools singled out for this national recognition are models of high educational standards and accountability.

This award recognizes the remarkable improvements made in student achievement rates at Williams-Cone Elementary over the past several years. During the 2007–2008 academic year, students achieved 66 percent proficiency in reading and math. Four years later, Williams-Cone's approximately 200 students scored 81 percent proficiency in reading and 77 percent in math. These outstanding academic improvements can be attributed to the positive learning environment fostered at Williams-Cone School, where students are encouraged to pursue their interests, teachers instruct in innovative ways, and teachers and adminis-

trators engage with families to create a strong school community.

I am pleased that the U.S. Department of Education has selected Williams-Cone Elementary School for this well-deserved honor, and congratulate not only the students, but also the administrators, teachers, staff, and parents on this outstanding achievement. Together, they are making a difference in the lives of hundreds of students and helping them become responsible learners and engaged citizens in their community.●

REMEMBERING PETE CENARRUSA

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, my colleague Senator RISCH joins me today in honoring the life of former Idaho Secretary of State Pete Cenarrusa. The State of Idaho lost a dear friend with the passing of Pete Cenarrusa.

Pete had a unique capacity to lead people and institutions with good will, great humor and wise counsel. Pete was a personal friend and adviser to both of us, and we will forever remember the example he set for all public servants.

Throughout his distinguished career, Pete was widely respected for his integrity, fairness, determination and dependability. He dedicated more than 50 years to public service, serving nearly 36 years as Idaho's Secretary of State and nine terms in the Idaho House of Representatives, three of which he served as Speaker of the House. In addition to his public service, Pete ran a successful sheep operation with his wife of 66 years, Freda. He was also a private pilot for 59 years and was a high school teacher in Cambridge, Carey and Glens Ferry, ID. Additionally, he served as a U.S. Marine Corps officer, aviator and instructor, which included his service as a pilot in World War II. Further, Pete was a strong advocate for the Basque community. Pete and Freda founded the Cenarrusa Foundation for Basque Culture that has provided resources for the promotion of the Basque culture.

Like the many people who greatly respected him, Pete's list of qualities and experiences is remarkably long. Pete lived life to the fullest. He developed skills in a variety of fields and utilized his talents and principles for the betterment of Idaho. We are truly blessed to have known Pete and to have learned from his example of committed service, honesty and resolve. Pete's long and dedicated service to the people of Idaho will last forever. He was a beloved public servant, rancher, pilot, veteran, teacher, son, brother, husband, father, uncle, grandfather, great-grandfather and friend. Our thoughts and prayers are with Freda, their family and all of Pete's friends.●

TRIBUTE TO SANDRA MATHESON

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and congratulate Director Sandra Matheson of the NH Attorney General's State Office of Victim/Witness Assistance, OVWA, for more than 30 years of dedicated service to the State of New Hampshire.

A former law enforcement officer and crisis center director, Ms. Matheson was on call to respond to homicides for over 12 years, where she learned first hand about the unique needs of victims. She coordinated New Hampshire's efforts to establish victim/witness services in all 10 counties and to establish the New Hampshire Victim Compensation Program in 1989.

During her long career, Ms. Matheson was responsible for founding and overseeing the OVWA homicide victim unit, which provides 24-hour statewide direct services in all of the State's homicide cases, from death notification throughout the judicial process. She has also developed and presented numerous trainings on traumatic grief and loss, homicide, and the extensive impact these crimes have on the families left behind. She developed and presented the State's first death notification training curriculum and she is a regular instructor at the NH Police Standards and Training Academy. She is on the faculty of the ME/NH Victim Assistance Academy, where she teaches the sessions on homicide and drunk driving, among others.

Ms. Matheson was an instrumental part of numerous statewide initiatives aimed at standardizing the systemic response to crime victim issues, and has built a strong, effective, collaborative relationship with numerous State and community partners. She was a founder of the NH Domestic Violence, Child Fatality and Elder and Incapacitated Adult Fatality Review Committees, and served as chair of the Attorney General's Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect, the NH Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner, SANE, Advisory Board, the Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Protocol Projects, the Sexual Assault Domestic Violence Conference Committee, and is a partner of the New Hampshire AmeriCorps Victim Assistance Program. She has been a key player in getting legislation passed to help victims of crime, including drafting the NH Crime Victim Bill of Rights in 1991.

A recipient of numerous awards for her work with victims and families, in April of 1994 Director Matheson received a National Victim Services Award from President Clinton and was honored at a Rose Garden ceremony for "outstanding service on behalf of victims of crime." Most recently in 2013, the National Association of Attorneys General selected Sandra for the "President's Award" for her extraordinary work over the years.

On a personal note, as New Hampshire's Attorney General, I was hon-

ored to work with Sandra. She is smart, passionate, and tireless in serving victims of crime and in making NH safer. She represents the very best of what it means to be a public servant.

As Director Matheson celebrates her retirement, I commend her on a job well done, and ask my colleagues to join me in wishing her well in all future endeavors.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on October 17, 2013, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 58) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability for religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations, further, that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the preamble of the concurrent resolution.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on October 23, 2013, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House has agreed to the following resolutions:

H. Res. 383. Resolution relative to the death of the Honorable Thomas S. Foley, a former Representative from the State of Washington.

H. Res. 384. Resolution relative to the death of the Honorable C.W. Bill Young, a Representative from the State of Florida.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 185. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the "Paul Brown United States Courthouse".

H.R. 2083. An act to require State educational agencies that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to have in effect policies and procedures on background checks for school employees.

H.R. 3080. An act to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3205. An act to reauthorize and restructure the adoption incentives grant program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3302. An act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Bay Pines, Florida, as the "C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. MCINTYRE of North Carolina, and Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2083. An act to require State educational agencies that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to have in effect policies and procedures on background checks for school employees; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 3205. An act to reauthorize and restructure the adoption incentives grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 3302. An act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Bay Pines, Florida, as the "C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar pursuant to Sec. 1002 of Public Law 113-46:

S.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as submitted under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 on October 17, 2013.

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3080. An act to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1592. A bill to provide for a delay of the individual mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until the American Health Benefit Exchanges are functioning properly.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3305. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, certification that absent suspension of the limit under 31 U.S.C. 3101(b) the Secretary of the Treasury would be unable to issue debt to meet existing commitments, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3306. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of funding for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism funding, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-159. A petition from a citizen of the State of New Jersey relative to the election of a Senator; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 376. A bill to reauthorize the National Integrated Drought Information System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-114).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

Special Report entitled "Activities of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs During the 112th Congress" (Rept. No. 113-115).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1576. A bill to redesignate the Department of Veterans Affairs Healthcare System located at 10000 Bay Pines Boulevard in Bay Pines, Florida, as the "C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 1577. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1578. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to cover the costs associated with the care of veterans at medical foster homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 1579. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to improve the protections provided to members of the uniformed services and their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 1580. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require recipients of per diem payments from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for the provision of services for homeless veterans to comply with codes relevant to operations and level of care provided, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1581. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide counseling and treatment for sexual trauma to members of the Armed Forces, to require the Secretary to screen veterans for domestic abuse, to require the Secretary to submit reports on military sexual trauma and domestic abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1582. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit reports on the provision of services by the Department of Veterans Affairs to veterans with hearing loss and other auditory system injuries and the measures that can be taken jointly by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense with respect to hearing loss and other auditory system injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1583. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct an education program and peer support program for the education and training of family members and caregivers of veterans with mental health disorders; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1584. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide replacement automobiles for certain disabled veterans and members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1585. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to update the Service-Disabled Veterans Insurance program to base premium rates on the Commissioners 2001 Standard Ordinary Mortality Table instead

of the Commissioners 1941 Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1586. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve dental health care for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1587. A bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal to each of Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods in recognition of their contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 1588. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for reimbursement for emergency medical treatment to certain veterans that were unable to receive care from the Department of Veterans Affairs in the 24-month period preceding the furnishing of such emergency treatment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 1589. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure the Department of Veterans Affairs has an up-to-date policy on reporting of cases of infectious diseases, to require an independent assessment of the Veterans Integrated Service Networks and medical centers of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

S. 1590. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 1591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity credit to small businesses which hire individuals who are members of the Ready Reserve or National Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 1592. A bill to provide for a delay of the individual mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until the American Health Benefit Exchanges are functioning properly; read the first time.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1593. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to enhance the protections accorded to servicemembers and their spouses with respect to mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S.J. Res. 26. A joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as submitted under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 on October 17, 2013; placed on the calendar.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. Res. 275. A resolution designating October 29, 2013, as "National Technological Innovation Day" to recognize that technological innovation is critical to the United States economy and commemorating the contributions of innovation to prosperity in the United States and abroad; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 15

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 15, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 29

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 29, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

S. 116

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 116, a bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 entirely.

S. 273

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 273, a bill to modify the definition of fiduciary under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to exclude appraisers of employee stock ownership plans.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 619

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 619, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent unjust and irrational criminal punishments.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 623, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services.

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New Jer-

sey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 666, a bill to prohibit attendance of an animal fighting venture, and for other purposes.

S. 676

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 676, a bill to prevent tax-related identity theft and tax fraud.

S. 689

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 689, a bill to reauthorize and improve programs related to mental health and substance use disorders.

S. 699

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes.

S. 718

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 718, a bill to create jobs in the United States by increasing United States exports to Africa by at least 200 percent in real dollar value within 10 years, and for other purposes.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 769

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 769, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to prohibit the employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to

increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 842

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 842, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 865, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 875

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 875, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the reporting of cases of infectious diseases at facilities of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 893

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 893, a bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2013, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 893, *supra*.

S. 931

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 931, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to raise awareness of, and to educate breast cancer patients anticipating surgery, especially patients who are members of racial and ethnic minority groups, regarding the availability and coverage of breast reconstruction, prostheses, and other options.

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 931, *supra*.

S. 932

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr.

MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 932, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for advance appropriations for certain discretionary accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 981

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 981, a bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules prohibiting deceptive advertising of abortion services, and for other purposes.

S. 1098

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1098, a bill to reform the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 to responsibly protect homeowner-ship.

S. 1106

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1106, a bill to improve the accuracy of mortgage underwriting used by Federal mortgage agencies by ensuring that energy costs are included in the underwriting process, to reduce the amount of energy consumed by homes, to facilitate the creation of energy efficiency retrofit and construction jobs, and for other purposes.

S. 1116

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1116, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to equalize the exclusion from gross income of parking and transportation fringe benefits and to provide for a common cost-of-living adjustment, and for other purposes.

S. 1126

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1126, a bill to aid and support pediatric involvement in reading and education.

S. 1143

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1143, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the

Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1183

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States.

S. 1240

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1240, a bill to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste, and for other purposes.

S. 1267

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1267, a bill to cut taxes for innovative businesses that produce renewable chemicals.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1320

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1320, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the armed forces.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S.

1361, a bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept additional documentation when considering the application for veterans status of an individual who performed service as a coastwise merchant seaman during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1381

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1381, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 1406

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1406, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1417

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S.

1417, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act.

S. 1442

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1442, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the minimum low-income housing tax credit rate for unsubsidized buildings and to provide a minimum 4 percent credit rate for existing buildings.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1497

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1497, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to apply the provisions of the Act to certain Congressional staff and members of the executive branch.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S. 1517

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1517, a bill to amend the Public Health Services Act and the Social Security Act to extend health information technology assistance eligibility to behavioral health, mental health, and substance abuse professionals and facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1526

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1526, a bill to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to prohibit the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board from requiring public companies to use specific auditors or require the use of different auditors on a rotating basis.

S. 1565

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1565, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas, to

make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 254

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 254, a resolution designating November 2, 2013, as "National Bison Day".

S. RES. 269

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 269, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on United States policy regarding possession of enrichment and reprocessing capabilities by the Islamic Republic of Iran.

S. RES. 270

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 270, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World Polio Day and commending the international community and others for their efforts to prevent and eradicate polio.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

S. 1590. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, before the Internet, RCA knew how many records Elvis sold every day. Before the Internet, Ford knew how many cars they were selling every day. Before the Internet, McDonald's could tell you how many hamburgers it was selling

every day. Yet the Obama administration cannot tell us how many Americans have tried to sign up for ObamaCare. They can't tell us how many Americans did sign up for ObamaCare. They can't tell us what level of insurance they bought, nor can they tell us in what zip code they live.

They told us that 20 million Americans have visited the ObamaCare Web site. They have the basic information to shop, but how many have tried to sign up? How many did sign up? Where do they live? What kind of insurance did they buy? Not only have they not told us, they have done their best to keep us from finding out.

With WikiLeaks and Edward Snowden spilling our beans every day, what is happening on the ObamaCare exchanges is the biggest secret left in Washington, DC. The National Security Agency could learn lessons from Secretary Sebelius. We should not have to rely on anonymous sources to get basic information about what is happening with ObamaCare.

Therefore, I am introducing legislation today to require the administration answer the following questions every week: How many people tried to sign up? How many people did sign up? What level of insurance did they buy? In what ZIP code do they live? What are they doing to fix the problems? This is not complicated information.

In the Internet age, the administration ought to be able to provide this information not every week but every day. In fact, they should be able to provide it every minute. We should not have to pass a law to find these things out. I hope that every Senator will support this simple request that this legislation makes. It is a six-page bill. I will put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, and everyone will have a chance to read it tomorrow. After everyone has had a chance to read it, I intend to ask unanimous consent to pass it.

This Congress—both sides of the aisle—is dedicated to transparency. This administration has described itself as the most transparent administration in American history. So why should we not unanimously pass legislation to ask for the most basic information about what is happening on the ObamaCare exchanges?

Health insurance companies say that in order to guarantee that everyone has a chance to sign up for insurance before January 1, which is when the law says they must, the application has to be in by December 15. That is not very far away.

The administration has been talking about giving a grace period of a few weeks before the IRS will fine them for not having bought insurance, as ObamaCare says most Americans must buy health insurance. Still, if the Web site is not fixed, millions of Americans will be required to sign up for health insurance on a Web site that does not

work. As a consequence of not being able to sign up for health care, they will be fined by the Internal Revenue Service.

There is a much bigger problem than the fine, and that is millions of Americans may be without any health insurance at all after January 1 because their insurance is being canceled because of ObamaCare. Remember when President Obama said: If you like your insurance, you can keep it? Well, like a lot of things that have been said about ObamaCare, that is turning out not to be the case.

Our staff has counted the announcements by health insurance companies that are ceasing to offer policies on January 1 because they don't qualify under the ObamaCare law. For example, in Tennessee, the State provides 16,000 Tennesseans who have trouble getting insurance with a plan called CoverTN. Because it doesn't meet the exact requirements of ObamaCare, the State is having to cancel that insurance on January 1, and those 16,000 Tennesseans won't have health insurance.

Other Americans—for example, Tennesseans I have talked to—have what we call catastrophic insurance. They have insurance that provides for a catastrophe. That kind of insurance is often not available under ObamaCare. It is not allowed by ObamaCare for most people. An insurance company that offers these policies will not be offering them after January 1, and as a result, millions of Americans will not be able to buy the insurance they now have.

If individuals can't or won't sign up, that will mean that after January 1, many of the sickest people will go into the exchanges. The result will be that the price of insurance—for everyone who has insurance—will go through the roof. We are already seeing that in the insurance markets today.

The bottom line: If the Web site is not fixed, millions of Americans will not only be fined by the IRS for not buying insurance on a Web site that doesn't work, more importantly, they will be without health care insurance on January 1, insurance that many of them have today.

The President has said over the last few days that the Web site will be ready by November 30. You are supposed to have your application in by December 15 and have the insurance bought by January 1, which only gives 2 weeks for millions of Americans to make their way through this maze. We tried to obtain this simple information that I have asked for, yet repeatedly, the requests which I have directed to Secretary Sebelius have come back with no answer at all—no answers, nothing.

Outside analysts tell us that only 1/2 of 1 percent of the people who logged on to the ObamaCare Web site in the

first week were able to enroll, but we really don't know.

Two weeks ago I sent a letter with House Oversight Chairman DARRELL ISSA to Secretary Sebelius, asking for the information she and the President are not giving us; such as how many people have enrolled successfully in the exchanges, what the technical problems are, how much it already costs, and how much it will cost to address these problems. The deadline for a response to our request has passed. Chairman ISSA has said—and I joined him in the letter—that he may consider a subpoena to get that information. The American people deserve an answer to these questions.

Often when the debate comes up, someone will say, Well, the Republicans don't have any proposals of their own. I have often made those proposals. I remember on this floor of the Senate many times proposing steps we should take to change our health care system so more people could afford insurance. We went back and counted the number of times when, during the health care debate, various Republicans talked about our step-by-step proposals for what we should do about health care, and there were 173 mentions of our step-by-step proposals.

The basic problem with what happened with the new health care law was that we—the Democratic Congress did, I didn't; I didn't vote for it—expanded a health care delivery system that already costs too much. That was the wrong thing to do. That was an historic mistake. What we should have done is to make changes, step by step, in the health care delivery system that would reduce the cost of health care for the largest number of Americans so more people could have afforded it. Those were the steps we should have taken. We can still do that. Our health care delivery system is nearly 20 percent of our economy.

ObamaCare is not our health care delivery system. Rather, ObamaCare includes some additions to our health care delivery system. ObamaCare is an expansion of a health care delivery system that already costs too much. The law is making some changes such as the ones I described earlier in my remarks. Those changes have been described as a train wreck, but we can turn the train around and head it in another direction—a direction of more competition, more choices, and lower costs for Americans buying health insurance.

How can we do that? That is a subject for a long discussion, but here are a few of the ideas: Make Medicare solvent. The trustees have said that in 10 years there won't be enough money to pay hospital bills. We have a duty to make Medicare solvent.

Reform Medicare Advantage to increase more choices and put it on a

more level playing field with Traditional Medicare. That will provide seniors more options and it should save some money.

Make Medicaid more flexible. I was Governor. I said on the floor that every Senator who voted for ObamaCare ought to be sentenced to go home and serve as Governor and try to implement the law. During my time as Governor, Medicaid was 8 percent of the State budget. I see it has grown to 26 percent today in Tennessee, soaking up money that otherwise would go for higher education or for other needed parts of State government.

We should encourage workplace wellness. We had a lot of debate about that during the ObamaCare debate and we have ended up with a regulation that is too restrictive. We can change that.

We can allow small businesses to pool their resources and offer a larger number of plans to a larger number of Americans at prices they can afford. We can allow Americans to purchase insurance across State lines. That would reduce the cost of health care, which should be our major goal.

We could expand health care savings accounts.

There is bipartisan legislation before the Senate that would define full-time employment for purposes of the health care law—this one or any one in the future—as 40 hours instead of 30 hours. That would be a great help to American business and an even bigger help to the employees who are being forced to go from 40 hours to 30 hours—employees who most need that income, and who, by going to 30 hours, will have to go to a second part-time job, and in many cases, in doing so, lose whatever health care benefits that might be available to them. I don't know where the 30 hours came from. That sounds as though it was made in France. A made-in-America part-time job ought to be up to 40 hours.

Those are just a few of the steps we could take to turn the train around and avoid the wreck and move us in the right direction. We will be making those arguments over time. But for now, we need information about what is happening on the ObamaCare exchanges.

I intend to ask unanimous consent tomorrow to pass a simple, six-page bill. It is legislation which requires the administration to give us weekly reports about how many have tried to enroll, how many have succeeded, what ZIP Code they live in, and what level of insurance they have purchased. Congress needs to know that, if millions of Americans are going to lose insurance on January 1, before they have a way to buy it through a Web site that doesn't work. States need to know it because, as time goes on, these decisions are going to have an effect on the Medicaid Programs that States are a

partner in and are operating. Americans need to know it because, in many cases—we have counted at least 1.5 million cases and we expect millions more policies that were available to Americans when the law passed will not be available after January 1. So these Americans—and this includes people working in the Congress and people who are in the Congress—these Americans are going to have to make decisions before January 1 about what insurance they will have, because the insurance they now have isn't going to be available under the new health care law.

This is a six-page bill, and a pretty simple idea. If RCA knew how many records Elvis was selling every day, if Ford knew before the Internet age how many cars Ford was selling every day, if McDonald's before the Internet age knew how many hamburgers it was selling every day, surely the Obama administration can tell us every week how many are enrolling on ObamaCare's Web site, how many are successfully getting their insurance, where they live, and what kind of insurance they buy. The stakes are much higher than Elvis's records, than Ford's cars, and than McDonald's hamburgers. These are the stakes of health insurance that involve the lives of millions of Americans, and I hope my colleagues will join me tomorrow when I ask unanimous consent to approve legislation that will require these weekly reports.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 1591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity credit to small businesses which hire individuals who are members of the Ready Reserve or National Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I rise today to highlight the importance of veteran unemployment and to announce the reintroduction of the "Hire-a-Hero Act"—a bill, which I introduced with Senator Scott Brown of Massachusetts at the start of the last Congress, to make permanent the Work Opportunity Tax Credit, WOTC, for qualified veterans and members of the Ready Reserve and the National Guard.

The issue of veteran unemployment is more important today, than it has ever been.

Though the overall unemployment rate stands at 7.2 percent, the jobless rate among veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan is 10.1 percent, nearly 3 percentage points higher than the national average. Overall, 708,000 veterans are without a job.

This issue is even more important in North Carolina, because of its large active duty and veteran population. More than 1/3 of our population is either in the military, is a veteran, or has an immediate family member who is in

the military or a veteran. In addition, North Carolina has 3 percent of the U.S. population, but 5 percent of the unemployed veterans.

Employers know that hiring a veteran is not only the right thing to do, but it also makes good business sense. These men and women are highly motivated, highly-trained, and have succeeded in the most trying circumstances imaginable.

I know the value of hiring veterans myself. I have three veterans and a member of the National Guard currently on my staff who bring unique perspectives to their roles that they acquired during their time in uniform. And it allows them to provide the best possible service to the people of North Carolina.

Unfortunately, the expiration of the WOTC for veterans at the end of this year could make it more difficult for employers to hire veterans.

The WOTC has been in place for many years. The credit for veterans has been subject to periodic short-term extensions. Recognizing the serious unemployment challenges facing veterans in North Carolina and the need for incentives to hire veterans, I introduced the "Hire-a-Hero Act of 2011" in February of 2011 to make this important tax credit permanent.

While that bill, did not become law, Congress was able to enact the Vow to Hire Heroes Act of 2011 on November 21, 2011. This legislation expanded the WOTC for returning heroes and wounded warriors, by allowing larger tax credits for certain groups and extended the credit through 2012. Recognizing that this credit was set to expire, on January 2, 2013, Congress extended the credit to December 31, 2013, as a part of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012.

This crucial tax credit is set to expire again in just two months. That is why I am re-introducing the Hire-a-Hero Act with the support of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Military Officers Association of America, the National Guard Association of the United States and the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America. This bill would finally, make the WOTC permanent for veterans and members of the Ready Reserve and National Guard.

I urge my colleagues to consider co-sponsoring this important legislation that will help address the unemployment issue among veterans in this country.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1593. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to enhance the protections accorded to servicemembers and their spouses with respect to mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I introduce the Servicemember Housing Protection Act along with my colleagues Senators BEGICH, WHITEHOUSE, DURBIN, and TESTER. Our country has a strong tradition of ensuring that our service members are protected while they serve to keep our nation safe. Building on such laws and efforts, in 1940, as World War II escalated across the globe, Congress enacted the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act "to protect those who have been obliged to drop their own affairs to take up the burdens of the nation." In 2003, Congress passed a new version of this law to reflect the new challenges of post-9/11 service and renamed it the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, SCRA. Since that time, Congress has further amended this law, most recently in August 2012, in order to address the country's high foreclosure rates and their impact on service members.

Additionally, in 2010, when it became evident that military families needed an entity to serve as a watchdog, provide education, and help monitor and respond to concerns, questions, and complaints about consumer financial products and services, I led the bipartisan effort during the Dodd-Frank Act debate to create a new Office of Servicemember Affairs within the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB.

The Servicemember Housing Protection Act continues in this vein, and seeks to address one such ongoing challenge—helping service members with their housing needs so they can maintain a focus on the difficult task of protecting our country.

First, this bill would make it easier for service members to claim deployment-related financial and credit protections by expanding what could be submitted to constitute "military orders." Currently, creditors require a copy of military orders in order to trigger SCRA protections. However, these orders are often not cut until just before deployment or once the service member is already deployed, placing a burden on some military families as they try to work with banks to secure SCRA protections. Broadening the scope of what could be submitted to trigger protections before orders have been received would further ensure that service members have more time to prepare for deployment and promptly receive SCRA protections, including the interest rate limitation of six percent on qualifying mortgages.

Second, this bill would extend foreclosure protections to surviving spouses. Currently, service members have a 1-year window of foreclosure protection following service, to provide time to reacclimate to civilian life and get their personal affairs back in order. Our bill extends this one-year window of foreclosure protection to a surviving

spouse who is the successor in interest to the home. After suffering such an unspeakable loss, a military spouse should not have the additional burden of dealing with immediate foreclosure.

Lastly, this bill would help facilitate the transition from off-base to on-base housing. Due to the shortage of on-base military housing, many service members temporarily find off-base housing until on-base housing becomes available. When a service member on a waiting list is given the chance to move into on-base housing, he or she is sometimes unable to terminate his or her off-base housing lease. Including an order or opportunity to move from off-base to on-base housing as additional grounds for lease termination would allow service members and their families the chance to move into the military housing community. Several States, including Florida, Georgia, and Virginia, have similar laws, and we should extend this opportunity to service members serving at any of our military bases.

While the men and women of our Armed Forces are protecting our Nation overseas, we should do everything possible to protect their families and homes. I urge my colleagues to join Senators BEGICH, WHITEHOUSE, DURBIN, TESTER and me, as well as the Military Officers Association of America and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in supporting this bill, and taking these next steps to add protections for our military families.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S.J. Res. 26. A joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as submitted under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 on October 17, 2013; placed on the calendar.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 26

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves of the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as exercised pursuant to the certification under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 275—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 29, 2013, AS "NATIONAL TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION DAY" TO RECOGNIZE THAT TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION IS CRITICAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY AND COMMEMORATING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF INNOVATION TO PROSPERITY IN THE UNITED STATES AND ABROAD

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 275

Whereas the economic growth and prosperity of the United States is dependent on the continued innovation and entrepreneurial spirit of citizens of the United States;

Whereas domestic innovators and their efforts to promote invention have created entire segments of the United States economy;

Whereas many of the greatest companies in the United States have formed in humble labs, garages, and homes, and have come to fruition through the creative and determined efforts of the founders and early workers of such companies;

Whereas great universities, national labs, and research organizations in the United States have contributed to the technological, intellectual, and moral growth of the United States by expanding the frontiers of human knowledge;

Whereas the United States is home to leading corporations that grow by responding to changing times with innovative products and strategies;

Whereas 347 Nobel Laureates, the recipients of more than one-third of all Nobel Prize awards, are citizens of the United States;

Whereas inventions from the United States, such as the light bulb, polio vaccine, laser, communications satellite, and global positioning system, have profoundly and positively benefitted the way of life in the United States and around the world;

Whereas the Internet, an incredible invention that emerged at the end of the 20th century, continues to revolutionize life and pave the way for new industries, businesses, and industrial leaders;

Whereas in the course of completing a project funded by the United States Government, a partnership of universities invented the Advanced Research Projects Agency Network (ARPANET), the precursor of the Internet, demonstrating the creative power of focused government action magnified by the effort of individuals in the United States;

Whereas on October 29, 1969, 2 computers, 1 at the University of California, Los Angeles and the other at the Stanford Research Institute, exchanged electronic messages or ARPANET for the first time; and

Whereas the continued inspiration of citizens of the United States to take risks, pursue dreams, and change the world through improved technology will make the world a richer place: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors United States inventors and entrepreneurs who have taken the initiative to advance technology and productivity in the United States;

(2) designates October 29, 2013, as “National Technological Innovation Day”;

(3) calls on individuals of the United States to observe the day by participating in activities that celebrate the history of innovation in the United States; and

(4) encourages youth and individuals of the United States to continue to enhance the future with invention, dedication, and entrepreneurship.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on October 30, 2013, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to consider the following legislation: S. 235, to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, AK, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium; S. 611, to make a technical amendment to the T’u’f Shur Bien Preservation Trust Area Act, and for other purposes; and S. 920, to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224-2251.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on October 30, 2013, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing to receive testimony on the following bills: S. 1074, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe; S. 1132, to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes; and S. 161, to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224-2251.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Molly Ganley, Katrina Rogachevsky, and Thomas Hecht of my staff be granted floor privileges for the duration of today’s session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. RES. 26

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following any lead-

er remarks on Tuesday, October 29, the Republican leader or his designee be recognized to move to proceed to Calendar No. 223, S.J. Res. 26, a joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President’s exercise of authority to increase the debt limit; that the time until 12:30 p.m. tomorrow be for debate on the motion to proceed, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; that at 2:15 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the motion to proceed; that if the motion is successful, then the time for debate with respect to the joint resolution be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the joint resolution be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the joint resolution; finally, that all other provisions of the statute governing consideration of the joint resolution remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERANS’ COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 165, S. 893.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 893) to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2013, in the rate of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 893) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 893

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Veterans’ Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) RATE ADJUSTMENT.—Effective on December 1, 2013, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall increase, in accordance with subsection (c), the dollar amounts in effect on November 30, 2013, for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation under the provisions specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:

(1) WARTIME DISABILITY COMPENSATION.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1115(1) of such title.

(3) CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.—The dollar amount under section 1162 of such title.

(4) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO SURVIVING SPOUSE.—Each of the dollar amounts under subsections (a) through (d) of section 1311 of such title.

(5) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO CHILDREN.—Each of the dollar amounts under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.—Each dollar amount described in subsection (b) shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2013, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons under section 10 of Public Law 85-857 (72 Stat. 1263) who have not received compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

(e) PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in subsection (b), as increased under subsection (a), not later than the date on which the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2014.

NATIONAL TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION DAY

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent to proceed to S. Res. 275.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 275) designating October 29, 2013, as “National Technological Innovation Day” to recognize that technological innovation is critical to the United States economy and commemorating the contributions of innovation to prosperity in the United States and abroad.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 275) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution (S. Res. 275), with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1592

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1592) to provide for a delay of the individual mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until the American Health Benefit Exchanges are functioning properly.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading on this measure and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, October 29, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate consider the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 26, as provided for under the previous order; and that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for our weekly caucus meetings; further, that following the disposition of S.J. Res. 26, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 344, the nomination of Richard Griffin to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, with up to 2 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form prior to the cloture vote on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. So, Mr. President, at 2:15 p.m. or thereabouts tomorrow we should have two rollcall votes.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:53 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 29, 2013, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

ALFREDO J. BALSERA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2014, VICE ELIZABETH F. BAGLEY, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE JANET ANN NAPOLITANO, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 8081:

To be major general

COL. ROOSEVELT ALLEN, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. PAUL S. DWAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL CATHERINE A. CHILTON
BRIGADIER GENERAL STAYCE D. HARRIS
BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM B. WALDROP, JR.
BRIGADIER GENERAL TOMMY J. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. LISA L. TURNER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL JAMES T. IACocca

COLONEL DANIEL G. MITCHELL
COLONEL KURT L. SONNTAG

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. ANTHONY L. HALL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624, 3037 AND 3064:

To be brigadier general, judge advocate general's corps

COL. PAUL S. WILSON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) REBECCA J. MCCORMICK-BOYLE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

JESUS M. MUNOZLASALLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

WAYNE J. AARON
DIANNE C. DIGIAMBERDEAL
WILLIAM J. ERLE
BRIAN P. GOLDEN
THOMAS J. GREEN
CHRISTOPHER R. HEDRICK
CRAIG J. JACOBSEN
ARTHUR F. KAFF
FRANCIS V. KELLY
JEFFREY S. KOPP
LAURA J. KURZYNA
OWEN D. LEWIS
RICHARD W. LONG
TOBY D. MCCOY
WILLIAM F. OSBURN II
LAMAR D. TURNER
DAVID M. WARD
ANN H. ZGRODNIK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOHN R. DOOLITTLE II
BAUCUM W. FULK

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on October 28, 2013 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

RONALD J. BINZ, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2018, VICE JON WELLINGHOFF, TERM EXPIRING, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JUNE 27, 2013.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, October 28, 2013

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOLF).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 28, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable FRANK R. WOLF to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair would now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 01 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

On this day, we ask Your blessing on the men and women, citizens all, whose votes have populated this people's House. Each Member of this House has been given the sacred duty of representing them.

O Lord, we pray that those with whom our Representatives met during this past weekend in their home districts be blessed with peace and an assurance that they have been listened to.

We ask Your blessing now on the Members of this House, whose responsibility lies also beyond the local inter-

ests of constituents, while honoring them. Give each Member the wisdom to represent both local and national interests, a responsibility calling for the wisdom of Solomon. Grant them, if You will, a double portion of such wisdom.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HARRIS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

PROMISES MATTER

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, promises matter.

Time and again, President Obama said:

If you like your insurance plan, you will keep it. No one will be able to take that away from you.

My constituent Michael knows better. His family plan is being canceled. Next year, he and his expectant wife could see their monthly insurance payments rise from \$324 to \$895. Michael told me:

It is now impossible for our family to afford private health insurance.

On January 1, as many as 16 million Americans will have the coverage they are familiar with yanked out from under them. Too many will be caught between a rock and a hard place—struggling to afford pricier plans without the guarantee of subsidies but with the threat of tax.

Yes, today, we all know better. If you like your insurance, you won't necessarily get to keep it because Presi-

dent Obama and 279 congressional Democrats chose to pass a flawed law that, for many, strips the choice away.

IT'S JUST THE BEGINNING

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, The Augusta Chronicle lead editorial on Saturday hit the nail on the head, pointing out the real truths about the ObamaCare train wreck. Americans remember a "soothing assurance from President Obama in 2009 when he was hawking his Affordable Care Act to the masses—if you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan. Now tell that to the hundreds of thousands of Americans who already have received letters from health plans essentially telling them, You're on your own."

As the failed rollout of ObamaCare continues, American families are beginning to see its disastrous impacts—and this is just the beginning. In the coming weeks, more reports will reveal their President's signature health care law will increase premium rates; force employers to cut back on workers' hours, destroying jobs; and terminate existing policies for needy families.

Congress must address this issue. The House has acted. The Senate must do the same to protect every American family from an unsustainable disaster.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

BROKEN PROMISES

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the White House Web site claims:

If you like your plan, you can keep it, and you don't have to change a thing due to the health care law.

Well, Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Maryland said that 76,000 customers in Maryland will lose their current plans because of ObamaCare; in New Jersey, 800,000; in Florida, 300,000; and in California, at least 119,000 will see their policies terminated. It is happening everywhere.

Dana from Denton called my office to tell me she will not be able to keep her Blue Cross & Blue Shield plan because of ObamaCare. The new plan she is required to get will increase her premiums by \$350 a month.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Alex from Manchester told me his letter from Blue Cross & Blue Shield said:

The ACA requires you to pick a new plan to maintain coverage because your current plan will cease to exist at the time of your renewal.

Alex's family will have to pay \$300 more per month for the new plan.

Mr. Speaker, the President made a promise to the American people that they would be able to keep their plans. We now know that this is just not true.

JOURNALISTS WRONGLY CHANGE THEIR CODE OF ETHICS

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Society of Professional Journalists has given Americans some bad news about the state of the media. Their previous code of ethics specifically affirmed that:

News reports should be free of opinion or bias and represent all sides of an issue.

This line has been removed. In fact, the revised code makes no mention that news reports should be free of bias.

How can we expect journalists to cover events in a fair and objective way when their own code of ethics no longer discourages biased reporting? Maybe that explains the slanted coverage we see so often today when news stories have become editorials.

The Society of Professional Journalists should reclaim their ethics and restate their commitment to fair and balanced reporting. The media should provide the American people with the facts, not tell them what to think.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE TO ATTEND THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE HONORABLE C.W. BILL YOUNG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 384, and the order of the House January 3, 2013, the Speaker on October 24, 2013, appointed the following Members of the House to the committee to attend the funeral of the late Honorable C.W. Bill Young:

The gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN

The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BOEHNER

The members of the Florida delegation:

Ms. CORRINE BROWN
Mr. HASTINGS
Mr. MICA
Mr. CRENSHAW
Mr. MILLER
Mr. DIAZ-BALART
Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ
Mr. BILIRAKIS
Mr. BUCHANAN

Ms. CASTOR
Mr. POSEY
Mr. ROONEY
Mr. DEUTCH
Mr. NUGENT
Mr. ROSS
Mr. SOUTHERLAND
Mr. WEBSTER
Ms. WILSON
Mr. GRAYSON
Mr. DESANTIS
Ms. FRANKEL
Mr. GARCIA
Mr. MURPHY
Mr. RADEL
Mr. YOHO
Other Members in attendance:
Mr. CANTOR
Ms. PELOSI
Mr. HOYER
Mr. MCCARTHY, California
Mr. YOUNG, Alaska
Mr. SENSENBRENNER
Mr. ROGERS, Kentucky
Mr. WOLF
Mr. VISCLOSKEY
Mr. BISHOP, Georgia
Mr. CALVERT
Mr. MCKEON
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN
Ms. JACKSON LEE, Texas
Mr. LATHAM
Mr. PRICE, North Carolina
Mr. ADERHOLT
Ms. GRANGER
Mr. SESSIONS
Mr. CARTER
Mr. COLE
Mr. KING, Iowa
Mr. GOHMERT
Mr. ROE, Tennessee
Mr. NUNNELEE
Mr. WOMACK

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1601

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI) at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

AUTHORIZING AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3304) to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor to Bennie G. Adkins and Donald P. Sloat of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam Conflict and to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to certain other veterans who were previously recommended for award of the Medal of Honor.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3304

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION AND REQUEST FOR AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO BENNIE G. ADKINS FOR ACTS OF VALOR DURING THE VIETNAM CONFLICT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding the time limitations specified in section 3744 of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation with respect to the awarding of certain medals to persons who served in the Armed Forces, the President is authorized and requested to award the Medal of Honor under section 3741 of such title to Bennie G. Adkins of the United States Army for the acts of valor during the Vietnam Conflict described in subsection (b).

(b) ACTS OF VALOR DESCRIBED.—The acts of valor referred to in subsection (a) are the actions of then Sergeant First Class Bennie G. Adkins of the United States Army serving with Special Forces Detachment A-102 from March 9 to 12, 1966, during the Vietnam Conflict for which he was originally awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION AND REQUEST FOR AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO DONALD P. SLOAT FOR ACTS OF VALOR DURING THE VIETNAM CONFLICT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding the time limitations specified in section 3744 of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation with respect to the awarding of certain medals to persons who served in the Armed Forces, the President is authorized and requested to award the Medal of Honor under section 3741 of such title to Donald P. Sloat of the United States Army for the acts of valor during the Vietnam Conflict described in subsection (b).

(b) ACTS OF VALOR DESCRIBED.—The acts of valor referred to in subsection (a) are the actions of then Specialist Four Donald P. Sloat of the United States Army serving with 3rd Platoon, Delta Company, 2nd Battalion, 1st Infantry, 196th Light Infantry Brigade, Americal Division on January 17, 1970, during the Vietnam Conflict.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES PREVIOUSLY RECOMMENDED FOR AWARD OF THE MEDAL OF HONOR.

Section 552(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107; 10 U.S.C. 3741 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “HONOR.—”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) In addition to the authority provided by paragraph (1), a Medal of Honor may be awarded to a veteran of the Armed Forces

who, although not a Jewish-American war veteran or Hispanic-American war veteran described in subsection (b), was identified during the review of service records conducted under subsection (a) and regarding whom the Secretary of Defense submitted, before January 1, 2014, a recommendation to the President that the President award the Medal of Honor to that veteran.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material into the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3304. This bill would waive the time limit for the President to consider awarding the Medal of Honor to a handful of American heroes. The battlefield actions of these brave Americans have undergone a thorough review by the Department of Defense and have been determined to merit consideration for our Nation's highest honor.

Among those heroes who would be considered under this bill is Mr. Bennie Adkins of Opelika, Alabama. In 1966, while serving in Vietnam, then-Sergeant First Class Bennie Adkins was assigned to Special Forces Detachment A-102 at Special Forces Camp A Shau in the Republic of Vietnam. From March 9 to March 12 of that year, he displayed extraordinary bravery during a sustained and well-coordinated attack from a determined, vicious, and highly lethal Viet Cong force. Though recommended at the time by his chain of command for the Medal of Honor, he received, instead, the Distinguished Service Cross for his actions.

His citation read:

When the camp was attacked by a large Viet Cong force, Sergeant First Class Adkins rushed through intense hostile fire and manned a mortar position. Although he was wounded, he ran through exploding mortar rounds and dragged several of his comrades to safety.

When the hostile fire subsided, Sergeant First Class Adkins exposed himself to sporadic sniper fire and carried his wounded comrades to the camp dispensary. During the evacuation of a seriously wounded American, Sergeant First Class Adkins maneuvered outside the camp walls to draw fire and successfully cover the rescue.

During the early morning hours of 10 March 1966, a Viet Cong regiment launched its main attack. Within 2 hours, Sergeant First Class Adkins was the only man firing a mortar weapon. Although he was painfully

wounded and most of his crew was killed or wounded, he fought off the fanatical waves of attacking Viet Cong. After withdrawing to a communications bunker where several Americans were attempting to fight off a company of Viet Cong, Sergeant First Class Adkins killed numerous insurgents with his suppressive fire.

Running extremely low on ammunition, he returned to the mortar pit, gathered the vital ammunition, and ran through intense fire back to the communications bunker. After being ordered to evacuate the camp, all signal equipment and classified documents were destroyed. Sergeant First Class Adkins and a small group of men fought their way out of the camp and evaded the Viet Cong for 2 days until they were rescued by a helicopter.

Sergeant First Class Adkins' extraordinary heroism in close combat against a numerically superior hostile force was in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army.

Mr. Adkins continued his stellar military career until he retired in 1977 at the rank of sergeant major. Mr. Adkins also served a term as the national commander of the Legion of Valor.

Following a thorough review of Mr. Adkins' actions in battle by the Department of Defense, Secretary of Defense Hagel recently wrote to Congress that Mr. Adkins' actions merited the Medal of Honor and that, if Congress would waive the time requirement, he would recommend to President Obama that the President should award the Medal of Honor to Mr. Adkins.

As such, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter from Secretary Hagel.

This bill would also allow Mr. Donald Sloat to be considered for the Medal of Honor. On January 17, 1970, while serving in Vietnam, then-Specialist Donald Sloat, a machine gunner with Company D, Second Battalion, First Infantry Regiment, 196th Light Infantry, American Division, was killed while saving the lives of his squad members by drawing an enemy grenade to his body and shielding them from the blast. For his ultimate sacrifice to save his fellow soldiers, the DOD determined that Mr. Sloat's actions merited consideration for the Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to commend the Department of Defense for completing the review of Jewish and Hispanic American veterans going back to World War II in order to correct an injustice to deserving members of our military who risked their lives for their country but whose actions were overlooked due to their ethnicities and religions. While conducting this review, the Department discovered seven individuals who did not meet the exact criteria of the congressionally mandated review but who, nevertheless, were deserving of the Medal of Honor. This bill would allow them to be recognized with the Nation's highest award for valor.

It is important to note that none of these brave Americans asked for this

renewed consideration. It was through the advocacy and admiration of loved ones and of those who served with them that led to this effort.

For those brave Americans who show such extraordinary heroism in defense of our liberties, it is never too late to say thank you. To Mr. Adkins and Mr. Sloat and to all of the brave Americans like them, I say thank you.

I reserve the balance of my time.

PENTAGON,

Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. MIKE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: I am writing in response to your request for award of the Medal of Honor to then-Sergeant First Class (SFC) Bennie G. Adkins under the provisions of section 1130 of title 10, United States Code (U.S.C.), "Consideration of proposals for decorations not previously submitted in timely fashion: procedures for review."

I reviewed the proposal for award of the Medal of Honor to then-SFC Bennie G. Adkins for his valorous acts from March 9 to March 12, 1966, during the Vietnam Conflict. After giving the nomination careful consideration, I believe then-SFC Bennie G. Adkins' actions merit award of the Medal of Honor. However, section 3744 of title 10, U.S.C., requires that the Medal of Honor be awarded "within three years after the date of the act justifying the award." Therefore, a statutory time waiver to section 3744 of title 10, U.S.C. is required before the President of the United States may, if he so chooses, award the Medal of Honor to then-SFC Bennie G. Adkins.

The final award authority for the Medal of Honor rests solely with the President of the United States. My favorable determination in no way presumes what the President's decision might be.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs. A similar letter is being sent to the Chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services.

Sincerely,

CHUCK HAGEL,
Secretary of Defense.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3304, introduced by my friend and colleague, Mr. DEUTCH of Florida.

H.R. 3304 authorizes the President of the United States to award the Medal of Honor to Bennie G. Adkins, Donald P. Sloat, Melvin Morris, Ardie Copas, Jack Weinstein, Leonard Kravitz, Alfred Nietzel, Donald Schwab, and William Leonard.

These individuals have distinguished themselves in service to our Nation in previous conflicts, ranging from World War II to Vietnam. The individuals were reviewed by the appropriate services, and their nominations were given careful consideration by the Secretary of Defense, and their names have been submitted to the Congress.

Section 3744 of title X, United States Code, requires the Medal of Honor to be awarded within 3 years after the date of the act justifying the award, which

is why we are here on the floor—to seek a statutory time waiver to allow the President of the United States to award the Medal of Honor to these particular individuals. So I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), the author of this bill.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend, the gentlelady from Guam.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3304. I was pleased to work with my colleagues, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BRIDENSTINE of Oklahoma, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida, on this bill; and I appreciate the work that they do on behalf of our veterans and the men and women who serve our country today.

This legislation will waive the time limitation to allow the award of the Medal of Honor to two brave men, Bennie G. Adkins, a constituent of Mr. ROGERS', and Donald P. Sloat, a constituent of Mr. BRIDENSTINE's. I sincerely appreciate my colleagues' support and the support of the House Armed Services Committee in the effort to bring this legislation to the floor today.

This legislation will also allow the award of the Medal of Honor to several other deserving veterans. This bill represents the culmination of a long fight to remedy discrimination against Jewish American and Hispanic American veterans of our Armed Forces who, in spite of their acts of valor above and beyond the call of duty, may have been overlooked as being deserving of the Medal of Honor.

Over 12 years ago, this important effort began because Mitch Libman, a close friend of Leonard Kravitz', made it known that then-Private First Class Kravitz may have been improperly bypassed for the Medal of Honor. After sacrificing his life in combat in Korea, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross with the following citation:

Upon order to withdraw, Private Kravitz voluntarily remained to provide protective fire for the retiring elements. Traversing the gun to the left to cover the infiltrating enemy and ignoring the pleadings of his comrades to fall back, he fearlessly maintained his position. Detecting a column of Communist troops moving toward friendly positions, he swept the hostile soldiers with deadly accurate fire, killing the entire group. His destructive retaliation caused the enemy to concentrate vicious fire on his position and enabled the friendly elements to effect a withdrawal.

Leonard Kravitz bravely gave his life for the men fighting at his side and for his country. In spite of his acts of valor above and beyond the call of duty, Kravitz was not awarded the Medal of Honor. In fact, when Mr. Libman came forward to share Mr. Kravitz' story, no Jewish American veteran had been recommended to receive the Medal of

Honor for service in Korea. To ensure that this disparity was not the result of discrimination, Congress required each military department to conduct a review of veteran files to identify any deserving veteran who may have been overlooked for the Medal of Honor. This review has ensured that our highest military honor will be awarded based only on the acts of valor and courage displayed in battle and that no veteran will be denied the Medal of Honor as a result of his or her religion, race, or heritage.

I am extremely proud of the long, rich history of Jewish Americans and Hispanic Americans serving in our Armed Forces. Over half a million Jewish Americans fought for the United States in World War II, and 11,000 of them perished while fighting for this country. Jewish Americans have served with distinction in Korea, Vietnam, Operation Desert Storm, and countless other missions around the globe. Hispanic Americans have a proud history of military service stretching back to the Revolutionary War. Over 1 million Latino veterans have served courageously in our Armed Forces. Hispanic Americans and Jewish Americans are among the brave young men and women who have stepped forward to serve our Nation in our most recent conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Members of both of these communities have fought for America's freedom and have had to fight to ensure that they receive the respect and honor they are owed for their service. The review of hundreds of service records resulted in the recommendation of the award of the Medal of Honor to at least seven veterans, including Mr. Kravitz.

I want to thank all of those at the Department of Defense who diligently reviewed their records to make certain that we properly recognize all of the brave veterans deserving of the Medal of Honor.

□ 1615

The President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, has awarded the Medal of Honor to 3,471 of our finest Americans over the course of our Nation's history. With the passage of this bill, the President will be authorized to add Bennie G. Adkins, Donald P. Sloat, and at least seven other veterans whose heroic acts can at last receive the highest honor that they richly deserve.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the passage of this legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I have no further requests to speak, so I am prepared to close with an urging to my colleagues that they vote in favor of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, but I do want to commend the author of this bill, this very worthwhile piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3304.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VULNERABLE VETERANS HOUSING REFORM ACT OF 2013

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1742) to exclude from consideration as income under the United States Housing Act of 1937 payments of pension made under section 1521 of title 38, United States Code, to veterans who are in need of regular aid and attendance, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1742

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Vulnerable Veterans Housing Reform Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. EXCLUSION FROM INCOME.

Paragraph (4) of section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and any amounts" and inserting ", any amounts";

(2) by striking "or any deferred" and inserting ", any deferred"; and

(3) by inserting after "prospective monthly amounts" the following: ", and any expenses related to aid and attendance as detailed under section 1521 of title 38, United States Code".

SEC. 3. UTILITY ALLOWANCES AND DATA.

Section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) UTILITY ALLOWANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In determining the monthly assistance payment for a family under subparagraphs (A) and (B), the amount allowed for tenant-paid utilities shall not exceed the appropriate utility allowance for the family unit size as determined by the public housing agency regardless of the size of the dwelling unit leased by the family.

“(ii) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN FAMILIES.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), upon request by a family that includes a person with disabilities, an elderly family, or a family that includes any person who is less than 18 years of age, the public housing agency shall approve a utility allowance that is higher than the applicable amount on the utility allowance schedule, except that in the case of a family that includes a person with disabilities, the agency shall approve such higher amount only if a higher utility allowance is needed as a reasonable accommodation to make the program accessible to and usable by the family member with a disability.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(21) UTILITY DATA.—

“(A) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall, to the extent that data can be collected cost effectively, regularly publish such data regarding utility consumption and costs in local areas as the Secretary determines will be useful for the establishment of allowances for tenant-paid utilities for families assisted under this subsection.

“(B) USE OF DATA.—The Secretary shall provide such data in a manner that—

“(i) avoids unnecessary administrative burdens for public housing agencies and owners; and

“(ii) protects families in various unit sizes and building types, and using various utilities, from high rent and utility cost burdens relative to income.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material for the RECORD on H.R. 1742, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1742, the Vulnerable Veterans Housing Reform Act of 2013, bipartisan legislation that ensures fairness in the housing assistance made available to our veterans who have borne the physical costs of service to the country.

First, H.R. 1742 amends current law to exempt expenses related to a veteran's in-home aid and attendance-care payments from qualifying as income when determining their eligibility and payments from HUD programs. The in-home aid and attendance-care benefit is an enhanced pension program provided by the VA to severely disabled wartime veterans who make less than \$12,256 per year. These pensions are provided out of medical necessity and should not be considered disposable income. Including them in income calculations skews eligibility and wrongly reduces the housing assistance that would otherwise be available to thousands of disabled veterans.

The Vulnerable Veterans Housing Reform Act also improves the way utility allowances are calculated by instructing public housing authorities to base payments on family size—that is, the number of people benefitting from a payment—rather than the current standard of dwelling size. Using this approach ensures, for instance, a family of four living in a one-bedroom apartment will not receive less in utility allowance than a single individual living in a two-bedroom apartment. These housing reforms have broad sup-

port from State and local housing agencies, low-income housing advocates, and for-profit and nonprofit affordable housing providers.

Mr. Speaker, many of our current veterans assistance programs are flawed—they spend too much and they help too few. Fortunately, the CBO estimates the reforms in this bill will save almost \$50 million over 5 years while helping thousands of veterans obtain the appropriate housing assistance.

Sadly, homelessness affects over 60,000 veterans nationwide and approximately 1,000 in my home State of Arkansas. These numbers are unacceptable. As a combat veteran of both Iraq and Afghanistan, I understand not only the difficulties faced while serving in the military, but also the struggles that too many encounter upon returning to civilian life—especially with a life-altering disability. These men and women have put their lives on the line for our country; we should be doing all we can to support them—not making it harder for them to obtain assistance.

I am grateful to my colleague and fellow veteran, Congressman JOE HECK, and the Financial Services Committee for their work on this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and our disabled veterans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

About a year ago, I talked to a young marine from Magnolia, Delaware, in my district. He had been wounded in Afghanistan and was home recovering. I had called him really just to wish him well and to see how he was doing. This marine was not focused on his injuries. All he could think about and talk to me about was getting back to his base.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we need to be worthy of this marine's sacrifice, his selflessness, and his dedication to fighting for his country. Our Nation's most sacred obligation is to care for our men and women in uniform, both when they are serving abroad and when they come back home.

Unfortunately, today, we are falling short of this duty. Today, about 60,000 veterans are homeless. Close to 13,000 of these are veterans from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. While veterans represent only 7 percent of the U.S. population, they represent 13 percent of homeless Americans.

These numbers are just unacceptable. That is why I was pleased to join with my colleagues and friends, Mr. HECK and Mr. RENACCI, in introducing the Vulnerable Veterans Housing Reform Act of 2013. We are all part of a bipartisan working group that meets a couple of times a month. We have come up with a number of commonsense ideas just like this bill. Mr. DELANEY and Mr. RENACCI have another bill later on today.

Simply put, the Vulnerable Veterans Housing Reform Act ensures that veterans who need and deserve housing assistance get it. Right now, those veterans who are struggling the most—those who are severely disabled and have virtually no income—receive a benefit from the VA to cover the cost of their care. This benefit goes to caretakers who help our veterans with the daily tasks of living, bathing, eating, maintaining prosthetics, and the list goes on. However, when these same veterans go to apply for housing assistance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, this aid counts as income, making it harder for them to qualify for housing assistance. This policy just doesn't make sense, and it is hurting our veterans.

H.R. 1742, the Vulnerable Veterans Housing Reform Act, fixes this problem so that our severely disabled veterans aren't victims of homelessness as well. It excludes this aid—meant to address the health and daily living needs of severely disabled veterans—from the calculation of income in the housing assistance program.

Mr. Speaker, often when Members come in through the doors of the House Chamber to vote, we are greeted by members of our military who have been wounded in service of our Nation. Most have lost limbs, and all their lives are irreparably changed. Despite all they have already given, these men and women come to our Nation's Capitol to continue giving back and to inspire and thank us. We should thank them.

As we approach Veterans Day, I hope the House will honor their sacrifice by passing legislation that will make life just a little easier for those who have given so much to protect ours.

I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle recognize this as a critical issue. A similar version of this bill passed the House by voice vote in the last Congress. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill once again for the sake of our Nation's most vulnerable veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada, Dr. HECK, the sponsor of this legislation, a colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve and soon to be brigadier general.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my brother veteran, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), and my friend from the State of Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) for joining me in support of H.R. 1742, this bipartisan bill, the Vulnerable Veterans Housing Reform Act of 2013.

As has been stated, this bill would remove an unnecessary barrier that prevents our wartime veterans from receiving the housing assistance they so critically need. This body recognized the importance of this issue when it unanimously passed a substantially

similar bill, H.R. 6361, the Vulnerable Veterans Housing Reform Act of 2012, which I introduced last year. Unfortunately, that legislation was not considered by the Senate prior to the conclusion of the 112th Congress.

Quite simply, H.R. 1742 prevents the Department of Housing and Urban Development from considering a veteran's "aid and attendance benefits" as income when calculating their need and eligibility for housing assistance.

The aid and attendance benefit is an enhanced pension provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to our Nation's wartime veterans who are severely disabled and have little or no income. Veterans eligible for this benefit are those requiring the aid of another person in order to perform their activities of daily living.

In order to receive this benefit, a veteran must first establish his or her eligibility for a low-income pension, which requires an annual adjusted gross income of less than \$12,256 for a single veteran with no dependents.

Once eligibility is determined, low-income disabled veterans can receive, roughly, an additional \$8,000 in aid and attendance benefits annually to help defray the cost of their medical care. This is an important point: the aid and attendance benefit is for medical care; it is not discretionary income; it cannot be used for groceries, utilities, or transportation.

As you can imagine, these low-income veterans struggle daily to keep the lights on, put food on the table, and to keep a roof over their heads. Add to that the costs of paying for a personal care attendant and it becomes increasingly difficult for them to stay in their homes.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development operates a number of programs to assist these veterans. However, current regulations require that the aid and attendance benefit be counted as income when determining eligibility for housing assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this makes no sense. The VA provides this benefit to ensure that our low-income disabled wartime vets have the necessary resources to receive the medical care they need and that they have earned. While \$8,000 per year may seem like a substantial amount of money, it doesn't fully cover the cost of a full-time aide, but it is much more cost effective than placing the veteran in a nursing home or assisted living facility.

Continuing to count the aid and attendance benefit as income does nothing more than to reduce the housing assistance available to our low-income disabled vets and jeopardizes their ability to live independently.

Mr. Speaker, it is its stated goal of both this House and this administration to reduce homelessness in our veteran population. The need for this legislative fix is just as strong today as it

was last year. Most recent statistics estimate that approximately 63,000 veterans across America are homeless. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1742 will go a long way toward preventing homelessness for our Nation's veterans.

I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I just would like to thank the sponsors, Mr. HECK, Mr. RENACCI, and other veterans, Mr. COTTON, the Members from the Democratic side who cosponsored this, and all the Members of the House who supported this the last time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Delaware, as well as the gentleman from Nevada, and everybody in this institution that helps serve our veterans every single day.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1742, the Vulnerable Veterans Housing Reform Act of 2013.

Our country enjoys unparalleled freedom because of the commitment and sacrifice of our troops. I believe that if you serve our country, we should have your back. That means ensuring that military families and veterans have access to the full level of benefits they have earned.

Mr. Speaker, it is unacceptable that the aid and assistance we provide to our heroes and their families, would end up diminishing housing benefits. Treating this allocation as part of the income calculation to determine HUD benefits could lead to an increase in homelessness. Why force our heroes to choose between the care they require and the shelter they need?

H.R. 1742 clarifies that the benefits earned by our military retirees shall remain used to the purposes provided—and that assistance for caring for the disabled shall not jeopardize the ability to get the housing and shelter they require.

Again I am proud to support the Vulnerable Veterans Housing Reform Act of 2013 and urge my colleagues to do the same. Let's continue our commitment to our veterans. Let us do what we can to honor their service and sacrifices. With more and more servicemen transitioning to veteran status, it's critical that we protect the benefits they have earned in service to their country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1742.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

ESTABLISHING COMMISSION OR TASK FORCE TO EVALUATE THE BACKLOG OF DISABILITY CLAIMS

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2189) to establish a commission or task force to evaluate the backlog of disability claims of the Department of Veterans Affairs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2189

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Scoring of budgetary effects.

TITLE I—IMPROVEMENT OF CLAIMS PROCESSING

- Sec. 101. Evaluation of backlog of disability claims and appeals of claims of Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 102. Supplemental reports to the Strategic Plan to Eliminate the Compensation Claims Backlog.
- Sec. 103. Expedition of transfer of certain records.
- Sec. 104. Claims processors training.
- Sec. 105. Report by Comptroller General of the United States.
- Sec. 106. Priority for processing claims of the Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 107. Public availability of certain information about pending and completed claims for compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 108. Annual report on processing of claims.
- Sec. 109. Department of Veterans Affairs notice of average times for processing claims and percentage of claims approved.
- Sec. 110. Claim defined.

TITLE II—COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

- Sec. 201. Improvements to authority for performance of medical disabilities examinations by contract physicians.
- Sec. 202. Consideration by Secretary of Veterans Affairs of resources disposed of for less than fair market value by individuals applying for pension.
- Sec. 203. Bifurcated payments of compensation benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 204. Pension for certain veterans covered by Medicaid plans for services furnished by nursing facilities.

TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS

- Sec. 301. Review of operation of certain ships during the Vietnam Era.
- Sec. 302. Methods for validating certain service considered to be active service by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 303. Designation of American World War II Cities.

Sec. 304. Observance of Veterans Day.

SEC. 2. SCORING OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

TITLE I—IMPROVEMENT OF CLAIMS PROCESSING

SEC. 101. EVALUATION OF BACKLOG OF DISABILITY CLAIMS AND APPEALS OF CLAIMS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established a commission or task force to evaluate the backlog of claims within the Department of Veterans Affairs and the appeals process of claims.

(b) STUDIES.—

(1) BACKLOG STUDY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission or Task Force, acting through the subcommittee described in subsection (d)(2)(A), shall carry out a study on the backlog of claims, including the current process the Secretary of Veterans Affairs uses to evaluate claims and appeals and the laws and regulations applicable to such claims and appeals. Such study shall be a comprehensive evaluation and assessment of the backlog of claims, an analysis of possible improvements to the procedures used to process such claims, and any related issues that the Commission or Task Force considers relevant.

(B) MATTERS INCLUDED.—In carrying out the study under subparagraph (A), the Commission or Task Force shall examine the following:

(i) The backlog of claims, including an analysis of—

(I) the most effective means to quickly and accurately resolve all claims pending as of the date of the study; and

(II) with respect to the Department, the annual funding, number of full-time employees, workload management practices, and the progress, as of the date of the study, of the strategic plan.

(ii) Possible improvements to the claims process, including an evaluation and recommendations with respect to whether substantive and structural changes to the overall claims process are required.

(iii) In carrying out the evaluation and recommendations under subparagraph (B), an examination of—

(I) options that make no major substantive changes to the claims process;

(II) options that maintain the process but make minor changes; and

(III) options that make broad changes to the process.

(2) APPEALS PROCESS STUDY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission or Task Force, acting through the subcommittee described in subsection (d)(2)(B), shall carry out a study on the anticipated increase of appeals of claims, including the current appeals process and the laws and regulations applicable to such appeals. Such study shall be a comprehensive evaluation and assessment of such anticipated increase of appeals claims, an analysis of possible improvements to the procedures used to process such appeals, and any related issues that the Commission or Task Force considers relevant.

(B) MATTERS INCLUDED.—In carrying out the study under subparagraph (A), the Com-

mission or Task Force shall examine the following:

(i) The anticipated surge in appeals of claims, including an analysis of—

(I) the most effective means to quickly and accurately resolve pending appeals and future appeals;

(II) with respect to both the Board and the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, the annual funding, number of full-time employees, workload management practices, and the progress, as of the date of the study, of the strategic plan; and

(III) the efficiency, effectiveness, and utility of the Veterans Benefits Management System with respect to appeals operations, including an identification of key changes that may need to be implemented to such system.

(ii) Possible improvements to the appeals process, including an evaluation and recommendations with respect to whether substantive and structural changes to the overall appeals process are required.

(iii) In carrying out the evaluation and recommendations under clause (ii), an examination of—

(I) options that make no major substantive changes to the appeals process;

(II) options that maintain the process but make minor changes;

(III) options that make broad changes to the process;

(IV) the necessity of the multi-tiered levels of appeals at the regional office level, including filing a notice of disagreement, receipt of a statement of the case, supplemental statement of the case (if applicable), and substantive appeal (VA Form 9);

(V) the role of the Board and the Appeals Management Center, including—

(aa) the effectiveness of the workload management of the Board and the Center;

(bb) whether the Board and Center should be regionalized or maintain the centralized structure in the District of Columbia;

(cc) whether Board members should be required to pass the administrative law judges certification examination; and

(dd) whether the Board should continue to require de novo review of appeals; and

(VI) the role of the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims and the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, including—

(aa) the continued effectiveness and necessity of a multi-tiered structure of judicial review;

(bb) whether the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims should have Article I or Article III status;

(cc) expansion of either the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims or the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit jurisdiction, including by allowing such courts to hear class action lawsuits with respect to claims; and

(dd) the possibility of expanding judicial review of claims to all Federal circuit courts of appeals or allowing judicial review beyond the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims only by the Supreme Court.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out the studies under paragraph (1)(A) and (2)(A) and making any recommendations under this section, the Commission or Task Force shall consider the following:

(A) The interests of veterans, including with respect to accuracy, fairness, and transparency in the claims process of the Department.

(B) The values and requirements of the Constitution, including with respect to compliance with procedural and substantive due process.

(C) The public interest, including with respect to the responsible use of available resources.

(D) With respect to the study conducted under paragraph (1)(A), the importance of the claimant friendly, nonadversarial nature of the claims process.

(E) With respect to the study conducted under paragraph (2)(A), the importance of an appeals process that is efficient and easily understandable by a claimant.

(4) ROLE OF SECRETARY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, AND CHIEF JUDGE.—

(A) INFORMATION.—In carrying out each study under paragraph (1)(A) and (2)(A), at times that the Commission or Task Force determines appropriate, the Commission or Task Force shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Chairman of the Board, and the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, as the case may be, information with respect to remedies and solutions that the Commission or Task Force identifies pursuant to such a study.

(B) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary, the Chairman of the Board, and the Chief Judge shall each—

(i) fully consider the remedies and solutions submitted to the Secretary, the Chairman, or the Chief Judge, as the case may be, under subparagraph (A);

(ii) implement such remedies and solutions as the Secretary, the Chairman, or the Chief Judge, respectively, determines appropriate; and

(iii) submit to Congress justification for failing to implement any such remedy or solution.

(C) PLAN.—The Commission or Task Force shall submit to the Secretary, the Chairman of the Board, and the Chief Judge a feasible, timely, and cost-effective plan to eliminate the backlog of appeals of claims based on the remedies and solutions identified pursuant to the study under paragraph (2)(A) and the information submitted under subparagraph (A).

(c) COMPREHENSIVE REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL COMPREHENSIVE REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Commission or Task Force first meets, the Commission or Task Force shall submit to the President and Congress an initial comprehensive report on the studies conducted under paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) of subsection (b), including—

(A) the findings of the causes of the backlog of claims;

(B) a proposed plan to handle the anticipated surge in appeals of claims; and

(C) the level of cooperation the Commission or Task Force has received from the Secretary and the heads of other departments or agencies of the Federal Government.

(2) INTERIM COMPREHENSIVE REPORTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Commission or Task Force first meets, and each 30-day period thereafter ending on the date on which the Commission or Task Force submits the final comprehensive report under paragraph (3), the Commission or Task Force shall submit to the President and Congress a comprehensive report on—

(A) the progress of the Secretary with respect to implementing solutions to expedite the elimination of the backlog of claims pursuant to subsection (b)(4)(B)(ii);

(B) the progress of the Secretary, the Chairman of the Board, and the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims with respect to implementing solutions to complete appeals of claims in a timely manner in a timely manner pursuant to such subsection; and

(C) the level of cooperation the Commission or Task Force has received from the Secretary and the heads of other departments or agencies of the Federal Government.

(3) FINAL COMPREHENSIVE REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Commission or Task Force first meets, the Commission or Task Force shall submit to the President and Congress a comprehensive report on the following:

(A) With respect to the study conducted under subsection (b)(1)(A)—

(i) The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Commission or Task Force with respect to the matters referred to in such subsection.

(ii) The recommendations of the Commission or Task Force for revising and improving the backlog of claims and the procedures used to process claims.

(iii) The progress of the Secretary with respect to implementing solutions to expedite the elimination of the backlog of claims pursuant to subsection (b)(4)(B)(ii).

(iv) Other information and recommendations with respect to claims as the Commission or Task Force considers appropriate.

(B) With respect to the study conducted under subsection (b)(2)(A)—

(i) The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Commission or Task Force with respect to the matters referred to in such subsection.

(ii) The recommendations of the Commission or Task Force for revising and improving the appeals process;

(iii) The information described in subsection (b)(4)(A).

(iv) The feasible, timely, and cost effective plan described in subsection (b)(4)(C).

(v) The progress of the Secretary, the Chairman of the Board, and the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims with respect to implementing solutions to provide timely appeals of claims.

(vi) Other information and recommendations with respect to the appeals process as the Commission or Task Force considers appropriate.

(d) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission or Task Force shall be composed of 15 members, appointed as follows:

(A) Two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on the Backlog of Claims and one of whom shall be designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on Appeals.

(B) Two members appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on the Backlog of Claims and one of whom shall be designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on Appeals.

(C) Two members appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, one of whom shall be designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on the Backlog of Claims and one of whom shall be designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on Appeals.

(D) Two members appointed by the minority leader of the Senate, one of whom shall be designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on the Backlog of Claims and one of whom shall be designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on Appeals.

(E) Three members appointed by the President, two of whom shall be designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on the Backlog of Claims and one of whom shall be designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on Appeals.

(F) One member appointed by the Secretary of Defense, whom shall be designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on the Backlog of Claims.

(G) Two members appointed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, one of whom shall be designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on the Backlog of Claims and one of whom shall be designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on Appeals.

(H) One member appointed by the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, whom shall be designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on Appeals.

(2) SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Commission or Task Force shall have two subcommittees as follows:

(A) A Subcommittee on the Backlog of Claims consisting of the eight members designated in accordance with paragraph (1).

(B) A Subcommittee on Appeals consisting of the seven members designated in accordance with paragraph (1).

(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—Each member appointed under paragraph (1) shall be appointed based on the experience of the member as a veteran or on the subject matter expertise or other relevant experience of the member.

(4) ADVISORS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the 15 members appointed under paragraph (1), the Commission or Task Force shall—

(i) have five nonvoting, nonmember advisors, appointed by a majority of the Commission or Task Force, each from a different organization that represents the interests of veterans; and

(ii) seek advice from experts from non-governmental organizations (including veterans service organizations and military organizations), the Internet technology industry, and the insurance industry.

(B) ADVICE.—Individuals described in clause (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) shall provide advice to both subcommittees described in paragraph (2).

(5) CHAIRMAN.—The President shall designate a member of the Commission or Task Force who is appointed by the President and designated to serve upon the Subcommittee on the Backlog of Claims to serve as the chairman of the Commission or Task Force. The chairman may designate a member to serve as the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Backlog of Claims and a member to serve as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appeals to chair such subcommittees as the designee of the chairman of the Commission or Task Force.

(6) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.—Members of the Commission or Task Force shall be appointed for the life of the Commission or Task Force. A vacancy shall not affect its powers.

(7) VACANCY.—A vacancy on the Commission or Task Force shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(8) APPOINTMENT DEADLINE.—The appointment of members of the Commission or Task Force established in this section shall be made not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) MEETINGS.—

(1) INITIAL MEETING.—The Commission or Task Force shall hold its first meeting not later than 15 days after the date on which a majority of the members are appointed.

(2) MEETINGS.—The Commission or Task Force shall meet at the call of the chairman.

(3) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission or Task Force shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(f) POWERS OF THE COMMISSION OR TASK FORCE.—

(1) HEARINGS.—The Commission or Task Force may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission or Task Force considers advisable to carry out the purposes of this section.

(2) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission or Task Force may secure directly from any department or agency of the Federal Government such information as the Commission or Task Force considers necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Upon request of the chairman, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission or Task Force.

(3) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission or Task Force may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(4) GIFTS.—The Commission or Task Force may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of service or property.

(g) PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(1) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Commission or Task Force who is not an officer or employee of the United States shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which the member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission or Task Force. All members of the Commission or Task Force who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission or Task Force shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of service of the Commission or Task Force.

(3) STAFF.—

(A) APPOINTMENT.—The chairman of the Commission or Task Force may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint an executive director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission or Task Force to perform its duties. The appointment of an executive director shall be subject to the approval of the Commission or Task Force.

(B) COMPENSATION.—The chairman of the Commission or Task Force may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(4) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Upon request of the chairman of the Commission or Task Force, the head of any department or agency of the Federal Government may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, any personnel of that department or agency to the Commission or Task Force to assist it in carrying out its duties.

(5) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The chairman of the

Commission or Task Force may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(h) **TERMINATION OF COMMISSION OR TASK FORCE.**—The Commission or Task Force shall terminate 60 days after the date on which the Commission or Task Force submits the final comprehensive report under subsection (c)(3).

(i) **FUNDING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall, upon the request of the chairman of the Commission or Task Force, make available to the Commission or Task Force such amounts as the Commission or Task Force may require to carry out the duties of the Commission or Task Force under this section.

(2) **AVAILABILITY.**—Any sums made available to the Commission or Task Force shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until the termination of the Commission or Task Force.

(j) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “appeals process” means the process to appeal the determination by the Secretary of a claim beginning with the notice of disagreement filed pursuant to section 7105 of title 38, United States Code, and ending with the review of a decision by the Supreme Court pursuant to section 7292(c) of such title.

(2) The term “Board” means the Board of Veterans’ Appeals.

(3) The term “strategic plan” means the Strategic Plan to Eliminate the Compensation Claims Backlog, published by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on January 25, 2013.

SEC. 102. SUPPLEMENTAL REPORTS TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN TO ELIMINATE THE COMPENSATION CLAIMS BACKLOG.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 120 days thereafter until Memorial Day (May 25), 2015, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a supplemental report on the implementation by the Department of Veterans Affairs of the Strategic Plan to Eliminate the Compensation Claims Backlog. Each such report shall include—

(1) verification that during the period covered by the report, each claim was approved or denied by not later than 125 days after the date on which the claim is submitted with an accuracy rate of 98 percent, as specified in the Strategic Plan;

(2) a description of the specific measures, procedures, and metrics used to assess the implementation of the Strategic Plan for purposes of the supplemental report; and

(3) a detailed timeline for the implementation of each initiative contained in the Strategic Plan.

SEC. 103. EXPEDITION OF TRANSFER OF CERTAIN RECORDS.

(a) **SSA RECORDS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall enter into an agreement with the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration to ensure that the Commissioner transfers to the Secretary disability or medical records of the Commissioner that the Secretary will use to evaluate a claim by not later than 30 days after the Secretary requests such records.

(b) **DOD RECORDS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall enter

into an agreement with the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the Secretary of Defense transfers to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs medical records of members or former members of the Armed Forces that the Secretary will use to evaluate a claim by not later than 30 days after the Secretary requests such records.

(c) **NATIONAL GUARD RECORDS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly—

(1) submit to Congress a plan to reduce to 30 days the amount of time needed to provide members of the National Guard and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with the medical records of such members, including by partnering with appropriate officials of Federal or State departments or agencies; and

(2) implement such plan.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 104. CLAIMS PROCESSORS TRAINING.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish a training program to provide newly hired claims processors of the Department of Veterans Affairs with training for a period of not less than two years. In carrying out such program, the Secretary shall identify successful claims processors of the Department who can assist in the training of newly hired claims processors.

(b) **ABILITY TO PROCESS CLAIMS.**—The Secretary shall carry out the training program established under subsection (a) without increasing the amount of time in which claims are processed by the Department.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 105. REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the progress of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in improving the timeliness of claims processing and eliminating the backlog of claims. The report shall include any recommendations of the Comptroller General with respect to improving the ability of the Secretary to make such progress.

SEC. 106. PRIORITY FOR PROCESSING CLAIMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter I of chapter 51 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 5109C. Priority for processing claims

“(a) **PRIORITY.**—In processing claims for compensation under this chapter, the Secretary shall provide the following claimants with priority over other claimants:

“(1) Veterans who have attained the age of 70.

“(2) Veterans who are terminally ill.

“(3) Veterans with life-threatening illnesses.

“(4) Homeless veterans (as defined in section 2002 of this title).

“(5) Veterans who were awarded the Medal of Honor.

“(6) Veterans who are former prisoners of war.

“(7) Veterans whose claims are being reviewed again in relation to a previously denied claim relating to military sexual trauma.

“(8) Veterans whom the Secretary determines, on a case-by-case basis, are seriously or very seriously injured.

“(9) Veterans whom the Secretary determines, on a case-by-case basis, should be given priority under this section based on an application for good cause established by the Secretary.

“(b) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to carry out subsection (a).”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5109B the following new item:

“5109C. Priority for processing claims.”.

SEC. 107. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN INFORMATION ABOUT PENDING AND COMPLETED CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION UNDER THE LAWS ADMINISTERED BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter I of chapter 51 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 5109C, as added by section 106, the following new section:

“§ 5109D. Information about pending and completed claims

“(a) **AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.**—The Secretary shall maintain on the Internet website of the Department publicly accessible information about pending and completed claims for compensation under chapter 11 of this title. Such information shall include each of the following:

“(1) For each regional office and for the Department as a whole—

“(A) the average number of days between the date of the submittal of a claim and the date of the decision with respect to the claim for each of the preceding three-month and one-year period;

“(B) the average number of days such a claim is pending during the preceding three-month and one-year periods;

“(C) the quality and accuracy rating of the claims adjudication process during the preceding three-month and one-year periods;

“(D) the number of claims pending;

“(E) the number of pending claims that have been pending for more than 125 days; and

“(F) the number of claims completed during—

“(i) the current month, to date;

“(ii) the month preceding the current month;

“(iii) the current calendar year, to date; and

“(iv) the calendar year preceding the current calendar year.

“(2) For each medical condition for which a claim for compensation is submitted, for each regional office and for the Department as a whole—

“(A) the average number of days between the date of the submittal of a claim relating to such medical condition and the date of the decision with respect to the claim for each of the preceding three-month and one-year period;

“(B) the average number of days such a claim is pending during the preceding three-month and one-year periods;

“(C) the quality and accuracy rating of the claims adjudication process as applied to claims relating to such medical condition during the preceding three-month and one-year periods;

“(D) the number of pending claims relating to such condition;

“(E) the number of such pending claims that have been pending for more than 125 days; and

“(F) the number of claims relating to such medical condition completed during—

“(i) the current month, to date;

“(ii) the month preceding current month; and
“(iii) the current calendar year, to date; and

“(iv) the calendar year preceding the current calendar year.

“(b) UPDATES.—The Secretary shall update the information on the website under subsection (a) not less frequently than once every seven days.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 5109C, as added by section 106, the following new item:

“5109D. Information about pending and completed claims.”.

SEC. 108. ANNUAL REPORT ON PROCESSING OF CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 51 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 5109D, as added by section 107, the following new section:

“§ 5109E. Annual report on processing of claims

“(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall include in the annual report to Congress required under section 529 of this title information on the following:

“(1) The automatic processing of claims for compensation.

“(2) The performance of any regional office that fails to meet the administrative goals of the regional office with respect to timeliness and accuracy in processing claims for compensation.

“(3) The timeliness of receiving information pursuant to a request by the Secretary to the head of another department or agency of the United States for information required by the Secretary in adjudicating a claim for compensation under chapter 11 of this title.

“(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—In carrying out subsection (a) to include information in the report required under section 529 of this title, the Secretary shall include the following:

“(1) With respect to the information required by subsection (a)(1)—

“(A) each medical condition for which claims relating to such condition were processed in an electronic automated fashion during the fiscal year covered by the report;

“(B) the feasibility of processing any additional medical conditions in an electronic automated fashion and any barriers to such processing, including any such barriers relating to the schedule for rating disabilities under section 1155 of this title;

“(C) the number of claims for compensation relating to each medical condition submitted during such fiscal year; and

“(D) for each medical condition, the percentage of claims denied and the percentage of claims approved during such fiscal year.

“(2) With respect to the information required by subsection (a)(2), in the case of any regional office that, for the fiscal year covered by the report, did not meet the administrative goal of having no claim pending for more than 125 days and achieving an accuracy rating of 98 percent—

“(A) a signed statement prepared by the individual serving as director of the regional office as of the date of the submittal of the report containing—

“(i) an explanation for why the regional office did not meet the goal;

“(ii) a description of the additional resources needed to enable the regional office to reach the goal; and

“(iii) a description of any additional actions planned for the subsequent fiscal year that are proposed to enable the regional office to meet the goal; and

“(B) a statement prepared by the Under Secretary for Benefits explaining how the failure of the regional office to meet the goal affected the performance evaluation of the director of the regional office.

“(3) With respect to the information required by subsection (a)(3)—

“(A) the number of requests described in such paragraph made during the fiscal year covered by the report; and

“(B) the average response time for such requests made during each month of such fiscal year, as determined based on the period beginning on the date on which the Secretary made the request and ending on the date on which the Secretary determines that the request is completed.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 5109D, as added by section 107, the following new item:

“5109E. Annual report on processing of claims.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 5109E of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 109. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS NOTICE OF AVERAGE TIMES FOR PROCESSING CLAIMS AND PERCENTAGE OF CLAIMS APPROVED.

(a) PUBLIC NOTICE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall post the information described in subsection (c)—

(1) in a conspicuous place in each regional office and claims intake facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

(2) on the Internet website of the Department.

(b) NOTICE TO APPLICANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide to each person who submits a claim for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary before the person submits such claim—

(A) notice of the information described in subsection (c); and

(B) notice that, during the period ending on August 6, 2015, the person is eligible to receive up to an extra year of benefits payments if the person files an original claim that is fully developed.

(2) ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT OF NOTICE.—Each person who submits a claim for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary shall include in such application a signed form acknowledging that the person received the information described in subsection (c).

(c) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The information described in this subsection is the following:

(A) The average processing time of the claims described in paragraph (2) and the percentage of such submitted claims for which benefits are awarded.

(B) The percentage of each of the following types of submitted claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for which benefits are awarded:

(i) Claims filed by veterans who authorized a veterans service organization to act on the veterans' behalf under a durable power of attorney.

(ii) Claims filed by veterans who authorized a person other than a veterans service organization to act on the veterans' behalf under a durable power of attorney.

(iii) Claims filed by veterans who did not authorize a person to act on the veterans' behalf under a durable power of attorney.

(2) CLAIMS DESCRIBED.—The claims described in this paragraph are each of the following types of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs:

(A) A fully developed claim that is submitted in standard electronic form.

(B) A fully developed claim that is submitted in standard paper form.

(C) A claim that is not fully developed that is submitted in standard electronic form.

(D) A claim that is not fully developed that is submitted in standard paper form.

(E) A claim that is not fully developed that is submitted in nonstandard paper form.

(3) UPDATE OF INFORMATION.—The information described in this subsection shall be updated not less frequently than once each fiscal quarter.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 110. CLAIM DEFINED.

Except as otherwise provided, in this title, the term “claim” means a claim for disability compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

TITLE II—COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

SEC. 201. IMPROVEMENTS TO AUTHORITY FOR PERFORMANCE OF MEDICAL DISABILITIES EXAMINATIONS BY CONTRACT PHYSICIANS.

(a) EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY AUTHORITY.—Subsection (c) of section 704 of the Veterans Benefits Act of 2003 (38 U.S.C. 5101 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2016”.

(b) LICENSURE OF CONTRACT PHYSICIANS.—

(1) TEMPORARY AUTHORITY.—Such section 704 is further amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) LICENSURE OF CONTRACT PHYSICIANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any law regarding the licensure of physicians, a physician described in paragraph (2) may conduct an examination pursuant to a contract entered into under subsection (b) at any location in any State, the District of Columbia, or a Commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States, so long as the examination is within the scope of the authorized duties under such contract.

“(2) PHYSICIAN DESCRIBED.—A physician described in this paragraph is a physician who—

“(A) has a current license to practice the health care profession of the physician; and

“(B) is performing authorized duties for the Department of Veterans Affairs pursuant to a contract entered into under subsection (b).”.

(2) PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 504 of the Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 1996 (38 U.S.C. 5101 note) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) LICENSURE OF CONTRACT PHYSICIANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any law regarding the licensure of physicians, a physician described in paragraph (2) may conduct an examination pursuant to a contract entered into under subsection (a) at any location in any State, the District of Columbia, or a Commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States, so long as the examination is within the scope of the authorized duties under such contract.

“(2) PHYSICIAN DESCRIBED.—A physician described in this paragraph is a physician who—

“(A) has a current license to practice the health care profession of the physician; and
 “(B) is performing authorized duties for the Department of Veterans Affairs pursuant to a contract entered into under subsection (a).”.

(C) **EXPANSION OF PILOT PROGRAM.**—Subsection (b) of such section 504 is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **LOCATIONS.**—

“(1) **NUMBER.**—The Secretary may carry out the pilot program under this section through not more than 15 regional offices of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

“(2) **SELECTION.**—The Secretary shall select the regional offices under paragraph (1) by analyzing appropriate data to determine the regional offices that require support. Such appropriate data shall include—

“(A) the number of backlogged claims;

“(B) the total pending case workload;

“(C) the length of time cases have been pending;

“(D) the accuracy of completed cases;

“(E) the overall timeliness of completed cases;

“(F) the availability and workload of the examination units and physicians of the medical centers in the regional office; and

“(G) any other data the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(3) **ANNUAL ANALYSIS.**—The Secretary shall carry out the data analysis of the regional offices under paragraph (2) during each year in which the program under this section is carried out to determine the regional offices selected under paragraph (1) for such year.”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section and the amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. CONSIDERATION BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OF RESOURCES DISPOSED OF FOR LESS THAN FAIR MARKET VALUE BY INDIVIDUALS APPLYING FOR PENSION.

(a) **VETERANS.**—Section 1522 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” before “The Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2)(A) If a veteran otherwise eligible for payment of pension under section 1513 or 1521 of this title or the spouse of such veteran disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i), the Secretary shall deny or discontinue the payment of pension to such veteran under section 1513 or 1521 of this title, as the case may be, for months during the period beginning on the date described in subparagraph (D) and equal to the number of months calculated as provided in subparagraph (E).
 “(B)(i) For purposes of this paragraph, a covered resource is any resource that was a part of the corpus of the estate of the veteran or, if the veteran has a spouse, the corpus of the estates of the veteran and of the veteran's spouse, that the Secretary considers that under all the circumstances, if the veteran or spouse had not disposed of such resource, it would be reasonable that the resource (or some portion of the resource) be consumed for the veteran's maintenance.
 “(ii) For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary may consider, in accordance with regulations the Secretary shall prescribe, a transfer of an asset (including a transfer of an asset to an annuity, trust, or other financial instrument or investment) a disposal of

a covered resource for less than fair market value if such transfer reduces the amount in the corpus of the estate of the veteran or, if the veteran has a spouse, the corpus of the estates of the veteran and of the veteran's spouse, that the Secretary considers, under all the circumstances, would be reasonable to be consumed for the veteran's maintenance.

“(C)(i) The look-back date described in this clause is a date that is 36 months before the date described in clause (ii).

“(ii) The date described in this clause is the date on which the veteran applies for pension under section 1513 or 1521 of this title or, if later, the date on which the veteran (or the spouse of the veteran) disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value.

“(D) The date described in this subparagraph is the first day of the first month in or after which covered resources were disposed of for less than fair market value and which does not occur in any other period of ineligibility under this paragraph.

“(E) The number of months calculated under this subparagraph shall be equal to—

“(i) the total, cumulative uncompensated value of the portion of covered resources so disposed of by the veteran (or the spouse of the veteran) on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i) that the Secretary determines would reasonably have been consumed for the veteran's maintenance; divided by

“(ii) the maximum amount of monthly pension that is payable to a veteran under section 1513 or 1521 of this title, including the maximum amount of increased pension payable under such sections on account of family members, but not including any amount of pension payable under such sections because a veteran is in need of regular aid and attendance or is permanently housebound,

rounded, in the case of any fraction, to the nearest whole number, but shall not in any case exceed 36 months.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” before “The Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2)(A) If a veteran otherwise eligible for payment of increased pension under subsection (c), (d), (e), or (f) of section 1521 of this title on account of a child, the spouse of the veteran, or the child disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i), the Secretary shall deny or discontinue payment of such increased pension for months during the period beginning on the date described in subparagraph (D) and equal to the number of months calculated as provided in subparagraph (E).
 “(B)(i) For purposes of this paragraph, a covered resource is any resource that was a part of the corpus of the estate of the child that the Secretary considers that under all the circumstances, if the veteran, the spouse of the veteran, or the child had not disposed of such resource, it would be reasonable that the resource (or some portion of the resource) be consumed for the child's maintenance.
 “(ii) For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary may consider, in accordance with regulations the Secretary shall prescribe, a transfer of an asset (including a transfer of an asset to an annuity, trust, or other financial instrument or investment) a disposal of

the corpus of the estate of the child that the Secretary considers, under all the circumstances, would be reasonable to be consumed for the child's maintenance.

“(C)(i) The look-back date described in this clause is a date that is 36 months before the date described in clause (ii).

“(ii) The date described in this clause is the date on which the veteran applies for payment of increased pension under subsection (c), (d), (e), or (f) of section 1521 of this title on account of a child or, if later, the date on which the veteran, the spouse of the veteran, or the child disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value.

“(D) The date described in this subparagraph is the first day of the first month in or after which covered resources were disposed of for less than fair market value and which does not occur in any other period of ineligibility under this paragraph.

“(E) The number of months calculated under this subparagraph shall be equal to—

“(i) the total, cumulative uncompensated value of the portion of covered resources so disposed of by the veteran, the spouse of the veteran, or the child on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i) that the Secretary determines would reasonably have been consumed for the child's maintenance; divided by

“(ii) the maximum amount of increased monthly pension that is payable to a veteran under subsection (c), (d), (e), or (f) of section 1521 of this title on account of a child, rounded, in the case of any fraction, to the nearest whole number, but shall not in any case exceed 36 months.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(c)(1) The Secretary shall not deny or discontinue payment of pension under section 1513 or 1521 of this title or payment of increased pension under subsection (c), (d), (e), or (f) of section 1521 of this title on account of a child by reason of the application of subsection (a)(2) or (b)(2) of this section to the disposal of resources by an individual to the extent that—

“(A) a satisfactory showing is made to the Secretary (in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary) that all resources disposed of for less than fair market value have been returned to the individual who disposed of the resources; or

“(B) the Secretary determines, under procedures established by the Secretary, that the denial or discontinuance of payment would work an undue hardship as determined on the basis of criteria established by the Secretary.

“(2) At the time a veteran applies for pension under section 1513 or 1521 of this title or increased pension under subsection (c), (d), (e), or (f) of section 1521 of this title on account of a child, and at such other times as the Secretary considers appropriate, the Secretary shall—

“(A) inform such veteran of the provisions of subsections (a)(2) and (b)(2) providing for a period of ineligibility for payment of pension under such sections for individuals who make certain dispositions of resources for less than fair market value; and

“(B) obtain from such veteran information which may be used in determining whether or not a period of ineligibility for such payments would be required by reason of such subsections.

“(d) Subsections (a)(2) and (b)(2) shall not apply with respect to the disposal of resources or the transfer of an asset if such disposal or transfer is to a trust described in section 1917(d)(4) of the Social Security Act

(42 U.S.C. 1396p(d)(4)) that is established for the benefit of a child of the veteran.”.

(b) SURVIVING SPOUSES AND CHILDREN.—Section 1543 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2)(A) If a surviving spouse otherwise eligible for payment of pension under section 1541 of this title disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i), the Secretary shall deny or discontinue the payment of pension to such surviving spouse under section 1541 of this title for months during the period beginning on the date described in subparagraph (D) and equal to the number of months calculated as provided in subparagraph (E).

“(B)(i) For purposes of this paragraph, a covered resource is any resource that was a part of the corpus of the estate of the surviving spouse that the Secretary considers that under all the circumstances, if the surviving spouse had not disposed of such resource, it would be reasonable that the resource (or some portion of the resource) be consumed for the surviving spouse’s maintenance.

“(ii) For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary may consider, in accordance with regulations the Secretary shall prescribe, a transfer of an asset (including a transfer of an asset to an annuity, trust, or other financial instrument or investment) a disposal of a covered resource for less than fair market value if such transfer reduces the amount in the corpus of the estate of the surviving spouse that the Secretary considers, under all the circumstances, would be reasonable to be consumed for the surviving spouse’s maintenance.

“(C)(i) The look-back date described in this clause is a date that is 36 months before the date described in clause (ii).

“(ii) The date described in this clause is the date on which the surviving spouse applies for pension under section 1541 of this title or, if later, the date on which the surviving spouse disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value.

“(D) The date described in this subparagraph is the first day of the first month in or after which covered resources were disposed of for less than fair market value and which does not occur in any other period of ineligibility under this paragraph.

“(E) The number of months calculated under this subparagraph shall be equal to—

“(i) the total, cumulative uncompensated value of the portion of covered resources so disposed of by the surviving spouse on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i) that the Secretary determines would reasonably have been consumed for the surviving spouse’s maintenance; divided by

“(ii) the maximum amount of monthly pension that is payable to a surviving spouse under section 1541 of this title, including the maximum amount of increased pension payable under such section on account of a child, but not including any amount of pension payable under such section because a surviving spouse is in need of regular aid and attendance or is permanently housebound, rounded, in the case of any fraction, to the nearest whole number, but shall not in any case exceed 36 months.

“(F) In the case of a transfer by the surviving spouse during the veteran’s lifetime that resulted in a period of ineligibility for

the veteran under section 1522 of this title, the Secretary shall apply to the surviving spouse any remaining ineligibility for that period.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4)(A) If a surviving spouse otherwise eligible for payment of increased pension under subsection (c), (d), or (e) of section 1541 of this title on account of a child or the child disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i), the Secretary shall deny or discontinue payment of such increased pension for months during the period beginning on the date described in subparagraph (D) and equal to the number of months calculated as provided in subparagraph (E).

“(B)(i) For purposes of this paragraph, a covered resource is any resource that was a part of the corpus of the estate of the child that the Secretary considers that under all the circumstances, if the surviving spouse or the child had not disposed of such resource, it would be reasonable that the resource (or some portion of the resource) be consumed for the child’s maintenance.

“(ii) For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary may consider, in accordance with regulations the Secretary shall prescribe, a transfer of an asset (including a transfer of an asset to an annuity, trust, or other financial instrument or investment) a disposal of a covered resource for less than fair market value if such transfer reduces the amount in the corpus of the estate of the child that the Secretary considers, under all the circumstances, would be reasonable to be consumed for the child’s maintenance.

“(C)(i) The look-back date described in this clause is a date that is 36 months before the date described in clause (ii).

“(ii) The date described in this clause is the date on which the surviving spouse applies for payment of increased pension under subsection (c), (d), or (e) of section 1541 of this title on account of a child or, if later, the date on which the surviving spouse (or the child) disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value.

“(D) The date described in this subparagraph is the first day of the first month in or after which covered resources were disposed of for less than fair market value and which does not occur in any other period of ineligibility under this paragraph.

“(E) The number of months calculated under this clause shall be equal to—

“(i) the total, cumulative uncompensated value of the portion of covered resources so disposed of by surviving spouse (or the child) on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i) that the Secretary determines would reasonably have been consumed for the child’s maintenance; divided by

“(ii) the maximum amount of increased monthly pension that is payable to a surviving spouse under subsection (c), (d), or (e) of section 1541 of this title on account of a child,

rounded, in the case of any fraction, to the nearest whole number, but shall not in any case exceed 36 months.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” before “The Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2)(A) If a child otherwise eligible for payment of pension under section 1542 of this title or any person with whom such child is residing who is legally responsible for such child’s support disposes of covered resources

for less than fair market value on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i), the Secretary shall deny or discontinue the payment of pension to such child under section 1542 of this title for months during the period beginning on the date described in subparagraph (D) and equal to the number of months calculated as provided in subparagraph (E).

“(B)(i) For purposes of this paragraph, a covered resource is any resource that was a part of the corpus of the estate of the child or the corpus of the estate of any person with whom such child is residing who is legally responsible for such child’s support that the Secretary considers that under all the circumstances, if the child or person had not disposed of such resource, it would be reasonable that the resource (or some portion of the resource) be consumed for the child’s maintenance.

“(ii) For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary may consider, in accordance with regulations the Secretary shall prescribe, a transfer of an asset (including a transfer of an asset to an annuity, trust, or other financial instrument or investment) a disposal of a covered resource for less than fair market value if such transfer reduces the amount in the corpus of the estate described in clause (i) that the Secretary considers, under all the circumstances, would be reasonable to be consumed for the child’s maintenance.

“(C)(i) The look-back date described in this clause is a date that is 36 months before the date described in clause (ii).

“(ii) The date described in this clause is the date on which the child applies for pension under section 1542 of this title or, if later, the date on which the child (or person described in subparagraph (B)) disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value.

“(D) The date described in this clause is the first day of the first month in or after which covered resources were disposed of for less than fair market value and which does not occur in any other period of ineligibility under this paragraph.

“(E) The number of months calculated under this clause shall be equal to—

“(i) the total, cumulative uncompensated value of the portion of covered resources so disposed of by the child (or person described in subparagraph (B)) on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i) that the Secretary determines would reasonably have been consumed for the child’s maintenance; divided by

“(ii) the maximum amount of monthly pension that is payable to a child under section 1542 of this title,

rounded, in the case of any fraction, to the nearest whole number, but shall not in any case exceed 36 months.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(c)(1) The Secretary shall not deny or discontinue payment of pension under section 1541 or 1542 of this title or payment of increased pension under subsection (c), (d), or (e) of section 1541 of this title on account of a child by reason of the application of subsection (a)(2), (a)(4), or (b)(2) of this section to the disposal of resources by an individual to the extent that—

“(A) a satisfactory showing is made to the Secretary (in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary) that all resources disposed of for less than fair market value have been returned to the individual who disposed of the resources; or

“(B) the Secretary determines, under procedures established by the Secretary, that

the denial or discontinuance of payment would work an undue hardship as determined on the basis of criteria established by the Secretary.

“(2) At the time a surviving spouse or child applies for pension under section 1541 or 1542 of this title or increased pension under subsection (c), (d), or (e) of section 1541 of this title on account of a child, and at such other times as the Secretary considers appropriate, the Secretary shall—

“(A) inform such surviving spouse or child of the provisions of subsections (a)(2), (a)(4), and (b)(2), as applicable, providing for a period of ineligibility for payment of pension or increased pension under such sections for individuals who make certain dispositions of resources for less than fair market value; and

“(B) obtain from such surviving spouse or child information which may be used in determining whether or not a period of ineligibility for such payments would be required by reason of such subsections.

“(d) Paragraphs (2) and (4) of subsection (a) and subsection (b)(2) shall not apply with respect to the disposal of resources or the transfer of an asset if such disposal or transfer is to a trust described in section 1917(d)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396p(d)(4)) that is established for the benefit of a child of the veteran or surviving spouse.”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Subsections (a)(2), (b)(2), and (c) of section 1522 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), and subsections (a)(2), (a)(4), (b)(2), and (c) of section 1543 of such title, as added by subsection (b), shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to payments of pension and increased pension applied for after such date and to payments of pension and increased pension for which eligibility is redetermined after such date, except that no reduction in pension shall be made under such subsections because of any disposal of covered resources made before such date.

(d) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once each year thereafter through 2018, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the administration of subsections (a)(2), (b)(2), and (c) of section 1522 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), and subsections (a)(2), (a)(4), (b)(2), and (c) of section 1543 of such title, as added by subsection (b), during the most recent 12-month period.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following, for the period covered by the report:

(A) The number of individuals who applied for pension under chapter 15 of such title.

(B) The number of individuals who received pension under such chapter.

(C) The number of individuals with respect to whom the Secretary denied or discontinued payment of pension under the subsections referred to in paragraph (1).

(D) A description of any trends identified by the Secretary regarding pension payments that have occurred as a result of the amendments made by this section.

(E) Such other information as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs and the Select Committee on Aging of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 203. BIFURCATED PAYMENTS OF COMPENSATION BENEFITS UNDER LAWS ADMINISTERED BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter III of chapter 51 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 5127. Bifurcated payments of compensation benefits

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—During the eight-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section, in the case of a claim described in subsection (b), prior to adjudicating the claim, the Secretary shall make payments of monetary benefits to the claimant based on any disability for which the Secretary has made a decision. Upon the adjudication of the claim, the Secretary shall pay to the claimant any monetary benefits awarded to the claimant for the period of payment under section 5111 of this title less the amount of such benefits paid to the claimant under this section.

“(b) **CLAIM DESCRIBED.**—A claim described in this subsection is a claim for disability compensation under chapter 11 of this title—

“(1) the adjudication of which requires the Secretary to make decisions with respect to two or more disabilities; and

“(2) for which, before completing the adjudication of the claim, the Secretary makes a decision with respect to a disability that would result in the payment of monetary benefits to the claimant upon the adjudication of the claim.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to such subchapter the following new item:

“§ 5127. Bifurcated payments of compensation benefits.”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Section 5127 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. PENSION FOR CERTAIN VETERANS COVERED BY MEDICAID PLANS FOR SERVICES FURNISHED BY NURSING FACILITIES.

Section 5503(d)(7) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “November 30, 2016” and inserting “September 30, 2018”.

TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 301. REVIEW OF OPERATION OF CERTAIN SHIPS DURING THE VIETNAM ERA.

(a) **REVIEW REQUIRED.**—By not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall review the logs of each ship under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy that is known to have operated in the waters near Vietnam during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975, to determine—

(1) whether each such ship operated in the territorial waters of the Republic of Vietnam during such period; and

(2) for each such ship that so operated—

(A) the date or dates when the ship so operated; and

(B) the distance from the shore of the location where the ship operated that was the closest proximity to shore.

(b) **PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**—Upon a de-

termination that any such ship so operated, the Secretary of Defense shall provide such determination, together with the information described in subsection (a)(2) about the ship, to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall make publicly available all unclassified information provided to the Secretary under subsection (b).

SEC. 302. METHODS FOR VALIDATING CERTAIN SERVICE CONSIDERED TO BE ACTIVE SERVICE BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Merchant Marine Act, 1936 established the United States Maritime Commission, and stated as a matter of policy that the United States should have a merchant marine that is “capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency”.

(2) The Social Security Act Amendments of 1939 (Public Law 76-379) expanded the definition of employment to include service “on or in connection with an American vessel under contract of service which is entered into within the United States or during the performance of which the vessel touches at a port in the United States, if the employee is employed on and in connection with such vessel”.

(3) The Joint Resolution to repeal sections 2, 3, and 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for other purposes (Public Law 77-294; 55 Stat. 764) repealed section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (related to the arming of United States vessels) and authorized the President during the national emergency to arm or permit to arm any United States vessel.

(4) On February 7, 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, through Executive Order Number 9054, established the War Shipping Administration that was charged with building or purchasing, and operating the civilian shipping vessels needed for the war effort.

(5) During World War II, United States merchant mariners transported goods and materials through “contested waters” to the various combat theaters.

(6) At the conclusion of World War II, United States merchant mariners were responsible for transporting several million members of the United States Armed Forces back to the United States.

(7) The GI Bill Improvement Act of 1977 (Public Law 95-202) provided that the Secretary of Defense could determine that service for the Armed Forces by organized groups of civilians, or contractors, be considered “active service” for benefits administered by the Veterans Administration.

(8) Department of Defense Directive 1000.20 directed that the determination be made by the Secretary of the Air Force, and established the Civilian/Military Service Review Board and Advisory Panel.

(9) In 1987, three merchant mariners along with the AFL-CIO sued Edward C. Aldridge, Secretary of the Air Force, challenging the denial of their application for veterans status. In *Schumacher v. Aldridge* (665 F. Supp. 41 (D.D.C. 1987)), the Court determined that Secretary Aldridge had failed to “articulate clear and intelligible criteria for the administration” of the application approval process.

(10) During World War II, women were repeatedly denied issuance of official documentation affirming their merchant marine seaman status by the War Shipping Administration.

(11) Coast Guard Information Sheet #77 (April 1992) identifies the following acceptable forms of documentation for eligibility meeting the requirements set forth in the GI Bill Improvement Act of 1977 (Public Law 95-202) and Veterans Programs Enhancement Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-368):

(A) Certificate of shipping and discharge forms.

(B) Continuous discharge books (ship's deck or engine logbooks).

(C) Company letters showing vessel names and dates of voyages.

(12) Coast Guard Commandant Order of March 20, 1944, relieved masters of tugs, towboats, and seagoing barges of the responsibility of submitting reports of seamen shipped or discharged on forms, meaning certificates of shipping and discharge forms are not available to all eligible individuals seeking to document their eligibility.

(13) Coast Guard Information Sheet #77 (April 1992) states that "deck logs were traditionally considered to be the property of the owners of the ships. After World War II, however, the deck and engine logbooks of vessels operated by the War Shipping Administration were turned over to that agency by the ship owners, and were destroyed during the 1970s", meaning that continuous discharge books are not available to all eligible individuals seeking to document their eligibility.

(14) Coast Guard Information Sheet #77 (April, 1992) states "some World War II period log books do not name ports visited during the voyage due to wartime security restrictions", meaning that company letters showing vessel names and dates of voyages are not available to all eligible individuals seeking to document their eligibility.

(b) METHODS FOR VALIDATING CERTAIN SERVICE CONSIDERED TO BE ACTIVE SERVICE BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of verifying that an individual performed service under honorable conditions that satisfies the requirements of a coastwise merchant seaman who is recognized pursuant to section 401 of the GI Bill Improvement Act of 1977 (Public Law 95-202; 38 U.S.C. 106 note) as having performed active duty service for the purposes described in paragraph (3)(A), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall accept the following:

(A) In the case of an individual who served on a coastwise merchant vessel seeking such recognition for whom no applicable Coast Guard shipping or discharge form, ship logbook, merchant mariner's document or Z-card, or other official employment record is available, the Secretary shall provide such recognition on the basis of applicable Social Security Administration records submitted for or by the individual, together with validated testimony given by the individual or the primary next of kin of the individual that the individual performed such service during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946.

(B) In the case of an individual who served on a coastwise merchant vessel seeking such recognition for whom the applicable Coast Guard shipping or discharge form, ship logbook, merchant mariner's document or Z-card, or other official employment record has been destroyed or otherwise become unavailable by reason of any action committed by a person responsible for the control and maintenance of such form, logbook, or record, the Secretary shall accept other official documentation demonstrating that the individual performed such service during period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946.

(C) For the purpose of determining whether to recognize service allegedly performed during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946, the Secretary shall recognize masters of seagoing vessels or other officers in command of similarly organized groups as agents of the United States who were authorized to document any individual for purposes of hiring the individual to perform service in the merchant marine or discharging an individual from such service.

(2) TREATMENT OF OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—Other documentation accepted by the Secretary of Homeland Security pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) shall satisfy all requirements for eligibility of service during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946.

(3) BENEFITS ALLOWED.—

(A) BURIAL BENEFITS ELIGIBILITY.—Service of an individual that is considered active duty pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be considered as active duty service with respect to providing burial benefits under chapters 23 and 24 of title 38, United States Code, to the individual.

(B) MEDALS, RIBBONS, AND DECORATIONS.—An individual whose service is recognized as active duty pursuant to paragraph (1) may be awarded an appropriate medal, ribbon, or other military decoration based on such service.

(C) STATUS OF VETERAN.—An individual whose service is recognized as active duty pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be honored as a veteran but shall not be entitled by reason of such recognized service to any benefit that is not described in this subsection.

(4) DETERMINATION OF COASTWISE MERCHANT SEAMAN.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall verify that an individual performed service under honorable conditions that satisfies the requirements of a coastwise merchant seaman pursuant to this section without regard to the sex, age, or disability of the individual during the period in which the individual served as such a coastwise merchant seaman.

(5) DEFINITION OF PRIMARY NEXT OF KIN.—In this section, the term "primary next of kin" with respect to an individual seeking recognition for service under this section means the closest living relative of the individual who was alive during the period of such service.

(6) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 303. DESIGNATION OF AMERICAN WORLD WAR II CITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall designate at least one city in the United States each year as an "American World War II City".

(b) CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION.—After the designation made under subsection (c), the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall make each designation under subsection (a) based on the following criteria:

(1) Contributions by a city to the war effort during World War II, including those related to defense manufacturing, bond drives, service in the Armed Forces, and the presence of military facilities within the city.

(2) Efforts by a city to preserve the history of the city's contributions during World War II, including through the establishment of preservation organizations or museums, restoration of World War II facilities, and recognition of World War II veterans.

(c) FIRST AMERICAN WORLD WAR II CITY.—The city of Wilmington, North Carolina, is

designated as an "American World War II City".

SEC. 304. OBSERVANCE OF VETERANS DAY.

(a) TWO MINUTES OF SILENCE.—Chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 145. Veterans Day

"The President shall issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe two minutes of silence on Veterans Day in honor of the service and sacrifice of veterans throughout the history of the Nation, beginning at—

"(1) 3:11 p.m. Atlantic standard time;
 "(2) 2:11 p.m. eastern standard time;
 "(3) 1:11 p.m. central standard time;
 "(4) 12:11 p.m. mountain standard time;
 "(5) 11:11 a.m. Pacific standard time;
 "(6) 10:11 a.m. Alaska standard time; and
 "(7) 9:11 a.m. Hawaii-Aleutian standard time."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"145. Veterans Day."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous material they may have on H.R. 2189.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most challenging issues facing the Department of Veterans Affairs and the veterans it serves is the huge disability backlog. According to last week's backlog report, there were 717,000 claims for disability compensation waiting for a decision, and almost 412,000, or 57 percent, of those claims were above the Secretary's stated processing goal of 125 days. In short, 57 percent of VA's claims work is currently backlogged. Although I am glad we have seen some progress of late, a 57 percent backlog is not acceptable. If we are going to reach the Secretary's goal of ending the backlog by 2015, we will all need a focused effort, and the provisions of this bill will help achieve that goal.

H.R. 2189, as amended, reflects the committee's bipartisan efforts to bring additional transparency to this very troubling and decades-old problem. I know that other Members are here to provide a brief description of the bill that they have sponsored, or those who have worked closely on the legislation, but I want to highlight some of the key provisions.

Title I would establish a commission or a task force to evaluate the backlog

of disability claims and the appeals process related to those claims. Time is of the essence, so the commission would be required to submit a series of interim reports to Congress and a final report to the President and to the Congress 180 days after the commission's first meeting. The purpose of the task force is very simple: we need the best and the brightest minds to put forward workable solutions that can be implemented immediately. Even though VA has made recent progress, it is still well short of its own goals. We must not take our foot off the gas when it comes to ending the backlog once and for all, and ideas coming from this focused task force will assist in that effort.

Title I of the bill would also direct VA to provide a supplemental report to its strategic plan to eliminate the compensation claims backlog within 60 days of enactment and every 120 days thereafter until May 25, 2015. The purpose of this provision is to hold VA accountable for the full execution of its own strategic plan. Too often, VA has made lofty promises, and its efforts have fallen short. This provision, authored by our majority whip, will verify progress every single step of the way.

Title II of the bill would extend and expand VA's authority to use contract examinations during its disability examination process. VA's use of contract providers serves two purposes. First, because quality and timely exams are an essential component of the claims process, having additional providers to assist in the effort is critical. Second, use of non-VA examiners frees up the time that VA medical professionals can spend treating veterans at clinics and hospitals.

Finally, title III would require the Secretary of Defense to catalog all Vietnam-era ships as serving in either "blue" or "brown" water for purposes of awarding service-connection on a presumptive basis to veterans potentially exposed to agent orange. Currently, only veterans serving in the inland waterways, or "brown" waters, of Vietnam are eligible for compensation on a presumptive basis. The problem is that some vessels which served offshore in the "blue" waters of Vietnam sent smaller vessels ashore. Without an accurate cataloging of these visits, compensation may unfairly be denied to deserving veterans. This provision will assist VA in making accurate decisions in this sensitive area.

Enactment of H.R. 2189 will not completely solve the claims backlog, but I do think it is a good step in the right direction. I thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. RUNYAN, and his ranking member, Ms. TITUS, for their hard work in moving the bill through the subcommittee as well. Everybody on the committee worked together to bring this piece of legislation to the floor tonight.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2189, as amended, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2189, as amended, is a bipartisan omnibus bill addressing veterans' disability benefits and compensation. This bill includes provisions from nine other measures. These bills are part of the slate of commonsense legislation introduced in May of this year. It provides the Department of Veterans Affairs with additional tools and reforms to assist in eliminating the backlog.

Included are provisions from H.R. 2086, the Pay As You Rate Act, introduced by the Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee ranking member, Representative TITUS of Nevada; H.R. 1809, the Faster Filing Act, introduced by Representative O'ROURKE from Texas; H.R. 1623, the Claims Efficiency Through Information Act, introduced by Representative NEGRETE MCLEOD of California; H.R. 1759, introduced by Representative RUIZ of California; H.R. 1805, the Veterans Claims Efficiency Through Automation Act, introduced by Representative KUSTER of New Hampshire; H.R. 1824, the VA Regional Office Accountability Act, introduced by Representative MENG of New York; H.R. 1521, the Disabled Veterans Red Tape Reduction Act, introduced by Representative SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York; H.R. 864, which will designate at least one city in the United States each year as an "American World War II City," introduced by Representative MCINTYRE of North Carolina; and H.R. 1288, the World War II Merchant Mariner Service Act, introduced by Representative BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina.

Collectively, H.R. 2189, as amended, gives VA real, useful tools they can begin using now. These tools will assist the Department of Veterans Affairs in making significant progress on its goal of eliminating the backlog by 2015.

The legislation will require VA to pay veterans more quickly. It will provide them with information that may lead to veterans receiving a quicker decision on their claims. It will formulate a task force to attack the growing appeals backlog, and it will require the VA to start tracking information that will help them better understand the claims inventory.

I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their bipartisan effort to create a smart, pragmatic solution. Together we will help VA provide better benefits and services to our veterans. I also want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for their work on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2189, as amended.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN), who chairs the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs.

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MILLER for yielding to me.

As chairman of the House Veterans' Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, I am keenly aware that one of the most critical issues impacting our Nation's veterans is the severe veterans' claims backlog.

Recently, the Department of Veterans Affairs reported it had a backlog of more than 400,000 veterans' benefits claims as the fiscal year ended in September. This is simply unacceptable. To help speed up the veterans' claims process, we must look at every phase of that process.

One of the first steps in this process is the medical exam to determine benefit eligibility. That is why earlier this year I introduced H.R. 2423, the Disabled Veterans' Access to Medical Exams Improvement Act, provisions of which are now contained within section 201 of H.R. 2189. This section would extend the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with private physicians to conduct veterans' medical disability evaluations.

With the passage of this bill, this successful program allowing physicians outside the VA to conduct contract examinations would continue for an additional 3 years, until 2016. This would allow VA to more quickly evaluate veterans' disabilities and facilitate quicker access to the care they need.

Second, this bill would also extend license portability to contract examination providers, meaning that physicians with an active State license may provide C&P exams in other States because they are working on behalf of the Federal Government. Although the VA and DOD already provide license portability for physicians working directly for them, this authority is not extended to contract examination providers. This provision is designed to facilitate the C&P examination process by allowing contract physicians the flexibility to travel and assist in areas that are experiencing lengthy delays in scheduling examinations.

Finally, this piece of legislation would also expand the number of VA regional offices that would utilize contract examinations from 10 to 15. These medical examinations are a key component of the disability claims process. By expanding the authority and scope of the contract examinations process, veterans would receive the necessary medical evidence for their claim in a timely manner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

This would reduce overall claim development and processing time, resulting in the faster issuance of a final decision for the claim.

I support H.R. 2189, as amended to include my provision, and encourage all Members to support this important bill for veterans.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MICHAUD for yielding to me.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, I strongly support the bill before us, the omnibus bill, H.R. 2189.

This legislation includes my bill, H.R. 2086, the Pay As You Rate Act, which would require the VA to pay benefits to veterans as individual components of their claims are reviewed rather than at the completion of the entire claim.

Currently, veterans typically receive payments when all medical conditions within a claim are fully adjudicated. Veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan average 8.5 components in their claims. While some of these are very complex and time-consuming, other components are simpler.

The Pay As You Rate Act will require the VA to pay veterans as individual medical conditions are adjudicated, providing tens of thousands of veterans and their families much-needed financial support while the VA continues to work on the more complex aspects of their claims.

I thank Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member MICHAUD, and Chairman RUNYAN for including my provision and other Democratic bills in this legislation.

Collectively, the legislation before us today should assist VA in its continued effort to transform the claims process from mountains of paper to a more efficient, effective electronic system. In just the past few months, the VA has made great strides in serving our Nation's heroes by reducing the benefits backlog. The VA has set ambitious goals, and Congress should work to support those efforts. More needs to be done, and it needs to be done quickly to ensure that veterans receive the benefits they have earned in a timely fashion.

I am also pleased to have worked with Chairman MILLER on some of the task force provisions of this legislation. The provision that I added at the full committee markup would improve the proposed task force by including a subcommittee to look at the appeals process. While the VA is making significant progress in reducing the backlog, it is important that we are not creating a new backlog of appeals in the years to come. This subcommittee would be charged with making recommendations aimed at preventing that future backlog of appeals.

So I thank you, and I support the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY).

□ 1645

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Veterans Pension Protection Act as part of this important legislation.

Last year, veterans groups came to my office with a problem called "pension poaching" that targets retired veterans. Currently, the VA only considers income at the time a veteran applies for benefits, meaning it can't determine if an applicant has diverted assets to qualify for benefits.

Under this scam, unethical financial advisers and firms prey on elderly veterans by promising to help them qualify for VA pension benefits if they divert their assets into trusts or annuities and charge excessive fees for their services. GAO has identified this fraud as a major weakness in the VA pension program, leaving taxpayers and retired veterans on the hook.

My bill imposes a 36-month look-back period that would track veterans' incomes to determine if they are truly eligible. This will discourage financial predators from duping elderly veterans, help reduce the claims backlog, and ensure that low-income individuals for whom the program was intended are not robbed of their benefits.

I want to thank Congressmen SCHRAEDER, BILIRAKIS, and BARBER for their work on this bill, and especially Chairman MILLER for including it as part of this package to improve services for our Nation's veterans.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD).

Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 2189, which includes provisions from the VA Claims Efficiency Through Information Act of 2013, which I introduced in April, that will require VA to track the time spent evaluating each medical condition in a disability compensation claim. VA would have to report the number of completed claims by region and by medical condition for the current and preceding month and year.

As Veterans Day approaches, we should remember veterans who are struggling to find work while living with service-connected disabilities. VA compensation is needed so veterans can support themselves and avoid homelessness.

The VA's legacy paper system has made it difficult to process claims of older veterans who need additional compensation later in life. Claims of younger veterans can also take longer to process because they have multiple medical conditions.

The claims backlog is a serious problem for the VA and the U.S. Depart-

ment of Veterans Affairs. Since July, the Los Angeles regional office has reduced the average time to process claims from 600 days to 400 days. The VA still has a long way to go to meet its own goal of 125 days, and the backlog will not end overnight and may even go up as more men and women apply for benefits.

No one is looking at directing blame but, instead, searching for a way to work together, and Congress and the VA must be willing to explore new methods for delivering services to veterans in the 21st century for the growing veteran population.

I thank Mr. MILLER for allowing my bill to be included in his.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD for their leadership on the committee and their commitment to maintaining strong oversight over the VA and their goal to reduce the backlog.

During my time on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have enjoyed the strong bipartisanship and the committee's dedication to get results for our veterans. Whether it is between Ranking Member KIRKPATRICK and me on the Oversight Committee or Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD on the full committee, we all share the same desire to help our veterans and do everything we can to help the VA operate more efficiently and effectively.

Fortunately for our veterans, this desire to help goes beyond the Veterans' Affairs Committee and is present in the entire House of Representatives. Earlier this year, I, along with 150 Members of the House, sent a letter to the President urging his immediate action to reduce this backlog.

Today, the House will have another opportunity to show its unity for veterans in passing H.R. 2189. This bill will aid the VA by establishing a task force to evaluate the backlog of veterans' disability claims, ensuring the VA will find innovative ways to reduce the backlog.

Currently, there are over 400,000 claims that have been waiting for over 125 days to process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COFFMAN. Although the VA has made some progress recently, the pace is still too slow for many of our veterans waiting for their claims to be processed.

As a Marine Corps combat veteran, I am proud to join my colleagues on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to urge the passage of H.R. 2189. There are

nearly 400,000 veterans in Colorado, and these men and women need Washington to step up and help the VA to reduce the backlog.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MICHAUD and our chair.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I was proud that we worked together to draft this bipartisan legislative package to help get veterans' claims settled faster and more efficiently.

Today, I am happy to join my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in passing this package, which includes my bill, the Veterans Claims Efficiency Through Automation Act. This commonsense legislation will push the VA to focus on the greater use of automation to boost efficiency and settle claims faster.

As our servicemembers and veterans transition back to civilian life, it is imperative that the VA and the DOD continue to collaborate on improving the delivery of care, eliminating the claims backlog, and mitigating the impact of sequestration.

It is simply unacceptable that so many of our heroic veterans are unable to get timely access to the care and services that they have earned. This bill is an important step toward addressing this problem, and I will keep fighting to end the backlog until the job is done.

We owe it to our men and women in uniform, to our veterans, and to our military families to do all that we can to ensure that their benefits and other services transfer from the Department of Defense to the Veterans Administration. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure effective and timely collaboration between the two departments and to eliminate this claims backlog once and for all.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kinderhook, New York (Mr. GIBSON).

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, as I rise in support of the bill, I thank the chairman, the ranking member, and all the members of the committee and the staff for their work.

Our veterans deserve our very best effort, and it is simply taking too long to process these claims. We have got to do better. I believe this bill will take a step in the right direction.

I also appreciate the leadership of this committee including one of my bills along with this bill.

Since arriving here, I have been working on supporting our Vietnam veterans who have been exposed to agent orange. The chairman mentioned that if you served on the ground or in the river in the Navy, you get presumed coverage; but if you served just offshore, you don't get that presumed

coverage. I believe that needs to change.

I have the bill to do that. Until the time of such policy change, I believe the DOD and VA need to be better organized so that we can work this out on a case-by-case basis, which is what we are doing right now. The leadership was kind enough to include that bill in this effort. I think we are going to make a positive difference.

I do want to give a shout-out to a couple of ladies in upstate New York making a difference, Carol Olszanecki and Susie Belanger, for the work that they have done on this, and we are going to continue to work it together. I urge support of this bill.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE).

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, which will help us to reduce the unacceptably long wait times for our veterans who are waiting to hear back on service-connected disability claims.

In El Paso, Texas, I have the honor of representing almost 80,000 veterans. Right now, their average wait time out of the Waco regional office is nearly 460 days to hear back on a service-connected disability claim. I visited that office not too long ago and witnessed people carrying around the claims files for single veterans in hand trucks with the files and the paperwork measuring 3 to 4 feet in some cases.

That is why, along with PAUL COOK, I introduced bipartisan legislation earlier this year to work with no cost to reduce that wait time by informing veterans of the average wait time to file a disability claim amongst all available methods. From the slowest, which is an incomplete paper-based claim, to the fastest, which is a fully developed claim filed online.

I am pleased that this legislation in section 109 includes this bill called the Faster Filing Act. I am convinced it will help us to get our veterans the response in the time they deserve. After all, they have sacrificed their health, their security, and their safety for ours. We need to meet our end of the obligation.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD. I also want to thank Mr. BROWN from the committee staff and Erin Snow from my legislative team for helping to write the legislation. And I encourage all of my colleagues in the House to pass this without delay.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the 12th District of Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2189. This legislation is an important step forward in addressing and resolving the VA's disability claims backlog.

We owe our veterans a debt of gratitude that can never be repaid. Unfortu-

nately, veterans in western Pennsylvania and around the Nation are forced to endure excessive wait times for their disability claims to be processed. That is unacceptable, and our veterans deserve better.

Finding ways to better serve our veterans is one of my top priorities in Congress. The legislation we are considering today increases reporting and oversight, improves coordination between the VA and other Federal agencies, provides more training for VA claims processors, and establishes a task force to look for other ways to address the backlog. Together these actions will bring transparency and accountability to the VA all in an effort to improve customer service to our veterans and their families.

I thank House Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman JEFF MILLER, Ranking Member MICHAUD, and Majority Whip KEVIN MCCARTHY for their leadership; and I look forward to continuing to work with them to find ways to better serve our veterans.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding me time, and I also want to thank Chairman MILLER for his hard work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2189. This legislation takes important steps to address the deplorable disability claims backlog at the Veterans Affairs Administration.

It does so by establishing a special task force to evaluate the full extent of the backlog and, more importantly, to determine solutions to eliminate the backlog. We all agree our veterans deserve better.

It is in this same spirit that I introduced H.R. 2185, Veterans Day Moment of Silence Act. This bill brings together all Americans to observe 2 minutes of silence each Veterans Day. It is a time when we all, regardless of ideology, can stop and reflect on the brave service of generations of U.S. veterans.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD for including the text of my bill into the text of H.R. 2189. Particularly, I want to thank Daniel and Michael Bendetson and their father, Dr. Peter Bendetson. As a family, they have worked relentlessly to bring the moment-of-silence provision to fruition, and I am honored to present this proposal today on their behalf in this 113th Congress.

Again, I am thankful to Mr. MICHAUD and to Chairman MILLER for enabling this provision to come to a vote today, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2189. It is a very timely bill. With hundreds of thousands of returning veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan and with over 700,000 veterans waiting for disability determinations, it is a very important bill.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority whip, who has been a strong supporter of veterans issues in this legislative body.

□ 1700

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2189, legislation that will provide real relief to hundreds of thousands of our Nation's veterans.

I first want to thank Chairman MILLER because this bill includes the provisions that are a result of the GAO audit that Chairman MILLER and I requested on the Department of Veterans Affairs due to the numerous complaints from veterans in all of our districts who had to wait months and, oftentimes, years for benefits. The audit confirmed these veterans' worst complaints about the severity of the claims and the backlog.

The GAO identified the Los Angeles regional office, which serves many of my local veterans in my home district, as one of the worst in the country. According to the current data, 61 percent of the over 16,000 claims are still backlogged.

Recent data from the VA shows that the Department processed 100,000 less claims than they planned for fiscal year 2013. Clearly, the VA is unable to implement needed reforms themselves.

This legislation today addresses the backlog problems in the VA by focusing on streamlining required paperwork and communications between Federal agencies and ensuring continued and, if needed, relentless congressional oversight of the administration's timeline to clear the compensation claims backlog.

When called to serve the United States of America, our Nation's veterans have answered. It is time Congress and the Department of Veterans Affairs answer their call as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting our veterans and supporting this bill to end the backlog.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 2189, as amended.

Once again, I want to thank Chairman MILLER and his staff for working very diligently on this piece of legislation, along with my staff on the minority side, and for bringing this forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2189 is a strong step forward in helping to resolve the severe backlog of disability claims that exist today at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I thank all the members of our committee for their bipartisan work on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to join us in passing H.R. 2189, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2189, legislation to establish a commission to evaluate the backlog of disability claims at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Although the VA has made important progress on reducing the backlog over the past several months, it still fell nearly 100,000 claims short of its Fiscal Year 2013 processing goal. As of October 19th, more than 400,000 disability claims remain backlogged at the VA. This problem persists despite the fact that Congress has given the VA every resource that they have asked for to end this problem. We must remain committed to a goal of completely eliminating this backlog.

Our veterans deserve timely processing of claims so that they can get the care and compensation that they so deserve. The legislation before us today will get us closer to that goal by establishing a task force to evaluate the backlog and appeals process of claims. Furthermore, H.R. 2189 directs the commission to analyze potential improvements to the current system and solutions to solve the problem and in turn requires the VA to implement appropriate solutions.

Our brave men and women in uniform put their lives on the line to protect our freedoms, and we must do everything in our power to demonstrate our gratitude for their dedication and sacrifice. A first step in that process is ensuring that our veterans are not forced to wait hundreds of days simply to have their disability claims processed.

Mr. Speaker, we owe our veterans efficient and effective care. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2189 so that we can find a solution to ending the backlog once and for all.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the veterans' disability claims backlog is simply unacceptable. American service members who risk their lives to protect our freedoms should not have to wonder if they will receive the basic benefits they deserve. Today, more than 405,000 veterans are waiting for their benefits in this tragically backlogged system. These aren't just numbers. These are real people—heroes who served our country.

Take for example Jeff Colaicovo, a veteran living in my district in South Florida. Jeff received two Purple Hearts for his courageous service during the Vietnam War. He sacrificed for his country, and unbelievably, our claims system failed him.

Until his case was brought to my office's attention earlier this year, Jeff had made little progress towards receiving the benefits he has earned. In fact, he and his wife spent over two years struggling with bills that his benefits should have helped cover. Finally, after reaching out to my office, Jeff began receiving his far-overdue benefits in June. Jeff, along with all of our nation's veterans, deserves better.

Thankfully, today, we took an important step towards helping our veterans by passing H.R. 2189.

Part of the reason veterans often wait so long for their benefits decisions is that the average number of conditions afflicting our veterans has grown significantly. This was true for Jeff whose conditions include PTSD, loss

of hearing, irregular heartbeat, and severe back problems. In fact, our service members currently returning home from Iraq and Afghanistan submit an average of 8.5 separate conditions, whereas WWII veterans typically submitted less than three.

Under the current system, each medical condition is individually adjudicated and the veteran only begins receiving benefits once the entire claim has been processed.

H.R. 2189 will address this issue by requiring the Veterans Administration to pay benefits as each element of a veteran's claim is reviewed, rather than when the entire package has been processed. This would allow veterans to begin receiving benefits checks much sooner.

While much more still needs to be done, this is an important step to help repair a broken system.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the passage of H.R. 2189, a bipartisan bill that among many things will finally recognize the valiant service of Merchant Mariners that operated domestically during World War II. It has been my honor for the past three Congresses to introduce legislation that would recognize these brave Americans and correct an injustice that has remained for over 70 years.

The Merchant Marine were private citizens employed by freight shipping companies. In an effort to support the American war effort during World War II, those same freight shipping companies and their employees became an auxiliary to the United States Navy. Their mission was to transport bulk war materials including food, clothing, weapons, and even troops to all areas of conflict and coastal installations here at home.

During the World War II war effort, many of these mariners were tasked with the critically important role of transporting materials along the U.S. coast using tugboats and barges. Although these mariners did not sail across the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans into areas of conflict, they still encountered the enemy while delivering cargo that kept the war effort moving forward. One tugboat, the *Menomonee*, operating just off the coast of Virginia on March 31st, 1942, was sunk by German U-Boat 754 tragically killing several members of the crew.

This tragic story has been the impetus for the legislation I have introduced in the past three Congresses to finally honor this small group of unsung heroes. In fact, a North Carolinian, Don Horton, whose brother William Lee Horton, Jr. was on that tugboat and lost his life aboard the ship that rescued him from the ocean and debris, has been the driving force behind this legislative effort. William Lee Horton, Jr., was 17 at the time of his death while bravely serving his country. Many members of Don Horton's family served on these tugboats and barges during World War II in support of the war effort. Don Horton has become the foremost expert on this forgotten segment of the World War II Merchant Marine, and has worked tirelessly to see mariners like his brother gain the recognition as veterans that they rightly deserve and earned through service to their country.

The ranks of these coastwise tugboats and barges were not solely operated by men, but

also women, as in the case of the Horton family. Don Horton's mother and sister, along with many other women, served alongside their male counterparts, but were never issued formal documentation for their service aboard these vessels because of an order by the War Shipping Administration. Many male Merchant Mariners that operated domestically were also never issued formal documentation or the documentation that was issued is extremely hard to find today because many of these documents were ordered destroyed by the U.S. Government.

Currently, a certificate of shipping and discharge forms, continuous deck or engine logbooks, and shipping company records that indicate the vessel names and dates of voyages are the only documents that are considered acceptable to determine an individual's service in the Merchant Marine. In fact, by order of the Coast Guard Commandant, captains of tugboats and seagoing barges were relieved of the responsibility of submitting reports of seamen shipped or discharged. The deck or engine logbooks were turned over to the War Shipping Administration and were ordered destroyed because they were too "voluminous to maintain, costly to keep, and rarely used for research." Shipping company records that indicate the vessel names and dates of voyages likely never existed because written communication relating to the movement of supplies and troops was strictly forbidden by U.S. military commanders.

After 70 long years, the passage of H.R. 2189 finally offers these mariners a chance to receive the recognition they deserve. H.R. 2189 expands the acceptable forms of documentation used to determine eligible service in the Merchant Marine. The bill allows Social Security Administration records, validated testimony by the applicant or closest living relative, and other official records that provide sufficient proof of service.

Mr. Speaker, estimates show that there are fewer than 2,000 of these mariners surviving today. It's time to finally recognize these mariners for their service to our country. I want to thank my colleagues in the House for supporting these brave men and women that served in the Merchant Marine during World War II, and I implore my colleagues in the Senate to consider this legislation as quickly as possible and support its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2189, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

VETERANS ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass

the bill (H.R. 2481) to amend title 38, United States Code, to codify and improve the election requirements for the receipt of educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2481

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Veterans Economic Opportunity Act of 2013".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. References to title 38, United States Code.

Sec. 3. Scoring of budgetary effects.

Sec. 4. Establishment of Veterans Economic Opportunity Administration of Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 5. Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity.

Sec. 6. Five-year extension of homeless veterans reintegration programs.

Sec. 7. Entitlement of children of certain deceased veterans to educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 8. Recodification and improvement of election process for Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program.

Sec. 9. Centralized reporting of veteran enrollment by certain groups, districts, and consortiums of educational institutions.

Sec. 10. Extension of loan guaranty fee for certain subsequent loans.

Sec. 11. Mortgage protection for members of the Armed Forces, surviving spouses, and certain veterans.

Sec. 12. Treatment of relocation for active duty for purposes of mortgage refinancing.

Sec. 13. Requirements for lending institutions that are creditors for obligations and liabilities covered by the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

Sec. 14. Protection of child custody arrangements for parents who are members of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. SCORING OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF VETERANS ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ADMINISTRATION OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part V is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 80—VETERANS ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ADMINISTRATION

"8001. Organization of Administration.

"8002. Functions of Administration.

"§ 8001. Organization of Administration

"(a) VETERANS ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ADMINISTRATION.—There is in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Veterans Economic Opportunity Administration. The primary function of the Veterans Economic Opportunity Administration is the administration of the programs of the Department which provide assistance related to economic opportunity to veterans and their dependents and survivors.

"(b) UNDER SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY.—The Veterans Economic Opportunity Administration is under the Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity, who is directly responsible to the Secretary for the operations of the Administration.

"§ 8002. Functions of Administration

"The Veterans Economic Opportunity Administration is responsible for the administration of the following programs of the Department:

"(1) Vocational rehabilitation and employment programs.

"(2) Educational assistance programs.

"(3) Veterans' housing loan and related programs.

"(4) The veterans small business program under section 8127 of this title."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The tables of chapters at the beginning of title 38, United States Code, and of part V of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 79 the following new item:

"80. Veterans Economic Opportunity Administration 8001".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Chapter 80 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2014.

SEC. 5. UNDER SECRETARY FOR VETERANS ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY.

(a) UNDER SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 3 is amended by inserting after section 306 the following new section:

"§ 306A. Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity

"(a) UNDER SECRETARY.—There is in the Department an Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity, who is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation or activity and solely on the basis of demonstrated ability in—

"(1) information technology; and

"(2) the administration of programs within the Veterans Economic Opportunity Administration or programs of similar content and scope.

"(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity is the head of, and is directly responsible to the Secretary for the operations of, the Veterans Economic Opportunity Administration.

"(c) VACANCIES.—(1) Whenever a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary for Veterans

Economic Opportunity occurs or is anticipated, the Secretary shall establish a commission to recommend individuals to the President for appointment to the position.

“(2) A commission established under this subsection shall be composed of the following members appointed by the Secretary:

“(A) Three persons representing education and training, vocational rehabilitation, employment, real estate, mortgage finance and related industries, and survivor benefits activities affected by the Veterans Economic Opportunity Administration.

“(B) Two persons representing veterans served by the Veterans Economic Opportunity Administration.

“(C) Two persons who have experience in the management of private sector benefits programs of similar content and scope to the economic opportunity programs of the Department.

“(D) The Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

“(E) The chairman of the Veterans’ Advisory Committee on Education formed under section 3692 of this title.

“(F) One person who has held the position of Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity, if the Secretary determines that it is desirable for such person to be a member of the commission.

“(3) A commission established under this subsection shall recommend at least three individuals for appointment to the position of Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity. The commission shall submit all recommendations to the Secretary. The Secretary shall forward the recommendations to the President and the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives with any comments the Secretary considers appropriate. Thereafter, the President may request the commission to recommend additional individuals for appointment.

“(4) The Assistant Secretary or Deputy Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs who performs personnel management and labor relations functions shall serve as the executive secretary of a commission established under this subsection.

“(d) QUALIFICATIONS OF RECOMMENDED INDIVIDUALS.—Each individual recommended to the President by the commission for appointment to the position of Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity shall be an individual who has held a senior level position in the private sector with responsibilities relating to at least one of the following:

“(1) Education policy.

“(2) Vocational rehabilitation.

“(3) Employment.

“(4) Home loan finance.

“(5) Small business development.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 306 the following new item:

“306A. Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Title 38, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) in section 306(c)(2), by striking subparagraphs (A) and (E) and redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (F), as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively;

(2) in section 317(d), by inserting after “Under Secretary for Benefits,” the following: “the Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity.”;

(3) in section 318(d)(2), by inserting after “Under Secretary for Benefits,” the following: “the Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity.”;

(4) in section 516(e)(2)(C), by striking “Health and the Under Secretary for Benefits” and inserting “Health, the Under Secretary for Benefits, and the Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity”;

(5) in section 541(a)(2)(B), by striking “Health and the Under Secretary for Benefits” and inserting “Health, the Under Secretary for Benefits, and the Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity”;

(6) in section 542(a)(2)(B)(iii), by striking “Health and the Under Secretary for Benefits” and inserting “Health, the Under Secretary for Benefits, and the Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity”;

(7) in section 544(a)(2)(B)(vi), by striking “Health and the Under Secretary for Benefits” and inserting “Health, the Under Secretary for Benefits, and the Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity”;

(8) in section 709(c)(2)(A), by inserting after “Under Secretary for Benefits,” the following: “the Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity.”.

(9) in section 7701(a), by inserting after “assistance” the following: “, other than assistance related to economic opportunity.”; and

(10) in section 7703, by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

(c) FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES.—For fiscal years 2014 and 2015, the aggregate number of full-time equivalent employees authorized for the Veterans Benefit Administration and the Veterans Economic Opportunity Administration, as established under chapter 80 of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 2, may not exceed 20,851.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 306A of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), and the amendments made by this section, shall take effect on October 1, 2014.

SEC. 6. FIVE-YEAR EXTENSION OF HOMELESS VETERANS REINTEGRATION PROGRAMS.

Section 2021(e)(F) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2018”.

SEC. 7. ENTITLEMENT OF CHILDREN OF CERTAIN DECEASED VETERANS TO EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE UNDER THE POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3311(b)(9) is amended—

(1) by striking “2001, dies in line of duty while serving on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces.” and inserting “2001—”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(A) dies in line of duty while serving on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces; or

“(B) is awarded the Purple Heart for an injury and dies as a result of that injury during the 31-day period beginning on the date of the person’s discharge or release from active duty service in the Armed Forces.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to a person who dies on or after September 11, 2001.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2014, and apply to payments of educational assistance for programs of education pursued after that date.

SEC. 8. RECODIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF ELECTION PROCESS FOR POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 33 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 3326. Election to receive educational assistance

“(a) INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE TO ELECT PARTICIPATION IN POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.—An individual may elect to receive educational assistance under this chapter if such individual—

“(1) as of August 1, 2009—

“(A) is entitled to basic educational assistance under chapter 30 of the title and has used, but retains unused, entitlement under that chapter;

“(B) is entitled to educational assistance under chapter 107, 1606, or 1607 of title 10 and has used, but retains unused, entitlement under the applicable chapter;

“(C) is entitled to basic educational assistance under chapter 30 of this title but has not used any entitlement under that chapter;

“(D) is entitled to educational assistance under chapter 107, 1606, or 1607 of title 10 but has not used any entitlement under such chapter;

“(E) is a member of the Armed Forces who is eligible for receipt of basic educational assistance under chapter 30 of this title and is making contributions toward such assistance under section 3011(b) or 3012(c) of this title; or

“(F) is a member of the Armed Forces who is not entitled to basic educational assistance under chapter 30 of this title by reason of an election under section 3011(c)(1) or 3012(d)(1) of this title; and

“(2) as of the date of the individual’s election under this paragraph, meets the requirements for entitlement to educational assistance under this chapter.

“(b) CESSATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD GI BILL.—Effective as of the first month beginning on or after the date of an election under subsection (a) of an individual described by paragraph (1)(E) of that subsection, the obligation of the individual to make contributions under section 3011(b) or 3012(c) of this title, as applicable, shall cease, and the requirements of such section shall be deemed to be no longer applicable to the individual.

“(c) REVOCATION OF REMAINING TRANSFERRED ENTITLEMENT.—

“(1) ELECTION TO REVOKE.—If, on the date an individual described in paragraph (1)(A) or (1)(C) of subsection (a) makes an election under that subsection, a transfer of the entitlement of the individual to basic educational assistance under section 3020 of this title is in effect and a number of months of the entitlement so transferred remain unutilized, the individual may elect to revoke all or a portion of the entitlement so transferred that remains unutilized.

“(2) AVAILABILITY OF REVOKED ENTITLEMENT.—Any entitlement revoked by an individual under this paragraph shall no longer be available to the dependent to whom transferred, but shall be available to the individual instead for educational assistance under chapter 33 of this title in accordance with the provisions of this section.

“(3) AVAILABILITY OF UNREVOKED ENTITLEMENT.—Any entitlement described in paragraph (1) that is not revoked by an individual in accordance with that paragraph shall remain available to the dependent or dependents concerned in accordance with the

current transfer of such entitlement under section 3020 of this title.

“(d) POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2) and except as provided in subsection (e), an individual making an election under subsection (a) shall be entitled to educational assistance under this chapter in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, instead of basic educational assistance under chapter 30 this title, or educational assistance under chapter 107, 1606, or 1607 of title 10, as applicable.

“(2) LIMITATION ON ENTITLEMENT FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of an individual making an election under subsection (a) who is described by paragraph (1)(A) of that subsection, the number of months of entitlement of the individual to educational assistance under this chapter 33 shall be the number of months equal to—

“(A) the number of months of unused entitlement of the individual under chapter 30 of this title, as of the date of the election, plus

“(B) the number of months, if any, of entitlement revoked by the individual under subsection (c)(1).

“(e) CONTINUING ENTITLEMENT TO EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE NOT AVAILABLE UNDER 9/11 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event educational assistance to which an individual making an election under subsection (a) would be entitled under chapter 30 of this title, or chapter 107, 1606, or 1607 of title 10, as applicable, is not authorized to be available to the individual under the provisions of this chapter the individual shall remain entitled to such educational assistance in accordance with the provisions of the applicable chapter.

“(2) CHARGE FOR USE OF ENTITLEMENT.—The utilization by an individual of entitlement under paragraph (1) shall be chargeable against the entitlement of the individual to educational assistance under this chapter at the rate of one month of entitlement under this chapter for each month of entitlement utilized by the individual under paragraph (1) (as determined as if such entitlement were utilized under the provisions of chapter 30 of this title, or chapter 107, 1606, or 1607 of title 10, as applicable).

“(f) ADDITIONAL POST-9/11 ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS HAVING MADE CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD GI BILL.—

“(1) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—In the case of an individual making an election under subsection (a) who is described by subparagraph (A), (C), or (E) of paragraph (1) of that subsection, the amount of educational assistance payable to the individual under this chapter 33 as a monthly stipend payable under paragraph (1)(B) of section 3313(c) of this title, or under paragraphs (2) through (7) of that section (as applicable), shall be the amount otherwise payable as a monthly stipend under the applicable paragraph increased by the amount equal to—

“(A) the total amount of contributions toward basic educational assistance made by the individual under section 3011(b) or 3012(c) of this title, as of the date of the election, multiplied by

“(B) the fraction—

“(i) the numerator of which is—

“(I) the number of months of entitlement to basic educational assistance under chapter 30 of this title remaining to the individual at the time of the election; plus

“(II) the number of months, if any, of entitlement under such chapter 30 revoked by the individual under subsection (c)(1); and

“(ii) the denominator of which is 36 months.

“(2) MONTHS OF REMAINING ENTITLEMENT FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of an individual covered by paragraph (1) who is described by subsection (a)(1)(E), the number of months of entitlement to basic educational assistance remaining to the individual for purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(i)(II) shall be 36 months.

“(3) TIMING OF PAYMENT.—The amount payable with respect to an individual under paragraph (1) shall be paid to the individual together with the last payment of the monthly stipend payable to the individual under paragraph (1)(B) of section 3313(c) of this title, or under subsections (b) through (g) of that section (as applicable), before the exhaustion of the individual's entitlement to educational assistance under this chapter.

“(g) CONTINUING ENTITLEMENT TO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CRITICAL SKILLS OR SPECIALITY AND ADDITIONAL SERVICE.—An individual making an election under subsection (a)(1) who, at the time of the election, is entitled to increased educational assistance under section 3015(d) of this title, or section 16131(i) of title 10, or supplemental educational assistance under subchapter III of chapter 30 of this title, shall remain entitled to such increased educational assistance or supplemental educational assistance in the utilization of entitlement to educational assistance under this chapter, in an amount equal to the quarter, semester, or term, as applicable, equivalent of the monthly amount of such increased educational assistance or supplemental educational assistance payable with respect to the individual at the time of the election.

“(h) ALTERNATIVE ELECTION BY SECRETARY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who, on or after October 1, 2014, submits to the Secretary an election under this section that the Secretary determines is clearly against the interests of the individual, the Secretary may make an alternative election on behalf of the individual that the Secretary determines is in the best interests of the individual.

“(2) NOTICE.—If the Secretary makes an election on behalf of an individual under this subsection, the Secretary shall notify the individual by not later than seven days after making such election and shall provide the individual with a 30-day period, beginning on the date of the individual's receipt of such notice, during which the individual may modify or revoke the election made by the Secretary on the individual's behalf. The Secretary shall include, as part of such notice, a clear statement of why the alternative election made by the Secretary is in the best interests of the individual as compared to the election submitted by the individual. The Secretary shall provide the notice required under this paragraph by electronic means whenever possible.

“(i) IRREVOCABILITY OF ELECTIONS.—An election under subsection (a) or (c)(1) is irrevocable.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“3326. Election to receive educational assistance.”

(c) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Subsection (c) of section 5003 of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 38 U.S.C. 3301 note) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. CENTRALIZED REPORTING OF VETERAN ENROLLMENT BY CERTAIN GROUPS, DISTRICTS, AND CONSORTIUMS OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3684(a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “32, 33,” after “31,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘educational institution’ may include a group, district, or consortium of separately accredited educational institutions located in the same State that are organized in a manner that facilitates the centralized reporting of the enrollments in such group, district, or consortium of institutions.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to reports submitted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 10. EXTENSION OF LOAN GUARANTY FEE FOR CERTAIN SUBSEQUENT LOANS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 3729(b)(2)(B) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “October 1, 2017” and inserting “October 1, 2018”; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking “October 1, 2017” and inserting “October 1, 2018”.

SEC. 11. MORTGAGE PROTECTION FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES, SURVIVING SPOUSES, AND CERTAIN VETERANS.

(a) MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES, SURVIVING SPOUSES, AND CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

“SEC. 303A. MORTGAGES AND TRUST DEEDS OF CERTAIN SERVICEMEMBERS, SURVIVING SPOUSES, AND DISABLED VETERANS.

“(a) MORTGAGE AS SECURITY.—This section applies only to an obligation on real or personal property owned by a covered individual that—

“(1) originated at any time and for which the covered individual is still obligated; and

“(2) is secured by a mortgage, trust deed, or other security in the nature of a mortgage.

“(b) STAY OF PROCEEDINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with subsection (d)(1), in a judicial action pending or in a nonjudicial action commenced during a covered time period to enforce an obligation described in subsection (a), a court—

“(A) may, after a hearing and on its own motion, stay the proceedings until the end of the covered time period; and

“(B) shall, upon application by a covered individual, stay the proceedings until the end of the covered time period.

“(2) OBLIGATION TO STOP PROCEEDINGS.—Upon receipt of notice provided under subsection (d)(1), a mortgagee, trustee, or other creditor seeking to foreclose on real property secured by an obligation covered by this section using any judicial or nonjudicial proceedings shall immediately stop any such proceeding until the end of the covered time period.

“(c) SALE OR FORECLOSURE.—A sale, judicial or nonjudicial foreclosure, or seizure of property for a breach of an obligation described in subsection (a) that is not stayed under subsection (b) shall not be valid during a covered time period except—

“(1) upon a court order granted before such sale, judicial or nonjudicial foreclosure, or seizure with a return made and approved by the court; or

“(2) if made pursuant to an agreement as provided in section 107.

“(d) NOTICE REQUIRED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be covered under this section, a covered individual shall provide to the mortgagee, trustee, or other creditor written notice that such individual is so covered.

“(2) MANNER.—Written notice under paragraph (1) may be provided electronically.

“(3) TIME.—Notice provided under paragraph (1) shall be provided during the covered time period.

“(4) CONTENTS.—With respect to a servicemember described in subsection (g)(1)(A), notice shall include—

“(A) a copy of the servicemember's official military orders, or any notification, certification, or verification from a servicemember's commanding officer that provides evidence of servicemember's eligibility for special pay as described in subsection (g)(1)(A); or

“(B) an official notice using a form designed under paragraph (5).

“(5) OFFICIAL FORMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall design and distribute an official Department of Defense form that can be used by an individual to give notice under paragraph (1).

“(B) USE OF OFFICIAL FORM NOT REQUIRED.—Failure by any individual to use a form designed or distributed under subparagraph (A) to provide notice shall not make such provision of notice invalid.

“(e) AGGREGATE DURATION.—The aggregate duration for which a covered individual (except a servicemember described in subsection (g)(1)(A)) may be covered under this section is one year.

“(f) MISDEMEANOR.—A person who knowingly makes or causes to be made a sale, foreclosure, or seizure of property that is prohibited by subsection (c), or who knowingly attempts to do so, shall be fined as provided in title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘covered individual’ means the following individuals:

“(A) A servicemember who is or was eligible for hostile fire or imminent danger special pay under section 310 of title 37, United States Code, during a period of military service.

“(B) A servicemember placed on convalescent status, including a servicemember transferred to the temporary disability retired list under section 1202 or 1205 of title 10, United States Code.

“(C) A veteran who was medically discharged and retired under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code, except for a veteran described in section 1207 of such title.

“(D) A surviving spouse (as defined in section 101(3) of title 38, United States Code, and in accordance with section 103 of such title) of a servicemember who died while in military service if such spouse is the successor in interest to property covered under subsection (a).

“(2) COVERED TIME PERIOD.—The term ‘covered time period’ means the following time periods:

“(A) With respect to a servicemember who is or was eligible for hostile fire or imminent danger special pay under section 310 of title 37, United States Code, during a period of military service, during the period beginning on the first day on which the servicemember is or was eligible for such special pay during such period of military service and ending on the date that is one year after the last day of such period of military service.

“(B) With respect to a servicemember described in paragraph (1)(B), during the one-year period beginning on the date on which the servicemember is placed on convalescent status or transferred to the temporary disability retired list under section 1202 or 1205 of title 10, United States Code.

“(C) With respect to a veteran described in paragraph (1)(C), during the one-year period beginning on the date of the retirement of such veteran.

“(D) With respect to a surviving spouse of a servicemember as described in paragraph (1)(D), during the one-year period beginning on the date on which the spouse receives notice of the death of the servicemember.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following new item:

“Sec. 303A. Mortgages and trust deeds of certain servicemembers, surviving spouses, and disabled veterans.”

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 107 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 517) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) OTHER INDIVIDUALS.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘servicemember’ includes any covered individual under section 303A.”

(b) INCREASED CIVIL PENALTIES FOR MORTGAGE VIOLATIONS.—Paragraph (3) of section 801(b) of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 597(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) to vindicate the public interest, assess a civil penalty—

“(A) with respect to a violation of section 207, 303, or 303A regarding real property—

“(i) in an amount not exceeding \$110,000 for a first violation; and

“(ii) in an amount not exceeding \$220,000 for any subsequent violation; and

“(B) with respect to any other violation of this Act—

“(i) in an amount not exceeding \$55,000 for a first violation; and

“(ii) in an amount not exceeding \$110,000 for any subsequent violation.”

(c) CREDIT DISCRIMINATION.—Section 108 of such Act (50 U.S.C. App. 518) is amended—

(1) by striking “Application by” and inserting “(a) APPLICATION OR RECEIPT.—Application by”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) ELIGIBILITY.—In addition to the protections under subsection (a), an individual who is entitled to any right or protection provided under this Act may not be denied or refused credit or be subject to any other action described under paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) solely by reason of such entitlement.”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 303A of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, as added by subsection (a), and the amendments made by this section, shall take effect on October 1, 2014.

SEC. 12. TREATMENT OF RELOCATION FOR ACTIVE DUTY FOR PURPOSES OF MORTGAGE REFINANCING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 531 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303A, as added by section 11(a)(1), the following new section:

“SEC. 303B. TREATMENT OF RELOCATION FOR ACTIVE DUTY FOR PURPOSES OF MORTGAGE REFINANCING.

“(a) TREATMENT OF ABSENCE FROM RESIDENCE DUE TO ACTIVE DUTY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), if, at any time that a servicemember who is the mortgagor under an existing mortgage does not reside in the residence that secures the existing mortgage because of relocation described in subsection (c)(1)(B), such servicemember inquires about or applies for a covered refinancing mortgage, such servicemember shall be, for all purposes relating to the covered refinancing mortgage, including such inquiry or application and eligibility for and compliance with any underwriting criteria and standards regarding such covered refinancing mortgage, considered to occupy the residence that secures the existing mortgage to be paid or prepaid by such covered refinancing mortgage as the principal residence of the servicemember during the period of any such relocation.

“(2) LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to a servicemember at any time if, during the five-year period preceding such time, the servicemember entered into a covered refinancing mortgage pursuant to this section.

“(b) MORTGAGES ORIGINATED BEFORE PERIOD MILITARY SERVICE.—If a covered refinancing mortgage is entered into pursuant to this section with respect to an existing mortgage that originated before the period of the servicemember's military service, such covered refinancing mortgage shall be deemed to be an obligation that originated before the period of the servicemember's military service and for which the servicemember is still obligated for purposes of section 303(a)(1).

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) EXISTING MORTGAGE.—The term ‘existing mortgage’ means a mortgage that is secured by a 1- to 4-family residence, including a condominium or a share in a cooperative ownership housing association, that was the principal residence of a servicemember for a period that—

“(A) had a duration of 13 consecutive months or longer; and

“(B) ended upon the relocation of the servicemember caused by the servicemember receiving military orders for a permanent change of station or to deploy with a military unit, or as an individual in support of a military operation, for a period of not less than 90 days that did not allow the servicemember to continue to occupy such residence as a principal residence.

“(2) COVERED REFINANCING MORTGAGE.—The term ‘covered refinancing mortgage’ means any mortgage—

“(A) that is made for the purpose of paying or prepaying, and extinguishing, the outstanding obligations under an existing mortgage or mortgages; and

“(B) that is secured by the same residence that secured such existing mortgage or mortgages.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303A the following new item:

“Sec. 303B. Treatment of relocation for active duty for purposes of mortgage refinancing.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 303B of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, as added by subsection (a), and the amendments made by this section, shall take effect on October 1, 2014.

SEC. 13. REQUIREMENTS FOR LENDING INSTITUTIONS THAT ARE CREDITORS FOR OBLIGATIONS AND LIABILITIES COVERED BY THE SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

Section 207 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 527) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and
(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) LENDING INSTITUTION REQUIREMENTS.—“(1) COMPLIANCE OFFICERS.—Each lending institution subject to the requirements of this section shall designate an employee of the institution as a compliance officer who is responsible for ensuring the institution’s compliance with this section and for distributing information to servicemembers whose obligations and liabilities are covered by this section.

“(2) TOLL-FREE TELEPHONE NUMBER.—During any fiscal year, a lending institution subject to the requirements of this section that had annual assets for the preceding fiscal year of \$10,000,000,000 or more shall maintain a toll-free telephone number and shall make such telephone number available on the primary Internet website of the institution.”.

SEC. 14. PROTECTION OF CHILD CUSTODY ARRANGEMENTS FOR PARENTS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION.—Title II of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 521 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 208. CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION.

“(a) RESTRICTION ON TEMPORARY CUSTODY ORDER.—If a court renders a temporary order for custodial responsibility for a child based solely on a deployment or anticipated deployment of a parent who is a servicemember, then the court shall require that, upon the return of the servicemember from deployment, the custody order that was in effect immediately preceding the temporary order shall be reinstated, unless the court finds that such a reinstatement is not in the best interest of the child, except that any such finding shall be subject to subsection (b).

“(b) LIMITATION ON CONSIDERATION OF MEMBER’S DEPLOYMENT IN DETERMINATION OF CHILD’S BEST INTEREST.—If a motion or a petition is filed seeking a permanent order to modify the custody of the child of a servicemember, no court may consider the absence of the servicemember by reason of deployment, or the possibility of deployment, as the sole factor in determining the best interest of the child.

“(c) NO FEDERAL JURISDICTION OR RIGHT OF ACTION OR REMOVAL.—Nothing in this section shall create a Federal right of action or otherwise give rise to Federal jurisdiction or create a right of removal.

“(d) PREEMPTION.—In any case where State law applicable to a child custody proceeding involving a temporary order as contemplated in this section provides a higher standard of protection to the rights of the parent who is a deploying servicemember than the rights provided under this section with respect to such temporary order, the appropriate court shall apply the higher State standard.

“(e) DEPLOYMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘deployment’ means the movement or mobilization of a servicemember to a location for a period of longer than 60 days and not longer than 540 days pursuant to temporary or permanent official orders—

“(1) that are designated as unaccompanied;

“(2) for which dependent travel is not authorized; or

“(3) that otherwise do not permit the movement of family members to that location.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title II the following new item:

“208. Child custody protection.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous material they may have on H.R. 2481, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2481 represents the collective work of our Economic Opportunity Subcommittee. Provisions of this bill streamline eligibility for veterans’ GI Bill benefits that would ensure that surviving loved ones of servicemembers who die as a result of service have all the educational assistance benefits that they are entitled to and makes improvements to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

I know other Members are here today to speak on provisions of this bill that they have authored, so at this time, I will focus on just a few areas.

Sections 4 and 5 of the bill would establish, within existing resources, a Veterans Economic Opportunity Administration at the Department of Veterans Affairs as an Under Secretary to head the effort. The purpose of creating a parallel administration is to serve alongside VA’s Veterans Benefits Administration, the Veterans Health Administration, and the National Cemetery Administration; it is to raise in importance the issues affecting veterans’ readjustment to civilian life.

Too often these issues, such as education, job training, and vocational counseling, do not receive the focus that they deserve because they are subsumed within an administration that also has responsibility for disability claims processing. Highlighting and emphasizing the importance of jobs and careers for veterans was an important reason why the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs created for itself a separate Economic Opportunity Subcommittee several years ago. These provisions would advance the same model within the Department of Veterans Affairs. It is my hope that the new Under Secretary for Economic Opportunity would be a powerful advocate serving veterans’ readjustment interests, whether at school, during TAP transition classes for departing servicemembers, or as a liaison with the Department of Labor’s Veterans Employment and Training Service.

The second provision I would like to touch on was authored by the late C.W.

Bill Young. It would permit the children of certain severely disabled servicemembers, who die shortly after their military service and who have received a Purple Heart, to be eligible for the Fry Educational Scholarship. The Fry Scholarship provides certain post-9/11 GI Bill benefits for the children of servicemembers, but only those who die on Active Duty.

Chairman Young rightly believed that the kids of those who may have been mortally wounded in service but who died shortly thereafter ought to be eligible for this benefit as well. I am honored to say that section 7 of the bill carries forward Bill’s provision and that his memory lives on in our work today in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 2481, as amended, the Veterans Economic Opportunity Act of 2013, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2481, as amended, makes several significant improvements to VA’s structure as well as several benefits programs. This bill represents the work of Members, both on and off the Veterans’ Affairs Committee, to improve veterans lives. I want to take a few minutes to highlight two of the key provisions of this measure.

Mr. CUMMINGS of Maryland originally introduced H.R. 1842, the Military Family Home Protection Act. Language from this measure is included in H.R. 2481, as amended, and aims to strengthen the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act foreclosure protections for servicemembers and their families during the course of deployment, regardless of when the home was purchased. Military homeowners deserve these protections so they can have peace of mind while they serve. We all have heard the horror stories of families fighting for their homes and, sadly, losing their homes while the family members were in harm’s way in Iraq or Afghanistan.

The 5-year extension of the Homeless Veterans’ Reintegration Program in this bill is vital to veterans. There are still approximately 62,000 homeless veterans on the streets each night. This program provides services to assist in reintegrating them into meaningful employment in the labor force. The HVRP is the only nationwide program that focuses on assisting homeless veterans by connecting them to employment. If we are to meet the goal of ending homeless veterans by 2015, we need to extend the help that is included in this bill.

I strongly support H.R. 2481, as amended, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. FLORES), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2481, as amended, and I thank Chairman MILLER for allowing me to express my support for this bill today.

This bill contains the original text of the Veterans GI Bill Enrollment Clarification Act of 2013, which I introduced in June, as well as the collective work of the subcommittee that I am honored to chair, the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity.

I want to thank the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, Mr. TAKANO, as well as Chairman MILLER and ranking member of the full committee, Mr. MICHAUD, for bringing this bill to the floor. Finally, I also thank the other members of the committee who authored the provisions that are included in this bill for their thoughtful legislation.

Mr. Speaker, sections 4 and 5, originally authored by Chairman MILLER, would authorize using existing VA resources for the creation of a fourth administration at VA, which will improve oversight over VA's education, vocational rehabilitation, and home loan programs, and the Center for Veterans Enterprise. Too often, these programs are overshadowed by VA's efforts to reduce the disability claims backlog, and I am hopeful that this new fourth administration will streamline oversight over these important VA programs that will help veterans reach economic success.

Section 6 includes Mr. COOK's bill that would extend the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program, which provides grant funding for job training services for homeless veterans.

Section 7 includes a bill authored by our late colleague, Mr. Young of Florida. This section would modify the Fry Scholarship program to include the children of certain veterans who die within 31 days of discharge from a service-connected cause. This is an issue that I know Mr. Young was personally passionate about, and I am thankful that we are able to include it in this bill that is being considered today.

Section 8 includes the original text of my bill, H.R. 2481, that would clarify the process to assist veterans in choosing the best GI Bill benefit to meet their unique education needs. I believe that, by making this one small change, we can reduce veterans' wait times and streamline their use of the benefits that they have earned.

Section 9 reflects a bill introduced by Mr. CALVERT and cosponsored by Mr. TAKANO to streamline the reporting of student data by college consortiums.

Section 10 would extend several existing VA loan guarantee funding fees to provide CutGo funding offsets for the costs of the bill.

Sections 11 and 12 contain the provisions of Mr. CUMMINGS' bill to expand

several mortgage foreclosure and refinancing-related protections and rights in the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to surviving spouses and Active Duty members. The section would also clarify refinancing options available for servicemembers, as well as penalties for violations of the SCRA law.

I want to thank Mr. CUMMINGS and his staff for working with us on this section over the past year. I believe these provisions would go a long way in protecting servicemembers and their families.

The final section would amend SCRA to protect child custody agreements of servicemembers while they are deployed. This provision, sponsored by Mr. TURNER, has passed the House multiple times in the last few Congresses, and it is designed to ensure that military service doesn't impact existing child custody agreements unless it is in the best interests of the child.

Once again, I thank all of the Members for their thoughtful contributions to this bill, and I encourage its passage.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maine, the ranking member of our committee, for yielding time, and I thank Chairman FLORES of the subcommittee for his hard work.

I am pleased to see that the Veterans Economic Opportunity Act of 2013 is receiving a vote today on the floor, as every Member of this distinguished body has servicemembers in his or her congressional district, and all of us believe that taking care of these heroes, when they complete their service, should be a top priority.

Bipartisanship in this Congress is rare, but Republicans and Democrats all agree that Congress should be making it easier for our servicemembers as they transition back to civilian life.

□ 1715

The House Veterans' Affairs Committee has a strong track record of being the least partisan committee in Congress, and this very bill is consistent with that record, as it passed in committee unanimously this past September.

I am especially proud that H.R. 331, which I originally introduced with my Republican colleague from California, Representative CALVERT, was included in the final legislation. With Riverside Community College District campuses in both of our congressional districts and with Riverside County having the eighth largest veterans population in the country, I am proud that Representative CALVERT and I joined forces to make it easier for veterans to receive their veterans education benefits.

Our legislation will help decrease education benefit processing times by eliminating unnecessary and duplicative

paperwork for individual community colleges that are part of a group, district, or consortium. Specifically, it will allow a multicollege system, such as the Riverside Community College District, to verify a student's class enrollment number with the Department of Veterans Affairs instead of requiring each individual constituent college to do so. Centralizing the reporting for veterans enrollment at multicollege systems will be a great benefit to veterans in the Inland Empire, as unnecessary and duplicative paperwork delays benefits, increases processing times, and increases costs to the Department of Veterans Affairs and multicollege systems, such as the Riverside Community College District.

I am also pleased to see the Military Family Home Protection Act, of which I was a lead cosponsor, included in the final bill. This portion of the legislation will expand foreclosure protections to all servicemembers regardless of when they purchased their home and will stay home foreclosures for servicemembers who are receiving hostile or imminent danger pay. It will also prohibit banks from discriminating against servicemembers, veterans, and surviving spouses who are looking for home loans and mortgages. Finally, it will double civil penalties for mortgage-related violations.

The veterans who so bravely served this country deserve every opportunity for success and every protection possible.

I thank my Republican colleagues from the Veterans' Affairs Committee for pushing this legislation, and I look forward to its passage.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Veterans Economic Opportunity Act of 2013.

As our servicemembers return home from war, it is incumbent on all of us and all Americans to ensure that they are receiving the support and opportunities they need to succeed in civilian life. This bill establishes the Economic Opportunity Administration, which would focus its efforts entirely on veteran education, employment, small business, and housing. The bill also contains the text of legislation I introduced earlier this year along with my colleague from California, Representative TAKANO, which is vital to my and his congressional districts.

For community college districts that have multiple colleges as part of the district, the Department of Veterans Affairs requires each campus to certify that their veteran students are enrolled for a specific number of classes before the VA will disburse student benefits. Under current regulations, each of the colleges in the district must write letters to other colleges

within the district to verify their classes and meet regulations. For the Riverside Community College District in Riverside, California, this unnecessary paperwork delays benefits to veterans and increases processing times and the costs to college districts as well as the VA.

This bill, which was wrapped into H.R. 2481, corrects that problem by permitting each college in the district to verify and certify veterans for all classes attended within the district rather than just for classes attended at that particular college. H.R. 331 would update the rules, which would mean veterans would receive their benefits sooner, and the VA would have less paperwork to process.

I would like to thank subcommittee Chairman FLORES and his staff, Ranking Member TAKANO, full committee Chairman MILLER, and full committee Ranking Member MICHAUD for their efforts to support our veterans, and specifically for the Veterans Economic Opportunity Act.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding; and I want to thank Chairman MILLER, Congressman FLORES, Ranking Member MICHAUD, Congressman TAKANO, and members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for working together in a truly bipartisan way to include provisions in this legislation to extend home foreclosure provisions to our servicemembers, veterans with disabilities, and surviving spouses.

For the last 2 years, I have aggressively investigated illegal foreclosures, inflated fees, and other abuses by banks against our servicemembers, veterans, and their families. In my opinion, no one is more deserving of our help than our servicemembers who have sacrificed so much, who have given their blood, sweat, tears, and sometimes their lives. Yet under current law, certain servicemembers, veterans with disabilities, and surviving spouses are not receiving the critical protections they need and truly deserve. As a result, banks are foreclosing on homes at the very moment when our heroes and their families deserve our support.

As a country, we can and must do better. That is why I introduced H.R. 1842, the Military Family Home Protection Act, which the House Veterans' Affairs Committee included in the bill before us today, and I am most grateful. These commonsense provisions will better protect military families and veterans with disabilities by closing loopholes and providing needed reforms to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

These provisions are supported by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Paralyzed Veterans of

America, Disabled American Veterans, Military Officers Association of America, Gold Star Wives of America, and the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, all of whom have written strong letters of support. This legislation has overwhelming bipartisan support, and I thank every single member of the committee for their continued support.

With Veterans Day approaching, I believe one of the best ways to honor our veterans and those that serve is to help keep a roof over their heads after they have sacrificed so much for our freedom and for our way of life. I ask every Member to support this effort.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Dayton, Ohio (Mr. TURNER), home of the United States Air Force Museum.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his diligence on a provision of this bill that would protect the custody rights of our servicemembers. I also want to thank the ranking member and the staff of the VA Committee for also being so diligent as to include this provision.

This provision has passed the House five times as part of the National Defense Authorization Act and three times as provisions coming from the VA Committee. It is an essential provision that would provide servicemembers the confidence and protection of the custody arrangements once they are deployed.

Unbelievably, across this Nation, family law court judges have been taking custody away from servicemembers upon their return from deployment, using their time against them in deciding a custody case. There are even cases in our Nation where the family law court judge took custody away based on the potential threat of deployment of servicemembers. I don't think anyone believes that it is in the best interest of the child for them to believe that there is something wrong with serving your country.

We have a national military that needs a national standard. Men and women who are serving need to know what standard is going to be applied. Many of these cases have multiple State provisions. This does not provide Federal jurisdiction for custody cases. It retains the State's authority on this, but merely provides a minimum standard upon which servicemembers can rely that says that their custody decisions will not be based solely upon the issue of their past or future deployment. This is the minimum that we could do for our servicemembers.

This arises in part out of the case of Eva Slusher, who was a Kentucky National Guard member. Her daughter, Sara, she had raised for 6 years alone after divorce. Upon returning from deployment, the court awarded her ex-husband custody. She fought for 2

years and spent \$25,000 to get her daughter back. She should be the type of servicemember who knows that there is a standard so that when she returns, that her time away will not be used against her.

This is important also so that servicemembers, when they are making arrangements upon departure, do not have the anxiety, when they are deployed, that when they return they might not get their families back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TURNER. Eva Slusher famously said that, under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, she is required to get her job back when she returns. She believes that, under that act, she should also be able to get her child back.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, once again, I would like to thank Chairman MILLER for bringing this bill to the floor, as well as Chairman FLORES and Ranking Member TAKANO of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity for their work on this particular bill, and I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it unanimously.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the members of our committee for their bipartisan efforts in bringing this piece of legislation to the floor.

I would ask all Members here to support this as we go forward with a vote to pass H.R. 2481, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2481, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to benefits, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENIAL OF BENEFIT REQUIREMENT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1405) to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include an appeals form in any notice of decision issued for the denial of a benefit sought, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1405

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. INCLUSION OF NOTICE OF DISAGREEMENT FORMS IN NOTICES OF DECISIONS OF BENEFITS DENIALS ISSUED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5104(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “and (2)” and inserting “(2)”; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and (3) a form that may be used to file a notice of disagreement to the decision”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to decisions made by the Secretary under section 511 of title 38, United States Code, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. PROVISION OF STATUS UNDER LAW BY HONORING CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS AS VETERANS.

(a) VETERAN STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 107 the following new section:

“§ 107A. Honoring as veterans certain persons who performed service in the reserve components

“Any person who is entitled under chapter 1223 of title 10 to retired pay for nonregular service or, but for age, would be entitled under such chapter to retired pay for nonregular service shall be honored as a veteran but shall not be entitled to any benefit by reason of this section.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 107 the following new item:

“107A. Honoring as veterans certain persons who performed service in the reserve components.”

(b) CLARIFICATION REGARDING BENEFITS.—No person may receive any benefit under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs solely by reason of section 107A of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

SEC. 3. PROVISION OF ACCESS TO CASE-TRACKING INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 59 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 5906. Provision of access to case-tracking information

“(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In accordance with subsection (b), the Secretary shall provide a covered employee with access to the case-tracking system to provide a veteran with information regarding the status of a claim submitted by such veteran if such employee is acting under written permission or a power of attorney executed by such veteran.

“(2) In providing a covered employee with access to the case-tracking system under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure—

“(A) that such access—

“(i) is provided in a manner that does not allow such employee to modify the data contained in such system; and

“(ii) does not include access to medical records; and

“(B) that each time a covered employee accesses such system, the employee must certify that such access is for official purposes only.

“(b) PRIVACY CERTIFICATION COURSE.—The Secretary may not provide a covered em-

ployee with access to the case-tracking system under subsection (a)(1) unless the covered employee has successfully completed a certification course on privacy issues provided by the Secretary.

“(c) TREATMENT OF DISCLOSURE.—The access to information by a covered employee pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall be deemed to be—

“(1) a covered disclosure under section 552a(b) of title 5; and

“(2) a permitted disclosure under regulations promulgated under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 1320d–2 note).

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘case-tracking system’ means the system of the Department of Veterans Affairs that provides information regarding the status of a claim submitted by a veteran.

“(2) The term ‘covered employee’ means an employee of a State or local governmental agency (including a veterans service officer) who, in the course of carrying out the responsibilities of such employment, assists veterans with claims for any benefit under the laws administered by the Secretary.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“5906. Provision of access to case-tracking information.”

SEC. 4. IMPROVEMENT OF FIDUCIARIES FOR VETERANS.

(a) APPOINTMENT AND SUPERVISION.—

(1) Section 5502 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 5502. Appointment of fiduciaries

“(a) APPOINTMENT.—(1) Where it appears to the Secretary that the interest of the beneficiary would be served thereby, payment of benefits under any law administered by the Secretary may be made directly to the beneficiary or to a relative or some other fiduciary for the use and benefit of the beneficiary, regardless of any legal disability on the part of the beneficiary.

“(2) When in the opinion of the Secretary, a temporary fiduciary is needed in order to protect the benefits provided to the beneficiary under any law administered by the Secretary while a determination of incompetency is being made or appealed or a fiduciary is appealing a determination of misuse, the Secretary may appoint one or more temporary fiduciaries for a period not to exceed 120 days. If a final decision has not been made within 120 days, the Secretary may not continue the appointment of the fiduciary without obtaining a court order for appointment of a guardian, conservator, or other fiduciary under the authority provided in section 5502(b) of this title.

“(b) APPEALS.—(1) If the Secretary determines a beneficiary to be mentally incompetent for purposes of appointing a fiduciary under this chapter, the Secretary shall provide such beneficiary with a written statement detailing the reasons for such determination.

“(2) A beneficiary whom the Secretary has determined to be mentally incompetent for purposes of appointing a fiduciary under this chapter may appeal such determination.

“(c) MODIFICATION.—(1) A beneficiary for whom the Secretary appoints a fiduciary under this chapter may, at any time, request the Secretary to—

“(A) remove the fiduciary so appointed; and

“(B) have a new fiduciary appointed.

“(2) The Secretary shall comply with a request under paragraph (1) if the Secretary

determines that the request is made in good faith and—

“(A) the fiduciary requested to be removed receives a fee from the beneficiary and a suitable volunteer fiduciary is available to assist the beneficiary; or

“(B) the beneficiary provides credible information that the fiduciary requested to be removed is—

“(i) not acting in the interest of the beneficiary; or

“(ii) unable to effectively serve the beneficiary because of an irreconcilable personality conflict or disagreement.

“(3) The Secretary shall ensure that any removal or new appointment of a fiduciary under paragraph (1) does not delay or interrupt the beneficiary’s receipt of benefits administered by the Secretary.

“(d) INDEPENDENCE.—A fiduciary appointed by the Secretary shall operate independently of the Department to determine the actions that are in the interest of the beneficiary.

“(e) PREDESIGNATION.—A veteran may pre-designate a fiduciary by—

“(1) submitting written notice to the Secretary of the predesignated fiduciary; or

“(2) submitting a form provided by the Secretary for such purpose.

“(f) APPOINTMENT OF NON-PREDESIGNATED FIDUCIARY.—If a beneficiary designates an individual to serve as a fiduciary under subsection (e) and the Secretary appoints an individual not so designated as the fiduciary for such beneficiary, the Secretary shall notify such beneficiary of—

“(1) the reason why such designated individual was not appointed; and

“(2) the ability of the beneficiary to modify the appointed fiduciary under subsection (c).

“(g) PRIORITY OF APPOINTMENT.—In appointing a fiduciary under this chapter, if a beneficiary does not designate a fiduciary pursuant to subsection (e), to the extent possible the Secretary shall appoint a person who is—

“(1) a relative of the beneficiary;

“(2) appointed as guardian of the beneficiary by a court of competent jurisdiction; or

“(3) authorized to act on behalf of the beneficiary under a durable power of attorney.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 5502 and inserting the following:

“5502. Appointment of fiduciaries.”

(b) SUPERVISION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 5502, as amended by subsection (a)(1), the following new section:

“§ 5502A. Supervision of fiduciaries

“(a) COMMISSION.—(1)(A) In a case in which the Secretary determines that a commission is necessary in order to obtain the services of a fiduciary in the best interests of a beneficiary, the Secretary may authorize a fiduciary appointed by the Secretary to obtain from the monthly benefits provided to the beneficiary a reasonable commission for fiduciary services rendered, but the commission for any month may not exceed the lesser of the following amounts:

“(i) The amount that equals three percent of the monthly monetary benefits under laws administered by the Secretary paid on behalf of the beneficiary to the fiduciary.

“(ii) \$35.

“(B) A commission paid under this paragraph may not be derived from any award to a beneficiary regarding back pay or retroactive benefits payments.

“(C) A commission may not be authorized for a fiduciary who receives any other form of remuneration or payment in connection with rendering fiduciary services for benefits under this title on behalf of the beneficiary.

“(D) In accordance with section 6106 of this title, a commission may not be paid to a fiduciary if the Secretary determines that the fiduciary misused any benefit payments of a beneficiary.

“(E) If the Secretary determines that the fiduciary has misused any benefit or payments of a beneficiary, the Secretary may revoke the fiduciary status of the fiduciary.

“(2) Where, in the opinion of the Secretary, any fiduciary receiving funds on behalf of a Department beneficiary is acting in such a number of cases as to make it impracticable to conserve properly the estates or to supervise the persons of the beneficiaries, the Secretary may refuse to make future payments in such cases as the Secretary may deem proper.

“(b) COURT.—Whenever it appears that any fiduciary, in the opinion of the Secretary, is not properly executing or has not properly executed the duties of the trust of such fiduciary or has collected or paid, or is attempting to collect or pay, fees, commissions, or allowances that are inequitable or in excess of those allowed by law for the duties performed or expenses incurred, or has failed to make such payments as may be necessary for the benefit of the ward or the dependents of the ward, then the Secretary may appear, by the Secretary's authorized attorney, in the court which has appointed such fiduciary, or in any court having original, concurrent, or appellate jurisdiction over said cause, and make proper presentation of such matters. The Secretary, in the Secretary's discretion, may suspend payments to any such fiduciary who shall neglect or refuse, after reasonable notice, to render an account to the Secretary from time to time showing the application of such payments for the benefit of such incompetent or minor beneficiary, or who shall neglect or refuse to administer the estate according to law. The Secretary may require the fiduciary, as part of such account, to disclose any additional financial information concerning the beneficiary (except for information that is not available to the fiduciary). The Secretary may appear or intervene by the Secretary's duly authorized attorney in any court as an interested party in any litigation instituted by the Secretary or otherwise, directly affecting money paid to such fiduciary under this section.

“(c) PAYMENT OF CERTAIN EXPENSES.—Authority is hereby granted for the payment of any court or other expenses incident to any investigation or court proceeding for the appointment of any fiduciary or other person for the purpose of payment of benefits payable under laws administered by the Secretary or the removal of such fiduciary and appointment of another, and of expenses in connection with the administration of such benefits by such fiduciaries, or in connection with any other court proceeding hereby authorized, when such payment is authorized by the Secretary.

“(d) TEMPORARY PAYMENT OF BENEFITS.—All or any part of any benefits the payment of which is suspended or withheld under this section may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be paid temporarily to the person having custody and control of the incompetent or minor beneficiary, to be used solely for the benefit of such beneficiary, or, in the case of an incompetent veteran, may be apportioned to the dependent or dependents, if any, of such veteran. Any part not so paid

and any funds of a mentally incompetent or insane veteran not paid to the chief officer of the institution in which such veteran is a patient nor apportioned to the veteran's dependent or dependents may be ordered held in the Treasury to the credit of such beneficiary. All funds so held shall be disbursed under the order and in the discretion of the Secretary for the benefit of such beneficiary or the beneficiary's dependents. Any balance remaining in such fund to the credit of any beneficiary may be paid to the beneficiary if the beneficiary recovers and is found competent, or if a minor, attains majority, or otherwise to the beneficiary's fiduciary, or, in the event of the beneficiary's death, to the beneficiary's personal representative, except as otherwise provided by law; however, payment will not be made to the beneficiary's personal representative if, under the law of the beneficiary's last legal residence, the beneficiary's estate would escheat to the State. In the event of the death of a mentally incompetent or insane veteran, all gratuitous benefits under laws administered by the Secretary deposited before or after August 7, 1959, in the personal funds of patients trust fund on account of such veteran shall not be paid to the personal representative of such veteran, but shall be paid to the following persons living at the time of settlement, and in the order named: The surviving spouse, the children (without regard to age or marital status) in equal parts, and the dependent parents of such veteran, in equal parts. If any balance remains, such balance shall be deposited to the credit of the applicable current appropriation; except that there may be paid only so much of such balance as may be necessary to reimburse a person (other than a political subdivision of the United States) who bore the expenses of last sickness or burial of the veteran for such expenses. No payment shall be made under the two preceding sentences of this subsection unless claim therefor is filed with the Secretary within five years after the death of the veteran, except that, if any person so entitled under said two sentences is under legal disability at the time of death of the veteran, such five-year period of limitation shall run from the termination or removal of the legal disability.

“(e) ESCHATEMENT.—Any funds in the hands of a fiduciary appointed by a State court or the Secretary derived from benefits payable under laws administered by the Secretary, which under the law of the State wherein the beneficiary had last legal residence would escheat to the State, shall escheat to the United States and shall be returned by such fiduciary, or by the personal representative of the deceased beneficiary, less legal expenses of any administration necessary to determine that an escheat is in order, to the Department, and shall be deposited to the credit of the applicable revolving fund, trust fund, or appropriation.

“(f) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide to a fiduciary appointed under section 5502 of this title materials and tools to assist the fiduciary in carrying out the responsibilities of the fiduciary under this chapter, including—

“(1) handbooks, brochures, or other written material that explain the responsibilities of a fiduciary under this chapter;

“(2) tools located on an Internet website, including forms to submit to the Secretary required information; and

“(3) assistance provided by telephone.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by

inserting after the item relating to section 5502 the following new item:

“5502A. Supervision of fiduciaries.”.

(c) DEFINITION OF FIDUCIARY.—Section 5506 of title 38, United States Code is amended—

(1) by striking “For purposes” and inserting “(a) For purposes”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b)(1) For purposes of subsection (a), the term ‘person’ includes any—

“(A) State or local government agency whose mission is to carry out income maintenance, social service, or health care-related activities;

“(B) any State or local government agency with fiduciary responsibilities; or

“(C) any nonprofit social service agency that the Secretary determines—

“(i) regularly provides services as a fiduciary concurrently to five or more individuals; and

“(ii) is not a creditor of any such individual.

“(2) The Secretary shall maintain a list of State or local agencies and nonprofit social service agencies under paragraph (1) that are qualified to act as a fiduciary under this chapter. In maintaining such list, the Secretary may consult the lists maintained under section 807(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1007(h)).”.

(d) QUALIFICATIONS.—Section 5507 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 5507. Inquiry, investigations, and qualification of fiduciaries

“(a) INVESTIGATION.—Any certification of a person for payment of benefits of a beneficiary to that person as such beneficiary's fiduciary under section 5502 of this title shall be made on the basis of—

“(1) an inquiry or investigation by the Secretary of the fitness of that person to serve as fiduciary for that beneficiary to be conducted in advance of such certification and in accordance with subsection (b);

“(2) adequate evidence that certification of that person as fiduciary for that beneficiary is in the interest of such beneficiary (as determined by the Secretary under regulations);

“(3) adequate evidence that the person to serve as fiduciary protects the private information of a beneficiary in accordance with subsection (d)(1); and

“(4) the furnishing of any bond that may be required by the Secretary in accordance with subsection (f).

“(b) ELEMENTS OF INVESTIGATION.—(1) In conducting an inquiry or investigation of a proposed fiduciary under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall conduct—

“(A) a face-to-face interview with the proposed fiduciary by not later than 30 days after the date on which such inquiry or investigation begins; and

“(B) a background check of the proposed fiduciary to—

“(i) in accordance with paragraph (2), determine whether the proposed fiduciary has been convicted of a crime; and

“(ii) determine whether the proposed fiduciary will serve the best interest of the beneficiary, including by conducting a credit check of the proposed fiduciary and checking the records under paragraph (5).

“(2) The Secretary shall request information concerning whether that person has been convicted of any offense under Federal or State law. If that person has been convicted of such an offense, the Secretary may certify the person as a fiduciary only if the

Secretary finds that the person is an appropriate person to act as fiduciary for the beneficiary concerned under the circumstances.

“(3) The Secretary shall conduct the background check described in paragraph (1)(B)—

“(A) each time a person is proposed to be a fiduciary, regardless of whether the person is serving or has served as a fiduciary; and

“(B) at no expense to the beneficiary.

“(4) Each proposed fiduciary shall disclose to the Secretary the number of beneficiaries that the fiduciary acts on behalf of.

“(5) The Secretary shall maintain records of any person who has—

“(A) previously served as a fiduciary; and

“(B) had such fiduciary status revoked by the Secretary.

“(6)(A) If a fiduciary appointed by the Secretary is convicted of a crime described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall notify the beneficiary of such conviction by not later than 14 days after the date on which the Secretary learns of such conviction.

“(B) A crime described in this subparagraph is a crime—

“(i) for which the fiduciary is convicted while serving as a fiduciary for any person;

“(ii) that is not included in a report submitted by the fiduciary under section 5509(a) of this title; and

“(iii) that the Secretary determines could affect the ability of the fiduciary to act on behalf of the beneficiary.

“(c) INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS.—

(1) In the case of a proposed fiduciary described in paragraph (2), the Secretary, in conducting an inquiry or investigation under subsection (a)(1), may carry out such inquiry or investigation on an expedited basis that may include giving priority to conducting such inquiry or investigation. Any such inquiry or investigation carried out on such an expedited basis shall be carried out under regulations prescribed for purposes of this section.

“(2) Paragraph (1) applies with respect to a proposed fiduciary who is—

“(A) the parent (natural, adopted, or step-parent) of a beneficiary who is a minor;

“(B) the spouse or parent of an incompetent beneficiary;

“(C) a person who has been appointed a fiduciary of the beneficiary by a court of competent jurisdiction;

“(D) being appointed to manage an estate where the annual amount of veterans benefits to be managed by the proposed fiduciary does not exceed \$3,600, as adjusted pursuant to section 5312 of this title; or

“(E) a person who is authorized to act on behalf of the beneficiary under a durable power of attorney.

“(d) PROTECTION OF PRIVATE INFORMATION.—(1) A fiduciary shall take all reasonable precautions to—

“(A) protect the private information of a beneficiary, including personally identifiable information; and

“(B) securely conducts financial transactions.

“(2) A fiduciary shall notify the Secretary of any action of the fiduciary that compromises or potentially compromises the private information of a beneficiary.

“(e) POTENTIAL MISUSE OF FUNDS.—(1) If the Secretary has reason to believe that a fiduciary may be misusing all or part of the benefit of a beneficiary, the Secretary shall—

“(A) conduct a thorough investigation to determine the veracity of such belief; and

“(B) if such veracity is established, transmit to the officials described in paragraph (2) a report of such investigation.

“(2) The officials described in this paragraph are the following:

“(A) The Attorney General.

“(B) Each head of a Federal department or agency that pays to a fiduciary or other person benefits under any law administered by such department or agency for the use and benefit of a minor, incompetent, or other beneficiary.

“(f) BOND.—In determining whether a proposed fiduciary is required to furnish a bond under subsection (a)(4), the Secretary shall consider—

“(1) the existence of any familial or other personal relationship between the proposed fiduciary and the beneficiary; and

“(2) the care the proposed fiduciary has taken to protect the interests of the beneficiary.

“(g) LIST OF FIDUCIARIES.—Each regional office of the Veterans Benefits Administration shall maintain a list of the following:

“(1) The name and contact information of each fiduciary, including address, telephone number, and email address.

“(2) With respect to each fiduciary described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the date of the most recent background check and credit check performed by the Secretary under this section;

“(B) the date that any bond was paid under this section;

“(C) the name, address, and telephone number of each beneficiary the fiduciary acts on behalf of; and

“(D) the amount that the fiduciary controls with respect to each beneficiary described in subparagraph (C).”

(e) ANNUAL RECEIPT OF PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5509 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “may require a fiduciary to file a” and inserting “shall require a fiduciary to file an annual”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Secretary shall transmit such annual report or accounting to the beneficiary and any legal guardian of such beneficiary.”;

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(c) MATTERS INCLUDED.—Except as provided by subsection (f), an annual report or accounting under subsection (a) shall include the following:

“(1) For each beneficiary that a fiduciary acts on behalf of—

“(A) the amount of the benefits of the beneficiary provided under any law administered by the Secretary accrued during the year, the amount spent, and the amount remaining; and

“(B) if the fiduciary serves the beneficiary with respect to benefits not administered by the Secretary, an accounting of all sources of benefits or other income the fiduciary oversees for the beneficiary.

“(2) A list of events that occurred during the year covered by the report that could affect the ability of the fiduciary to act on behalf of the beneficiary, including—

“(A) the fiduciary being convicted of any crime;

“(B) the fiduciary declaring bankruptcy; and

“(C) any judgments entered against the fiduciary.

“(d) RANDOM AUDITS.—The Secretary shall annually conduct random audits of fiduciaries who receive a commission pursuant to subsection 5502A(a)(1) of this title.

“(e) STATUS OF FIDUCIARY.—If a fiduciary includes in the annual report events de-

scribed in subsection (c)(2), the Secretary may take appropriate action to adjust the status of the fiduciary as the Secretary determines appropriate, including by revoking the fiduciary status of the fiduciary.

“(f) CAREGIVERS AND CERTAIN OTHER FIDUCIARIES.—(1)(A) In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that a caregiver fiduciary is required only to file an annual report or accounting under subsection (a) with respect to the amount of the benefits of the beneficiary provided under any law administered by the Secretary—

“(i) spent on—

“(I) food and housing for the beneficiary; and

“(II) clothing, health-related expenses, recreation, and other personal items for the beneficiary; and

“(ii) saved for the beneficiary.

“(B) The Secretary shall coordinate with the Under Secretary for Benefits and the Under Secretary for Health to—

“(i) minimize the frequency with which employees of the Department visit the home of a caregiver fiduciary and beneficiary; and

“(ii) limit the extent of supervision by such Under Secretaries with respect to such a fiduciary and beneficiary.

“(C) In this paragraph, the term ‘caregiver fiduciary’ means a fiduciary who—

“(i) in addition to acting as a fiduciary for a beneficiary, is approved by the Secretary to be a provider of personal care services for the beneficiary under paragraph (3)(A)(i) of section 1720G(a) of this title;

“(ii) in carrying out such care services to such beneficiary, has undergone not less than four home visits under paragraph (9)(A) of such section; and

“(iii) has not been required by the Secretary to take corrective action pursuant to paragraph (9)(C) of such section.

“(2) In carrying out this section, the Secretary may adjust the matters required under an annual report or accounting under subsection (a) with respect to a fiduciary whom the Secretary determines to have effectively protected the interests of the beneficiary over a sustained period.”; and

(C) by striking the section heading and inserting the following: “**Annual reports and accountings of fiduciaries**”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 5509 and inserting the following new item:

“5509. Annual reports and accountings of fiduciaries.”.

(f) REPAYMENT OF MISUSED BENEFITS.—Section 6107(a)(2)(C) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period the following: “, including by the Secretary not acting in accordance with section 5507 of this title”.

(g) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Section 5510 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “The Secretary shall include in the Annual Benefits Report of the Veterans Benefits Administration or the Secretary’s Annual Performance and Accountability Report” and inserting “Not later than July 1 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate a separate report containing”.

(h) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives a comprehensive report on the implementation of

the amendments made by this Act, including—

(1) detailed information on the establishment of new policies and procedures pursuant to such amendments and training provided on such policies and procedures; and

(2) a discussion of whether the Secretary should provide fiduciaries with standardized financial software to simplify reporting requirements.

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON AWARDS AND BONUSES TO EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

For each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may not pay more than \$345,000,000 in awards or bonuses under chapter 45 or 53 of title 5, United States Code, or any other awards or bonuses authorized under such title.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous material they may have on H.R. 1405, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) for identifying another step in cleaning up the claims process. Her bill also includes provisions authored by the former sergeant major of the Minnesota National Guard, Mr. WALZ, to provide honorary veteran status to members of the National Guard and Reserves.

H.R. 1405 would also improve access to veterans' claims information by certain State and local government officials. And finally, the bill would revise the process by which fiduciary agents are assigned and limit the amount of bonuses that can be paid under chapters 45 and 53 of title V.

Again, I know that there are other Members who wish to speak in more detail on the provisions of this bill, so at this time, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1405, as amended.

I introduced this legislation, H.R. 1405, to improve the veterans' claims appeals process. Currently, a veteran must first exercise his or her appeal rights before the appeal process formally begins and the VA sends the required forms.

H.R. 1405, as amended, requires the VA to include an appeals form with the notice of decision for every claim. This cuts out several steps and speeds up

the appeals process. This commonsense change will immediately reduce the time frame of the appeals process by 60 days.

H.R. 1405 will also allow the VA to provide better customer service to those veterans who are already struggling with significant delays and bureaucratic challenges.

This legislation is, indeed, a commonsense improvement that will result in veterans in southern Nevada receiving the benefits they have earned in a timely fashion. I constantly hear from veterans in Las Vegas that the process is too complicated and takes too long. This change will eliminate an unnecessary bureaucratic step and speed up the process for those veterans and all our veterans across the country.

H.R. 1405, as amended, is supported by the VA and the veterans service organizations who came and testified.

This piece of legislation also includes language from three other bills: H.R. 679, the Honor America's Guard-Reserve Retirees Act, introduced by Representative WALZ of Minnesota; Chairman RUNYAN's bill, H.R. 733, the Access to Veterans Benefits Improvement Act; and Mr. JOHNSON's bill, H.R. 894, to reform VA's fiduciary program.

I want to thank the chairman of our subcommittee, Mr. RUNYAN, for moving this legislation through the subcommittee and for the bipartisan cooperation that guides our work on behalf of Nevada's veterans.

□ 1730

I also want to thank the many veteran service organizations for their helpful input and for supporting this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 1405, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN), the subcommittee chairman for Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs.

Mr. RUNYAN. Thank you, Chairman MILLER, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have sponsored H.R. 733, the Access to Veterans Benefits Improvement Act, with my good friend and colleague, Mr. TIM WALZ of Minnesota. This legislation is included as section 3 of H.R. 1405 and would provide certain local and State government employees access to case-tracking information through the Department of Veterans Affairs.

There is no doubt that we have a responsibility to veterans to ensure that every effort is made to simplify the claims process. Key to this effort are the County Service Veterans Officers, whose expertise in claims development helps veterans in New Jersey and in communities all across America.

Veterans are often frustrated, as they ask for help from a county service officer, that this person acting on their

behalf cannot directly access even the most basic information about the status of their claim. However, while looking to remedy that complication and broaden access to case-tracking information, consideration must also be given to the protection of veterans' private information. That is the balance that this bill strikes.

Mr. Speaker, I support section 3 of H.R. 1405, along with all the other provisions contained within the bill, and I encourage all Members to join me in support of the legislation.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ), who brings incredible expertise and compassion to the committee as a decorated veteran himself.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee and the subcommittees for doing exceptional work, for putting our veterans first, for bringing a package of commonsense legislation to honor our Nation's veterans, and doing it in the best and smartest manner we can. If the entire Congress functioned like the VA Committee, I think the American public would be far better served.

There is a provision in this bill that is very simple. It recognizes the service and sacrifice of members of the National Guard and Reserves. These are the men and women of our Reserve component. They take the same oath of office. They do the same training. They and their family sacrifice their time and energy and stand at the ready at all times. They assist flood victims in Colorado and Minnesota, fight fires across the Western United States, and stand ready to fight and defend this Nation at a moment's notice. They truly are the minutemen.

I would guess that the vast majority of Americans and maybe even Members of this body don't recognize that you can serve 20 years doing that, and if you are not called to a specific title X service, you cannot be considered a veteran. You can go to the VA hospital, you can go use the GI Bill, you can be buried in a veterans' cemetery, but you are technically a military retiree.

This may seem like a small thing, but it is not. The title of "veteran" means more than just a license plate you get from your State. It is something your neighbors know about. These people don't and should not have to explain that they are technically not a veteran.

This piece of legislation—and I thank, again, the people who made this possible—simply corrects that. Very seldom do we get a chance to do this. It doesn't add any cost, and it does the right thing. So it is not an added benefit—which was earned, by the way. It simply corrects this, puts it in line, and honors. If you serve 20 or more years in uniform, you stand ready, you

train people who went to war, we are going to give you the dignity and the honor of calling you a veteran.

So I ask my colleagues to support this important package of legislation. This one small piece is the right thing to do. It is many, many years overdue. I ask for the support of H.R. 1405.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), a former member of the VA Committee and a 26-plus year veteran of the United States Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank the chairman for recognizing me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today of H.R. 1405, which, in addition to improving the disability claims appeals process for veterans, contains language from H.R. 894, legislation I introduced to provide necessary reforms to the Department of Veterans Affairs' Fiduciary Program.

In response to an investigation by the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, which I chaired in the last Congress, this legislation includes significant changes that will strengthen the VA's standards for administering the Fiduciary Program and increase protection for vulnerable veterans.

Requiring background checks and lowering the fee a fiduciary can charge would increase scrutiny over fiduciaries and help root out potential predators. It also adds a layer of protection for veterans with fiduciaries by allowing veterans to petition to have their fiduciary removed and replaced. Importantly, it would also enable veterans to appeal their incompetency status at any time. That is a right not currently granted to veterans.

I would like to thank Chairman RUNYAN and Ranking Member TITUS of the Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee for their support of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to join us in support of H.R. 1405, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1405, as amended, is yet another bipartisan bill that has been advanced out of our committee. I, again, thank all the members for their collaborative work on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to join us in passing H.R. 1405, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1405. This straightforward legislation contains several provisions relating to veterans benefits, and also includes a cut in bonuses at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Under current practice, the VA pays out about \$400 million in bonuses to its workers each year. Recently we have seen these bonuses too often go to people whose work does not merit a reward, and to the contrary, may even merit reprimand.

This practice has been evident at the Atlanta VA Medical Center, where despite the fact that four unexpected deaths were attributed to mismanagement and lack of oversight, tens of thousands of dollars in bonuses were awarded to top level executives at the facility. It is past time that we stop rewarding people for simply showing up to work—bonuses should be the exception, not the norm. Furthermore, at a time when so many of our soldiers are returning from war, and in light of the deaths in Atlanta, I believe the VA should prioritize veterans' health and well-being above all else.

H.R. 1405 takes a positive step in ensuring that more discretion is used when providing bonus payments to employees at the VA. The legislation caps financial awards at the VA to no more than \$345 million for fiscal years 2014 to 2018. It is time we stop rewarding lackluster work and focus instead on providing the best possible care for our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in showing our gratitude for our nation's veterans by supporting H.R. 1405.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1405, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include a notice of disagreement form in any notice of decision issued for the denial of a benefit sought, to improve the supervision of fiduciaries of veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2011) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a two-year extension of the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2011

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education Improvement Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF VETERANS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

Section 3692 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting "31," after "30,"; and

(B) by striking "and the Persian Gulf War" and inserting "the Persian Gulf War, and the

post-9/11 operations in Iraq and Afghanistan"; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking "December 31, 2013" and inserting "December 31, 2015".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material they may have on H.R. 2011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, having the right skills is one of the keys to finding a good job, and America's taxpayers are now providing the most valuable GI Bill benefit to veterans and dependents since World War II.

To assist VA and the Congress in making sure that veterans' educational assistance benefits are meeting the needs of our veterans, title 38 has established a committee to advise the Secretary on the needs of veteran students. The committee's statutory term will expire on December 31 of this year. H.R. 2011 would extend that term for 2 years. I thank Mr. DELANEY for bringing his bill forward to our committee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 2011, the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education Improvement Act of 2013. The Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education provides advice to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on the administration of education and training programs for veterans and servicemembers, Reservists and Guard personnel, and dependents of veterans. The Advisory Committee is composed of veterans and persons who are eminent in their respective fields of education, labor, and management and are representatives of institutions and establishments furnishing education to veterans.

Besides providing advice to the Secretary, the Advisory Committee recommends new educational benefits and services. It also plays a key role in the long-range planning and development of existing education benefit programs for our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, as our post-9/11 GI Bill continues to evolve and be fully understood by the VA, colleges, veterans, and their dependents, the Advisory Committee is crucial to full implementation and resolving lingering issues.

The authority for the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education is slated to end on December 31, 2013. H.R. 2011 would extend this authority for 2 years so that the Advisory Committee can continue its important work in ensuring that veterans receive the full value of their educational benefits.

I wish to thank Representative DELANEY of Maryland for introducing this bill and Chairman MILLER for bringing it to the floor today. I wish also to thank Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity Chairman FLORES and Ranking Member TAKANO for their hard work on this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the 16th District of Ohio (Mr. RENACCI).

Mr. RENACCI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today with many of my colleagues who worked together as part of a bipartisan working group, including Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HECK, Mr. DELANEY, and others, in strong support of H.R. 2011, the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education Improvement Act. It was my great pleasure to join my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), in introducing this legislation.

America's veterans sacrifice dearly for this country, and I believe it is our obligation to help them once their service is complete.

The Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education was created in 1972 to advise the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on education and job training programs. Our legislation will not only continue the work of this valuable committee by reauthorizing it for 2 years, but it will also expand the committee to include representatives for those that served after September 11, 2001.

Every military conflict has its own unique atrocities and every generation of veterans faces a unique set of obstacles as they rejoin the civilian job market. For this reason, it is critical that we include members to represent those who served in Iraq and Afghanistan.

As a Member of Congress, I believe there is no greater cause than protecting and caring for our service men and women. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2011. Doing so will ensure that our troops receive the most effective education and training opportunities available.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

Mr. DELANEY. I want to thank the ranking member for yielding. I also want to thank Chairman MILLER and the rest of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for their support during this committee process.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee does some of the most important work

here in Congress and has long been applauded as a place where both parties work together. In that vein, our bill, H.R. 2011, the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education Improvement Act, is bipartisan legislation which I was pleased to introduce with my colleague from Ohio, Congressman RENACCI. H.R. 2011 is commonsense legislation designed to improve the VA's education and job training programs, and I am proud that it is being considered on the House floor today.

Mr. Speaker, one of the real privileges of our work in Congress is getting to meet so many dedicated servicemen and veterans and learn about the incredible work they have done to keep our country safe and defend our way of life. Likewise, in our district work, one of the most essential services in our offices is to provide help to veterans so that they can earn the benefits that they deserve. When we travel across our districts, what we see is the deep appreciation the American people have for her veterans. There is a reverence for their heroism and gratitude for their service.

Mr. Speaker, the American people feel strongly that our veterans deserve to be repaid for their service. I believe that one of the most significant commitments that we can make to these servicemen is their education.

Going back to 1944, with the first GI Bill, we have joined together as a Nation and said that when our veterans come home, they are going to be able to receive the education they need. In today's high-tech global economy, that commitment is more important than ever. The veterans' unemployment rate is too high, especially for post-9/11.

To give our veterans the best chance to succeed, we need to make sure that they have a choice in the VA, we need to make sure that our current benefit programs are working, and we need to make sure that our veterans' education programs are adapting to an ever-changing world.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation does two very important things.

□ 1745

First, it reauthorizes the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education through 2015. Absent congressional action, the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education will sunset this December.

Second, this legislation updates the U.S. Code to ensure that the committee includes post-9/11 veterans. There are over 2 million post-9/11 veterans in the United States, and their perspectives need to be heard on the committee and at the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to note that H.R. 2011 is supported by numerous important veterans organizations, including the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, the Military Officers Association of America, the Student Vet-

erans Association, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I can't think of better endorsements than these.

Helping our veterans transition to civilian life is one of the most critical challenges facing our country. These men and women are truly our country's heroes, and they deserve a world-class education. Our constituents feel strongly that this is something that we get right.

I thank the ranking member for his time, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. So if my good friend Mr. MICHAUD is ready to close, so am I.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I also have no further requests for time.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2011, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I, too, Mr. Speaker, ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2011, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2011.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2189, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2011, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

ESTABLISHING COMMISSION OR TASK FORCE TO EVALUATE BACKLOG OF DISABILITY CLAIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2189) to establish a commission or task force to evaluate the backlog of disability claims of the Department of Veterans Affairs, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 1, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 561]

YEAS—404

Amash	Cohen	Gabbard
Amodel	Cole	Gallego
Andrews	Collins (GA)	Garamendi
Bachmann	Collins (NY)	Garcia
Bachus	Conaway	Gardner
Barber	Conyers	Garrett
Barletta	Cook	Gerlach
Barr	Costa	Gibbs
Barrow (GA)	Cotton	Gibson
Barton	Courtney	Gingrey (GA)
Bass	Cramer	Gohmert
Beatty	Crawford	Goodlatte
Becerra	Crenshaw	Gosar
Benishek	Crowley	Govdy
Bentivolio	Cuellar	Granger
Bera (CA)	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Bilirakis	Cummings	Grayson
Bishop (GA)	Daines	Green, Al
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Danny	Griffin (AR)
Black	Davis, Rodney	Griffith (VA)
Blackburn	DeFazio	Guthrie
Blumenauer	DeGette	Hahn
Bonamici	Delaney	Hall
Boustany	DeLauro	Hanabusa
Brady (PA)	DelBene	Hanna
Brady (TX)	Denham	Harper
Braley (IA)	Dent	Harris
Bridenstine	DeSantis	Hartzler
Brooks (AL)	DesJarlais	Hastings (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Deutch	Hastings (WA)
Brown (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Heck (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Hensarling
Buchanan	Doyle	Himes
Bucshon	Duckworth	Hinojosa
Burgess	Duffy	Holding
Bustos	Duncan (SC)	Holt
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Honda
Camp	Edwards	Horsford
Cantor	Ellison	Hoyer
Capito	Ellmers	Hudson
Capps	Engel	Huelskamp
Capuano	Enyart	Huffman
Cárdenas	Eshoo	Huizenga (MI)
Carney	Esty	Hultgren
Carson (IN)	Farenthold	Hunter
Carter	Farr	Butterfield
Cartwright	Fattah	Israel
Cassidy	Fincher	Issa
Castor (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Jackson Lee
Castro (TX)	Fleischmann	Jeffries
Chabot	Fleming	Jenkins
Chaffetz	Flores	Johnson (GA)
Chu	Forbes	Johnson (OH)
Cicilline	Fortenberry	Johnson, E. B.
Clarke	Foster	Johnson, Sam
Clay	Fox	Jones
Cleaver	Frankel (FL)	Jordan
Clyburn	Franks (AZ)	Joyce
Coble	Frelinghuysen	Kaptur
Coffman	Fudge	Keating

Kelly (IL)	Murphy (FL)	Schrader
Kelly (PA)	Murphy (PA)	Schweikert
Kennedy	Nadler	Scott (VA)
Kildee	Napolitano	Scott, Austin
Kilmer	Neal	Scott, David
King (IA)	Negrete McLeod	Sensenbrenner
King (NY)	Neugebauer	Serrano
Kingston	Nolan	Sessions
Kinzinger (IL)	Nugent	Sewell (AL)
Kirkpatrick	Nunes	Shea-Porter
Kline	Nunnelee	Sherman
Kuster	O'Rourke	Shimkus
Labrador	Olson	Shuster
LaMalfa	Palazzo	Simpson
Lamborn	Pallone	Sinema
Lance	Pascarell	Sires
Langevin	Paulsen	Slaughter
Lankford	Pearce	Smith (MO)
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Smith (NE)
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Smith (NJ)
Latham	Perry	Smith (TX)
Latta	Peters (CA)	Smith (WA)
Lee (CA)	Peters (MI)	Southerland
Levin	Peterson	Stewart
Lewis	Petri	Stivers
Lipinski	Pingree (ME)	Stockman
LoBiondo	Pittenger	Swalwell (CA)
Loebach	Pitts	Takano
Lofgren	Pocan	Terry
Long	Poe (TX)	Thompson (CA)
Lowenthal	Polis	Thompson (MS)
Lowe	Pompeo	Thompson (PA)
Lucas	Posey	Thornberry
Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Tiberi
Lujan Grisham	Price (NC)	Tierney
(NM)	Quigley	Tipton
Lujan, Ben Ray	Radel	Titus
(NM)	Rahall	Tonko
Lummis	Rangel	Tsongas
Lynch	Reed	Turner
Maffei	Reichert	Upton
Maloney	Renacci	Valadao
Carolyn	Ribble	Van Hollen
Maloney, Sean	Rice (SC)	Vargas
Marchant	Richmond	Veasey
Marino	Rigell	Vela
Massie	Roby	Velázquez
Matheson	Roe (TN)	Visclosky
Matsui	Rogers (AL)	Wagner
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
McClintock	Rogers (MI)	Walden
McCollum	Rohrabacher	Walorski
McDermott	Rokita	Walz
McGovern	Rooney	Wasserman
McHenry	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz
McIntyre	Roskam	Waters
McKeon	Ross	Watt
McKinley	Rothfus	Waxman
McMorris	Roybal-Allard	Weber (TX)
Rodgers	Royce	Webster (FL)
McNerney	Ruiz	Welch
Meadows	Runyan	Wenstrup
Meenan	Ruppersberger	Westmoreland
Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Whitfield
Meng	Ryan (WI)	Williams
Messer	Salmon	Wilson (SC)
Mica	Sánchez, Linda	Wittman
Michaud	T.	Wolf
Miller (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Womack
Miller (MI)	Sarbanes	Woodall
Miller, Gary	Scalise	Yarmuth
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Yoder
Moore	Schiff	Yoho
Mullin	Schneider	Young (IN)
Mulvaney	Schock	

NAYS—1

Sanford
NOT VOTING—25

Aderholt	Herrera Beutler	Payne
Butterfield	Higgins	Rush
Campbell	Kind	Schwartz
Connolly	McCarthy (NY)	Speier
Cooper	McCaul	Stutzman
Graves (MO)	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Grijalva	Noem	Young (AK)
Grimm	Owens	
Gutiérrez	Pastor (AZ)	

□ 1854

Messrs. ROHRABACHER and BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to improve the processing of disability claims by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2011) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a two-year extension of the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 562]

YEAS—404

Amash	Carter	Dingell
Amodel	Cartwright	Doggett
Andrews	Cassidy	Doyle
Bachmann	Castor (FL)	Duckworth
Bachus	Castro (TX)	Duffy
Barber	Chabot	Duncan (SC)
Barletta	Chaffetz	Duncan (TN)
Barr	Chu	Edwards
Barrow (GA)	Cicilline	Ellison
Barton	Clarke	Ellmers
Bass	Clay	Engel
Beatty	Cleaver	Enyart
Becerra	Clyburn	Eshoo
Benishek	Coble	Esty
Bentivolio	Coffman	Farenthold
Bera (CA)	Cohen	Farr
Bilirakis	Cole	Fattah
Bishop (GA)	Collins (GA)	Fincher
Bishop (NY)	Collins (NY)	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Fleischmann
Black	Conyers	Fleming
Blackburn	Cook	Flores
Blumenauer	Costa	Forbes
Bonamici	Cotton	Fortenberry
Boustany	Courtney	Foster
Brady (PA)	Cramer	Fox
Brady (TX)	Crawford	Frankel (FL)
Braley (IA)	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Bridenstine	Crowley	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (AL)	Cuellar	Fudge
Brooks (IN)	Culberson	Gabbard
Brown (GA)	Cummings	Gallego
Brown (FL)	Daines	Garamendi
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Garcia
Buchanan	Davis, Danny	Gardner
Bucshon	Davis, Rodney	Garrett
Burgess	DeFazio	Gerlach
Bustos	DeGette	Gibbs
Calvert	Delaney	Gibson
Camp	DeLauro	Gingrey (GA)
Cantor	DelBene	Gohmert
Capito	Denham	Goodlatte
Capps	Dent	Gosar
Capuano	DeSantis	Govdy
Cárdenas	DesJarlais	Granger
Carney	Deutch	Graves (GA)
Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Grayson

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant

Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz

Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—24

Aderholt
Butterfield
Campbell
Connolly
Cooper
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Kind
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
Moran
Noem
Owens
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Rush
Schwartz
Speier
Stutzman
Young (AK)

□ 1903

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 992, SWAPS REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2374, RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-253) on the resolution (H. Res. 391) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 992) to amend provisions in section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act relating to Federal assistance for swaps entities, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2374) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF CONGRESSMAN MAJOR R. OWENS

(Ms. CLARKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, we were all saddened last Monday evening to hear of the passing of my predecessor, the Honorable Congressman Major R. Owens, and I stand here with colleagues to commemorate his life and his record of dedicated service to the people of central Brooklyn.

Congressman Owens was committed to the children and families who had been marginalized and ignored by the body politic. He worked to involve the community in the control of local public schools in Brooklyn and was a strong advocate for education as a member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce. His efforts were critical to the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Congressman Owens had always been dedicated to expanding access to information and the empowerment of the citizenry. Before being elected to the New York State Senate, he was a proud

librarian at the Brooklyn Public Library, and he remains the only librarian to have been a Member of Congress; and he was a mayoral appointee of Mayor John Lindsay as commissioner for the Community Development Agency, fighting on behalf of impoverished New York citizens.

Congressman Major Owens retired from elected office. He devoted himself to training the next generation of leaders. As a professor, he shared his experience with the students at Medgar Evers College.

Mr. Speaker, the example of Congressman Major R. Owens' public service will remain an inspiration to this and future generations of elected officials in Brooklyn and across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House stand to offer a moment of silence in honor of the late Congressman Major R. Owens.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay homage and respect, to the life and legacy of Major Owens. Having been elected to the United States Congress in 1992, I got the grand opportunity to work alongside Major until his retirement in 2007. During this time, Major was a hardworking member and great person. He was resolute in his desire to help others and improve the quality of life for his constituents.

Finding a career as librarian prior to coming to Congress in 1983, I can vividly remember how wise and articulate he was. Often times during a special order, Major would control the entire time speaking about issues impacting those in his district and the broader African American community.

While in Congress, Major was a champion for many issues. Among his greatest accomplishments was securing over \$100 million for Historically Black Colleges and Universities, helping pass the Americans with Disabilities Act, and consistently ensuring the voices of the disenfranchised did not go mute during his tenure.

My continued thoughts and prayers are with his wife, children, family, friends, and colleagues during this difficult time. I pray that they find solace in knowing that Major lived a great life in which they and many others, can be proud of and inspired by.

A man who believed in God, provided for his family, and served his country. Major was the absolute epitome of what it is to be a model citizen.

There is an old gospel song that says . . . "May the works I've done speak for me." There is no doubt that the great things Major accomplished during his 24 years as a Member of Congress will surely speak for him. May his soul rest in peace and legacy forever live on.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable man, a twenty four year distinguished Member of this body and an outstanding American, Congressman Major Owens.

It was through his work in the community as a librarian, chief administrator of New York City's anti-poverty program and a State Senator where he learned the benevolence of kindness and value of public service.

NAYS—2

Massie

Schweikert

In Congress, Congressman Owens worked tirelessly to improve education for all. His dedication to this cause extended further than the boundaries of our country and touched countless lives.

Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon this body to acknowledge Congressman Owens service which has improved our Nation.

On behalf of the people of the 30th Congressional District of Texas and the United States Congress, I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family and celebrate his life of service.

ACA RAISES COSTS ON YOUNG AND HEALTHY COVERAGE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius is scheduled to testify before the House Energy and Commerce Committee on the massive technological failures of the online rollout of the Affordable Care Act; and while some of my colleagues would lead you to believe that these are only minor Web site glitches, I rise to address a more basic, fundamental flaw in the construct of the Affordable Care Act.

The structure of the design, admittedly by an MIT economist who helped create ObamaCare, was to increase rates for the young and healthy while decreasing rates for the elderly or sick. The problem is this only serves to deter young Americans from purchasing health care when faced with the costs of education, a first home, and the prospect of starting a family.

We all want Americans to be covered, but higher premiums for the young and healthy to subsidize those who are greater consumers of health care was not the bill of goods the American people were originally sold. Mr. Speaker, young Americans deserve better.

IMMIGRATION AND WOMEN

(Ms. DUCKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, achieving immigration reform is not just an issue of security or economics; it is also an issue of women's rights. It is women who disproportionately bear the brunt of our inability to fix the immigration system. Undocumented women are more likely to suffer from domestic violence, poor work conditions, or be victims of human trafficking. They are afraid to demand justice for crimes that are committed against them, and they are afraid of retaliation and deportation.

A pathway to citizenship is critical to putting an end to a system that encourages the exploitation of women.

Far too many mothers have been separated from their children because our immigration system does not value family unity and parental rights. Family values are American values. Women waiting decades to reunite with their families is not acceptable.

Ensuring that our family-based immigration policies are strong and that they come with rights to employment are key to promoting the well-being of women. We benefit as a Nation when women have the ability to reach their full potential. With the help of women, it is projected that comprehensive immigration reform will reduce our deficit by \$1 trillion over 10 years.

I know that my neighbors care about women's rights and care about keeping families together. That is why we need to pass comprehensive immigration reform now.

COMMEMORATING CHLI'S 10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to commemorate the 10-year anniversary of the Congressional Hispanic Leadership Institute, known as CHLI.

Through his vision and leadership, former Congressman Lincoln Diaz-Balart has guided CHLI in its mission to advance our community's diversity of thought, while preparing young Hispanics to become the leaders of tomorrow.

CHLI's programs and initiatives focus on a wide variety of issues, from public service to commerce and technology. This month, I spoke at CHLI's Trade and International Affairs Symposium to highlight the importance of our community's contribution to the global economy. As the fastest growing group of both consumers and producers, Hispanics can benefit from reducing trade barriers and opening new markets.

CHLI has also helped many young people and provided them with the necessary tools to succeed in this increasingly globalized world. Through CHLI's Global Leaders Internship and Fellowship Program, students from across our Nation have expanded their professional horizons and enhanced their understanding of the public and private sectors.

As a CHLI board member, I am proud of the opportunities that CHLI provides to our youth and its commitment to ensuring that we continue to prosper as a Nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF YVONNE "BONNIE" GONZALEZ OF SOUTH TEXAS

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Yvonne "Bonnie" Gonzalez, an extraordinary public servant who has worked tirelessly to improve the lives of south Texas residents.

As CEO of Workforce Solutions, she has played a vitally important role in leading transformational change in the Rio Grande Valley and in the workforce industry. In fact, due to her exemplary leadership, Workforce Solutions has become one of the highest performing workforce boards in Texas.

Prior to joining Workforce Solutions as their CEO, Ms. Gonzalez served as founding president and CEO of the RGV Empowerment Zone Corporation. Under her direction, the Empowerment Zone took a \$40 million Federal investment and leveraged an additional \$416 million in local, State, national, and private sector investment into the Empowerment Zone communities.

As a devoted public servant, Ms. Gonzalez has inspired others to strive for excellence and to put the needs of our community first. Today I congratulate Ms. Bonnie Gonzalez on her new venture as president of the Knapp Community Care Foundation and thank her for the many years of public service to south Texas residents.

□ 1915

U.S. MONEY TO PAKISTAN IS FOOLISH

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, Pakistan is a disloyal, deceptive, and devious ally of the United States. Pakistan harbors Taliban terrorists that are at war with our troops in Afghanistan. Pakistan hid out Osama bin Laden. Pakistan put the Pakistani doctor that helped the United States take out "the devil of the desert" in prison for 30 years.

Pakistan is playing the United States for a nation of fools. Otherwise, why would our Government just send \$1.2 billion to Pakistan? Haven't we learned that Pakistan takes our money and slyly and seditiously uses it for purposes counter to U.S. interests?

Pakistan has become the Benedict Arnold ally of America. Why do we pay Pakistan to hate us? Madam Speaker, they will do it for free.

No American taxpayer money to Pakistan. Use that American money in America. Freedom-loving nations that give Pakistan money in the delusive hope of fighting terrorism are sailing the ships of the foolish—and the United States has become the admiral of the fleet.

And that's just the way it is.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, oceans cover 70 percent of our Earth's surface. They are home to a vast number of organisms that form an intricate food web—one that the world has relied on for high-quality protein and steady employment for generations. If we continue on our current path, we will face a serious decline in these essential resources.

The oceans have been absorbing nearly one-fourth of the carbon emissions we release every day. We think of the oceans as too big to fail, but we are altering their physical, chemical, and biological characteristics at an increasing pace. Our oceans are warming, current patterns are changing, and salinity and acidity are changing. Sea levels are rising, and many fisheries are being overexploited.

It is long past time for us to address climate change—to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and manage our coastal waters and the oceans in a more sustainable way. Oceans have sustained life on this planet for thousands of years. We should act now to ensure that they continue to do so for thousands more.

REDUCING EMPLOYER BURDENS, UNLEASHING INNOVATION, AND LABOR DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. GUTHRIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the importance of manufacturing to our economy.

Today, I introduced the Reducing Employer Burdens, Unleashing Innovation, and Labor Development, or the REBUILD Act of 2013.

The REBUILD Act is aimed at stimulating domestic production and increasing our global competitiveness. Provisions included in the bill seek to redesign workforce training, achieve comprehensive tax reform, increase access to energy and decrease costly regulations, reform health care, reform trade policy, and open up more spectrum for technological innovation.

Pieced together, these policies will allow us to ensure the United States of America remains the best place in the world to do business. I come from a small business and manufacturing background and understand how Federal policies can encourage or stifle innovation and job creation. I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in this effort to restore American innovation and boost our global competitiveness.

IN TRIBUTE TO MAJOR OWENS

(Mr. WATT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATT. Madam Speaker, I simply wanted to rise and pay tribute to the memory of my dear friend and colleague, Major Owens, who passed last week. I express my condolences to his family.

As new Members, we take for granted sometimes that there is a system in place to provide support and mentorship to new Members. It is not just the way things operate.

When I came to Congress in 1993, Major Owens was already here. He became one of the monitors and advisers who taught me the rules of how this institution operates—the rules of civility, respect, and honor—and the rules by which we operate the floor of the House. I learned so much from him, and over the years became a good, close friend of Major Owens and the members of his family, all of whom we join in grieving with on this occasion.

I simply wanted to say how much I respected him and how much appreciation I had for the advice and mentorship he provided to me.

CONGRATULATING MARY GIBSON SCOTT

(Mrs. LUMMIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Mary Gibson Scott, the superintendent of Grand Teton National Park and the John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Memorial Parkway. She announced her retirement from the National Park Service this week after 33 years of public service.

Mary is one of just 10 top-level park managers in the United States and is also the only woman among them. Before taking her current position in Wyoming in 2004, Mary held park management positions across the U.S., including at fabulous Carlsbad Caverns, the Golden Gate Park, the Santa Monica Mountains, and the Channel Islands in the West, and in the East, the Gateway in New York and the Blue Ridge Parkway in Virginia.

Over the course of her career, Mary has earned a variety of awards, including the Department of the Interior Superior Service Award and the Inter-mountain Region's Superintendent of the Year for Natural Resources, just to name two.

To many of us in Wyoming, Madam Speaker, Mary Gibson Scott is a neighbor and a friend, immersed in the Wyoming community; a valued and treasured public servant; and the epitome of a leader in stewardship of both natural resources and human relationships. I am proud and pleased to call Mary Gibson Scott my friend.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mary Gibson Scott on her illustrious career and in wishing her the very best

for a happy and well-earned retirement.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on Ms. CLARKE's 1-minute speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas? There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR R. OWENS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in celebrating "the people's Congressman." I am so delighted that we have the opportunity to share our friendship toward the late Congressman Major Owens, who loved his Brooklyn district and loved his family. My deepest sympathy goes to his wife Maria, and all of his family members.

Major Owens was truly someone who served the people.

I am reminded of a story that he told of when his family heard that FDR was providing opportunities for work in the 1940s. No one in his community was getting jobs, but his parents wrote to FDR, and all of a sudden things changed. That is the kind of man Congressman Owens was.

He was a change-maker, educator, and librarian. He was always there to say that his district and America's poor people needed to be represented. He was, in fact, the people's Congressperson because he extended his hand. He loved the people. He provided resources and he fought the good fight.

I want to thank you, Congressman Major Owens, for being my friend and a friend of those in Congress, Republicans and Democrats. Most of all, I want to thank Congressman Major Owens for being the friend of poor people around the Nation who could not speak for themselves.

I am glad that his giant footsteps had a great impact on the congressional district he represented. More importantly, he had a great impact on America. He was a soldier on the battlefield for those who could not speak for themselves.

May he rest in peace. God bless him and his family.

Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great American, a fighter for justice and equality, one of the most passionate advocates for educational opportunity, and a man who served in this body with distinction, Major R. Owens of New York. Congressman Owens died Monday, October 21, in Manhattan at the age of 77.

Major Owens was born June 28, 1936, in Collierville, Tennessee. He was educated at Morehouse College, from which he received his baccalaureate degree, and Atlanta University, from which he earned a Master of Science degree. Major Owens later moved to New York where he worked as a librarian before accepting an appointment from Mayor John V. Lindsay to serve as Director of the New York City Community Development Agency. He also served as a faculty member in the Department of Public Administration at Medgar Evers College.

In 1974, Major Owens was elected to the New York State Senate and was reelected to serve a second term in 1978. In 1982, Major Owens won a competitive primary to fill the seat of retiring Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, the first African American woman elected to the House of Representatives and the first woman ever to seek the Democratic nomination for President of the United States.

As the Member of Congress for the 11th Congressional District of New York, Major Owens represented a diverse district and eclectic district centered in Brooklyn, and including low income areas of Brownsville and parts of Bedford-Stuyvesant, the large Hasidic community of Crown Heights, the heavily Caribbean areas of Flatbush and East Flatbush, and the more affluent neighborhoods Park Slope and Prospect Park.

Affectionately known as the "Education Congressman" by his constituents, Major Owens fought tirelessly throughout his twelve terms in Congress to protect and expand educational opportunity for all Americans, especially those from economically and socially disadvantaged backgrounds. As he often reminded his colleagues in the House, education was "the kingpin issue." In an article he published in Black Issues in Higher Education, he wrote: "We have to believe that all power and progress really begins with education."

Major Owens served on the House Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on Education and the Workforce. As the Ranking Member on the Education and Workforce Subcommittee for Workforce Protections, Congressman Owens helped lead the fight for minimum wage increases, blocked the attempt to eliminate cash payments for overtime, fought against efforts to roll back or repeal Davis-Bacon and to weaken the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

As Chairman of the Education Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights (1988–94), Congresswoman Owens was one of the earliest and strongest supporters of the Americans With Disabilities Act, which was enacted into law in 1991. In recognition for his yeoman work to pass the ADA, Major Owens was awarded an honorary degree by Galludet University, the world's premier higher education institution serving deaf and hard of hearing people.

Major Owens loved serving in this body and he was a valued member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus and the Congressional Black Caucus. As Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Task Force on Haiti, he led the successful three-year fight which restored the democratically elected President Jean-Bertrand Aristide.

Madam Speaker, Congressman Owens was a legislator's legislator. Our prayers and con-

dolences go out to his wife Maria, his sons Chris, Geoff, and Milard; his grandchildren; and to all his friends and loved ones. Major Owens touched so many lives in so many helpful ways that he will always be remembered by people he served so ably and selflessly for more than thirty years.

Madam Speaker, a dear colleague has fallen. We are all saddened at the loss but overjoyed to have had the honor of serving with the distinguished gentleman from Brooklyn, New York, the honorable Major R. Owens.

FIGHTING AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IN OUR COMMUNITIES

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend and bring attention to the recent candlelight vigil held in Eden Prairie, Minnesota, honoring the 38 deaths from domestic violence this year.

The vigil, which was organized as part of Domestic Violence Awareness Month by the local domestic abuse prevention nonprofit, Cornerstone, was held at Purgatory Creek Park earlier this month. There was an incredible showing of support by members of our community and local police departments and law enforcement for those that are affected by domestic violence.

Madam Speaker, this is an issue which affects families and communities all across our country, and we must do more to put an end to these horrible acts.

Earlier this year, I was proud to author a provision in the Violence Against Women Act to assist domestic abuse victims in locating safe housing, which is a critical step on the path to recovery, but more work needs to be done to bring attention and an end to domestic violence in our neighborhoods.

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN MAJOR ROBERT ODELL OWENS

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, like my colleagues, I mourn the death of Major Owens, but I also want to celebrate his life. My purpose for rising tonight is to do just this: celebrate his life.

Major Owens was a person of character who had a great reputation. I had the honor of knowing him through my chief of staff, who was his chief of staff for 16 years. In working with her, she explained to me all of the many things that he was a party to over the course of the years, not only here in Congress, where he worked on legislation to help persons who had disabilities, but also back in his home district, where he was

a person who championed the causes of people who were in need.

It means something to me to know that he has this great reputation, but it is equally as important for me to share with people that he did have character.

When I met with him to discuss the hiring of Jackie Ellis, my chief of staff, because she was working with him, and he was contemplating some other things and moving, he explained to me how important it was in this body to keep your word. He explained that, among your friends and your colleagues, your word is the thing that will give you the opportunity to continue to have support in the Congress of the United States of America. His words about character and integrity are still with me.

I suspect that because he was a teacher—and as you know, teachers impact eternity—I will pass on to others what he has done because he passed it on to me, and what his chief of staff caused me to learn vicariously from him will impact my office eternally.

I am grateful to him. I pay tribute to him. I want his family to know that he has been a blessing to me and to my staff and to the people I serve.

God bless you, and thank you, Major.

CONGRESSMAN MAJOR ROBERT ODELL OWENS

Born—June 28, 1936 (Collierville, TN).

Elected to Congress representing Brooklyn's 12th Congressional District from 1983–1992 (98th–102nd Congress).

After redistricting—Represented Brooklyn's 11th Congressional District from 1993–2006 (103rd–109th Congress).

Transitioned to Eternity—October 21, 2013 (Brooklyn, NY).

Father of five children.

First librarian elected to Congress.

Chaired the Brooklyn chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE).

Past Commissioner of New York City's Community Development Agency.

Served on the Education and Labor Committee throughout his tenure in Congress (From 1987–1993 chaired the Education and Labor Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights).

Served on the Government Reform Committee throughout his tenure in Congress.

Chaired the Congressional Black Caucus Higher Education Braintrust.

Floor manager and original co-sponsor of the American with Disabilities Act of 1990.

Sponsor of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Authored legislation that prevented the Immigration and Naturalization Service from deporting the parents of American-born children under age 18 and legislation that extended citizenship to immigrant children under 12 who were in the U.S. without their parents.

Founder and organizer of the National Commission for African American Education.

Strong Organized Labor advocate—Championed the need for maintaining the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).

Lead sponsor of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act—Providing for major reforms in

the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) Program (Programs designed to aid community agencies in combating urban and rural poverty).

Past chair of the CBC's Haitian Task Force.

Has written several books including: "Roots and Wings", a semi-autobiographical book about his life.

In 2006 was named a distinguished visiting scholar at the John W. Kluge Center at the Library of Congress, where he completed a case study of the CBC and its impact on national politics.

Prior to his death, Congressman Owens taught at Medgar Evers College in Brooklyn, NY.

OBAMACARE CHOICE ACT OF 2013

(Mr. BARTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON. Madam Speaker, I rise to announce to my colleagues in the House that I just introduced H.R. 3348, the ObamaCare Choice Act of 2013.

This is a simple 1½-page bill. It simply lets the American people choose for the next year whether they want to participate in what we commonly call ObamaCare. If it is as good as the President says it is, people will join and get the benefits from it. If, on the other hand, they can't get the software fixed, the policy mandates are unsustainable, and the costs are too high, the American people will choose not to participate. It is a simple bill that makes participation voluntary by suspending the tax for nonparticipation.

So I would encourage all of my colleagues to join as a cosponsor of H.R. 3348, the ObamaCare Choice Act of 2013.

□ 1930

REMEMBERING THE HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Madam Speaker, I am very pleased tonight to lead a Special Order in memory of the life and service of our dear friend, our colleague from Florida, Mr. Bill Young. We will hear from members of the Florida delegation and also from leaders from the committee on which he was a leader, himself.

To lead off tonight in our Special Order in that vein, I am very pleased to yield first to the chair of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, on which Mr. Young served so distinguishably, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Let me thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today with a very heavy heart to honor the memory and service of our dear friend and colleague, Bill Young.

Bill served in this House and he served this country for decades with compassion and distinction. I have not known this institution without him—most of us are in that same situation—and I believe it will take a long time to fill the hole that his absence has left. As an appropriator, he was a role model for all of us. When I became chairman of the committee, I knew I had some very large shoes to fill in following in the footsteps of Chairman Young, among others. He fought with determination and enthusiasm to make this country a better place.

Bill was a champion for our troops and veterans especially, both in the Halls of the Congress and outside. His fierce determination and dedication to our troops and veterans never wavered. As we all know, he and his dear wife, Beverly, were to be found very frequently at Bethesda or at Walter Reed in the city or at a hospital overseas where troops were sick, and they spent hours and hours helping those who were injured.

He was, of course, the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee on the Appropriations Committee for many years. He also served on the Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, and his thumbprint is very visible in the improved medical care and in the quality of life of our troops, among the many other issues that he held dear to his heart.

Bill was a leader in this House who was able to make his mark with grace and fortitude. He was a lion about the things that he cared about; but he was a gentle lion, and he did things with grace and with a quiet voice until you crossed him on the betterment of our troops. Then Bill Young would let you know where to get off.

I will miss Bill Young greatly as I know all of us will. My prayers are with his family, with Beverly, with his many friends, and with all of those who had the privilege of knowing and working with Bill Young. He will be greatly missed.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman.

We are also pleased to have with us tonight a distinguished leader of the Florida delegation and now the dean of the Florida delegation—our senior member—to pay tribute to Bill Young. I yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the time.

A good man, a warm friend and a true patriot, Bill Young was an example for all of us here in Congress, and it was an honor and a privilege to serve with him. Madam Speaker, the loss of Bill's experience and knowledge will be felt by everyone in this Chamber.

The consummate gentleman from Florida, Bill was always ready to listen

to his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, greeting everyone with a smile. Both principled and honest while maintaining civility with his colleagues, Bill never allowed differences of opinion to devolve into partisan bickering, and he worked with Republicans and Democrats to balance our budget as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

A tenacious public servant, Bill dedicated his life to his constituents. His number one priority was ensuring those who serve our country get the help and the services they need to be successful. Improving the quality of life for veterans and for all Active Duty personnel, including those in the Reserve and the National Guard, was Bill's mission. Bill was always there for those returning from combat, visiting and helping our wounded warriors with his wife, Beverly, and providing for our veterans at the medical facility in Bay Pines, which now bears his name.

As chairman of the Appropriations National Defense Subcommittee, Bill oversaw spending by the Pentagon and worked to ensure the readiness of our military in combat. His efforts helped not just those in his district but Americans across the Nation. His legacy will be seen around every corner, from the beaches of Pinellas County to our fighting forces around the world.

A genuine statesman, Bill's accomplishments are as varied as they are numerous. He fought to protect Florida's environment by blocking drilling close to our gulf coast and in helping to restore eroding beaches. With Beverly, Bill helped create a national bone marrow registry with almost 10 million donors registered thus far. Just as he fought for his own district, he could always be counted upon to help us with our constituent needs.

In 1991, in his district, he saved MacDill Air Force Base from closure; and a year later, he helped rebuild and protect Homestead Air Reserve Base in my congressional district after the devastation of Hurricane Andrew. Through his vital efforts in my district, the Miami River dredging project was completed—a project that continues to generate billions for the shipping industry, to create jobs and to spur economic growth in south Florida. It couldn't have happened without Bill Young. Bill was instrumental in assisting Tampa Bay residents and those in my south Florida community and, indeed, across our country.

A true gentleman, a public servant and a friend, Bill Young deserves all of our thanks, Madam Speaker. He will be forever remembered as a champion not just for Florida but, indeed, for our entire great Nation.

I thank the gentleman for arranging this Special Order.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Young was respected not only by his Republican peers and colleagues

but by peers on both sides of the aisle. So I am pleased now to yield to a senior member of the Florida delegation on the other side of the aisle, the co-chair, Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you very much. I appreciate you, Mr. MICA, my colleague, for arranging this Special Order, and it is special that we come here to speak about a gentleman who was special to us all.

Madam Speaker, obviously, we are here with heavy hearts and with great sadness tonight in our honoring of a friend and a colleague, Congressman Bill Young.

Bill was an assiduous public servant and a tireless advocate for all Floridians; but above all, he was a man of integrity and a true statesman. The House of Representatives will not be the same without him. He served in Congress for 42 years; and I, as well as others, am deeply honored to have had the opportunity to serve alongside him for the past two decades. He dedicated himself to providing for our Nation's servicemen and servicewomen and was a powerful voice for America's best interests at home and abroad. His distinguished career has left its mark on the lives of countless Americans.

When I first came to Congress in 1992, I met with Bill Young and Sam Gibbons. They were on opposite sides of the aisle, but were dear friends, dedicated to Florida and to making the Florida delegation strong. I remember vividly learning from both of them through the years. In addition, throughout all of the travails of hurricanes and disasters, Bill Young stood with all of us who suffered during those periods, and he did everything he could to bring resources to Florida and to this Nation during disasters.

My first experience with an earmark was when Bill became chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I didn't know much about the process, but I knew that I wanted to get money in the budget to contribute to the African American Research Center in Fort Lauderdale in my congressional district. When I went to him, I was nervous because I wasn't sure how it would be handled, and he calmed me very easily by saying, It is done. For sure, he had had a hand in the development of that particular research center, which stands, and I honor him for having assisted in bringing resources there.

Last week, Speaker BOEHNER said:

It has only been a week since we began trying to imagine the House without Bill Young—an impossible task in its own right—and now he is gone. In our sorrow, we recall how not a day went by without a colleague seeking Bill's counsel as he sat on his perch in the corner of the House floor.

I certainly had the distinction of going to that corner and consulting with him.

President Obama said in his statement:

Congressman Young will be remembered for his advocacy and support for the armed services, servicemembers and their families, as well as for his statesmanship and his long history of working across the aisle to keep our country moving forward.

Defense Secretary Hagel said:

He will be remembered as a passionate advocate for the welfare of America's servicemembers and military veterans. Though his loss will be felt by many, his legacy and commitment to a strong national defense will always inspire us.

It is the height of irony that our friend would pass at Walter Reed Hospital. No one in this body spent as much time with our military at Walter Reed and around this country as did Bill Young. He, of course, has a legacy that is far excellent in that arena and also in bringing resources to the area that he served as well as to other areas around this Nation.

Tonight, I join with the people of Florida in keeping Beverly, Bill's sons, grandchildren, family, friends, and staff in my thoughts and prayers during this time of enormous sadness and loss.

Once again, I thank you, Chairman MICA, for arranging for us to have the privilege of honoring this great American.

Mr. MICA. Thank you.

Now, in continuing hearing from the leadership of our delegation, I am pleased to yield to the chairman of the Florida delegation, the gentleman whose district is adjacent to Mr. Young's, to the south, Mr. VERN BUCHANAN.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the memory of my dear friend, colleague and mentor, Congressman Bill Young.

For over four decades, there has not been a stronger voice in this Chamber for our brave men and women in uniform other than Bill Young. My district was just south of Bill Young's district, and we have almost 90,000 veterans. There is nobody who has benefited, I think, in terms of a district more than our veterans have in terms of Bill Young's leadership and in what he has brought to Pinellas County and to the State of Florida. He was an inspiration to so many because he personified the most important virtue of public service—he did it for others.

As dean of the Florida delegation, Bill provided wisdom and counsel to Members on both sides of the aisle. He served this great institution with devotion, civility, and distinction. I am honored personally to have served with this extraordinary man. With his passing, the State of Florida and the Nation have lost an outstanding lawmaker, statesman, and public servant. My thoughts and prayers are with his family during this difficult time.

□ 1945

Mr. MICA. I am pleased now to recognize another colleague across the aisle.

Again, Bill Young's friendships and his service included everyone in the House of Representatives and in the Congress, so I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Ohio, MARCY KAPTUR.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Chairman MICA so very much for the privilege of extending the deepest condolences of the people of Ohio to the Young family, to the constituents of Congressman Bill Young's district in Florida.

It was such a privilege to know him. Truly, he was not just a vigilant patriot, though that surely would have been enough, but he really was a man of the House. He belonged here, and his people knew that for over four decades.

When I think of Bill Young, I think of words like "courage," "perseverance," "insight," and "fair play." He had a gentlemanly demeanor at any time that I ever encountered him. He had a respect for regular order, for the gavel, and for seniority, which I share. He had a fortitude about him that people in my part of the country call real "spunk," and he had a sparkle in his eye and an easy smile and an understanding. He was such a real human being.

Part of that is the fact that he grew up very poor in Pennsylvania in a coal town in an old shack. He really knew what poverty was. He didn't have an easy childhood and he never forgot that. Yet he rose to be a master appropriator. In that capacity, he was not imperious but collegial, and he handled the gavel with fair play.

He loved his wife, Beverly, so much. I can still see her sitting in the gallery or coming unannounced into a committee meeting. He loved his family and he loved Florida.

He worked so hard for the men and women in our armed services and our veterans, certainly in his own State where right near him is the Bay Pines Veterans Medical Center, the fourth largest veterans facility in the country, but also all the operations of SOUTHCOM, as in his last decade of service dealing with all that we have to on the Defense Subcommittee in terms of the wars being conducted in Afghanistan and, of course, Iraq. He was engaged in all the intelligence at the highest levels and kept his good measure. His endurance and his heroic battles in these years that all of us witnessed showed the true measure of the man.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I would just like to say I will be seeing Bill Young in all the old familiar places, not just here on the floor, but as we travel in codels to some of the most godforsaken places on Earth, as we visit some of the highest level research facilities in our country and our men and women in uniform. I shall always remember Bill Young and be grateful for having been able to serve with him.

Mr. MICA. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Miami, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART, another Florida colleague, who is also a gentleman who served with Mr. Young distinguishably on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Chairman MICA, thank you for bringing us together today.

Madam Speaker, you have heard of Bill Young, the statesman, and that he was. We all know how he was, perhaps, the best friend and strongest ally of our troops, men and women in uniform, those in battle, those currently in uniform, and those who are veterans.

But those of us who worked with him and got to know him here know him, frankly, almost as like a godfather to all of us. There is not one time that we didn't go to him that he would not be helpful.

I remember after those storms in Florida, when we had a bunch of hurricanes, going to see Bill Young about getting help for the folks who had been hurt by the storms. His wisdom and his desire to help was always so present. He was always helpful, whether it was Everglades restoration, because he was also such a champion for the environment. Again, always with a smile.

Then I got to know him better when I, again, served with him in Appropriations and was able to see how he mastered that appropriations process like, frankly, potentially nobody before him and I think potentially nobody after him will again.

But I will tell you, Madam Speaker, the part that to me was a real privilege was that he was one of the people that I whipped. He was on my whip card. So I would go on different issues and talk to him about the issue and find out if he was leaning one way or another. Every time I went there, what I got from Bill Young was, frankly, a lesson. He instructed. I was never able to inform him about what the issues were; he informed me. He instructed me like he always instructed all of us. And always, Madam Speaker, with that incredible, warm smile, with that warm, firm handshake, which he had until the very end.

He never complained. We all know that for a long time he was in pain and yet never complained. He always wanted to make sure that you were feeling good, and he always wanted to know what he could do for you, never asking for himself.

I said recently—and I have got to find out who said this—but I heard or read someplace that “to be a great man you first have to be a good man.” Madam Speaker, Bill Young was a great man for so many reasons: for all that he did for this country, for all that he did for the State of Florida, for all that he did for our troops and the environment, the way he helped his colleagues, or how generous and how

humble and how caring and loving he was. He was an incredibly, an incredibly good man. And yes, if there is anybody that applies to, that before you can become a great man you have to be a good man, if there is anybody that that describes, it is our chairman, Bill Young.

To his family, to his constituents, to the troops, and the veterans who are, in essence, his family as well, our deepest condolences. Bill Young is irreplaceable. There will never be somebody like him again.

What a privilege and what an honor. One of the privileges and honors, the greatest privileges and honors of my life, was to be able to work with him, to get to know him, to be his friend.

So again, to his constituents and to his family, our condolences. We will miss him, and he will never be forgotten.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), again, reaching across the aisle with the respect and esteem in which Mr. Young was held.

Mr. FARR. Thank you, Congressman MICA, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I feel it is a very special privilege to be able to pay honor to our colleagues here. I think of Bill Young as being one of the lions, one of the giants of this institution, because he really used the institution for what we all get elected to do.

First of all, he loved public service. He was in an elective office for 52 years between State and Federal Government. He also served in the National Guard Active Duty and reservist for 15 years. His life was about service. He used his service here in Congress to be what I think this institution is all about: it is about leadership; it is about friendship; and it is also about accomplishment. I don't think anybody has had a better record of accomplishment in so many different fields.

I came here in 1993, and I had the largest military base in the United States close—Fort Ord, California. I got to know the people on the Defense Appropriations Committee. On my side of the aisle was Jack Murtha. It seems like Jack's best friend was a Republican on the other side of the aisle, Bill Young. Jack said, You better go tell Bill everything you have told me about needing some help.

We were trying to convert swords to plowshares by building a brand-new university to serve the underserved population in Fort Ord, and we needed appropriations for it. Bill just jumped on it. He knew the purpose. Even though he was a strong warrior, he really realized that this was the future after a base was closed.

I invited him out to the district. He came to Monterey, California, where we still had the Defense Language Institute. Bill went in there and saw that

all the languages we were teaching were the old tape recorders where you had to wind and rewind. He said, My God, you need some modern equipment, and put in appropriations to get that equipment. He visited the Naval Postgraduate School and got a lot of really interesting feedback from soldiers who had just come out of theater.

But his and Jack's friendship—Jack Murtha, who predeceased him—was just remarkable in this House. If there is a legacy here, it is their legacy. It is how two people being on Appropriations Committee should—and we all need to go back to what we have been calling regular order, where we come here to accomplish things, to fix things that are broken. Bill Young was probably the first, if any, who would talk about needing to bring back the ability to help areas that just don't get formula money—earmarks. If you disclose of them and go through a process so that you don't have the client-assigned stuff, these things are good, particularly for rural Americans, and particularly for areas where people are really poor.

I think my favorite story is that when he came out to the Defense Language Institute, came on military air, Beverly, his wife, insisted, since I represent Carmel, that I get our former mayor, Clint Eastwood, to have lunch with them. So we arranged that at Clint's Mission Ranch.

On the way from Monterey over to Carmel, we passed by the beach, and there is a stranded sea lion there. Beverly gets out and says, We've got to take care of the sea lion before anything else, and had the entire crew of the airplane—because she insisted they had to come to lunch with her, they had to help get the sea lion. Well, we had marine mammal rescue, and they eventually showed up.

But when we got to the restaurant, I don't think anybody thought that the whole crew was going to come. Bill was insistent, no, everybody is equal here. It didn't matter whether you were a Congress member or just a crew member; you were going to get a chance to have lunch with Clint Eastwood.

We had a lot of laughs, a lot of discussion about things. Then that led to—and I hadn't realized it. Bill was a big animal rights supporter. He and I authored a bill with his friend, Bob Barker, who was here. I met Bob Barker through him. Bob Barker, “The Price is Right,” had dedicated a lot of his life to banning elephants in circuses. Bill said, I am going to author that bill. So we did a bipartisan author, and Bob Barker came. In fact, we linked up with Kim Basinger, the movie star, who was very interested in that issue. We went on, and we didn't win that bill, but we won the puppy mill bill, and we won some other humane treatment of animals. He was really interested in that.

But best of all, I think he left a legacy that we need to get back to: a legacy of production, a legacy of comradery where we really like each other, and a legacy that takes care of not only all the soldiers—because they didn't care what rank you had; if you were a person in uniform, you were all equal and being treated in the most respectful way—but he also did that for people of less fortune and for animals who need a voice in Congress as well. What a wonderful man.

Beverly and your sons, I really am going to miss going to Appropriations Committee and seeing Bill there. So Beverly and your three adult sons, Rob, Billy, and Patrick, we all share your grief, and Congress will certainly miss Bill Young, a great man in this institution.

Mr. MICA. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable GUS BILIRAKIS, another Florida colleague, and he also has a district that is adjacent to Mr. Young's.

□ 2000

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the life and service of someone I admire greatly for his wisdom and humility, by dear friend and mentor, Chairman Bill Young.

While I always referred to him as "Chairman" because of the respect he commanded, he used to beg me not to use that term, insisting, in his typical humble fashion, as Mr. FARR alluded to, that we were all equal in this Chamber.

Over the past five decades, the Chairman graciously served Florida and the Tampa Bay area, leading many projects and initiatives to promote economic growth and create jobs back at home. His contributions to his district, the entire Tampa Bay area, and to the military in particular, are immeasurable.

He was instrumental in saving MacDill Air Force Base and helped grow Tampa Bay into a hub for our defense industry. In addition, he played a significant role in winning critical funding for Bay Pines Veterans Administration Medical Center, which supports a large number of veterans in our area. For his efforts, my colleague and I have joined together in support of renaming this valuable medical facility in his honor.

His contributions also extend to higher education with his role in developing centers of excellence in technology and marine science at the University of South Florida.

Finally, we will all remember his work on behalf of sick children in creating a national registry for bone marrow donors.

While the Chairman came from humble beginnings, he has left behind a rich legacy that we, as Members of

Congress and Americans, must all aspire to achieve. The Chairman was never afraid to reach across the aisle and always worked for the greater good.

I am extremely thankful that I was able to express my gratitude and admiration to him last week when I visited him at his bedside. I told him how much his colleagues and constituents loved him and appreciated all he did for them.

In closing, I wanted to share a few words from a final letter my father, former Congressman Mike Bilirakis, sent to his former colleague:

Dear Bill: Since we are roughly the same age (remember, I am 5 months older so we've joked about "respecting your elders"), we have expected that this day would come for both of us but first for me and not so soon. We grew up in the same Pittsburgh area at the same time—tough depression poverty, which made us tough. We didn't know each other then, but I guess our Lord decreed we would meet in Pinellas County, Florida, years later. We worked hard, climbed out of poverty and became successful—the good old American way.

Bill, you have earned eternal rest, but our world will certainly miss you. The Florida corner in the House Chambers will miss you as well. Thanks for being my friend and, in many ways, a younger mentor. Thanks for being a great American patriot. Thanks for the good you have done for all of us. Yours has been a life well lived. May your memory be eternal.

We will certainly miss you, Mr. Chairman.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, at this time I will yield back my time with the intent of relinquishing the balance of the time to one of the leaders from Florida and also a member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. CRENSHAW.

I yield back the balance of my time. Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to my good friend and fellow Member of Congress, C.W. Bill Young.

More than four decades ago, I first met Bill when I served as a campaign aide to the late Congressman Bill Cramer. Bill Young was a Florida State Senator at the time who was seeking the St. Petersburg, West Florida Coast Congressional seat being vacated by my boss who was running in 1970 for the U.S. Senate.

Bill Young had already served as a Congressional aide to Bill Cramer and then was elected as Florida's first Republican State Senator since the Civil War. Bill Cramer when elected was the first GOP U.S. House Member since that era.

As fate would unfold, Bill Cramer lost and Bill Young took his seat in Congress.

I had aligned myself with Florida's West Coast GOP political operatives called the ICY Machine. Those were initials for Jack Insko, a top Cramer aide and political strategist, Bill Cramer and Bill Young, a Florida political powerhouse at that time.

While my boss lost his election, I gained great experience and wonderful friends. Among them, Bill Young, rising GOP star, and his two young aides, George Cretekos and Doug Gregory. Both George and Doug served with Bill Young for over three decades, during which I was privileged to count all among my friends and political allies.

As an aide to U.S. Senator Paula Hawkins from 1980 to 1985, I had the honor of working with two GOP leaders who worked tirelessly for Florida and our Nation.

I must say, two legends with two very different styles. Paula had a flair for the media and attention and Bill quietly pursued his legislative agenda. Both were highly effective in their own way. Paula championed missing children and Bill rose as a champion of our military. Now both have joined the ages and are part of the history of Congress and the State of Florida.

Having worked with Bill Young on military issues important to our State and Nation as recently as the past few weeks, I can tell you no one could be more effective. No one could be more respected or trusted.

While fond memories of Bill Young continue, his real legacy will transcend generations for our military and long benefit our national defense.

For his tireless work on behalf of all Americans and all citizens of the Sunshine State, I join my colleagues in this special tribute to C.W. Bill Young.

What a great privilege it has been to share part of my life and grow memories with Bill Young. I extend my deepest sympathies to his wife, Beverly, to the Young family and to his devoted staff and constituents.

REMEMBERING THE HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) will control the remainder of the hour.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, before I introduce and call on a couple of my colleagues, I would like to say a brief word about my longtime friend and mentor, C.W. Bill Young. I first met Bill when he was in the Florida Senate. He was the Republican leader in the Florida Senate. He was the minority leader. I think my colleagues might be interested to know that he was the Republican leader, minority leader, not because he gathered all the votes of the other minority members, the Republicans; he was the Republican leader because he was the only Republican in the Florida Senate.

You might say maybe that diminishes that leadership role, and I would say just the reverse is true because Bill Young was such a great leader, such a man of courage and conviction that he

would stand up for whatever he believed, even if there was no one there to stand up with. I think it is because of that conviction, because of that commitment, that we are here tonight to honor his legacy.

I found it interesting that about 25 years later I found myself in the Florida Senate, and I became the first Republican to be elected president of that body, and I got a note from Bill Young. He said, "We've come a long way."

Of course when I came to Congress, he was there to help me become a member of the Armed Services Committee because he knew that I cared about the military. He was there to help me become a member of the Appropriations Committee and the Defense Subcommittee which he loved so very much. He taught me and he taught all of us that everyone has value. Everyone has worth, whether it is a private first class or four star general, and he lived and died by the belief that if we are to be the land of the free, it is because we take care of our brave.

So that is the way he lived his life, and we will hear tributes tonight—we heard tributes last Thursday in Largo at his funeral, but I believe that the lasting legacy that Bill Young leaves will be seen for generations to come in the greatness of our military, and in the compassion that we have for those who serve and those who are wounded.

So, Madam Speaker, I simply want to say tonight that America lost a great leader, and I lost a great friend.

Godspeed, Bill Young.

Now I would like to yield to one of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, the chairman of the State, Foreign Operations Subcommittee and a member of the Defense Subcommittee which Bill Young chaired, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to and celebrate the life of an outstanding public servant, Bill Young. It is a true honor to have been able to know a man like Chairman Young and to be able to call him both a friend and a role model for all of us. There is no one who was more respected, decent, gracious, dedicated and humble. Everyone who crossed his path is richer for the experience. That is evident through the hundreds of people who attended his memorial service last week. His service was attended by over 30 Members of Congress. During a time of such partisanship, the respect for Chairman Young was illustrated through the attendance from both sides of the aisle, including leadership.

The respect the military has for his lifelong advocacy for our national security and for our servicemembers was evident through the attendance and heartfelt eulogies of former Deputy

Secretary of Defense Gordon England and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General James Amos.

It was clear that the Department of Defense depended on him. Immediately before the service began, General Amos bestowed a very rare and appropriate honor by naming Chairman Young an honorary marine.

I will never forget when I was first appointed to the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. As one of the first women ever to serve on the subcommittee, I wasn't sure how I would be treated, but Bill immediately brought me in and treated me with respect and kindness, as he did to everyone. Gender didn't matter to him; he only cared about my commitment to the military and to our Nation.

When John Wooden wrote "the true test of a man's character is what he does when no one is watching," he clearly was talking about Chairman Young. Over the years, we have all heard many, many stories about the personal interest and assistance that he and Beverly provided for our wounded soldiers, but we never heard these stories from him. He never talked about what he did. He was motivated by doing what was right for someone else's health and well-being.

When Marine Lance Corporal Josh Callihan spoke at the memorial service, it was the first time that most of us had ever heard about the extraordinary efforts the Chairman and Beverly took to help this wounded warrior.

Lance Corporal Callihan had been shot in the back and sustained significant damage to his spinal cord. With no family support system, he was in Bethesda injured both physically and emotionally. Then he met Bill and Beverly Young, and his life changed forever. They stepped in and became his family, helping him to recover. Today, Josh calls the Chairman and Beverly "mom" and "dad." After many years of hard work, he is now married and expecting his first child. According to Josh, none of this would be possible without Bill Young.

As I was thinking about what I wanted to say about Chairman Young, I realized it was impossible to do justice to such an extraordinary man merely through words. He was truly one of a kind. The best way we can honor this man is to redouble our efforts to our national security and to the treatment of our servicemembers and their families. I ask that all of my colleagues join me to make sure that we carry on his legacy.

In closing, I want to let Beverly, their children, his friends and his staff, who were part of his family, know that you all remain in our thoughts and our prayers.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), another member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

We can talk about Bill Young all night, a man who came from nothing and grew to be head and shoulders above, champion for America's military. But I think the thing that struck everybody who ever met Bill Young was his humanity. He was just such a kind, gentle, fine man. He cared about every soul he met. He took the time when I was a freshman to meet me and talk to me. I told him I had some interest in appropriations and learning how it worked, and he sat down and talked to me about it. Whenever I had any questions I needed to ask him, he was always very, very informative and very, very kind in explaining things to people, to me and others.

Bill Young was a very special man because he came from very, very meager means and he rose up to a position of power, but you would have never known by his interaction with humanity that he was a man of power in this government because everybody who draws a breath was important to Bill Young. But the most important people were those who served in our armed services.

I wanted to share something which I think is a perfect description of the kind of man Bill Young was. I had the privilege to go on a trip with him to Normandy for an anniversary of that landing on D-day, and on the way we landed in Shannon, Ireland. When we arrived, it just so happened that at least one or two brigades from Fort Hood, Texas, which is in my district, were there, ordinary soldiers and their officers in transit to Afghanistan.

When Bill Young came into the room, ordinary soldiers, as if he were some kind of star that you would see in a rock concert, started moving over to have their picture taken with Chairman Young. Chairman Young at that time was in a wheelchair most of the time. But as he did when he presented his bill on this floor, he stood with every soldier and took a picture. I stood on the periphery of that and listened. He asked about their parents and where were they from and about their deployments and their needs. Just a gentle, kind, friendly man with hundreds of soldiers gathered around him.

I heard one soldier ask another soldier:

Who is that guy? It looks like everybody here wants to have their picture taken.

The other guy said:

I don't know for sure, but the way I understand it, he is the guy who makes sure when we go to battle, we have everything that we need to be victorious.

That is a great statement about a human being and a great statement about the man. He cared about all who serve our Nation, but in particular

those who risk their lives on our behalf. In honor of Bill Young, I will always remember that day where soldiers flocked to him just to be seen with Mr. Young.

□ 2015

Mr. CRENSHAW. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), another member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee that Bill Young chaired.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, tonight I join my colleagues in honoring the life and legacy of a great man and an American patriot, Bill Young.

I keep looking to my right and expect to see him with that great smile, but I am sure tonight he is sitting at the right hand of God.

The death of Congressman Bill Young was a great loss for this Chamber, for our country, and for the millions of men and women in uniform who were Bill Young's priority for more than 40 years. Anyone who has served with Bill knew of his unwavering dedication to our Active Duty military, our veterans, and their families.

As chairman of both the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee, he was both firm and fair. When it came to our troops, he was uncompromising and insisted on nothing but the best for the U.S. servicemembers.

Chairman Young was motivated by his genuine and deep concern for the well-being of the individual soldier, sailor, airman, marine, and guardsman. His concern went far beyond politics and policies. As many of you know, Bill and his wonderful wife, Beverly, took special interest in our wounded veterans, visiting the wounded regularly at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center. Whether in a committee hearing or in the military hospitals around the world, he was tireless in visiting, speaking with, and listening to these incredible servicemembers.

While we can't hope to replace Bill Young, perhaps we can follow his example and let his integrity, his gracious manner, his firm commitment to the men and women who protect this country serve as an inspiration to this Chamber as we continue to wrestle with the same issues to which he devoted his life.

On a personal note, I was honored to work with Chairman Young on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. I was continually impressed by his depth of knowledge. I think it is safe to say that no one understood the Department of Defense quite like Bill Young. His knowledge, expertise, and compassion will be sorely missed on the subcommittee.

On my own behalf and on behalf of so many former Members who served with Bill, like our mutual friend and former chairman, Jerry Lewis, I extend my condolences to his wife, Beverly, his sons, and his entire family.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Thank you.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), another member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. COLE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, like every Republican in this Chamber, until 10 days ago, every day I served in the House of Representatives I served with Bill Young.

It has been noted here that he was a lion and a legend. At the time I was fortunate enough to come to this Chamber in 2003, he was probably at the zenith of his influence. He was chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and he was the confidant of the President, our military leaders, and leaders around the world at a time when the United States was at war.

No one cared more about the defense of the United States of America than Bill Young, and no one cared and did more for the people who actually bear the burden, the men and women that wear the uniform of this country—past, present, and future—than Chairman Young.

He was also a role model for many of us, a mentor, and a friend. He was somebody who would reach out and help you, take care of you, look after you, and give you the wisdom and advice that only he, with all his years of experience, can give. I remember on one occasion, not too long ago, when the chairman was obviously ill in the last several years of his life and still very active chairing our committee, a pretty busy man, a man dealing with his own problems; and I had tornados that hit my town in Moore, Oklahoma. Two days after those tornados hit, Bill Young was on the phone to tell me that I would be getting a telephone call from representatives of a New York investment bank called Cantor Fitzgerald, which had suffered grievous damage during 9/11, where they had lost 650 of their 950 employees at the World Trade Center. That company made a commitment that it would look after all of its people and all of their families and would reconstitute itself, and it did. Then they built on that commitment and said, We are going to help other people that are in tragedy by devoting all of our revenues earned on 9/11 of every year—not just profits, everything we earn—to help people in need. They have kept that commitment.

Bill Young had forged a relationship with them because of all they had done to help men and women in uniform and the victims of disaster. He said they will be calling you and they want to help. They did. They helped literally hundreds of families with millions of dollars' worth of personal and directed relief. That probably never would have happened if Bill and Beverly Young had not reached out to me at that point,

and I and the people in my community will be forever grateful to them.

So we have lost arguably, I think, the greatest Republican Member of this body in the last two generations. We have not seen his like before, and it will be a long time again before we see anyone that rivals his compassion, his character, his civility, his decency, and his absolute devotion and commitment to our country and to the men and women who defend it.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), another member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DENT. I too want to take a moment to reflect upon the life and service and dedication of Bill Young. Much has been said about him already this evening, and I too, like many, look back at that corner and want to see Bill Young there, but obviously he is not with us.

Before calling Florida his home, Chairman Young was actually born in Harmarville, Pennsylvania, in Allegheny County in western Pennsylvania, that area best known for steel and coal. A lot of tough people came out of that area, and certainly Bill Young, I think, really had a lot of the character traits I associate with people there. He could be very tough when he needed to be, very firm. He was just like steel.

Also, we should not forget about his compassion. He was a kind man, a gentle man, a patient man. I would often ask him questions or make a request of him from time to time, and he always listened to me very patiently. He had served here for 22 terms. He didn't have to spend a whole lot of time with me, but he did, and I always appreciated that. He was a great mentor to me and to many other Members here. It was a pleasure to serve with him.

There are so many other things about Chairman Young, too. It has been mentioned his support of our troops, particularly our wounded warriors, and the impact they had on him and the impact he had on those wounded warriors.

When you get beyond the defense and veterans policy, though, Chairman Young played an integral role in creating a national registry for bone marrow donors back in 1986, and that registry helped save more than 50,000 lives over the years.

Again, not having known Bill Young as long as some of my colleagues, I just wanted to say what an extraordinary privilege it was for me to serve with him, to know him, to call him a friend, and really to be one of my mentors here in the House.

My deepest thoughts and prayer go out to Beverly and the entire Young family during a difficult time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY), one of Mr. Young's colleagues.

Mr. POSEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I first met the man, the legend, really, known as Bill Young, in 1974; but it wasn't until I got elected to Congress in 2008 that I realized what a larger-than-life true leader this man was and what a wonderful and great mentor he was not just to me and everybody in my freshman class, but we find out everybody that has ever served in this place. He was wise, gentle, kind, honest, thoughtful, and helpful to anyone just for the asking.

I called him a hero; and until his last days, he would blush, as he was so humble, that anybody would address him like that. What a wonderful man. Never, ever before and probably never again will every man and woman serving us in uniform have as great an advocate as they had in Congressman Young.

My thoughts and prayers remain with Beverly, his family, and his staff. Rest in peace, Bill.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Thank you.

Now I yield time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT), another colleague and a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, it is with great humility that I stand here tonight, and I think you have heard from a lot of Members tonight talk about Bill Young.

I think he has made the same impression on so many Members on this side of the aisle and on the other side about his humility, about his true caring about people, about the caring that he has for the members of the military.

As a father and a parent of three sons who serve in the United States Army, what struck me so much about Bill and his wife, Beverly, was their true compassion, particularly his compassion as it relates to those who serve us. Beverly was really the fire behind Bill with regards to a lot of these issues as it relates to our veterans. Bill led the way, but Beverly was right there carrying the flag along side of Bill.

Madam Speaker, they were a team together. They worked together for the betterment of all, and that is why Bill is such a great American. While you have heard tonight in this House talk about his legacy, you can't replace Bill Young.

When I first met Bill Young here in this Chamber 3 years ago, he was on that side sitting over there, and he had had a fall and he was injured and he had been at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, and his health continued to decline over the last few years. But I came in every day in these Chambers to go see Bill Young because Bill was such a good, kindhearted person. He had a great grip when he shook your hand, but he always had a smile. When you asked him, Mr. Chairman, how are you feeling today? It was never about him. You heard that from other Mem-

bers today. It was always about, How are your sons? How are your boys? He knew that they were serving in harm's way in Iraq and had been in Afghanistan. He was more worried about them than himself.

I saw him and his wife, Beverly, on the airplane ride back to Tampa almost every week, and without fail they would offer their better seats to a serviceman or servicewoman who was in uniform walking down the aisle. They would get up and say, Would you sit here?

That is just the way they were built.

Bill and Beverly were a perfect match, and Bill has gone on to a place that we can only aspire to go. I truly believe that Bill is at the right hand of God. Maybe he is talking about appropriations, talking about what is right with America.

Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the time you have given all of us to be down here to talk about our good friend, C.W. Bill Young, who will be missed by all.

God bless America.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Thank you, Mr. NUGENT.

Our hour is just about over. We could go on for hours, but I think you have all heard tonight that Bill Young was a man that loved his Lord, he loved his wife, he loved his family, he loved his country. You might say it just seems like they don't make them like that any more, but the truth is that they never did.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Speaker, I was honored to be asked by the Young family to be among those who delivered eulogies for my departed friend and mentor last week in Largo, Florida. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be included in the RECORD:

"From the back row of the House Chamber, Congressman C.W. 'Bill' Young was able to see across the House Floor. And, for over forty years, through the terms of eight Presidents and 16 Secretaries of Defense, he watched members of both parties meet and greet each other as both Democratic and Republican Speakers presided.

"From that prized vantage point, he could also keep tabs on his longtime Defense Appropriations Committee counterpart and partner, Jack Murtha, sitting opposite him in the back row of the Democratic side of the aisle known as the 'Pennsylvania section.'

"Jack Murtha left us a few years ago, but Bill soldiered on. In recent months he used a walker or sat in a wheelchair taking greetings from colleagues from both sides of the aisle. He was beloved—engaging everyone with a smile and handshake, however he might have felt on that particular day. He was always gracious, well-humored and accommodating to freshmen and old-timers alike.

"It is well known that Bill Young chaired the House Appropriations Committee, and twice, its Defense Subcommittee. He also served as Ranking Member when the majority changed hands. He loved our committee, constantly sa-

luted our members for their dedication and fully expected each one to support the process, limit debate, support open rules and with a minimum of partisanship and 'do the nation's business.'

"A copy of the Constitution was ever-present in his pocket, to remind all of Article 1, Section Nine, Clause 7. For those of you unfamiliar with this provision, I suggest you look it up!

"On the Defense Subcommittee, he always spoke of the dedication of members of our Armed Forces and the sacrifice of their families and our committee's obligation to serve them!

"He would say at every meeting: our soldiers, sailors, Marines and airmen and women are the ones doing the work of freedom—the ones who work every day to make the world safer for Americans and our friends and more dangerous for those who would do us harm.

"That's why Bill Young would often state on the House Floor, 'there is no room for politics in our bill'—we must always be there for all those who serve and sacrifice.

"As you know, Bill and Beverly visited the old Walter Reed Army Medical Center, the old Bethesda Naval and the newly-expanded Bethesda National Military Medical Center just about every week.

"They were quiet visits, executed without fanfare or press release.

"Each time, they met with our wounded warriors and their families, adopting their hardships and often underwriting their expenses—helping them meet every type of crisis: food, travel, rent, inattention from medical personnel or hospital administrators.

"The Youngs confronted military brass whenever necessary in order to get those with physical and mental wounds the best care and support possible. They were fierce in their determination!

"And wherever they were with the troops, the Youngs took names, called their families and carried grievances to 'the top' to be resolved. This was their SOP, their passion, and woe to those who underestimated their dedication and resolve!

"You might say from time to time they 'rang a few chimes' to get a tough situation resolved! In fact, I am confident that there are many officers with us here today who would vouch for that. I won't ask for a show of hands, but you know who you are!

"Typical was the story Bill told us once—about a Saturday lunch at a small restaurant in Alexandria, Virginia—an area teeming with military personnel on-duty and off-duty. As Beverly left the table to greet another soldier or Marine, Bill was presented with the meal check and was stunned! '\$171 for a tuna fish sandwich and a burger and two cokes?!?!' The waitress calmly replied that 'it's not just a sandwich and a burger, sir. Your wife volunteered you to pay for that soldier at that table and that Marine family over there and the sailor in the corner and a couple that have already left.'

"I also know that, over the years, many military families were pleasantly surprised when their grocery tab was covered by Bill or Beverly Young standing behind them in the supermarket check-out line.

"Bill and my late father served together for a few years before my father retired from Congress in 1974. With that early tie, he has been a friend and mentor to me since my arrival.

"I know these personal connections may not count for much these days, but were it not for Bill, it is likely that I would not be serving on the Defense Appropriations Committee or honored to be speaking here today.

"Nor would I have had the opportunity to occupy the back row of the House chamber—from which Bill Young had an expansive view of American history as few others ever did or as few others ever will.

"He personally made much of that history, directing an appropriations process that actually worked, despite its procedural flaws and partisan challenges.

"It is well-documented that his strong support for our national security made America the envy of the world and improved the lives of our servicemembers and their families in more ways than they will ever know and assured that their sacrifice will never be forgotten.

"A reverent hush has now fallen over that back row of the House chamber.

"The Congress has lost a leader.

"The nation has lost an experienced authority on national security.

"Our Armed Forces have lost a valuable partner.

"And whether they know it or not, the troops and their families have lost one of the best friends they ever had.

"We all have lost a great, principled man who lived a life from which we all could learn.

"May the tributes and prayers that have flowed in recent days be a source of comfort and strength to you, Beverly, and to Billy, Patrick and Rob and the rest of the Young family and his loyal, long-serving staff—past and present—both in his personal offices in Washington and Florida and the Defense Committee's staff—the unsung majority and minority professionals who make the Committee work.

"Ladies and gentlemen, the sun is setting on an American life of service. Bill Young, now an Honorary Marine, may be gone, but he will never be forgotten!

"From the back row of the House chamber, Bill Young had a front row seat to history—a history he helped shape. And for that, our nation is a stronger and a better place."

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our late colleague, Congressman Bill Young.

Congressman Young was an extraordinary public servant whose legacy of caring for his constituents and veterans will not soon be forgotten. I am truly honored to have served alongside him in Congress.

For more than four decades, Congressman Young championed legislation to improve the lives of Floridians and all Americans and never hesitated to reach across the aisle to find common ground.

A veteran of the Army National Guard, Congressman Young used his expertise on defense and security issues to advocate for our men and women in uniform. Throughout his legislative career, Congressman Young worked diligently to ensure that our military had access to the training and equipment necessary to be successful in their missions. He

also stood by our brave soldiers and their families at home—making sure military retirees had access to health care, defending benefits for military spouses, supporting our wounded veterans, and honoring our fallen heroes who made the ultimate sacrifice.

Congressman Young was a tireless advocate for Florida. In the 1980's, he established the first moratorium on drilling off the West Coast of Florida, and fought subsequent efforts to repeal this moratorium. Mr. Young also championed landmark legislation to protect the Everglades, raising his voice to break a deadlock amongst his colleagues.

His work to establish the National Marrow Donor program and support for biomedical research is another example of how Congressman Young's efforts will touch lives many years after his public service.

I remember shortly after I was first elected to Congress, Mr. Young made it a point to reach out and share his insights with me. During our time together on the Appropriations Committee, I was so fortunate to learn from this experienced Floridian and great statesman.

Congressman Young's leadership and service to all Floridians will be truly cherished and forever missed. He never stopped working for a better nation and a better Florida, and for that, we should all be thankful. Our nation has lost a true champion whose legacy will continue to inspire generations to come.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Chairman Bill Young, whose passing we mourn and whose dedication to America's servicemembers is well known to his fellow Floridians, as well as to all who serve in this House.

Taking care of our nation's men and women in uniform was his passion. He often called them, "kids" because he cared for them as deeply as if they were family.

Chairman Young was an officer and a Gentleman. He served for nine years in the Army National Guard. During his decades in Congress, he and his wife, Beverly, regularly visited with hospitalized combat troops in Florida, and here at Bethesda. They helped arranging travel for military family members, or those who were having trouble paying the bills. Here in the House, at the Appropriations Committee, and in any other way he could find, he was tireless in his work on behalf of servicemembers, veterans and their families.

I worked with him when we were trying to finish the new courthouse in Orlando. This was just after the Oklahoma City Bombing, and all the new security requirements that were added to protect the buildings and the people in them.

The project was \$19 million over budget, but the Chairman came to what must have been the longest town hall meeting ever. Everyone had something to say. The Chairman was a gentleman as always and wanted what was best for the people of Florida, regardless of party. This was the case also when it came to funding for research. Chairman Young knew how important cutting edge research is and made it a priority to find the funding to help future generations of Americans.

Madam Speaker, as we say goodbye to our friend and colleague, Chairman Bill Young, I want to thank him for being a reasonable per-

son to work with. All of our encounters were pleasant and I will miss working with him.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, C.W. Bill Young was a truly great American who served the people of the State of Florida with the utmost degree of professionalism, excellence, and dedication for more than 50 years in both the Florida State Senate and the United States House of Representatives.

It was truly an honor and a privilege for me to serve with Bill, and it would be impossible to list all the things that I have learned from Bill in the few short minutes that I have today. Anyone who was fortunate enough to get to know Bill can tell you that there was perhaps no greater advocate for our Nation's veterans and no greater friend to our military than Bill Young.

Last week, I was here on this floor to offer legislation to rename the Bay Pines VA Medical Center after Bill. The enormous outpouring of support, with 378 original cosponsors, was a testament to Bill's tireless work on behalf of veterans and the boundless respect that his colleagues had for him. But, what many may not know is that the current medical center in Bay Pines may not have existed at all if not for Bill's work back in 1976. As President Ford travelled through Florida, Bill joined him aboard Air Force One. Despite opposition from high ranking senior officials in the Administration, Bill convinced President Ford that the veterans of Central Florida needed a new facility to make sure that our Nation upheld our solemn promise "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan." Thanks to Bill that facility was built.

Madam Speaker, Bill's distinguished service to our Nation, as a veteran and a lawmaker, stands as a shining example for every public servant, and indeed every American, of what can be achieved through hard-work, patriotism, and an abiding faith in God. My wife Vicki and I extend our deepest condolences to Bill's wife, Beverly, children, Rob, Billy and Patrick and the entire Young family. We will all miss Bill dearly, but we know that his legacy will never be forgotten and that our Nation is that much stronger thanks to his service.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 2030

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to rise this evening and once again stand as an anchor for the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order, this hour of power,

where, for the next 60 minutes, members of the Congressional Black Caucus will have an opportunity to speak to the American people about building a budget to create progress and prosperity for all Americans in this great country of ours.

Now, earlier today, myself and several other Members of Congress, including the distinguished Representative from the Ninth Congressional District of New York, YVETTE CLARKE, and the legendary Congressman JOHN LEWIS, had an opportunity to attend the homegoing service of Congressman Major Owens, who so proudly served in this institution for 24 years, first elected in 1982, having retired in 2006.

As I listened to speaker after speaker reflect on Congressman Owens' time in this great institution, it seemed to me that one of the things that became increasingly clear was his steadfast commitment to making sure that the funding priorities that emanated from this Congress were decent, were humane, were humanitarian, and were designed to stand up for and protect the least of those in American society.

Congressman Owens, during his 24 years in this Congress, consistently stood up for funding as it relates to early childhood education. He consistently stood up for funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities. He consistently stood up for social safety net programs. He consistently stood up to open up the doors of the American Dream for the greatest number of people possible.

And so, in that regard, on the day of his homegoing service, I think it appropriate that we just dedicate the pathway toward prosperity that we are endeavoring to put forth today in the great spirit of Congressman Major Owens, who, for more than two decades labored in the vineyards of this Congress, fighting for budgets that stood up for the least of those amongst us.

I want to yield first to the distinguished chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, who so ably and passionately and intelligently led the CBC forward in this 113th Congress. Let me now yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio, Chairwoman MARCIA FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE, I thank my friend for yielding, and I would like to thank my colleagues, Congressmen JEFFRIES and HORSFORD, for once again leading the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order Hour.

Mr. Speaker, this week, the House and Senate conferees will begin deliberations to produce a budget for the first time in 4 years. Mr. Speaker, these deliberations, which are long overdue, are critical because they may provide a long-term plan that will continue to move our country forward out of our economic recession and towards a stronger America. There is a long overdue discussion needed.

For so many around this country, the barriers to economic opportunity and mobility have become insurmountable. The American people are looking to Congress to provide leadership and to turn our economy around. Unfortunately, some in Congress have put austerity before economic recovery, draining resources that might otherwise have improved our economic outlook.

While many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are focused on shrinking the government at any cost, the CBC is focused on making our government smarter and its programs more efficient. It is time to prioritize projects that will not only turn our country's economy around, but that will also open the doors of opportunity for future generations.

No longer can we ignore high levels of unemployment among those living in poverty and the disproportionately high unemployment rates among people of color.

We cannot pretend that our current investments in education are sufficient, while report after report details our country's academic shortcomings and our declining international standing.

We must acknowledge the fact that one in five children are hungry, and nearly 50 million Americans live in households suffering from food insecurity.

We must face the reality of a crumbling transportation infrastructure and the fact that improvement costs rise every year we delay investments.

Congress can spend the next month-and-a-half hiding from these truths and hoping for an improved economy that will magically fix these problems, or we can directly address our issues through bipartisan cooperation and with a common goal to make our country better.

Congress can place a renewed focus on investing in the American people through quality programs that promote access, equality, and accountability. All this can be done while we cut wasteful spending, preserve the Affordable Care Act, and set the stage for meaningful tax reform.

Admittedly, that may seem like a lot of priorities to tackle for one Congress, much less this one, but we can. We can do this if we move past the usual partisan bickering and do what is most important for the Nation.

Of course, as they say, the devil is in the details. A very smart, ambitious, and detailed plan is necessary to make it work. Luckily, the Congressional Black Caucus has just the plan to make this work: the CBC budget.

The CBC budget cuts wasteful spending, invests in education, preserves the ACA, provides the resources to rebuild our transportation infrastructure, addresses crippling poverty, creates jobs now, and ensures America is a leader in the high-growth industries of the future.

I want to thank Congressman BOBBY SCOTT for all of his work on the CBC budget.

By considering ideas and proposals from the CBC budget, Congress can stimulate the economy while expanding the middle class. From the dark days of the government shutdown, this opportunity is now a bright spot for Congress and this country. We can rebuild America using the principles on which our Nation was founded: that everyone, no matter their background, should have the opportunity to achieve their dreams.

To my colleagues in the House and Senate, we have the opportunity and a blueprint. Let's build a better America together.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished chair of the Congressional Black Caucus for her always thoughtful and eloquent remarks.

I now want to yield some time to the architect of the CBC budget, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Representative BOBBY SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding, and I join in your remarks for praising Congressman Major Owens, because he, as you pointed out, led the Congressional Black Caucus budget for many years. He showed how you can be fiscally responsible and still address the critical needs of our Nation with a particular emphasis on the least of these and the need to invest in education. So I appreciate your comments.

Mr. Speaker, as the conferees begin to negotiate a budget agreement to fund the Federal Government for the remainder of fiscal year 2014, they should look at the Congressional Black Caucus budget. The CBC budget makes tough choices, but not at the expense of our most vulnerable communities.

The CBC budget cancels the economically disastrous sequester. It protects and enhances Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, TANF, and other vital safety net programs that protect millions of families from poverty. It also reduces our Nation's budget deficit by approximately \$2.8 trillion over the next decade.

Mr. Speaker, most of the ideas that have been presented over the past to either cancel the sequester or reduce the deficit almost always involve proposals that cut Social Security and Medicare. These ideas have included changing the way the Social Security benefits are calculated, the so-called chained CPI that cuts the cost of living increases or raises the age of eligibility for Medicare from 65 to 67. These are cuts in those programs.

The CBC budget shows how you can be fiscally responsible without attacking those critical programs that people have paid for during their working years. The CBC budget is able to pay for the cancellation of the sequester and reduce the budget deficit without

harmful cuts to Social Security and Medicare. It calls for revenue enhancements totaling \$2.7 trillion over the next decade.

Our budget outlines how the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee can reach this number by highlighting several options that total \$4.2 trillion that could be used to reach the \$2.7 trillion revenue target. Some of these options include \$1.1 trillion by limiting the deductibility of corporate interest payments.

Now, when corporations want to raise money, they can sell stocks or they can sell bonds. If they sell stocks, they make a profit and pay dividends to their stockholders, but they pay tax on the income before they pay the dividends. With corporate debt financing, with bonds, when you pay the interest on the bonds, that is tax deductible.

Why should there be a tax preference for debt financing instead of equity financing? If it was the same and you deny the deductibility of corporate debt interest payments, you could raise \$1.2 trillion over 10 years.

You could close special tax breaks and corporate loopholes by limiting deductions for upper-income individuals, closing some of the corporate loopholes, like the gas and oil advantages that they enjoy.

You can raise almost \$1 trillion, over \$800 billion, by taxing capital gains and dividends as ordinary income. Traditionally, 30, 40, 50 years ago, they were taxed at, actually, above ordinary income for dividends. If you tax them just the same, \$880 billion could be achieved.

A surcharge, 5.4 percent surcharge on income over \$1 million gets you almost a half a trillion dollars.

A trading speculation tax.

You could also limit the Bush-era tax cuts to that portion of your income, cancel those tax cuts on that portion of your income over \$250,000. Only a privileged few make more than \$250,000, so that \$200 billion could be achieved without being disadvantageous to very many individuals.

Almost another \$135 billion can be raised by returning the estate tax exemption to what it was in 2009. You could raise over \$300 billion if you reduce it to what the rate was when President Clinton left office.

These are just some of the ideas, and we have listed them specifically, showing over \$4 trillion of possibilities for only \$2.7 trillion to make our budget add up.

Now, that is a lot of money, but it is in stark contrast to the budget that we actually passed in this House, because that budget calls for closing a gap of \$4 trillion. Unspecified, I don't know how in the world they are going to close a \$4 trillion deficit because they would have to raise \$4 trillion in taxes, or if they are not raising any taxes, spend-

ing cuts in the area, in discretionary spending in the area of one-third across the board. Now, we are having trouble dealing with a sequester of about a 10 percent cut across the board. You can imagine how unlikely it would be to achieve one-third across-the-board cuts.

So this budget is real. They are real numbers. The revenue enhancements provided in the CBC budget would allow Congress to totally cancel the sequester, actually pass a jobs bill totaling about half a trillion dollars, which would end the recession by putting millions of Americans back to work, and provide billions more for long-term investments in our economy through education, job training, health care, and advanced science and research.

As I said earlier, these reforms contained in the CBC budget would reduce the deficit by about approximately \$2.8 trillion over the next decade when compared to the CBO's baseline. This would put our Nation on a strong and sustainable fiscal path, all without jeopardizing programs that support our seniors and programs that educate our next generation of leaders in business, science, and technology.

The CBC budget would be a wise starting point for the House and Senate conferees, much better than the budget that we passed, because there is that \$4 trillion gap that is unexplained. These numbers add up.

It is an imperative that the Congress pass a budget that expands economic opportunity, invests in the American people, and reduces the deficit. The CBC budget presents a concrete plan, in stark contrast to the budget that we passed in the House, because it is backed up by actual numbers; and it adds up, and it shows how we can reduce the deficit while not being forced to make further cuts to vital programs that support our Nation's safety net.

Most importantly, the CBC budget presents a clear path both to economic and fiscal prosperity for our Nation.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 2045

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for his very thoughtful and comprehensive remarks.

It is now my privilege to yield the floor to the distinguished gentlelady from California, Representative BARBARA LEE, a very distinguished member of the House Budget Committee, someone who has consistently been a voice for the voiceless and an advocate for the poor, for the disenfranchised, for all those that are aspiring to the American Dream.

Ms. LEE of California. First of all, let me thank you, Congressman JEFFRIES, for your tremendous leadership, for your vigilance, and for your dedication. Every week, you have brought forth these discussions to real-

ly inform and educate the public about the very important work of the Congressional Black Caucus, which, of course, is part of our work to strengthen our Nation with policies and a budget that will reignite the American Dream for all. So I just have to thank you for the time that you have put into this because this is so important, and your voice and leadership is tremendously needed at this moment in our history.

Also, I just have to salute our phenomenal chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlewoman from Ohio, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, for her very bold and her brilliant leadership, ensuring that the entire Congressional Black Caucus continues to be the conscience of the Congress.

As a member of both the Appropriations Committee and the Budget Committee, I have seen firsthand the Tea Party Republican vision for our country's future, and believe you me, it is not a vision of shared prosperity or economic growth. This was reaffirmed earlier this month when the Tea Party Republicans held the government hostage in a failed attempt to take away health care from millions of Americans across the country.

This week, as House and Senate conferees meet to develop a broader budget plan, I am pleased to join my CBC colleagues calling on Congress to adopt a fair and equitable budget, such as the budget the Congressional Black Caucus proposed earlier this year.

And I, too, must thank the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, for his stellar and dedicated leadership in leading the Congressional Black Caucus' task force in the development of this. It is a pro-growth, pro-people, and pro-American budget.

Now we have already seen through the Republican Ryan budget, which was released earlier this year, what the Tea Party's priorities are. Their budget would shortchange 99 percent of the American people in order to give even more tax breaks to millionaires and to billionaires. It protects tax loopholes for special interests and Big Oil, and at a time when we need job creation the most, the Tea Party Republican budget would kill more than 2 million American jobs in 2014 alone.

The Republican budget would take away food from hungry children and families, take thousands of children off of Head Start, and close the door to college for thousands of students next year. In fact, Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of all of the Tea Party Republican budget cuts target programs for people who are poor or low income. Communities of color, once again, would be hardest hit, communities that have already borne the brunt of the last economic recession. And all this is taking place as income inequality only continues to grow.

The Tea Party's vision of America is very clear. Their budget would shred the safety net, shatter our economic recovery, and push millions of struggling families over the edge.

Now, in stark contrast, the Congressional Black Caucus budget is a different way forward. This is a document that shows our Nation's priorities and values.

A budget is a moral document. How we spend our money reflects our values, and the CBC budget spends money where we value it the most. It protects and enhances Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, better known as TANF, and all of our vital safety net programs that keep millions out of poverty. The CBC budget also protects all of our safety net programs, including SNAP.

While protecting these and other important antipoverty programs, the CBC budget also makes sound investments in critical areas like infrastructure, education, innovation, and poverty reduction in order to create ladders of opportunity for all.

Finally, we must ensure that the Pentagon will not be exempt from any budget deals. The Pentagon should be audited and their bloated spending kept in check. Billions and billions are spent and wasted every year, and the American people deserve to know where their taxpayer dollars are going. Not only will it bring accountability to the Defense Department, but those wasted funds could be used for programs like Head Start or Meals on Wheels.

So, in closing, Mr. Speaker, let me remind all of my colleagues that a budget, once again, as I said earlier, is a moral document. How we spend our money reflects who we are as a Nation. We must recognize that the choices we make impact real people and especially the most vulnerable: people of color, women, and children.

I hope that tonight in honor and in memory of our beloved, the late Congressman Major Owens, who worked so hard—and I had the privilege and honor to work with him and Congressman SCOTT each and every year for a fair and balanced budget. I hope that we will remember his legacy by recommitting ourselves to his values and his ideals by putting people first in every budget that we put forward.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from California for her very eloquent and thoughtful comprehensive remarks, as well as the remarks of Representative BOBBY SCOTT as well, and noting, of course, the role that the late Congressman Major Owens played in the context of the CBC budget during the years that he served in this Congress with such distinction.

I want to now yield the floor to the distinguished gentlelady from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE,

whom I have the honor and the privilege of serving with on the House Judiciary Committee, who represents her district in Houston so ably, but of equal significance has stood on the floor of the House of Representatives as a Member of Congress standing up for those who might not otherwise be able to stand up for themselves in the context of making sure they get a fair shake in their pursuit of the American Dream.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from New York. It is a pleasure to be able to join you and my colleagues today, and I thank you for beginning your remarks today, continuing the tribute that we have given to Congressman Major Owens. He would be proud that we were here tonight speaking for the voiceless, speaking for the poor, speaking for those who need educational dollars, speaking for those who, with a little investment, would, again, be able to reach for and grab the American Dream.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for again bringing us together. We all have different responsibilities, Judiciary, Homeland Security. We are all concerned about comprehensive immigration reform, border security. It is important, however, that we give a challenge and a charge to those individuals who will be gathering to reform the budget, and I cannot thank you enough for your timeliness and your leadership on these issues.

So I rise today, joining my colleagues, and adding, again, my appreciation to the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congresswoman FUDGE, who, in a day or two, will be joining the Ag conference and will be raising her voice for individuals who simply want a good and decent meal. I want to thank her for her leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus.

I will repeat the words of my colleagues, and those words are that we remain, I believe, the heart and conscience for the American people whose voices, again, and whose issues may be lost in the conflicts of partisanship. The Congressional Black Caucus speaks clearly and loudly to the issue of pain suffered by so many that are poor in this country.

So tonight I want to give a sense of urgency, and I want to raise the siren. I want to have a clanging bell, a loud noise, a banging of the drums, a call to the town by the town crier that we just can't live, we cannot suffer anymore in budgetless, fundingless government that we are now in.

The President of the United States has called on Congress to do its job. The President provided great wisdom and leadership in the first beginning stages of his administration in 2009 when he wisely, through great sacrifice and criticism, presented the stimulus

package to the Congress and infused needed and important dollars to create growth and jobs, some 3 million-plus jobs, closing the gap on some of the bleeding that was going on. Having built on the restoration of the auto industry, President Obama continued to build on the restoration of Wall Street. All of the prime industries that were crying out to this Nation, our President, along with the Democrats, sacrificed to do what is right for this Nation.

And, of course, as many know, it was a sacrifice for the Congressional Black Caucus, because at the same time, we knew that there were people who were suffering, but we looked to the greater good. And now we have come to ask, Is there anyone listening to the greater good?

We don't have to go very far to look and see that the size of the middle class that my friends on the other side of the aisle—Republicans—keep talking that they are for the middle class, and all we need do is to look and to be able to see its decline. The percent of households with an annual income within 50 percent of the median, they don't need any more cuts. They need dollars into education. They need dollars into R and D, research and development. They need to be able to ensure that the transportation and infrastructure of America is funded. That creates jobs. They don't need any more sequesters.

So the budget that we are about to engage in, the conference, should be a serious conference about ensuring that there is investment, because what we are suffering in the backdrop of mindless sequester continues on and on because we cannot get our friends to come to the table.

The Nation has been operating on a shrunken budget, slashed \$80 billion in forced spending cuts since March 1. And in the course of that, and while the middle class is gone, 57,000 children have been taken off the rolls of Head Start, and the numbers are growing. Poor families and working families that fall into the middle class are trying to strive to the middle class.

The cuts have also cut into public defenders and have cut into the justice system. The cuts have caused layoffs of lawyers. It has caused, in essence, an overturning of liberty justice.

And so in those ways, we can see pointedly the loss of the growth of the middle class.

Sequester is an across-the-board cut that does not allow the dream of Major Owens and the Congressional Black Caucus, the infusion of dollars into higher education, Head Start, pre-K, primary, and secondary, title I funding. All of these fundings that are considered discretionary are slashed and burned. I want to see the growth of the American public—training for nurses,

more training for medical professionals. All of that gets slashed in the sequester.

So, Mr. Speaker, you would wonder, what has America become? And I want to thank Mr. GARAMENDI from California for sharing this poster. What has America become?

Like the "Tale Two of Cities," they have not listened to the thoughtfulness of the Congressional Black Caucus budget that actually focuses on getting rid of the sequester so that we can not have a tale of two Americas. It hurts my heart to know that there are people in this country that are not benefiting from the greatness of the Nation.

Let me pause for a moment to make a simple statement: America is not broke. I am tired of people talking about how America is broke; a \$4 trillion economy, a larger economy than the European Union that includes many countries.

The ability to service our debt, let me just say to you: I don't like debt. I don't like the deficit. But, in actuality, in a capitalistic system, part of what churns the economy is the servicing of the debt. How do you have the money to service the debt? You infuse more capital, more dollars into the economy. You begin to sensibly talk about tax reform. You raise the revenue. You pay your bills. You build new roads. You help higher education. You pay for the military. You create opportunities for people to invent and build businesses. You create access to credit. You build more homes. That is how you turn the economy.

And so, tragically, from 2009 to 2012, the fraction of economic growth for the top 1 percent—not the 99ers, but the top 1 percent—according to this resource from the University of California, 95 percent went to the top 1 percent. They are growing beyond imagination.

□ 2100

Let me defend the top 1 percent to say that there are people in the top 1 percent that want to give back to the Nation. Warren Buffett wants to invest back into this country. Yet the economic structure of 2009–2012, when my Republican friends were in charge, was 95 percent going to the top 1 percent.

The preceding President, President Clinton, had an economy that included a sacrificial budget, that actually had a budget that did tax reform and revisions and had revenue. Thank goodness it was at least fair. The 1 percent were getting 45 percent and the bottom 99 percent were getting 55 percent.

What is the configuration now? I might venture to say, Mr. JEFFRIES, that the 99 percent are getting zero and the top 1 percent may be right now at 100 percent.

So I am asking for the conference to go and work for America, not this configuration; to grow the 99 percent in-

vestment in America to be able to take the CBC budget and look at some of the tax reforms that could be utilized, to look at our job creation, which would include the maintenance and repair of public transit, highways, airports, ports, railroads, and bridges.

The Houston Metro would appreciate having the opportunity to expand and create jobs, from those who had worked on the rail lines to those who would build the railcars to those who would run it, and the opportunity for people going to work to ride on it.

Workforce development programs such as the Workforce Investment Act, programs and legislation that I have introduced in times of high unemployment to actually give those unemployed a stipend while they retrain and retrofit themselves into new jobs; veterans programs, which provide for investment in our veterans. One of the greatest gifts we could have given to the second generation of veterans was a second GI Bill that Democrats passed for the returning Iraqi and Afghan veterans. They provided opportunity.

So I simply come today with a number that, as I close, I wanted to leave. Maybe my friends in Texas will understand why this is so drastic. Because we are losing out of the gross domestic product in Texas some \$15.2 billion. We are losing 153,541 jobs in the State of Texas alone, someplace where they are celebrating that they are creating jobs and the economy is growing, but the sequester is causing the loss of jobs across America.

Tomorrow, we will be standing against the SNAP cuts that will be coming on November 1. Through Mr. Obama's and the Democratic Caucus' support, we passed stimulus that gave more food money to those who are in need. Why couldn't we simply keep that going? On November 1, because we have not acted, this Congress will shut down the food for those who have gotten just a little bit to feed their families.

So I am hoping that when they go to conference, what will be on their minds as they are pledging allegiance to the flag of the United States of America is not the 1 percent, but the 99 percent, and that we will come back out of this economy and there will not be a tale of two Americas, but one America, where everyone has an opportunity, and that the model of America—united—is an investment into more than just a few people, but to a lot of people, giving them the opportunity to build this economy.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank my constituents in Houston for understanding and recognizing that we must work together to build a better Houston, a better Texas, and a better America.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from Texas for her very powerful, strong, thoughtful, and comprehensive remarks.

Hopefully, as we move forward in this Congress with the conference committee that Representative LEE just discussed, they will take heed to her plea that you keep in mind those in America and the middle class and working families, those who aspire to be part of the middle class, and be compassionate as we move forward to address the issues that confront this Nation.

Earlier this month, as a result of the reckless behavior of some in this House of Representatives, we experienced 16 days of a government shutdown. It was a legislative joyride that was doomed to end in a crash-and-burn scenario, as it did. Unfortunately, as a result, the American people have been left with the damage of a \$24 billion hit to the economy in terms of lost economic productivity.

Thankfully, as a result of the agreement that reopened the government, both sides agreed to finally move forward with the appointment of negotiators to try and resolve differences in the House Republican budget and the Senate Democratic budget and move forward with a plan for America that both re-energizes our economy and deals with the long-term deficit problems that we will have to confront.

We believe the CBC budget that has been discussed here on the floor of the House of Representatives provides insight into the type of things that should be considered by the negotiators in the House and the Senate as they move forward.

I would note, parenthetically, that though the conference committee is just at the early stages of beginning, at this point in time, this process really should have occurred months and months ago. This House passed its budget in March. The Senate passed its budget shortly thereafter, and Democrats in the House and the Senate have been calling for the appointment of conferees since the early spring.

For some reason, there was a refusal amongst our friends on the other side of the aisle to move forward, but we are thankful that at this point there is an agreement finally to sit down. The American people have demanded that we attempt to find common ground to resolve the issues of concern for this great Nation.

Now there are two different approaches that have been put forth. Our approach is designed to deal with the deficit problems that we have in a balanced fashion. The other approach, I believe, is designed to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable people in other society: children, working families, the poor, the disabled, middle class folks, senior citizens.

Now some may say that is just hyperbole. Well, what does the budget on the other side of the aisle actually do? It cuts assistance pursuant to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program,

or SNAP, by \$135 billion. That is not hyperbole. That is in the budget. In a country, at this moment, where 50 million people are hungry, 18 million of them are children.

The budget put forth by the other side of the aisle also cuts spending on higher education by \$168 billion. That is not hyperbole. That is in the budget. It makes it more difficult for young people in this great country to access the American Dream—young people who are already in a debt crisis. Student loan debt in this country exceeds \$1 trillion. We should be doing more to help people get a higher education, not less, in this country.

The document that was presented by the other side that will be subject to negotiation at the conference committee also cuts assistance and spending on Medicaid by the amount of \$810 billion. That is not hyperbole. That is in the House Republican budget. That is notwithstanding the fact that the majority of people who benefit from Medicaid assistance in this country are actually children and the disabled and senior citizens.

So we have got very different priorities, blueprints, road maps as it relates to dealing with the problems that we confront here in America.

The balanced approach that we advocate for essentially has four different elements.

First, we believe it is important to invest in the American economy. It is time to invest in America, invest in job training and education, transportation and infrastructure, research and development, and technology and innovation.

Let's invest in America so we can create increased economic activity. We are in the midst of a very schizophrenic economic recovery. It is a recovery that has disproportionately benefited the wealthy in America.

Let's just look at the facts that have been laid before us.

We have got corporate profits that are way up. The stock market is way up. CEO compensation is way up. Productivity of the American worker is way up. Yet wages have remained stagnant, and unemployment is still stubbornly high.

Working families and middle class folks have been left behind in the context of this recovery. That is why we believe the first element of any budget has to invest in America. Because if you invest in America, you increase economic activity. If you increase economic activity, you raise consumer demand. If you raise consumer demand, the economy grows. If the economy grows, by definition, the deficit will be reduced.

Parenthetically, let me also note that despite all the rhetoric from some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, under this administration, Barack Obama, the deficit has actually

been reduced by half during his 5 years in office. In fact, I think as a percentage of GDP, the deficit has been reduced to a degree that has not been seen since the drawdown in the aftermath of World War II. So we hear a lot about fiscal irresponsibility directed at the White House, notwithstanding the fact that this White House has presided over a near historic level of deficit reduction.

Invest in the economy.

The second thing that is important is that we should get rid of some wasteful corporate loopholes that have outlived their usefulness. We can just close or change or modify some of the benefits that oil and gas companies have received. They are making record profits. There is no reason for the loopholes and the benefits and the subsidies that exist right now. If we just were to address them, we could save the American people \$25 billion over the next 10 years. If we were to change some of the loopholes that actually incentivize companies to move jobs overseas, we could save the American people \$168 billion over the next 10 years.

If there is such a moral imperative not to saddle our children with the debt burden that we have in America, if that is such a moral imperative, can't we not agree upon a single loophole that can be closed in the name of the children and the grandchildren of America? Not one?

That is what we believe is the right thing to do here in the CBC.

□ 2115

The third thing that, I think, is part of a balanced approach to dealing with the budget and a reduction in the deficit has to do with making some spending cuts where appropriate, but we have got to do it in a manner that is sensitive to the fragile nature of the economy. I think all of us on this side of the aisle are willing to concede that there are probably some areas in which efficiencies can be found in the name of fiscal responsibility for the American people. Spending reduction sensitive to the fragile nature of our recovery should be part of any balanced approach in dealing with the problems that we face in America.

Lastly, we in the CBC certainly believe that any budget agreement has to stand up for important social safety net programs in America, like Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid—programs that have been phenomenally successful, particularly in reducing poverty amongst older Americans. It is unfortunate because there are times when these programs—Social Security and Medicare—are unfairly demonized and are made part of deficit reduction talks even if the facts suggest they don't necessarily have a place in that regard. Social Security, for instance, remains a solvent program at this moment and into the foreseeable future.

Social Security has nothing to do with the deficit. That, in fact, was a statement that Ronald Reagan made in 1984 in a debate with Walter Mondale. It was true then, and it is true almost 30 years later.

Now, when you think about the attack on our social safety net programs and on the obsessive desire to change—decimate—so-called entitlement programs, often this discussion is raised in the context of the enormous debt problem that we have in America—\$16.7 trillion. Certainly it is a problem that we have got to confront in this country, but what also is often not clear is the fact that spending on so-called entitlement programs really does not account for the debt problem that we confront in America. This is what this poster board and the chart so clearly illustrate.

In fact, much of the debt that we currently confront in this America can be tied directly to policies emanating from the 8 years that George W. Bush was at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. More than half of our debt can be traced to the failed war in Iraq—totally unjustified in search of weapons of mass destruction that still haven't been found and never will be found. The debt can be tied to the war in Afghanistan and to the fact that it was mis-prosecuted as a result of being distracted by the joyride that took place in Iraq, costing lives and American treasure. The debt problem can be traced to the Bush tax cuts passed in this Congress in 2001 and 2003 without being paid for.

Then, of course, was the laissez-faire attitude toward Wall Street, resulting in reckless behavior by some that collapsed the economy, robbed millions and millions of Americans of the little wealth that they had tied into homeownership, and the resulting bailout that took place and the need for an economic stimulus package through the Recovery Act. All of that accounts for a significant amount of the debt that we now confront.

So when both sides sit down at the negotiating table in the context of the Budget Committee, we should do so with the facts objectively established as opposed to putting a bull's-eye on the back of important social safety net programs like Social Security and Medicare just because some folks in this Capitol don't like those programs from their very inception.

The last observation that I will make is that the budget that has been set forth by the CBC and by Democrats in the House and the Senate, as compared to the budget that has been put forth by the House GOP, is very different in the context of how we review and evaluate tax fairness in America.

I think some would be surprised to know that, in the House GOP budget, it cuts taxes by lowering the top tax rate for high-income Americans from 39.6 percent to 25 percent. This is not the

Reagan budget, supply-side economics. This is not George Herbert Walker Bush or George W. Bush in 2001 and 2003. This is the current budget on which we are going to have to negotiate and find common ground. It cuts the tax rate from 39.6 percent to 25 percent in order to slash all of the social safety net programs that we reviewed earlier.

Why is that a wrong-headed policy?

As I close, and as this chart illustrates, the top tax rate was at 39.6 percent notwithstanding the fact that so many people on the other side of the aisle, in good faith, constantly say, that type of tax rate is the type of rate that hurts the economy. Under the 8 years of the Clinton administration, with a 39.6 percent top tax rate, 20-plus million jobs were created; 8 years later, when the top tax rate was cut by this Congress from 39.6 percent to 35 percent, we lost 580,000 jobs. That is an apples-to-apples comparison that discredits the notion that lowering the tax rate somehow stimulates growth in the economy when the 8 years of the Clinton administration as compared to the 8 years of the Bush administration clearly discredit that theory in the manner that a former President referred to as voodoo economics.

So I am just hopeful that, as we move forward with this conference committee—we have got big differences—we can sit down and endeavor to find common ground and do the business of the American people: keep government open, invest in our economy, protect our social safety net programs, and help create prosperity for the greatest number of Americans possible.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE SECRET OF AMERICA'S SUCCESS—TECHNOLOGY AND FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, in the words of my former boss, President Reagan, Well, here we go again.

Over the last 25 years, I and a small band of “just refuse to go along and get along” types here in Congress have engaged in a constant fight to maintain the intellectual property of American inventors.

The intellectual property rights of our inventors is something that has been a great treasure to our country. Our Founding Fathers felt so strongly about technology and freedom—and, yes, with the profit motive—that that was the formula that would uplift human kind, and they believed in it so much that they wrote that into our Constitution.

Article I, section 8, clause 8 of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have power to promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

I might add that this is the only place in the body of the Constitution in which the word “right” is used.

The Bill of Rights comes in during the amendment process of the Constitution, but our Founding Fathers thought so highly of technology and technology advancement that the right of inventors was included in the body of the Constitution.

This provision has served America well. It has led to general prosperity that we would not have had otherwise. It has led to national security where we have faced foes that have outnumbered us so heavily, but what were heavily relied upon were the technologies that were developed to help our Armed Forces defend themselves and, thus, defend the country. Of course, this has served us well because the technology and the freedom we have has created a society in which ordinary people—decent people—can live very fruitful lives and can enjoy the fruits of their labor.

Americans work hard, but this wasn't just created by hard work. That is the important thing to remember. Without hardworking Americans, it wouldn't have worked; but it was the technology that they used that made the difference. People work hard all over the world. They work long hours, and they live in poverty and deprivation, but we coupled the hard work of our people with technology; and, thus, what we have had is a success that has uplifted the common man and has served as a light of hope for all human beings in that we can produce the wealth needed for regular people to lead decent lives. So that is the secret of America's success—technology and freedom—and, yes, perhaps we could include the right values.

It was our strong patent system and a respect for law that made the difference in that technology and freedom. Yet, today, multinational corporations run by Americans want to diminish patent protection in the United States. We have had the strongest patent protection of any country in the world; yet we have had for these last 25 years major, major efforts to diminish the patent protection that we have and to harmonize it with the rest of the world. It just happens that the European and Japanese patent systems are much weaker and offer less protection for the inventors. Over the years, we have had to fight back and have had to turn back efforts to weaken the patent system a number of times, and I have been part of that effort and part of that struggle.

I remember when, for example, they had a bill—it was so blatant that we defeated it—called the Patent Publica-

tion Act. They said, after 18 months, if someone hasn't filed for a patent, even if he were not going to get his patent, they were going to publish his patent application, meaning all the secrets would be out in the world. They tried to push that over on us. We just barely defeated that, but we defeated it in a bipartisan effort that was led by MARCY KAPTUR and me, Chris Cox, Tom Campbell, and others at that time.

Then there was the effort, of course, to say that, as soon as one files for a patent application, after 20 months, the ticking of the clock starts, and you could end up then with maybe 5 years of patent protection by the time it was issued.

□ 2130

Here we had always said 17 years after you are given the patent you then lose control, but you have 17 years where you own your patent. They tried to change that and could have changed it in a way that somebody, if it took the Patent Office 15 years or 10 years to develop a concept of a new idea and to figure out how to patent it, well, then that person would only have 2 years left.

These were the ways that they were trying to destroy the patent rights that our people have enjoyed. Sometimes we turned those efforts back, other times we had to compromise, and other times, like last time around, we lost. For example, over our objection this body changed the fundamental principle that patents were to be given to the first to invent. If someone has invented it, they should be given the patent. That has been the fundamental guiding post ever since our country was founded. We changed that last year. We changed that to say, not first to invent, but the first person who files for the patent.

Of course, at an age when you have people who are able to sneak in on your computers and there are hackers around, that could turn out to be a catastrophe. Already we could hear rumblings of that from China where patents are being churned out and patent applications are being put in. And, yes, if they can prove they were the first one, and even if they found out about it some other way and can't explain it, no, they get the patent over the people who have done the work.

Well, once again I find myself fighting for the small inventors and struggling to defend the patent rights of these people to own and control their own invention. What we have got now is a bill that has been introduced and that is just making its way. There will be a hearing on it tomorrow in the Judiciary Committee.

There has always been an excuse to change the fundamentals of the way our system works, because we have had the strongest patent system in the world and they have always tried to

find some excuse of changing it and there is some sinister force at play that demands that we change the fundamentals of our patent system. Well, we have heard it before.

For example, they claimed there were "submarine patents." That is a derogatory term. A submarine patent, that must be undercover or something suspicious about that. They used that as an excuse to try to limit the time people owned their patent. They used that as an excuse to publish everybody's patent application even before it was issued.

This time, the new word, the new bugaboo that they are talking about and the scary word for the day is "patent troll." "Patent troll" is being used as a word—and they probably hired a very sophisticated public relations company to come up with that "patent troll" term—they have been used to fundamentally change our patent system, again, in order to diminish and damage the rights of small inventors. They can't say that that is their purpose, so they have to come up with a scary word like "patent troll."

These so-called patent trolls are patent holders or they are companies which represent patent holders, meaning people who own patents. They are engaged in defending the rights of those patents that they own. They purchased these patents or their companies purchased these patents basically from small inventors who didn't have the resources to defend and to enforce their own patent rights. These small inventors are now the partners of some of these companies or some of these individual investors. But it comes down to this: the inventor or the investor owns those patents. If you buy a piece of land or a patent from someone, you have that right. These patents that they own are just like any other patent granted by the Patent Office.

But huge corporate infringers would have us believe that these patents are in some way unfair or evil. So what makes these patents different than the good patents that these very same corporations own? There are no differences. They are the same patents, the same kind of patents. Some of these multinational corporations have bought patents from small inventors. They own that and they enforce them through a type of legal action when they are infringed upon. The multinational corporations have coined the scare terms "patent assertion entity," or PAE; they have coined "nonpracticing entity," NPE; and, of course, all of that means "patent troll."

The PR blitz, as I say, which was obviously created by a public relations company who made a lot of money coming up with that boogeyman, is used to change the basic legal protection of American inventors and, yes, change the legal protection of people who have bought the legal rights and

own the intellectual property rights that they bought from the inventor.

I suppose Halloween is the proper time to talk about scary trolls. How frightening. The so-called patent troll has been identified as being out for a profit from technology that he did not invent. My, my, someone who is trying to receive a profit by making an investment into something that they didn't build themselves. Huh? Doesn't that describe banks and insurance companies and everybody else who puts investments down and hopes that they are going to have a return from those investments? But they, themselves, aren't making anything. They are using money and paper and contracts and helping people who need help.

I have consulted with a number of outside individual inventors and groups, and they have reaffirmed that the legislation being proposed by the Judiciary Committee further disadvantages the little guy against the deep-pocketed, multinational corporations. This is achieved in the guise of targeting the so-called patent trolls. Pay attention to the patent trolls, but don't pay attention to how this weakens the small inventor.

This means that persons or companies who have contracted with inventors who really need the help to see that his or her patent rights are respected are going to be undercut. How horrible it is of making business out of helping small inventors see to it that their patent rights are enforced.

Proponents of this legislation are covering up the fact that they have stolen someone else's patent rights and now want to change the system so they can get away with it so that someone whose patent rights they don't own, that they have blatantly just arrogantly grabbed and put into their own technology projects, that they don't have to pay for it. When they are challenged in court, they complain, Oh, this is a patent troll. No. What we have here is large companies who are willing to take from the little guy which will in the end, yes, maybe be of short-term help to those companies, but it will undermine the progress of the United States of America, undermine our ability to create a wealth in our society that will make sure that our people can out-compete foreigners. Most of the corporations who are complaining about this are multinational corporations run, of course, by Americans, sometimes not.

Often the only way that a small business inventor can enforce his patent rights is by hiring a patent assertion entity as an advocate, meaning a patent troll. Sometimes the big guys want to simply steal the idea and say, sue me, because these little guys, these small inventors, the mainspring of so many ideas, they don't have the money to fight the big corporations. Now the big corporations want to make it im-

possible for them by changing the very law that protects them and protects what they have created in their invention.

One of the biggest alleged crimes of these nonpracticing entities is that they don't actually make anything, but just shift money around. Like I say, how horrible that is that some people make money in our society although you can't really see what they actually make with their hands. Banks, lawyers, investment companies, insurance companies, well, they make money, but they don't necessarily make things, but they are important to our economy. Even more important to our economy are those inventors. If we change the rules so that big companies can steal from them, those inventors will not be there in the next generation to come with the creations that uplift our people and defend our country and permit us to have security and prosperity.

We are told that trolls are different. Well, let's put it this way: the trolls are different. They are trying to make money off something they didn't actually make themselves. They aren't trying, as our multinational corporations are trying to do, to infringe on other people's property rights. Look who is pointing the fingers. The arrogance of these megacompanies warning us against small investors having the help of some investor is nauseating.

These attacks on the rights of patent holders are seen as valid and virtuous, but if they happened against any other rights, they would be identified as the problem they are.

Remember the big groups that are angry because they used patented technology without paying the owners, justifying it on the idea of the lack of the owner's enforcement. These companies say, Well, the patent wasn't being enforced, so we can use it. Now they are really upset when someone wants to enforce that patent. Now the rights for the patent are being enforced by someone who paid the inventor to sell him that property right.

A landowner who chooses not to develop a farm or land could be described as a nonpracticing entity. Should we make it simpler and easier for others to take or steal the land because that owner isn't using it? Should we make it harder for him to continue to own his land simply because he doesn't use it or isn't using it like others would want him to? How about a music lover who purchases the rights to a song or an entire catalog of an artist's songs, should we make it hard for him to defend his ownership rights because he wasn't the musician, he didn't make the music himself?

This campaign by multinational corporations and some of the world's richest men is an attack on the little guy's right to sell his intellectual property or to partner with someone else who

can help him defend what is rightfully his.

While I don't have time to go through all of the problems of this legislation point by point, I will refer to several problems brought up in this bill.

The claim that this legislation is designed to go after patent trolls, to make these patent trolls more accountable, that is what they claim, but how are they doing it? They are doing it by making it harder for every patent holder to defend his patent rights, every ordinary American. They claim they are making it easier and less costly to defend baseless claims of patent infringement. Well, they claim these are bad patents that should never have been issued. They claim many things.

Section 3 of this bill, for example, makes it easier to defend against false charges of patent infringement, but it also adds significant new burdens onto a patent holder who seeks to defend, rightfully seeks to defend, his patent rights. In addition, this section increases the potential downside risk of suing to defend one's own patent rights.

We should be doing everything we can to make the system quick, cheap, and simple to defend, both to defend patent rights and to defend against baseless charges of infringement. But this legislation is primarily geared toward making it harder, more costly, and more time intensive to file claims of infringement. That is exactly the wrong direction to take.

The added pleading requirements will also require a very thorough and expensive prefiling discovery processes, again, discouraging underfunded patent holders from defending their patents. While there are limitations on a fishing trip type of discovery that may hold costs down and also protect patent holders from discovery IP, those protections don't overcome the provisions which make it more difficult to defend perfectly respectable patents.

In addition, by moving to what is essentially a "loser pays" system, which is what this legislation is attempting, the little guy is once again put at great risk when suing a big corporation for infringement. So now the inventor who is being victimized may have to risk everything that he owns to pay the legal fees of his much better financed corporate infringers.

This concept of fee shifting is alien to this country's history but very common in Europe. It has been demonstrated to have a chilling effect on litigation at the expense of the rights of those who can't afford to sue because they can't afford to lose.

The corporations, they can afford to lose. They are not personally having to pay anything; but the small inventor, he will lose everything in his life if he loses. He will owe them that much money. The big corporations, of course,

are very capable of handling their own legal fees.

□ 2145

Section 4 requires a patent holder who believes they are being infringed upon to disclose all of his partners, assignees, and other information to court and to the Patent Office as well, and to the accused infringers. Well, what we have then, if you sue somebody because they are stealing your intellectual property, you have to give up all of your privacy rights and from that point on, you are an open book to anyone who is your competition, anyone who is your adversary, and they will probably, as we see happen with large corporations, you now are wide open to victimization by the corporates.

Section 5 seems to repeal a current provision that guarantees a patent holder's right to sue a State, for example. If a State or the government infringes on your patent, there seems to be a provision in the bill that could say that you can't sue to get paid for what the government has stolen from you. That, of course, has to be looked at, and looked at by the court.

Section 9 claims to make technical corrections to the bill, but they make sweeping, wholesale changes to the way patent applicants and patent holders are allowed to pursue their rights. One of these so-called minor corrections entirely removes section 145 from the law, which allows patent applicants to bring suit in civil court if they are not getting due consideration at the Patent Office. In other words, if the government employees at the Patent Office are blatantly not doing their job for some reason, whether it is corruption or incompetency, the patent applicant now by this rule, by this bill, will not be able to seek justice in the court system. This is totally inconsistent with what our national tradition is all about.

Removing section 145 concentrates all decisional power within the Patent Office, with the exception of an appeal to the circuit, which is required to give deference to the Patent Office through that process. That is exactly the opposite of what we want to do. We want to make sure that people have a legal right, if our government is off base, to appeal it to another branch of government. That's why we have the judicial and the legislative and the executive branches of government. Here again, part of the bill is going in exactly the wrong direction.

A review of this legislation titled "A Small Business and Startup Perspective on the Goodlatte Patent Bill," this is an analysis of the patent bill that we are talking about:

would gratuitously repeal 35 U.S.C. section 145, which has long protected patent applicants' fundamental right of de novo judicial review of adverse patentability determinations by the Patent Office.

They note here that since 1836, anybody could repeal a decision within the

Patent Office, but now they want to take that away, diminish the rights of our inventors, which will mean that we will not have the same type of innovation and creativity that we have enjoyed in this country.

All of this is being done on the notion that these evil trolls are driving up the number of patent litigations. An independent report from the World Intellectual Property Organization, as well as a study from the U.S. Government Accountability Office, says that is not true. So-called trolls may be backing up the little guys, but that is not a major cause of litigation.

So we have the experts telling us that their excuse is wrong, and the GAO suggests that there are many things we can do, but what is being suggested in this bill and others is going exactly the wrong way.

The bottom line is these provisions make it more difficult for the patent holder to defend his rights and raises the stakes so that the downside of pursuing an infringement in cases becomes more costly. We are hurting the little guy. We are making it difficult for the mainspring of human progress. The ideas, the creativity of our country and our countrymen can be brought to play to uplift the lives of our people, to create more energy, to create higher quality goods, to make sure that we compete with the hordes of people in Africa and China and India.

Instead, if we are going to do that, we have to have the best technology, and we are taking our great national asset of a Patent Office that has helped our country over the years, has helped us keep our country safe by producing the best defense technology, to keep ourselves competitive so that the average American can outproduce their counterparts overseas—we are now going to take what has given us that ability, which is the genius of our inventors, and we are going to squash it by giving in to corporate interests of multinational corporations that are not owing their allegiance to us, but instead owe their allegiance to their company, which they see now as an international company, not even an American company.

I ask my colleagues to pay close attention to this legislation and to join me in rejecting this attempt to diminish the fundamental property rights, intellectual property rights of the American people in the name of some troll or some scary title that would get us away from the basic fundamentals of what is being proposed. I would ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of

the week on account of an illness in the family.

Mr. COOPER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 29 and 30 on account of the death of a family member.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 29, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3399. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methyl Parathion; Removal of Expired Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0332; FRL-9401-3] received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3400. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Connecticut: Ansonia, City of, New Haven County; [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8301] received October 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3401. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Extension of Temporary Registration of Municipal Advisors [Release No.: 34-70468; File No. S7-19-10] (RIN: 3235-AK69) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3402. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality: Revision to Definition of Volatile Organic Compounds — Exclusion of 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoropropene [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0605; FRL-9900-53-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR70) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3403. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule for the Update of the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Lancaster 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0058; FRL-9901-21-Region 3] received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3404. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; West Virginia's Redesignation Request for the Wheeling, WV-OH 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the As-

sociated Maintenance Plan [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0368; FRL-9901-41-Region 3] received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3405. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Thurston County Second 10-Year PM10 Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R10-OAR-2013-0088; FRL-9901-34-Region 10] received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3406. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — FD&C Blue No. 1; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0568; FRL-9396-1] received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3407. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — FD&C Yellow No. 5; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0945; FRL-9400-6] received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3408. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Maintenance, Testing, and Replacement of Vented Lead-Acid Storage Batteries for Nuclear Power Plants Regulatory Guide 1.129 Revision received September 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3409. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 11-13 informing of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Defense of Australia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3410. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the provisions of 22 U.S.C. Section 2291-4, as amended, a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2014-02 determining that Brazil meets the statutory requirements relating to the interdiction of aircraft reasonably suspected to be engaged in illicit drug trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3411. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3412. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3413. A letter from the Director, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting five reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3414. A letter from the Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the Office's annual report for FY 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3415. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting information and documents related to the Department's Civil Rights Division's efforts to ensure that the State of Louisiana complies with the longstanding court orders requiring it to desegregate its public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3416. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a letter notifying the Congress that the Department will no longer enforce section 101(3) and 101(31) of title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3417. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Activities, Progress, and Plans"; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 391. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 992) to amend provisions in section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act relating to Federal assistance for swaps entities, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2374) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-253). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NORTON (for herself and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 3343. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to clarify the rules regarding the determination of the compensation of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 3344. A bill to ensure that the provision of foreign assistance does not contribute to human trafficking and to combat human trafficking by requiring greater transparency in the recruitment of foreign workers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MICA, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 3345. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to consolidate suspension and debarment offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 3346. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code, to increase the

requirement for American-made content, to strengthen the waiver provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 3347. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to report on the disaster assistance obligations of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARTON (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BARR, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. FLEMING):

H.R. 3348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the individual health insurance mandate voluntary in 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. WATT, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 3349. A bill to provide for the permanent funding of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. HALL, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LONG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BARTON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LATTI, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 3350. A bill to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current individual health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. CLARKE):

H.R. 3351. A bill to assist survivors of stroke and other debilitating health occurrences in returning to work; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. ROONEY):

H.R. 3352. A bill to amend the Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act to provide a permanent appropriation of funds for the payment of death gratuities and related benefits for survivors of deceased military service members in event of any future period of lapsed appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. WATERS, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms.

DELAURO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 3353. A bill to amend the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 to extend the period during which supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits are temporarily increased; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 3354. A bill to require that spent nuclear fuel be stored in certified dry cask storage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 3355. A bill to increase the competitiveness of American manufacturing by reducing regulatory and other burdens, encouraging greater innovation and investment, and developing a stronger workforce for the twenty-first century, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, House Administration, the Judiciary, Rules, Appropriations, Science, Space, and Technology, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 3356. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the prohibition against the conversion of contributions to personal use to contributions to political committees, to clarify that contributions accepted by political committees may be used for authorized expenditures in connection with their political activities and for other lawful purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MENG (for herself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3357. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to States to improve the knowledge, credentials, compensation, and professional development of early childhood educators working with children in early childhood education programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 3358. A bill to provide for an exemption from the individual mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act for individuals residing in States in which the Exchange Websites are not fully functional, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RADEL (for himself, Mr. COOK, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MESSER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROKITA, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 3359. A bill to provide for a delay of the individual mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until the American Health Benefit Exchanges are

functioning properly; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 3360. A bill to reform Article 32 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to specify the burden of proof applicable at the investigative hearing, the required qualifications for the investigating officer, the permitted scope of the investigation to assist the convening authority, and the protection of witnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.J. Res. 99. A joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as submitted under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. HAHN, Ms. SPIEER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Mr. WATT, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. TITUS):

H. Res. 392. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of October as National Domestic Violence Awareness Month and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should continue to raise awareness of domestic violence and its devastating effects on individuals, families, and communities, and support programs designed to end domestic violence in the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

150. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 30 urging the Congress to enact amendments to the Federal Electronic Communications Privacy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3343.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 3344.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3345.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18: the Necessary and Proper Clause.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3346.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 3347.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, "[t]o pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States"

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 3348.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3349.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, section 8, clause 8

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 3350.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 3351.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 3352.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1 and Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3353.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 8. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States;

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3354.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 3355.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excise, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 3356.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to make laws governing the time, places and manner of holding federal elections.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3357.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 3358.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which empowers Congress, in part, to "lay and collect Taxes" and "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ." The bill will exempt certain individuals, who through no fault of their own, will be subject to taxes imposed by Public Law 111-148, as amended. Congress has the power to delay such taxes and provide for the general welfare of those who have been and will be harmed by their imposition.

By Mr. RADEL:

H.R. 3359.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 3360.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.J. Res. 99.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 relating to the power to pay the debts of the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. DENHAM and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 29: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 164: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 184: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 272: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARBER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. ENYART, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 320: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 351: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 375: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 411: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 460: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 485: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 541: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 556: Mr. REED.
H.R. 666: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 669: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 685: Mr. HARPER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. GALLEGGO.
H.R. 715: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. JORDAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 721: Mr. BARROW of Georgia and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 851: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 855: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 920: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 924: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 962: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1009: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1015: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1024: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 1041: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 1077: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 1091: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. PITTINGER.
H.R. 1094: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1095: Mr. BARBER, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1098: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1148: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1175: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1176: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1199: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1240: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1313: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1317: Mr. COHEN and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1354: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 1473: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1528: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1563: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1634: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1652: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 1666: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1726: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PERRY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1731: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1732: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1744: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1750: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 1755: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 1761: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1779: Mr. PETERS of Michigan and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1795: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1803: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1805: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1843: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1953: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1984: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1985: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1992: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1998: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2026: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2027: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
 H.R. 2028: Mr. BERA of California, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 2037: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 2041: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2043: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 2046: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H.R. 2066: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 2144: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 2159: Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 2223: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
 H.R. 2248: Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 2274: Mr. MCHENRY.
 H.R. 2278: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BARTON, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. LAMALFA.
 H.R. 2300: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 2328: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 2358: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 2368: Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 2369: Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 2426: Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 2429: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 2452: Mr. MORAN.
 H.R. 2510: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 2590: Mr. REED.
 H.R. 2591: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 2632: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 2656: Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 2663: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
 H.R. 2697: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 2725: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. POLIS, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 2805: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 2810: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 2822: Mr. LEWIS and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2825: Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 2839: Mr. ENYART and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 2866: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 2870: Mr. PAULSEN.
 H.R. 2907: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 2941: Mr. ENYART, Mr. RUIZ, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 2959: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. JONES, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2981: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ESTY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr.

CRAMER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HALL, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 2992: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 3035: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
 H.R. 3040: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 3043: Mr. YODER.
 H.R. 3077: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 3083: Mr. LABRADOR.
 H.R. 3097: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 3111: Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. FOX, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 3112: Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 3118: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3121: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 3143: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 3163: Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 3179: Mr. GARDNER.
 H.R. 3206: Mr. KEATING, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 3211: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 3279: Mr. LABRADOR and Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 3297: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3304: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 3308: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COOK, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HALL, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. YOHO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H.R. 3310: Mr. KIND, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 3316: Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 3323: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 3325: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 3329: Mr. VEASEY.
 H.R. 3336: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 3337: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.J. Res. 34: Mr. TONKO.
 H.J. Res. 98: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
 H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. COHEN.
 H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H. Res. 36: Mr. SANFORD.
 H. Res. 97: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H. Res. 109: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H. Res. 147: Mr. CAMPBELL.
 H. Res. 227: Mr. HONDA.
 H. Res. 276: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. NORTON.
 H. Res. 302: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H. Res. 326: Mr. STOCKMAN and Mr. BARLETTA.
 H. Res. 345: Mr. MORAN.
 H. Res. 356: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H. Res. 387: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H. Res. 388: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. RANGEL.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP.

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.J. Res. 99, relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as submitted under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 and October 17, 2013, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

The amendment to be offered by Representative GEORGE MILLER of California, or a designee to H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF INTERNATIONAL DAY OF RADIOLOGY

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the International Day of Radiology, and draw attention to the vital role that diagnostic imaging and radiation therapy serve in the American health care system. The International Day of Radiology is observed annually on November 8—an important date in medical and world history. On that day in 1895, Professor Wilhelm Conrad Roentgen discovered X-rays, which ultimately led to modern medical imaging and radiation therapy. This year, the 118th anniversary of Roentgen's discovery, will focus on lung imaging, and be commemorated by many groups, including the American College of Radiology (ACR), the Radiological Society of North America and the European Society of Radiology.

Radiologists (physicians with special training in imaging), radiation oncologists (physicians trained to treat cancer with radiation) and the imaging community continue to move medicine forward. Most recently, lung computed tomography (CT) scans were shown by clinical trials to significantly reduce lung cancer deaths among smokers. In response to the positive results generated from these trials, the ACR will issue CT lung cancer screening guidelines and standards. Nationwide, CT screening programs for lung cancer, including teams of health care providers from various medical specialties, will follow. These multidisciplinary screening programs will save tens of thousands of lives each year from the nation's leading cancer killer.

Medical imaging has been shown to help lower many cancer and hospital mortality rates. A 2009 National Bureau of Economic Research (BEA) report found that individuals with greater access to imaging live longer than those with lesser access. Imaging exams also reduce the number of invasive surgeries, unnecessary hospital admissions and lengths of hospital stays, which can lower health care costs.

The U.S. National Academy of Engineering recognized the tremendous contribution of medical imaging when it ranked imaging among the 20 greatest engineering achievements of the 20th century. Most telling, the New England Journal of Medicine named medical imaging one of the top 10 medical advances of the last 1,000 years.

With its incredible impact on patients' health, and significant benefit to the American health care system, I am pleased to recognize the importance of diagnostic imaging and radiation oncology, and call attention to November 8 as the International Day of Radiology.

HONORING THE WORK OF MY LIFE SPEAKS

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, a great society is often given their place in history based on how they serve the least among them. A great people are often judged from how well they serve the least of all. I rise today to honor the work of My Life Speaks as they work to bring aid to orphans in Haiti.

Cited as one of the poorest countries in the world, Haiti has almost 500,000 orphans. With high illiteracy and unemployment rates, the Haitian society struggles with poverty, and the high orphan rate it accompanies. Often forgotten, children with special needs are orphaned and overlooked completely. My Life Speaks works to provide the best quality of life possible to orphans, those with and without special needs, by providing safe housing, quality education, and accessible medical care.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in celebrating the good work of all who follow the call of the Almighty to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and care for the orphan. May our vocations be a light of the old prayer, "at the end of our lives, may we all be found in the service of others."

IN RECOGNITION OF THE KOREAN AMERICAN FILM FESTIVAL NEW YORK

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, during the Korean War, almost two million American soldiers, including myself, fought to defend freedom and democracy for a country and people they did not know. Despite the tragic losses and extreme hardships endured by the Korean people and those who fought in their defense, little is known about the war and its aftermath. I proudly recognize the Korean American Film Festival New York (KAFFNY) and its efforts to educate and inform the New York community about the so-called "Forgotten War" through presenting new opportunities for intercommunity outreach.

Through their organization, the KAFFNY has brought attention to the Korean Diaspora and Korean-American experience, recognizing and supporting new filmmakers and artists in the community. This year, the KAFFNY explores how the reverberations of the Korean War are still felt to this day and how they are explored in the area of film. Their festival taking place from October 24–26, 2013, commemorates

the 60th anniversary of the Korean War Armistice. It premieres some of the richest and most diverse selection of films on the Korean War, such as the world premiering of "Fading Away" by Christopher H.K. Lee, a seven-part documentary based on the account of a 13-year-old Korean orphan who fled North Korea to the South.

Putting their own personal time and resources into promoting films which help connect us to other communities-at-large, domestically and globally, the KAFFNY continues to play a vital role in the Great City of New York, as it works to spread the story of the Korean War, which I and my comrades believe should be referred as the 'Forgotten Victory.'

Since returning home from my service in the Korean War over six decades ago, I have witnessed the Korean American community flourish in New York City and across the United States and am very proud of all their contributions to the American fabric.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. EVERETTE J. FREEMAN

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding leader, Dr. Everette J. Freeman, the Eighth President of Albany State University, who will be leaving the school after eight successful and productive years as President. He was honored at a farewell reception on Thursday, October 24, 2013, at Orene Hall on the ASU campus.

Dr. Freeman is a Washington, D.C. native and alumnus of Antioch College with a bachelor of arts degree in sociology and economics. He also earned a master's in labor and industrial relations from the University of Illinois, and a doctorate in education from Rutgers University. He holds a certificate from the Institute for Educational Leadership at Harvard University, as well as a Certificate in Economics from Fircroft College in Birmingham, England.

Prior to his tenure at Albany State, Dr. Freeman made his mark on several institutes of higher learning, serving as senior vice president and provost of the University of Indianapolis, dean of continuing education at Jackson State University, and executive assistant to the president at Tennessee State University. He also acted as interim vice president for university relations and development at Tennessee State.

The Second Congressional District of Georgia gained a valuable and respected leader when Dr. Freeman came to Albany. He has transformed Albany State University, both fiscally and academically. Despite State budget cuts, he initiated new online programs and

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

joint enrollment policies, led the fiscal affairs division from the worst audit ratings to the best, and facilitated the transition of students from technical colleges into the University. Moreover, Dr. Freeman has demonstrated a continued dedication to improving the academic community at ASU. Under his strategic leadership, the University saw simultaneous annual enrollment increases and higher SAT scores of entering classes.

In addition, Dr. Freeman oversaw \$20 million in capital improvements to the Albany State campus, including a state-of-the-art student center, a learning center, and six residence halls. The positive impact of the construction reverberated throughout the student community, as well as in the surrounding city. The relationship between ASU and the Greater Albany area has been significantly strengthened, as the University's economic impact on the city reached \$156 million during Dr. Freeman's time as president. Dr. Freeman also worked to establish partnerships with several local businesses, further improving the town and gown relationship between Albany and ASU.

On a personal note, I am proud to call Dr. Freeman a friend and I am so grateful for all he has done for Albany State University and the Albany community. His heartfelt dedication to this school will be felt and remembered for years to come.

Nelson Henderson once said, "The true meaning of life is to plant trees under whose shade you do not expect to sit." Dr. Freeman has not only planted trees of knowledge whose fruit ASU students and alumni can yield, but he has also planted the seeds of success for future generations of Albany State University Golden Rams.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Dr. Everette J. Freeman for his eight outstanding years as President of Albany State University. His energizing leadership and his commitment to academic excellence has helped to make lasting improvements to Albany State University so to better provide current and future students with the tools they need to lead successful and productive lives.

WILEY COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EX- HIBITION DEBATE

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, today, we recognize and celebrate the Wiley College and University of Southern California debate teams on their Exhibition Debate. On October 25, 2013 the Wiley College and USC debate teams will reenact their historic debate of 1935.

The 1935 debate was depicted in the 2007 movie, "The Great Debaters," which Denzel Washington starred in and directed. "The Great Debaters" tells the story of Wiley's defeat of USC, the then reigning national forensics champion, under the direction of Professor Melvin B. Tolson. Following the re-

lease of the movie, Denzel Washington donated \$1 million to Wiley College to revive the debate team.

October 25th will not be the first meeting of the teams in recent years. In 2012, USC traveled to Wiley College in Texas' 1st Congressional District for an exhibition match with the great debaters at the Julius S. Scott Sr. Chapel. At the conclusion of the evening, both teams were declared victors and they committed to another match at USC. The Wiley College team also known as the Melvin B. Tolson/Denzel Washington Forensics Society, will be represented by Sophomore Lyle Keinman and Junior Nathan Leal along with team director, Christopher Medina.

Now ranked fourth in the nation, Wiley's debate team completed its 2012-2013 season of competition having amassed 82 national awards, 368 season-long awards, 16 championship trophies, and the first team title by a historically black college. The debate team is affiliated with Pi Kappa Delta, the National Forensics Association, and the American Forensics Association.

We commend both Wiley College and USC in their efforts on enhancing students' critical thinking skills through the medium of debate. We wish the best for both teams and look forward to have such a historical event re-enacted in the California 37th Congressional District.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. BRAD WILLIAMS

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Brad Williams who will be installed as the 2014 Chairman of the Board for the National Apartment Association on November 8, 2013.

As a native of Dallas, Texas, Mr. Williams is a graduate of the University of Texas with a degree in History, holds a Certificate of Real Estate from Southern Methodist University, and has received the Certified Property Manager designation from the Institute of Real Estate Management. He has over 40 years of experience in property management with Lincoln Property Company and is responsible for management of over 50,000 rental units throughout Texas and the Midwest.

Mr. Williams is the past President of the Apartment Association of Greater Dallas and the Texas Apartment Association. In addition, he has served as the Chairman of the National Apartment Association's Political Action Committee for the last three years and currently serves on the Executive Committee for the National Apartment Association. As Chairman of the Board, Mr. Williams will lead the National Apartment Association towards continued success as America's leading advocate for quality rental housing, serving the interests of rental housing owners, managers, developers and suppliers, and promoting a high level of professionalism in the rental housing industry to better serve the housing needs of the public.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my esteemed colleagues to join me in expressing our heartiest congratulations and best wishes to Mr. Brad Williams as he guides the National Apartment Association this upcoming year as Chairman of the Board.

VETERAN HALL OF FAME INDUCTEE JOSEPH K. VRABEL

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Joseph Vrabel. Joe served in the United States Army during the Korean War. Upon his return, he served his fellow veterans by joining the Veterans of Foreign Wars in 1956, and soon thereafter, becoming Post Commander. His service continued as a Life Member of the American Legion Mahoning Valley Post 15, where he served five years as Post Commander, going on to serve as Mahoning County Commander of the Dynamic Ninth District; and then proceeding on to serve as the American Legion Department of Ohio Commander. Joe was an enthusiastic supporter of the American Legion's Buckeye Boys State, promoting the program whenever he could and securing local sponsorships which would allow the youth of this area to gain first-hand experience in state government. Joe was a significant supporter of the Gifts for the Yanks program which provided gifts for hospitalized veterans during the Christmas season. Joe was instrumental in obtaining a van to transport veterans from Youngstown to the Cleveland American Legion, where he served as Post 15 Sons of the American Legion Advisor for 15 years. In addition, he spent countless hours as a member of Mahoning Valley Post 15's Honor Guard and Color Guard, providing final military honors to his fellow veterans. Joe was locally known as the "Veteran's Veteran", for his dedicated work with veterans. As the owner of Hillcrest Tavern, Joe was able to support local youth sports teams, mainly golf, bowling, and softball in his hometown of Poland, Ohio. For his significant contributions to the veterans and youth of the Mahoning Valley, Joe is very worthy to be inducted, posthumously, into the 2013 Ohio Veterans Hall of Fame.

HONORING SUNCOAST HIGH SCHOOL IN RIVIERA BEACH, FLORIDA ON CELEBRATING 25 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE IN PRO- VIDING SECONDARY EDUCATION

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Suncoast High School in Riviera Beach, Florida on the occasion of its 25th anniversary as an institution of secondary education in Palm Beach County.

This remarkable school is perennially ranked as a top high school in America, as it

offers a wealth of coursework in Math, Science and Engineering, Computer Science, International Baccalaureate studies, as well as Interactive Technology magnet programs. Children from across Palm Beach County seek admission to Suncoast for its acknowledged excellence in comprehensively educating students. The school has also become renowned in the community for the diligent attention that the faculty and staff offer to their students. These students leave prepared for whatever career aspirations they may have. And for those that do choose to pursue an undergraduate degree, Suncoast students do not simply matriculate. They are challenged to succeed in college, and many have gone on to have successful careers in an array of fields. Currently led by Principal Dr. Linda Cartledge and a very talented faculty and staff, Suncoast has earned the respect of professional educators from across the country.

I am always delighted and impressed when I hear about the latest awards and honors accrued by Suncoast High School. Twenty-five years of high-standard education is something we should all admire. Suncoast is representative of the best America has to offer its young people, and its reputation is one to which all schools aspire.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to recognize Suncoast High School for their invaluable commitment to preparing the young minds of Palm Beach County, and their leadership as a positive example for success in secondary education. I congratulate them again and wish them many more years as one of America's top high schools.

HONORING HANNAH KRANZBERG

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hannah Kranzberg, who today is receiving the Guardian of Democracy award from the New Israel Fund for her long-time service to the global community promoting peace, justice, and social and economic equality.

Before moving to the San Francisco Bay Area from her native New York in the 1970s, Hannah taught in an all-day neighborhood school program in Brooklyn as part of a broader effort to provide enrichment programs to children who lived in disadvantaged communities.

Then, as an activist in the San Francisco Bay Area, Hannah continued her interest in making and supporting social documentaries that brought important issues to the attention of the public. As an artist, she was also one of three principal individuals who painted the People's Park mural in Berkeley in 1976, which is now a local landmark with major historical and cultural significance.

In the last 40 years, Hannah's significant philanthropic work has left a lasting impact on our society. She has supported organizations that advocate everything from human rights and civil rights, economic and social justice, and conflict transformation in a local, national

and global context. I am proud to call her my confidant, my supporter, but most importantly, my friend.

As part of her long term efforts to advance women's equality locally and throughout the world, Hannah was a supporter of the San Francisco Women's Building, the first woman-owned and operated community center in the country, which advocates self-determination, gender equality and social justice. She has also supported the Global Fund for Women, a non-profit that provides grants to women-led organizations worldwide to enable women and girls to reach their potential, and to live free of discrimination and violence. In addition, she has been a founding contributor to the Urgent Action Fund for women's human rights, which provides rapid response grants to women human rights defenders throughout the world.

The spectrum of Hannah's philanthropic work is wide-reaching. She contributed to the founding of La Peña Cultural Center in Berkeley, California. She is also an ongoing advocate of the Martin Luther King Jr. Freedom Center in Oakland, California, which offers nonviolence classes and civic engagement for youth from diverse racial and cultural communities. She has been a supporter of the Funding Exchange, the Berkeley Community Fund, the Women's Initiative for Self-Employment, the Rosenberg Fund for Children, the American Jewish World Service, Jewish Family & Children's Services of the East Bay, Equal Rights Advocates, the ACLU, The Center for Constitutional Rights, MALDEF, NAACP Legal Defense Fund, the United Negro College Fund, the Freedom Archives, California Rural Legal Assistance, and the Southern Poverty Law Center, to name just a few.

Beyond that, Hannah is a coalition builder. She serves on the Regional Board of the New Israel Fund, and as a longtime supporter of the Peace Development Fund, she has sought to bring together communities as well as oppressed and marginalized groups of people to enhance opportunities for movement building.

Hannah continues to be a supporter of innovative community-based cultural institutions, including groundbreaking social documentaries, among them, the Oscar nominated "Forever Activists: Stories from the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade," a documentary about seven American veterans of the Spanish Civil War, "The Barber of Birmingham," a documentary about James Armstrong, one of the unsung heroes of the U.S. civil rights movement, and "Discovering Dominga: A Survivor's Story," about the 1982 Guatemalan massacre of 200 villagers who opposed the construction of a dam sponsored by the World Bank.

Therefore, on behalf of California's 13th Congressional District, I salute you, Hannah Kranzberg. Your 40 years of committed activism for peace, justice, and equality, has made an indelible mark in our community, and you are truly worthy of being called a Guardian of Democracy.

IN RECOGNITION OF LEONARD R. SENDELSKY

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Leonard R. Sendelsky as he is honored by the New Jersey Builders Association with its first Lifetime Achievement Award.

Leonard Sendelsky has been a member of the New Jersey Builders Association (NJBA) Board of Directors since 1960. He has served as secretary, treasurer, second vice president, first vice president, and president. He has also served on various committees, including the Legislative Committee and Codes Committee and helped get the NJ State Uniform Construction Code Act signed by Governor Brendan Byrne in 1975. In 1967 and 1989 he was chosen as NJBA Builder of the Year. He has also been honored with the Silver Hammer Award, Legend of Housing Award and the Golden Hammer Award.

In addition to his service on the NJBA, Mr. Sendelsky is also an active member of the Shore Builders Association of Central New Jersey. He has served on the Board of Directors since 1957, has held various leadership positions and has served as chairman on several committees. He received the Builder of the Year Award in both 1966 and 1989. Likewise, he was a member of the Board of Directors of the National Association of Home Builders from 1963 until 2011 and currently serves as the National Area Chairman Representative.

The son of a carpenter and homebuilder, Mr. Sendelsky founded Lenguy Construction Company in 1958 and today owns and operates many additional corporations. He was inducted into the New Jersey Builders Hall of Fame in 1974 and the National Housing Center Hall of Fame in 2004. Mr. Sendelsky is a member of the New Jersey State Uniform Construction Code Advisory Board, a member of the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs Committee on Uniform Sub-division Site Improvement Standards, Chairman of the Middlesex County Uniform Construction Board of Appeals and is also an active member of his community. He is a long-time resident of Colonia along with his wife of nearly 60 years, Judith Kuhn Sendelsky. They have two sons, Leonard Drew and Guy Sean.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in honoring Leonard Sendelsky for his outstanding contributions to the building industry. He is truly deserving of the New Jersey Builders Association Lifetime Achievement Award and this body's recognition.

HONORING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FINANCE AUTHORITY OF MAINE AND THE 2013 SHOWCASE MAINE AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Finance Authority of Maine as it celebrates 30 years of helping Maine citizens pursue business and higher education opportunities, as well as the recipients of its 2013 Showcase Maine Awards.

The Finance Authority of Maine, also known as FAME, was founded in 1983 as the state's business finance agency. By increasing access to capital, its innovative programs enable the start up and growth of the state's business community. Since 1990, FAME has also been responsible for administering Maine's higher education finance programs, helping Maine students and families meet the costs of higher education through a variety of loan, grant and scholarship programs. It also administers an outreach and counseling program that helps inspire and empower young people to pursue higher education.

Each year, the Finance Authority of Maine honors community members that have been exceptional partners in their efforts to aid the Maine business community and Maine students at the Showcase Maine Awards. This year's award recipients include: the Hodgdon Group, recipient of the Business at Work for Maine Award; Jim Wellehan, recipient of the Education at Work for Maine Award; the Honorable Mary Nelson, recipient of the Dirigo Legislative Champion Award; and Camden National Bank, recipient of the Financial Institution of the Year Award.

These award-winners exemplify the hard-working and innovative spirit of Maine. Their dedication and leadership make Maine a better place to live and do business.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in congratulating the Finance Authority of Maine and the 2013 Showcase Maine Award recipients on their outstanding service and achievement.

IN HONOR OF LCPL SEAN ADAMS

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of Georgia's most heroic sons, Combat Engineer LCpl Sean Adams of 1 CEB, 1/8 United States Marine Corps. LCpl Adams is from my District in Gainesville. In Helmond, Afghanistan, LCpl Adams or Big Country, as he is called by his platoon, stepped on a 25-pound IED. It nearly killed him. He lay there in the field for sixty minutes before the air evac arrived. He lost both of his legs and sustained numerous other life threatening injuries. He has come back from the dead after 17 months at Walter Reed Hospital. His courage and his family's support have

helped pull him from the abyss. He has a passion for football, baseball and his Georgia Bull Dogs. He possesses a need for speed; he loves stock cars and racing. He plans to start a business related to cars when he gets back home. I submit this poem penned in his honor by Albert Caswell.

A PEDAL TO THE METAL MARINE
(By Albert Caswell)

A . . .
A Pedal!
A Pedal To The Metal Marine!
Built for honor!
Built for speed!
Being a grunt,
is but his most heroic of all creeds!
As a Sapper all out on the hunt!
Oh what a combination,
a Bull Dog and a Devil Dog,
to so confront the enemy all at speed!
Clearing the way both night and day!
When every moment counts,
that full amount . . .
all for his Band of Brothers in need!
So serving his home of the brave,
and land of the free,
as one fine Georgian United States Marine!
All in search of the enemy!
From 0 to 60 Sean,
was built for speed!
As one who so locks and loads!
As one who so lives by a code!
A code of Strength In Honor,
all in those most magnificent shades of green!
For he's bad to the bone!
As he puts it to the floor!
While, all at speeds himself he'd so ignore!
Big Country was Georgia born,
and Georgia bred!
Whose colors would not so run even as his blood ran red!
As he loves his stock cars,
and his Bull Dogs!
And loves his country music,
as ever so courageously forth he so charged!
And maybe Toby Keith,
might write a song about him, that bard!
Who so heroically answered his Nation's call!
That Call to War!
But for The Greater Good,
as himself he so ignored!
To so wear those most heroic shades of green!
To become,
one of Nation's greatest of all things!
A United States Georgia Bull Dog Devil Dog Marine!
Oh rahhh!
A Bull Dog and a Devil Dog,
there's nothing more Dognatious so as seen!
All for God and Country Big Country,
you have so fought and bled!
And you have given up so much lying,
lying there so very close to death!
All in what your Strength In Honor has so said!
Let's look under the hood!
And see that engine that we call his heart,
which so gives Sean all of that power he so needs to start!
Start all over again!
From 0 to 60 like no one could!
Yea you're not getting close!
As he puts that pedal to the metal,
oh what a turbo boost!
So sapping all those in his path to recovery!
Making pain and heartache disappear at all speeds!
To get him to the finish line and victory!
With a force of nature,
that which so made the enemy grieve!
For he's a bad boy,

who on a battlefield of honor so lived his creed!

Turbo charged putting it into high gear,
as into those turns as he'd gain speed!
Marching forth so all without fear,
but to so pursue the enemy!
And he so loves his Atlanta Braves,
and would love to throw out the first ball one day!

Or hang out with Falcons,
because both of them are but birds of prey!
And for those Georgia Bull Dogs,
as its for them he now so bleeds!
Making this Dog's heart bark, continually!
Rouuuuughhhh Roughhhhh,
watch out in The SEC there's hell to pay!
As it was out on his tour!
As an IED went off and death was almost so assured!

With his two strong legs so lost,
and so many injuries more!
For 60 minutes he lay there without help before!

Before helo picked him up!
As Big Country had a choice,
to so listen to that inner voice!
And put it into gear,
and put it to the floor!
And make it to the finish line for a pit stop,
so he could but live one day more!
Or leave this world for sure!
As one day somehow,
Sean would walk out of that hospital door!
Just like Chip Foose,
he had some OVERHAULING TO DO FOR SURE!

As they took this Hero into the shop,
to a place called Walter Reed which above them all stands high atop,
where the Nurses and Doctors are the cream of the crop!

Where these Heroines and Heroes,
so know how to death to stop!
And how to rebuild and remodel and restore,
and OVERHAUL America's finest of all Heroes so for sure!

And when he came out,
Big Country's work had just begun!
Because,
his engine was running a little rough my son!
And with each new day such pain begun!
But Bull Dog's and Devil Dog's don't know how to run!

And no matter how matter laps he had to take,

he was but in a DOGNATIOUS STATE!
And you could still hear his engine roar!

As he put that pedal to the metal,
in first place to come so for sure!
Crossing that finish line,
because of all what he had endured!
To rebuild and to restore!
Holding that winners cup high above his head!

All in what his faith and courage,
in The Game of Life his had so said!
As straight to victory lap his heart so sped!
And all of you stock car boys and gals,
you most famous drivers all of this world so now!

You gotta give this good old boy some major cred!

Because from 0 to 60,
from the beginning,
all of the way to the very end his heart has led!

And I don't think you want to go up against this Big Country,
this Georgia Bull Dog on the race track of life head to head!

Cause it's going to get pretty bumpy,
if you catch his draft!
Because, until you've been through,
what he's been through . . .

nothing stops you in your path!
 Because, in The Game of Life . . .
 all at such high speeds Sean gave all that he
 would so need!
 Was asked!
 And when all out in front of him in that fast
 lane,
 pity and sorrow was strewn all across his
 path!
 He took it up high,
 and put it into gear . . .
 and blew past all of that sorrow and loss he
 so sped!
 Leaving them all in his dust,
 as he put that pedal to the medal . . .
 and with a tears in his eyes he put it into
 turbo thrust!
 As to all of that heartache and sorrow,
 said goodbye!
 Because, he's got a life to lead!
 And because its all in his DNA,
 all in Big Country's need for speed!
 As now he's in his victory lap called recovery!
 While, down in Georgia they all scream and
 shout . . .
 Big Country's coming home so soon no doubt!
 And On The Road of Life,
 look for him way up out ahead!
 For there's so much we can all so learn from
 him,
 all in what his short life has said!
 In life we all must make those final choices!
 When up ahead there lies such forces . . .
 Do we so listen to our most inner voices?
 Will we down shift and lose our path?
 Or we take it up high,
 and leave heartache and sorrow so far behind
 as her we so pass?
 And put that pedal to the medal,
 making those Angels up in heaven so smile
 and laugh!
 Sean the results are in,
 the checked flag is now waving you home
 . . .
 waving you in!
 As the next part of your new great life,
 is all so ready to so begin!
 Go ahead!
 START YOUR ENGINES!
 And put that pedal to the metal,
 you most Dogmatic of all ones!
 I low bout them Dogs!
 ROOOGHHH ROOOGHH!
 For you are one of Georgia's Most Heroic
 Sons!

VETERAN HALL OF FAME
 INDUCTEE ROGER H. GARDNER

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished military service of Roger Gardner as he is inducted into the 2013 Ohio Veterans Hall of Fame. Roger has been a member of the American Legion Post 540 Honor Guard in Cortland since 1957, and served as Commander and Captain since 2000. Under his leadership, the Honor Guard has participated in 2,281 funerals. He is actively involved in local Memorial Day and Veterans Day activities each year. As a Post Commander, he was instrumental in the construction of several veterans' memorials in the area, most notably the Korean War Monument in Trumbull County Veterans Park. Roger has

logged over 8,000 volunteer hours between the Warren Community Base Outpatient Clinic and the Youngstown VA Clinic. He is an active speaker in the "Tell America" program in local schools, where he shares his military experiences and encourages patriotism among young people. He has been the recipient of numerous awards and honors, some of which include the Mahoning County United Veterans Council Veteran of the Year; the Tri-County Funeral Directors Association Award for Community Service for his diligent work as Captain of American Legion's Post 540 Honor Guard; and the Warren Tribune-Chronicle Community Star Award for his significant contributions to the Warren area. Roger is deeply committed to serving the veterans of Trumbull County and is very worthy of being inducted into the Ohio Veterans Hall of Fame.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ORLANDO DAY NURSERY

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the incredible contributions of the Orlando Day Nursery.

Founded in 1921 as an all-volunteer organization, Orlando Day Nursery Association, Inc. (ODN) has provided early childhood care and education services to working-poor families living in Central Florida for 91 years. The Nursery has been recognized as the oldest childcare in the South Eastern U.S. by Childcare Exchange. President George H.W. Bush recognized ODN as the 909th Daily Point of Light Award and America's Promise Alliance honored ODN with the Keeping the Promise Award.

ODN makes a concerted effort at laying a positive foundation for low income preschoolers in order to ward off the negative self-concept and academic problems these children often face. ODN's HighScope curriculum is backed by over forty years of studies proving its effectiveness in preparing at-risk children for school and life. Monthly parenting classes and family activities organized by ODN help Central Florida parents improve their parenting skills and become better equipped to fulfill their role as their child's first teacher.

In order to better care for children outside of the classroom, ODN started an afterschool program in 2011 and a tutoring program in January of 2012. ODN has also initiated an Early Head Start classroom and began offering a transitional kindergarten program for children who are five-years-old but not ready for the public school structure.

ODN partners with many local organizations to meet the needs of its students and their families. The University of Central Florida (UCF) sends nursing students to help track obesity rates at ODN. UCF's Audiology and Speech students also screen all of the children at ODN and provide services to children with speech and language delays. The Winter Park Day Nursery partners with ODN for staff training and curriculum development.

ODN works hard to keep fees low so that no child is left without quality care and early education. ODN provides childcare services for the Salvation Army's homeless shelter, Harbor House, and the Coalition for the Homeless.

The Board of Directors of ODN is a committed group of outstanding citizens that work to achieve ODN's mission: to develop the whole child by providing high-quality, affordable care and early childhood education services in the Orlando area. ODN supports the whole family, as they are the foundation from which our children develop.

I am proud to honor the Orlando Day Nursery for all of its outstanding accomplishments and its contributions to the Central Florida community.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF
 DR. JONATHAN D. JANSEN

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished public service of Jonathan D. Jansen as he receives this year's Alice and Clifford Spendlove Prize in Social Justice, Diplomacy and Tolerance presented by the University of California, Merced (UC Merced). Dr. Jansen is the Vice Chancellor and Rector of the University of the Free State and South Africa's first black dean.

Dr. Jansen was born on September 29, 1956 in the town of Montagu in the Western Cape province of South Africa. It was here in the Cape Flats where he had to face chaos and was stripped of his family, land, and property. Even in the face of adversity, Dr. Jansen believed that he could achieve great things.

Higher education was of utmost importance to Dr. Jansen. He attended the University of the Western Cape where he received his Bachelors of Science degree in Botany and Zoology, and then completed his qualifications for teaching through the University of South Africa. Later, he went on to receive his Bachelors of Education from the University of South Africa and his Masters of Science from Cornell University. As if that were not enough, he even received his PhD from the Stanford University School of Education.

Dr. Jansen's passion for upholding strong race relations shined in all of his work. His books offer a detailed account on the social and political change in post-apartheid South Africa and addressed how education served a role in confronting the hardships of the past. His effective role goes well beyond the written word: Dr. Jansen also serves as President of the South African Institute of Race Relations. He is well known for his work to advance education in South Africa and his Nelson Mandela-like attitude of "reconciliation over revenge."

UC Merced established the Alice and Clifford Spendlove Prize in Social Justice, Diplomacy and Tolerance to honor a scholar, author, artist, or citizen who dedicates his or her work to the delivery of social justice, diplomacy, and tolerance in local and global society. Dr. Jansen is deserving of this recognition

as he is someone who truly wants to make this world a better place.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. Jonathan D. Jansen for his contributions to society and to congratulate him on receiving this most prestigious award.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS S. FOLEY,
57TH SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to former House Speaker Thomas "Tom" S. Foley, the 57th Speaker of the House of Representatives and a man whose love for this chamber and whose commitment to public service was unsurpassed. Speaker Foley died Friday, October 18, at his home in Washington, D.C. He was 84 years old.

Tom Foley was in every sense of the word a gentleman. He believed in bipartisanship. He treated everyone equally and with respect. Upon relinquishing the Speakership, he left these parting words of advice to this successor, incoming Speaker Newt Gingrich: "Remember, you are the Speaker of the whole House and not just one party."

The environment of the House of Representatives under the leadership of Speaker Foley was marked by mutual respect and cooperation, which enabled the Congress to work with the President and pass legislation that made our country better.

During Tom Foley's speakership, the Congress passed, and the President signed into law the Family and Medical Leave Act; the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1991; the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA); the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT); the 1994 Crime Bill which put 100,000 new police officers on the streets and banned assault weapons and reduced crime rates by more than a third; and the 1993 Clinton Economic Plan that led to the creation of 22 million jobs, four balanced budgets, and the longest period of sustained economic prosperity in the post-war period.

Thomas Stephen Foley was born March 6, 1929, in Spokane, Washington. He attended a Jesuit preparatory school, where he acquired the nickname "the senator" for his intellect and the way he solved problems. He is reported to have overcome a lisp to excel in debate and to earn his baccalaureate degree from the University of Washington in 1951. Six years later, Tom Foley was admitted to the bar after graduating from the University of Washington School of Law. He practiced law in Spokane prior to becoming a prosecutor and later an assistant state attorney general.

In 1960, he joined the staff of his mentor, the legendary Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson (D-WA), and moved to Washington, D.C., where he met his future partner in life, his beloved Heather, whom he married in 1968, and who remained by his side for the next 45 years and was with him when he died.

Mr. Speaker, in 1964 Tom Foley defeated an 11-term incumbent and was elected by the people of the 5th Congressional District of

Washington to represent them in the House of Representatives. He was reelected to the next succeeding 14 Congresses.

Over those 30 years, Tom Foley compiled a truly impressive record. He sought and obtained a seat on the Agriculture Committee to advocate on behalf of his constituents in the wheat-growing region of eastern Washington.

Tom Foley was an accomplished legislator. One of his major achievements as a member of the Agriculture Committee was the grand bargain he crafted which led to the enduring partnership between conservative farmers and progressive supporters of nutrition programs.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Foley was an unwavering advocate for progressive policies and a formidable opponent of policies he believed were harmful to the interests of the poor, workers, or women. He supported President Johnson's Great Society Programs and voted for the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968. He also supported a strong national defense and sensible foreign policy, which is why he opposed the escalation of the Vietnam War.

After the watershed election of 1974, he was elected by his colleagues to chair the Agriculture Committee, a position he held until 1981, when he was appointed Majority Whip by then Speaker Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill. When Speaker O'Neill was succeeded by Majority Leader Jim Wright (D-TX), Tom Foley was elevated to the post of Majority Leader and served in that post until June 6, 1989 when he was elected Speaker of the House upon the resignation of Speaker Wright.

Tom Foley was Speaker of the House in 1991 when President George H.W. Bush launched Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, the first Persian Gulf War. Thanks in large part to the spirit of bipartisanship that Tom Foley embodied, the nation remained unified throughout the Persian Gulf War.

Following Speaker Foley's service in the House of Representatives he served with distinction as U.S. ambassador to Japan during the second Clinton Administration. In recognition of his exceptional service to our country, in 2001 the federal courthouse in Spokane, Washington was renamed the Thomas S. Foley United States Courthouse.

Today, one of the things cited most as being what is wrong with Congress is the environment of hyper partisanship which is threatening the ability of the House to fulfill its function.

It is my hope that we all remember and learn from the example of Speaker Foley that civility is a virtue, that compromise is not weakness, and that it is possible for persons of goodwill to disagree without being disagreeable.

Thank you, Speaker Thomas S. Foley, for your service to our nation. You made the People's House a better place by promoting mutual respect and cooperation.

IN HONOR OF HENRY TEICHERT

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise in honor of Henry Teichert,

who recently passed away in Sacramento at the age of 96. As his family, friends, and the entire Sacramento community gather to celebrate his life and legacy, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Teichert.

Henry Teichert was born on September 6, 1917 in Sacramento to Augusta and Adolph Teichert Jr. He was married to Wendy Downey for 56 years until her passing in 2003. Together they had five children, Frederick, Jonathan, Isaiah, Rose and Wendy-Marie, 17 grandchildren and 20 great grandchildren. Mr. Teichert graduated from the University of California, Berkeley in 1939, where he earned a degree in English and proudly served our country as an intelligence officer in the United States Army Air Corps during World War II. After the war he earned his law degree from Boalt Hall Law School and returned to his hometown of Sacramento where with several other attorneys, formed one of the first group law practices in the region, which later became McDonough Holland & Allen.

Mr. Teichert's law career ended when he took over the family construction business, A. Teichert and Son, when his father passed away in 1953. A. Teichert and Son, now Teichert, Inc., has been serving the Sacramento region for over one hundred and twenty-five years and holds the oldest active contractor's license in the state, No. 8. Mr. Teichert served as the corporation's president and chairman of the board for thirty-five years. He had the business acumen to turn Teichert from a company to a corporation which includes Teichert Construction, Teichert Materials, StoneBridge Properties, and the Teichert Foundation. Together, these companies are leaders in the fields of construction, aggregate production, and real estate development, while also being one of the most charitable organizations in Sacramento.

Beyond being a stellar businessman and committed father, Mr. Teichert was a civic minded individual. He belonged to many social organizations, including the Sacramento Rotary Club for over fifty years, the Sutter Club and he was an active member of Sacramento's Trinity Cathedral. He was a founding board member of the Sacramento Region Community Foundation. In 1968, Mr. Teichert helped establish the Sacramento Chapter of the National Urban League with the goal of improving job and education opportunities for Sacramento's African American community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in paying honor to Henry Teichert for being an exemplary member of the Sacramento Community. I ask that we all take a moment and give our utmost respect and condolences to his children, grandchildren and great grandchildren. His life and commitment to Sacramento are an inspiration to us all.

VETERAN HALL OF FAME
INDUCTEE ALEXANDER P. KISH

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exemplary military service of Alex

Kish as he is inducted into the Ohio Veterans Hall of Fame. After serving in the U.S. Army during the Korean War, Alex returned to his home in Newton Falls, Ohio, and served as Commander of the AMVETS Post 112 and the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 3332. Since then, he has devoted his life in efforts to honor both the living and deceased veterans. Alex is dedicated to recognizing the contributions of veterans and caring for those less fortunate. He has organized an Honor Guard serving multiple veterans organizations in an effort to provide full military honors during burials at the National Cemetery in Rittman, Ohio. Alex was instrumental in raising funds that provided more than 400 phone cards for veterans and active duty soldiers. He arranged for transportation, hotel accommodations, and admission tickets for World War II veterans to attend the dedication of the World War II Memorial and to tour Washington, D.C. Alex organized a fundraiser that provided a summer camp experience for underprivileged children of Trumbull County. He has served as Vice President of an organization that provides transportation to medical appointments and shopping for senior citizens. Alex is deeply committed to serving the veterans of Trumbull County, Ohio and is very worthy of being inducted into the 2013 Ohio Veterans Hall of Fame.

RECOGNIZING ERIE CANAL HARBOR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AS 2013 BUSINESS OF THE YEAR

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation (ECHDC) on its many accomplishments including being recognized by the Amherst Chamber of Commerce at its 2013 Business of the Year Awards Ceremony. The Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation is being honored with the Stewardship Award at the Chamber's event on October 28, 2013.

In 2005, as part of the NYPA settlement agreement, we called for a dedicated revenue stream to fund waterfront development in the city of Buffalo. But perhaps more importantly, we called for a locally controlled, waterfront development corporation, whose express purpose was to enhance public access to Buffalo's Inner and Outer Harbor waterfront areas. The Corporation's primary objective would be the design and construction management of physical improvements to the Buffalo waterfront areas to create private and public sector recreational and commercial development along the Lake Erie shoreline.

Fortunately, we won that settlement and in 2007 the Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation was created. Since that time, ECHDC has taken an aggressive approach to waterfront development and is credited with remarkable projects along Buffalo's Inner and Outer Harbors that are reinvigorating our city and residents and visitors alike.

ECHDC is responsible for the work on the Erie Canal Redevelopment Project, which reviv-

alized 12.5 acres of idle waterfront space into a highly trafficked downtown destination now known as Canalside. This site incorporates historic elements of the original Erie Canal and celebrates Buffalo's role as the western end of the canal.

The Corporation has successfully managed development of 23 acres at the Inner Harbor for public, commercial and mixed uses. ECHDC oversaw demolition of the Buffalo Memorial Auditorium, ongoing construction of historically aligned canals to be used as unique water features and public ice skating destinations, and improvements to the public landscape including a vibrant central wharf at Canalside that accommodates large concerts, public markets, and hundreds of other popular events throughout the year.

As a result of the groundwork laid by ECHDC, work is now underway on HARBORcenter, an over \$170 million private sector investment on the Webster block that builds off of the success of Canalside.

Thanks to the hard work of the ECHDC, we now have increased business and recreational activity on the Inner and Outer Harbors including 1,000 feet of boat dock installments at Canalside, two new restaurants, the development of Wilkeson Pointe, a 20 acre parcel of parkland on the Outer Harbor among many other public access improvements and amenities. Given ECHDC's record of accomplishment in the waterfront development business, the Corporation was recently entrusted with devising a plan for the future use of approximately 130 acres of Outer Harbor lands.

Mr. Speaker, the Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation has worked tirelessly in their mission to revitalize the City of Buffalo's Inner and Outer Harbor areas and restore economic growth to Western New York. The region has benefited from the leadership and innovative vision of the Corporation, its staff and Board of Directors. I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation for their dedication to Western New York and congratulate them in receiving the Stewardship Award from the Amherst Chamber of Commerce.

HONORING THE 3RD ANNIVERSARY OF RICHMOND AREA HEALTH CENTER'S STAR PROGRAM

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Richmond Area Health Center as it celebrates its third year of providing outstanding medical care through its "Star Program."

The Richmond Area Health Center is a Federally Qualified Healthcare Center site, providing primary care to 3,500 people in a medically underserved community. The Health Center has worked over the last several years to improve health outcomes and lowers costs by inspiring individuals to change their lifestyles. The Health Center's "Star Program" incorporates healthy lifestyle strategies and affir-

mations into every primary care visit to improve patients' health and well-being.

This no-cost program has helped approximately 900 patients collectively lose more than 11,000 pounds. By helping patients make lifestyle changes, the team at Richmond Area Healthcare Center has been able to reduce the number of medications it prescribes and diagnostic tests it orders. The Health Center's model of lowering costs and empowering patients is now serving as a model for several similar programs throughout the state of Maine.

On October 18, 2013, the Richmond Area Health Center celebrated three years of exceptional healthcare by hosting a reception with patients and members of the greater community. I am delighted to recognize the accomplishments of this dedicated team of healthcare workers and look forward to their continued success in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the Richmond Area Health Center on three years of exceptional patient care.

HONORING WILLIE HESELMAYER AND ELDA ZEPLIN

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the lasting love and commitment of two great Texans.

On November 2, 1938 millions of Americans recalled the thrilling race the day before between thoroughbreds Seabiscuit and War Admiral. Others were still recovering from Orson Welles' legendary War of the Worlds radio broadcast from the previous weekend.

Willie Heselmeyer and Elda Zeplin of Taylor, TX had bigger things on their minds. They were joining hands at the Prince of Peace Lutheran Church (founded by Elda's family in 1894) to become husband and wife.

75 years later, they still walk together hand in hand. Willie, with Elda constantly by his side, worked the land as a cotton, corn, and milo farmer. They brought two sons into the world and were united through feast and famine. Together they witnessed their nation's brave soldiers defend freedom on foreign shores, watched a humble midwesterner take mankind's first steps on another world, and marveled at technological advances beyond any of their dreams.

What began in 1938 continues strong into a new millennium. Willie and Elda still live independently in their home on their farm east of Taylor. They play dominoes with friends nearly every day. Family and faith remain at the center of their happy life together.

Willie and Elda will gather this November with friends and family at the Fellowship Hall of St. Paul Lutheran Church in Taylor to celebrate 75 years of love and commitment. Marriages like the Heselmayers are the foundations of one of our most cherished institutions and give us all an ideal to which we can aspire. They make both Texas and our nation strong. Erika and I, who will celebrate a half century of marriage in a few years, congratulate Willie and Elda on 75 years together and wish them the best in the years to come.

HONORING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BLACK MEN OF LABOR

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Black Men of Labor as they celebrate 20 years of service in preserving art and culture in the city of New Orleans.

The Black Men of Labor was established in 1993 by musicians Fred J. Johnson Jr., Benny Jones Sr., and Gregory Stafford. For the past twenty years, they have honored the contributions of African American men in the work place while promoting and preserving traditional jazz music.

Rooted in the historic neighborhood of Tremé, America's oldest African American community, these men celebrate their West African heritage with yearly parades throughout the streets of New Orleans.

I want to commend the Black Men of Labor for their commitment to preserving the living, breathing birthright of the city of New Orleans, jazz music. Through our triumphs and tragedies, it is our rich legacy in the arts that keeps us grounded as a community. Organizations like the Black Men of Labor are at the core of this commitment.

On Sunday, October 20th, the streets once again came alive to the sound of music as the Black Men of Labor celebrated their 20th anniversary. I want to join the New Orleans community in celebrating their contributions.

In 1987, the United States Congress designated jazz as a rare and valuable national treasure to which we should devote our attention, support, and resources to make sure it is preserved, understood and promulgated. Today, I echo that sentiment and applaud these men for their dedication to empowering their communities through music and the arts.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,087,891,889,205.15. We've added \$6,461,014,840,292.07 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING PEOPLE INC. AS RECIPIENT OF THE 2013 HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES AWARD

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize People Inc. in being awarded the

2013 Health and Health Services Award from the Amherst Chamber of Commerce.

People Inc. began in 1970 to ensure that people with disabilities or special needs have an available support so they can succeed.

The organization provides services to people of all ages, from children and adults with disabilities to senior citizens. These services include residential, employment/vocational, community outreach, health care and recreation programs. Their comprehensive services are well-known throughout Western New York.

Over the years, People Inc. has grown to expand their services. They have increased their populations served, spectrum of services, geographic locations and number of sites.

Since 2010, People Inc. has been recognized as one of New York State's certified Compass Agencies. Compass stands for Consumerism, Outcome, Management Plan and Agency Self Survey, and conveys People Inc.'s effective model of person centered planning, managed outcomes, and advocacy involvement by individuals and their families to accomplish their mission.

Those involved with People Inc. strive toward a future where all persons whose needs limit their integration into the community reach their highest potential as responsible members of society. These individuals deserve to become contributing and active members in their communities, enjoy the greatest possible degree of independence, and acceptance in all aspects of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to honor People Inc. for being awarded the Health and Health Services award and commend them for their great work on behalf of all Western New Yorkers.

HONORING SANDRA GOVE CHAMBLEE FOR HER SERVICE TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN HER COMMUNITY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pride to rise today to recognize Ms. Sandra Gove, a resident of Belle Glade, Florida. Sandra recently received the Athena Award from the Chamber of Commerce of the Palm Beaches. This distinguished award honors individuals for professional accomplishment and service to improve the quality of life for others in the community. It warms my heart to learn that Sandra was the individual to receive it this year.

For the last 14 years, she has served as Executive Director of the Glades Health Initiative, an agency that provides HIV prevention services. Since her retirement, Sandra has continued devoting herself to volunteer work with the Arc of the Glades, American Cancer Society and Visiting Nurse Association. In addition, she is also the longtime president of the General Federation of Women's Club of Belle Glade.

Over the course of her life, she has earned the love and respect of her fellow residents of Belle Glade and people throughout the Glades

area. She is a remarkable individual who continues to devote her time and energy to numerous important agencies and projects. Always an advocate for the Glades, she represents their best interest on numerous county boards and committees. For all of these reasons, I am very proud to recognize Sandra as a Hastings' Hero, and to be her representative in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful to Sandra for her continued service to the Glades community. She has selflessly helped so many people, and I am honored to recognize her for her service.

TRIBUTE TO OAIL ANDREW "BUM" PHILLIPS, TEXAS ICON, HOME-SPUN PHILOSOPHER, AND LEGENDARY COACH OF THE HOUSTON OILERS

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House of the sad news that America has lost one of the most beloved, successful, and colorful coaches in the history of the National Football League. Oail Andrew "Bum" Phillips passed away last Friday, October 18, 2013, at his ranch home in Goliad, Texas. He was 90 years old.

The Houston Oilers was not a very good team when Bum Phillips was named head coach and general manager in 1975. In fact, they were one of the worst teams in the league. But within the space of three short years, Bum turned the Oilers into a powerhouse and transformed the downtrodden franchise into one of the most popular and entertaining teams in the NFL.

Along the way, Bum Phillips' mastery of the one-liner endeared himself to his fans and the media. He once quipped in response to a question about the Dallas Cowboys, "that other team up North": "The Dallas Cowboys may be America's team but the Houston Oilers are Texas's team!" On another occasion, when he was asked to describe the great Earl Campbell, his star running back, he said: "He may not be in a class all by himself, but it don't take long to call the roll."

As coach of the Houston Oilers, Bum Phillips was the winningest coach in franchise history (59–38 record), leading the team to the American Football Conference Championship game in 1978 and 1979 but losing each time to the eventual Super Bowl champion Pittsburgh Steelers.

Who can ever forget the sight of Bum Phillips patrolling the sidelines with his trademark buzz cut, decked out in work shirt, blue jeans, cowboy boots, and white Stetson, which he wore except when the Oilers played in the Astrodome? Asked to explain why he did not wear his cowboy hat in the Astrodome, Bum replied: "Mama always said that if it can't rain on you, you're indoors."

Oail Andrew Phillips was born on September 29, 1923, in Orange, Texas, the son of a truck driver, also named Oail, which is pronounced "Awl." He got his nickname when his

younger sister, Edrina, tried to say "brother," only to have it come out as "bumble" and later "bum." In recounting the story, Bum remarked, "I don't mind being called Bum, just as long as you don't put a 'you' in front of it."

Bum Phillips played football at Lamar College in Beaumont, Texas but left to serve in the Marines during World War II. Upon his return he played for Stephen F. Austin State College in Nacogdoches, Texas, graduating in 1949. He then embarked upon a career coaching high school football in Texas. In 1958, he was hired as an assistant coach by Texas A&M head coach Paul "Bear" Bryant, who would go on to become the legendary coach of the Alabama Crimson Tide. In 1962, Bum Phillips was the head coach of Texas Western University (now the University of Texas at El Paso).

Three years later in 1965, Bum Phillips made the jump to professional football when he was named defensive coordinator for the Houston Oilers of the American Football League. In 1967 he was hired by San Diego Chargers head coach Sid Gillman to be his defensive assistant and in 1974 followed Gillman back to the Houston Oilers as the team's defensive coordinator, replacing him as head coach the following year.

Bum Phillips' Oilers teams were known for their physical style of play and outstanding defense anchored by Robert Brazile and future Hall of Famers Elvin Bethea and Curley Culp. Bum was a "players coach"; his players loved him because he kept them fresh by shunning overly long practices and encouraged camaraderie.

The unquestioned leader and star of the team was running back Earl Campbell, the 1977 Heisman Trophy winner from the University of Texas and the first player selected in the 1978 NFL draft. The "Tyler Rose," who still holds every major Oilers rushing record and is one of the greatest running backs in NFL history, also would go on to be enshrined in the NFL Hall of Fame in Canton, Ohio.

About Earl Campbell, who ushered in the "Luv Ya Blue!" era and dazzled a Monday Night Football national television audience with a breathtaking display of speed and power in rushing for 221 yards and leading the Oilers to a wild 35-30 victory over the Miami Dolphins, Bum Phillips once said: "That young man is the difference between losing your job and winning the national championship."

After 5 years as head coach of the Oilers, Bum Phillips was offered and accepted the head coaching job of the New Orleans Saints, whom he almost led to the playoffs for the first time in the history of that franchise. In 1985 he resigned as coach of the Saints but remained connected to the game by working as a TV and radio analyst for the Oilers. Asked what he planned to do in his retirement, Bum said, "Nothing. And I don't start before noon!"

In addition to his wife Debbie, Bum Phillips is survived by his son, Wade, a former head coach of the Dallas Cowboys, the Denver Broncos and the Buffalo Bills, and five daughters from a previous marriage, Susan, Cicely, Dee Jean, Andrea and KimAnn; many grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, more than three decades have passed since Bum Phillips strolled the sidelines of the Astrodome as the head coach of

the Oilers and the beloved leader of "Luv Ya Blue!" Nation, but he will always be remembered as the man who put the Oilers on the map and embodied the spirit and civic pride of Houston, the greatest city in the greatest country in the only world we know.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment of silence in memory of Oail Andrew "Bum" Phillips.

Luv Ya Blue!

RECOGNIZING THE VILLAGE OF WILLIAMSVILLE'S PICTURE MAIN STREET PROJECT

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Village of Williamsville: Picture Main Street Project as the Amherst Chamber of Commerce's choice for the Revitalization Award for their 2013 Business of the Year Awards for their efforts to transform the main commercial strip of the Village of Williamsville into a more vibrant and vital urban village core.

Through the process of placemaking, the village of Williamsville initiated a citizen-driven effort to create a vision for what Main Street should be and to create a plan to make that vision a reality. More than 36,000 vehicles travel down Main Street each day, and residents and businesses identified the lack of a pedestrian environment as a detriment to both commerce and the viability of the future of the village.

The Community Plan was devised in 2005 which identified a solution to the traffic problems on Main Street. Picture Main Street directly addressed those issues by seeking to make the state road more equitable for both drivers and pedestrians. The plan called for numerous improvements to make the shopping district more accessible to pedestrians which include \$7,000,000 streetscape enhancements, aggressive tree planting, bulb-outs, a mid-block signal for pedestrians, lighting, gateways, pocket parks, and even a smartphone application or valet parking in the village. Changes could also result in the creation a "village-square" or second shopping district around the Historic Williamsville Water Mill.

Although pending approval by the state, the changes are set to go into effect next spring. Within the waiting period, thousands of residents took part in "taking back Main Street," an old-fashioned block party that closed the thoroughfare to traffic and invited residents out onto the street.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to recognize the Village of Williamsville: Picture Main Street Project's effort to revitalize the Village of Williamsville. Their innovation and determination are not only admirable and deserving of such praise, but an incredible asset to the future success of Western New York. I congratulate the Village of Williamsville: Picture Main Street Project as the recipient of the Revitalization Award for the Amherst Chamber of Commerce's 2013 Business of the Year Awards.

IN SUPPORT OF UKRAINE'S EUROPEAN ASPIRATIONS

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, as Ranking Member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, I rise along with the co-chairs of the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus, Representatives KAPTUR, LEVIN, and GERLACH, to voice my support for Ukraine's European aspirations.

As long-time advocates for the democratization and economic liberalization of Ukraine, we welcome the progress that has been made to date and encourage Ukraine's continued efforts in the coming weeks to realize the final steps necessary to enter into an Association Agreement with the European Union (EU) at the Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius this November.

By strengthening Ukraine's bilateral relationship with the EU, we are confident that through greater economic integration and political cooperation, Ukraine will be able to achieve a stronger relationship with current EU Member States, as well as transatlantic partners, such as the United States, through a shared respect for democratic principles, rule of law, good governance, human rights, and essential freedoms. As such, we believe that the signing of an Association Agreement between Ukraine and the EU will continue to serve as a catalyst for democratic and human rights reforms, enhanced economic development, and improved welfare for all Ukrainians.

Over the last year, we have observed with interest Ukraine's efforts to meet the EU's conditions for this agreement, and as the Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius draws near, we wish to encourage all parties to continue to cooperate and work swiftly to complete all remaining reforms, in law and in practice.

Recognizing that key progress has been made in certain areas, including the enactment of a new criminal procedure code, we support further tangible action by Ukraine to address critical issues and incorporate the reforms necessary to improve its electoral system, governing institutions, and its system of justice. In particular, we believe that a crucial step towards such reform would be the pardon and release of former Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko under mutually acceptable terms.

The signing of an Association Agreement with the EU marks a significant opportunity for Ukraine to fulfill its commitments to democracy and human rights and is in the strategic interests of Ukraine, the EU, and the United States. We offer our support and encouragement to Ukraine in the coming weeks as it takes the final steps towards a stronger and enhanced relationship with the EU.

MONICA BARLETTA

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Monica Barletta, longtime parishioner of the Holy Rosary Church in Hazleton, Pennsylvania.

Monica Barletta has been a member of the Holy Rosary Church for over 70 years, joining in 1943 to receive her First Communion. She and her late husband Fred Barletta Sr. have been instrumental in every major project undertaken by Holy Rosary Parish. Mrs. Barletta has been a member and officer of the Christian Woman's Society for over 50 years, and has served as a lector for nearly 25 years. Additionally, she was an active member of the committee which initiated the annual Holy Rosary Bazaar in 1978 and she held the position of Bazaar chairperson. She was one of the founders of the church's annual Mother's Day Carnation Sales that support the Pennsylvanians for Human Life organization, an effort which has raised tens of thousands of dollars for the local pro-life movement over the past 30 years. She is also currently a member of the Holy Rosary Parish Council.

Mr. Speaker, for her dedicated work at the Holy Rosary Church in Hazleton, Pennsylvania, I commend Monica Barletta.

RECOGNIZING COL. PAULETTE SCHANK

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a career dedicated to service to our country. After more than two decades of service, Colonel Paulette Schank will be retiring from her command, but her service and commitment to others will not soon be forgotten. Colonel Schank, a Bucks County resident, is the Commander of the 514th AMDS, Aerospace Medicine Squadron based out of Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst, New Jersey. Her detachment provides medical support for over 2,600 Airmen, ensuring their medical readiness to meet mission requirements both state-side and abroad.

As both a civilian nurse-anesthetist at Saint Mary Medical Center in Langhorne and an Air Force reserve officer, Colonel Schank has dedicated her life to caring for others—be it in Bucks County or around the world. During her tenure with the Air Force she has provided medical assistance in times of war and in humanitarian efforts—from Iraq to Haiti, Mozambique to Peru.

Colonel Schank is a vital part of my Veterans Advisory Board and a trusted consultant when it comes to pursuing legislation that benefits my district's veterans and military members.

On behalf of a grateful community, a grateful nation, and a grateful world I thank Colonel Paulette Schank for her service and wish her the best in her retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, 2013, I was unavoidably absent and missed the following rollcall votes: No. 556, the DeFazio Amendment No. 2; No. 557, the Flores Amendment No. 3; No. 558, the Hastings Amendment No. 6; No. 559, the Richmond Amendment No. 16; and No. 560 on final passage of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act. Had I voted, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote No. 556, "aye" on rollcall vote No. 557, "nay" on rollcall vote No. 558, "aye" on rollcall vote No. 559, and "aye" on rollcall vote No. 560.

IN HONOR OF UNITED STATES ARMY COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR DONALD R. WINGROVE

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of United States Army Command Sergeant Major (CSM) Donald R. Wingrove and commemorate his valiant service to our great nation.

CSM Wingrove was born on November 12, 1936, and enlisted in the United States Army two short months after turning eighteen. After basic training, CSM Wingrove quickly rose up the ranks, training and serving from Fort Bragg, North Carolina to Thailand. In November of 1970, CSM Wingrove heroically put himself in harm's way and displayed immense dedication to this nation in a clandestine mission to rescue American prisoners of war in North Vietnam.

CSM Wingrove was awarded the Silver Star Medal, the third highest military decoration for valor, for his extraordinary heroism and devotion to duty in the face of enemy forces.

I applaud CSM Wingrove's bravery and service, and I thank him for his heroic and selfless actions. We are fortunate to have brave men and women like CSM Wingrove who stand committed to defending our great nation at home and abroad. His dedication and sacrifice represent the best our nation has to offer.

Mr. Speaker, CSM Wingrove was one of the greatest American soldiers and patriots, but he was also a loving father and husband, and a faithful friend to many. North Carolina is no stranger to heroes like CSM Wingrove. Our state boasts some of the finest warfighters the nation has ever seen. We are forever indebted to him and other American soldiers who dedicate their lives to defend our freedom, secure our homeland, and protect our democracy.

HONORING COLONEL TIMOTHY E. TARCHICK, USAF

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Colonel Timothy E. Tarchick and to recognize his lifetime of service to our country in the United States Air Force.

On October 31, Col. Tarchick will retire from the United States Air Force after more than 35 years of dedication and sacrifice for our great nation.

While Col. Tarchick currently serves as the Commander of the 94th Airlift Wing at Dobbins Air Reserve Base, he has worked in many other capacities. After enlisting in the Air Force Reserve in 1978, he became an X-Ray Technician, and would later serve as a Loadmaster with the 910th Tactical Airlift Group in Ohio. After graduating from Officer Training School in 1984, he served in many units as Squadron Training Officer, Wing Plans Officer, Tactics Instructor, Flight Examiner, Chief Navigator, 4th Air Force Operations Staff Officer, Director of Operations, and Operations Group Commander.

Throughout his career, Col. Tarchick was always ready to meet the call of duty. During hurricanes Katrina and Rita, he led the first Air Force rescue efforts that saved more than 1,000 people. And at his current position, he has successfully converted the 94th Airlift Wing from a training wing to a combat-coded tactical wing. Under his leadership, the 94th Airlift Wing hasn't suffered a single casualty. For his exceptional service, Col. Tarchick has earned the Legion of Merit, the Aerial Achievement Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal with three oak leaf clusters, and the Air Force Commendation Medal with oak leaf cluster, and many other awards.

Col. Tarchick will surely be missed. He has played an invaluable role in the U.S. Air Force for decades, and his effective leadership has left a positive example of leadership that will be passed to all of those who served under him.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Georgia's 11th Congressional District, I would like to extend my deepest thanks to Col. Tarchick for devoting his life to the upholding of our Constitution and to the protection of our American way of life. I wish him a happy—and well-deserved retirement.

IN MEMORY OF TADEUSZ MAZOWIECKI

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Tadeusz Mazowiecki, who passed away today at the age of 86.

Tadeusz Mazowiecki played a pivotal role in the Round Table talks that paved the way for Poland's peaceful democratic transition. He

was an architect of the agreement that led to Poland's first partially free elections in June 1989 and went on to serve as Poland's first post-communist prime minister.

Throughout his life, Mazowiecki was a courageous advocate for workers' rights and human dignity. He was the leader of a small group of Polish intellectuals who traveled to Gdansk in 1980 to show their solidarity with striking shipyard workers. He was one of the first to be arrested when communist authorities declared martial law in December 1981 and one of the last to be released a year later. Throughout the 1980s, Mazowiecki served as an advisor to Lech Walesa and played a leading role in Solidarity movement. As prime minister, Mazowiecki sped political reforms, enacted civil and political rights, and laid the groundwork for Poland's successful transition to a free market economy. Poland's peaceful revolution sparked a chain reaction throughout Central Europe, culminating in Czechoslovakia's Velvet Revolution and the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States and Europe owe Tadeusz Mazowiecki an immeasurable debt of gratitude. The world today is safer and more free because of him and Polish patriots like him. His memory serves as an inspiration to those who fight—often against all odds—for rule of law and human dignity in their own countries, and as a reminder to all that the blessings of liberty and democracy should not be taken for granted.

YVONNE "BONNIE" GONZALEZ

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retiring CEO of Workforce Solution Yvonne "Bonnie" Gonzalez. She has been CEO of Workforce Solution since 2003 and is ending her tenure after ten years. Her tireless efforts have improved the community and served to better the development and progress for south Texas.

"Bonnie" Gonzalez was born in Rio Grande City, Texas. Gonzalez earned a Bachelor's of Science in Nursing from The University of Texas at Austin in 1981, and was recruited by Harvard University to attend the John F. Kennedy School of Government where she earned a Master of Public Administration in 1993. Prior to becoming the CEO for Workforce Solutions, she served as founding President/CEO of the RGV Empowerment Zone Corporation from 1995–2003. Under her direction, the Empowerment Zone took a \$40 million dollar federal investment and leveraged an additional \$416 million in local, state, national, and private sector investment into Empowerment Zone communities. From establishing the Teenage Parent Alternative Program, a state recognized program for McAllen I.S.D. in 1988; to being a founding member of South Texas Community College, now South Texas College; to testifying before state and federal officials on development, community and economic development, and education, Ms. Gon-

zalez continues to be an advocate for the Valley.

As CEO, Gonzalez plays an integral role in leading change and leveraging strategic partnerships within the workforce development industry and in the Rio Grande Valley. Gonzalez is a devoted public servant and community leader. Gonzalez challenges the organization to be innovative, efficient and effective in the programmatic and fiscal oversight of workforce development services for Hidalgo, Starr, and Willacy counties in South Texas. She, together with the Board of Directors, strives to ensure that public dollars go directly to the development of the local workforce, in training, job seeker, and business services. Workforce Solutions was recently recognized as one of the highest performing workforce boards in Texas and one of only 26 national grantees for the 2012 Workforce Innovation Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Ms. Yvonne "Bonnie" Gonzalez, retiring CEO of Workforce Solution. Her years of dedication and commitment to our community have truly impacted the quality of lives for the people of the city. Thank you for this time.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF POLISH GENERAL KAZIMIERZ PULASKI

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, during this month of October, the American people honor the life of Polish General Casimir (Kazimierz) Pulaski whose love of liberty, bravery and military prowess in founding the American cavalry played a pivotal role in winning our American Revolution. Let his timeless story inspire generations to come. May the eagles that soar over both our lands—as symbols of liberty—strengthen our partnership in freedom's cause. Onward.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF POLISH GENERAL KAZIMIERZ PULASKI

Thank you to all who have gathered here today to remember and to commemorate the contributions of General Casimir Pulaski to our nation's victory in the American Revolution and to passing to us the blessings of liberty. As a young child, I first learned his name as the street on which our grandparents lived which was named "PULASKI".

Kazimierz Pulaski was born in Warsaw, Poland in 1745, 268 years ago, son of Polish Count Jozef Pulaski and Marianna Zielinska. Within a little more than two decades, he would come to be known as a freedom fighter and "the father of the American cavalry." Through his family in Poland, Pulaski became involved at a very early age—age 15—in political and military activity. He accompanied his father and other members of the Polish nobility to publicly oppose the Prussian, Russian, and Austrian empires' designs on dominating their Polish homeland. Pulaski pushed for Polish independence, free of outside interference. When he was outlawed in his homeland by the Russian empire after initial uprisings failed, he decided to travel to Paris, France, in a self imposed exile. In so doing, he came to befriend Benjamin Franklin, a father of our country, who also

had travelled to France imbued with the spirit of the French Revolution and its values of liberty, equality, fraternity. They both were seeking alternatives to the empire-driven political systems of the European continent. Franklin was captivated with the ideas of the Enlightenment as he tried to help lead a fledgling nation, casting off the oppression of Great Britain's monarchy. Franklin was impressed by Pulaski and wrote of him to George Washington: "Count Pulaski of Poland, is an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of the liberties of his country against the three great invading powers of Russia, Austria and Prussia . . . he may be highly useful to our service."

A century before their encounter, new ideas of how people should live, and govern themselves, were brewing and emerging on a European continent fraught with empires and suppression of individual liberty. These ideas were transformational concepts in human history. They revolved around how people should live and govern themselves. The new concepts emphasized democracy not monarchy; equality not subservience nor serfdom; liberty not repression; freedom of thought and reason, not dogma nor emotion; freedom of expression not regimented thought; freedom of press, not propaganda; and full separation of church and state, not theocratic control of government. For those of us living in the 21st century, with our nation an heir of Enlightenment thinking, perhaps we have become so accustomed to our way of life that we forget how radical these thoughts were at the time. Let us remember what a price was paid for their emergence globally.

Pulaski's life reminds us of that early struggle of our founders to build a new America, casting off the remnants of old empires. Pulaski volunteered his services in the Revolutionary War of the United States. America's founders were about building a brand new nation girded by Enlightenment ideals. That struggle did not happen overnight. In fact we should recall that almost 4 decades after Pulaski first volunteered, the new America was still fighting for its future. The ballad "Battle of New Orleans" recounts America's fight to finally drive the British from its territory. You might recall the words from the last great land Battle in the War of 1812 . . . "in 1814, we took a little trip, along with Colonel Jackson down the mighty Mississippi. We took a little bacon and we took a little beans, and we caught the bloody British in a town called New Orleans." Of course, this year of 2013, our region of the United States is commemorating the 200th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, when Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry defeated the British in Lake Erie, the only time the British Navy has ever lost a battle on the high seas. The British monarchy finally was driven out of the westernmost reaches of the new America.

So, imagine, Casimir Pulaski fighting bravely 33 years earlier before the War of 1812, at the dawn of the American Revolution. To my knowledge, there are no ballads written yet about his achievements, though they are legendary and worthy of expression.

Pulaski travelled in 1777 to Philadelphia—America's first capital—a decade before our Constitution was drafted and signed. He wrote to Washington: "I came here, where freedom is being defended, to serve it, and to live or die for it." Washington knew that the colonies had no trained cavalry, so he met with Pulaski and introduced him to Marquis de Lafayette and John Hancock. Pulaski

showed off some of his riding abilities, and tried to convince Washington of the superiority of the cavalry over the infantry. And in Sept. 1777 Washington persuaded the Continental Congress to give Pulaski temporary command of the Cavalry. On that very same day, Pulaski pushed back the Birdshot at the Battle of Brandywine in which he came to the aid of Washington's forces and demonstrated his brilliant military tactics. He saved Washington's Army from defeat, and some have recorded he took a bullet aimed at George Washington himself. Congress acknowledged Pulaski's leadership and commissioned him as a Brigadier General. He was placed in command of four light cavalry regiments. But, Pulaski as a foreigner had difficulty with the Continental Congress allowing him to fight. So he asked Washington to allow him to start his own legion. He even offered to pay for them. Congress finally agreed. With 68 horses and 200 foot soldiers, the Pulaski Legion would become the colonists' first fully trained cavalry. He spent the winter of 1777 to 1778 at Valley Forge with most of the army. He was then ordered to defend Little Egg Harbor in New Jersey and then Minisink on the Delaware; Washington then ordered him to proceed South to Charleston, South Carolina. During the Battle of Savannah, on October 9, 1779, Pulaski was wounded by cannon as he charged into battle on horseback. He fell to the ground, mortally wounded. He died from complications from that wound. But Pulaski was so respected for his courage, even by his enemies, that he was spared the musket and permitted to be carried from the battlefield. He died on Oct 15, 1779 at age 34. There is a Pulaski Monument erected in his honor, on Monterrey Square in Savannah, Georgia.

In 1791, twelve years after his death, his homeland in Poland adopted a new constitution modeled on that of the U.S. Constitution, which just had been adopted in 1789. The Polish Constitution too was a revolutionary document as Poland became the first nation in Europe to outlaw serfdom. Indeed, her constitution was so threatening to Europe's empires, Poland was wiped off the map of Europe for 126 years emerging as a nation after World War I and the Peace Treaty of Versailles due significantly to the friendship between U.S. President Woodrow Wilson and Polish pianist Ignacy Paderewski.

Many national recognitions of Pulaski's contributions to America's victory in our Revolution have been accomplished. On October 29, 1779, the U.S. Congress passed a resolution that a monument be dedicated to him. The first memorial was built in 1854 and a bust of Pulaski was added to busts of other heroes in the U.S. Capitol in 1867. In 1910, President William Taft of Ohio unveiled a Congress-sponsored General Casimir Pulaski statue. In 1929, Congress passed a General Pulaski Memorial Day. There is a federal observance of General Pulaski Memorial Day commemorating Pulaski's death from wounds suffered at the Siege of Savannah on October 9, 1779. After a previous attempt failed, on Nov. 6, 2009, President Barack Obama signed a joint resolution of the U.S. Senate and House conferring on Pulaski an honorary American citizenship, 230 years after his death, making him the 7th person so honored.

Today, we, here in the heart of Cleveland, again bear witness and respectfully remember General Casimir Pulaski. We express our gratitude in America's third century for his bravery and vision. And we collectively join together, as eagles fly above both our nations, to say: Long live his memory, long

live America, long live Poland and long live liberty.

HONORING THE 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PLANNED PARENTHOOD OF MINNESOTA, NORTH DAKOTA, AND SOUTH DAKOTA

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Planned Parenthood of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota (PPMNS) on the 85th anniversary of its founding.

In 1928, Minnesota's first clinic was established, providing women with access to reproductive care. Since then, additional clinics in Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota have opened ensuring women, men and their families have access to affordable, comprehensive care. Each year, more than 60,000 patients access a broad range of health services including preventative screenings, reproductive care, and routine exams.

Over the past 85 years, the caring staff, advocates, and volunteers have been invaluable to the success of PPMNS. Their dedication ensures that women and their families have access to the health services and information they need regardless of race, gender, or economic status.

Mr. Speaker, please join me to honor the critical work of Planned Parenthood of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota as we celebrate their 85th anniversary today.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE BRAVERY OF UNITED STATES ARMY CORPORAL WONG SUEY LEE

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor United States Army Corporal Wong Suey Lee, a veteran who resides in my district of Southern Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and esteem that I request this body recognize Corporal Lee for his courageous service and tremendous bravery.

Corporal Lee is a veteran of the Korean War and saw firsthand the brutality of battle. He was one of more than 1 million heroic Americans who committed to support their nation in a time of war halfway around the world to face an unknown enemy in a strange land. Six months into his service with the U.S. Army, and nearly a year after the communist invasion of South Korea, Corporal Lee faced mortar and small arms fire to rally his platoon and continue the advance of his unit toward the Iron Triangle, a key communications and transportation hub in the Yonchon-Cheorwon area of the Korean peninsula.

Through testimonials by his fellow soldiers, a stirring picture has been painted of what transpired on June 3rd, 1951 and of Corporal

Lee's fierce determination and grit. As point man for the lead platoon of the lead company of his assault battalion, Corporal Lee encountered a number of enemy positions, drawing heavy fire and killing an enemy soldier.

Having cleared enemy forces from two entrenched positions, taking fire from small arms and mortar rounds, Corporal Lee gallantly exposed himself to that fire and rallied his squad leaders to take on a third enemy position upon a nearby steep hill. Corporal Lee tended to the wounded around him, as the platoon took aim and neutralized the enemy on the small hill. He then scaled that hill, dodging grenades and coming face-to-face with enemy soldiers, killing three at point-blank range.

From the portrait laid out in the testimony of his many colleagues, it is clear that Corporal Lee was instrumental in keeping together his platoon and showed immense leadership in the face of incredible hardship. Indeed, two days later, Corporal Lee was severely wounded in battle and returned to the United States.

Everyone in this great nation owes Corporal Lee and his family a debt of gratitude for his selfless sacrifice. I call on my fellow colleagues and all Americans to rise today and thank Corporal Lee for helping to secure freedom for millions of people worldwide.

IN RECOGNITION OF GEORGIAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the people of Georgia on the conduct of the October 27 presidential election. International observers, including the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, characterized the election as "positive and transparent," noting that freedom of expression, movement and assembly were respected, and that candidates were able to campaign without restriction.

The election's successful conduct—and the pending peaceful transfer of power—demonstrate the growing maturity of Georgia's democracy. This is an important indication that Georgia is indeed ready to initial an Association Agreement with the European Union at the November 28–29 Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius, Lithuania. The Association Agreement, which includes deep and comprehensive free trade provisions, will give the Georgian people new tools and new incentives to strengthen their democratic institutions, fight corruption, and uphold the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I also congratulate Giorgi Margvelashvili on his electoral victory. I call on all political parties to work together to advance Georgia's interests and the interests of the Georgian people.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference.

This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, October 29, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 30

9:15 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 1562, to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, S. 1557, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals, S. 1561, to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve provisions relating to the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees, H.R. 2094, to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements), S. 1302, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans, H.R. 2747, to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title, and the nominations of Michael Keith Yudin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, and James Cole, Jr., of New York, to be General Counsel, both of the Department of Education, and Chai Rachel Feldblum, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and any pending nominations.

SD-430

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment

To hold hearings to examine the "JOBS Act" at a year and a half, focusing on assessing progress and unmet opportunities.

SD-538

Conferees

Meeting of conferees on S. Con. Res. 8, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary lev-

els for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

HC-5

11 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership.

SD-215

1 p.m.

Conferees

Meeting of conferees on H.R. 2642, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018.

1100-LHOB

2 p.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine pending health care and benefits legislation.

SR-418

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To receive a briefing on the U.S. Civil Rights Movement, focusing on how the movement has impacted Europe and the continuing work of the United States in advancing human rights for minorities in Europe.

RHOB-2255

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 235, to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, S. 611, to make a technical amendment to the T'uf Shur Bien Preservation Trust Area Act, and S. 920, to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine S. 1074, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Easter Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe, S. 1132, to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and S. 161, to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana.

SD-628

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of John B. Owens, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Matthew Frederick Leitman, Judith Ellen Levy, Laurie J. Michelson, and Linda Vivienne Parker, all to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, and Peter Joseph Kadzik, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SD-226

OCTOBER 31

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine housing finance reform, focusing on a government guarantee for mortgage-backed securities.

SD-538

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider S. Res. 268, condemning the September 2013 terrorist attack at the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, and reaffirming United States support for the people and Government of Kenya, and the nominations of Gregory B. Starr, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security, Mark Bradley Childress, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the United Republic of Tanzania, Thomas Frederick Daughton, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Namibia, Matthew T. Harrington, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Lesotho, Eunice S. Reddick, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Niger, John Hoover, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Sierra Leone, Michael Stephen Hoza, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cameroon, Tomasz P. Malinowski, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Crystal Nix-Hines, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Pamela K. Hamamoto, of Hawaii, to be Representative to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador, Philip S. Goldberg, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines, Robert O. Blake, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia, Karen Clark Stanton, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste, Timothy M. Broas, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Donald Lu, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Albania, Robert A. Sherman, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Portuguese Republic, Anne W. Patterson, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern Affairs, Adam M. Scheinman, of Virginia, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the rank of Ambassador, Rose Eilene Gottemoeller, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security, Frank A. Rose, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary for Verification and Compliance, Dwight L. Bush, Sr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco, James Walter Brewster, Jr., of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, Brian A. Nichols, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru, and Carlos Roberto Moreno, of California, to be Ambassador to Belize, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine attaining a quality degree, focusing on innovations to improve student success.

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine government clearances and background checks, focusing on the Navy Yard tragedy.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 42, to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers, S. 822, to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and the nominations of Robert Leon Wilkins, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Brian J. Davis, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, Timothy L. Brooks, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, James Donato, Beth Labson Freeman, and Vince Girdhari Chhabria, all to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, Pedro A. Delgado Hernandez, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, Carolyn B. McHugh, of Utah, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Pamela L. Reeves, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee, and James Maxwell Moody, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

SD-226

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine Syria.

SD-419

2 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Daniel W. Yohannes, of Colorado, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador, Department of State.

SD-419

NOVEMBER 6

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Bureau of Prisons and cost-effective strategies for reducing recidivism.

SD-226

NOVEMBER 7

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the impact of sequestration on the national defense; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217, following the open session.

SD-G50

NOVEMBER 20

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining

To hold hearings to examine S. 182, to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city

of Anchorage, Alaska, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversion interest to the City, S. 483, to designate the Berryessa Snow Mountain National Conservation Area in the State of California, S. 771, to provide to the Secretary of the Interior a mechanism to cancel contracts for the sale of materials CA-20139 and CA-22901, S. 776, to establish the Columbine-Hondo Wilderness in the State of New Mexico, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of National Forest System land in the State, S. 841, to designate certain Federal land in the San Juan National Forest in the State of Colorado as wilderness, S. 1305, to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado, S. 1341, to modify the Forest Service Recreation Residence Program as the program applies to units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain by implementing a simple, equitable, and predictable procedure for determining cabin user fees, S. 1414, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, S. 1415, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and S. 1479, to address the forest health, public safety, and wildlife habitat threat presented by the risk of wildfire, including catastrophic wildfire, on National Forest System land and public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to expedite forest management projects relating to hazardous fuels reduction, forest health, and economic development.

SD-366

SENATE—Tuesday, October 29, 2013

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, how great You are. You are clothed with majesty and glory, riding on the wings of the wind. From the rising of the Sun to its setting, we lift our hearts in gratitude for You have done marvelously.

Lord, continue to sustain our Senators with Your constant love and faithfulness, answering them when they call to You in prayer. Help them to make every effort to do Your will on Earth, giving You their doubts and fears as they trust You to order their steps. May they realize that weakness provides an opportunity for Your strength to be revealed.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 29, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks the Republican leader

or his designee will move to proceed to S.J. Res. 26, which is a joint resolution of disapproval regarding the debt ceiling. The time until 12:30 will be equally divided and controlled.

The Senate will recess from 12:30 to 2:15 p.m. for our weekly business meetings of each caucus.

At 2:15 Senators should expect two rollcall votes, first on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 26 and, second, a cloture vote on the nomination of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., to be general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term for 4 years.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1592

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told S. 1592 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1592) to provide for a delay of the individual mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until the American Health Benefit Exchanges are functioning properly.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to this legislation at the present time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed upon the calendar.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today the Senate will proceed to consider the motion to proceed to a resolution of disapproval filed by the Republican leader, which would cause the country to default on its debts for the first time in its history. The Democrats will oppose this motion and vote to preserve the full faith and credit of our great country. I remind my Republican friends that every Democrat and 27 Republicans in the Senate, as well as 285 Members of the House of Representatives, already voted to do the right thing and pay the Nation's debts.

I look forward to quickly dispensing with this Republican resolution, which would risk America's economic security, as well as a global depression. This vote will take place this afternoon, after our weekly business meetings.

I want to spend a little bit of time talking about nominations. Directly after the vote on the default legislation, we will have the vote to break a filibuster of President Obama's nomination of Richard Griffin to serve as

general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

There have already been 67 of President Obama's nominations filibustered. Let's just vote on these nominations. I cannot imagine why it would be a good thing for this country, or the Senate, to not allow us to go forward on the nomination. If you don't like him, vote against him, but don't stop the debate from going forward.

If cloture is invoked, there will be up to 8 hours of debate under the new rules we have established in the Senate. We will have 4 hours and the minority will have 4 hours. So I think that would be appropriate.

Few Americans are aware of the job that the National Labor Relations Board does. It looks out for the rights of millions of U.S. workers every day—Democratic workers, Republican workers, independents, tea party workers—regardless of whether they are in a union.

Mr. Griffin has extensive experience in employment law. He is highly respected by his fellow labor lawyers on both the union and the business sides. As general counsel for the NLRB, he will safeguard fair compensation and working conditions for all American workers.

This week the Senate will also vote on a number of other crucial executive nominations, some of which have been stalled for more than a year. The Senate will consider the nomination of Katherine Archuleta to serve as Director of the Office of Personnel Management. That is an extremely important position. She started her career in public service as an elementary school teacher. She will be the agency's first Hispanic director. Her desire to serve is earnest. This is what she said:

You do it [as a public service] because you have a deep passion for public good, for civic engagement.

She has worked in both the Transportation and Energy Departments under President Clinton. She served as chief of staff to Labor Secretary Hilda Solis for 3 years. She is eminently qualified. Yet Ms. Archuleta is the first OPM Director to be filibustered in the entire history of this agency.

This week the Senate will also consider the stalled nomination of Alan Estevez to be Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense. This man's nomination has been stalled for 402 days. He will be responsible for a \$170 billion logistics budget—\$170 billion. That is a year. This budget supports our men and women in uniform as well as millions of machines that take them where they want to go. He specialized in military

logistics for more than 10 years. It is unfortunate that Republicans will hold up confirmation of such a crucial Defense Department nomination.

I am told most of it is that it is held up for an unrelated matter, dealing with some other issue. It is just wrong. If you do not like this guy, stand and say why you don't like him and vote against him. Don't stop us from moving forward on the nomination.

Most of the opposition to this man, who has been held up for 200 days, is, I am told, by the senior Senator from Texas.

The junior Senator from Texas has placed a hold on another nomination, a man by the name of Tom Wheeler to be Democratic member of the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, a very important agency. In addition to writing two books, Mr. Wheeler has founded several technological companies—important companies. He cofound the largest online targeted news service and helped develop the U.S. Government's telecommunications policy.

President Obama nominated Tom Wheeler as well as Republican Michael O'Rielly to fill two vacant seats on the FCC; so what is stopping us from filling these vacancies with a bipartisan pair of nominees? Listen to this. The Senator from Texas has stalled the nomination because he opposes legislation proposed by Democrats in Congress that would require shadowy groups that spend millions on political advertising to disclose their donors.

This next one is really a doozy: the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury. It is an extremely important job. This man is qualified. He has run the Office of Management and Budget. He has been the President's Chief of Staff. He is now Secretary of the Treasury. What a fine, fine man—Jack Lew. Jack Lew, even though he is the Secretary of the Treasury of this great country, cannot go to meetings that other finance ministers from around the world can go to. Why? Because Republicans are holding up his nominations to all these important bank boards, finance boards, the International Monetary Fund. He is supposed to be there. He cannot go.

He is a talented and dedicated public servant. He has already been approved by the Senate, confirmed by the Senate. Every Treasury Secretary serves as the U.S. representative on the international bank boards and offers input on America's position on global financial matters. That is his job. He cannot do that because of what I have just said. It is an embarrassment that we have not acted more swiftly to confirm him in this role. To think that we have to file cloture on this. Yet the junior Senator from Kentucky has subjected this nomination to partisan wrangling—and others have joined with him, I assume—as he threatens to do with the nomination of Janet Yellen to serve as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve.

The Presiding Officer and others who serve in this body and have served in the House of Representatives have served with a fine public servant by the name of MEL WATT. I got to know MEL WATT when he was chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus. He would come over and visit with me every month or so—a fine man. He has represented North Carolina's 12th Congressional District since 1993, and as senior Member of the House Financial Services Committee he understands the mistakes that led to the housing crisis.

He also has proposed legislation to crack down on the worst abuses in mortgage lending and helped to pass the Dodd-Frank bill to prevent predatory lending. By any measure Congressman WATT is qualified to help struggling homeowners recover from the worst downturn in generations. My Republican colleagues should give him the up-or-down vote he deserves, not filibuster him.

I know some Republicans do not like Dodd-Frank. Obviously, they didn't mind the abuses that took place that led to the crashing of Wall Street. But he should not be punished for that.

At a time when America faces difficult economic times at home and various threats abroad, it is crucial the Senate confirm these talented and dedicated individuals to serve in the executive branch of government. Let us vote on these nominations. These normally easily confirmable positions should not have a filibuster. Not long ago I can remember Republicans who, in this body, were concerned because they could not get the votes they wanted on their nominees for President Bush. They spread on this record, clearly, that it is a right of the President to choose the players on his team. We should return to that custom, remove partisanship from the confirmation process and ensure highly qualified nominees receive the fair and speedy confirmation they deserve.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

OBAMACARE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I think at this point Senators from both parties can agree that healthcare.gov is a rolling disaster. Every day seems to bring more near-comic calamities. We hear about visitors being told things like their wife is really their daughter or that they have multiple spouses or that they are unable to apply "due to current incarceration."

Unsurprisingly, just 12 percent of Americans think the rollout has gone well. That is less than the 14 percent of Americans who believe in Bigfoot.

Those who have succeeded in actually enrolling in a plan are vastly outnumbered by those who have lost their plan. The real tragedy is that many who have succeeded are finding out the product is actually worse than the Web site.

The only thing the Web site seems to be good at right now is creating punchlines for late-night comedians. It is almost as though Americans are being forced to live through a real-life "Saturday Night Live" sketch. If you caught last week's opener, it is getting harder to tell the ObamaCare headlines from the ObamaCare punchlines these days.

Paper applications, 800 numbers, applying by fax—ObamaCare appears to be leading us boldly into the 1980s. Remember, before this thing launched, the administration swore up and down that ObamaCare was ready to go. Democratic leaders in Congress told Americans that the law's implementation was fabulous and that ObamaCare was wonderful. The President reassured everyone it was working the way it was supposed to, and of course Washington Democrats bragged about their fancy new Web site, the Web site that cost taxpayers—\$100 million? \$200 million? \$300 million? No one is quite sure. That is just one of the unanswered questions we hope they will clarify soon.

To be fair, the President likes to say that ObamaCare is about more than just a Web site. He is absolutely right, and that is why fixing a Web site will not solve the larger problem. The larger problem is ObamaCare itself. The larger problem is what the few people who actually have signed up for coverage have discovered about this law. The larger problem is how ObamaCare is hurting people out there.

It is about college graduates and middle-class families getting hit with massive premium increases they cannot afford. It is about workers seeing their hours cut and their paychecks shrink because of this law. It is about millions of Americans who will lose their current health coverage because of ObamaCare, despite the President's promises.

According to news reports, the Obama administration knew for at least 3 years that millions of Americans would not be able to keep their health care coverage. The President's press secretary basically admitted yesterday that Americans would lose coverage too. Remember, this is the same President who said:

If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period . . . No one will take it away, no matter what.

This is just one of the many reasons Americans feel betrayed. One woman who was quoted in the Los Angeles Times put it this way:

All we have been hearing for the last 3 years is if you like your policy, you can keep

it . . . [well] I'm infuriated because I was lied to.

Here is how one North Carolinian put it to NBC News:

Everybody's worried about whether the website works or not, but that's fixable. That's just the tip of the iceberg. This stuff isn't fixable.

That was after he lost a \$228-a-month plan and was faced with a choice of taking a comparable plan for \$1,208 or the best option he could find on the exchanges, one for \$948 a month.

After looking at all of that, he said: "I'm sitting here looking at this, thinking we ought to pay the fine and get insurance when we're sick."

Americans up and down the country are beginning to experience the cost of ObamaCare firsthand, and they are realizing they are the ones stuck with the bill. It is not fair, it is not right, and Republicans are going to keep fighting to get our constituents relief from this partisan law.

Of course, the most logical course would be to stop this train wreck and start over, but Washington Democrats still appear more interested in protecting the President's namesake and legacy than protecting their constituents from this law. I hope that will change because we cannot move forward without Democrats.

We have seen some signs that at least some Democrats are coming around slowly—slowly—much more slowly than we would like. I am happy to engage in discussions to see where we might find common ground. Hopefully, we will eventually get to the increasingly obvious endgame: Repeal, followed by true bipartisan health care reform. It may be universally accepted that healthcare.gov is a disaster, but as the President reminds us, that disaster does not exist in a vacuum. The failure of the ObamaCare Web site is emblematic of the larger failure of ObamaCare itself and of the kind of problems we can expect if Washington Democrats continue their stubborn defense of this partisan law.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Politicians regularly come to Washington promising fiscal responsibility, but too often they can't agree to cut spending when it counts, and that is why the Budget Control Act is such a big deal. Since Congress passed the BCA with overwhelming bipartisan majorities in 2011, Washington has actually reduced the level of government spending for 2 years running. That is the first time this has happened since the Korean war.

The BCA savings are such a big deal, in fact, that the President campaigned on it endlessly in 2012. He bragged about the bipartisan cuts in Colorado and in Iowa. He trumpeted the reductions from coast to coast, telling audiences from California to Baltimore that he "signed \$2 trillion of spending cuts into law."

As our Democratic friends like to say these days, elections matter, and the President explicitly staked his reelection on the back of these bipartisan spending cuts.

Look at the exit polls from November. A majority of Americans said the government was doing too much. About two-thirds said raising taxes to cut the deficit was a nonstarter. Compared to ObamaCare, which more voters said they wanted to repeal, these levels of support are striking.

If our friends on the other side want to keep trying to claim an electoral mandate for retaining ObamaCare—contradicted by the facts as that might be—using their own logic, we would then have to call the mandate for reducing the size of government a supermandate. That is why their new plan to undo the cuts the President campaigned on and increase the debt is so outrageous.

We hear that the senior Senator from New York will soon announce a proposal to give the President permanent power to borrow more; in other words, he wants to extend the debt ceiling permanently by going around Congress. Let me repeat that. The so-called Schumer-Obama plan is a plan to permanently hand the President a credit card without spending limits and without lifting a finger to address the national debt. It is truly outrageous, especially when we consider that our debt is now \$17 trillion, which makes us look a lot like a European country. We have to get our debt under control before we move any further down the road to Greece or Spain, and time is not on our side.

I hear the Senator from New York is going to try and sell his proposal as a "McConnell" plan. I appreciate the attempt at a PR gimmick, but there are two huge differences between the Schumer-Obama plan and what I have proposed in the past.

First, Schumer-Obama would raise the debt ceiling permanently. I reject that idea entirely. Second, unlike Schumer-Obama, I believe that increases in the debt ceiling should be accompanied by reforms. That is what we did in 2011 when Congress raised the debt ceiling in return for enacting \$2 trillion in bipartisan spending control—the spending control the President endlessly campaigned on last year. That is the real "McConnell" plan.

If the Senator from New York is interested in working with me to enact another \$2 trillion in bipartisan cuts, then let's get down to brass tacks. The American people would love to see us working in a bipartisan way to actually help them. If he insists on pushing the Schumer-Obama plan, he is not going to find any dance partners on this side of the aisle. Handing the President a permanent blank check, increasing the size of government, and

trying to overturn the most significant bipartisan accomplishment of the Obama years is a nonstarter.

Our debt is a serious problem. I know Kentuckians think so. Similar to Americans all across the country, they understand it is completely unsustainable over the long run, and they understand it is standing in the way of jobs and economic growth today.

Let's shelve the gimmicks and the blank checks and get to work on bipartisan plans to get spending under control. That is what our constituents expect.

DISAPPROVAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND THE DEBT LIMIT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S.J. Res. 26.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion to proceed.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 223, S.J. Res. 26, a joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as submitted under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 on October 17, 2013.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, before I make my remarks, I understand the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has been waiting to make some remarks himself. I ask unanimous consent that he go first, and then if Senator BAUCUS is here, he goes second, and I go third, but if Senator BAUCUS is not here, I will go second.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah. If that suits his convenience, I appreciate that courtesy very much. I will not take more than 8 or 10 minutes.

The President should ask the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius, to resign her position because of the disastrous rollout of ObamaCare.

Taxpayers have spent \$400 million to create exchanges that—after 3½ years—still don't work. As a result, the White House had to announce last night that the key enforcement mechanism to their individual mandate—a

\$95 fine that increases every year—will be waived until the end of March of next year. That may be fine for those currently without insurance, but for the millions being forced into the exchanges and losing their current insurance, there is no relief, just higher prices, a likely lapse in insurance coverage, a broken Web site, and broken promises.

We already know of 1.5 million Americans who are losing their policies because starting January 1, many insurance policies they now have will not be legal under ObamaCare, and because the exchange will not be working, they will not be able to choose another policy. This chart gives an example of what is going on. Just in three States—California, Florida, and New Jersey—there are 1.4 million insurance policies that will not be valid after January 1 because they are not legal under ObamaCare.

Compare that number, 1.4 million, to the number of Americans in those three States who have reportedly applied or enrolled on the Web site for insurance, 7 or 8 percent of all the people who will lose their current policy have applied for a different policy through the exchange. That is what is going on with families across this country as people worry about health care.

These are policies in the individual market. There are 19 million Americans in the individual market. We also heard on NBC News over the last couple of days that the Obama administration knew that 47 to 60 percent of the policies in the individual market would not be legally offered under ObamaCare. Yet they still said to people: "If you like your insurance, you can keep it."

At some point there has to be accountability. Expecting this Secretary to be able to fix what she has not been able to fix during the last 3½ years is unrealistic. It is throwing good money after bad. It is time for her to resign and for someone else to take charge. No private sector chief executive would escape accountability after such a poor performance. The principle of accountability is not and should not be foreign to the public sector.

Admiral Hyman Rickover, father of the nuclear navy, told his submarine captains they were not only accountable for their ships, they were also accountable for the nuclear reactors on their ships. If anything went wrong with the reactor, their career in the Navy was over, the Admiral said. As a result of that dose of accountability, since the 1950s, there has never been a death as a result of a problem with a nuclear naval submarine reactor.

Americans deserve that kind of accountability in the implementation of the new health care law. Instead, the Secretary appears not even to have told the President about known problems with the ObamaCare Web site in

the months and days leading up to the launch. Despite repeated requests, she has refused to tell Congress or the public the reasons the ObamaCare Web site continues to fail, while insisting on more time and an undisclosed amount of money to fix it.

Before the Internet, RCA knew how many records Elvis was selling every day, Ford knew how many cars they were selling every day, and McDonald's could tell us how many hamburgers they were selling each day. Yet, here we are in the advanced stages of the Internet age and, under Secretary Sebelius's leadership, the Obama administration will not tell us how many Americans have tried to sign up for ObamaCare, or how many have actually signed up, or what level of insurance they have purchased, or in what ZIP Code they live. Not only will they not tell us, they have done their best to keep us from finding out.

With WikiLeaks and Edward Snowden spilling our beans every day, what is happening on the ObamaCare exchanges is the best kept secret left in Washington, DC. The National Security Agency could learn some lessons from Secretary Sebelius.

Later today I will ask unanimous consent to approve a six-page bill I introduced yesterday to require the administration to answer these questions every week. Secretary Sebelius is not responsible for enacting ObamaCare, but she has been responsible for 3½ years for implementing it. Now many Americans have only a few weeks to purchase new insurance or be without health insurance. To expect the Secretary to correct in a few weeks what she has not been able to do in 3½ years is unrealistic.

It is time for the President to ask the Secretary of Health and Human Services to resign.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, during the debt limit impasse in 2006, then-Senator Obama stated:

The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. Leadership means the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership, and Americans deserve better.

That was former Senator Barack Obama.

At that time our gross debt was \$8.3 trillion. It is now well above twice that, currently standing at \$17.1 trillion, which is over 100 percent of the size of our economy.

During that same 2006 debt limit debate, then-Senator BIDEN said:

My vote against the debt limit increase cannot change the fact that we have incurred this debt already and will no doubt incur more. It is a statement that I refuse to be associated with the policies that brought us to this point.

That was then-Senator BIDEN. Things have certainly changed since 2006.

Now President Obama and Vice President JOE BIDEN preside over an administration which tells us that raising the debt limit is merely a matter of paying our bills and is a reflection of decisions made in Congress. Yet while it is ostensibly true that the Congress has the power to raise the debt limit, it is not true that Congress makes spending decisions unilaterally, with no role being played by the executive branch. No amount of spending can be enacted without the President signing it into law.

In addition, the President submits a budget every year. The White House also issues policy statements and veto threats on spending bills on a more or less frequent basis. And, of course, every administration works with Congress to enact its domestic agenda which inherently includes setting priorities on Federal spending. So, in short, the commonly repeated notion that questions surrounding spending and the debt limit are Congress's and Congress's alone to answer is simply an attempt by this administration to avoid accountability on these issues.

Ultimately, regardless of what President Obama and those in his administration are saying now, both Congress and the executive branch are to blame for our current predicament.

The President has exercised his authority to suspend the debt limit under the Continuing Appropriations Act of 2014, which he signed into law on October 17. On October 16, public debt subject to the limit was around \$16.7 trillion. On October 17—the very next day—public debt subject to the limit was over \$17 trillion. In one day, Treasury increased the debt subject to the limit by over \$328 billion. Let me repeat that. The debt increased by over \$328 billion in a single day. That brings the increase in total public debt under this administration to more than \$6.4 trillion, an amount that is, by all accounts, unprecedented.

Echoing earlier sentiments of then-Senator BIDEN, I refuse to be associated with the policies that brought us to this point.

The debt limit debate provides us with an opportunity to reexamine our Nation's fiscal course and take steps to correct it. Sadly, we have a President who appears unwilling to have that conversation. Instead, he apparently wants to press forward, full steam ahead, on our already unsustainable course, saddling future generations with unheard-of debts and broken entitlement promises in the process. Unfortunately, as the Congressional Budget Office has made clear, over the course of President Obama's administration, the Federal Government has recorded the largest budget deficits relative to the size of the economy since 1946, causing our debt to soar, as we all

know. Federal debt as a percent of the economy's annual output is higher than at any point in U.S. history, except for a brief period around World War II.

CBO makes three other points equally clear. No. 1, our debt path is unsustainable, threatening our economy and putting us at risk of a fiscal crisis. No. 2, the root of our fiscal problem is Federal spending, not a lack of revenue. No. 3, the main source of our spending problem is our unsustainable entitlement programs. That being the case, any serious talk about raising the debt limit must include a real, concrete discussion about entitlement reform.

As every credible analyst tells us, we need to face the fiscal facts and enact serious structural reforms to our entitlement programs. So far, President Obama has been unwilling to even engage in this discussion. These days, every fiscal discussion with the White House begins and ends with demands for additional tax hikes to fuel even more spending. I guarantee it will be spending, not paying down the national debt or paying down what we owe; it will be to spend more.

Of course, the President will occasionally resurrect offers he has made in past failed fiscal negotiations to include small entitlement changes, including, for example, movement to a different price index for certain cost-of-living adjustments, but at the same time the President and his administration have made clear that even those small entitlement changes will only be on the table if tax hikes are delivered first. That is the President's precondition for even entertaining tax reform or entitlement reform, even on the heels of a more than \$630 billion tax hike at the beginning of this year and another \$1 trillion in revenue delivered courtesy of ObamaCare.

Entitlement reform is not an option, it is a necessity.

Structural reforms to our health care entitlements should not hinge on another tax-and-spend operation. And structural reforms to Social Security should not be held hostage to another tax hike.

Earlier this year I personally presented to the President, in detail and in writing—again, I emphasize I personally gave him this—five reform proposals relating to Medicare and Medicaid that have received bipartisan support—Democratic and Republican support—in the past. I asked him to consider the proposals and have since asked members of his administration to likewise give the proposals consideration.

By the way, when we had our supper at the White House in the family dining room, I brought it up again. By the way, I brought it up with the Secretary of the Treasury over and over. I did not wait until an impending debt limit de-

bate. Rather, I put my proposals forward in a good-faith effort to begin timely discussions. Unfortunately, thus far, I have not received even the slightest response, while the clock on Medicare and Medicaid keeps ticking, and both of them are running more and more deficits as we speak. By the way, the five points were bipartisan. They were bipartisan measures that both Democrats and Republicans supported.

The situation with Social Security isn't much better. The trustees of the trust funds embedded in the Social Security system, including top administration officials such as the Treasury Secretary, have, in no uncertain terms, urged Congress to act quickly on reforming the retirement and the disability insurance programs to move them toward sustainability. Quite simply, it would be folly to approve of yet another debt limit increase without also working to address these programs, which are the main drivers of our debts and deficits.

Therefore, I disapprove of the President's exercise of an authority to suspend the debt limit, and I urge all of my colleagues to similarly disapprove.

The recent debt limit impasse and the impasse of 2011 also provided a good deal of information about lack of accountability of the Treasury Department and of our regulatory agencies.

I currently serve as the ranking member on the Senate Finance Committee which has oversight responsibility toward the Treasury Department. To fulfill those responsibilities, I have been asking questions of Treasury about debt and cash management procedures, and I have repeatedly been stonewalled by the Treasury Department. I don't know that I have ever seen this happen before in either Republican or Democratic administrations.

For example, when we have approached the debt limit, I have asked questions about how much cash our Nation has in the till, only to find that Treasury won't tell me and that they prefer the Congress rely on estimates from think tanks and Wall Street firms.

Furthermore, during the most recent debt limit impasses, administration officials were busy frightening seniors, our troops, and financial market participants about whether they would be paid in the event the Treasury were to run out of cash. Officials also identified threats of massive financial instability stemming from a breach of the debt limit and of potential disruption from a downgrade of the rating on U.S. Government securities.

So, naturally, I asked Treasury and, in fact, every voting member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, or FSOC, to provide Congress and the American people information regarding the plans they had in place to respond to such catastrophes. Out of close to 20

letters I sent to FSOC members, I received only 3 responses. Apparently, the FSOC, which was empowered by the so-called Dodd-Frank Act to monitor and respond to merging threats to financial stability, does not identify or share response plans with respect to any threat that could emerge as a result of government policies.

That being the case, I believe we should strip FSOC of any notional oversight of financial stability and call it what it really is: another unrestrained regulatory agency created only to enact additional regulations.

After the fact, we have found that Treasury and some financial regulators had plans for how to respond to a debt limit breach or a ratings downgrade. Yet none of these plans were shared with Congress.

Put simply, if we are going to empower a Federal regulatory body such as the FSOC to develop contingency plans to respond to threats to financial stability, then that body should be required to share those plans with the American people. Sadly, thus far that has not been the case.

Another thing I have learned from our recent debt limit impasses is that we need to take a closer look at the Treasury Department's use of so-called extraordinary measures, which have become all too ordinary. These "extraordinary measures" are merely ways for the Treasury Department to temporarily delay facing a debt limit increase by issuing shadow debt. For example, Treasury can simply declare a debt issuance suspension period and stop issuing debt that it normally would issue while instead effectively telling the lender: Don't worry, I will pay you back later with interest. I believe the authority to use these types of extraordinary measures needs to be reexamined.

As you can see, Mr. President, there are a number of problems that need to be confronted with regard to our Nation's ever-growing debt. As I said, we need to work together to address our Nation's unsustainable entitlement programs; otherwise, any effort to rein in our debts and deficits will amount to little more than tinkering around the edges.

In addition, we need to improve information sharing between Congress and the executive branch on issues relating to our debt. The Treasury Department and our financial regulators have a lot to do with maintaining the depth, liquidity, and efficiency of the market for Treasury securities, and Congress has a duty to exercise oversight over these functions. Unfortunately, the administration, far more often than not, opts to keep Congress in the dark on these issues. And, the Treasury and financial regulators choose to keep their plans secret. This has to stop.

By using his authority to suspend the debt limit through February 7, 2014,

President Obama has opted not to confront any of these serious issues. Instead, he is leading us even further down a path that we already know is unsustainable. That being the case, I plan to vote in favor of the resolution of disapproval of this debt limit suspension, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Having said all this, we are in a really big mess on ObamaCare—or if you want to call it the “Affordable Care Act” that nobody believes is affordable at all. They know it is going to lead us right into even more unsustainability than we have right now. I suspect that over time our brilliant people in the IT world, the information technology world, many of whom I know personally, will find some way to resolve what really has been a horrible, horrible situation with the broken introduction of the ObamaCare website. We all know it is horrible, and I hope they can resolve that. I think it is going to be hard because it is such a mess. I hope Mr. Zients is successful in his efforts to try to cure the broken system, but that does not cure the faults or problems with ObamaCare as a whole.

What about the 30-hour rule? A lot of people, a lot of businesses, especially small businesses today, are making sure their employees do not work more than 30 hours because if they do, it triggers their having to pay what appear to many to be outrageous health care costs. That is just one thing, and that is not going to be easily resolved because the bill is such a stupid bill. It was stupid to begin with. We knew it would not work to begin with. We made the case that it would not work, and frankly we are here in this really ridiculous posture where we have been stymied because of an ineptly implemented introduction of a flawed law, and there is certainly some incompetency here. I hope they can resolve that, but that still does not resolve the 30-hour rule, which is very important.

How about the 50-employee rule? A lot of businesses that would have expanded, small businesses that would have grown, that would have tested the market and really gotten going, do not want to employ more than 49 people and trigger a massive sudden cost to their businesses.

These are problems that basically are unsolvable under the bill, and they may be even larger problems than those we have with regard to the website problems I have been mentioning.

ObamaCare is full of cliffs: to implicit tax rates; to hours of work; to numbers of employees. And those cliffs have led and will lead to more economic damage.

That is just the beginning. I could speak for hours about what is wrong with this lousy Act called ObamaCare. I wish some of my colleagues on the other side would start saying what

they actually know. They know it is a lousy Act. They know it is something that is not going to work. And if it does—if they continue to maintain that it has to work—it is going to be a massive cost to society, with less effective health care than we have ever had before.

It is not just these technical problems that we have to solve; it is the economic problems that arise from ObamaCare. And I know what is going to happen. Within the next year or two, our friends on the other side—or should I say the White House in particular—President Obama is going to throw his hands in the air and say: It is not working. We have to go to a single-payer system, meaning socialized medicine. Anybody who believes that is the way to go—it sounds easy, but anybody who believes that is the way to go has not looked at socialized medicine around the world. They can point to some instances where it has worked for a short time, but over time it results in less health care, higher costs, and stultification of what really could be a great health care system.

I want to solve these problems in health care, but I believe they ought to be solved on a bipartisan basis and not just a partisan basis, which is where we are with regard to ObamaCare—or should I say the “Affordable Care Act.”

There are a number of people in this body and in the other body who, like me, have worked in health care areas and on health care issues ever since they have been in the Congress who would be willing to sit down and get this resolved. But I have to say there was no real consultation, there was no real effort to work in a bipartisan way, as far as I could see, even at the lower levels in Congress, in developing the partisan product called ObamaCare. It was just they were going to pass this and that is the way it will be. Now they are stuck with it—should I say they are not really the ones who are stuck with it; it is the American people and the American taxpayers who are stuck with it. We have to, sooner or later, get together to resolve this problem without going to socialized medicine.

I have talked to a number of doctors, health care providers, who are going to get out of the profession. They do not want to be governed by this type of governance. Frankly, you are going to find that if we go to socialized medicine, doctors are not going to work more than 6 or 8 hours a day, where today they will work as long as it takes to serve people who need their help. We are going to find a real dearth of doctors. We are going to find a real dearth of the ability to provide the health care people need. We are going to start doing what that payment advisory board really is set up for, and that is rationing. Once that starts, the American people are going to rebel.

It is going to happen sooner or later if we do not get our friends on the

other side to at least work with us on finding some resolution. I have to say that we are working on our side to come up with a resolution, and I hope I can interest our colleagues on the other side. I admit that we can do a lot better than we are doing around here. We can do it in a much better bipartisan way than we are doing it. I think some people get a joy out of creating battles around here when we should get a joy out of resolving problems.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Utah and appreciate his very eloquent remarks. He has been a great leader on health care issues for a lot of years around here and was a fierce opponent of ObamaCare when it passed and laid out very compelling arguments at the time about why we should not adopt this law. Unfortunately, for the people of this country, many of the predictions he made are coming out to be true. I appreciate the leadership he provides for us as a member of the Finance Committee and his continued advocacy for policies that are good for consumers in this country when it comes to the issue of health care.

This Friday marks a full month since healthcare.gov went live. This is the Web site that, in conjunction with the new health care law, was promised as a solution to all of the problems in the delivery and cost of health care in this country.

To be frank, I do not think anybody on either side of the political aisle would deny this fact: These past 29 days have been nothing short of a disaster. The administration will not disclose how many Americans were actually able to enroll in plans. They are not forthcoming when it comes to disclosing exactly what the problem is with the Web site, other than calling the problems glitches. Well, glitches refer to temporary problems that are easily remedied. The problems with the health care law cannot merely be called glitches. The problems go deeper than technical problems on a Web site which, by the way, cost \$400 million to develop.

As the President said last week, ObamaCare “. . . is not just a website. It's much more.” Well, that is true. It is much more. It is a fundamentally flawed piece of legislation that is resulting in real-life consequences for middle-class Americans.

My colleagues and I, the Senator from Utah and others, have been speaking about the broken promises of this legislation since it came to the floor of the Senate almost 4 years ago. We know this law will not work as promised. Unfortunately, thousands of Americans are realizing it too as they

face higher costs and canceled insurance plans.

Many Americans are experiencing sticker shock when it comes to their health care costs. Middle-class Americans already struggling to make ends meet are now facing steep premium increases in the ObamaCare exchanges.

Last month, Avik Roy of Forbes reported on a recent study that said:

ObamaCare will increase insurance rates for younger men by an average of 97 to 99% and for younger women by an average of 55 to 62%.

In my home State of South Dakota, that is more than just a statistic; that is a grim reality facing thousands of young men and women.

By comparing a typical low-cost plan for a healthy 30-year-old person in my State of South Dakota this year with a bronze plan that they would be able to get in South Dakota's health care exchange next year, the premium increases are nothing short of staggering. Younger women are going to face a 223-percent premium increase and younger men are going to face a 393-percent premium increase when you compare data from HHS with data from GAO about premiums in South Dakota in January of this year. That is more than a \$1,500 annual increase for women and a \$2,000 increase in health care premiums each year for 30-year-old men in my State of South Dakota.

But it is not just South Dakota. It is not confined to South Dakota alone, and people in my State are not alone in their experience of sticker shock. Look at what is happening in the State of Nebraska where premium increases are 143 percent or in Georgia where premium increases are 198 percent. Money that could be used to pay off student loans, save for a home, or start a family is now going to be used to pay for ObamaCare.

According to a new analysis by Avalere Health, Americans could face steep cost-sharing requirements—such as copayments, co-insurance, and deductibles—layered on top of their monthly premiums.

It is clear that health care costs are going up—they are not going down—particularly for younger Americans.

Additionally, President Obama promised that health care premiums would go down by an average of \$2,500 per family. Well, if you look at what family premiums have done, they have actually jumped by more than \$2,500 since ObamaCare became law.

While costs continue to increase despite the President's promises to the contrary, household income has fallen by over \$3,700 since President Obama first took office. No IT specialist can fix the problem of increased health care costs due to ObamaCare. The only fix is to repeal this law and to start over.

In addition to higher costs, families are discovering other grim news. For

example, they cannot keep the plan they like, despite the fact that the President promised they would be able to. Over and over the President told Americans they would be able to keep the insurance they have.

Well, millions are now facing health insurance cancellation notices due to ObamaCare. That number is expected to increase up to nearly 10 million by the end of this year. In fact, just this morning, CBS News published a story. The headline read, "More than 2 million people getting booted from existing health insurance plans." These are Americans who had coverage they liked and now cannot continue to purchase.

Finally, after dozens of media reports of Americans who are losing plans they like, the White House spokesman said, it is true that some Americans will not be able to keep the health care plan that they like under ObamaCare. Well, you do not have to tell people in this country, as Deborah from Westchester, CA, said in an article last week in the Los Angeles Times:

All we've been hearing the last three years is if you like your policy you can keep it . . . I'm infuriated because I was lied to.

CareFirst BlueCross BlueShield is being forced to cancel plans that cover 76,000 individuals in Virginia, Maryland, and Washington, DC, due to changes made by President Obama's health care law. That represents more than 40 percent of the 177,000 individuals covered by CareFirst in those States.

President Obama said on July 21, 2009: If you like your current plan, you will be able to keep it. Let me repeat that. He said: If you like your plan, you will be able to keep it. That is from 2009.

But he also went on to say, "I won't sign a bill that somehow would make it tougher for people to keep their health insurance." That is from another conference he had with bloggers back in 2009. It is abundantly clear that this is not a simple misstatement or a glitch in the law, it is another broken promise that reveals serious underlying problems with the core principles of this law.

No IT specialist can fix the problem of canceled plans due to ObamaCare. The only fix is to repeal this law and to start over. The President promised the people could keep a health care plan they liked. But an NBC News article published yesterday shows that the administration knew as early as 2010 that this was not going to be the case.

NBC is reporting that 50 to 70 percent of the 14 million consumers who buy their insurance individually—in the individual marketplace—can expect to receive a cancellation letter or the equivalent over the next year, because their existing policies do not meet the standards mandated by the new health care law. One expert predicts that

number could reach as high as 80 percent. All say that many of those forced to buy pricier new policies will experience "sticker shock." You do not have to look any further than George Schwab, a 62-year-old man from North Carolina who said he was "perfectly happy" with the plan from Blue Cross Blue Shield, the plan he currently had, which also insured his wife for a \$228 monthly premium. But this past September he was surprised to receive a letter saying his policy was no longer available. The comparable plan the insurance company offered him carried a \$1,208 monthly premium and a \$5,500 deductible. The best option he has found on the exchange so far offered a 415-percent jump in premiums, to \$948 a month.

The deductible is less—

He said.

But the plan doesn't meet my needs. Its unaffordable. I am sitting here looking at this, thinking we ought to just pay the fine and just get insurance when we're sick.

That is what Schwab said.

Everybody's worried about whether the website works or not, but that's fixable. That's just tip of the iceberg. This stuff isn't fixable.

That is from Mr. Schwab of North Carolina. That is just one of many stories out there about how this law is affecting average Americans, so much so that now even Democrats have come out criticizing parts of the health care law. Most recently there were 10 Senate Democrats who asked the administration to delay the deadline to sign up for ObamaCare before the tax on the individual mandate kicks in.

While I agree that Americans should not be expected to pay a fine for not having a product they cannot even access, delaying implementation does not solve the underlying problem that this bill is simply bad policy. It was a partisan bill. It was rushed through without adequate forethought in the implementation problems and the serious adverse effect it would have on Americans' daily lives.

Giving people more time to try to navigate a broken Web site with glitches is not going to fix this underlying fundamental flaw in this law. A majority of Americans, 56 percent, believe the Web site glitches are part of a broader problem with the health care law. ObamaCare is more than a Web site. Its real-life consequences squarely hit middle-class Americans.

Americans are facing sticker shock discovering they are being dropped from an insurance plan they like. As one woman said: I was all for ObamaCare until I found out I was paying for it. That too was a story that the LA Times ran over the weekend. ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. The President has got a new healthcare.gov czar, Jeffery Zients, who has been tasked with coming in and trying to fix the Web site by the

end of November. But a fix to the Web site by the end of November does not rectify the underlying problems with this law. The problems with this law are more than just problems with a Web site. We need to continue to work to repeal the onerous parts of this law and replace it with solutions that actually lower the cost of health care and give Americans continued access to a doctor they choose at a cost they can afford.

Republicans here at the time when this law was being debated and passed in the Senate several years ago and subsequent to that time have consistently put forward solutions to the health care challenges that we face in this country that do not entail having government take over literally one-sixth of the American economy. As we can see from the rollout, the government does not do complicated things very well.

This is a disaster at the rollout, but it is a train wreck in terms of substance and what it is going to do and the harm it will cost middle-class Americans. There are so many better solutions. We should allow people to buy insurance across State lines, create interstate competition, allow market forces to drive insurance costs down, allow people and businesses to join groups so they can get the benefit of group purchasing power, do away with the issue of defensive medicine by getting rid of a lot of the junk lawsuits that are clogging up our legal system in this country, allowing people to have a tax credit where they can buy their own insurance and use their judgment and allow for transparency when it comes to pricing and outcomes so that the market in the competition that exists out there works in a way that makes insurance rates come down for everybody and improves the quality of health care in this country.

There are so many good ideas out there that do not involve a government takeover of health care and the results we have seen that has caused. So I hope that not only will the American people who I think are quickly coming to the conclusion that this is a bad law, it is a flawed policy to start with, but Members of Congress here in Washington, DC, Members of the Senate will also come to that conclusion and will decide it is time to not only delay this but to repeal it and start over.

We need a do-over. The American people need a do-over. We need an opportunity to put policies in place that actually put downward pressure on insurance rates in this country, rather than increasing them, which is what we have seen with ObamaCare, dramatic increases for many people across this country, loss of coverage that people like. They were told by the President repeatedly, over and over the President went out there and said: If you like the insurance you have, you

can keep it. We now know that is not true. We know that the administration knew that was not true.

So it is time we acknowledge we need a do-over. The American people need a do-over. We need health care policies in this country that drive down costs for people, for families, middle-class Americans, that improve the quality of health care delivery in this country, and that do not create costly harm to the economy.

We hear over and over that the mandates and the requirements and the costs associated with ObamaCare are making it more difficult and more expensive to create jobs in this country. We are seeing an economic growth rate that is sluggish, in the 1-percent to 2-percent range. We are seeing the lowest labor participation rate literally in the last 35 years, since Jimmy Carter was the President of the United States, chronically high unemployment, lower take-home pay, an economy that is suffering from too much cost and too many policies that actually make it more difficult and more expensive to create jobs.

We need to be looking at health care policies that improve coverage, lower costs, and make it less difficult and less costly to create jobs in this economy so we can get Americans back to work, we get our economy growing and expanding at a more robust rate and improve the standard of living and the quality of life for people all across this country.

This policy, the ObamaCare health care policy, was ill-fated, was misguided from the beginning. Now we are seeing the effects and the results of that. Hopefully, politicians in Washington, DC, on both sides of the aisle will come to the correct conclusion; that is, it is time to start over and do this the right way.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPERSTORM SANDY

Mr. CARPER. As many of us recall, on October 29, 2012, Superstorm Sandy made landfall in my part of the United States. Its impacts up and down the east coast were devastating and heart-breaking. New York, New Jersey, and parts of New England were hit particularly hard. In Delaware we did not experience the level of devastation that was inflicted on our neighbors to the north and to the east, but our State did receive significant damage. In total there were over 200 deaths attributed to Superstorm Sandy. Today we re-

member the lives lost and those forever impacted by this storm.

As I traveled through Delaware during and after the storm, I saw some of the massive impacts of that storm firsthand, but I saw something else as well. I saw people from all walks of life pulling together, helping one another, and taking care of their neighbors. The impacts of that superstorm are still fresh in my mind today as we continue to rebuild in Delaware, New Jersey, in New York, and in other places up the East Coast.

But not only are the impacts of the superstorm still fresh in my mind, something else is as well, and that is this: the extraordinary efforts of ordinary people who left the comfort of their own homes in Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut and in other States as well to help people they had never met and will probably never see again. They did so not because they were paid to do it, not because someone told them to do it, but because they wanted to do it.

This morning I met a handful of Delawareans who were called to action by the Red Cross to volunteer in the shelters and communities in Delaware and New Jersey and New York. Those volunteers included Charlotte and Richard Duffy, Joe Miller, and Glenn Sholley, who are joining us today in the Senate, and we welcome them. In the days and weeks following Sandy, they stopped their lives to help others, and for that we are truly grateful. I thank you all for your extraordinary service.

As our rebuilding efforts continue, I am so thankful for the first responders, for the volunteers, and for the Good Samaritans who pulled together not only in Delaware but in our States to the north to ensure the safety and health of our neighbors.

A few minutes ago I told the folks who gathered in my office for some light refreshments before we came over here—the same group that is joining us here today—that last night I had heard a speech from Paul Begala, who our Presiding Officer will remember was a key member of President Clinton's team during his Presidency. He was on television a million times and widely known for his wit. We saw another side of Paul Begala last night. We saw his wit as well, but we also heard from him a recounting or retelling of the story of the Old Testament and of the question that was asked in the Bible. He asked the audience: Who asked the first question? Nobody knew. He said, actually, the first question was asked by Abel, who had slain his brother Cain. The Heavenly Father, of course, knew what had happened. He tracked down Abel and said: Where's Cain? And Cain said: Am I my brother's keeper? Am I my brother's keeper?

That story is retold in the Bible in a number of places as the Golden Rule,

to look out and help other people the way we would like to be helped, treat other people the way we would want to be treated. Not only does that show up in the Old and New Testaments, including in the parable of the Good Samaritan, but it shows up in the sacred scriptures whether you happen to be Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Buddhist or Hindu. It shows up in the scriptures of virtually every major religion on Earth—the idea that we have an obligation to help our neighbors, whoever they may be.

In the parable in the New Testament, Jesus is asked by some of the Pharisees: Who is my neighbor? And that is when he tells the story of the Good Samaritan, who ultimately was helped not by someone from his community, not by a clergyman who walked by, but he was helped by somebody from another part of that country who didn't care at all for the fellow who was beaten and left for dead.

The financial costs of Superstorm Sandy were also severe and estimated to be in not just the hundreds of millions of dollars but billions of dollars. It will take years to recover from devastation such as this. As my colleagues and I know, it is important we get that recovery right.

I want to take a look at a few pictures of Seaside Heights, NJ, before Sandy and after. Before I turn to the photographs on my left here, I would just say to the Presiding Officer that a lot of people who might be watching this across the country on C-SPAN may wonder where Seaside Heights, NJ, is. I wondered that myself, and I am from Delaware, less than 100 miles away. A lot of people have heard of Asbury Park, where Bruce Springsteen is from. Asbury Park is just a little bit north of Seaside Heights, NJ. About 50 miles south of Seaside Heights is a place called Atlantic City that a lot of us have heard of.

This is a shot taken in May of 2009 in Seaside Heights, NJ. This is a before shot. This is a little more than 3 years before the hurricane. There are a couple of buildings here where we have these yellow arrows. They are there for a purpose—so that when we look at the after shot we can figure out what happened to those structures. Here is a red arrow on this building.

This is about 3½ years later when Sandy came a-calling. Here we go. These buildings aren't in the same place. They do not look the same. What looked to have been a pier along through here is gone. There used to be roads through here and now there are what appear to be sandy trails. Virtually every house here is badly damaged, many of them absolutely totally destroyed.

We have another shot here, same town, Seaside Heights. This is obviously the beach, the boardwalk, and this is an amusement park. A lot of

people went there over the years, for decades, and had a great time with their families. They had a roller coaster here. There were a lot of rides here. I must admit I like rides. My wife says: Are you ever going to grow up? I say: I hope not, because this stuff is still fun to me. But here is the roller coaster. Again, this is taken in late May 2009. There is the roller coaster.

Let's see what it looks like after Hurricane Sandy. Here is the roller coaster. Here is the roller coaster. It is in the ocean. And here is what is left of the pier and of the amusement park.

The power of that storm is demonstrated graphically by these photos, which I said earlier destroyed not just this amusement park, the beaches and the homes in this community, but wreaked havoc throughout the mid-Atlantic and northeastern seaboard and took the lives of over 200 people.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, we saw many problems during the recovery phase that held communities back and created great suffering, and not only great suffering, also a lot of anger in terms of the inadequate response, the untimely response, the inept response. Money was not always well spent, the efforts were not well coordinated, and the recovery moved slowly as a result.

Thanks in part to the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006, which was shepherded through the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee and through Congress by Senators SUSAN COLLINS and Joe Lieberman, many of the problems we saw during Katrina's recovery efforts have been fixed, and we have seen a great deal of improvement in the emergency response efforts as a result.

I have a friend who, when you ask him "How are you doing?" he always says, "Compared to what?" So when speaking of how are we doing with respect to the recovery after Superstorm Sandy, I say: Well, compared to what? Compared to Katrina, we are doing great. Can we do better? You bet we can. We have learned a lot, and 7 years later you can tell we have learned not all our lessons but certainly a number of them.

That act that was passed about a half dozen years ago required FEMA to bolster their regional offices in order to build strong relationships with State, local, and tribal governments. As an old recovering Governor—and the Presiding Officer is a recovering Lieutenant Governor—we know the Federal Government can't do everything, particularly in responding to emergencies. It is the relationships with the State and the local folks, in some cases with tribal units, with the emergency responders, with the National Guard, and all of the above, that is critical. Those strong relationships not only improve the ability of the Federal Government to respond to disasters, but they also

enhance FEMA's capability to support State, local, and tribal governments as they rebuild.

That law also required FEMA to coordinate with other Federal departments to write a national disaster recovery strategy. This eventually led to the National Disaster Recovery Framework, which has helped to organize and coordinate recovery efforts to Hurricane Sandy.

A key question we need to ask, however, after a storm such as this, is whether it was an aberration or a harbinger of things to come. I would like to think it was an aberration. There is a good chance it was not. Just a few short years ago, hurricanes hitting the areas along the northeastern half of the East Coast were relatively uncommon. Hurricane Sandy is actually the third major hurricane to threaten or strike the northeastern coast of our country in the last 3 years. Fortunately, we are almost through this hurricane season—knock on wood—without a major storm hitting our coast. Unfortunately, the Northeast, mid-Atlantic, and other vulnerable areas are expected to see more frequent and larger storms such as Sandy in the future.

Earlier this year, the Government Accountability Office, affectionately known as GAO, added a new area to its recently updated High Risk List—the impact of climate change on the Federal Government and on our country. GAO explained that, among other things, climate change "could threaten coastal areas with rising sea levels, alter agricultural productivity, and increase the intensity and frequency of severe weather events."

The GAO also argued the Federal Government is not prepared to deal with the impacts of climate change. I might add State governments and local governments as well are not prepared to deal with the impacts of climate change. They recommended we take a strategic look at them and start to prepare accordingly.

The costs associated with responding to and recovering from a hurricane such as Sandy, both in human and financial costs, are so severe we simply cannot afford to face this devastation over and over again.

It might have been Einstein who defined the definition of sanity as doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result. We can't do the same thing over and over. It is a different world in which we live, and we have to respond to those changes.

Fortunately, we have seen States take promising steps toward addressing some of the issues GAO has identified. In particular, the States of New York and New Jersey have begun to plan to mitigate against future disasters. We know all too well that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

In fact, a few years ago the National Institute of Building Sciences issued a

report that concluded that for every \$1 we spend on various mitigation measures we can save \$4 in response and recovery costs. For \$1 of investment we end up saving \$4. Through mitigation, then, we can get better results—save money and, most importantly, we can save lives.

We must ensure that sound and effective mitigation policies are thoroughly incorporated into this recovery effort. This is especially important as climate change drives the sea level to rise and increases the severity and frequency of coastal storms. By working together, we can rebuild and become stronger by better protecting ourselves from future storms. But in doing so, we can't ignore what I and many experts believe may be the underlying cause of storms such as Hurricane Sandy. It is not enough to just address the symptom—that is the storm, the wind, the sea level rise, the surge—we need to address the underlying cause or causes.

As we recover from Sandy and put in place the protections, we need to reduce the impact of the next big one. We would make a mistake if we didn't think about what we need to do to address not just the symptoms of climate change but the underlying cause itself.

We have been joined on the floor by my colleague Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey. Through the Presiding Officer, let me just say to my colleague, we have some folks here today from Delaware who ended up, as I said earlier, in New Jersey, and I think in New York. Our State was hit, but nothing like the Senator's State. These folks, serving in the spirit of the Good Samaritan, with the encouragement and actually the organizational skills of the Red Cross, came to his State, across the Delaware River, in order to lend a hand to people they didn't know, had never met, and will probably never see again.

Someday the tables will be turned, someday it will be our State, someday it will be Delmarva that is reeling from the impact of such a storm. We know when that happens, the Senator will be there for us as well.

I am pleased to yield the floor for my friend from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, let me start by thanking my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Delaware, for his remarks, and the people of Delaware who came to New Jersey to help us. That is the essence of why we call this great country the United States of America. In moments of challenge and adversity we come together. We appreciate the Delawareans who came to help us. We hope we never have to repay the kindness, but if perchance it comes, we will.

I come to the floor on this anniversary of Superstorm Sandy a year ago. We all remember what has now become

an iconic photo. It is hard to believe that it has been 1 year since Sandy, but it has. For a year, under difficult and trying circumstances, New Jerseyans have pulled together, worked together, and helped each other to recover. I rise today in praise of their tenacity, their resilience, their spirit of community, and remembering all of the hard work of the many first responders, Federal, State, and local officials, community leaders, and volunteers who helped in those recovery efforts.

Just yesterday I was with Secretary Donovan in New Jersey to announce another \$1.4 billion in community development grant disaster relief funding. This is \$1.4 billion in flexible-use funding that comes in addition to the \$1.8 billion we have already received from the hard-fought \$60 billion disaster relief package we secured a year ago. We secured that funding after a long debate over whether we as a nation and the Congress were prepared to provide disaster relief to the people of my State and others who suffered devastating losses. Standing with me in that effort were many in this Chamber, and one who is no longer with us, our late colleague and friend Senator Frank Lautenberg. He and I worked against many who did not want to provide New Jersey the disaster relief we needed. We were in the midst of a debt ceiling debate, a fiscal cliff at the end after a congressional session, and even after Sandy relief had passed the Senate with bipartisan support, the House Republican leadership chose not to immediately bring the relief package to a vote, unnecessarily delaying our recovery from Sandy by 6 weeks.

There were those in Congress who believe that even in times of disaster and crisis we are on our own. I don't believe that. I believe we are all in this together and in times of crisis we come together as a community.

That is why when the State of New Jersey submitted its application last March to use \$1.83 billion in Federal Sandy relief to help thousands of homeowners and small businesses rebuild, the Obama administration, through HUD Secretary Donovan, approved the application in April, the following month.

We have come a long way since October 29th when Sandy made landfall in southern New Jersey. One hundred and fifty-nine people lost their lives, 8.5 million customers lost power, more than 650,000 homes were damaged and 40,000 in our State were severely damaged or destroyed.

Here is a perfect example of how far we have come. You can see here the damage Sandy brought on this home one year ago today. And, as you can see in this second photo, today it is well on its way to being fully restored. But we have a long way yet to go in every community to fully recover from the extent of the damage and to make families and businesses whole again.

A year ago, this headline ran in the Record: "Business losses mount; Some choosing to close rather than rebuild." Hundreds of thousands of businesses were forced to close, causing an estimated \$65 billion in economic loss and resulting in emergency declarations or disasters in 13 States up and down the East Coast.

In a matter of minutes, people had lost loved ones, they lost their homes, their property, and their livelihoods, but they stood strong and began to rebuild. Beyond the headlines of this story, we see the Jersey spirit that came through in person after person. Despite the uphill climb, New Jersey rebuilt one home at a time, one business at a time, one community at a time. That's what makes us Jersey Strong.

For 10 days, millions along the East Coast lived without power, without phones, seniors were stranded on the upper floors of buildings where elevators were out, and the loss of power led to fuel shortages and long gas lines. You can see in this photograph of the PATH Train Terminal in Hoboken, the extent of damage to our transportation infrastructure.

It was a wake-up call to what could happen again in the future and the investment we need to make in our infrastructure to avoid future damage from future storms.

The Sandy Recovery package we passed last year included \$13 billion in critical funding I sought to help restore our transit and highway systems from what they looked like then, as you can see in this photograph.

The Port Authority was able to repair the PATH station at Hoboken and harden electrical equipment to prevent future damage. NJDOT was able to elevate roads that were washed away by Sandy.

At the end of the day, the legislation included necessary policy reforms that helped streamline recovery efforts and improve FEMA's Public Assistance Programs, allowing us to rebuild what was in place before the storm and build it stronger and better than before.

Since then, almost \$400 million in FEMA grants have been approved to help individuals and families recover. That is over \$341 million for housing assistance and more than \$54 million for additional needs.

Homeowners, renters, and business owners have received over \$764 million in SBA disaster loans and \$314 million in FEMA Public Assistance grants to help local communities and local nonprofits that serve the public and provided relief.

National Flood Insurance Program payments to New Jersey have amounted to \$3.5 billion to help people rebuild and get their lives back on track. In New Jersey alone, more than 261,000 people contacted FEMA for help and information and over 126,000 homes have been inspected.

While these numbers show the progress we have made, the reality is that for thousands of people in New Jersey, recovery is a round-the-clock, 24-7 effort.

Many New Jersey families have been hit with the “triple whammy,” having been flooded by Sandy, then facing repair and mitigation costs and then facing astronomical increases in flood insurance costs built into a flood reform bill that was passed before Sandy hit.

Even as we slowly recover from the worst natural disaster in our State’s history, a manmade disaster is looming in the distance, jeopardizing our recovery.

The combination of updated flood maps and the phaseout of premium subsidies for the National Flood Insurance Program threatens to force victims out of their homes and destroy entire communities.

Many homeowners will be forced to pay premiums that are several times higher than the current rate they pay. Those who cannot afford the higher premiums will be forced to either sell or be priced out of their home—probably at a fire-sale price. This in turn will drive down property values and local revenues at the worst possible time.

I have heard from countless New Jerseyans, many who have come to me in tears, who are facing this predicament. These are hardworking middle class families, who played by the rules, purchased flood insurance, and are now being priced out of their home.

In order to stop this manmade disaster from doing even more damage, I am leaving the floor in a few minutes and going to introduce bipartisan legislation to take a time-out and assess the impact these premium hikes will have on homeowners and the flood insurance program as a whole.

The Homeowners Flood Insurance Affordability Act, which we will be announcing in a few minutes, would delay flood insurance premium increases imposed in the Biggert-Waters legislation for most primary residences until FEMA completes an affordability study that I had offered, and proposes a regulatory framework to address the issues found in the study.

This will give current homeowners some breathing room before their flood insurance premiums go up. For prospective homebuyers, the certainty that they will not see their rate dramatically increase simply because they purchased a home is critically important to maintaining property values.

At the end of the day, we look back at the year since the storm struck and remember those who lost their lives and those who came together to help their neighbors rebuild. We remember the efforts of first responders and government and community leaders pulling together.

It is often said that “the hardest steel must go through the hottest

fire,” and Sandy tested what we were made of.

When we look at this photograph of twisted metal that once was a rollercoaster, we associate it with the destruction of Sandy, but we also associate it with how far we have come and what we have learned. We learned that it is not enough to live in a community, we have to be part of it. We have to remember that citizenship comes with responsibility not just to ourselves, but to each other.

In the face of Sandy—in the aftermath, the tragedy, and the loss—we pulled together as a community. We worked together, helped each other rebuild lives, businesses, homes, our beaches and boardwalks—and, in doing so, we strengthened New Jersey’s sense of pride and a belief that we are, in fact, all in this together. It is that spirit, that unity, that has made New Jersey stronger and better than before.

Let me conclude by saying that recovery from any disaster depends on our continuing cooperation within our communities at every level of government. The business of government is people—their lives, their hopes, their dreams of a better life for themselves and their families.

In New Jersey, we proved that—at every level of government—with various agencies working together—we all came together. There can be no tolerance of partisan division when it comes to the future of my State or any State’s efforts to help families rebuild from a disaster like Sandy. The storm was extraordinary, but what makes me extraordinarily proud is that New Jerseyans rose to the challenge as they always do.

There is much work left to do. We have learned that recovery from a disaster is not a one-size-fits-all endeavor. Full recovery from Sandy will take more than a village.

But at the end of the day the biggest reason New Jersey has made the progress that it has, and why our State will come back better and stronger than before, is because of the people who live there. It hasn’t been easy. But I have never been more proud to represent the people of New Jersey than I have during this last year since Sandy struck.

I have seen the best of who we are and what we can do when we pull together, each of us working for the recovery of all of us. Looking back at the last year, I would say we are all New Jersey proud as well as New Jersey strong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Mr. CHIESA. Mr. President, nearly 5 months ago I had the high honor to stand in this historic Chamber, surrounded by my family, and be sworn in as a Member of the Senate. My service

as a Senator will soon draw to a close, so I wish to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues a few thoughts before I leave.

I want to begin by thanking Governor Christie for providing me with this incredible opportunity. Our professional relationship, and our friendship, began more than 20 years ago as young lawyers working together in a New Jersey law firm. We had our entire careers ahead of us. If someone had suggested that one day Chris Christie would have been Governor, I would not have been surprised. I would, however, have dismissed out of hand any suggestion that I might someday be the New Jersey attorney general, let alone a Member of the Senate.

To have served here representing the people of New Jersey has to rank as the greatest honor of my professional life. I will always be grateful to Governor Christie for the confidence he has shown in me by appointing me, and I will always be thankful for the wonderful opportunities he has given me, time and again, to serve in public life.

I also thank my colleagues in the Senate from both sides of the aisle who have gone out of their way to make me feel welcome, to help me navigate the sometimes confusing rules and traditions of the Senate, and for assisting me in making the most of my time here.

One thing I did know for certain when I arrived here in June was that I wanted to use my time as effectively as possible. To the extent I have, I have so many of my colleagues to thank. The senior Senator from New Jersey, who will have to break in another new Senator from our State, has been a supportive colleague. I truly appreciate his willingness to assist me in my time in the Senate. I thank the Senator.

The Republican leader has gone above and beyond to give me the opportunity to work and make a difference during my tenure here, and I thank him very much.

I also thank the senior Senator from Delaware and the junior Senator from Oklahoma for agreeing to my request to hold a hearing on human trafficking in the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee. Eliminating human trafficking or, more directly, abolishing modern-day slavery has been a priority for me throughout my career in public service. The chairman and ranking member of the committee could not have been more helpful in my efforts to raise awareness of this evil crime, a crime that robs people of their innocence and dignity, taking a terrible toll on our victims and society as a whole.

The junior Senators from New Hampshire and North Dakota, both former attorneys general themselves, stood alongside me in this effort. When I first spoke with them about my desire to hold a hearing, they immediately

agreed to work with me to make it work as productively as possible. I am grateful to them for partnering with me and I know they will continue to make this issue a top priority.

I also thank the senior Senator from Arizona for attending and contributing to the hearing on a day when no votes were scheduled and for his strong commitment for righting this terrible wrong. These are important and forceful voices for the victims of human trafficking, and I appreciate their support of my efforts.

I want all of my colleagues to know I will continue to work to abolish this scourge on our Nation and on the entire human family. I hope they will feel free to call on me if I can ever be helpful to them in their efforts, just as I may call on them from time to time.

So many of my colleagues have made this a wonderful experience, and I am proud to call all of them my friends.

I know I looked pretty lost on more than one occasion here, but I always had someone pointing me in the right direction. I am particularly grateful to my good friends from Utah, Wyoming, Tennessee, Ohio, and Illinois, who have repeatedly helped me over the past 5 months both by listening and also providing good advice.

As every Senator knows, the work we do here would not be possible without the work of the people who serve on our staffs. I have been incredibly fortunate to have an outstanding group of people on my Senate staff—a group that jumped right in with me on very short notice and a group I am so proud to have worked with. They were fully aware that their tenure, like mine, would be short. They interrupted and, in many cases, disrupted their lives to serve with me.

My chief of staff Donna Mullins did an amazing job assembling a talented and dedicated group of professionals to serve both here in Washington and back in New Jersey. Their willingness to do so reflects their commitment to the people of New Jersey, the Senate, and to our Nation. Some of them I have worked with for years, others only for a few short months. All of them have earned my everlasting respect and friendship.

I want to acknowledge each of them by name: Donna Mullins, John Lutz, Tomi-Anne Nolino, Nick DiRocco, Jeannette Larkins, Chip Sinderson, Ken Lundberg, Bob Bostock, Ryan Berger, Krista Powers, Tyler Yingling, Marissa Watkins, Michael Rebuck, Chris Mindnich, Taylor Holgate, Nicole Dube, Jamie Rhoades, Michael Pock, and Shante Palmer. They reflect the best of public service, and I will always be thankful to them and the work we have done together.

Of course, the greatest thanks goes to my family. My wife Jenny and our children Al and Hannah have always given me their unconditional love and

support. I could not have done this without them. I am lucky to have them.

I was born and raised in New Jersey. It is not just my home State, it is my home in every sense of the word. The honor of representing the people of my State—my friends, my neighbors—is almost beyond description. After all, there could be no greater calling for any citizen than to have the opportunity to represent the people of your State in the highest councils of government. Although the past 5 months have passed very quickly, my deep sense of gratitude for the opportunity to serve will stay with me for the rest of my life.

My experience as a Member of this body has confirmed what I already thought was true—every Member of the Senate is a dedicated public servant. Every Senator is deeply committed to the work they do. Every Senator is here because he or she wants to contribute to the centuries-old work of forming a more perfect union. We do not always agree on how this is best accomplished, but vigorous, respectful debate is critical in a government such as ours.

There is so much talent, so much commitment, and so much love of country here. I urge my colleagues to advance their efforts to find common ground in pursuit of their common purpose, to continue to advance the success of the country we love and secure the blessings of liberty for the people we serve.

Soon there will be a new Senator-elect from New Jersey who will stand where I stood just a few months ago to be sworn in. When he takes his place in this body, he will be joining a long list of dedicated public servants who have served New Jersey—stretching back to the very first Congress. I urge him to continue to work as hard for the people of our State as he did while serving as the mayor of New Jersey's largest city. I know he will always put the people of New Jersey first.

New Jersey's new Senator will have a very long list of priorities waiting for him when he arrives in Washington—all of them important. There is one area that will require his immediate and ongoing focus, and that is New Jersey's continued effort to recover and rebuild from the devastation of Superstorm Sandy, which struck my State a year ago today. Working together New Jerseyans have made incredible progress in coming back from what the storm delivered, but our work continues.

For those who have suffered so much loss, a year seems like an eternity. They must know that until all the damage done by the storm is undone, and until all the work needed to protect our State and its people and their property from future storms like this is completed, we will not rest.

As I prepare to make the transition back to private life, I do so with a deep sense of gratitude to all of those who made my service in the Senate possible, and an even deeper sense of humility for having been given this opportunity.

This has been, for me, a remarkable 5 months. I know I will in the years ahead look back on this time with gratitude and appreciation for the privilege of having served the people of New Jersey and the Senate of the United States of America.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

MR. CARPER. Mr. President, while Senator CHIESA is still on the floor, I want to take a moment to say to him how much we have enjoyed getting to know him, work with him, and come away with a wonderful—not just a first impression but a lasting impression. Governor Christie did the State of New Jersey well by appointing Senator CHIESA to serve as the interim Senator.

We had a similar experience with losing an elected Senator when JOE BIDEN was elected as Vice President and to the Senate at the same time. He had to choose between being the Senator from Delaware or Vice President. I don't know if he ever regrets it, but he made the choice to be our Vice President, as we know. The Governor of our State appointed Ted Kaufman to serve as the interim Senator for 2 years, and he was subsequently succeeded by CHRIS COONS when CHRIS was elected a couple of years ago.

We have a tradition of folks who are appointed as interim Senators who turn out to do an extraordinary job. Sometimes I wonder—with tongue in cheek—if maybe that is not a better approach, in some cases, for populating this place with men and women from across the country.

The Senator from New Jersey has been here for 5 tumultuous months, and he has seen the good, the bad, and the ugly—in some cases the very ugly. If we had more people who would bring Senator CHIESA's values and commitment to comity—not comedy with a “d,” but comity with a “t”—communicating, and his willingness to compromise, not on principles but on policy, this would be a better place and a better country.

As the chairman of the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, I say on behalf of TOM COBURN, ranking Republican—and on behalf of those of us who have the privilege to serve on that committee—what a privilege it has been for the Senator from New Jersey to be one of our members.

We are joined on the floor by Senator BARRASSO, and it has been my privilege to serve on the Environment and Public Works Committee with him. As Senator BARRASSO knows, JEFF CHIESA

came early and stayed late. He asked great questions and brought forth good issues—including the issue of human trafficking, which has reminded us in extraordinary ways of the terrible situation that is faced by millions of women and children in this country and around the world. That is a gift the Senator from New Jersey has brought to this body, and I think ultimately to our country.

Senator CHIESA is going to leave us now and sail off into the sunrise, and we look forward to having our paths cross many times in the future—maybe even in Delaware on a summer vacation. My friend can bring his wife Jenny and his two kids. He is always welcomed in the first State.

Good luck, God bless, and Godspeed. I thank my friend for serving our country and his State so well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I wish to add in a bipartisan way my thanks to Senator CHIESA for his service and add to the kind words the Senator from Delaware has spoken of our friend and our colleague.

In Wyoming we talk about the code of the West, and there are 10 parts to that code, but No. 1 is live each day with courage; and No. 2 is take pride in your work. Members on both sides of the aisle have seen that sort of code lived day by day by the Senator from New Jersey who has joined us.

I join my colleague from Delaware in thanking our friend from New Jersey. I say that with great admiration, great appreciation, and deep respect for his time in the Senate, and I know we are going to continue to hear great things from him in the future.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt said:

Our capacity is limited only by our ability to work together. What is needed is the will.

I have just returned from a week at home in Montana traveling from Fort Benton to Billings to Bozeman. I visited with constituents from all across our State. At each one of my meetings, the conversation would touch on the first snow of the season or football and the Bobcats or the Grizzlies. Those are, in this case, football teams. But inevitably every conversation turned to the challenges we face in Washington and the standoff we just had over the country's borrowing limit and funding the government.

People have lost faith in our ability to serve them. They are worried about what the dysfunction means for the future of our country.

For more than 2 weeks, Congress was stuck in a stalemate, unable to agree on a course for our Nation. The political standoff shook America's confidence and threatened the global economy. Thankfully, compromise was able to overcome conflict. Cooler heads finally prevailed. But our Nation didn't emerge from the fight unscathed.

The 16-day government shutdown took a \$24 billion bite out of the U.S. economy, according to Standard & Poor's. The rating agency now projects the U.S. economy will only grow at 2.4 percent in the fourth quarter as opposed to the already slow 3 percent predicted prior to the shutdown. That is a staggering self-inflicted wound, and defaulting would have been even worse.

Thankfully, that didn't happen. Leader REID and Minority Leader MCCONNELL were able to find the will and come together to provide a path that averted default. Their bipartisan legislation, passed on October 16, pulled us back from the brink. It created a conference committee to negotiate a budget compromise and it gave the President the power to suspend the debt limit until early February. It also gave Senators an opportunity to object and overturn the suspension using what is called a resolution of disapproval. That is what we are considering today.

I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this resolution. For the good of our economy, it cannot pass. Passing this resolution would plunge this Nation back into the same economic crisis we were facing just a few weeks ago. With economic confidence still suffering from the shutdown, another debt ceiling crisis could drive the Nation—and the world—back into recession. We cannot let that happen. It is time to be responsible leaders. Congress needs to stop governing from one self-created crisis to another.

Tomorrow, the budget conference committee will begin discussions on a plan to resolve the fiscal challenges before us. The conference will be led by Chairman MURRAY and Chairman RYAN. They are smart, hardworking and solutions oriented and I am confident they can craft a compromise.

I began my remarks with a quote from President Roosevelt and I will close with another. Roosevelt once said:

The great test for us in our time is whether all the groups of our people are willing to work together for continuing progress.

Today, we face our test. Can we work together for continuing progress?

I strongly urge Members of the Senate to reject the resolution before us. It is a step backward, a return to shutdowns and showdowns. Enough is enough. Instead, we must find the will to work together for progress, for the good of our economy and the good of our country.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

• Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, earlier this month, I expressed my opposition to S. 1569, which allowed our debt limit to increase through February 7, 2014. Today, the Senate considers S.J. Res. 26, which would reject the suspension in the debt limit and immediately halt any new debt issuances by the United States. I support this resolution.

My position remains unchanged from earlier this month. Our national debt is topping \$17 trillion and has nearly doubled since the beginning of the Obama administration. If we allow the Nation to continue on its current path, it will only lead to economic destruction. Allowing the debt to continue increasing without any commonsense solutions to rein in the federal government would be irresponsible and reckless.

The recent increase in the debt limit is President Obama's sixth since coming to office. In that time, no significant action has been taken to reduce the long term trajectory of the debt. If we continue to do nothing to rein in spending, the national debt will skyrocket to \$25 trillion in the next decade. Even the President agrees with these numbers. We cannot allow this to happen, which is why I support the resolution prohibiting a continued suspension of the debt limit.●

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:29 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

DISAPPROVING OF THE PRESIDENT'S EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND THE DEBT LIMIT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question now occurs on agreeing to the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 26.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 220 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Alexander	Boozman	Coats
Ayotte	Burr	Coburn
Barrasso	Chambliss	Cochran
Blunt	Chiesa	Collins

Corker	Hoeven	Portman
Cornyn	Isakson	Risch
Crapo	Johanns	Roberts
Cruz	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Enzi	Kirk	Scott
Fischer	Lee	Sessions
Flake	McCain	Shelby
Graham	McConnell	Thune
Grassley	Moran	Toomey
Hatch	Murkowski	Vitter
Heller	Paul	Wicker

NAYS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Landrieu	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Inhofe

The motion was rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF RICHARD F. GRIFFIN, JR., TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination.

Who yields time? The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, we are getting ready to vote to end debate. This is a cloture vote on the nomination of Richard Griffin to serve as general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. As I stated yesterday, this is an important role for making sure the NLRB can do its job.

This summer, as we know, we voted to fill the Board with the requisite number of Republicans and Democrats on the Board. I thought that was a good vote. This is the one left over; that is, the general counsel position. Mr. Griffin is very well qualified. He has been thoroughly vetted.

I have received absolutely not one objection to his qualifications or his background. He has had 30 years' experience as a labor lawyer and he de-

serves strong bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to vote for cloture so we can get to the vote later today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I am not going to vote to confirm Mr. Griffin because I think his nomination to be general counsel to the Board does not do anything to keep it from moving toward advocacy instead of being an umpire. But I do think it is time to close the debate and have an up-or-down vote. I am going to vote yes on cloture.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Brian Schatz, Barbara Boxer, Carl Levin, Bill Nelson, Jeff Merkley, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Debbie Stabenow, Mark R. Warner, Tammy Baldwin, Jeanne Shaheen, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Mark Udall, Tom Udall, Michael F. Bennet, Amy Klobuchar, Elizabeth Warren, Ron Wyden.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 221 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Corker	Landrieu
Ayotte	Donnelly	Leahy
Baldwin	Durbin	Levin
Baucus	Feinstein	Manchin
Begich	Flake	Markey
Bennet	Franken	McCain
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	McCaskill
Blunt	Hagan	Menendez
Boxer	Harkin	Merkley
Brown	Heinrich	Mikulski
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Murkowski
Cardin	Hirono	Murphy
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Murray
Casey	Kaine	Nelson
Collins	King	Pryor
Coons	Klobuchar	Reed

Reid
Rockefeller
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer

Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)

Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—37

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Chiesa	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Coburn	Johanns	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Inhofe

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Pursuant to S. Res. 15 of the 113th Congress, there will now be 8 hours of debate on the nomination equally divided in the usual form.

The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, in the aftermath of the battle over the continuing resolution and the debt ceiling, I am sure I am not alone in hearing from my constituents they are hoping that Democrats and Republicans can now work together on some of the most important and chronic problems that challenge our country. But instead of doing that, my friends across the aisle have taken this opportunity to engage in what can only be described as a power grab that will result in even more polarization and partisan acrimony here in Washington.

What I am talking about specifically is the effort of the President and Democratic leadership to pack the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. For those who may not follow the Federal court system, America has 13 different Federal appellate courts, but the D.C. court stands out as the most powerful in the country. Some have called it the second most important court in the Nation because it has jurisdiction over a variety of regulatory and constitutional matters. Whether it relates to Dodd-Frank in financial services, to ObamaCare and its implementation, or to national security matters, all of those types of cases get heard in the D.C. Circuit Court. No other appellate court in the Nation wields such vast influence over hot-button issues, ranging, as I said, from health care to the Environmental Protection Agency and its activities, which I know are as important to the Presiding Officer as they are to me, as well as gun rights and the war on terrorism.

President Obama argues the D.C. Circuit Court needs three more judges in order to get its work done, but the facts simply don't bear that out. That is not true. For example, between 2005 and 2013, the D.C. Circuit's total number of written decisions per active

judge actually went down by 27 percent. The number of appeals filed with the court fell by 18 percent. So instead of having more work to do, it has less work to do than it did in 2005.

As one commentator has observed: The D.C. Circuit already has the lowest caseload in the Nation and, if anything, trends show their workload is decreasing—decreasing, going down—not up.

Indeed, one D.C. Circuit Court judge recently told the senior Senator from Iowa that if any more judges were added now, there wouldn't be enough work to go around. So one might wonder why then the President and Senator REID would want to pack the D.C. Circuit Court with three additional judges if there is not enough work to go around today.

Let me also note the D.C. Circuit Court has a unique record in that it actually took 4 months off between May and September of this year. That is hardly the record of a court that has too much work to do and simply can't get it done.

Meanwhile, there are courts across our country, both appellate courts and district courts, that are overburdened. Some of these courts are labeled as judicial emergencies because they simply have such a heavy caseload they can't get the work done. Why wouldn't we want to allocate more judicial resources, more help, to those courts that need the help rather than to pack the D.C. Circuit Court with judges it simply doesn't need?

Don't just take my word for it. Prominent Democratic leaders have actually made no secret of what is happening here. One might wonder what the rationale is, if there is not enough work to do. Why would Senator REID and other Democratic leaders want to add new judges to a court that doesn't have enough work to do? Well, back in March, the senior Senator from New York, Senator SCHUMER, said the following of the D.C. Circuit judges:

Here's what they have done in the last year: They have overturned the EPA's ability to regulate existing coal plants . . . They have rendered the SEC impotent by saying that the SEC can't pass rulings unless they do what is called a cost-benefit analysis . . . They have ruled that recess appointments couldn't be taken into account.

Senator SCHUMER also said:

We will fill up the DC circuit one way or another.

Well, I disagree with Senator SCHUMER's characterization on some of these cases, but it is true the D.C. Circuit Court has a unique role in American jurisprudence in deciding some very important cases for the entire country. There are administrative agencies that are part of the executive branch, and when they make decisions—whether it relates to financial services, the Environmental Protection Agency, Health and Human Services,

or any administrative agency—those decisions typically get decided and reviewed by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals.

More recently, the majority leader put it this way when he said:

We're focusing very intently on the D.C. Circuit. We need at least one more. There's three vacancies. We need at least one more and that will switch the majority.

So this isn't about the efficient administration of impartial justice. This is about stacking the court by changing the majority. That was a quote from the majority leader of the Senate. So there is no mystery about what is going on here. The majority leader and his allies are attempting to pack the court with judges who will rubberstamp their big-government agenda.

The majority leader is also threatening to use the nuclear option again unless Senate Republicans simply snap to attention and salute smartly. Well, that is not going to happen. In simple terms, Democrats are prepared to violate the Senate's own rules to help flip the D.C. Circuit in favor of the Obama administration's aggressive administrative overreach. If these tactics succeed, the Senate will be weakened as an institution and the Nation's second highest court will be transformed into a far-left ideological body.

But I will remind my colleagues that what goes around comes around in the Senate. When Republicans control the Senate and we have a Republican in the White House, I warn my colleagues the same rules they put into effect with the nuclear option will be used to their disadvantage then. We shouldn't do it. We shouldn't go there.

But it is clear what the motivation is. Again, this is not about the efficient administration of impartial justice. This is about getting your way and getting a rubberstamp on the actions of regulatory overreach that are far too common here in Washington, DC.

It is true the D.C. Circuit Court has ruled against the Obama administration and its regulatory agencies, but it is also true they have affirmed many of the most important and far-reaching decisions of the Obama administration's regulatory agencies. One example where it ruled against the administration is in 2011, when it struck down the "proxy access" rule of the Securities and Exchange Commission by declaring the agency failed to conduct a cost-benefit analysis required by law before adopting the regulation.

I don't know about anyone else, but I wish the government would do more cost-benefit analyses, not less, and so I am glad the D.C. Circuit Court struck down that rule because of the failure of the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a cost-benefit analysis.

In another example last year, the court vacated the cross-State air pollution rule of the Environmental Protec-

tion Agency, noting it would "impose massive emissions reduction requirements" on certain States "without regard to the limits set by the statutory text."

In other words, they acted beyond their congressional authorization. This was also an example, in Texas—Texas got swept into this cross-State air pollution rule without even an opportunity to be heard and to offer competing analyses of the models the Environmental Protection Agency used. No matter how committed we all are to clean air, we should not sanction an administrative agency run amok, doing what is not authorized by the statutory text.

The D.C. Circuit has also rejected as unconstitutional a pair of appointments the President made to the National Labor Relations Board. Talk about overreach. This is where the President tried to trump the confirmation powers of the U.S. Senate in the Constitution—the power of advice and consent, it is called—by making unconstitutional so-called recess appointments. The D.C. Circuit called him on it and held that it was unconstitutional.

More recently, the court held that the President's Nuclear Regulatory Commission was simply flouting the law. Do we not want a court to call the President when administrative agencies are simply flouting the law if we are a nation of laws? In this case, they flouted the law by delaying a decision on whether to use Yucca Mountain as a nuclear waste repository.

These were all commonsense decisions, and you can probably tell from my comments that I think they were well grounded in the law and the facts and I agree with the decision. In that case, they all went against the Obama administration's preferred position, but it is true that the D.C. Circuit has also ruled in favor of the administration's position in a number of cases. Again, here is an EPA decision. Since 2012, Jeremy Jacobs reports, the Agency has won 60 percent of the cases that have been reviewed by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. In 60 percent of the lawsuits where the Environmental Protection Agency has been taken to court for exceeding its authority, 60 percent of the time the EPA position has prevailed. That is a better performance than the EPA had at the circuit during George W. Bush's administration. In particular, the EPA has scored landmark victories related to greenhouse gas regulations, ethanol-blended gasoline, and mountaintop-removal coal mining. But beyond energy and environmental issues, the D.C. Circuit Court has upheld President Obama's Executive order regarding embryonic stem cell research on two separate occasions, in 2011 and 2012.

Again, these are not my preferred outcomes, but I think they demonstrate that the D.C. Circuit Court

has learned to strike a balance and certainly is not pro-administration or anti-administration. It epitomizes what a court should be, which is an impartial administrator of justice. Again, this same court upheld the Affordable Care Act in 2011, ruling that the individual health insurance mandate was constitutional under the commerce clause. We know what happened when it got to the U.S. Supreme Court. They had a different view.

It demonstrates the kind of judicial restraint that the current D.C. court, balanced as it is with four nominees by a Republican President and four nominees by a Democratic President—how it has administered evenhanded justice, which would be destroyed if the President is successful and if Senator REID is successful in packing this court with three more of their liberal allies. As I said, this court is currently split right down the middle. Four of the active judges were appointed by a Republican President and four were appointed by a Democratic President. Yet it is clear that the D.C. Circuit Court is in the crosshairs of the majority leader and his Democratic allies, including the President, because they want to tilt the court in their direction—a more liberal, bigger government direction, one that is more deferential to administrative agencies, such as the Environmental Protection Agency and other agencies that refuse to take into account a cost-benefit analysis, which we ought to have more of, not less.

The truth is that there is an answer to this standoff in terms of the court-packing President Obama and Senator REID are attempting. There actually is a way to reallocate these unneeded seats from the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals to other courts that actually need the judges, unlike this court that has the lightest caseload of any circuit court in the Nation.

Senator GRASSLEY, the senior Senator from Iowa, has offered a reasonable compromise which would allow several of President Obama's appellate nominees to be approved for district courts or courts of appeals where they are actually needed. In other words, President Obama would still get to pick them; he would just have to pick them for courts where they would actually have enough work to do and where they are needed.

Again, based on current caseloads, the D.C. Circuit Court does not need new judges, but other appellate courts really do. I would think that during a time when judgeships are constrained after the Budget Control Act, when discretionary spending is down, and when the courts need more resources allocated, we would want to allocate the resources to courts and to jurisdictions where they are actually needed, not to places where they are not needed.

For all these reasons and more, I hope Members of both parties will

agree that the reasonable way to do it would be to pass the Grassley bill, the Grassley compromise to reallocate these judges to the places where they are really needed and to prevent the stacking of this court and this reckless power grab.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

SUPERSTORM SANDY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy's landfall in the Northeast and the destruction it brought on a ruinous path through Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Rhode Island. I will be joined today on the floor—and I ask unanimous consent that we be permitted to engage in a colloquy—by my colleague from New York, Senator SCHUMER, and from Rhode Island, Senator WHITEHOUSE, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I can scarcely capture in words the awesome, monstrous power of this storm as it hit the Northeast as I traveled there. I was near the coastline of Connecticut, traveling some of the roads in the midst of this storm as it ripped through my State, tearing apart communities along the coast, destroying homes and businesses, displacing families, and forever altering the shoreline itself. Anybody who questions the power of nature at its most destructive should have seen this storm as it unfolded and the damage it left in its wake—in fact, in Connecticut, \$770 million in damages.

What I remember from touring Connecticut is not only the size and magnitude of the destruction but also the resilience and strength of Connecticut's people as they struggled through the pain and anguish of coping with this devastation, wondering how they would ever rebuild. In fact, they have rebuilt with the courage and relentless strength and fortitude that have so marked the character of Connecticut and New England and New York as they rallied around one another and exhibited that sense of optimism and hope. It was as important as any material resources that were brought to bear. They rallied around each other with gratitude and with hope because they had each other, and they have succeeded in clearing the debris, reconstructing, rebuilding in a way that is inspiring.

I only wish Congress's response was as effective and courageous as that of the citizens of Connecticut that I viewed in the storm's aftermath. The Senate was slow to act, but it was before the House in passing the \$60 billion recovery package for the Northeast. The effort was stalled in the House, quite bluntly, with bipartisan politics

of the worst kind and trivial obstruction.

There are lessons to be learned. No. 1 is that partisanship and politics should have no role in our response to disasters, whether in Oklahoma or Colorado or Louisiana or the Northeast. We are all in this effort together when disaster strikes. We should rally around each other as the people of Connecticut rallied.

Our response has to be quicker, smarter, stronger than it was in this institution. We owe it to ourselves as well as to the people who suffered the financial and emotional loss. For many of them, there were physical injuries as a result of this natural disaster.

Those two lessons are reinforced by a third, which is that these superstorms have become a new normal. We can no longer regard the once-in-a-century storm as once every hundred years. They are coming once every year because climate disruption is increasing their frequency and force in a way that is awesome and alarming and astonishing. So another lesson is that there has to be preparation to prevent damage and to mitigate the effects of these storms when they strike, and the investments—and they are investments—have to be smart and strong, with means such as storm barriers, breakers, better shoreline resilience.

Eventually, the Federal Government provided aid, and Connecticut has put to good use the \$200 million that was distributed through the National Flood Insurance Program to homeowners and business owners. Cities and towns around my State have used \$42 million in FEMA assistance, and more than \$10 million has gone toward health services and facilities. As our Governor announced yesterday, an additional \$65 million has been granted to the State to supplement the initial \$72 million from the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the form of community development block grants for disaster relief. These new Federal dollars are critical to the effort of rebuilding, and I will continue to fight not only for additional funds but also against the bureaucratic logjams and redtape that have prevented so many from receiving more timely aid.

This aid has come too slowly, it has been too small, and it has been behind the efforts—in time and strength—of the people of Connecticut. I will continue to fight for increased aid, including from the \$100 million that was announced yesterday and today—today's announcement of the U.S. Department of Interior of \$100 million in the coastline resiliency project. I will support all qualified applicants from Connecticut securing some of this competitive funding. We will fight for a fair allocation of this money to benefit the important work Connecticut is doing to strengthen our coastline so that we can prevent and reduce the effects of these storms in the future.

I had the privilege to travel the State as a leader of a listening tour for the Hurricane Sandy Rebuilding Task Force this past May, just over the half-year mark from the time Sandy hit.

The progress made with this help from the Federal Government, combined with the good will, drive, and sense of responsibility toward one another—exemplified by the people of Connecticut—has been remarkable. We must resolve to do better at the Federal level, and I hope that not only the storm itself but the shortcomings of the relief effort will be a teaching moment for the Nation.

The evidence is irrefutable that climate disruption is impacting our oceans and atmosphere and leading to an increasing number of severe weather storm events across the country that we cannot control. We will see more of such monstrous storms here and in other parts of the country.

I thank my colleagues, Senator WHITEHOUSE and Senator SCHUMER, who have been strong and steadfast leaders in this effort to recognize the effects of climate disruption and prepare for them.

Connecticut is in the process of upgrading our infrastructure to strengthen our resiliency among the most vulnerable communities. We are investing in microgrids, often powered by hydrogen fuel cells manufactured in our State, to provide backup power for hospitals and senior communities in towns such as Preston and Franklin, which I visited in the aftermath of the storm.

In Milford, residents are using HUD funding to elevate their homes so they can guard against these storm surges. Other coastal towns are employing green infrastructure with marsh grass to slow surging waters during storms.

In Stamford, CT, my hometown, the city is using Federal aid to upgrade a 17-foot hurricane barrier by replacing manual pumps to ensure against damage to the city's communities in future storms. I visited the shoreline of Stamford, as I did up and down the coast of Connecticut, and I have since, to see how Connecticut is learning these lessons so we can reduce dollar costs as well as human costs. The improvements taking place across Connecticut speak volumes to our strength of will and mind and the determined character of our people in Connecticut.

I express appreciation to colleagues, such as Senators SCHUMER and WHITEHOUSE and others in this body, who helped us in a time of need. They came forth to provide encouragement and support. They assured the people of Connecticut that they are not alone.

No one in the United States—whether it is in the Presiding Officer's State of West Virginia or in the westernmost part of Hawaii—should be alone after being struck by a natural disaster. We need to rally together.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Before I join the colloquy with Senators BLUMENTHAL and SCHUMER, I have two bits of housekeeping.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. today all postcloture time on the Griffin nomination be yielded back, and the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this is my 48th trip to the floor to remind Congress that it is time to wake up to the threat of climate change.

I am joined by Senators BLUMENTHAL and SCHUMER because 1 year ago today Hurricane Sandy struck our States with frightening force. Now, a year later, communities across the Northeast have dug out and are rebuilding, but Sandy left a permanent mark on our coasts and on our consciousness.

To be sure, we cannot say that this devastating storm was specifically caused by climate change. However, Sandy showed the many ways we are vulnerable to the undeniable effects of climate change, such as rising sea levels and warming oceans—effects that can in turn load the dice for more damaging storms.

As evening fell on October 29, 2012, a storm surge from the largest Atlantic hurricane ever recorded swept against Rhode Island's shores about 5 feet above mean sea level. A few hours later, waters peaked around New York City—about 9 feet above mean sea level. A harrowing night followed for victims of Hurricane Sandy. It was a night that took more than 150 lives and caused \$65 billion in physical damage and economic loss.

Hurricane Sandy, or Superstorm Sandy as many remember it, hit 24 States with direct effects. Floodwaters invaded homes and swept out roads. High winds knocked out power to 8.5 million homes and businesses, cutting a swath of darkness that could be seen from space. An entire New York neighborhood was gutted by fires that emergency personnel could not reach through the storm.

Sandy flooded nearly the entire coastline with beaches and dunes driven down by the waves and wind. Displaced sand and stone covered roads like here on Atlantic Avenue in Misquamicut, RI. Houses were swept off their foundations in Rhode Island's southern coast communities like

Matunuck, shown in this photo. Here we see Governor Lincoln Chafee, a former Member of this body, surveying the damage to these homes.

President Obama granted Governor Chafee's request for a Federal disaster declaration covering four of Rhode Island's five counties. More than 130,000 Rhode Islanders lost power. Eight cities and towns implemented evacuation actions. Nearly one-third of all Rhode Islanders were directly affected one way or another. In a close-knit State such as ours, nearly everyone was touched by Sandy.

Rhode Islanders are resilient and we are recovering. Over \$30 million has been paid out to Rhode Islanders for more than 1,000 Federal flood insurance claims. FEMA has approved more than 260 projects for reimbursement. Over \$12 million has been put to repairing our State's parks, wildlife refuges, and historic sites. Individuals and families received more than \$423,000 in grants to meet their immediate basic needs for housing and other essential disaster-related expenses.

The Federal Government will always play a central role for communities such as ours, picking up after a disaster like Sandy. So it would make sense for the Federal Government to learn from these events and be smart as we plan for future risks.

The Government Accountability Office recently reported on the risks to U.S. infrastructure posed by climate change. Roads, bridges, and water systems are designed to operate for 50 to 100 years. Well, 50 to 100 years from now, our climate and our coastline will be very different. Sandy threw at Rhode Island's shores Atlantic seas that had risen almost 10 inches since the 1930s, against a shoreline that had already retreated more than 100 feet in some locations. As climate change progresses, more and more infrastructure will be exposed to more and more risk.

Earlier this year GAO added to its High Risk List the United States financial exposure to climate change. GAO, our congressional watchdog, now warns that it is fiscally irresponsible to ignore the signs of climate change. The President's Hurricane Sandy Rebuilding Task Force, and his Climate Action Plan, both call for adaptation to this risk from climate change—particularly for better coastal resiliency and preparedness.

Here is an example of doing it right. When hurricane Katrina hit the I-10 Twin Span Bridge that crosses Lake Pontchartrain near New Orleans, it twisted and toppled the bridge's 255-ton concrete bridge spans off their piers and into the lake. The bridge was rebuilt by using Federal Highway Administration funding, but they built it stronger, better engineered, and in some sections they built it more than 20 feet higher.

It makes sense to make sure that our agencies repair American infrastructure to the commonsense standard that it is ready for future risks. Rebuilding to the specs that failed is not common sense. Being deliberately stupid in order to deny climate change is a losing proposition.

Congress can do something smart right now. We could pass the Water Resources and Development Act with the resiliency and restoration provisions that were in the Senate-passed bipartisan bill. Congress could support the President's Climate Action Plan, using our wise Earth's natural protections for our coastal infrastructure.

Of course, even robust climate adaptation won't let us off the hook in some places. New England can build levees and dams to hold the waters back, but the vast low areas of southeastern Florida are porous limestone. Even if you built a giant dike, the water would just seep in through the underlying limestone.

A study last year found that 3 feet of sea level rise, which is what we presently expect, will hit more than 1.5 million Floridians, and nearly 900,000 Florida homes—almost double the effect on any other State in the Nation. So Florida should want to prevent as much climate as possible, and that means cutting carbon pollution.

Ultimately, for the open market to work, we need to include the full cost of carbon pollution in the price of fossil fuels. Anything less is a subsidy to polluters. What Florida should want is for Congress to enact a carbon pollution fee to correct the market, and then return that fee to American families.

Ultimately, inaction is irresponsible, and Americans get it. Eighty-two percent of Americans believe we should start preparing now for rising sea levels and severe storms from climate change.

Young Americans, in particular, see through the phony climate denial message. Three-quarters of independent young voters and more than half of Republican young voters would describe climate deniers as "ignorant," "out of touch," or "crazy." Let me repeat that. The majority of Republican voters under 35 would describe climate deniers as "crazy," "ignorant," or "out of touch." Continuing the climate denial strategy is not a winning proposition for our friends on the other side. Even their own young voters see through it.

Congress should wake up to the alarms that are ringing in nature and to the voices of the American people. One of the loudest alarm gongs was Hurricane Sandy. Voltaire said: "Men argue, nature acts." Well, nature acted, driving epic winds and seas against our shores, and she will continue to act if we continue to tip her careful balances with reckless carbon pollution and shameless subsidies to the big polluters.

We need to wake up as a Congress and take responsible action to protect our homes and communities. We need to remember Sandy and learn her lessons.

I yield the floor for my distinguished colleague from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island, for calling Senator BLUMENTHAL and me and others together and for taking action on climate change. There has been no one in this body who has done more to sound the alarm about climate change.

I have enjoyed his regular "time to wake up" speeches. I guess this is number 49—excuse me, 48. One of them was so good I read it twice. He has been relentless on this issue in a positive, articulate, and superb way.

There could not be a better day to talk about climate change than today because we are at the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy. Senators WHITEHOUSE and BLUMENTHAL and I remember it vividly. We each visited our communities on the days afterwards and saw the terrible blow that Sandy delivered to New York and the whole east coast. It created such damage and upheaval to communities and lives. Sandy was a horrible event, but the one silver lining in this large awful cloud is that people take climate change more seriously. I think most Americans agreed that climate change is real, but there was not a sense of urgency about climate change pre-Sandy. People said, well, it is happening 25 years from now or 50 years from now. Unlike Senator WHITEHOUSE, who has a sense of passion and a sense of urgency daily and immediately about this, most people said we can let things wait.

Unfortunately, despite the efforts of the Senator from Rhode Island and others, our bodies are not doing enough on climate change. But when Sandy occurred, a sea change occurred. Americans understood—those of us in the Northeast probably more than anybody else—that we cannot afford to wait. It took 10 years to get the American people to accept the fact that climate change is real. It took one storm to get them to understand that we had to move immediately.

Sandy was awful. In the days after the storm, I toured places such as the Rockaways and Long Beach, Staten Island, Lindenhurst. Whole neighborhoods were leveled and thousands of New Yorkers were homeless. To see an elderly gentleman, Mr. Romano, sitting in front of his lot in Great South Bay in Lindenhurst, his house totally destroyed, sitting in one of his few possessions left, a little lawn chair, was devastating. I asked Mr. Romano: Are you going to move?

He said: Look at the view.

Two days after Sandy, the skies were peaceful, the Sun was beautiful, and it

was reflected off of Great South Bay. He said: Every year I have had 364 good days and 1 bad day. I am not moving.

That story can be repeated, but the devastation was real. To drive down the streets in the Rockaways or the streets of Long Beach or of Staten Island, the South Shore of Staten Island, and see house after house with piles in front of the houses of not just furniture, although that was a problem—we all have our favorite chair, a favorite place to sit. But people's lives were out there: heirlooms that had been in the family for generations, pictures and albums gone, like that.

This is an example of one of the places hurt the worst: Breezy Point, a hardy community of cops, firefighters, teachers, EMT workers; the heart of New York City's middle class. They are the very same people—many did from Breezy Point—who rushed the towers on 9/11, and some lost their lives. They were the people who were devastated here. A fire erupted, 120 houses—it looked like Dresden after the bombings in World War II—and all that was left was this religious shrine. I will never forget that scene and having the local firefighters showing me what had happened.

Of course, our local infrastructure was terribly damaged as well. Here we have the R train, which Secretary Fox and I just announced is going to be up and ready in 1 year. The tunnel had millions of gallons of water—brackish water, salty water—that not only ruined the infrastructure of the tunnels, but the signals that depended on electric functioning—gone. These scenes are repeated over and over.

What Sandy did is make climate change real to New Yorkers in a horrible way. The same is now happening across the country. So what Sandy did was not alert us to the fact that climate change exists but alerted us that it was a call to action. While climate scientists try to avoid blaming any single weather event on climate change, we know that a warming planet can load the dice for more frequent and extreme storms. As sure as we all are sitting here, there will be other storms, unfortunately, and God forbid but in all likelihood, of Sandy's devastation that will affect different parts of the country. As I and others have said in the days after Sandy, we have had far too many events over the past 3 years in New York, including Irene, Lee, and then Sandy, to think we can ignore the impact of a warming planet and the impact that is having on our communities.

Even if one denies the scientific reality of climate change, there is little dispute over the stark challenge facing our country. The weather is more dangerous than ever and threatens our economy. According to recent polling, Americans now support taking action on climate change to protect our children and grandchildren.

So we need to do two things at once. We need to decrease our reliance on fossil fuels to slow down the warming of the planet, and we have to start investing in real climate adaptation projects in the most vulnerable parts of the country.

My colleague from Rhode Island talked about the devastation in Florida. He is right. The Florida delegation should be up in arms. I know some of our colleagues—they tend to be on this side of the aisle—are, but we hear silence from the other side of the aisle on climate change. In just a generation, a good percentage of Florida will be out of commission. Miami, one of the largest cities in the country, is virtually unprotected when it comes to climate change.

So we have to do both of these things. One year after Sandy, I am pleased we have made some progress.

First, the Hurricane Sandy relief law we passed earlier this year provided an injection of billions of dollars into mitigation for the east coast. When we rebuild this subway line, the signals are going to be higher up so if, God forbid, there is another flood, they will not be out of commission. At the entrances to the various tunnels—hundreds of thousands of people take these every week—there will be gates or a certain kind of airbag that can instantaneously prevent the tunnel from being flooded. We are elevating homes and building new floodwalls and dunes to prevent damage from the next Sandy.

So one thing we are doing is mitigation. Those of us—Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator BLUMENTHAL, and others from New Jersey and Maryland and Pennsylvania and Delaware and New York and Connecticut, Massachusetts and Rhode Island delegations made sure in this legislation there is ample money for mitigation, so that if or when, God forbid, another storm such as Sandy occurs, we will be better protected.

Second, the President took a bold and important step in releasing his climate action plan, a critical blueprint for reducing carbon pollution. The plan also lays out a framework for implementing new mitigation plans for Federal, State, and local governments by tying Federal funding to new standards on climate adaptation. We now know a simple economic truth from many years of investing in mitigation projects: They save money. According to research, for every \$1 we invest in mitigation, we save \$4 down the road because of what will be protected and taxpayers will not have to shell out the same dollars again and again and again.

So it doesn't matter what side of the climate change debate one is on when it comes to investing in mitigation. Being promitigation makes good fiscal sense for the Federal Government.

A recent study found that Federal taxpayers spent \$136 billion on disaster relief in just the 3 years of 2011, 2012, and 2013—\$400 per household. The only way we can shrink this burden for the American people over time is to make critical mitigation investments at the same time we fight climate change by cutting carbon pollution.

I wish to specifically mention one piece of legislation which my colleague from Rhode Island also mentioned. He is on the EPW Committee and he has championed it with many of our colleagues. WRDA, the bipartisan Water Resources Development Act, got 83 votes in the Senate and will be a real boost for investment in climate adaptation.

In this bill, there is a new program called WIFIA. The very successful TIFIA Program which, for instance, without the local taxpayers spending a nickel, will bring our subway system all the way over to the far west side. I look forward to opening it with the mayor soon. Modeled on that program is WIFIA. It helps local governments invest in mitigation projects by providing low-interest loans and a new banking design to attract private investment into these projects.

There are also new authorities that will allow the Army Corps to expedite and prioritize hurricane protection studies and project recommendations. I thank my colleagues, led by Senator BOXER, of the EPW Committee for working with us to draft some of this language.

These new policies are very important for New York and the States affected by Sandy. I urge our colleagues in the House to work with us to include these items in the WRDA conference.

We need to use the tragedy of Sandy to learn how to make our cities and towns stronger for the next storm. We know it is coming. We have to work at the local level in terms of mitigation. We have to work at the macro level to reduce the amount of carbon that has poured into our atmosphere that will just devastate the planet if we continue to sit on our hands.

I will close my remarks by borrowing a simple refrain from my friend from Rhode Island. As his poster says, it is time to wake up. Superstorm Sandy was New York's wake-up call. Let's honor the thousands of victims of that event by investing in our future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, before I depart the floor, and while Senator SCHUMER and Senator BLUMENTHAL are still here, I wish to add a point that is a personal observation of mine as a Senator; that is, first the Senator from New York is widely and properly regarded as one of the more formidable presences in the Senate. Having witnessed the difficulties

that Senator BLUMENTHAL discussed at getting the Sandy disaster relief out and done, I will say we learned Senator SCHUMER has an even higher gear when it comes to the urgent needs of his home State and of his coast. When his New York City lies battered and drowned by storm, the work that he did to make sure a reluctant House passed this relief for us was an exercise in legislative craftsmanship and personal vigor that many of us will long remember.

Of course, I have seen Senator BLUMENTHAL fighting for his people in Connecticut, both after Hurricane Sandy and, of course, after the terrible tragedy that Connecticut experienced when a crazed gunman went into an elementary school and began to murder its children. So Senator BLUMENTHAL, in responding to those cares, concerns, and crises of his home State of Connecticut, has been truly exemplary. It has been a privilege for me as a Senator to see these two Senators in action in their causes I just mentioned.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I yield the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. I am sure Senator BLUMENTHAL joins me. I wish to say to my dear friend from Rhode Island—and he truly is a dear friend—that his generosity of word and spirit is only equaled by his intelligence, his diligence, and his foresightedness, not only on this issue but on so many other issues on which we are working. In fact, we are going to make a call in a few minutes—he and I and a few of our colleagues and I think Senator BLUMENTHAL as well—to talk about another of his issues. He is just such an intelligent thinker, and he is thinking ahead of the curve on climate change. But delivery system reform in health care is another issue on which the Senator from Rhode Island has taken leadership.

So I thank him for his kind words and just say “right back at you, baby.” I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I thank both of my colleagues. I am not sure I can match their eloquence in describing their gifts and their contributions on this issue and so many others, but I hope they and others will join me in meeting with the present Sandy task force in seeking to remedy or correct perhaps some of the logjams and redtape and deficiencies in process that led the people of our States to wait for so long before they saw relief in practical terms.

I thank them for their eloquence today and for their truly formidable contribution on the issue of climate change and global warming and to thank them also for the very powerful contributions they have made on the response to Superstorm Sandy that affected so many people in Connecticut.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

BUDGET CONFERENCE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an opportunity—actually something good that this body could do for the American people and for our economy and for the taxpayers. Tomorrow, the Senate budget conference that was established as part of this recent agreement that was made over reopening the government and extending the debt limit will meet. This will be the first public meeting of the group. We have had some other meetings, including the one I just had with some of the Members of that group, but this is the first opportunity for us to meet as House Members and Senate Members, Republicans and Democrats, in this budget conference, and it could not come soon enough.

The opportunity we have with this group is that in the wake of what happened at the beginning of this month—which was, again, a government shutdown and then a debt limit debate and then pushing right up against the debt limit—the opportunity we have now is to finally deal with this issue of government shutdowns and to deal with the underlying problem of overspending that forces us to extend the debt limit time and time again.

So let's start with government shutdowns.

The agreement opened the government for 3 months. That is right. In January, we once again come to this cliff where the government shuts down unless we act. So Merry Christmas and Happy New Year everybody. In January we hit this again.

It does not have to be that way. Earlier this year I introduced, with Senator TESTER from Montana, bipartisan legislation that would have prevented the last shutdown and would prevent all shutdowns in the future. It is called, appropriately, the End Government Shutdowns Act. It is pretty simple, and it addresses several critical issues we saw firsthand during this last shutdown.

It would end the chaos we saw on Federal services and citizens who depend on them. It would give government agencies the predictability they need to plan their budgets based on these appropriations levels. It would add certainty to the economy, and more certainty in the economy is certainly needed right now as we try to bring back the jobs. It would also take away the pressure for these haphazard, last-minute budget deals, which inevitably have stuck in them little provisions that nobody finds out about because they are all done at the last minute to avoid a government shutdown.

Here is how this would work: When we do not have spending bills agreed to by the time the fiscal year comes to an

end—and that would be October 1—then the spending continues just as it was the previous year. So it is the same level of spending, except that automatically it would begin to reduce spending after 120 days and 90 days. So Congress would have 120 days to come together and figure out a budget. That is the carrot. The stick is that after 120 days the spending would be ratcheted down 1 percent and then again every 90 days another 1 percent.

I think it has become painfully obvious that Congress needs encouragement to get its work done, and this certainly would be encouragement. By the same token, we would not have these government shutdowns. That gradual decline in spending, by the way, would treat all spending equally. So all discretionary spending would be treated the same way—no exceptions for liberal spending priorities or conservative spending priorities. It would be the same for everybody. Both sides of Congress would feel the pain, and both sides then might be more willing to actually get the work done.

Is this the ideal solution to end government shutdowns? No, it is not. The ideal solution is that Congress actually does its work, which is our constitutional duty—the power of the purse—and that is to sit down and have these appropriations bills pass. That requires oversight of the agencies and departments which are badly in need of it. It then requires prioritizing spending in 12 different areas. That is how it should work. This legislation, the End Government Shutdowns Act, would actually encourage that to work, again, because it would establish this situation where, instead of doing a last-minute deal where you can kind of throw in these provisions that Appropriations Committee members might want, you actually have to go through the process; otherwise, it just continues the spending from the previous year and then ratchets it down over time.

Sadly, Congress has shown it is pretty much incapable of doing appropriations bills without some sort of pressure. The Congress has not completed all regular appropriations bills by the October 1 deadline since 1997. Here in the Senate, actually, over the past 4 years, during the current administration, the Obama administration, and under Democratic control here for the last 4 years, we have passed all of one appropriations bill on time. So that is 1 out of 48 that has been done on time. It was a MILCON bill in about 2011, as I recall.

Congress does better with a deadline. Again, we see this with the debt limit and with what we just went through these last few weeks. We can do better. This legislation would keep the impetus for Congress to act without including the threat of another costly and destructive shutdown. I think it is a good idea. It is one that is already bipar-

tisan. It should be adopted by both sides. We had a vote on it earlier this year. It got nearly half of this Chamber. I hope others will take a look at it. I think particularly with what we have just gone through, it is something our constituents would think would make a lot of sense. I hope it gets the support it deserves in this body.

Of course, in addition to dealing with government shutdowns in this budget conference that we are meeting on this week, we also have a chance to address the debt limit—which is going to come up soon also because February 7 is the date that was chosen there. Now some say, well, the Treasury Department can use extraordinary measures to shift that beyond February 7. I suppose they could. But instead, why not deal with the underlying problem—why we need to extend the debt limit—which is the overspending.

It is as though you have maxed out on the credit card. It is a lot like that. We can spend only at a certain level in Congress, and then we have to have statutory authority to go beyond that limit. When you max out on the credit card, you do not just go to the bank and say: I would like to extend it. You have to deal with the underlying problem; otherwise, you cannot keep your credit card and you cannot keep your credit.

So dealing with the debt limit is the other part that I think gives us an opportunity. Over the past 2 weeks I know the administration has said repeatedly: Even though we would not negotiate on the debt ceiling before, even though the President refused to talk to Congress about it—which was unprecedented, by the way; no President in history has ever said that—but he said over the last couple weeks: If you all extend the debt limit and if you reopen government, then I will talk. So now is the time to talk, and the President should talk. I have worked for two Presidents: President Bush 41 and President Bush 43. They did talk to Congress about debt limits. Why? Because it is a tough vote, because our constituents get it, because it is akin to maxing out on the credit card and they want to know we are not just going to extend it again without doing something about the underlying problem. So this budget conference gives us the opportunity to do that, and I hope the administration will engage with us.

It has been 4 years since we have had a budget conference. Think about that. The debt has gone up \$5.9 trillion since we had the last budget conference around here. Almost \$6 trillion later we are sitting down again, and things are only going to get worse if we do not do something to deal with the underlying problem.

The two-thirds of the budget that is on autopilot—the mandatory spending—obviously is where not just the biggest part of the budget is but the

fastest growing part of the budget. It includes vital programs to our seniors, for those in poverty—Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security—vital but unsustainable. These programs cannot be sustained in their current form. By the way, that is not me saying it. That comes from data from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. The President himself has talked about this. By the way, the Congressional Budget Office says that Social Security and health care entitlements alone are 100 percent of the long-term increase in deficits. Revenues are starting to pick up. The discretionary spending is now being capped. The issue is this part that is on autopilot. By the way, it is 66 percent of spending now. It is 77 percent of spending in 10 years. The health care entitlements alone are going to increase 100 percent over the next 10 years based on what the Congressional Budget Office has told us.

I have heard rumblings in the press that this upcoming budget conference is just going to kick the can further down the road; in other words, we are not going to deal with the issue. We are going to say let's just extend the debt limit a little bit further and push off the issue.

I think it is time for the can to kick back. If the can kicks back, that means we will actually tackle some of these tough problems. After all, that is why the American people hired us. That is why they sent us here. If we are not going to do it now, I do not know when we are going to do it. I think divided government is actually an opportunity to do it.

It is time for leadership in the Senate and the House, and certainly from the President. It is time to come to the table. As I said earlier, the President has indicated he now is willing to do it. Do so in good faith and try to put our country on a stable fiscal path. If we do nothing, by the way, if we allow these annual deficits to continue, they will more than quadruple. Annual deficits will more than quadruple to \$3.4 trillion within three decades. That is based on the Congressional Budget Office.

We already have a debt that is about \$140,000 per household in America. We are talking about annual deficits quadrupling. If we let mandatory spending reach that point where it becomes 100 percent of the deficit—which is what they project—if we allow our national debt to reach two and a half times the entire size of our economy—it is about the size of our economy now, and it would go up to two and a half times the size of our economy—it will be the next generation that will pay, and pay dearly, and our legacy will be one of bankruptcy, skyrocketing interest rates, skyrocketing unemployment rates, and the collapse of these vital programs we talked about earlier: Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security.

Again, this is not ideology; this is math. It is fact, and it is fact that has been reiterated by the Congressional Budget Office, the trustees of Social Security, the trustees of Medicare, their trust funds time and time again.

This is our opportunity to begin to do something about it—at least take the first steps—both in terms of ending government shutdowns, as I talked about, but also dealing with this underlying problem that everybody acknowledges and that has to be dealt with if we are not going to have for future generations these issues of bankruptcy, higher interest rates, lower value of the dollar, higher unemployment.

The single greatest act of bipartisanship in this Congress over the past few decades has been overpromising and overspending. We created this mess together, and we can only get out of it working together. I have suggested where we can start: \$600 billion in the President's own budget. In his own budget he has \$600 billion-plus in savings on mandatory spending over the next decade. But whatever we do, I think we can call agree that we are tired of the gridlock, we are tired of the stalemates, we are tired of getting nothing done.

It is time to make some progress, and this is an opportunity to do it. These past few weeks have been trying. They have been tough on the American people, as they have looked at us and said: Wow. Are these guys going to figure it out? And we just kicked the can down the road. But we also set up this process and this structure. Let's take advantage of it. Let's use this opportunity to do something important for the future of our country and for the good of the people we represent. Let's seize it.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

DEFICIT REDUCTION

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I say to the Presiding Officer, former Governor MANCHIN, I wish to follow on the comments we just heard from Senator PORTMAN, who, as he said, served in two administrations—in one of them as OMB Director, in the other as Trade Representative. Before that he had a distinguished career in the House of Representatives. He is someone I am fortunate to serve with on the Finance Committee. I have a lot of respect for his intellect and for his intellectual honesty.

Before I talk about the real reason I came to the floor, I feel compelled to say something. As former Governors, the Presiding Officer and I have made tough decisions on spending, we have made tough decisions on revenues, and they are not always well received by people. They are not always well received by people in our own party.

I like to say there are three or four things we need to do on this issue to

make sure our deficits continue to head in the right direction. I do not worship at the altar of a balanced budget every single year. But what I do believe is that when the economy is strengthened and growing stronger, we ought to be having the deficit heading down, and when we are in a war or when we are in an economic doldrum, then I think it is appropriate to, in some cases, deficit spend.

Four things we need to do if we are serious about deficit reduction: No. 1, we need, in the President's words, entitlement reform that saves money, saves these programs for our children and our grandchildren, and does not savage old people or poor people. That is No. 1.

No. 2, we need, in my view, tax reform that brings down the top corporate rates—something more closely aligned with every other developed nation in the world. At the same time we are doing that, we need to generate some revenues for deficit reduction to match what we are doing on the spending side.

If you think about it, the Senator from Ohio knows and the Senator from West Virginia knows about tax expenditures: Tax breaks, tax credits, tax deductions, tax loopholes, tax gaps, add up over the next 10 years anywhere from \$12 trillion to \$15 trillion. We are going to spend more money out of the Treasury for tax expenditures than we are going to spend on all of our appropriations bills combined. If we could somehow capture 5 percent of \$12 trillion over the next 10 years for deficit reduction, that is \$600 billion. If we can match that in a Bowles-Simpson number, such as \$2 of deficit reduction on the expenditure side and \$1 on the revenue side, we could do about another \$2 trillion on deficit reduction on top of what we have already done. Is that a grand compromise that I want and I think the Senator from Ohio wants, I know the Senator from West Virginia wants?

It is not a grand compromise, but I would call it a baby grand. A baby grand is certainly better than kicking that can down the road. The last time we kicked the can down the road at the beginning of this year, I remember saying on this floor: We kicked a rather large can down the road not very far. I am tired of doing that. I do not want us to do that.

We have maybe our last best chance here in this budget conference in order to do the kinds of things I talked about. Democrats do not want to give on entitlements. I am willing to do that. But I am only willing to do that if Republicans will give on tax reform that generates some revenues.

I mentioned there are three things to do. The third thing is to look in every nook and cranny of the Federal Government—everything we do. The Senator from Ohio is a member of the

Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee. He knows that we focus—we have large, broad investigative powers, oversight powers, authority over the whole Federal Government. There are all kinds of ways to save money, all kinds of ways to save money in this government of ours, just as there are all kinds in big corporations, big businesses. What we need to do is, in everything we do, look at that and say: How do we get a better result for less money in everything we do?

I do not know if my friends from Ohio and West Virginia hear this from their constituents, but I hear from Delaware constituents and folks outside of my State these words: I do not mind paying more taxes, I just do not want you to waste my money or I do not want to pay more taxes, but if I do, I do not want you to waste my money. I do not want to waste your money or mine.

The fourth thing we need to do to be serious about moving the economy and getting out of this kind of rut we are in right now is to be able to make sure we have some money around that we can invest in the things we know will strengthen our economy. Foremost among those is a strong workforce, capable workforce. The second thing is infrastructure, broadly defined, not just transportation: roads, highways, bridges; not just ports, not just airports, not just railroads, but broadband, all kinds of infrastructure-related items.

The third thing is R&D, research and development that will lead to technologies that can be commercialized, turned into products, goods, and services we can sell all over the world.

The fourth thing we need to do is to do an even better job—and Senator PORTMAN was the leader as our trade ambassador. He knows what it is all about in terms of knocking down trade barriers. But while we do entitlement reform, we do tax reform, while we look in every nook and cranny of the Federal Government, investing in the three areas I mentioned, we have got to make sure when we develop these new products and services that we can sell them around the world without impediment, we can knock down trade barriers. The Senator has done a lot of work in that regard as well.

As the Senator leaves the floor, I will say there are many things for us to work on. I hope we will.

ARCHULETA NOMINATION

That is not why I came to the floor, but I thank the Senator for letting me join in that colloquy with the Senator from Ohio. The reason I came to the floor is to say a word on behalf of the President's nominee to be our next Director of the Office of Personnel Management. We have not had a confirmed OPM Director for the last half year. If you look across the Federal Government, the executive branch of the Fed-

eral Government, it reminds me a lot of what I call Swiss cheese, executive branch Swiss cheese.

We start with the Department of Homeland Security. We do not have a confirmed Secretary. We have one nominated, just nominated, just starting to go through the vetting process in the Senate. We have not had one for a month. The Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security—we do not have a confirmed Deputy Secretary. We have had “acting” for a number of weeks now, months. While the people who are in the acting capacity are very good people, very able people, it is not the same as having a confirmed Secretary of Homeland Security or confirmed Deputy Secretary.

There are any number of other positions in Homeland Security. As chair of Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, I probably focus more on that than on the OMB, Office of Management and Budget, trying to make sure that Sylvia Burwell from Hinton, WV—the Presiding Officer knows her well. As a guy who grew up in West Virginia a little bit, born there, spent some time in Hinton, I have a huge respect for her. We worked very hard to get her management team, her senior leadership team confirmed. They are confirmed. She has a great team. We need to make sure that in our other departments we have from the top to way down the ranks strong people in confirmed positions.

OPM, Office of Personnel Management. The President nominated a woman I had never heard of earlier this year. He nominated a woman named Katherine Archuleta. Katherine Archuleta—I never met her, never heard of her. The first thing I learned about her is she has been the political director in the President's reelection campaign. She must have done a pretty good job if the results were to be examined. Maybe some people are troubled by that. If we stopped there, that does not define who she is or what she has done.

If somebody looked at my resume while I have been a Senator, if they think that is all I have ever done in my life, they would be wrong. I have been privileged to be Governor of my State, leader, and, as the Presiding Officer has, chairman of the National Governors Association, one of the great privileges of my life. I was privileged to be a Congressman for a little bit, treasurer of my State, and before that a naval flight officer for 20 some years, retired Navy captain. That is who I am. That is not all of who I am, but that is a better resume. If people say all I have ever done is my current job or my last job, they would say: Well, he is not very well rounded.

I want us to take a minute and say—I am going to date myself on this, but a guy named Paul Harvey used to do the news. He used to say page 1, and

then he would say page 2. I am going to go to page 2. Page 2 is a little resume of some other things she has done with her life. I want to quote one of our old colleagues, Ken Salazar, who has known her for decades and hear what he has to say about her. She was born and raised in Colorado, I think has spent almost more than half of her life there. She has been, from time to time, among other things, chief of staff at the U.S. Department of Labor. She did that for several years. She also served as senior advisor on policy and initiatives for the city and county of Denver, CO. There are more people who live in the city and county around Denver than live in a lot of States, including my own. She has done that job.

Before that, a number of years ago, she had a number of roles in the office of mayor of Denver, for almost a decade, including deputy chief of staff. In a city that size, again as big or bigger than a number of States, that is a lot of responsibility.

She has been a senior policy advisor at the U.S. Department of Energy.

She has also served at the U.S. Department of Transportation, first as deputy chief of staff, and then later as chief of staff.

She has been a professor at the University of Denver. She has done all kinds of things. But she is a whole lot more than what people see and say: Well, I know what her last job was. She has done a whole lot before that. I think that helps prepare her for this job.

There has been a bunch of people who have been nominated to serve as Office of Personnel Management Director since I guess the 1970s. I think this is the first time we have ever had a situation where the President's nominee—I do not care what party, Democrat or Republican—where the OPM nominee has required cloture or even a rollcall vote since the agency was created in 1978. That is 35 years ago.

I want to quote Ken Salazar, one of my dearest friends, who was a Senator, went on to become Secretary of the Interior, who has known Katherine Archuleta for 25, 30 years, really all of her adult life. Here is what Ken Salazar says about Katherine Archuleta. He says she is a “terrific” human being. He goes on to say she “helped create modern Denver” as we know it as deputy chief of staff through Mayor Pena. She led economic development efforts throughout the city. She was instrumental in the creation of the new Denver International Airport. Ken went on to say she was “a star of the Clinton team in the U.S. Department of Transportation.” Star.

I say to my friends and colleagues, we have to get past this situation—I do not care if it is a Democrat President or Republican President—where we leave these gaping holes in leadership in confirmed positions. It is not good

for our country; it is not good for these departments; it is not good for morale; it is not good for efficiency. We are interested in getting work done.

You can disable the government by shutting it down or you can disable the government and make it less effective, less efficient, by making sure we do not have key people in the top leadership positions. It makes a difference if people are confirmed as secretaries, deputy secretaries, and these other positions.

As the agency responsible for managing our Federal workforce, OPM's mission is critical to ensuring that our government runs efficiently. Unfortunately, vacancies at the top levels of leadership have limited OPM's ability to fulfill its mandate. They have backlogs in terms of the processing they are supposed to be doing in job applications and others, people applying for pensions. They need to be addressed.

In Katherine Archuleta's hearing before a subcommittee chaired by Senator TESTER, one of the things she made clear is that she would make that her priority, going after the backlog, which I would say God bless her if she is confirmed. I hope she will be.

But at any given moment, we are lacking critical leadership in any number of positions in just about every agency. It undermines the effectiveness of our government. While Congress and the administration have taken some steps to address this problem, the fact remains we still have more work to do to ensure we have got the talented people in place to make these critical decisions.

This week, we consider the President's nomination of Katherine Archuleta to be the next Director of OPM, Office of Personnel Management. I have talked a little bit about her background. One of the other people who knows her pretty well, another Senator from Colorado, is Senator UDALL. She was actually introduced at her confirmation hearings along with MICHAEL BENNET. Here is what Senator UDALL said about Katherine Archuleta. He said, "Throughout her career, Katherine has demonstrated her ability to lead, to motivate and to work constructively with a diverse range of people and personalities."

Her story is a story of firsts. Although neither of her parents completed high school, they worked tirelessly to create better opportunities for their children. Throughout her career, she served as an example for women and Latinos and would be the first Latina Director of OPM.

The President nominated her to this critical position back in May. We held a hearing to consider her nomination—Senator JON TESTER held it. We voted her out of committee shortly thereafter. At her confirmation hearing, Ms. Archuleta committed to quickly taking steps to identify some of OPM's

challenges, such as continuing to implement the multistate plan under the Affordable Care Act, reducing the retirement claims backlog to ensure retirees receive their full pension benefits without serious delays, which many retirees see today.

As to the recruiting and retaining the next generation of Federal employees, I think we have a nominee who is qualified. We have a nominee who has been vetted. We have a nominee who is ready to go to work. It is our responsibility to give her a swift vote, a thoughtful vote, but a swift vote here on the Senate floor, I hope this week, so she can go to work, take the reins at OPM, and begin directing this critical agency with oversight from us.

When the Presiding Officer was Governor of his State of West Virginia, when I was privileged to be Governor of my State, the tradition in Delaware is the Governor would nominate the people to serve on his or her cabinet. The tradition in our State was to nominate division directors under the cabinet secretaries. The tradition in my State is that the legislature, the senate to which the nominees were sent, would hold hearings, and would vote up or down without delay on those nominations. I think in the 8 years I was privileged to serve as Governor of my State, every one of them was confirmed. I do not think I ever lost a nomination for a cabinet secretary or for division director. That is the way we do business in Delaware. That is the way we ought to do business here.

If you have a nominee who is qualified, who has good integrity, is going to work hard, surround themselves with good people and has a track record he or she can be proud of, that nominee deserves a vote. Let's give this nominee a vote and let's give her a chance to go to work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

SUPERSTORM SANDY

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Today it has been exactly 1 year since Superstorm Sandy hit my home State of New York and the surrounding region. Today is a very solemn day where we pause to ponder the unimaginable loss of 61 precious lives and the great collective pain as countless other lives were shattered. Over 300,000 homes were damaged or destroyed and businesses lay in rubble. Over 250,000 businesses were affected, many of which are still unable to open their doors.

There is something else to remember today. In the days and weeks that followed Superstorm Sandy, we also saw the absolute best of New York. We know New Yorkers are a resilient bunch. We got knocked down, but we get right back up.

As I traveled all across New York City, I saw neighbors coming together, going door to door to help the home-

bound, donating resources, volunteering their time, clearing debris. In the Rockaways I saw hundreds of residents create an impromptu bustling plaza of hot food, clothing, and anything people might need.

I remember talking to one small business owner in Staten Island whose restaurant was nearly split in two by a boat from a nearby marina, and he simply said to me: "We will rebuild this better than it was before," before agreeing to have dinner together this time next year in that very spot where that boat was resting. He said yes, and we had lunch at his restaurant only a few months ago. It was amazing.

In Westchester, a small business owner gave me a hug, and she vowed she would rebuild. She said defiantly, "This is our community."

On Long Island, I walked the streets of Lindenhurst, Massapequa, and visited Long Beach and Fire Island. While the devastation I saw was awful, I have never met more resilient and compassionate people. I witnessed homeowners struggling to pick up their own pieces and to get it out of the way to help neighbors, sharing food, sharing water supplies, giving each other rides to the stores, sharing generators, and clearing each others' debris.

While the road to recovery is very long and very hard, New Yorkers will rebuild. They will rebuild stronger, but we all have to do our part. Too many communities are still recovering and rebuilding. Some families are actually still homeless, living in trailers or confined to the second floor of their homes and still waiting for additional assistance. Too many homeowners have not yet received the funding to repair their homes and their businesses. Too often, those who are struggling to rebuild have been caught in redtape.

Throughout the past year, I have pushed to change some of the Federal policies that have stood in the way of recovery. We have had some successes. We were successful at pushing FEMA to extend critical deadlines for Sandy survivors to document their losses, so that those who have had trouble getting back into their homes are not prevented from filing flood insurance claims.

We were able to get the Department of Housing and Urban Development to relax regulations that would have prevented substantially damaged homes from accessing critical recovery funds. We received assurances from the Army Corps of Engineers that they will fund critical shore protection projects at full Federal expense, ensuring that these projects can move forward quickly without having to wait for our communities to find the matching funds out of very tough and local struggling budgets that are already stretched too thin.

That is not enough. For all of our successes, we are still facing so many

challenges. There is still far too much redtape getting in between families and recovery. My office hears every single day from homeowners and families who are struggling just to move forward.

Many of us are working on a bipartisan bill to postpone the potentially disastrous flood insurance rate increases coming into effect as a result of the Biggert-Waters flood insurance reform law. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to pass this bipartisan bill that was introduced by Senator MENENDEZ and Senator ISAKSON that would delay the premium increases set to go into effect until after FEMA has completed a study and provided Congress with a plan to make the rates more affordable. Our families working so hard to rebuild, frankly, deserve nothing less.

Some homeowners, even as they do rebuild, have started seeing their rates increase. This would cause so many of our constituents to be forced out of their homes and communities that they love, that they have lived in their whole lives. This is why the Menendez-Isakson bill is so critical and why I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense legislation.

As we focus on providing communities with all of the resources they need to rebuild from Sandy, the Federal Government is partnering with States, local governments, the private sector, and academia to develop solutions that will protect us from the next disaster. We know that for every dollar spent to make our homes, businesses, and infrastructure more resilient, \$4 is saved in potential recovery costs down the road.

Earlier this year Senator WICKER and I introduced the STRONG Act, which stands for Strengthening the Resiliency of Our Nation on the Ground. This bipartisan bill seeks to build on the progress that has been made locally by requiring the Federal Government to develop a national resiliency strategy, assess where there are gaps and opportunities for improvements. It also creates a new information portal for both the public and private sectors to share information about how to strengthen our communities and protect against future extreme weather threats.

We have come a long way in the past year, but I am very sad to say we have so much more work to be done. Our communities are working as hard as ever to recover, but we have to work equally as hard toward rebuilding and being better prepared for the next storm.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Later this week we will hit the 1-month anniversary of the launch of President Obama's health in-

surance exchanges. My question is, what have we learned the past 4 weeks? We know the rollout of the exchanges and the healthcare.gov Web site, Americans would agree, has been disastrous.

Last week the Associated Press ran a headline about what people in my home State of Wyoming had experienced. It said: "National health insurance site sputters in Wyoming."

The article goes on to talk about the health care law, the Web site, and says: "Wyoming Insurance Commissioner Tom Hirsig said Monday that he's personally been unable to register on the Federal Government's Wyoming site despite trying every day."

The insurance commissioner from the State of Wyoming has been unable to register on the Federal Government's Wyoming site despite trying every day starting October 1. This is the same story we have seen all across the country.

We have also learned over the past 4 weeks that the President's health care law is much more than just a failed Web site. What we know is that there is sticker shock hitting people all across the country as they start shopping and find that higher premiums are what they are facing. They are going to be paying much higher premiums if they are able to buy health insurance, if they are able to get through the exchange.

CBS News had the story of one woman in Florida whose health insurance will cost 11 times what she is currently paying—from \$54 a month to \$591 a month.

Over the past 4 weeks, another thing we have learned is that many people have received notices in the mail—cancellation notices—from their insurance companies. They are being told that the insurance policies, the coverage they have had, is being cancelled. Only a small number of people have been able to get insurance through the government exchanges so far. We have seen that over the last month.

In testimony today in the House hearing, a person from the administration said they cannot tell us how many people have been unable to get insurance through the exchanges, but we know that hundreds of thousands of people are losing the insurance they had.

Here is what one woman told CBS: "What I have right now is what I'm happy with, and I just want to know why I can't keep what I have. Why do I have to be forced into something else?"

Like many Americans, this is a person who actually believed President Obama when he promised that if people liked the insurance they had, they could keep it. Now she learned under the President's health care law, it is not only a Web site, it is a broken promise. It turns out if the White House likes your plan, then you can

keep it. If the White House doesn't like your plan, then you are out of luck, you can't keep it.

Yesterday the Obama administration finally admitted that millions of people across the country will lose their insurance. We know all of these ways that the President's health care law is more than a failed Web site, so the big question now is what don't we know yet? What is there that the American people don't know about the health care law? How much worse are things going to get before the White House admits the entire law is broken?

We have seen one headline after another about problems with the health care law that the Obama administration knew about and would not admit. There has been one revelation after another about troubles they hid from the American people and did so deliberately. What else is this administration not telling the American people?

The White House may have finally said publicly that millions of people are going to lose the insurance they have but, according to NBC News, the Obama administration has known that for at least 3 years.

When the train first went off the tracks, the White House said its Web site crashed because they said millions of people tried to use the Web site at the same time. According to the Washington Post, the limited testing the administration did before the launch found the site would crash if only a few hundred people used it.

It is fascinating. The Democrats' whole law was based on the idea that Washington, government, is capable of running America's health care system competently. What we have seen is gross incompetence. It turns out that Washington can't even set up a Web site competently, and it looks as if they knew it.

Computer programmers warned about the rush to get the Web site done by October 1. Instead of hitting the pause button, which they should have done, hitting the pause button until it could get things working, the White House pushed on. This is what we learned from some of the contractors who built the Web site. This Web site cost the taxpayers over \$400 million so far and the bills are still coming in.

These contractors testified last week in the House that full tests of the site should have started months in advance, but testing didn't happen until the last 2 weeks of September. Who decided to go ahead anyway? President Obama's administration. They are the ones who decided.

Contractors thought if the registration process wasn't going to work, then maybe it would help to set up a way for people to shop for plans and get information without registering. The administration told them to "deprioritize" that plan. What a government word, "deprioritize" that plan.

Then when the Web site turned out to be a complete disaster, a systems failure, the Obama administration tried to hide how bad it was. It asked the largest health insurer in North Dakota not to tell anybody how many people have signed up for insurance through the exchange—the administration telling the State: Don't open up, don't tell people the truth. Why not? Because as of last week only 14 people had been able to sign up for the companies' plans. The numbers are so embarrassing for the administration they have been trying to cover up. They continued to cover up today when there was testimony and no numbers were given. It is the same reason the administration won't say how many people have signed up nationwide. They know how many people have signed up, but they refuse to tell the American people, the taxpayers, the people who pay the taxes and see their money being wasted by this administration and this government. There are new problems with this health care law every day.

The Web site was supposed to be the easy part, but to me it is the tip of the iceberg. The Web site failures are just the tip of the iceberg.

What else does the White House know about? By now they should know about cancelled coverage because it looks as if millions of Americans have already received notices from their insurance companies that they have lost their insurance, their insurance has been cancelled.

There have been premium increases. People have talked about the fact that their premiums are going up, and there are higher copays and deductibles to deal with. People are losing access to the doctor. Plus there are always the issues of fraud and identity theft.

What else are we going to learn this week when Secretary Sebelius testifies in the House tomorrow? Will she actually open up? Will she give them the truth? Will she give them the real numbers, or will she not admit to what is actually going on and refuse to answer the questions?

How much worse does the Obama administration's incompetence get? What will it take for the President to admit that his health care law has been a train wreck and they will have to delay it for at least a year? We know he is going to have to do it eventually. There is no way all of these problems are going to get fixed quickly, and he is going to have to delay the individual mandate—the mandate that says every American must buy or have and prove they have health insurance. And who is the enforcer? The IRS—the Internal Revenue Service. The President should just go ahead and do it now and also delay all the other parts of the law, not just the mandate.

It is time for President Obama to really come clean with the American people about what his administration

knew and then come to the table to work with Republicans and give people the real health care reform that they need, want, and deserve so people can get the care they want from a doctor they choose at a lower cost.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my colleague from Wyoming.

Here in Washington and, indeed, throughout the country everyone is talking about the ObamaCare Web site. No doubt that is a serious concern. The healthcare.gov Web site has been, to put it bluntly, a debacle. I don't know of a single Member of Congress, Democrat or Republican, who would say otherwise.

That said, we need to be clear about something: The problems with ObamaCare go much deeper than a faulty Web site. Sure, the administration would have the American people believe that the problems with this law are simply technical in nature and that once they bring in technical experts to fix the Web site, all will be right with the world. But let's not kid ourselves. The problems with ObamaCare are fundamental and systemic. The administration may very well get the Web site up and running in the next few weeks, and they should, but that won't fix the health care law. I would like to take a few minutes today to talk about some of the problems facing ObamaCare that have nothing to do with the Web site.

When he was trying to get the law passed, President Obama repeatedly promised Americans that "if you like your current health plan, you will be able to keep it." This promise was central to the President's efforts to sell ObamaCare to the American people, and as it turns out, it was all a lie. Now even the White House admits that millions of Americans will not be able to keep their health plan under the law, and if recent news reports are to be believed, they have known this for years. Experts have predicted that as many as 16 million Americans may lose their existing coverage due to ObamaCare's new requirements. According to the NBC News story from yesterday, the Obama administration has known about this for at least 3 years. We have known about it as well.

Consumers throughout the country are already receiving cancellation letters from their insurance providers. For example, in New Jersey 800,000 individuals are being dropped from their existing plans. Kaiser Permanente in California has sent notices to 160,000 people informing them their current coverage will end. Florida Blue is ending policies of 300,000 customers due to ObamaCare. This isn't some unforeseen or unintended consequence of the law. On the contrary, it is precisely what was intended when the law was put into place.

As you know, Mr. President, the President's health care law includes a mountain of new mandates and requirements for health insurance plans. Any plans that fail to meet those onerous requirements are invalidated under the law. True enough, the law provides that plans that were in effect as of March 2010 will be grandfathered in, allowing consumers who prefer to keep those policies to do so even if the plan's don't meet the law's requirements. However, the Department of Health and Human Services has, through regulations, all but eliminated the protections enjoyed by those in existing plans by saying that the grandfathering provision does not apply to plans that have undergone any changes—even small changes to deductibles or copayments—since 2010. Under this requirement, many of the plans that were in place before passage of ObamaCare, particularly those in the individual health insurance market, will fail to pass muster. That is why we are seeing hundreds of thousands of Americans being dropped from their current insurance plans and why the same fate is certain to befall millions more.

As I said, the Obama administration knew about these problems a long time ago. In fact, regulations issued in July of 2010 estimated that because of normal turnover in the individual insurance market, 40 to 67 percent of consumers would not be able to keep their policies. Let me repeat that. The administration knew in July 2010 that at least 40 to 67 percent of consumers in the individual market would not be able to keep their plans in place. Yet the President never took back his promise: "If you like your current health plan, you will be able to keep it." This, quite frankly, is preposterous.

The response we are getting from the administration is that, sure, many people will lose their existing health insurance, but it will be replaced by better, cheaper options. This claim is at odds with the facts. For many people, health expenses will increase under the new plan as a result of higher premiums, higher deductibles, and higher copays. One study from the Manhattan Institute found that individual market premiums will increase 99 percent for men and 62 percent for women nationwide. For others, the new plans may not cover visits to their current doctor or the hospital they have used in the past. That is because insurers are reducing the number of doctors and hospitals covered by plans in the exchanges in order to reduce premium prices. These changes are a direct result of ObamaCare's new requirements and mandates.

I have received letters from my constituents from all over Utah who are scared, who are angry, and who are confused about the changes they are

facing. For example, Brenton in Provo, UT, currently has a high-deductible plan and uses a health savings account. This arrangement works well for Brenton and his family, and they would like to keep it. Unfortunately, Brenton's plan has been canceled due to ObamaCare. The plan he will be required to purchase is more expensive and includes coverage he doesn't want. There is also Kathy from Salt Lake City, who wrote to tell me her deductible will increase from \$3,000 to \$5,000, her copays for doctor visits will increase by 30 percent, and her copays for prescription drugs will increase to 50 percent. Kathy let me know that as a result of these changes, her health care expenses will now be higher than her income.

Even those who were in favor of the law are now finding it is not being implemented as they expected. A recent L.A. Times article profiled a young woman who was shocked by the 50-percent rate hike she received as a result of the health care law. She was quoted as saying, "I was all for Obamacare until I found out I was paying for it." That is a refrain I think we will be hearing from a number of people who supported "health care reform."

Increased costs aren't the only problem consumers will be facing under ObamaCare. There are other serious, more subtle problems that have yet to be addressed. For example, some consumers may have their personal information compromised by an ObamaCare navigator or by submitting an application to the federally facilitated marketplace, the Federal data services hub, or one of the Affordable Care Act call centers. I have warned about that for a number of months—that they are moving too fast and not doing the job well enough—and a lot of people are going to get hurt.

Social Security numbers, employment information, birth dates, health records, and tax returns are among the personal data that will be transmitted to this data hub, resulting in an unprecedented amount of information collected in one place by a government entity. Every piece of information someone would need to steal an individual's identity or access their confidential credit information will be available at the fingertips of a skilled hacker, providing a gold mine for data thieves and a staggering security threat to consumers. The entire system, including the data hub—a new information-sharing network that allows State and Federal agencies to verify this information—has not gone under any independent review to determine whether the data that is entered is secure. This means an individual's personal and financial records may be at serious risk of becoming available to data thieves.

I have already been to the floor several times to discuss these issues. I am

here again today because as of yet there has been no solution—or should I say no solutions—to these problems. In fact, the ObamaCare exchanges are less than a month old and data breaches are already occurring at the State level. A recent CBS News story featured a Minnesota insurance broker who was looking for information about assisting with ObamaCare implementation. Instead, what landed in his in-box last month was a document filled with the names, Social Security numbers, and other pieces of personal information belonging to his fellow Minnesotans. In one of the first breaches of the new ObamaCare online marketplaces, an employee of the Minnesota marketplace, called MNSure, accidentally emailed him a document containing personally identifying information for more than 2,400 insurance agents. While the incident was resolved, the broker said it raised serious questions for him as to whether those who sign up for MNSure can be confident their data is safe. These types of incidents are only going to increase as time goes on if rigorous testing is not performed to ensure that the data hub is sufficiently secure.

Despite assurances by the chief technology officer for the administration in early September that "we have completed security testing and received certification to operate," we all now know that all the testing had not been completed until just days before the October 1 launch date and that no third party—no third-party expert—had a chance to review it.

But there is much we don't know. What kind of testing was done? Who did the testing? What did they look for? What were the results? And perhaps most importantly, what are the risks of using the Web site? To help get answers to these questions, today several of my colleagues on the Senate Finance Committee and I are sending a letter to Secretary Sebelius asking detailed questions about the testing protocols, what waivers were received with respect to the testing requirements, and any and all results of the limited testing that did occur. Hopefully, that will enable Congress and the American people to better understand exactly what is broken with the system and help to ensure it does not happen again.

These questions and problems demonstrate why it is imperative that the Government Accountability Office—GAO—independently verify that sufficient privacy and security controls are in place for the data hub and the entire Federal marketplace so that Congress has independent assurance that the necessary controls exist and that taxpayers know their personal information is secure. That is why I introduced S. 1525, the Trust But Verify Act, which calls on the GAO to conduct such a review and delays implementa-

tion of the exchanges until the review is completed. The bill currently has 32 Senate cosponsors.

As you can see, Mr. President, the problems with ObamaCare are numerous and fundamental. As I said before, this law was bad policy when we debated it, it was bad policy when the Democrats forced it through the Congress, and it remains bad policy today.

I have little doubt the administration can eventually get the Web site up and running. They would have us believe that once that task is accomplished, everything will be fine. But that is simply not the case. They can't say everything will be fine when millions of Americans are losing their existing health coverage as a direct result of the health care law. They can't say everything will be fine when health care costs are continuing to skyrocket even though the President claimed his health law would bring costs down. And they can't say everything will be fine when consumers' personal information is at serious risk because the administration didn't take the proper precautions with its new data system.

As I said, the healthcare.gov Web site has been a debacle and the President is right to recognize it as such, but it would be a huge mistake to simply write off the problems with ObamaCare as a simple IT problem.

My own position on ObamaCare is very clear. I support repealing the law in its entirety. As more and more Americans lose their health coverage—coverage they shopped for and liked—and face outlandish costs as a result of the law, I believe that position will eventually be vindicated. In the meantime, I think we can all agree that the law is simply not ready for prime time and that at the very least it should be delayed so we can protect the American people from further harm.

I have made this call before and I am sure I will make it again. Today, with all the new information we have received—the broken Web site, the security problems, the skyrocketing costs, and the millions of Americans losing existing coverage—I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle will begin to see the light. I hope they will finally see what happens when one party tries to take on something as vast and as complicated as our health care system all on its own without any help from the other side.

I hope that they would work with us to come up with real solutions to our Nation's health care problems. I will keep waiting, and if the problems we have seen in the last few weeks are any indication, I should not have to wait too much longer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Under the previous order, all postcloture time is yielded back.

The question occurs on the nomination.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

At the moment there is not.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I suggest the absence of quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR THAD COCHRAN'S 12,000TH VOTE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, our good friend, the senior Senator from Mississippi, is about to cast his 12,000th vote, a truly remarkable accomplishment by a remarkable man. He was the first Republican to be elected to the Senate from Mississippi since Reconstruction. A few years ago he was named by Time magazine as one of the 10 most effective Members of the Senate, and they called him "the quiet persuader."

For those of you who have recently arrived at the Senate, if you have not had any dealings with Senator COCHRAN yet, you will find that indeed he is the quiet persuader. In fact, it may be the secret to his success.

He has had an extraordinarily accomplished career here in the Senate, and I wanted to take a few moments to congratulate him, not only on his service to his State and the Nation but to our institution.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I am sorry I am a little late here. I see my colleague, the senior Senator from Mississippi. I have had the pleasure of knowing THAD COCHRAN during my entire stay in Washington. He is a fine man. He has had experience in the House and the Senate, as I have. I have always appreciated his courtesies. He is just such a fine human being.

Before his election to Congress, he served honorably in the U.S. Navy. He was a lieutenant in the Navy. After his tour of duty, while attending law school at Ole Miss, Senator COCHRAN returned to active duty for his naval work, even while he was going to law school. After graduating from law school in 1965, he joined the very prestigious law firm Watkins & Eager in Jackson, MS, and in less than 2 years he became a partner in that law firm—which was remarkable. It speaks well

for his acumen in the law and for being a nice person.

His break from public service did not last long, though. From the Navy he ran for Congress in 1972 and served in the House for 6 years before running for the Senate. He served as Chairman of the Republican Conference, the Agriculture Committee, and the Appropriations Committee.

Throughout his time in Congress, Senator COCHRAN has promoted the best interests of Mississippi's citizens. Even when we were on different sides of the issues, I always respected Senator COCHRAN's service to his country, his dedication to the people of Mississippi and to the people of this country. I congratulate him on this impressive milestone and appreciate most of all his friendship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 222 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Baucus	Heitkamp	Pryor
Begich	Hirono	Reed
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rockefeller
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Landrieu	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Wyden
Hagan	Murphy	
Harkin	Murray	

NAYS—44

Alexander	Cruz	McConnell
Ayotte	Enzi	Moran
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blunt	Flake	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Chambliss	Hatch	Rubio
Chiesa	Heller	Scott
Coats	Hoeven	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Thune
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Corker	Kirk	Vitter
Cornyn	Lee	Wicker
Crapo	McCain	

NOT VOTING—1

Inhofe

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only until 7 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 1590

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, before the Internet, RCA knew how many records Elvis was selling every day. Before the Internet, Ford knew how many cars they were selling every day. Before the Internet, McDonald's could tell you how many hamburgers it sold each day. Yet the Obama administration cannot tell us how many Americans have tried to sign up for ObamaCare. They can't tell us how many people have tried to sign up for ObamaCare. They haven't told us what level of insurance they bought or in what ZIP Code they live. Not only can they not tell us, they have done their best to keep us from finding out.

With WikiLeaks and Edward Snowden spilling our beans every day, what's happening on the ObamaCare exchanges is the only secret left in Washington. The National Security Agency should learn some lessons from Secretary Sebelius.

We shouldn't have to rely on anonymous sources to get basic information about what's happening with the ObamaCare exchanges.

Yesterday I introduced legislation to require the administration to tell Congress and the American people how many people have tried to sign up, how many did sign up, what level of insurance did they buy, in what ZIP Code do they live, and what the administration is doing to fix the problems. This isn't complicated information. In the Internet age, the administration ought to be able to provide this information every day. They should be able to provide it really every minute. We shouldn't have to pass a law to find these things out.

So I hope every Senator will support my legislation. It is a six-page bill. It

has been available to the public now for 24 hours. It is easy to read. The stakes are high for every American.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 1590, a bill to require transparency in the operation of the American health benefit exchanges, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, my good friend from Tennessee has raised just another effort to divert resources from the implementation of the Affordable Care Act which we can then use to fix the very problems he has mentioned. I will point out that we report jobs data on a monthly basis, and this is going to be a different standard. I might also point out that in Medicare Part D, we release those data on a monthly basis.

I agree with my friend that there should be accountability for the mistakes that have happened and the implementation of the law going forward. In fact, right now, the Department is giving us daily updates on their progress in fixing the Web site.

So, again, let's get on with business. I think enough focus has been placed on the mistakes. Hearings are ongoing. There will be hearings in the Senate also. Let's get the problems fixed and move ahead on enrollment without diverting resources.

I thought about my friend's proposal, and I thought maybe we should amend it to say we will put in more money and get more people. I don't think my friend would want to do that, either, so we can take care of it.

So the people there need to get the problem fixed, and let's move ahead aggressively to get people enrolled in what is going to be a positive change for health care in America.

On that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Iowa. I'm disappointed—this administration described itself as the most transparent in history. All we have asked for is how many people are signing up, how did they do, where do they live, and what level of insurance do they have. We ought to know that. Taxpayers ought to know it. So we'll keep trying other ways to get the information the American people deserve to have.

I thank the President, yield the floor, and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FINDING A BUDGET SOLUTION

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I read with great interest the recent opinion piece on congressional budget negotiations written by my good friend Kent Conrad, our former colleague here in the Senate and distinguished chair of the Budget Committee.

I have been fortunate to serve in this Chamber for the past 38 years with principled leaders like Kent Conrad. I was elected to the Senate in 1974, the same year the Congressional Budget Act passed into law, and I have served here with all of the Budget Committee chairs—from Edmund Muskie to PATTY MURRAY.

I think Kent Conrad is right that at this critical juncture we need to have a grown-up discussion about our Nation's finances—both about the debts we incur and the ways in which we pay for them. We have all heard a lot of talk in the last few years about getting our fiscal house in order. It makes for a great campaign slogan. But I am afraid that too many are not following through on their responsibility to govern.

After jumping from one manufactured crisis to another for the past few years, which has hurt the U.S. economy and America's standing in the world, it is time for reason and sanity to return to the Senate—on the budget process, on nominations, and on a whole host of other issues. Returning to regular order on the budget conference—and letting conference members from the House and the Senate work out a final agreement free from rigid ideological positions—would be a good first step to bringing some comity and order back to this body so we can serve the American people.

I remain ready to work with people on both sides of the aisle in the hopes that we can find a workable budget solution in the coming weeks, and I suggest that everyone heed the calls for bipartisanship and compromise made by Senator Conrad.

With that, I ask unanimous consent that Kent Conrad's full opinion piece from the October 24, 2013, Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 24, 2013]

OPINION: A FAIR TRADE FOR ENTITLEMENT REFORM INCLUDES INCREASED REVENUE

(By Senator Kent Conrad)

Kent Conrad, a Democrat, represented North Dakota in the Senate from 1987 to 2013.

The Post's Oct. 20 editorial on the budget challenge ["A fiscal quid pro quo"] made important points but was way off-base on the issue of revenue. It suggested that a fair trade would be reductions to the "sequester" budget cuts in exchange for reforms to Medicare and Social Security and said that Democrats should not insist on additional revenue because that's a non-starter with many Republicans. Democrats would make a serious mistake by following that advice.

Our country needs more revenue to help us get back on track. Citing Congressional Budget Office calculations, The Post said that "federal revenue as a share of [gross domestic product (GDP)] will hit 18.5 percent by 2023, near the upper-end of the postwar range." That's true, but the last five times our country had a balanced budget, revenue averaged 20 percent of GDP. The Bowles-Simpson plan, which The Post strongly endorsed, achieved revenue of 20.6 percent of GDP—not by raising tax rates but by broadening the tax base and lowering tax rates.

Tax reform should be part of any budget deal. Tax reform is necessary to unlock the full potential of our economy. The current tax system is not fair and damages U.S. competitiveness. A five-story building in the Cayman Islands claims to be home to more than 18,000 companies. Is it the most efficient building in the world? No! That and other tax scams cost our country more than \$100 billion each year, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has found.

If we don't fix the revenue side of the equation at the same time as we repair Social Security and Medicare, it will never happen. To suggest, as The Post does, that Democrats should trade adjustments to the sequester for reforms to these programs assumes that the sequester affects only Democratic priorities. More than half of the \$1.2 trillion in sequester cuts are to defense, long a Republican priority.

A fair trade would be modest additions to revenue as part of a balanced plan. A revenue increase of \$300 billion to \$400 billion over 10 years would amount to only 1 percent of the \$37 trillion the federal government is expected to collect over that time. We can't do 1 percent? Of course we can. And by reforming the tax code, we could do it without raising tax rates on a single American.

A similar \$300 billion to \$400 billion in savings out of Medicare and Medicaid would amount to about 3 percent of the \$11 trillion the federal government is expected to spend on health care over that time. We can't do 3 percent? Of course we can. And we must: Health spending is the fastest-growing part of the federal budget, projected to increase from 1 percent of GDP in 1971 to more than 12 percent of GDP in 2050. And the trustees of the Medicare system say it will be insolvent by 2026.

The Post was correct that adoption of a "chained CPI," or consumer price index, system of measuring inflation should be part of any agreement. Most economists say that chained CPI, which accounts for behavioral changes people make when faced with increasing prices, is a more accurate way of measuring inflation. Going to chained CPI would raise revenue because our tax system is indexed for inflation, and it would cut spending because many programs, including Social Security, are indexed for inflation.

Federal spending has been cut by \$900 billion in the Budget Control Act, by \$1.2 trillion in the sequester and by more than \$500 billion in the 2010 continuing resolution. That is spending cuts of \$2.6 trillion, while only \$600 billion in revenue has been added. That is hardly balanced.

To suggest that Democrats should give up on revenue because it's a non-starter with many Republicans is like telling Republicans they should give up on entitlement reform because it is a non-starter with many Democrats. The truth is, both sides need to give a little ground on their must-haves for real progress to be made.

A mini-"grand bargain" would require all of these elements: changes to Social Security and Medicare to ensure their solvency for future generations; a modest increase in revenue so all parts of society participate in getting our country back on track; and changes to the sequester cuts that force nearly all of the deficit savings on less than 30 percent of the budget.

We can do this, but everyone must be prepared to give a little so that our nation can gain a lot.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ASHTON CARTER

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, after 4½ years at top posts in the Pentagon, Dr. Ashton Carter announced last week that in December he will be stepping down as Deputy Secretary of Defense. On this occasion, I want to recognize Ash's many years of distinguished public service—as a scholar, a professional, and a national leader. In so doing, I also thank him for his outstanding leadership of the 2.2 million uniformed and civilian members of the Department of Defense and his unwavering support of their most important mission.

Much can be said of Ash's scholarship. He graduated at the top of his class with honors from Yale University, earning degrees in medieval history and physics. His academic achievement also earned Ash a Rhodes scholarship, which sent him to Oxford University, where he received a doctorate in theoretical physics.

Much can also be said of Ash's dedication to public service. Before assuming his current position as Deputy Secretary of Defense, Ash ably served as the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and earlier under President Clinton as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy. Throughout his tenure at the Pentagon, Ash received several Defense Distinguished Service Medals—the Defense Department's highest civilian award—as well as the Defense Intelligence Medal. Ash has also helped to promote the Nation's defense from outside the walls of the Pentagon through his service on the boards and committees of several defense, international security and counterterrorism organizations, as well as at some of the world's finest academic institutions.

In my view, what is just as important as what Ash has done is how he has done it. With regard to the Department's procurement practices, Ash articulated a cogent strategy to improve the Department's buying power and empowered good, talented people throughout the acquisition workforce

who have long been concerned about government inefficiency to implement that strategy effectively. Indeed, it could be said that Ash's most significant legacy as the Pentagon's chief weapon's purchaser is that he has helped to force the Department to be as skilled in buying products and services as industry is in selling them. This achievement is perhaps best exemplified, for example, in the restructuring of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program; the successful award of a contract for an aerial refueling tanker; and making tough decisions on some very large, chronically poor-performing weapon procurement programs.

Finally, as Deputy Secretary of Defense, Ash has distinguished himself through his professionalism. Indeed, his commitment, skill, judgment, and temperament are reminiscent of those of some of the Pentagon's finest leaders. There can be no doubt that on many issues relating to defense and national security, Ash and I have had our differences. Some have been profound. But Ash has always conducted himself in a manner that appreciated the valid concerns underlying opposing views, while also mindful of the constitutional responsibilities of the elected officials who hold them. As a result, my working relationship with Ash has always been respectful, candid, clear, and productive. More importantly, it has been conducive to Congress and the Executive working together to address some of the biggest challenges to our national defense.

With this in mind, I join many in thanking Ash for his service and wishing him and his wife Stephanie fair winds and following seas. While Ash will move on from the Department in December, knowing his insatiable intellectual curiosity and his continuing desire to contribute, I suspect he will never be too far away.

NOMINATION OF MR. THOMAS E. WHEELER

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Tom Wheeler to be Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

No one can question that Mr. Wheeler is a supremely qualified nominee to lead the FCC. He brings to the job a long and distinguished career in the communications industry. He was a pioneer in the cable and wireless industries, having been instrumental in the growth of both these critical communications sectors. As an entrepreneur, he built businesses and created jobs.

This collective experience provides Mr. Wheeler with a unique insight into the challenges facing the Nation's communications regulator. And it affords him the experience to lead an agency that has the most challenging and

complicated set of issues pending before it since the Commission implemented the 1996 Telecommunications Act. I do not say this lightly. The decisions the FCC will make over the next few years will shape the future of the Nation's telephone network, public safety, the wireless industry, broadcasting, the Internet, and consumer protection for decades to come.

The Commission has before it a number of key proceedings to implement my Public Safety Spectrum legislation that became law last year. Not only will the agency implement a new tool for identifying spectrum through voluntary incentive auctions, the revenues from those auctions will provide critical support for deployment of the long-overdue nationwide interoperable wireless broadband network for first responders.

Aside from that work, the Commission is examining the future of the Nation's voice telephone network, and what the transition of that network can mean to longstanding, fundamental tenets of communications policy like universal service, competition, public safety and consumer protection.

The FCC continues to look at the future of media policy in an era when online video distribution looks to disrupt traditional business models and bring more consumer choice to the video industry. The FCC will need to conclude its work on the E-Rate program and update it to meet the next-generation connectivity needs of our schools and libraries. And finally, the FCC will have to implement a decision from the courts on the FCC's net neutrality rules and potentially on the Commission's underlying authority to protect consumers in the broadband age.

I have absolute confidence in Mr. Wheeler's ability to guide the agency through its consideration of these far-reaching issues. This confidence comes in part from my strong belief that Mr. Wheeler agrees with me that the FCC must always have consumer protection and the public interest as its primary touchstones.

Acting FCC Chairwoman Mignon Clyburn has done an excellent job as the steward of the Commission over the last several months. I am proud of her accomplishments, especially her commencement of a proceeding to strengthen and expand the hugely successful E-Rate program, something our Nation's children deserve. But acting chairs of agencies can only accomplish so much, particularly when they have taken charge of an agency that lacks a full complement of its members. It is past time for the Senate to act on Mr. Wheeler's nomination and to put in place the President's permanent head of this essential agency.

At its core, the FCC is a regulatory agency. Too many have forgotten that the agency's fundamental responsibility is the regulation of communications networks. These regulations

serve important policy goals. You cannot have universal service without regulation. You cannot ensure competition without regulation. You cannot have consumer protection without regulation. Given his experience and history, Mr. Wheeler understands the vital role of the Commission and the need for an active, smart regulator for the nation's communications markets.

The Members of the Senate Commerce Committee have fully vetted Mr. Wheeler's nomination. And an overwhelming, bipartisan majority of the committee favorably reported Mr. Wheeler's nomination out of committee in July. At his nomination hearing in June, Mr. Wheeler ably demonstrated his knowledge of the issues the FCC will face in the coming years. Mr. Wheeler answered all of the questions for the record submitted to him after that hearing—including all 78 questions from Republican committee Members. And he did so in a substantive and detailed manner. And honest, thoughtful responses by nominees have always been sufficient for this body to move forward when they are eminently qualified for a position and capable of fulfilling their mission.

It also has not been the practice of the Senate Commerce Committee to demand that a nominee to an independent regulatory agency like the FCC prejudge issues that might come before his or her agency. In fact, it was our colleague and former Commerce Committee Chairman Senator JOHN MCCAIN who, during consideration of a past Republican FCC Chairman nominee, said "Just as it is not appropriate for nominees to the bench be asked how they will vote on a specific issue that is currently before, or likely to come before, their court; it is not appropriate for commissioners who have quasi-judicial responsibilities to prejudge cases they must consider."

As Chairman of the FCC, Mr. Wheeler will be able to use the power of the FCC to spur universal deployment of advanced technologies, foster job growth and innovation, and protect consumers. This is an agency that oversees, by some estimates, nearly one-fifth of the U.S. economy. This is an agency that has raised over \$50 billion for the U.S. Treasury through spectrum auctions. This is the agency that has, through smart policy, guided the Nation into the digital age. This is the agency that has wide-ranging authority over so many communications services that are a vital part of our daily lives. From broadband to wireless phones to television content to public safety communications—this little agency oversees it all.

Because we entrust the FCC with such great responsibility, we expect a lot from those whom the President chooses to run that agency. I am pleased to support Mr. Wheeler for Chairman of the FCC, and I call on my

colleagues to do the same today. With all the important issues before the FCC, it is critical that the agency has a confirmed Chair and strong leader in place. I am confident, given Tom Wheeler's extensive experience and capabilities in the communications industry, he is the right person for this job.

EMPLOYEE BENEFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention the work of the Employee Benefit Research Institute, EBRI, in acknowledgment of the institute's 35th anniversary. EBRI is a nonpartisan, objective, and reliable source of information and analysis of private sector health and retirement issues in the Nation. Much of EBRI's work, including its data on qualified retirement accounts and its analysis of health care coverage, is unique and available nowhere else. As a research institution that is well respected by members and policy experts on both sides of the aisle, EBRI is frequently asked to testify on retirement, health, and economic security issues before committees in both the House and Senate. For more than three decades, the institute has provided credible, reliable, and objective research, data, and analysis that Congress can rely on. I congratulate EBRI on its 35th anniversary and look forward to many more years of its valuable, nonpartisan, and dependable analysis.

NATIONAL MEDICINE ABUSE AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the Centers for Disease Control has declared the misuse and abuse of some prescription and over-the-counter medicines in the United States to be an epidemic. According to the most recent National Survey on Drug Use and Health, NSDUH, there were over a quarter of a million new nonmedical users of prescription drugs in the past year and 1.9 million new nonmedical users of either prescription or over-the-counter pain relievers. These staggering numbers reflect the urgent need to raise awareness about the dangers associated with medicine abuse. To this end, October has been designated National Medicine Abuse Awareness Month.

Millions of Americans are prescribed medicines every year to treat the symptoms of a variety of injuries and illnesses, from depression to the common cold. Many of these patients do not use the entire amount of medication they were prescribed and either forget about or do not know how to properly dispose of the leftover drug. As a result, half-filled bottles remain in medicine cabinets across the coun-

try for months or years. And many of these medicines, when not properly used or administered, can be just as deadly and addictive as street drugs like methamphetamine or cocaine. Indeed, according to the NSDUH, almost 70 percent of those who abused prescription drugs last year obtained them from a friend or relative, many of whom may have had excess drugs remaining in a family medicine cabinet.

As a result, Federal law enforcement and drug policy organizations like the Drug Enforcement Administration and the Office of National Drug Control Policy, as well as national advocacy groups such as the Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America, the Consumer Healthcare Products Association, and the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, are reaching out to community coalitions throughout the Nation to help raise awareness and address the problem head on.

For example, in my home State of Iowa, the Van Buren County SAFE Coalition—with the help of the local pharmacy and the Van Buren County Reserve Officers—organizes regular drug take-back events at various locations throughout the county to provide an avenue to properly dispose of excess prescription drugs. Additionally, the local pharmacy there has started a take-back program that allows the pharmacy to collect unused and expired medication at any time. Another example of the response to this crisis is the Gateway Impact Coalition, located in Clinton, IA, that has collected nearly 3,500 pounds of old or unwanted medicine from residents in Clinton and Jackson Counties since 2008.

We can stop the growing problem of medicine abuse, but it will require all sectors of the community to join together to make it happen. I applaud the work of community coalitions, such as the Van Buren County SAFE Coalition and the Gateway Impact Coalition, along with many others throughout Iowa and the Nation. I urge my colleagues to do all they can in their home States to make their constituents aware of the dangers associated with the misuse and abuse of prescription and over-the-counter medicines.

SPECIAL ENVOY APPOINTMENT

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, as chairman of the Near East and South and Central Asia subcommittee on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, today I cosponsored S. 653, a bill that authorizes the President to appoint a Special Envoy within the Department of State to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

Unfortunately, there is a wide range of persecuted minorities who too often are victims of discrimination, marginalization, and violence in the

region. Coptic Christians in Egypt, Baha'i in Iran, Ahmadi Muslims in Pakistan, and Christians in Syria are examples of communities and faiths that suffer intolerance.

I believe that all peoples deserve equal treatment, regardless of faith, and I hope the appointment of a Special Envoy within the State Department will help protect those universal rights.

HONORING THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER OF GREATER COLUMBUS

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, today I wish to honor the 100th anniversary of the Jewish Community Center of Greater Columbus. The center promotes physical, intellectual, and spiritual wellness for the 6,500 members across Central Ohio.

Joseph Schonthal, an immigrant from Austria, founded the Jewish Community Center in 1913 to assist immigrants from Eastern Europe as they settled into their new life in the United States. The center provided those immigrants with a community center to learn and to grow. Mr. Schonthal also established Camp Schonthal in the center, one of the first Jewish camps in the region.

Today, the Jewish Community Center has several centers located around Columbus that provide adult, youth, and early childhood programs. The center is home to several cultural events a year and hosts a recreation and wellness center.

The Jewish Community Center recently opened the Columbus Jewish Day School to provide children from kindergarten through the fifth grade with a general curriculum, while also helping to foster their Jewish heritage.

The Jewish Community Center of Greater Columbus provides the Jewish community in Central Ohio with educational and cultural programs for members of all ages. I congratulate all who were involved in making its first 100 years a success.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO RAYMOND S. BURTON

• Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, today I wish to honor the remarkable service of a great New Hampshire statesman: Councilor Raymond S. Burton of Bath.

Councilor Burton has devoted his life to serving the people of New Hampshire—and it is been a labor of love. He has served with great distinction, remarkable diligence, Yankee wit and wisdom, and a deep and abiding love for the people of northern New Hampshire.

For 18 terms, he has represented District One on the State's Executive Council, distinguishing himself as a

tireless champion for the North Country. Ray is the longest serving Executive Councilor in New Hampshire's history.

He has also served for 22 years as a Grafton County Commissioner, and is now the board's Clerk. His position as a county commissioner allows him to double his efforts to improve the lives of the people of northern New Hampshire, which is his life's work.

This past weekend, Councilor Burton made the very sad announcement that he will not seek reelection to either elected post next year. This was no doubt a difficult decision for Ray, given his decades of service. I look forward to being in Council District One on Friday to join with Ray's many friends and supporters to honor his unmatched record of service to our state.

I am confident that he will continue to give 110 percent to serving his constituents, just as he has done for decades.

But his announcement represents a tremendous loss, not just for the people of the North County, but for citizens across New Hampshire.

Daniel Webster once said, "... in the mountains of New Hampshire, God Almighty has hung out a sign to show that there He makes men." Webster was referring to our beloved Old Man of the Mountain. But he could have just as easily been talking about Councilor Ray Burton, a gold standard public official of unmatched stature.

No one brings the same level of dedication, commitment, and enthusiasm to public life as Ray Burton.

To him, public service is not just a privilege—it is a calling and a true joy. And no one is better at constituent service than Ray Burton.

District One is vast, stretching from Pittsburg on the Canadian border south to the Lakes Region, and from the Connecticut River Valley to the Mount Washington Valley.

He has logged countless miles traveling the villages, towns, cities and counties of his district, frequently behind the wheel of a classic car. And if he is not driving an antique car, you will frequently find him on a snowmobile.

Seventeen hour days are not unusual for Councilor Burton. He has been known to start days in Claremont and finish way up in northern Coos County, before returning to his cherished home in Bath.

No community gathering or meeting is too small for Councilor Burton. If it is important to his constituents, it is important to him.

He has said for many years that he always runs for office like he is three votes behind—a real statement, given that he has served on the Executive Council for nearly 4 decades, frequently was the nominee of both the Republicans and the Democrats, and comfortably wins reelection by double digit

margins. It just goes to show you how seriously he takes the job and how eager he is to make a difference in the lives of his constituents.

The fruits of his labor can be found across Council District One, whether it is an improved bridge or road, or an initiative to strengthen the economy and create jobs.

It can also be found in quieter ways: the constituent he helped with a state agency, or the citizen who needed a hand with local or county government.

In addition to handing out his trademark combs, Ray gladly gives out his office number, his home office number, his car phone number and his email address—and he encourages people to use them. They call for help in times of need—and he delivers results.

In fact, a former State commissioner once joked that when she switched on her computer on Monday mornings, she would find two dozen emails from Councilor Burton. That would not surprise me, given his view that the concerns of his constituents are of paramount importance and should go straight to the top. I can personally report having received dozens of inquiries from Ray—signed with his familiar line, "May I hear from you?"

When not traveling his district, Ray is an enormously respected leader in Concord, where he first arrived in the late 1960s to work as a Sergeant at Arms in the State House of Representatives and the State Senate. Remarkably, he has served at the Statehouse during the administrations of 10 governors.

In 1976, he was first elected to New Hampshire's Executive Council, an executive branch panel that functions as a check on executive power and dates back to 1680. It is a position he has held since 1981, earning the honorary title of "dean" of the council.

When I served as New Hampshire's Attorney General, I saw up close that Councilor Burton is someone who does his homework, asks tough questions, and fights with every fiber of his being for what he believes is right. I also saw how deeply he loves our State—and how hard he fights for the people of northern New Hampshire.

Beyond his tremendous efforts on behalf of his constituents, Ray also deserves great credit for working to prepare future generations of leaders. After his election to the Executive Council, he initiated a student internship program, which has become legendary in New Hampshire. Over the years, 140 interns have served Councilor Burton. Many of these young men and women have gone on to great careers in politics and government, carrying on his proud tradition of excellence in public service. I know that Ray's interns are a source of tremendous pride to him, and I commend him for continuing a program that has served so many so well.

I am pleased to join citizens across New Hampshire in thanking Councilor Burton for his decades of extraordinary service to our State. No one has fought harder for his constituents than Ray Burton. And for generations to come, public officials will look to Ray as a model—striving to match his tremendous energy, his inherent decency, and his extraordinary commitment to strengthening our beloved state.●

REMEMBERING BERNARD WYNDER

● Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to an extraordinary individual, Bernard “Bernie” Wynder, who passed away at the much too young age of 58 this past June while serving as the president of the Allegany County chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP. Bernie overcame the challenges of a childhood on the streets of East Baltimore and made it his life’s work to mentor young Black men and help them to succeed as students, professionals, husbands, and fathers. Bernie generously gave his time and inimitable leadership to numerous community organizations, including Maryland Salem Children’s Trust, Western Maryland Food Bank, Potomac Council Boy Scouts of America, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Allegany County Multicultural Committee, American Red Cross, and the City of Cumberland Mediation Advisory Council. He also served on the Allegany County Human Relations Commission and as chair of the Friends of the NAACP.

Most recently, Bernie’s loving attention help reignite the local NAACP branch as a powerful voice for social justice in Mountain Maryland. I was privileged to spend time with Bernie on my visits to Allegany County and get to know his love for his community and to be inspired by his passion for social justice.

Bernie was born in Baltimore on January 4, 1955. He graduated in 1974 from Mergenthaler Vocational-Technical High School, where he served as president of the Student Senate for the Baltimore City School System. He is a 1978 graduate of Frostburg State University and received his master of education from FSU in 1984. Bernie started his professional career in January 1979, accepting the position of admissions counselor & minority recruiter at FSU. He became coordinator of minority recruitment at Slippery Rock University and then returned to FSU in 1982 as associate director of admissions. He served in this role until 1986, when he was promoted to be the director of the Office of Student Human Relations & Minority Affairs. In this capacity, he developed an academic monitoring program which is still in use today. In 1996, Bernie took over the management duties of both the Admissions and Fi-

nancial Aid Offices at FSU. In 2001, he moved to the Athletic Department, where he served as the assistant director of athletics and worked with coaches and the Office of Enrollment Services to develop recruitment activities for athletes and to increase their retention and graduation rates. Later, Bernie served as assistant vice president of student services.

Bernie Wynder’s lifetime of service has been recognized and appreciated by others. In 1986, Bernie received the Trio Achiever’s Award for the State of Maryland. He was inducted into Mergenthaler Vocational-Technical High School’s Hall of Fame in 1993. He received FSU’s Alumni Achievement Award in 1997 and received the College Admissions Representative of the Year Award given by the College Bound Foundation for service to Baltimore City high school students in 2002. In 2005, Bernie received the NAACP Image Award. In 2010, Bernie was one of three Marylanders honored as a “Living Legend” by the Associated Black Charities for his “profound achievement in higher education.” He is also an alumnus of Leadership Allegany.

Madam President, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said, “Everybody can be great . . . because anybody can serve . . . You only need a heart full of grace. A soul generated by love.” Dr. King could have been describing Bernie Wynder, who devoted his life to service to others. The NAACP and FSU students, faculty, staff, and alumni mourn his death, as do his brothers in Omega Psi Phi to whom he was a mentor and a source of inspiration. His love and concern transformed the lives of so many generations of Frostburg students.

I send my deepest condolences to his wife of 32 years, Robin Vowels Wynder; their son, Bernard “Bear” Wynder Jr.; their daughter, Brandie McIntyre; and the rest of his family. Bernie Wynder was a man of uncommon integrity, wisdom, compassion, and commitment. We will miss his courage and vision and voice.●

REMEMBERING PAUL RALSTIN

● Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of an outstanding conservationist, sportsman, and dear friend.

Paul Ralstin’s interest in the outdoors and wildlife conservation began at a young age, when he was an active Boy Scout and Eagle Scout. He grew that appreciation into a strong devotion to advancing conservation efforts as an active Ducks Unlimited volunteer, hunter, and fisherman. A graduate of Capital High School, Paul grew up and lived in Boise. In addition to serving in multiple leadership roles in Ducks Unlimited, Inc., Ducks Unlimited Canada, and Ducks Unlimited de Mexico, Paul was successful in the con-

struction industry as owner of the family construction business, Gem State Builders. Paul also helped develop opportunities for others through serving as a mentor.

Throughout his life, Paul led with a heartfelt exuberance. His wit, friendliness, sense of adventure, and fun-loving spirit will be forever remembered. I have greatly valued his friendship and insight and extend my deep condolences to his wife Jeanne, children, and many friends and family. Paul’s exemplary commitment to improving our natural resources and wildlife habitat will not be forgotten. His enthusiasm and dedication will live on in the many lives he touched throughout his life.●

BUCKSKIN MINE

● Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise today with great pride to speak about another Wyoming success story. I am very pleased to have this opportunity to extend our congratulations to the Buckskin Mine, which is located in my home State of Wyoming, for the outstanding record of safety they were able to compile in 2012. The mine’s focus on safety and the great results they were able to achieve speak volumes about the mine and the care and attention they give to safety and to keeping their employees safe at work.

I have often heard it said that successful safety and health programs don’t just “happen.” They take a great deal of time and effort and they result from a teamwork approach that involves everyone from the owner of the mine to the dedicated and hard-working team that works in the mine every day. That means this safety award was earned by everyone at the mine.

It is no secret. Working in a mine is a difficult and dangerous job, and it requires every worker to look out for their own safety as well as their fellow workers’ safety. That kind of diligence, exercised every day, is what helps to ensure that all our workers will make a safe return home at the end of the day to be with their families.

Simply put, that is why the Buckskin Mine is receiving this recognition. Their staff goes the extra mile every day to make sure their mine is as safe as it can possibly be. The culture of workplace safety that is then created helps to keep each of their workers focused on safety throughout the day. The result is this special award.

I have always believed that the best way to lead is by example, and by earning this important recognition they have established a record of safety that other mines will want to emulate. In the end, that is something that will continue to benefit Wyoming and the mining industry all across the Nation.

The Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, on which I serve, has focused our attention on this key issue for many years.

As a committee, we are well aware of what an impressive record this is, and we hope their record of success will become the norm across the United States. Safe work habits create safe workplaces and low accident rates for all employees which makes our business community, especially our mining industry, more productive. Good safety records also help to make our businesses more prosperous which is another benefit that comes from putting workplace safety first.

That is why it gives me a great deal of pride to extend these best wishes and words of congratulations to every employee of the Buckskin Mine, its management, and all those who have worked so hard to keep the mine safe. It took a team with a vision to create and put a safety program into effect, and the Buckskin mine team can be very proud of their efforts and the great result they were able to achieve. They have made a difference that will have an impact from their own backyard to every corner of our country that relies on mines and mining.

Now their challenge is to keep up the good work and to keep their excellent safety record going strong. With the hard-working group that makes the Buckskin Mine such a safe workplace, I have every confidence they will continue to serve as an example of what is possible when workers and management work together to keep our workplaces safe.●

TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN N. ADUBATO, SR.

● Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise today to honor the extraordinary work of Stephen Adubato, Sr., and the lifetime of contributions he has made to better the lives of Newark, NJ residents. From the 3- and 4-year-olds who attend the preschool program he founded, to the older adults who are cared for at Casa Israel Adult Medical Day Care, thousands of people each and every day are positively touched by the institutions that Mr. Adubato has created.

Mr. Adubato began his own career in education as a history and government teacher in the Newark public schools, where he taught for 15 years. While teaching, he obtained a master's degree in education and completed the coursework for a doctorate in education.

Beginning in 1970, Mr. Adubato built the North Ward Center from a small storefront office on Bloomfield Avenue into the thriving institution it is today. During an era of instability, uncertainty, and transformation in the city, the North Ward Center served as a pillar of stability, offering job training, education, and recreational opportunities to families struggling for survival. Given his strong commitment to education, it is no surprise that one of

the first programs created by the North Ward Center was a preschool. Today, the North Ward Child Development Center educates 700 children a year and is one of the largest Abbott preschools in the State.

In 1980, the North Ward Center founded the Newark Business Training Institute, NBTI, which has helped thousands of adults transition from welfare to work and has returned more than \$1 billion into the State's economy. NBTI currently offers English as a second language to ensure recent immigrants have the language skills necessary to find good jobs.

The crowning achievement of Mr. Adubato's lifelong dedication to education is the Robert Treat Academy Charter School, which enrolls 450 students in grades K-8. Founded in 1997 as one of the State's first charter schools, Robert Treat has gained a national reputation for its academic success and was named a Blue Ribbon school in 2008.

In August 2009, Robert Treat opened a second campus in the Central Ward of Newark. It started with a kindergarten and first grade class and will add a grade each year. Between the two campuses, Robert Treat will eventually enroll 675 students.

Mr. Adubato received a doctor of humane letters from Kean University in May 2010. He received the Official Knight of the Order of Merit of the Republic of Italy and was honored by the New Jersey Ballet and the Archdiocese of Newark as the Humanitarian of the Year. Mr. Adubato was also honored by the Thurgood Marshall College Fund and National Organization of African-American Administrators. In September 2009, he was honored by Essex County, which named the recreation complex in Branch Brook Park the Stephen N. Adubato, Sr., Sports Complex.

There is no doubt that the lifetime work of Stephen Adubato, Sr., has greatly benefited the people of Newark. His commitment to helping those around him is not only admirable, it is inspiring, and his legacy is sure to have a lasting impact on the city. I join together with all New Jerseyans in thanking him for a career of remarkable contribution.●

RECOGNIZING MICRO 100

● Mr. RISCH. Madam President, sons can learn so much from their fathers. Whether it is changing a tire, throwing a football, or loving a family, the lessons derived from our fathers can have a profound impact on our lives. In 1969, 24-year old Dale Newberry agreed to join his father Jack in a family business selling cutting tools to local machine shops. What began 44 years ago as a two-machine operation based out of a carport of a southern California home is now a \$15 million-a-year business based in Meridian, ID, that em-

ployes 110 Idahoans and sells from a catalog of 12,000 carbide cutting tools to more than 600 U.S. distributors and others in 40 countries.

Micro 100 specializes in manufacturing both industry standard and custom carbide tools which are used to manufacture items essential to modern life, including airplane wings, watch parts, telephone receivers, car-door handles, and household appliance components. The strength of these tools makes them virtually unbreakable.

Micro 100 utilizes a proprietary process that increases the toughness of micrograin carbide material without diminishing its hardness. Carbide is 90 percent tungsten—one of the hardest metals on the planet—but Micro 100 uses machines whose grinding wheels are coated in industrial diamond, the only substance known that will cut tungsten. As a result, carbide tools produced by Micro 100 stay sharp for 10 or 20 times longer than steel.

For years, Micro 100 products have achieved a 99.9 percent customer satisfaction rate from clients engaged in a wide range of metalworking fields, including mold and die making, high-speed cutting, high-precision cutting, high-performance milling of aluminum, plastics, and nonferrous materials, and hard milling. Therefore, it is only fitting that we celebrate this firm's growth and successes, as they have simultaneously helped create jobs in Idaho and enhanced the reputation of American manufacturing in the global community. I am proud to extend my congratulations to Dale Newberry and everyone at Micro 100 for their tremendous efforts and offer my best wishes for their continued success.●

TRIBUTE TO CORY KLUMB

● Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I wish to honor Cory Allen Klumb, a veteran of the U.S. Army and the Army National Guard. Cory, on behalf of all Montanans and all Americans, I stand to say thank you for your service to this Nation. It is my honor to share the story of Cory's service, because no veteran's story should ever go unrecognized. Cory was born in Wisconsin in 1965. He joined the Army in January of 1986 and reached the rank of sergeant when he was discharged in May of 1989. After a few years, Cory decided to use the veterans' education benefits he earned to attend Montana State University, a State he had only visited once before.

In 1999, Cory got a job with the Montana Highway Patrol and decided to enlist in the Montana Army National Guard—10 years to the day after he was discharged from active duty. Cory was a member of the 143rd Military Police Detachment out of Belgrade. In 2003, his unit was deployed to Iraq to assist with Operation Iraqi Freedom.

On April 13, 2004, Cory's convoy was traveling from Baghdad National Airport to their station when they were struck by an improvised explosive device, or I-E-D. Fortunately, no lives were lost in that explosion, but Cory experienced permanent hearing damage. Two months later, the 143rd MP detachment returned to Montana. Cory left the National Guard in 2006 at the rank of staff sergeant.

Today, he is a police sergeant in Bozeman, where he lives with his wife Kelly and his daughter Piper.

Earlier this month, in the presence of Cory's family, it was my honor to present him with his Purple Heart Medal.

This decoration—and the decorations that Cory has already received—are small tokens, but they are powerful symbols of true heroism, sacrifice and dedication to service. This medal is presented on behalf of a grateful nation.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:28 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1405. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include a notice of disagreement form in any notice of decision issued for the denial of a benefit sought, to improve the supervision of fiduciaries of veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1742. An act to exclude from consideration as income under the United States Housing Act of 1937 payments of pension made under section 1521 of title 38, United States Code, to veterans who are in need of regular aid and attendance, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2011. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a two-year extension of the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education.

H.R. 2189. An act to improve the processing of disability claims by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2481. An act to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to benefits, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3304. An act to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor to Bennie G. Adkins and Donald P. Sloat of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam Conflict and to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to certain other veterans who were previously recommended for award of the Medal of Honor.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1405. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include a notice of disagree-

ment form in any notice of decision issued for the denial of a benefit sought, to improve the supervision of fiduciaries of veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1742. An act to exclude from consideration as income under the United States Housing Act of 1937 payments of pension made under section 1521 of title 38, United States Code, to veterans who are in need of regular aid and attendance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2011. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a two-year extension of the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2189. An act to improve the processing of disability claims by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2481. An act to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3304. An act to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor to Bennie G. Adkins and Donald P. Sloat of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam Conflict and to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to certain other veterans who were previously recommended for award of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1592. A bill to provide for a delay of the individual mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until the American Health Benefit Exchanges are functioning properly.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1594. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the Paul Brown United States Courthouse; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1595. A bill to establish a renewable electricity standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 1596. A bill to require State educational agencies that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to have in effect policies and procedures on background checks for school employees; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1597. A bill to provide for the use of savings promotion raffle products by financial

institutions to encourage savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1598. A bill to provide a process for ensuring the United States does not default on its obligations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1599. A bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HELLER, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. COONS, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COATS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. RISCH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1600. A bill to facilitate the reestablishment of domestic, critical mineral designation, assessment, production, manufacturing, recycling, analysis, forecasting, workforce, education, research, and international capabilities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1601. A bill to ensure that certain communities may be granted exceptions for floodproofed residential basements for purposes of determining risk premium rates for flood insurance; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 1602. A bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for the diagnosis, treatment, and research of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces, to provide certain services to those descendants, to establish an advisory board on exposure to toxic substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 1603. A bill to reaffirm that certain land has been taken into trust for the benefit of the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatami Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1604. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand and enhance eligibility for health care and services through the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1605. A bill for the relief of Michael G. Faber; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

S. 1606. A bill to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be constructed at 3141

Centennial Boulevard, Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "PFC Floyd K. Lindstrom Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1607. A bill to provide conformity in Native small business opportunities and promote job creation, manufacturing, and American economic recovery; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 1608. A bill to authorize appropriations for the SelectUSA Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 1609. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to authorize the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to lease tidelands and submerged lands under control of the Coast Guard for periods longer than five years; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1610. A bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BROWN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 276. A resolution designating October 2013 as "National Work and Family Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 29

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 29, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

S. 80

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 80, a bill to amend the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 to provide for Debbie Smith grants for auditing sexual assault evidence backlogs and to establish a Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Reporting System, and for other purposes.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 203, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame.

S. 209

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 209, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 264

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 264, a bill to expand access to community mental health centers and improve the quality of mental health care for all Americans.

S. 288

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 288, a bill to increase the participation of historically underrepresented demographic groups in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education and industry.

S. 289

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of S. 289, a bill to extend the low-interest refinancing provisions under the Local Development Business Loan Program of the Small Business Administration.

S. 372

At the request of Ms. WARREN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 372, a bill to provide for the reduction of unintended pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections, including HIV, and the promotion of healthy relationships, and for other purposes.

S. 395

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 395, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide further protection for puppies.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 554

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 554, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 641, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. KAINE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 669

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 669, a bill to make permanent the Internal Revenue Service Free File program.

S. 699

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes.

S. 700

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 700, a bill to ensure that the education and training provided members of the Armed Forces and veterans better assists members and veterans in obtaining civilian certifications and licenses, and for other purposes.

S. 709

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 709, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, leading to better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

S. 731

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 731, a bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance

Corporation, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency to conduct an empirical impact study on proposed rules relating to the International Basel III agreement on general risk-based capital requirements, as they apply to community banks.

S. 820

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 820, a bill to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, and for other purposes.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 924

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 924, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to enhance existing programs providing mitigation assistance by encouraging States to adopt and actively enforce State building codes, and for other purposes.

S. 932

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 932, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for advance appropriations for certain discretionary accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 945

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 945, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program.

S. 1012

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from North Caro-

lina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1012, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve operations of recovery auditors under the Medicare integrity program, to increase transparency and accuracy in audits conducted by contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 1053

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1053, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen and protect Medicare hospice programs.

S. 1150

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1150, a bill to posthumously award a congressional gold medal to Constance Baker Motley.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1187

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1187, a bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt.

S. 1195

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1195, a bill to repeal the renewable fuel standard.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee

Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1318

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1318, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 1332

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 1340

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1340, a bill to improve passenger vessel security and safety, and for other purposes.

S. 1351

At the request of Mr. KAIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1351, a bill to provide for fiscal gap and generational accounting analysis in the legislative process, the President's budget, and annual long-term fiscal outlook reports.

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1351, *supra*.

S. 1357

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1357, a bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program.

S. 1452

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1452, a bill to enhance transparency for certain surveillance programs authorized by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and for other purposes.

S. 1490

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1490, a bill to delay the application of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1507

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr.

CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

S. 1517

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1517, a bill to amend the Public Health Services Act and the Social Security Act to extend health information technology assistance eligibility to behavioral health, mental health, and substance abuse professionals and facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1529

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1529, a bill to provide benefits to domestic partners of Federal employees.

S. 1551

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1551, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 1590

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1590, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges.

S. 1592

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1592, a bill to provide for a delay of the individual mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until the American

Health Benefit Exchanges are functioning properly.

S. RES. 26

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 26, a resolution recognizing that access to hospitals and other health care providers for patients in rural areas of the United States is essential to the survival and success of communities in the United States.

S. RES. 254

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 254, a resolution designating November 2, 2013, as "National Bison Day".

S. RES. 270

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 270, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World Polio Day and commending the international community and others for their efforts to prevent and eradicate polio.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1594. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the Paul Brown United States Courthouse; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the late Judge Paul Brown, and to urge the Senate to adopt a bill I am introducing, along with the Senior Senator from Texas. This bill will rename the Federal courthouse in Sherman, TX, as the Paul Brown United States Courthouse.

Judge Brown was a Federal judge for the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas. He joined the court in 1985, after being nominated by President Reagan. He served on that court admirably until his death on November 26, 2012.

Judge Paul Brown was born on October 4, 1926. He was the youngest of 6 children. He was raised on a farm near Pottsboro, TX. He graduated from Denison High School in 1943.

He left home to attend the University of Texas at Austin. But with World War II escalating, he left UT to enlist in the Navy at the age of 17. He returned to UT, where he got his law degree in 1950. He is said to have loved UT so much that a fellow judge once recalled that although Judge Brown never wore a burnt orange tie on the bench, you could see him "glow orange" by simply mentioning UT.

Just after Judge Brown got his law degree, the Korean War began. And he served our country admirably once

again in the Navy from 1950 to 1951. In 1951, he returned to Sherman, TX, and began private practice. In 1953, he was appointed as an Assistant U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas. President Eisenhower named him U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas in 1959.

After meeting and marrying Francis Morehead in Texarkana, Judge Brown then moved back to Sherman and reentered private practice in 1961. After almost a quarter century of practicing law in Sherman, Senator Phil Gramm recommended Judge Brown to President Reagan for a new vacancy in the Eastern District of Texas.

Judge Brown was confirmed for this vacancy in 1985. He served with distinction for the next 27 years. Judge Brown took senior status in 2001. At Judge Brown's retirement celebration, Chief Judge Heartfield called Judge Brown "a textbook member" of "the Greatest Generation."

His legacy lives on today, as the Judge Paul Brown Endowed Scholarship was established at the University of Texas School of Law in 2005. He was honored as a Distinguished Alumnus of Denison High School in 2006.

Judge Brown will be missed by his family, his community, and his nation. He, and his family, deserve this great honor, as the people of Sherman, TX, will forever remember the great jurist, Judge Paul Brown.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1599. A bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, was enacted 35 years ago to limit the government's ability to engage in domestic surveillance operations. In the years since September 11, 2001, Congress has repeatedly expanded the scope of this law to provide the government with broad new powers to gather information about law-abiding Americans. No one underestimates the threat this country continues to face, and we can all agree that the intelligence community should be given necessary and appropriate tools to help keep us safe. But we should also agree that there

must be reasonable limits on the surveillance powers we give to the government. That is why I have consistently fought to curtail the sweeping powers contained in the USA PATRIOT Act and FISA Amendments Act, while also bolstering privacy protections and strengthening oversight. And that is why I continue my efforts today by joining with Congressman JIM SENSENBRENNER, as well as members of Congress from both political parties, to introduce the bipartisan USA FREEDOM Act of 2013.

Over the past several months, Americans have learned that government surveillance programs conducted under FISA are far broader than previously understood. Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act has for years been secretly interpreted to authorize the dragnet collection of Americans' phone records on an unprecedented scale, regardless of whether those Americans have any connection to terrorist activities or groups. The American public also learned more about the government's broad collection of Internet data through the use of Section 702 of FISA. And the world has learned that this surveillance has extended to millions of individuals in the global community including some of our allies and their leaders. These revelations have undermined Americans' trust in our intelligence community and harmed our relationships with some of our most important international partners.

While I do not condone the manner in which these and other highly classified programs were disclosed, I agree with the Director of National Intelligence that this debate about surveillance needed to happen. It is a debate that some of us in Congress have been engaged in for years. Since this summer, the Judiciary Committee convened two public hearings and a classified briefing with officials from the administration, including the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the National Security Agency, and the Deputy Attorney General.

As a result of these hearings and the recent declassification of documents by the administration, the public now knows about the repeated and substantial legal and policy violations by the NSA in its implementation of both Section 215 and Section 702. The public now knows that, in addition to collecting phone call metadata on millions of law-abiding Americans, the NSA collected, without a warrant, the contents of tens of thousands of wholly domestic emails of innocent Americans. The NSA also violated a FISA Court order by regularly searching the Section 215 bulk phone records database without meeting the standard imposed by the Court.

These repeated violations, which have occurred nearly every year that these programs have been authorized by the FISA Court, led to several rep-

rimands from the FISA Court for what it called "systemic noncompliance" by the government. In addition, the Court admonished the government for making a series of substantial misrepresentations to the Court about its activities. The NSA has assured Congress that these problems have been corrected. Yet with each new revelation in the press about new techniques developed by the NSA that intrude into the privacy and everyday lives of Americans, I grow increasingly concerned about the lack of sufficient oversight and accountability.

Last week, the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, Lisa Monaco, stated that the government should only collect data "because we need it and not just because we can." I completely agree—and that is why the government's dragnet collection of phone records should end. The government has not made a compelling case that this program is an effective counterterrorism tool, especially when balanced against the intrusion on Americans' privacy. In fact, both the Director and the Deputy Director of the NSA have testified before the Judiciary Committee that there is no evidence that the Section 215 phone records collection program helped to thwart dozens or even several terrorist plots.

It is clear that as the administration has become more open and forthright about these programs, the facts have not matched the rhetoric. It is time for serious and meaningful reforms to FISA in order to restore the confidence of the American people in our intelligence community. Modest transparency and oversight provisions are a good first step, but by themselves they are insufficient to protect the privacy rights and civil liberties of Americans. We must do more.

The USA FREEDOM ACT is a legislative solution that comprehensively addresses a range of surveillance authorities contained in FISA. I want to thank Congressman SENSENBRENNER for his dedicated work on this bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation that we are introducing today. We are joined in this effort by members of Congress from both chambers and across the political spectrum, and I want to thank the following Senators for cosponsoring this legislation: Senator LEE, Senator DURBIN, Senator HELLER, Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator HIRONO, Senator UDALL of New Mexico, Senator BEGICH, Senator BALDWIN, Senator HEINRICH, Senator MARKEY, Senator UDALL of Colorado, Senator WARREN, Senator MERKLEY, Senator TESTER, and Senator SCHATZ.

Our bill will end the dragnet collection of phone records under Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act by requiring that only documents or records relevant and material to an investigation may be

obtained, and that they have some particular nexus to a specific foreign agent or power. It will also ensure that the FISA pen register statute and National Security Letters cannot be used to authorize similar dragnet collection by applying the same standard. The bill also adds more meaningful judicial review of Section 215 orders and raises the standard for the government to obtain a gag order for every Section 215 order.

In addition to stopping the dragnet collection of phone records, our legislation will address privacy concerns related to surveillance conducted under the FISA Amendments Act, which allows the government to gather vast amounts of Internet communications content by foreigners located overseas. Given the technological nature of Internet communications, we must vigilantly protect against the inadvertent collection of the contents of the wholly domestic communications of U.S. persons—something that the NSA acknowledged has happened before. Our bill will place stricter limits on this type of collection, and also require the government to obtain a court order prior to conducting 'back door' searches looking for the communications of U.S. persons in databases collected without a warrant under Section 702 of FISA.

Finally, the USA FREEDOM Act will require enhanced accountability, transparency, and oversight in the FISA process. Our bill builds on a proposal by Senator BLUMENTHAL to provide for the creation of a Special Advocate who will advocate specifically for the protection of privacy rights and civil liberties before the FISA Court, as well as a process for publicly releasing FISA Court opinions containing significant interpretations of law. Under the bill, public confidence in the government's activities will also be strengthened by more detailed public reporting about the numbers and types of FISA orders that are issued.

Importantly, this measure requires new Inspector General reviews and imposes new sunset dates. I have long believed that sunset provisions are an important tool because nothing focuses the attention of Congress or the Executive Branch like the looming chance that a law will end. It is important to note that Section 215, which the government is using to conduct dragnet phone records collection, will expire in June 2015 unless Congress decides otherwise. This bill also shortens the FISA Amendments Act sunset by 2 years, and adds a new sunset for National Security Letters. This aligns all of these FISA sunsets so that Congress can address them comprehensively in 2015, rather than in a piecemeal fashion.

These are all commonsense, bipartisan improvements that will ensure appropriate limits are placed on the government's vast surveillance powers.

The American people deserve to know how laws governing surveillance authorities are being interpreted and will implicate their personal information and activities. The American people also deserve to know whether these programs have proven sufficiently valuable as counterterrorism tools to justify their extraordinary breadth. This legislation will help to repair that trust deficit by providing enhanced layers of transparency, oversight, and accountability to ensure that we are protecting national security while restoring protections for the privacy rights and civil liberties of law-abiding Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1599

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ending Eavesdropping, Dragnet-collection, and Online Monitoring Act” or the “USA FREEDOM Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—FISA BUSINESS RECORDS REFORMS

Sec. 101. Privacy protections for business records orders.

Sec. 102. Inspector general reports on business records orders.

TITLE II—FISA PEN REGISTER AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICE REFORMS

Sec. 201. Privacy protections for pen registers and trap and trace devices.

Sec. 202. Inspector general reports on pen registers and trap and trace devices.

TITLE III—FISA ACQUISITIONS TARGETING PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES REFORMS

Sec. 301. Clarification on prohibition on searching of collections of communications to conduct warrantless searches for the communications of United States persons.

Sec. 302. Protection against collection of wholly domestic communications.

Sec. 303. Prohibition on reverse targeting.

Sec. 304. Limits on use of unlawfully obtained information.

Sec. 305. Modification of FISA Amendments Act of 2008 sunset.

Sec. 306. Inspector general reviews of authorities.

TITLE IV—FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT REFORMS

Sec. 401. Office of the Special Advocate.

Sec. 402. Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court disclosure of opinions.

Sec. 403. Preservation of rights.

TITLE V—NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER REFORMS

Sec. 501. National security letter authority.

Sec. 502. Limitations on disclosure of national security letters.

Sec. 503. Judicial review.

Sec. 504. Inspector general reports on national security letters.

Sec. 505. National security letter sunset.

Sec. 506. Technical and conforming amendments.

TITLE VI—FISA AND NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER TRANSPARENCY REFORMS

Sec. 601. Third-party reporting on FISA orders and national security letters.

Sec. 602. Government reporting on FISA orders.

Sec. 603. Government reporting on national security letters.

TITLE VII—PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD SUBPOENA AUTHORITY

Sec. 701. Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board subpoena authority.

TITLE VIII—SEVERABILITY

Sec. 801. Severability.

TITLE I—FISA BUSINESS RECORDS REFORMS

SEC. 101. PRIVACY PROTECTIONS FOR BUSINESS RECORDS ORDERS.

(a) **PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 501(b) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

“(A) a statement of facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the tangible things sought—

“(i) are relevant and material to an authorized investigation (other than a threat assessment) conducted in accordance with subsection (a)(2) to—

“(I) obtain foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person; or

“(II) protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities; and

“(ii) pertain to—

“(I) a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power;

“(II) the activities of a suspected agent of a foreign power who is the subject of such authorized investigation; or

“(III) an individual in contact with, or known to, a suspected agent of a foreign power; and

“(B) a statement of proposed minimization procedures; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following paragraph:

“(3) if the applicant is seeking a nondisclosure requirement described in subsection (d), shall include—

“(A) the time period during which the Government believes the nondisclosure requirement should apply;

“(B) a statement of facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that disclosure of particular information about the existence or contents of the order requiring the production of tangible things under this section during such time period will result in—

“(i) endangering the life or physical safety of any person;

“(ii) flight from investigation or prosecution;

“(iii) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(iv) intimidation of potential witnesses;

“(v) interference with diplomatic relations;

“(vi) alerting a target, an associate of a target, or the foreign power of which the target is an agent, of the interest of the Government in the target; or

“(vii) otherwise seriously endangering the national security of the United States; and

“(C) an explanation of how the nondisclosure requirement is narrowly tailored to address the specific harm identified under subparagraph (B).”.

(2) **ORDER.**—Section 501(c) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “subsections (a) and (b)” and inserting “subsection (a) and paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) and that the proposed minimization procedures meet the definition of minimization procedures under subsection (g)”; and

(ii) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: “If the judge finds that the requirements of subsection (b)(3) have been met, such order shall include a nondisclosure requirement, which may apply for not longer than 1 year, unless the facts justify a longer period of nondisclosure, subject to the principles and procedures described in subsection (d).”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by inserting before the semicolon “, if applicable”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) shall direct that the minimization procedures be followed.”.

(3) **NONDISCLOSURE.**—Section 501(d) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) **NONDISCLOSURE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—No person who receives an order entered under subsection (c) that contains a nondisclosure requirement shall disclose to any person the particular information specified in the nondisclosure requirement during the time period to which the requirement applies.

“(2) **EXCEPTION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A person who receives an order entered under subsection (c) that contains a nondisclosure requirement may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

“(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary to comply with the order;

“(ii) an attorney to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the order; or

“(iii) other persons as permitted by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director.

“(B) **APPLICATION.**—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom an order is directed under this section in the same manner as the person to whom the order is directed.

“(C) **NOTICE.**—Any person who discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall notify the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(D) **IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.**—At the request of the Director of the

Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.

“(3) EXTENSION.—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director (whose rank shall be no lower than Assistant Special Agent in Charge), may apply for renewals of the prohibition on disclosure of particular information about the existence or contents of an order requiring the production of tangible things under this section for additional periods of not longer than 1 year, unless the facts justify a longer period of nondisclosure. A nondisclosure requirement shall be renewed if a court having jurisdiction under paragraph (4) determines that the application meets the requirements of subsection (b)(3).

“(4) JURISDICTION.—An application for a renewal under this subsection shall be made to—

“(A) a judge of the court established under section 103(a); or

“(B) a United States Magistrate Judge under chapter 43 of title 28, United States Code, who is publicly designated by the Chief Justice of the United States to have the power to hear applications and grant orders for the production of tangible things under this section on behalf of a judge of the court established under section 103(a).”

(4) MINIMIZATION.—Section 501(g) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861(g)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “Not later than” and all that follows and inserting “At or before the end of the period of time for the production of tangible things under an order entered under this section or at any time after the production of tangible things under an order entered under this section, a judge may assess compliance with the minimization procedures required by such order by reviewing the circumstances under which information concerning United States persons was acquired, retained, or disseminated.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting “acquisition and” after “to minimize the”.

(5) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 501(f)(1)(B) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861(f)(1)(B)) is amended by striking “an order imposed under subsection (d)” and inserting “a nondisclosure requirement imposed in connection with a production order”.

(b) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Section 501(f)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861(f)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(A) by striking “that order” and inserting “such production order or any nondisclosure order imposed in connection with such production order”; and

(B) by striking the second sentence;

(2) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(C) A judge considering a petition to modify or set aside a nondisclosure order shall grant such petition unless the court determines that—

“(i) there is reason to believe that disclosure of the information subject to the nondisclosure requirement during the time period in which such requirement is in effect will result in—

“(I) endangering the life or physical safety of any person;

“(II) flight from investigation or prosecution;

“(III) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(IV) intimidation of potential witnesses;

“(V) interference with diplomatic relations;

“(VI) alerting a target, an associate of a target, or the foreign power of which the target is an agent, of the interest of the Government in the target; or

“(VII) otherwise seriously endangering the national security of the United States; and

“(ii) the nondisclosure requirement is narrowly tailored to address the specific harm identified under clause (i).”;

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) If a judge denies a petition to modify or set aside a nondisclosure order under this paragraph, no person may file another petition to modify or set aside such nondisclosure order until the date that is one year after the date on which such judge issues the denial of such petition.”.

(c) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY FOR ACCESS TO CALL DETAIL RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 502 as section 503; and

(B) by inserting after section 501 the following new section:

“SEC. 502. EMERGENCY AUTHORITY FOR ACCESS TO CALL DETAIL RECORDS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Attorney General may require the production of call detail records by the provider of a wire or electronic communication service on an emergency basis if—

“(1) such records—

“(A) are relevant and material to an authorized investigation (other than a threat assessment) conducted in accordance with section 501(a)(2) to—

“(i) obtain foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person; or

“(ii) protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities; and

“(B) pertain to—

“(i) a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power;

“(ii) the activities of a suspected agent of a foreign power who is the subject of such authorized investigation; or

“(iii) an individual in contact with, or known to, a suspected agent of a foreign power; and

“(2) the Attorney General reasonably determines that—

“(A) an emergency requires the production of such records before an order requiring such production can with due diligence be obtained under section 501; and

“(B) the factual basis for issuance of an order under section 501 to require the production of such records exists;

“(3) a judge referred to in section 501(b)(1) is informed by the Attorney General or a designee of the Attorney General at the time of the required production of such records that the decision has been made to require such production on an emergency basis; and

“(4) an application in accordance with section 501 is made to such judge as soon as practicable, but not more than 7 days after the date on which the Attorney General requires the production of such records under this section.

“(b) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—

“(1) TERMINATION.—In the absence of an order under section 501 approving the production of call detail records under sub-

section (a), the authority to require the production of such records shall terminate at the earlier of—

“(A) when the information sought is obtained;

“(B) when the application for the order is denied under section 501; or

“(C) 7 days after the time of the authorization by the Attorney General.

“(2) USE OF INFORMATION.—If an application for an order under section 501 for the production of call detail records required to be produced pursuant to subsection (a) is denied, or in any other case in which the emergency production of call detail records under this section is terminated and no order under section 501 is issued approving the required production of such records, no information obtained or evidence derived from such records shall be received in evidence or otherwise disclosed in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof, and no information concerning any United States person acquired from such records shall subsequently be used or disclosed in any other manner by Federal officers or employees without the consent of such person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

“(c) REPORT.—The Attorney General shall annually submit to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report containing the number of times the authority under this section was exercised during the calendar year covered by such report.

“(d) CALL DETAIL RECORDS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘call detail records’—

“(1) means session identifying information (including originating or terminating telephone number, International Mobile Subscriber Identity number, or International Mobile Station Equipment Identity number), telephone calling card numbers, or the time or duration of a call; and

“(2) does not include—

“(A) the contents of any communication (as defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code);

“(B) the name, address, or financial information of a subscriber or customer; or

“(C) cell site location information.”.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 is amended by striking the item relating to section 502 and inserting the following new items:

“502. Emergency authority for access to call detail records.

“503. Congressional oversight.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 102(b) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (50 U.S.C. 1805 note) is amended by striking “sections 501, 502, and” and inserting “title V and section”.

SEC. 102. INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS ON BUSINESS RECORDS ORDERS.

Section 106A of the USA Patriot Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-177; 120 Stat. 200) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and calendar years 2010 through 2013” after “2006”;

(B) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(D) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated)—
(i) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(C) with respect to calendar years 2010 through 2013, an examination of the minimization procedures used in relation to orders under section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) and whether the minimization procedures adequately protect the constitutional rights of United States persons;” and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “(as such term is defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)))”;

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) CALENDAR YEARS 2010 THROUGH 2013.—Not later than December 31, 2014, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the audit conducted under subsection (a) for calendar years 2010 through 2013.”;

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For the period beginning on January 1, 2010, and ending on December 31, 2013, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall—

“(A) assess the importance of the information acquired under title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) to the activities of the intelligence community;

“(B) examine the manner in which that information was collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated by the intelligence community;

“(C) describe any noteworthy facts or circumstances relating to orders under such title;

“(D) examine any minimization procedures used by elements of the intelligence community under such title and whether the minimization procedures adequately protect the constitutional rights of United States persons; and

“(E) examine any minimization procedures proposed by an element of the intelligence community under such title that were modified or denied by the court established under section 103(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1803(a)).

“(2) SUBMISSION DATE FOR ASSESSMENT.—Not later than December 31, 2014, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the assessment for calendar years 2010 through 2013.”.

(5) in subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “a report under subsection (c)(1) or (c)(2)” and inserting “any report under subsection (c) or (d)”;

(ii) by striking “Inspector General of the Department of Justice” and inserting “Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Intel-

ligence Community, and any Inspector General of an element of the intelligence community that prepares a report to assist the Inspector General of the Department of Justice or the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community in complying with the requirements of this section”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “the reports submitted under subsection (c)(1) and (c)(2)” and inserting “any report submitted under subsection (c) or (d)”;

(6) in subsection (f), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “The reports submitted under subsections (c)(1) and (c)(2)” and inserting “Each report submitted under subsection (c)”;

(B) by striking “subsection (d)(2)” and inserting “subsection (e)(2)”;

(7) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term ‘intelligence community’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

“(2) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).”.

TITLE II—FISA PEN REGISTER AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICE REFORMS

SEC. 201. PRIVACY PROTECTIONS FOR PEN REGISTERS AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Section 402(c) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1842(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(2) a statement of facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the information sought—

“(A) is relevant and material to an authorized investigation to obtain foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person or to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities (other than a threat assessment), provided that such investigation of a United States person is not conducted solely upon the basis of activities protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

“(B) pertain to—

“(i) a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power;

“(ii) the activities of a suspected agent of a foreign power who is the subject of such authorized investigation; or

“(iii) an individual in contact with, or known to, a suspected agent of a foreign power; and

“(3) a statement of proposed minimization procedures.”.

(b) MINIMIZATION.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 401 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1841) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The term ‘minimization procedures’ means—

“(A) specific procedures that are reasonably designed in light of the purpose and technique of an order for the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device, to minimize the acquisition and retention, and prohibit the dissemination, of nonpublicly available information concerning unconsenting United States persons consistent with the need of the United States to

obtain, produce, and disseminate foreign intelligence information;

“(B) procedures that require that nonpublicly available information, which is not foreign intelligence information, as defined in section 101(e)(1), shall not be disseminated in a manner that identifies any United States person, without such person’s consent, unless such person’s identity is necessary to understand foreign intelligence information or assess its importance; and

“(C) notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), procedures that allow for the retention and dissemination of information that is evidence of a crime which has been, is being, or is about to be committed and that is to be retained or disseminated for law enforcement purposes.”.

(2) PROCEDURES REQUIRED.—Section 402 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1842) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and that the proposed minimization procedures meet the definition of minimization procedures under this title” before the period at the end; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(I) in clause (ii)(II), by striking “and” after the semicolon; and

(II) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iv) the minimization procedures be followed; and”;

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) At or before the end of the period of time for which the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device is approved under an order or an extension under this section, the judge may assess compliance with the minimization procedures by reviewing the circumstances under which information concerning United States persons was acquired, retained, or disseminated.”.

(3) EMERGENCIES.—Section 403 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1843) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) If the Attorney General authorizes the emergency installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device under this section, the Attorney General shall require that minimization procedures required by this title for the issuance of a judicial order be followed.”.

(4) USE OF INFORMATION.—Section 405(a)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1845(a)(1)) is amended by inserting “and the minimization procedures required under the order approving such pen register or trap and trace device” after “of this section”.

(c) TRANSITION PROCEDURES.—

(1) ORDERS IN EFFECT.—Notwithstanding the amendments made by this section, an order entered under section 402(d)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1842(d)(1)) that is in effect on the effective date of the amendments made by this section shall remain in effect until the expiration of the order.

(2) EXTENSIONS.—A request for an extension of an order referred to in paragraph (1) shall be subject to the requirements of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), as amended by this Act.

SEC. 202. INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS ON PEN REGISTERS AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICES.

(a) AUDITS.—The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall perform comprehensive audits of the effectiveness and use, including any improper or illegal use, of pen registers and trap and trace devices under title IV of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1841 et seq.) during the period beginning on January 1, 2010, and ending on December 31, 2013.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The audits required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an examination of the use of pen registers and trap and trace devices under such title for calendar years 2010 through 2013;

(2) an examination of the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device on emergency bases under section 403 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1843);

(3) an examination of any noteworthy facts or circumstances relating to the use of a pen register or trap and trace device under such title, including any improper or illegal use of the authority provided under such title; and

(4) an examination of the effectiveness of the authority under such title as an investigative tool, including—

(A) the importance of the information acquired to the intelligence activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(B) the manner in which the information is collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including any direct access to the information provided to any other department, agency, or instrumentality of Federal, State, local, or tribal governments or any private sector entity;

(C) whether, and how often, the Federal Bureau of Investigation used information acquired under a pen register or trap and trace device under such title to produce an analytical intelligence product for distribution within the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to the intelligence community, or to another department, agency, or instrumentality of Federal, State, local, or tribal governments; and

(D) whether, and how often, the Federal Bureau of Investigation provided information acquired under a pen register or trap and trace device under such title to law enforcement authorities for use in criminal proceedings.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2014, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the audits conducted under subsection (a) for calendar years 2010 through 2013.

(d) INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the period beginning January 1, 2010, and ending on December 31, 2013, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall—

(A) assess the importance of the information to the activities of the intelligence community;

(B) examine the manner in which the information was collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated;

(C) describe any noteworthy facts or circumstances relating to orders under title IV of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1841 et seq.); and

(D) examine any minimization procedures used by elements of the intelligence community in relation to pen registers and trap and

trace devices under title IV of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1841 et seq.) and whether the minimization procedures adequately protect the constitutional rights of United States persons.

(2) SUBMISSION DATES FOR ASSESSMENT.—Not later than December 31, 2014, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the assessment for calendar years 2010 through 2013.

(e) PRIOR NOTICE TO ATTORNEY GENERAL AND DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE; COMMENTS.—

(1) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days before the submission of any report under subsection (c) or (d), the Inspector General of the Department of Justice and the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall provide the report to the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) COMMENTS.—The Attorney General or the Director of National Intelligence may provide such comments to be included in any report submitted under subsection (c) or (d) as the Attorney General or the Director of National Intelligence may consider necessary.

(f) UNCLASSIFIED FORM.—Each report submitted under subsection (c) and any comments included in that report under subsection (e)(2) shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the terms “Attorney General”, “foreign intelligence information”, and “United States person” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801);

(2) the term “intelligence community” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003);

(3) the term “minimization procedures” has the meaning given that term in section 401 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1841), as amended by this Act; and

(4) the terms “pen register” and “trap and trace device” have the meanings given those terms in section 3127 of title 18, United States Code.

TITLE III—FISA ACQUISITIONS TARGETING PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES REFORMS

SEC. 301. CLARIFICATION ON PROHIBITION ON SEARCHING OF COLLECTIONS OF COMMUNICATIONS TO CONDUCT WARRANTLESS SEARCHES FOR THE COMMUNICATIONS OF UNITED STATES PERSONS.

Section 702(b) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively, and indenting such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, an additional two ems from the left margin;

(2) by striking “An acquisition” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An acquisition”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) CLARIFICATION ON PROHIBITION ON SEARCHING OF COLLECTIONS OF COMMUNICATIONS OF UNITED STATES PERSONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), no officer or employee of the United States may conduct a search of a collection of communications acquired under this section in an effort to find communications of a particular United States person (other than a corporation).

“(B) CONCURRENT AUTHORIZATION AND EXCEPTION FOR EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a search for communications related to a particular United States person if—

“(i) such United States person is the subject of an order or emergency authorization authorizing electronic surveillance or physical search under section 105, 304, 703, 704, or 705, or title 18, United States Code, for the effective period of that order;

“(ii) the entity carrying out the search has a reasonable belief that the life or safety of such United States person is threatened and the information is sought for the purpose of assisting that person; or

“(iii) such United States person has consented to the search.”.

SEC. 302. PROTECTION AGAINST COLLECTION OF WHOLLY DOMESTIC COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) limit the acquisition of the contents of any communication to those communications—

“(i) to which any party is a target of the acquisition; or

“(ii) that contain an account identifier of a target of an acquisition, only if such communications are acquired to protect against international terrorism or the international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.”; and

(2) in subsection (i)(2)(B)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iii) limit the acquisition of the contents of any communication to those communications—

“(I) to which any party is a target of the acquisition; or

“(II) that contain an account identifier of the target of an acquisition, only if such communications are acquired to protect against international terrorism or the international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 701 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “‘international terrorism’,” after “‘foreign power’,”; and

(B) by striking “and ‘United States person’” and inserting “‘United States person’, and ‘weapon of mass destruction’”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (6), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

“(1) ACCOUNT IDENTIFIER.—The term ‘account identifier’ means a telephone or instrument number, other subscriber number,

email address, or username used to uniquely identify an account.”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 303. PROHIBITION ON REVERSE TARGETING.

Section 702(b)(1)(B) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a), as redesignated by section 301(1) of this Act, is amended by striking “the purpose” and inserting “a significant purpose”.

SEC. 304. LIMITS ON USE OF UNLAWFULLY OBTAINED INFORMATION.

Section 702(i)(3) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(i)(3)) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(B) CORRECTION OF DEFICIENCIES.—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Court finds that a certification required by subsection (g) does not contain all of the required elements, or that the procedures required by subsections (d) and (e) are not consistent with the requirements of those subsections or the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the Court shall issue an order directing the Government to, at the Government’s election and to the extent required by the order of the Court—

“(I) correct any deficiency identified by the order of the Court not later than 30 days after the date on which the Court issues the order; or

“(II) cease, or not begin, the implementation of the authorization for which such certification was submitted.

“(ii) **LIMITATION ON USE OF INFORMATION.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subclause (II), no information obtained or evidence derived from an acquisition pursuant to a certification or targeting or minimization procedures subject to an order under clause (i) concerning any United States person shall be received in evidence or otherwise disclosed in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof, and no information concerning any United States person acquired from the acquisition shall subsequently be used or disclosed in any other manner by Federal officers or employees without the consent of the United States person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

“(II) **EXCEPTION.**—If the Government corrects any deficiency identified by the order of the Court under clause (i), the Court may permit the use or disclosure of information acquired before the date of the correction under such minimization procedures as the Court shall establish for purposes of this clause.”.

SEC. 305. MODIFICATION OF FISA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008 SUNSET.

(a) **MODIFICATION.**—Section 403(b)(1) of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-261; 50 U.S.C. 1881 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “June 1, 2015”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 403(b)(2) of such Act (Public Law 110-261; 122 Stat. 2474) is amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “June 1, 2015”.

(c) **ORDERS IN EFFECT.**—Section 404(b)(1) of such Act (Public Law 110-261; 50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended in the paragraph heading by striking “DECEMBER 31, 2017” and inserting “JUNE 1, 2015”.

SEC. 306. INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEWS OF AUTHORITIES.

(a) **AGENCY ASSESSMENTS.**—Section 702(1)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(1)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “authorized to acquire foreign intelligence information under subsection (a)” and inserting “subject to the targeting or minimization procedures approved under this section”;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “United States persons or” after “later determined to be”; and

(3) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “such review” and inserting “review conducted under this paragraph”;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv); and

(D) by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause:

“(iii) the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community; and”.

(b) **INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY REVIEW.**—

(1) **RECURRING REVIEWS.**—Section 702(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(1)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) **INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY REVIEW.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Inspector General of the Intelligence Community is authorized to review the acquisition, use, and dissemination of information acquired under subsection (a) to review compliance with the targeting and minimization procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d) and (e) and the guidelines adopted in accordance with subsection (f), and in order to conduct the review required under subparagraph (B).

“(B) **MANDATORY REVIEW.**—The Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall review the procedures and guidelines developed by the elements of the intelligence community to implement this section, with respect to the protection of the privacy rights of United States persons, including—

“(i) an evaluation of the limitations outlined in subsection (b), the procedures approved in accordance with subsections (d) and (e), and the guidelines adopted in accordance with subsection (f), with respect to the protection of the privacy rights of United States persons; and

“(ii) an evaluation of the circumstances under which the contents of communications acquired under subsection (a) may be searched in order to review the communications of particular United States persons.

“(C) **CONSIDERATION OF OTHER REVIEWS AND ASSESSMENTS.**—In conducting a review under subparagraph (B), the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall take into consideration, to the extent relevant and appropriate, any reviews or assessments that have been completed or are being undertaken under this section.

“(D) **PUBLIC REPORTING OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS.**—In a manner consistent with the protection of the national security of the United States, and in unclassified form, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall make publicly available a summary of the findings and conclusions of the review conducted under subparagraph (B).”.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2014, the Inspector General of the Intel-

ligence Community shall submit a report regarding the reviews conducted under paragraph (3) of section 702(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(1)), as amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection, to—

(A) the Attorney General;

(B) the Director of National Intelligence; and

(C) consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Standing Rules of the Senate, and Senate Resolution 400 of the 94th Congress or any successor Senate resolution—

(i) the congressional intelligence committees; and

(ii) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(c) **ANNUAL REVIEWS.**—Section 702(1)(4)(A) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(1)(4)(A)), as redesignated by subsection (b)(1), is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “conducting an acquisition authorized under subsection (a)” and inserting “subject to targeting or minimization procedures approved under this section”; and

(ii) by striking “the acquisition” and inserting “acquisitions under subsection (a)”; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “acquisitions” and inserting “information obtained through an acquisition”; and

(2) in clause (iii), by inserting “United States persons or” after “later determined to be”.

TITLE IV—FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT REFORMS

SEC. 401. OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL ADVOCATE.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new title:

“TITLE IX—OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL ADVOCATE

“SEC. 901. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) **DECISION.**—The term ‘decision’ means a decision, order, or opinion issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review.

“(2) **FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT; COURT.**—The terms ‘Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court’ and ‘Court’ mean the court established under section 103(a) and the petition review pool established under section 103(e).

“(3) **FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW; COURT OF REVIEW.**—The terms ‘Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review’ and ‘Court of Review’ mean the court of review established under section 103(b).

“(4) **OFFICE.**—The term ‘Office’ means the Office of the Special Advocate established under section 902(a).

“(5) **SIGNIFICANT CONSTRUCTION OR INTERPRETATION OF LAW.**—The term ‘significant construction or interpretation of law’ means a significant construction or interpretation of a provision, as that term is construed under section 601(c).

“(6) **SPECIAL ADVOCATE.**—The term ‘Special Advocate’ means the Special Advocate appointed under section 902(b).

“SEC. 902. OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL ADVOCATE.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established within the judicial branch of the United States an Office of the Special Advocate.

“(b) **SPECIAL ADVOCATE.**—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of the Office is the Special Advocate.

“(2) APPOINTMENT AND TERM.—

“(A) APPOINTMENT.—The Chief Justice of the United States shall appoint the Special Advocate from the list of candidates submitted under subparagraph (B).

“(B) LIST OF CANDIDATES.—The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board shall submit to the Chief Justice a list of not less than 5 qualified candidates to serve as Special Advocate. The Board shall select candidates for such list whom the Board believes will be zealous and effective advocates in defense of civil liberties and consider with respect to each potential candidate—

“(i) the litigation and other professional experience of such candidate;

“(ii) the experience of such candidate in areas of law that the Special Advocate is likely to encounter in the course of the duties of the Special Advocate; and

“(iii) the demonstrated commitment of such candidate to civil liberties.

“(C) SECURITY CLEARANCE.—An individual may be appointed Special Advocate without regard to whether the individual possesses a security clearance on the date of the appointment.

“(D) TERM AND DISMISSAL.—A Special Advocate shall be appointed for a term of 3 years and may be removed only for good cause shown, including the demonstrated inability to qualify for an adequate security clearance.

“(E) REAPPOINTMENT.—There shall be no limit to the number of consecutive terms served by a Special Advocate. The reappointment of a Special Advocate shall be made in the same manner as appointment of a Special Advocate.

“(F) ACTING SPECIAL ADVOCATE.—If the position of Special Advocate is vacant, the Chief Justice of the United States may appoint an Acting Special Advocate from among the qualified employees of the Office. If there are no such qualified employees, the Chief Justice may appoint an Acting Special Advocate from the most recent list of candidates provided by the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board pursuant to subparagraph (B). The Acting Special Advocate shall have all of the powers of a Special Advocate and shall serve until a Special Advocate is appointed.

“(3) EMPLOYEES.—The Special Advocate may appoint and terminate and fix the compensation of employees of the Office without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service.

“(c) DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF THE SPECIAL ADVOCATE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Special Advocate—

“(A) may consider any request for consultation by a party who has been served with an order or directive issued under this Act requiring the party to provide information, facilities, or assistance to the Federal Government;

“(B) may request to participate in a proceeding before the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court;

“(C) shall participate in such proceeding if such request is granted;

“(D) shall participate in a proceeding before the Court if appointed to participate by the Court under section 903(a);

“(E) may request reconsideration of a decision of the Court under section 903(b);

“(F) may appeal or seek review of a decision of the Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review under section 904; and

“(G) shall participate in such appeal or review.

“(2) ACCESS TO APPLICATIONS AND DECISIONS.—

“(A) APPLICATIONS.—The Attorney General shall provide to the Special Advocate each application submitted to a judge of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court under this Act at the same time as the Attorney General submits such applications.

“(B) DECISIONS.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review shall provide to the Special Advocate access to each decision of the Court and the Court of Review, respectively, issued after the date of the enactment of the USA FREEDOM Act and all documents and other material relevant to such decision in complete, unredacted form.

“(3) ADVOCACY.—The Special Advocate shall vigorously advocate before the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review, as appropriate, in support of legal interpretations that protect individual privacy and civil liberties.

“(4) OUTSIDE COUNSEL.—The Special Advocate may delegate to a competent outside counsel who has or is able to obtain an appropriate security clearance any duty or responsibility of the Special Advocate set out in subparagraph (C), (D), or (G) of paragraph (1) with respect to participation in a matter before the Court, the Court of Review, or the Supreme Court of the United States.

“(5) AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS AND MATERIAL.—The Court or the Court of Review, as appropriate, shall order any agency, department, or entity to make available to the Special Advocate, or appropriate outside counsel if the Special Advocate has delegated duties or responsibilities to the outside counsel under paragraph (4), any documents or other material necessary to carry out the duties described in paragraph (1).

“(d) SECURITY CLEARANCES.—The appropriate departments, agencies, and elements of the Executive branch shall cooperate with the Office, to the extent possible under existing procedures and requirements, to expeditiously provide the Special Advocate, appropriate employees of the Office, and outside counsel to whom the Special Advocate delegates a duty or responsibility under subsection (c)(4) with the security clearances necessary to carry out the duties of the Special Advocate.

“SEC. 903. ADVOCACY BEFORE THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.

“(a) APPOINTMENT TO PARTICIPATE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court may appoint the Special Advocate to participate in a proceeding before the Court.

“(2) STANDING.—If the Special Advocate is appointed to participate in a Court proceeding pursuant to paragraph (1), the Special Advocate shall have standing as a party before the Court in that proceeding.

“(b) RECONSIDERATION OF A FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT DECISION.—

“(1) AUTHORITY TO MOVE FOR RECONSIDERATION.—The Special Advocate may move the Court to reconsider any decision of the Court made after the date of the enactment of the USA FREEDOM Act by petitioning the Court not later than 30 days after the date on which all documents and materials relevant to the decision are made available to the Special Advocate.

“(2) DISCRETION OF THE COURT.—The Court shall have discretion to grant or deny a mo-

tion for reconsideration made pursuant to paragraph (1).

“(c) AMICI CURIAE PARTICIPATION.—

“(1) MOTION BY THE SPECIAL ADVOCATE.—The Special Advocate may file a motion with the Court to permit and facilitate participation of amici curiae, including participation in oral argument if appropriate, in any proceeding. The Court shall have the discretion to grant or deny such a motion.

“(2) FACILITATION BY THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.—The Court may, sua sponte, permit and facilitate participation by amici curiae, including participation in oral argument if appropriate, in proceedings before the Court.

“(3) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of USA FREEDOM Act, the Court shall promulgate regulations to provide the public with information sufficient to allow interested parties to participate as amici curiae.

“SEC. 904. APPELATE REVIEW.

“(a) APPEAL OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT DECISIONS.—

“(1) AUTHORITY TO APPEAL.—The Special Advocate may appeal any decision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court issued after the date of the enactment of the USA FREEDOM Act not later than 90 days after the date on which the decision is issued.

“(2) STANDING AS APPELLANT.—If the Special Advocate appeals a decision of the Court pursuant to paragraph (1), the Special Advocate shall have standing as a party before the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review in such appeal.

“(3) MANDATORY REVIEW.—The Court of Review shall review any Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court decision appealed by the Special Advocate and issue a decision in such appeal, unless it would be apparent to all reasonable jurists that such decision is dictated by statute or by precedent.

“(4) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The standard for a mandatory review of a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court decision pursuant to paragraph (3) shall be—

“(A) de novo with respect to issues of law; and

“(B) clearly erroneous with respect to determination of facts.

“(5) AMICI CURIAE PARTICIPATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Court of Review shall accept amici curiae briefs from interested parties in all mandatory reviews pursuant to paragraph (3) and shall provide for amici curiae participation in oral argument if appropriate.

“(B) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the USA FREEDOM Act, the Court of Review shall promulgate regulations to provide the public with information sufficient to allow interested parties to participate as amici curiae.

“(b) REVIEW OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW DECISIONS.—

“(1) AUTHORITY.—The Special Advocate may seek a writ of certiorari from the Supreme Court of the United States for review of any decision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review.

“(2) STANDING.—In any proceedings before the Supreme Court of the United States relating to a petition of certiorari filed under paragraph (1) and any proceedings in a matter for which certiorari is granted, the Special Advocate shall have standing as a party.

“SEC. 905. DISCLOSURE.

“(a) REQUIREMENT TO DISCLOSE.—The Attorney General shall publicly disclose—

“(1) all decisions issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign

Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review after July 10, 2003, that include a significant construction or interpretation of law;

“(2) any decision of the Court appealed by the Special Advocate pursuant to this title; and

“(3) any Court of Review decision that is issued after an appeal by the Special Advocate.

“(b) DISCLOSURE DESCRIBED.—For each disclosure required by subsection (a) with respect to a decision, the Attorney General shall make available to the public documents sufficient—

“(1) to identify with particularity each legal question addressed by the decision and how such question was resolved;

“(2) to describe in general terms the context in which the matter arises;

“(3) to describe the construction or interpretation of any statute, constitutional provision, or other legal authority relied on by the decision; and

“(4) to indicate whether the decision departed from any prior decision of the Court or Court of Review.

“(c) DOCUMENTS DESCRIBED.—The Attorney General shall satisfy the disclosure requirements in subsection (b) by—

“(1) releasing a Court or Court of Review decision in its entirety or as redacted;

“(2) releasing a summary of a Court or Court of Review decision; or

“(3) releasing an application made to the Court, briefs filed before the Court or the Court of Review, or other materials, in full or as redacted.

“(d) EXTENSIVE DISCLOSURE.—The Attorney General shall release as much information regarding the facts and analysis contained in a decision described in subsection (a) or documents described in subsection (c) as is consistent with legitimate national security concerns.

“(e) TIMING OF DISCLOSURE.—

“(1) DECISIONS ISSUED PRIOR TO ENACTMENT.—The Attorney General shall disclose a decision issued prior to the date of the enactment of the USA FREEDOM Act that is required to be disclosed under subsection (a)(1) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of such Act.

“(2) FISA COURT DECISIONS.—The Attorney General shall release Court decisions appealed by the Special Advocate not later than 30 days after the date on which the appeal is filed.

“(3) FISA COURT OF REVIEW DECISIONS.—The Attorney General shall release Court of Review decisions for which the Special Advocate seeks a writ of certiorari not later than 90 days after the date on which the petition is filed.

“(f) PETITION BY THE SPECIAL ADVOCATE.—

“(1) AUTHORITY TO PETITION.—The Special Advocate may petition the Court or the Court of Review to order—

“(A) the public disclosure of a decision of the Court or Court of Review, and documents or other material relevant to such a decision, previously designated as classified information; or

“(B) the release of an unclassified summary of such decisions and documents.

“(2) CONTENTS OF PETITION.—Each petition filed under paragraph (1) shall contain a detailed declassification proposal or a summary of the decision and documents that the Special Advocate proposes to have released publicly.

“(3) ROLE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

“(A) COPY OF PETITION.—The Special Advocate shall provide to the Attorney General a copy of each petition filed under paragraph (1).

“(B) OPPOSITION.—The Attorney General may oppose a petition filed under paragraph (1) by submitting any objections in writing to the Court or the Court of Review, as appropriate, not later than 90 days after the date such petition was submitted.

“(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Not less than 91 days after receiving a petition under paragraph (1), and taking into account any objections from the Attorney General made under paragraph (3)(B), the Court or the Court of Review, as appropriate, shall declassify and make readily available to the public any decision, document, or other material requested in such petition, to the greatest extent possible, consistent with legitimate national security considerations.

“(5) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Special Advocate may not file a petition under paragraph (1) until 181 days after the date of the enactment of the USA FREEDOM Act, except with respect to a decision appealed by the Special Advocate.

“SEC. 906. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

“(a) REQUIREMENT FOR ANNUAL REPORT.—The Special Advocate shall submit to Congress an annual report on the implementation of this title.

“(b) CONTENTS.—Each annual report submitted under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) detail the activities of the Office of the Special Advocate;

“(2) provide an assessment of the effectiveness of this title; and

“(3) propose any new legislation to improve the functioning of the Office or the operation of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review that the Special Advocate considers appropriate.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as amended by section 101(c)(2) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new items:

“TITLE IX—OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL ADVOCATE

“Sec. 901. Definitions.

“Sec. 902. Office of the Special Advocate.

“Sec. 903. Advocacy before the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

“Sec. 904. Appellate review.

“Sec. 905. Disclosure.

“Sec. 906. Annual report to Congress.”.

SEC. 402. FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT DISCLOSURE OF OPINIONS.

Section 103 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (h) and (i), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g)(1) A judge of the court established under subsection (a) who authored an order, opinion, or other decision may sua sponte or on motion by a party request that such order, opinion, or other decision be made publicly available.

“(2) Upon a request under paragraph (1), the presiding judge of the court established under subsection (a), in consultation with the other judges of such court, may direct that such order, opinion, or other decision be made publicly available.

“(3) Prior to making an order, opinion, or other decision of the court established under subsection (a) publicly available in accordance with this subsection, the presiding judge of such court may direct the Executive branch to review such order, opinion, or other decision and redact such order, opin-

ion, or other decision as necessary to ensure that properly classified information is appropriately protected.”.

SEC. 403. PRESERVATION OF RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title or an amendment made by this title shall be construed—

(1) to provide the Attorney General with authority to prevent the court established under section 103(a) of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(a)), the petition review pool established under section 103(e) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1803(e)), or the court of review established under section 103(b) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1803(b)) from declassifying decisions or releasing information pursuant to this title or an amendment made by this title; or

(2) to eliminate the public's ability to secure information under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Freedom of Information Act”) or any other provision of law.

TITLE V—NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER REFORMS

SEC. 501. NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER AUTHORITY.

(a) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACCESS TO TELEPHONE TOLL AND TRANSACTIONAL RECORDS.—Section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “may—” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “may request the name, address, length of service, and local and long distance toll billing records of a person or entity if the Director (or his designee) certifies in writing to the wire or electronic communication service provider to which the request is made that—”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(1) the name, address, length of service, and toll billing records sought are relevant and material to an authorized investigation to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities, provided that such an investigation of a United States person is not conducted solely on the basis of activities protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

“(2) there are reasonable grounds to believe that the name, address, length of service, and toll billing records sought pertain to—

“(A) a foreign power or agent of a foreign power;

“(B) the activities of a suspected agent of a foreign power who is the subject of such authorized investigation; or

“(C) an individual in contact with, or known to, a suspected agent of a foreign power.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) For purposes of this subsection, the terms ‘agent of a foreign power’, ‘foreign power’, ‘international terrorism’, and ‘United States person’ have the same meanings as in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).”.

(b) ACCESS TO FINANCIAL RECORDS FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE AND PROTECTIVE PURPOSES.—Section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1114. ACCESS TO FINANCIAL RECORDS FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE AND PROTECTIVE PURPOSES.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director whose rank shall be no lower

than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or Special Agent in Charge in a Bureau field office, may issue in writing and cause to be served on a financial institution, a request requiring the production of—

“(A) the name of a customer of the financial institution;

“(B) the address of a customer of the financial institution;

“(C) the length of time during which a person has been, or was, a customer of the financial institution (including the start date) and the type of service provided by the financial institution to the customer; and

“(D) any account number or other unique identifier associated with a customer of the financial institution.

“(2) LIMITATION.—A request issued under this subsection may not require the production of records or information not listed in paragraph (1).

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A request issued under subsection (a) shall—

“(A) be subject to the requirements of subsections (d) through (g) of section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, in the same manner and to the same extent as those provisions apply with respect to a request under section 2709(b) of title 18, United States Code, to a wire or electronic communication service provider; and

“(B) include a statement of facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the records or other things sought—

“(i) are relevant and material to an authorized investigation (other than a threat assessment and provided that such an investigation of a United States person is not conducted solely on the basis of activities protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States) to—

“(I) obtain foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person; or

“(II) protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities; and

“(ii) pertain to—

“(I) a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power;

“(II) the activities of a suspected agent of a foreign power who is the subject of such authorized investigation; or

“(III) an individual in contact with, or known to, a suspected agent of a foreign power.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms ‘agent of a foreign power’, ‘foreign intelligence information’, ‘foreign power’, ‘international terrorism’, and ‘United States person’ have the same meanings as in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

“(c) DEFINITION OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—For purposes of this section (and sections 1115 and 1117, insofar as the sections relate to the operation of this section), the term ‘financial institution’ has the same meaning as in subsections (a)(2) and (c)(1) of section 5312 of title 31, United States Code, except that the term shall include only a financial institution any part of which is located inside any State or territory of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or the United States Virgin Islands.”.

(c) NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN CONSUMER REPORT RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) is amended—

(A) by striking subsections (a) through (c) and inserting the following new subsections:

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director whose rank shall be no lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or Special Agent in Charge in a Bureau field office, may issue in writing and cause to be served on a consumer reporting agency a request requiring the production of—

“(A) the name of a consumer;

“(B) the current and former address of a consumer;

“(C) the current and former places of employment of a consumer; and

“(D) the name and address of any financial institution (as that term is defined in section 1101 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3401)) at which a consumer maintains or has maintained an account, to the extent that the information is in the files of the consumer reporting agency.

“(2) LIMITATION.—A request issued under this subsection may not require the production of a consumer report.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A request issued under subsection (a) shall—

“(A) be subject to the requirements of subsections (d) through (g) of section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, in the same manner and to the same extent as those provisions apply with respect to a request under section 2709(b) of title 18, United States Code, to a wire or electronic communication service provider; and

“(B) include a statement of facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the records or other things sought—

“(i) are relevant and material to an authorized investigation (other than a threat assessment and provided that such an investigation of a United States person is not conducted solely on the basis of activities protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States) to—

“(I) obtain foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person; or

“(II) protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities; and

“(ii) pertain to—

“(I) a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power;

“(II) the activities of a suspected agent of a foreign power who is the subject of such authorized investigation; or

“(III) an individual in contact with, or known to, a suspected agent of a foreign power.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms ‘agent of a foreign power’, ‘foreign intelligence information’, ‘foreign power’, ‘international terrorism’, and ‘United States person’ have the meaning given such terms in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).”;

(B) by striking subsections (f) through (h); and

(C) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (m) as subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i), respectively.

(2) REPEAL.—Section 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v) is repealed.

SEC. 502. LIMITATIONS ON DISCLOSURE OF NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.

(a) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACCESS TO TELEPHONE TOLL AND TRANSACTIONAL RECORDS.—Section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(c) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

“(1) PROHIBITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under subsection (d) is provided, no wire or electronic communication service provider, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subsection (b), shall disclose to any person that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has sought or obtained access to information or records under this section.

“(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director whose rank shall be no lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge of a Bureau field office, certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

“(i) endangering the life or physical safety of any person;

“(ii) flight from investigation or prosecution;

“(iii) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(iv) intimidation of potential witnesses;

“(v) interference with diplomatic relations;

“(vi) alerting a target, an associate of a target, or the foreign power of which the target is an agent, of the interest of the Government in the target; or

“(vii) otherwise seriously endangering the national security of the United States.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A wire or electronic communication service provider, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subsection (b) may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

“(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

“(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

“(iii) other persons as permitted by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director.

“(B) APPLICATION.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request is issued under subsection (b) in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

“(C) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall notify the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(D) IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.—At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.

“(3) TERMINATION.—In the case of any request for which a recipient has submitted a notification or filed a petition for judicial review under paragraph (3)(B), if the facts supporting a nondisclosure requirement cease to exist, an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall promptly notify the wire or electronic service provider, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement that

the nondisclosure requirement is no longer in effect.”.

(b) ACCESS TO FINANCIAL RECORDS FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE AND PROTECTIVE PURPOSES.—Section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414), as amended by section 501(b) of this Act, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—“(1) PROHIBITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under subsection (d) is provided, no financial institution, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subsection (a) shall disclose to any person that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has sought or obtained access to information or records under subsection (a).

“(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director whose rank shall be no lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge of a Bureau field office, certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

“(i) endangering the life or physical safety of any person;

“(ii) flight from investigation or prosecution;

“(iii) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(iv) intimidation of potential witnesses;

“(v) interference with diplomatic relations;

“(vi) alerting a target, an associate of a target, or the foreign power of which the target is an agent, of the interest of the Government in the target; or

“(vii) otherwise seriously endangering the national security of the United States.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A financial institution, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subsection (a) may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

“(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

“(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

“(iii) other persons as permitted by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director.

“(B) APPLICATION.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request is issued under subsection (a) in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

“(C) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(D) IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.—At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to

whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.

“(3) TERMINATION.—In the case of any request for which a financial institution has submitted a notification or filed a petition for judicial review under paragraph (3)(B), if the facts supporting a nondisclosure requirement cease to exist, an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall promptly notify the financial institution, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement that the nondisclosure requirement is no longer in effect.”.

(c) IDENTITY OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CREDIT REPORTS.—Section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u), as amended by section 501(c) of this Act, is further amended by striking subsection (c) (as redesignated by section 501(c)(1)(D) of this Act) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(c) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

“(1) PROHIBITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under subsection (d) is provided, no consumer reporting agency, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subsection (a) shall disclose or specify in any consumer report, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has sought or obtained access to information or records under subsection (a) or (b).

“(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director whose rank shall be no lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge of a Bureau field office, certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

“(i) endangering the life or physical safety of any person;

“(ii) flight from investigation or prosecution;

“(iii) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(iv) intimidation of potential witnesses;

“(v) interference with diplomatic relations;

“(vi) alerting a target, an associate of a target, or the foreign power of which the target is an agent, of the interest of the Government in the target; or

“(vii) otherwise seriously endangering the national security of the United States.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subsection (a) may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

“(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

“(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

“(iii) other persons as permitted by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director.

“(B) APPLICATION.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request is issued under subsection (a) or (b) in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

“(C) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclo-

sure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(D) IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.—At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.

“(3) TERMINATION.—In the case of any request for which a consumer reporting agency has submitted a notification or filed a petition for judicial review under paragraph (3)(B), if the facts supporting a nondisclosure requirement cease to exist, an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall promptly notify the consumer reporting agency, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement that the nondisclosure requirement is no longer in effect.”.

(d) INVESTIGATIONS OF PERSONS WITH ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3162) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(b) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

“(1) PROHIBITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under subsection (c) is provided, no governmental or private entity, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subsection (a), shall disclose to any person that an authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a) has sought or obtained access to information under subsection (a).

“(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the head of an authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a), or a designee, certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

“(i) endangering the life or physical safety of any person;

“(ii) flight from investigation or prosecution;

“(iii) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(iv) intimidation of potential witnesses;

“(v) interference with diplomatic relations;

“(vi) alerting a target, an associate of a target, or the foreign power of which the target is an agent, of the interest of the Government in the target; or

“(vii) otherwise seriously endangering the national security of the United States.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A governmental or private entity, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subsection (a) may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

“(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

“(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

“(iii) other persons as permitted by the head of the authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a).

“(B) APPLICATION.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request is

issued under subsection (a) in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

“(C) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(D) IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.—At the request of the head of an authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a), or a designee, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the head of the authorized investigative agency or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.

“(3) TERMINATION.—In the case of any request for which a governmental or private entity has submitted a notification or filed a petition for judicial review under paragraph (3)(B), if the facts supporting a nondisclosure requirement cease to exist, an appropriate official of the authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a) shall promptly notify the governmental or private entity, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement that the nondisclosure requirement is no longer in effect.”

(e) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Section 3511 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(b) NONDISCLOSURE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) NOTICE.—If a recipient of a request for a report, records, or other information under section 2709 of this title, section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u), section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414), or section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3162), wishes to have a court review a nondisclosure requirement imposed in connection with the request, the recipient may notify the Government or file a petition for judicial review in any court described in subsection (a).

“(B) APPLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of a notification under subparagraph (A), the Government shall apply for an order prohibiting the disclosure of the existence or contents of the relevant request. An application under this subparagraph may be filed in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the recipient of the order is doing business or in the district court of the United States for any judicial district within which the authorized investigation that is the basis for the request is being conducted. The applicable nondisclosure requirement shall remain in effect during the pendency of proceedings relating to the requirement.

“(C) CONSIDERATION.—A district court of the United States that receives a petition under subparagraph (A) or an application under subparagraph (B) should rule expeditiously, and shall, subject to paragraph (3), issue a nondisclosure order that includes conditions appropriate to the circumstances.

“(2) APPLICATION CONTENTS.—An application for a nondisclosure order or extension thereof or a response to a petition filed under paragraph (1) shall include a certification from the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, an Assistant Attorney General, or the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or in the case of a request by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government other

than the Department of Justice, the head or deputy head of the department, agency, or instrumentality, containing a statement of specific facts indicating that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

“(A) endangering the life or physical safety of any person;

“(B) flight from investigation or prosecution;

“(C) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(D) intimidation of potential witnesses;

“(E) interference with diplomatic relations;

“(F) alerting a target, an associate of a target, or the foreign power of which the target is an agent, of the interest of the Government in the target; or

“(G) otherwise seriously endangering the national security of the United States.

“(3) STANDARD.—A district court of the United States shall issue a nondisclosure requirement order or extension thereof under this subsection if the court determines that there is reason to believe that disclosure of the information subject to the nondisclosure requirement during the applicable time period will result in—

“(A) endangering the life or physical safety of any person;

“(B) flight from investigation or prosecution;

“(C) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(D) intimidation of potential witnesses;

“(E) interference with diplomatic relations;

“(F) alerting a target, an associate of a target, or the foreign power of which the target is an agent, of the interest of the Government in the target; or

“(G) otherwise seriously endangering the national security of the United States.”

SEC. 503. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACCESS TO TELEPHONE TOLL AND TRANSACTIONAL RECORDS.—Section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 501(a) of this Act, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A request under subsection (b) or a non-disclosure requirement imposed in connection with such request under subsection (c) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3511.

“(2) NOTICE.—A request under subsection (b) shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in paragraph (1).”

(b) ACCESS TO FINANCIAL RECORDS FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE AND PROTECTIVE PURPOSES.—Section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414), as amended by section 502(b) of this Act, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) (as redesignated by such section 502(b)) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A request under subsection (a) or a non-disclosure requirement imposed in connection with such request under subsection (c) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code.

“(2) NOTICE.—A request under subsection (a) shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in paragraph (1).”

(c) IDENTITY OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CREDIT REPORTS.—Section 626 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u), as amended by section 502(c) of this Act, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) through (i) (as redesignated by such section 502(c)) as subsections (e) through (j), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A request under subsection (a) or a non-disclosure requirement imposed in connection with such request under subsection (c) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code.

“(2) NOTICE.—A request under subsection (a) shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in paragraph (1).”

(d) INVESTIGATIONS OF PERSONS WITH ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3162) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (e) as subsections (d) through (f), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A request under subsection (a) or a non-disclosure requirement imposed in connection with such request under subsection (c) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code.

“(2) NOTICE.—A request under subsection (a) shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in paragraph (1).”

SEC. 504. INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS ON NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.

Section 119 of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-177; 120 Stat. 219) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and calendar years 2010 through 2013” after “2006”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking “(as such term is defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)))”;

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) CALENDAR YEARS 2010 THROUGH 2013.—Not later than December 31, 2014, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report containing the results of the audit conducted under subsection (a) for calendar years 2010 through 2013.”

(3) by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term ‘intelligence community’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

“(2) NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER.—The term ‘national security letter’ means a request for information under—

“(A) section 2709(b) of title 18, United States Code (to access certain communication service provider records);

“(B) section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(5)(A)) (to obtain financial institution customer records);

“(C) section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3162) (to obtain financial information, records, and consumer reports); or

“(D) section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) (to obtain certain financial information and consumer reports).

“(3) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).”;

(4) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively;

(5) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For the period beginning on January 1, 2010, and ending on December 31, 2013, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall—

“(A) examine the use of national security letters by the intelligence community during the period;

“(B) describe any noteworthy facts or circumstances relating to the use of national security letters by the intelligence community, including any improper or illegal use of such authority;

“(C) assess the importance of information received under the national security letters to the activities of the intelligence community; and

“(D) examine the manner in which information received under the national security letters was collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated.

“(2) SUBMISSION DATE FOR ASSESSMENT.—Not later than December 31, 2014, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the assessment for calendar years 2010 through 2013.”;

(6) in subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (4)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “a report under subsection (c)(1) or (c)(2)” and inserting “any report under subsection (c) or (d)”;

(ii) by striking “Inspector General of the Department of Justice” and inserting “Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, and any Inspector General of an element of the intelligence community that prepares a report to assist the Inspector General of the Department of Justice or the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community in complying with the requirements of this section”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “the reports submitted under subsection (c)(1) or (c)(2)” and inserting “any report submitted under subsection (c) or (d)”;

(7) in subsection (f), as redesignated by paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking “The reports submitted under subsections (c)(1) or (c)(2)” and inserting “Each report submitted under subsection (c)”;

(B) by striking “subsection (d)(2)” and inserting “subsection (e)(2)”.

SEC. 505. NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER SUNSET.

(a) REPEAL.—Effective on June 1, 2015—

(1) section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as such provision read on October 25, 2001;

(2) section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(5)) is

amended to read as such provision read on October 25, 2001;

(3) subsections (a) and (b) of section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) are amended to read as subsections (a) and (b), respectively, of the second of the 2 sections designated as section 624 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) (relating to disclosure to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for counterintelligence purposes), as added by section 601 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–93; 109 Stat. 974), read on October 25, 2001; and

(4) section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3162) is amended to read as such provision read on October 25, 2001.

(b) TRANSITION PROVISION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the provisions of law referred to in subsection (a), as in effect on May 31, 2015, shall continue to apply on and after June 1, 2015, with respect to any particular foreign intelligence investigation or with respect to any particular offense or potential offense that began or occurred before June 1, 2015.

SEC. 506. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 3511 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in subsections (a), (c), and (d), by striking “or 627(a)” each place it appears.

TITLE VI—FISA AND NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER TRANSPARENCY REFORMS

SEC. 601. THIRD-PARTY REPORTING ON FISA ORDERS AND NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each electronic service provider may report information to the public in accordance with this section about demands and requests for information made by any Government entity under a surveillance law, and is exempt in accordance with subsection (d) from liability with respect to that report, even if such provider would otherwise be prohibited by a surveillance law from reporting that information.

(b) PERIODIC AGGREGATE REPORTS.—An electronic service provider may report such information not more often than quarterly and only to the following extent:

(1) ESTIMATE OF NUMBERS OF DEMANDS AND REQUESTS MADE.—The report may reveal an estimate of the number of the demands and requests described in subsection (a) made during the period to which the report pertains.

(2) ESTIMATE OF NUMBERS OF DEMANDS AND REQUESTS COMPLIED WITH.—The report may reveal an estimate of the numbers of the demands and requests described in subsection (a) the electronic service provider complied with during the period to which the report pertains, regardless of when the demands or requests were made.

(3) ESTIMATE OF NUMBER OF USERS OR ACCOUNTS.—The report may reveal an estimate of the numbers of users or accounts, or both, of the electronic service provider, for which information was demanded, requested, or provided during the period to which the report pertains.

(c) SPECIAL RULES FOR REPORTS.—

(1) LEVEL OF DETAIL BY AUTHORIZING SURVEILLANCE LAW.—Any estimate disclosed under this section may be an overall estimate or broken down by categories of authorizing surveillance laws or by provisions of authorizing surveillance laws.

(2) LEVEL OF DETAIL BY NUMERICAL RANGE.—Each estimate disclosed under this section shall be rounded to the nearest 100. If an estimate is zero, an electronic service provider may report the estimate as zero.

(3) REPORT MAY BE BROKEN DOWN BY PERIODS NOT LESS THAN CALENDAR QUARTERS.—For

any reporting period, an electronic service provider may break down the report by calendar quarters or any other time periods greater than a calendar quarter.

(d) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—An electronic service provider making a report that the electronic service provider reasonably believes in good faith is authorized by this section is not criminally or civilly liable in any court for making the report.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit disclosures other than those authorized by this section.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELECTRONIC SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term “electronic service provider” means an electronic communications service provider (as that term is defined in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code) or a remote computing service provider (as that term is defined in section 2711 of title 18, United States Code).

(2) SURVEILLANCE LAW.—The term “surveillance law” means any provision of any of the following:

(A) The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

(B) Section 802(a) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 436(a)).

(C) Section 2709 of title 18, United States Code.

(D) Section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(5)(A)).

(E) Subsection (a) or (b) of section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u(a), 1681u(b)).

(F) Section 627(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v(a)) (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act).

SEC. 602. GOVERNMENT REPORTING ON FISA ORDERS.

(a) ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE.—

(1) REPORT OF ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE.—Section 107 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1807) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively;

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph)—

(i) by striking “In April” and inserting “(a) In April”;

(ii) by striking “Congress” and inserting “the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate”;

(C) in subsection (a) (as designated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph)—

(i) in paragraph (1) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(3) the total number of individuals who were subject to electronic surveillance conducted under an order entered under this title, rounded to the nearest 100; and

“(4) the total number of United States persons who were subject to electronic surveillance conducted under an order entered under this title, rounded to the nearest 100.”;

(D) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b)(1) Each report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form.

“(2) Not later than 7 days after a report is submitted under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall make such report publicly available.”.

(2) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.—Section 108(a)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1808) is amended by striking “the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate” and inserting “the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate”.

(b) PHYSICAL SEARCHES.—Section 306 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1826) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate” and inserting “Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate”; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives”.

(c) PEN REGISTER AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICES.—Section 406 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1846) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) each department or agency on behalf of which the Government has made application for orders approving the use of pen registers or trap and trace devices under this title;

“(5) for each department or agency described in paragraph (4), a breakdown of the numbers required by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3);

“(6) a good faith estimate of the total number of individuals who were targeted by the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device authorized under an order entered under this title, rounded to the nearest 100;

“(7) a good faith estimate of the total number of United States persons who were targeted by the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device authorized under an order entered under this title, rounded to the nearest 100; and

“(8) a good faith estimate of the total number of United States persons who were targeted by the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device authorized under an order entered under this title and whose information acquired by such pen register or trap and trace device was subsequently reviewed or accessed by a Federal officer, employee, or agent, rounded to the nearest 100.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c)(1) Each report required under subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form.

“(2) Not later than 7 days after a report is submitted under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall make such report publicly available.”.

(d) ACCESS TO CERTAIN BUSINESS RECORDS AND OTHER TANGIBLE THINGS.—Section 503 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as redesignated by section 101(c) of this Act, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate” and inserting after “Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “to the preceding calendar year—” and inserting “to the preceding calendar year the following:”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “the total” and inserting “The total”; and

(ii) by striking the semicolon and inserting a period;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “the total” and inserting “The total”; and

(ii) by striking “; and” and inserting a period;

(D) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “the number” and inserting “The number”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(F) Records concerning electronic communications.

“(G) Records concerning wire communications.”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) A description of all other tangible things sought by an application made for the production of any tangible things under section 501, and the number of orders under such section 501 granted, modified, or denied, for each tangible thing.

“(5) A description of each order under section 501 granted, modified, or denied for the production of tangible things on an ongoing basis.

“(6) Each department or agency on whose behalf the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or a designee of the Director has made an application for an order requiring the production of any tangible things under section 501.

“(7) For each department or agency described in paragraph (6), a breakdown of the numbers and descriptions required by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5).”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(C) a good faith estimate of the total number of individuals whose tangible things were produced under an order entered under section 501, rounded to the nearest 100;

“(D) a good faith estimate of the total number of United States persons whose tangible things were produced under an order entered under section 501, rounded to the nearest 100; and

“(E) a good faith estimate of the total number of United States persons whose tangible things were produced under an order entered under section 501 and subsequently

reviewed or accessed by a Federal officer, employee, or agent, rounded to the nearest 100.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) Not later than 7 days after the date on which a report is submitted under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall make such report publicly available.”.

(e) ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES REGARDING CERTAIN PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Section 707 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881f) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) ADDITIONAL ANNUAL REPORT.—

“(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—In April of each year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report setting forth with respect to the preceding year—

“(A) the total number of—

“(i) directives issued under section 702;

“(ii) orders granted under section 703; and

“(iii) orders granted under section 704;

“(B) good faith estimates of the total number of individuals, rounded to the nearest 100, whose electronic or wire communications or communications records were collected pursuant to—

“(i) a directive issued under section 702;

“(ii) an order granted under section 703; and

“(iii) an order granted under section 704;

“(C) good faith estimates of the total number, rounded to the nearest 100, of United States persons whose electronic or wire communications or communications records were collected pursuant to—

“(i) a directive issued under section 702;

“(ii) an order granted under section 703; and

“(iii) an order granted under section 704; and

“(D) a good faith estimate of the total number of United States persons whose electronic or wire communications or communications records were collected pursuant to a directive issued under section 702 and subsequently reviewed or accessed by a Federal officer, employee, or agent, rounded to the nearest 100.

“(2) FORM.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form.

“(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 7 days after the date on which a report is submitted under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall make such report publicly available.”.

SEC. 603. GOVERNMENT REPORTING ON NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.

Section 118(c) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (18 U.S.C. 3511 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) REPORT ON REQUESTS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.—

“(1) CLASSIFIED FORM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2015, and every 180 days thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report fully informing the committees concerning

the requests made under section 2709(a) of title 18, United States Code, section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(5)(A)), section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u), or section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3162) during the applicable period.

“(B) CONTENTS.—Each report under subparagraph (A) shall include, for each provision of law described in subparagraph (A)—

“(i) authorized requests under the provision, including requests for subscriber information; and

“(ii) the number of authorized requests under the provision—

“(I) that relate to a United States person;

“(II) that relate to a person that is not a United States person;

“(III) that relate to a person that is—

“(aa) the subject of an authorized national security investigation; or

“(bb) an individual who has been in contact with or otherwise directly linked to the subject of an authorized national security investigation; and

“(IV) that relate to a person that is not known to be the subject of an authorized national security investigation.

“(2) UNCLASSIFIED FORM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2015, and every 180 days thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report fully informing the committees concerning the aggregate total of all requests identified under paragraph (1) during the applicable period. Each report under this paragraph shall be in unclassified form.

“(B) CONTENTS.—Each report under subparagraph (A) shall include the aggregate total of requests—

“(i) that relate to a United States person;

“(ii) that relate to a person that is not a United States person;

“(iii) that relate to a person that is—

“(I) the subject of an authorized national security investigation; or

“(II) an individual who has been in contact with or otherwise directly linked to the subject of an authorized national security investigation; and

“(iv) that relate to a person that is not known to be the subject of an authorized national security investigation.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) APPLICABLE PERIOD.—The term ‘applicable period’ means—

“(i) with respect to the first report submitted under paragraph (1) or (2), the period beginning 180 days after the date of enactment of the USA FREEDOM Act and ending on December 31, 2014; and

“(ii) with respect to the second report submitted under paragraph (1) or (2), and each report thereafter, the 6-month period ending on the last day of the second month before the date for submission of the report.

“(B) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).”.

TITLE VII—PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD SUBPOENA AUTHORITY

SEC. 701. PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.

Section 1061(g) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(D), by striking “submit a written request to the Attorney General of the United States that the Attorney General”;

(2) by striking paragraph (2); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3).

TITLE VIII—SEVERABILITY

SEC. 801. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or an amendment made by this Act, or the application of the provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected thereby.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HELLER, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. COONS, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COATS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. RISCH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1600. A bill to facilitate the reestablishment of domestic, critical mineral designation, assessment, production, manufacturing, recycling, analysis, forecasting, workforce, education, research, and international capabilities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, our national security depends upon minerals that enable nearly all of the defense and weapons systems used by the U.S. Armed Forces. These minerals are also critical to the clean energy, electronics, and medical industries. Yet, for how critical these minerals are, the vast majority of our domestic supply is imported from China in order to reduce cost. In fact, China supplies 90 to 95 percent of our rare earth oxides, a special class of critical minerals. We have seen how dangerous this dependence can be—in 2009, China choked off the supply of these materials to the rest of the world, restricting exports by 72 percent and causing the prices of rare earth elements to skyrocket here in the U.S.

I am pleased to join Senators MURKOWSKI, UDALL, and HELLER as the leading sponsors of bipartisan legislation to prevent future supply shocks of these critical minerals that are the key to our defense, energy, electronics, and medical industries by expanding U.S. production and supply of these important substances. This legislation—the Critical Minerals Policy Act of 2013—builds on two bills that were introduced in the 112th Congress and which

were referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. S. 383, the Critical Minerals and Materials Promotion Act of 2011, which I cosponsored, was introduced by Senator MARK UDALL. S. 1113, the Critical Minerals Policy Act, was introduced by Senator MURKOWSKI. The Energy and Natural Resources Committee held a hearing on these bills in June 2011, and this new bill is a product of those efforts. We are being joined by 13 of our Senate colleagues as original bipartisan cosponsors: Senators RISCH, HAGAN, THUNE, BEGICH, ENZI, COONS, HOEVEN, LANDRIEU, COATS, KLOBUCHAR, BLUNT, FRANKEN, and CRAPO.

Critical minerals are pervasive in our everyday life. Let me give you a few examples. They are the key to stronger permanent magnets, which allow for smaller electric motors and other electronic devices, as well as for more efficient clean wind energy and MRI machines. They are essential for rechargeable batteries in hybrid and electric vehicles and the high-efficiency motors that power them. They are vital to phosphors, which give us more efficient lighting and flat panel displays. They serve as catalysts for fuel cells and for refining automobile fuel. Our Armed Forces also rely on critical minerals every time they use night-vision goggles, heads-up displays, satellite images, radar systems, high-energy laser weapons, precision-guided missiles, and fighter jets. By one estimate, the Defense Department alone constitutes 5 percent of total U.S. demand for rare earth elements. In short, critical minerals are so indispensable that we can't imagine life without them. They are called critical minerals because they are indeed critical to the development of so many high-tech weapons systems and commercial products.

Although China currently enjoys near-monopoly in the global production of critical minerals, the truth is that it doesn't have to be this way. China only holds 50 percent of the world's natural reserves, while the U.S. holds about 13 percent of the world's reserves, according to a recent study by the U.S. Geological Survey. In fact, a large part of the critical minerals supply shock in 2009 was due to uncertainty about the global distribution of critical minerals. When China began to restrict supply, the rest of the world was in the dark about what alternative sources of supply were even available. Clearly, there is significant work to be done in this field.

The bill being introduced today outlines a series of measures to expand U.S. supplies of critical minerals starting with the identification of which minerals and elements are truly in need of special attention. The bill then requires the Interior Department to conduct assessments of where these minerals are located within the U.S. and expands research to find more efficient ways of extracting and processing

those minerals. The bill also includes research programs to extract critical minerals from unconventional sources, such as coal or geothermal energy wells, as well as recycling these important substances from obsolete devices. The bill also requires the two lead agencies which manage our public lands and forests—the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture—to reexamine the permitting processes for hard rock minerals under current law to see if there are ways of reducing delays for mining projects that would extract critical minerals. This legislation also includes programs to enable our next generation of scientists studying critical minerals and to prepare them for jobs in these fields as well as efforts to work with our international trading partners on expanding worldwide supplies of these materials.

I commend Senator MURKOWSKI for her leadership on this issue. This legislation is important for our national security. It is important for our high-tech manufacturing industries. It is important for U.S. competitiveness. I ask all Senators to support this bipartisan legislation.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1605. A bill for the relief of Michael G. Faber; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce unique legislation to remedy a clear mistake by the Federal Government that affects only a single person, an Army veteran, formerly from Alaska, now living in Idaho, who for the past nearly 40 years has been trying to get the Federal Government to remedy an inequity that has affected him, but also has impacts on his family.

While Congress is struggling to find solutions for the economic and health care problems of all 311 million Americans and a means to fund the Federal Government, I hope we also can find the time to right a wrong for a single man and his family.

The issue briefly is that Michael Faber, a Tsimshian Indian whose family has long roots in Southeast Alaska, initially had been granted membership/stock in 1973 in the Sealaska Native Regional Corp., the corporation made up of Southeast Alaska Natives formed as a result of the aboriginal land claims settlement between the Federal Government and Alaska Natives accomplished through passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, ANCSA, of 1971. Because of a clerical error by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the early 1970s Mr. Faber was shifted without cause or his permission to the out-of-state 13th Regional Corporation in late 1976. For decades Mr. Faber has been trying to win reinstatement to the Sealaska Corp., a request the corporation has endorsed, but that the

Federal Government, and now seemingly the Federal courts, have decided can't happen without Congress expressly authorizing his reenrollment.

The legislation I offer today, which to my knowledge is supported by everyone possibly connected to this case, will do nothing but right an error by our government that never should have happened. It is a bill that affects a sole individual, which I know is something that has become unpopular on Capitol Hill in recent years. But Congress early in history provided an avenue for passage of legislation to provide relief for individuals who are the victims of an injustice. In fact, it was once relatively common for Congress to pass such legislation. There were hundreds of such bills approved between 1817 and 1971. Admittedly just one was approved last year, when Nigerian student, Sopuruchi "Victor" Chukwueke, became the first person in two years to win a private relief bill so he could stay in the United States on an expired visa and gain a path to permanent residency so he could enter medical school in Ohio. Mr. Faber's case is even more worthy of approval because this bill simply remedies a mistake clearly caused by a Federal agency.

This issue stems from the fact that during the original enrollment process following passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, Michael Faber enrolled in the Sealaska Corporation, the tenth of the thirteen corporations created by the Act, along with his father, Clyde Benjamin Faber, his brother Gary Dennis Faber and his sister Debra Marlene Faber. Michael Faber's enrollment was approved by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and he received Sealaska share number 13-752-39665-01, and an initial 100 shares of stock in the Sealaska Corporation. The family lived in Metlakatla, Alaska prior to passage of the claims act, and by the time of implementation of the act had moved to Juneau, AK.

In the mid-1960s Mr. Faber joined the U.S. Army and was stationed in Germany. At some point in 1976, while Mr. Faber was on duty with the Army, and consequently had an out-of-Alaska mailing address, someone in BIW apparently moved to shift his enrollment from the Sealaska Corp. to the then newly created 13th Corporation. That corporation was intended to serve the needs of Alaska Natives living outside of Alaska.

Under the law, Mr. Faber was sent a ballot that he was required to sign to accept the shift in enrollment. However, he never received the ballot; it was returned to BIA—unopened and unsigned. Mr. Faber had been badly injured during his military service and, in early 1976, was in and out of rehabilitation hospitals and clinics at different locations. By late 1976, Mr. Faber spent 19 months in a military hospital in Texas recovering from se-

vere burns. Unfortunately, someone at BIA went ahead, and without Mr. Faber's legal approval, administratively completed the enrollment shift. Mr. Faber eventually was placed on the military's Temporary Disability Retirement List, TDRL, and then was involved in years of post-service counseling. It wasn't until after his recovery that he fully realized he had been shifted from Sealaska to the 13th Corporation, and it was then that he began his effort to be reenrolled in the Sealaska Corp.

The record indicates that during the 1990s BIA acknowledged it made an error in shifting Mr. Faber's enrollment without his written approval. Unfortunately, by then BIA believed it did not have the legal authority to reenroll Mr. Faber in the Sealaska Corporation shareholder rolls. Over the years, Mr. Faber won a resolution of support by the Sealaska Corporation's Board of Directors. The resolution welcomed his reinstatement to that corporation. He filed in U.S. District Court in Idaho a request for a writ ordering BIA to change his enrollment back to membership in Sealaska. In late 2012, however, a Federal judge in Idaho encouraged all parties to dismiss the suit without prejudice. Accordingly, there is no avenue for this injustice to be rectified without congressional authorization of Mr. Faber's reenrollment in the Sealaska Corp.

This case has been complicated by the fact that Mr. Faber moved back to the community of Metlakatla, Alaska in the mid-1990s to work as the Executive Director of the Metlakatla Housing Authority. The complication is that residents of Metlakatla, the main community on the Annette Island Indian Reservation, were allowed by ANCSA to maintain their reservation status—the only reservation in the state to be reauthorized by the claims settlement act. But in return, members of the Metlakatla Indian Community were required to denounce other ANCSA benefits. This legislation, to prevent any precedents and to clarify the factual record, not only requires Mr. Faber to surrender or abrogate any possible membership in the Metlakatla Indian Community before his enrollment in the Sealaska Corp. can take effect, but also in no way alters the Section 19(a) provisions of ANCSA involving Metlakatla reservation status.

Mr. Faber has been waiting for nearly 40 years for someone to champion his quest to be restored to the Sealaska Corp., a legacy he wants largely for the benefit of his children. This legislation will allow Mr. Faber retroactive benefits only to 2011. In that year, Sealaska's board voted to welcome Mr. Faber back to its membership. It also voted to support the legislation. The bill sets no precedents for other Natives to seek changes in their ANCSA enrollments because of the unique and

singular nature of the clerical error that was responsible for this change in enrollment status in the first place. This bill will simply treat Mr. Faber and his descendants humanely and formally recognize their legal and cultural status as Alaska Natives.

I hope that Congress will see fit to pass this bill promptly—truly the right and just result.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1607. A bill to provide conformity in Native small business opportunities and promote job creation, manufacturing, and American economic recovery; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1607

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Native Small Business Conformity Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. SMALL BUSINESS CONFORMITY.

(a) HUBZONE ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(p)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(3)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) a small business concern that is owned and controlled by an organization described in section 8(a)(15);”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(p)(5)(A)(i)(I)(aa) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(5)(A)(i)(I)(aa)) is amended by striking “subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) of paragraph (3)” and inserting “subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E) or (F) of paragraph (3)”.

(b) 8(a) PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(a)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(6)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “(F) If an organization described in paragraph (15) establishes that it is economically disadvantaged under this paragraph in connection with an application for 1 small business concern owned or controlled by the organization, the organization shall not be required to reestablish that it is economically disadvantaged in order to have other businesses that it owns or controls certified for participation in the program under this subsection, unless specifically requested to do so by the Administration.”.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by this subsection shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and apply to determinations of economic disadvantage made before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 1608. A bill to authorize appropriations for the SelectUSA Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1608

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “SelectUSA Authorization Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. SELECTUSA INITIATIVE DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “SelectUSA Initiative” means the SelectUSA Initiative established by Executive Order 13577 of June 15, 2011.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SELECTUSA INITIATIVE.

There is authorized to be appropriated for the SelectUSA Initiative \$17,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

SEC. 4. REPORTS AND NOTIFICATIONS TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31 of 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit to Congress a report on the activities of the SelectUSA Initiative during the preceding fiscal year.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall include, for the period covered by the report, the following:

(1) A description of the outreach activities of the SelectUSA Initiative and the amounts used by the SelectUSA Initiative for such activities.

(2) The number of foreign firms that relocated to the United States as a result of the activities of the SelectUSA Initiative.

(3) A description of the progress made by the United States in increasing its share of foreign direct investment from the Asia and Pacific regions.

(4) Any findings that are made by the SelectUSA Initiative in conducting its activities and are relevant to promoting the United States as a destination for the location of foreign direct investment.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 276—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 2013 AS “NATIONAL WORK AND FAMILY MONTH”

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BROWN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 276

Whereas, according to a report by WorldatWork, a nonprofit professional association with expertise in attracting, motivating, and retaining employees, the quality of a job and the supportiveness of a workplace are key predictors of the job productivity, job satisfaction, and commitment to the employer of workers, as well as of the ability of an employer to retain workers;

Whereas the term “work-life balance” refers to specific organizational practices, policies, and programs that are guided by a philosophy of active support for the efforts of employees to achieve success within and out-

side the workplace, such as caring for dependents, promoting health and wellness, providing paid and unpaid time off, providing financial support, encouraging community involvement, and improving workplace culture;

Whereas numerous studies show that employers that offer effective work-life balance programs are better able to recruit more talented employees, maintain a happier, healthier, and less stressed workforce, and retain experienced employees, which produces a more productive and stable workforce with less voluntary turnover;

Whereas job flexibility often allows parents to be more involved in the lives of their children, and research demonstrates that parental involvement is associated with higher achievement in language and mathematics, improved behavior, greater academic persistence, and lower dropout rates in children;

Whereas military families have special work-life needs that often require robust policies and programs that provide flexibility to employees in unique circumstances;

Whereas studies show that family rituals such as sitting down to dinner together and sharing activities on weekends and holidays positively influence the health and development of children, and that children who eat dinner with their families every day consume nearly a full serving more of fruits and vegetables per day than those who never eat dinner with their families or do so only occasionally; and

Whereas the month of October is an appropriate month to designate as National Work and Family Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 2013 as “National Work and Family Month”;

(2) recognizes the importance of work schedules that allow employees to spend time with their families to job productivity and healthy families;

(3) urges public officials, employers, employees, and the general public to work together to achieve more balance between work and family; and

(4) calls upon the people of the United States to observe National Work and Family Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in executive session on Wednesday, October 30, 2013, at 9:15 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to mark-up S. ___, Children’s Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2013; S. ___, CHIMP Act Amendments of 2013; H.R. 2094, School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act; S. ___, Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2013; S. 1302, Cooperative and Small Employer Charity Pension Flexibility Act, H.R. 2747, Streamlining Claims Processing for Federal Contractor Employees Act, the nominations of Michael Keith Yudin, to serve as Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education; James Cole, Jr., to serve as General Counsel, Department of Education; and

Chai Feldblum, to serve as Commissioner, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; as well as any additional nominations cleared for action.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224-5375.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in open session on Thursday, October 31, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Attaining a Quality Degree: Innovations to Improve Student Success"

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Aissa Canchola of the committee staff on (202) 224-2009.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO
MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN
AFFAIRS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 29, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Housing Finance Reform: Essentials of a Functioning Housing Finance System for Consumers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 29, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATION,
TECHNOLOGY, AND THE INTERNET

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 29, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, "Broadband Adoption: The Next Mile."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION, CIVIL
RIGHTS, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 29, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Of-

fice Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "'Stand Your Ground' Laws: Civil Rights and Public Safety Implications of the Expanded Use of Deadly Force."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Aaron Goldner and Danielle Schreiber, two fellows in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 242 and 377; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Thomas Edgar Wheeler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission.

Michael P. O'Rielly, of New York, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

NATIONAL BISON DAY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 254.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 254) designating November 2, 2013, as "National Bison Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the

preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 254) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 24, 2013, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL WORK AND FAMILY
MONTH

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 276, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution, (S. Res. 276) designating October 2013 as "National Work and Family Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 276) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY,
OCTOBER 30, 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, October 30, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the Estevez nomination, with the time until 10:30 a.m. equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. The first rollcall vote will be at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow morning on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Alan Estevez to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask

unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:30 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 30, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 29, 2013:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

THOMAS EDGAR WHEELER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS FROM JULY 1, 2013.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

RICHARD F. GRIFFIN, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

MICHAEL P. O'RIELLY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2014.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 29, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 29, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

BUILDING A NEW MIDDLE EAST— THE WORK OF A GENERATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 3 years, the Arab Middle East, an enormous arc stretching from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean, has been in turmoil. Restive millions, frustrated by a lack of economic opportunity, repressive politics, and a social structure often at odds with modernity, have taken to the streets demanding change. Their revolution hangs in the balance with the entrenched interests of the former regimes on one side and the stifling religious rule on the other.

Faced with these daunting realities, the Obama administration may be in the midst of a strategic reevaluation of our role in the region—one that is far more modest in ambition, more tempered in expectation, and certainly more reliant on the use of its diplomatic, not military, resources.

This new approach stands in stark contrast to the effort by the George W. Bush administration to deliver a “freedom agenda”—sometimes through the barrel of a gun—that would bring de-

mocracy to a region that has known mostly misrule. That doctrine, or its application, proved entirely unworkable, as the societies freed of their authoritarian shackles had nothing upon which to build. This is a lesson we may be bitterly learning in Libya as well.

These setbacks and the realization that democracy building is a generational undertaking must not lead us to disengage from the region. The forces freed by the Arab Spring will not be contained, and I still believe they can lead hundreds of millions of people to more representative forms of government, more economic opportunity, and, we must hope, more tranquility and peace within their borders.

The United States needs to help build institutions capable of supporting a transition in the Arab world in three dimensions: political, economic, and civil society. Unmet economic needs are the most pressing. At its heart, the Arab Spring is the expression of discontent of millions of idle, young Arabs, who have seen the economic opportunities that the outside world offers, but whose own economic realities are plagued by stagnation, mismanagement, and cronyism.

The cure is not outright assistance, which will do little to unleash or occupy long-term energies of Arab youth. It is investment that will allow this generation of Arabs to drag inefficient, antiquated, and highly statist economies in the 21st century. Since the ouster of Ben Ali and Mubarak, I have pushed for the creation of enterprise funds and other nimble vehicles that will allow us to direct resources at specific sectors that can help to drive economic growth, as well as improve the quality of life for ordinary people.

In coming years, these economies will need to produce sufficient jobs and wealth to both sustain workers and their families and to provide the economic conditions for sustainable political stability. But that cannot be an excuse to put off political reform now, because capital flows will not resume until investors have some confidence that their money is safe.

The experience of both Egypt and Tunisia serve to reinforce the inchoate nature of their political transitions. Both countries emerged from their respective revolutions with energized Islamist movements that were able to triumph over less well-organized secular parties—in large measure because the old governments had atomized their opposition and left political Islamist governments as the only via-

ble alternative. In both countries, this experiment failed as a result of overreaching and a misreading of the people's wishes—a development that should ease the fears of those who saw a “green wave” sweeping across the Middle East.

The dysfunction in both Cairo and Tunis, and the Egyptian military deposing of President Mohammed Morsi in a coup, are a reminder that a democratic outcome is never assured or to be assumed. The United States must stand ready to assist Arab nations with the long-term institution-building and political spadework that are necessary preconditions for democracy.

In Tunisia, which is small, relatively prosperous, and not nearly as divided as some of its larger neighbors, prospects for a peaceful transition and transfer of power from the current Islamist government to a technocratic government that would oversee elections are alive, if not entirely well. But while a framework for the installation of a caretaker government remains, squabbling between the Islamists and the secular opposition has slowed the process and reintroduced uncertainty into Tunisia's fragile politics.

Political institution-building and creating a culture of good governance will require targeted assistance, training programs, and a lot of patience. Egypt and Tunisia may be a mess now but 10 years from now will not be the same as they are today, and we can play a role in helping to shape that future.

Think of some of the other countries that have democratized in recent years in Eastern Europe, Asia, and Latin America. The transitions have not been quick or smooth, and many of them are still ongoing. Amid the euphoria that accompanied the collapse of the Communist bloc in Eastern Europe, we were tempted to believe we were all witnesses to the “end of history,” as one academic put it.

The reality has been far messier vestiges of communist oppression still remain throughout the former Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact.

These experiences hold an important lesson for the Arab states—that persistence pays and that democracy is possible, even where it had not existed previously. The United States must support these transitions, and we must be willing to use financial inducements and other levers to steer their political development in a direction that will best serve the Arab peoples and preserve regional and global peace. The partial cutoff of military aid to Egypt and the broader conversation it has sparked about how best to configure assistance may presage

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

a new diplomatic strategy that is less reliant on military relationships devoted to the status quo and more supportive of civil society, economic and political reform.

This leads to the third area where the United States can play an important role—in trying to support the transition of Arab civil society from one that was imposed from above to one driven primarily by the needs and interests of its people. Free expression, women's empowerment and respect for minority groups are essential to the growth of democracy. Focusing assistance to groups in these areas can help to broaden the constituency for change and also give the young and disaffected an alternative to jihad.

Today's Arab twentysomethings face even greater challenges than the Europeans of 1990s. But President George H.W. Bush and his successor, Bill Clinton, both understood that the investment in Eastern Europe was one that would pay dividends for decades. They were right and it has. I believe that we have a similar opportunity to help the Arab people. It will take longer and there will be setbacks. But the alternative is to watch a generation succumb to despair—a despair that is likely to have negative consequences for us and for our allies. I prefer to bet on hope and work for change.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, at this point in our Nation's history, I believe both parties will acknowledge that we have major economic issues facing our country. As Congress just recently came to a temporary resolution which raised the debt ceiling by \$230 billion, it is incredible to me that we still found \$30 billion in aid to send to Afghanistan and \$1.6 billion in aid to send to Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when America is drowning in debt, this is completely unacceptable. And even more important than the money are the American lives that have been lost—six in the time the government was shut down and one the weekend after.

As we work to fix our national problems, we should be wise enough to follow the lead of the nations who have interfered in Afghanistan before us—England and Russia are only two examples—and stop wasting lives and money on a country that will never change. History tells us that it is time to bring our troops home.

I want to thank ABC News for their effort each Sunday morning during “This Week with George Stephanopoulos” to faithfully list the names of the Americans who have been killed in Afghanistan, just as they did during the Iraq war. It is with sadness that I report that they have added seven names to this list over the last 3 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, on the poster beside me are the faces of two little girls, Step-

anie and Eden, whose father, Sergeant Kevin Baldof, from Camp Lejeune Marine Base, which is in my district, was killed in Afghanistan. He and Colonel Palmer, from Cherry Point Marine Air Station, also in my district, were trying to train the Afghans to be policemen. One of the trainees turned their pistol on Palmer and Baldof and killed both of them. So these little girls are standing at Arlington Cemetery with their mom holding their hands.

Perhaps more disheartening is the fact that two of the most recent deaths in Afghanistan also were an example of Afghans that we were trying to train killing Americans. We were just trying to help them.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I spoke on the floor about an article I read, entitled, “The Forgotten War” by Ann Jones. I also will submit an article written by an Iraq war veteran named Jayel Aheram, who now attends the University of Southern California, which is entitled, “Afghanistan War Must End Immediately.” Both of these articles hold the same conclusion: the war in Afghanistan is a misuse of American youth, American money, and American military power.

It is time for the Congress of the United States to face the fact that we have our own problems here in America. To send over \$600 billion to Afghanistan to build roads, schools, and utility plants so the Taliban can blow them up makes no sense.

It is time for little girls like these two to have their daddies at home and not in a coffin.

[From the Daily Trojan, Oct. 7, 2013]

AFGHANISTAN WAR MUST END IMMEDIATELY

(By Jayel Aheram)

Yesterday marked the 12 year anniversary of the war in Afghanistan. Americans have grown weary of the drawn-out conflict's undefined goals and increasingly unsustainable financial costs. According to a CBS News poll, support for the war in Afghanistan plummeted last year to its lowest with only 1 in 4 Americans agreeing that the United States is doing the right thing. President Barack Obama responded to this political reality when he announced last February that “by the end of next year, our war in Afghanistan will be over.” But will there really be an end to the Afghanistan war?

There were three ends to the war in Iraq: The first was in May 2003, when President George W. Bush announced, “Mission accomplished,” in an infamous speech aboard the USS *Abraham Lincoln* just two months after the invasion of Iraq. The second was in September 2010, when “combat troops” silently crossed the Iraqi border into Kuwait, an event Obama's MSNBC boosters were breathlessly proclaimed as the triumphant “End of the Iraq War.” The third was in December 2011, when the Iraqi parliament refused to grant further immunity to U.S. troops beyond 2011, finally forcing to U.S. troops' withdrawal from Iraq. If Iraq had three “end of wars,” how many will there be in Afghanistan? According to the Washington Post, a few thousand U.S. combat troops will likely remain in Afghanistan beyond 2014 to train and advise security forces. Despite this

promise by Obama of the war's end, American presence in Afghanistan will merely add to the grim death toll after 2014.

According to Los Angeles Times, an American service member was killed last week in an “insider attack”—incidents where Afghan allies attack the U.S. troops who train them. This recent event follows another from the weekend before in which three U.S. troops were killed. According to NATO, in 2011 and 2012, 97 coalition members were killed by their Afghan counterparts in these insider attacks. Even as the United States shifts its role from combat to advisory and training, deaths from insider attacks will most likely continue. Taliban leaders, including Mullah Muhammad Omar, have urged their sympathizers and members to continue to infiltrate the security forces and kill American trainers and Afghan trainees.

Bob Dreyfuss wrote in The Nation that military commanders believe in an “insurgent math”—that is, for every civilian the U.S. military kills, 20 insurgents take their place. Approximately 6,841 civilians have been killed since the beginning of the Afghanistan war. Using this “insurgent math,” that would mean the U.S. military has created more than 120,000 insurgents who continue to threaten the lives of U.S. troops and Afghans loyal to the Karzai regime. These newly created insurgents have empowered the Taliban as evidenced by a recent article by the Associated Press, which reported that Taliban fighters have started an insurgent campaign of regaining lost territories as foreign troops depart. After 12 long years, \$600 billion spent, more than 2,000 military deaths, 6,000 civilian deaths and tens of thousands of lives irrevocably altered, when will Americans muster the political will and courage to end America's longest war? Renaming the war is not progress, it is not peace and it will certainly not stop American deaths.

HURRICANE SANDY 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of SEEC, the House Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, I rise today to recognize the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy. Today, we remember those who lost their lives during this catastrophe and salute those who continue the rebuilding efforts.

One year ago, Sandy ravaged the east coast, producing devastating floods and widespread power outages, disrupting cellular phone networks and transit systems. As a whole, the region suffered over \$65 billion in economic losses. Families lost their homes, their precious mementos, and reminders of their daily lives. Communities lost their businesses. Tragically, some individuals lost their lives.

While the east coast was the primary victim of Sandy, extreme weather knows no boundaries and other communities around the country are not immune from suffering the same fate. Floods, hurricanes, wildfires, and droughts are becoming all too common, all too intense, and all too costly.

These events will continue to wreak economic havoc and uproot families, unless we take meaningful action to address climate change.

In California, climate change is increasing the frequency of extreme heat and prolonged drought, placing millions of Californians at greater risk of public health threats such as heat-related sickness, forest fires, and water scarcity.

At home, my constituents live under the constant threat of flooding, which is why I work relentlessly to strengthen our levees and upgrade our infrastructure. If extreme weather caused a levee to be breached in Sacramento, the damage would be similar to that experienced in New Orleans.

Mr. Speaker, events like Sandy can happen anywhere. They don't just threaten the coasts, but all communities in all States. Events like Sandy can happen at any time—and are happening with alarming frequency. This was not an isolated event that happens every decade.

We cannot continue to sit back and wait for the next disaster to happen before we take action. The time to act is not a year from now, not a month from now, not even a day from now. The time to act is today.

We must implement preventative measures to make our communities more resilient and be proactive in addressing climate change, the root cause of extreme weather events. Only then will we be able to safeguard the country from the destructive effects of extreme weather and ensure that the legacy of Sandy is one of action and not despair and procrastination.

COLLAPSE OF AMERICAN HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks, it has become obvious that we are watching nothing less than the collapse of the American health care system. Millions of Americans are losing their health plans and set adrift into a dysfunctional system where they cannot find comparable affordable policies.

Few are signing up on the ObamaCare exchanges. How few, we don't know. Because the numbers are so embarrassing, the administration refuses to report them. There are published reports that some 80 percent of the signups are pushed into the Medicaid system, which is itself nearing functional collapse as doctors simply opt out. Those who are able to keep their health plans are seeing their rates skyrocket to unaffordable extremes. Those few who can find affordable policies often discover they are losing their doctors.

□ 1015

Many employers are dropping their employee health plans or reducing salaries or cutting back on work hours or laying off workers while trying to cope with increased costs. A constituent of mine reports her employer cut her salary 23 percent as it tries to cope with ObamaCare costs.

The ObamaCare Web site is a monument to governmental incompetence. This is a Web site designed to sell a single product that has been under development for more than 3 years at a taxpayer cost of more than \$600 million—more than was spent developing Facebook or Twitter—and it does not work.

But that is not the big problem.

The big problem is that, today, there are fewer people with health insurance—apparently, a lot fewer than before this program began less than 1 month ago. This is the disaster that Republicans tried to prevent or at least to delay, but that disaster is now unfolding before our eyes with dire consequences for millions of Americans.

With all its flaws, the American health care system was the finest in the world. It was the most innovative, the most advanced, the most adaptable, and the most responsive to the individual needs of patients, and now we are losing it.

The one question I keep hearing is: Well, what do the Republicans propose?

In fact, Republicans have had a comprehensive alternative for years. Spearheaded by Dr. TOM PRICE of Georgia and Dr. PHIL ROE of Tennessee and sponsored by the Republican Study Committee, this package would bring within the reach of all Americans health plans that they could choose according to their own individual needs of their own families, that they could own and that they could control, but this package has never passed the House, and it is high time that it did.

It extends the same tax breaks we currently give to companies to employees so they can afford to buy their own health care, again, according to their own needs.

It expands Health Savings Accounts so people can meet their needs with pretax income.

It restores to people the freedom to shop across State lines to find the best policies to suit their needs.

It restores flexibility so that health plans can accommodate people with preexisting conditions while expanding risk pools to provide for those conditions.

It attacks cost drivers like medical liability law that are making health care unaffordable.

It restores pricing flexibility to plans so that a healthy young person can again purchase catastrophic insurance for next to nothing.

It takes the best of the American health care system, preserves it, and corrects its flaws.

Now, I realize the Senate is likely to bury this reform as it has so many, but it is important that the House pass it so the American people can see that there is still hope to save what was once the finest health care system in the world and that it can be again as soon as this fever dream of ObamaCare finally breaks.

We have just been through a government shutdown because Democrats refused to even consider delaying the ObamaCare train wreck. They got their way, and that train wreck is now upon us. I believe, in coming months, the American people will recognize the urgent warnings that the Republicans tried so desperately to convey, and they will be looking for a way out. We need to blaze that trail now.

For that reason, I ask the House leadership to bring the Republican health care reforms to the floor, to get them to the Senate, and then let the American people decide.

Mr. Speaker, freedom works. It is time we put it back to work.

PERSONALIZE YOUR CARE ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I started my day with my friend and colleague Dr. PHIL ROE, a Republican Congressman from Tennessee. We met with representatives from the American Academy of Hospice and Palliative Medicine. These dedicated professionals deal with helping patients and their families contend with some of the most difficult circumstances any of us will ever face: loved ones in pain with difficult medical conditions at the end of life.

We were discussing legislation that Dr. ROE and I have cosponsored—the Personalize Your Care Act of 2013, H.R. 1173.

Despite widespread agreement in principle that individuals should be fully involved with decisions related to their health care, too often, this is not the reality. Most adults have not completed an advanced directive. If documents are completed, they are not regularly revisited and can be difficult to locate when needed. Because these issues are difficult to discuss, often surrogates feel ill-prepared to interpret their loved ones' written wishes. These shortcomings leave families and health care proxies faced with the burden of determining their loved ones' wishes in the midst of crisis, adding greater stress and anxiety.

One of the great misconceptions about advanced care planning is that it is a onetime event. Attempting to plan for all of the possibilities in a single document or within a single conversation is both overwhelming and impossible. For advanced care planning to be

successful, it must become less about legal documentation and more about facilitating ongoing communication about the future care wishes among individuals, their health care providers and their families.

This approach recognizes that documents like advance directives and physician orders for life-sustaining treatment are not the end but the means—the tools—for documenting care preferences based on informed decisions that incorporate an individual's values, personal goals and current circumstance. This process not only provides higher quality care but personalized care. This is the right time to embrace this simple, commonsense reform.

I stepped out of a hearing going on in Ways and Means about the Affordable Care Act, which has basically become a contest, an ongoing soap opera, not an effort to fix the expensive health care system that too often delivers mediocre results. Instead, it is used as a political tug of war. The Personalize Your Care Act is a way out of this cul-de-sac. It is a way that we can come together to empower families, to know what they face, to understand their choices, to make their wishes known, and to assure their wishes are respected.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join Dr. ROE and me to cosponsor H.R. 1173, the Personalize Your Care Act, and to work with us to guarantee this important protection for all American families.

NSA AND THE SNOOP AND SPY CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker:

The administration puts forward a false choice between the liberties we cherish and the security we provide. No more illegal wiretapping of citizens, no more ignoring the law when it is convenient—that is not who we are. That is not what is necessary to defeat the terrorists. We will again set an example for the world that the law is not subject to the whims of stubborn rulers and that justice is not arbitrary. This administration acts like violating civil liberties is the way to enhance our own security. It is not.

Mr. Speaker, those were the words of Senator Barack Obama in 2007.

That was then. This is now.

The NSA, the National Spy Agency, as I call it, is continuing its stealth intrusion into the lives of not only Americans but of foreign leaders as well, whom Senator Obama once talked about. The NSA has been caught eavesdropping on the Germans, the French, and now new reports say 60 million phone calls in Spain were monitored by the NSA.

A bit more history about the NSA and its spying:

The Department of Justice stealthily seized information from 20 different

Associated Press phone lines, including some in the U.S. Capitol—right up there. The Department of Justice stealthily seized phone records of Fox News reporter James Rosen, of his parents and of several Fox News phone lines. In the month of January of 2013 alone, 125 billion phone calls were monitored worldwide, and at least 3 billion of them were phone calls in America.

The NSA stealthily seized from Verizon Business Network Services millions of telephone records, including the locations, numbers and times of domestic calls. A secret government program called PRISM allowed the NSA to search photos, emails and documents from computers at Apple, Google and Microsoft, among many other Internet sources.

NSA and the Snoop and Spy Caucus say this spying on Americans and our allies is necessary to catch the terrorists. They even claim terrorist attacks have been prevented. If this is true, show the evidence. Prove it. Where are the terrorists who supposedly have been thwarted by these surveillance tendencies?

Even if it is true, which I doubt, it still violates the law. In my opinion, it violates the PATRIOT Act. The PATRIOT Act doesn't allow for this nonsense. It violates the constitutional right of privacy, Mr. Speaker. It violates the Fourth Amendment and the right of persons to be secure in their homes, papers and effects without government intrusion. Government cannot use the old Soviet-style, dragnet approach, hoping to catch a big fish while also catching the endangered species of freedom.

Those who argue otherwise say they must seize the whole haystack to find the needle in the haystack. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what is prevented in the Fourth Amendment. I would like to quote the Fourth Amendment:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

The Fourth Amendment specifically prohibits government from seizing the whole haystack to find the one needle.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have lost trust in government. It is time for Congress to intervene to prevent the invasion of privacy by government against the citizens. The Federal Government must stop redlining the Fourth Amendment.

According to an administration official, the President did not sign off on this stuff, and was unaware of the depth of the surveillance of foreign leaders.

Who did sign off?

Mr. Speaker, is there a shadow government in America that operates outside the law, outside the knowledge of the administration?

Sort of spooky, isn't it, Mr. Speaker? Technology may change, but the Constitution does not. We can have security but not at the cost of losing individual freedom because, to quote the constitutional law professor:

There should be no choice between the liberties we cherish and the security we provide.

And that's just the way it is.

TRADE AND KOREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Politico recently reported that U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman is pressing for another trade bill as soon as possible. This one is called the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), to be signed with Asian Pacific countries, about a dozen of them. But whether it is the Obama administration, the Bush I or Bush II administration or the Clinton administration, the executive branch continues to push the same old failed trade model that puts foreign involvement and multinational interests ahead of America's workers and America's businesses. In fact, these deals have cost America millions and millions of jobs as our trade deficit continues to get worse.

This TPP proposal is particularly disturbing as a new trade deal. Because, if you look at the results of the first Obama administration trade deal, the Korean deal, you will see the proof is in the pudding that things didn't get better with our economy, they actually got worse. We were told with the Korean free trade deal that America would create 70,000 jobs here at home.

Guess what?

The fact is, in reality, with the Korean free trade deal, America has lost another 40,000 jobs as a result of that agreement alone. That is about 4,000 jobs lost each month because of the Korean free trade deal.

We were promised with the Korean deal that our economy would grow through increased exports by \$10 billion to \$11 billion.

Guess what?

In reality, U.S. exports to Korea have actually declined by roughly \$800 million since the agreement took effect. Yes, that is a 20 percent decline. That translates into lost jobs and lost income.

America was told that if we signed the Korean trade agreement that, actually, our trade deficit would shrink.

□ 1030

Well, guess what, the month the Korean trade agreement took effect, the U.S. trade deficit with Korea was \$564 million. It has nearly tripled to \$1.6 billion, adding to the sea of red trade-deficit ink and more lost jobs.

We were told that America would actually level the playing field in the

field of automotive trade if we passed the Korean free trade deal. I didn't vote for it. But guess what? Since the Korean agreement took effect, U.S. exports of motor vehicles to Korea have gone up monthly by, guess what, how much—44 cars—44 cars. That is it. At the same time, guess how many more cars the Koreans are shipping in here per month—20,000. All told, Korea has imported more than 1.5 million motor vehicles to the United States since the agreement took effect.

Meanwhile, America has only exported 34,000 cars—only 34,000. That is a 44 to one advantage on Korea's side. That doesn't sound like an agreement that is working to me. Why model the new TPP on that agreement. The Korean deal isn't working.

The sad thing is the American people have been told the same free-trade agreement lies for the past quarter century. All the lies that are contained in them have resulted in a sea of red ink that is costing us jobs. It is no surprise America has amassed a \$17 trillion budget deficit when you have a \$9 trillion accumulated trade deficit over the last 25 years. Too much of our economic powerhouse has been traded away.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to stop these bad trade deals. Focus on creating jobs inside our country. I call on Republican leaders to sideline the Trans-Pacific Partnership deal and bring up my bill H.R. 192, the Balancing Trade Act, as a start.

This legislation would require the administration to outline actions to balance the trade deficit with every single country with which we have a trade deficit—including Korea—country by country. America can then again begin to create jobs in this country at a level that the American people expect—to yield a vibrant economy here at home—and grow our middle class forward, not backward.

GOVERNMENT GLITCHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the American people have become all too accustomed to government glitches, which result largely from government that has grown too large, too bureaucratic, and too difficult to navigate.

Every day, with a dedicated and compassionate staff, I assist constituents in navigating the frustrating and challenging bureaucracy of the Federal Government. On a daily basis, we attempt to problem-solve issues that citizens face when seeking resolution on issues with Federal agencies, agencies such as the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, Veterans Affairs, or FEMA, just to name a few.

The frustrations and difficulties created as unintended consequences of the Affordable Care Act have dramatically expanded how large and damaging government glitches can be. The Web site glitches are just icing on the cake; for over the last several years, the broken promises have continued to mount. One of the more glaring broken promises was reported yesterday when Americans found out they won't be able to keep the plan they have, despite what the President has been telling us.

Yesterday, NBC News aired a report that sources involved in the Affordable Care Act have admitted that:

Fifty to 75 percent of the 14 million consumers who buy their insurance individually can expect to receive a "cancellation" letter or the equivalent over the next year because their existing policies don't meet the standards mandated by the new health care law.

One expert was reported as predicting that number could reach as high as 80 percent. All of the four NBC sources said that many of those forced to buy pricier new policies will experience "sticker shock."

While millions of Americans are being shocked by cancellation letters for their health insurance, the Obama administration has known of this government glitch for at least 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called Affordable Care Act has been anything but affordable. Prices continue to rise on insurance premiums, and the cost of care nationally continues to go up.

Mr. Speaker, this law was intended to expand access and quality. Yet in Pennsylvania, children are being forced out of the Children's Health Insurance Program, commonly known as PA CHIP, and into medical assistance. CHIP is serving our kids adequately through commercial products that are widely accepted by physicians. It is low-cost, market-based health insurance coverage. Moving these kids onto Medicaid has the potential to dramatically limit access to care.

Given the mounting evidence of glitches in ObamaCare's rollout, affordability, and individual choice, you have to wonder about what the future holds. From the missed deadlines, delays, and special waivers to, now, Web site crashes and Americans losing the plans they have, the outcomes we are encountering with this law are completely unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the administration to delay and fix all these glitches that are so evident in the Affordable Care Act. It is time for the Obama administration to do the right thing. The American people deserve as much.

IN CELEBRATION OF DIWALI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, let me just be a little uplifting today.

I rise today to wish my friends and colleagues a happy Diwali. Diwali is this Sunday, November 3, and it signifies the start of the lunar new year. The festival of Diwali is a rich cultural history. It celebrates the victory of good over evil, light over darkness, and knowledge over ignorance.

Diwali is one of the biggest festivals for Hindus, celebrated with great enthusiasm and happiness. The festival is celebrated for 5 continuous days, where the third day is celebrated as the main Diwali festival or Festival of Lights. This holiday commemorates Lord Rama's return from 14 years of exile after defeating the demon King Ravan.

Different colorful varieties of fireworks are always associated with this festival. People shoot firecrackers to drive away evil spirits. On this auspicious day, people light up diyas lamps and candles all around their house. These lamps are kept on during the night and people clean their houses to welcome Lakshmi, the goddess of wealth, into their homes. Lakshmi is said to bring prosperity and happiness to people in the new year.

During Diwali, all the celebrants wear new clothes and share sweets and snacks with family members and friends. They perform the ceremonial Puja in the evening and seek divine blessings from Lakshmi. The festival of Diwali is never complete without the exchange of gifts. People present Diwali gifts to all near and dear ones.

Diwali is an official holiday in India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Mauritius, Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago, Suriname, Malaysia, Singapore, and Fiji. This holiday is one of the most important holidays in Indian culture and a time for families to reunite and enjoy one another's company.

I ask my colleagues to join me in the celebration of Diwali, the Festival of Lights. Happy Diwali.

HONORING GEORGE BERRY, SR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the craftsmanship of George Berry, Sr.

George's life has been dedicated to woodcarving. This interest began at a young age and developed into a lifelong pursuit. His artwork displays a passion for nature, particularly the wildlife of Mississippi.

George has not only been committed to his art, but also to sharing his gifts through teaching. He has become an important fixture within the local art community in Mississippi, and he has been recognized both within this community and outside of it with several distinguished awards. Through his passion for art and education, George Berry, Sr. has made a tremendous impact on many Mississippians and others throughout this country.

George was born in Vinita, Oklahoma; and at the age of 6, George was taught woodcarving by his father. He moved to Mississippi in 1972 to teach industrial arts at the Piney Woods School, a historically African American boarding school located in Rankin County, Mississippi. A year later, he became a charter member of the Craftsmen's Guild of Mississippi, a program created to promote folk art within the State.

After retiring from Piney Woods in 1984, George Berry has dedicated a majority of his time to woodcarving. Even so, he continues to spend a great deal of his time teaching others. George teaches weekly classes for the Mississippi Craftsmen's Guild and frequently instructs students at the Allison Wells School of Arts and Crafts in Canton, Mississippi. Additionally, he has taught at the John C. Campbell Folk School in Brasstown, North Carolina.

George Berry's preference in style is reflected in his large body of work. His realistic depictions of nature are the constant theme in his artwork. In particular, many of his wood pieces represent Mississippi wildlife with works such as catfish, deer, and hunting dogs. Beautiful sculptures of leaves and birds are other staples of his artwork. His skillful craft is a demonstration of the grace and rustic beauty that is found in nature.

This Mississippi craftsman has been recognized with many awards and honors. George Berry received a Folk Artist Fellowship from the Mississippi Arts Commission in 1999. In 2002, he was presented with the prestigious Governor's Award for Excellence in the Arts. The Craftsmen's Guild of Mississippi awarded him with their Lifetime Achievement Award in 2009. On October 18 of this year, I had the privilege of speaking at the celebration of the opening of the George Berry, Sr. Gallery of the Craftsmen's Guild of Mississippi, joining hundreds of family and friends in honoring George.

In addition to these awards, George Berry's work has been on display at several major festivals, including the Mississippi Arts Festival, Festival USA on the Strand, the Festival of Pennsylvania Folklife Bicentennial, and the Mississippi pavilion at the world's fair. His carved wood sculptures are on exhibit in a number of museums, including the Old Capital Museum in Jackson, Mississippi, and the Museum of Natural Science.

George has been featured in many national and regional publications, such as *Southern Living* and *Mississippi Outdoors*. These many accolades are a testament to this gifted artist.

So again, on behalf of the House of Representatives, I would like to congratulate and recognize Mr. George Berry, Sr. on his achievements as both an artist and as a teacher. For more

than 50 years, George has used his God-given gift as a skillful craftsman to make beautiful pieces of art. Today, he continues to graciously share his knowledge and skill with many others.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Jack Hibbs, Calvary Chapel Chino Hills Church, Chino, California, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father, if it be Your will that we be revived as a Nation, hear my prayer. I ask You to make us a thankful people, that we would bless You, the author of abundant mercies.

Enable us to display our gratitude for all Your goodness by endeavoring to fear and obey You. Bless us with Your wisdom in this House, success in our battles, and let our prosperity be tempered with generosity.

We pray that You would keep the United States in Your holy protection, that You would incline our hearts to cultivate a spirit of peace and obedience to both You and Your government, and that You would cause us to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly in that love that is characteristic of Your Son, the author of our blessed faith.

Grant us this prayer through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. QUIGLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 893. An act to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2013, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

WELCOMING REVEREND JACK HIBBS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to have my good friend and my pastor, Jack Hibbs, here with us today to give the opening prayer.

He is a senior pastor with Calvary Chapel Chino Hills. He has an incredible mission going on in California. Plus, he has a global ministry going on the radio. He does an amazing job in preaching God's word, and I am glad to have him here with us today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONSTITUENTS CONCERNED ABOUT OBAMACARE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, constituents living across South Carolina's Second Congressional District have communicated very sincere concerns about the implementation of ObamaCare.

Sarah from North Augusta writes:

People should not be punished because they grow old. One day, we will all be in their shoes . . . It is preposterous that the government will be the one to tell doctors what to charge for their services and what services can be provided.

Justin from Columbia writes:

The full implementation of ObamaCare will be a disaster for America and the American people. Not only is it a direct assault on our freedom, but it also puts the government in the middle of our health care decisions; it increases costs, and it will inevitably lead to a single-payer system.

As the rollout of ObamaCare continues to fail, Congress must act to address this problem now before it is too

late and before every American family falls victim to this unworkable law which destroys jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

UKRAINE'S 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF MAN-MADE FAMINE AND GENOCIDE

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 80th anniversary of Ukraine's man-made famine and genocide.

The "Great Man-made Famine" was executed under Joseph Stalin's Communist rule in an effort to eradicate Ukrainian culture, education, and social institutions. Under Stalin's regime, the Ukrainian people were stripped of their land and grain and were herded onto collective farms where they were eventually left to starve to death. What was once the "breadbasket of Europe" became home to a forced famine that ultimately took the lives of over 6 million innocent men, women, and children.

But Stalin's attempt to squelch the spirit and history of the Ukrainian people failed.

This Friday, the Ukrainian National Museum in Chicago will remember those whose lives were taken by this man-made genocide. The museum will also, justifiably, celebrate the strong and vibrant people in the nation of Ukraine that thrives today.

PUTIN OPPRESSION OF AHISKA TURKS

(Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was stunned to see Russian President Vladimir Putin disparage American exceptionalism a few weeks ago. Simply put, Mr. Putin's human rights record leaves much to be desired, including his treatment of Ahiska Turks. A distinct minority, they are severely persecuted by top Russian authorities in Putin's government solely for their ethnicity and religion.

During Mr. Putin's first term, the State Department designated Ahiska Turks as a group of special humanitarian concern. Since then, 12,000 Turks have resettled in America, including many in Illinois and in my district. However, 80,000 Ahiska Turks remain in Russia, and they routinely face discrimination and persecution in areas of their lives that we often take for granted. In an ethnic cleansing campaign, Stalin uprooted and resettled

Ahiska Turks to central Asia from their ancestral lands in Georgia in 1944. Unable to return, they have since been perennial refugees in Central Asia and Russia.

This is the reality of Putin's Russia: in Russia, people are routinely and severely discriminated against, tortured, even killed, and are economically and financially repressed.

When given the freedom to chase the American Dream, these same Ahiska Turks have fulfilled their potential in less than a decade. I will let my colleagues make their own determinations about which nation is exceptional.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT—A WINNER FOR SENIORS

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, the government announced yesterday good news for seniors: their Medicare part B premiums for 2014 will go up zero dollars and zero cents. It will stay at \$104 per month. This is now the third year in a row that CMS Medicare part B premiums have defied the trustees' predictions and have come in lower than projected. It also defies the relentless campaign of misinformation that seniors have been subjected to that their Medicare part B premiums are going to go up.

Just on Friday, I was at a senior fair where a woman showed me a chain email that read that Medicare part B premiums for 2014 were going up to \$247 a month—just a viral infection that has been out there and that I have been confronted with at senior centers over and over again. The facts are that they are going up zero. Medicare Advantage premiums have stabilized. Medicare part B premiums have stabilized. Prescription drug costs have gone down because of closing the doughnut hole.

In every respect, the Affordable Care Act since it passed in 2010 has been a winner for seniors, and it has helped strengthen the solvency of the program. Again, Medicare part B premiums are going up zero for 2014.

LEGION OF VALOR BRONZE CROSS RECIPIENT

(Mr. DESJARLAIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend an exceptional young leader from Rutherford County in Tennessee's Fourth District. Elizabeth Ethridge recently received the Legion of Valor Bronze Cross for leadership, a testament to her strong work ethic and dedication to her Junior ROTC battalion.

An honor student at Smyrna High School, Elizabeth is exceptionally well-

rounded. She is ranked in the top 10 percent of her class as well as of her JROTC grade. In addition to her service through JROTC, Elizabeth volunteers to give back to the community. Elizabeth is one of six Bronze Cross recipients, competing against cadets from more than 200 schools for this great honor. Last month, Elizabeth was presented with the award at the Rutherford County Board of Education meeting.

Elizabeth hopes to attend Vanderbilt University to study medicine and to one day join Doctors without Borders. I wish her the best of luck in her future endeavors, and I know she will continue to make our Fourth District proud.

PRESERVE THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this week, unfortunately, food stamps will be cut by \$5 billion. We expected that. What is worse is that even deeper cuts could follow.

Conferees start negotiating a farm bill this week, and billions of dollars in cuts—in fact, \$40 billion—have been proposed by Republicans in the House, which is 10 times the number of cuts passed in the bipartisan bill in the Senate.

Since I have been here in Congress, I have talked to dozens of people in my district who have come up to me and said, Thank you for fighting to preserve the food stamp program. I have never told anybody, they say, but I received food stamps at one point in my life, so thank you for fighting.

I am afraid that many Members of Congress simply don't know what it is like to be poor in America. These are real people—real human beings. The cuts that we contemplate here are not numbers on a piece of paper but are cuts that would literally take food out of the mouths of people who are hungry.

This is wrong. It cannot stand. I urge my colleagues to fight to preserve this important program.

FALSE PROMISES

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, another day goes by, and the ObamaCare train wreck continues.

In 2009, President Obama promised, If you like your health care plan, you can keep it. It still promises that on the White House Web site and on the healthcare.gov Web site if and when you can get on that Web site.

Mr. Speaker, when are these false promises going to end? What do I say

to Gail in Maryland who wrote me this?

I have been informed by Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Maryland that I cannot keep my current coverage and will have to choose a new policy. . . . I have to change my coverage and pay 53 percent more in premiums for coverage that is not as good. My husband and I . . . will now have to pay at least \$330 more per month for less coverage.

Gail and her family will lose the plan they like and will have to pay almost \$4,000 more per year for a plan that delivers less.

Mr. Speaker, American families deserve better than false promises.

BUILDING A BETTER BUDGET

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to you today about the importance of responsible budget-making in our government. Budgets are moral documents that reflect our priorities as a Nation. For the sake of our economy, this Congress must turn back from the current brinksmanship and obstruction, and must return to the practice of negotiation and compromise.

The proposed budget and across-the-board spending cuts to domestic programs are continuing to slam families, children, seniors, veterans, and persons with disabilities in the congressional district that I represent. Impacts to Texas include \$9 billion in cuts to SNAP benefits over 10 years, almost \$32 billion in cuts to health care for Texas seniors, and the loss of over 5,000 jobs for our Texas educators.

We should focus on improving our education, on strengthening old infrastructure, on investing in advanced domestic manufacturing, and in paving the way for the future.

Let's show the American people that compromise and negotiation are not a thing of the past and that Washington can work together on their behalf. As elected leaders, we owe it to the American people to do the jobs we were sent here to do.

IF YOU LIKE YOUR HEALTH PLAN, YOU CAN'T KEEP IT

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, "If you like your health plan, you will be able to keep your health plan."

That is what the President said in 2009, but now NBC News is reporting that this administration knew for at least 3 years that that wasn't true.

Now millions of hardworking Americans in the individual market will not be able to keep their plans even if they like them. People across the Nation are experiencing sticker shock as they re-

ceive cancellation letters from their insurers and see their monthly premiums rise up to 400 percent. More people have received cancellation letters than have enrolled so far through all of the Affordable Care Act exchanges.

The Affordable Care Act has proven to be anything but. It is time for the President and my Democratic colleagues to work with us to suspend this flawed law and to work to fix it. We have to find a better way to deliver the reforms people really need because this law isn't working.

□ 1215

SUPPORT OUR VETERANS

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will consider a number of bills to honor and support our veterans.

These are good bills, but they are not enough. A good and grateful Nation would also make sure a strong commitment is made to helping our veterans find work when they return home.

Mr. Speaker, the current unemployment rate for post-9/11 veterans is 10 percent; and among young veterans between the ages of 18 and 24, it is 22 percent. This is unacceptable. We owe it to our veterans to support programs like the not-for-profit Helmets to Hardhats, which partners with the Department of Defense, American businesses, and organized labor to help returning veterans prepare for work in the construction trades.

We must also be sure that veterans have the ability to get the educational benefits they have earned without being constrained by deadline, as my legislation, the Veterans Educational Flexibility Act, would do.

Along with the commitment to nation-building right here at home, we can create good American jobs that can't be outsourced and give back to those who have served our Nation.

DEBT AND SPENDING

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, just a week after the debt ceiling was suspended, the Federal Government added \$375 billion in new debt. Without a limit on spending until mid-February, the Federal Government continues to borrow more than it takes in and spend at an outrageous rate.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, at a spending rate of \$375 billion a week, U.S. debt would be over \$22 trillion by the next debt ceiling deadline. This is unacceptable and unsustainable.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we have found ourselves in a fiscal rut is be-

cause of outrageous, frivolous government spending. We have to come to the table and do more to cut spending in the next debt deal. This includes comprehensive tax reform to make our Tax Code less burdensome and changes to our entitlement programs to ensure that they are working as they should for future generations.

American families know that they cannot spend limitlessly and never pay their bills. Our Federal Government should not be any different, and it is time to break our bad spending habits.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT IS WORKING

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is more than a Web site; it is affordable, quality health insurance made available to everyone.

While my friends on the other side of the aisle like to keep talking about bad stories, there are some good stories about the Affordable Care Act, and I have one of them. It is Sarah and Joe, parents of two small children from Los Angeles, who have been working very hard every day to provide for their family while they were paying a high health care premium every month.

Just last month, they were paying \$1,259 a month for COBRA. Last week, they got on the exchange, and they enrolled in a Blue Cross Silver 70 plan and are now paying more than \$400 less a month—less a month. Sarah shared with us:

We are a family of four with two young kids. Regular access to doctors is a must for us.

This plan does that.

The recent problems people have encountered on the Web site are unacceptable, and they are being fixed. Let's not allow these temporary glitches to overshadow the life-changing benefits that the Affordable Care Act is bringing to millions of American families like Sarah and Joe.

BUREAUCRATS, NOT PATIENTS, ARE THE FOCUS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, people want to be able to trust their President.

When he said: If you like your plan, you can keep your plan, many Americans believed him. But keeping the insurance you liked was never a real possibility under ObamaCare.

By design, the law requires every single new health plan and any existing plan that has been altered over the past 3 years to satisfy the one-size-fits-all requirements of Washington's central planners. That means millions of Americans are losing their current coverage, even though many liked their

plans—plans that were tailored to work for them—that meet their specific needs and fit into their family budgets.

Unsurprisingly, though, when placating bureaucrats is the rule, patients certainly can't be the focus.

The President did say: If you like your plan, you can keep your plan, but he simultaneously championed a law that replaced custom care with cookie-cutter care.

Millions are being booted from their health plans as a result.

SUPERSTORM SANDY 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, New York City and the entire eastern seaboard were ravaged by Superstorm Sandy. Entire communities were shattered, families were torn apart, and lives were lost.

In New York City, the water level was so high it was covering cars. The Nation's largest and busiest mass transit system closed down for the first time in a century; 8½ million people lost their power and some still do not have it returned; and 125 Americans lost their lives.

The gratitude I feel for all those who helped their friends and neighbors is hard to express. There were a great number of heroes and heroines, and we sorely needed them.

On the Federal level, with the support of this body, FEMA has approved over \$3.2 billion in funding for emergency work and over \$1.4 billion in assistance to over 182,000 survivors. The Small Business Administration has approved \$2.4 billion in low-interest loans. The National Flood Insurance Program has provided more than \$7.9 billion to policyholders.

I would like to thank all of my colleagues and all those who stepped up to help during these difficult times. New York and others are deeply grateful.

OBAMACARE ROLLOUT III

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, over and over and over again, the President told the American people: If you like your health plan, you can keep it.

If that were true, why then is Kaiser Health News reporting that "health plans are sending hundreds of thousands of cancellation letters to people who buy their own coverage"? The Kaiser report goes on to say that some consumers are now being forced to "buy more costly policies."

If folks turn to the government for help—if they go to healthcare.gov—they will be met with so many bugs

and glitches as to make signing up almost impossible.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply not fair. Nor is it fair that the President wants to find people who can't sign up using his own faulty Web site.

House Republicans want to promote fair solutions that create more jobs for all Americans. That is how we are going to get our economy growing.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, the annual Battle for Nevada between the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and the University of Nevada, Reno, is not just a football game played once a year; it is a time-honored tradition that reflects the best of Nevada's sports rivalries. The victor not only wins bragging rights for a year, but also the coveted Fremont Cannon, which is painted in the winning school's colors.

For 8 long years, Reno has claimed these spoils. But this past Saturday, after a great game between Nevada's two outstanding universities, UNLV celebrated its first victory against the Wolf Pack since 2004 and the long-anticipated return of Fremont Cannon to Las Vegas.

Congratulations to UNLV's coach, Bobby Hauck, and all the Rebels for their 27-22 victory against UNR. You have made southern Nevada proud.

As part of a friendly wager placed on the game and in honor of Make a Difference Day, my colleague, MARK AMODEI from Nevada's Second District, and I will be performing a community service project wearing Rebels red.

Go Rebels.

SUPERSTORM SANDY 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, I rise today to recognize the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy and remember those who tragically lost their lives, as well as those continuing to rebuild from that destruction.

In the year since Superstorm Sandy ravaged the east coast, communities across the Nation have suffered through new extreme droughts, storms, wildfires, and flooding.

My home State of Hawaii is incredibly vulnerable to the effects of climate change. As you can imagine, a sea level rise is a real threat and concern for us. Earlier this year, Honolulu joined more than 70 other U.S. communities asking for the President to cut greenhouse gas emissions that are driv-

ing climate change and increasing Hawaii's risk of extreme weather events and sea level rise.

When I was in the Hawaii Legislature, I am proud to say that we passed a bill, and were one of the first States, to address the greenhouse gas emissions.

As we reflect on this somber anniversary, I remain committed to ensuring the people of Hawaii have the resources to prepare, respond, and recover from devastation. We must all remember it is climate change.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the American people have fully understood what has been going on here for the last 6 weeks.

The Republicans offered what? The Republicans offered to delay ObamaCare as a compromise position in order to have the continuing resolution to keep our government going. That compromise was rejected. We were called all kinds of names, and then we were told we were the ones that closed down government.

Take a look at what has happened. ObamaCare, this disaster that is taking place, the glitches, all of the problems, we know now ObamaCare wasn't even ready. The President and the country needed the extra time in order to perfect ObamaCare, but he would rather have closed it down—our government—rather than reach a compromise with the House of Representatives.

That is what this is all about. We had arrogance on the part of our Chief Executive unwilling to negotiate with the House. What was the House offering? Time to delay ObamaCare so it could work.

Now the American people have not only suffered a closure, but now are suffering from an ObamaCare that is not ready to be launched.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

CONGRATULATING ASTRONAUT RICK MASTRACCHIO

(Ms. ESTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations and support to Astronaut Rick Mastracchio of NASA's best and brightest and a proud son of Waterbury, Connecticut.

Astronaut Mastracchio and two colleagues will launch on a mission to the International Space Station on November 6, bringing along a package of trackable geocaching tags from Waterbury Elementary students.

He will spend 6 months on the ISS, conduct several hundred experiments, and return to Earth in May.

Astronaut Mastracchio attended Crosby High School and received his bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering and computer science from the University of Connecticut.

He is a veteran of three space flights, having logged nearly 40 days in space.

He continues to be an inspiration for students back home in Connecticut and around the world.

We wish him the best of luck and a safe journey.

OBAMACARE ROLLOUT I

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, just how unworkable is the Affordable Care Act, or the "Unaffordable Care Act," as I am often corrected back home in District 11?

Let's take a look at some recent headlines about the launch of the new Web site:

The Orlando Sentinel called it a "hit-or-miss proposition."

CNN said:

Americans are still having a tough time.

Wow, what an understatement.

Yes, we all know about how the ObamaCare Web site—built with taxpayer dollars—is riddled with glitches.

But is a bad Web site the only problem Americans face? Not by a long shot.

How about those premiums that are shooting up all over America for affordable health care?

Last month's mediocre jobs reports show our economy is still struggling, and higher insurance costs will not help hardworking Americans solve those problems.

This is not what we were promised, but it is exactly what we are getting under the Unaffordable Care Act.

□ 1230

CONGRATULATING LINDENWOOD UNIVERSITY-BELLEVILLE ON 10TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. ENYART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 10th anniversary of Lindenwood University's campus in Belleville, Illinois.

On November 3, 2003, Lindenwood acquired the 22-acre site at the old Belleville West High School. Fifty-two students enrolled in evening classes that semester. In the decade since, Lindenwood University-Belleville has grown into a strong and vibrant institution that contributes much to the richness of Belleville and to the higher

education choices of southern Illinois. Today, Lindenwood has over 1,000 full-time students enrolled in a wide range of academic programs, with hundreds more in graduate, continuing education, and specialized programs.

This past spring, I had the high honor of addressing graduates at Lindenwood's first commencement exercises. I quoted Lindenwood University's mission statement to provide programs "leading to the development of the whole person—an educated, responsible citizen of a global community."

In its first decade, Lindenwood has done just that. I congratulate Lindenwood University-Belleville on its 10th anniversary and wish the entire campus community much continued success.

OBAMACARE ROLLOUT

(Mr. SESSIONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, more and more news continues to come to light about the poor workmanship that went into the Obama administration's Web site for ObamaCare. It is a problem and it is a mistake, and Americans are dealing with it all across America. The Associated Press reports that folks in the administration "saw red flags for months," and The Washington Post said that bureaucrats insisted on plowing ahead despite this known failure that would lie ahead.

So, Mr. Speaker, we would ask a question: Why are the American people going to be required to be in a health care system other than the one that they chose? And the answer is because President Obama and Democrats passed a law years ago that is something that the American people do not want and were misled into. Premiums are skyrocketing, and some insurers are kicking people off their plan that they were on entirely.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have a plan for the future, and it allows people to have their own doctor, their own insurance company, and to make their own decisions.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. PERLMUTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition, I rise today to recognize the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy and remember those who tragically lost their lives as well as those continuing to rebuild from the destruction.

My constituents in Colorado understand the pain that comes with extreme weather events, having recently suffered from devastating and historic

flooding and fires. The flooding killed nine people, damaged or destroyed almost 18,000 homes and businesses across the State, damage to our roads and bridges is estimated to be \$450 million, and our cities and counties saw over \$170 million in infrastructure damage.

Yet floods were not the only severe weather events in Colorado this year. Numerous wildfires and droughts damaged and destroyed property and crops and took lives.

I applaud the President for putting forth his climate action plan in an effort to implement meaningful policies that are slowing the effects of climate change. Congress should take further action to minimize the impacts of these natural disasters and to better understand our weather patterns.

We will and we must work together to rebuild stronger and smarter to better prepare for future natural disasters that are becoming all too common because of the real impacts of climate change.

LET THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT WORK FOR FAMILIES

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to share a letter I received from a constituent of mine named Mary Ann from Milford, Connecticut. She is suffering from cancer, and she wrote to me during the recent Republican government shutdown. She wrote:

I'm attaching a picture I snapped of the statement I received from my insurance company regarding my chemotherapy treatment of the month of July, which was one treatment.

Over \$110,000.

I'm grateful I have insurance right now, but it's COBRA. It is expensive, and it runs out in 18 months. If the Affordable Care Act is not in place in 18 months, I will never be able to get insurance or treatment.

This is real for me. It is life or death for me, and I am grateful that President Obama is not willing to negotiate with my life as this Nation is held hostage by political terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I receive calls and letters like this every single week. The Affordable Care Act is already making a profound difference for individuals and their families. Those on the other side of the aisle who talk about it is not necessary, they have health insurance. They have it.

Why is it that this body goes on to say "no" to health insurance for millions of Americans who are out there? This body needs to stop partisan political games and let the Affordable Care Act work for families. It is a matter of life or death.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, I rise today to recognize the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy and to remember those who tragically lost their lives, their homes, and so much of the communities that they knew.

The storm's crippling impacts still persist up and down the east coast. While we cannot blame climate change for any one event, all of these natural disasters taken together are undeniable evidence of a looming man-made disaster.

My constituents in California are also struggling to deal with climate change. In my State, 12 of the 20 most damaging wildfires occurred in the last 10 years, and crops have been decimated due to rising temperatures and water scarcity.

We need to ask ourselves: What have we learned from Sandy? What have we learned from other disasters, and what can we do to prevent the next one?

This problem has no party. There is no more personal or more compelling issue. Climate change is a human problem, with the direst of consequences. It is time to put aside our partisan differences and start working together to address these issues.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 992, SWAPS REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2374, RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 391 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 391

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 992) to amend provisions in section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act relating to Federal assistance for swaps entities. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2374) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes. All

points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-23 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative George Miller of California or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding section 1002 of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014—

(a) a motion to proceed under such section—

(1) may be offered even if the committee to which a joint resolution has been referred has not reported or been discharged; and

(2) shall be in order only on the legislative day of Tuesday, October 29, 2013, or the legislative day of Wednesday, October 30, 2013; and

(b) a joint resolution under such section shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from October 31, 2013, through November 11, 2013—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved;

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 5. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Boulder, Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 391 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2374 and a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 992. However, I think it is important to note that H.R. 992 is a closed rule by default because the Rules Committee did not receive any amendments despite Members having ample time to submit them. So we made sure that, in the interest of time, we are going to move forward on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today's bills are technical in nature, but each carries very important policy implications designed to strengthen our Nation's financial services industry while simultaneously protecting consumers and providing more certainty for our economy.

First, H.R. 992, the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act, amends section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Act to provide banks and their customers the flexibility to effectively manage risk better.

Today, many banks and bank customers, such as utility companies and agricultural co-ops, use swaps as an effective means to manage their businesses and to operate their cash flows in a safe and practical manner. Unfortunately, section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Act would require banks and their customers to shift these practices out of the traditional bank model and place them in newly created, capitalized, nonbank entities. Such a change to current business models would create unnecessary instability in domestic markets and potentially restrict access to these important financial instruments. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has said that such a move would "weaken both financial stability and strong prudential regulation."

H.R. 992 would allow banks and their customers to keep the majority of swaps transactions in-house and prevent needless financial instability. Additionally, it is important to note that, despite what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may say, this legislation only permits traditional swaps to continue under the current operating structure. All structured swaps, such as an asset-backed security and other riskier investment vehicles, will be required to be housed in nonbank entities. I believe this legislation represents commonsense ideas that allow for greater financial flexibility for consumers while ensuring that investors are not subject to unnecessary risk.

□ 1245

The second bill, H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act, aims to prevent potentially conflicting and costly definitions of fiduciary standards from being applied to broker-dealers and other financial service professionals. Currently, the Department of Labor is in the final stages of drafting a new definition of fiduciary standards for

broker-dealers under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act known as ERISA. This new requirement would dramatically change a longstanding business model and potentially diminish the ability of everyday Americans to access quality investment advice, meaning, the broker that they choose.

At the same time, the Securities and Exchange Commission, known as the SEC, is considering adopting its own uniform fiduciary standard for broker-dealers pursuant to the Frank-Dodd Act. H.R. 2374 would prevent the Department of Labor from issuing any new fiduciary standards before the SEC finalizes its new rule. In other words, we would like for them to work together. This delay would prevent the two agencies from promulgating different and conflicting definitions that could prove difficult, if not impossible, for many financial service professionals to adhere to. Such a change in current business practices is a solution in search of a problem. Current suitability standards applied to broker-dealers did not play a role in the financial crisis of 2008, and Congress should not force American families to have to pay more not only for legal definitions they do not need, but against their own common sense.

Today, millions of Americans who save for retirement take advantage of many affordable investment options that broker-dealers provide. Changing fiduciary standards for broker-dealers would increase costs and decrease access to important investment tools, especially for low- and middle-income families. I believe that H.R. 2374, as brought to the Rules Committee by the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the Honorable JEB HENSARLING from Dallas, Texas, provides the certainty and flexibility that Americans need for retirement and to plan for their future and for their own children's education while promoting a safe and equitable marketplace.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, which is a closed rule for H.R. 992, the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act. It only makes in order one amendment for H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act, and it would allow for this political game that we like to play which is called the "vote on the disapproval of raising the debt ceiling," which I will talk about a little bit more later.

What I truly object to here is the way that this body, this House, is only meeting for one full day this week. We came in yesterday evening around 6:30 p.m. We are meeting today and, it is

my understanding, for about half the day tomorrow. Most people in this country, Mr. Speaker, work a solid 40-hour workweek. I don't know why Members of Congress in this House, the expectations would somehow be they work 10, 12, 15 hours a week, call it a week, and go home, when there are many important things that we could be doing.

Don't get me wrong, Mr. Speaker. What we are talking about today—and I agree with some of the bills under this rule and I disagree with others—is an honest day's work. We are discussing and debating important bills. Would that we were having these kinds of discussions for 5 days a week rather than 1 day a week, Mr. Speaker.

While I disagree with this approach to getting very little work done that is important to the people of this country, this bill does make in order H.R. 992, which I support. I think this bill is common sense. It modifies a revision of the Dodd-Frank bill, which many, including many of the bill's authors, like former Representative Barney Frank and Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, regard as problematic. It corrects that.

Many economists and regulators have noted that, without this legislation, it is quite likely that certain swaps activity could be pushed out from the heavily regulated bank institutions, having the opposite effect of what many of us wanted to accomplish with the Dodd-Frank bill and increasing costs to financial institutions. In fact, if we don't pass this bill, it could make our financial system more susceptible to systemic risk and reduce our international competitiveness, according to former Chairman Bernanke.

I am confident that this bill will pass with a strong bipartisan coalition and does represent important work that this body will do.

The underlying bill, H.R. 992, also ensures that federally backed financial institutions can continue to conduct risk-mitigation efforts that serve commercial and hedging needs of their customers, while still prohibiting dangerous swaps that contributed to our economic collapse. I am pleased to join my colleagues from across the aisle in making this important fix, rather than repealing the law entirely.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that the approach to ObamaCare and the Affordable Care Act was more analogous to this approach that we are having with Dodd-Frank. I think many of us who supported Dodd-Frank agree there are a number of changes that need to be made.

As far as I know, in the history of this institution, there has never been a perfect piece of legislation passed. It is regularly routine to have cleanup bills that improve and build upon what has been done. I wish that we could get there with the Affordable Care Act. I

am a cosponsor of a number of bills that I think would improve the Affordable Care Act. I know that my colleagues from across the aisle are as well.

I think it is time to get past this discussion of trying to repeal ObamaCare and instead get to a discussion of: How do we make it work for our country? How do we make health care work for our country? How do we make health care affordable for our country and build upon the successes of the Affordable Care Act and address the shortcomings of the Affordable Care Act?

This rule also makes in order H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act, which addresses pending rulemakings at both the Department of Labor and the Securities and Exchange Commission regarding the new fiduciary standards of care. Again, while the merits of this legislation are up for debate, under this rule the House majority only allowed consideration of one amendment for the two underlying bills. Instead, it is sending us home early with half a day of work tomorrow, Wednesday, rather than staying through the week and allowing further discussion of additional amendments and other important topics, like replacing our broken immigration system with one that works for our country.

More disappointingly, the light workload this week of a day and a half is emblematic of how the next 2 months are calendared for this House of Representatives. There are only 19 days left of work for this House before the end of the year. The House is only in session for 2½ days before we recess in a week. Again, I think that the American people expect and demand a minimum 40-hour workweek from the people that they hire to represent them here in Washington, and I think most people in this country have more than 19 days that they have to work in November and December. That is 2 full months, November and December. Yet, we only have 19 days over that 2-month period that this body will be in session.

Yet, there are critical issues that the American people are demanding that we act on. As an example, today is the 302nd day of 2013 that we have failed to bring to the floor a comprehensive immigration reform bill. Time is running short, and the need for a comprehensive immigration overhaul is growing every day. Even the United States Senate, hardly an institution that is prized for the speed with which it moves, has passed comprehensive immigration reform with more than a two-thirds majority.

Now, I am proud to be a part of a coalition of House Members, a bipartisan coalition, that has introduced a bill very similar to the Senate bill that has replaced some of the border security language with House border security language, H.R. 15, the Border Security,

Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act. This bill would create jobs, reduce our budget deficit, include a pathway to citizenship, unite families. It would help reflect our values as Americans in our immigration laws, grow the economy, create jobs for Americans here at home, and finally get real about enforcing our immigration laws.

Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, there are over 10 million people in this country illegally? When are we going to get serious about enforcing our laws and not making a mockery of them? This Nation is a Nation based on the rule of law. H.R. 15 reflects that commitment, as does the Senate immigration bill. It is time that we fix our broken immigration system rather than go home on a Wednesday and meet for 19 days in a 63-day period.

This is a bipartisan bill, H.R. 15. We have been joined by several Republicans—Representative DENHAM, Representative ROS-LEHTINEN. We encourage my colleagues, and I certainly invite my friend and colleague from Texas, to join us as cosponsors of this bill that will allow us to create enforcement, a pathway to citizenship, grow jobs, and finally resolve our broken immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I am being paranoid, but it appears to me that perhaps leadership—Mr. Speaker, leadership, as you know, controls what we vote on here on the floor of the House. Leadership, of course, being my colleague, Mr. CANTOR from Virginia, and my colleague, Mr. BOEHNER from Ohio. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, they fear that this bill would pass if it was brought to the floor. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this bill would pass if it was brought to the floor of the House. Twenty-nine Republicans have already publicly expressed support for a pathway to citizenship. Many more Republicans, Mr. Speaker, have privately expressed support for a pathway to citizenship. It should hardly take courage to do so. Over 70 percent of the American people have expressed support for a pathway to citizenship.

Regrettably, the only action that this House has taken on immigration has been one vote, which voted to undo the deferred action program for childhood arrivals. It voted to deport DREAMers. Yes, the House of Representatives actually voted to do that. Fortunately, it didn't happen. The Democrats control the Senate and stopped it. The President likely would have vetoed it. It is his program that he started in the absence of this body acting. By the way, in the absence of the House of Representatives taking on immigration reform, I hope the President expands deferred action. What other tools does he have at his disposal to address our immigration system if this body, the law-making body, refuses to actually solve the immigration

issue? If this body refuses to solve the immigration issue, the number of people here illegally will only increase, and this body, the House of Representatives, and the majority, the Republican Party, who won't allow us to vote on H.R. 15, will be responsible for more illegal immigration and having more people here illegally if we do not act now.

Mr. Speaker, just this week, nearly 600 conservative supporters of immigration reform will storm Capitol Hill from the faith community, the business community, the law enforcement community. An unprecedented coalition will be meeting with Republican members, and is meeting with Republican members, demanding that they take action. We are talking about Partnership for a New American Economy; the Bibles, Badges, and Business coalition for immigration reform; FWD.us; strong support from the technology and business community; and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Speaker.

Regrettably, the only immigration amendment that has passed this House has been to deport DREAMers. Again, thankfully, it didn't happen. The Senate and President were able to stop it. That is the only idea so far that has been proposed and, sadly, tragically, accepted by this body for dealing with DREAMers. We are talking about young people who grew up in this country, have been through American schools, football teams, cheerleaders, prom, got good grades, played by every rule they knew. They were brought here when they were 2 years old, 5 years old. Frequently, they don't even speak another language. They want to get back to our country if only we will let them. Yet, this House voted to eliminate the program that allows them to work in this country. It instead would deport them back to a country they don't know anybody in and don't speak the language of. We would be denying them the ability to be legally in the only country they know, to make our country stronger.

That is action. The majority party took action on an amendment. They passed the amendment to undo the deferred action program, but I refuse to believe that that is the action that Speaker BOEHNER had in mind when he said he wants to move forward and fix our broken immigration system. Regardless of what we do with the DREAMers, that is only a small part of our broken immigration system.

□ 1300

There are many adults that are working illegally in this country because we refuse to enforce or fix our immigration laws; and that will continue unless this House of Representatives chooses to change that.

The American people, Mr. Speaker, are fed up. That is why enormous ma-

ajorities of Democrats and Republicans, of Independents, of men, of women, of every single breakdown that you have of the American people want to see the House of Representatives fix our broken immigration system, would like to see us pass the bill, H.R. 15, here in the House of Representatives, a bipartisan bill ready for the floor today and ready to be passed into law.

The House majority needs to move a bill to the floor that includes an earned pathway to citizenship, border security, enforcement of our laws, meets the needs of the businesses, the technology sector, the agriculture sector, other important sectors that rely on an immigrant workforce.

And, yes, we can count the votes, Mr. Speaker. We can help Majority Whip MCCARTHY with his job. The votes for a pathway to citizenship, I am proud to report back to my colleague from Texas, who I know is a member of Republican leadership, and my good colleague, Mr. SESSIONS, we can report back, and you can report back to Majority Whip MCCARTHY that at least 29 House Republicans have publicly endorsed the pathway to citizenship as a component of immigration reform, the principles that are included in H.R. 15 in the Senate bill, and many more Republicans have privately committed their support.

Yet we are hearing more and more about counterproductive measures that might be brought to the House. For instance, I have heard that there might be an effort to introduce the so-called SAFE Act in an immigration package, which would, essentially, turn undocumented immigrants into criminals overnight, creating an enforcement challenge.

If we can't enforce our current laws, can you imagine trying to enforce a set of laws where there are 10 million or 15 million criminals in our country?

Now, it is important also to distinguish, Mr. Speaker, when we look at our immigrant detention centers, and we are talking about people who are here illegally who have committed crimes, not just the civil violation of being here illegally, we join with our Republican colleagues in seeking deportation and punishment.

Whether somebody is here legally or illegally, whether they have paperwork or not, if they ever commit a crime that harms our community, we have no sympathy for them, and we seek their full punishment under the law.

But how can you enforce or punish people when you create a whole new class of criminals?

We can barely punish the criminals we have. We already incarcerate more people, as a percentage of our population, than any other Western industrialized nation. Clearly, incarcerating and deporting more not only is not the answer, but would be a tremendous burden to the American taxpayer.

Each deportation, Mr. Speaker, costs over \$10,000 of your money. Over \$10,000. Is that the solution?

Or should we make sure that people who are working here pay taxes?

Would you rather pay, Mr. Speaker, \$10,000, or would you rather accept their checks to make sure that they are paying their fair share to reduce our budget deficit and reduce the tax burden on everybody else, to the tune of over \$200 billion, which is how much, according to the scoring of the Senate bill, comprehensive immigration reform will reduce our deficit?

And we will be happy to work with the Republican majority to use that \$200 billion to reduce the individual tax rate. It is an issue that I have talked about with my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). We would love to bring down those marginal rates. Instead of 39.6 percent, let's get them down to 38, 35, I think, you know, however low we can get them and bring down rates for everybody else as well.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I will address the question to my good colleague and friend from Texas. We might be able to use the \$200 billion in immigration reform to bring down the individual or corporate tax rate. I will be happy to pose that question to my good friend.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. I will answer the question quickly. We believe there should be no more than a 25 percent tax on any American for paying their taxes.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, and in that mix of the pay-fors might be immigration reform. That won't get us fully there. That is \$200 billion, and I would have to see the scoring on getting it down to 25; but that is a pay-for that I think would have support from my side of the aisle. There are other pay-fors that would as well.

Now, we are not willing to do this if it is going to increase the deficit, as we have talked about. If we just bring down tax rates for the people and that goes to the deficit, I think there would be problems on both sides of the aisle.

But if we can offset it with spending cuts, if we can offset it with immigration reform, if we can offset it by getting rid of loopholes for the oil and gas industry, I think we have a good, bipartisan way to discuss bringing down tax rates for all Americans going forward.

Immigration needs to reflect our values as Americans. It needs to bring people out of the shadows, enforce our laws, be good for American business, be good for labor, create jobs, and help make America more competitive.

Let me talk briefly, Mr. Speaker, about the overwhelming public support for immigration reform. Take my home State of Colorado as an example. More than three-quarters of Coloradans support comprehensive immigration

reform with a pathway to citizenship for the people already here.

In California, there have been a number of polls. In the 21st District, represented by my friend and colleague, Representative VALADAO, 77 percent of voters support the Senate immigration bill, H.R. 15, comprehensive immigration reform.

In the 22nd District in California, represented by my friend and colleague, Mr. NUNES, over 74 percent support H.R. 15-style legislation.

Let's move to Nevada. In the Second District of Nevada, represented by my friend, Mr. AMODEI, 72 percent, Mr. Speaker, of voters support comprehensive immigration reform.

In the Third District of Nevada, represented by my colleague, Mr. HECK, over 74 percent.

I can go on and on; the point being, Mr. Speaker, that the American people are demanding action of this body.

H.R. 15 is simply common sense. Instead of going home after 1 day of work, let's bring it to the floor on Thursday, then pass it on Friday, Mr. Speaker. Let's get it done. Common sense.

If the House majority is serious about bolstering innovation, growing our economy, reducing our deficit, bringing down taxes, increasing prosperity for all Americans, a pro-growth agenda that they frequently lend lip service to, then put this immigration reform bill on the floor, and let the House work its will. It will pass.

We can attract investment and entrepreneurs and encourage them to create American jobs, reduce our deficit, bring down the tax burden and, guess what, help restore integrity to our entitlement programs, help make sure that people are paying in to Social Security and Medicare, and that they are solvent. We can accomplish that this week. Or, you know, if you really want to go home on Wednesday of this week, let's come back next week, instead of taking next week off, and we will pass immigration reform then.

I will be happy, and many Members from my side of the aisle would be happy, to cancel vacation plans for next week to come back and pass immigration reform; and I would encourage my colleague from Texas to encourage his leadership to do that.

It is time, Mr. Speaker. Frankly, it is past time. H.R. 15 improves border security, interior enforcement, resolves the issue of the 11 million people who are here illegally, improves our legal immigration system.

The bill makes sure that the Department of Homeland Security develops a comprehensive plan to protect our southern border, a plan that has passed unanimously by the House Homeland Security Committee, Democrats and Republicans joining together to actually get serious about our border security.

The American people are calling out for this body to take the moral high road, the economically beneficial path, for Democrats and Republicans to work together to bring a comprehensive immigration reform bill to the House before the end of the year.

So I can't support this rule today, Mr. Speaker. I can't support a rule that sends us home on Wednesday of a work-week. I can't support a rule that only gives us 19 more legislative days before the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, I would love to be able to support a rule here on the floor of the House. And if my colleague from Texas and my colleagues on the Rules Committee are willing to bring forward a rule, bring forward H.R. 15 Thursday, bring it forward next week, I will be happy to stand here and proudly support that rule.

But until we reach that time, I will have to voice my opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the dialogue that the gentleman from Colorado is having. In fact, I have, for a long period of time, not only understood the plight of those who are perhaps in this country as undocumented people, but also I understood the plight of people who are trying to get a job in this country, Americans who are trying to find work.

And there are lots of things that we should have done on this. I would remind the gentleman that for 4 years the Democrat majority had this front and center as a promise that they would accomplish, and the Republican majority now is attempting to work through this issue.

We have had working groups. We have had Members who are very serious about how we work on a bipartisan basis; and I know the gentleman, Mr. POLIS, has been not only aware of that, but also understands the intricacies.

We need to be able to understand that there are still very dangerous people in this country, and the Senate bill did not even get close to understanding who is in this country that is dangerous, some 30,000 people who are special interest aliens who this government is watching. They would sneak right underneath the wire toward citizenship; that normally a person who comes into this country would have to go through a background check, and we would know who they are and we would transform them from a great member of another country to a proud American.

What we want to make sure is that we measure twice and saw once, and that is really what the Republican Party is trying to do.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I will not. The gentleman had 18 minutes to get his message out, and I am going to take my few minutes to get this out.

And with great respect to the gentleman from Colorado, I do recognize not only his heart, but his brain is engaged in trying to make sure that we work together; that we do it on a bipartisan basis; that we see the future of hardworking people who are in this country; but that we also recognize that there must be a chance to protect this country and not give constitutional rights and the hard work in this country away, as the Senate bill does, gives it away, rather than having an earned citizenship to where people then have a chance to make our country stronger.

It is a big debate, and the gentleman is most eloquent in his enunciation of support of pushing all of us together. I stand with him. But we will keep working until we get it right.

We will, once again, measure three times and saw once.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Bowling Green, Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to speak on an important issue that the Retail Investor Protection Act addresses.

Employee Stock Ownership Plans provide good jobs and secure retirements in my home State, the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and across the Nation. In fact, ESOPs had fewer layoffs during the recession than other businesses.

I have been joined by two dozen colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, on a bill to prevent the Department of Labor from imposing the fiduciary standard on appraisers of ESOP stock.

IRS law today requires that ESOPs get an independent appraisal in order to determine the value of the stock. On the other hand, fiduciaries are, by definition, not independent. Any rule that would define ESOP appraisers as fiduciaries would create a conflict with the IRS regulations; and by creating conflicting duties for appraisers, any Department of Labor rules in this area would substantially increase the cost of ESOPs and, in fact, could regulate them out of existence.

DOL's proposal would add costs to all parties and encourage needless litigation time and again. DOL has failed to sufficiently document the problems with ESOPs that they claim they are trying to remedy.

This is simply another example of this administration overreaching and creating unnecessary burdens on business leaders for providing a great service to their employees.

I am pleased to stand in support of the rule and the underlying bill today because, if enacted, this bill will help protect ESOPs in the near term. By barring DOL from finalizing a rule on fiduciaries until after the SEC has acted, this bill will provide some tem-

porary protection for ESOPs and their appraisers.

We must continue to defend business leaders and their employees from professional regulators whose ill-considered and counterproductive proposals are making it more difficult for hardworking Americans to achieve the American Dream.

And we have been working with both sides of the aisle; and this party, the Republican Party, on this side of the aisle wants to make sure Americans have the opportunity to achieve the American Dream. This bill does that; and, therefore, I support the rule and the underlying bill.

□ 1315

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), my friend.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my friend from Colorado in lamenting the lack of legislative action on immigration and so many other issues.

I am sure the gentleman doesn't want to leave the impression that Members of Congress do nothing when we are not actually in session. However, the lack of number of days in session, the small number of days in session, is really symptomatic of the problem. It is an unwillingness to deal with the great issues of the day, be they immigration, appropriations and funding for government activities, reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to replace No Child Left Behind, providing workplace training and job creation, the transportation legislation and nutrition programs.

It is worth pointing out that only now—I mean right now, we are about to lose 13 percent in the SNAP program, the food stamp program. For all of those reasons, we should be working here in the Chamber and in committee and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the so-called Retail Investor Protection Act, which is one more attempt to delay and derail implementation of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform law. The financial crisis should be all the evidence we need to know that stronger, not weaker, enforcement; tougher, not weaker, regulations are necessary.

Dodd-Frank is the law of the land. Yet, as with ObamaCare, the Republican agenda consists only of delay and repeal, with no solutions to, in this case, prevent a future economic meltdown.

I want to be clear that, in voting against this bill, I am not stating approval or endorsement of the U.S. Department of Labor's proposed fiduciary rule. In fact, since 2011, I have voiced concerns about how the proposed changes to the definition of "fiduciary" might lead to a reduction in fi-

nancial education and access to investment advice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOLT. Americans are not well prepared for retirement. I have long believed that the more investment advice available to employees the better. They need more advice, not less; more encouragement to invest, not less.

I look forward to continuing to work with the Secretary of Labor to craft a rule to allow more Americans, not fewer Americans, to be better prepared, not less prepared, for retirement.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado for the time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Gainesville, Georgia, Congressman COLLINS, a member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as I come here today, one of the things that I have been listening to—and my friend from across the aisle, from Colorado, we talk about things and substantive issues.

I have been in three committee hearings this morning, and a lot of it was going across the aisle, working on issues that work.

One of the things that just concerned me as I was listening to this as well is that the Republican majority is working toward finding solutions for bad bills. Now that doesn't mean that everything is delay, as it was just explained. But when you find something that is wrong, from where I am at, you fix it.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I will yield at the end.

I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bills, especially H.R. 2374. You know, I rise because we must continue to look at this regulatory beast. It is strangling, really, what I feel American business and families are struggling with, the very same issues that really are across the aisle.

I have Democrat friends. I have Republican friends. The bottom line, when it comes to business, is that business has always been about making a profit, money. The gentleman understands that. The gentlemen and ladies on this side understand this.

We have got to get into a position in which the Federal Government is out of the way, except in the areas where it needs to be, so that businesses can flourish and businesses can thrive. I believe this is what we are looking at today.

The Federal agencies too often move forward with new and burdensome regulatory mandates without proving they are needed to correct harm in the marketplace. I call it, in some ways, a job protection.

They want to do good. I am not implying that the government employees are not hardworking, strong individuals. But many times, they are looking at their own job, and they are saying, What do I need to do to make sure that we are “doing something?”—at the expense, many times, of the ones that are having to live with what they are doing.

So as I look into this today, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for putting forward legislation to ensure that families in my district and across the Nation are not harmed as they strive to pay for their kids' college or invest for the future.

Our Republican majority is working on bills like this that remove these kinds of issues. The SEC must explore all other options before moving to a fiduciary standard for brokers and dealers. Anything less is a disservice, really, to the individuals the SEC is supposed to protect.

But before I go, one of the things that I have advocated for in my short time here is that Congress has to take back its article I authority. We have got to get into our oversight. Passing bills and leaving it to a nameless, faceless executive agency is not what we need to be doing. When need be, Congress needs to be doing things like this, where we come in and say, No, let's take a break. Let's slow down. Is this really what the law intended? Is this really what the law meant? Is this what we are supposed to be doing?

Congress has a constitutional role. We have got to take that back. I think what we are doing here today—and I think having exchanges across the aisle, whether it be today or tomorrow or next week, when I will be back home actually working and talking to people and preparing for what really right now is crushing in our area, the implementation of the health care legislation is what we are getting—these are the kinds of things that we need to be talking about. When we do that, then we have real dialogue. We have real solutions. But Congress has got to take back its article I authority. We have let it go for years.

This is a small part. Even what my friend from Colorado is talking about, these are issues that need to be debated. We are debating.

The Judiciary Committee, on which I sit, has taken up several of these kinds of issues, and we did it this morning under patents and all kinds of things. This is what matters to the American people. They want to see us work. They want to see us be a part of it and not just simply here talking to the cameras and talking to each other. We have really got to be out listening and working our committees and doing things back home so that they understand that as well.

So when I look at this, I look at this as something powerful to move forward

on. I look at it as something that is a good rule. It is a good underlying bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate the chairman yielding.

This Republican majority was working in a bipartisan manner, giving us the ability to work like this. These are bipartisan pieces that we understand.

So I did promise, and I am good to my word. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia, and I appreciate his words, that there is a lot of important work going on. Committees are meeting. You mentioned the Judiciary Committee working on patents. It is a very important issue.

I just wanted to ask the gentleman, with all of the important work that is going on, why the House will be adjourning on Wednesday and not meeting next week as well?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Well, I think as we go back here and if we really look at this—and you took the opportunity to discuss immigration and other things—I have to simply back up my chairman and go back to when the Democrats had the entire floor, they had everything that they wanted. They chose other priorities, strangling typically businesses and other ideas that right now we are having to deal with. The Republican majority is moving forward on getting the un-strangling back. I just have to go back and say, We will work on those things.

In support of our Republican majority, we are working for businesses and families who right now are struggling to put back jobs, but I do appreciate the question.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, part of this rule is addressing the debt ceiling. This Congress put the American people and our economy through the spectacle of 16 days of shutdown, with the culmination being the actual threat that we would not pay our bills; we would default. That is the second time we have done that in 2 years. There is some progress in this rule because it is going to allow Congress to vote to disapprove, but it can't pass unless it gets, in effect, the President's signature.

There is another way that we ought to do this. We ought to, once and for all, acknowledge that if this Congress, with Republican and Democratic votes, passes an appropriation that has an impact on the debt ceiling, that is the time of reckoning at the moment that appropriation is passed.

What we have done is a good deal hypocritical towards the people we rep-

resent. We will vote for spending on day one, and then on day two, when the bill comes due, we will vote against the debt ceiling increase that was required by the very vote we made. That is just not a stand-up way for a country to operate. We pay our bills.

The idea that we would have a debate, as we did in this Congress, where the premise of that debate was that it was actually an acceptable outcome that we would stiff our creditors, that we wouldn't pay the mortgage, that we might forsake the 1 million veterans who are coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan and not provide to them the services that we have all promised, that is just not right.

The damage we did with the debt ceiling debate and the threat to default was enormous both in August of 2011 and in October of 2013.

In August of 2011, consumer confidence dropped to a 31-year low. The third quarter gross domestic product increased barely at 1.4 percent. It led to, for the first time in the history of this country, us losing our AAA credit rating and suffering a downgrade from Standard & Poor's.

The loss of 0.3 percent of the fourth quarter growth rate translated into \$24 billion of lost revenue. Household wealth collapsed by \$2.4 trillion. While it is true that wealth has come back, the loss of that created an immense amount of insecurity, reduced consumer spending, and cost us jobs. The Peter Peterson Foundation indicated that the uncertainty that was created was something that contributed to \$150 billion in lost output and 900,000 jobs.

The October 2013 shutdown and the threat of default was the biggest plunge in consumer confidence—bigger even than August of 2011—the biggest plunge since the Lehman Brothers collapse in '08. We must acknowledge something very simple: we must pay our bills.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman, my dear friend from Colorado, speaking most eloquently about the effects of 5 years of President Barack Obama.

I will remind this body that President Obama said he would not negotiate with House Republicans. In fact, the majority responsible for the bill that had to prepare our country for what we would do for moving our country forward with not only the CR but also the sequestration, House Republicans for months have spent time to make sure we did appropriations bills. Meanwhile, our friends on the Senate did zero appropriations bills.

House Republicans prepared us not to have the demise that we did, and our friends across the aisle did nothing to help us in this endeavor, not even to begin a negotiation. So, unfortunately, it turns out that it goes on someone's record.

I would like for the RECORD to reflect that House Republicans came up with

ideas to avoid the government shut-down and to fund the government. We have done that for months, and we will continue to do that.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Winfield, Illinois, Congressman HULTGREN, a member of the Committee on Financial Services and one of the cosponsors and lead sponsors of the bills that are on the floor today.

Mr. HULTGREN. I thank the gentleman from Texas, Chairman SESSIONS, so much for your work. I want to thank the entire Rules Committee for your important work as well.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a couple of deserving bills that redirect cumbersome and burdensome Federal regulation and, for a change, put customers first.

I am particularly interested in the fate of H.R. 992, the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act. I introduced this bill in the 113th Congress and want to thank my bipartisan cosponsors Representative JIM HIMES and, also from the Agriculture Committee, Representative RICHARD HUDSON and Representative SEAN PATRICK MALONEY, who all have done great work in coming together in a bipartisan way to put together legislation that solves a real problem with the law that was passed a couple of years ago. We also owe a debt of thanks to former Representative Nan Hayworth, who carried this effort in the 112th Congress.

H.R. 992 may seem complicated, but the aim is simple: it is to save, for me, Illinois farmers and manufacturers, utility providers, hospitals, and small businesses from higher costs and greater uncertainty.

So much that I hear from my constituents—specifically from people who are looking to grow jobs, grow this economy—is the fear and the uncertainty that they are facing. It is not an uncertainty of whether they can do the job or whether they can provide a product or whether they can provide a service. They know they can do that. The uncertainty they are feeling is can they deal with what government is going to do to them if they grow their business and the greater uncertainty that has come from laws that have passed over the last couple of years.

One area that has created great uncertainty is this Dodd-Frank law that was passed a couple of years ago, and specifically, provision section 716 was supposed to really be focused at Wall Street. What we have seen is, it hurts Main Street, Main Street customers more than anything else, taking away options, raising costs, and raising uncertainty for, again, farmers and manufacturers, people who are providing a great product to our consumers in our districts.

□ 1330

So this legislation is important to bring back that certainty.

For me, as well, this is important. My history is I grew up in a family funeral home. I worked in helping people plan for their future certainly through that family business, but also as an investment adviser and as an attorney helping people.

In Congress, my hope is to continue to help people—and our Nation—plan for the future and to fight for future generations to make sure we are going to be making good decisions for our kids and grandkids.

This is one of the areas where I see, throughout my lifetime, through our family business and the work that I have done, that trust relationships are important; and the trust relationships that our farmers and our manufacturers have been able to create with their local community banks are important.

Unfortunately, this law that was passed a couple of years ago forces those relationships to be broken so that you can no longer use the trusted financial bank or financial services provider in your local area to be able to help you plan for uncertainty in the future; but, again, they are pushed out into other entities that are less regulated and oftentimes offshore.

I am so excited about taking this step to bring certainty back, and ultimately, hopefully, as that confidence grows with our farmers and manufacturers and employers, our job creation will grow once again. Investment in hiring people is what we want. That is the number one priority that we are fighting for.

There will be time for further debate on this, but I ask my colleagues to adopt the rule for the reasons stated by Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke in testimony before the House Financial Services Committee on February 27. He said: 716—the section that we are changing here—requires the push-out of certain kinds of derivatives. And it is not evident why that makes the company, as a whole, safer. And what we do see is that it will likely increase costs of people who use the derivatives and make it more difficult for the bank to compete with foreign competitors who can provide a more complete set of services.

This is an important change.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer an amendment to the rule that would allow the House to consider the Make It In America Manufacturing Act of 2013. To discuss the proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is beyond time for Congress to focus on getting Americans back to work. If we want to get things back on the right track, we have to start making things again in this country.

Job creation should not be a Democratic issue or a Republican issue; it is

an American issue. At some point, the gridlock in Washington needs to end and we need to take advantage of the opportunities we have to reinvigorate this critical sector of our economy.

That is why I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question today, so we can consider the Make It In America Manufacturing Act, legislation that I have introduced that would facilitate the creation of unique public-private partnerships, bringing together Federal, State, local, and regional stakeholders to develop comprehensive manufacturing enhancement strategies and deliver targeted resources to strengthen the manufacturing sector, which has proven vital to our country's economy.

It will provide small- to medium-sized manufacturers with the resources they need to retool and retrofit their operations and train their workforce in order to transition to the manufacturing of clean energy, high technology, and advanced products. It would enhance the competitiveness of the industry, including through increased exports and domestic supply chain opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to work together to make things again so that Americans can make it again; and this is about strengthening the manufacturing sector, which helped build the middle class of this country, which helped build one of the strongest economies in the world. This would allow manufacturers who are beginning to see a resurgence, a revival, because of some market conditions. Because of the great innovations and the great quality of our workforce, it would allow us to strengthen this sector and grow jobs at a critical time for my State and for our country.

So I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can consider the Make It In America Manufacturing Act, something we should be able to come together on that would create job growth in this critical sector of our Nation's economy.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentleman speaking very clearly about getting manufacturer jobs, and that is why the Republican Party listens to the National Association of Manufacturers. They have a very specific list of things that they, as manufacturers, want as they try and make not only more jobs available in this country, but also as they want to make sure that investment and opportunity and keeping their companies alive is something that goes forward into the future.

That is why they oppose ObamaCare. That is why their number one issue is to say that they see a big government spending program, not just like ObamaCare, but also taxes on energy, which our friends on the other side of the aisle push every day, and higher taxes for investors and more and more and more Big Government.

So I do understand what manufacturers want, and it is directly related to the meetings that I have with people from Dallas, Texas, and all across this country who are in the business. They put their names on their doors. Manufacturers are awesome and important people to our economy.

Mr. Speaker, what we are really here to speak about are these two bills from the Financial Services Committee today.

H.R. 2374 is something that has been talked about. What it really boils down to is there are investment advisers, and investment advisers are those people in the marketplace that an individual customer would go to. That financial adviser has not only a higher standard on them, but they also have legal and regulatory costs to go with it. But they are to know the customers and the customers' needs and how old that customer is and what they are trying to achieve and to know about their family and their processes, and not to take risks where there shouldn't be any but to match the expectation of performance.

And then there is the broker-dealer. That broker-dealer is available in the marketplace. Maybe they are a \$5 or \$6 or \$7 per trade person. It is somebody that you call up and you execute the agreement that you have from your investment adviser.

What we are trying to say here today—Mr. HULTGREN and others—we don't think that the regulatory burdens, including costs, including legal fees and other burdens, should be placed on the broker-dealers. They should be someone that has a lesser or different standard. They are simply the person that takes the order to effectively and cheaply get the order done that came from the customer as a result of their advice from the financial adviser.

How important is this? It is important enough because the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, that stalwart that stands for all business—not just manufacturers, but also customers—has said this about what Chairman HENSARLING is attempting to accomplish today. I quote from a letter that came from Bruce Josten, who is executive vice president of the Chamber, dated October 28, to all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, asking them for support:

Due to the increasing overlap between the Department of Labor and the SEC in the area of retirement plans and the related nature of each agency's fiduciary initiative, the Chamber believes that the two agencies should coordinate and work in a systematic manner, allowing the SEC to complete its rules first to avoid investor confusion, regulatory conflict, and one rule being usurped by the other.

Mr. Speaker, this is common sense. That is your U.S. Chamber that is speaking on behalf of all the people across this country saying let's not put

ourselves into a circumstance where indecision that has been talked about today becomes a hindrance in the marketplace and where good rules and commonsense are able to flourish.

And that is what the Republican majority is attempting to do today. That is why H.R. 2374 means that what we are trying to do is to provide our ideas to a marketplace rather than having the Department of Labor go first and perhaps have one set of rules and then the Securities and Exchange Commission, who really should be the lead agency, come up with their own rules and regulations. Let's have them work together. And that is what we are doing here. Common sense means asking government to work with itself between a regulatory body and a Cabinet-level position.

I believe that if we are successful on the floor today, we will see that white flag that comes up that says, well, this bill may not make it through the other body, like so many other bills that we have, but common sense should prevail. That is why Republicans are here today, and that is why the U.S. Chamber of Commerce stands up and says, This is what we see as the real issue in the marketplace.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, since this week is spoken for, that leaves us with 19 legislative days before the end of the session. Reportedly, I have read in the press, that House leadership is struggling to find ways to fill that time. Well, I have an idea.

Four weeks is more than enough time to pass immigration reform; and if we can't stay here on Thursday and Friday to do it, let's do it in the 19 days we have left. There is no reason at all for us to leave here in December, disappoint the American people, without taking action on an issue that is on Speaker BOEHNER's agenda and on Majority Leader CANTOR's agenda for over a year. Speaker BOEHNER and the House leadership can present a plan for votes on immigration reform before the end of the year.

Every week that Congress is in session until we pass immigration reform, I will be on the floor speaking about the cost of inaction. Immigration reform will create 750,000 to 900,000 jobs for Americans that are out of work.

My colleague from Texas mentioned that there are dangerous people that we don't know where they are in this country. That is true. By passing com-

prehensive immigration reform, we will make sure that we know where people who represent a threat to this Nation are. The people have to register. Enforcement of the law actually means something.

The Senate has acted and passed a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration bill last June. Meanwhile, the House of Representatives hasn't dedicated a single minute of legislative floor time to any immigration bill; and so, too, this week, this House is going home Wednesday instead of discussing immigration reform.

The price of inaction is too heavy a price to pay for the American people. The majority of this body—the Republicans who control the floor of the House—have a choice: they can sit back, twiddle their thumbs and watch the costs of our immigration problems go up for the American people, destroying more jobs and decreasing our deficit; or they can come to the table, start a serious discussion about immigration reform, bring a bill to the floor of the House and pass it, reduce our deficit, improve security, and create jobs for Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and defeat the previous question. I urge a “no” vote on the rule, and I urge us to bring up immigration reform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the courtesy that the gentleman has afforded me with what I believe is his support of the bill, the underlying legislation, the importance to the marketplace, and perhaps more importantly, what we are trying to do here today, and that is to move forward with ideas that will help the American people.

I also know that the discussions that he wanted to have are really not what we are here to meet for today but are very, very important issues not only to the gentleman from Colorado, but I think every single Member of this body, and that is an intention that we give to understanding the legislation that could be attached to the immigration bill.

But the work that we are doing today is about what we have, which is here for a reason, and that is to make it easier for people back home to be able to make decisions about financial long-term issues and ideas, whether it is their retirement, whether it is about sending their kids to college, or whether it is about trying to take costs out of the marketplace to allow a consumer a better opportunity to come to a broker-dealer of their choice, to go to the financial adviser to work whatever they do and then to go to a marketplace that is cost-effective for them. That is why we are here today.

The bottom line is that the Dodd-Frank Act puts unnecessary rules and

regulations on the entire industry. That takes away from the effectiveness and how nimble the marketplace can be. It takes away and adds cost to consumers who would wish to not only make a trade—they have already gotten the advice they need, and now what they are interested in is executing that trade without trying to receive, necessarily, someone who is trying to be careful about what they do.

□ 1345

So, Mr. Speaker, you know why we are here today. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the rule and “yes” on the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 391 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 375) to require the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor to establish the Make It in America Incentive Grant Program, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 375 as specified in section 6 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT
REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the

opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 193, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 563]

YEAS—226

Amash	Graves (MO)	Petri
Amodei	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Bachus	Grimm	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barr	Hall	Posey
Barton	Hanna	Price (GA)
Benishek	Harper	Radel
Bentivolio	Harris	Reed
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Black	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Blackburn	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Holding	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Roby
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Brown (GA)	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Issa	Rokita
Burgess	Jenkins	Rooney
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Cantor	Jones	Ross
Capito	Jordan	Rothfus
Carter	Joyce	Royce
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Runyan
Chabot	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Salmon
Coble	Kingston	Scalise
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Schock
Cole	Kline	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lamborn	Sessions
Cook	Lance	Shimkus
Cotton	Lankford	Shuster
Cramer	Latham	Simpson
Crawford	Latta	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Long	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Denham	Lummis	Stewart
Dent	Marchant	Stivers
DeSantis	Marino	Stockman
DesJarlais	Massie	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Duffy	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Tiberi
Ellmers	McKeon	Tipton
Farenthold	McKinley	Turner
Fincher	McMorris	Upton
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Valadao
Fleischmann	Meadows	Wagner
Fleming	Meehan	Walberg
Flores	Messer	Walden
Forbes	Mica	Walorski
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Fox	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Westmoreland
Gardner	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Noem	Wittman
Gibson	Nugent	Wolf
Gingrey (GA)	Nunes	Womack
Gohmert	Nunnelee	Woodall
Goodlatte	Olson	Yoder
Gosar	Palazzo	Yoho
Gowdy	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Granger	Pearce	Young (IN)
Graves (GA)	Perry	

NAYS—193

Andrews	Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)
Barber	Braley (IA)	Cartwright
Barrow (GA)	Brown (FL)	Castor (FL)
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Castro (TX)
Becerra	Bustos	Chu
Bera (CA)	Butterfield	Cioccilline
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Clarke
Bishop (NY)	Capuano	Clay
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Cleaver
Bonamici	Carney	Clyburn

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2640) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to adjust the Crooked River boundary, to provide water

certainty for the City of Prineville, Oregon, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2640

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Central Oregon Jobs and Water Security Act”.

SEC. 2. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER; CROOKED, OREGON.

Section 3(a)(72) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)(72)) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking “15-mile” and inserting “14.75-mile”.

(2) In subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking “8-mile” and all that follows through “Bowman Dam” and inserting “7.75-mile segment from a point one-quarter mile downstream from the toe of Bowman Dam”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “The developer for any hydropower development, including turbines and appurtenant facilities, at Bowman Dam, in consultation with the Bureau of Land Management, shall analyze any impacts to the Outstandingly Remarkable Values of the Wild and Scenic River that may be caused by such development, including the future need to undertake routine and emergency repairs, and shall propose mitigation for any impacts as part of any license application submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.”.

SEC. 3. CITY OF PRINEVILLE WATER SUPPLY.

Section 4 of the Act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058), (as amended by the Acts of September 14, 1959 (73 Stat. 554), and September 18, 1964 (78 Stat. 954)) is further amended as follows:

(1) By striking “ten cubic feet” the first place it appears and inserting “17 cubic feet”.

(2) By striking “during those months when there is no other discharge therefrom, but this release may be reduced for brief temporary periods by the Secretary whenever he may find that release of the full ten cubic feet per second is harmful to the primary purpose of the project”.

(3) By adding at the end the following: “Without further action by the Secretary, and as determined necessary for any given year by the City of Prineville, up to seven of the 17 cubic feet per second minimum release shall also serve as mitigation for City of Prineville groundwater pumping, pursuant to and in a manner consistent with Oregon State law, including any shaping of the release of the up to seven cubic feet per second to coincide with City of Prineville groundwater pumping as may be required by the State of Oregon. As such, the Secretary is authorized to make applications to the State of Oregon in conjunction with the City to protect these supplies instream. The City shall make payment to the Secretary for that portion of the minimum release that actually serves as mitigation pursuant to Oregon State law for the City in any given year, with the payment for any given year equal to the amount of mitigation in acre feet required to offset actual City groundwater pumping for that year in accordance with Reclamation ‘Water and Related Contract and Repayment Principles and Requirements’, Reclamation Manual Directives and Standards PEC 05-01, dated 09/12/2006, and guided by ‘Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Re-

lated Land Resources Implementation Studies’, dated March 10, 1983. The Secretary is authorized to contract exclusively with the City for additional amounts in the future at the request of the City.”.

SEC. 4. FIRST FILL PROTECTION.

The Act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058), as amended by the Acts of September 14, 1959 (73 Stat. 554), and September 18, 1964 (78 Stat. 954), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 6. Other than the 17 cubic feet per second release provided for in section 4, and subject to compliance with the Army Corps of Engineers’ flood curve requirements, the Secretary shall, on a ‘first fill’ priority basis, store in and release from Prineville Reservoir, whether from carryover, infill, or a combination thereof, the following:

“(1) 68,273 acre feet of water annually to fulfill all 16 Bureau of Reclamation contracts existing as of January 1, 2011, and up to 2,740 acre feet of water annually to supply the McKay Creek lands as provided for in section 5 of this Act.

“(2) Not more than 10,000 acre feet of water annually, to be made available to the North Unit Irrigation District pursuant to a Temporary Water Service Contract, upon the request of the North Unit Irrigation District, consistent with the same terms and conditions as prior such contracts between the District and the Bureau of Reclamation.

“SEC. 7. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, nothing in this Act—

“(1) modifies contractual rights that may exist between contractors and the United States under Reclamation contracts;

“(2) amends or reopens contracts referred to in paragraph (1); or

“(3) modifies any rights, obligations, or requirements that may be provided or governed by Oregon State law.”.

SEC. 5. OCHOCO IRRIGATION DISTRICT.

(a) EARLY REPAYMENT.—Notwithstanding section 213 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390mm), any landowner within Ochoco Irrigation District in Oregon, may repay, at any time, the construction costs of the project facilities allocated to that landowner’s lands within the district. Upon discharge, in full, of the obligation for repayment of the construction costs allocated to all lands the landowner owns in the district, those lands shall not be subject to the ownership and full-cost pricing limitations of the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act, including the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390aa et seq.).

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Upon the request of a landowner who has repaid, in full, the construction costs of the project facilities allocated to that landowner’s lands owned within the district, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide the certification provided for in subsection (b)(1) of section 213 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390mm(b)(1)).

(c) CONTRACT AMENDMENT.—On approval of the district directors and notwithstanding project authorizing legislation to the contrary, the district’s reclamation contracts are modified, without further action by the Secretary of the Interior, to—

(1) authorize the use of water for instream purposes, including fish or wildlife purposes, in order for the district to engage in, or take advantage of, conserved water projects and temporary instream leasing as authorized by Oregon State law;

(2) include within the district boundary approximately 2,742 acres in the vicinity of McKay Creek, resulting in a total of approxi-

mately 44,937 acres within the district boundary;

(3) classify as irrigable approximately 685 acres within the approximately 2,742 acres of included lands in the vicinity of McKay Creek, where the approximately 685 acres are authorized to receive irrigation water pursuant to water rights issued by the State of Oregon and have in the past received water pursuant to such State water rights; and

(4) provide the district with stored water from Prineville Reservoir for purposes of supplying up to the approximately 685 acres of lands added within the district boundary and classified as irrigable under paragraphs (2) and (3), with such stored water to be supplied on an acre-per-acre basis contingent on the transfer of existing appurtenant McKay Creek water rights to instream use and the State’s issuance of water rights for the use of stored water.

(d) LIMITATION.—Except as otherwise provided in subsections (a) and (c), nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(1) modify contractual rights that may exist between the district and the United States under the district’s Reclamation contracts;

(2) amend or reopen the contracts referred to in paragraph (1); or

(3) modify any rights, obligations or relationships that may exist between the district and its landowners as may be provided or governed by Oregon State law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2640, sponsored by our colleague, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, is an important step towards restoring water and power abundance and jobs to a rural area that has been devastated by Federal logging restrictions.

This bill is a reflection of years of negotiation, and it is identical to the bill this Chamber passed last year without opposition. Its supporters include those who would normally be water adversaries in most parts of the West. Municipalities, irrigators, the Warm Spring tribes, utilities, organized labor, and an environmental organization have all come together to support this legislation.

I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), for his good work to bring all these parties together and urge adoption of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2640, as my colleague described, does several things, including providing water and economic certainty to the City of Prineville and the Ochoco Irrigation District. The legislation also outlines how reclamation is to operate and manage the Prineville Reservoir through the first fill provision and removes some flexibility on reclamation's part to mitigate and adapt to changing conditions.

We do not fully support the first fill provision but understand that there are ongoing negotiations that look at providing the certainty that the city needs while protecting the environment. Stakeholder-driven processes are the best way to address local needs.

We look forward to working with our colleagues in the Senate and on the other side of the aisle to ensure that all of the needs are met and protected.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I thank Chairman YOUNG, and thank you for your help on this, and Chairman HASTINGS as well. Mr. GRIJALVA, thank you for your comments, and I want to thank Representative DEFAZIO for his work on this, among many others.

Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out, in 2012 this bill passed the House unanimously, and I am glad to see this legislation is once again before this Chamber. The legislation is a collaborative effort between the City of Prineville, Crook County, local farmers, the Deschutes River Conservancy, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, among others. I am grateful for their efforts in creating and moving this legislation forward. This bill we have before us will create jobs in central Oregon and will remove government red tape.

This is actually a photo of Bowman Dam. This is what we are talking about. When the "wild and scenic" designation was passed by Congress, they sort of arbitrarily and temporarily, at the time—this was decades ago—placed the wild and scenic designation line right here in the yellow stripe of the road. Now, I have told people that the only thing wild and scenic about a dam is if you are falling over the face of it and tumbling down, then it might be wild and scenic.

What we seek to do is move this boundary off the center of this dam and go down about a quarter of a mile where the river really becomes natural. As a result of that, then we are pretty well convinced that a company will come in and add clean, renewable hydropower through a generation facility on the dam. The result of that, then, is the water will come out with less siltification so it will be better for fish.

So we will get about 50 construction jobs for 2 years, good-paying construction jobs for 2 years as they install this hydropower facility. We will get enough hydroelectricity to light, I think it is, 500 homes. So you get clean hydropower and you get construction jobs. The water will come out from a different place and actually be better for the fish going forward, and all we do is move the scenic boundary down to where, frankly, probably everyone would agree, it should have been, not on the center line at the top of the dam where cars drive over it, but rather down about a quarter of a mile.

In addition to that, this facility, about 20 miles upriver from Prineville, is a reclamation project that holds about 80,000 acre-feet of uncontracted water. That is part of the discussion: What do you do with that uncontracted water? This is rare in the Federal Government to have a facility where all of the water hasn't been determined. That is an issue that can be dealt with down the road. We don't deal with that here other than to make sure that Prineville has access to that 6 percent, about 5,100 acre-feet, of water.

And why is that important? Because the City of Prineville, right now, is constricted. They don't have enough water. And this is a small, rural community with high unemployment in the county. We would make sure that they get about 5,100 acre-feet of water. They would pay fair market price for the value of the water, and that extra water would allow the city to not only meet its residential needs, which it cannot do today, but also allow it to engage in more economic development, which it desperately needs to do.

This water issue came to our attention initially because Facebook was planning, and has since constructed, a data center which they have now doubled in size. Apple is also constructing a data center there. Both of them need water for cooling. They have been able to be more efficient about how they do that, but they still need water. And others will.

Because the city would access the water through the ground and not from directly behind the dam, the water actually flows downstream in excess of about 20 miles, which is better for the fish to have that much more water going and released down the dam, and then the city would, through their underground pumps, pump the water out. In dry years, particularly in the winter, this higher release requirement would benefit fish and wildlife, including the Blue Ribbon trout fishery below Bowman Dam. And as I said, it fixes this problem with the wild and scenic designation and creates 50 jobs.

Additionally, the bill expedites the McKay Creek restoration project. This is something we worked closely with the Warm Springs tribal leaders on because it would increase water flows for

redband trout and summer steelhead. This project has long been supported by the Warm Springs tribes and the Deschutes River Conservancy, and so I want to thank both Warm Springs and Deschutes Conservancy for their work on this issue and on, especially, McKay Creek. It is a very good, commonsense conservation project.

So this is a good, commonsense, job-creating bill. It is the culmination of years of work in a collaborative effort.

I want to thank the mayor of Prineville. Mayor Roppe has testified before the committee on a couple of occasions. Judge McCabe has been terrific in helping us, as have been many others as we have moved this forward.

So this is a jobs bill that doesn't cost the government anything. It is a good, clean water bill that helps the community provide jobs and take care of its citizens, and it resolves a longstanding issue that has been a problem for this area. Actually, this debate has gone on since Mark Hatfield was in the Senate back in the 1970s. So I appreciate the committee's diligent efforts on this and the bipartisan way we are moving forward on this piece of legislation.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for your unanimous support of this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for his presentation. He has done an excellent job.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I have no further speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2640.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1430

ALASKA NATIVE TRIBAL HEALTH CONSORTIUM LAND TRANSFER ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 623) to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 623

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium Land Transfer Act".

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ANTHC.**—The term “ANTHC” means the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium.

(2) **PROPERTY.**—The term “property” means the property described in subsection (d).

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(b) **CONVEYANCE.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, but not later than 90 days after that date, the Secretary shall convey to ANTHC all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property for use in connection with health and related programs. The Secretary's conveyance of title by warranty deed under this section shall, on its effective date, supersede and render of no future effect any quitclaim deed to the property described in subsection (d) executed by the Secretary and ANTHC.

(c) **CONDITIONS.**—The conveyance of the property under this Act—

(1) shall be made by warranty deed;

(2) shall not require any consideration from ANTHC for the property;

(3) shall not impose any obligation, term, or condition on ANTHC; and

(4) shall not allow for any reversionary interest of the United States in the property.

(d) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.**—The property (including all improvements thereon and appurtenances thereto) to be conveyed under this Act is described as follows: Tract A-3A, Tudor Centre, according to plat no. 2013-43, recorded on June 20, 2013 in Anchorage recording district, Alaska.

(e) **ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, ANTHC shall not be liable for any soil, surface water, groundwater, or other contamination resulting from the disposal, release, or presence of any environmental contamination, including any oil or petroleum product, any hazardous substance, hazardous material, hazardous waste, pollutant, toxic substance, solid waste, or any other environmental contamination or hazard as defined in any Federal or State law, on the property on or before the date on which the property was conveyed by quitclaim deed.

(2) **EASEMENT.**—The Secretary shall be accorded any easement or access to the property as may be reasonably necessary to satisfy any retained obligation or liability of the Secretary.

(3) **NOTICE OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE ACTIVITY AND WARRANTY.**—In carrying out this Act, the Secretary shall comply with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 120(h)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)).

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 623 transfers by warranty deed a 2.79-acre parcel of federal land located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the Indian Health Service to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium. This consortium is a nonprofit authorized by Congress to render health services to Alaska Natives under a contract with the Indian Health Service.

The land has been used for parking to accommodate nearby facilities run by the consortium and the Indian Health Service. It will be used to construct a patient housing facility, thereby expanding its capacity to offer vital health services for Alaska Native patients, some of whom travel great distances from rural areas to receive care.

Following a subcommittee hearing on the bill in May, the Indian Health Service administratively conveyed the land to the consortium by quitclaim deed. H.R. 623 remains necessary because transferring the land by warranty deed provides cleaner title to the property than by quitclaim deed.

The bill was also referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The chairman of that committee, Mr. UPTON, has kindly foregone action on the bill in the interest of expediting it for consideration on the House floor. I thank him for his cooperation and have an exchange of letters memorializing our agreement. CBO estimates that H.R. 623 would have no significant impact on the Federal budget and would not affect direct spending on revenues.

H.R. 623 is non-controversial, and I hope the House will pass it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, October 1, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS, I write concerning H.R. 623, Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium Land Transfer Act, which was ordered to be reported out of your Committee on July 31, 2013. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on H.R. 623 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving any of its jurisdiction, and the Committee will not in any way be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding, and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 623 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, October 10, 2013.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 623, the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium Land Transfer Act. As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, as amended, on July 31, 2013. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 623 at this time, the Committee on Energy and Commerce does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Energy and Commerce represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium was established in 1997 to provide health services to Alaska Natives. Based in Anchorage, the consortium now serves over 130,000 patients from all over the State.

H.R. 623 conveys 2.79 acres of Federal land in Anchorage, Alaska, to the consortium. The parcel will be used to construct patient housing for visiting patients, allowing continued growth so that the Anchorage facilities can meet the health care needs of more and more people from rural Alaska. Some patients travel long distances to access health care facilities in Anchorage. H.R. 623 helps ensure that traveling patients are not burdened with finding their own accommodations. This is an important component of making sure that all Native Alaskans have access to equitable health care.

I am happy to report that the Indian Health Service transferred the parcel in question by quitclaim deed on June 20 of this year.

While the consortium is now able to start planning and preparation for patient housing, H.R. 623 transfers the parcel to the consortium by warranty deed. This removes future complications and guarantees there will be no hiccups in the development of additional patient housing at the Anchorage site.

We support H.R. 623 and urge its passage by the House today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for commenting on this bill and supporting it,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 623, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS NATIONAL MEMORIAL ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 330) to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 330

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial Act".

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS NATIONAL MEMORIAL IN RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The most reliable statistics regarding the number of members of the Armed Forces who have been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross indicate that 126,318 members of the Armed Forces received the medal during World War II, approximately 21,000 members received the medal during the Korean conflict, and 21,647 members received the medal during the Vietnam War. Since the end of the Vietnam War, more than 203 Armed Forces members have received the medal in times of conflict.

(2) The National Personnel Records Center in St. Louis, Missouri, burned down in 1973, and thus many more recipients of the Distinguished Flying Cross may be undocumented. Currently, the Department of Defense continues to locate and identify members of the Armed Forces who have received the medal and are undocumented.

(3) The United States currently lacks a national memorial dedicated to the bravery and sacrifice of those members of the Armed Forces who have distinguished themselves by heroic deeds performed in aerial flight.

(4) An appropriate memorial to current and former members of the Armed Forces is under construction at March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

(5) This memorial will honor all those members of the Armed Forces who have distinguished themselves in aerial flight, whether documentation of such members who earned the Distinguished Flying Cross exists or not.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The memorial to members of the Armed Forces who have been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, located at March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, is hereby designated as the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial.

(c) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—The national memorial designated by this section is not a unit of the National Park System, and the designation of the national memorial shall not be construed to require or permit Federal funds to be expended for any purpose related to the national memorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 330 designates the memorial located at March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, as the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial in honor of current and former members of the Armed Forces who have been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross.

This national memorial will not be a unit of the National Park System, and the designation does not require or permit any expenditures of Federal funds.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 330, which has passed the House as part of the most recent Department of Defense authorization bill, as well as a stand-alone bill in the 112th Congress by a vote of 392-1.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 330, designates the memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, as the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial.

The memorial to recipients of the U.S. Air Force's Distinguished Flying Cross was dedicated on October 27, 2010, and since then, it stands as a proud symbol of remembrance and honor for all members of the U.S. Armed Forces who have demonstrated heroism or extraordinary achievement.

The Distinguished Flying Cross is the oldest military award for aviation, but there is no national memorial to recognize the sacrifice and commitment of these brave men and women.

We support H.R. 330 and urge its passage by the House today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the author of the bill, an outstanding Member from California.

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 330, a bill to designate a national Distinguished Flying Cross memorial in Riverside, California.

The memorial honors all current and former members of the Armed Forces who have been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross.

For the past two Congresses, the House has overwhelmingly passed this bill, and today I stand again in support of H.R. 330, which would designate the memorial at March Field Air Museum as the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial.

The legislation is supported by the Distinguished Flying Cross Society, the Military Officers Association of America, the Air Force Association, the Air Force Sergeants Association, the Association of Naval Aviation, the Vietnam Helicopter Pilots Association, and the China-Burma-India Veterans Association. I would like to point out that the language in the bill specifically states that the designation shall not be construed to require or permit Federal funds to be expended for any purpose related to the national memorial. Funds have been and will continue to be raised through private means for these purposes.

Distinguished Flying Cross recipients have received the prestigious medal for their heroism or extraordinary achievement while participating in aerial flight while serving in any capacity within the United States Armed Forces. There are many well-known people that have played a vital role in the history of military aviation that have received the award. This renowned group includes Captain Charles L. Lindbergh, former President George H.W. Bush, Brigadier General Jimmy Doolittle, General Curtis LeMay, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, Senator George McGovern, Jimmy Stewart, and Admiral Jim Stockdale, just to name a few.

The March Air Reserve Base, which hosts the C-17As of the 452nd Air Mobility Wing, is adjacent to the location of the memorial at March Field Air Museum. Visitors are able to witness active operational air units providing support to our troops around the world, which is an appropriate setting that honors the many aviators who have distinguished themselves by deeds performed in aerial flight.

I would like to thank those who have worked tirelessly to ensure this memorial was built and is properly designated in honor of the distinguished aviators who have served this great Nation. In particular, I would like to recognize Jim Champlin; his late wife, Trish; Distinguished Flying Cross Society's president, Chuck Sweeney; and the society's historian, Dr. Barry Lanman, who was instrumental in this effort.

Again, I hope you will join me in supporting the designation of the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum and H.R. 330.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Riverside, California (Mr. TAKANO), an original sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial Act, which would designate the Distinguished Flying Cross Memorial currently under construction at March Air Field Museum in Riverside County as a national memorial.

Established by Congress in 1926, the Distinguished Flying Cross has been awarded to tens of thousands of Americans and gives recognition to members of our Armed Forces for heroism in aerial flight. This legislation could not be more important as there is no national memorial for these brave men and women. I believe that it is our duty to properly honor our heroes for their service.

In addition to its bipartisan support, this legislation also has the backing of countless veterans and military organizations, including the Distinguished Flying Cross Society, the Military Officers Association of America, the Air Force Association, the Air Force Sergeants Association, the Association of Naval Aviation, and the Vietnam Helicopter Pilots Association.

I was proud to introduce this legislation with my Republican colleague from the Inland Empire, Representative KEN CALVERT, and hope we can continue to work together on issues such as this because our region has deep military roots.

I would also like to express my gratitude to California Senators BARBARA BOXER and DIANNE FEINSTEIN, along with Senator BILL NELSON of Florida, who introduced the Senate version of this bill.

Let's honor these heroes, Mr. Speaker, and pass the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial Act.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 330.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAKE HILL ADMINISTRATIVE SITE AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 2337) to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2337

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Lake Hill Administrative Site Affordable Housing Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COUNTY.—The term "County" means Summit County, Colorado.

(2) LAKE HILL ADMINISTRATIVE SITE.—The term "Lake Hill Administrative Site" means the parcel of approximately 40 acres of National Forest System land in the County, as depicted on the map entitled "Lake Hill Administrative Site" and dated June 2012.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF FOREST SERVICE LAKE HILL ADMINISTRATIVE SITE, SUMMIT COUNTY, COLORADO.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—Upon receipt of an offer from the County in which the County agrees to the condition imposed by subsection (c), the Secretary shall use the authority provided by the Forest Service Facility Realignment and Enhancement Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-54; 16 U.S.C. 580d note) to convey to the County all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site.

(b) APPLICATION OF LAW.—

(1) TREATMENT AS ADMINISTRATIVE SITE.—The Lake Hill Administrative Site is considered to be an administrative site under section 502(1)(A) of the Forest Service Facility Realignment and Enhancement Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-54; 16 U.S.C. 580d note).

(2) EXCEPTION.—Section 502(1)(C) of that Act does not apply to the conveyance of the Lake Hill Administrative Site.

(c) COSTS.—The County shall be responsible for processing and transaction costs related to the direct sale under subsection (a).

(d) PROCEEDS.—Proceeds received from the conveyance pursuant to subsection (a) shall be available, without further appropriation and until expended, for capital improvement and maintenance of Forest Service facilities in Region 2 of the United States Forest Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2337 authorizes the Forest Service to convey approximately 40 acres of the White River National Forest to Summit County, Colorado.

The parcel, sandwiched between Interstate 70 and a local highway and largely isolated from the rest of the White River National Forest, would be utilized by Summit County to construct affordable workforce housing. This conveyance would benefit both the county and the Forest Service by eliminating the agency's management over this isolated parcel.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2337 conveys the approximately 40-acre Forest Service Lake Hill administrative site in the White River National Forest to Summit County, Colorado. The Forest Service has established that the site has lost its national forest character and is severed from the rest of the White River National Forest.

Summit County will use the site to construct workforce housing, a need identified by the county. Summit County will cover all costs associated with the conveyance, and the Forest Service will be able to use any proceeds to address regional forest management issues.

H.R. 2337 is a great example of the Federal government working with local governments to identify and solve common problems.

□ 1445

Congressman POLIS is to be commended for his leadership in addressing the needs of his constituents using a commonsense, practical solution. We support the legislation and urge its passage.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chair and the ranking member for their hearing, as well as the support of this bill.

For those of us who represent areas of the country where the Federal Government is a major landowner, it is absolutely critical to be able to work with this body to have the flexibility we need to meet the needs of our community.

This legislation is the product of a community-driven effort in Summit County where they were able to take a look at the 40-acre parcel, saw that it no longer had the characteristics of wildlife habitat or recreation, but it was ideally situated for housing for a community, which is a real need in Summit County.

People who work in our thriving mountain communities need to be able to live near where they work, to be

able to get their cars and vehicles off the road. For families to be able to afford to live in the area, it is an absolutely critical need that the Summit County Commissioners, as well as our municipalities, as well as others, have come to the table around finding a real-life solution.

This bill is the first step. H.R. 2337 conveys a 40-acre parcel in the White River National Forest, known as the Lake Hill site, to Summit County for fair market value. Summit County will pay for all of the administrative costs associated with the conveyance.

As a result, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bill has no cost. In fact, proceeds from the sale will support much-needed U.S. Forest Service facility improvements and maintenance, which is absolutely critical to be able to do their job as stewards of our Federal lands, which is one of our main economic drivers for jobs, as well as a quality lifestyle in Summit County.

This bill had input from a variety of local stakeholders, received broad community support from the towns of Dillon and Frisco, from Summit County, from local environmental organizations and businesses.

In July, the House Natural Resources Committee approved the bill by unanimous consent; and our Senators, MARK UDALL and MICHAEL BENNET, have introduced a companion bill, S. 1305, which, hopefully, will be considered in committee in the weeks ahead.

This Lake Hill site was selected for sale because the property no longer has national forest character. The parcel is isolated from other U.S. Forest Service land. It sits between an interstate to the north, a highway to the south, and condominiums to the west.

The parcel was heavily logged and has unsightly infrastructure. As a result, it is no longer suitable for wildlife habitat or recreation purposes, but it is ideally suitable for additional housing to reflect the needs of our growing community.

Fortunately, Lake Hill can provide a great community purpose. Affordable housing availability is a critical problem in Summit County. Increasingly, families that work in Summit County are having a harder and harder time living in Summit County.

During the winter, approximately one-third of the Summit County workforce has to commute into the county, sometimes 45-minute, hour-long commutes, because local housing prices are too high for many people who work in the community to be able to afford to live there. In fact, nearly 40 percent of Summit County residents are paying more for housing than they can afford.

There is also a substantial housing gap in the face of a growing population. Over the last decade, the number of seniors increased faster in Summit County than any other county in Colo-

rado. Latino households have doubled during the last decade, now comprising 15 percent of the county's population.

There is a real need for affordable housing options to meet the demands of our growing workforce and the needs of our economy, a need that will only become more urgent over time.

A lot of work remains to be done to put together the community partnership to look at the design elements and how this will work for the community, but this critical step can only occur here in the United States Congress, which is the transference of the Lake Hill site.

It will be a perfect setting for affordable housing. The property is located in the heart of Summit County, between the towns of Frisco and Dillon, and near free public transit that is already available.

This bill is a win-win. It adds affordable housing options, while providing funding for the U.S. Forest Service to improve Forest Service administrative facilities.

I urge my colleagues to support this essential legislation that contributes to the well-being of Summit County and our greater community.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2337.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 391, I call up the bill (H.R. 2374) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 391, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-23 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2374

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Retail Investor Protection Act".

SEC. 2. STAY ON RULES DEFINING CERTAIN FIDUCIARIES.

After the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall not prescribe any regulation under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) defining the circumstances under which an individual is considered a fiduciary until the date that is 60 days after the Securities and Exchange Commission issues a final rule relating to standards of conduct for brokers and dealers pursuant to the second subsection (k) of section 15 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(k)).

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.

The second subsection (k) of section 15 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(k)), as added by section 913(g)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO RULEMAKING.—The Commission shall not promulgate a rule pursuant to paragraph (1) before—

"(A) identifying if retail customers (and such other customers as the Commission may by rule provide) are being systematically harmed or disadvantaged due to brokers or dealers operating under different standards of conduct than those standards that apply to investment advisors under section 211 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-11); and

"(B) identifying whether the adoption of a uniform fiduciary standard of care for brokers or dealers and investment advisors would adversely impact retail investor access to personalized investment advice, recommendations about securities, or the availability of such advice and recommendations.

"(4) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMULGATING A RULE.—The Commission shall publish in the Federal Register alongside the rule promulgated pursuant to paragraph (1) formal findings that such rule would reduce the confusion of a retail customer (and such other customers as the Commission may by rule provide) about standards of conduct applicable to brokers, dealers, and investment advisors.

"(5) REQUIREMENTS UNDER INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.—In proposing rules under paragraph (1) for brokers or dealers, the Commission shall consider the differences in the registration, supervision, and examination requirements applicable to brokers, dealers, and investment advisors."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 113-253, if offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 2374, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at a time that the American people demand and deserve that Democrats and Republicans work together to fix real problems in our Nation, today this body has the opportunity to do just that.

Today the House will consider H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act. The bill has strong support from both Democrats and Republicans. In fact, it passed the Financial Services Committee earlier this year on a strong bipartisan recorded vote, including half-half-of our committee's Democrats.

H.R. 2374 will ensure that hardworking families and individuals throughout our country who are trying to save for their retirements, save for their children's college education, saving for their first home are not harmed by confusing, costly regulations coming out of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans know that a flood of Washington red tape has hurt our economy. That is why tens of millions of our fellow countrymen remain either unemployed or underemployed. Unfortunately, even more regulations are on the way.

Specifically, today, Mr. Speaker, we are here speaking about the Securities Exchange Commission and the Department of Labor, which are headed toward proposing two massive and inconsistent rulemakings that are going to hurt the ability of retail investors to get financial advice that they need for their portion of the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, retail investors are not big-time professionals on Wall Street. Retail investors had no role in causing the financial crisis, and they should not be punished for it which, regrettably, this rulemaking could do.

Rather, retail investors are ordinary, hardworking citizens from all of our congressional districts who buy and sell securities for themselves, their families and their futures, not for a company.

And in this struggling economy, when people who need help most, what are the SEC and the Department of Labor planning to do? They are planning to make it harder and more expensive for these Americans to get the financial advice that they both want and need.

Perhaps even more incredibly, the SEC, the Securities and Exchange Commission, is moving forward with this new regulation even though the agency has failed to provide any evidence that it would better protect investors.

So the Securities and Exchange Commission apparently is going to regulate

first, ask questions later. This makes no sense for millions of struggling Americans trying to save for the future.

Mr. Speaker, again, we know that millions of middle class families are sitting around their kitchen tables struggling to save and invest in order to make ends meet. Every day, millions of them turn to financial professionals for advice.

Yet here comes from Washington regulations that will make that advice either unavailable or unaffordable, so fewer Americans will get the advice they need. That is unfair.

Let me provide you just a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker. Under the current suitability standard, an investor can have an account with a low-cost, online broker with whom he or she can both make trades and get investment advice.

Due to technological advances and the relatively low costs associated with operating an online platform, these brokers can offer trades and investment advice for as little as \$7.

But should a fiduciary standard be applied to these online brokers, the impact on investors could be one or all of the following: higher fees per trade, higher fees for investment advice, or brokers may simply stop providing this investment advice to less affluent customers altogether. That is not fair.

Take the example of the single mother who supports her mother and wants to save for her daughter's college education. She has finally saved enough money to open up an IRA with \$2,000 in savings.

But we know that should these rules continue to be promulgated, with these new Washington regulations, well, this lady may just be told she now needs \$25,000 in order to open up the very same account.

Again, Mr. Speaker, patently unfair.

How about a middle-aged father who works with a financial professional. He wants the professional to get him access to products and ideas, instead of managing his investment portfolio for him. He wants to trade individual bonds, but potential regulations might not allow the financial professional to offer him bonds on a principal basis.

So the result? The father either gets worse execution prices or ends up paying a whole lot more for his investments.

Fortunately, one of our colleagues has stepped up to the table. The gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) has introduced a commonsense bill, the Retail Investor Protection Act, and I and the rest of the committee who have voted for it congratulate her for her great work.

This bill would require the SEC to first consider the potential impacts its proposed regulation will have on investors, especially those with low and moderate incomes who would lose ac-

cess to personalized investment advice that they need.

Second, the bill would require coordination between the SEC and the Department of Labor. These Washington agencies will have to sequence their rulemakings, with the SEC going first, so there will be no inconsistent rules that end up confusing and costing investors.

The Retail Investor Protection Act that we are debating today will avoid regulatory conflict between the SEC and the Department of Labor. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, even the SEC itself acknowledges that the cost of its regulation could ultimately be passed on to retail investors in the form of higher fees or lost access to services and products—yet, again, unfair.

It is not what Americans need. It is not what they deserve, especially as our economy remains in the throes of the weakest, slowest nonrecovery of the last 70 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this bipartisan bill, again, a bipartisan bill that passed with half of the Democrats on the Financial Services Committee choosing to support this commonsense legislation. H.R. 2374 will help struggling American families get the financial assistance they want and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I strongly oppose H.R. 2374, the bill inappropriately entitled the Retail Investor Protection Act. Quite the opposite. H.R. 2374 hinders the Labor Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission from protecting the average retail investor when they save for retirement.

For the last 2 years, the Labor Department has been updating an outdated rule regarding the fiduciary responsibility owed to employee benefit plans under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, ERISA, and for Individual Retirement Accounts, IRAs, under the Tax Code.

Today retirees are more likely to rely on 401(k)s than IRAs and are less likely to have defined benefit plans from their employers. At the same time, financial products have become increasingly complex. The cost of rules governing the rights of investors and the responsibilities of advisers are more than 35 years old. DOL is attempting to modernize these rules in order to reflect the changing nature of the retirement marketplace.

Given these realities, it is necessary for the Department to make sure that the professionals offering retirement advice have a duty to put their clients' interests first before their own or, at the very least, tell their customers that they may be conflicted.

At the same time, the SEC is considering moving forward on a rulemaking that would impose a uniform fiduciary standard of conduct for broker-dealers and investment advisers consistent with the Dodd-Frank Act. This would ensure that whatever the business model, if an individual is providing personalized investment advice about securities to a retail customer, they would have a duty to put that customer's interests before their own. This is particularly important as many retail customers are unaware of the differences in the standards of care that various professionals owe them.

Both agencies have been making progress with their rules, collecting the necessary data and responding to stakeholder concerns about preserving access to investment advice, particularly for individuals with small accounts.

Given these facts, H.R. 2374 is the wrong approach. This legislation makes it significantly more difficult for both the SEC and the Department to move forward.

First, the provision requiring the SEC to do a new study, another study documenting that investors are being systemically harmed or disadvantaged under the existing standard, creates a high hurdle for the Commission to overcome. The purpose of this provision is to impose further roadblocks before the Commission can take any action, providing another avenue for industry to sue the SEC.

Secondly, H.R. 2374 would prohibit the Labor Department from modernizing the fiduciary duty standard under ERISA and the Tax Code until the SEC issued their rule. This provision would represent a historic abrogation of the Department's unique authority, and in spite of whatever pressing need for an updated rule.

Finally, H.R. 2374 seems premised on the faulty notion that the Department and the SEC are not coordinating when, in fact, staff have regular ongoing SEC-DOL staff meetings; in addition, leadership meetings, as well as a memorandum of understanding to share information on retirement and investment matters.

On behalf of millions of consumers, retirees, and investors, several organizations, including the AARP, the Consumer Federation of America, the AFL-CIO, and Americans for Financial Reform all oppose this legislation. A coalition of financial planning professionals wrote that H.R. 2374 is a backdoor attempt to undermine investor protection provisions in Dodd-Frank. In addition, SEC Chair White said in a letter to the committee that H.R. 2374 would make it difficult for the Commission to adopt such a rule.

Simply put, H.R. 2374 just goes too far. The bill holds the Labor Department hostage while throwing out roadblocks for the SEC. Mr. Speaker, for

these reasons, I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. KLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 4 years since the recession ended, yet economic growth is still anemic, job creation remains sluggish, and wages are flat. With each passing day, countless Americans feel they are falling further behind. In these difficult times, working families shouldn't need to fear yet another regulatory scheme that will make it more difficult to rebuild their retirement savings. That is why I support the Retail Investor Protection Act, legislation that will force the Department of Labor to hit the brakes on sweeping changes to the way workers save for retirement.

For many Americans, investing in a retirement plan can be confusing and, frankly, intimidating. Workers want to know their hard-earned dollars are managed wisely and in a way that could lead to financial security in their retirement years.

Investment professionals provide a crucial service to those who want to plan for their retirement yet lack the time and expertise to manage an investment portfolio. All investment advisers should be well trained, adhere to the highest ethical standards, and promote the best interests of their clients. Rules governing the actions of particular investment advisers, also known as fiduciaries, have helped provide workers with certainty for decades. However, since 2010, the Labor Department has tried to expand the definition and duties of a fiduciary and, in the process, diminished that certainty.

While we support looking for ways to modernize current fiduciary regulations, the Department's recent proposal threatens to drive up costs, restrict investment opportunities, and harm efforts to educate workers about responsible retirement planning.

Despite bipartisan concerns, Department officials are still pursuing this flawed approach behind closed doors. H.R. 2374 will force the Department of Labor to abandon this misguided effort and help ensure any future attempt to redefine "fiduciary" promotes the retirement security of America's workers.

I want to thank Representative WAGNER, Chairman HENSARLING, and members of the House Financial Services Committee for their strong bipartisan leadership on this important issue.

I urge my colleagues to support the Retail Investor Protection Act.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massa-

chusetts (Mr. LYNCH), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2374, the so-called Retail Investor Protection Act. Despite its innocuous-sounding title, the intent of this bill is not to protect investors, but to protect an outdated system that systematically weakens the average American's retirement savings protections.

When Americans sit down across the table from a financial adviser and entrust their retirement nest egg, they expect the advice they receive to be the best financial advice for them. That is why when Congress created the Employee Retirement Income Security Act in 1974, it did so with the express purpose of protecting employees and their dependents through robust disclosure requirements and fiduciary standards of care.

But the quality of advice they receive is often dependent on whether their adviser is an investment adviser or a broker-dealer, a distinction which is really a reflection of an accident of chance that retail investors typically are not aware of and do not fully understand.

Moreover, as employers have come to back away from defined benefit pension plans to defined contribution plans like 401(k)s, average workers more often are on their own to weigh advice received directly from their financial adviser about how best to invest their retirement. The result is a retirement savings system in which many workers often are unaware that they are turning over their savings to advisers who may have no legal requirement whatever to act in the worker's best interest.

This bill before us today will make it harder for the Department of Labor and the Securities and Exchange Commission to protect workers' retirement savings at a time when expanding and strengthening those retirement savings and protections has never been more important.

The average Social Security beneficiary receives about \$1,200 per month, or just under \$15,000 per year, representing just 41 percent of required pre-retirement income. With the cost of services for retirees—such as health care, food, and other essentials—continuing to go up, it is more important than ever that Americans have robust retirement savings to supplement the modest benefit that Social Security now guarantees.

Unfortunately, this bill before the House today takes us in the opposite direction in order to protect its status quo. That is why AARP opposes this bill. That is why the AFL-CIO opposes this bill. That is why the Consumer Federation of America opposes this bill. That is why Americans for Financial Reform opposes this bill. That is

why I will vote “no” on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the sponsor of the legislation and an outstanding freshman member of our committee who has led on this issue.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Chairman GARRETT for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today. I also want to thank my Financial Services Committee colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their work and support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, we have been caught up in a fierce debate over the imperiled balance sheet of our Nation. It goes without saying that for a Nation that is \$17 trillion in debt, getting our Federal balance sheet under control remains of extreme importance for future generations of Americans.

We must also keep in mind these days that it is not just the Federal balance sheet that is upside down. Indeed, the household balance sheet of American families is under some of the greatest stress we have seen in decades. Median household income has declined by \$2,400 since the previous recession ended in June of 2009. Millions of Americans remain out of work, and an alarming number of our fellow citizens have flat-out given up on their search to find a job. Recent studies have shown that an alarming percentage of Americans do not have adequate savings set aside for their retirement. The fact is that many families in Missouri and all across the country are struggling just to make it to the 15th and the 30th of every month, let alone finding the ability to put something away for retirement or for a rainy day.

Regrettably, despite all of these economic challenges, two Federal agencies are on a path towards making it even harder for our fellow citizens to save and invest money for the future. At issue are attempts by the Department of Labor and the SEC to increase the liability of financial professionals that provide services to hardworking families all across our country. These new rules are likely to impose tremendous new burdens on Main Street businesses and will take choices away from hardworking families who understand better than anyone else what investments are in their “best interest.”

For example, when the Department of Labor originally proposed the new “fiduciary” rules in 2010, it was pointed out by several commentators and by Republicans and Democrats in Congress that the likely result would not have been enhanced investor protection. Rather, scores of low- and moderate-income Americans would have suddenly found themselves unable to work with a financial professional and

unable to make investments that would help them achieve financial security for their future.

Similar dynamics are at play with the SEC. Without providing any evidence of investor harm, the SEC is heading towards a rulemaking that could disrupt the valuable relationship that Americans have with their financial professionals. Perhaps most concerning, these two agencies appear to be on a collision course with one another and could end up issuing two very different and conflicting rules.

Recently, the SEC issued a 72-page request for information to support a rulemaking, but nowhere, nowhere in this request did the SEC mention the Department of Labor’s fiduciary project or its effect on the SEC’s work. So despite the claims we have heard from both agencies, it doesn’t appear that there is much coordination going on at all. This suggests that we are heading toward a situation where rules come into conflict with one another, creating a great amount of confusion and cost for businesses and retail investors.

That brings us to H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act, which passed the House Financial Services Committee in June by a bipartisan vote of 44-13. To those who are just tuning in to this debate, it may help to understand exactly who it is we are talking about when we use the term “retail investor.”

“Retail investor” could describe two young working parents that are trying to figure out ways to save for that first home. It could describe a single mother who has scraped together \$1,000 to open up an IRA or an educational account for her child. Or it could describe a new dad looking to set up an insurance policy for his family.

□ 1515

It is these Americans that will be hurt the most by overbearing and misguided rules that prohibit them from making investments they both want and desperately need.

So the underlying legislation is quite simple. First, it requires that the Department of Labor wait for the SEC to act before issuing new fiduciary rules. I would note that a recent letter from 10 Democratic Senators to the Office of Management and Budget made this very same request.

Second, the legislation requires that the SEC identify whether investors are being harmed or disadvantaged under current regulations. In other words, the SEC would have to identify a problem it is trying to address. The SEC would also have to identify whether new rules would restrict investor access to financial products and services and show that any final rule would actually reduce any confusion investors have over standards of conduct within the industry.

In short, this bill brings much-needed checks and balances to a regulatory process gone bad.

We must remember what is at stake here. Americans invest trillions of dollars through IRAs, education accounts, and other investment vehicles. The Retail Investor Protection Act would require that Federal agencies act in the best interest of all investors and would go a long way towards preserving access to financial services for Americans of all income levels.

I thank my colleagues again for their support, and I urge passage of the bill.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, October 28, 2013.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world’s largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America’s free enterprise system, strongly supports H.R. 2374, the “Retail Investor Protection Act.” The Chamber believes that ensuring retail investors have continued access to their choice of financial products and services that best meet their needs will help meet investment objectives, secure retirement security, and bolster long-term economic growth.

If enacted, the Retail Investor Protection Act would require that the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) complete a rulemaking on fiduciary standards for broker dealers before the Department of Labor (“DOL”) finalizes its rule redefining a fiduciary under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, as the two agencies have shown to work at cross-purposes on their fiduciary initiatives. Due to the increasing overlap between the DOL and SEC in the area of retirement plans and the related nature of each agency’s fiduciary initiative, the Chamber believes that the two agencies should coordinate and work in a systematic manner, allowing the SEC to complete its rules first to avoid investor confusion, regulatory conflict, and one rule being usurped by the other.

H.R. 2374 would also require that before the SEC promulgates new rules expanding the fiduciary standard in the retail investor context, it must first (1) identify any issues with the current fiduciary structure; and (2) identify whether uniform fiduciary standards for broker dealers and investment advisors would have any adverse impact, resulting in reduced products and services for retail investors. These are all common sense measures that would ensure the appropriate balance in investor protection while mitigating potentially harmful consequences.

The Chamber also opposes an amendment expected to be offered by Rep. George Miller and Rep. John Conyers, which would completely undermine the intent of a provision in H.R. 2374 by giving DOL free reign to promulgate rules without prioritization and consideration of the SEC’s fiduciary initiative. Moreover, the Miller-Conyers Amendment would also deprive owners, directors, and shareholders of the ability to manage a business by authorizing the DOL to set compensation for investment advisors and financial services providers, thus shifting some securities oversight away from the SEC and to the DOL.

The Chamber strongly supports the Retail Investor Protection Act and opposes the Miller-Conyers Amendment. The Chamber may consider including votes on, or in relation to, this bill and the Miller-Conyers Amendment in our How They Voted scorecard.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF PLAN-ADVISORS,

Re ASPPA Support of H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act

Arlington, VA, September 25, 2013.

Congresswoman ANN WAGNER,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN WAGNER: On behalf of the 6,700 members of the National Association of Plan Advisors (NAPA), I would like to express our support for H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act. We commend you for your leadership on this important issue.

As you know, both the Department of Labor (DOL) and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) have indicated they are moving forward with proposed rules that would expand "fiduciary" responsibilities to more investment professionals. NAPA is especially concerned that these proposed regulations could increase costs and limit availability of products and advice for retail investors, especially those with low or moderate incomes. Additionally, NAPA is concerned that the regulations could result in retail investors not receiving assistance from their trusted investment professionals based on whether their accounts are after-tax retail accounts or tax-favored IRAs.

Your legislation includes two provisions that NAPA especially supports. First, it prohibits the DOL from issuing any new fiduciary rules until sixty (60) days after the SEC finalizes its rule. Second, it requires the SEC to identify whether expanded fiduciary standards would result in less access to investment products and advice for retail investors and to submit formal findings that any final rule would reduce retail investor confusion about standards of care that apply to brokers, dealers and investment advisers.

Again, thank you for your leadership on this issue. We look forward to working with you on passage of this important legislation in both the House and the Senate.

Sincerely,

BRIAN H. GRAFF, ESQ., APM,
Executive Director/CEO.

SEPTEMBER 30, 2013.

Hon. ANN WAGNER,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WAGNER: On behalf of the Association for Advanced Life Underwriting ("AALU"),¹ thank you for all of your hard work on H.R. 2374, "The Retail Investor Protection Act of 2013." This bipartisan legislation, which you introduced and led through the Financial Services Committee, will help ensure that any rulemaking undertaken by the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") to modify the standards of conduct and other regulatory requirements applicable to brokers, dealers, and investment advisers² is sufficiently supported by empirical information and focused principally on remedying the identified problem of investor confusion without raising costs and reducing choices for investors.³

The SEC is considering whether to engage in a rulemaking that would impose a "uni-

form fiduciary duty" on all brokers, dealers, and investment advisers providing personalized investment advice about securities to retail customers. The sole impetus for such a rule is the SEC's concern about investor confusion over the roles and legal obligations of financial professionals. The SEC appears to be operating from a presumption that the regulatory regime governing brokers and dealers is disproportionately responsible for creating this investor confusion and is seeking to address it by imposing a broad principles-based fiduciary duty on broker-dealers, breaking with eighty years of rules-based regulation.

The problem of investor confusion does not dictate a regulatory solution of this sort. There is no evidence to suggest that such a rule would provide consumers with better or clearer information about the roles and obligations of the financial professionals that serve them, nor is there reason to believe that it would enable consumers to make better-informed investment decisions.

Indeed, because, as the SEC has acknowledged, a "pure fiduciary duty" is unworkable in the context of the broad activities of a broker-dealer, any new fiduciary duty imposed on the industry will include exceptions for various types of activities—leaving investors even more confused as to what the legal obligations of their financial professionals might be. For this reason, the AALU has urged the SEC to directly address the problem of confusion through enhanced disclosure, not to do so through an entirely new regulatory approach that purports to apply uniformly to financial professionals—when, in practice, it does not.

H.R. 2374 would build into the rulemaking process important safeguards to ensure that the SEC adequately justifies any rule prescribed to improve investor confusion and that it appropriately tailors such a rule in a way that remedies the identified problem, but does not adversely affect consumers in the process of doing so. Specifically, the legislation requires the SEC to identify, prior to any rulemaking, if: current differences in the legal and regulatory obligations of brokers, dealers, and investment advisers actually produce harmful outcomes for retail customers—and—whether the adoption of the "uniform fiduciary duty" as proposed by the SEC could in fact have an adverse impact on consumers by limiting access to investment advice, raising costs, and adding to investor confusion.

Should the SEC proceed with a rulemaking, H.R. 2374 would require the SEC to publish alongside a proposed rule formal findings that demonstrate how the rule would reduce investor confusion. Finally, the legislation imposes a stay on the promulgation of conduct regulations by the Department of Labor ("DOL"), which is currently considering a rulemaking that would redefine the term "fiduciary" for purposes of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA"). This provision would allow the SEC to freely carry out the congressional objective underlying Section 913 of the Dodd-Frank Act⁴ without concern over any potential interference from the DOL, which, through its anticipated rulemaking, may or may not encroach upon marketplace activity traditionally governed by the securities laws and overseen by securities regulators.

If enacted, H.R. 2374 will ensure a thorough fact finding by the SEC and, if necessary, will result in regulation targeted to address the problem originally contemplated by Congress when it provided the SEC with this

rulemaking authority. We believe that such an outcome would greatly benefit investors.

Again, we thank you for introducing H.R. 2374 and we look forward to working with you and your staff as the 113th Congress continues.

Sincerely,

DAVID J. STERTZER,
Chief Executive Officer.

¹The AALU is a nationwide organization comprised of more than two thousand life insurance agents and professionals primarily engaged in sales of life insurance used as part of estate, charitable, retirement, and deferred compensation and employee benefit services. The AALU is organized behind a mission to promote, preserve and protect advanced life insurance planning for the benefit of our members, their clients, the industry and the general public.

²Pursuant to Section 913(g)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act ("Dodd-Frank Act").

³For additional information on the AALU's support of H.R. 2374, see Legislative Proposals to Relieve the Red Tape Burden on Investors and Job Creators: Hearing Before the H. Subcomm. On Capital Mkts. and Gov't Sponsored Enters. of the H. Comm. on Fin. Servs., 113th Cong. (2013) (statement of Ken Ehinger, President and CEO, M Securities, Inc.), available at <http://financialservices.house.gov/UploadedFiles/HHRG-113-BA16-WState-KEhinger20130523.pdf>.

⁴Namely, an evaluation of the need for a new standard(s) of conduct and harmonization of the regulation of brokers, dealers, and investment advisers—and, if warranted by the SEC's findings, the promulgation of rules to establish new requirements.

INDEPENDENT INSURANCE AGENTS
& BROKERS OF AMERICA, INC.

September 30, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America (IIABA or the Big "I"), I write today in support of H.R. 2374, the "Retail Investor Protection Act" introduced Rep. Ann Wagner (R-MO). With over a quarter of a million agents and employees nationwide, the Big "I" is the largest association of insurance producers in the United States.

The IIABA is greatly concerned that agents, brokers and the consumers they serve would be adversely affected by the establishment of a universal fiduciary standard of care. An expansion of the fiduciary duty promises to create undue compliance burdens and increased liability for our small business membership, thereby increasing costs for consumers and restricting access to quality investment advice for those most in need. Furthermore, simultaneous and possibly overlapping rulemakings by the Department of Labor (DOL) and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) have the potential to create confusion in the marketplace and even more liability concerns for marketplace participants.

Rep. Wagner's bill would create a number of important checks and balances on the rulemaking process to ensure that consumers are not harmed by an expansion of the fiduciary duty. First, it would require the DOL to wait until 60 days after the SEC

finalizes any fiduciary rule before issuing its rule. The measure would also require the SEC to determine that any new mandate would not harm consumers or restrict access to investment advice, and would require the completion of a cost-benefit analysis.

The IIABA thanks you for scheduling H.R. 2374 for consideration this week and urges all members to support this important legislation.

Sincerely,

CHARLES SYMINGTON,
Senior V.P. of External & Government Affairs.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, DC, August 2, 2013.

Hon. SYLVIA MATTHEWS BURWELL,
Director, Office of Management and Budget,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR BURWELL: We write with regard to the work the Securities Exchange Commission (SEC) is currently undertaking to implement Section 913 of the Dodd-Frank Act, and its intersection with the work the Department of Labor (DOL) is currently engaged in to redefine the term "fiduciary" under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA). We remain very concerned that uncoordinated efforts undertaken by the agencies could work at cross-purposes in a way that could limit investor access to education and increase costs for investors, most notably Main Street investors.

The fundamental purpose of Section 913 of the Dodd-Frank Act is to provide for the establishment of a uniform fiduciary standard that applies equally to Broker-Dealers and Registered Investment Advisors for the benefit of investors when personalized investment advice is provided. While it is unclear what the Department of Labor's re-proposal in this area will look like, the Department's 2010 proposal could have caused all Broker-Dealers that service Individual Retirement Accounts (IRAs) to be ERISA fiduciaries, which would have as a practical matter eliminated access to meaningful investment services for millions of IRA holders.

We believe that Congress clearly intended that a single standard should apply to retail accounts, including retirement accounts, based on the specific guidelines enumerated in Section 913. We are concerned that while the SEC is proceeding in accordance with its Congressional mandate, the DOL seems poised to issue a regulation that could directly conflict with the SEC's work.

Given the Office of Management and Budget's role in coordinating and streamlining Agency regulations, we write to make you aware of the potential conflict between these regulations. We would also encourage you to promote regulations that are workable and encourage, rather than limit professional investment education and guidance. We believe that, at a minimum, the Department of Labor should not issue final regulations in this area until the SEC has completed its work and that any regulation the DOL ultimately may propose should be carefully crafted so that it does not upend the SEC's work.

We urge you to review any regulation proposed by the DOL to be sure it does not undermine the SEC's implementation of a fiduciary standard for the benefit of retail investors. We know that you share our goal of ensuring that any regulations issued in the area are consistent rather than working at cross-purposes and we look forward to working with you in furtherance of this goal.

Sincerely,

JON TESTER,
United States Senator.

CLAIRE MCCASKILL,
United States Senator.
TOM CARPER,
United States Senator.
MARK BEGICH,
United States Senator.
BEN CARDIN,
United States Senator.
MARK WARNER,
United States Senator.
KAY HAGAN,
United States Senator.
AMY KLOBUCHAR,
United States Senator.
MARK PRYOR,
United States Senator.
KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND,
United States Senator.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), cochair of the Progressive Caucus, a member of the Financial Services Committee, and Democratic whip.

Mr. ELLISON. I want to thank the ranking member, Congresswoman WATERS, for the time, and I thank the chairman.

We have a crisis in our country, and the crisis has to do with retirement. This retirement crisis is huge. We literally have about \$6.6 trillion between what people have for retirement and what they need for retirement.

And so the Labor Department is doing what makes sense: making sure that when a person representing themselves as a financial adviser is going to a person who wants to retire—rollover a 401(k) or whatever—they are getting the best advice for them, and if the adviser is making money off the products they are pushing, that that would not be all right.

But you know what? The Labor Department is not even done with the rule. They are still writing it. But before they ever do, this shoddy piece of legislation is going to try to interrupt that process. This bad piece of legislation is going to interrupt the Department of Labor as they are pulling together a rule to protect retirees.

We have a record amount of more than \$10 trillion invested in retirement accounts, and yet median retirement account balances are about \$45,000. That is a huge gap. Part of the reason this amount is so low is due to the high fees and hidden commissions. An annual fee of 1 percent could lower the amount of an account by 21 percent over more than 30 years.

I am grateful to the Department of Labor for their efforts to come together to do a good plan. Too often, workers leave jobs and are contacted by people who urge them to rollover their 401(k) investment into an IRA. Too often, workers do not know that these callers are salespeople who can put investors into accounts with high fees and hidden commissions, yet this bill would not protect the public from such rip-offs. Investors lose 3, 4, or 5 percent of the value of their savings without even knowing about it.

This bill, H.R. 2374, is harmful. It prevents the Department of Labor from taking steps to ensure advisers do not have conflicts of interest. Why would anybody want to say, yes, have all the conflicts of interest you want as you are messing with our retirees' accounts?

Taking the unprecedented step to stop an agency midprocess in protecting workers is bad. That is why AARP, the National Council of La Raza, the Consumer Federation of America, and many, many people representing Americans oppose it.

This antigovernment rhetoric and all this stuff about government regulation we hear all the time is the same rhetoric that led to the shutdown that undermined the interests of American workers. Let's just shut this bill down. It is not good.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

The Administration strongly opposes passage of H.R. 2374 because it would derail important rulemakings underway at the Securities Exchange Commission (SEC) and the Department of Labor that are critical to protecting Americans' hard-earned savings and preserving their retirement security.

H.R. 2374 prohibits Labor from issuing a rule to protect investors until the SEC engages in and completes further study of the effect of a rulemaking on retail investors. The bill ignores the fact that significant work has already been conducted in both agencies and that the agencies have included and continue to include the public, industry, and numerous stakeholders in their rulemaking processes. Moreover, the two agencies are already working closely to avoid conflicting requirements for the regulated community, and this legislation would hamper effective coordination between the two agencies. The bill would hinder efforts to protect consumers from conflicts of interest among brokers, dealers, financial advisors, and others whose incentives may be misaligned with investors, potentially leading to deceptive and abusive practices.

The Administration is committed to ensuring that American workers and retirees are able to receive advice about how to invest their money in safe, secure, and transparent financial products that is free from harmful conflicts of interest. These ongoing rulemakings are designed to protect trillions of dollars in retirement savings of millions of workers and retirees by ensuring that paid advisors and other entities do not place their own financial interests over those of their customers. This legislation would place an unnecessary obstacle in the way of these efforts to prevent such harmful conflicts of interest, which hurt businesses, consumers, and retirees and their families.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2374, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE, a distinguished member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Retail Investor Protection Act and preserving access to financial advice to all Americans.

The Department of Labor's efforts to redefine the fiduciary standards is classic Washington. It is a solution in search of a problem. The DOL has yet to present tangible evidence—beyond anecdotes—that workers are being hurt by current law, nor has the Department conducted a sufficient cost-benefit analysis.

This is not to say that the fiduciary standards must never be changed. All of us, Republicans and Democrats, want to strengthen workers' retirement security and perhaps need to modernize the longstanding fiduciary standard; but instead of working with Congress, the Department of Labor has single-mindedly pursued a course that would actually drive up the cost of retirement planning and restrict access to important investment advice. Millions of Americans could potentially be left to prepare for retirement on their own. How on Earth could this be a good thing?

The 2007 recession wreaked havoc on the retirement savings of American workers. We should work together on responsible solutions that will help workers enjoy their retirement years with financial security and peace of mind.

I am privileged to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, and that is precisely what we are trying to do in the area of multiemployer pension reform. The subcommittee has convened numerous bipartisan hearings to closely examine the problems plaguing the multiemployer pension system and potential solutions. In fact, we held such a hearing earlier today. Will we all agree on every point? Of course not. However, we remain committed to working together on real solutions that will promote the best interests of American families.

I hope the Department of Labor will reconsider its ill-conceived approach to revising Federal fiduciary standards and work with Congress, interested stakeholders, and other Federal agencies to strengthen the retirement security of hardworking Americans. Until the Department does what is right and changes course, I urge my colleagues to support the Retail Investor Protection Act.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), who serves as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises of the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the ranking member for yielding and for all her hard work, and I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2374. The bill would require the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct yet another cost-benefit analysis of a fiduciary duty rule, ap-

parently in the attempt and hope of derailing a new fiduciary duty rule to protect consumers. The Securities and Exchange Commission has already completed a lengthy study on whether or not to propose a fiduciary duty rule for brokers. That study included an extensive cost-benefit analysis.

So, my colleagues, outside of trying to derail a new consumer safeguard, what could possibly be the purpose of requiring the SEC to do yet another cost-benefit analysis on the exact same issue again? How about we just take the first one and make two copies?

The rule also prohibits the Labor Department from even proposing a rule until 60 days after the SEC finalizes its final rule. And what is the harm, my colleagues, in allowing an agency—in this case, the Labor Department—to release the proposed rule for public discussion, for public input? Since when has Congress been afraid of a debate?

If my colleagues believe that the proposed rule gets it wrong, then they have every opportunity to say so, as does the public, as do businesses, and that is exactly what the public comment period is for. That is what happened the last time the Labor Department proposed a fiduciary rule; there were questions raised. They have recalled it to reconsider it, and they are withdrawing that proposal and working on a new one.

If the SEC has a better idea for a fiduciary duty rule, then let's debate that one and have that released, but preventing an agency from even putting out a regulatory proposal for public debate is flat-out dead wrong.

This bill would delay and possibly derail important rulemaking at the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Labor Department to protect retirement security and investor protection rights. This is a transparent attempt to slow down the rulemaking process and possibly derail the whole rulemaking process for protections for consumers.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets and GSEs.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for advancing this bill to the floor. I also congratulate the sponsor of the bill, Mrs. WAGNER, for leading forward with a piece of legislation that has, at its heart, to work in a bipartisan manner to protect American investors big and small, senior citizens, and regular people across this country who are concerned about their investment, concerned about what they pay for their advice and for their transactions. So I commend both of them for moving this legislation along.

The other side of the aisle likes to get engaged with name-calling, like

"shoddy," "bad," "rip-off," and throw out numbers which, I guess, are just sort of pulled out of the air when they say, If it is 1 percent for this, how much over 30 years? If it is a commission of X, I don't know, how much is it over 40 years?

I always wonder when I hear comments from the other side of the aisle if they really actually sit and read the bill or do they just pull these numbers out of a hat. But I did hear one of their comments which went to the point of trying to help investors, which is: How do we help Americans, and how do we do it in a bipartisan manner?

Well, this was one of the most bipartisan bills that we have ever had coming out of our committee. Over half of the Democrats on the committee said they are going to stand with Americans, stand with investors. I will share some of those.

Mr. SHERMAN voted "yes"; Ms. MOORE said "yes," stand with Americans; Mr. PERLMUTTER said "yes"; Mr. HIMES said "yes"; Mr. PETERS said "yes." Messrs. CARNEY, FOSTER, KILDEE, DELANEY, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. HECK, to name just a few, joined with Republicans to work in a bipartisan manner to stand with Americans and stand with American investors, realizing that, at the end of the day, part of the problem in Washington is too many agencies that are not communicating with each other. Lack of communication is one of the problems that we have seen in this country in the last few weeks and months.

All we are suggesting is that the various agencies, like the SEC and the Department of Labor, actually coordinate and work together for investors. How will they do that? Well, the SEC, is principally charged with the responsibility of looking at the areas of broker-dealers and investment advisers. And you know there is a difference on how they are treated right now, and there is a reason for that. They have been treated differently for eight decades, I guess, or so.

The SEC will be looking at this. As the gentlelady from New York has indicated, there is a study outstanding right now. They are getting comments in already for that study. We are saying let's make sure we hear all the information, collect all the data, and before we go forward, let's have communication between these two agencies.

Let the SEC take the first step here. Nothing in here prevents them from taking any final actions or final steps. Nothing in this bill prevents the investor from being protected as these various agencies see fit.

All we are really asking for is the SEC, the agency principally charged with this, to take the first action, make sure they have the data, then work in harmony with the Department of Labor, and at the end of the day, we will be helping the American investors in a completely bipartisan manner.

□ 1530

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, who is the ranking member on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the ranking member for all of her work on this legislation and for her yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2374. This bill is very bad news for working families. It protects the loophole in the law that allows conflicted brokers and advisers to rip off ordinary Americans who are trying to save for their retirements.

The 2008 financial crisis wiped out trillions of dollars of Americans' retirement accounts. Working families now need help in rebuilding those nest eggs, and they need better protection for their savings. The SEC and the Labor Department have moved to provide these protections, proposing to close the harmful loophole, but this bill would scuttle those efforts. Here is what is at stake.

Millions of Americans are putting money aside every day in their 401(k)s and in their IRAs to save for retirement. They have to make these investment choices, and Wall Street is more than happy to advise, but some of those advisers and brokers have conflicts of interest, often undisclosed conflicts of interest. The brokers know about their conflicts of interest, and the brokerage houses know about their conflicts of interest, but the person who is handing over his hard-earned retirement funds doesn't know about the conflicts of interest. The workers think they can trust this investment advice.

But what they don't know is that their advisers may get paid more for, in fact, in actual cases, steering them into high-cost funds with the worst performing of the family of funds. It is very good for the family of funds, but it is very bad for that individual worker who is now handing over his retirement nest egg. That product might have higher fees than other products. It might underperform compared to other products. In other words, the product is not in the worker's best interest, but it certainly is in the broker's best interest.

The SEC and the Labor Department are trying to close this loophole that allows this rip-off to continue to happen, and it is, indeed, a rip-off of ordinary Americans. I know my friend from New Jersey doesn't like the term "rip-off," but that is what is happening to these hardworking American families. Multiple studies—not conjecture—have found that these conflicts of interest cost these retirees, these workers, very real money.

In 2009, the GAO found that, when a pension consultant has conflicts of interest, a defined benefit retirement

plan underperforms by 130 basis points. If a conflicted broker in the defined contribution world recommends funds at a similar rate of underperformance, a 40-year-old worker who rolls over his \$20,000 401(k) balance into an IRA will see his retirement savings cut by a third over 30 years. If he normally earns 6 percent returns, he would now only be making a 4.7 percent return. The bottom line is he is \$35,000 poorer by the time he reaches 70. Thank you for that conflicted advice.

This year, researchers found that the funds recommended by conflicted brokers in 401(k) plans underperformed by an average of 3.6 percent. That translates into workers losing \$1 billion every month from their retirement funds because of these conflicts of interest. As a result, consumers are getting bad advice and are putting their retirement savings at stake.

Where do those figures come from?

They come from the founders of the Vanguard funds, who worked out the differences between these funds, conflicted funds, and other funds. That is why the Dodd-Frank law directs the SEC to transition brokers to a fiduciary standard, and, separately, the Department of Labor is trying to align the protections as well.

Brokers need to either act solely in the best interests of investors or otherwise disclose who they work for and how they are paid, but some on Wall Street have cried out, claiming that they will not be able to offer investment advice, especially to working people, if they cannot offer conflicted advice. They can't tell you how to invest your money unless they can offer you conflicted advice wherein they are getting paid more to offer you a substandard product. With the knowledge of that and the higher fees, they somehow can't make money. Let's remember that 75 percent of the brokers can't beat the S&P 500 that is on automatic pilot.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WATERS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, is that what they are really saying? Is that what American workers want to know—if I don't give you money, for which you can keep secret conflicts of interests that you have with the investment of my money, I have to give you my money anyway if I am looking for this investment? That is absolutely wrong.

The American worker deserves better than that. These people work hard to make the decisions to try to save, to add to their 401(k)s, and you want to talk about, oh, we should educate them about the value of a 401(k) and about the value of an IRA. You can educate them until the cows come home, but if they know that somebody is stealing

their money because someone can conceal a conflict of interest, all of that education won't make a damned bit of difference because the fact of the matter is they've worked too hard to hand over their money to those conflicted advisers.

That is what this bill is about. This bill would continue those conflicts, make every effort to delay and stop this rulemaking—or we change the law, we go forward, we protect working families, we protect the retirees, and we make sure that the financial marketplace is free of these conflicts of interest.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman for all of her effort on this legislation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. MCHENRY. I want to thank the committee chairman as well, Mr. HENSARLING, for yielding to me, and I want to thank my colleague ANN WAGNER from Missouri for putting together this very wise bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my Democrat colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are speaking out with loud voices that the only rip-off here is when retail investors and the American people have two different government agencies writing rules. When they are not coordinating with each other and when they are not talking to one another, they are not writing rules that work together. In fact, you could be a retail investor and be complying with the Department of Labor's rules but could be running counter to the Securities and Exchange Commission's rules if this coordination is not done as required by this legislation.

So the Retail Investor Protection Act is just that. It protects retail investors. It reconciles uncoordinated efforts between the Securities and Exchange Commission and the U.S. Department of Labor, and it says that they have to work together and also use a cost-benefit analysis when they are writing these rules.

I think that is a very wise thing. In fact, the court system has agreed that it is a wise thing, and 44 members of the House Financial Services Committee thought it was a wise thing, while only 13 opposed passing this out. Also, we have 10 Democrat United States Senators who have written to the Office of Management and Budget, making an identical request as this bill to the SEC, stating that the SEC act first in writing these rules before they come together.

So, today, it is not only a bipartisan vote but also a bicameral vote, both the House and the Senate. I would ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill coming out of Financial Services in order to make sure that our

government agencies actually coordinate when they write rules. Let's actually protect retail investors and do that first.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BOBBY SCOTT, who is on the Judiciary Committee and who is the ranking member on its Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2374, the so-called Retail Investor Protection Act. H.R. 2374 delays the Department of Labor's rulemaking process that would protect investors from unscrupulous investment scams.

Now, in past generations, pension plans were what were called "defined benefit plans" in which there were defined benefits. You would look at the number of years, your last salary, and the multiple, and you could calculate what your pension would be. But more and more we are seeing defined contribution plans in which the employer just makes a contribution, and the final benefit would be whatever happens to the money over the years with the investment advice that you would be given. The trend has had a profound impact on ultimate retirement benefits and security.

Two people investing the same amount—for example, \$100 a month over 30 years—could see very different retirement savings over that same period of time based on the investments they chose. Those investment choices could be the difference between a savings at the end of \$100,000 or as much as \$500,000 depending on which strategies were used. Now, most employees are not sophisticated investors, and therefore they need advice on what investment strategies should be used. How much should be in stocks? how much in bonds? how much in mutual funds, and which mutual funds? They seek advice.

The rule that the Department of Labor introduced in 2010 and will most likely reintroduce this fall simply requires that an investment adviser provide advice as a fiduciary responsibility to the investor, consistent, therefore, with the best interest of the investor, not with what would ultimately be most profitable to the adviser. That is, he has a duty to give primary consideration to the investor, not to his own profit. There are a lot of different products. A lot of mutual funds have extremely high fees when comparable funds—even better funds—have lower fees. Often the adviser will push products that are totally inappropriate for the investor, which is compromising the investor's retirement security in the long run but which is maximizing the profits for the adviser.

The bill we are considering today will allow investments to be sold which are laden with conflicts of interest and

would immunize advisers who give self-serving, unscrupulous advice from any liability. There is an apparent belief that investment advice that is self-serving and full of conflicts of interest is better than no investment advice at all. That is absolutely absurd. There is nothing wrong with those selling investment products to be required to give primary consideration to the investors they are purporting to advise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WATERS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the bill that we are considering today would delay the rulemaking that would take the necessary steps to protect employees and retirees who are currently being taken advantage of by investment advisers who are giving this unscrupulous advice.

Millions of Americans look to financial advisers for advice. There is nothing wrong with requiring them to have a fiduciary responsibility to those they are advising. It is about time that we make sure the investors are getting the good advice that they deserve. Therefore, we should defeat this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT), the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets and GSEs.

Mr. HURT. Thank you to the chairman of this committee, and thank you to the sponsor for your leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Retail Investor Protection Act.

Fifth District Virginians and Americans across the country are working hard to save for their futures, whether it be for their retirements or college tuitions for their children. Unfortunately, these hardworking Americans are being faced with the prospect of increased costs and fewer choices for the financial products that they currently rely on for their investments.

Currently, the Department of Labor and the Securities and Exchange Commission have indicated they will move forward with rulemakings to make changes to the fiduciary standards that would decrease the availability of financial advice for retail investors and increase the cost of financial advice for retail investors.

We must protect the ability of these Americans to choose the financial professionals who best meet their investment needs, and this bill is an important step in that direction. The Retail Investor Protection Act ensures that retail investors, including many American families, are not affected by unnecessary regulations that have been put in place without sufficient economic analysis or regulatory coordination.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bill so that

Washington does not stand in the way of Americans' ability to seek the best financial advice for their needs.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), who is an expert on retirement savings. He is the ranking member on the Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions. He is also the cochair of the Steering and Policy Committee.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my very good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, so you are in the lunchroom at work. This guy comes in from the investment house, and he shows 18 slides about the red fund—smiling people who are on fishing trips and on European vacations. They are really happy people.

□ 1545

He shows one slide about the blue fund at the very end and finishes his presentation. The red fund looks pretty good. What he doesn't tell you is that he gets 2½ percent of every dollar you put into the red fund, but ½ of 1 percent of every dollar you put in the blue fund. He neglects to mention that. So people rush and put their money in the red fund.

Now, should his interest be aligned with you or should his interest be aligned with his own interest? That is the question that is raised by this bill.

The Department of Labor is writing a rule that for the first time would say that that person standing in front of you in that room has a fiduciary obligation to the person listening, that is to say that he has to put the interest of the listener ahead of his own financial interest.

Self-interest is the malignancy that brought the U.S. economy to its knees 5 years ago. People who made mortgage transactions and insurance transactions benefited them and not the people they are supposed to be representing. To permit the cancer of self-interest to invade the second most important asset people have in their lifetime, which is their pension, would be an enormous mistake. That is a mistake that this Department of Labor rule is trying to avoid. This bill is a mistake because it rolls back those efforts and protections for the American people.

John Bogle, the founder and patron of Vanguard, has estimated that nearly 30 percent of people's pension funds have evaporated because of unnecessary fees. If people want to choose a high-fee plan, that is their choice; but they should make that choice only after receiving the advice that is fiduciary, that is directed to their own best interest, from a competent professional.

The Department of Labor rule promotes that result; this bill undercuts that result. For that reason, we should oppose this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), another distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING for all his fine work on this issue, as well as other financial services issues.

I also would like to thank my good friend and neighbor in Missouri, Mrs. WAGNER, for introducing this legislation and all her hard work on it. What she is trying to do here is propose legislation that tries to solve a problem that we have got in the situation here with these two agencies—DOL and SEC—trying to coordinate and propose a regulation which they don't seem to be willing to do or do it in the right way.

As usual, when the bureaucracy tries to propose things, there always are unintended consequences of those actions and those rulings. We have here some of those unintended consequences, which Mrs. WAGNER in her legislation is trying to mitigate.

This proposal has the potential to drive up the cost and availability of investment services and products for investors, particularly those with low and moderate incomes. I will give you an example. I recently spoke to a broker-dealer in rural Missouri who I represent, who is one of only a handful of small brokers in a two-county radius. If the Department of Labor rule moves forward, he, like many other small broker-dealers, will have no choice, because of the way this rule is written or being proposed, that they will stop offering his services to clients, and many Missourians are going to be without or have limited access to financial products and advice.

This hurts not only the big investors, but this hurts the small investors. As I said earlier, you are talking about the low- and moderate-income folks and, particularly, one of the most basic investments that we have, which is the IRA. How basic can you get to not allow people to be able to utilize an IRA if this goes into force?

So it is important today that we take this action. I, again, thank the gentlelady from Missouri for her efforts, and I urge my colleagues for support.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time we have remaining on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 5 minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. I am prepared to close. However, I will reserve the balance of my time if the chairman has other Members that he would like to put forth at this time.

Mr. HENSARLING. We have one more speaker, and then we would allow the gentlelady to close.

Then I believe I have the right to close, Mr. Speaker. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HENSARLING. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here for the past 45–50 minutes watching the debate. It strikes me that with all of the financial terms and with some of the heated rhetoric—and it has been heated—I never thought I would see the day where enlightened self-interest was called a cancer in this Nation. I wonder what Alexis de Tocqueville would think about that. But in any event, with all of that, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that we have lost sight of what we are talking about. We are talking about a bill, what the bill specifically does, and why.

Let's talk first about why we are here. We have a situation where Dodd-Frank has given authority to the SEC to make some rules. The Department of Labor also thinks it has the authority to make rules in the same area.

I hope we can all agree that there is a potential for conflict there. We all know what it is. We have seen it a hundred times before. We don't want the SEC to come out and say that you can't do X and have the Department of Labor come out the next week and say, but you have to do X.

There are hundreds of examples like that in the Federal Government, and this bill is simply trying to address that. How is it trying to do that? What does the bill do?

Number one, it asks the two agencies to work together. Someone please tell me how that is a bad thing—and a cancer of all things—on this Nation.

It then requires the two agencies to actually try and figure out if there is a problem—to ask them to identify a problem before they come up with a solution. Again, I think this makes a good bit of sense. The questions that we require them to ask in this bill are pretty simple: Are investors being systematically harmed? Would new rules limit people's access to investment advice? What are the costs and benefits of the rule?

How is this controversial? And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is not. That is the reason that it came out of committee on a bipartisan basis, the reason it is going to pass today on a bipartisan basis, and the reason that it has the bipartisan basis that it does in the Senate.

Too often I think we get sidetracked by coming in here and giving big speeches, and perhaps sometimes I am as guilty of that as anybody else. But today we have completely lost sight of why we are here. I hope we can come together and pass this bill this afternoon.

Ms. WATERS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members, H.R. 2374 is yet another attempt by Republicans to prevent our regulators from doing their job, this time protecting the average retail investor when they try to save for retirement.

Under this bill, the Securities and Exchange Commission would have to navigate new obstacles to harmonize the standard of care broker-dealers and investment advisers have when providing investment advice. The Department of Labor would have to wait possibly forever to update its rules protecting 401(k) and IRA plan participants.

H.R. 2374's restrictions put additional work in the way, stopping brokers from SEP dealing when selling investment products to Main Street.

Several studies have demonstrated that Americans do not understand that a broker does not necessarily have the investor's best interest when pushing financial products. The line between advisers and brokers has blurred over the last few decades, and this bill makes it harder to bring clarity for investments.

Mr. Speaker and Members, this administration has taken a strong stand against this bill. Let me read to you from the letter that they have sent to us, and I would like to offer this for the RECORD:

The administration strongly opposes passage of H.R. 2374 because it would derail important rulemakings under way at the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Department of Labor that are critical to protecting Americans' hard-earned savings and preserving their retirement security.

They further say:

H.R. 2374 prohibits Labor from issuing a rule to protect investors until the SEC engages in and completes further study of the effect of a rulemaking on retail investors.

Of course, there is a lot said here, but I think this says it all:

The bill would hinder efforts to protect consumers from conflicts of interest among brokers, dealers, financial advisers, and others whose incentives may be misaligned with investors, potentially leading to deceptive and abusive practices.

The administration is committed to ensuring that American workers and retirees are able to receive advice about how to invest their money in safe, secure, and transparent financial products that is free from harmful conflicts of interest.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I would just bring this to your attention: the Department of Labor is working to protect investors. My friends on the opposite side of the aisle are working to protect broker-dealers who may not have the best interest of these small individuals who want to invest, who want to earn money for retirement.

My friends on the opposite side of the aisle are putting all of this energy out to protect them no matter if they may be in a conflict of interest with those

who are simply trying to save for retirement.

I have watched as we have been through the subprime meltdown in this country. People lose money in their 401(k)s. I have watched people lose money in their IRAs. I have watched single women in their 60s losing their entire investment retirement savings who can't go back to work because they are too old—they can't find a job.

Whose side are we on? Are we on the side of broker-dealers who will have no fiduciary responsibility, who can tell you any old thing, direct you any old place? They get higher commissions and the people lose money. Whose side are we on? Why are we here in the Congress of the United States of America, voted on by our constituents to come here to advocate for their best interest?

The gentlelady from Missouri talked about what a hard time families are having. She is right. Families are having a hard time. I want to tell you, families are having a hard time even when my friends on the opposite side of the aisle would deny them food stamps when they lose their jobs, even when they stand here in the Congress of the United States and support sequestration that denied that family the ability to send their child to Head Start. They don't have money for fancy early childhood education. Head Start is all they have, but they are losing the ability to do that because my friends on the opposite side of the aisle support cutting back every agency.

My friends on the opposite side of the aisle can't care about families in the way that they say they do because they shut down this government and they caused families to lose money to stay at home, to not know when they were going to get paid, or how to pay their bills. Not only did they harm these families; they harmed many of our agencies that are trying to help the families. I could go on and on and on.

But let me say that consumer protection is advocated by some organizations we are all familiar with: AARP, AAUW, AFL-CIO, AFSCME, Alliance for Retired Americans, Americans for Financial Reform, the Association of BellTel Retirees, on and on and on. These are the people who protect consumers.

I will submit this for the RECORD.

I yield back the balance of my time.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, October 28, 2013.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2374—RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT
(Rep. Wagner, R-MO, and Rep. Murphy, D-FL)

The Administration strongly opposes passage of H.R. 2374 because it would derail important rulemakings underway at the Securities Exchange Commission (SEC) and the Department of Labor that are critical to pro-

tecting Americans' hard-earned savings and preserving their retirement security.

H.R. 2374 prohibits Labor from issuing a rule to protect investors until the SEC engages in and completes further study of the effect of a rulemaking on retail investors. The bill ignores the fact that significant work has already been conducted in both agencies and that the agencies have included and continue to include the public, industry, and numerous stakeholders in their rule-making processes. Moreover, the two agencies are already working closely to avoid conflicting requirements for the regulated community, and this legislation would hamper effective coordination between the two agencies. The bill would hinder efforts to protect consumers from conflicts of interest among brokers, dealers, financial advisors, and others whose incentives may be misaligned with investors, potentially leading to deceptive and abusive practices.

The Administration is committed to ensuring that American workers and retirees are able to receive advice about how to invest their money in safe, secure, and transparent financial products that is free from harmful conflicts of interest. These ongoing rulemakings are designed to protect trillions of dollars in retirement savings of millions of workers and retirees by ensuring that paid advisors and other entities do not place their own financial interests over those of their customers. This legislation would place an unnecessary obstacle in the way of these efforts to prevent such harmful conflicts of interest, which hurt businesses, consumers, and retirees and their families.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2374, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

GROUPS IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2374

1. AARP
2. AAUW
3. AFL-CIO
4. AFSCME
5. Alliance For Retired Americans
6. Americans for Financial Reform (AFR)-w/over 200 signatories
7. The Association of BellTel Retirees, Inc.
8. Certified Financial Planner Board (CFP)
9. Consumer Federation of America
10. Financial Planning Association
11. Fund Democracy
12. Investment Advisor Association (IAA)
13. National Council of La RAZA
14. The National Association of Personal Financial Advisors (NAPFA)
15. The National Association of Professional Geriatric Care Managers
16. North American Securities Administrators Association (NASAA)
17. OWL-The Voice of Midlife and Older Women
18. Pensions Rights Center
19. ProtectSeniors.org
20. Public Citizen
21. Wider Opportunities for Women

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I must admit in the time that I have served as a Member of Congress, I have noticed the more shrill the debate the less defensible the position. As I have listened closely to what appears to be a very shrill debate, it certainly buttresses that position.

I hear my friends talk about us on the other side of the aisle. I have heard the phrase "my friends on the other side of the aisle" consistently. But I

would say perhaps the debate has to be between my friends on that side of the aisle, since the ranking member well knows that half—half—of her caucus on the Financial Services Committee supported this bill by the gentlelady of Missouri. As was pointed out earlier, it is not only bipartisan; it is also bicameral.

I am sitting here, Mr. Speaker, with a letter signed by no fewer than 10—10 Democratic Senators imploring that the very same provisions of the Wagner bill be enforced: JON TESTER, MARK WARNER, CLAIRE MCCASKILL, KAY HAGAN, and the list goes on and on. I would say to my friends on that side of the aisle, perhaps they ought to finish the debate amongst themselves before they carry it on over here.

Then, again, we all know that people are entitled to their own opinions; they are not entitled to their own facts. There have been a number of misstatements of facts from my friends on that side of the aisle, particularly that broker-dealers have no standard whatsoever in disclosing conflicts of interest; but that is not true. Within the antifraud provisions, sections 9, 10, 15(c)(1) and (2), it prohibits misstatements, misleading omissions of material facts; and, indeed, broker-dealers must fully disclose any conflicts of interest, yet another huge section of debate that was totally misleading and false by friends on that side of the aisle.

□ 1600

And I must admit, it is a very disappointing debate; but, it is in some respects illuminating to see the cynical position of those who simply believe that everyone appears to be a crook unless you are a government worker. The phrase "cancer of self-interest" is working mothers have a self-interest to invest in their children's education. If the guy at the Pepsi bottling plant that I represent is trying to invest so he can buy a home and put a roof over his family's head, that is the cancer of self-interest?

All we are trying to do here is preserve investment advice and investment opportunities for working Americans, and I would encourage all Members, all Members of this body, to vote for the Wagner bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as the Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, my Subcommittee directly oversees the Securities and Exchange Commission's budget. And since 2001 the SEC's budget has increased by over 200 percent . . . this is a larger increase than almost any other agency in our government.

As the agency tasked with protecting investors and ensuring fair and orderly capital markets, you would think they would carefully coordinate with all agencies involved to ensure much needed certainty and to provide clear

guidance to a trillion dollar industry. However, this again is not the case and we are here today to ensure that the SEC and the Department of Labor coordinate and work in a systematic manner to avoid investor confusion, regulatory conflict, and decrease costs for retail investors.

This is why I rise today to put my support for H.R. 2374, the “Retail Investor Protection Act.”—common sense legislation, requiring the SEC complete a rulemaking on standards of care governing broker dealers and investment advisers before the Department of Labor finalizes their rule redefining the definition of a person providing investment advice under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act. Plain and simple, ensuring collaboration between the two agencies that are trying to reach the same goal.

In addition H.R. 2374 requires that before the SEC writes one new rules on expanding fiduciary standards, they need to identify whether investors are being harmed under current standards of care. We all need to remember what’s at stake here. American families invest trillions of dollars in IRAs and through mutual funds, stocks, and bonds. The Retail Investor Protection Act will ensure that federal regulators will not lose focus on the impact these rules could have on retail investors and must consider all other options first, before moving forward with broad new regulatory mandates.

The lack of regulatory coordination between these two financial regulators does not provide a cohesive landscape for investors and will be difficult for service providers to follow. These rules affect the lives of many and have profound and far reaching effects on our economy. The SEC itself has acknowledged that the costs of this action could “ultimately be passed on to retail investors in the form of higher fees or lost access to services and products.

We in Congress have an obligation to amend or fix provisions whose costs outweigh purported benefits. Therefore, as we move forward with the fiscal year 2014 budget in my Appropriations Subcommittee I plan to address with Chairwoman White whether a more thorough economic analysis of these rules are needed to ensure the SEC does not harm families who are investing to build up their retirement or to save for college—the very investors the SEC is supposed to protect. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2374.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am an advocate for consumer choice and appreciate the value of a variety of different business models in a competitive financial services marketplace. I also support full transparency regarding compensation arrangements and believe investors have a right to recommendations based on their best interests when receiving investment advice from financial services professionals.

Consistent with these principles, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and the Department of Labor (DOL) are currently in the process of coordinating a harmonized “fiduciary” standard of care for financial services professionals offering investment advice to their clients. Rather than allowing the SEC and the DOL to complete their work, today’s legislation would prejudge the outcome of the ongoing rulemakings and have the practical

effect of delaying implementation of final harmonized rules to protect consumers’ retirement savings from conflict of interests and potentially deceptive or abusive practices.

Accordingly, I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, well, here we go again. The House is taking up another bill that seeks to gut the Dodd-Frank Act. H.R. 2374’s authors purport that the bill is meant to protect investors. But its practical effect would be just the opposite. The bill would impose onerous—and unnecessary—new requirements on the Securities and Exchange Commission from imposing a common fiduciary standard on broker-dealers and investment advisers alike. Dodd-Frank directed that the Commission study this matter, and it did. The Commission found it necessary in a 2011 report and stands ready, willing, and able to complete a rulemaking. What’s worse is that the bill would also prevent the Department of Labor from moving forward with a fiduciary duty rulemaking for employee benefit plans until after the Commission has acted. In the simplest of terms, the Commission’s and Department of Labor’s common intention with these rulemakings is to protect investors. H.R. 2374’s practical effect would be to prevent both from doing so.

This is another example of not having learned the lessons of the past. Investor abuses in part precipitated the 2008 financial crisis. Passing H.R. 2374 would be a terrible step backward and a validation of the practices that nearly brought this country to its knees. The financial services industry is in no way, shape, or form deserving of this type of deregulation. Vote this bill down, and stand up for the financial security of American investors.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act. As you may know, this legislation would prohibit the Secretary of Labor from finalizing a regulation related to investment advisors until the SEC issues a final rule on the standard and conduct for brokers and dealers of securities. The SEC, under Dodd-Frank, already has been designated with the duty of providing universal standards of conduct for brokers and dealers that are similarly in place for investment advisors.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have been disappointed in the Department of Labor’s (DOL) efforts to redefine fiduciary duty for the purposes of ERISA. While I have no doubt that the ERISA law needs to be updated, I believe that the Department has not acted in good faith to put out a pragmatic and acceptable rulemaking. I, along with a bipartisan group of my colleagues, was successful in having the DOL withdraw their original rulemaking pertaining to fiduciary status after we raised both financial security concerns on behalf of average consumers and investors and conflicts of intent with the SEC. Unfortunately, since the Department’s withdrawal, it has not been amenable to making practical changes going forward.

Over the course of the past couple of years, I have questioned then-Secretary of Labor Hilda Solis and have met with Employee Benefits Security Administration officials, including Assistant Secretary Phyllis Borzi to get a better handle on the impetus of DOL’s efforts.

Following those conversations, I can report that, while the Department’s intent is in the right place in regard to this rulemaking, its efforts have ultimately been misplaced. For me, concerns remain for the future of low-balance IRA holders who may be orphaned if the DOL abandons the brokerage model in favor of either “do it yourself” online tools, that are often times confusing to average investors, or an advisory model, that typically is out of the price range of average consumers and requires a high minimum balance for account holders. Further, questions remain over the extent of the coordination between DOL and the SEC. The letters I’ve seen between the agencies are superficial in nature and certainly do not give the indication that any substantial conversations have occurred on the issue. Finally, DOL has not quelled the fears of advisors and broker-dealers that believe that liability concerns might curb access to basic financial information for consumers if a broad fiduciary definition is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2374 is not an ideal bill and I do have reservations about the precedent this legislation may set in regard to the regular order process for agency rulemakings. However, as I noted above, the Department of Labor has not given me full faith that this process is moving forward in a responsible manner, especially given its shared jurisdiction with the SEC.

Especially in these uncertain economic times, this Congress must be focused on incentivizing responsible investment and augmenting access to financial literacy and education. I do not believe these tests have been met successfully thus far by DOL and because of the potentially stifling affect a shortsighted rule may have on the national economy, I will lend my support to the Retail Investor Protection Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike “After” and insert “(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), after”.

Page 1, after line 14, insert the following:

(b) EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor may issue a rule that—

(A) establishes standards of care to improve investment advice provided to participants and beneficiaries under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.);

(B) requires that personalized investment advice is provided in a fiduciary capacity that is in the best interests of such participants and beneficiaries;

(C) requires that, before receiving investment advice, the compensation of investment advisors and financial service providers is clearly disclosed to such participants and beneficiaries; and

(D) satisfies the requirements of paragraph (3).

(2) PROCESS.—The Secretary of Labor may issue a rule pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) after coordination and consultation with the Securities and Exchange Commission; and

(B) after considering surveys and data on investment education and investment advice.

(3) PARTICIPANT INVESTMENT EDUCATION; APPRAISALS.—The rule issued pursuant to paragraph (1) shall provide standards of conduct for—

(A) participant investment education;

(B) access to reliable investment education and investment advice to traditionally underserved communities;

(C) reasonable compensation for investment advisors and financial service providers; and

(D) fair market value appraisals of stock held by employee stock ownership plans to employers, participants, and beneficiaries under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 4. REPORTS ON THE IMPACT OF PRACTICES OF PERSONS WHO PROVIDE INVESTMENT ADVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall report to Congress on how certain practices of persons who provide investment advice affect the standard of care exercised in relation to investors.

(b) REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—Such report shall—

(1) describe how the structure of compensation for persons who provide investment advice affects the standard of care exercised by such persons, including—

(A) practices involving fees paid from investment vehicles to such persons; and

(B) other forms of compensation paid to such persons that are not dependent upon the investor's return;

(2) compare the standards of care exercised by persons who provide investment advice to low-income and middle-class investors with the standards of care exercised by persons who provide investment advice to high-income investors, and the effect such standards of care have on the investment vehicles selected by investors; and

(3) evaluate the extent to which the standard of care used by persons who provide investment advice affects the adequacy of investment returns to provide for retirement for investors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 391, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment that I am offering along with Mr. CONYERS is the way H.R. 2374 should have been drafted. Instead of short-circuiting the regulatory process on behalf of Wall Street profits, this represents the appropriate and balanced way forward to advise the Department of Labor in their current rulemaking on investment advice.

First, Congress should not be in the business of shutting down any and all efforts by the Department of Labor to make rules for fiduciaries. The fiduciary rule is the cornerstone of pension law. It is what makes sure that, when

you hand your money over to someone else to invest it for you, they are going to act in your best interest. Stopping any and all regulatory action to ensure that people's retirement nest eggs are protected is irresponsible. My amendment would allow the Department to proceed.

At the same time, it addresses concerns that have been raised with the Department of Labor's proposed rules. Under my amendment, Congress would send a message to the Department of Labor that we want investors protected, not Wall Street brokers or advisers trying to protect their gravy train.

This amendment makes it clear that the Department may proceed with better protections for retirement investors in a way that provides for unbiased investment education, ensures that underserved communities are not unduly harmed by basic financial protections for investors, ensures reasonable competition to advisers, and protects employee stock ownership plan appraisals.

We want investment advice to be provided in consumers' best interests, not in whatever way makes advisers and brokers the most money.

Studies show that most Americans who save think their investment advisers are acting in their best interests. In fact, AARP found that overwhelming majorities of consumers thought all advisers were required to act in their best interests. But, in fact, they are not, under the current law. They are not required to disclose that they have a conflict of interest.

With poll after poll showing that most Americans are worried about their retirement, they should have the confidence that their investment adviser is working in their best interest, and not conflicted in the advice he gives that person because he may receive additional fees or higher commissions because of recommending a product that is not in their best interest.

This amendment is a no-brainer. It supports consumers and their retirement savings. It supports unbiased investment education. It supports reasonable compensation for advisers for the important duties they perform. This is a proper and balanced way forward. I urge my colleagues to support the Miller-Conyers amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I urge opposition to this amendment which would absolutely eviscerate this bill that we are considering now from the gentlelady from Missouri.

Number one, we have speaker after speaker who come up and seem to ignore the fact that broker-dealers already are subject to a suitability standard, including antifraud provisions that prohibit misstatements, misleading omissions of material facts, and fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices in connection with the purchase and sale of securities. They have a duty of fair dealing, which include the duty to execute orders promptly, disclose certain material information that the customer would consider important as an investor, charge prices reasonably related to the prevailing market, and fully disclose any conflict of interest.

I could go on and on.

The proponents of this amendment, as speakers before them, seemed to ignore this set of facts. And so again, it is interesting to me how the American people are demanding that their Congress work on a bipartisan basis; and so out of our committee, the Financial Services Committee, we have gone above and beyond the call of duty, and now we have a bill that has been supported by half of the Democratic members of the Financial Services Committee. And I just read a letter where 10 Democratic U.S. Senators are urging the exact same language as the Wagner bill and, thus, oppose the Miller amendment.

So, again, Mr. Speaker, I urge the proponent of the amendment to first have the debate with his own Caucus, and then we can have a fuller, richer debate on the floor.

What is really happening here is that all we are doing is saying to the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Department of Labor that this is an economy that is being crushed—crushed—by a red tape burden, that at least justify it. Make sure that the person you claimed you are going to protect, that you actually protect; and instead, we, quite honestly, fear they will not be protected, that instead they will be harmed, that all of a sudden, people who have access to \$7 trades won't have access to them.

Now, again, for the affluent, that is no big deal, but for working mothers struggling to make ends meet, it is a very big deal.

To be denied the opportunity to open up an IRA with \$2,000? No, I think now Congress has deigned that the Department of Labor can institute a fiduciary standard, and now you are going to need \$25,000. Well, what the heck, let's make it \$50,000. And so the very people they claim they want to protect very well could be harmed by this standard.

We understand the talk, but where is the proof? Where is the proof? Because what is going to happen if this fiduciary standard is imposed? All of a sudden investment advice that working Americans count on is either going to disappear or become far more expensive.

So, again, maybe it helps the trial lawyer; maybe it helps the labor union bosses; but it doesn't help the working mothers. It doesn't help the struggling fathers. It doesn't help low- and moderate-income people struggling in this economy where tens of millions remain underemployed and unemployed under this administration's economic policies, and so I urge that we reject this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I just want to say that it is an interesting concept that the only way the investment community can continue to survive and offer advice is if they can have the right to have conflicted advice—conflicted advice—be protected by the law, as opposed to representing the person that they are taking the money from to invest.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), coauthor of the amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank GEORGE MILLER for the work he has done, along with the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

The Miller-Conyers amendment simply encourages the Department of Labor to issue a rule that requires investment advisers to provide advice in a fiduciary capacity and protect access to investment education, ensure reasonable compensation to advisers, and ensure the availability of ESOP appraisals.

This is what we are seeking so badly, and this is the comment that has been made about the inaccurate drafting of the bill. The Department of Labor should issue a proposed rule that seeks to protect workers, provide access to investment education, and ensure that advisers are reasonably paid.

Under current rules, investment advisers may hold themselves out as acting in workers' best interests even though they are not. I repeat: under current rules, investment advisers may hold themselves out as acting in workers' best interests even though they are not.

Workers in these types of plans often are required to choose between dozens of investment choices and need the advice on their investment options from people who do not have secret conflicts. Over 70 million workers and retirees depend upon 401(k) retirement plans and IRAs for their retirement savings. If there is any hope for this measure at all, H.R. 2374, it would have to have this amendment on it. I plead with those who enthusiastically support this measure to please support this amendment.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the author of the Retail Investor Protection Act.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The language of the amendment attempts to sound benign, but its inclusion would undermine a key tenet of the legislation, which is a requirement that the Department of Labor wait for the SEC to finish any rulemaking in this area.

It has been noted time and time again by Chairman HENSARLING and others that 10 Democratic Senators recently sent a letter to the Office of Management and Budget requesting that Labor wait on the SEC. So there seems to be bipartisan and, as we have stated before, bicameral consensus for the process here.

I also must say that I find some of the terms in the amendment particularly troubling. The amendment would allow the Department of Labor to define what constitutes a "financial services provider," a term that I believe is broad and which I am not sure the Department of Labor has either the expertise or the jurisdiction to rule upon.

Paragraph 3 of the amendment also states that the Department of Labor's rules should provide for "reasonable compensation" within the industry. I, for one, do not believe that it is up to the Federal Government to determine what constitutes reasonable compensation. That is a determination that belongs to consumers and to investors who I believe are more than capable of determining for themselves what is reasonable.

The Retail Investor Protection Act would require that Federal agencies act in the best interest of all investors and would go a long way towards preserving access to financial services for Americans of all income levels. This, Mr. Speaker, is about access. It is about availability. It is about affordability for hardworking American families and investors.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my friend, the chairman from Texas, asked, I think, a couple of very important questions about this amendment, and he really points out why I support it. First, he asked: Where is the proof that American pensioners have suffered because of conflicted investment advice?

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, we can all look to the Government Accountability Office, which looked at that very question a few years ago, at Mr. MILLER's request and mine and several others, and found that upwards of 27 percent of people's accounts evaporated because of high fees in plans in which they put their money in defined contribution accounts. That is pretty significant proof.

As I said earlier on the floor, they could look to the opinion of someone who is not political at all, I think, someone who is an expert in this field, Jack Bogle, from Vanguard, who uses the number 30 percent in unnecessary fees that have gone up here. Proof is ample that many Americans have rather paltry retirement accounts because of the very high fees that they are paying.

Second, Mr. Speaker, the chairman talked about the suitability standard under the securities law. That is kind of the point. The suitability standard is not a fiduciary standard. The suitability standard assumes an arm's-length transaction between people of equal or similar competence, where it is every investor for him- or herself.

The pension situation is very different. This is a situation where someone is driving a bus or building houses or teaching school or working in a software company, and that is what they do. They don't do investment all the time. So when they turn to someone for advice, they are assuming that that someone is on their side, that the advice that someone is giving them is in their best interests. That is the very nature of a fiduciary relationship.

So I think the questions that were raised point out the reasons to support Mr. MILLER's amendment. There is ample evidence of harm that has been done to America's investors; and, secondly, the suitability standard is wholly insufficient to protect the interests of those investors.

For those reasons, I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and a "no" vote on the bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

How you ended your comments was, Let's move this bipartisan amendment to this bill, and what I was trying to do in a bipartisan manner was to ask the question: Is simply what you are trying to do is to require that investment advisers, that they would have to have, you are saying, a fiduciary duty going forward? That is what you are trying to do to add to this bill? I heard you say that, and I heard Mr. MILLER say that. That was my question to you.

You said it once. Mr. MILLER said it twice. I made a note of it each time. That is my question. That is what you basically want us to do. You want us to make it the law that an investment adviser would have to have a fiduciary standard to do in the best interest, if you will?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Do I believe that advisers have a fiduciary relationship to the people that they are taking money from to invest? I do. I think the law should reflect that, absolutely.

Mr. GARRETT. Earlier I said that I often wonder whether people who come to the floor to oppose some of our bills ever actually read the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GARRETT. Now I am going to go a step further. I wonder whether the people who oppose this bill actually know what the law is.

The law is and has been for decades that, if you are an investment adviser, you already have a fiduciary standard with regard to your client. That is the current law. Already the investment adviser, going through an ERISA plan, has a fiduciary standard. I think what you are talking about is a broker-dealer.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. That is what the amendment addresses.

Mr. GARRETT. Exactly. That is why I asked both of you twice what you said. What you said on the floor and what you just said a moment ago is, you were talking about broker-dealers, but you said it was investment advisers. It just points out, Mr. Speaker, that they come to the floor with absolutely no understanding of what the law is.

Once again, we encourage the bill to go unamended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Texas have additional speakers?

Mr. HENSARLING. I have no further speakers, Mr. Speaker, and I believe I have the right to close.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, let me get this straight. You can talk about the advisers having a fiduciary responsibility and obligation under the law, but then you can have the broker-dealers come in and close the deal, and they can provide conflicted advice and, in fact, conflicted products—in the best interest of this retired individual who is trying to invest their funds? Very clever.

But this comes from an industry where we saw the banks sell a tranche of mortgages to their best friends and customers and then immediately bid against the success of that tranche of mortgages. So conflicted advice can be

very profitable. They worked it to a fare-thee-well among the big players.

Now you come in with your \$100,000, your \$80,000, your retirement funds, and you want to make an investment and you want some advice and you want to talk to a broker, and the broker says, Oh, yes, we have exactly the product for you. In fact, he or she has been told to sell this product, even though it is not the best-performing product, it may not be a match for this couple, but it has the highest commissions for the firm and for the broker. That is what they do.

What you are suggesting is that should be written into the law, that conflict of interest, and you talk about all the terrible things that happen. But when the adviser fiduciary study was done in 2013, 68 percent said the fiduciary—this is of the investment industry—68 percent said the fiduciary standard will not reduce products or services; 79 percent said it does not cost more to work as a fiduciary; and 65 percent said the fiduciary standard will not price investors out of the market. So the industry says that, but you have a whole theory how this is doomsday for the small investor. It is just not so.

What you are doing is protecting the right of brokers to give you conflicted advice about the investment of your money, and they knowingly do it. You are saying that the industry cannot continue unless they are allowed to continue to give conflicted advice. That is why we have conflict of interest laws, because we don't allow people to do this when they have a responsibility.

We should vote for this amendment and vote against the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think the audio system on the House floor is working quite well, and so I continue to be somewhat amazed by the number of speakers who get up and claim that broker-dealers can engage in conflicts of interest.

Again, I will give the citation for the duty to disclose conflicts of interest, FINRA's Suitability Rule 2111. I would encourage those who haven't read it to actually read it so that we can actually have facts on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, what is truly radical here is the proponents of this amendment trying to upset 80 years of settled law, without any evidence that is compelling, to somehow believe that all of a sudden we are going to help a universe of people, who most of us believe, including half of the Democrats on the Financial Services Committee, instead

will be hurt, including a number of prominent Democratic senators who believe they will be hurt, these working moms and pops trying to provide for their family, trying to manage their nest eggs, having a new standard forced upon people they rely on. So all of a sudden, that investment advice is either going to get more expensive, it is going to disappear. All of a sudden, IRAs for working moms at prices they can afford will disappear all because we hear rhetoric about Wall Street.

Well, I don't think I have had any letters of endorsement from anybody on Wall Street. We can talk about something else that is not applicable. Perhaps we can talk about ObamaCare. I am always happy to have that discussion once again.

Again, this is a bipartisan bill. All we are trying to do is ensure, if 80 years of settled law that has helped working families is about to be upset, then we better have proof it is going to help the people that it claims to help. The amendment from the gentleman from California would totally eviscerate that.

I urge opposition, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2374 is postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1637

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.

RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2374 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be followed by 5-minute votes on a motion to recommit, if ordered, and passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 174, nays 243, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 565]

YEAS—174

Andrews	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Barber	Grijalva	Pallone
Bass	Gutiérrez	Pascrell
Beatty	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hanabusa	Payne
Bera (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Perlmuter
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Peters (CA)
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Bonamici	Holt	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Honda	Polis
Bralley (IA)	Horsford	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Rahall
Bustos	Israel	Rangel
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Capps	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Chu	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Kuster	Schiff
Clarke	Langevin	Schwartz
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Cohen	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Connolly	Lewis	Shea-Porter
Conyers	Lipinski	Sherman
Courtney	Lofgren	Sires
Crowley	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Cummings	Lowe	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lujan Grisham	Speier
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Swailwell (CA)
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
DeGette	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Maloney	
Deutch	Carolyn	
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	
Doggett	Matsui	
Doyle	McCollum	
Duckworth	McDermott	
Edwards	McGovern	
Ellison	McIntyre	
Engel	McNerney	
Enyart	Meeks	
Eshoo	Meng	
Esty	Michaud	
Farr	Miller, George	
Fattah	Moore	
Frankel (FL)	Moran	
Fudge	Nadler	
Gabbard	Napolitano	
Garamendi	Neal	
Garcia	Negrete McLeod	
Green, Al	Nolan	

NAYS—243

Amash	Bridenstine	Coble
Amodei	Brooks (AL)	Coffman
Bachmann	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Bachus	Broun (GA)	Collins (GA)
Barletta	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Barr	Bucshon	Conaway
Barrow (GA)	Burgess	Cook
Barton	Calvert	Costa
Benishek	Camp	Cotton
Bentivolio	Cantor	Cramer
Bilirakis	Capito	Crawford
Bishop (UT)	Carney	Crenshaw
Black	Carter	Cuellar
Blackburn	Cassidy	Culberson
Boustany	Chabot	Daines
Brady (TX)	Chaffetz	Davis, Rodney

Delaney	King (NY)	Rice (SC)
Denham	Kingston	Rigell
Dent	Kinzinger (IL)	Roby
DeSantis	Kline	Roe (TN)
DesJarlais	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
Duffy	LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Rokita
Elmers	Lankford	Rooney
Farenthold	Latham	Roskam
Fincher	Latta	Ross
Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Fleischmann	Loebbeck	Royce
Fleming	Long	Runyan
Flores	Lucas	Ryan (WI)
Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Salmon
Fortenberry	Lummis	Scalise
Foster	Maffei	Schneider
Fox	Marchant	Schock
Franks (AZ)	Marino	Schrader
Frelinghuysen	Massie	Schweikert
Galleo	Matheson	Scott, Austin
Gardner	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Garrett	McCaul	Sessions
Gerlach	McClintock	Shimkus
Gibbs	McHenry	Shuster
Gibson	McKeon	Simpson
Gingrey (GA)	McKinley	Sinema
Gohmert	McMorris	Smith (MO)
Goodlatte	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Gosar	Meadows	Smith (NJ)
Gowdy	Meehan	Smith (TX)
Granger	Messer	Southerland
Graves (GA)	Mica	Stewart
Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)	Stivers
Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)	Stockman
Griffith (VA)	Miller, Gary	Stutzman
Grimm	Mullin	Terry
Guthrie	Mulvaney	Thompson (PA)
Hall	Murphy (FL)	Thornberry
Hanna	Murphy (PA)	
Harper	Neugebauer	
Harris	Noem	
Hartzler	Nugent	
Hastings (WA)	Nunes	
Heck (NV)	Nunnelee	
Hensarling	Olson	
Himes	Owens	
Holding	Palazzo	
Hudson	Paulsen	
Huelskamp	Pearce	
Huizenga (MI)	Perry	
Hultgren	Peters (MI)	
Hunter	Peterson	
Hurt	Petri	
Issa	Pittenger	
Jenkins	Pitts	
Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)	
Johnson, Sam	Pompeo	
Jones	Posey	
Jordan	Price (GA)	
Joyce	Radel	
Kelly (PA)	Reed	
Kilmer	Reichert	
Kind	Renacci	
King (IA)	Ribble	

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Campbell	Kaptur	Sanford
Cooper	McCarthy (NY)	Wasserman
Diaz-Balart	Rogers (MI)	Schultz
Grayson	Ros-Lehtinen	

□ 1706

Messrs. FRELINGHUYSEN, STIVERS, ROSKAM, RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, REED, RIGELL, GARY G. MILLER of California, HUNTER, CAMP, and ROKITA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. HORSFORD, LEVIN, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TIERNEY. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Tierney moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2374 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:
SEC. 4. PROTECTING RETIREMENT SAVINGS FROM INVESTMENT FRAUD.

Nothing in this Act shall limit the authority of the Secretary of Labor to issue regulations to—

(1) prevent fraud in regard to pensions, 401k plans, and other retirement savings accounts of seniors, veterans, and other American workers;

(2) require that financial service providers, when advising employers or employees about pensions, 401k plans, or other retirement savings accounts, clearly disclose any fees or other charges; or

(3) promote investment education and sound financial advice to employers and employees with regards to pensions, 401k plans, and other retirement savings accounts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill. It will not send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, over 70 million Americans and their families depend on 401(k)s and similar retirement plans for their retirement security. Veterans, seniors, and middle class workers and families in my district in Massachusetts—in fact, in those districts of all of my colleagues—are concerned about their pensions, 401(k) plans, and retirement savings.

A retired worker from Danvers, Massachusetts, in my district, recently called my office and shared concerns about her pension. She believed it is at risk, and she has no other means of income.

That constituent of mine shares the same situation as do many across this country, believing that their retirement is at risk and that they have no other means of income. Millions of Americans are worried that they won't have adequate resources to retire with dignity after decades of work, and those who are retired, like that constituent from Danvers, feel that what they have won't last.

Retirement plans can also be subject to fraud and abuse. Last year, the Department of Labor recovered almost

\$1.3 billion that was misappropriated from retirement plans. It included over \$800 million in prohibited transactions. The Department of Labor reportedly filed indictments against 117 persons for crimes related to employee benefit plans.

In 401(k) and similar plans, workers have to make investment decisions, and to do so, they need access to reliable investment advice.

The motion to recommit is straightforward. It simply states that the bill does not prohibit action from being taken on the following three things:

It does not prohibit the Secretary of Labor from using regulations to prevent fraud in regard to pensions, 401(k) plans, and other retirement savings accounts for seniors, veterans, and other Americans;

It does not prohibit the Secretary of Labor from using regulations to require the disclosure of any fees so as to promote transparency and accountability;

It would promote investment education and sound financial advice.

Veterans, seniors, and the over 70 million investors who depend on 401(k)s and IRAs for their future security deserve to know that these kinds of responsible actions can be taken on their behalf. I think everyone here agrees.

I ask my colleagues for their support of this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise again in opposition. I don't even find how this is relevant to the underlying bill, the Retail Investor Protection Act. It simply says that it shouldn't prohibit something that apparently the Secretary of Labor already has the right to do. And given that the Obama administration has had a Secretary of Labor for 5 years, I suppose, if they already wanted to do what was the subject of the gentleman's MTR, they would have already done it. I suppose the gentleman certainly has a right, if he hasn't already done it, to introduce legislation.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is simply irrelevant. There are lots of things that the Retail Investor Protection Act does not prohibit.

□ 1715

It does not prohibit the Secretary of State from holding somebody accountable for the tragedy in Benghazi, when there were 29 systemic failures and four dead.

There is nothing in the underlying bill that prohibits the Secretary of the Treasury from holding somebody accountable at the Internal Revenue Service for targeting Americans for exercising their First Amendment rights.

There is nothing in the bill that prohibits the Secretary of HHS from holding somebody accountable for the ObamaCare Web site, which was 3½ years in the making for a half a billion dollars and still crashed.

There is nothing in the bill that prohibits the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from holding somebody responsible at the Federal Housing Administration for receiving its first-ever taxpayer bailout and being in violation of the law for almost 5 straight years for failing to adhere to its statutory minimum capital standards.

No, there are a lot of things that this bill doesn't prohibit, but let me tell you what the bill does, Mr. Speaker.

The Retail Investor Protection Act, sponsored by the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), requires the Department of Labor and the Securities and Exchange Commission to coordinate a rulemaking. I know that is a radical departure for many, but, yes, they should coordinate a rulemaking.

Then we actually require justification. If you are going to pass a rule that you claim is going to help retail investors, then actually help them.

On a more fundamental level—and it is why we should oppose the motion to recommit—the bill preserves that \$7 online trade for the working mom who is trying to send a child to college. It preserves the \$2,000 startup IRA for somebody who has worked 20 years at Walmart and is trying to have a retirement savings. It allows low-cost access to ideas and products to people who want to manage their own investments so they can finally buy their own homes.

Mr. Speaker, it does it all on a bipartisan basis because half of the Democrats on the Financial Services Committee supported this commonsense legislation. I would urge all of them now and the entirety of the House to vote down the motion to recommit and to vote in favor of retail investors and to vote “aye” on the Retail Investor Protection Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 223, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 566]

AYES—195

Andrews	Green, Al	Neal
Barber	Green, Gene	Negrete McLeod
Barrow (GA)	Grijalva	Nolan
Bass	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Beatty	Hahn	Owens
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pallone
Bera (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Payne
Blumenauer	Himes	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Peters (CA)
Brady (PA)	Holt	Peters (MI)
Braley (IA)	Honda	Peterson
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Pocan
Bustos	Huffman	Polis
Butterfield	Israel	Price (NC)
Capps	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Capuano	Jeffries	Rahall
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Cicilline	Kildee	T.
Clarke	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kind	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kuster	Schiff
Cohen	Langevin	Schneider
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Costa	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Levin	Scott, David
Crowley	Lewis	Serrano
Cuellar	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	Loebach	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Sinema
DeFazio	Lowey	Sires
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter
Delaney	(NM)	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
DelBene	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Lynch	Takano
Dingell	Maffei	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	Carolyn	Tierney
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Tonko
Edwards	Matsui	Tsongas
Ellison	McCollum	Vargas
Engel	McDermott	Veasey
Enyart	McGovern	Vela
Eshoo	McIntyre	Velázquez
Esty	McNerney	Visclosky
Farr	Meeks	Walz
Fattah	Meng	Waters
Foster	Michaud	Watt
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Waxman
Fudge	Moore	Welch
Gabbard	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Galleo	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Nadler	
Garcia	Napolitano	

NOES—223

Amash	Camp	DeSantis
Amodei	Cantor	DesJarlais
Bachmann	Capito	Diaz-Balart
Bachus	Carter	Duffy
Barletta	Cassidy	Duncan (SC)
Barr	Chabot	Ellmers
Barton	Chaffetz	Farenthold
Benishek	Coble	Fincher
Bentivolio	Coffman	Fitzpatrick
Bilirakis	Cole	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Fleming
Black	Collins (NY)	Flores
Blackburn	Conaway	Forbes
Boustany	Cook	Fortenberry
Brady (TX)	Cotton	Fox
Bridenstine	Cramer	Franks (AZ)
Brooks (AL)	Crawford	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (IN)	Crenshaw	Gardner
Broun (GA)	Culberson	Garrett
Buchanan	Daines	Gerlach
Bucshon	Davis, Rodney	Gibbs
Burgess	Denham	Gibson
Calvert	Dent	Gingrey (GA)

Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)	Ross	Bucshon	Hensarling	Pitts	Ellison	Lewis	Richmond
Goodlatte	McCauley	Rothfus	Burgess	Himes	Poe (TX)	Engel	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Gosar	McClintock	Royce	Calvert	Holding	Pompeo	Enyart	Loeb	Ruiz
Gowdy	McHenry	Runyan	Camp	Hudson	Posey	Eshoo	Lofgren	Ruppersberger
Granger	McKeon	Ryan (WI)	Cantor	Huelskamp	Price (GA)	Esty	Lowenthal	Ryan (OH)
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Salmon	Capito	Huizenga (MI)	Radel	Farr	Lowey	Sánchez, Linda T.
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Scalise	Carney	Hultgren	Reed	Fattah	Lujan Grisham	Sanchez, Loretta
Griffin (AR)	Rodgers	Schock	Carter	Hunter	Reichert	Frankel (FL)	(NM)	Sarbanes
Griffith (VA)	Meadows	Schweikert	Cassidy	Hurt	Renacci	Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray	Schakowsky
Grimm	Meehan	Scott, Austin	Chabot	Issa	Ribble	Gabbard	(NM)	Schiff
Guthrie	Messer	Sensenbrenner	Chaffetz	Jenkins	Rice (SC)	Garamendi	Lynch	Schwartz
Hall	Mica	Sessions	Coble	Johnson (OH)	Rigell	Green, Al	Maloney, Carolyn	Scott (VA)
Hanna	Miller (FL)	Shimkus	Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Roby	Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean	Scott, David
Harper	Miller (MI)	Shuster	Cole	Jordan	Roe (TN)	Grijalva	Matsui	Serrano
Harris	Miller, Gary	Simpson	Collins (GA)	Joyce	Rogers (AL)	Gutierrez	McCollum	Sewell (AL)
Hartzler	Mullin	Smith (MO)	Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)	Hahn	McDermott	Shea-Porter
Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney	Smith (NE)	Conaway	Kilmer	Rogers (MI)	Hanabusa	McGovern	Sires
Heck (NV)	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NJ)	Connolly	Kind	Rohrabacher	Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Slaughter
Hensarling	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)	Cook	King (IA)	Rokita	Hinojosa	Meeks	Smith (WA)
Holding	Noem	Southerland	Costa	King (NY)	Rooney	Holt	Meng	Speier
Hudson	Nugent	Stewart	Cotton	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen	Honda	Michaud	Swalwell (CA)
Huelskamp	Nunes	Cramer	Cramer	Kinzinger (IL)	Roskam	Horsford	Miller, George	Takano
Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee	Crawford	Crenshaw	Kline	Ross	Hoyer	Moran	Thompson (CA)
Hultgren	Olson	Cuellar	Cuellar	Labrador	Rothfus	Huffman	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Hunter	Palazzo	Terry	Culberson	Lance	Royce	Israel	Napolitano	Tierney
Hurt	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)	Thornberry	Lankford	Runyan	Jackson Lee	Neal	Titus
Issa	Pearce	Tiberi	Tiberi	Lance	Salmon	Jeffries	Negrete McLeod	Tonko
Johnson (OH)	Perry	Tipton	Tipton	Larsen (WA)	Scalise	Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Tsongas
Johnson, Sam	Petri	Denham	Denham	Latham	Schneider	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke	Van Hollen
Jordan	Pittenger	Dent	Dent	Latta	Schock	Jones	Pallone	Vargas
Joyce	Pitts	DeSantis	DeSantis	LoBiondo	Schrader	Kaptur	Pascarell	Veasey
Kelly (PA)	Poe (TX)	DesJarlais	DesJarlais	Long	Schweikert	Keating	Pastor (AZ)	Velázquez
King (IA)	Pompeo	Deutsch	Deutsch	Lucas	Scott, Austin	Kelly (IL)	Payne	Visclosky
King (NY)	Posey	Diaz-Balart	Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner	Kennedy	Pelosi	Walz
Kingston	Price (GA)	Radel	Reed	Lummis	Sessions	Kildee	Pingree (ME)	Waters
Kinzing (IL)	Radel	Walorski	Weber (TX)	Maffei	Sherman	Kirkpatrick	Pocan	Watt
Kline	Reed	Webster (FL)	Webster (FL)	Marchant	Shimkus	Kuster	Polis	Waxman
Labrador	Reichert	Wenstrup	Wenstrup	Marino	Shuster	Langevin	Price (NC)	Welch
LaMalfa	Renacci	Farenthold	Fincher	Massie	Simpson	Larson (CT)	Quigley	Wilson (FL)
Lamborn	Ribble	Matheson	Matheson	McCarthy (CA)	Sinema	Lee (CA)	Rahall	Yarmuth
Lance	Rice (SC)	McCarthy (CA)	McCauley	McCauley	Smith (MO)	Levin	Rangel	
Lankford	Rigell	McClintock	McClintock	McClintock	Smith (NE)			
Latham	Roby	McHenry	McHenry	McHenry	Smith (NJ)			
Latta	Roe (TN)	McIntyre	McIntyre	McIntyre	Smith (TX)			
LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	McKinley	McKinley	McKinley	Southerland			
Long	Rogers (KY)	McMorris	McMorris	McMorris	Stewart			
Lucas	Rogers (MI)	Rodgers	Rodgers	Rodgers	Stivers			
Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher	Meadows	Meadows	Meadows	Stockman			
Lummis	Rokita	Meehan	Meehan	Meehan	Stutzman			
Marchant	Rooney	Messer	Messer	Messer	Terry			
Marino	Ros-Lehtinen	Garcia	Garcia	Garcia	Thompson (PA)			
Massie	Roskam	Miller (FL)	Miller (FL)	Miller (FL)	Thornberry			
		Miller (MI)	Miller (MI)	Miller (MI)	Tiberi			
		Miller, Gary	Miller, Gary	Miller, Gary	Tipton			
		Moore	Moore	Moore	Turner			
		Mullin	Mullin	Mullin	Upton			
		Mulvaney	Mulvaney	Mulvaney	Valadao			
		Murphy (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Vela			
		Murphy (PA)	Murphy (PA)	Murphy (PA)	Wagner			
		Neugebauer	Neugebauer	Neugebauer	Walberg			
		Noem	Noem	Noem	Walden			
		Nugent	Nugent	Nugent	Walorski			
		Nunes	Nunes	Nunes	Weber (TX)			
		Nunnelee	Nunnelee	Nunnelee	Webster (FL)			
		Olson	Olson	Olson	Wenstrup			
		Owens	Owens	Owens	Whitfield			
		Palazzo	Palazzo	Palazzo	Williams			
		Paulsen	Paulsen	Paulsen	Wilson (SC)			
		Pearce	Pearce	Pearce	Wittman			
		Perlmutter	Perlmutter	Perlmutter	Wolf			
		Perry	Perry	Perry	Womack			
		Peters (CA)	Peters (CA)	Peters (CA)	Woodall			
		Peters (MI)	Peters (MI)	Peters (MI)	Yoder			
		Peterson	Peterson	Peterson	Yoho			
		Petri	Petri	Petri	Young (AK)			
		Pittenger	Pittenger	Pittenger	Young (IN)			

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt	Jenkins	Van Hollen
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Wasserman
Cooper	Pelosi	Schultz
Grayson	Rush	
Herrera Beutler	Sanford	

□ 1726

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 254, noes 166, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 567]

AYES—254

Amash	Barton	Boustany
Amodei	Benishek	Brady (TX)
Bachmann	Bentivolio	Bridenstine
Bachus	Bilirakis	Brooks (AL)
Barletta	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (IN)
Barr	Black	Brown (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Blackburn	Buchanan

Andrews	Butterfield
Barber	Capps
Bass	Capuano
Beatty	Cárdenas
Becerra	Carson (IN)
Bera (CA)	Cartwright
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Castro (TX)
Blumenauer	Chu
Bonamici	Cicilline
Brady (PA)	Clarke
Braley (IA)	Clay
Brown (FL)	Cleaver
Brownley (CA)	Clyburn
Bustos	Cohen

NOES—166

Conyers	Crowley
Courtney	Cummins
Crowley	Davis (CA)
Danahy	Davis, Danny
DeFazio	DeGette
DeLauro	DeBene
Dingell	Doggett
Doyle	Duckworth
Edwards	

NOT VOTING—10

Aderholt	Herrera Beutler	Sanford
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Wasserman
Cooper	McKeon	Schultz
Grayson	Rush	

□ 1736

Messrs. PAYNE, ISRAEL, and BISHOP of Georgia changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

October 29, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I write to inform you of my resignation from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. It was an honor to serve on this important committee and I remain committed to promoting a government that is transparent and accountable to the American people.

Sincerely,

MARK POCAN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.
There was no objection.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 393

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—Mr. Pocan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION RELATING TO DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 391 and section 1002(e) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Young of Indiana moves that the House proceed to consider House Joint Resolution 99.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 1002(e)(2)(B) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014, the motion is not debatable.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 99

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves of the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as exercised pursuant to the certification under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 391 and section 1002(e)(2)(C) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014, the joint resolution is considered as read, and the previous question is considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion, except 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) as the proponent and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) as the opponent.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the joint resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Some people may be wondering why we find ourselves here today. Some people may be confused as to why we are voting on a resolution to disapprove of the debt limit suspension 2 weeks after the fact. And some people may be asking why I introduced this resolution of disapproval on behalf of some people who voted "yes" and others who voted "no" to give the President the authority to suspend the debt limit.

The answers to these questions are much simpler than they might appear.

We are here today because the United States of America carries a debt load of over \$17 trillion and counting.

We are voting on this resolution today because this is the procedure that was put in place by the Senate when they crafted a package to end the government shutdown. Many of us voted for that Senate legislation largely because we didn't think it was responsible to risk defaulting on our national debt.

However, I introduced this resolution, and a majority of House Members will vote to disapprove, because it is also not responsible to ignore the problems created by our long-term debt.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that a large number in this body voted to avoid default, it would be a gross mischaracterization to say that we approve of a debt limit suspension absent adoption of bold policy reforms that will set our Nation on a sustainable fiscal trajectory.

We must break the habit of negotiating these fiscal deals at the last minute. We must stop kicking the can down the road, proverbially skipping along from crisis to crisis.

Simply put: enough is enough. Let's start talking across party lines about how to fix our debt problems now, not the end of a deadline.

We know that programs like Medicare and Social Security are on unsustainable footing. That is why a Democratic President and Republican House have both offered up reforms for these programs. So if we agree there is a problem, why must we wait until the next crisis to address it?

We know that our Tax Code is outdated and that it has become too larded up with narrowly tailored provisions that benefit only a small number of special interests. That is why our House Ways and Means chairman has met weekly with the Senate Finance

chairman to discuss how best to achieve a fairer, flatter Tax Code in a bipartisan way.

If there is agreement here, then why are we looking to self-imposed fiscal deadlines in hopes of getting a deal? I could go on and on, but I think the point is clear: Washington missed an opportunity during our most recent fiscal showdown.

This resolution sends a message that ignoring our problems does not make them go away. It sends a message that we should not wait until the last minute, but should reach across the aisle to face these challenges now; and it sends a message that we take these issues very seriously because they bear directly on job creation, personal income levels, and our collective faith in America's enduring exceptionalism.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution of disapproval.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just a short time ago, a number of us joined many others in paying tribute to Speaker Tom Foley. There was a commemoration ceremony just 100 feet or so from here.

There was a lot of discussion, appropriately, of the need for bipartisanship. There was much reference to the role that Tom Foley played in that in trying to reach across the aisle.

Bob Michel, the former leader on the Republican side, spoke so eloquently as to how there was a level of trust and how there was an effort at bipartisanship.

□ 1745

I think what has happened in this House is that the increased polarization has really twisted this institution and has even, to some extent, twisted the ability to have close relationships. I say this because I think this resolution is not within that spirit.

It was only the week before last that 87 House Republicans joined 198 House Democrats to pull this Nation back from the brink of a default that would have magnified the economic damage inflicted by the Republican shutdown of this government. That was a bipartisan effort with leadership support from both sides of the aisle.

And I can understand why those who voted "no" on October 16 might vote "yes" on this bill in order to be consistent. And while I disagree with the policy, at least their vote would be consistent. I think the vote would be consistently wrong, but it would be consistent.

What is hard to understand is how anybody who voted "yes" on October 16 to avoid a default would now vote "yes" on this bill that would bring about a default. So you talk about the message. Essentially, the message of this bill is once again we will utilize the threat of default. That is what this

bill says. When you vote for it, that is precisely what you are saying. So you are saying that serious impairment of our Nation's full faith and credit, which economists warned would plunge us back into recession, was a bad idea on Wednesday, 2 weeks ago, but doing so is a good idea on Wednesday, 2 weeks later, when we vote tomorrow. That is precisely what you are saying. That is your message. So the same person who voted one way then is soon going to vote the other way.

Let me just say why I think this is not within the spirit of an effort at bipartisanship that I referred to earlier and that I think is so important, and the lack of any effort at that has really twisted—I use that word—the strength of this institution.

Just a short time ago, a few weeks ago, as the Republicans took us to the brink of default, the minority leader on the Senate side said:

There is no education in the second kick of a mule, and we are not going to do this again in connection with the debt ceiling or with a government shutdown.

That is precisely what this legislation says—precisely. It says—forget about the second kick of a mule. What it says is that you would do it again in connection with the debt ceiling. So that is your message. And you would do that; you would take us to the brink of default that, earlier this month, the Council of Economic Advisers estimated lost 120,000 jobs that would have been created in October and private forecasters estimated slowed fourth quarter GDP growth by between 0.2 and 0.6 percentage point.

So I think there is no escape from the inconsistency. There is no escape from essentially saying once again there is no real effort to reach across the aisle. There is no real effort to try to instill some belief that the two parties can work together. So that is a bad message, and I guess a lot of you think you can be inconsistent because it will never come up in the Senate. And it won't. But that doesn't take away the fact that there is an inconsistency here, I guess to try to cover some people's votes, to somehow minimize their impact.

But when it comes to the default of the full faith and credit of this country, there has to be something more important than providing us cover. We need to provide cover for the citizens of this country so that they are not vulnerable to playing with the default and the full faith and credit of this country.

So you shouldn't be bringing up this resolution. It will pass, I guess. There will be enough inconsistent votes, and it will go nowhere, but it sends the very, very wrong message.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have so much respect for the long-standing service and distinguished tenure of my colleague on the other side of the aisle, and I just think that there is some clarification that is required in this body and for all who may be watching this evening's proceedings, so let me begin by reminding those who would review the record.

I am not sure I invoked the words “Republican” or “Democrat” in my opening comments. If I did, it certainly wasn't in a partisan nature. Instead, I extended a hand of friendship. I tried to actually increase trust and offered the hope that we might work together, we might actually work together to work on the very problems that caused me to run for office for the first time in 2010: the \$17 trillion national debt that I know has grown to a great degree during the service of the good gentleman on the other side of the aisle who just spoke; the unsustainable entitlement programs that, when push comes to shove and we can no longer find the resources to fund them because people haven't made bold enough leadership decisions, those on the margins of society will be most adversely impacted.

I know these are issues that my good ranking member friend on the other side of the aisle cares about as much as I do. We have just not yet come together and found bipartisan solutions to these things.

Now, the continuing resolution vote that we passed, the package, if you will, the vote that we passed a few days ago, accomplished a few things. We indicated that the President could suspend the debt ceiling, but that move could be checked by votes of disapproval in the House and the Senate. So this was a process that was put into motion by that earlier bipartisan vote that occurred right here in this body.

It is true that it has been made clear over in the other Chamber, the Senate, that the leader there will never bring this bill up in the Senate. That has been made eminently clear. The risk of default is something that ought not be mentioned. We needn't spook the markets here. We will pay our bills in this country. That is something I have been proud to stand for ever since I have been in this body.

The continuing resolution package also indicated that, on February 8, the debt limit would be increased to reflect the borrowing that occurred during the debt limit suspension period, and then the Treasury would be given the ability to create additional headroom via so-called extraordinary measures after the debt limit was reinstated on February 8, 2014.

So that is the larger context here. It sounds to me very procedural, not particularly partisan. In fact, my hope was that this could be offered in the spirit of bipartisanship. This is a messaging bill.

There was an allusion during my good friend's comments to a message

being sent as if that is somehow a negative thing. Now, most of the bills that are introduced in this body are introduced in part, at least, to offer a message to the broader American people, and we stand here and argue on behalf of the message that we are trying to drive home.

The message that I am trying to drive home is that these debt problems have lingered on too long and that to increase a debt limit, to suspend a debt limit, is certainly not to approve further borrowing in the future absent the sort of bold changes that, frankly, have not been enacted when my good friend has served many years in Congress. So that is the larger message here, and that is how I would respond.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished freshman gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), who has had a lot of life's experiences.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, during World War II, man, woman, young, old, rich, poor, everyone in this Nation pulled together to bring our country through a difficult time. It was a bipartisan effort, for sure. After the war, we cut spending and we were a Nation that went to work.

But I ask my colleagues today, as we continue to increase our spending and run up our debt: What is the limit? At what point do you finally say it is dangerous, it is dangerous for the future of America? Is there a limit? We can't keep going in this direction.

No one in this body wants America to default—that is not good for this country—but we need to be serious about what we plan for the future of this country. People are always saying, “Do it for the kids; do it for the kids.” We do a lot for kids, and we can always do more for kids, but what about when those kids today are grown up and they are stuck with all this debt? What are we doing to them?

The Temptations, in the 1970s, had a song that said:

Papa was a rolling stone. And when he died, all he left us was “a loan.”

It was not a compliment. And if it was irresponsible in the 1970s, it is irresponsible today.

I spoke earlier about the Greatest Generation and the legacy they left. What is going to be our legacy? A legacy of nothing but debt?

Can you imagine the potential for opportunity in this country, for investment and for jobs, if we are serious and we are on a solvent course for the United States of America? And the sooner we go in that direction, the more we can do to help Americans that are in need.

It is about stability. It is about certainty for the United States of America.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The gentleman from Indiana mentioned about spooking the market—and

Halloween is in a couple of days. Essentially, what this bill says is you would be willing to spook the market if you could. That is the wrong message.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a veteran of these battles and a friend of Tom Foley's.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, whoever hired the Republican consultants on keeping the majority should be able to get their money back.

I had a thought just a few weeks ago that a small group in this House had such an obsession with the Affordable Care Act and such a dislike for the President that they were prepared not only to close the government, but to attack the integrity of the full faith and credit of the United States. The scorn and ridicule that this caused this Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, because of this strategy to repeal a bill that already had been signed into law and approved by the United States Supreme Court, you would think that no one would want to go anywhere near that again.

But still, we have a bill before us that admittedly has already been rejected by the Senate because we want to remind the American people how totally irresponsible we have been in the past in not only causing our great country to lose \$125 billion, not only the job loss, not only the pain and sacrifice that so many people have gone through because they weren't paid for the work that they were supposed to be doing, but to have the whole country call us irresponsible and to have people who loaned us money be uncertain as to our ability to pay it back, and then we want to revisit this with a bill that is destined to go nowhere.

□ 1800

I am a partisan Democrat, but I am more of a patriot, and I hate to see the Republican Party do this to itself because I really think that our country needs another party, not just a Democratic party. I know that individuals don't care about the national Republican reputation, but what has happened here is that the irresponsibility, the ridicule, the insanity of these strategies has gone beyond the Republican Party in the House. It has now infested part of our party, and people are talking about the Presidency in terms of "bring on the clowns."

This is embarrassing to all of us as Americans, and especially as lawmakers. This body wasn't created for us to send messages; it was created for us to pass laws.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), a hard-working colleague.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) for introducing this resolution.

This is about communicating with the American people. I am not quite

sure what to say after the last speaker, who said he was a partisan Democrat, would not want to come together, both parties, to work together to find a problem to the \$17 trillion of debt that we have. That seems to be more of the problem in Washington today—the fact that parties don't want to work together to find a problem to the threat to our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. YOUNG mentioned earlier that that was the reason that he ran for office—because of the \$17 trillion of debt that at the time in 2010 was roughly closer to \$13 trillion and has only exceeded that since we have been elected to office.

We are Americans first—not partisans, Americans—who believe that we need to pass on a better future for our children and our grandchildren and for future generations here in America. That is what is wrong with Washington: too many partisans.

I believe we have got to find solutions that are going to balance the budget, like Americans do across the country every day, whether it is filling up gas at the gas station or whether it is the book dues for the kids at school, health care costs, the cost of utilities.

People are trying to make ends meet. Instead, Washington is only making it harder, through partisanship, on the American people. Both parties, Republican and Democrat, have driven Washington \$17 trillion in debt. For decades, Republicans and Democrats offered empty promises and cheap excuses, but our fiscal crisis cannot be ignored any more.

The national debt now exceeds our gross domestic product and saddles every American with a \$53,000 share of Washington's red ink. The facts are very clear. Our current path is unsustainable. Although Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security will grow dramatically over the next decade, recent budget debates between Congress and the White House have largely ignored these key drivers of the debt. So what is going to happen? Washington is going to continue to stumble from one crisis to the next. This is no way to run a country.

Madam Speaker, it is irresponsible to raise the debt ceiling without tackling the underlying spending problems of this crisis. Hoosiers don't expect Republicans and Democrats to agree on every proposal, but they do expect us to make the difficult choices to put us on a path of fiscal stability. Now is the time for both parties to break Washington's cycle of manufactured crises and pay down our debt.

I thank the gentleman for bringing this resolution to the floor of the House so we can discuss not only the spending problems, but what is the problem underlying the spending habits and the spending problems in Washington. Is it just ObamaCare, as the gentleman said previously? ObamaCare

is part of the problem of our spending in Washington. Washington continues to look out for Washington interests and special interests rather than looking out for American interests.

Mr. YOUNG, thank you for bringing this important resolution. If there is anything that threatens our security, it is our national debt. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 2011, Admiral Mike Mullen, said that this is the greatest threat to our national security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman.

As I mentioned, Admiral Mike Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 2011, after the last debt ceiling discussion in July and August of 2011, said that the debt was the greatest threat to our national security.

Not only is it a threat to our ability to protect our country militarily, but it is an even greater threat to our country economically. Families are feeling the brunt day to day in the fact that salaries are not increasing, jobs are not being created. This is the fundamental crisis that our country is facing today, and we do need to talk about it, and we do need to share with one another here in Congress ideas and ways that we can tackle our debt problems.

Mr. YOUNG, thank you for this resolution. I proudly support it, and I am glad to work with anyone, Republican or Democrat, to tackle our debt problems.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (DANNY K. DAVIS), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding.

I hope that we have learned from 3 weeks ago, and that we are not easing down the road to brinksmanship once again. Every American will pay another heavy price if some of our colleagues are able to again trigger another shutdown of the government.

I agree with President Obama that the full faith and credit of our country is not negotiable. If there are colleagues who are thinking about it, I would urge you not to do it. Don't create higher mortgage costs. Don't cause investors to lose on their retirement plans. Don't cause doctors and hospitals to wonder whether or not they are going to be paid for treating Medicare and Medicaid patients. Don't cause student loans to go up. Don't create anxiety for more than 10 million seniors who will be wondering whether

or not they are going to get their Social Security checks. Don't create concern among veterans who will be wondering whether or not they are going to get their disability benefit checks.

Anybody that might be thinking about it, I would urge you not to do it. Don't attempt to hold the debt ceiling hostage. I would say, as it was said in the Book of Isaiah, Come and let us reason together, because if we don't, then the whole country will suffer. Come and let us find the way to work in a way that our problems can be dealt with. I believe that we can do it. It has been done before.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I end with: let's do it. Let's show the American people that we can work in a bipartisan way and solve the problems and meet the needs of the people of this country.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), a distinguished colleague.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of my colleague from Indiana bringing this before the House for discussion.

The reality is, the staggering fact is that since the President's reelection through to the next debt limit vote, Washington will have added about \$1 trillion to our national debt—in exchange for what? For no spending reductions, in exchange for maintaining the status quo.

This is not, as Democrats would argue, about paying our bills; it is about mortgaging our Nation's future. Not only must we vote "yes" on this resolution to disapprove of this culture of debt, but it is also time to bring long overdue transparency to the process.

As we approached the so-called "default deadline," the White House press secretary told reporters that Secretary Lew did not say we risked default at midnight on October 17; only that we were likely to exhaust our borrowing authority that day. The press corps, as you might recall, responded in disbelief that their doomsday default clocks may actually be wrong. Let's be clear: we were not going to default.

Why do I say that? Ask the Vice President, who disappeared for a couple of weeks. It was the Vice President who went to China in August of 2011 and told the Chinese we would never default. Moody's said we were not going to default. The markets showed little volatility. They knew we would not default. Default was just a scare tactic to scare the American people, and we as elected Representatives had no access to the actual data to determine how much borrowing authority the Secretary and the administration had left. We were simply left to take Jack Lew's word for it. In the future, I believe we must require a fuller accounting of how extraordinary measures are used, reported, and are re-

maining by any administration. In the words of Ronald Reagan, we should "trust, but verify."

Madam Speaker, earlier this year, the President sent us a budget that never balances. In fact, he has done that now for 5 years straight. That means under his plan, time and time and time and time and time again, we would only add to our national debt and never pay it off.

A vote today to disapprove this debt limit increase may have little impact on the previous \$17 trillion in debt or the next \$600 billion in debt that we approved as a body a few weeks ago, but it does say three things:

It is time to end our culture of debt; It is time to end the Washington status quo;

It is time to end the crisis of out-of-control spending and massive debt.

I appreciate my colleague's leadership on this matter.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

I rise in opposition to this resolution, but I am strongly in favor of the process that we are using to deal with the debt limit. There is a difference.

If this resolution to force an unprecedented default passes both this House and the Senate, the President can decide to sign it or not. Even if he doesn't sign it, Congress will have another opportunity to stop a debt ceiling raise.

This is a process that the Senate Republican leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, first suggested in 2011 and has been used in debt limit bills to avoid defaulting since. It is good enough to use right now, it has been good enough to use for 2 years, and it is good enough to help us avoid these manufactured crises on a permanent basis.

This is a process that helps us separate the true need for congressional intervention on the debt limit from those that are manufactured and motivated by politics. This is a process that works and helps us avoid unnecessary pain. We should never have a replay of the hostage-taking and brinksmanship that we recently went through to get to this point.

We know what we have to do, and we know we should not be playing games with the debt limit. That is why I offer a bill that would make this process permanent and keep this Nation fiscally solvent. Senators BOXER, SCHUMER, and HIRONO introduced this very same bill today in the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HONDA. I support this process, and I hope my colleagues will support my efforts to make it the permanent solution to the debt crisis.

I urge a "no" vote on the resolution, but I support this process that allows it.

□ 1815

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and my friend and colleague.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 99, offered by the gentleman from Indiana, my good friend and colleague on the House Ways and Means Committee.

And I want to be clear: this is not a resolution for default. This is an opportunity to talk about how we have got to, when raising the debt ceiling, deal with the underlying drivers of the debt.

History shows numerous instances in which spending cuts and reforms have been coupled with increases in the debt limit. This dates back to the inception of the debt ceiling limit in 1917. It also includes two instances during the 110th Congress when President Obama served in the Senate.

Further, in March 2006, then-Senator Obama voted against raising the debt limit. And we have heard some folks tonight talk about how they agree with President Obama. Well, let's listen to what he said in March 2006:

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

Well, I also agreed with then-Senator, now President, Obama. And it is abundantly clear that no one is going to fail to raise the debt ceiling. No one is going to jeopardize our credit, but we must speak out on the failure to address the debt drivers.

In July 2008, then-Senator Obama said that adding \$4 trillion to the national debt over 8 years was "irresponsible" and "unpatriotic." I agree with what he said then.

Since he became President in 2009, President Obama has increased the total Federal debt from \$10.6 trillion to over \$17 trillion. One has to wonder what then-Senator Obama would have to say about President Obama.

He has continually called for raising the debt ceiling during his Presidency without implementing any of the necessary reforms needed to get our Federal spending under control.

My focus has always been on working with anyone who is willing to find a real, long-term solution to Washington's spending addiction. This resolution shows the House is ready to start talking across party lines about how to fix our debt problems now, not at the next deadline.

Late last year, CNN reported that "the United States spends about 71

cents of every Federal tax dollar it collects on what is called the Big 4—Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and interest on the debt.”

If nothing is done, in just 13 years the Big 4 could eat up every penny of tax revenue collected by the Federal Government, leaving nothing to pay for the discretionary spending that we like. That includes spending on defense, veterans benefits, education, roads, national parks, museums, medical research, food safety and air traffic control, to name a few.

CNN further said that “by 2040, more than half of all Federal tax revenue would be eaten up by interest payments on the debt alone.”

In 2006, then-Senator Obama said those “interest payments are a significant tax on all Americans, a debt tax that Washington doesn’t want to talk about.”

But let’s be clear: House Republicans in Congress, and the voters who put us here, are the only reason—the only reason—anyone in August of 2011 talked about the debt problem and reached a debt deal. Otherwise, the President would have simply had the debt ceiling raised, and there would have been nothing done structurally.

And we are the only reason why we talk about it now. Otherwise, it would be a clean debt ceiling increase with no strings attached.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important resolution and getting our excessive spending under control.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time, and I will speak very briefly because the message here is so clear, that those who vote for this bill are saying they are willing to use the threat of default once again, and we shouldn’t be doing this.

I don’t think the Nation believed that this government and its programs would be shut down; but it turned out, because of the way the Republicans handled it, this government was shut down, and programs were very much undercut that were needed by the people of this country.

We came within a flicker of default. The consequences of playing with that were very, very substantial.

So now, once again, the Republicans bring up a bill, and whatever the reason is, are giving people a chance, once again, to say that playing with default is a legitimate method of operation. You shouldn’t do this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just like to reiterate five key points:

One, our current national debt exceeds \$17 trillion, an amount that is greater than our annual GDP, the size of our economy.

Two, while I and so many others in my party agree with many of my col-

leagues across the aisle that risking default is irresponsible, it is just as irresponsible to ignore why our debt is so darn high and what it means for the future of our country.

Three, we can and must work across partisan lines to avoid default in conjunction with a debt ceiling vote or a default related to a continued failure to address the largest drivers of our debt; and we must begin that work now, not at the last minute, or the next self-imposed fiscal deadline.

Four, those who have served here for decades have known for decades that our population was growing older, that health care costs were rising, and that our long-term fiscal trajectory was unsustainable; but nothing has happened.

Five, this recognition that Washington continually misses opportunities to put our country on a path to fiscal health ought to be something on which we can all agree.

I urge all my colleagues who want to see our country address our long-term challenges before it is too late to vote “yes” on this resolution of disapproval.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 99.

My Republican colleagues can’t help themselves. It wasn’t enough that they nearly caused a global economic meltdown by forcing the government to close and stonewalling an increase in the debt limit earlier this month. Now they want to do it all over again by revoking the President’s authority to raise the debt limit, which Congress granted him in a bipartisan manner. Republicans in the House aren’t just welching on that compromise, but they’re also signaling their intention to take the country over the brink again, all to score political points.

This is a farcical exercise and one undeserving of this body’s consideration. I would hope that early October’s nightmare taught us a lesson or two, but it appears that some of my colleagues haven’t learned a thing. All of this boils down to a simple question: Do you support preventing a catastrophic worldwide economic calamity that will decimate the lives of your constituents? If so, then vote down H.J. Res. 99.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the statute, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF OAIL ANDREW “BUM” PHILLIPS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in about 2 hours today, in Houston, at the Lakewood Church, we in Houston will honor the famed, the humble, and the especially loved Oail Andrew “Bum” Phillips, our favorite coach, Coach Bum Phillips of the Houston Oilers, our friend, my friend.

We lost Coach Phillips October 18, 2013, at his home, his ranch in Texas. I offer to his wife, his son and daughters and grandchildren and great-grandchildren my deepest sympathy.

But I know, as he is honored this evening, there will be a celebration of his life; for Bum Phillips was the kind of character-building leader that led young men into the most winningest franchise of the then-Houston Oilers. He did it because he had a championship spirit, and he had the ability to add quips to anything that you would ask him.

When asked one time about Earl Campbell, he said, “What kind of class is Earl Campbell in? He may not be in a class all by himself, but it doesn’t take long to call the roll.”

When asked about the Dallas Cowboys as America’s team, Bum said, “The Dallas Cowboys may be America’s team, but the Houston Oilers are Texas’ team.”

Tonight I know there will be many who will celebrate his life and the service he gave.

I want to thank Mike Barber for organizing this great effort. I will miss being there, but Bum, I want to thank you. Coach Bum Phillips, I want to thank you for the joy you brought to Houston, the excitement of the team, the spirit of winning and losing, the fairness and the balance that you added to those young men that were under your tutelage.

You went on to coach the New Orleans Saints, but you will always be special in our hearts, and I hope this body will offer a moment of silence for our dear friend, the Nation’s friend, Texas’ friend, Coach Bum Phillips.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing this tribute on the floor to this great American, Coach Bum Phillips.

COMMEMORATING THE 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF SUPERSTORM SANDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New

York (Mr. TONKO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on this evening of October 29, we commemorate the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy, which devastated the east coast. Many are still recovering from that tragic storm, and it certainly was a major force to be reckoned with.

That force of nature was, at one point, nearly 1,000 miles wide over the ocean front, and when it landed in southern Jersey, it was nearly 900 miles wide. It impacted so many States; 24 States, in number, felt the impact of that superstorm.

It was devastation to property; it was devastation to lives: 162 people in the United States lost their lives. And the fact that the storm surged to some record proportions reminds us of the impact of climate change.

□ 1830

Now as a member of the New York delegation in this House, my area received some mild impact from that superstorm. But ironically, the year before, Hurricanes Irene and Lee impacted the upstate region of New York and, again, devastated our area with loss of life, certainly of valuable farmland that was eroded, and damage to communities, businesses, and farms across the upstate region.

These are issues that are brought to mind this evening as we commemorate that 1-year anniversary, as many continue to struggle to recover from the ravages of Mother Nature.

The cost of climate inaction is severe. Climate change is an issue of science. It is certainly an issue of public health. And most definitely, it is an issue of economics, economic vitality.

Earlier, the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition, which is a growing number—56, to be exact—of Democrats in the House looking to bring about significant policy reforms that speak to the environmental and energy needs of this Nation, began to provide a laser-sharp focus on the cost of climate change to our economy.

In 2011 and 2012, there were some 25 extreme weather events that caused at least \$1 billion each or more in damages. Total estimated economic damages were approaching \$200 billion, and the cost to taxpayers, some \$136 billion. The cost to individual taxpayers totaled \$1.61 billion. So we know that there is a tremendous impact here that has been realized by the lack of a focus on climate change and global warming.

As we continue to look at recovery—even from Irene and Lee in the upstate New York portion—as we look at the impact, the damage that came with Superstorm Sandy, as we look at the damage recently to Colorado, and if we look at the other extreme—not rainfall and flooding, but certainly drought and

looking at the wildfires that have consumed some States in our country, there is definitely economic consequence that comes with climate change.

In my territory, in my area that is part of the 20th Congressional District, it becomes very apparent that we need to do more than just replace. If data compiled are telling us that extreme rainfall has been part of the last decade or two, then wise, effective government will not merely replace but reevaluate how to reconfigure, for instance, a bridge that may cross, traverse one of the creeks. I know that that is the case in many locations.

Looking at electric utilities, looking at what withstood the pressures of the storm; combined heat and power systems that we will talk about during this hour that apparently withstood greater pressure than some of the traditional systems, so we go forward with not just merely replacement, but we go forward with a renewal, a revision of how to take that area that was affected and make it work again. That is sound government. That is effective government.

Tonight we are joined by several colleagues. We are joined by Representative RUSH HOLT from the State of New Jersey, and we are joined by Representative SCOTT PETERS from the State of California. We may be visited by other colleagues this evening. We are going to talk about impacts they have seen perhaps in their region and talk about the science and economics related to climate change.

I believe we, through SEEC, through the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition, have brought about the discussion, have developed the dialogue, have encouraged moving forward, if you will, on this very important dynamic, understanding it full well so that we can move into prevention because the question asked here by a growing number of colleagues is, how long can we afford to go without a plan of action before we understand that the cost of replacement or renewal or transformation is going to drain the taxpayers, is going to drain the individuals and families impacted, the businesses impacted? No one wins in that scenario.

So, Representative RUSH HOLT, if you would like to share some thoughts this evening as we begin our hour, we welcome you.

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend from New York (Mr. TONKO) for arranging this discussion.

It is well worth recognizing the anniversary of this devastating storm because it might be said this was a storm like we have never seen before. That may be true, but I don't think it is correct to say this is a storm such as we will never see again.

A year ago, Hurricane Sandy devastated New Jersey and much of the

east coast. The storm may have faded from the headlines, but New Jerseyans haven't forgotten. It is felt in a very personal and painful way by thousands and thousands of New Jerseyans still today.

These New Jerseyans are not alone. I mean that in two senses. First, we can hear from some who are representative of the millions. But also, when we hear from the younger New Jerseyans who are affected, we understand that they represent the future that will be affected by climate change. Quite simply, superstorms like Sandy are the new normal, and we had better get used to it, even if climate change skeptics claim otherwise.

I think response to Sandy means, of course, tending to the human needs of those who have been victims of the storm, but it also means making significant investments in power engineering and transportation engineering and rail engineering and wireless engineering and shoreline engineering and river flood control engineering and residential planning, and taking steps to deal with the root cause of what we see.

We may not be able to stop hurricanes in their tracks. In fact, we certainly can't. But we can make sure that our infrastructure and our environment and our communities are more resilient when they strike, and if we work hard as a Nation and as humanity, we may be able to stem the climate change that will result in more and more powerful superstorms.

I know some in Washington are skeptical of the role of the Federal Government in fighting climate change, but as Sandy's \$83 billion pricetag should make clear, society, our economy, yes, and our government will bear the costs of climate change one way or another. If we make the investments today, as the debts are coming due, we would do far better than to wait to pick up the pieces after other superstorms hit.

I will be happy, as we go along, to talk about some specific New Jerseyans who were affected. I will be happy to talk about some of the science that suggests where we are as a world. Mostly, I just want to make the point that this is the new normal that we should be prepared for.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you very much, Representative HOLT. Certainly your State, my home State suffered economic consequences to the nth degree. It is a stark reminder that the cost of inaction here is painfully borne by taxpayers into the future also.

So I am proud of the SEEC organization, the coalition raising the consciousness of the House as to the importance of this issue.

We are joined by Representative SCOTT PETERS from California. Representative PETERS has worked in the environmental arena and has contributed greatly in that regard. We are

proud to have you join us this evening, Representative.

Mr. PETERS of California. Thank you very much, Mr. TONKO. I appreciate the chance to speak with you on this special occasion.

I am the climate task force chair of the House Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition, SEEC, and I rise to recognize the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy and to recognize those who have lost their lives as well as those continuing to rebuild from the destruction.

I might mention, for the benefit of Mr. HOLT, that I am a graduate of Westfield High. I spent my high school years in New Jersey. I still have sisters in Chatham and New Providence and nieces and nephews. I visited regularly Long Beach Island, Ship Bottom, and Beach Haven for family vacations. So I know well a lot of those areas and how hard they have been hit both from a personal and an economic standpoint.

I want to speak a little bit too about San Diego, though, as it has been my home for 25 years. My constituents in San Diego have experienced and know the long rebuilding and recovery process after disaster strikes, and we have a little bit of a different effect from climate change and global warming.

October marks the 10-year anniversary—and I think the anniversary was a few days ago—of the beginning of the Cedar Fire, the largest wildfire in California history. As a San Diego City Council member at the time, I remember firsthand the destructive impact of this fire on people's lives. It destroyed hundreds of homes, personal belongings and memories, and the recovery costs were in the billions of dollars.

The Cedar Fire burned through 273,246 acres of San Diego County, destroyed 2,232 homes, and took 15 lives. It burned through 95 acres of the Cuyamaca State Park and blazed through 98 percent of its mature conifer trees. To date, little of the forest has grown back from the bare mineral soil left behind by the wildfire.

The community faced similar damage in 2007 during the Witch Creek Fire, and parts of the city of San Diego were also scarred at that time.

Wildfires aren't new to California, but the damages from these fires are rising. This will sound familiar when we think about the warmest years on record all being recent. In California, 12 of the 20 most damaging wildfires occurred in the last 10 years. This has huge implications for California's tourism and farming industries. For example, take the Rim Fire this summer that pushed into parts of the Yosemite National Park and devastated local tourism.

After the Cedar Fire, San Diego, the county and the city, are undoubtedly more prepared and ready to respond to a large wildfire. We have better communication equipment, better commu-

nication among agencies, and better fire equipment in general. More importantly, we have worked to minimize further damage through better planning. As Thom Porter, the chief of the San Diego Fire Authority said, "It's not about stopping a fire from occurring but preventing the amount of damage it causes."

Today San Diego has new planning guidelines and building codes and 100-foot brush clearance requirements around homes. Before 2003, it was just 30 feet. We found that we could decrease risk and save homes and lives.

Resiliency starts at the local level because they know the conditions and the situations on the ground. They are the people who can talk to the neighbors about what they have to do to be ready. We have to make our communities more resilient to wildfires, hurricanes, and other extreme weather.

In the last 5 years, wildfires have cost taxpayers more than \$1.6 billion a year. Last year, 9.2 million acres were burned by wildfires, which is an area bigger than the States of Delaware, Rhode Island, and Connecticut combined.

In June, I introduced the bipartisan STRONG Act so the Federal Government could give tools for planning and resiliency to State and local actors. I think one of the first things we noticed as freshmen here, one of the first votes we were asked to take, was \$60 billion for Sandy relief, which was the appropriate vote to take. We have spent \$136 billion on relief in the last 2 years off the budget.

Every dollar we spend now on disaster preparedness and resiliency, we can avoid at least \$4 in future losses and FEMA expenses. We can bounce back faster with less economic damage. Each day that a community is disrupted by extreme weather, we lose economic output. So we need to be doing more to support our local communities with emergency management communication, public health, and energy reliability in the event of an extreme weather event, whether it is a wildfire or something like Superstorm Sandy.

Swiss Re, a major reinsurer, recently ranked the top 10 metro areas in North and Central America that face the highest value of working days lost from natural perils. Nine of them were in the United States.

On this occasion, I commit with my colleagues to better protect my district from the devastation caused by extreme weather by working to rebuild stronger and smarter with a mind for the future.

Again, thank you very much for inviting me. I would be happy to discuss some of these items.

□ 1845

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative PETERS.

We are also joined by Representative DENNY HECK from Washington State, who is a freshman but has brought a very strong voice of advocacy for the environment to this Chamber. We are proud to have him join us this evening and raise again the dialogue that is so essential about climate change, global warming, and the economic impact that every region across this country is experiencing.

So, welcome, Representative HECK, and thank you for being such an outstanding advocate.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Thank you, sir. Thank you for the privilege to be able to add my voice to this also.

As a member of the House Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, I stand here today as well to recognize the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy and remember all those whose lives were lost and all those left behind who are in the process of continuing to rebuild their lives from that destruction—not just in the months ahead but, undoubtedly, in the years ahead. Our Nation must—it can, it will, and it should—stand with those families and businesses as they undertake that task all along the Atlantic coast as they seek to recover.

I actually come from about as far away from that in the continental United States as possible. I am from Washington State, and so the district that I have the honor to represent was not directly affected by Superstorm Sandy. However, my district has begun to feel the very real effects of climate change.

Science has shown that climate change is driving an ongoing decrease in seawater pH. Scientists refer to that as "ocean acidification."

You might ask, How does that happen? Truthfully, with all due respect to my colleague from New Jersey, you don't have to be a "Jeopardy!" champion to get this. In fact, you only need be exposed to a junior high- or senior high-level biology or chemistry course.

It only stands to reason that as more and more carbon is emitted into the atmosphere, not all of it goes into the atmosphere, but, in fact, a goodly portion of it is absorbed by what covers approximately three-fourths of our little globe's surface, namely the ocean. And that carbon being absorbed into the ocean does, in fact, affect the pH level.

So ocean acidification, in turn, affects marine life in a lot of different ways; but the effect that I am the most familiar with is the damage that it causes to shellfish, including the shellfish grown at farms in my districts, specifically in Mason County. Indeed, I am proud to tell that you the largest shellfish farm in America, Taylor Shellfish Farms, is located, along with many others, in the 10th Congressional District of Washington State.

The acidity in the water—the direct result of carbon emitted into atmosphere absorbed by the ocean—makes it

difficult for the shellfish to grow and harden their shells. Frankly, it decreases survival rates. It makes it harder to raise shellfish.

More than 3,200 people in our State—a lot of them in my district—are employed directly or indirectly in the shellfish industry and by growers. The estimated total economic contribution is well over a quarter-billion dollars. But that entire industry is threatened by ocean acidification resulting from climate change. It is totally threatened by this.

I have said here on this floor and elsewhere many times that a healthy economy is completely dependent and requires a healthy environment. The effect of climate change on Washington State's shellfish industry is but one of the clearest examples of that fact.

Washington State has a climate change adaptation strategy that we are working on with our regional neighbors—and, I might add, with some degree of progress. But without the involvement at the Federal level and with the Federal Government, our plan isn't going to be successful. The reason: this is a global problem that will require global action; and global action is only going to occur if the United States leads, which it has so often in the past.

And so, sir, on this occasion, the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy, I also commit to better protecting the district I represent, our Nation, and the planet from the devastating effects of climate change. We have been waiting long enough. The science is in, and it is time to act.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative HECK.

We have also been joined by yet another freshman of the House, from the State of Pennsylvania, another strong friend of the environment and a person who has spent much of his career defending the environment. Representative MATT CARTWRIGHT joins us this evening.

Welcome. Thank you for participating with the SEEC coalition.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. It is my pleasure, my dear friend and colleague from New York.

It is almost hard to believe, I would say, that we are noting the 1-year anniversary of the terrible storm we called Hurricane Sandy striking our Nation's shores. It seems like no more than 6 or 7 months ago that that all happened.

Maybe one of the reasons is that it was so horrific, so damaging, so devastating, that the harm continues. There are still families searching for a place to live. There are Americans still digging out from this problem, trying to salvage the situation for themselves and their families. And so it is almost hard to believe that it was a full year ago that this happened.

This is a country that suffered so much in loss because of Hurricane

Sandy, with \$245 billion in business losses and \$50 billion in property damage.

I come from Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania, so far as it is from the seacoast, still had 1.2 million residents lose electricity during that event. In my own district, up in the hills of the 17th District of Pennsylvania, we still lost power for 53,000 residents.

Indeed, I am so sorry to say that we had several lives lost in my district due to Hurricane Sandy; people who perished because of falling tree limbs and because of hypothermia due to exposure. We had somebody we lost because of exposure to carbon monoxide because of generator fumes that were emitted during the blackout.

We had tens of thousands of homes and businesses damaged in my district because of Hurricane Sandy. So don't think we didn't notice it either and don't think we didn't pay attention to the suffering of all of the other Americans because of Hurricane Sandy.

There is no denying that there is climate change. There is just no denying it. We can argue all day about what is causing it and what to do about it, but there is no denying that it is happening and that it is resulting in more and more frequent weather events like this and more and more severe weather events like this. There is no denying that these things are happening, and there is no denying the damage and harm that comes to our Nation as a result.

In 2011 and 2012, there were 25 severe weather events that caused a billion dollars or more in damage each; 25 of them were in a 2-year span. The total price tag for that was \$188 billion in property damage to our Nation. And the taxpayers had to pick up \$136 billion of those losses because that is what we do in emergency relief and in flood insurance and in crop insurance. These weather events cost taxpayers money.

We have something in the legislature called the GAO. The GAO used to stand for the General Accounting Office. In 2004, we changed the name to the General Accountability Office, better to reflect the mission of that office—accountability and the proper husbanding of the assets and resources of the Federal Government. And they keep track of these things.

Every year, they come up with something that they call the GAO High Risk Report. The GAO High Risk Report is a compilation of all the risks and assets and finances we have in this Nation as part of our government. It is a list of the things that threaten the assets of the Federal Government. For the first time, earlier this year, the GAO High Risk Report included climate change as a reason for risk to the American Government's assets.

This is not just about security. It is not just about infrastructure. It is not

just about damage to agriculture. It is not just about risk to the health and well-being of all Americans. It is also about financial losses to the American Federal Government, because, after all, we are an insurance company.

We are a government that insures against flood. We are a government that insures against crop damage. We do that. That is something that we have thought about and something that makes sense for our Nation. But we end up in the position of an insurance company, and we end up paying the price tag when these storms happen. The GAO recognizes that and recognizes that climate change is a major driver in the risks to the American finances as a result of these programs that we do.

As a result of all of that, in a few months, I will be introducing a comprehensive climate adaptation bill. Because, again, we can argue until the cows come home about what causes climate change and what the effects of it are, but one thing that can't be denied and that the GAO doesn't even deny is that this costs American taxpayers money, and the best way to handle that is to plan for it. And so, with the support of the White House, I will be introducing a comprehensive climate adaptation bill later this year. It should be out in a few months.

And so, on this, the 1-year anniversary of the horrible tragedy that was Hurricane Sandy, we remember the devastation and we remember the losses. We remember the loss of life. We remember the communities that are continuing to struggle with the damage that was caused by that storm. And I say it is time for us also to plan for the future to minimize these losses that will continue to happen as the planet climate continues to change.

Mr. TONKO. The Representative talks about the growing acknowledgment by agencies and various elements of government, and I can tell you also a personal experience of watching the constituents in our area understand more starkly and painfully the impact of global warming in the aftermath of Irene and Lee.

Representative PETERS has long promoted the awareness concept—wanting people to understand the awareness of global warming and climate change.

Your thoughts on that.

Mr. PETERS of California. Just to follow on.

I think what Mr. CARTWRIGHT said is exactly right. We don't know that our house is going to burn down, yet we buy fire insurance because we know that there is a risk of it.

I often hear in this building, unfortunately, a lot of professed doubts about climate change; but even though I disagree with it, I think the science is pretty clear. If you doubt it, that doesn't mean it is not going to happen and you don't prepare for it and you

don't plan for it and you don't make the investments to be more resilient, which is what the STRONG Act is about.

So I completely agree. In the face of doubt, that doubt should not equal inaction. The fact that we have the strong evidence that this is happening, that we have had these off-budget expenses, is every reason in the world we need here to plan.

I would say to folks listening at home that they need to get in touch with people in this body to let them know that.

One thing I would just add briefly about what we did in San Diego, I was chair of a volunteer climate initiative which was part of the San Diego Foundation's effort to do civic engagement. What we tried to do was, through philanthropy, provide good support for decisionmaking locally around climate, because a lot of leadership, as you know, Mr. TONKO, is happening at the local level.

We provided research on science. We did a study of what the major climate effects in San Diego would be, which are more intense wildfires, water supply threats, and sea level rise—no surprise to anyone here. And we were able to give that information to our elected officials so that they knew what we had to plan with locally.

We also did a public opinion survey just to let them know what people thought. It turned out that people in San Diego wanted to be leaders on climate action. First of all, they wanted to be leaders in the State. They also didn't want the jobs associated with the industrial opportunities to be going to China or Texas. So we were able to arm our elected officials with that information and made them a lot bolder about taking the actions that we needed to take.

I bet the people in this body would benefit from the same kind of information and wouldn't be surprised that America is behind us in taking action, particularly on getting ready and being resilient and being prepared to save money down the road.

□ 1900

No one likes spending \$134 billion off-budget. I certainly didn't, and I know my colleagues don't. There is no need to do that. We can be prepared.

Again, thank you very much for scheduling this at this hour.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you very much, Representative PETERS.

The gentleman makes mention of awareness and of the many visuals out there that strike awareness even a coast away.

Representative HOLT, I just noticed recently in the news the reopening of the boardwalk—of the very famous, traditional boardwalk in your home State—as you continue to recover from the damages of Superstorm Sandy. The

awareness is an amazing piece of the action here, and something as visible and understandable as that boardwalk brings it home for many people far removed from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Some of the repair has taken place, but the recovery takes a very long time.

Today, three New Jerseyans came to visit me.

One, Eric, from Jersey City, had been ready to open his bakery with his wife when Sandy hit. The bakery was flooded by 6 feet of water, and a lot of equipment was damaged. It delayed until fairly recently the opening of that bakery, and of course there was the loss of income to that family.

Norma, from Seaside Park, was displaced by severe flooding, nearly 4 feet. We can talk about the depth of the storm surge or about the record low barometric pressure or what the wind speed was, but we mustn't lose sight of the people who were affected here. Norma had space in her home that was flooded, and so she lost the rental income for that space. She is still cleaning up. Incidentally, she is a science supervisor at a local school, and is now talking personally about climate change and extreme weather.

April, from Jersey City, is a single mother of a child with asthma, who was uprooted because of the flooding from Sandy. She is now dealing with mold issues in her child's school as a result of the flooding, and she has gotten involved in helping low-income families recover from Sandy.

I want to make this point about who is hurt the most.

Researchers at Rutgers University in New Jersey looked at families who are employed but who are struggling. These would be asset-limited people, people who are barely earning a living. This makes up, really, about a third of New Jerseyans. They have no cushion. Yet about a third of New Jerseyans incurred more than half of the residential damage—the cost—and are obtaining only slightly more than a quarter of the resources that are available for rebuilding. So low-income families, who tend to have less safe, less resilient housing, are the ones who suffer the most damage. Many who work hourly jobs are less able to deal with the loss of wages that occur from these disasters. Many of them were underinsured, and about 90 percent did not have flood insurance. So it is only a fraction of the people in New Jersey, but it is a very large fraction of the people, who suffered the really severe damage.

As bad as this is in America, the effects of climate change are even worse in developing countries around the world. Developing nations are more vulnerable to crop failure. Tropical diseases are very sensitive to climate change. Malaria and dengue fever and diarrheal disease are more prevalent

now because of climate change, and developing nations are less able to afford the damage that results.

I got in some trouble earlier this year—I was challenged earlier this year—when I said we have got to deal with climate change or millions will die. In fact, I looked it up. The World Health Organization estimates that climate change is already causing 140,000 deaths per year—more than would have occurred without the climate change—primarily in developing countries. So it doesn't take very many years before, indeed, millions are dying. That is something of the human cost of what we are talking about.

Mr. TONKO. In every measurement that we make, there is a huge impact that climate change calculates to the negative. You talked about the impact worldwide. It is the sightings of a perfect storm, with less available land as it erodes with these floodings and with a growing population worldwide. That is the formation of a perfect storm.

But when we look closer to home, in these United States, you and I are part of the delegations that represent coastal States. The coastal erosion and the erosion of valuable farmland in my district are realities, and it is measurable already. The forewarnings are out there to take action to prevent further erosion. When you think of that impact, it comes in several dimensions, perhaps agricultural in nature as it is a major sector of our economy in this country, or in tourism. One of the bits of erosion that I saw—one of the impacts that came—was with tourism infrastructure, with very valuable historic sites that were nearly ruined and that are along the beds of creeks and rivers that are tourism destinations but that now are shut for business as they get repaired. Some of these elements are extremely delicate, and part of our fabric as a Nation is to be able to share our sense of history with either other people of the United States or with visitors who travel to this land, so there are impacts that come.

I would also talk about the infrastructure impacts on the energy side. We witnessed situations in which some fared better than others, and I was proud of our SEEC organization. Now, you and I are longtime charter members of SEEC, and I am proud of the fact that we called upon the Sandy Rebuilding Task Force to help communities rebuild stronger and smarter by having the task force issue guidance for combined heat and power, CHP systems. Those systems fared well in areas ravaged by these superstorms.

CHP, as many know, is an innovative sort of concept, an energy-efficient method for generating electricity and harnessing heat, the thermal energy that accompanies that. In CHP systems, heat that normally is wasted—allowed to escape—is captured and recovered as useful energy, and that allows

us to require and to, perhaps, promote this integrated concept approach far more efficient than conventional power generation would be. Conventional methods have a typical combined efficiency of 45 percent, while CHP can operate as high as 80 percent. This technology is not only efficient; it also has demonstrated resiliency to extreme weather events. I can cite South Oaks Hospital on Long Island, which is a hospital facility that includes an acute psychiatric hospital, a nursing home and an assisted living center. During the storm and its aftermath, the hospital maintained full power through the use of its 1.3 megawatt CHP system.

Again, lessons, hopefully, will be learned. So, as we go to replace, we also have to transition some of our thinking and make certain that we are building systems that will be able to endure these storms into the future. Certainly amongst our priorities has got to be this all-out effort to combat global warming, climate change, to make certain that we do all of our preventative measures. Then when we rebuild, we do it in a way that is efficient so that sound government, smart government, is the tool that is reached to rather than awkwardly replacing in a sort of rush order to get us back into a working progressive outcome, but where we haven't addressed some of the dynamics of the ravages of weather, which is teaching us several lessons as we go through these many storms.

So you are absolutely right. The people are the most impacted here. We have to keep them front and center in our thinking, but all of these services that either provide jobs for people or provide economic opportunities, economic growth, or that meet their public safety needs or their energy needs or their household needs or their business needs have got to be brought into this calculus that is adjusting concepts based on the theory of climate change, and where we, again, underscore the importance of prevention.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that all of our colleagues understand that when my friend from New York talks in detail about new energy systems that he is talking about human welfare, that he is talking about addressing the human cost that we were speaking of earlier. In other words, it is not just a matter of providing energy for people to power our economy and provide comfortable daily lives; it is also a matter of doing it in a way that avoids this enormous human cost from climate change. The way we produce and use energy is the greatest insult to our planet. It is changing our very climate, and we must address that. The sooner we address it, the more effective we will be at addressing it, and the more of these costs we can avoid.

It is unmistakable, unequivocal, that global warming has taken place and is

taking place. Just in the past month, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change came out with its fifth very carefully prepared report. It says that global temperatures are likely to rise from a third of a degree to 4½ degrees, roughly, Celsius, and that sea levels will rise. It is certain that the upper ocean has already warmed over the last three decades. It is certain that the upper ocean has already absorbed carbon dioxide, making it more acidic, as we heard from our friends earlier.

Most of the aspects of climate change will continue for centuries with the result in a cost in lives and dollars if the CO₂ emissions are not brought under control. In fact, some of these costs will be incurred now even if we bring CO₂ emissions under control because of the damage already done, but it is important to emphasize that it comes down to the human cost. That is what we mustn't forget in all of the charts and graphs and scientific discussions of the causes and effects of climate change.

Mr. TONKO. I think it is very important for us to recognize, too, that here this evening you and several of our colleagues and I have shared thoughts about painful consequences in our given regions, or we have talked about not only flooding but drought situations and wildfires. We have talked about the economic impact of climate change with these associated storms. We have talked about the recovery efforts. We have talked about Superstorm Sandy on this 1-year commemoration date, still finding its neighborhoods, its communities, its people, its businesses, its farming communities still struggling to recover. We have talked about all of this, and now I think we need to close, in the remaining minutes we have in this hour, and talk about a plan of action.

□ 1915

Now, SEEC, the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition, has a growing number of representatives—56 strong as we speak. Individuals are talking about the consciousness, raising the consciousness, talking about awareness out there in the community. But there is also a requirement for legislative action. Absent that, we move to an executive order, and some have expressed concern about that.

Leaving no other option available, the Chief Executive, the President, has moved to resolve some of these concerns through organizations and agencies like the Environmental Protection Agency. So I think there needs to be this dialogue here and in the United States Senate, working with the President, with the White House, and the administration to develop a sound package of legislation that allows us to go forward.

It is apparent after the number of stories heard here just this evening and

the personal anecdotes that you shared, Representative HOLT, about people from New Jersey and the pain that they endured. That should motivate us to move forward with a plan of action, understanding that the cost of inaction is very, very heavy. Many have placed threshold dates out there. They are not that far into the future—2017, 2020 some say at the latest.

It is our stewardship that is called upon. We inherited this environment, this Earth, from ancestors who preceded us. Now it is our challenge, I believe, to hand that to next generations unborn in even better working order with the growth worldwide of population, with the industrialization of many Third World nations, the reach to automobiles being put on the highways around the world, the development of power supplies around the world, causing this huge growth of challenge in terms of carbon emission and eventually methane that will destroy antibodies out there.

So the challenge is before us. I think we need to go forward with a very focused effort of policy development that can be done in the very near future here in the House.

Avoiding that, walking away from it, denying it ought to be revisited by those who have suffered heavily from the damages of these storms. Certainly as we focus on Superstorm Sandy this evening, on that one storm here, it has brought to mind many, many situations where people are still suffering—blocks destroyed by fires in Superstorm Sandy that destroyed neighborhoods.

We have a challenge before us, Representative HOLT.

Mr. HOLT. The work of the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition here in Congress is to see that we can move into the future in a sustainable way.

It is completely appropriate that we talk about both energy and environment in this same—really with the same breath. Because as I said, the way we produce and use energy is the greatest insult to our planet. But it is possible to produce and use energy that will power our economy and provide a good quality of life for 10 billion people in the world if we are smart and if we get to work now. We can do it in a way that doesn't ruin the world and condemn all of these billions of people to the kinds of superstorms, the kinds of effects of climate change and spreading diseases and so forth that will result if climate change runs amuck.

New Jerseyans need no further reminder that climate change is real. Evidently, some of our colleagues here do need that reminder. This year, one year after Hurricane Sandy, we are here to tell our friends, to tell our colleagues this is for real, this is serious, and we should get to work. The work of

the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition is dedicated to that work.

I thank my colleague, Mr. TONKO of New York, for his work to propel the SEEC coalition.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative HOLT.

I will close by just focusing in on this graphic, which showed the enormity, the immense breadth and depth of this Superstorm Sandy.

Many didn't relate that storm to a huge tide coming in. For any of us who have jumped into the ocean, we know the power of a tide. But to have the highest storm surge ever measured recorded at Kings Point, New York, the highest ever recorded at 14.38 feet, tells a story. The fact that the water level at Battery Park in Lower Manhattan reached 9.1 feet above the average high tide line. Think of it—1 inch, 2 inches, a foot of water additional that comes into a flood zone calculates that much more damage.

Here, what we had with the situation were records beyond 9 feet, approaching 10 feet, a storm surge of 14.38 feet. We are talking monumental damage. We are talking about a force that swept away lives, a force that sparked fires in neighborhoods, a force that wiped out businesses and found neighborhoods still vacant, a silence that has befallen these given communities because of the ravages of Mother Nature that can be prevented if we put our minds and hearts and efforts into that concept of being better stewards of the environment.

This is a place where a plan of action can take hold. In these Halls of government, leadership is called upon. A moral compass points in the direction of us being sounder friends of the environment and protectionists when it comes to getting things done so as to avoid the high scale of economic destruction that has gripped our communities.

I still see it in the aftermath of Irene and Lee in the 20th Congressional District of New York. Damage done in 2011 is still causing hardship in 2013, impacted by all sorts of weather events that are atypical of our region—tropic storms, hurricanes, tornados—that wiped through the area and required all sorts of volunteerism to enter in, and certainly dollars that were shared from private sector sources and from FEMA at the Federal level and various other programs at the Federal Government. It will be an exhausting situation that will continue to drain the taxpayers as we move forward if we don't take action.

On this very solemn day of commemoration, as we call to mind all of the destruction that came into 24 States a year ago this evening, should be all the call to action that is required of us. Since then, it has been followed by devastation in Colorado, wildfires in

the Southwest, and predictions that more and more damage will be part and parcel to a future that is allowed to go forward without the soundness of stewardship of the environment that ought to be a high priority in this House, in the United States Senate, and certainly across this Nation.

Sound leadership begins with the acknowledgement that there is a challenge out there and that the challenge is then met with accurate and detailed and information exchange that builds a dialogue that creates a package of response that indicates that we are a compassionate, caring, loving people in this Nation that through the Halls of this House can provide hope for this environment and hope to families who have suffered the consequences and hope to generations unborn as we pass to them a stronger sense of stewardship of this Earth.

It has been our pleasure in this hour to have shared many of our ideas, many of our concerns, many of the anecdotal bits that personalize a given situation for far too many, and we are thankful for the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

TRIBUTE TO OUR MILITARY VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are here 2 weeks before Veterans Day to take some time to pay tribute to so many of our outstanding veterans and for the great things that they have done. Arthur Ashe, a world-class tennis player, a hero to many, was once asked about heroism. He said:

True heroism is remarkably sober, very undramatic. It is not the urge to surpass all others at whatever cost, but the urge to serve others at whatever cost.

This describes our veterans so well—serving others at whatever cost.

Tonight, we give credit where credit is due. In honor of Veterans Day, we willingly say thank you, thank you to the 1 percent. Only 1 percent of Americans have worn the uniform. Over that time, they have produced exceptional results on behalf of freedom time and time again.

Army Chaplain Father Tim Vakoc was hit by an IED in Mosul, Iraq, in May of 2004. He suffered severe head wounds from the explosion and from shrapnel. He came home, but over time he succumbed to these wounds. The troops often asked Father Vakoc, Why did you go out so often with us when you could have stayed back on the base where it was safer? But, no, you came out with us into the fight, into the combat. He was quoted as saying:

The safest place for me to be is in the center of God's will; and if that is in the line of fire, then that is where I will be.

As I served as a surgeon in Iraq, it was part of my job to talk to troops whose comrade just was being taken back to the operating room, to talk to them before and after surgery when they were wounded. There are things you never forget from that.

I will never forget going into a room full of marines to tell them about the condition of their buddy before we operated, and sitting in that room hunched over was a marine praying his rosary. I will never forget how I felt when I went back an hour later to have to tell them that he didn't make it. They fight for their country, but they die for each other.

Tonight, we are honored to have several Members here, Members that very served, to tell their stories, to tell their stories about a hero that they have served with, to let America know about these great people, and to pay respect to our veterans.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, Lieutenant Colonel TIM GRIFFIN, who is a colonel in the United States Army Reserve JAG Corps. He served in Iraq in 2006. He had been assigned to the Southeast Medical Area Readiness Support Group as a command judge advocate. When he went to Iraq, he was assigned to the 101st Airborne Division.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman, and I thank the gentleman for his service.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk first here about a fellow Screaming Eagle, a fellow member of the 101st Airborne Division, who was wounded in action, Sergeant Carl Moore, III, from Bigelow, Arkansas, in the Second Congressional District, my district.

Sergeant Moore in early June of this year was wounded while on patrol in Afghanistan. A bullet struck him under his arm, puncturing one of his lungs and grazing his spine.

I pray for Carl's speedy recovery so he can get back to enjoying the things that he loves. My thoughts go out to his parents, Carl and Teresa of Conway, Arkansas, also in my district, and his wife, Heather, and their 4-year-old daughter, Addison.

□ 1930

This is just one example of the type of service that we should all be thankful for, and tonight I want to thank Sergeant Carl Moore for his service and for his sacrifice, and for his family's sacrifice.

When I think about all the vets who have impacted my life personally, it is a list that is too long to read, and they have impacted me in so many ways.

I often think of my grandfather who served in World War I in France in 1918. I never met my grandfather on my mother's side. He died in 1966, just 2

years before I was born, but he was in the Army. He processed through Camp Pike in Little Rock, Arkansas, where I did a lot of Reserve duty. I often thought of him when I was there. I went to basic at Fort Lee in Virginia, and come to find out, that is where he went. He went to Fort Lee before he went to France in 1918, and I thank him for his service.

I also want to mention one of our famous vets in closing, one of our most famous vets from the Second Congressional District of Arkansas, and that is Nick Bacon. We recently were able to name a post office after Nick Bacon. He is a Medal of Honor winner. He passed away recently. He was born in Caraway, Arkansas, in 1945. He enlisted in 1963 at age 17. The story goes that he was too young to enlist, so he just sort of fudged a little bit on the age. He was stationed in Germany for awhile, did a tour in Vietnam. He was wounded three times during his first tour in Vietnam when the helicopter he rode in collided with another, and all were killed but Bacon and one other. So he volunteered for a second tour in Vietnam because that wasn't enough. I want to read this little paragraph that talks about what happened that led to him being awarded the Medal of Honor.

On August 16, 1968, while leading a squad in Bravo Company's 1st Platoon, in an operation, Bacon and his unit came under fire from an enemy position. He personally destroyed the position with hand grenades, but the platoon leader was wounded on open ground. Bacon assumed command, led the platoon in destroying still more enemy emplacements. The 3rd Platoon lost its leader, and Bacon took command of that platoon as well and led both platoons against the remaining enemy positions. During the evacuation of the wounded, Bacon climbed the side of a nearby tank to gain vantage point and direct fire into enemy positions, despite being exposed to enemy fire himself. He was personally credited with killing at least four enemy soldiers and destroying an anti-tank gun. For his actions in this battle, Bacon received the Medal of Honor, formally presented to him by President Richard Nixon during a 1969 White House ceremony.

He earned multiple awards within the military for various accomplishments. In addition to the Medal of Honor, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal with two Valor devices, and two Purple Hearts.

Then he went back to Arkansas and years later served as the director of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and was reappointed by Governor Mike Huckabee in that position, and he served until February 2005.

We lost Nick in 2010, but he is a shining example of the type of selfless service that veterans often give, dem-

onstrate for their country, and I just want to say thank you to Nick Bacon and the many veterans that he represents, the thousands of veterans from Arkansas that he represents.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for putting this together. A lot of times we come down here and debate a lot of policy issues, but I think it is the right thing to do, to take this time tonight to honor our veterans.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

At this time, I would like to recognize the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG). Mr. YOUNG is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy. He was a rifle platoon commander as well as an intelligence officer, serving a decade in the military as a Marine Corps captain.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership in these early stages of his first tour in Congress. I know he is proud of his military background, and I know he is proud of our Nation's veterans. I am proud of my own service, and I am proud of our veterans as well, the veterans of Indiana's Ninth Congressional District, those veterans I served with.

And I would like to just highlight today one veteran who inspires me as I reflect upon his life, one veteran that I had the opportunity to get to know when I was at the United States Naval Academy. He is a fellow marine. And Veterans Day, you will recall, is a day of celebration. November 11 is a time we celebrate not only those living, but also those who have worn the uniform and died in the course of service.

So today, I would like to talk about my classmate, the class of 1995 at Annapolis, Doug Zembiec. Maybe some of you have heard of Doug. He is a man of quite a reputation. He was a two-time NCAA All-American wrestler at the Naval Academy. He was a leader. He had an amazing presence. Even among his fellow athletes who spent a lot of their hours preparing for the next match, the next game, he stood out. He worked especially hard, always went above and beyond. Because of his tireless work ethic, because of his infectious personality and a certain X factor about him, Doug just earned all sorts of friends. And he earned the respect of people in an atmosphere at a service academy where leaders and aspiring leaders are competing for the respect of their peers, and that really says something.

On May 31, 1995, Doug and I were commissioned as second lieutenants in the U.S. Marine Corps, at which point our careers took separate paths. After initial training at The Basic School in Quantico, Doug joined a Force Reconnaissance platoon. It was among the toughest of the United States Marines. We like to think we are all tough, but we can certainly agree that Force Recon marines have earned the respect

of their fellow marines and fellow Americans.

He was among the first to enter Kosovo in 1999 with his first unit, and 5 years later, he found himself in command of Echo Company, 2nd Battalion, 1st Marines. During Operation Vigilant Resolve in 2004, Doug led his rifle company of 168 marines and sailors in the first ground assault into Fallujah. His remarkable leadership earned him a number of decorations. These things weren't important to Doug, but it is important that our country recognize our fearless leaders like him. We awarded him a Silver Star, a Bronze Star, two Purple Hearts for the wounds he suffered in the course of the Battle of Fallujah. His men were so impressed by the bravery and the principled leadership that Doug exhibited that they named him the "Lion of Fallujah." The Lion of Fallujah would serve four combat tours in Iraq.

In his final tour, on May 11, 2007, Doug was killed by small arms fire. He was always thinking of others first. Doug warned the Iraqi forces that he helped train to get down, but Doug himself did not make it.

A mutual friend of ours and fellow Naval Academy classmate, Eric Kapitulik, who was very close to Doug, he delivered a moving eulogy at Doug's funeral at the Naval Academy chapel. He read some words that were written by Doug himself in the closing of that eulogy, entitled, "Principles My Father Taught Me," and here they are:

Be a man of principle. Fight for what you believe in. Keep your word. Live with integrity. Be brave. Believe in something bigger than yourself. Serve your country. Teach. Mentor. Give something back to society. Lead from the front. Conquer your fears. Be a good friend. Be humble and be self-confident. Appreciate your friends and family. Be a leader and not a follower. Be valorous on the field of battle. And take responsibility for your actions. Never forget those that were killed, and never let rest those that killed them.

That is Doug Zembiec. May God continue to bless Doug Zembiec and his wife and beautiful child he left behind. May God continue to bless our Nation's veterans, and may God continue to bless this great Nation, the greatest Nation on Earth, America.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Indiana, and thank you for sharing that story of heroism. So often we don't get to hear about our heroes today. They go unnoticed.

What you just spoke on reminds me of a gentleman named Mike Spann. Very few people know who Mike Spann is. Mike Spann was a marine, and he joined the CIA. After 9/11, 2001, he was the first American killed in Afghanistan. What is even more impressive about Mike Spann is what he wrote on his CIA application. He said:

I believe in the meaning of honesty and integrity. I am an action person who feels personally responsible for making changes in

this world that are within my power, because if I don't, no one else will.

These are the type of people that we are here to honor tonight.

Next, it is my privilege to yield to the gentleman from Utah, CHRIS STEWART, an Air Force pilot for 14 years, flying both rescue helicopters and B-1 bombers. He holds three world speed records, including the world's record for the fastest nonstop flight around the world.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. WENSTRUP, for organizing this Special Order honoring our country's heroes. It is a privilege for me to be with you tonight.

As you mentioned, I come from a family with deep roots in the military. I was a pilot for 14 years, and my father was a pilot in World War II. Four of my five brothers have served in the military. I have to tell you, my time flying in the military was, in many ways, the happiest years of my life. I remember I would be up flying, and I would think I can't believe that they pay me to do this. I would do this for free if I could.

In addition to my family members, three of my congressional staff are veterans. I know firsthand some of the sacrifices that come with service—the time away from family, the personal discomforts, the danger, being put in harm's way—for many of our soldiers, all to protect our Nation and to protect the freedoms of others.

There have been great sacrifices in the past. Some of those we have heard about tonight. I suspect that we will probably hear about some others.

I would like to mention one man from my hometown of Farmington, Utah. I think he is a great example of sacrifice and courage. His name is Lieutenant Colonel Jay Hess. He spent 5½ years as a prisoner of war at the Hanoi Hilton during the Vietnam war. During this time, you can imagine what he endured—starvation, beatings, isolation, and deprivations, which it is very difficult—probably impossible—for us to appreciate. After 2½ years, he was finally given a letter from his family. As he read this letter, he found himself smiling, and after awhile it hurt, because those smile muscles had not been exercised in 2½ years and he had lost that ability to smile. It was a joyous day when he was returned to his family, his wife and five children.

□ 1945

Despite all of this hardship, he looks back on his life and his experience with great humility and appreciation. He said, "How could I be so lucky? So fortunate? It is a good life." This man was a true American hero.

Heroism continues today. This fall I had the opportunity to honor four Army soldiers. Two of them, Sergeant Daryl Williams and Sergeant John Russell, were jogging here on the National Mall one morning when they

heard a collision. They looked over and saw that a civilian had been hit by a bus. They didn't hesitate. They knew immediately what to do. They ran over, and using their shirts, they provided a tourniquet and they saved this man's life. That may seem like a small thing, but it is a great example, once again, of the caliber of men and women that we find serving in our United States military. As Veterans Day approaches, I find myself humbled to share this background and experience with such people. I have always said that the military is the greatest incubator for leadership that there is anywhere in the world, and we see that demonstrated again and again.

Let me end with this. The United States of America is a special place. I recognize that most nations feel that way. Every one is proud of the land from which they come. I think God intended that they should feel that way. That is a good thing. Even though that is true, there is something special about this place. There is something truly unique about the United States, and there is no better example of that than the young men and young women that serve in our United States military. We don't fight to conquer people; we fight to keep a people free. We don't fight to capture a land; we fight to set a land free. The only thing we have ever asked is, as Colin Powell once said, the only land we have ever demanded is a tiny piece of pasture in which we could bury our soldier dead.

If you have ever been to a military cemetery—and they are spread all over the world, from France to England to the Netherlands to Panama to the Philippines to Japan—if you have walked among those stone-cold graves, then you know that this is sacred land. A poet once wrote about these soldiers:

Here dead we lie, because we did not choose to live
And shame that land from which we had sprung
Life, to be sure, is nothing much to lose
But young men think it is
And we were all young

I, like millions of other Americans, will always be grateful for their sacrifice. I honor them, and once again I am grateful to be among them.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Utah for his profound words and for sharing such a nice tribute.

Next, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada, Dr. JOE HECK. Dr. HECK is a colonel in the United States Army Reserve and commands the Medical Readiness Support Group. He was recently selected for general, and he continues to serve. Over time he has served us in Operation Joint Endeavor, Operation Noble Eagle, and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. I would like to thank my brother in uniform, the gen-

tleman from Ohio, for organizing this very important Special Order to pay tribute to some very special people, America's veterans, America's heroes.

I want to tell a story that I think epitomizes the very sacrifice and dedication that our men and women in uniform have to this Nation. The date was February 21, 2008. The place was Al Asad, Anbar Province, Iraq. I was assigned as the chief of emergency services and aeromedical evacuation at a combat support hospital. A combat support hospital is similar to any inner city emergency department, with periods of hustle and bustle, kind of routine stuff, punctuated by moments of controlled chaos and sheer terror.

Such was that day on February 21. We were taking care of routine cases in the emergency services section when the radio crackled and we received a call from an incoming helicopter saying that they were bringing in a young Marine who had been shot in the chest. Of course we quickly focused on the task that would soon be at hand. As the chief, I was making assignments, making sure all our equipment was ready. We were ready to receive this casualty and make sure that we could return him home.

A couple of minutes later, the radio crackles again, and it is the helicopter calling in to tell us that the casualty was now unresponsive and that they have lost his pulse. A quiet fell over the resuscitation area. Everybody was singularly focused on what we were going to do for this young Marine when he arrived. The helicopter lands, we offload him, get him into the resuscitation suite, and we start doing what medical folks do, ripping off clothing, starting IVs, doing an assessment. It winds up that he received a single gunshot wound to the chest, just mere millimeters to the side of his trauma plate protecting his center of mass.

His eyes stared up at me lifeless as I was at the head of the bed. He was unresponsive. We quickly tried everything that we could to bring this young man back. We worked for over a half an hour doing things that in a civilian emergency department would be considered heroic, but we were going to do everything we possibly could. Alas, we were not successful. That young man was Lance Corporal Drew Weaver of St. Charles, Missouri, and he was 20 years old. He sacrificed and gave his last full measure of devotion to this country.

What happened next was even additionally awe-inspiring. My charge nurse, Lieutenant Colonel—now retired—Maria Tackett came into the room with a bucket of sudsy water and gingerly, carefully started to wash down Lance Corporal Weaver, wiping the dirt from his brow and his face, wiping off the now dried blood from his body. Just like a caring mother, she took care of this young 20-year-old Marine.

Just when I thought I couldn't see any other acts of compassion greater than that, two of my medics, young enlisted folks, came in with an American flag. I have no idea where they got it from. They might have taken it off the flagpole in front of the hospital. They carefully draped the flag over Lance Corporal Weaver, and then they both took up a position of parade rest at the foot of the bed. While we were waiting for Mortuary Affairs to come and retrieve Lance Corporal Weaver, they stood there and they stood there and they stood there.

I went in and said, "Guys, you need a break? Take a break. Sit down." Their response to me was, "Sir, never leave a fallen comrade." There they stood until Mortuary Affairs came to retrieve that young Marine.

Such is the story of those who sacrifice and of those who are dedicated to those who wear the uniform. I remember their names and I remember their faces to this day. I remember that day and the actions that those heroic men and women took, from Lance Corporal Weaver to the helicopter pilot to the medics in the back of that helicopter to my team and everything we tried to do. That is why we gather here tonight to pay tribute to these very special men and women.

May God bless our veterans, their families, their survivors, and may he continue to bless the greatest Nation on his Earth, the United States of America.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Thank you very much, Dr. HECK, Colonel HECK. Thank you for sharing that story. As a surgeon who served in Iraq, that was very moving to me and very familiar.

I think about how my experience in war has changed the national anthem for me. When I hear the "rockets red glare and bombs bursting in air," I think of those that we didn't save. When I think of "home of the brave, land of the free," I think of those that have saved us time and time again throughout our history.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). He is retired as a sergeant first class in the Army National Guard. He had service in Iraq in 2007 and served in Vietnam as an infantry rifleman from '70 to '71.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. I thank the gentleman from Ohio and brother in arms for the opportunity to speak today.

Mr. Speaker, my grandfather served in World War I, and my father and uncle served in the 1940s. The gentleman who lived in the house across the street from where I grew up was a former sailor in World War II. His aircraft carrier was hit by a kamikaze.

Down the street a few houses, was someone who fought in the Korean war. His daughter, Cookie, gave me my first

kiss. Near him lived another veteran who served on a destroyer in the Navy, and there were two men across the street from him who served together in General Patton's 3rd Army as part of the force that relieved the 101st Airborne at Bastogne. I can still see their faces. Their examples of service played a crucial role in why I served in the armed services.

Our next door neighbor was Charles Parker, Sr. As a Marine in World War II, he received the Purple Heart on Iwo Jima. His son, Charles, Jr., was my best friend. When I think of Chuck, I still smile. He was the guy who stood up for the little guy. I remember one time when this big bully picked on this little kid and a fight started. Chuck rushed into action and broke up the fight. He defended the weak. Doing the right thing matters.

Charles Parker's name is inscribed on the Vietnam Wall memorial, panel 40 west, line 25. He died in service to his country on October 23, 1968. Doing the right thing matters.

I think my understanding of service can be best summed up in the message of the movie "Saving Private Ryan." Perhaps you have seen it. If you haven't, let me tell you what it is about. The movie begins with an elderly man walking through the cemetery off the beach at Normandy. His family is quietly following behind him. The scene then shifts to a landing craft heading for the beaches of Normandy on D-day. Tom Hanks plays the part of Captain Miller, 2nd Rangers. As the landing craft hits the beach, the soldiers quickly experience the horrors of battle.

Many of his comrades are killed and wounded in the scenes that follow. But after securing the beachhead, Captain Miller receives new orders. His new mission is to locate and bring home Private Ryan, played by Matt Damon, who is in the 101st Airborne. Ryan's three brothers were recently killed within weeks of each other, and the Army thinks that no family should lose four sons to war. With a small contingent of soldiers under his command, Captain Miller sets off to locate Ryan.

Over the course of a few days, Miller's group takes several losses. Eventually, they find him in a small village in France, but alas, he decides to stay and fight alongside his brothers in arms as they defend the small bridge in the village. During the battle, most of Miller's soldiers are killed. Only two remain. Captain Miller receives a mortal wound and sits gasping, his back against a motorcycle. He looks up at young Private Ryan and says with his last breaths, "Earn this. Earn this."

The scene changes to a close-up of Matt Damon. His face changes from young Ryan to the older man we met at the beginning of the movie. He is overlooking a gravestone that reads, "Captain Miller, 2nd Rangers." Old

Ryan falls to his knees in front of the gravestone and says, "Not a day goes by that I don't remember what you all did for me. I tried to live my life the best that I could. I hope that was enough. I hope that, at least in your eyes, I have earned what all of you have done for me."

Let me tell you something. Not a day goes by that I don't remember what the fathers of my childhood friends and playmates did for us to protect the American Dream, and my good friend Charles Parker. No matter where your family hails from, no matter what your background is, as citizens of this great Nation, we must never let it be said that we have forgotten what our forefathers did for us.

To my fellow veterans of the 182nd Field Artillery of the Michigan Army National Guard, and to all the veterans past and present, thank you for your service. May God always bless America, and may we continue to be the home of the free because of the brave.

□ 2000

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) for his words.

I would like to take a moment to tell you about James McNaughton, Staff Sergeant James McNaughton, Army Reservist, an MP, New York City policeman.

We served on the same base in Iraq; and one day he and some other sergeants were being tasked with a mission that was going to be dangerous, and one of them had to go. James McNaughton volunteered over the other two. He did that because the other two had children.

On that mission, Staff Sergeant James McNaughton was killed by a sniper; and today there are two families that have their father because of James McNaughton. This is the type of selfless service that we see from our troops day in and day out.

I had the opportunity to tell that story on TV one time, national cable TV. A couple of days later I got a call from James McNaughton's father who said they were so shocked to hear their son's name and so honored that he was remembered in that way.

We need to honor and remember all of our veterans, especially those that have made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of us.

At this time, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS. Mr. DAVIS is not a veteran, but he is a supporter of veterans, and he will be speaking on behalf of one of his staff members. Outside of his office he has a sign that says, I hire veterans.

I yield to you, Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my colleague from the great State of Ohio.

I am humbled to be here as a non-veteran, somebody who has not served

our country in our military, but is so proud of those of you who have. And I am just honored to be able to be a part of this Special Order that you have arranged.

Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity that many in this country will take for granted as they are watching this tonight, and not know that it is because of the sacrifices of those like my colleague BRAD WENSTRUP, who have served their country so well, that give us the freedoms today to stand on this floor and debate the issues that will impact this country for generations to come.

I would like to stand here as somebody who hasn't served to thank all of my colleagues who have come to this floor to honor those who have, who have served with them, those who have served our country and have had the opportunity to come home and, as we have heard tonight, those who have served our country and paid the ultimate sacrifice.

So I would like to personally thank my colleague, TIM GRIFFIN from Arkansas, for his service, not only as a member of our military, but as a Member of this Congress.

I would like to thank my colleague, TODD YOUNG from Indiana, for his service in the military, and also for his service in this body.

I would like to thank my colleague, JOE HECK, Dr. JOE HECK, for his service for our Nation, not only in our Nation's military, but also in this body.

I would like to thank CHRIS STEWART, my good friend and colleague from Utah, for his service for this country and our military and, again, for his service today as a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank one who has yet to rise, Mr. DOUG COLLINS, for his service to our country as a member of our military, protecting our freedoms, and also for his service to the citizens of Georgia.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for your service in our Nation's military and for the service that you provide today for the great citizens in the great State of Michigan.

Thank you on behalf of those of us who have not had the opportunity to serve. I want to say thank you for giving us this great Nation that we now have the opportunity to serve in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I, again, am humbled to rise today to talk about our veterans and the sacrifices they have made to ensure the freedom of every single American, and I want to specifically mention a couple of folks.

One is a good friend of mine who served our country in Vietnam, who came back injured and served my State, my great State of Illinois as a Member of the Illinois General Assembly.

He still serves the citizens of Illinois today as somebody who is a phar-

macist, works in the private sector; but my friend, Representative Ron Stephens from Greenville, Illinois, now spends his time, his spare time, raising money to help our wounded warriors. He walked miles upon miles over the last 2 years to raise thousands of dollars to help those who made it back home but paid a price.

Representative Ron Stephens, thank you for your service in Vietnam, thank you for your service to the great State of Illinois, and thank you, sir, my good friend, for serving this country for our heroes who walk the streets with us today.

And one of those heroes, as my colleague from Ohio mentioned, is someone who is not only a good friend of mine, but he works for me in my office in Champaign, Illinois. His name is Garrett Anderson.

Garrett was on patrol in Iraq, ran over an IED. Garrett sacrificed his right arm. He sacrificed time away from his family, and he sacrificed the road to recovery for the freedoms that we enjoy and take for granted every day.

Garrett now works with the veterans who are trying to access the benefits that they were promised; and Garrett was out here with me a few weeks ago as we stood here and did an unprecedented, bipartisan Special Order that honored all 79 living Congressional Medal of Honor recipients.

We stood here with my colleague, TULSI GABBARD, who has also served her country and continues to serve her country today in this body. We stood there side by side, making sure that we honored every single recipient.

These are our heroes, and I was humbled to see men and women from both parties come here to honor those who have served our country and showed acts of heroism.

But since that time, Mr. Speaker, we had someone else awarded, given the Congressional Medal of Honor, and I would like to stand here today because he didn't have the opportunity to have his story told until now.

I would like to honor today the heroic efforts of the newest Medal of Honor recipient, Captain William D. Swenson of the United States Army. Captain Swenson would have made the 80th living Medal of Honor recipient. However, Sergeant Nicholas Oresko passed away on October 4, leaving the number of Medal of Honor recipients at 79 still.

My thoughts and prayers are with Sergeant Oresko's family and friends.

Captain Swenson, though, was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme bravery at the risk of his life, above and beyond the call of duty in the Kunar province in Afghanistan on September 8, 2009.

Captain Swenson's combat team was ambushed as it moved into the village of Ganjal for a meeting with village

elders. The enemy began unleashing a barrage of fire onto the team. Captain Swenson immediately returned fire and directed his Afghan border police, while simultaneously calling in suppressive fire.

Surrounded on three sides by enemy forces, Captain Swenson coordinated air assets and medical evacuation helicopter support to allow for the evacuation of the wounded.

He ignored enemy radio transmissions demanding surrender and maneuvered uncovered to render medical aid to a wounded fellow soldier and moved him for air evacuation. With complete disregard for his own safety, Captain Swenson unhesitatingly led a team in an unarmored vehicle, exposing himself to enemy fire to recover the wounded.

Captain Swenson's team returned to the battlefield amidst enemy fire again to recover three fallen marines and one fallen Navy corpsman. His exceptional leadership and gallantry during 6 hours, 6 hours of continuous fighting, rallied his teammates and effectively disrupted the enemy's assault.

It is for his unwavering courage and heroism that I am proud to honor the actions today of Captain William D. Swenson.

And I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not mention the role that one of our other colleagues and veterans and heroes who have served this great country in the military and who serve this country now in this body, my colleague, DUNCAN HUNTER, who played a role in making sure that Captain Swenson was awarded this great honor as the now 79th living recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Thank you, Mr. WENSTRUP, for what you have done for veterans tonight and what you continue to do every single day that you are here. May God bless you. May God bless all those who you have honored this evening, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for that fine tribute.

I would like to share a story about Major John Pryor, John Pryor, MD, trauma surgeon from Philadelphia. He joined the Army Reserve in 2004; but on September 11, 2001, seeing that his Nation was under attack, he got in his car and he drove to Ground Zero, hitchhiked all the way in after he drove as far as he could. And after that, he took care of people.

After that, he started thinking that there is more that he could do for his country. He joined the Army Reserve. We served together in Iraq, became good friends; and after returning, we did a trauma conference together in Cincinnati.

John returned to Iraq in 2008; and on Christmas Day, after attending mass, he walked out and he was hit by a mortar and killed.

John was the type of person that did all for others. He left behind, unfortunately, a wife and three children.

Above his desk he had a quote by Albert Schweitzer that said:

Seek always to do something good, somewhere. Every man has to seek in his own way to realize his true worth. You must give some time to your fellow man. Even if it is a little thing, do something for those who need help, something for which you get no pay but the privilege of doing it. For remember, you don't live in a world all your own. Your brothers are here too.

It is now my privilege to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. DOUG COLLINS. He serves as the Air Force Reserve Chaplain with the 94th Airlift Wing.

Doug has ministered to members of our military as a chaplain in the Air Force Reserve since 2002. He served a combat tour, stationed at Balad Air Force Base in Iraq in 2008.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Thank you, I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, it is just an honor to be here tonight, for in 2 weeks, Americans across this great Nation will pause to remember, to honor, and to commemorate the men and women who have served the cause of liberty while wearing the uniform.

Veterans Day origins come from the battlefields of Europe when, on the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month, the guns of World War I fell silent.

Of all of our Nation's holidays, Veterans Day holds a special meaning for me and my family. This day affords a unique opportunity to reflect and to remember people I have served alongside in the uniform and out.

It also reminds me tonight of not only those that I served in uniform with, but I continue to serve with who are actually members of my staff. I serve with two, one who is with me tonight in the gallery, retired Master Sergeant Bill Kokley, and also Vernon Robinson, Major, United States Army, who serves in my D.C. office as well.

It is just a reminder of the continuity of those who serve and the areas in which they serve as we go forward each and every day in our daily walk.

As a chaplain serving at Balad Air Base in Iraq, I was privileged to know and to comfort those who bore the wounds of battle. I watched in awe at the absolute determination and phenomenal dedication of doctors, nurses and medical technicians as they fought back against death itself to save the lives of our military warriors.

And because of their skills, more than 98 percent of those arriving at Balad alive left Balad alive. That is an amazing statistic and a compliment to you, Congressman, and others like you, and seeing the others at night on the flight line, both Army and Air Force,

Marine, Navy, and even Coast Guard, in the middle of the desert.

I also think of the young airman I met one night while he was on guard duty. He didn't come to the gate when I first drove up, and I sat there for a second in the truck, and then he didn't come out. And he finally came out and he came rumbling out of the back. He said, oh, Chap, I'm sorry I didn't see you sitting there. I didn't see you. I apologize.

I looked at him and I said, okay if it is just me, but if the colonel had come along, it might have been a different issue. What were you doing? I was going to try and help him.

And I was ready for some excuse, that he was tired or whatever, and he got out a little piece of paper and he had written down. And I said, what are you doing?

He said, well, I was figuring up my salary, because now I have got a little bit of money, and last year wasn't real good at home. Mom and Dad, Mom was sick and Dad got laid off, and he said, we didn't have a lot of Christmas.

□ 2015

He said, "But this year, I am making big money." He is an A1C. "Big money." He said, "I want to make sure that I will be able to send stuff home so my brother and my sister can have Christmas." That is what I met that night.

When I came home, I carried with me a reminder, because one day, I picked up the Stars and Stripes—you know, in a war zone, you pick up anything to read, and I would pick up the Stars and Stripes, pick up everything. One of those papers I happened to just be reading while I was eating, and I opened it up, and in the Stars and Stripes, they carry pictures of those who did not make it. They died in combat. I remember opening that page up, and I looked, and along the bottom, there were eight pictures. I remember distinctly four of them because I stood beside their bed and held their hand in Balad. I carry that picture and that flag.

As Congressman WENSTRUP has said, the National Anthem is no longer—if it ever was—just a song. It is a spirit that lives.

The Ninth District of Georgia has a great legacy of citizens who have proudly served in our Armed Forces. This spring, we lost one of our greatest, Colonel Benjamin Purcell, United States Army. Colonel Purcell was the highest-ranking Army officer held as a prisoner of war.

Colonel Purcell was commissioned a lieutenant through the Army Reserve Officers Training program at North Georgia College, my alma mater. He was stationed at Fort Benning, Georgia, and was subsequently sent to Europe. In August 1967, a year after I was born, he was stationed in Vietnam.

Colonel Purcell became a POW after his helicopter was shot down in Quang Tri City, Vietnam, in 1968. Most of his time as a POW was spent in solitary confinement. He was unable to be with other prisoners until shortly before he was released. On March 27, 1973, Colonel Purcell was freed, as the U.S. was finally pulling out of Vietnam.

During his military career, Purcell was awarded the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, and the Purple Heart, along with the Parachutist and Combat Infantryman badges. Colonel Purcell was laid to rest with full military honors.

Colonel Purcell's courageous story is just one of the many we remember on Veterans Day. He will always have the thanks and admiration of many Georgians.

On this Veterans Day, I will think about a young Marine from my hometown of Gainesville. In 2011, Corporal Sean Adams was on patrol in Afghanistan when he stepped on an improvised explosive device. The IED left him without legs, his left thumb, and his right pinky finger. He told me that when he went to Afghanistan, "I fought for myself, my family, my country, and the Corps, and now I'm fighting for my life."

Sean is being medically retired from his beloved Marine Corps and is even now searching for the opportunity to continue to serve his community. He is now fitted with prosthetic legs. His stated goal is to run the Marine Corps Marathon next year. Having seen this young man's courage and strength, I am certain he will make it.

Later this week, I have the privilege of attending a retirement ceremony at Dobbins Air Force Reserve Base for Colonel Timothy E. Tarchick, who has honorably served our Nation for his entire adult life. I am humbled to call him a mentor and, most importantly, my friend.

These are just a few of the veterans who have touched my life. I often think back on the men and women of our Armed Forces with whom I have had the pleasure of serving our Nation, and I think of the conversations, the laughter, and also the tears that we have shared. It is often the very short or one-time interactions with a comrade in arms that leave the most indelible memories.

On my desk, if you were to come to my office, if you can find it on the fifth floor of Cannon, you will see on my desk a little bracelet that was made for me by a young lady in Balad who was struggling every day. I would go by and see her, and I would take her stuff, and I would give her encouragement or I would give her a coke or give her a candy. One night, I came by, and she said, "Chap, you are always giving me something. I want to give you something," and she gave me this parachute bracelet which sits on my desk right now.

So I don't care what goes on on the floor of this House in the big sense because all I have to do is remember that bracelet on my desk and remember why we are here and what that flag means.

This Veterans Day, let us commit ourselves to express our gratitude to America's veterans by remembering their service and sacrifice and, of course, thanking each of the veterans in our own lives in our own way.

Before I yield back, I want it to be known the one who put this together, the gentleman who has become a valued part of my life in the time that we have served together.

Lieutenant Colonel BRAD WENSTRUP has served in the United States Army Reserve since 1998. In 2005 and 2006, he served a tour in Iraq as a combat surgeon and was awarded the Bronze Star and the Combat Action Badge for his service. During his time in Congress, BRAD is fulfilling his Reserve duties by treating patients at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center in Bethesda.

I commit to you, Mr. Speaker, he is serving every day on a place called Capitol Hill with the gifts that he has been entrusted to by his Creator. He is also a soon-to-be dad who will pass along this legacy of service to his child.

With that, I yield back to you, sir.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, my dear friend, Chaplain DOUG COLLINS, for those kind words.

We are honored to serve here with so many that have served—not all of them are here tonight—on both sides of the aisle.

I think of my colleague from Illinois, TAMMY DUCKWORTH, who suffered severe injuries in Iraq, has bilateral leg prosthesis. She had the courage to serve again and to continue to serve not only in the Guard but here as a Congresswoman from Illinois. It is an honor to serve with her here on Capitol Hill.

Teddy Roosevelt said it so well when he said, "It is not the critic who counts; not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles, or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood."

Our veterans serve. They fight in wars, wars they didn't start, and those who serve in war are probably the greatest lovers of peace, the ones who appreciate it the most.

Our great American veterans, they may be best described in this way: they are what others care not to be. They go where others fear to go, and they do what others fail to do, and they ask nothing from those that gave nothing.

I want to thank everyone for being here tonight to honor those that felt

that they should give of themselves for something greater than themselves.

You know, when I was a child, and we would go to bed at night, we would kiss my parents good night, and my father would come in one more time, and he would take his thumb, and he would make the sign of the cross on our forehead.

When you tuck your children in at night, when you go to bed and you close your eyes and you feel safe and secure and unafraid, remember why.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight we will be talking about a very important accomplishment that this body, the House of Representatives, could make on a bipartisan basis for our country, and that is immigration reform.

By refusing to act on comprehensive immigration reform, there is great cost to the American people in jobs, the undermining of the rule of law, and destruction of the opportunities that will arise by tackling this head-on. The longer we delay passing comprehensive immigration reform, the greater the cost of inaction in both economic, human, and security terms. Every week that Congress is in session for the rest of the year, I will be here on the floor, talking about the cost of inaction on immigration reform.

There is a clear path forward. There is a comprehensive immigration reform bill, a compromise. It took a little give-and-take from both sides, a compromise supported by the business community and labor, by the faith community, by the law enforcement community, by farmers, and by farmworkers, that has passed the United States Senate with more than a two-thirds majority.

We have introduced a similar bill, H.R. 15, here in the House with a growing number of bipartisan cosponsors and are encouraging the Speaker and the majority leader to bring this bill to a vote, where we have confidence that it will pass.

Our economy will suffer tremendously if we fail to pass comprehensive immigration reform. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, immigration reform helps grow the economy, creating between 500,000 and 1 million jobs, reduces the deficit by over \$200 billion, bolsters job creation, and strengthens the viability of Social Security and Medicare. What is not to like?

Let's restore the rule of law to our country. Let's improve our security, and let's unite families. In human

terms, the cost of inaction is inflicting a heavy toll.

Over 135,000 deportations have taken place since the Senate passed immigration reform last June, including thousands of people who are noncriminals who would have benefited from immigration reform and, instead, became a cost to U.S. taxpayers to the tune of more than \$10,000 each to deport.

Take a few examples from my district of people that immigration reform will help today. Dianna and Kathia are two young women from Larimer County in my district. They are high school students who were brought here from Mexico as young children by their parents. They are excellent students, both straight-A students. They want to go to college. Kathia wants to go to medical school, and Dianna wants to study cinematography.

Both of these young women are applicants to the President's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA program, and we hope that they receive their DACA permit soon, but that is only a temporary fix for a limited period of time. They are both ambitious, capable young women who want to give back to our country and make it stronger, if only we will let them.

It is time to find a way for Kathia and Dianna and the so many like them to pursue their dreams and contribute to our communities without having to live in constant fear because of lack of status.

Another woman in my district who feels the pain of our current broken immigration system is Norma. Norma came to the U.S. over a decade ago, like so many of our ancestors, including my great grandparents, in search of a better life. She is the mother and primary caretaker of twin boys who are U.S. citizens. Both of her children suffer from medical conditions, and she works incredibly hard to ensure that her kids have access to what they need. She is a hardworking, honest person, a leader in her community, doesn't have any criminal history or pose any kind of threat to national security. All she wants to do is to give back to our country, to pay taxes, and contribute like every other American.

Nevertheless, Norma was placed in deportation proceedings last year following a traffic stop. If we don't reform our broken immigration system today, how many more families will be torn apart?

People like Kathia, Dianna, and Norma feel the negative impact of this House of Representatives' failure to act on the Senate immigration reform bill every single day. There is no excuse for inaction. We need to finalize and pass immigration reform this year.

I will be talking more about the cost of inaction in a few moments, but I want to yield to my good friend and colleague from Florida (Mr. GARCIA), the sponsor of H.R. 15.

Mr. GARCIA. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct privilege of representing a district that, in the last several decades, has in large part been built by immigrants.

I lived in south Florida during some very tough times for the immigrant community. I remember as a young man seeing bumper stickers on the backs of cars that said, "Would the last American please bring the flag." But you know what? The flag still flies high in Miami. It is a thriving, growing economy and a beacon of work and opportunity for millions. People from all over are drawn to my community because they believe in the American Dream.

My constituents know that immigrants only add to the American way of life. They make our country better. They create more opportunity for all. A vast majority of Americans recognize this.

Some polls show that 70 to 80 percent of Americans support comprehensive immigration reform, with a pathway to citizenship. Fixing our broken immigration system isn't something that we can tackle on a step-by-step basis, only addressing parts of the problem.

□ 2030

It is a bill that secures our borders, builds our economy, and provides a way forward for millions of undocumented individuals living in the United States.

With every day that passes, millions continue to live in the shadows and jobs continue slipping away overseas. This is an issue that is not simply about justice. It is about fairness. It is about ensuring, also, America's economic prosperity.

In Florida alone, legalizing all of the currently undocumented immigrants would generate \$1.3 billion in additional tax revenues and create 97,000 new jobs. Fixing our broken immigration system will help small businesses expand, foster innovation, increase productivity, raise wages, and help create thousands of jobs.

The fight for comprehensive immigration reform is one that makes all Americans better, makes our country richer, and creates opportunity for all. In the history of the world, there has never been a great nation that was shedding citizens. In fact, great nations welcome opportunities.

The last few weeks have not cast a positive light on the House of Representatives, but this is an issue where we can repair that broken image. It is possible to find a bipartisan compromise that is the right thing for our Nation to do. The costs of inaction are simply too high.

More than enough Members of this Chamber understand the benefits of immigration, understand that it is a necessity for our country's prosperity,

and understand that it is what we will do inevitably. Let's do it now. Let's do it right. Let's get it done.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Miami, a leader on the effort to reform our broken immigration system.

I want to talk about the overwhelming public support for immigration reform.

More than 70 percent of the American people support immigration reform, including majorities of Republicans, Independents, and Democrats. The American people know that what we are doing now isn't working, and by failing to act and only continuing to perpetuate the undermining of the rule of law, a population of over 10 million people that are here illegally and a system that is out of whack with reality, will only continue to hurt the American people.

With that, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding the time.

Reforming our immigration system is one of the top issues in our Nation. I was happy to see the Senate act this past June when it passed a comprehensive immigration bill with an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

The Senate bill solves many of the problems with our current immigration system. It creates a pathway to citizenship, secures our borders, addresses the current backlog, and helps the DREAMers, who were brought here through no fault of their own. Unfortunately, the push for immigration reform hit a brick wall when the legislation moved over to the House and Speaker BOEHNER flatly refused to bring it up for a vote.

Sadly, this is not the first time Speaker BOEHNER and his irresponsible faction of the House Republican caucus have stood in the way of what is best for the American people, even though there is a clear governing majority that is ready to act. Despite Speaker BOEHNER's desperate attempt to follow the so-called rule which requires him only to allow votes supported by a majority of House Republicans, the governing majority has been able to pass several pieces of substantive legislation this year.

Just who is this governing majority? It is made up of nearly the entire Democratic Caucus and a handful of moderate, sensible Republicans.

In January of this year, a governing majority of 172 Democrats and 85 Republicans came together to avoid the fiscal cliff, saving our economy from ruin.

Several weeks later, when a majority of the Republican caucus stood opposed to relief for the victims of Superstorm Sandy, it took overwhelming support from Democrats and a small group of Republicans to help those in need.

Shortly thereafter, the House passed the Senate's version of the Violence Against Women Act, providing protections for victims of domestic violence, with unanimous Democratic support and a portion of the Republican caucus.

Then, in March, facing the deadline of a government shutdown, a temporary budget extension to keep the government funded until September 30 also needed the support of the Democrats to pass the House.

Finally, despite claims indicating that the votes weren't there to pass a clean CR, the House reopened the government and avoided default with the unanimous support of Democrats and a group of Republicans.

The reality is, to pass anything with substance, Speaker BOEHNER needs to stand up to the extreme faction of his party, stop blocking important legislation, and get out of the way and let the House of Representatives work its will. America needs Democrats and Republicans to come together. We have seen what can be accomplished when we are united.

And who are we kidding about the Hastert rule? The Speaker has already violated it multiple times this year.

In the lead-up to the most recent crisis, he said that he didn't want the government to shut down or default on its debts. If Speaker BOEHNER truly meant that, he would have turned to the governing majority and we would have avoided a 16-day shutdown that cost our country \$24 billion in economic activity.

The governing majority has done its job with the fiscal cliff, with aid to Superstorm Sandy, with the Violence Against Women Act, and the recent government shutdown and debt ceiling negotiations. We have escaped manufactured crisis after manufactured crisis. I know that the American people are eagerly waiting for the House of Representatives to pass meaningful legislation that addresses our challenges.

The governing majority is ready to do its job once again with comprehensive immigration reform. As millions of Americans and aspiring Americans are waiting for this body to act, it is time to put aside the theatrical displays, Mr. Speaker. Let us govern so we can bring our brothers and sisters out of the shadows.

I believe that if the Senate's comprehensive immigration reform bill came to the floor of the House, the governing majority would once again do what is right for the American people and pass this important legislation. Let's vote on the Senate's bill and fix our broken immigration system. The time is now.

Mr. GARCIA. I thank the gentleman from California.

I take this opportunity to sort of point out that, as he talks about the governing majority, we are seeing a coalition already built around immigration reform. In a bill that was filed less

than 3 weeks ago, we already have 187 cosponsors, which puts us in a very good place to pass it if it is allowed to come to the floor. That means that already 95 percent of Democrats have signed on to the bill. That means that a Democratic Senate already passed out a bill and that the President stands ready to sign a comprehensive immigration reform if it gets to his desk.

So our hope is that in the days to come, the 17 days left of working session before the end of the year, that we will find the will to bring something to the floor so that we can move this forward.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Miami.

I want to talk a little bit about supporting Colorado.

Colorado is a purple State. It is middle of the road, with four Republicans and three Democrats in our congressional delegation. It is a State that is affected by immigration. We have a strong tradition of immigration in our district, a strong exchange of economic ties with our neighboring countries.

Here are some recent polls in a few of our congressional districts in a few of our State:

In the Third Congressional District, represented by my friend, Congressman SCOTT TIPTON, a recent poll showed that 77 percent of the people in the district—this is the district including Pueblo, Grand Junction, and Aspen—support immigration reform with a pathway to citizenship. Only 17 percent oppose it.

In the neighboring district of my good friend CORY GARDNER, the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado, 76 percent support immigration reform with a pathway to citizenship.

In the district of my friend and colleague MIKE COFFMAN of Aurora, Colorado, and Douglas County, 74 percent support immigration reform with a pathway to citizenship.

Failure to act and avoid this issue is, in fact, not delivering for the American people. One cannot speak out of both sides of their mouth forever and say that in some abstract sense we are for immigration reform but not give this body the ability to pass immigration reform. The American people, Mr. Speaker, are smarter than that.

It has been 123 days since the Senate has passed an immigration reform bill. And you know what? We have H.R. 15 in the House. We want that to come to a vote. But there may be other immigration reform packages. I know there has been a bipartisan group that has been meeting for awhile. Recently, some of the Members have pulled out. If there are other ideas, let's put them on the table. But inaction for 123 days is inexcusable—inexcusable.

The time for action is not now. It wasn't just yesterday. It was last year.

It was 5 years ago. It was 10 years ago. We can't afford to continue to wait day after day, week after week, year after year, without taking action. The American people, Mr. Speaker, have had enough and are demanding more.

There is something that we know for sure. The enforcement-only approach has failed. It hasn't worked. The number of people here illegally has only increased. We have increased the budget of the Border Patrol by 10 times, and the number of unauthorized people here illegally increased by 3 times during that same period.

So what does that mean? If we increase that budget 20 times, does that mean the number of people here illegally will quadruple? Maybe. But that is clearly not a solution; just look at the data.

And there is a human toll, Mr. Speaker. From 1998 to 2010, over 5,000 people died crossing the U.S.-Mexico border looking for a better life, just as my ancestors did, Mr. Speaker, and just as your ancestors did.

From 1998 to 2007, over 100,000 parents of U.S. citizen children were removed from this country. Yes, little Johnny, little Sara coming home from school, they are American. They were born here. They will vote some day. Coming home from school and, Sorry, Mom is in deportation proceedings. Your mom won't be here for you, little Johnny or little Sara. What did she do? A tail-light out on her car or 10 miles over the speed limit.

I got a speeding ticket last year, Mr. Speaker. I have a 2-year-old son, Mr. Speaker. To think something like that could force me to be ripped from my family—not for months, not for years—forever.

There is something called the lifetime bar, Mr. Speaker. Forever being taken away from my family, Mr. Speaker, I would risk crossing that border and dying—like 5,000 people did—to be with my son, Mr. Speaker. And that is an American trait. That is what a good American would do. That is what a good American parent would do, Mr. Speaker.

Let's let people give back to our country and provide for their families. That is an American value, and we can do that now.

My colleague, Mr. TAKANO, talked about a governing majority. There is a governing majority for passing H.R. 15, the Comprehensive Immigration Reform bill, now.

□ 2045

I can't tell you whether it is 25 Republicans or 45 Republicans or 80 Republicans, but they will join nearly every Democrat, if not every Democrat, in passing comprehensive immigration reform now.

I ask my colleague from Miami if he has ever seen this kind of coalition of business and labor and faith-based

community and agriculture and farm workers—unlikely suspects—coming together around something that is such common sense. Have you seen this kind of unprecedented coalition of public support on any other issue, and what do you think it means for immigration reform?

Mr. GARCIA. I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado, and I think he is absolutely right.

This is an unprecedented partnership with business, labor, the tech community all coming together around a basic thing—to help our country move forward. I think about all of the opportunities that we are missing and of all of the places that are doing better than we are in competition because we don't offer a pathway forward.

I would mention to the gentleman from Colorado that there are 130,000 Chinese students in the United States right now, that there are somewhere in the neighborhood of 90,000 Indians studying in the United States, that there are 70,000 South Koreans studying in the United States. Under the present immigration system, if your company thinks, "Hey, I can hire this guy, and it will be good for us," they just can't. He has got to go home. So we are sending them home to come back and compete with our workers when we could offer them a future here and when they could create a better future for other Americans.

This is something we have done always. We take people from all over the world, and we put them to work for America in the best interest of America. Yet, under our broken immigration system, you just can't do it.

Mr. POLIS. I represent a district with two fine universities—the University of Colorado at Boulder and Colorado State University. Both have excellent graduate programs—engineering, physics, environmental engineering, the biological sciences, you name it. Like many of our institutions of higher education, a high number of students there are foreign nationals who are studying under student visas.

Under our current immigration policy, Mr. Speaker, at our public State institutions, we provide this world-class education for people who fill a need in the economy—they are going to be great engineers; they are going to be great mathematicians; they are going to be great computer scientists. Guess what? They graduate with a master's, and they graduate with a Ph.D., and what do we tell them? Oh. Go back to another country, and compete against us.

Compete against us. We are telling them to compete against us. How does that make sense, Mr. Speaker?

What we need to do is to provide a way—and the Senate bill and H.R. 15 do this—for people who graduate with advanced degrees in these fields to be able to stay here, keeping the jobs

here, because guess what? Today's companies don't care where the jobs are. You can be a computer programmer in India. You can be a computer programmer in France. You can be a computer programmer here. Out of convenience, we would rather have you here, but the job is going to follow you. It is not the other way around.

In addition, if we act with H.R. 15, it will lead to over \$5 billion in additional tax revenues. It will reduce our deficit by over \$200 billion. It will create between three-quarters of a million and 900,000 jobs for Americans—jobs for Americans that are created under H.R. 15. It includes provisions around startups and entrepreneurs—people who want to come here to found companies and hire Americans. Don't we want that? Don't we want jobs for our brothers, our sisters, our friends, and our neighbors, jobs for Americans? H.R. 15 is the biggest jobs bill for Americans before the House of Representatives, and that is another reason we need to pass it.

Mr. GARCIA. I would also add to that the report that the Congressional Budget Office has released.

Here is what we know: in the next 10 years, if we move forward with comprehensive immigration reform, it will produce \$175 billion to the U.S. economy. Here is what we know even further: in the 10 years after that, it will produce \$870 billion to our economy. This is a net positive overall.

For my colleagues across the aisle who love to talk about the deficit, who love to talk about the fact that our country isn't bringing in revenue, here is revenue that is sitting there—people who are working, people who are ready to contribute to the American economy. They are there, and we know that, if we bring them out from the shadows and give them a pathway forward, they will make our Nation richer, and they will make our country better.

Mr. POLIS. So we can improve our security, and we can restore the rule of law, and we can create jobs for Americans, and we can reduce our deficit—all in one bill? What is not to like?

I yield to my colleague from probably the longest congressional district in the country. I don't know if it is the largest in area, but I think it is probably the longest in the country. I yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. GALLEGO. Thank you for yielding.

We were visited today by a group called Bibles, Badges and Business. One of the Bible passages which was quoted to me today is in the Gospel according to St. Matthew, in which he talks about, I was hungry, and you gave me to eat. I was thirsty, and you gave me to drink. I was a stranger, and you took me in.

That is the genesis, I think, for a lot of people who want, from a Christian

ethics' perspective, to support immigration reform.

You also have the people who support immigration reform, frankly, because of the idea that they are parents. Frankly, I think any parent understands that, once you hold that kid in your arms for the first time, I mean, you will do anything you have to do to make sure your little boy or your little girl eats.

Then there are the economic arguments that we have been talking about. For me, the economic arguments also are so important because the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, for example, has cited a study that shows that immigrant-owned businesses would generate more than \$775 billion in revenue with \$125 billion in payroll and \$100 billion in income. That is pretty impressive.

Do you know what percentage of the American workforce they could employ if they were unleashed? They could employ 1 out of every 10 workers, which is just a phenomenal statistic.

The other thought that I find really interesting is, of course, that immigrants are also consumers, and when they consume, they further drive the job growth. Now, many Members of Congress and, certainly, many people from Texas are familiar with George W. Bush.

Do you know there is now a George W. Bush Institute? Were you aware of that?

The George W. Bush Institute has, frankly, been a very strong proponent of immigration reform, and it has produced a 65-page document titled "Growth and Immigration" which states that immigrants serve as catalysts for growth. In fact, the report from the George W. Bush Institute says that communicating the positive economic contributions of immigrants is the first step in helping Americans recognize the hidden advantages of immigration. The institute is confident that bipartisan solutions exist and that, when properly informed, Americans agree more on this topic than they realize. That is pretty impressive coming from the George W. Bush Institute.

Further, the Congressional Budget Office shows that immigration reform wouldn't negatively impact U.S. workers and that it would reduce the Federal budget deficit by \$175 billion.

So I think it is important that we get the facts out and that we make a difference because comprehensive immigration reform is so important to everybody from across the border. I have never seen so many groups unified to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his words.

This is 123 days. That is 123 days too long. Let's pass immigration reform now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

OBAMACARE ORIGINATION CLAUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in 2012, the Supreme Court narrowly and specifically upheld the individual mandate at the heart of ObamaCare under Congress' general taxing power. The Court specifically noted:

Even if the taxing power enables Congress to impose a tax on not obtaining health insurance, any tax must still comply with the other requirements in the Constitution.

Let me read that again, Mr. Speaker:

Even if the taxing power enables Congress to impose a tax on not obtaining health insurance, any tax must still comply with the other requirements in the Constitution.

In short, ObamaCare was upheld as a tax. The Supreme Court did not and has not yet considered a challenge to the Affordable Care Act's taxing provisions on the grounds that it violated the Origination Clause in the United States Constitution, and it most certainly did exactly that. The Origination Clause is found in article I, section VII of the Constitution, and it states:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

In creating ObamaCare, Senator HARRY REID took an entirely unrelated bill, H.R. 3590, containing just 714 words that did not raise taxes, and then stripped it of everything but its bill number. He then put the 400,000-word ObamaCare that raised taxes in 17 different places into its empty shell. Through this bit of legislative trickery, Mr. REID claims that ObamaCare originated in the House, when, in fact, every last provision of ObamaCare, including the largest tax increase in American history, all came from the Senate.

This sort of procedure absolutely ignores and vacates the Founders' intent, and it renders the Origination Clause of our Constitution completely meaningless. If it is allowed to stand, the Origination Clause in the Constitution is a dead letter.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a small or marginal issue. The principle behind the Origination Clause was the moral justification for our entire War of Independence. Its importance was expressed through the Virginia House of Burgesses, the Stamp Act Congress, and the First Continental Congress, all of whom petitioned the Crown and the Parliament in England for redress of their tax grievances. It was with these realities in mind that the Origination Clause of our Constitution was written, and without it at the core of the Great Compromise of 1787, the 13 original States would have never agreed to ratify the Constitution.

When our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution, they knew it was vital for the power to raise and levy

taxes to originate in the people's House, whose Members are closest to the electorate with 2-year terms, rather than in the Senate, whose members sit unchallenged for 6-year terms and who do not proportionally represent the American population and who already enjoy their own unique and separate Senate powers intentionally divided by the Framers between the two Chambers.

If we as Members of the House of Representatives, who took a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution, including its Origination Clause, fail to assert this right and responsibility as the immediate Representatives of the people and those most accountable to them, we dishonor the Founders' memory, and we fundamentally abrogate our sworn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States from all enemies, foreign and domestic.

This fall, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit will hear an appeal in the case of *Sissel v. HHS* as to whether ObamaCare violates the Origination Clause of the Constitution. I would urge my colleagues to sign on to H. Res. 153 and to join me in an amicus brief, along with currently 31 other Members of Congress, that I will be filing with the court. This brief expresses our collective conviction that the passage of ObamaCare was and is unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare was the largest tax increase in American history. The United States Supreme Court specifically and officially ruled it a tax. Consequently, under NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID, the House and the Senate, in passing it in the manner that they did, categorically violated the Origination Clause, without which the U.S. Constitution never would have been born in the first place.

It is now the duty of the judiciary to strike down ObamaCare as a clear violation of the Origination Clause.

□ 2100

By following this amicus brief, we hope the judiciary will seize on the opportunity to support and defend the origination clause of the United States Constitution. If the judiciary does not strike down ObamaCare as an unconditional Senate-originated tax, Mr. Speaker, it would allow the Obama administration to blow yet another huge hole into the constitutional fabric of this noble Republic.

Mr. Speaker, Daniel Webster once said:

Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution and to the Republic for which it stands. Miracles do not cluster and what has happened once in 6,000 years, may never happen again. Hold on to the Constitution, for if the American Constitution should fail, there will be anarchy throughout the world.

U.S.-IRAN NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS ACT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to another subject.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest security threat in the world today is that of a nuclear-armed Iran. Now, Iran is once again the news of the moment. As talks between the United States and Iran have begun, American leaders given the charge to protect America's national security must not be charmed by wolves in sheep's clothing.

When innocent Syrian civilians were mercilessly attacked by chemical weapons, the Obama administration was caught on its heels in a foreign policy quandary. America was reminded again that the United States must always be vigilant and embrace an international relations framework which enables proactive engagement rather than merely reactionary, crisis response.

Mr. Speaker, I desperately hope that these discussions will proceed in the context of the grave reality the human family will face if nuclear weapons fall into the hands of jihadists in Iran.

To use the slightly altered words of our Secretary of State, Mr. Speaker: In a world of terrorists and extremists, we ignore these risks at our peril. We simply cannot afford to have nuclear weapons become the IED or car bomb of tomorrow. Neither our country, nor our conscience, can bear the costs of inaction.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S.-Iran Nuclear Negotiations Act is: an action that will reinforce the prohibition against illegal nuclear weapons development. We are talking about actions that will degrade Iran's capacity to use these weapons and ensure that they do not proliferate.

With this authorization, the President will simply have the power to make sure that the United States of America means what we say.

Now, Mr. Speaker, actually, the words I have just quoted are really just the essential words of Secretary Kerry's recent justification for wanting to attack Bashar al Assad's regime in Syria. However, I changed the quote a little bit, Mr. Speaker. Whenever he said "Syria," I inserted "Iran," and whenever he said "chemical weapons," I inserted "nuclear weapons," Mr. Speaker. If this line of reasoning of the administration chooses to stand behind this, then we simply cannot refute the parallel argument related to a nuclear Iran which poses an exponentially greater threat in terms of our security to the United States of America.

Secretary Kerry asserted that Mr. Obama "means what he says." But, Mr. Speaker, if the world truly believed that this President means what he says, the chemical weapons crisis in Syria would never have occurred in the first place.

Secretary Kerry said of the Syrian crisis that North Korea and Iran were

closely watching our actions. However, Mr. Speaker, the converse is actually far more accurate: Syria has been closely watching Mr. Obama's inaction toward North Korea and Iran since he became President; and, consequently, Assad felt he could use chemical weapons on innocent men, women, and children with impunity. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the entire world now sees the U.S. under this President as all talk.

However, in this monumentally important issue of preventing Iran from gaining nuclear weapons, our critical diplomatic policies must be backed by our unmovable will to back them up by all means necessary.

The popular narrative of the Obama administration is to embrace Iran's openness and reward their willingness to negotiate, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, we know United Nations resolutions, IAEA declarations, and diplomatic efforts, including 10 rounds of negotiations toward this regime, have produced absolutely no fruit at all. Decades have passed without a single concession from this, the world's leading sponsor of terror.

In 2005, we saw North Korea, another rogue nation, petition for "talks" about ending their nuclear weapons program, and demanding U.S. concessions. How did they hold up that end of that bargain? They conducted three flagrant nuclear weapons tests. This, in spite of the fact that North Korea has been sanctioned, in terms of economic sanctions, into the virtual starvation of their people for now a half century.

Mr. Speaker, Iran is closer than ever before and racing toward a full nuclear weapons capability. The Iranian Government's intentions, actions, and capacity to develop nuclear weapons capability and sponsor international terrorism are terrifyingly clear. The time to regain our credibility with both our allies and foes alike in this region is now, before the situation devolves into a Syria-like situation, frantically searching for solutions after the crisis has already begun.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the U.S.-Iran Nuclear Negotiations Act, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill along with 25 other Members of Congress who are now signed on. The U.S.-Iran Nuclear Negotiations Act will strengthen the United States negotiating position in the upcoming talks with Iran, and it will outline vital congressional priorities on any nuclear negotiations with Iran.

Mr. Speaker, a bad deal with Iran which does not definitively prevent a weapons-capable Iran is worse than no deal at all. I am afraid that is exactly where this administration may take us.

Mr. Speaker, we must not let it happen.

Whatever the cost is to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran, it will pale in significance compared to the cost to our children and the entire human family of allowing the jihadist regime in Iran to gain nuclear weapons.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a thought I would like to repeat.

Mr. Speaker, in 2012, the Supreme Court of the United States narrowly, but specifically, upheld the individual mandate at the heart of ObamaCare under Congress' general taxing power. The court noted specifically that "even if the taxing power enables Congress to impose a tax on not obtaining health insurance, any tax must still comply with other requirements in the Constitution."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to read that one more time: "Even if the taxing power enables Congress to impose a tax on not obtaining health insurance, any tax must still comply with other requirements in the Constitution."

In short, Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare was upheld as a tax. The Supreme Court did not, and has not yet, considered a challenge to the Affordable Care Act's taxing provisions on the grounds that it violated the origination clause in the United States Constitution. Mr. Speaker, it most certainly did exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, the origination clause is found in article I, section 7 of the Constitution, and it states:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

In creating ObamaCare, Senator HARRY REID took an entirely unrelated bill, H.R. 3590, containing just 714 words that did not raise taxes, and then he stripped it of everything but its bill number. He then put the 400,000-word ObamaCare that raised taxes in 17 different places into this empty shell bill.

Through this bit of legislative trickery, Mr. Speaker, Mr. REID claims that ObamaCare originated in the House when, in fact, every last provision of ObamaCare, including the largest tax increase in American history, all came from the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this sort of procedure absolutely ignores and vacates the Founders' intent, and it renders the origination clause of our Constitution completely meaningless. If it is allowed to stand, the origination clause in the Constitution is a dead letter, Mr. Speaker.

This is not a small or marginal issue. The principle behind the origination clause was the moral justification for our entire War of Independence. Its importance was expressed through the Virginia House of Burgesses, the Stamp Act Congress, and the First Continental Congress, all of which petitioned the Crown and Parliament in England for redress of their tax grievances.

It was with these realities in mind that the origination clause of our Con-

stitution was written. Without it at the core of the great compromise of 1787, the 13 original States would never have agreed to ratify the Constitution of the United States.

It is not a small issue, Mr. Speaker. When our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution, they knew it was vital for the power to raise and levy taxes to originate in the people's House whose Members are closest to the electorate with 2-year terms, rather than the Senate whose Members sit unchallenged for 6-year terms and who do not proportionately represent the American population and who already enjoy their own unique and separate Senate powers intentionally divided by the Framers between the two Chambers.

If we, as Members of the House of Representatives, who took a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution, including its origination clause, fail to assert this right and this responsibility as immediate representatives of the people and those most accountable to them, Mr. Speaker, we dishonor the Founders' memory and we fundamentally abrogate our sworn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States from all enemies foreign and domestic.

Mr. Speaker, this fall the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit will hear an appeal in the case of *Sissel v. HHS* as to whether ObamaCare violates the origination clause of the Constitution.

I would urge my colleagues to sign on to H. Res. 153 and to join me in an amicus brief that I will be filing with the court along with currently 31 other Members of Congress. This brief expresses our collective conviction that the passage of ObamaCare was and is unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare was the largest tax increase in the history of the United States of America. The United States Supreme Court specifically and officially ruled it a tax. Consequently, under NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID, the House and the Senate in passing it in the manner that they did categorically violated the origination clause without which the U.S. Constitution never would have been born in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, it is now the duty of the judiciary to strike down ObamaCare as a clear violation of the origination clause.

By filing this amicus brief, we hope the judiciary will seize on the opportunity to support and defend the origination clause of this our United States Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, if the judiciary does not strike down ObamaCare as an unconstitutional Senate-originated tax, it would, Mr. Speaker, allow the Obama administration to blow yet another huge hole in the constitutional fabric of this noble Republic.

Mr. Speaker, Daniel Webster said something that I think applies so profoundly here. He said:

Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution and to the Republic for which it stands. Miracles do not cluster and what has happened once in 6,000 years, may not happen again. Hold on to the Constitution, for if the American Constitution should fall, there will be anarchy throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, we must defend this Constitution. We must as the House of Representatives do our part to uphold those privileges and responsibilities we have been given by the Constitution, and I hope we do it, sir.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2115

MORE PROBLEMS WITH AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, to follow on my dear friend Mr. FRANKS from Arizona's discussion about the so-called Affordable Care Act, I continue to hear from people who have lost their insurance, had insurance go up significant amounts, it is not affordable.

Now, I did hear from one of my constituents tonight that about 30 out of 147 people at his place of business actually were helped by the Affordable Care Act, and that is great. Eighty percent of Americans seem to have gotten no help or been greatly harmed by the Affordable Care Act. Their insurance has gone up dramatically. They didn't get to keep their insurance. They didn't get to keep their doctor. They didn't save \$2,500. Most Americans have been harmed by the Affordable Care Act.

It is just very hard for me to call it the Affordable Care Act, but in this body so often there have been bills which had for a title, such as the Affordable Care Act, had a name that was exactly opposite of what the bill actually was going to accomplish. The cap-and-trade bill, as it was called, certainly didn't help trade, but it sure did cap a lot of commerce that could have taken place and would not have been able to if that bill had been passed.

There are just all kinds of bills. Some people are pretty creative in the way that they put a name on. There is no law that says the title to a bill has to be truthful, and that is how you can end up with a bill calling it "affordable care" when the majority lose their insurance and don't get the care that they need or, for example, find out that in 3 to 5 years, when they need a new pacemaker, the new law will not allow them to get it. Those are problems.

What I have also found more and more of are senior citizens who are now beginning to figure out that when the AARP-endorsed ObamaCare—and I

don't think it is disrespectful to the President to call the bill ObamaCare, just as the President and others called the bill that Governor Romney signed in Massachusetts RomneyCare. I don't consider it disrespectful to former Governor Romney to call it RomneyCare, and I don't think it is disrespectful to call the un-Affordable Care Act ObamaCare. So no disrespect to the President intended by referring to his signature bill.

But people have been hurt. People have been moved from full-time employment to part-time employment. They liked their insurance policy, but then they found out they didn't get to keep it. They have lost it. They found out their deductible shot up dramatically, and now they don't think that they can afford the thousands of dollars that will be required before their insurance policy kicks in.

We have seen news reports repeatedly about companies that have had to drop spouses from coverage or families from coverage or drop coverage altogether. We found out that there may be as many as 80 percent of those who individually bought their insurance that will or have lost their insurance. And so when I see a number projected like 14 million Americans will lose their insurance, my understanding is that most of these projections about the millions that are losing their insurance are actually talking about millions of policies that are lost. So, for example, if it were my family when my children were growing up, then it would mean not just one policy was lost, but it would mean five people lost their insurance. So I think we will continue to see millions and millions losing their insurance rather than getting to keep it, which is a broken promise.

Now, there was an article written by Lisa Meyers, and it is referenced here in the blog of Ace of Spades, and I don't have the article itself here, but a great point is made that it is bad enough that we were told over and over: If you like your insurance, you can keep it. If you like your insurance, you can keep it. If you like your insurance, you can keep it. If you like your insurance, we will make sure you can keep it. You want to keep your insurance, you can keep it.

We were told those types of things over and over by the President himself and people speaking for the President as well. And the point is made that actually the law itself did not destroy as many insurance policies as have now been lost, but so many of the lost insurance policies have been forcibly lost by this administration by the law but also by the thousands of pages of regulations that have been written. And this article points out:

In other words the ACA, Affordable Care Act, did make it incredibly hard for insurers to continue plans for the millions of Americans who don't want comprehensive insur-

ance. Financially, insurers almost certainly had to adjust them in such a way that they would lose the grandfathered status. This isn't "normal turnover in the insurance market," although there is plenty of that in the individual market. There is a reason why an exceptionally large number of Americans are getting cancellation notices this fall.

It points out that very often insurance companies will keep premiums down despite rising costs of insurance by raising deductibles or copayments, and that is precisely what Obama's regulations say makes a policy automatically ungrandfathered. So people were told, if you like your policy, you can keep it because we are going to grandfather them in. The President himself used that term, "we are going to grandfather in these policies."

Then his Health and Human Services wrote the regulations in such a way that it forced insurance companies to have to change their policies, mandated some new coverage if it was going to comply with the law, but there were so many things that were written into the regulations that forced insurance companies to change their policies which meant they could not be grandfathered. So it was bad enough that people were promised, if you like your insurance, you can keep it, and then there were going to be some people who lost their insurance anyway, but then the regulations were written in such a way that it was going to force and has forced people to lose their insurance.

So the President's own Health and Human Services Department has created more lost policies by the way they have written the regulations. They could have been written in such a way so that the President would have been allowed to keep his promise. And all it would have taken from a strong leader who wanted to make sure that no Department made a liar out of him would have been to either pick up the phone or write a letter or have an email sent saying, Hey, don't make a liar out of me. Don't you write these regulations in such a way that it causes people to lose insurance policies when I promised them they won't lose their policies.

That could have happened, but it didn't happen. In fact, what the Health and Human Services Department did, by virtue of the Secretary who is in charge, they made sure that millions and millions and millions of Americans would lose their health insurance. So it makes that point, the Affordable Care Act as written and passed, would have protected the grandfathered plans for a longer period of time and with more freedom for adjustment, but the Obama administration filled out the Secretary's "shalls," and there are so many "shall this," "shall do that," "shall do this" in such a way as to make it that much harder, if not basically impossible to do.

The Obama administration's original June 2010 rules were actually even

stricter and have, for example, made it impossible for an insurer company to change the firms it uses to manage and administer the plan, which needn't affect coverage and is a simple way to lower costs. But those ludicrous restrictions were eliminated, but enough rules remained that it is again near impossible to maintain a grandfathered health insurance policy.

Very tragic. Promises made were not kept.

And also, I had some folks tell me that, gee, it seems disrespectful for Republicans to say, to talk about President Obama without mentioning the word "President." It seems disrespectful. And so, Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't mean any ill will any time I have used the shorthand, and I try to use "President Obama," but I also hope that my friends, probably every one of the Democrats in this body and probably all of the Republicans in this body that have referred to anything that happened in the Bush administration or used the shorthand rendition "under Bush" without saying "President Bush," that those people who want President Obama to always have "President" before "Obama" said that they will go ahead and apologize for ever referring to Bush without "President" in front of that.

But the reason that doesn't necessarily need to happen is I know most people didn't mean any ill will by that. Obviously, those who hung President Bush in effigy or said some of the most mean-spirited, nasty things about President Bush, it never crossed my mind that they might be racist, because I thought they just disliked the man. But we are hearing now from so many people that if you say something about the President, then you must be a racist. I just look so forward to the day when the dream of Martin Luther King, one of them, will be realized that people will be judged by the content of their character and not by the color of their skin.

I testified today before the Senate Subcommittee of the Judiciary about the Stand Your Ground Act, and actually that language comes from an 1895 Supreme Court case where the Supreme Court said an individual could stand his ground, so that is not a new invention. But I was reminded, when people began to talk in terms of racism from stand your ground laws, that, as a prosecutor, we didn't care what anybody's race was, not as a defendant nor as a victim. Everybody deserved to have protection regardless of race, creed, color, gender, national origin.

But it did remind me that back when I was a judge, judges did not select the grand jury, their grand jury members. Those were chosen by grand jury commissioners the judges chose, but the commissioners chose the panel members for the grand jury.

□ 2130

There were some defense attorneys that decided to attack the system by claiming judges were by a disproportionate number appointing too many Anglos as grand jury foreman because that is something that judges did in Texas. A judge selected the foreman for the grand jury. He did not select the members. But among the members, they would choose who the foreman would be.

I was subpoenaed at one time back then without the defense attorneys doing their homework, and they intended to put me on the stand in their attack on a racist grand jury foreman system and use that to establish that, gee, it was grossly unfair, the disproportionate number of Anglos that were chosen as grand jury commissioners. Then, after I was subpoenaed and before I testified, they did their homework, and they found out that actually it was a disproportionate appointment if you only looked at race. I had appointed proportionately more African Americans as foremen of my grand jury than the percentage of African Americans in my district. The reason I did that was because I did not care what anybody's race was. It didn't matter to me. I had to look at the backgrounds of the individuals, look at the individuals that were on the grand jury, and then select from among those someone that I believed would be a leader, would be good at organization, would have the respect of the other grand jurors, and be able to work for 6 months as head of the grand jury and make good decisions as a peacemaker and an organizer.

I never looked at their race. I didn't care about that. But I happened to know the people that I appointed as grand jury foremen. Sometimes they were women; sometimes they were men. I couldn't have told them, but they went back and checked and, wow, I had appointed a majority of African Americans during the time I was in charge of the grand jury rather than Anglos. Once they found that out, that blew their theory as far as me as a witness. So they quickly sent word that my subpoena had been dismissed and my testimony was not desired because, clearly, I wasn't going to help them establish a case of district judges being racist.

I can remember a couple of the grand jury foremen I selected. It had nothing to do with race. They were good people. One I remember was a community leader, was in so many organizations that everybody respected her. I knew she was amazing in organization, a former assistant superintendent. Anyway, I feel like so many times people want to use the term "racist," and they are like those defense attorneys that don't bother to check the facts before they start mouthing off.

Another article that I saw in the last couple of days disturbed me greatly be-

cause it follows along in a pattern of abuse of law enforcement, of the tools of the administration. It follows along in what really amounted to the weaponization of the Internal Revenue Service. We still need a special prosecutor to go through and indict anyone and bring them to trial, anyone in the IRS that abused their positions, anybody that has committed perjury. We need a special prosecutor to do that. Obviously, the Justice Department will not, and we need someone to do that.

We have seen how abusive this administration can be using the powers of its office to go after people. We also know, despite the promises before being elected that this administration would be the most transparent in history, it has not been so. More and more mainstream reporters are starting to realize that, wait a minute, these guys are not even as open as the Bush administration was. I am sorry, the President Bush administration.

This story by John Hayward in Human Events is entitled "DHS Raids Human Events Alumnus, Seizes List of Whistleblowers." We also know this administration, instead of being the most transparent, has the dishonor of having prosecuted more whistleblower or leakers than any other administration, in fact, than all other administrations put together. It is ruling with an iron fist.

This article points out that:

Human Events alumnus Audrey Hudson was the target of a Department of Homeland Security raid in August that was ostensibly related to firearms, but in a new interview with the Daily Caller, she revealed that DHS and the Maryland State Police also just happened to confiscate her files and notes, which included information about whistleblowers inside Homeland Security.

Hudson says the files were taken without her knowledge and without a subpoena. The Daily Caller confirmed that the search warrant pertained to firearms and ammunition. Even that part of the story seems rather flimsy, but then we get to all those juicy files that got hoovered up during the raid.

At about 4:30 a.m. on August 6, Hudson said officers dressed—

That is 4:30 in the morning. It is hard to believe that people sleeping peacefully, law abiding citizens, a reporter who has written stories using sources within Homeland Security that the administration didn't like, they bust into her home with a subpoena and say we are here to look for firearms, and instead, without the consent—I would say that if the subpoena did not allow for them to take her notes pertaining to DHS whistleblowers that provided this reporter information, it begs the question that perhaps these law enforcement officers acting under color of State law or Federal law stole these without due process.

So it bears looking into. If we had a Justice Department that was going to do justice in such an abuse of power, the same kind that would actually prosecute people who brought a billy

club and intimidated voters at a voting location—but that doesn't seem to be the case.

Anyway, the article says:

After the search began, Hudson said she was asked by an investigator with the Coast Guard Investigative Service if she was the same Audrey Hudson who had written a series of critical stories about air marshals for The Washington Times over the last decade. The Coast Guard operates under the Department of Homeland Security.

Hudson said that investigator, Miguel Bosch, identified himself as a former air marshal official.

But it wasn't until a month later, on Sept. 10, that Hudson was informed by Bosch that five files, including her handwritten and typed notes from interviews with numerous confidential sources and other documents, had been taken during the raid.

In particular, the files included notes that were used to expose how the Federal Air Marshal Service had lied to Congress about the number of airline flights there were actually protecting against another terrorist attack, Hudson wrote in a summary about the raid provided to The DC.

The Coast Guard was involved because Audrey's husband works for them as an ordnance technician. What was the reason given for grabbing his wife's files?

She said she asked Bosch why they took the files. He responded that they needed to run them by TSA to make sure it was "legitimate" for her to have them.

I am sorry. Legitimate for a reporter to have her own handwritten notes? What kind of a country are we living in that busts into somebody's home at 4:30 in the morning to take her notes regarding whistleblowers at Homeland Security? We are living in a scary time.

Back to the article.

This guy basically came in here and took my anonymous sources and turned them over—took my whistleblowers—and turned it over to the agency they were blowing the whistle on," Hudson said. "And these guys still work there."

Hudson says none of the documents were classified, and no laws were broken in obtaining them. She said the government papers in her possession were obtained through a Freedom of Information Act request, an assertion the Coast Guard confirmed. And how did they confirm it? They handed the material over to the "source agency" for review—or, as Hudson put it, they turned the whistleblower information over to the agency that had the whistle blown against it.

It wasn't just official documents that were seized, however. Hudson says they also "took four other files with my handwritten and typed interview notes with confidential sources, that I staked my reputation as a journalist to protect under the auspices of the First Amendment of the Constitution." One of her major reasons for coming forward with the story is to give the whistleblowers a heads-up, because she's "terrified to contact them" directly.

This is unbelievable. This is happening in America. Mr. Speaker, I think we should defund the Department of Homeland Security until such time as they start being honest about what they are doing and we get answers from the Justice Department. They need to be addressed until they

provide the information that the Attorney General has been held in contempt for. We want to make sure law enforcement services are done, we fund those, but we don't defund the Attorney General himself or the head of DHS until such time as they start complying with the requirements of the law, like Americans across the country are required to do without this kind of abuse.

We have got to stop the abuse. We have the power to do it. All we have to do is defund it until they come within the letter of the law themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for October 28 through October 30 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2013, 2014 AND THE 10-YEAR PERIOD FY 2014 THROUGH FY 2023

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, October 29, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, Office of the Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate application of sections 302 and 311

of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal years 2013, 2014 and for the 10-year period of fiscal year 2014 through fiscal year 2023. This status report is the last update for fiscal year 2013, which ended on September 30, 2013. For fiscal year 2014, the report is current through October 22, 2013.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

Table 1 in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the overall limits set in H. Con. Res. 112 (112th Congress) for fiscal year 2013 and H. Con. Res. 25 (113th Congress) for fiscal year 2014 and the 10-year period of fiscal year 2014 through 2023. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2014 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

Table 2 compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for action completed by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 112 (112th Congress) for fiscal year 2013 and H. Con. Res. 25 (113th Congress) for fiscal years 2014 and the 10-year period 2014 through 2023. "Action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their

allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

Table 3 compares the current status of discretionary appropriations for fiscal years 2013 and 2014 with the "section 302(b)" sub-allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation. The table also provides supplementary information on spending in excess of the base discretionary spending caps allowed under section 251(b) of the Budget Control Act.

Table 4 gives the current level for fiscal year 2015 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 601 of H. Con. Res. 25. This list is needed to enforce section 601 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

In addition, letters from the Congressional Budget Office are attached that summarize and compare the budget impact of enacted legislation during the FY 2013 and FY 2014 fiscal years against the budget resolution aggregates in force during those years.

If you have any questions, please contact Paul Restuccia.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

TABLE 1—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 AND 2014 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET AS ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 112 AND H. CON. RES. 25

[Reflecting Action Completed as of October 22, 2013 (On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars).]

	Fiscal Year 2013 ¹	Fiscal Year 2014 ²	Fiscal Years 2014–2023
Appropriate Level:			
Budget Authority	2,793,848	2,761,945	n.a.
Outlays	2,891,589	2,811,517	n.a.
Revenues	2,089,540	2,310,972	31,089,081
Current Level:			
Budget Authority	3,021,853	2,904,124	n.a.
Outlays	3,065,784	2,922,851	n.a.
Revenues	2,015,873	2,310,977	31,089,104
Current Level over (+)/under (–)			
Appropriate Level:			
Budget Authority	+228,005	+142,179	n.a.
Outlays	+174,195	+111,334	n.a.
Revenues	–73,667	+5	+23

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2015 through 2022 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

¹ The appropriate level for FY2013 was established in H. Con. Res. 112, which was subsequently deemed to be in force in the House of Representatives pursuant to H. Res. 5. The current level for FY2013 starts with the baseline estimates contained in Updated Budget Projections: Fiscal Years 2012 to 2022, published by the Congressional Budget Office, and makes adjustments to those levels for enacted legislation.

² The appropriate level for FY2014 was established in H. Con. Res. 25, which was subsequently deemed to be in force in the House of Representatives pursuant to H. Res. 243. The current level for FY2014 starts with the baseline estimates contained in Updated Budget Projections: Fiscal Years 2013 to 2023, published by the Congressional Budget Office, and makes adjustments to those levels for enacted legislation.

TABLE 2—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES

[Reflecting Action Completed as of October 22, 2013 (Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars).]

House Committee	2013		2014		2014–2023	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture						
Allocation	–1,577	–1,503	–2,631	–2,501	–209,044	–208,556
Current Level	–106	–106	0	0	0	0
Difference	+1,471	+1,397	+2,631	+2,501	+209,044	+208,556
Armed Services						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	+77	+94	0	0	0	0
Difference	+77	+94	0	0	0	0
Education and the Workforce						
Allocation	–18,098	–7,096	–21,712	–7,430	–217,458	–198,921
Current Level	+16,870	+11,355	+14,400	+12,670	–16,770	–8,795
Difference	+34,968	+18,451	+36,112	+20,100	+200,688	+190,126
Energy and Commerce						
Allocation	–20,137	–4,661	–22,996	–20,659	–1,604,166	–1,596,356
Current Level	+9,762	+11,695	0	0	0	0
Difference	+29,899	+16,356	+22,996	+20,659	+1,604,166	+1,596,356

TABLE 2—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES—Continued

[Reflecting Action Completed as of October 22, 2013 (Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars).]

House Committee	2013		2014		2014–2023	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Financial Services						
Allocation	–8,562	–8,495	–11,465	–10,428	–94,439	–94,325
Current Level	+5,245	+5,245	0	0	0	0
Difference	+13,807	+13,740	+11,465	+10,428	+94,439	+94,325
Foreign Affairs						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	+2	+2	+20	+20
Difference	0	0	+2	+2	+20	+20
Homeland Security						
Allocation	0	0	–305	–305	–12,575	–12,575
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	+305	+305	+12,575	+12,575
House Administration						
Allocation	0	0	–34	0	–295	–130
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	+34	0	+295	+130
Judiciary						
Allocation	–8,490	–594	–11,506	–637	–47,461	–45,809
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	+8,490	+594	+11,506	+637	+47,461	+45,809
Natural Resources						
Allocation	–460	–229	–900	–632	–17,995	–17,225
Current Level	+259	+596	–16	–58	–95	–95
Difference	+719	+825	+884	+574	+17,900	+17,130
Oversight and Government Reform						
Allocation	–8,146	–8,113	–11,758	–11,758	–165,996	–165,996
Current Level	–9	–9	0	0	0	0
Difference	+8,137	+8,104	+11,758	+11,758	+165,996	+165,996
Science, Space and Technology						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Small Business						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure						
Allocation	–36,626	–9,354	–78	–47	–116,444	–951
Current Level	+6,588	+6,200	0	0	0	0
Difference	+43,214	+15,554	+78	+47	+116,444	+951
Veterans' Affairs						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	–36	–36	–1	–1	–4	–4
Difference	–36	–36	–1	–1	–4	–4
Ways and Means						
Allocation	–5,970	–8,211	–22,567	–21,667	–1,298,202	–1,291,946
Current Level	+23,031	+23,031	0	0	0	0
Difference	+29,001	+31,242	+22,567	+21,667	+1,298,202	+1,291,946

TABLE 3—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013—COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

[Figures in Millions]¹

	302(b) Allocations (H. Rept. 112–489)		302(b) for GWOT		Current Status General Purpose		Current Status GWOT		General Purpose less 302(b)		GWOT less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	19,405	22,759	0	0	20,531	22,910	0	0	+1,126	+151	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	51,129	62,853	0	0	50,210	62,708	0	0	–919	–145	0	0
Defense	519,220	573,770	88,480	48,420	517,632	572,413	87,226	48,044	–1,588	–1,357	–1,254	–376
Energy and Water Development	32,098	40,682	0	0	36,744	41,350	0	0	+4,646	+668	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	21,150	23,939	0	0	21,453	24,370	0	0	+303	+431	0	0
Homeland Security	44,598	45,194	0	0	51,385	46,785	254	203	+6,787	+1,591	+254	+203
Interior, Environment	28,000	31,058	0	0	29,827	31,583	0	0	+1,827	+525	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	150,002	162,699	0	0	157,355	167,544	0	0	+7,353	+4,845	0	0
Legislative Branch	4,289	4,381	0	0	4,284	4,315	0	0	–5	–66	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	71,747	79,069	0	2	71,930	79,400	0	2	+183	+331	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	40,132	48,569	8,245	2,454	42,093	49,660	11,203	3,510	+1,961	+1,091	+2,958	+1,056
Transportation, HUD	51,606	115,161	0	0	51,817	115,117	0	0	+211	–44	0	0
Full Committee Allowance	2	0	0	249	0	0	0	0	–2	0	0	–249
Total	1,033,377	1,210,134	96,725	51,125	1,055,261	1,218,155	98,683	51,759	+21,883	+8,021	+1,958	+634

Comparison 302(a) and Total Appropriations¹

	General Purpose		GWOT	
	BA	OT	BA	OT
302(a) Allocation	1,033,377	1,210,134	96,725	51,125
Total Appropriations	1,055,261	1,218,155	98,683	51,759
302(a) Allocation vs. Total Appropriations	+21,884	+8,021	+1,958	+634

Memorandum:	Amounts Assumed in 302(b)		Emergency Requirements		Disaster Funding		Program Integrity	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories								
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	0	0	224	72	0	0	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	0	0	363	97	0	0	0	0
Defense	0	0	88	42	0	0	0	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0	1,889	327	0	0	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0	811	430	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security ²	5,481	274	6,693	283	11,779	1,453	0	0
Interior, Environment	0	0	1,443	153	0	0	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	0	0	827	108	0	0	483	430
Legislative Branch	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	0	0	261	24	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Memorandum:	Amounts Assumed in 302(b)		Emergency Requirements		Disaster Funding		Program Integrity	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories								
Transportation, HUD	0	0	29,070	588	0	0	0	0
Totals	5,481	274	41,669	2,124	11,779	1,453	483	430

¹ Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown above.

² On May 22, 2012 the House Budget Committee provided an adjustment to the 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Appropriations to accommodate \$5.481 billion in budget authority and \$274 million in outlays for disaster designated spending. On September 28, 2012 the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 was signed into law which provided \$6.400 billion in budget authority and \$320 billion in outlays for disaster designated spending through March 27, 2013. This amount was subsequently extended through September 30, 2013 as part of P.L. 113–6. On January 29, 2013, the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act was signed into law which provided a full-year appropriation of an additional \$5.379 billion in budget authority and \$1.133 billion in outlays for disaster designated spending.

TABLE 3—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF OCTOBER 22, 2013

[Figures in Millions]¹

	302(b) Allocations (H. Rept. 113–143)		302(b) for GWOT		Current Status General Purpose		Current Status GWOT		General Purpose less 302(b)		GWOT less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	19,450	21,300	0	0	19,450	21,294	0	0	0	–6	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	47,396	58,700	0	0	47,396	58,700	0	0	0	0	0	0
Defense	512,522	543,685	85,769	42,994	512,510	543,674	79,741	41,051	–12	–11	–6,028	–1,943
Energy and Water Development	30,426	38,363	0	0	30,414	38,369	0	0	–12	+6	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	16,966	19,711	0	0	16,966	19,707	0	0	0	–4	0	0
Homeland Security	44,617	45,961	0	0	44,617	45,961	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interior, Environment	24,278	25,207	0	0	0	12,537	0	0	–24,278	–12,670	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	121,797	133,809	0	0	24,642	104,421	0	0	–97,155	–29,388	0	0
Legislative Branch	4,124	4,085	0	0	3,233	3,385	0	0	–891	–700	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	73,320	76,204	0	0	73,320	76,204	0	0	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	34,103	36,308	6,520	5,016	34,103	41,824	6,520	2,182	0	+5,516	0	–2,834
Transportation, HUD	44,100	114,931	0	0	44,100	114,928	0	0	0	–3	0	0
Full Committee Allowance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	973,099	1,118,264	92,289	48,010	850,751	1,081,004	86,261	43,233	–122,348	–37,260	–6,028	–4,777

Comparison 302(a) and Total Appropriations¹

	General Purpose		GWOT	
	BA	OT	BA	OT
302(a) Allocation	973,099	1,118,264	92,289	48,010
Total Appropriations	850,751	1,081,004	86,261	43,233
302(a) Allocation vs. Total Appropriations	–122,348	–37,260	–6,028	–4,777

Memorandum	Amounts Assumed in 302(b)		Emergency Requirements		Disaster Funding		Program Integrity	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories								
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Defense	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security	5,626	281	0	0	5,626	281	0	0
Interior, Environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legislative Branch	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation, HUD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	5,626	281	0	0	5,626	281	0	0

¹ Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown above.

TABLE 4—2015 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO H. CON. RES. 25 AS OF OCTOBER 22, 2013

[Budget Authority in Millions of Dollars]

Section 601(d)(1) Limits	2,015
Appropriate Level	55,634
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Department of Veterans Affairs	
Medical Services	0
Medical Support and Compliance	0
Medical Facilities	0
Subtotal, enacted advances ¹	0
Section 601(d)(2) Limits	2015
Appropriate Level	28,852
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Payment to Postal Service	0
Employment and Training Administration	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement Programs	0

TABLE 4—2015 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO H. CON. RES. 25 AS OF OCTOBER 22, 2013—Continued

[Budget Authority in Millions of Dollars]

Special Education	0
Career, Technical and Adult Education	0
Tenant-based Rental Assistance	0
Project-based Rental Assistance	0
Subtotal, enacted advances ¹	0
Previously Enacted Advance Appropriations ²	2,015
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	445
Total, enacted advances ¹	445

¹ Line items may not add to total due to rounding.

² Funds were appropriated in Public Law 113–6.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 24, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on

the fiscal year 2013 budget and is current through September 30, 2013. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 112, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2013, as approved by the House of Representatives and subsequently revised.

Since my last letter dated September 9, 2013, there has been no Congressional action affecting budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2013.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,
Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2013 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted ^a			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,293,339
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,869,081	1,818,079	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	553,169	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-729,799	-729,799	n.a.
Total, Previously enacted	1,139,282	1,641,449	2,293,339
Enacted Legislation:			
Authorizing Legislation			
Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-121)	0	0	1
Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (P.L. 112-141)	8,795	9,439	2,291
Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act (P.L. 112-144)	-16	-16	0
Honoring America's Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-154)	-36	-36	0
An act to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act . . . and to make technical corrections to the Harmonized Tariff schedule . . . for the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement, to approve the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes (P.L. 112-163)	0	0	-59
FDA User Fees Corrections Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-193)	-33	-195	0
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (P.L. 112-239)	-33	-16	0
American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-240)	57,428	49,804	-279,700
Medicare IVIG Access and Strengthening Medicare and Repaying Taxpayers Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-242)	3	3	0
An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to make clear that accounts in Thrift Savings Fund are subject to certain Federal tax levies (P.L. 112-267)	0	0	1
An act to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for carrying out the National Flood Insurance Program (P.L. 113-1)	5,250	5,250	0
Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-28)	14,290	8,080	0
Total, Authorizing Legislation	85,681	72,313	-277,466
Appropriations Legislation			
Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 (P.L. 112-175) ^b	423	423	0
Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-2) ^c	8,840	1,479	0
Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-6)	1,867,246	1,426,973	0
Reducing Flight Delays Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-9)	0	203	0
Total, Appropriations Legislation	1,876,509	1,429,078	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	1,962,190	1,501,391	-277,466
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	-79,619	-77,056	0
Total Current Level ^d	3,021,853	3,065,784	2,015,873
Total House Resolution ^e	2,793,848	2,891,589	2,089,540
Current Level Over House Resolution	228,005	174,195	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	73,667
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2013-2022:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	28,846,212
House Resolution ^f	n.a.	n.a.	28,957,333
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	111,121

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Note: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^a Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues and were cleared by the Congress in 2012, but before adoption of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2013 (H. Con. Res. 112): the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-95), the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-96), and an act to apply the countervailing duty provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 to nonmarket economy countries, and for other purposes (P.L. 112-99).

^b Sections 140(b) and 141(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 provided \$423 million for fire suppression activities, available until expended.

^c Pursuant to Section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not count for purposes of Title III and Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act. The amounts so designated for 2013, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013	41,667	2,122	n.a.
^d For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.			
^e Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the totals in H. Con. Res. 112, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution:			
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original House Resolution	2,793,848	2,891,589	2,293,339
Revisions:			
For the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012	0	0	-203,799
Revised House Resolution	2,793,848	2,891,589	2,089,540

^f Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the 2013-2022 revenue totals in H. Con. Res. 112, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 24, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2014 budget and is current through October 22, 2013. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the

technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 25, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, as approved by the House of Representatives and subsequently revised.

Since my last letter dated September 9, 2013, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2014:

Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-37);

Helium Stewardship Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-40);

An act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas (Public Law 113-42); and

Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-46).

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,
Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2014 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH OCTOBER 22, 2013

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted ^a			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,310,972
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,848,718	1,778,493	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	504,662	n.a.

FISCAL YEAR 2014 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH OCTOBER 22, 2013—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Offsetting receipts	– 707,692	– 707,792	n.a.
Total, Previously enacted	1,141,026	1,575,363	2,310,972
Enacted Legislation: ^b			
Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–28)	14,400	12,670	0
Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–37)	– 1	– 1	0
Helium Stewardship Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–40)	– 16	– 58	0
An act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas (P.L. 113–42)	2	2	5
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (P.L. 113–46) ^c	635	635	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	15,020	13,248	5
Continuing Resolution: ^d			
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (P.L. 113–46)	1,000,318	602,907	0
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	747,760	731,333	0
Total Current Level ^e	2,904,124	2,922,851	2,310,977
Total House Resolution ^f	2,761,945	2,811,517	2,310,972
Current Level Over House Resolution	142,179	111,334	5
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2014–2023:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	31,089,104
House Resolution ^g	n.a.	n.a.	31,089,081
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	23
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office.

Note: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^a Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during this session, but before adoption of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014 (H. Con. Res. 25): an act to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the FEMA for carrying out the National Flood Insurance Program (P.L. 113–1), the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113–2), the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–5), the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113–6), and the Reducing Flight Delays Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–9).

^b Pursuant to Section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not count for purposes of Title III and Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act. The amounts so designated for 2014, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (Sec. 155)	0	50	n.a.
^c Sections 135 and 136 of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (P.L. 113–46) provide \$636 million for fire suppression activities, available until expended. Section 146 of the Act freezes the pay of Members of Congress, which is estimated to result in a reduction in spending of \$1 million in 2014.			
^d The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (P.L. 113–46) provides funding through January 15, 2014.			
^e For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.			
^f Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the totals in H. Con. Res. 25, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution:			

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original House Resolution:	2,769,406	2,815,079	2,270,932
Revisions:			
Pursuant to section 603 of H. Con. Res. 25	– 14,089	– 4,100	40,040
Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending	6,079	230	0
Adjustment for Technical Correction to the Budget Control Act Spending Caps	549	308	0
Revised House Resolution	2,761,945	2,811,517	2,310,972

^g Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the 2014–2023 revenue totals in H. Con. Res. 25, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2014 BUDGET RESOLUTION RELATED TO LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, October 29, 2013.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the aggregate budget levels set forth pursuant to H. Con. Res. 25, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, as put into effect by H. Res. 243. The revision is a correction for disaster designated spending that was incorrectly included in a previous revision to the budget aggregates. A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Budget Act. For the purposes of the Budget Act, these revised aggregates are to be considered as aggregates included in the budget resolution, pursuant to section 101 of

H. Con. Res. 25 and H. Rept. 113–17, as adjusted.

Sincerely,
PAUL D. RYAN OF WISCONSIN,
Chairman,
House Budget Committee.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year	
	2014	2014/2023
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,767,571	(¹)
Outlays	2,811,798	(¹)
Revenues	2,310,972	31,089,081
Correction for Disaster Designated Spending:		
Budget Authority	– 5,626	(¹)
Outlays	– 281	(¹)
Revenues	0	0
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,761,945	(¹)
Outlays	2,811,517	(¹)
Revenues	2,310,972	31,089,081

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2015–2023 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 893. An act to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2013, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 30, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3418. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Maryland: Accident, Town of, Garrett County; [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket

No.: FEMA-8299] received October 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3419. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Approval of Lending Institutions and Mortgages: Streamlined Reporting Requirements for Small Supervised Lenders and Mortgages [Docket No.: FR-5536-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AJ00) received October 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3420. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule [Docket No.: R-1442; Regulations H, Q, and Y] (RIN: 7100-AD87) received October 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3421. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received October 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3422. A letter from the Director of Government Affairs, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the Corporation's 2011 annual report on the provision of services to minority and diverse audiences by public broadcasting entities and public telecommunication entities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3423. A letter from the Chairman and Co-chairman, Congressional-Executive Commission on China, transmitting the Commission's annual report for 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3424. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) To Make the Commerce Control List (CCL) Clearer [Docket No.: 110818512-3478-02] (RIN: 0694-AF37) received October 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3425. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3426. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Initial Implementation of Export Control Reform; Correction (RIN: 1400-AD37) received October 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3427. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting As required by section 401(c) of the National

Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3428. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3429. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Allowability of Legal Costs for Whistleblower Proceedings [FAC 2005-70; FAR Case 2013-017; Item II; Docket 2013-0017, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM64) received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3430. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-70; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket: FAR 2013-0078, Sequence 6] received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3431. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Update on Non-Reporting Public-Private Development Construction Projects"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3432. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Department of Small and Local Business Development Certified Business Enterprise Program"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3433. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Department of General Services Fiscal Year 2012 Procurement of Snow and Ice Removal and Pretreatment Services"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3434. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup Fishery; Adjustment to the 2013 Winter II Quota [Docket No.: 121009528-2729-02] (RIN: 0648-XC749) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3435. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 2013 Annual Islamorada Swim for Alligator Lighthouse, Atlantic Ocean; Islamorada, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0663] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3436. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's

final rule — Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection With Licensing and Related Services — 2013 Update [Docket No.: EP 542 (Sub-No. 21)] received October 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3437. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Eligibility of Disabled Veterans and Members of the Armed Forces With Severe Burn Injuries for Financial Assistance in the Purchase of an Automobile or Other Conveyance and Adaptive Equipment (RIN: 2900-AO31) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. AMASH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FARR, Mr. POLIS, Ms. CHU, Ms. BASS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. MICA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. STEWART, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MASSIE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DUFFY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. COBLE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. O'Rourke, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. YODER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. JONES, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3361. A bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

H.R. 3362. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges; to the Committee

on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 3363. A bill to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3364. A bill to authorize and request the President to issue a posthumous commission in the regular Army to Milton Holland, who, while sergeant major of the 5th Regiment, United States Colored Infantry, was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry during the Civil War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 3365. A bill to exempt certain long-term care hospitals operating in a single-hospital MSA from the Medicare threshold payment adjustment policy for long-term care hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 3366. A bill to provide for the release of the property interests retained by the United States in certain land conveyed in 1954 by the United States, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to the State of Oregon for the establishment of the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center of Oregon State University in Hermiston, Oregon; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself and Mr. BERA of California):

H.R. 3367. A bill to amend section 9010 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to delay the application of the health insurance provider annual fee until 2016 and to provide a process to return to consumers any amounts attributable to the expected application of the annual fee to 2014 or 2015; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3368. A bill to require employers to provide veterans with time off on Veterans Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TITUS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3369. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to inter in national cemeteries individuals who supported the United States in Laos during the Vietnam War era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. OLSON,

Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KEATING, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ENYART, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VELA, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. SIRE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 3370. A bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself and Mr. CASTRO of Texas):

H.R. 3371. A bill to exempt certain education loans made by States from certain preferred lender requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 3372. A bill to provide a process for ensuring the United States does not default on its obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 3373. A bill to prohibit incurring further obligations with respect to the healthcare.gov website without offsetting savings; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. COTTON, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 3374. A bill to provide for the use of savings promotion raffle products by financial institutions to encourage savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr.

GARDNER, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 3375. A bill to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be constructed at 3141 Centennial Boulevard, Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "PFC Floyd K. Lindstrom Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 3376. A bill to provide a 12-month exemption from the health insurance mandate for individuals whose employer-sponsored health plan coverage or individual health insurance coverage is terminated for a plan year beginning during 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 3377. A bill to clarify the definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 3378. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the nonbusiness energy property credit to include the insulation component of insulated siding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3379. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to authorize the Commandant of the Coast Guard to lease tidelands and submerged lands under the control of the Coast Guard for periods longer than 5 years; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 393. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 394. A resolution condemning the September 2013 terrorist attack at the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, and reaffirming United States support for the people and Government of Kenya, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3361.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 and Article I, section 8, clause 18

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3362.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. (Commerce Clause)

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 3363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 3364.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 3365.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 3366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 3367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 3369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 3370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 3371.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 3372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 3373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 3374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among

the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 3375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 3376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 3377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. TIERNEX.

H.R. 241: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 351: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 366: Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 411: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 455: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 495: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 543: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 556: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 562: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 611: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 721: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 724: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 736: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 778: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 961: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1020: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1030: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1108: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1129: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1146: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 1186: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1201: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1339: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1354: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 1507: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1508: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1518: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. YODER, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 1690: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1692: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1694: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1708: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1726: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1767: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CARDENAS.

H.R. 1770: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 1771: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1801: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1814: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1827: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1832: Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CARTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1920: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1921: Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1975: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1992: Mr. YOHIO.

H.R. 1998: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2001: Ms. ESTY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2066: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2144: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2250: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2424: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2429: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 2485: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2504: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 2590: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 2663: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 2726: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2734: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2744: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 2767: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. AMASH, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 2780: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. SIREs, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2810: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 2866: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. REED, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

- H.R. 2894: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2909: Mr. KEATING, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 2932: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 2997: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2998: Mr. HECK of Washington and Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 3077: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 3111: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3121: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 3154: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 3172: Mr. POLIS, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 3186: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 3196: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 3279: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3286: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 3292: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 3309: Mr. CHABOT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3311: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 3319: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 3333: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CHU, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3336: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3349: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 3350: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. YODER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WOMACK, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 3358: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 3359: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 60: Ms. ESTY.
H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H. Res. 30: Mr. KILDEE.
H. Res. 75: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H. Res. 110: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H. Res. 131: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H. Res. 302: Ms. BASS.
H. Res. 327: Mr. WOLF, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. BROWN of Georgia.
H. Res. 359: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING JEREMY HISSONG'S EFFORTS TO SUPPORT HOME- LESS STUDENTS

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an inspiring effort to support homeless students in Rockford, Illinois. Under the leadership of Jeremy Hissong, friends and neighbors of the Rockford School District banded together to collect clothes and school supplies to benefit the District's homeless student program.

After learning of the over 1,200 homeless children in the Rockford Public School District, Mr. Hissong utilized social media and the Internet to organize "Kids Need Us" to gather support for a supply drive. His employer, Mondelez International, provided space in its parking lot for volunteers to collect needed supplies from the community such as socks, pants, coats, hats, pens, and paper to be donated to the homeless student program.

I applaud Mr. Hissong, and the community, for their success in bringing people together, gathering needed items, and educating the public about the awful reality of youth homelessness in our communities. This story of action is an important reminder of the victims of a slow economy and the importance of taking action in order to help those most in need.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 16th District of Illinois, I wish to express our deep appreciation for Jeremy Hissong's work and the rest of the community for their support of this important cause.

HONORING THE CAREER OF JUSTICE THOMAS KILBRIDE

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Justice Thomas Kilbride, who just completed his term as Chief Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court on October 25th. Justice Kilbride received his law degree from Antioch School in Washington, DC, and practiced law for 20 years in the 17th District of Illinois before being elected to the Illinois Supreme Court in 2000. He graciously conducted a ceremonial swearing in for me in Rock Island after I took office in the U.S. House of Representatives in January.

Justice Kilbride made a great impact on public access to the law during his term as Chief Justice. He promoted the increased use of technology in the court, spearheading efforts to put cameras in Illinois courtrooms and

allowing electronic filing of many documents for the Supreme Court.

Additionally, Justice Kilbride formed the Illinois Supreme Court Access to Justice Commission, as he explained, in order to "make access to justice a high priority for everyone in the legal system." Among other accomplishments, the Commission has broadened the use of standardized legal forms in plain English to make it easier for people to navigate the law without needing to hire an attorney.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Justice Kilbride for his friendship, his commendable work as Chief Justice and his dedication to making the law accessible to everyone in Illinois.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLEY GREENE DIXON, JR.

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend and true leader for southern Kentucky, Charley Greene Dixon, Jr., in honor of his selection as the 2013 Knox County Chamber of Commerce Man of the Year.

During his ten-year service as the Knox County Attorney, Charley Greene Dixon witnessed first-hand how the prescription drug abuse epidemic destroyed the lives of countless families in our region. The rapid rate of overdose deaths and repeat drug trafficking offenders funneling through his courtroom stirred a passion within him to do more—to try to save the lives of his neighbors and their children. In response, Charley played a key role in establishing Juvenile, Family and Adult Drug Courts in his hometown, and he remains a steadfast advocate for expanding drug-free education and treatment efforts across our region. I count it an honor to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with Charley in this fight for our communities.

Outside of the courtroom, Charley Greene Dixon has rallied efforts in our schools and communities, as Chairman of the Knox County UNITE Coalition. Through his dedicated support, thousands of young people have had the opportunity to attend drug-free events like, Hooked on Fishing Not on Drugs, a prevention camp, as well as faith-based walks, parades, along with basketball and cheerleading programs. He has undoubtedly inspired countless young people to break the cycle of addiction in their families, encouraging them to dream big and to accomplish great things through a life of sobriety.

Additionally, Charley has worked diligently to obtain several instrumental grants for Knox County, including a victim advocate grant, a truancy prevention grant, and an environ-

mental PRIDE award. Those grant dollars have been vital to the growth, security, and health of area communities.

Despite his battle with cancer, Charley's passion for progress in Knox County is still holding strong. He continues to serve as a member of the Knox County Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors and President of the region's Bar Association. He is also very active in his church, serving as an usher for the past 15 years and a trustee for two years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring a champion for southern Kentucky, Charley Greene Dixon, Jr. His recognition as the Knox County Chamber of Commerce Man of the Year is duly warranted and I wish Charley the very best in the years to come.

MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE

HON. ALAN NUNNELEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, Mississippi College, the oldest institution of higher learning in the state of Mississippi and the second oldest Baptist university in the United States, recently celebrated the opening of its 187th school year. Mississippi College has since pre-Civil War days provided students from across the state and around the world an education informed by Christian values, and was the first co-educational institution in the nation to grant a degree to a woman.

The university has a long and distinguished history of educating future public servants, counting current leaders in federal and state government among her alumna, including current Third Congressional District Rep. GREGG HARPER, and current Mississippi Gov. Phil Bryant. As a member of the Board of Trustees I am also proud to recognize the leadership of Order of the Golden Arrow recipient Gayle Wicker has provided to the university's presidents through the years. Mississippi College, located in Clinton, is a proud constituent of the Second Congressional District represented by Rep. BENNIE THOMPSON.

For 64 years, students have received exemplary training in areas of speech, media, public relations, theater and related practices in the Mississippi College Communication Department. Founded in 1949 by Drs. Hollis and Julia Todd as the Department of Speech, the current Communication Department presented diplomas to hundreds of students who have subsequently experienced personal and career success in their chosen fields. Among its alumni, the department prides itself by seeing former graduates become leaders in fields as diverse as business and ministry, education and journalism.

The faculty of the Mississippi College Communication Department embodies dedicated

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

and sustained service to the university and its mission. In fact, only three men have chaired the department over the span of its 64 years: Dr. Hollis Todd, Dr. Billy Lytal, for whom the annual student scholarship fund is named, and current chair Dr. Cliff Fortenberry. With a teaching philosophy built around the practical application of theory and curriculum, departmental faculty are teachers first, individuals who view their service at Mississippi College as an investment in their students' lives and in their community.

The Mississippi College Communication Department currently enrolls undergraduates in interpersonal and public communication, journalism, mass media, public relations, and theater concentrations, and offers graduate degrees in journalism, health services communication, professional communication in sports, and public relations and corporate communication. Leading in innovative online classroom offerings, the communication department partners with other academic departments to offer unique degree programs to meet student and market demands.

With a current enrollment of over 5,000 students and future leaders, Mississippi College seeks to be known as a university recognized for academic excellence and commitment to the cause of Christ. The faculty, staff, students and alumni of the Mississippi College Communication Department are proud to fulfill this vision as the department enters its 65th year of service.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE ONE
YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF HURRICANE SANDY

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reflect on the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy, which made landfall one year ago.

Super Storm Sandy was the second largest natural disaster in our nation's history and the second costliest. New York State alone incurred \$32.8 billion in damage, \$8.4 billion of which was on Long Island. 305,000 homes and 265,300 businesses in the state were damaged or destroyed. While these numbers are shocking, they don't begin to tell the story of the suffering my constituents experienced.

This devastation was exacerbated by the failure of Congress to provide immediate aid to the affected communities. The Northeast was forced to wait more than three months for a federal aid package, thereby delaying the region's recovery. Fortunately, this assistance is beginning to flow and communities are in the process of rebuilding.

While we have made progress, the road to recovery remains long and difficult. Thousands of New York and New Jersey residents are still displaced and others are living in partially repaired homes. Infrastructure throughout the region awaits repair and needs to be hardened. I am confident that with the continued commitment of state and federal partners, our communities will rebound and come out stronger than ever.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN AND MARY
PAPPAJOHN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor John and Mary Pappajohn for being named the 2013 recipients of the Eli and Edythe Broad Award for Philanthropy in the Arts at the National Arts Awards ceremony.

In celebration of National Arts and Humanities Month, Americans for the Arts organizes the National Arts Awards each October to recognize the achievements of individuals and corporations who have exhibited outstanding leadership in the arts, arts education and philanthropy. Accordingly, the Eli and Edythe Broad Award for Philanthropy is reserved for individuals who have demonstrated an extraordinary commitment of philanthropic generosity to one or more major arts institutions.

The selection of the Pappajohns to receive such a prestigious award should come as no surprise to those that know this incredible couple and their love of the arts. John served on the board of directors of the Des Moines Art Center and continues to be an honorary trustee, while his wife serves as the head of the museum's Acquisition Committee and has continued to serve as an active trustee for nearly two decades. Together they have donated several works of art to the museum, including those that comprise the beloved sculpture park in downtown Des Moines. They have also been members of the National Committee of Performing Arts of the Kennedy Center in Washington, DC for more than two decades and continually rank among the top art collectors in the world.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. Pappajohn's lifelong commitment to philanthropy at the local, state, and national levels cannot be overstated. John and Mary's selfless contributions have changed countless lives for the better and I cannot imagine a more deserved selection for this prestigious award. It is a great honor to represent John and Mary in the United States Congress and I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating them for this momentous recognition and thanking them for their continued dedication to their community and our nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 28, I missed a series of roll-call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Nos. 561 and 562.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT
OF THE HONORABLE
JUDGE JOHN D. ALLEN

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my personal congratulations and best wishes to a great friend and servant of humankind, Judge John D. Allen, Chief Judge of the Chattahoochee Circuit of the Third Superior Court District of Georgia. Judge Allen will be recognized by the Columbus Bar Association for his distinguished service on Tuesday, October 29, 2013, at the Columbus Convention and Trade Center in Columbus, Georgia. He will be retiring on Thursday, October 31, 2013.

Judge Allen was born on January 17, 1943 in segregated Columbus, Georgia. It seemed like all the odds were against him of one day becoming a Superior Court Judge. Despite the lack of black role models in the law as he was growing up, Judge Allen kept education as his main priority. He graduated from Tuskegee University in 1966 with a Bachelor's degree in Mechanical Engineering.

A distinguished cadet in the ROTC, Judge Allen was commissioned into the Air Force in 1966 as a 2nd Lieutenant Pilot. He completed Advanced Survival Training in 1967, and he was promoted to 1st Lieutenant/Tactical Fighter Pilot in 1968. Upon completion of course, he was assigned to Southeast Asia and flew 167 combat missions while stationed in Thailand. After promotions to Tactical Aircraft Commander, then to Captain, Judge Allen flew another 127 combat missions in Southeast Asia before returning to Tampa, Florida and serving as an academic and flight instructor until his discharge in July of 1973. He left the Air Force as a highly decorated pilot, earning 23 Air Medals, 2 Air Force Commendation Medals, and numerous other awards for his service during the Vietnam War.

In 1975, Judge Allen earned a Juris Doctor from the University of Florida. He was admitted to the Georgia bar in 1976. From 1976 to 1987, he maintained a private law practice in the Columbus area. At that time, Judge Allen and I were two of only four black lawyers in Columbus.

Judge Allen continued to break barriers when he began serving as a Columbus Recorder's Court judge for a year before assuming a position on the State Court for Muscogee County in 1987. In 1993, he was appointed to the position of Chattahoochee Judicial Circuit Superior Court Judge. He has been re-elected repeatedly since his appointment.

Judge Allen's diligent judicial service has also been mirrored by his extensive involvement with the local and state communities. In conjunction with his professional accomplishments in the Air Force and on the bench, Judge Allen has served on a number of boards and commissions, most notably as Chairman of the Judicial Qualifications Commission, and has received many awards and accolades for his service. Judge Allen's contributions to the Columbus area and the state

of Georgia have even earned him recognition from the Columbus Ledger-Enquirer as one of "100 People to Remember for the Century."

None of Judge Allen's momentous accomplishments would have been possible without the enduring love and support of his wife Victoria; children John Jr., Geoffrey, and Kevin; and grandchildren John III and Carson.

A true Georgian devoted to serving his great state, Judge Allen embodies Georgia's state motto, "Wisdom, Justice and Moderation." Judge Allen is a man of great integrity who sets a high standard of values that make for a strong foundation of character in himself and in others. On a personal note, I would like to thank Judge Allen for his friendship, advice and counsel over the years. His wisdom and sage advice have contributed immensely to my success. For that I will always be grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the more than 700,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in honoring Judge John D. Allen for his outstanding professional achievements and dedicated service to his country and to the people of the state of Georgia as he retires from his position as Chief Judge of the Chattahoochee Circuit of the Third Superior Court District of Georgia.

WELCOMING GUEST CHAPLIN JACK HIBBS TO U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. GARY G. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome Pastor Jack Hibbs of Calvary Chapel Chino Hills and thank him for delivering today's opening prayer.

I have known Pastor Hibbs for many years through his teaching of the Lord's message. He is best known for his passion, and great ability to incorporate the Lord's word into our everyday lives.

Each week, thousands come together from all over Southern California to hear his sermons. And his radio broadcast is listened to on five continents.

Pastor Hibbs is the author of "Turnaround at Home," a practical guide to inviting God into your home, and creating positive cycles in marriage and parenting. He and his wife, Lisa, share their own experiences and inspiring stories about understanding how emotional, spiritual and social background factors play into families. And how to make changes for good—starting at home.

I thank Pastor Hibbs for what he's done for my community and sharing his time with us today.

CONGRATULATING SAINT LOUIS DE MONTFORT CATHOLIC SCHOOL, A BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an outstanding school in my district that is being honored as a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School. It is a pleasure to congratulate Saint Louis de Montfort Catholic School in Fishers, Indiana in celebration of this special occasion.

The National Blue Ribbon designation, given by the U.S. Department of Education, is awarded to both public and private schools across our great nation. Started by President Reagan and given annually since 1982, the award celebrates great American schools that achieve very high learning standards or are making significant improvements in the academic achievements of their students. In my district and across the country, the award recognizes the great educators, students and parents who have worked so hard to ensure Indiana's children reach their full potential and achieve academic success.

For all of these reasons and many more, I am so proud that Saint Louis de Montfort is receiving this prestigious designation. It is a wonderful acknowledgement of the school's commitment to providing young Hoosiers an exceptional education. While 417 schools nationwide may be nominated, only 286 are chosen as a National Blue Ribbon School, making this recognition all the more impressive.

Serving children from junior kindergarten through eighth grade, Saint Louis de Montfort Catholic School provides its students with an outstanding education in both academics and the Catholic faith. It has consistently been graded as an "A" school by the Indiana Department of Education and is a leader in incorporating technology and learning in the classroom, while also engaging its students in daily prayer, religion classes, liturgical celebrations, and service learning projects. As a mother whose children attended Catholic school, I applaud Saint Louis de Montfort for its work to ensure its students engage with the Hoosier community and remain service-oriented.

As a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, I also want to acknowledge how important it is to our nation's future to encourage and raise a new generation of Americans who have the skills and knowledge to succeed both in and out of the classroom. Students like those at Saint Louis de Montfort give me hope that we will accomplish this vital mission. Their outstanding work is an inspiration to students, educators and parents across the nation. Once again, congratulations to Saint Louis de Montfort. I am very proud of you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 562 I was unable to be present for the vote on H.R. 2011.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

RECOGNIZING LUCY BILLINGSLEY AS RECIPIENT OF THE 2013 H. NEIL MALLON AWARD

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lucy Billingsley who received the 2013 H. Neil Mallon Award from the World Affairs Council on Friday, October 25. Mrs. Billingsley is a Dallas native and well-known real estate developer in North Texas.

Past recipients of the H. Neil Mallon Award include Stanley Marcus, Ray Hunt, President George H.W. Bush, Ross Perot, and Trammell Crow. The World Affairs Council was founded by H. Neil Mallon in 1951 in order to educate and involve Americans in global issues.

The only daughter of developer Trammell Crow Sr., Mrs. Billingsley is not only a local real estate mogul but also has a major global impact. Billingsley serves as the International Board Chair of Women for Women, the Chiapas International Founder, a member of the National Geographic Society Council of Advisors, a member of the Council of Foreign Relations, a member of the Tate Board at Southern Methodist University, and on the University of Texas at Dallas Center for Brain Health Advisory Committee.

Before developing Billingsley Company with her husband, Henry, Mrs. Billingsley was the Chief Executive Officer of the Dallas Market Center and the Crow Design Centers across the United States. Billingsley also grew her travel agency, Wyndham Jade, to be the largest privately owned travel agency in the Southwest. The recently re-imagined and acclaimed Dallas Arts District was just one brain child of Billingsley's many.

Lucy Billingsley has served as an inspiration not only to women of Dallas, but also nationally and internationally. Her humanitarian efforts to promote business and diplomatic relations across the globe will not go unnoticed. Mrs. Billingsley is a personal friend and I applaud her efforts in Dallas and globally.

RECOGNIZING DETECTIVE STEVE LAIR FOR RECEIVING THE PARTNERSHIP FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AWARD

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Detective Steve Lair of Carrollton, Texas and his earning of the Partnership for Public Safety award for going above and beyond his normal duties as a Carrollton police officer in his work with an Immigrations and Customs Enforcement Task Force involved in the statewide, multi-agency investigation and prosecution of members of the Aryan Brotherhood of Texas.

The Partnership for Public Safety Award is given to an officer on a local level which proves critical in the joint actions with Immigrations and Customs Enforcement. Detective Lair was selected from among hundreds of other applicants throughout the nation, where his credentials withstood the rigorous process of approval. The citizens of North Texas are certainly safer due to his actions, and he is a perfect example of how all members of Operation Community Shield Gang Task Force should operate.

In August 2011, Detective Lair was asked to participate in an ongoing investigation of the Aryan Brotherhood of Texas as well as organize Dallas-Fort Worth area law enforcement in an effort to disrupt and dismantle the powerful race-based criminal prison street gang in North Texas. As a direct result of the actions of the law enforcement agencies Detective Lair organized, three Aryan Brotherhood of Texas members have been indicted, one of which has pleaded guilty. The overall case currently has 36 defendants who have been indicted on racketeering charges. Detective Lair has been instrumental in coordinating the flow of information between agency partners and the Special Prosecutor from the Department of Justice Organized Crime and Gang Section. Additionally, he has been essential in the development of confidential sources, providing information on numerous short term investigations of both federal and state violations.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing the work of Detective Steve Lair and congratulating him on this prestigious award.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE AMERICAN JAZZ VOCALIST GLORIA LYNNE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the passing of one of Harlem's most talented musicians, and a dear friend of mine, the late Gloria Lynne. As I speak with grief of such an overwhelming loss, I join my commu-

nity in rejoicing a life well-lived and to celebrate the accomplishments of a remarkable woman. At 83, Gloria remained a golden child of Harlem, and with an incredible soul touching the lives of everyone who met her. Her passing on October 15th, 2013 at Columbus Hospital in Newark, N.J., brought immense sorrow to the countless fans of and individuals associated with the R&B, jazz, and pop genres.

Gloria Lynne was born in Harlem on November 23, 1929. Throughout her lengthy career, which spanned more than five decades, her signature resonant contralto could be recognized on more than 25 albums. During her extraordinary life, Gloria Lynne brought great pride to her beloved neighborhood by releasing such hits as her English rendition of "I Wish You Love" and receiving a multitude of awards, including the Outstanding Achievement in Jazz at the New York MAC awards, International Women of Jazz Award and having the City of New York proclaim July 25, 1995 as "Gloria Lynne Day."

Gloria displayed immense talent and love for her community, participating in her local church choir and winning first prize at the "Amateur Night" at the Apollo at 15. As she grew famous she never forgot her hometown, despite sharing the stage with many renowned names, including artists such as Quincy Jones, Ray Charles and Ella Fitzgerald.

Gloria will be long remembered for her extraordinary voice, charisma, discipline, spirit, and clear purpose which won the admiration of all who were privileged to come to know and work with her during her distinguished career in and around music. I consider myself fortunate to have had the opportunity to enjoy her music and observe her example as a personal inspiration.

But most of all Gloria Lynne was a loving mother and sister, and is survived by her son P.J. Allen and her brother John Wilson who now inherit the solemn pride of having known Ms. Lynne so closely.

Mr. Speaker, rather than mourn her passing, I hope that my colleagues will join me in celebrating the life of my friend Gloria Lynne by remembering that she exemplified greatness in every way.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 561 I was unable to be present for the vote on H.R. 2189. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

CONGRATULATING THE NORTHERN VIRGINIA BLACK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC., AND THE GLOBAL BUSINESS NETWORK ASSOCIATION

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Northern Virginia Black Chamber of Commerce, Inc. (NVBCC) and the Global Business Network Association (GBNA) on five years of dedicated achievement, and to recognize the Celebration Gala and Awards Dinner being held to commemorate this auspicious occasion.

This year not only marks a milestone for both organizations, it signals the emergence of an improving economy five years after the economic strife that impacted the globe. The Celebration Gala and Awards Dinner will honor the achievements of business leaders and young scholars in our region who are significantly contributing to a more robust economy and vibrant business community.

The NVBCC is creating opportunities for businesses and entrepreneurs to build networks, obtain practical professional development, and gain the skills to strategically grow companies. The Chamber delivers products and services designed to maximize investment, including networking events, seminars, and resources, connecting members, companies, fellow entrepreneurs, public and private leaders who can help advance businesses and inform on the economic, legal, policy, social, cultural and other factors that impact black-owned businesses.

GBNA is a regional network of business and nonprofit leaders that represents all industry sectors. Founded in 2007, GBNA's membership consists of start-up and experienced entrepreneurs and businesses. GBNA has assisted the local business community by working to bring the issues and concerns of small businesses to the forefront to the national economic agenda.

Mr. Speaker, we applaud the work of these two venerable institutions in Northern Virginia, and send our best wishes for a successful celebration dinner.

CONGRATULATING SAINT MARIA GORETTI SCHOOL, A BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an outstanding school in my district that is being honored as a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School. It is a pleasure to congratulate Saint Maria Goretti School in Westfield, Indiana in celebration of this special occasion.

The National Blue Ribbon designation, given by the U.S. Department of Education, is awarded to both public and private schools

across our great nation. Started by President Reagan and given annually since 1982, the award celebrates great American schools that achieve very high learning standards or are making significant improvements in the academic achievements of their students. In my district and across the country, the award recognizes the great educators, students and parents who have worked so hard to ensure Indiana's children reach their full potential and achieve academic success.

For all of these reasons and many more, I am so proud that Saint Maria Goretti School is receiving this prestigious designation. It is a wonderful acknowledgement of the school's commitment to providing young Hoosiers an exceptional education. While 417 schools nationwide may be nominated, only 286 are chosen as a National Blue Ribbon School, making this recognition all the more impressive.

Since opening in 1996, Saint Maria Goretti School has consistently provided its students with an outstanding education in both academics and the Catholic faith and currently serves 460 students in grades K-8. The school starts each day with a prayer that provides guiding principles for its students. As a mother whose children attended Catholic school, I applaud Saint Maria Goretti for its work to develop each child in mind, body, and spirit.

As a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, I also want to acknowledge how important it is to our nation's future to encourage and raise a new generation of Americans who have the skills and knowledge to succeed both in and out of the classroom. Students like those at Saint Maria Goretti School give me hope that we will accomplish this vital mission. Their outstanding work is an inspiration to students, educators and parents across the nation. Once again, congratulations to Saint Maria Goretti School. I am very proud of you.

RECOGNIZING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF LINDENWOOD UNIVERSITY-BELLEVILLE

HON. WILLIAM L. ENYART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the 10th Anniversary of Lindenwood University-Belleville.

While Lindenwood University-Belleville, at 10 years old, is a relative newcomer for institutions of higher learning, it is part of Lindenwood University which has a long history in the Midwest. Founded in 1827 in St. Charles, Missouri, Lindenwood University is the second oldest college west of the Mississippi River.

As a four-year liberal arts university with a rich tradition in the St. Louis metropolitan area, the administration of Lindenwood University began talks with city leaders in Belleville, Illinois around 2001, looking to expand the university to the east side of the Mississippi River. The Belleville High School District had recently moved the location of the Belleville

West High School to another location, leaving an existing facility ready for use. Talks proved fruitful and Lindenwood University acquired the 22 acre tract of land for its Belleville campus in November of 2003.

The first classes for LU-Belleville were held in the Spring Quarter of 2004 for an incoming class of 52 students. Initially only offering evening classes, the first programs were a Master of Arts in Education and Education Administration.

Today, LU-Belleville has over 1,000 full-time students enrolled in a wide range of academic programs with hundreds more in graduate, continuing education and specialized programs. In its first decade, LU-Belleville has grown into a strong and vibrant institution that contributes much to the richness of Belleville and to the higher education choices of Southern Illinois.

This past spring, I had the high honor of addressing graduates at LU-Belleville's first commencement exercises. I quoted Lindenwood University's mission statement to provide programs "leading to the development of the whole person—an educated, responsible citizen of a global community." In its first decade, LU-Belleville has done just that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the administration, faculty, staff and student body of Lindenwood University-Belleville on the occasion of their 10th Anniversary and wishing them continued success for many more years to come.

RECOGNITION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Domestic Violence Awareness Month. During each October since 1981, we mourn those who have died due to domestic violence, celebrate those who have survived, and connect those who work to end violence.

Many of us know someone who has suffered from domestic violence. Whether you are a sibling, parent, or friend, your support is necessary. Each day, three women die as a result of domestic violence. Your support could turn a battered woman into a survivor.

Domestic violence not only affects more than 12 million people each year, but one in four women have been a victim of physical violence by a partner. The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) is a helpful tool to combat violence, but the fight against domestic violence must continue. VAWA improved the criminal justice response to violence against women and the reauthorization this year extends protection to native women, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals.

Though policies are put in place to end domestic violence and to support women who are survivors, it is essential that we also provide critical resources to save lives and prevent future domestic crimes. When women are silent, domestic violence thrives. But when women speak out, domestic violence can end.

I urge my colleagues to support programs and shelters nationwide that provide safety for the many survivors each day.

HONORING CHARLES L. BLOCKSON

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the scholarship and dedication of historian Charles L. Blockson, upon the occasion of the publication of his latest book—The President's House Revisited Behind The Scenes: The Samuel Fraunces Story. For most of his life Mr. Blockson has collected and preserved African and African American historical tomes, art and artifacts. In 2001 I was privileged to have sponsored an appropriation to fund the digitalization of the Collection.

Housed at Temple University, the Collection is one of the nation's leading research facilities for the study of the history and culture of Africans of the Diaspora with special emphasis on the lives and experiences of African Americans in Philadelphia and the surrounding Delaware Valley.

I am proud to know this much esteemed and dedicated man who has provided us with a window into the lives of the African and African Americans who too often have been written out of history. I salute Charles L. Blockson, a distinguished scholar.

HONORING BENAVIDEZ-PATTERSON "ALL AIRBORNE" CHAPTER, 82ND AIRBORNE DIVISION ASSOCIATION

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the Benavidez-Patterson "All Airborne" Chapter of the 82nd Airborne Division, a distinguished Veterans Service Organization in El Paso, Texas.

The Benavidez-Patterson "All-Airborne" Chapter is comprised of current and former military paratroopers. The unit develops new relationships and cultivates existing bonds among those who have served in the Airborne; honors the memory of troopers who died in service; and informs its members of legislative changes and policy ideas relevant to veterans.

With 250 members, the Benavidez-Patterson Chapter is the largest "All-Airborne" chapter in Texas and has included representation from virtually every Airborne unit since World War II. It is comprised of national heroes. Members have included veteran paratroopers who had combat assignments in Africa, Sicily, Italy, France, The Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Korea, the Dominican Republic, Vietnam, Grenada, Panama, Iraq and Afghanistan, along with others currently deployed in the Middle East. Members have included one of the original Darby's Rangers and a Pathfinder

on D-Day. Others were involved in "Operation: Overlord" into Normandy, France, on D-Day; "Operation: Market Garden" in Holland; and the "Battle of the Bulge."

Chartered in August 1985, the Benavidez-Patterson "All-Airborne" Chapter is named in honor of the late MSG Roy P. Benavidez and CSM Robert Patterson (Ret.), both recipients of the Medal of Honor. The Chapter was further honored through the membership of Medal of Honor recipients COL. Joseph Rodriguez (Deceased) of El Paso and LTC (Ret.) Alfred Rascon. Other distinguished members have included MG Howard Bromberg; BG Shuffer, a statesman, author and paratrooper; in addition to LTG Lionetti, MG Lennox, MG Cravens, MG Infante, MG Little, MG Oblinger and MG Michael G. Vane.

I thank the Benavidez-Patterson "All-Airborne" Chapter for their commitment to honoring our veterans and for helping to strengthen the bonds among service members and veterans in the El Paso community.

HONORING LAUREN HALLSTROM

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lauren Hallstrom from Douglas County, Colorado. Last November, sixteen-year-old Lauren participated in Douglas County Libraries' National Novel Writing Month (NaNoWriMo) and authored an entire novel in only 30 days.

Miss Hallstrom's novel, *Dreamweaver*, tells the tale of a girl named Audrey in a place called Fortune. The novel follows Audrey's efforts to rid her town of bad luck after an unlucky penny wreaks havoc on Fortune and its citizens. This intriguing story and Lauren's outstanding efforts were recognized when *Dreamweaver* was announced the winner of the Douglas County Libraries' novel-writing contest last February.

As part of Lauren's prize, Douglas County Libraries provided editing and cover design services for *Dreamweaver*, and it is now possible to find Lauren's book on both Bookcrafters.net and Amazon.com. Such literary success is truly remarkable for a sixteen-year-old.

I am extremely honored to represent this talented young woman. Please join me in congratulating Lauren on the publication of her first novel. I hope we continue to see many more from her in the future.

SUPPORT OF A WOMAN'S RIGHT TO CHOOSE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the recent determination by a federal judge that new Texas abortion restrictions directly violate the

U.S. Constitution. When Governor Rick Perry signed into law Texas H.B. 2, a smattering of new limitations on access to abortion, he threatened to take away a woman's right to choose.

The Texas law would ban abortions 20 weeks after fertilization, mandate that abortion providers have admitting privileges at a hospital within 30 miles of the facility, and requires doctors to administer the abortion-inducing medication in person rather than at home. These provisions would cause dozens of abortion clinics to shutter their doors, restricting access to women.

District Judge Lee Yeakel struck down the regulation that would require doctors to have admitting privileges at nearby hospitals, a notion that creates an undue obstacle for women seeking an abortion. Yeakel also blocked the provision that would require physicians to follow U.S. Food and Drug Administration procedure for abortion medication because a physician can ultimately determine what route of medication is best for the preservation of the life or health of the mother.

Unfortunately, the law still bans abortions at 20 weeks of pregnancy and requires all physicians to perform abortions in surgical facilities. Restricting care for women is unconscionable. Currently, a woman's access to abortion depends mostly on her zip code. While the U.S. Constitution federally protects women, states with anti-abortion leaders impose restrictive laws. These state laws cannot stand up to the U.S. Constitution.

I urge my colleagues to support a woman's right to choose, a law that was established in 1973 with the decision made in *Roe v. Wade*. I am proud to stand as a pro-choice legislator and vow to protect fair access to abortions in my state.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,081,509,219,288.50. We've added \$6,454,632,170,375.42 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING SERGEANT PAUL CAVALLARO

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Sergeant Paul Cavallaro of the Pennsylvania State Police.

Sergeant Cavallaro has been serving the citizens of Pennsylvania as a State Trooper

since 1992. He has served in numerous patrol and crime units in stations throughout the Commonwealth. He has held numerous roles within the State Police such as: Alternate Identification Unit Officer, Alternate CIA officer, Patrol Unit Supervisor, Criminal Investigation Unit Supervisor, Patrol Section Supervisor, and his most recent title as Station Commander.

Sergeant Cavallaro has received letters of commendation in 2002 and 2008, and received a nomination for the International Association of Chiefs of Police Trooper of the Year Award in 2003. Additionally, he has also received letters of appreciation from the Pike County District Attorney's Office and the Monmouth & Ocean County Intelligence Bureau.

As a member of the Pennsylvania State Police, Sergeant Cavallaro has obtained training in wiretap, street gangs, domestic violence, hate crimes, advanced crime scene investigation, terrorism awareness, FBI post blast investigations, interview and interrogation, advanced hidden compartments and has received special deputation as a United States Marshall.

Along with his duties as Station Commander, Sergeant Cavallaro is a bugler for the Pennsylvania State Police Ceremonial Unit, negotiator with the Special Emergency Response Team and he sponsors the annual Troop R Cadet Golf Tournament. In his spare time he coaches youth baseball, hockey, football and soccer.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Cavallaro has devoted his life to serving his community and others; it is with great pride that I honor him today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Monday, October 28, 2013. I had family obligations that kept me in Wisconsin. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 2189 (rollcall No. 561) and in favor of H.R. 2011 (rollcall No. 562).

CONGRATULATING CREEKSIDE MIDDLE SCHOOL, A BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an outstanding school in my district that is being honored as a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School. It is a pleasure to congratulate Creekside Middle School in Carmel, Indiana in celebration of this special occasion.

The National Blue Ribbon designation, given by the U.S. Department of Education, is awarded to both public and private schools

across our great nation. Started by President Reagan and given annually since 1982, the award celebrates great American schools that achieve very high learning standards or are making significant improvements in the academic achievements of their students. In my district and across the country, the award recognizes the great educators, students and parents who have worked so hard to ensure Indiana's children reach their full potential and achieve academic success.

For all of these reasons and many more, I am so proud that Creekside is receiving this prestigious designation. It is a wonderful acknowledgement of the school's commitment to providing young Hoosiers an exceptional education. While 417 schools nationwide may be nominated, only 286 are chosen as a National Blue Ribbon School, making this recognition all the more impressive.

Since opening ten years ago, Creekside has grown tremendously and now serves nearly 1,500 students. Creekside has also consistently placed as one of Indiana's top middle schools. I applaud its administrators and teachers for their focus on rigorous and relevant curriculum that will help students succeed in their future endeavors.

As a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, I also want to acknowledge how important it is to our nation's future to encourage and raise a new generation of Americans who have the skills and knowledge to succeed both in and out of the classroom. Students like those at Creekside give me hope that we will accomplish this vital mission. Their outstanding work is an inspiration to students, educators and parents across the nation. Once again, congratulations to Creekside. I am very proud of you.

RECOGNIZING DR. CATALINA GARCIA

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Catalina Garcia, an accomplished anesthesiologist from El Paso, Texas, and one of the first Mexican-Americans to graduate from the UT Southwestern Medical School. Dr. Garcia is being honored as a "Latina Living Legend" by the DFW Hispanic 100, a local service organization that enables Hispanic women to participate in social issues.

Dr. Garcia was inspired early in her youth to pursue a career in medicine. From a family of doctors, dentists, and pharmacists, Dr. Garcia grew up with the value of helping others embedded in her psyche. Today, Dr. Garcia blazed her own path as a prominent community leader.

In addition to her accomplishments in medicine, Dr. Garcia spearheaded a number of philanthropic endeavors. She is a founding member of the Dallas Women's Foundation, an organization that promotes women's issues through education, and dedicates much of her time to teach English to immigrant women.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Garcia deserves great recognition for her efforts to empower members

of our community. Dr. Garcia demonstrated tremendous resolve in bringing community-oriented services to Texas, and I am proud to recognize her many accomplishments.

HONORING THE REV. THOMAS E. GILMORE

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the extraordinary contributions of Rev. Thomas E. Gilmore, a Civil Rights icon and Alabama treasure who was the first black sheriff elected to serve in Greene County, Alabama. Recently, the courthouse square in Greene County was named in honor of this American hero and I am honored to join with my home State in saluting the numerous contributions of this American hero.

Rev. Gilmore was born on May 1, 1941 in Forkland, Alabama to Beatrice O'Neal and a loving grandmother, Clara Gilmore. Throughout his lifetime, Rev. Gilmore has often credited his journey of greatness to the unyielding love of both of these extraordinary women. Today, he reflects on the passion, wisdom and courage they instilled in him that served as cornerstones for his desire to make a difference.

Gilmore attended Greene County public schools and later enrolled in Selma University in 1959. Shortly after, he married his childhood sweetheart, the late Minnie Gilmore, whom Rev. Gilmore also credited for being a source of great strength throughout their 35-year partnership. The young couple left Alabama briefly for a move to Los Angeles, but the native son made the decision to return home in 1963.

Gilmore returned home to an Alabama that was plagued by the perils of racism and injustice. And one evening, as Gilmore was headed to a local gas station to purchase milk for his young son, he fell victim to a painful reminder of the racial turbulence in Greene County. As he drove, Gilmore unknowingly ran into a puddle of water and splashed a white state trooper. Assuming that Gilmore was a civil rights worker, the trooper retaliated by pushing Gilmore against a gas pump and forcing him to wash his car. At that moment, the young minister was led to make a difference and he was inspired to find ways to end police brutality.

Gilmore became active in the local civil rights movement and mass meetings and was later recruited by the Rev. James Orange to work for Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Under Dr. King's leadership, Gilmore helped to organize and lead voter registration drives.

The impetus for Gilmore's run for sheriff stems from his efforts in attempting to file a complaint against a local officer that assaulted a young black woman. During his attempt, the Greene County Sheriff savagely beat Gilmore in the district attorney's office. Shortly after the incident, Gilmore and other local civil rights leaders constructed the idea that he should

run for sheriff to combat the violence that was brewing in Greene County, Selma and surrounding areas.

At the age of 24, this young warrior launched his first campaign for sheriff in 1966. Today, he describes his candidacy as "unheard of." While he was unsuccessful on his first attempt, he was elected four years later. He served as Sheriff of Greene County from 1971-1983. When asked what it was like to be a trailblazer, this humble servant simply replied "I thought about being the best sheriff I could be . . . I thought about walking tall."

During his influential tenure, Gilmore became known as "The Sheriff Without A Gun." Led by the nonviolent teachings he learned during his time as a civil rights activist, Gilmore endeavored to govern through the use of non-violence. Gilmore retired as Sheriff in 1983 and relocated to Birmingham to serve as Pastor of First Baptist Church in Ensley, AL. Today Rev. Gilmore remains a dedicated Pastor, leader, and servant.

Rev. Gilmore's many accomplishments are an inspiration to us all. He is truly an Alabama treasure and an American hero worthy of recognition. On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Rev. Thomas E. Gilmore.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I had to tend to a personal matter in Plattsburgh, NY. Consequently, I was not able to return to Washington, D.C. in time to vote on H.R. 2189, a Bill to Improve the Processing of Disability Claims by the Department of Veterans Affairs (rollcall No. 561) and H.R. 2011, the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education Improvement Act (rollcall No. 562). As a veteran and representative of thousands of other veterans, making sure the men and women who served our Nation have access to the care they deserve is one of my top priorities. Had I been present to vote, I would have voted "yea" for both bills.

HONORING PROFESSOR TERENCE J. ANDERSON ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT AS PROFESSOR OF LAW EMERITUS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI SCHOOL OF LAW

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my good friend, Professor Terence J. Anderson on the occasion of his retirement as Professor of Law Emeritus at the University of Miami School of Law. Professor Anderson is not only one of the most revered and respected law professors in the United

States, but his legal jurisprudence far exceeds the boundaries of this nation, as his students and his influence span the globe.

Professor Anderson is an intellectual giant in the law and over the course of his career has demonstrated acute success as a practicing lawyer, an international courts commissioner, and an academic dean. His knowledge of constitutional law is renown, and he has become not only a trusted advisor to me throughout my legal career, but a good friend, too.

Since he joined the Law School faculty at the University of Miami in 1976 as a prized professorial recruit of the late Soia Mentschikoff, then-Dean of the Law School, Professor Anderson has been an indelible influence on virtually every aspect of law student and faculty life. Upon graduating from the University of Chicago Law School in 1964, he served for two years as a regional courts commissioner in Malawi, Africa as a member of the Peace Corps, practiced commercial and corporate transactional law for seven years in Chicago, and taught law and served as academic dean at the cutting-edge Antioch School of Law in Washington, DC.

As a law professor, he has been instrumental in helping students develop the analytical and critical thinking skills needed to successfully provide valued legal representation. Known for his demanding pursuit of perfection, Prof. Anderson's first-year elements course and upper-class evidence class were legendary for their reputation as both impossible to master yet required for those desiring to become formidable advocates. Having perfected Henry Wigmore's chart method of constructing arguments about questions of fact in complex cases, using boxes, circles and arrows, Prof. Anderson mystified the uninitiated but brought enlightenment and depth to the truly dedicated.

Professor Anderson's long-time collaboration with Professor William Twining in Great Britain and the United States redefined the law of evidence, culminating in a 27-year adventure with the publication of the critically acclaimed *Analysis of Evidence*. The analytical structure that Prof. Anderson developed is not confined to legal jurisprudence, as he and Prof. Twining are now applying their principles to such varied domains as archeology and the applied sciences.

His meticulous attention to detail and perfection has produced a body of work that stands the test of time. His quick-thinking, crisp and clear arguments, and quick-fire repartee has been known to both amaze and confuse, all for the purpose of striking at the core of even the most intractable problems. His students remain passionate, as he is, about evidence, argumentation, and advocacy.

Professor Anderson knows no distinction between legal theory and practice, following in the footsteps of the great legal thinker Karl Llewellyn and his mentor Soia Mentschikoff, both of whom rejected any sharp divide between the two. His skills were much in demand when, during his 1994–1995 fellowship at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies in Wassenaar, he lectured extensively on the American criminal process as the world focused on the unfolding O.J. Simpson trial. During that period, Professor Anderson devel-

oped an "audit model" that critically analyzed and explained how the Dutch system of criminal procedure was different from but no less as effective as the American adversarial system.

Through nearly 50 years as a gifted lawyer, advocate, professor, public servant, community conscience, international observer, family man, and legend, Terry Anderson has been a gift to the law and the legions of lawyers who owe their skills and successes to him. In ways both monumental and profound, Terry Anderson has changed for the better the course of the law and legal education in the United States and beyond. He truly represents the best of the American legal system.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his Celebration of A Life of the Law at the University of Miami School of Law on November 7, 2013, I am proud to recognize his outstanding legacy that will remain for all time an important component of the history of the United States of America.

HURRICANE SANDY: ONE YEAR LATER

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise as we recognize the anniversary of Hurricane Sandy, which made landfall in New Jersey one year ago today.

By now, we all know that Sandy was a storm of epic proportions. In New Jersey, 357,000 homes were damaged or destroyed, and 2.7 million households were left without power—some for weeks.

We pause to remember the over 3 dozen New Jerseyans tragically killed by the storm. It is only thanks to the heroic efforts of our first responders that many more were saved from the rising waters.

As media coverage focused on the destruction to shore communities, inland towns along the Hackensack River in Northern New Jersey were also being inundated by floodwaters.

The towns of Little Ferry and Moonachie in Bergen County were particularly hard hit. About 90 percent of the homes there were damaged or destroyed.

Over \$19.6 million in Individual Assistance from FEMA has been awarded in my district, including \$9.3 million in Little Ferry and \$6.2 million in Moonachie—two working class towns with a combined population of just over 13,000.

We have come far over the past year, but we still have a long way to go moving forward.

Moonachie's Borough Hall, which houses the municipal government and public safety department, is still operating out of temporary trailers.

In Little Ferry, many homeowners were only recently informed that after spending thousands on repairs, the extent of the damage was severe enough that their homes would have to be elevated—weeks after grant programs to help fund the elevations had closed their applications.

Unfortunately, the State of New Jersey has been slow to spend its initial allocation of HUD

funding provided under the Sandy supplemental appropriations legislation. According to some estimates, just 25 percent of the funding allocated for housing programs has gone out the door to those in need.

With the next round of Community Development Block Grant—Disaster Recovery funding on the way for the regions impacted, I will be fighting to ensure that these critical aid dollars go towards addressing our outstanding needs and priorities quickly and efficiently.

Sandy taught us how utterly vulnerable we are when disaster strikes—a lesson we cannot soon forget.

As we continue to rebuild for the long term, we need to focus on finding solutions which will make our communities more resilient to better protect us from future storms.

We must also work towards reducing our carbon emissions in order to slow the warming of our climate, which is driving stronger storms, sea level rise, and more severe weather.

As we move into the second year of our recovery efforts, I urge my colleagues to stay firm in their resolve to support us in the work we still have ahead of us.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL WORK AND FAMILY MONTH

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Work and Family Month. As a father of five, I understand the constant struggle faced by American families to balance their work and family life. Policies that promote work-life balance can, and have, helped to create healthier, more flexible work environments.

Today's families are increasingly likely to include two working parents. In addition to caring for children, a number of working-age adults face other demands on their time such as caring for an aging parent. To meet the needs of a modern workforce, many companies have created work-life programs to assist employees in balancing their jobs with their personal commitments.

Studies show that both employees and employers benefit from work-life flexibility programs. Benefits from such programs include increased productivity, recruitment, retention, and employee satisfaction. Work-life initiatives lead to better business, higher employee morale, and healthier families.

In today's economy, public and private employers, including our government, are finding it is not only necessary, but beneficial to support work-life balance. With this in mind, I have introduced the 'Paid Vacation Act' (H.R. 2096) to provide workers one week of paid leave annually under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). My bill would provide much needed time off to the one in four Americans, working in the private sector, who do not receive any paid vacation.

Today's employees work longer and harder than ever before. I strongly support policies, like paid vacation leave and sick leave, that

allow workers to spend more time with their families, improve their mental and physical health, and ultimately be more productive. We in Congress must take National Work and

Family Month as an opportunity to consider how to better promote work-life programs and policies that will benefit working families.

This October, in honor of National Work and Family Month, I encourage my colleagues to

acknowledge the positive impacts of a healthy work-life balance on family life and the workforce.

SENATE—Wednesday, October 30, 2013

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the giver of gifts, thank You for Your unchanging promises that we can claim each day. Lord, You have promised to supply our needs and to work everything together for our good.

Bless our lawmakers. Help them to seek not what they can get from You but what Your power can enable them to do for You. Remind them that in prayer they do not so much hear a voice as acquire a voice. Show them how to use that acquired voice to speak for the voiceless. May they even use their pain to put them in touch with the pain of others.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 30, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following the remarks of myself and Senator

MCCONNELL, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Alan Estevez to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, working with Senator Hagel. The time until 10:30 a.m. will be equally divided. At 10:30, there will be a cloture vote on the nomination. If cloture is invoked, we expect to confirm this nomination later today and continue with cloture votes on additional nominations.

We always complain about what we don't get done, but I think everyone in the Senate should recognize that as a result of our having changed the rules in the Senate, we are able to move through some of these things much more quickly. We have reduced the time from 30 hours after cloture has been invoked to 8 hours, and that has helped us move through these issues. So everybody complains about our never changing things around here, but we have, and it has helped us.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate has the privilege of considering the nominations of many exceptionally talented individuals for a variety of jobs. This week the Senate has already approved three qualified and dedicated nominees—including Richard Griffin, to serve among the people's watchdogs against labor abuses, and Tom Wheeler, to lead the body that oversees the Nation's telecommunications industries. This week we will consider five other fine public servants for a variety of crucial roles in the executive branch. So when one nominee's personal story and professional dedication stands out in this distinguished crowd, it is remarkable. And it is remarkable when we talk about a woman by the name of Patricia Millett.

Ms. Millett has been chosen by the President to be a nominee to serve on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. She graduated at the top of her class from the University of Illinois and then attended Harvard Law School. She clerked for the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and served as an appellate attorney in the Justice Department's civil division. She then served as assistant to the Solicitor General under Democratic President Bill Clinton as well as Republican President George W. Bush. Ms. Millett then was chosen to lead the Supreme Court practice at the prestigious law firm of Akin Gump, and has argued more than 32 cases before the U.S. Supreme Court. This is a stunning number that rarely anyone ever reaches. I am sure there are others who

have reached this number, but the two who come to my mind are the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court who argued many cases, and a long-time friend, the late Rex Lee, who was Solicitor General for President Reagan. Prior to, during his tenure as Solicitor General, and after he argued many cases before the Supreme Court. But 32 arguments before the Supreme Court is a stunningly high number.

Patricia Millett's professional credentials are matched by her personal integrity and determination. She is a military spouse, mother of two children, who argued a case before the Supreme Court while her husband, who serves in the Navy, was deployed in Kuwait. Ms. Millett has been a literacy tutor for more than two decades, and volunteers at her church's homeless shelter. She has the support of law enforcement officials, legal professionals, and military organizations from across the political spectrum. Her colleagues have called her fair-minded, principled, and exceptionally gifted, with unwavering integrity. So it is truly a shame that some Republicans would filibuster this exceedingly qualified nominee for unrelated political reasons.

Patricia Millett is nominated to what many call the second most important court in the land—the D.C. Circuit. This court reviews the complicated decisions and rulemakings of Federal agencies, and since September 11, 2001, has handled some of the most important terrorism and detention cases in the history of our country.

This is what former D.C. Chief Judge Patricia Wald said about the court's caseload:

The D.C. Circuit hears the most complex, time-consuming, labyrinthine disputes over regulations with the greatest impact on ordinary Americans' lives: clean air and water regulations, nuclear plant safety, health-care reform issues, insider trading and more. These cases can require thousands of hours of preparation by the judges, often consuming days of argument, involving hundreds of parties and interveners, and necessitating dozens of briefs and thousands of pages of record—all of which culminates in lengthy, technically intricate legal opinions. . . . The nature of the D.C. Circuit's caseload is what sets it apart from other courts.

Unfortunately, today the court is functioning far below its full complement of judges. The number of judges was chosen legislatively a long time ago. Today, only 8 of the 11 seats on the D.C. Circuit are full. The three remaining vacancies are due in part to Republican obstruction of qualified nominees such as Caitlin Halligan, an extremely qualified woman. Twice she was defeated.

Republicans claim that filling these three remaining vacancies on the D.C. Circuit would amount to court packing. This is ridiculous. We are not changing any law. We are filling vacancies. Circuit court nominees, including nominees for the D.C. Circuit, have waited seven times longer for confirmation under President Obama than they did under the last President Bush. So it is no mystery why we have a judiciary crisis in America. Making nominations to vacant judgeships is not court packing. It is the President's job.

I repeat, filling vacant judgeships is the President's job. It has nothing to do with court packing.

Senate Republicans were happy to confirm judges to the D.C. Circuit when President Reagan and President George W. Bush were in office, but now that a Democrat serves in the White House, they want to eliminate the remaining three D.C. Circuit seats, although the court's workload has actually grown since President Bush was in office.

Republicans are using convenient but flawed political arguments to hamstring our Nation's court and deny highly qualified nominees such as Ms. Millett a fair up-or-down vote. But she deserves better. She deserves a return to the days when all Senators—including Republicans—took their duty to advise and consent seriously.

I am cautiously optimistic that enough Republicans understand their responsibilities and will allow us to move forward on this very important nomination. She deserves a return to the days when qualified nominees were guaranteed a full and fair confirmation process to avoid the political games. It is basically fairness.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader.

OBAMACARE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, each of us was sent here to serve and protect our constituents. That is why Republicans voted unanimously against ObamaCare in 2009, because we believed it was our job to stand for middle-class families we were sent here to represent, because we—and not just us, but countless health care professionals, policy experts, and citizens across the country—saw this train wreck coming literally years ago, knew the pain it would cause, and warned against it.

I wish the President and Washington Democrats had listened back then. I really do. I wish we had been wrong about ObamaCare too, because the failings of this law are about so much more than a Web site. They are about real people.

Yes, the healthcare.gov fiasco can seem almost comical at times—like a surreal parody of government bungling. But as the President says, this is about so much more than a Web site. He is right about that. The pain this law is causing is not digital—it is real.

Workers first began to feel the pain when employers started cutting hours, and then benefits, and some jobs altogether. Spouses felt it when they lost their health coverage they had had through their husband's or wife's job. College graduates felt it when they could only find part-time work, if they could find anything at all in the Obama economy. And this was before basically anyone had even heard of this ObamaCare Web site.

Now that the health care law is actually coming online, many Americans are finding they will be seeing premium increases or that they will be getting hit with higher copays and deductibles or that they can no longer see the doctors who use the hospitals of their choice. In fact, I have been hearing from constituents in western Kentucky that a number of the hospitals and health care providers they have relied upon will no longer be available in their network—and, in many cases, they will be responsible for 100 percent of the costs associated with services performed at those facilities they used to use.

Let me repeat. One hundred percent of the costs. How is that an improvement? How is that reform?

Many in the middle class are also learning that the health plans they were promised they could keep are being taken away from them anyway. They feel absolutely betrayed. They feel hurt. And they feel vulnerable. When these folks are offered “comparable” plans at all, they are often completely unaffordable. And if they poke around on the exchanges—assuming they could even log on—many are finding that ObamaCare coverage is going to cost them way too much, not offer them what they want, or both.

Here is a note I recently received from a constituent in Caldwell County:

According to . . . our health insurance provider, we can elect to stay on our current plan for this year with less coverage or switch to the ‘Affordable’ Care Plan that provides a little more coverage but at a cost increase that is almost double. We currently pay \$653 per month and it would increase to over \$1100 . . . after talking to the insurance company today, it seems . . . I was lied to by the President and Congress when we were told that the ‘Affordable’ Care Act would not require us to switch from our current insurance provider. My husband and I work hard, pay a lot in taxes and ask for little from our government. Is it asking too much for government to stay out of my health insurance?

Her family is not alone. A CNN report this morning estimates that roughly one-half of the 600,000 people in Kentucky's private insurance market will have their current insurance plans discontinued by the end of the year.

This is not right and it is certainly not fair. It is even more unfair when you consider that the administration chose to exempt businesses from this law for a year but did not think the middle class deserved the same treatment.

Republicans do. We think the middle class actually deserves a permanent exemption from this law. But as long as partisans in Washington continue to jealously defend ObamaCare, we will do at least whatever we can to fight for greater fairness for the middle class.

I hope more Democrats will join us to make that happen because a Web site can be fixed but the pain this law is causing—higher premiums, canceled coverage—that is what is really important, and that is what Democrats need to work with us to address by starting over, completely over, with true bipartisan health care reform.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ALAN F. ESTEVEZ TO BE A PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Alan F. Estevez, of the District of Columbia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 10:30 will be equally divided and controlled in the usual form prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Vermont.

MILLETT NOMINATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today we are debating whether the Senate is going to be allowed to vote on the confirmation of Patricia Millett. She is nominated to fill the vacancy that our current Chief Justice John Roberts previously occupied on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.

If she is confirmed, as of course she should be, she will be only the sixth woman to serve on the D.C. Circuit in its more than 120-year history. She is an extraordinary nominee. She has impeccable credentials for this important appellate court.

I, like so many others across this country, hope that her confirmation is not going to suffer from the partisanship and gridlock that consumed Congress earlier this month.

Ms. Millett was born in Dexter, ME and now calls Virginia home, but growing up she lived in Kansas, Virginia, Ohio, and Illinois. She earned her undergraduate degree, *summa cum laude*, from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and her law degree, *magna cum laude*, from Harvard Law School. She served as a law clerk for Judge Thomas Tang on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in Phoenix, AZ.

Patricia Millett has had a brilliant legal career. She has argued 32 cases before the Supreme Court. Until recently, she held the record for the most Supreme Court arguments by a woman attorney before the court. She has argued dozens of cases in the Federal courts of appeal. She has briefed numerous cases in the Supreme Court and also appellate courts across the Nation.

Ms. Millett has extensive experience on issues that come before the D.C. Circuit. She served for 15 years in the U.S. Department of Justice in both Democratic and Republican administrations. She worked for 4 years on the appellate staff of the civil division. She argued cases in Federal and State appellate courts, including the successful constitutional defense of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, and the inclusion of "In God We Trust" on Federal currency.

She spent over a decade in the Solicitor General's office. Her stellar reputation led a bipartisan group of seven former Solicitors General to praise her as "unfailingly fairminded."

In 2004, Republican Attorney General John Ashcroft awarded Ms. Millett the Attorney General's Distinguished Service Award for representing the interest of the United States before the Supreme Court.

Since 2007, she has led the Supreme Court practice in the Washington, DC, office of Akin Gump. Her work in private practice spans commercial litigation, administrative law, constitutional matters, statutory construction, and even criminal appeals. She has represented Army reservists and business interests, including the Chamber of Commerce as well as civil rights plain-tiffs.

Ms. Millett is a nominee with unquestionable integrity and character. She has committed herself to pro bono work. She has done this throughout her career. She has also engaged in some very significant community service.

She helps the neediest among us, volunteering through her church to prepare meals for the homeless and serving regularly as an overnight monitor at a local shelter. Twenty years after serving as a law clerk in Arizona, Patricia Millett will return next summer with her family for a mission trip with the White Mountain Apache tribe in Fort Apache, AZ.

It is interesting that in a press conference I held yesterday when we had spouses of people in the military, we talked about another aspect of her career. Her husband is now a retired Navy reservist, but as a military spouse when he was called up, Ms. Millett has a personal understanding of the sacrifice we ask of our servicemembers and their families.

At the very height of her legal career, her husband was called on to deploy as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Of course he left, as those who are called to serve do, but she was left at home with two young children. And what did she do? She did what spouses all over this country do. She filled the role of both parents at home while her husband served in the Navy overseas.

In fact, just the other day the Senate passed a bipartisan resolution to honor families like Ms. Millett's family. We commemorate October 26 as the Day of the Deployed.

Not only is she committed to her own military family, she has helped to secure employment protections for members of our National Guard and Reserve through her pro bono legal work.

I know the distinguished Presiding Officer is concerned about the Guard and Reserve in his State of Massachusetts as I am in my State of Vermont. Ms. Millett also knows the strains that they face. In a case decided by the Supreme Court in 2011, Ms. Millett represented an Army reservist who was fired, in part, because some of his co-workers who stayed at home didn't like his military absences. She stood up for every Guard member and every reservist in Vermont or Massachusetts or any other State in this country. The successful arguments Ms. Millett helped craft have made it easier for all members of our Reserve and National Guard to protect their right under the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act.

Through her legal work, she has earned broad bipartisan support. This includes the support of Peter Keisler, Carter Phillips, Kenneth Starr, Ted Olson, Paul Clement, and a bipartisan group of 110 appellate practitioners, as well as 37 Deputy Solicitors General and assistants to the Solicitor General from both Republican and Democratic administrations.

She is supported by both the national president of the National Fraternal Order of Police, Chuck Canterbury; the Deputy Commissioner of the New York Police Department, Douglas Maynard;

the President of the National Bar Association, John Page; and Andrea Carlise, the current President of the National Conference of Women's Bar Associations. Ms. Millett has the support of the military community including Major General Clark H. McNair, Jr., U.S. Army, Retired; Michael Hall, Command Sergeant Major, U.S. Army, Retired; Blue Star Families; and the Gallant Few.

Based on Ms. Millett's advocacy in private practice, she has the support of former executive vice president at the Chamber of Commerce Litigation Center, Robin Conrad, who declares that Ms. Millett is:

a non-ideological, non-partisan, 'lawyer's lawyer,' who has proven herself to be a trusted advisor to business with a practical appreciation of the challenges faced by businesses, large and small. She is open-minded, fair, even-tempered and superbly qualified to serve on the District of Columbia Circuit.

In fact, the list is so long, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

If a President was to be given a textbook about the type of nominee to send to the Senate, or if Senators were given a textbook of the type of person to confirm, this would be the golden standard right here. We should not even be having this debate. She should have been confirmed unanimously weeks ago. She is the kind of nominee we should support because hers is a great American story of dedication, diligence, patriotism, and extraordinary professional ability.

I hope nobody is going to get involved in partisan politics and choose to filibuster her nomination. She deserves to be confirmed.

I understand that some Republicans have newfound concerns about the number of judges on the D.C. Circuit. During the Bush administration, Senate Republicans voted unanimously to fill four vacancies on the D.C. Circuit—giving the court a total of 11 judges in active service. Today there are only eight judges on the court. What has changed? It is not the caseload—that has remained fairly constant over the past 10 years. The only thing that has changed is the party of the President nominating judges to the court.

Incidentally, a Republican President nominated a man named John Roberts to the seat Ms. Millett has now been nominated to. When his nomination came up for a vote on the Senate floor, as I recall, all Democrats and all Republicans supported him for that seat. While Democrats did not agree with him philosophically on all issues, we knew he was highly qualified, and he was confirmed.

I don't think it is any stretch to say she is just as qualified. It is the same seat, but the only difference is it is a Democratic President who has nominated her. The standards should be the

same. The same standards that allowed John Roberts to be confirmed to that seat with a Republican President are the same standards that should allow her to be confirmed to the seat with a Democratic President. She should be confirmed.

I want to talk about the caseload. The caseload was 121 pending appeals per active judge when President Bush was in office. The Republican-controlled Senate had no problem in confirming the 11th judge to that court.

Now, when the caseload is 185 pending appeals per active judge instead of 121 with a Democratic President, we are told: Gosh, we have to cut back. We have too many judges. It doesn't pass the giggle test. The fact is that this is what Republicans said. They voted for nominees to fill these 11 seats. Now, when three of those seats are vacant and we are trying to fill one—the same one John Roberts had—some are saying maybe we have too many judges. Back then we had 121 appeals pending per active judge and now we have 185. No matter how we do it, the issue simply comes down to, is this nominee qualified?

I have had the great privilege of serving in this body for almost 40 years. I have voted on thousands of judges nominated by both Republicans and Democrats. I voted to confirm the vast majority of them whether we had a Republican President or a Democratic President. Thinking back through all of those thousands of judges, I have a hard time finding even a handful who were as well qualified as this woman is or where there is as much of a need to have somebody in there.

This is important. This is not only important on the merits—and on the merits it is an easy case—but there should be no delay based on politics. At a time when the American people are looking at the Congress and saying: What are you people doing—first the shutdown and then other things—we should not allow one more example that will bring the scorn of the American people toward this great body by saying no to somebody when every single person, no matter what their politics are and no matter what part of the country they are from, knows how qualified she is.

I was thinking yesterday about when the group representing spouses in the military spoke about what she did to maintain her legal career but first and foremost to take care of her family while her husband was abroad and even then to do such things as help provide food to food kitchens for those less able and less fortunate. When we see a background such as this, we think it is too good to be true, but in this case it is all true. So let's confirm her.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS RECEIVED FOR PATRICIA MILLETT

June 24, 2013—Robin Conrad, Former Executive Vice President, National Chamber Litigation Center, Chamber of Commerce

July 2, 2013—Independent Group of Private Attorneys, Law Professors, and Former Judges

July 2, 2013—Jefferson Keel, President, National Congress of American Indians

July 3, 2013—Barbara Arnwine, President and Executive Director, and Jon Greenbaum, Chief Counsel and Senior Deputy Director, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law

July 3, 2013—Stuart Bowen, Jr.

July 3, 2013—Solicitors General at the Department of Justice, 1989–2009

July 3, 2013—Dan Schweitzer, Supreme Court Counsel, National Association of Attorneys General

July 3, 2013—Lisa Soronen, Executive Director, State and Local Legal Center

July 8, 2013—Jessica Adler, President, Women's Bar Association of the District of Columbia

July 8, 2013—Silvia Burley, Chairperson, California Valley Miwok Tribe

July 8, 2013—Major General Clark H. McNair, Jr., U.S. Army, Retired

July 8, 2013—Leonard Forsman, Chairman, Tribal Council of the Suquamish Tribe

July 8, 2013—Lilly Ledbetter

July 8, 2013—Judge Timothy Lewis, Former Federal Judge of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals

July 8, 2013—Carter Phillips and Peter Keisler, Attorneys

July 8, 2013—Douglass B. Maynard, Deputy Commissioner, NYPD

July 9, 2013—Chuck Canterbury, National President, National Fraternal Order of Police

July 9, 2013—David Diaz, Co-Chair, Endorsements Committee of the Hispanic Bar Association of the District of Columbia

July 9, 2013—37 Assistant, Deputy, and Acting Solicitors General

July 9, 2013—Ofelia L. Calderon, President, Hispanic Bar Association of the Commonwealth of Virginia

July 9, 2013—Nancy Duff Campbell and Marcia D. Greenberger, Co-Presidents, National Women's Law Center

July 9, 2013—Chuck Wexler, Executive Director, Police Executive Research Forum

July 9, 2013—Wade Henderson, President, and Nancy Zirkin, Executive Vice President, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights

July 10, 2013—John Page, President, National Bar Association

July 11, 2013—John E. Echohawk, Executive Director, Native American Rights Fund

July 17, 2013—Maryse Allen, President, Virginia Women Attorneys Association

July 17, 2013—Gene Rossi, Assistant U.S. Attorney and Chief of the Specials Unit, Eastern District of Virginia

July 17, 2013—Douglas Kendall, President, and Judith Schaeffer, Vice President, Constitutional Accountability Center

July 23, 2013—Mary Grace A. O'Malley, Attorney

July 23, 2013—Catherine M. Reese, Attorney

September 11, 2013—Andrea Carlise, President, National Conference of Women's Bar Associations

September 29, 2013—Matthew Crotty, U.S. Army and National Guard Veteran

September 30, 2013—Karl Monger, Major, Retired U.S. Army Reserves, and Executive Director, GallantFew, Inc.

October 1, 2013—Michael Hall, Retired from the U.S. Army after 31 years of active duty,

Command Sergeant Major, Retired U.S. Army

October 4, 2013—Karen Kelly, wife of General John F. Kelly, the Commander of the United States Southern Command

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate right now is considering the Estevez nomination, and the time is equally divided between both sides.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Alan F. Estevez, of the District of Columbia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

Harry Reid, Carl Levin, Robert Menendez, Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Christopher A. Coons, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher Murphy, Patty Murray, Tom Harkin, John D. Rockefeller IV, Bill Nelson, Benjamin L. Cardin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Alan F. Estevez, of the District of Columbia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 91, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 223 Ex.]

YEAS—91

Alexander	Franken	Mikulski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Moran
Baldwin	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Murphy
Baucus	Hagan	Murray
Begich	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Hatch	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Boozman	Heller	Reid
Boxer	Hirono	Roberts
Brown	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Shaheen
Casey	Kaine	Shelby
Chambliss	King	Stabenow
Chiesa	Kirk	Tester
Coats	Klobuchar	Thune
Coburn	Landrieu	Toomey
Cochran	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Collins	Lee	Udall (NM)
Coons	Levin	Vitter
Corker	Manchin	Warner
Donnelly	Markey	Warren
Durbin	McCain	Whitehouse
Enzi	McCaskill	Wicker
Feinstein	McConnell	Wyden
Fischer	Menendez	
Flake	Merkley	

NAYS—8

Cornyn	Paul	Scott
Crapo	Risch	Sessions
Cruz	Rubio	

NOT VOTING—1

Inhofe

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 91, the nays are 8. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 15 of the 113th Congress, there will now be up to 8 hours of postcloture consideration on the nomination equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12 noon today all postcloture time on the Estevez nomination be yielded back and the Senate proceed to a vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEGICH. For the information of all Senators, we expect a voice vote on the Estevez confirmation. The next vote in order will be cloture on the Archuleta nomination. Senators should expect a rollcall vote at noon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I know we are in the postcloture time on the Estevez nomination. I wanted to explain why it was necessary for me to put a hold on this nomination this last March. This is a very important posi-

tion, the second ranking acquisition official at the Department of Defense.

Actually my objection does not have anything to do with Mr. Estevez personally, who I trust will do an admirable job in this very important position. But the reason I put a hold on the nomination was so I could try to get the attention of the Department of Defense to protest the Department's business relations with a notorious Russian arms dealer. For the last few years, the Pentagon has been buying helicopters, Mi-17 helicopters, from Rosoboronexport, a Russian arms dealer, to supply the Afghan military. But this is the arms dealer, of course, who is supplying Bashar al-Assad with the weapons he is using in Syria in that civil war to kill his own innocent civilian population.

The Pentagon itself has confirmed that Bashar al-Assad security forces have used these very same Russian-made weapons to massacre an untold number of civilians. Yet the Department of Defense has stubbornly refused—I do not think arrogant is too strong a word—stubbornly and arrogantly refused to end its relationship with Assad's personal arms supplier.

In fact, since 2011, the Pentagon has given more than \$1 billion—\$1 billion—to Rosoboronexport in no-bid contracts. It is planning to spend another \$345 million on the company's Mi-17 helicopters in 2014.

Let me be clear. By purchasing Mi-17s from Rosoboronexport, our own Department of Defense is effectively subsidizing the mass murder of Syrian civilians, which is, by all accounts, simply outrageous.

To make matters worse, the Mi-17 program is apparently plagued by internal corruption. According to published news reports, there are at least two separate ongoing criminal investigations into the U.S. Army office that manages the procurement and sustainment contracts for the Mi-17s. Last month, I joined 31 of my congressional colleagues in a bipartisan letter to the Attorney General of the United States, urging him to utilize all available resources to support these criminal investigations.

For that matter, I have also joined with 12 of my Senate colleagues in a bipartisan letter to General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Pentagon, asking him for assurances that its contracts with Rosoboronexport are not being abused by corrupt Russian officials.

Americans have good reason to be concerned. It is their tax dollars that are being used to buy these helicopters from Russia for the Afghan military.

Russia has a particularly bad track record. They received an abysmal grade of D-minus in Transparency International's latest Government Defence Anti-Corruption Index. In 2011, Russia's chief military prosecutor publicly stat-

ed that 20 percent of his country's annual military equipment budget is being stolen by corrupt officials and contractors. One independent watchdog believes that figure could be as high as 40 percent.

In short, there are plenty of legitimate reasons and questions about why American tax dollars are going to Rosoboronexport. On a per-aircraft basis, the U.S. Army is paying Rosoboronexport more than double what the Russian military itself is paying to buy nearly identical helicopters. About 1 year ago, I convinced the Pentagon to conduct a formal audit of the Army's 2011 no-bid contract. Unfortunately, that audit went nowhere due to persistent stonewalling by—you guessed it—Rosoboronexport.

In other words, we still have a lot of questions and the Pentagon and Rosoboronexport still owe us a lot of answers which we don't yet have. One question is what prompted the Department of Defense to buy Russian helicopters in the first place? To my knowledge, there are plenty of American manufacturers of helicopters that would be anxious to compete for this no-bid contract. By relying upon Moscow to supply the Afghan military with essential equipment, we have given the Kremlin significant leverage over U.S. foreign policy. Moreover, equipping the Afghans with Russian helicopters will make it virtually impossible to achieve any real level of interoperability between the U.S. and Afghan helicopter fleets.

The Department of Defense has repeatedly and disingenuously claimed that a 2010 study of Afghanistan's helicopter requirements shows the necessity of buying Mi-17 helicopters from Russia. In fact, the unclassified portion of that study found that the ideal aircraft for the Afghan military was a particular American-made helicopter.

Why are we buying Russian helicopters when there are American manufacturers that can meet that very same requirement? It makes no sense whatsoever, and the Department of Defense has steadfastly refused to cooperate with reasonable inquiries into why in the world they continue to persist along this pathway.

The reality is the Department of Defense has plenty of alternatives to buying Mi-17s from Russia, but for some reason or reasons known only to them, they steadfastly refuse to consider any of these alternatives. The most sensible and cost-effective alternative would involve keeping many of the Mi-17s the Afghans already have on hand and life-extending them, instead of retiring them early, which is what is happening now. In other words, Mi-17s that the Afghans already have are being retired early rather than being life-extended because of the Pentagon's stubborn insistence on buying new ones to replace these existing helicopters. In

fact, a majority of the Mi-17s the Afghan military already has have more than half of their useful lifetime left in terms of flight hours, and they are being retired early so the Pentagon can buy these new helicopters to replace them.

It makes no sense whatsoever, particularly at a time when I know we are all concerned about our defense expenditures and making sure the Defense Department has the resources they need in order to keep America safe and maintain our commitments around the world. Why would the Defense Department be acting so irresponsibly as they are in the purchase of these Mi-17 helicopters?

While I don't have any personal objection to the nomination of Mr. Alan Estevez, I could not support cloture on the nomination.

Along with my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I am going to do everything I can to shine a bright light on the Pentagon's troubling relationship with a Russian arms dealer, which is also Bashar al-Assad's arms dealer from which he purchases weapons to kill innocent civilians in Syria. What reasonable person wouldn't be troubled by this tangled relationship?

Ideally, the Mi-17 program would simply be terminated. At the very least, it should be placed on constant and vigorous congressional oversight, and that would serve the interests of U.S. taxpayers and U.S. national security alike.

For all of these reasons, I could not support a cloture vote on the nomination of Mr. Estevez. I am going to continue to come back to the floor and use other vehicles.

I see the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee on the floor. I know we are going to be taking up the Defense authorization bill later on this year, and I will be reaching out to him and other colleagues on both sides of the aisle to try to bring an end to this troubling relationship with Rosoboronexport and to seek alternative means—hopefully, from American manufacturers—for this requirement for the Afghan military.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two letters, one dated August 5, 2013, to GEN Martin E. Dempsey, and a letter dated September 16, 2013, addressed to the Attorney General of the United States, Eric Holder.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, August 5, 2013.
General MARTIN E. DEMPSEY,
Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint
Staff Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR GENERAL DEMPSEY: We write to express deep concern over your support for the ongoing Department of Defense (DoD) procurement of helicopters from Rosoboronexport, the Russian Federation's official arms export firm, as well as DoD's

seeming blindness to the real risk of both Russian corruption in these deals and overreliance on a potentially hostile power. You are on the record, as recently as your Senate reconfirmation hearing on July 18, saying that we should "stay the course with the existing program." In the interests of national security and proper stewardship of taxpayer dollars, we ask you to reconsider.

In June, DoD awarded Rosoboronexport a \$572 million contract for the procurement of 30 more Mi-17 helicopters for the Afghan Special Mission Wing, ignoring the recommendation of the Special Inspector General for Afghan Reconstruction (SIGAR) to halt this procurement. SIGAR, in its June 28 report, cast doubt on the validity of the requirement for the aircraft, providing ample evidence that it is based on unrealistic and outdated projections. We request an explanation of DoD's decision. We also understand that DoD plans to buy approximately 15 more of these aircraft using FY14 funds.

As you know, while Rosoboronexport receives huge payments from DoD, it also continues to serve as a key enabler of atrocities in Syria, transferring weapons and ammunition to prop up the bloodthirsty regime of Bashar al-Assad. DoD has confirmed that Assad's forces have used these very weapons to murder Syrian civilians, and the United Nations estimates that over 100,000 people have been killed. DoD has now awarded well over \$1 billion in no-bid contracts to this Russian state-controlled firm, which handles more than 80 percent of Russia's arms exports. What's more, as recently as 2005, Russia reportedly forgave more than \$10 billion of Syria's past arms sales debt. As such, DoD has put American taxpayers in the repugnant position of subsidizing the mass murder of Syrian civilians.

While DoD's relationship with this firm is troubling on many levels, the prospect that American taxpayers have been made into unwitting victims of Russian corruption demands special scrutiny. Rosoboronexport is an arm of the Russian Federation and a key component of Russia's defense establishment, in which corruption is rampant. In June, the British nonprofit group Transparency International published its Government Defence Anti-Corruption Index, giving Russia a D-minus rating as one of the worst-ranked exporters. This group found "evidence of organised crime penetration into defence and security establishments, and little evidence of the government's ability to address this," and it concluded that several top Ministry of Defence officials have convictions on their records.

In May 2011, Russia's chief military prosecutor publicly stated that 20 percent of Russia's own military equipment budget is stolen by corrupt officials and contractors each year, citing practices such as "fake and fictitious invoices" and "kickbacks for state contracts." The head of Russia's National Anti-Corruption Committee independent watchdog put his estimate at 40 percent. Concerns about corruption in Russia's arms trade also reportedly led Iraq to cancel a \$4.2 billion arms deal with Russia last year. We have very serious concerns over where the proceeds of DoD's Mi-17 contracts might be going.

In September 2012, one of us raised concerns about the price per aircraft that DoD was paying to Rosoboronexport and persuaded DoD to direct the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) to conduct a formal audit of the Army's 2011 no-bid contract with the firm. In May of this year, we learned that, due to a total lack of cooperation by

Rosoboronexport and months of stalling tactics, DCAA had to abandon the audit. At the same time, DoD was negotiating the \$572 million no-bid contract with this firm, but failed to use that leverage to secure its cooperation with the audit. DoD should complete this audit.

We need your personal assurance that American taxpayers are not being cheated out of their hard-earned dollars by corrupt Russian officials and contractors who may be lining their own pockets. Further, we request a briefing on exactly what due diligence DoD did on this issue prior to awarding these contracts to Rosoboronexport, as well as what continuing safeguards DoD has in place to prevent this.

The strategic vulnerabilities that DoD's Mi-17 program have potentially created are also deeply troubling. DoD argues that its direct relationship with Russia's official arms exporter provides essential benefits, such as recognition of "Russian Military Airworthiness Authority," special tools and test equipment, and engineering "reach back" for Mi-17s, which it says includes service bulletins, certification of modifications, root cause corrective actions, lifting of life limits on parts, counterfeit part mitigation, special access to technical info, support for future modifications and fielded aircraft. If DoD's dependence on Russia for Afghanistan's future rotary airlift capacity is as complete as DoD suggests, this raises serious questions: (1) If the Afghan military continues to operate Russian aircraft for decades to come, can it ever be fully independent of Russia? (2) Should Russia decide at some point to withhold support for the Afghan Mi-17 fleet, does DoD have a fallback plan to ensure the Afghan fleet's readiness? (3) Does the overreliance on Russia fostered by this Mi-17 program put the U.S. at risk of Russian coercion or blackmail on other security issues, such as the crisis in Syria, Iran's drive to obtain nuclear weapons, U.S. missile defense, arms control negotiations, or the security of former Soviet republics?

We are concerned by DoD's apparent failure to consider the strategic implications of sourcing mission-critical military equipment from a potentially hostile power such as Russia. DoD's preference for Russian helicopters will also make it highly difficult to achieve robust interoperability between the U.S. and Afghan helicopter fleets, which is in the long-term interests of both nations. These problems are self-inflicted, and this policy is extremely shortsighted.

For these reasons, we ask that DoD cancel all current contracts with Rosoboronexport, as it has previously confirmed it has the right to do at any time, and fully sever its business relationship with this firm.

Sincerely,

John Cornyn, U.S. Senator; Mark Begich, U.S. Senator; Kelly Ayotte, U.S. Senator; Mark Kirk, U.S. Senator; John Boozman, U.S. Senator; Jeff Sessions, U.S. Senator; David Vitter, U.S. Senator; Charles E. Schumer, U.S. Senator; Richard Blumenthal, U.S. Senator; Kirsten E. Gillibrand, U.S. Senator; Christopher Murphy, U.S. Senator; Roger F. Wicker, U.S. Senator; Ron Wyden, U.S. Senator.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, September 16, 2013.

Hon. ERIC HOLDER,
Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice,
Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington,
DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER: We write with great concern about reported allegations of criminal activity by one or more

government officials within the Department of the Army's Non-Standard Rotary Wing Aircraft (NSRWA) Project Management Office, which leads the Department of Defense's troubled Mi-17 helicopter program. These allegations, if substantiated, would represent not just a violation of the law, but also a breach of the public trust.

According to an August 29, 2013, report from Reuters, the Defense Criminal Investigative Service has been conducting a criminal investigation and is examining "questionable transactions" by NSRWA, including potentially improper payments to Russian companies involved in Mi-17 overhauls, as well as problematic personal ties between one or more Army officials and these foreign entities.

In addition, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction has launched a probe into NSRWA's procurement of new Mi-17 helicopters, according to the Reuters report. Since 2011, NSRWA has negotiated and executed more than \$1 billion worth of contracts for procurement of these Russian aircraft from Rosoboronexport, Russia's state-controlled arms exporter who simultaneously continues to supply weapons and ammunition to the Syrian government.

The prospect that American taxpayers have been made into unwitting victims of corruption demands special scrutiny. On a per aircraft basis, the Army is paying Rosoboronexport more than double what the Russian military itself is paying right now to buy nearly identical helicopters. These facts, taken together with the news report, raise very serious questions about the Army's entire Mi-17 program, including whether the various contracts for procurement and overhaul were the products of criminal misconduct.

In light of these ongoing concerns, we urge you to utilize all available resources, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to support any criminal investigation into these matters. If the allegations are founded, we urge you to ensure the guilty parties are prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. Thank you for your consideration of this important request.

Sincerely,

John Cornyn, U.S. Senator; Richard Blumenthal, U.S. Senator; John Boozman, U.S. Senator; Mark Kirk, U.S. Senator; Kelly Ayotte, U.S. Senator; Mark Begich, U.S. Senator; Roger F. Wicker, U.S. Senator; Christopher A. Coons, U.S. Senator; David Vitter, U.S. Senator.

Rosa L. DeLauro, Member of Congress; Kay Granger, Member of Congress; James P. Moran, Member of Congress; Frank R. Wolf, Member of Congress; John Garamendi, Member of Congress; Jack Kingston, Member of Congress; Michael H. Michaud, Member of Congress; Betty McCollum, Member of Congress; Jackie Speier, Member of Congress; Janice D. Schakowsky, Member of Congress; Elizabeth H. Esty, Member of Congress; Steve Stivers, Member of Congress; Daniel T. Kildee, Member of Congress; Joe Courtney, Member of Congress; Jim Bridenstine, Member of Congress; James P. McGovern, Member of Congress; Steve Cohen, Member of Congress; Alan S. Lowenthal, Member of Congress; Carol Shea-Porter, Member of Congress; William L. Owens, Member of Congress; Juan Vargas, Member of Congress; Tom Cole, Member of Congress; Ken Calvert, Member of Congress.

Mr. CORNYN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I very much support the nomination of Alan Estevez to be Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics.

Mr. Estevez is a career civil servant who has served under Presidents of both political parties since 1981, when he started work at the Military Traffic Management Command. Over the last 30 years, Mr. Estevez has developed an expertise in military logistics, eventually rising to become the first career Federal official to hold the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness, a position in which he provides civilian oversight for more than \$190 billion of DOD logistics operations. He previously played a key role in reengineering Department of Defense transportation processes and in helping to address logistics deficiencies identified during Operation Desert Shield.

Mr. Estevez is the recipient of the 2010 Presidential Rank Distinguished Executive Award and the 2006 Presidential Rank Meritorious Executive Award, two Office of the Secretary of Defense medals for Meritorious Civilian Service, and the 2005 Service to America Medal awarded by the Partnership for Public Service.

He is extremely well qualified for this position. I am pleased we have now achieved cloture so his nomination may be voted on at noon.

I don't know of opposition to him and his personal qualifications. I understand the debate over the helicopter issue. He is not the one who ordered nor can he reverse it. That issue is an issue which has been raised by a number of Senators, including the Senator from Texas. Senator BLUMENTHAL has raised it in committee as well.

The letter that went out to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs has not yet been answered. However, I have spoken to General Dunford about this matter, and I will have more to say about that when this issue is raised either on the Defense authorization bill or on some other matter.

For the time being, let me say simply that helicopter is a requirement which has been set by our generals, not by our Pentagon people, civilians. It is a top priority that the Afghans be supplied that helicopter because it is the one they have flown. The Army of Afghanistan has used that helicopter. So without getting into the merits of this, because this is left for a later time by the Senator from Texas, I am grateful the debate cannot be connected to the Estevez nomination, where it has no relevance, since he didn't accept the requirement nor can he reverse the decision. It will be set for a later time—hopefully, after the Senators receive the answer to the letter they sent to

the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I very strongly support the Estevez nomination and look forward to a confirmation vote, either by voice vote or rollcall vote, as necessary, at noon. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak on two separate and distinct matters relating to the military.

REMEMBERING OUR ARMED FORCES

JUSTIN ELDRIDGE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, no one in this body other than I had the privilege to know Justin Eldridge of Waterford, CT. Justin was a true American hero, a patriot—a U.S. marine who served our country in Afghanistan and who scarcely more than 24 hours ago took his own life at his home. My thoughts and prayers are with Justin's wife Joanna and their four children and all of Justin's family and friends, fellow marines, who grieve his loss at this difficult time.

I first came to know Justin when he formed a chapter of the Marine Corps League in southeastern Connecticut. He believed deeply in the Marine Corps and in service to his country, his family, and in the values and traditions and ethos of all of our great U.S. marines and the men and women who wear the uniform.

Yesterday, Justin Eldridge lost his own battle—a long battle with post-traumatic stress that he fought heroically after serving in the Marine Corps for 8½ years before his medical retirement in 2008. Even after he returned home from Afghanistan, Justin had a long fight ahead of him. He returned home with the signature wounds of this war—both traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress—and he worked for years to get the specialized treatment he needed. He tried hard to be there for his family. According to his wife Joanna, his four children loved having him around.

He faced another all-too-common problem in this country—health care at the Veterans' Administration and accessing the care he needed. He was admitted to the VA hospital and began a long road of treatment. I cannot express in words how deeply sorry I am that treatment evidently proved unsuccessful—perhaps not the result of the VA or its doctors or its hospital because we are only beginning to learn as a country and society how to confront post-traumatic stress and traumatic brain injury with the specialized diagnosis and care these diseases demand.

Even in grief we should not forget Justin's service to his country and his joy and his pride in that service—and he deserved both joy and pride—as well as his long-fought battle here at home.

I wish to take this occasion to encourage anyone who is suffering from post-traumatic stress, traumatic brain injury, or any other wounds of war to reach out for help. The Veterans Crisis Line is there to help you. Anyone who needs that help can call 1-800-273-TALK. Courage is shown not only on the battlefield but afterward upon return when an individual in need of help seeks it, as Justin did.

Justin's story also reminds us of the heroic caregivers who take care of our Nation's veterans. We owe thanks to the people who dedicate their lives to helping those who have served.

Joanna also deserves our thanks because she was there for Justin, by his side throughout his treatment. She never gave up; she never relented; she never surrendered. She was his full-time caregiver, participating in the VA's caregiver program.

Justin himself continued to give back. I will never forget my conversations with him at that Marine Corps League event and afterward by email and phone.

Joanna is a strong advocate for all veterans, as we should all be. She studied psychology in college and hopes to go to law school. She wants to dedicate her life to being a veterans advocate, and I commend her and all of our military families, all of our military spouses who are there for their loved ones who seek to reach out. We need to keep faith with those veterans. We need to know and discover what will conquer the demons that often threaten to subdue our bravest and most selfless veterans when they come back and to give them the courage and the strength they need to conquer these dreaded diseases that we ourselves have a complicity in creating. We have an obligation and an opportunity to do more and we must keep faith and make sure no veteran is left behind.

My heart and prayers go to Justin's family and, of course, I know I am joined by all the Members of this body not only in grieving but in offering our help and service if there is anything we can do.

Madam President, I would like to speak on a topic that has been discussed by two of my colleagues this morning, the senior Senator from Texas, Senator CORNYN, and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Chairman CARL LEVIN. I thank my colleagues for joining me in raising a vital issue that must be addressed by this body and by Alan Estevez—a well-qualified nominee for the position of Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics.

I will vote for the confirmation today of Alan Estevez. I believe he is well

qualified and has the credentials to perform with distinction in this role. I hope that uppermost on his list of priorities will be the Mi-17 helicopter acquisition that is so misguided and wrongheaded in the way it has been handled by our own Department of Defense.

If one were to stop at Stella's corner restaurant on Main Street in Stratford, CT, for lunch or a cup of coffee and ask the folks there: What do you expect from your government? I think one of the things they would say is they expect the Congress and all of us here to keep our country safe; and that when it comes to buying the equipment for our troops and allies, we should do so, hands down, no doubt about it, by buying American. It should be made in America, manufactured in Connecticut or in the United States. Nothing could be more simple or straightforward. Yet somehow that Main Street common sense is simply ignored across the river at the Department of Defense, the Pentagon, where so many decisions are made.

Since becoming a member of the Armed Services Committee I have become aware the Department of Defense committed almost \$1 billion to provide Afghanistan a fleet of Mi-17 helicopters. Let me clarify: Russian helicopters going to Afghanistan with American tax dollars, bought from the Russian export agency that at the same time is selling arms to Bashar Assad to kill his own people in Syria.

Since 2005, the United States has been procuring Mi-17s to build the capacity of the Afghan military and is working toward a total fleet size of approximately 80 helicopters. The Afghan military had approximately 50 Mi-17s as of last year, and this year the Army awarded a \$572 million contract to purchase another 30, with approximately 15 more to come, to replace the aging helicopters the Afghan military has already run into the ground and failed to maintain.

The contract to award these helicopters was managed in a way to prevent any American helicopter companies from bidding on the work, even though the analysis of the Department of Defense in 2010 concluded the made-in-America CH-47D Chinook helicopter is the most cost-effective single platform type fleet for the Afghan Air Force over a 20-year life cycle.

I acknowledge I may be partial to helicopters made in Connecticut. The best helicopters in the world are made in Connecticut by the Sikorsky employees who happen to stop at Stella's on Main Street for lunch or a cup of coffee, and I see them there all the time. The H-92 troop transport helicopter or H-60 should also be considered by the Department of Defense for this mission. But at the end of the day, "made in the USA" ought to be the ruling principle. Made in the USA—

American helicopters for the American military and American allies.

In 2011, the Army contracted with the Russian state-owned arms export firm Rosoboronexport. Yes, the very same Rosoboronexport that arms our enemies in Iran and is a key enabler of Assad's ongoing slaughter of his own civilians in Syria. Women and children in Syria die by the arms provided by Rosoboronexport—purchased by Assad with money financed by Russian banks and purchased from Rosoboronexport. These are well-documented crimes against humanity—war crimes that eventually should be prosecuted.

I am working with my colleague Senator AYOTTE on legislation to strengthen the contracting provisions that prohibit "contracting with the enemy." These contracts are, in effect, supporting enemy purchases. Before us is a glaring example of contracting with the enemy.

We have all heard testimony that preventing mass atrocities in Syria was complicated by their air and naval defense systems that prevent the protection of civilians in Syria and threaten its neighbors in Turkey and Jordan. Where did those systems come from? The answer is Rosoboronexport—the same systems that could shoot down our planes if we pursue additional measures against Syrian war crimes, the same entity that arms Iran, where we currently are seeking solutions against nuclear armament, and where we have said all options should be on the table in terms of our military action. The Department of Defense thinks the best thing for our long-term national security is to pay the Russian arms dealer that threatens global stability and our own freedom of action.

But it gets worse. Without question we have overpaid for these Russian helicopters. A general told me the best way to think about these helicopters is they are "flying refrigerators" that we never should have bought in the first place. We paid about \$18 million a copy, while Russia sold other nations Mi-17s for \$4 million each. What a bargain. Other countries buy each helicopter for \$4 million, we pay \$8 million.

And it is still worse. The Army acquisition office that handled this contract is now under investigation for "questionable transactions," including potentially improper payments to Russian companies involved in the repair of these helicopters as well as problematic personal ties between the Army officials in this office and those foreign entities.

If I went to Stella's and I told this absolutely remarkable story, I am hoping the folks there would say: No, you must be making this up. This couldn't happen at the U.S. Department of Defense. No way in the United States of America, not with our tax dollars. But in fact it is all true, and I have tried to cite the facts as objectively and dispassionately as possible.

I suspect for anybody at Stella's who might have believed this incredible tale, they would have said: Well, if a tenth of that is true, what are you going to do to stop it? What are you going to do to end this waste of taxpayer money and the insult and outrage to the American taxpayer? Well, we did something. At my urging, and through the work of my colleagues who have spoken, including Senator CORNYN, Congress, in the Defense Appropriations Act, expressly prohibited the Department of Defense from spending any more taxpayer money on Russian helicopters and doing business with Rosoboronexport.

In fact, I wrote to the Secretary of Defense about this program. I have written numerous letters, and I have met with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Did that stop these purchases? No. The \$½ billion contract recently signed, recently completed, now under way by the U.S. Army for more Russian helicopters, used previously appropriated funds to ignore the will of Congress. Clearly, the spirit and intent of the National Defense Authorization Act was to end these purchases. The U.S. Department of Defense, in effect, has defied the will of Congress.

So here we are today, almost \$1 billion out the door and the near certainty these helicopters are going to be used to smuggle drugs—that is right, smuggle drugs in Afghanistan. That purchase has occurred. The contract has been completed. And we can be sure, just as they failed to maintain those helicopters in the past, they will fail again in the future because the Afghan national security forces don't have the people trained to maintain the helicopters. In fact, right now it doesn't have the people trained to fly those helicopters. And in a few years what the American taxpayer will have to show for this folly is rusted scrap heaps at Bagram Air Force Base.

I understand that some in the Pentagon started this program with good intentions. Their thinking may have been that the Afghans already had some of these helicopters in the process of standing up their capability to defend themselves, they ought to have a few more, and then transition to a more capable helicopter. I have heard from our generals that we need these helicopters because the Afghans know how to fly them. But the fact is this program was never designed to be sustainable after we leave Afghanistan. My hope is we will leave Afghanistan sooner rather than later. There is simply no transition in place now or in the foreseeable future to buy American, to train those Afghan pilots how to fly those American helicopters, how to maintain American helicopters.

When the Russians forced us to procure the helicopters from them directly, rather than excess helicopters from countries like the Czech Republic,

we should have made a course correction immediately, even if we thought those kinds of helicopters were necessary in the short term. There were options and alternatives that should have been pursued and they were not.

That is why I believe the plan requested by the senior Senator from Texas makes a lot of sense. He has asked the Department of Defense for an alternative plan for meeting the Afghan requirements. We cannot walk away from a problem that we created. We cannot walk away from the need for a transition. But there is a better way to get there. The answer, very simply, is buy American, buy American helicopters.

I expect Mr. Estevez will be confirmed today. But I want to say to him please, as one of your priorities, figure out a way to end these purchases from Rosoboronexport. You owe it to the Members of this body. You owe it to the American people to find a way to buy American and to keep faith with the brave men and women who will use the equipment that you will help purchase with taxpayer dollars. I know you take this responsibility seriously, and I hope that you will bring that seriousness of purpose to these issues because they are important, not just to the military and not just to taxpayers, but most especially to the American men and women who wear the uniform of the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I have come to the floor many times over the past several months to outline the problems that we are facing with the rollout of the ObamaCare law, problems that my constituents are facing, as are people all across the country. While it is important to discuss the generic and macro effects of this law—and we see it unrolling before us every day—it is also important to understand what the direct effects are on people at a personal level.

Last week, during our break, I traveled throughout Indiana and talked to a number of people. Many of them came up to me voluntarily to tell me the effects of the confusing, complex, and seemingly intractable aspects of ObamaCare. Let me read for the record just a couple of statements that were made.

An email that I received from Daniel in Elkhart, IN, summarizes the experiences of hundreds of thousands of Hoosiers and millions of Americans are having with the Web site alone. He wrote:

I have tried for two weeks to apply through the marketplace, only to electronically sign

my application and be kicked back to my profile page. This is the most bizarre system I have ever experienced. If a company put a business Web site together like this, they would go out of business.

Anthony in Indianapolis shared similar concerns. He said:

I have been unable to get through the healthcare.gov Web site. My wife must notify our insurance company by November 15 if she will keep her existing plan . . . I understand there are problems with the Web site. I think we all understand that at this point.

I heard the President say you could sign up in person, on the phone or on paper. But the two navigators I called said that until the Web site works, they cannot help. I called the 1-800 number but the healthcare.gov rep [said his] computer froze up and could not help. I hear about the tech surge, how there will be a few rough spots—another understatement—and how they will be fixed. Senator, if you listen to the news the problems with the system are much deeper than the President let on [in his] Tuesday [address]. I need help and I don't think the system will be in operation in time for me to make an informed decision.

These are two statements from only two of the many Hoosiers who described similar problems to me—which is probably why, when asked about the ObamaCare Web site, an experienced online and database programmer told CBS News, "I would be ashamed and embarrassed if my organization delivered something like that."

We know this law passed the Senate on Christmas Eve in 2009 without any bipartisan support. One party alone put this law into place. We now know that over \$400 million have been spent to create a Web site so Americans who are mandated to enroll in ObamaCare can go and sign up for it. We know that nearly 4 years of notice has been in place to get the Web site up. This rollout, as one Democratic Senator said over the weekend, has been a disaster.

If the administration, after nearly 4 years of effort and over \$400 million, can't get the Web site right, how in the world can anybody believe that the Federal Government can manage this monstrous and dysfunctional law that has been imposed on the American people?

Despite the Web site's numerous glitches and many other implementation problems, the administration still insists on fining taxpayers if they do not sign up and purchase ObamaCare under the mandate. What an irony it is. You need to sign up or you are going to get fined. The Web site is so dysfunctional you can't sign up, but you are still going to get fined. That is mind-boggling, head-scratching, and simply unacceptable.

We know that there have been numerous attempts to repeal this law and replace it with something far more acceptable, affordable, and implementable. We now know that the defund effort, that resulted in the shutdown, failed to gain the necessary votes to

achieve that goal. But attempting to repeal this law is the responsible thing to do. In September I introduced a bill to delay the roll out of the ObamaCare mandates for a year. As the problems with the health care law pile up, I am going to continue to push for this delay. The delay makes sense because the program is simply too dysfunctional to be implemented.

The bottom line, however, is that I want this delay so the American people have another chance to learn what is in this law, to evaluate as to whether or not they want this to go forward as the health care law of the United States or whether they think a viable alternative is that we have the responsibility to put forward—and many of us have advocated components of that—whether or not that alternative is the better way to go.

I know it has been said by the President and others that in 2012 the public went to the polls to vote for the Presidential election. Therefore, that vote certified that the American people supported and wanted ObamaCare.

First of all, that was not the primary issue. It was one of the issues that was a determinative factor in the outcome of that election but not nearly “the” factor, because most Americans at that point still had not had the opportunity or the experience that they are having now, finding out exactly just how this law works and does not work; finding out all the dysfunction and learning that all of those campaign promises made or promises made when the law was passed have simply been broken. “You can keep the insurance policy that you have now. No problem. Won’t cost a penny more. No problem.”

On and on it goes. “Keep the doctor that you want.” Americans are finding out that none of this is true. “Premiums will not rise.” Premiums are rising for many Americans. “This will be easy. Go to a Web site, sign up, punch in, put your name in, you are on board. Everything will be great.”

None of this has worked. Why not delay this process, not just to learn what is here, but to give the American people another opportunity to vote, to walk into the polling booth. A number of Members will have to stand up and either explain why they supported this or why they didn’t support it. Americans will have a choice. We will put alternatives in front of them.

That is the purpose of the delay for a year: No. 1, because it is dysfunctional; No. 2, because Americans deserve a second chance to express their opinions on this bill. This has already been passed by the House of Representatives. My colleague, Representative TODD YOUNG of Indiana sponsored that. It gained bipartisan support, and 22 Democrats, House Democrats, recognized the need to give Americans the same relief from ObamaCare that businesses are receiving. Delay on the employer mandate,

which the President has proposed and put into practice, and doing that for the individuals and families who do not fall under the employer category only, is a matter of fairness. That also is something that has to be addressed.

Recently, several Senate Democrats have come out in support of delaying parts or all of the President’s health care law as well. I think the opportunity is before us to put the brakes on trying to jam through something that simply is dysfunctional and not working and secondly to give the American people the opportunity to go back to the polls and decide whether or not this is the way they want their health care programs to go forward.

We have had nothing but broken promises. We are learning about how difficult it is for the Government to manage even the first step, let alone the one-sixth of the economy that deals with our health care. This is important for all Americans. I am urging my colleagues to support this effort to give the American people another chance to look at a more viable and more affordable alternative.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words today in support of my fellow Coloradan, Katherine Archuleta, and her nomination to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management. I have known her for years and have tremendous respect for her. She has given much of her life to public service, and her dedication to her community, her State, and her country is a testament to her character. I am very confident that she will be a steady hand at the helm of OPM. I urge all my colleagues to support her confirmation.

Not everyone watching may be familiar with the Office of Personnel Management, but it is an important agency. Let me talk about Colorado in that context. Thousands of Federal employees are in Colorado, including those who are helping to rebuild our State in the wake of September’s tragic flooding count on OPM. It is a critical part of the integrity and strength of the entire Federal workforce. It is responsible, among other duties, for employee recruitment and employee retention and for managing Federal benefit and retirement programs.

We all expect Federal agencies and departments to function effectively and efficiently for our constituents. As someone who ran a nonprofit in Colorado for 10 years, I know the importance of maintaining a talented and motivated workforce. Strong workforce

management leads directly to better work, better service, and better outcomes, which is why it is so important to have someone leading OPM who is an advocate for Federal employees and also a strong manager with high expectations.

Again, that is why I stand here this morning. I believe Katherine will be this type of leader. She has years of high-level management experience. She is sharp, hard working, and she is dedicated to the goal of making government work as effectively and efficiently as possible.

She has an impressive resume, as I noted at her hearing when I had an opportunity to introduce her. She has local and State-level experience. She served senior roles in two Denver mayoral administrations as well as extensive experience here in Washington serving as the chief of staff to the former U.S. Secretary of Transportation Federico Pena in the 1990s, and more recently to U.S. Secretary of Labor Hilda Solis.

In between her years of public service in Denver and also in Washington, Katherine consulted with charities, nonprofits, cities, regional governments, and businesses to help them pursue community development, workplace diversity, and crisis management strategies.

If you look for a common thread throughout Katherine’s career, it is her capacity and talent to work with individuals and organizations, identify priorities, and then, notably, to create the conditions for successful implementation of those priorities. That is what we need at the helm of OPM. It is what Americans expect and demand.

As we look at Katherine’s career, she has demonstrated an ability to lead, to motivate, and to work constructively with a diverse range of people and personalities. She is a true westerner. She has personal integrity. She has a strong sense of right and wrong, she has obvious pride in the work she does, and that makes her a topnotch choice to lead our Federal workforce.

For all those reasons, I am honored to speak in support of Katherine Archuleta’s nomination, and hopefully we will confirm her quickly. She is eminently qualified for this position, and she deserves an up-or-down vote as soon as possible.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Alan F. Estevez, of the District of Columbia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense?

The nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate

the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Katherine Archuleta, of Colorado, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

Harry Reid, Bill Nelson, Barbara A. Mikulski, Patty Murray, Barbara Boxer, Bernard Sanders, Amy Klobuchar, Carl Levin, Thomas R. Carper, Jr., Tim Johnson, Patrick J. Leahy, Max Baucus, Robert Menendez, Richard J. Durbin, John D. Rockefeller IV, Tim Kaine, Mazie Hirono.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Katherine Archuleta, of Colorado, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 81, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 224 Ex.]

YEAS—81

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Grassley	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson
Begich	Harkin	Paul
Bennet	Hatch	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Boxer	Hirono	Reid
Brown	Hoeben	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Isakson	Sanders
Cardin	Johanns	Schatz
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Casey	Kaine	Scott
Chambliss	King	Sessions
Chiesa	Kirk	Shaheen
Coats	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cochran	Landrieu	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Levin	Thune
Corker	Manchin	Toomey
Crapo	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCain	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Fischer	Merkley	Whitehouse
Flake	Mikulski	Wicker
Franken	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—18

Ayotte	Cruz	McConnell
Barrasso	Enzi	Moran
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter

NOT VOTING—1

Inhofe

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 81, the nays are 18. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF KATHERINE ARCHULETA TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Katherine Archuleta, of Colorado, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 15 of the 113th Congress, there will now be up to 8 hours of postcloture consideration of the nomination equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise to speak on this nomination and to oppose it because of the recent actions of the Office of Personnel Management with regard to the Washington exemption from ObamaCare. I voted just now against cloture on the nomination, and I will vote against the nomination itself later today because of these very serious matters.

OPM, the office to which this nominee is nominated and which she would head, has issued an illegal rule that is very offensive and flies in the face of the ObamaCare statute language itself, and this nominee has pledged to continue to enforce that illegal rule and illegal policy.

Furthermore, OPM has completely stonewalled Members, including myself, my colleague Senator HELLER, and others regarding how they came to that decision and, importantly, whom they talked with, whom they e-mailed with, and whom they met with in coming to the decision to create this illegal Washington exemption.

Let me back up a little bit and explain exactly what we are talking about. Really, this story started several years ago in the ObamaCare debate. During the original debate on the ObamaCare statute, several conservatives, including myself, pushed an amendment that said every Member of Congress and all of our official congressional staff have to use the same fallback plan as is there for all other Americans—originally, it was called the public option, and then it became known as the exchanges—no special rules, no special treatment, no special subsidy. In fact, that is one of the very few battles in that debate we won because that provision was adopted during the consideration of the ObamaCare statute. It was adopted right here in the Senate.

So in the statutory language as it finally passed into law is that section, and that section says very clearly that every Member of Congress and all of our official congressional staff have to go to the ObamaCare exchanges for our health care—the same fallback plan as is there for all other Americans—no special rules or privileges or subsidies or exemptions. We go there. Well, I

guess this became an example of what NANCY PELOSI was talking about when she famously said: Well, we have to pass the law in order to figure out what is in it—because the law did pass. It had that specific statutory provision. Then people on Capitol Hill started reading it, and they came to that section and a lot of them said: Oh, you know what. We can't live with this. We can't have this. We can't be pushed to the same fallback plan as all other Americans. We can't stand for this.

From that moment on, a furious lobbying campaign and scheming behind the scenes started to avoid that provision fully going into effect, to avoid the pain of that provision, the pain of ObamaCare that millions of other Americans are facing as we speak. Meetings happened, leadership meetings happened, Member meetings happened, furious scheming behind the scenes, and a lot of lobbying. Ultimately, that lobbying of the Obama administration paid off because in early August of this year, right after Congress got out of town for the August recess, conveniently right after Congress left the scene of the crime, the Obama administration issued a special rule with no basis in the law, in my opinion, no basis in the ObamaCare statute. This special rule was a special exemption for Congress, a carve-out to take all of the financial sting out of that ObamaCare section.

What this special OPM rule is—and, again, OPM, the Office of Personnel Management, was the agency that came up with this illegal rule after this furious lobbying, after President Obama became personally involved, literally personally participated in the discussions leading to this rule. What this illegal rule does is essentially two things. First of all, the rule says: Well, “official congressional staff”—we do not know who that is. We cannot possibly determine who official congressional staff are, so we are going to leave it up to each individual Member of Congress to figure out who is their official staff.

Well, I would submit that is just ludicrous on its face. Congressional staff is congressional staff. Official staff is anyone who works for us through the institution of Congress versus outside entities and institutions, such as our campaign staff. So leaving it up to each individual Member of Congress is contrary to the statute on its face. It is outrageous on its face. But under this OPM rule, that is exactly what they do. So an individual Member of Congress can say: Well, these 10 people are not official staff. They are on my staff, but for some magical reason they are not official for purposes of this mandate. In fact, under this rule a Member can say: Nobody on my congressional staff is official staff for purposes of this mandate. And we see Members doing that as we speak. We see examples of

that being reported in the press as we speak—Members deciding, “Well, nobody is official staff. I do not have official staff” because it will mean they will have to go to the ObamaCare exchange and live by the same rules through the same experience as other Americans. That is flatout ridiculous.

But that is not the only thing the OPM rule did. It did a second thing that is perhaps even more outrageous. It said Members of Congress and staff who do go to the exchange—they get to take along with them a huge taxpayer-funded subsidy that no other American at similar income levels has, enjoys, going to the ObamaCare exchanges. This is a huge subsidy worth at least \$5,000 for individuals and \$10,000 or \$11,000 for families. Again, no other American at similar income levels is privy to that sort of subsidy.

Again, I believe this part of the OPM rule is flatout illegal. It is not in the ObamaCare statute. There was discussion of it. There were drafts that allowed that to happen, but the language that was put in the law did not include that subsidy. It was specifically left out. And, in fact, magically transforming what was, under previous law, a Federal employees health benefits plan subsidy, magically transforming that into some ObamaCare exchange subsidy—that is contrary to law, and that is beyond OPM and the administration’s legal authority, but they just did it because they could to bail out Washington, to bail out Congress. Well, this is outrageous and it is illegal.

As soon as I heard of this proposed rule in early August, I joined with many colleagues, House and Senate, and I appreciate all of their leadership. I am joined by many colleagues in the Senate whom I specifically want to acknowledge, who are fighting for this change: Senators ENZI, HELLER, LEE, JOHNSON, INHOFE, CRUZ, and GRAHAM. We are also joined by House Members, led by Representative RON DESANTIS of Florida. All of us quickly got together and said: This is illegal, this is wrong, and we have to stop it.

So we came up with language to do just that, to reverse this illegal OPM rule and to make sure that every Member of Congress and all of our congressional staff go to the ObamaCare exchanges and that we go there just like other Americans go there—no special exemption or special subsidy or special treatment. Our fix also expands that to the President, the Vice President, their White House staff, and all of their political appointees because that is appropriate as well. So our language says to all those folks—Congress and the administration—you have to get your health care the same way other Americans are in the backup plan, in the fallback plan, in the so-called exchanges. You go to the exchanges, and you get no special treatment, no special exemption, no special subsidy.

This is very important for two reasons. First of all, basic fairness. It should be the first rule of American democracy that what Washington passes on America, it lives with itself. Washington should have to eat its own cooking. It is like going to a restaurant and hearing that the chef in the kitchen never eats there. Something is wrong with that restaurant. Something is wrong with that picture. And something is wrong with Washington when Washington exempts itself over and over from eating its own cooking.

The second reason this is important is a very practical one because the sooner we demand that Washington live by exactly the same rules it imposes on America, the sooner Washington will start getting things right on ObamaCare, on taxes, on regulation across the board. So for that very practical reason, we need to make sure the same rules apply to Washington the same way they apply to the rest of America.

Let me come back to OPM because what we are debating is the nominee to head the Office of Personnel Management, OPM, the bureaucracy that came up with this illegal rule. That nominee has pledged to continue to enforce that illegal rule, to continue to defend that illegal rule.

Also, OPM, to date, has been completely unresponsive—“stonewalling” is the more appropriate term—to all of my and other Members’ inquiries about the process they used to come up with this illegal rule. I have written OPM several times. I wrote them immediately after their draft rule was issued. I wrote them very soon after their final rule was issued. I specifically wrote them demanding all emails and other correspondence and other documentation and information they had from Members of Congress, from leadership, from the administration with regard to the work and discussion that went into their rule.

Other colleagues of ours here in the Senate and also in the House have done the same. My distinguished colleague from Nevada DEAN HELLER talked to the then-OPM Director face to face. He asked the OPM Director: Did you speak with, were you lobbied by Members of Congress or the administration about this rule? That Director said: No, absolutely not. It now turns out that apparently is a lie. According to other sources, there absolutely were discussions, communications, emails, and the like between congressional leadership and the administration and OPM. So DEAN HELLER was lied to face to face about this by OPM.

I have asked for all of the emails, all of the correspondence, all of the discussions that happened leading up to this rule involving Members of Congress, leadership, and also the President and the Vice President and members of their administration. That request for

information has been completely stonewalled.

So, first, OPM caves to intense lobbying from Washington insiders. Second, it caves and issues an illegal rule contrary to the statutory language of ObamaCare. Third, it stonewalls regarding the process and the conversations and the emails that led to that illegal rule.

We cannot stand for that. That is precisely why I am opposing this OPM nomination and why I voted no on cloture and why I will vote no on the nomination. We need answers. We need to reverse this illegal rule. Yes, we need a vote on the Vitter amendment the distinguished majority leader and others have blocked for months now. We need that vote. We need that vote that has been actively blocked by the majority leader for months.

Let’s do things right. Let’s get that information from OPM. Let’s reverse this illegal rule. Let’s vote on this important matter.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN.) The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FARM BILL

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, this afternoon the 2013 farm bill conference committee will finally convene for the first time, bringing us one step closer to finishing the farm bill. I know the Presiding Officer, being from Wisconsin, understands how important this is to our country’s future, and certainly the farmers, businesses, and families in Minnesota understand how important this bill is. We have waited a long time to go to this conference committee. The Senate has passed two farm bills now that continue the strong policies of the last farm bill but in fact reduce the debt by \$24 billion over the farm bill that is currently in place. I am part of the group that negotiated the details of the bill to help finish the process which started over 2 years ago.

Before I go on about the details of the Senate bill, I thank Chairman STABENOW for her incredible leadership and perseverance in getting us to this point that has been so long awaited. Under Chairman STABENOW’s leadership, the Senate Agriculture Committee put together a farm bill that strengthens the safety net for our Nation’s farmers and ranchers, reforms and streamlines our agriculture, conservation, and nutrition programs while still keeping them strong, and, as I mentioned, reduces \$24 billion from the Nation’s debt.

Throughout the process we faced unprecedented challenges and delay. We had the lack of a dance partner over in the House, but then of course we had

the traditional issues—regional disputes about how certain crops and commodities should be handled, a few partisan issues here and there, but somehow we were able to come together to the point where the Senate bill was supported by 68 Senators, including 18 Republicans. I believe this is a testament to the open process we had, the endless amendments we voted on on the floor, as well as the strong committee that was brought together to work on this bill.

No matter where I go in my State—and I am sure the Presiding Officer has seen this in Wisconsin—I am always reminded of the critical role agriculture plays in our economy. Minnesota is No. 1 in turkeys—something we think of a lot as we head into the Thanksgiving season. We are No. 1 in sweet corn, green peas, and oats, and No. 2 in hogs. I don't think people would think about that with our State, but we have surpassed some other States. But we are No. 2 in hogs and spring wheat, and No. 3 in soybeans, and No. 4 in corn.

But we don't just grow the crops and raise the livestock. We are also home to a number of major agricultural companies which have kept our economy strong, and is one of the reasons our unemployment rate is down to 5.1 percent in Minnesota. These companies include Hormel, Cargill, General Mills, coops such as CHS, and Land o' Lakes. That is why one of the first things I did when I came to the Senate was ask to be on the Agriculture Committee. I am honored to serve on this conference committee and to team up with my friend and House colleague, Representative COLLIN PETERSON, who will be leading the Democratic side in the House, as well as Congressman Tim Wells who represents the southern part of our State.

The expiration of the current farm bill on September 30 is hurting our agricultural economy and is creating a huge amount of uncertainty for our farmers and for our consumers. Last week I visited with Minnesotans from across the State who want Congress to pass a farm bill. I was in Kiester, MN, where I got to ride in a combine and see the good work of our farmers as they harvested the corn. I have to say that sitting in the combine after the 3 weeks of the shutdown was actually quite rewarding, as I saw firsthand you could actually get results very quickly in a combine, which I hope will happen in Congress as we move ahead.

From farmers in Redwood County to the Red River Valley to volunteers at a food bank in Minneapolis, where we also had a joint event with hunger groups, conservation groups, including Pheasants Forever, which is based in Minnesota, and the Farm Bureau and the Farmers Union, we all came together to say we had to get this done.

I journeyed up to the Moorhead area and joined Senator HOEVEN in Fargo.

We like to call it Moorhead-Fargo in Minnesota instead of Fargo-Moorhead—two towns divided by a river but joined by many common interests. We met there with farmers about the importance of sugar beets and about the importance of a strong farm bill for that region of the country.

Through my week I quickly heard—as I am sure the Presiding Officer did in Wisconsin—that the people of this country are sick and tired of gridlock politics, they are sick and tired of people standing in opposite corners of the boxing ring and throwing punches. They are sick and tired of the red-light, green-light game that has been played with policy. It is time to come together and get this done.

I am convinced if there is any silver lining or hope that came out of the chaos of last month, it is that the American people saw firsthand why we need change and why we need to work together. That is why in fact Senator HOEVEN and I came together across the river, to make a very strong statement that we thought we had to get this bill done.

As a member of the conference committee, I know that if we don't pass a new farm bill, farmers will not be able to sign up for crop insurance, something that is so central to this new bill and is part of the \$24 billion in debt reduction. They won't be able to sign up for a conservation program at a time when we need more conservation, when we see a decline in our pheasant population, where we have seen the signs that we need to have strong conservation programs. We would also see a skyrocketing of dairy prices as we would be going back to the farm bill that was passed in 1949. As I like to say at home, we don't want to party like it is 1949, and we certainly don't want to farm like it is 1949.

The failure to come together and resolve the differences between the two bills now would likely result in either 1949 prices or some kind of extension. And guess what. Ask the farmers and ranchers about that in South Dakota who just saw a decimation of their cattle because of the sudden cold weather and blizzard they experienced in South Dakota. This current bill that is in place does nothing to provide a safety net for them that used to be in place but isn't in place because of the fact we haven't passed a permanent farm bill.

It does nothing, if we simply extended it, about energy programs or about changes we need to see in the milk program or about reforms or the streamlining of our conservation programs. We simply cannot afford to do that again.

Finally, it does nothing to reduce the debt if we simply extend the current program.

Farmers and ranchers do not want another extension like the one we saw last year that left out the programs I

just mentioned, the livestock disaster program, any significant deficit reduction. I believe the Senate bill lays a strong foundation for a conference agreement that can be supported on a bipartisan basis and signed into law by the President. To put it more directly, over the weekend I got a call from Greg Schwarz, who works with the Minnesota corn growers. He was hard at work, bringing in the harvest. He actually was calling me while driving his combine. His words offer some perspective, as they were passed on to me, about where we have been and where we need to go. He said:

We have been working on this farm bill for over 2 years now, and we just want to get it done. Farmers are working around the clock on this year's harvest, and if you don't hear from us, it is not because we don't care, it's because we have work to do.

Greg is right. Members of the farm bill conference committee have work to do as well. I believe that Washington should strive to be more like the farmers and ranchers that we represent who work and hope they get the job done. They can't leave a bunch of corn or soybeans in the field just because they get sick of it or they don't like their neighbor. They have to finish the job. If it starts getting cold or if it is raining, they have to bring that harvest in before there is a blizzard. That is what they do, and that is what we need to do. We have a time deadline here, an important reason we need to get moving on this bill.

I would like to highlight some areas of the Senate bill that I believe need to be preserved as part of the final agreement as near as possible to the way they are right now. I recognize there will be some compromise, but I think whatever compromise needs to be worked out should be closer to the bipartisan Senate bill that, as we know, had the support of 18 Senate Republicans, including Senators in my part of the country such as Senator GRASSLEY and Senator HOEVEN.

I know that important differences need to be worked out, especially in the areas of nutrition. I think we can do that. But, again, given what we are seeing in terms of the cuts over on the House side, we have to get them much closer to where we are in the Senate bill, which is something that will keep a safety net not just for our farmers, not just for our conservation and our pheasants and our wildlife, but also for the people of this country.

I believe the people who grow our food deserve to know that their livelihoods cannot be swept away in the blink of an eye, either by market failures or by natural disasters. That is why in the Senate farm bill the foundation of the safety net is a strengthened crop insurance program. We made the program work better for underserved commodities and specialty crops.

In recognition of the importance of crop insurance, we extended conservation compliance rules to this program to ensure that all producers benefiting from this safety net play by the same set of rules and keep our water clean and soil productive for future generations.

This agreement has the support of agriculture, environmental wildlife leaders, including the National Farmers Union and the National Corn Growers Association, as well as the Environmental Defense Fund and Ducks Unlimited. That is quite a crew.

In our charge to do more with fewer resources, the Senate bill pulls back on crop insurance subsidies for the wealthiest farmers, while ensuring that everyone can still participate in the program, keeping the risk pool strong. We also eliminated direct payments and further focused commodity title programs on our family farmers by strengthening payment limits on rules that ensure that farmers and not urban millionaires are eligible for farm payments.

We continued the successful sugar program, funded the livestock disaster programs, which I mentioned earlier, and put in place a new safety net for dairy producers to address the wild volatility in that market. No one knows that better than those in the State of Wisconsin, the home of a lot of cheese, the home of a lot of cows and a lot of dairy.

We streamlined conservation programs from 23 to 13. Specifically, I worked with COLLIN PETERSON to ensure that local communities such as those in the Red River Valley have tools they need to address conservation challenges like flooding. The bill funds energy title programs to extend homegrown renewable energy production.

When you look at our reduction in dependence on foreign oil, from 60 to 40 percent in just the last few years—yes, you look at the increased domestic drilling and natural gas; yes, you look at the facts that we finally increased gas mileage standards that made a big difference in this country, but you also look at biofuels which are now 10 percent of our Nation's fuel supply.

These bills ensure that we are working to support our farmers and workers in the Midwest and not the oil cartels in the Middle East. That is why I strongly support mandatory funding for the energy titles to help provide incentives for homegrown energy production from the next generation of biofuels to blender pumps. This is a vital industry in States such as mine, supporting thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in economic growth. I appreciate the support of my colleague Senator FRANKEN for this important industry. As many of us understand, we want an "all of the above" energy approach that includes oil, includes natural gas, but also includes biofuels.

The Senate bill ensures that our energy innovators have the certainty and stability they need to develop the next generation of American energy.

The Senate bill also includes a number of initiatives for beginning farmers and ranchers, including two of my provisions. The first provision I produced with Senator BAUCUS, which would reduce crop insurance costs for beginning farmers by 10 percent. The second provision that I have introduced with Senators JOHANNIS, BAUCUS, and HOEVEN would allow beginning producers to use conservation reserve program acres for grazing without a penalty. I believe that both of these provisions will go a long way in building the next generation of farmers who will grow our food supply. Both of these provisions should be included in the final bill.

I believe that if we want to recruit a new generation of farmers and ranchers we must take further action to improve the quality of life in our small towns and our rural areas. That is why I worked with Senators HOEVEN and HEITKAMP, and I led the amendment to provide additional resources for critical priorities in the farm bill, including research—something the Presiding Officer knows something about from the University of Wisconsin—as well as rural development, conservation, and energy.

Our provision funds the new non-profit foundation, the Foundation for Food and Agricultural Research, to leverage private funding with a Federal match to support agricultural research. It provides additional funds to address the \$3.2 billion backlog of water and wastewater projects in rural America. You literally cannot go to a region of any State in rural America without hearing about this backlog of rural wastewater and water projects. This amendment that we passed helps with that.

It also increases funding for a regional approach to conservation to address a variety of challenges, including the flooding that we saw in the Red River Valley. The provision also added an additional \$100 million to the energy title to help farmers, ranchers, and rural businesses produce homegrown energy. I was pleased to get the strong support of our committee for that amendment, and I am pleased it is included in the final Senate bill.

In the Senate we also preserve the essential nutrition programs that millions of families and children rely on every day. In recent years, programs such as the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program, also known as SNAP, became especially important as hard-working families and seniors were suddenly cashed-strapped but still in need of groceries. One of my predecessors—in fact I have his desk—Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, was an early champion of the food stamp program now known as SNAP. As one of

the founders—Humphrey was one of the founders of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota—he understood the importance of a stable government policy for both agricultural producers as well as families struggling to put food on the table.

That is why we have always seen this combination of these programs. It makes sense—food comes from farms. Food is a safety net for the people of this country, as are the farm provisions, which are actually a minority of the provisions in this bill. The farm provisions provide a safety net for those who provide food. What we have done with this bill, of course, is reduce some costs and made it more efficient but still kept a strong safety net.

For more than 40 years we have linked together food and farm policy in 5-year farm bills. Nearly 72 percent of the SNAP participants are families with children, and more than one quarter of participants are in households with seniors or people with disabilities. This is not the time to make the deep cuts, as proposed in the House bill, to programs that provide important nutritional support for working families, low-income seniors, and people with disabilities with fixed incomes.

Yet what we have seen is that those cuts—which we will be discussing—on the House side include 170,000 veterans who would be cut off from food assistance if the House bill were to pass. The Senate bill, on the other hand, makes reforms that were necessary, that bring the debt down by \$4 billion, reforms that were necessary. So it is not like there were no reforms to this program in the Senate bill. As I noted, 68 Senators voted for this bipartisan bill, including 18 Republicans.

The cuts proposed by the House are in addition to the \$11 billion cuts to the program that will go into place this Friday, when the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act supplemental nutrition payments expire.

This program is already moving in the right direction. As the economy has improved, nutrition assistance has been further focused on families in areas with the greatest need. In fact, the CBO projects that without any changes to the program, the number of people eligible for nutrition assistance and the cost of nutrition programs will continue to fall as the economy improves. In this way, nutrition programs operate a lot like the farm safety net for agricultural producers. Just as agriculture payments spiked during the 2012 drought, which was the worst since the 1950s, the need for nutrition assistance, for example, similarly increased when our economy was struck with the worst recession since the 1930s.

When farmers are blessed with a strong harvest or when workers bring home a paycheck from a new job, we have designed agriculture and nutrition programs to adjust accordingly and be reduced.

I believe that instead of trying to find ways to make people ineligible for nutrition assistance, we need to focus on real solutions that put people back to work. This farm bill is an opportunity to do that, as are a number of these efforts—Innovate America, workforce training—and bringing in other things we should be focused on, bringing the tax reform in, bringing the corporate tax rate down and paid for. But if we continue to engage in the brinkmanship as we did in the last month we will never get to the core issue. I believe our country is on the cusp of economic expansion. I believe we have so many opportunities out there when you look at how we are situated with the increase in manufacturing and exports. We need to do work with the immigration bill to help the economy move forward, instead of what we went through last month.

I think this farm bill is the first chance to show that, out of this chaos, came something positive. It is a 5-year farm bill. It worked in the past. It brings the debt down by \$24 billion. It is a bipartisan bill. Let's show the people of America that we mean business about working across the aisle.

I see my colleagues here from Tennessee. I have just about 3 minutes more on a very different topic, and that is the nomination of Patty Millett to the D.C. Circuit Court.

In the past few weeks, as I mentioned, we have made some efforts to come together and get work done on behalf of the American people. There are many of us who work together in relationships of trust, and I hope that continues with regard to nominations.

Patty Millett would make an excellent addition to the court on the D.C. Circuit, and I urge my colleagues to vote for cloture and to confirm her without delay.

Patty Millett has extensive Federal appellate and Supreme Court experience. She previously served 15 years as an attorney on the appellate staff of the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division, and then as an assistant to the Solicitor General. She has argued 32 cases in the Supreme Court—32—in addition to dozens of cases in other appellate courts across the country. In addition to her work for the Justice Department and in private practice, she has also devoted substantial time to pro bono work. Ms. Millett clearly has an impressive professional background, but even outside the legal world she volunteers as a literacy tutor and for the homeless in the DC area.

She was given the Attorney General's Distinguished Service Award for representing the interests of the United States before the Supreme Court and the National Association of Attorneys General award for assistance to the States in preparation for their appearances before the Supreme Court. Ms. Millett is the kind of woman we should

have on the bench. It should be no surprise that the nonpartisan American Bar Association committee that reviews every Federal judicial nominee unanimously gave her its highest rating, and over 100 leading lawyers and law professors wrote a letter in support of her nomination. This letter included 7 former Solicitors General who served under Democratic and Republican Presidents alike.

Clearly there can be no question she has the experience and ability to sit on the Federal bench. She also has the support of the Fraternal Order of Police, the Police Executive Research Forum, the National Women's Law Center, the Women's Bar Association, and the National Congress of American Indians.

Ms. Millett is well qualified, and we should confirm her now.

One justification—and there is only one that I have heard and I don't think it is a good one, and I am about to debunk it. The only justification I have heard is not about her at all, it is about the D.C. Circuit. Some of my colleagues think they should remain with three openings on the bench. I don't think this argument squares with the facts. Currently, 3 of the 11 seats on the D.C. Circuit are empty. According to the Administrative Office of the Courts, senior judges—judges who are partially retired—are now involved in over 40 percent of the cases that are decided on the merits.

Before he was our Supreme Court Justice, John Roberts was confirmed to sit on the D.C. Circuit. Ten years ago when Chief Justice Roberts was confirmed to sit on that circuit, the average judge on that court had only 125 pending cases. Today, with 3 vacancies on the court, that number is 185 cases. Those are the complex cases that are pending. Even if we fill all the empty slots, the judges on the D.C. Circuit will still have more pending cases on average than John Roberts did when we confirmed him to sit on the D.C. Circuit back in 2003.

There are no excuses. We have a finely qualified nominee, with 32 Supreme Court arguments, support of the nonpartisan group that looks at these nominees, someone whose spouse served in the military for 22 years, someone who raised her kids while he was over in Kuwait, and we are going to turn her down? That makes no sense to me at all, and I urge my colleagues to help Patty Millett get into this job to do what she says is the highest honor you can have; that is, public service.

She should be confirmed without delay. The Senate should have confirmed her this week. We heard from the American people—we all heard this when we were home—how they are sick and tired of this kind of delay and partisanship. She is a fine, highly qualified nominee. She should get an up-or-down vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of Congressman MEL WATT to serve as director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

It has been over 5 years since the FHFA's inception, and it still has never had a confirmed Director. First, Senate Republicans blocked President Obama's original nominee for the post, Joe Smith, who was a technocrat. Today they are trying to block Congressman WATT because they say he is a politician and not a technocrat.

But they forget that Congressman WATT has over 40 years of experience in housing, real estate, and other financial services issues. Before coming to Congress, he practiced business and economic development law and personally walked hundreds of families through real estate closings.

In Congress, he has served on the House Financial Services Committee for the past 21 years. In that capacity, he was one of the first Members to recognize the need for action on predatory lending. With great foresight, he introduced the Prohibit Predatory Lending Act in 2004 and introduced it every Congress until it became the foundation for the qualified mortgage provision of the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010. If we had all listened to Congressman WATT before the housing crisis, then thousands of consumers might have avoided being scammed into unsafe mortgages that ultimately led to foreclosure.

Congressman WATT has also shown a commitment to housing finance reform. In 2007, he partnered with Congressman Frank and introduced a bill to reform Freddie and Fannie. This bill eventually led to the Housing and Economic Recovery Act, which established the FHFA.

Industry groups, consumer advocates, and fellow Members of Congress have recognized Congressman WATT's impressive track record and support him for this position.

One of his home State Senators, and the Republican Senator who probably knows him best, has supported his nomination from the beginning. Shortly after Congressman WATT's nomination was announced, Senator BURR stated:

Having served with Mel, I know of his commitment to sustainable federal housing programs and am confident he will work hard to protect taxpayers from future exposure to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. I look forward to working with Representative Watt in his new role to find new ways to facilitate more private sector involvement in the housing and mortgage markets.

Recently, the National Association of Home Builders sent a letter in support of Congressman WATT's nomination, stating:

During Representative Watt's tenure on the House Financial Services Committee, he

has proven to be a thoughtful leader on housing policy. The FHFA needs a permanent director with his leadership capabilities.

The National Association of Realtors has also sent a letter of support praising Congressman WATT by stating:

The Director of the FHFA must weigh the costs of action and inaction with the benefits of protecting the taxpayer, and ensuring that the housing sector can stabilize and grow. Mr. Watt has the experience and skill necessary to ensure that both are handled in a manner that will benefit our nation.

It is time we finally confirm a Director for the FHFA, to ensure stability and confidence in the housing market. Congressman WATT has the experience, intellect, and temperament to succeed as Director, and there is no legitimate reason why Congressman WATT should not be confirmed. At a minimum, as a sitting Member of Congress, he deserves the courtesy of an up-or-down vote. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the motion to invoke cloture so we can proceed to an up-or-down vote on Congressman WATT's nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the majority leader says it is time to cut off debate and vote on the President's nominees to fill three vacancies on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. I will not vote to end debate now because I think such a vote would be premature.

Before the Senate has an up-or-down vote on the three judges, there is something else we ought to do first. We should first consider the bipartisan proposal that was made 10 years ago to have the right number of judges on this Federal appellate court. For more than a decade, Senators of both parties have argued that this court has more judges than it needs and that other Federal appellate courts have too few. In 2003, 2005, and 2007, with a Republican President in the White House, Republican Senators SESSIONS and GRASSLEY introduced legislation to reduce the number of seats on the D.C. Circuit.

In 2006, they were joined by a distinguished group of eight Judiciary Committee Democrats who made the same argument. These included the chairman, Senator LEAHY, Senator SCHUMER, Senator Feingold, Senator Kennedy, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator DURBIN, Senator Kohl, and Senator BIDEN. When President Bush nominated Peter Keisler to the D.C. Circuit, the Democrats wrote Senator Specter, the committee chairman, a strong letter.

The letter says:

We believe that Mr. Keisler should under no circumstances be considered—much less confirmed—by this Committee before we first address the very need for that judgeship . . . and deal with the genuine judicial emergencies identified by the Judicial Conference.

The Democratic Senators argued, first, the committee should—before

turning to the nomination itself—hold a hearing on the necessity of filling the 11th seat on the D.C. Circuit, to which Mr. Keisler has been nominated. They cited a number of objections by Senators to the need for more judges on that circuit.

They then argued 6 years ago:

[That] since these emphatic objections were raised in 1997, by every relevant benchmark, the caseload for that circuit has dropped further.

Only after we reassess the need to fill this seat and tend to judicial emergencies should we hold a hearing on Mr. Keisler's nomination.

That was the Democratic Senators' position in 2007. These distinguished Democratic Senators were not only forceful in 2006 and 2007, they were persuasive. They worked with President Bush and Congress agreed to reduce the D.C. Circuit by one seat and add it to the Ninth Circuit, where the caseload was 526 filings per judge—well above the caseload average for all the judicial circuits.

In 2007, Senator FEINSTEIN, a Democrat, and Senator Kyl, a Republican wrote:

It makes sense to take a judgeship from where it is needed the least and transfer it to where it is needed the most.

Mr. Keisler, by the way, was never confirmed. For 2½ years his nomination was held in the Judiciary Committee, from June 2006 until January 2009. The same arguments made in 2006 and 2007 should be persuasive today.

Today, the average caseload for the D.C. Circuit—even if it were reduced by three judgeships to the eight seats currently occupied—would be less than one-half the national average for circuit courts. The national average is 344 cases filed per judge this year in Federal appellate courts. The D.C. Circuit average, if it were reduced to the 8 current judges, would be 149 per year. The national average is 344 cases per year. The D.C. Circuit average—even if it is reduced to 8—would be 149 per year, less than half.

Since 2005, there has been a decrease of 27 percent in the number of written decisions by an active judge on the D.C. Circuit. Since 2005, the number of appeals filed in the D.C. Circuit has fallen by 17½ percent.

Before it considers any of the President's nominees for the D.C. Circuit, the Senate should do in 2013, today, what Republican President Bush and the Democratic Senate did in 2007; first, consider the appropriate number of judges for the D.C. Circuit, and then, as Senator Kyl and Senator FEINSTEIN wrote, "take a judgeship from where it is needed least and transfer it to where it is needed most."

I heard the argument that the cases in the D.C. Circuit are more complex than in another circuit, and therefore the caseload ought to be lighter. With eight judges, it will be a lot lighter—

half the national average for circuit courts. That ought to allow plenty of time to write decisions in complex cases.

Other circuits have complex cases as well. For example, the Second Circuit, including New York, regularly handles many of the most complex cases that come to the Federal courts. Finally, there are a number of senior judges who are active in the D.C. Circuit—that is true in almost all the circuits, and that is part of the way our system works today. They can carry some of the workload when that becomes necessary.

I think it is striking that even if this court only has eight seats, that the average caseload is less than half of the national average. So why does it need three additional judges? That is the question Democratic Senators asked in 2007, and that is what the Senate and President Bush addressed. That is the question we should be asking today before we fill any more seats for an underworked circuit court.

So I will not vote to end the debate on the President's nominees until the Senate does in 2013 what Democratic Senators suggested and what the Senate did in 2007: Assess the need for judges on the D.C. Circuit and transfer judges from where they are needed least to where they are needed most. That means that before we act on the President's three nominees, the Judiciary Committee and the full Senate should consider Senator GRASSLEY's legislation that would transfer one judge to each of the overworked Second and Eleventh Circuits and eliminate one judge, leaving the D.C. Circuit with a caseload that still is less than half the national average for the eight remaining judgeships. Then, if there are still vacancies to be filled in the D.C. Circuit, the Senate can consider them one by one.

The Senate has treated President Obama very well in considering his nominations. According to the Congressional Research Service, as of August of this year President Obama's Cabinet members were, on average, 54 days—moving from announcement to confirmation at about the same pace as those of President Bush and President Clinton.

As far as President Obama's judicial nominees, President Obama has had 38 article III judges confirmed at this point in his second term, including 9 circuit judges, 25 district judges, and 4 judges to other article III courts. By comparison to those 38, President George Bush had 16 article III judges confirmed, 7 circuit judges, 7 district judges, and 2 judges to other article III courts.

What about a waiting list of judges who are waiting to be confirmed by the Senate? Is there a big backlog? The answer is no. As of today, only two circuit judges have been reported by the

committee and await floor action. Remember, the committee is controlled by Democrats and they can report whomever they want. Both of these are for the D.C. Circuit and are not judicial emergencies. Only seven district court nominations await floor action. None have been waiting long. Three were reported in August, and four were reported in September.

So while there are always a few nominations that provoke controversy and take a while to consider, one of the Senate's most important and best known powers is the constitutional authority to advise and consent on Presidential nominations. That is a part of the checks and balances our Founders set up so we didn't have a king, we didn't have a tyranny. We made it slower. We gave the President the right to nominate, but the Senate has the right to advise and consent. Sometimes that takes a while. Sometimes those nominees are rejected.

I believe and have argued consistently that with rare exceptions, Presidential nominations deserve an up-or-down vote after an appropriate time for consideration. President Obama's nominations have been receiving timely up-or-down votes. But first, as Senators of both political parties have argued for 10 years, we should make certain we have the right number of judges on the court. We don't have money to waste in this country with the debt we have today. We should transfer judges from where they are needed the least to where they are needed the most. That is the sensible thing to do. The President's nominees for the D.C. Circuit will receive up-or-down votes insofar as I am concerned unless there are exceptional circumstances.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter of July 27, 2006, from eight Democratic Senators to Chairman Arlen Specter suggesting that the hearing on Mr. Keisler be postponed until the Senate had considered the number of judges on the D.C. Circuit. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as well "Additional Views of Senators Feinstein and Kyl" which were written at that time.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, July 27, 2006.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary, Dirksen
Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SPECTER: We write to request that you postpone next week's proposed confirmation hearing for Peter Keisler, only recently nominated to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. For the reasons set forth below, we believe that Mr. Keisler should under no circumstances be considered—much less confirmed—by this Committee before we first address the very need for that judgeship, receive and review necessary information about the nominee, and

deal with the genuine judicial emergencies identified by the Judicial Conference.

First, the Committee should, before turning to the nomination itself, hold a hearing on the necessity of filling the 11th seat on the D.C. Circuit, to which Mr. Keisler has been nominated. There has long been concern—much of it expressed by Republican Members—that the D.C. Circuit's workload does not warrant more than 10 active judges. As you may recall, in years past, a number of Senators, including several who still sit on this Committee, have vehemently opposed the filling of the 11th and 12th seats on that court:

Senator Sessions: "[The eleventh] judgeship, more than any other judgeship in America, is not needed." (1997)

Senator Grassley: "I can confidently conclude that the D.C. Circuit does not need 12 judges or even 11 judges." (1997)

Senator Kyl: "If . . . another vacancy occurs, thereby opening up the 11th seat again, I plan to vote against filling the seat—and, of course, the 12th seat—unless there is a significant increase in the caseload or some other extraordinary circumstance." (1997)

More recently, at a hearing on the D.C. Circuit, Senator Sessions, citing the Chief Judge of the D.C. Circuit, reaffirmed his view that there was no need to fill the 11th seat: "I thought ten was too many . . . I will oppose going above ten unless the caseload is up." (2002)

In addition, these and other Senators expressed great reluctance to spend the estimated \$1 million per year in taxpayer funds to finance a judgeship that could not be justified based on the workload. Indeed, Senator SESSIONS even suggested that filling the 11th seat would be "an unjust burden on the taxpayers of America."

Since these emphatic objections were raised in 1997, by every relevant benchmark, the caseload for that circuit has only dropped further. According to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the Circuit's caseload, as measured by written decisions per active judge, has declined 17 percent since 1997; as measured by number of appeals resolved on the merits per active judge, it declined by 21 percent; and as measured by total number of appeals filed, it declined by 10 percent. Accordingly, before we rush to consider Mr. Keisler's nomination, we should look closely—as we did in 2002—at whether there is even a need for this seat to be filled and at what expense to the taxpayer.

Second, given how quickly the Keisler hearing was scheduled (he was nominated only 28 days ago), the American Bar Association has not yet even completed its evaluation of this nominee. We should not be scheduling hearings for nominees before the Committee has received their ABA ratings. Moreover, in connection with the most recent judicial nominees who, like Mr. Keisler, served in past administrations, Senators appropriately sought and received publicly available documents relevant to their government service. Everyone, we believe, benefited from the review of that material, which assisted Senators in fulfilling their responsibilities of advice and consent. Similarly, the Committee should have the benefit of publicly available information relevant to Mr. Keisler's tenure in the Reagan Administration, some of which may take some time to procure from, among other places, the Reagan Library. As Senator Frist said in an interview on Tuesday, "[T]he D.C. Circuit . . . after the Supreme Court is the next court in terms of hierarchy, in terms of re-

sponsibility, interpretation, and in terms of prioritization." We should therefore perform our due diligence before awarding a lifetime appointment to this uniquely important court.

Finally, given the questionable need to fill the 11th seat, we believe that Mr. Keisler should not jump ahead of those who have been nominated for vacant seats identified as judicial emergencies by the non-partisan Judicial Conference. Indeed, every other Circuit Court nominee awaiting a hearing in the Committee, save one, has been selected for a vacancy that has been deemed a "judicial emergency." We should turn to those nominees first; emergency vacancies should clearly take priority over a possibly superfluous one.

Given the singular importance of the D.C. Circuit, we should not proceed hastily and without full information. Only after we reassess the need to fill this seat, perform reasonable due diligence on the nominee, and tend to actual judicial emergencies, should we hold a hearing on Mr. Keisler's nomination.

We thank you for your consideration of this unanimous request of Democratic Senators.

Sincerely,

PATRICK LEAHY.
CHUCK SCHUMER.
NITA FEINGOLD.
DIANNE FEINSTEIN.
HERB KOHL.
TED KENNEDY.
DICK DURBIN.
JOE BIDEN.

THE COURT SECURITY ACT OF 2007

MARCH 29, 2007—ORDERED TO BE PRINTED

Mr. LEAHY, Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, submits the following report together with additional views

VI. ADDITIONAL VIEWS

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATORS FEINSTEIN AND KYL

Section 506 of this bill transfers a judgeship from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Once this provision is enacted into law, the Ninth Circuit will have 29 judgeships and the D.C. Circuit will have 11.

Section 506 will help to ease the backlog of pending cases in the Ninth Circuit, where more judgeships are sorely needed. At the same time, it will eliminate a judgeship on the D.C. Circuit that many Senators—including both Democrats and Republicans on this committee—have indicated that they believe to be unnecessary.

The numbers tell a striking story. According to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, 107 appeals per judge were filed in the D.C. Circuit in 2006. By contrast, in the Ninth Circuit, the filings were nearly five times higher—a total of 523 filings per judge in 2006. Filings per judge in the Ninth Circuit are also substantially higher than the national average of 399 filings per judge. The D.C. Circuit's rate of filings, by contrast, falls far below the national average.

The merits of transferring a judgeship from the D.C. Circuit to the Ninth Circuit are also brought into relief by considering the total number of appeals left pending in each circuit at the end of the 2006 reporting cycle. In the Ninth Circuit, 1,853 appeals were pending at the end of this period. This was the highest total for any circuit in the nation. By contrast, in the D.C. Circuit, only

387 appeals were pending at the end of the 2006 period. This was the lowest total for any circuit in the nation.

The backlog of cases in the Ninth Circuit is not merely a problem for lawyers and judges. It injures ordinary people who have to wait longer to have their cases resolved. Plaintiffs who have been injured, criminal defendants seeking review of their convictions, and victims waiting for justice—for all of these people, justice delayed is justice denied.

It just makes sense to take a judgeship from where it is needed least, and to transfer it to where it is needed most.

California is hit hardest by the inadequate number of judgeships on the Ninth Circuit. In 2005, 10,000 federal appeals—70% of the circuit's total docket—were filed in California. On February 14, during his testimony before this Committee, even U.S. Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy commented on the overloaded docket of the Central District of California. Yet of the Ninth Circuit's 28 judgeships, only 14 are assigned to California.

California needs more judges. Transferring a judgeship from the D.C. Circuit to the Ninth Circuit in California would be a first step toward correcting this deficiency.

The D.C. Circuit, by contrast, has seen its caseload decline in recent years. In fact, filings in that circuit dropped by 7.1% in 2006 alone. Removal of the 12th judgeship would only modestly increase filings per judge in that circuit to 115—a figure still well below half the national average for U.S. courts of appeals. And in any event, the burden on that court of removing a seat is largely hypothetical. The 12th seat on the D.C. Circuit was created in 1984 and has remained vacant for most of the intervening years, including all of the last decade. On the other hand, adding one seat to the Ninth Circuit would reduce filings per judge on that court to 503—still a heavy burden on the justice system of the Western States.

Section 506 is a reasonable step toward the solution of a pressing problem in the administration of United States courts. We are pleased to see it made part of this bill.

DIANNE FEINSTEIN.
JON KYL.

NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to give thanks and show respect to World War II and Cold War heroes who served in our Nation's nuclear weapons programs on this fifth National Day of Remembrance. They weren't serving in the heat of battle but in the laboratory, handling materials on a daily basis that ranged from benign to toxic and highly radioactive. These materials posed risks that many scientists did not understand at the time.

Today in Oak Ridge, TN, the American Museum of Science and Energy, and Cold War Patriots are gathering to celebrate former workers and view a quilt that honors nuclear workers for their contribution to America's safety. This one-of-a-kind remembrance quilt has 1,250 commemorative handwritten quilt squares that form an American flag that measures 17 feet by 11 feet.

I want to specifically remember Bill Wilcox for his service to our country and passion for preserving Oak Ridge history. Bill passed this September.

Bill was a former manager of the K-25 operations, a Manhattan Project veteran, and the official historian for the city of Oak Ridge.

In 1943, Bill was hired by Tennessee Eastman on a "Secret, secret, secret!" project in an unknown location. When he started at Eastman he was told:

As chemists you'll have to know that you'll be working [on] this project with a substance called uranium. That is the last time that you will hear that word or you will speak it until after the war. And if you are ever heard speaking the word you will be subject to discharge from our employment immediately, and very likely prosecuted by the United States government, and may end up in jail. Is that clear?

In Oak Ridge ground was broken for the Y-12 plant in February of 1943, and by the end of the summer they started installing complex physics machines, called calutrons. About 1,000 calutrons were installed at Y-12.

How were these calutrons operated? Tennessee Eastman said that the calutrons couldn't be run as an experiment but should be run like an industrial plant. Rather than manuals, there should be a simple red line on meter A. The operator would turn knob A until the needle is on the red line on meter A.

However, General Leslie Groves, head of the Manhattan Project, along with physicists disagreed. So they took five calutrons and ran them for a week with the best physicists and then another week with girls right out of high school that kept the needle on the red line of the meters. "After a week the girls had won hands down in terms of productivity."

These women were called the "calutron girls." One calutron girl first learned of the war effort in Oak Ridge when she was at a café in Sweetwater, TN. She was working in a hardware store at the time. The store had a big window where people from the surrounding counties put photos of their sons who went away to war. She had the job of straightening up the photos when the heat from the window caused the cardboard frames to buckle. With great dignity, the families would take down the pictures of their fallen soldiers.

Wanting to help the war effort, she went to Oak Ridge, where there was "mud everywhere, and green Army trucks, and vehicles, and soldiers, and that was just inside the gate." As a calutron girl, she wore a blue uniform. The chemical workers wore white. She said:

You weren't allowed to go in the other room . . . you'd stick out like a sore thumb, a blue something in a white-uniformed place . . . But they let us go over—towards the end . . . they told us to take all the bobby pins out of your hair before you go out there because it would yank your bobby pins out.

She remembers:

You couldn't talk. You couldn't say anything to anybody about where you worked,

what building, when you left the plant. In fact, there were huge banners up all over the plant: 'When you leave here what you see here stays here.' And you weren't allowed to tell even . . . somebody [that] worked on the same thing you did.

There were signs everywhere: "Keep your mouth shut!" "Loose lips sink ships!" "See no evil; hear no evil; speak no evil" with posted fines of \$10,000 and warnings of jail time.

One of the things that was curious about Oak Ridge was that these rail cars came in every week, but nobody ever saw any product going out. The reason was that the product went out in a standard-sized briefcase every week chained to the wrist of a military officer, in plainclothes. He would get on the train and go to Chicago to exchange the briefcase.

During 1945, a different process at the K-25 building was surprisingly successful and cost less than 10 percent of the cost of the Y-12 process. The K-25 building was a mile-long U-shape—once the world's largest buildings under one roof. The operators had to use bicycles just to get around their building.

The successful K-25 process ran full blast for another 20 years, while the Y-12 plant received a new mission.

These efforts along with others by our nuclear weapons workers across the country won World War II and the cold war. At the peak of the Cold War, nearly 600,000 workers across the country were involved in the research and production of nuclear weapons.

Today, many former nuclear weapons workers are retired. Many of them are sick. Some are dying. The government is helping these sick nuclear workers through the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program created by Congress in 2001.

This program provides compensation to those who were exposed to radiation and toxic materials while building our nuclear weapons, especially those that were instrumental in our winning the cold war. This program receives claims from all 50 States nearly 100,000 individual workers.

This program is especially important to Tennessee. Tennessee has the highest number of claims than any other State—over 14,000 workers. Tennesseans, mostly former workers at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Y-12 and K-25, have received over \$1.7 billion in compensation and paid medical bills, according to the Department of Labor.

Today, the nuclear workers across the country continue this heroic legacy to advance nuclear power, nuclear medicine and other technology that continues to make our lives better and keep our country safe.

So I am privileged to work with Senator MARK UDALL in honoring these patriots who worked countless hours with little-understood hazardous materials to build our country's nuclear deterrent.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with my colleagues from Delaware and Ohio for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MANUFACTURING IN AMERICA

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, this is one of those all-too-rare occasions anymore where we all agree, and it is about making things. We will be talking for the next few minutes about what happens in our country and what needs to happen so we can not just make things again—because we still make lots of things, and we make them very well—but what we need to do to be able to make more things. What do we need to do to be sure we are at the competitive front of the line as we work to make things.

All of us are working on things together. Senator BROWN and I have been working on advanced manufacturing—something that he has spoken about and we have spoken about together and that he has been a leader on for a long time—and all of our States benefit.

Missouri and Ohio have certainly been among the significant manufacturing States. In Missouri we have more than \$32 billion a year in manufacturing. For about the last 4 years that has been the top manufacturing employment, has been in the agricultural industry, in food processing, as well as transportation equipment, fabricated metals, machinery of all kinds, and automobiles have been in the top of our manufacturing sectors.

I believe we are really at a point where so many things could easily come together, and the Federal Government and the Congress can help make those things come together by taking down barriers and by creating easier ways to work together. In the case of advanced manufacturing, we have talked about the centers of excellence and we have worked on that together, and we have both seen some of these ideas work.

I wish to ask Senator BROWN some of the things he has seen and the things he thinks we can do better through the legislation we have been talking about.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate Senator BLUNT yielding. I appreciate the opportunity to engage in this colloquy with the Senator from Missouri as well as the Senator from Delaware, both of whom have been leaders in manufacturing in Missouri and in Delaware.

It is pretty clear what these public-private hubs can do in terms of a multiplier effect. When we look at manufacturing history in this country—and of course I will use an illustration in my State, as I understand my State better than I do any other—when Akron was the leading tire manufacturer and was sort of the center for tire

manufacturing along the Ohio turnpike in northeast Ohio; to Toledo, where glass manufacturing was prominent and prevalent for decades; to autos in Cleveland; to steel; and then to rubber in Akron, we can see that once we have an innovative focus, then other kinds of manufacturing come out of that. As the tire industry declined over the decades, Akron is now one of the leaders in polymer. Toledo, which was a leader in glass manufacturing—plate glass for cars, bottles, and a lot of other kinds of glassware—has become a solar center.

So the legislation Senator BLUNT and I have come up with will help American workers and American business have the drive and the creative thinking and the determination to innovate ahead of the rest of the world.

Before turning to Senator COONS, I wish to tell a quick story that tells me why it is so important that manufacturing take place here. We out-innovate the rest of the world. We are still the most creative. We are the best innovators. We lead in foundational research and in other kinds of research. The problem is that as we invent things in this country, if we then outsource the manufacturing, so much of the creativity and innovation, both in process and in product, takes place in that other country because it takes place in the shops.

I will give a quick example. The largest yogurt manufacturer in North America is in western Ohio near the town where Neil Armstrong grew up, western Ohio near Wapakoneta. That yogurt manufacturer—I was there one day, and they used to bring in—the suppliers would send the plastic cups to the shop floor, to the manufacturer, and they would fill them—in these big silver vats—they would fill these plastic cups with fermented milk, with yogurt, package it, and send it. A young industrial engineer and a couple of people who worked on the line for years said: We can do this a lot less expensively and save money for the company and be more productive and efficient. So the three of them developed something pretty simple to an engineer, not so simple, perhaps, to me, but they simply fed a roll of plastic, a sheet of plastic, it was slowly heated, and it was then extruded and then cooled and filled with yogurt. The line was about 75 feet, and it made for a much more efficient innovation. That innovation took place on the shop floor of an American manufacturing plant, making the productivity of that plant much greater.

That is really how we need to look at this. If we are going to do this partnership with government and local manufacturers and local labor unions and local businesses and local suppliers, we can do the kind of work Senator BLUNT mentioned with these manufacturing hubs, this network of manufacturing innovation initiative we have had.

We introduced the bill this summer. We are working to build support. We welcome the support of our colleagues. Senator BLUNT has already mentioned what it could mean in Missouri, and perhaps Senator COONS could tell us what it would mean in Delaware and in this country and what better manufacturing and more innovation means to our country.

I thank my two colleagues. I have a conference committee I need to join, but I appreciate very much my colleagues opening this discussion.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his tireless and engaged leadership on manufacturing, on fighting for access to foreign markets on fair terms, for fighting for skills and increasing the skills of our manufacturing workforce, and in this instance, in this strong bipartisan bill, for working with our colleague from Missouri on a national network of manufacturing innovation centers.

My own work of 8 years at a manufacturing company in Delaware in a materials-based science company that makes things helped make it clear to me how important research and development and continuous innovation are for manufacturers at all levels. I have seen this across the State of Delaware. Our Presiding Officer—long owner and leader of a manufacturing business in his home State of Indiana—knows this better than any of us: that if we don't innovate, if we don't invest in research and development, in improving the skills in the workforce and improving the productivity and the operating efficiency of any manufacturing company, we can't survive in the tough headwinds of the global marketplace today.

One of the programs I championed here in the Senate that has bipartisan support is the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. It is a long-established program that takes the latest cutting-edge research and development work at universities and moves it to the shop floor. I have visited companies up and down Delaware, from FMC in Newark to Speakman in New Castle, where they have taken those innovations from the university to the shop floor.

One of the things I am grateful to Senator BLUNT for is his leadership in taking that insight that in order to have the most productive manufacturing workforce in the world, in order to continue to compete globally, we have to find ways to continue to invest in demonstrating the power of innovation and we have to find ways to do that in a bipartisan way.

I thank the Senator for being willing to work with Senator BROWN and others here. This is exactly the sort of stuff I hear from Delawareans they want us to be doing. There is lots that divides us. This is something that unites us: working together to

strengthen our manufacturing sector, to make it more competitive, to bring jobs back to the United States, and to grow this sector.

We have grown half a million jobs in the last 3 years in the manufacturing sector. These are good jobs, at high wages, high benefits, high skills. But we can and should do more, pulling together to sort of lift further this ongoing manufacturing revival.

If Senator BLUNT would share some more with us about this specific bill and about his experience in what else we can and should be doing together to strengthen manufacturing in Missouri, I would be grateful.

Mr. BLUNT. The Senator's point is well made. These manufacturing jobs are goods jobs. The American workforce is competitive. As Senator BROWN said, we have always been on the cutting edge, the outside of competition, making things in a better way than we did last year. Everybody who is competing today is trying to figure out how they can do whatever they did last year better. We see that and what we can add to that, how we can make that process work better.

In our State, the average manufacturing job pays 21.5 percent more than the average wage. Mr. President, \$52,000 or so for the average manufacturing job salary in Missouri is a significant improvement in where you might otherwise be. In Missouri we have 6,500 manufacturing firms. Almost a quarter of a million people work in manufacturing in Missouri. We used to have more than that. We used to have more than that, and I think we will have more than that again. The country used to do more in terms of manufacturing than it does now. But we are going to see that happen.

The Senator from Delaware just wrote an article in Congressional Quarterly that talked about what needs to be done, the great opportunities we have in energy. If we take advantage of those great energy opportunities, suddenly the utility bill is more predictable, the delivery system is more guaranteed.

I was talking to a manufacturer today in my office and this topic came up. At some point now, as you get further and further into innovation, people not only have to be better trained—the Senator talked about that too: the importance of a skilled workforce—but how the workforce competes with maybe a lower paid workforce in some other country maybe is not nearly as important as how the utility bill competes.

If you can run that facility—and I just gave him an example of another manufacturing facility in my hometown of Springfield, MO, that was making a significant expansion, I think about a \$150 million expansion. They did not expect to hire any more people, but they expect to use that current

workforce in a much more competitive way. Nobody was losing a job because of advanced competition. They are just expanding that workforce in a way that ensures they will keep their job and be more competitive. Of course, somebody, by the way, is building that expansion. There are jobs there as well. And those all matter.

We have all kinds of examples.

Perryville, MO, is a town of less than 10,000 people. In that town, they have become a hub—it is about 80 miles south of St. Louis—of 21st century manufacturing. A Japanese company is there, Toyoda Gosei, that makes plastic components for automobiles. Sabreliner makes aviation parts and is in the airplane industry. There is Gilster-Mary Lee, a much more traditional employer. But here is a town that has a significant number of manufacturing jobs.

The town of Cassville, near Springfield, for a number of years had more manufacturing jobs than they had population. Now, of course, that meant in the part of the country where I live lots of people may have been driving a significant number of miles to get to those jobs. But there are not very many cities. This is a smaller community. It is the county seat of Barry County. But they had more manufacturing jobs than the number of people who lived in the community itself. It meant that is a competitive community. That is a community that knows how to build jobs.

Perryville is a community that has launched itself well into the 21st century. And the skills the Senator was talking about—the skilled workforce, the energy needs, the research component—one of the components of these hubs of excellence that we have been looking at and talking about, Senator BROWN and I have been working on, is to create ways to encourage that higher education be part of that research component.

I think Americans are eager to produce. I bet the Senator and I both hear the same thing over and over: How can we have a strong economy if we do not produce? Well, you can have a strong economy in parts of the economy that do not produce, but I think not only do you need to produce, but there is something that defines who we are in a positive way when people see American production that is not only heavily competitive here but competitive all over the world.

I think that is what Senator COONS and I are talking about, the kind of bipartisan effort we need to make. I do not know any Republicans or any Democrats anywhere, or any Independents, who have said: Oh, we don't need to worry about making things. We don't need to worry about a competitive economy. Actually, private sector jobs should be the No. 1 domestic goal of the Federal Government today. And

the jobs we are talking about are a significant component because they lead to lots of other jobs. All of the ripple effects of manufacturing jobs are great: the other businesses that spring up, the suppliers that come.

Of course, the Senator and I have talked about his father was a significant part of launching new things into the marketplace. I think that is what the Senator and I want to see this Congress encourage, as we can encourage things without law and look for legislative ways to facilitate a growth back toward manufacturing.

Mr. COONS. I thank Senator BLUNT for his work on this bill with Senator BROWN. There are other bills that I hope this body will take up and discuss and debate where I hope we can find ideas that are out there, with progress that is being made and policy innovation that is being made, and that we can take them up, debate them, and find bipartisan sponsors who will carry them forward.

I absolutely agree with the Senator's point that we are seeing in manufacturing a revival in this country for a variety of reasons. One of them is less expensive energy. The shale gas revolution is reducing the feedstock costs for chemical manufacturing and reducing the energy costs broadly for manufacturing of all kinds.

We are also seeing that lots of American companies fear the loss of their inventions, their innovations, if they move offshore. So some of the attractiveness of operating in other countries has dimmed a bit, as they have recognized that the United States is one that has a rule of law that protects their inventions and innovations.

There is also less of a wage gap, frankly, as wages have come up in the developing world. In China, the wage gap is less. So that combination gives us a window, gives us a moment of opportunity. We lost millions of manufacturing jobs in the first years of this century, but in the last three we have been growing them and growing them steadily. If we can work in partnership across the aisle on manufacturing skills, on access to credit, on innovation, on a coordinated strategy, I cannot imagine a community in this country that would not rather have high-quality manufacturing jobs.

As Senator BLUNT was mentioning, for every manufacturing job that is created, there is 1.6 new support jobs created. For every \$1 spent in manufacturing, there is \$1.34 spent in the local economy that moves around. It is the sector that has the most positive secondary impact in our communities.

I do think there is broadly in our country a sense that we have sort of lost our leading edge in manufacturing because of the large-scale layoffs and the large plant closings. But in my State, and I presume in the Senator's State and in the Presiding Officer's

State of Indiana, and others, there are dozens and dozens of small and medium-sized manufacturers who have seized this moment, who are growing, and who simply want us to help facilitate their access to the market, their access to innovation and new research, their access to a skilled workforce.

If we can pull together, I think we can do great things for the United States going forward.

Also, before we close, I thank Senator BLUNT for being a cosponsor with me of the startup innovation tax credit—something Senator ENZI and I and many others—Senator RUBIO, Senator SCHUMER, Senator STABENOW, as well as Senator MORAN—have cosponsored and introduced and discussed over time. It would help with access to capital for early stage startup manufacturers.

There are lots of good ideas we can and should discuss on the floor, in hearings, and going forward. But for today I am grateful to Senator BLUNT for his leadership with Senator BROWN on this bill that would help strengthen the National Network of Manufacturing Innovation centers. The Senator is a strong leader for manufacturing in his home State of Missouri, and I am grateful for a chance to spend some time with him on the floor today discussing that good bill and his good ideas.

Mr. BLUNT. Let me just talk a little bit about the startup act that Senator COONS and I have worked on. The Senator mentioned, I think, all the cosponsors of that: Senator RUBIO, Senator STABENOW, Senator MORAN, Senator KAINE, Senator SCHUMER, and Senator ENZI.

What that does is try to extend the opportunity of research and development to startup businesses. The way the tax credit works, you can deduct those costs from the taxes you pay. Well, if you are a startup business, you often do not have any profit to deduct from. That is part of the courage, frankly, of starting a business. You are almost insured, guaranteed, that for the first weeks, months, sometimes the first years, depending on how big a venture this is, you are not making money yet. So what the Senator and I and our friends have done in the startup act is say—these people would have employees—so what we do is allow the same tax credit for a big corporation or a big business or a highly successful business with lots of profit to be applied against what they pay as taxes for their employees—the Social Security tax, the other taxes that are paid—and, again, trying to encourage innovation.

We all know that small business is the engine that drives the country. But also small business can be the engine that drives manufacturing, if we figure out a way to let them have some of the same benefits that existing businesses have that have already gotten them-

selves in a profit-making situation. This just gives them a place to go and utilize that credit.

That is the kind of thing we ought to be looking at. Startup businesses are important, encouraging traditional businesses to figure out how to upgrade their equipment, upgrade the way they do things so they are more competitive in an international marketplace. I really do firmly believe that for reasons the Senator mentioned—the wage gap is not what it was, the transportation costs are more than they were to get something made from somewhere else back to the greatest market in world, the United States of America; and the more we know about the utility bills—Senator DONNELLY from Indiana, who is the Presiding Officer, and I have been working on things that pay attention to the utility bills. Again, that is a key component of future manufacturing. The more competitive you are, the more innovative you are, the more you are likely to be concerned about that part of your input costs. And sometimes when you expand, the utility bill is a bigger than the additional labor cost. But that may be exactly what ensures you can keep the labor you have and grow that labor by being able to make a commitment that you feel good about because you feel good about your ability to run that facility once you build it. You feel good that not only is it going to work this year, but, by the way, we are doing so well and doing so many things that 10 years from now we feel whatever the utility costs are going to be, they are going to be within the range we can deal with and still produce right in Missouri, right in Ohio, right in Delaware, or right in Indiana.

That is the kind of thing we ought to be focusing on. How do we make things again? How do we create other kinds of private sector jobs, the No. 1 domestic priority of the country today?

Every time the Senator and I talk about manufacturing, I really do get excited about an America that is thinking about not are we going to be able to continue to make what we have always made, but what can we make better than anybody else that we are not making yet that is going to allow us to be out there in a world marketplace? Trade has become a much greater opportunity for the American workforce, as all of these other factors we have been talking about on the floor have come together to make our workforce what it is.

If Senator COONS has any final remarks, I would like him to finish our time here on the floor.

Mr. COONS. I thank Senator BLUNT. I thank the Senator for his enthusiasm for manufacturing and for his enthusiasm for working together with me on the startup innovation credit bill, as the Senator referenced, and with Senator BROWN on the national network of

manufacturing innovation centers as he spoke about.

Manufacturing is the center, the beating heart of the middle class of America. Manufacturing jobs are good jobs. We do need to get back to being a country where inventing, growing, and making things is an area of bipartisan, sustained, purposeful focus. I know for the folks who watch us at home and for the folks here in this Chamber, nothing could meet the demands and the needs of our communities and our States more than for us to come together in a bipartisan, balanced, and responsible way to advocate for a stronger manufacturing sector in the United States.

I thank Senator BLUNT very much.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1592

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, we have all now been aware over the last few days in the news about the problems being faced with the Web site upon which people are supposed to go in order to sign up to be on one of these exchanges. That is important, because next year Americans are going to owe money to the IRS if they do not have health insurance by a certain date.

One of the ways people are supposed to get health insurance is by going on one of those Web sites and logging on, registering, and being able to see what their options are for insurance, and then signing up. If you do not do that, then you are going to owe money to the IRS next year.

The problem is those Web sites are not working. In fact, just today as the Secretary was testifying before a House committee, the Web site crashed again. There are a lot of different reasons why that is happening. I am sure eventually, with all of the experts who are involved in it, they will be able to set up a Web site that functions, because this is the 21st century. The ability to go online and buy something, frankly, is something people do every single day with all kinds of things. So to me, it is inexplicable that they are not able to do that when it comes to health insurance.

But in the meantime, people are struggling not just with the Web site, by the way, there are problems now with the 800 number and the paper application.

I believe the prudent approach is to say we are going to delay, that we are going to put off punishing people, that we are going to put off the individual mandate until the Web site works. I will admit, I do not think the law works at all in its totality and it will eventually have to be repealed. That is what I favor. But in the interim, what I am proposing is something that I think is pretty reasonable; that is, the notion that until these Web sites are working, how can we punish people for not buying health insurance? Why are

we going to punish someone for not buying health insurance if the Web site they are supposed to buy it on, by the administration's own admission, is not properly working?

This is creating a lot of anxiety for people. That is why I filed a bill to do that. That is why I come on the floor today for the purpose of making a motion.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 225, S. 1592, which is a bill to delay the individual mandate until the health exchanges are functioning properly. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think it is pretty clear that this motion is inappropriate. This is not what we should be doing and how we should potentially change the act. Actually, the effect here is to disrupt implementation of the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act is a law. It has been in place for several years. The Supreme Court has upheld it. Attempts to repeal it failed. I think the House has voted up to 20 times to try to repeal the ACA. They have all failed. The act is here. So the goal here is to make it work, make the act work. Then later on we can ask questions about what happened, why it didn't work, why wasn't implementation of the exchanges as good as a lot of us would have liked it to have been. Then find out who is responsible, et cetera. Right now it works.

The effect of this motion is several-fold. One, it will deny people having health insurance, people who otherwise would get health insurance. If you delay the individual responsibility requirement, it is going to cause a delay. People will not have insurance.

Second, it is going to increase the cost of health insurance for a lot of people. Why? Because fewer people will be signed up. The individual responsibility requirement will not be followed as much as otherwise would be the case. The result is fewer people will be in the insurance pool, and therefore prices will be higher.

Another consequence is it lowers the quality of health insurance, especially for those individuals who are seeking to be insured. They are going to have a lower quality product as a consequence of this request. It is an attempt to destabilize, it is an attempt to undermine the ACA.

I think for those reasons it is inappropriate and again is another effort to obstruct. We should not proceed in this way, so I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I do not intend to offer another motion since the objection has been heard. I do want to point out a couple of things. First of all, this notion that ObamaCare is the law—it is true it is the law. It was passed by Congress in the years before I got here. This is called the Calendar of Business. This is the Executive Calendar. Basically every single bill that is in here is an effort to change existing law, for the most part. That is what we do around here. That is what the legislative process is about. Virtually every bill that is filed is either an effort to create a new law, but usually it is an effort to change existing law. So if we begin to argue around here that once something is existing law it can never be changed, we might as well close up shop, because that is what we do. That is what the legislative process is about.

The second point that was made was that this law will prevent people have having health insurance. That is not true. Let me say this: No. 1, I am in favor of people having health insurance. I do think we cannot ignore the health insurance problem this country faces.

No. 2, admittedly, I am in favor of repealing ObamaCare and replacing it with a better alternative. But that is not what this bill does. All this bill says—this is the only thing it says: The only thing it says is you cannot enforce the individual mandate, you cannot tell people next year that we will fine you, that the IRS is going to impose a fine on you. You will not be able to do that until the Web site is fully working.

In terms of this preventing people from getting health insurance, that is simply not accurate. This does not prevent anyone from going onto the Web site and signing up. If the bill I am proposing is adopted, it would not keep anybody from signing up for health insurance under ObamaCare. The only thing it would do is keep the IRS from fining you if you are unable to do it. The reason why that makes sense is because the way we are supposed to do it on a Web site simply is not working.

So it is not accurate to say this will somehow prevent people from buying health insurance. It does not. It does not prohibit you from trying to get it on the Web site. It is just the recognition that the Web site is not working well and there is a consequence to it. The consequence to it is if they cannot get these Web sites up and running, there are people who will not be able to buy health insurance and they are going to get fined for it. That does not sound fair to me.

So while I continue to want to repeal ObamaCare, I think for the good of our people it is unfair to continue to hold over their head the threat of an IRS fine when the method of compliance we

are asking them to follow is not fully functioning. That is all this would do.

I would point out this is not a theoretical concern. I get letters and emails every day. But I want to read one I got. I will paraphrase it. It is from Barbara in Ruskin, FL. She is 63 years old. She tried to apply to the health insurance marketplace on October 1. As of the writing of this email, she is no further along. She sought the services of a certified navigator on October 14. After spending hours on line trying to get an account established and making the application, the navigator, with her on speaker phone, after many hours finally assisted her in making an application. She was told she would receive additional information via email. Ten days later she has still heard nothing. She is worried because she is currently covered, but that is being terminated at the end of the year because of ObamaCare. It is going to end on December 31. According to the information provided to her, she has to be enrolled in another insurance plan or she is going to face the fine.

This is just one example. I could go on and on. I do not want to burden the time of the Senate. But there are thousands upon thousands of people who are dealing with this problem.

Here is the last point I would make. I have now heard on a number of occasions the administration say with full confidence that by the end of this coming month, by the end of November, the Web sites will be up and running. If that is true, then there is no reason to be against my bill. If, in fact, you are so confident the Web sites are going to be up and running by the end of November, then this problem will be taken care of. If, in fact, you are right, and the Web sites are going to be up and running at the end of November, then the mandate will be back in effect.

The only thing my bill does is say: As long as the Web site is not working and until it is working, you cannot enforce the ObamaCare mandates on people through a fine from the IRS. That is it. That is all it says. That is why I think this makes all the sense in the world. I am surprised that we somehow believe we should continue to hold the penalty over people's heads when the way we are asking them to comply with the law, by the admission of the administration, by the admission of the Secretary today, is simply not working well enough.

I hope in the days to come my colleagues will reconsider, because I think our people, irrespective of how you feel about ObamaCare, deserve better. To that end, I would read to you one email I got from someone who actually supports ObamaCare. Nicholas in Palm Bay, FL, wrote an extensive email. He talked about how he submitted an application to the Web site. It took hours to complete because of Web issues.

They finally finished the application 23 days later. The application is still in progress, but it will not let him go any farther to choose the insurance. So while he does not agree with me about defunding or repealing ObamaCare, he agrees with me that we should suspend the individual mandate penalty until this Web site issue is fixed.

I think there are a lot of people who are going to feel that way. I think there are a lot of people who would be shocked that the government is going to punish them for not buying insurance when the Web site they are being sent to buy it on does not work.

Again, I think it is a commonsense approach. I am surprised there is objection to it. I suppose I should not be, but I am. I hope in the days and weeks to come my colleagues will reconsider, because in my opinion, and I think in the opinion of many Americans, it is simply unfair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in favor of Ms. Patricia Millett's nomination to the D.C. Circuit Court. As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I have the opportunity to closely examine each of the judicial candidates nominated by our President. I did so with Ms. Millett, attending her nomination hearing and speaking to a wide range of the practitioners and colleagues who have direct knowledge of her professionalism and experience. Without exception, at every stage of her career and with every personal and professional colleague with whom she has had work experience, Patty—Ms. Millett—has distinguished herself as a person of integrity, intelligence, and dedication. She is a person whose capability and devotion to a family is an inspiration to those around her. She is unanimously recommended by former living Solicitors General, and received the ABA's highest rating.

Some of my colleagues here have argued that President Obama is trying to "pack the court" by nominating Ms. Millett and two other nominees to fill three current vacancies on the D.C. Circuit Court. These charges of court packing strike me, frankly, as without foundation. Court packing is an historical term used to describe when politicians try to change the size of a court, expand a court, in order to control its expected outcome. That was the cause of the objection to President Roosevelt's plan to add up to six Justices to the U.S. Supreme Court back in 1937.

In fact, a current legislative proposal to strip the President's ability to fill

three vacant seats on the D.C. Circuit could better be called court stripping. In this particular case, making nominations to vacant judicial positions is not court packing, it is a President doing his job. Confirming highly qualified nominees to serve on this circuit in this vacancy would be this body doing its job.

The charges of court packing are absurd on their face. They are even more absurd when put in context.

Ms. Millett has been nominated to the ninth seat of the 11 authorized on this court. There are currently three vacancies on this vital circuit court.

I held a hearing earlier this year on judicial staffing levels in my role as the chair of the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts of the Judiciary Committee. I invited the chair of the Judicial Conference Committee on Judicial Resources, Judge Tymkovich, to come testify. For those who ascribe significance to such things, Judge Tymkovich was nominated by President George W. Bush to sit on the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals.

Judge Tymkovich testified—convincingly, in my opinion—that the Federal judiciary needs more judges, not fewer. Every other year, the Judicial Conference submits to Congress a report on recommendations on judgeships. That report did not conclude that any judgeships should be removed or remain unfilled on the D.C. Circuit.

Judge Tymkovich also explained why the caseload statistics used by some of our colleagues to argue that the D.C. Circuit has a low caseload—and thus need not have its vacancies filled—are, in fact, unconvincing. The D.C. Circuit hears a unique caseload, with four times the number of complex administrative appeals than other circuit courts around the country.

The D.C. Circuit is the circuit from which all the Federal agencies' actions are repealed. More than any other court in the country, its caseload is made up of very complex, very difficult cases with far-reaching consequences and that require a great deal of time. Simply looking at the raw number of cases filed, opened, and closed is not an accurate predictor of whether a vacant seat on the D.C. Circuit should, in fact, be filled. The D.C. Circuit's caseload has remained steady over the past 10 years, so the Judicial Conference has seen no reason to recommend any alteration in its staffing level.

The court packing argument made by some is also at odds with history, especially when one considers that caseloads lower than they are now on the D.C. Circuit were sufficient when all Republican Members then in office voted to confirm then Judge Roberts to the 9th seat, Janice Rogers Brown to the 10th seat, Thomas Griffith to the 11th seat, and Brett Kavanaugh to the 10th seat when it became vacant. When Ms. Millett is confirmed, the D.C. Cir-

cuit will still have more pending appeals per active judge than after the confirmations of any of those four earlier Bush nominees I just referenced. The caseload on the D.C. Circuit would also remain above that of the current 6th Circuit and 10th Circuit, to which courts the Senate has confirmed Republican supported judicial nominees this year.

A filibuster of Ms. Millett on caseload grounds would bring the Senate to an unprecedented and regrettable place. It would destroy comity and trust at a time when our Nation needs it most, when we need to demonstrate to the people of the United States that this Congress can function and that this Senate can fulfill its constitutional role.

It would not only facilitate the administration of justice by our courts, but also allow us to tackle other issues if we could move past endless and needless filibusters on issues such as this. It would allow us to move forward to the broader issues of the day, tackling long-term debt and deficit challenges, the fight against global terrorism, re-investing in our future, and working together to invest in manufacturing and grow our economy. There are so many other issues that call for the time of this body.

With that, I wish to urge my colleagues to look at Ms. Millett's nomination on its merits and to not be distracted by what I think are groundless arguments that this is an instance of so-called court packing by this President.

This President is doing his job. He is nominating supremely qualified candidates to serve in the highest courts of this land, and this body should do its job and confirm those qualified nominees.

NATIONAL TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION DAY

If I might, I simply wanted to comment to this body that something passed with little notice here yesterday, October 29, 2013, was National Technological Innovation Day. This was recognizing the role that technological innovation plays in the United States economy.

We know that innovation is absolutely essential to developing new medicines, treatments, and cures to help us live longer and more healthy lives. Innovation is essential to strengthen the manufacturing sector of the American economy and make us more competitive. Innovation is essential to allow us to take advantage of new materials and new opportunities in the world and to access new export markets overseas. Innovation overall is what has brought all that is best about modern life and the modern world.

Yesterday, in a bipartisan way, we recognized that on October 29, many years ago, was the very first day that DARPA was able to exchange communications from one computer to another. It was literally the dawning of

the modern Internet age. This was made possible in part by Federal investment and innovation.

I am grateful that Senator MORAN, Senator ISAKSON, Senator HEINRICH, and Senator KIRK joined me in recognizing the unique and important role that technological innovation has played in America's past, America's present, and America's future.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin pertaining to the introduction of S. 1617 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to support my colleague and my friend, Congressman MEL WATT of North Carolina, who has been nominated by the President to be the next Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency—the FHFA. I have total confidence that MEL is fully capable and qualified to serve as the FHFA Director, and I am not alone.

This week, the National Association of Home Builders wrote a letter to Leaders REID and MCCONNELL unequivocally endorsing Congressman Watt, stating:

During Representative WATT's tenure on the House Financial Services Committee, he has proven to be a thoughtful leader on housing policy. The FHFA needs a permanent director with his leadership capabilities.

Senator BURR, Congressman WATT's Republican colleague from North Carolina, and Senator HAGAN recently shared a "Dear Colleague" in which both North Carolina Senators stated clearly, in their words:

Congressman Watt has shown himself to be an honest, kind, and capable individual with deep understanding of the housing market. We urge you to support his nomination.

He is indeed qualified to serve as the FHFA Director. He is an incredibly decent and honest person who I know will always work diligently toward a decision based on the facts, not on ideology or momentary trends. Democrats know

this, and Republicans who have worked and served with him know this.

Despite this, there is some question whether Congressman Watt has the technical experience to run FHFA. So let us look at Congressman WATT's record to see if we can peel that back and look closely.

He is a graduate of Yale Law School, who for 22 years practiced business, economic development, and real estate law. He is not a theoretician. He understands the impact of foreclosure, not just the macroeconomics but the personal dimension. He understands the role of financial intermediaries, banks and housing agencies. He has been a 21-year member of the House Financial Services Committee, so legislatively he has been engaged and involved in every major business, financial, and housing initiative in the last two decades, and he has seen this from the perspective of a legislator.

He has earned the support of his colleagues, but also he has earned the support of his constituents and his neighbors back home. He has the endorsement of the former Republican Chairman of the House Financial Services Committee, SPENCER BACHUS of Alabama, who noted:

Congressman Watt has played an integral role in the financial services committee's deliberations on housing policy and is known as a serious and substantive legislator . . . In my experience in working with him on a variety of issues, I have always personally respected Congressman Watt for his intellect, attention to detail, and dedication to serving the public.

Again, this is a reflection of two decades of service at the heart of the process of legislating with respect to housing policy in the United States. So when we combine his legal training, his practical experience as a lawyer, his two decades of service as a member of the House Financial Services Committee, he is fully qualified for this key position, which is so vitally important now because we have to seriously tackle the issue of housing finance reform, and we have to take into consideration the needs and concerns of all the stakeholders, from investors to homeowners.

Again, Congressman WATT has that perspective—knowing the intricacies from his legal training of financial laws, doing what he has to do to protect the interests of his clients, and as a legislator with over two decades of experience in creating housing policy in the United States.

The FHFA should be led by a Director, confirmed by the Senate, not an Acting Director. We have to send the signal this is a position that is important and deserves a confirmed Director, notwithstanding the skills and abilities and the great dedication of the current Acting Director. We need to have someone in the position who has been confirmed by the Senate. There are too many critical decisions each day, and

too much at stake in terms of housing finance reform not to have a confirmed Director of the FHFA.

I urge my colleagues to allow this nomination to come before this body for a vote. Congressman WATT deserves no less, and I indeed urge support for his confirmation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, today I rise to call attention to a problem that seems to have gotten lost in the shuffle recently. That issue is our unemployed and underemployed American youth.

On September 14, the Wall Street Journal published a must-read story entitled: "Wanted: Jobs for the New 'Lost' Generation." I would like to read a brief excerpt from that article.

Like so many young Americans, Derek Wetherell is stuck. At 23 years old, he has a job, but not a career, and little prospect for advancement. He has tens of thousands of dollars in student debt but no college degree. He says he is more likely to move back in with his parents than to buy a home, and he doesn't know what he will do if his car—a 2001 Chrysler Sebring with well over 100,000 miles—breaks down. "I'm kind of spinning my wheels," Mr. Wetherell says. "We can wishfully think that eventually it's going to get better, but we really don't know, and that doesn't really help us now."

Derek Wetherell's experience is hardly unique. It is unfortunately an experience shared by Americans across this Nation, including in my home State of Nebraska. Despite promises of economic recovery, jobs remain scarce, particularly for young people. A quick survey of family members, neighbors, and friends reveals that too many adult children are now living at home, stuck in their parents' proverbial basements.

A study released by The Opportunity Nation shows that 6 million young people between 16 and 24 are neither in school nor are they working. That means roughly 15 percent of America's youth are idle when they should be gearing up for their most productive years. The study went on to state:

Youth unemployment is at its highest in more than a decade, and young people in many European countries now have a better shot at moving up the ladder from poor to rich than they do in America.

The United States has always stood as the land of opportunity—the new home sought by immigrants from Europe and from around the world, risking life and limb for personal freedom and economic progress.

It seems that the ancient European capitals now offer young people more hope—a better chance at upward mobility—than our failing economy. That must change.

The jobless youth don't belong exclusively to any class, race, or gender. This problem does not discriminate.

Nearly 1 in 4 African-American youth is unemployed, while the unemployment rate for young Latinos in September was 15.8 percent. Young men are unemployed at a rate of over 17 percent, while nearly 13 percent of young women are out of work.

Washington Monthly recently discussed the long-term impact of joblessness on our youth.

The consequences are dire for these young Americans.

They're not only more likely to have a hard time in the job market; researchers have found that disconnection has scarring effects on health and happiness that endure throughout a lifetime.

Unemployed, uneducated youth are at greater risk for criminality and incarceration, and they often go on to become unreliable spouses and improvident parents.

The costs to society are also considerable.

The direct support expenses and lost tax revenues associated with disengaged young people cost U.S. taxpayers \$93 billion in 2011 alone—a bill that will only compound as the years progress.

In short, our weak economy is not only frustrating young Americans presently eager for work; it is jeopardizing their future. It is threatening more than just their ability to find present jobs; it is thwarting their efforts to build rewarding careers and to start families. They are getting a late start—if any start at all.

And what about those young Americans who have found work? According to a report by Accenture, over 40 percent of college graduates in the last 2 years are overqualified for their jobs. In other words, many of them are underemployed.

I believe all work has dignity. And while a college degree is important, it is not for everyone. But hard-working young people should have the opportunity to use their degrees and pursue their passions. They are not asking for special treatment—they are just asking for a chance. This economy is holding them back.

As if young people weren't facing enough adversity, now they are told they are legally required to purchase costly health insurance. In fact, the new law completely depends on their participation. Yet the report on premiums released by the Department of Health and Human Services shows that many young people will not qualify for subsidies to make their premiums affordable.

A study published by the National Center for Public Policy Research found that subsidies did not exist for people from 18 to 34 years of age in 11 of 15 exchanges. These young people will be required to pay the full price of their premiums, which we all know are skyrocketing around this country. The American Academy of Actuaries published an article noting that the young people who don't qualify for subsidies will see an increase in costs of 42 percent.

Tom from Omaha wrote me to tell me about his 26-year-old son, who had

been paying \$159 a month for his health coverage. "Effective January 1, 2014, his rate will be \$231. What is affordable about this?" Tom added that his son's deductible would "increase by \$3,000 and his out-of-pocket costs by \$3,850." We are no longer dealing with projections, we are dealing with real people.

The National Center for Public Policy Research also found that even with the subsidies, about 3.7 million young people would actually save at least \$500 by forgoing insurance and paying the fine, and as many as 3 million young people would save at least \$1,000 by opting out of ObamaCare.

The bottom line? We have record numbers of unemployed young Americans now being forced to purchase health plans they do not want and, in some cases, with coverage they don't even need. We need to empower, not burden, young Americans.

The American dream of launching a career, starting a family, buying a home, and forging a brighter future is not some quaint relic of a bygone era. The dream is alive and well. Our young people are still dreaming. It is time for us to honor our duty to ensure that the next generation has the tools and experience to succeed, to keep America strong, and to pursue that dream. Right now, we are falling woefully short. But we can do better. Our children and our grandchildren are counting on us. This generation isn't lost yet, and I am here to fight for them.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on why I had a hold on this particular nomination.

Contrary to some who are speculating on this issue, I am not voting against this specific nominee. My concerns are with the way OPM determines who can ask questions and who can receive answers.

Imagine, there is a Federal Government agency which determines who can ask a question to them and who can get an answer. Whether a Member of the minority or majority, every Member should be able to ask questions and to receive those answers. Frankly, if you ask a question, you should be able to get an answer; and when you get the answer, it probably should be truthful. That is my argument, and that is the purpose I have this hold.

I want to be very clear that I am not voting against the nominee as an individual. I am voting against the agency itself.

OPM, in my opinion, has become one of the most politicized agencies in Washington, DC. I believe the Office of Personnel Management has refused to do its part to ensure that all Americans are treated fairly under ObamaCare. Specifically what I mean by that is I believe what is good for the American people should probably be good for Congress, and what is good for Congress should be good for the American people. I believe that is a standard which many of us in the Senate live by. I think there are some who don't, but I think the majority do. If something is good for the American people, it should be good for Congress. And I think ObamaCare is a good example of that.

For me, the most concerning issue is whether OPM engaged in negotiations with the Senate and House leadership to secure exemptions and subsidies for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I wish to thank a colleague of mine from Louisiana, Senator VITTER, for his hard-fought effort on this particular issue.

I am not the only person here in this Chamber who can't get questions answered from OPM. I would like to walk for a minute the time line and the difficulty I have had with OPM over the last couple of months trying to get direct and truthful answers from this agency.

I will start on August 28. I wrote OPM asking specifically from the agency to ensure that all congressional staff, including leadership and committee staff, be fairly treated under ObamaCare.

This is what I said:

This is a missed opportunity for the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), which currently administers and operates Congressional health care, to ensure that all Congressional staff, including Committee and Leadership, play by the same rules as the American taxpayer.

I go on to say later:

As you issue your final rule in order to comply with Section 1312 of the Affordable Care Act, I encourage you to clarify this issue once and for all and require in addition to Members of Congress that all Congressional staff—Committee and Leadership—to go into the exchanges.

I wanted the dialog. I wanted this conversation. That is why I wrote to OPM. Of course I was looking to hear back from them, and I received no answer. I received no answer from the agency, so I followed up on September 13. From August 28 to September 13, I got no answer.

On September 13, I wrote:

I would like to first express my disappointment with your agency's lack of response to my stated concerns. In addition, I would like to reiterate my request that the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) clearly mandate in its final rule that all Congressional staff, including Committee and Leadership, be subject to the consequences of ObamaCare.

I think that is a fair dialog and a fair question to ask. That was on September 13. Finally, on September 18, I

got the response. Not the response that I wanted, as you can imagine, but I did get a response. In their letter, it says:

In issuing our final rule, OPM will address this specific issue as well as others raised by members of Congress and the public at large.

So in this letter on September 18, I wanted to have a discussion with OPM, and OPM says: You can read the final rule. We are not going to have a discussion with you. We are not going to reach out. We are not going to come to your office. We just want you to read the final rule, like every other American, and we are not going to have a discussion prior to issuing the rule.

Obviously, I wasn't going to take that for an answer, so I reached out and I requested a formal briefing with the Acting Director. Sure enough, we had that meeting on September 26. So this is from August 28 all the way to September 26. I will tell you, frankly, it was a good discussion. They were frank. They had a couple of members of their staff there. I raised concerns about possible back door negotiations that would allow for special treatment under the law. I asked specifically whether OPM had engaged leadership on this issue. I asked that question: Have you engaged leadership on this issue? I asked the question three times: Did you engage with leadership on either the House side or Senate side on how you wrote these rules? Three times I asked that question and three times OPM had insisted that they had not, that the answer was no. So they said no three times. They formulated their proposal based on the advice of their lawyers.

I was OK with that. We had discussions on other principles of the bill itself, but that was the essence of the conversation I had and I was fine with that. Frankly, I was ready to release my hold. But what I did want was answers in writing. I wanted to memorialize the conversation that we had in my office, so I sent them another letter on September 28, formally requesting OPM to provide me with a detailed list of all conversations or negotiations that they had with staff members of the Senate or House leadership when crafting the proposed rule.

I want to be super specific. On September 28 we had numerous questions but question No. 4 that I had:

Provide me a detailed list of all conversations or negotiations you had with any staff member of Senate or House Leadership when crafting your proposed rule specifically, the provision giving each Member of Congress the authority to determine who on their staff goes to the Exchange. If you engaged in any discussions—both formal and informal—with Leadership staff was there any undue pressure received from staff during these discussions? Do you believe this to be a conflict of interest?

So that question, that letter, was sent out. We had a great discussion. Please memorialize, please respond, and I received none. That was Sep-

tember 28. Please respond to that. They refused to do that.

On October 1, I started reading press reports, press reports both in Politico and also in the National Review. After I asked OPM have you ever dealt specifically with leadership in either House on these proposed rules and they told me no three times, then we find out in Politico that leadership worked for months—months to save these very same longstanding subsidies, according to documents and emails provided to Politico.

I go back to the original question and my concern, if you talk to an agency, do you have a right, whether you are in the majority or minority, to talk to OPM? Do you have a right to receive an answer, and when you get an answer, should that answer be truthful? Three times they told me no, they had not dealt with leadership, and you can see in the press reports, the emails that were released that was not the case.

What was reported in these stories is directly counter to what OPM told me in our meeting. I followed up with another letter dated October 8. I asked for OPM to provide me with detailed lists of all conversations or negotiations that they had with leadership staff. So this is what I said specifically:

In light of recent press reports that Congressional Leadership staff negotiated with the Office of Personnel and Management (OPM) regarding changes made to the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program, I respectfully reiterate my request that you provide me with a detailed list of all conversations or negotiations with any staff member of Senate or House Leadership. These news reports run directly counter to statements that you made with [me and] three other OPM staff members during our meeting two weeks ago.

This time I got a response. I finally get a response. OPM told me they couldn't answer my question. They told me they couldn't answer the questions because the government was shut down.

Pretty convenient and, frankly, very disturbing. All I am asking is what OPM told me in our meetings—is it true or whether the press is reporting the truth? Where is the truth? Senators have a right to ask questions. They have a right to receive answers. Those answers should be truthful. That is why I put on the hold. That is why I voted against cloture on this nominee. This is why I will vote against the nominee, not because I have an issue with the nominee herself. I have a problem with this agency.

I want to reiterate and again express my appreciation with others in this Chamber who are as frustrated as I am with OPM—Senator VITTER being one of them—of not being able to get answers, to receive answers back from this particular agency. I want to say I still believe—and I think most in this Chamber believe this—that what is im-

portant and good for the American people should be good for Congress; what is good for Congress should be good for the American people. I stand by that and will be voting against final confirmation on this nominee.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to enter into a colloquy with my colleague from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Ms. MURKOWSKI and Ms. HEITKAMP pertaining to the introduction of S. 1622 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Montana.

THE TAX CODE

Mr. BAUCUS. The famed author George Bernard Shaw once wrote:

The reasonable man adapts himself to the world; the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself.

A few weeks ago, lost among the headlines about shutdowns and showdowns was another very important news story. This story didn't receive big headlines. It didn't make the evening news, and it wasn't trending on Twitter.

Yet the story in the October 8 edition of the New York Times has serious implications for the future of our economy and our ability to adapt to the modern world. The eye-opening article discussed the merger of a California-based chip maker called Applied Materials. Applied Materials merged with a Japanese company called Tokyo Electron.

Applied Materials is one of the biggest companies in Silicon Valley, an industry leader with a global presence. They have more than 13,000 employees across 18 countries. Their headquarters, where they got their start 46 years ago, is in Santa Clara, CA. In addition to 8,000 workers in the Bay Area of California, Applied Materials has employees at research, development, and manufacturing facilities in Texas, Utah, Massachusetts, and in my home State of Montana.

Now, with the merger with Tokyo Electron, what is this all-American company doing? It is shifting its corporation, not to Japan, but to the Netherlands. That is right. This new American-Japanese company will be incorporated in Holland.

Why are they moving to the Netherlands? What is going on.

In the New York Times article on the merger, reporter David Gelles wrote:

Executives at Applied Materials highlighted a number of advantages in announcing a merger recently with a smaller Japanese rival, but an important one was barely mentioned: lower taxes.

The merged company will save millions of dollars a year by moving—not to one side of the Pacific or the other, but by reincorporating in the Netherlands.

The article goes on to note that Applied Materials' effective tax rate will drop from 22 percent to 17 percent as a result of the merger. For a company that had nearly \$2 billion in profit in 2011, that amounts to savings of about \$100 million per year.

Mergers resulting in U.S. companies being owned by companies in tax haven jurisdictions such as Ireland, Bermuda, or the Cayman Islands, are a new spin on the old "inversion" problem, and it is becoming an increasingly popular practice.

The Times article highlighted the following additional examples.

Last year, the Eaton Corporation, a power management company from Ohio, acquired Cooper Industries from Ireland for \$13 billion and then reincorporated in Ireland. The company expects to save \$160 million a year as a result of the move.

In July, Omnicom, the large New York advertising group, agreed to merge with Publicis Groupe, its French rival, in a \$35 billion deal. The new company will be based in the Netherlands, resulting in savings of about \$80 million a year.

Also in July, Perrigo, a pharmaceutical company from Michigan, said it would acquire Elan, an Irish drug company, for \$6.7 billion. Perrigo will also reincorporate in Ireland, lowering its effective tax credit from 30 percent to 17 percent, and saving the company an estimated \$150 million a year, much of it in taxes.

Earlier in the year, Actavis, based in New Jersey, bought Warner Chilcott, a drug maker with headquarters in Dublin, and said it would reincorporate in Ireland, leading to an estimated \$150 million in savings over 2 years.

It would be easy for us to attack these companies by calling them immoral and unpatriotic, but it is much more constructive to step back and ask: What's motivating these companies? Why are they moving their headquarters abroad? How can we keep them in the United States? How can we adapt to the world and fix the problem?

It is a very simple issue. Globalization has made America's Tax Code system out of date.

The United States is stuck with a 35 percent corporate tax rate—one of the highest in the world—and a maze of incentives that only an army of tax lawyers can navigate. Some of these tax incentives are extremely costly but are

much less valuable to businesses than a rate reduction with the same price tag.

When U.S. companies look abroad, what do they see? They see other countries with more modern, more efficient, and more competitive tax codes. Then, what do they do? They reincorporate overseas by acquiring or merging with another business.

They are not necessarily breaking laws. In fact, many of these companies are following the rules that America's outdated, overly complicated Tax Code provides.

The United States is losing hundreds of millions in revenue as a result. Even worse, it is losing jobs. When headquarters moves abroad, good-paying jobs often go abroad too. We need to reverse that tide. We need to bring our tax system into the 21st century to make the United States more competitive. That is what tax reform can do. It can help America overcome the competitiveness crisis that is driving businesses and jobs overseas.

This competitiveness crisis was made very clear in a Harvard Business School study last year with the sobering title: "Prosperity at Risk." This indepth report examined the risks that threaten to undermine U.S. competitiveness in the global marketplace. It also looked at what action we could take in the United States to restore our country's economic vitality.

Harvard Business School surveyed 10,000 of its graduates who live and conduct business worldwide. They asked about the challenges of doing business in America. These individuals are leaders on the front lines of the global economy. They are CEOs, CFOs, business owners, and presidents. They are personally involved in decisions about whether to hire, where to locate, and which markets to serve.

Unfortunately, these business leaders are pessimistic about America's economic future. They think America's prosperity—our success, our growth, and our economic status—is at serious risk. The vast majority of those surveyed, 71 percent, expected U.S. competitiveness to deteriorate over the next several years.

A survey found that the U.S. fared poorly when competing to attract business and pointed to increased competition from emerging markets. According to the survey: "For the first time in decades, the business environment in the United States is in danger of falling behind the rest of the world."

What did they identify as the root of America's competitiveness problem? Respondents—remember, these are 10,000 Harvard Business School graduates working all around the world and in the United States—pointed to America's Tax Code as the root of the problem. Specifically, they pointed to the complexity of the code as one of the greatest current or emerging weaknesses in the U.S. business environment.

The Harvard study made clear that our Tax Code puts American businesses at a competitive disadvantage on the world market. That obviously concerns us.

Where do we go from here? I believe we have to reform our Tax Code. We have to adapt. We have to help make America more competitive. It is very clear. It is very simple. We have to give companies such as Applied Materials a reason to keep their headquarters in the United States.

We have been through a difficult and counterproductive period on Capitol Hill. The recent shutdown and the threat of default undermined confidence in the U.S. and did \$24 billion in unnecessary damage to our economy.

According to a report from the White House Council of Economic Advisers, the shutdown cost 120,000 jobs in October alone.

I spent last week home in my State, as others were in their States. I was meeting with my bosses, the folks and citizens of Montana. They are not too happy with the antics going on in Washington, DC—and rightly so.

Fortunately, that battle is behind us and the government is back to work. It is time for us to come together to tackle the challenges facing our country.

Right now there are more than 11 million unemployed Americans looking for work. Our economy is expected to continue growing at a sluggish rate for the next year, less than 3 percent.

We have to ask: How do we create jobs? How can we spark faster growth in our economy? How can we boost our competitiveness and keep American companies at home in America?

Tax reform must be part of the solution. It is not the whole solution, but it is part of the solution.

That was the clear message I heard traveling around the country this summer with my friend DAVE CAMP. DAVE is the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. DAVE and I met with families and businesses, large and small, to hear about their experiences in dealing with the Tax Code.

We visited a family-owned bakery in Minneapolis, a small appliance store in New Jersey, a tech start-up in Silicon Valley, and a farm in Tennessee. We visited some large companies as well, companies such as 3M, Intel, FedEx, who employ thousands of people in the United States and around the world.

At every stop DAVE and I heard the same message. U.S. companies and workers, companies large and small, workers employed at large and small companies, want a more simple, more fair Tax Code that closes loopholes and helps them compete and strengthens our economy.

This issue is not going away. It is too important. With so many people out of work, with economic growth still too slow, with a competitiveness gap costing us jobs and revenue, it is time for

us to act. It is time for us to reform our Tax Code.

The chairman of the House and Senate Budget Committees brought their conferees together for the first time today. They have come together to try to find common ground on a budget and a plan to rebuild confidence in our economy. PATTY MURRAY and PAUL RYAN are incredibly smart and hard-working people. They care. And I am confident they can craft a compromise to help get America back on track.

I look forward to working with Chairman MURRAY and Chairman RYAN in the tax entitlement components of their discussions, but at the same time I will continue to work on a parallel track with the Finance Committee advancing tax reform.

We are working hard—in Bernard Shaw's words—to adapt to the world and build a tax code that works. And DAVE CAMP is doing the same thing in the House. We are going down separate paths but coming together with a common goal—reducing the deficit, creating jobs, and promoting economic growth. We are coming together to put America back on track.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time on both sides be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time having been yielded, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Katherine Archuleta, of Colorado, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management?

Mr. BAUCUS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 225 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baucus	Hagan	Murray
Begich	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Boxer	Hirono	Reid
Brown	Johanns	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Cardin	King	Schatz
Carper	Klobuchar	Schumer
Casey	Landrieu	Shaheen
Chambliss	Leahy	Stabenow
Chiesa	Levin	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Toomey
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCain	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Fischer	Merkley	Whitehouse
Flake	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murkowski	

NAYS—35

Alexander	Cruz	Paul
Ayotte	Enzi	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hatch	Rubio
Burr	Heller	Scott
Coats	Hoeven	Sessions
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cochran	Kirk	Thune
Corker	Lee	Vitter
Cornyn	McConnell	Wicker
Crapo	Moran	

NOT VOTING—3

Inhofe Isakson Kaine

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF JACOB J. LEW TO BE UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that cloture motion on Calendar No. 63 be withdrawn and that the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination; that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the motion to invoke cloture on the Lew nomination is withdrawn.

Is there any further debate? If not, the question is, will the Senate advise and consent on agreeing to the nomination of Jacob J. Lew, of New York, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund; United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; United States Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank; United States Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the cloture vote on the Watt nomination occur immediately following the swearing in of Senator-elect Booker, of New Jersey, tomorrow, and the Senate proceed to legislative session and a period of morning business for debate only, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CHIESA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as we all know, today is Senator CHIESA's last day in the Senate.

And while the Senator has only been here four months, it has been an interesting few months to say the least. He has found himself right in the middle of everything from the farm bill to the immigration bill, to the debate over Syria, to an October I am sure he will not soon forget.

He has had to work out of a temporary office, complete with vinyl siding and plastic chairs. He was here for less than an hour before having to take his first vote. He has had to deal with 99 Senators pronouncing his name 99 different ways. And one of our colleagues from Arizona threatened to quote "waterboard" the Senator if he didn't support a particular bill. I haven't asked how that situation ended up working out, but I see the Senator from New Jersey is still here.

Bottom line: Senator CHIESA is going to have quite a few stories for his family—for his wife Jenny and his kids, Al and Hannah. I know he is eager to get back home to see them—and catch up on some Notre Dame football—too. Even though he tells us his rank is "fourth" out of four in the family pecking order.

Well, that is at least better than 100th out of 100. But Senator CHIESA has not let his lack of Senate seniority stand in the way of pushing important issues.

Human trafficking was his focus as Attorney General, and it has been his focus here too. He has helped convene

committee hearings about it, he has raised the issue with administration officials, he has embarked on a series of school visits to educate young folks on the issue, and he has worked with the Junior Senator from Ohio to advance awareness through the Caucus to End Human Trafficking. His determination is something we all admire. I know a lot of it comes from his strong Catholic faith. Much of it must come from his upbringing too: this is a Senator who lost his father and was forced to become the man of the house when he was just 8 years old.

Last year, Senator CHIESA said this:

If someone had ever said 20 years from now you'd be the attorney general of New Jersey, I would have laughed. . . . I didn't think I'd even have met the attorney general by the age of 46.

Well, he has done more than that. He can add Senator to his résumé too—a Senator who has made the most of his time here, who has done good work, who we have all enjoyed getting to know. So, Senator CHIESA can be proud of his service. We thank him for it, and we look forward to welcoming our newest colleague from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, before I make these remarks, let me join in thanking the Senator from New Jersey. Although his tenure in the Senate was brief, he was here during a very exciting and interesting time in American political history. We thank him for his service on behalf of New Jersey and wish him the very best in his future endeavors.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the President has nominated three extraordinarily well-qualified Americans—appellate lawyer Patricia Millett, Georgetown Law professor Nina Pillard and D.C. District Judge Robert Wilkins—to serve on the D.C. Circuit, the second most important court in the Nation. The D.C. Circuit currently has 8 active judges out of 11 authorized judgeships.

These nominees should be given an up-or-down vote on the Senate floor.

Patricia Millett is the first nominee up for consideration. Ms. Millett, who is currently in private practice, is recognized as one of the leading appellate lawyers in the country.

She has argued 32 cases before the Supreme Court and dozens more in other appellate courts.

Ms. Millett served in the Solicitor General's office under both Democratic and Republican presidents. Seven former Solicitors General—including prominent Republicans Paul Clement, Ted Olson and Ken Starr—sent a letter in support of Ms. Millett saying she “has a brilliant mind, a gift for clear, persuasive writing, and a genuine zeal for the rule of law. Equally important, she is unfailingly fair-minded.”

At her hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee, no Senator ques-

tioned Ms. Millett's qualifications or fitness for the Federal bench. She is simply an outstanding nominee.

Let me tell you why I have a personal interest in her nomination.

Ms. Millett is also a proud daughter of Illinois. She grew up in Marine, a small town in the southern part of the State that I know well. Her mother was a nurse and her father was a history professor at Southern Illinois University—Edwardsville, one of my favorite campuses.

Ms. Millett graduated summa cum laude from the University of Illinois and magna cum laude from Harvard Law School. She clerked for two years for Judge Thomas Tang on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

She is part of a military family. Her husband, Robert King, served in the Navy and was deployed as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Ms. Millett also comes highly recommended by distinguished members of the Illinois legal community.

I received a letter from Patrick Fitzgerald, the former U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, expressing “strong support” for Ms. Millett's nomination and urging “prompt consideration of her candidacy on the merits.”

I also received a letter from 28 prominent attorneys including former Illinois Governor James Thompson, a Republican, and current Illinois State Bar Association president Paula Holderman.

They expressed their strong support for Ms. Millett, saying that: she embodies the evenhandedness, impartiality, and objectivity required for the Federal judiciary, as evidenced by her more than 10 years of service in the Solicitor General's office in both the Clinton and Bush administrations.

The bottom line is that Ms. Millett is an outstanding nominee with broad support from across the ideological spectrum. There is no question that she is well-qualified to serve on the bench, and she will serve with distinction.

I urge my colleagues to give her a chance with an up-or-down vote. She does not deserve to have her nomination filibustered. If there is anyone who can step forward and question this nominee's qualifications, they should do so. They have not to date.

Some of my Republican colleagues have accused the President of trying to “pack” the D.C. Circuit by making nominations to fill the outstanding vacancies in that court. This argument is simply not credible. Filling vacancies for existing judgeships is not court packing. These judgeships are authorized by law, and it is incumbent upon the President to nominate qualified candidates to fill them.

Others across the aisle have argued that the D.C. Circuit does not have a high enough caseload—there are just

not enough cases—to justify a full complement of 11 judges. I note that these same Republican Senators did not make that argument in 2005 when the Senate confirmed Janice Rogers Brown and Thomas Griffith to the 10th and 11th judgeships on the D.C. Circuit. When the Senate confirmed the 10th and 11th judgeships in the D.C. Circuit in 2005, they were the choices of the Republican side of the aisle, even though these confirmations, which we approved, reduced the Court's workload to fewer cases per active judge than what we would see if President Obama's nominees were confirmed.

On April 5, the Judicial Conference of the United States, which is led by Chief Justice John Roberts, made its Federal judgeship recommendations for the 113th Congress. The Judicial Conference is nonpartisan, and according to its letter, its recommendations “reflect the judgeship needs of the Federal judiciary.” The Judicial Conference did not recommend stripping any judgeships from the D.C. Circuit. So this argument on the other side of the aisle finds no support in the non-partisan Judicial Conference's recommendations.

My Republican colleagues like to argue about workload statistics when it comes to the D.C. Circuit, but according to the Washington Post fact checker Glenn Kessler, who I have come to know, “The voluminous and detailed statistics on the appeals courts allows each side to pick and choose the stats that support their position.”

Republicans may claim the D.C. Circuit's workload is too light, but in the Washington Post Mr. Kessler points out that by some metrics, the D.C. Circuit “could be very well in first place” when it comes to workload.

I also note that one of my Republican colleagues came to the floor today and explained his opposition to Ms. Millett's nomination. In doing so he cited a letter that the Senate Judiciary Committee Democrats sent in 2006 seeking a hearing postponement on Peter Keisler, who was nominated to fill the 11th seat on the D.C. Circuit. I would like to point out that this letter dealt with filling the 11th seat on the D.C. Circuit. Ms. Millett is seeking the 9th seat. I also wish to point out that the Senate had already voted to confirm a nominee to be the 11th judge on the D.C. Circuit, Thomas Griffith, just 1 year before this 2006 letter. I voted for Mr. Griffith on the floor.

The bottom line is that these judicial vacancies currently exist, it is the President's job to nominate qualified men and women to fill them, and there is no question that the President's nominee for this position, Patricia Millett, is one of the most well-qualified persons he could have found to fill this important position. No one comes forward to criticize her background

and her resume because, frankly, it is hard to find a nominee with any stronger credentials for the Federal bench.

Let's not play political games with this important nomination, nor with people such as Patricia Millett, who have put their names forward, have gone through this process, and have waited for us politicians to work our will on the floor. She deserves an up-or-down vote.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter from Illinois lawyers supporting Patricia Millett for the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, dated October 24, from former U.S. attorney for the Northern District Patrick Fitzgerald of Chicago.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATRICK J. FITZGERALD,
Chicago, IL, October 24, 2013.

Re Patricia Millett.

Hon. DICK DURBIN,
U.S. Senate, Hart Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MARK KIRK,
U.S. Senate, Hart Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS DURBIN AND KIRK: I write in strong support of the President's nomination of Patricia Millett to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and urge the Senate to promptly confirm her to this position.

I support the nomination of Patricia Millett because I believe our system of justice will be positively impacted with her as a member of our judiciary. Her career accomplishments as a lawyer are extraordinary. Over the past 20 years, Patricia has argued 32 cases before the United States Supreme Court and even more in the federal appeals courts, including the D.C. Circuit. Her cases have spanned the spectrum of legal issues that the D.C. Circuit confronts, including constitutional law, administrative law, civil and criminal procedure, commercial disputes, national security, and civil rights. Importantly, she has represented parties on both sides of those many issues, handling cases for the government at every level (federal, state, and local), private individuals, businesses, employers, employees, civil rights plaintiffs, prosecutors and criminal defendants. Patricia is a lawyer's lawyer who is committed to the rule of law and stare decisis. She embodies the evenhandedness, impartiality and objectivity required for the federal judiciary, as evidenced by her more than 10 years of service in the Solicitor General's office in both the Clinton and Bush Administrations.

Patricia grew up downstate in the small farm town of Marine. Her father was a history professor at Southern Illinois University—Edwardsville and her mother was a registered nurse and hospice practitioner. Patricia graduated summa cum laude from the University of Illinois with Highest Distinction in political science, before going on to the Harvard Law School. The country would be well served to have someone with her tremendous qualifications—and deep ties to our state—hold such an important judicial appointment.

I would urge a prompt consideration of her candidacy on the merits.

Sincerely,

PATRICK J. FITZGERALD.

ILLINOIS LAWYERS SUPPORTING PATRICIA MILLETT FOR THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE D.C. CIRCUIT

SEPTEMBER 27, 2013.

Hon. DICK DURBIN,
U.S. Senate, Hart Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MARK KIRK,
U.S. Senate, Hart Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS DURBIN AND KIRK: We write in strong support of the President's nomination of Patricia Millett to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and urge the Senate to promptly confirm her to this position. As lawyers here in Illinois, we care deeply about the rule of law and the quality of our system of justice. We strongly believe that stellar nominees with broad bipartisan support, like Patricia, should be quickly confirmed to ensure our justice system works effectively and efficiently. We feel even more strongly about that knowing that Patricia is an Illinois native.

We support the nomination of Patricia Millett because we believe our system of justice will be positively impacted with her as a member of our judiciary. Her career accomplishments as a lawyer are extraordinary. Over the past 20 years, Patricia has argued 32 cases before the United States Supreme Court and even more in the federal appeals courts, including the D.C. Circuit. Her cases have spanned the spectrum of legal issues that the D.C. Circuit confronts, including constitutional law, administrative law, civil and criminal procedure, commercial disputes, national security, and civil rights. Importantly, she has represented parties on both sides of those many issues, handling cases for the government at every level (federal, state, and local), private individuals, businesses, employers, employees, civil rights plaintiffs, prosecutors, and criminal defendants. Patricia is a lawyer's lawyer who is committed to the rule of law and stare decisis. She embodies the evenhandedness, impartiality, and objectivity required for the federal judiciary, as evidenced by her more than 10 years of service in the Solicitor General's office in both the Clinton and Bush Administrations.

Patricia grew up downstate in the small farm town of Marine. Her father was a history professor at Southern Illinois University—Edwardsville and her mother was a registered nurse and hospice practitioner. Patricia graduated summa cum laude from the University of Illinois with Highest Distinction in political science, before going on to Harvard Law School. We would be extremely proud to have someone with tremendous qualifications—and deep ties to our state—hold such an important judicial appointment.

We believe it is critically important that the country rise above partisan politics when it comes to judicial appointments. Such unwarranted politicization can become a threat to the citizens' trust in the integrity of our great judicial process. We, and the citizens of Illinois, are counting on you and the U.S. Senate to do the right thing by putting aside partisan politics and supporting Patricia's nomination.

Sincerely,

Sergio Acosta, Hinshaw & Culbertson LLP; Sean M. Berkowitz, Latham &

Watkins; Robert L. Byman, Jenner & Block; Vincent J. Connelly, Mayer Brown; Tyrone C. Fahner, Mayer Brown; John N. Gallo, Sidley Austin LLP; Paula H. Holderman, Winston & Strawn LLP; Donald G. Kempf, Jr., Donald G. Kempf, Jr., P.C.; Steven F. Molo, MoloLamken LLP; C. Barry Montgomery, Williams Montgomery & John; Manuel Sanchez, Sanchez Daniels & Hoffman LLP; Jeffrey Stone, McDermott Will & Emery LLP; James R. Thompson, Winston & Strawn LLP; Christopher B. Wilson, Perkins Coie.

Julie A. Bauer, Winston & Strawn LLP; Joel D. Bertocchi, Hinshaw & Culbertson LLP; Linda T. Coberly, Winston & Strawn LLP; J. Timothy Eaton, Shesky & Froelich; James R. Figliulo, Figliulo & Silverman, P.C.; Rodger A. Heaton, Hinshaw & Culbertson LLP; James I. Kaplan, Quarles & Brady LLP; Michael H. King, Edwards Wildman; James S. Montana, Jr., Vedder Price; Lynn H. Murray, Grippio & Elden; Suzanne Saxman, Seyfarth Shaw LLP; Thomas P. Sullivan, Jenner & Block; Ann C. Tighe, Cotisrillos Tighe & Streicker; Alison Siegler, University of Chicago Law School.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleague Senator DURBIN from Illinois in support of Patricia Millett's nomination to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. As he said so eloquently, Ms. Millett has broad bipartisan support, extensive public and private sector litigation experience, and she would make an outstanding addition to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. After graduating with honors from the University of Illinois and Harvard Law School, Ms. Millett clerked at the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. She then spent 15 years at the Department of Justice, including 11 years as assistant to the Solicitor General in both Republican and Democratic administrations. Again, I think it is important to point out she has support on both sides of the aisle.

Ms. Millett has argued 32 cases before the Supreme Court as well as dozens of others at the circuit court level, and she currently manages her law firm's Supreme Court and national appellate practice.

She was unanimously rated "well qualified" by the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary, and that is their highest rating.

In addition to her professional work, Ms. Millett is very active in her community. She has been a literacy tutor for over 20 years, and through her church she volunteers at homeless shelters.

Ms. Millett has strong support across the political spectrum. Again, as Senator DURBIN pointed out, she has been endorsed by seven former Solicitors General of the United States, three former Republican attorneys general,

law enforcement groups, and civil rights groups. She also has tremendous support from retired members of the military and groups representing military families.

In addition to being a highly qualified nominee, Ms. Millett will fill one of three current vacancies on the 11-member D.C. Circuit Court. Again, as Senator DURBIN pointed out, the D.C. Circuit is considered the second-most important court in our Nation. It is critical that it be fully staffed with qualified judges. The court handles important terrorism and detention cases, it hears a large volume of complex issues involving administrative actions of the Federal Government. The D.C. Circuit is also considered the most important civilian court for members of the Armed Services and veterans.

Former D.C. Circuit Chief Judge Patricia Wald noted “the D.C. Circuit hears the most complex, time-consuming, labyrinthine disputes over regulations with the greatest impact on ordinary Americans’ lives: clean air and water regulations, nuclear plant safety, health care reform issues, insider trading and more.”

The Senate should have the opportunity to vote up or down on all of President Obama’s nominees to this important court. It is way past time we took action on this nomination.

I urge my colleagues to support the Millett nomination.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the nomination of Patricia Millett to be a judge on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. Pattie, as she is known, is clearly well qualified. She has received support from Attorneys General appointed by Republican Presidents, and from conservative Solicitors General such as Ken Starr, Theodore Olson, and Paul Clement. Her resume is stellar, her qualifications unquestioned, and her support broad.

Although Senator DICK DURBIN claims she is an “Illinois native” in a letter of support to the President claims her as living in Virginia—she is actually a daughter of the State of Maine. Her mother grew up in the small town of Dexter, where Pattie went to school through high school. She also attended school in Bangor, and for a time, even worked at Eastern Maine General Hospital as it was then known. She truly comes from good Maine stock.

Millett also juggles an extremely full life while excelling at most everything she tries. The wife of a veteran, Pattie herself holds a black belt in taekwondo—a pastime that she took up in order to spend more time with her kids. She is also very engaged with her community and volunteers at local homeless shelters. And when her husband was deployed to Iraq, she single-handedly took care of their kids and

managed to continue with her incredible career. She does all of these things while preparing for and arguing cases before the United States Supreme Court. In fact, she has argued more cases than any other woman—over 30 cases to date.

I am pleased to fully support the confirmation of Patricia Millett, a true daughter of Maine, to serve on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals.

TRIBUTE TO CARMEN TARLETON

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President. I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to a Vermont woman who personifies inspirational. Carmen Tarleton’s journey as a survivor of domestic violence began nearly 6 years ago, when her estranged husband broke into her home, attacked her with a baseball bat and doused her with industrial-strength lye. She suffered severe burns over 80 percent of her body.

I have followed Carmen’s recovery with great interest and even greater awe. Despite the scars that left her blinded and severely disfigured, Carmen made no effort to hide the effects of that attack. She never sought pity, nor did she dwell on the past. Instead, Carmen wrote a book and went on television, talking bravely and candidly about her long road back. She learned how to play the banjo and piano, and through the many surgeries and long hospital stays, Carmen’s determination and spirit remained unbroken.

Last February, Carmen underwent a miraculous face transplant at Brigham and Women’s Hospital in Boston, which was detailed in an October 26 front-page story in *The New York Times*. As that piece pointed out, “There is evidence that Ms. Tarleton’s new face is more than just donated tissue, (it) is becoming part of who she is.”

I ask unanimous consent to have *The New York Times* article inserted in the RECORD. I believe everyone will be as inspired by Carmen Tarleton as I have been.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *New York Times*, Oct. 25, 2013]
FOR VICTIM OF GHASTLY CRIME, A NEW FACE,
A NEW BEGINNING
(By Abby Goodnough)

THETFORD, VT.—At 1:30 a.m. on Valentine’s Day this year, Carmen Tarleton left her rural home here and drove through the frigid dark to Brigham and Women’s Hospital in Boston. Her doctor had called hours earlier with the news she had been waiting for: a suitable donor had been found. She would get a new face.

Almost six years had passed since her estranged husband broke into her house one spring night, beat her with a baseball bat and soaked her with industrial lye that he squirted from a dish-soap bottle. The attack nearly blinded Ms. Tarleton, a nurse and mother of two, and burned her beyond recognition. She lost her eyelids, upper lip and

left ear. What remained of her face and much of her body was a knobby patchwork of scar tissue and skin grafts, painful to look at and far more painful to live with.

Now, after overcoming some initial fears, she was ready to receive someone else’s features. After 15 hours of transplant surgery, Ms. Tarleton, 45, emerged from the operating room with what looked to her mother, Joan VanNorden, like a puffy, surreal mask. At first she wanted to faint as she stared at the new face, smooth and freckled, stitched to her daughter’s pale scalp. But when Ms. Tarleton started talking in her old familiar voice—“Can’t you just get in here?”—Mrs. VanNorden relaxed.

“I said, ‘This is who Carmen is now,’ and it really looked beautiful,” she recalled. “Although it didn’t look anything like her, it was her face.”

Face transplants are still an experimental procedure, the first having taken place just eight years ago in France. Some two dozen full or partial transplants have been completed worldwide, including five at Brigham and Women’s, which used nearly \$4 million in research grants from the Department of Defense to do four of the surgeries. Arteries, veins, nerves and muscles from the donor face must be painstakingly connected to the recipient’s, in what Dr. Bohdan Pomahac, Ms. Tarleton’s chief transplant surgeon, called “by far the most complicated operation that I do.”

Yet the psychological impact of a face transplant is perhaps as far-reaching as the surgical one. Unlike a kidney or liver or heart, a donated face is visible to all, challenging recipients and their loved ones to incorporate an entirely new countenance into long-held perceptions of a person’s identity.

Ms. Tarleton’s appearance is still evolving: her scalp was so badly burned that hair will never return to parts of her head, but her donor’s hair, the same shade of brown as her own, is growing around her forehead and temples. Her right eye remains closed, and her left droops. Her face is sometimes mask-like, betraying little emotion, because the muscles are still reconnecting and she cannot yet move them well. And that mask, oddly enough, looks like neither her nor the woman who donated it.

But eight months after the operation, there is evidence that Ms. Tarleton’s new face is more than just donated tissue, and is becoming part of who she is.

When her family thinks, or even dreams, about her, they imagine her new visage. “When someone at work asks me, ‘How’s Carmen?’ the picture that comes up in my mind more and more is that face,” said Ms. Tarleton’s sister, Kesstan Blandin.

Yet for Ms. Tarleton herself, the process of acceptance has been trickier. For one thing, her poor vision keeps her from seeing herself clearly unless she holds a mirror up close. “I don’t yet feel it is my face,” she wrote in a recent blog post. “I feel like I am still borrowing it.”

Ms. Tarleton’s former husband, Herbert Rodgers, 58, pleaded guilty to a charge of maiming and is serving a prison sentence of at least 30 years. Mr. Rodgers told the police that he had been angry at Ms. Tarleton, believing she was seeing another man after they separated.

Ms. Tarleton underwent a number of reconstructive surgeries, but with little success. When Dr. Pomahac called in May 2011 to propose a face transplant, Ms. Tarleton’s mind first leapt to a “Twilight Zone” episode that had jarred her as a child, about a man who could change his appearance to look like other people.

"Initially I felt that it was very sci-fi," she said in a recent interview while curled on the couch in the modest home she shares with her two daughters. But she and her family started researching, and after a few weeks of weighing the pros and cons—for one thing, she is likely to be on immunosuppressant drugs for the rest of her life, raising her risk of infection and cancer—Ms. Tarleton decided to forge ahead.

After a number of trips to Boston for physical and psychological screening to determine if she was a good candidate, she got on the donor list that fall. "It was like a big surprise, a big gift," she said. "I'd already accepted my disfigurement, fine. But I accepted it believing there wasn't an alternative."

The things Ms. Tarleton wanted from a new face were more pragmatic than aesthetic. Tight bands of scars ringed her neck, causing debilitating pain. She drooled constantly and could not blink, jeopardizing a synthetic cornea in her left eye. And with her face frozen from scarring, it was hard for others to read her emotions.

For a time, she was devastated that she could not see "the old me," as she put it. But she moved on, writing a book about her physical and emotional recovery from the attack and speaking publicly about the experience. She seemed mostly unconcerned about her appearance.

But in December 2012, she gained a more urgent desire for a new face. She had started taking piano lessons at a music shop not far from her home. Her teacher was Sheldon Stein, an earthy, soft-spoken musician with whom she felt an instant affinity. The feeling, it turned out, was mutual. The two say they are in love.

"I kept looking in the mirror all of a sudden when I met Sheldon," she said. "I wasn't insecure before. But now—now you have feelings for somebody and now you have something to lose, when before, one of the reasons I did so well is I had nothing to lose anymore."

After the operation, she went through a harrowing three weeks when her immune system rejected the face. But medications helped her accept the new tissue. And some of the improvements she had hoped for came shortly after. Her neck pain disappeared, and her left eyelid, immobile for years, began to blink again. The drooling diminished, and is likely to stop once she gets more feeling in her lips.

The transplant did not make Ms. Tarleton look like her donor, Cheryl Denelli Righter of North Adams, Mass., who died at 56 after a stroke. That is a typical outcome for face transplant recipients, partly because their bone structures are different from their donors'. Mysteriously, she now has a cleft in her chin, something neither Ms. Denelli Righter nor Ms. Tarleton's old face had.

Yet to Ms. Denelli Righter's daughter, something of her mother lives on in Ms. Tarleton's new face. "I get to feel my mother's skin again, I get to see my mother's freckles, and through you, I get to see my mother live on," the daughter, Marinda Righter, told Ms. Tarleton in May. The two have kept in touch, and Ms. Tarleton said she could feel Ms. Righter's loss "so strongly"—another complicating factor as she adjusts.

One Tuesday in August, Ms. Tarleton made her way yet again to Brigham and Women's, where doctors monitor the level of anti-rejection medications in her blood and take biopsies of the skin on her neck—which is the donor's—to look for any sign of rejection.

Ms. Tarleton has undergone nearly 60 operations, mostly skin grafts, at Brigham and Women's and has visited 21 times since her latest release in March. On this day she was exhausted, recovering from a bad headache the previous night and a recent fall that had left her with an aching foot. But she had a bit of good news for her doctors.

"If I put my head on Sheldon's chest, I can feel his hair," she said, "and I couldn't before."

Ms. Tarleton also met with Bridget Bowler, a speech therapist who is helping her learn to move her new lips—where nerve function typically takes the longest to return in transplant recipients—and practice facial expressions. She still has an air of the ventriloquist when she speaks, a habit that Ms. Bowler is trying to help her shake.

"One of these days in the near future," Ms. Tarleton said, "when I start to cry or I laugh, you're going to be able to tell by looking at me how I feel."

These days, Ms. Tarleton has returned to her hard-charging self. Her summer included speaking engagements, weekend road trips and late-night jam sessions with Mr. Stein and his musician friends. She decided to take up the banjo in addition to the piano, because she wanted to join in the jams. "Our whole lives," she said, "are just about experience."

Ms. Blandin said Ms. Tarleton's new face has helped mute the grief she still feels about the horrible damage done by the lye attack. "Now I just feel like a warm nostalgia: I know you and I haven't forgotten you," she said of her sister's original face. "She's still Carmen in some ways, but in other ways she's someone new and the face transplant represents that."

But Ms. Tarleton's daughters, Liza, 21, and Hannah, 19, who live with her in a red barn that has been converted to apartments, on a hill thick with wildflowers, were more matter-of-fact when discussing her transformation, perhaps intentionally.

"Mom's going to do what she's going to do," Liza said.

Hannah chimed in. "And we're going to get used to it," she said, laughing.

"And we're going to support it," Liza added, "for sure."

With that, Liza got up to make her mother a hot dog. Ms. Tarleton took her spot on the couch, a barely perceptible smile flickering across her face.

HOMEOWNER FLOOD INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY ACT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation seeks to protect homeowners across the country from severe flood insurance rate hikes until Congress is provided assurances from the agency related to flood mapping methodologies and affordability.

The long-term solvency of the National Flood Insurance Program is critical to protecting taxpayer investments, communicating perceived flood risk to homeowners, and encouraging communities to invest in mitigation measures. The rates imposed by the legislation we adopted last summer are working against those worthy goals.

A constituent from Ocean Springs, MS, contacted my office to give her

perspective on the legislation. She wrote: "Built in 1986, [my house] survived all hurricanes including Katrina. I used my retirement savings to buy the house. Before closing, flood insurance was grandfathered at \$245.00 per year. After closing, the rate skyrocketed to \$18,450. You can understand my shock." If you do the math, her new rates are more than 75 times the rate when she purchased her home.

I heard from Thomas Schafer, the Mayor of Diamondhead, MS. This city in Hancock County was "ground zero" for Hurricane Katrina in 2005. Mayor Schafer called this legislation a "devastating loss to [his] community," pointing specifically to "plummeting property values with increased cost of flood insurance."

These are communities that suffered the greatest natural disaster in our Nation's history in 2005, the effects of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill in 2010, and now this.

The bill I join my colleagues in introducing today aims to restrain the rate increases to homeowners that are very troublesome.

Under this bill, the Federal Emergency Management Agency must provide assurances to Congress that it is using sound mapping methods to make flood insurance rate determinations. A study by the National Academies of Science produced in March of this year has called into question some of the engineering practices FEMA uses to determine rates. Before we let these rates devalue private property and perhaps even devastate local economies, we need to be absolutely sure our practices and procedures are as sound as possible.

Second, FEMA must complete the affordability study mandated by the same legislation that is driving insurance rates up. If rates become so high that homeowners cannot participate in the program, or entire communities opt out of the program, all participants in the program will suffer from a smaller risk pool. It is important that we understand the implications of these rates before we allow them to ruin people's lives and communities.

I am pleased with the work accomplished by the bipartisan group of Senators who introduced this bill. The bill reflects the priorities of Senators from both parties and several regions. I believe it gives the Senate a strong starting point to address this important issue.

NATIONAL MEDICINE ABUSE AWARENESS MONTH

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, I rise in strong support of efforts being made across the country to reduce prescription drug abuse as part of National Medicine Abuse Awareness Month. In

California, and throughout the country, the misuse and abuse of prescription and over the counter drugs is a significant problem. While the consequences are tragic and profound, they are also preventable.

According to the Office of National Drug Control Policy, prescription drug abuse is our Nation's fastest-growing drug problem. The U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's 2012 National Survey on Drug Use and Health found that over the past decade, the non-medical use of prescription drugs among persons 12 years or older rose from 1.9 million in 2002 to 11.1 million in 2011. The 2012 National Survey on Drug Use and Health estimates that the abuse of prescription medications such as pain killers, tranquilizers, stimulants, and sedatives is second only to marijuana, the No. 1 abused drug in the United States. The Centers for Disease Control have classified prescription drug abuse as an epidemic.

To combat the epidemic of prescription drug and over the counter medicine abuse, many community anti-drug coalitions are working to raise awareness about the negative consequences associated with the misuse of these drugs.

The North Coastal Prevention Coalition in California is just one example of a coalition pushing back against this problem. Together with San Diego County's Prescription Drug Task Force, the Coalition has worked to create county-wide Pain Prescribing Guidelines. They have helped facilitate National Take Back Days during which individuals are able to turn over unused prescription drugs. They also developed and disseminated a brochure on "Safe Pain Prescribing" to emergency room physicians.

I would like to acknowledge the critical efforts of the North Coastal Prevention Coalition and other anti-drug coalitions throughout the country in raising awareness about and combating the misuse of prescription medications. By designating October 2013 as National Medicine Abuse Awareness Month, Americans are able to reaffirm our national, state and local level commitment to living healthy, drug-free lives.

VA EMERGENCY CARE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, on Monday I introduced a bill, S. 1588, with Senators MORAN, ISAKSON, and BEGICH to provide an emergency safety net to roughly 144,000 veterans waiting for VA care. I thank my colleagues for their support. This bill fixes a catch-22 in current law that puts veterans who have recently returned from overseas at financial risk if they experience a medical emergency.

Under current law, a veteran enrolled in the VA system who receives emer-

gency care at a non-VA facility can be reimbursed for those costs only if the veteran had also received care at a VA facility in the preceding 24 months. The intent of this requirement is to encourage veterans to seek preventative care, which decreases the need for more expensive emergency care. The problem is thousands of veterans have recently come home from overseas and they can't meet the 24-month requirement through no fault of their own. These veterans have scheduled their first new patient examination with VA, but they have not yet received their examination because of VA waiting times.

In other words, they haven't received their first VA appointment because of VA waiting times, but if they need to go to a non-VA hospital for a medical emergency VA cannot reimburse them because they haven't received their first VA appointment.

VA estimates 144,000 veterans are caught in this catch-22. With the war in Afghanistan ending, even more veterans will be affected. This is why veteran service organizations such as the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America are supporting this measure.

This bill gives VA the flexibility to reimburse veterans who have not yet received their new patient examination if the veterans have to go to a non-VA hospital for a medical emergency. For Hawaii veterans in rural Oahu or the neighbor islands who live far from VA facilities, emergency care outside the VA may be their only option. Just last week I met a veteran from Waiānae who had a medical emergency while waiting 4 months for his first appointment at VA. Veterans such as he who were denied VA reimbursement would get much needed relief under this legislation.

In its FY2014 budget request, VA asked for the statutory authority provided by this legislation. The VA has already budgeted for this new authority in its FY2014 budget request, and the funding provided in H.R. 2216, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee on June 27, 2013, is sufficient to cover any additional costs VA will incur using this new authority.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this commonsense legislation. We owe it to our brave men and women in uniform who put their lives on the line for our country that the VA has the tools it needs to better serve new veterans accessing the care they have earned.

CONGRATULATING AZERBAIJAN

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate and offer my support and encouragement to the people and government of Azerbaijan. On October 9 Azerbaijanis overwhelmingly reelected President Aliyev to a third five year term in only their fifth Presidential election since Azerbaijan gained its independence in 1991.

I, along with several of my colleagues, met privately with President Aliyev in Baku several months ago to discuss the great challenges facing Azerbaijan, the United States, and our allies in the region.

I took this opportunity to personally thank President Aliyev, his government, and the Azerbaijani people for their unwavering support for the United States government and its people.

President Aliyev was among the first few foreign leaders to call President Bush immediately after the attacks on 9/11 to offer his country's prayers and tangible support at a time of great crisis in our Nation.

The United States and Azerbaijan share many common strategic interests. Azerbaijan plays a vital role in efforts ranging from counter-terrorism, energy security, to the transit of U.S. and NATO supplies to and from Afghanistan.

As an important partner in the region, Azerbaijan is an active participant in NATO's Partnership for Peace program and was among the first nations to militarily support American led efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Azerbaijan's stability and prosperity in the South Caucasus, along with its continued commitment to democratic reforms, will serve as an important beacon of hope in a complex region.

NATIONAL LIBERTY MEMORIAL

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wish to speak today about an effort long championed by my predecessors in the Senate, Senators Dodd and Lieberman, and to express my commitment to carry on their work. That important project, the National Liberty Memorial, will commemorate the patriotism of African American soldiers during the American Revolution.

From the very first days of the American Revolution, African Americans took part in the effort to establish a new nation and secure liberty's blessings. They did this despite the fact that the vast majority of their brothers and sisters remained slaves.

Many of these African American patriots were from Connecticut. In 1776, the town of Milford established a memorial to six black soldiers of the Revolutionary War. Nero Hawley, a slave who joined the Continental Army and served at Valley Forge, was later freed after the war. You can visit his grave today at Riverside Cemetery in Trumbull. Jupiter Mars lived an extraordinary life, serving in the Continental Army during the war. He now rests in peace in beautiful Norfolk, CT. Cato Meed enlisted in the Continental Army in Norwich in 1777, and served at Valley Forge with General Washington.

These soldiers fought in every battle of the Revolutionary War, from the colonists' defeat at the Battle of Long

Island to our final victory at Yorktown. At every point, African American men served bravely and with honor. In fact, one of the first men to die in America's struggle for independence was Crispus Attucks, who was shot by British troops during the Boston massacre. This dedication to the war effort continued right up to the last battle when Salem Poor, a freed slave, earned commendation recommendations from 14 officers for his bravery at Bunker Hill. In recounting Poor's performance at the battle, officers wrote there were too many heroic deeds to describe.

Committed to the cause of American independence, African American soldiers filled every role that the war required of them, whether they served on local militias, worked as cooks and carpenters in camps like Valley Forge, or served as crewmembers on America's first Navy ships. Many African Americans escaped the bondage of slavery to join the American Navy. Still others, like James Armistead, acted as spies for the Revolution by providing American patriots with vital information needed to win the war. Regardless of their roles, they served ably and with distinction.

After the war, the agreements negotiated between slaves and masters were largely honored and the patriots freed upon either enlistment or the end of the war. However, once they had put down the weapons used to win the Nation's independence, a few had to resort to legal means to enforce their claim to liberty. For one patriot—James Robinson, later of Detroit, MI, who also fought in the War of 1812—freedom did not come until the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863. Many other African Americans remained trapped in bondage as the institution of slavery expanded in spite of lawsuits, petitions, and agitation.

Many of these African American soldiers would go on to organize early abolitionist and civil rights organizations. One such man was Samuel Harris, a soldier, Baptist minister, and early abolitionist who said, "Liberty is dear to my heart. I cannot endure the thought that my countrymen live as slaves." Nevertheless, despite their valiant service to this country's founding, many African American soldiers were not treated with the dignity that their service demanded. While this country's founding documents stated that all men were created equal, the Nation still sought to hold many Americans as property.

It is estimated that the names of at least half of these brave soldiers would have been lost to history had it not been for the efforts of Plainville, CT native Lena Santos Ferguson. Five years ago, the Daughters of the American Revolution fulfilled a promise made to her in 1984 to identify as many African American Revolutionary War

soldiers and patriots as possible. "Forgotten Patriots," contains the names of over 5,000, as well as the communities where they once resided. Nearly 20 Connecticut towns have approved resolutions that honor them, and they have joined the ranks of those seeking construction of the National Liberty Memorial.

At the beginning of this year President Obama signed into law legislation that was passed by the Congress last year that once again affirmed our public commitment to memorialize these brave patriots through a new memorial in the Monumental Core of our capital city. Liberty Fund D.C., a nonprofit established to lead the effort to construct the memorial, is currently working with architects and Federal agencies to make that goal a reality.

I believe that we must do what we can to build this memorial. Further, I believe that a key feature of any such memorial is that it should be visually tied to the Washington Monument, the most prominent Revolutionary-era monument in the District. There should be a clear sightline from the memorial to the Washington Monument.

For good reason, constructing any new memorial in the Washington, DC area is a rigorous process, and there are a number of prerequisites to be met before construction can begin. I look forward to continuing to work with Liberty Fund D.C. to achieve the goals of this important legislation, to ensure that a monument to the African American patriots of the Revolutionary War be constructed in a prominent location in our Nation's capital.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL KIRK VAN PELT

• Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and congratulate Arkansas's native son, COL Kirk Van Pelt, for attaining to the rank of brigadier general. On November 3 of this year, Colonel Van Pelt will receive this well-deserved promotion at a ceremony in Arkansas.

Colonel Van Pelt began his military career in 1983 and was commissioned as a second lieutenant in 1985. Colonel Van Pelt has served in a variety of positions in the 39th Infantry Brigade, including Company Commander, Battalion Operations Officer, Battalion Executive Officer, Battalion Commander, Brigade Operations Officer, Brigade XO, Deputy Brigade Commander, and Brigade Commander. Colonel Van Pelt also served as the Commandant of the Arkansas Regional Training Institute Officer Candidate School and the Arkansas Army National Guard G3.

Colonel Van Pelt is a graduate of Excelsior College and received a master's

degree from the U.S. Army War College in 2011. He is a veteran of Operation Iraqi Freedom and has received numerous awards and decorations for his service to our country, which include the Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Meritorious Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Army Commendation Medal with five Oak Leaf Clusters, the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Reserve Component Achievement Medal with seven Oak Leaf Clusters, the Iraqi Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, the National Defense Service Medal with Bronze Service Star, the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Humanitarian Service Medal, the Armed Forces Reserve Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon with Numeral '2', the Army Reserve Component Overseas Training Ribbon with Numeral '2', and the Joint Meritorious Unit Citation.

In addition to his excellent military career, Colonel Van Pelt is also the vice president of AIC Inc., a systems integration firm in Sherwood, AR. He and his wife, Kelley, have raised three children: James, a senior at the University of Central Arkansas, Katie, a freshman at the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, and Hannah, a junior at North Little Rock High School.

Colonel Van Pelt is a valued servant to the people of Arkansas and the United States of America. Our State and Nation have been fortunate to have Colonel Van Pelt's 30 years of service, and I can only hope he can serve another 30 years. I thank him again for his dedication and commitment to keeping our Nation and State safe.●

TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL ROGER MCCLELLAN

• Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, today I wish to acknowledge and thank BG Roger McClellan, who will retire from the Arkansas Army National Guard at the end of this month after proudly serving 36 years.

A native of Warren, AR, Brigadier General McClellan, is a veteran of Operation Iraqi Freedom and has served in a variety of positions in the Arkansas Army National Guard's 39th Infantry Brigade, including Battalion Commander, Civil Affairs Officer S-5, and Deputy Commander of the 39th Infantry Brigade Combat Team.

Since January 1, 2008, Brigadier General McClellan has served as the Arkansas Army National Guard Land Component Commander, where he has been responsible for the overall readiness, training, maintenance, and operational employment of the units assigned and attached to the Arkansas Army National Guard, a position which he has commanded with distinction.

Brigadier General McClellan is a graduate of the University of Arkansas

at Monticello and has earned master's degrees from Louisiana Tech University in 1983 and the United States Army War College in 2003. He has received numerous awards and decorations for his service to our country, which include the Bronze Star Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal, and the Combat Infantry Badge. He and his wife, Patricia, reside in Edinburg, AR, and are the proud grandparents of Wren, Avery, and Jackson.

Brigadier General McClellan has been a valued servant to the people of Arkansas and the United States of America. Our State and Nation have been fortunate to have had his 36 years of service, and I thank him again for his dedication and commitment to keeping our Nation and State safe.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY RELATIVE TO THE ACTIONS AND POLICIES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SUDAN AS DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13067 OF NOVEMBER 3, 1997—PM 23

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within the 90-day period prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the Sudan emergency is to continue in effect beyond November 3, 2013.

The crisis constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of

Sudan that led to the declaration of a national emergency in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, and the expansion of that emergency in Executive Order 13400 of April 26, 2006, and with respect to which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13412 of October 13, 2006, has not been resolved. These actions and policies are hostile to U.S. interests and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Sudan and maintain in force the sanctions against Sudan to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 30, 2013.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:22 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 330. An act to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

H.R. 623. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium.

H.R. 2337. An act to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado.

H.R. 2640. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to adjust the Crooked River boundary, to provide water certainty for the City of Prineville, Oregon, and for other purposes.

At 11:42 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2374. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes.

At 3:51 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hanrahan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 623. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 2337. An act to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Admin-

istrative Site in Summit County, Colorado; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2374. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2640. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to adjust the Crooked River boundary, to provide water certainty for the City of Prineville, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 330. An act to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3307. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that involved fiscal year 2007 and 2009 Operation and Maintenance, Navy funds, that occurred at Camp Lemonnier, Djibouti and was assigned Navy case number 11-08; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3308. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report entitled "Pilot Program: Civilian Credentialing for Military Occupational Specialties"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3309. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advance Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule" (RIN7100-AD64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3310. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3311. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 on November 14, 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3312. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order

13536 on April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3313. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Manufactured Housing: Revision of Notification, Correction, and Procedural Regulations" (RIN2502-AI84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3314. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspended Counterparty Program" (RIN2590-AA60) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 21, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3315. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advance Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule; Final Rule" (RIN7100-AD87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3316. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Land and Minerals Management, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf—Adjustment of Service Fees" (RIN1014-AA12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 1, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3317. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Generator Requirements at the Transmission Interface" (RIN1902-AE67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3318. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report on Federal Agency Cooperation on Permitting Natural Gas Pipelines"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3319. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fifth report on Government dam use charges; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3320. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Decommissioning of Nuclear Power Reactors" (Regulatory Guide 1.184, Revision 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3321. A communication from the Administrator, General Services Administra-

tion, transmitting, pursuant to law, prospectuses that support the Administration's fiscal year 2014 Capital Investment and Leasing Program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3322. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California; South Coast; Contingency Measures for 1997 PM_{2.5} Standards" (FRL No. 9901-77-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3323. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Idaho; State Board Requirements" (FRL No. 9901-76-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3324. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Perfluoroalkyl Sulfonates and Long-Chain Perfluoroalkyl Carboxylate Chemical Substances; Final Significant New Use Rule" (FRL No. 9397-1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3325. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Permitting Authority and Tailoring Rule" (FRL No. 9901-71-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3326. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Revision to Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Utah" (FRL No. 9901-92-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3327. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revised Ambient Air Quality Standards for Fine Particulate Matter" (FRL No. 9901-80-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3328. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air

Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Determinations of Attainment of the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Standards for the Liberty-Clairton Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 9901-81-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3329. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9901-83-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3330. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Temporary Shelter for Individuals Displaced by Severe Storms, Flooding, Landslides, and Mudslides in Colorado" (Notice 2013-63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3331. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fringe Benefits Aircraft Valuation Formula" (Rev. Rul. 2013-20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3332. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2013-2014 Special Per Diem Rates" (Notice 2013-65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3333. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; FY 2014 Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems: Changes to Certain Cost Reporting Procedures Related to Disproportionate Share Hospital Uncompensated Care Payments" (RIN0938-AR53) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 21, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3334. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Applicable Federal Rates—November 2013" (Rev. Rul. 2013-22) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 23, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3335. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Replacement Period for Livestock Sold on Account of Drought in Specified Counties" (Notice 2013-62) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of

the Senate on October 23, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3336. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of Presidential Determination No. 2014-02 relative to U.S. drug interdiction assistance to the Government of Brazil; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3337. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2013-0163- 2013-0170); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3338. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, the report of a rule entitled "Visas: Regulatory Exception to Permit Compliance with the United Nations Headquarters Agreement and Other International Obligations and Clarification of the Definition of 'Immediate Family' for Certain Nonimmigrant Visa Classifications" (RIN1400-AD43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3339. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period April 1, 2013 through May 31, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3340. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 40(g) (2) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-152); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3341. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 40(g) (2) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-160); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3342. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act 2003 on Loan Guarantees to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3343. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1002 (P.L. 107-243) and the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution (P.L. 102-1) for the June 20, 2013-August 18, 2013 reporting period; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3344. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 40(g) (2) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-161); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3345. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-116); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3346. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of the

Government of Cuba's compliance with the United States-Cuba September 1994 "Joint Communiqué" and on the treatment of persons returned to Cuba in accordance with the United States-Cuba May 1995 "Joint Statement"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3347. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-090); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3348. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-119); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3349. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-135); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3350. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Initial Implementation of Export Control Reform; Correction" (RIN1400-AD37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3351. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2013-0171- 2013-0178); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3352. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (RSAT 13-3643); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3353. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Iran-Related Multilateral Sanctions Regime Efforts" covering the period February 17, 2013 to August 17, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3354. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Feed Materials Production Center (FMPC) in Fernald, Ohio, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3355. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Pantex Plant in Amarillo, Texas, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3356. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Pantex Plant in Amarillo, Texas, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3357. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Pantex Plant in Amarillo, Texas, to the

Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3358. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Baker Brothers site in Toledo, Ohio, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3359. A communication from the Secretary to the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-276, "Sense of the Council in Support of the Fair Minimum Wage Act Emergency Resolution of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3360. A communication from the Executive Director, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the annual audit of the Thrift Savings Funds received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3361. A communication from the Associate Attorney General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary, Science and Technology Directorate, Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3362. A communication from the Associate Attorney General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3363. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-158, "Extension of Time to Dispose of Hine Junior High School Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3364. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-159, "Fire and Emergency Medical Services Major Changes Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3365. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-160, "School Transit Subsidy Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3366. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-183, "Chief Financial Officer Compensation Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3367. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-184, "CCNV Task Force Temporary Act of 2013"; to the Committee on

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3368. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-185, "Income Tax Secured Bond Authorization Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3369. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-186, "Community Renewable Energy Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3370. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-187, "Smoking Restriction Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3371. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-188, "Bicycle Safety Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3372. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-189, "Personal Property Robbery Prevention Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3373. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-190, "Older Adult Driver Safety Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3374. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-191, "Veteran Status Driver's License Designation Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3375. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-192, "Commercial Driver's License Tests Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3376. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-193, "Tax Lien Compensation and Relief Reporting Temporary Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3377. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-194, "District Real Property Tax Sale Temporary Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3378. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-195, "Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Support Technical Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3379. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-196, "Board of Ethics and Gov-

ernment Accountability Establishment and Comprehensive Ethics Reform Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3380. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-197, "Visitor Parking Pass Preservation Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3381. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-206, "Medical Marijuana Cultivation Center Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3382. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-207, "Elected Attorney General Implementation and Legal Service Establishment Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3383. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Audit of the Department of Employment Services Adult Career and Technical Education Programs"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3384. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Audit of the Department of General Services Fiscal Year 2012 Procurement of Snow and Ice Removal Pretreatment Services"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3385. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Audit of Non-District Resident Students Enrolled in Public Schools"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3386. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Audit of the DC Department of Parks and Recreation Facility Use and Permit Process"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3387. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Update on Non-Reporting Public-Private Development Construction Projects"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3388. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, four reports relative to the Public Service Commission Agency Fund; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3389. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2013 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals through the 3rd Quarter of the Fiscal Year 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3390. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Audit of the Department of Small and Local Business Development Certified Business Enterprise Program"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

H.R. 2094. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

H.R. 2747. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title.

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1302. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. 1557. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1561. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve provisions relating to the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HARKIN for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Chai Rachel Feldblum, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2018.

*James Cole, Jr., of New York, to be General Counsel, Department of Education.

*Michael Keith Yudin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. COBURN, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1611. A bill to require certain agencies to conduct assessments of data centers and develop data center consolidation and optimization plans; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1612. A bill to deter abusive patent litigation by targeting the economic incentives that fuel frivolous lawsuits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1613. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify Federal law with respect to reporting full-file alternative data, including positive and negative consumer credit information to consumer reporting agencies by public utility or telecommunications companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1614. A bill to require Certificates of Citizenship and other Federal documents to reflect name and date of birth determinations made by a State court and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 1615. A bill to develop and recruit new, high-value jobs to the United States, to encourage the repatriation of jobs that have been off-shored to other countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 1616. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for simplification, to reduce the number of tax brackets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1617. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to ensure that individuals can keep their health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. AYOTTE, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1618. A bill to enhance the Office of Personnel Management background check system for the granting, denial, or revocation of security clearances or access to classified information of employees and contractors of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1619. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to develop a strategy report to address the skills gap by providing recommendations to increase on-the-job training and apprenticeship opportunities, increase employer participation in education and workforce training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 1620. A bill to prohibit the consideration of any bill by Congress unless a statement on

tax transparency is provided in the bill; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1621. A bill to enhance transparency for certain surveillance programs authorized by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1622. A bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. RISCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1623. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1624. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit for hiring veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1625. A bill to amend section 31306 of title 49, United States Code, to recognize hair as an alternative specimen for pre-employment and random controlled substances testing of commercial motor vehicle drivers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1626. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide employees in the private sector with an opportunity for compensatory time off, similar to the opportunity offered to Federal employees, and a flexible credit hour program to help balance the demands of work and family, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 277. A resolution recognizing the religious and historical significance of the festival of Diwali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. Res. 278. A resolution designating October 2013 as "School Bus Safety Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 310

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 310, a bill to jump-start economic recovery through the formation and growth of new businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 582, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

S. 699

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes.

S. 723

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 723, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 1183

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1318

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1318, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the

ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1361, a bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept additional documentation when considering the application for veterans status of an individual who performed service as a coastwise merchant seaman during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S. 1559

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1559, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the method of determining whether Filipino veterans are United States residents for purposes of eligibility for receipt of the full-dollar rate of compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

S. 1561

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1561, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve provisions relating to the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees.

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1561, supra.

S. 1590

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1590, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to re-

quire transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges.

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1590, supra.

S. 1606

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1606, a bill to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be constructed at 3141 Centennial Boulevard, Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "PFC Floyd K. Lindstrom Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic".

S.J. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S. RES. 203

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 203, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding efforts by the United States to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution.

S. RES. 251

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 251, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Preventive Services Task Force should reevaluate its recommendations against prostate-specific antigen-based screening for prostate cancer for men in all age groups in consultation with appropriate specialists.

S. RES. 268

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 268, a resolution condemning the September 2013 terrorist attack at the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, and reaffirming United States support for the people and Government of Kenya, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 276

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 276, a resolution designating October 2013 as "National Work and Family Month".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1612. A bill to deter abusive patent litigation by targeting the economic incentives that fuel frivolous lawsuits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1612

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Patent Litigation Integrity Act of 2013".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—MANDATORY FEE SHIFTING

Sec. 101. Litigation and other expenses.

TITLE II—DISCRETIONARY BONDING

Sec. 201. Motion for a bond.

TITLE I—MANDATORY FEE SHIFTING

SEC. 101. LITIGATION AND OTHER EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 285 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 285. Fees and other expenses

"The court shall award to a prevailing party reasonable fees and other expenses, including attorney fees, incurred by that party in connection with a civil action in which any party asserts a claim for relief arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, unless the court finds that the position and conduct of the nonprevailing party or parties were substantially justified or that special circumstances make an award unjust."

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 285 and inserting the following:

"285. Fees and other expenses."

TITLE II—DISCRETIONARY BONDING

SEC. 201. MOTION FOR A BOND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 285 the following:

"§ 285A. Motion for a bond

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The court, on motion by the defendant or a respondent in a proceeding, may order the party alleging infringement to post a bond sufficient to ensure payment of the accused infringer's reasonable fees and other expenses, including attorney fees.

"(b) FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.—For purposes of this section, in determining whether a bond requirement would be unreasonable or unnecessary, the court shall consider—

"(1) whether the bond will burden the ability of the party alleging infringement to pursue activities unrelated to the assertion, acquisition, litigation, or licensing of any patent;

"(2) whether the party alleging infringement is—

"(A) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)); or

"(B) a non-profit technology transfer organization whose primary purpose is to facilitate the commercialization of technologies developed by one or more institutions of higher education;

"(3) whether a licensee, who has an exclusive right under a patent held by an institution of higher education or a non-profit organization described in paragraph (2), conducts further research on or development of the subject matter to make the subject matter more licensable;

“(4) whether the party alleging infringement is a named inventor of or an original assignee to an asserted patent;

“(5) whether the party alleging infringement makes or sells a product related to the subject matter described in an asserted patent;

“(6) whether the party alleging infringement can demonstrate that it has and will have the ability to pay the accused infringer’s fees and other expenses if ordered to do so; and

“(7) whether any party will agree to pay the accused infringer’s shifted fees and other expenses, provided that the person or entity can demonstrate that it has and will have the ability to pay the accused infringer’s shifted fees and other expenses.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, as amended by section 101, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 285 the following:

“285A. Motion for a bond.”.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1617. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to ensure that individuals can keep their health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. President, I come before you today to introduce a piece of legislation which is timely and very much needed.

One of the reasons I decided to run for the Senate was the passage of the health care law. The reason I thought it was pretty important is because I said at the time that passage of the health care law represented the greatest assault on our freedoms in my lifetime. I believe that is true, and I believe that is being borne out today. We are witnessing it today.

The passage of the health care law resonated with me. It made such an impact on me because my wife and I are beneficiaries of the freedom that we had with our current health care system. Our first child, our daughter Carey was born with a very serious congenital heart defect. Her aorta and pulmonary arteries were reversed. Her first day of life, our daughter Carey was rushed down to Children’s Hospital of Wisconsin in Milwaukee, where a wonderful man, Dr. John Thomas, came in at 1:30 in the morning and did a procedure and saved her life.

Eight months later, when her heart was the size of a small plum, another incredibly dedicated team of medical professionals in 7 hours of open-heart surgery totally reconstructed the upper chamber of her heart. Her heart operates backwards today. She is 30 years old and a nurse practitioner practicing at that same hospital in which her life was saved. She married about 3 weeks ago.

Our story has a happy ending because my wife Jane and I had that freedom. I was able to call Boston Children’s and Chicago children’s hospitals and talk to the preeminent surgeons in the world—which means in America—and find out what is the most advanced medical treatment, the most advanced surgical technique at the time. We were able to avail ourselves of that, and now I have a beautiful daughter who is 30 years old. She is also taking care of those little babies in a neonatal intensive care unit.

I decided to file this piece of legislation today because as a Senator from the State of Wisconsin we have been getting a number of phone calls in our office from Wisconsinites who are getting letters of cancellation from their insurance companies. In particular, one couple touched my heart and gave me a great cause for concern.

This couple—who do not want to be identified because they fear IRS retribution, which is a little different story and a little off topic, but I think it is worth pointing out—both have cancer. The wife has stage IV lung cancer. The husband is recovering from prostate cancer. It is in remission.

This couple had availed themselves and are currently covered under the Wisconsin high-risk insurance pool. It is a high-risk pool that works. I know in my business, when we had individuals who were lased off of our insurance policy, those individuals were able to avail themselves of this sharing-of-the-risk pool in the high-risk pool. It works and it is affordable.

This couple received their notice of cancellation from the high-risk pool, and they panicked. They were in a panic.

When one has stage IV lung cancer, the last thing one needs is stress. ObamaCare caused them a great deal of stress. It is causing them a great deal of stress.

They tried to get on healthcare.gov almost 40 times without success. They contacted our office. We have done everything we can to help them.

They have been in touch with some of the insurance carriers that will be part of the exchange participating in Wisconsin. They have received quotes. This was preliminary. This isn’t final, but under the high-risk pool their maximum out-of-pocket exposure, including the cost of their premiums, is about \$20,000 per year. He is working and has a good job. They can barely afford that.

Preliminary indications show that exposure will double to \$40,000. The only reason they might remain whole is they may qualify for a subsidy. Nobody can calculate it yet. They have received three different answers. It is like taking a tax return to 100 different preparers and getting 100 different results of what tax is owed. But based on those preliminary estimates it is looking as though their total exposure won’t be \$20,000, it will be more like \$40,000, and their subsidy might cover half of that. So their health care expense didn’t decline, as President Obama promised, by \$2,500 per year. It is going to virtually double. And if it doesn’t double, it is because the American taxpayer will be picking up that other half.

So one of the primary promises made by President Obama—that if we passed a health care law, the cost to a family health care plan would decline by \$2,500 a year by the end of his first term—has been broken. That was not true.

Of course, the other very famous promise the President made repeatedly was: If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan. I would like to go through a number of times President Obama actually made that statement. He looked the American people in the eye, trying to sell his health care plan, and guaranteed them if they liked their health care plan they would be able to keep it.

On March 6, 2009, he said:

If somebody has insurance they like, they should be able to keep that insurance. If they have a doctor they like, they should be able to keep their doctor.

On May 11, 2009:

Americans must have the freedom to keep whatever doctor and health care plan they have.

On June 2, 2009:

If they like the coverage they have now, they can keep it.

That was from a letter to Senate Democratic leaders.

On June 11, 2009, President Obama said:

Americans must have the freedom to keep whatever doctor and health care plan they have.

On June 15, 2009—and this is probably the most famous one I remember—in an address to the American Medical Association, President Obama said:

If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. Period. If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan. Period. No one will take it away. No matter what.

I think I have made my point, but I have another 13 quotes I can continue reading that basically make the same point with the same promise and the same guarantee.

As recently as the beginning of this month, on the White House Web site it says:

We’ve got some good news for you. If you currently have private health insurance, you

should be able to keep it, and that's exactly what the health care law says.

Unfortunately, today over 2 million Americans have received cancellation notices of their insurance policies—the policies they chose, and that for just a little more time they will have the freedom to choose. They won't have that freedom come January 1.

So one of two possibilities is true. Either President Obama was being entirely dishonest with the American public when he made those repeated promises, those repeated guarantees or he was totally disengaged from the process, did not have a clue what was in his own health care plan or did not understand the incredibly negative consequences of that health care plan.

That brings me to my bill. The reason President Obama can claim if you like your health care plan you can keep it is that within the health care bill there actually is a grandfather clause. The first two paragraphs of that grandfather clause actually would work. The problem is those first two paragraphs or sections are followed by an evisceration of the grandfather clause. So basically what we have is a phony grandfather clause contained within the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

My piece of legislation—the If You Like Your Health Plan You Can Keep it Act—actually is a real grandfather clause and it uses President Obama's exact language. All my bill does is it simply strikes the phony grandfather clause and inserts basically the exact same language that was there, although we remove those exceptions, those mandates. In other words, we eviscerate the evisceration of the grandfather clause.

I am here today to announce I have filed that bill. We have at least 35 Republican cosponsors of the bill. I know the House is moving a similar piece of legislation. I know there is talk, and hopefully we will be joined by our Democratic colleagues. It is a simple proposition. I am asking every Senator to join me in passing this bill, the true grandfather clause, to help President Obama keep his promise to the American people.

I have to say that, unfortunately, this bill won't help the Wisconsin couple I would so like to help, so like to guarantee they can keep their health care coverage. The only way we can help that couple is if we repeal the entire law, because the guaranteed issue, high-risk pools are extinct. They do not exist. That coverage is gone. But if my Democratic Senate colleagues will join me in passing this bill—the If You Like Your Health Plan You Can Keep it Act—we can keep President Obama's promise to millions of Americans. I think it is worth it, and I ask all my Senate colleagues to join me in this effort.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. AYOTTE, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1618. A bill to enhance the Office of Personnel Management background check system for the granting, denial, or revocation of security clearances or access to classified information of employees and contractors of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today, Senator MCCASKILL, Senator AYOTTE, Senator HEITKAMP, and I are introducing the Enhanced Security Clearance Act of 2013, which would strengthen our process for allowing federal employees and other individuals to have access to classified information. We must improve our current security clearance process to prevent, as much as possible, future incidents such as the murders at the Washington Navy Yard. Our bill directs OPM to institute at least two audits of every security clearance at random times during each five-year period the clearance is active. Any red flags raised would then be reported back to the employing agency to determine if a re-investigation of the clearance is needed.

As a former Chairman and Ranking Member of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, the issue of background investigations as it relates to security clearances is an issue with which I am well acquainted. There needs to be a balance between processing of clearances quickly enough to allow individuals to do their jobs, but also thoroughly enough to flag potential problems.

Following the attacks of September 11, 2001, and several high-profile espionage cases, heightened national security concerns underscored the need for a timely, high-quality personnel security clearance process. In the early part of this decade, the Department of Defense processed hundreds of thousands of security clearance background investigation requests—both initial and re-clearances, for service members, government employees, and industry personnel who were conducting classified work for the government. The timeliness of DOD's security clearance process was a problem which, when coupled with an increased demand for security clearances, had led to a backlog of more than 500,000 investigations.

Delays in updating overdue clearances for command, agency, and industry personnel performing classified government work increased risks to national security and the costs of doing classified government work. This led GAO to designate the DOD clearance program as a high-risk area, and in 2005 for DOD to transfer its personnel security function and about 1,600 personnel to OPM. At the time, this change seemed a logical step in addressing the problems caused by the

backlog. And by 2008 OPM had eliminated the backlog and announced end-to-end electronic processing of background investigations. Now, OPM oversees approximately 90 percent of all background investigations for security clearances with the assistance of private sector contractors.

Although we have made significant advances in the processing of background checks, there is still a gaping hole in the current security clearance process that has enabled people who exhibit obvious signs of high-risk behavior to remain undetected. We have seen this time and time again in incidents like Edward Snowden's disclosure of stolen classified information, and most recently we have Aaron Alexis, the Navy Yard shooter with apparently severe mental illness.

Once an individual is cleared, the process of maintaining the clearance requires a reinvestigation at various points in time based upon the type of clearance. These "gaps" between clearance and re-clearance can be 5, 10 or even 15 years, and most of the data is self-reported by the individuals themselves. These periods of time pose a significant concern in the current clearance process. OPM has announced, in some cases, that it is going to reduce the time frame down to one year, but this is not the case for all clearances. People's lives may change dramatically over these gaps of time, which poses significant and unnecessary security risks.

The United States issues approximately 5 million clearances to government employees and contractors, and the ongoing review process is conducted manually, by a limited number of investigators. Further, the manual process is flawed. The OPM Inspector General recently reviewed 18 investigators and found disturbing abuses in the quality of clearance investigations they conducted, which included interviews that never occurred, answers to questions that were never asked, and record checks that were never conducted. Even if done properly, however, given the limited number of investigative agents in the field, it is not feasible to manually track nearly five million clearances effectively.

For example, in fiscal year 2010, fewer than one percent of all contractors with clearances filed an incident report, despite the fact that they are required to file these reports on a wide variety of events including marital status change, excessive financial hardship, and criminal activity, to maintain their clearance. Generally, such events occur in the lives of more than half of the U.S. population during the same time periods. The fact is, cleared personnel under-report lifestyle changes, allegiance changes, and derogatory information for fear of job loss, embarrassment, and, most important, the discovery of nefarious intent. Further, because the system relies on self-

reported data, the chances of someone getting caught are minimal. Between 1997 and 2013, of the civilian clearances issued, fewer than one percent were revoked. This can mean that the people who are cleared very seldom go bad, that cleared individuals are not self-reporting changes in their lives, or the current process is not detecting everything.

In 2004, I sponsored the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act, which became law in December of that year. This law allows for the use of advanced technology and third party databases to expedite, verify, and enhance the investigative and adjudicative process. The government needs to utilize existing solutions, which are already used by law enforcement, to automate random audits on individuals with active security clearances.

If random audits had been in place after Aaron Alexis's secret clearance was granted in 2007, red flags would have been generated with his arrest in 2009 and the two liens on his property, which could indicate potential excessive financial hardship. Further, it may have identified a potential alias with a vast social media trail indicating other concerning traits. The alerts generated would have prompted OPM to notify DOD, which would have provoked a reevaluation before Alexis's 2017 re-clearance. This re-evaluation could have discovered that he openly discussed "hearing voices," a clear sign of his mental illness. A random audit would have alerted OPM of these new issues and potentially averted tragedy.

The OPM Background Investigation process must be capable of flagging high-risk individuals holding clearances and alert case officers of situations requiring review before any adverse consequence takes place. The current process, however, is dated, but the system can be strengthened to better help the government identify these dangerous individuals. OPM must address the blind spots that exist in the current manual security clearance review process. The shooting tragedies at the Washington Navy Yard, along with the information security breaches perpetrated by Bradley Manning and Edward Snowden, have demonstrated that the current security clearance process is inadequate.

This legislation has been endorsed by the Federal Managers Association; the FBI Agents Association; the Alcohol-Tobacco-Firearms and Explosives Association; The International Association of Chiefs of Police; The International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, AFL-CIO & CLC; The National Native American Law Enforcement Association; TechAmerica; General Dynamics Information Technologies; LexisNexis; Lt. Gen. Charles J. Cunningham Jr., Former Director of the Defense Security Service, 1999-2002; Brian Stafford, Former Director of the

United States Secret Service, 1999-2003; Howard Safir, Former Police Commissioner of New York City, 1996-2000; Floyd Clarke, Former Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1993; and Michael Sullivan, Former Acting Director of the ATF, 2006-2009, and US Attorney for the District of Massachusetts, 2001-2009.

We must act now. Our legislation represents a sensible path forward to protect national security and to help prevent future tragedies. I urge my colleagues to support this common sense solution.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 1620. A bill to prohibit the consideration of any bill by Congress unless a statement on tax transparency is provided in the bill; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1620

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Tax Transparency Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. TAX EFFECT TRANSPARENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2 of title 1, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 102 the following:

"§ 102a. Tax effect transparency

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Each Act of Congress, bill, resolution, conference report thereon, or amendment there to, that modifies Federal tax law shall contain a statement describing the general effect of the modification on Federal tax law.

"(b) FAILURE TO COMPLY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A failure to comply with subsection (a) shall give rise to a point of order in either House of Congress, which may be raised by any Senator during consideration in the Senate or any Member of the House of Representatives during consideration in the House of Representatives.

"(2) NONEXCLUSIVITY.—The availability of a point of order under this section shall not affect the availability of any other point of order.

"(c) DISPOSITION OF POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Any Senator may raise a point of order that any matter is not in order under subsection (a).

"(2) WAIVER.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Any Senator may move to waive a point of order raised under paragraph (1) by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn.

"(B) PROCEDURES.—For a motion to waive a point of order under subparagraph (A) as to a matter—

"(i) a motion to table the point of order shall not be in order;

"(ii) all motions to waive one or more points of order under this section as to the matter shall be debatable for a total of not more than 1 hour, equally divided between the Senator raising the point of order and the Senator moving to waive the point of order or their designees; and

"(iii) a motion to waive the point of order shall not be amendable.

"(d) DISPOSITION OF POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If a Member of the House of Representatives makes a point of order under this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition of whether any statement made under subsection (a) was adequate or, in the absence of such a statement, whether a statement is required under subsection (a).

"(2) CONSIDERATION.—For a point of order under this section made in the House of Representatives—

"(A) the question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the Member making the point of order and by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House of Representatives adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be;

"(B) in selecting the opponent, the Speaker of the House of Representatives should first recognize an opponent from the opposing party; and

"(C) the disposition of the question of consideration with respect to a measure shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this section with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

"(e) RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.—The provisions of this section are enacted by the Congress—

"(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 2 of title 1, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 102 the following new item:

"102a. Tax effect transparency."

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1622. A bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to speak to an issue in my State of Alaska, in the State of North Dakota—quite honestly, in so many of our home States. We have facts, we have statistics, and we have issues that face our indigenous peoples, most particularly our indigenous children that, truth be told, are not what we want to write home about. In fact, in many, many cases, these statistics are shameful.

The effort and the initiative to make a difference in the lives of the children of our first peoples is an effort I want to speak to today, and I join with my colleague from North Dakota in addressing this issue. I want to help shine

a light on the conditions facing indigenous children in our country to whom the United States has a legal commitment. This is a Federal trust responsibility that is owed to these children.

I thank Senator HEITKAMP for her commitment and for her compassion to address these issues facing our Nation's indigenous children by introducing legislation to establish the Commission on Native Children. I will defer to my colleague so we can have a conversation about this, but it is important to note that the very first time I had ever met Senator HEITKAMP, we literally exchanged handshakes, introduced ourselves, and within 5 minutes we were talking about children's issues, Native children's issues in our respective States. That little 5-minute discussion led to much further discussion later on and a commitment to work to address these issues.

I do have many remarks I would like to make this afternoon, but I would like my colleague from North Dakota, who has worked so diligently on this issue, with her staff working with my staff, to describe to our colleagues the legislation that today we are both introducing establishing the Commission on Native Children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I will start with a story because I think a lot of us come to the Senate with a lot of experiences, a lot of common experiences, and I think the Senator from Alaska and I have shared this common experience of seeing the despair, looking at the statistics, but more importantly, in my case, in Indian Country, and in her case, working with indigenous people, seeing that so much more needs to be done; seeing the disparities in education, seeing the disparities in health care, seeing the disparities in housing, and recognizing that all of those things have huge consequences; seeing what high poverty does to people who are not given the right opportunities.

I think frequently it is so important that we do something like this so we can begin that process of educating our colleagues on how this situation is different, what our experiences are. If you have not seen or been in Indian Country, if you have not looked at the statistics, it is alarming. It is absolutely alarming.

The story I want to give before I talk about our legislation is the statistic on mortality rates. In this country, child mortality has decreased by 9 percent since 2000. That is good news. We are paying more attention, doing a better job at infancy, doing a better job raising our kids. The child mortality rate among Native children has increased 15 percent—increased 15 percent at the same time it has decreased in this country 9 percent. We have tried various programs, whether it is housing

programs, education programs, higher education programs, but we know this works better if we all work together and if we work collaboratively.

I know a lot of people have suspicions about things called commissions, but I believe for the first time we will be pulling together the data regarding what is exactly the status of Native children all across the United States of America—in Alaska, Alaska indigenous people, as well as Alaskan folks—and saying: Where do we begin to understand this problem differently and change outcomes, because if we keep doing what we are doing right now, we will fail the next generation of Native children, and we will fail to do what we need to do. This is not a new issue for me. When I was attorney general, I spent a lot of time in Indian Country, a lot of time on Indian issues.

I want to tell a story before I describe briefly what this Commission would do. It is a story about a woman who showed up at a conference. We were talking about trying to get resources to do a conference on juvenile crime on the reservations. She told a story about how she was dyslexic as a child and her mother was not a very patient woman. She was waiting to go to a birthday party, and she was sitting and looking out the window, and she would ask her mother every 5 minutes: Is it time yet? Are they going to come? Finally, her mother, out of frustration, took this little girl's hand and dragged it back and forth across a nail that was on the window ledge and said: Maybe now you will remember. She held up her hand, and you could still see the scars. And she said something I will never forget. She said: Who cares about me? I looked out that window and thought, who is going to come and help me?

All across America there are children looking out a window in Indian Country and in all of these very remote places wondering who is going to care about them. Who is going to help them? When we have trust obligations, isn't that the job of the U.S. Congress? Isn't that the job of all of us, to care about all of our children? Yet these children are left behind.

Time and time again, you will read a story in the paper about an abducted child, and you do not realize there could have been 10 children abducted off a reservation in North Dakota. You do not read a story about trafficking in North Dakota, but it is happening. You do not read a story about child abuse and neglect, and it is happening, or failed schools, schools whose roofs are caving in because we have not met our education obligation.

So what this Commission would do is bring attention to this very important part of our population, the part that gets left behind, that no one looks out for, and start saying: What are we going to do differently? What are we

going to do differently for our children? These are all our children.

I can tell you I felt a kindred spirit when I began to talk about this issue with the Senator from Alaska and talk about how important it is for people to really understand those challenges and how important it is to prevent costs later on if we just do a little Head Start. Children in Indian Country go to Head Start at a lower rate. Their education system fails them. Fifty percent of Native kids graduate from high school, compared to 75 percent in the White population.

These statistics mean a lot. We all look at statistics. But behind each one of them is a young child struggling to make something out of their lives in this world and wanting to believe that they matter. So what we are doing today is establishing a commission on the status of Indian children to simply say: You matter.

We need to come up with different ideas and different solutions on how we are going to solve the problem. I had a great opportunity to go to Alaska and spend some time with the Alaska corporations and the indigenous people in Alaska. It was a new experience for me because we are used to Indian Country. We are used to reservations.

But so many of the challenges—I am sure the Senator from Alaska would agree—so many of the challenges are so similar in Alaska and North Dakota, partly because of our remoteness but partly because these are obligations that have not been lived up to. So I wish to ask the great Senator from Alaska how she thinks this commission could work to actually better the children, the Native children in our country?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. I appreciate that as we work to advance opportunities for American Indian, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian children throughout the country, we remember these are not just statistics. As horrifying as these statistics are, these statistics truly do come to life when we hear those real stories.

When we were working with the Senator's office to develop this legislation, kind of looking at the indigenous children in this country through the lens of the justice system, the education system, the health care system, and then work to provide recommendations to the respective government agencies that will help to address these issues that affect our Native children, we talk about the trust responsibility.

That trust responsibility does not mean anything unless we keep our commitment. We just simply are not keeping the commitment. The Senator mentioned the issue of housing. Having had an opportunity to serve on the Indian Affairs Committee now for 10 years, we hear in committee hearing after committee hearing the situation

with regard to housing and the inadequate situation on so many of our reservations.

In the State of Alaska, our housing situation is truly a crisis in so many places. Bethel, which is probably—I believe it is now our fourth or fifth largest community in the State—is viewed as a hub community. So if you come in for health care from one of the surrounding villages, you come into Bethel. If you are trying to escape an abusive situation, trying to get your children to safety, leaving the village, you come into Bethel, where there is a women's shelter where you can kind of pull yourself together.

But the problem then is, when you have been able to pull yourself together, when your children feel they are in a safe place right now, then there is no place for you to take your children. There is no housing out on the market there in Bethel. So what happens. Time after time after time the woman goes back to the abuser, the children go back to an abusive situation, a situation where domestic violence is oftentimes out of control.

Let me speak to just some of the statistics that we are facing in dealing with rural justice in Alaska. Nearly 95 percent of the crimes in rural Alaska can be traced back to alcohol abuse. By the time an Alaska Native reaches adulthood, the chance of experiencing domestic violence or sexual violence is 51 percent for women, 29 percent for men. On Native children, 60 percent of the children are in need of foster parents. I have been working on the issue of fetal alcohol syndrome and how we raise awareness and how we eliminate this entirely preventable disease.

I think it is noteworthy that for years I worked with Senator Daschle, formerly of this body and the majority leader, on this initiative. But he knew that on the reservations in his State, they were facing the same situation that we were in Alaska with fetal alcohol spectrum disorder. In Alaska, we have the highest rate of fetal alcohol spectrum disorder in the Nation. But in the Native areas of the State, they are then 15 times higher than in any of the non-Native parts of the State; again, an area where we think, if we can make some inroads in awareness, this is a disease that is 100 percent preventable.

Suicide is an issue that strikes home to far too many. Alaska Native males between the ages of 12 and 24 experience the highest rate of suicide of any demographic within the country. We have the highest rate of suicides per capita in the country. It is our young Native men who drive that statistic.

When it comes to rape statistics, also a horrific example, unfortunately, the term has been applied that Alaska is the "rape capital of America." It is our Native women—one in three—who are experiencing much of the sexual abuse. We cannot accept this reality.

When we talk about infrastructure—I mentioned housing. We think about the lack of public infrastructure and how that impacts the health of a child or the health of a family. We are still a relatively young State. You have heard me say 80 percent of our communities are not accessible by road. So we lack certain infrastructure, including in many of our villages basic water, basic sewer systems. We simply do not have it. If you do not have clean water for cooking, for drinking, for cleaning, just basic hygiene, it can be deadly for our families.

The CDC has determined that lack of in-home water services causes high rates of respiratory and skin infections. We see this in our rural Native villages. The average toddler in the United States gets RSV, which is this respiratory syncytial virus, before they are about 2 years old. The average Alaska Native baby gets RSV before they are 11 weeks old. So they are just mere infants and they are getting this respiratory virus because of sanitation issues.

A lack of clean drinking water, proper wastewater systems leads to fever, to hepatitis, leads to infectious disease. Then what happens? You are a child out in the small village. You are then sent in, your family has to take you into Anchorage, not just one airplane flight away, oftentimes two airplane flights, \$1,000-plus airfare in the city where your costs are high.

You think about the impact to a family when you have a sick infant, an infant who has been sick because their family lacks basic sanitation in this day and age.

One of the household chores—and we all had chores when we were growing up as kids. In far too many of our villages in the State of Alaska, one of the chores the kids have is emptying the honey bucket. For those who do not know what a honey bucket is, a honey bucket is the big 5-gallon bucket that you get from Home Depot with a toilet seat lid on it that is put in the corner of the house. That is the bathroom.

You have to take that bucket out and dispose of it. You have children, your 10-year old walking down the boardwalk with a bucket of human waste to dump. This is happening in this day and this age. Who, again, bears the weight of so much of this is our Native children. Think about this from a health safety perspective.

I wish to share a story, as my colleague from North Dakota did, and then—I just came from the Alaska Federation of Natives annual conference. It is the largest gathering of Natives in the country. They come from all corners of the State. It is truly like a family reunion, usually a very upbeat, very happy occasion where people come together for a great deal of sharing.

This year there was sharing on a personal side that perhaps we have not

witnessed before. Much of the sharing came from children, and sharing, rather than stories of happiness and opportunities for the future, was driven by a feeling of not helplessness—because if you are helpless you will not speak up—but a feeling that we can no longer remain silent.

The instances of domestic violence in the home, of child sexual assault in the home, of alcoholism and drug abuse that brings about attempted suicide in the home caused a group of 4-H kids from Tanana, AK, to come together—about a half dozen of them—ages maybe 6, 7, up to high school, to stand in front of an audience of 3,000-plus people and say: We have had enough. We have to speak out, even though we have been told do not talk about this; do not talk about this because it might shame your family. These children had the courage to step forward and say: This is not right. We are taught to respect our elders, but when our elders do not respect us, we are going to speak out. Their courage in front of this huge gathering was amazing. It is not unlike the story my colleague from North Dakota just told when that young girl looked out the window and said: Who will come and take care of me? Who is waiting for me?

These children from Tanana were saying: We are not going to be quiet.

It ought to be us. It ought to be the grownups who are saying: Let's take charge of this. Let's turn these horrible statistics around. Let's make every day a better day for our children. Those kids are the real heroes.

So when I come together with my colleagues in an effort such as this—I am with the Senator—oftentimes we say: Oh, commissions. What do commissions do? Maybe this starts to give some of these young people hope, whether you are on the reservations in North Dakota or whether you are in Tanana, AK. Maybe there is hope that the grownups out there are listening and can work with them.

We are trying to look at this holistically, through the education system, the health care system, and through the justice system. I am quite pleased to be able to work with my colleague on this initiative. I do not think there is anything more important that we can be doing for our young people than to offer them a ray of hope.

I thank my colleague from North Dakota and all she has done to get us to this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, suicide is the second leading cause of death among Native American young adults ages 15 to 24. It is 2½ times the national average. The despair my great friend from the great State of Alaska has just outlined for us—it seems there is no way out, that no one is looking, they are invisible, that their problems

are inconsequential and no one cares. Yes, I thank my colleague from Alaska for that wonderful vision that this commission tells them they are not invisible to us, they are not invisible to the Congress, they are not invisible to the administration; that people are there and they care.

Maybe it offers that hope. Maybe it offers that opportunity to tell more of these stories and to shine a greater light of awareness onto this problem.

It is a national disgrace. If we continue to do what we have always done in housing, education, health care, and public safety, if we continue to do what we have always done, we will lose yet another generation to despair.

It is time for Congress to step up, honor our treaty obligations and recognize that if we cannot protect the smallest among us, the most vulnerable, the most remote among us, that we aren't worthy of this body. We aren't worthy of this government.

I invite all of our colleagues to join with us and send a message loudly and clearly to Native children in our country that they matter; they matter at their homes, in their communities, their States, their clubs, and their schools, but they also matter in the halls of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The senior Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. If I may close out my comments, Senator HEITKAMP has honored an individual, Alyce Spotted Bear, by naming this commission on Native American children after Alyce Spotted Bear. She has invited me to also include a leader on so many education and children's issues.

I wish to take a moment to speak to the contributions of a great Alaskan, Dr. Walter Soboleff. Senator HEITKAMP has honored Alaskans by including Dr. Soboleff with the naming of this children's commission.

I was very honored to learn of Dr. Soboleff, who passed away in 2011 at 102 years old. In our State he was an elder statesman. He was a spiritual leader and an Alaska Native advocate who championed Alaska Native rights and cultural education. He was the first Alaska Native to serve on our State Board of Education, in which he served as chairman. He established the Alaska Native Studies Department at the University of Alaska Fairbanks to ensure that our Native students could be taught their history, culture, and language within that university system.

Clearly, when one is 102 years old, they live through a transition of time, but he lived through a transition for our Native people in our State. He advocated to ensure that our State's education system recognized that Native students must know their culture. In order to know who they are, they need to know where they have come from. They need to know their culture. They

need to know how to hunt, how to fish, and that their culture is the foundation of a strong identity, ensuring student success and pride in oneself.

When I thought about how we might be able to recognize one of Alaska's own who demonstrated to our young people that if you know yourself, if you know your culture, if you are proud of that, even under some daunting challenges, you can move forward. You can persevere.

I thank my colleague for giving me this opportunity to show him recognition as we also honor Alyce Spotted Bear.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1626. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide employees in the private sector with an opportunity for compensatory time off, similar to the opportunity offered to Federal employees, and a flexible credit hour program to help balance the demands of work and family, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1626

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Family Friendly and Workplace Flexibility Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. COMPENSATORY TIME.

Section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) COMPENSATORY TIME FOR PRIVATE EMPLOYEES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘employee’ does not include an employee of a public agency; and

“(B) the terms ‘overtime compensation’, ‘compensatory time’, and ‘compensatory time off’ have the meaning given the terms in subsection (o)(7).

“(2) GENERAL RULE.—An employee may receive, in accordance with this subsection and in lieu of monetary overtime compensation, compensatory time off at a rate not less than one and one-half hours for each hour of employment for which overtime compensation is required by this section.

“(3) AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—An employer may provide compensatory time to an employee under paragraph (2) only in accordance with—

“(A) applicable provisions of a collective bargaining agreement between an employer and a labor organization that has been certified or recognized as the representative of the employees of the employer under applicable law; or

“(B) in the case of an employee who is not represented by a labor organization described in subparagraph (A), an agreement between the employer and employee arrived at before the performance of the work—

“(i) in which the employer has offered and the employee has chosen to receive compensatory time off under this subsection in lieu of monetary overtime compensation;

“(ii) that the employee enters into knowingly, voluntarily, and not as a condition of employment; and

“(iii) that is affirmed by a written or otherwise verifiable record maintained in accordance with section 11(c).

“(4) HOUR LIMIT.—An employee may accrue not more than 160 hours of compensatory time under this subsection, and shall receive overtime compensation for any such compensatory time in excess of 160 hours.

“(5) UNUSED COMPENSATORY TIME.—

“(A) COMPENSATION PERIOD.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), not later than January 31 of each calendar year, the employer of the employee shall provide monetary compensation for any unused compensatory time under this subsection accrued during the preceding calendar year that the employee did not use prior to December 31 of the preceding year at the rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A).

“(ii) ALTERNATIVE COMPENSATION PERIOD.—An employer may designate and communicate to an employee a 12-month period other than the calendar year for determining unused compensatory time under this subsection, and the employer shall provide monetary compensation not later than 31 days after the end of such 12-month period at the rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A).

“(B) EXCESS OF 80 HOURS.—An employer may provide monetary compensation, at the rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A), for any unused compensatory time under this subsection of an employee in excess of 80 hours at any time after giving the employee not less than 30 days' notice.

“(C) TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT.—Upon the voluntary or involuntary termination of an employee, the employer of such employee shall provide monetary compensation at the rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A) for any unused compensatory time under this subsection.

“(6) WITHDRAWAL OF COMPENSATORY TIME AGREEMENT.—

“(A) EMPLOYER.—Except where a collective bargaining agreement provides otherwise, an employer that has adopted a policy of offering compensatory time to employees under this subsection may discontinue such policy after providing employees notice 30 days prior to discontinuing the policy.

“(B) EMPLOYEE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An employee may withdraw an agreement described in paragraph (3)(B) after providing notice to the employer of the employee 30 days prior to the withdrawal.

“(ii) REQUEST FOR MONETARY COMPENSATION.—At any time, an employee may request in writing monetary compensation for any accrued and unused compensatory time under this subsection. The employer of such employee shall provide monetary compensation at the rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A) within 30 days of receiving the written request.

“(7) MONETARY COMPENSATION.—

“(A) RATE OF COMPENSATION.—An employer providing monetary compensation to an employee for accrued compensatory time under this subsection shall compensate the employee at a rate not less than the greater of—

“(i) the regular rate, as defined in subsection (e), of the employee on the date the employee earned such compensatory time; or

“(ii) the final regular rate, as defined in subsection (e), received by such employee.

“(B) TREATMENT AS UNPAID OVERTIME.—Any monetary payment owed to an employee for unused compensatory time under this subsection, as calculated in accordance with subparagraph (A), shall be considered unpaid overtime compensation for the purposes of this Act.

“(8) USING COMPENSATORY TIME.—An employer shall permit an employee to take time off work for compensatory time accrued under paragraph (2) within a reasonable time after the employee makes a request for using such compensatory time if the use does not unduly disrupt the operations of the employer.

“(9) PROHIBITION OF COERCION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer that provides compensatory time under paragraph (2) shall not directly or indirectly intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any employee for the purpose of interfering with the rights of an employee under this subsection—

“(i) to use accrued compensatory time in accordance with paragraph (8) in lieu of receiving monetary compensation;

“(ii) to refrain from using accrued compensatory time in accordance with paragraph (8) and receive monetary compensation; or

“(iii) to refrain from entering into an agreement to accrue compensatory time under this subsection.

“(B) DEFINITION.—In subparagraph (A), the term ‘intimidate, threaten, or coerce’ includes—

“(i) promising to confer or conferring any benefit, such as appointment, promotion, or compensation; or

“(ii) effecting or threatening to effect any reprisal, such as deprivation of appointment, promotion, or compensation.”

SEC. 3. FLEXIBLE CREDIT HOUR PROGRAM.

Section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207), as amended in section 2, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(t) FLEXIBLE CREDIT HOUR PROGRAM.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘at the election of’, used with respect to an employee, means at the initiative of, and at the request of, the employee;

“(B) the term ‘basic work requirement’ means the number of hours, excluding overtime hours, that an employee is required to work or is required to account for by leave or otherwise within a specified period of time;

“(C) the term ‘employee’ does not include an employee of a public agency;

“(D) the term ‘flexible credit hour’ means any hour that an employee, who is participating in a flexible credit hour program, works in excess of the basic work requirement; and

“(E) the term ‘overtime compensation’ has the meaning given the term in subsection (o)(7).

“(2) PROGRAM ESTABLISHMENT.—An employer may establish a flexible credit hour program for an employee to accrue flexible credit hours in accordance with this subsection and, in lieu of monetary compensation, reduce the number of hours the employee works in a subsequent day or week at a rate of one hour for each hour of employment for which overtime compensation is required by this section.

“(3) AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer may carry out a flexible credit hour program under paragraph (2) only in accordance with—

“(i) applicable provisions of a collective bargaining agreement between an employer

and a labor organization that has been certified or recognized as the representative of the employees of the employer under applicable law; or

“(ii) in the case of an employee who is not represented by a labor organization described in clause (i), an agreement between the employer and the employee arrived at before the performance of the work that—

“(I) the employee enters into knowingly, voluntarily, and not as a condition of employment; and

“(II) is affirmed by a written statement maintained in accordance with section 11(c).

“(B) HOURS DESIGNATED.—An agreement that is entered into under subparagraph (A) shall provide that, at the election of the employee, the employer and the employee will jointly designate flexible credit hours for the employee to work within an applicable period of time.

“(4) HOUR LIMIT.—An employee participating in a flexible credit hour program may not accrue more than 50 flexible credit hours, and shall receive overtime compensation for flexible credit hours in excess of 50 hours.

“(5) UNUSED FLEXIBLE CREDIT HOURS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not later than January 31 of each calendar year, the employer of an employee who is participating in a flexible credit hour program shall provide monetary compensation for any flexible credit hour accrued during the preceding calendar year that the employee did not use prior to December 31 of the preceding calendar year at a rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A)(i).

“(B) ALTERNATIVE COMPENSATION PERIOD.—An employer may designate and communicate to the employees of the employer a 12-month period other than the calendar year for determining unused flexible credit hours, and the employer shall provide monetary compensation, at a rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A)(i), not later than 31 days after the end of the 12-month period.

“(6) PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE AND WITHDRAWAL.—

“(A) EMPLOYER.—An employer that has established a flexible credit hour program under paragraph (2) may discontinue a flexible credit hour program for employees described in paragraph (3)(A)(ii) after providing notice to such employees 30 days before discontinuing such program.

“(B) EMPLOYEE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An employee may withdraw an agreement described in paragraph (3)(A)(ii) at any time by submitting written notice of withdrawal to the employer of the employee 30 days prior to the withdrawal.

“(ii) REQUEST FOR MONETARY COMPENSATION.—An employee may request in writing, at any time, that the employer of such employee provide monetary compensation for all accrued and unused flexible credit hours. Within 30 days after receiving such written request, the employer shall provide the employee monetary compensation for such unused flexible credit hours at a rate prescribed by paragraph (7)(A)(i).

“(7) MONETARY COMPENSATION.—

“(A) FLEXIBLE CREDIT HOURS.—

“(i) RATE OF COMPENSATION.—An employer providing monetary compensation to an employee for accrued flexible credit hours shall compensate such employee at a rate not less than the regular rate, as defined in subsection (e), of the employee on the date the employee receives the monetary compensation.

“(ii) TREATMENT AS UNPAID OVERTIME.—Any monetary payment owed to an employee

for unused flexible credit hours under this subsection, as calculated in accordance with clause (i), shall be considered unpaid overtime compensation for the purposes of this Act.

“(B) OVERTIME HOURS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Any hour that an employee works in excess of 40 hours in a workweek that is requested in advance by the employer, other than a flexible credit hour, shall be an ‘overtime hour’.

“(ii) RATE OF COMPENSATION.—The employee shall be compensated for each overtime hour at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which the employee is employed, in accordance with subsection (a)(1), or receive compensatory time off in accordance with subsection (s), for each such overtime hour.

“(8) USE OF FLEXIBLE CREDIT HOURS.—An employer shall permit an employee to use accrued flexible credit hours to take time off work, in accordance with the rate prescribed by paragraph (2), within a reasonable time after the employee makes a request for such use if the use does not unduly disrupt the operations of the employer.

“(9) PROHIBITION OF COERCION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer shall not directly or indirectly intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any employee for the purpose of interfering with the rights of the employee under this subsection—

“(i) to elect or not to elect to participate in a flexible credit hour program, or to elect or not to elect to work flexible credit hours; or

“(ii) to use or refrain from using accrued flexible credit hours in accordance with paragraph (8).

“(B) DEFINITION.—In subparagraph (A), the term ‘intimidate, threaten, or coerce’ has the meaning given the term in subsection (s)(9).”

SEC. 4. REMEDIES.

Section 16 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “(b) Any employer” and inserting “(b) Except as provided in subsection (f), any employer”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) An employer that violates subsection (s)(9) or (t)(9) of section 7 shall be liable to the affected employee in the amount of—

“(1) the rate of compensation, determined in accordance with subsection (s)(7)(A) or (t)(7)(A)(i) of section 7, for each hour of unused compensatory time or for each unused flexible credit hour accrued by the employee; and

“(2) liquidated damages equal to the amount determined in paragraph (1).”

SEC. 5. NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall revise the materials the Secretary provides, under regulations contained in section 516.4 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, to employers for purposes of a notice explaining the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) to employees so that the notice reflects the amendments made to such Act by this Act.

SEC. 6. PROTECTIONS FOR CLAIMS RELATING TO COMPENSATORY TIME OFF AND FLEXIBLE CREDIT HOURS IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDING.

Section 507(a)(4)(A) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “and”; and

(2) by inserting “, the value of unused, accrued compensatory time off under section 7(s) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938

(29 U.S.C. 207(s)), all of which shall be deemed to have been earned within 180 days before the date of the filing of the petition or the date of the cessation of the debtor's business, whichever occurs first, at a rate of compensation not less than the final regular rate received by such individual, and the value of unused, accrued flexible credit hours under section 7(t) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207(t)), all of which shall be deemed to have been earned within 180 days before the date of the filing of the petition or the date of the cessation of the debtor's business, whichever occurs first, at a rate of compensation described in paragraph (7)(A)(i) of such section 7(t)" after "sick leave pay".

SEC. 7. GAO REPORT.

Beginning 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act and each of the 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress providing, with respect to the reporting period immediately prior to each such report—

(1) data concerning the extent to which employers provide compensatory time and flexible credit hours under subsections (s) and (t) of section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207), as added by this Act, and the extent to which employees opt to receive compensatory time under subsection (s) and flexible credit hours under subsection (t);

(2) the number of complaints alleging a violation of subsection (s)(9) or (t)(9) of such section filed by any employee with the Secretary of Labor, and the disposition or status of such complaints;

(3) the number of enforcement actions commenced by the Secretary or commenced by the Secretary on behalf of any employee for alleged violations of subsection (s)(9) or (t)(9) of such section, and the disposition or status of such actions; and

(4) an account of any unpaid wages, damages, penalties, injunctive relief, or other remedies obtained or sought by the Secretary in connection with such actions described in paragraph (3).

SEC. 8. SUNSET.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall expire on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 277—RECOGNIZING THE RELIGIOUS AND HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FESTIVAL OF DIWALI

Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 277

Whereas Diwali is a festival of great significance and celebrated annually by Hindus, Sikhs, and Jains throughout India, the United States, and the world;

Whereas Diwali is a festival of lights that marks the beginning of the Hindu new year, during which celebrants light and place small lamps around the home and pray for health, knowledge, peace, wealth, and prosperity in the new year;

Whereas Diwali will be celebrated throughout the world for five days and is an oppor-

tunity to celebrate the faith of all people and the universal right to religious expression and spiritual freedom;

Whereas the lights symbolize the light of knowledge within the individual that over-whelms the darkness of ignorance, empowering each celebrant to do good deeds and show compassion to others;

Whereas Diwali falls on the last day of the last month in the lunar calendar and is celebrated as a day of thanksgiving for the homecoming of the Lord Rama and worship of Lord Ganesha, the remover of obstacles and bestower of blessings, at the beginning of the new year for many Hindus;

Whereas, for Sikhs, Diwali is celebrated as Bandhi Chhor Diwas (The Celebration of Freedom), in honor of the release from imprisonment of the sixth guru, Guru Hargobind; and

Whereas, for Jains, Diwali marks the anniversary of the attainment of moksha, or liberation, by Mahavira, the last of the Tirthankaras (the great teachers of Jain dharma), at the end of his life in 527 B.C.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the religious and historical significance of the festival of Diwali, the festival of lights, and expresses its respect for the people of India, Indian Americans, and members of the Indian diaspora around the world on this significant occasion; and

(2) supports a strong relationship between the people and governments of the United States and India, based on mutual trust and respect that will enable the countries to more closely collaborate across a broad spectrum of interests, such as global peace and prosperity.

SENATE RESOLUTION 278—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 2013 AS "SCHOOL BUS SAFETY MONTH"

Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 278

Whereas approximately 450,000 public and private school buses carry 26,000,000 children to and from school every weekday in the United States;

Whereas America's 450,000 public and private school buses comprise the largest mass transportation fleet in the Nation;

Whereas during the school year, school buses make more than 55,000,000 passenger trips daily and students ride these school buses 10,000,000,000 times per year as the Nation's fleet travels over 4,000,000,000 miles per school year;

Whereas school buses are designed to be safer than passenger vehicles and are 13 times safer than other modes of school transportation, and 44 times safer than vehicles driven by teenagers;

Whereas in an average year, about 25 school children are killed in school bus accidents, with one-third of these children struck by their own school buses in loading/unloading zones, one-third struck by motorists who fail to stop for school buses, and one-third killed as they approach or depart a school bus stop;

Whereas The Child Safety Network, celebrating 25 years of national public service, has collaborated with the school bus industry to create public service announcements to reduce distracted driving near school buses, increase ridership, and provide free resources to school districts in order to in-

crease driver safety training, provide free technology for tracking school buses, and educate students; and

Whereas the adoption of School Bus Safety Month will allow broadcast and digital media and social networking industries to make commitments to disseminate public service announcements designed to save children's lives by making motorists aware of school bus safety issues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates October 2013 as "School Bus Safety Month".

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2007. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3204, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2008. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2007. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3204, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—USE OF ANTIMICROBIAL DRUGS IN FOOD ANIMALS

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Delivering Antimicrobial Transparency in Animals Act of 2013".

SEC. 302. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to provide the Food and Drug Administration and the public with better information on the use of antimicrobial drugs in animals used for food to—

(1) enable public health officials and scientists to better understand and interpret trends and variations in rates of microbial resistance to such antimicrobial drugs;

(2) improve the understanding of the relationship between antimicrobial drug use in animals used for food and antimicrobial drug resistance in microbes in and on animals and humans; and

(3) identify interventions to prevent and control such antimicrobial drug resistance.

SEC. 303. RESEARCH PROGRAMS TO STUDY ANTIMICROBIAL RESISTANCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this title—

(1) the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Food and Drugs; and

(2) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAMS.—The Secretary, acting through the Commissioner, shall develop a research program or programs to study the relationship between the sales, distribution, end-use practices of animal drugs containing an antimicrobial active ingredient in food-producing animals and antimicrobial resistance trends.

(c) PURPOSE OF PROGRAMS.—Any research program developed under subsection (b) shall be developed in order to better determine—

(1) the relationships between sales data, distribution data, and end-usage data of animal drugs containing an antimicrobial active ingredient in food-producing animals to inform policies of Food and Drug Administration regarding data collection and regulation of antimicrobial products in agriculture, including consideration of the potential value of data from veterinary feed directives; and

(2) the relationships between antimicrobial resistance and use of animal drugs containing an antimicrobial active ingredient in food-producing animals and trends in antimicrobial resistance, including by using the data collected through the National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring Program or other studies regarding resistance levels in bacteria associated with food-producing animals.

(d) CONSULTATION.—Any research program developed under subsection (b) shall be developed in consultation with the Under Secretary for Food Safety, the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, and the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics at the Department of Agriculture. To the extent practicable, such Under Secretaries shall provide assistance in developing and conducting such research programs.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall implement the research program or programs developed under subsection (b). The Secretary shall analyze data from such program or programs to determine the contribution of such data to studying antimicrobial resistance, protecting public health, and establishing the coordinated data collection strategy as described in section 305.

(f) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the results of any research program developed under this section as soon as practicable.

SEC. 304. ENHANCED REPORTING AND PUBLICATION OF SALES DATA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 512(l)(3)(E) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360b(l)(3)(E)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II);

(2) by striking “The Secretary shall make summaries of the information reported under this paragraph publicly available, except that—” and inserting “(i) Not later than a date established by the Secretary for 2014, and on such date in each year thereafter, the Secretary shall make publicly available a summary of the information (including dosage form information, if practicable) reported under this paragraph for the previous year, except that—”; and

(3) by inserting after subclause (II), as redesignated by paragraph (1), the following:

“(ii) In making the summaries available under this subparagraph, the following shall apply:

“(I) The Secretary shall segregate the categories of amounts reported into the following 2 subcategories, after consultation with the applicable classifications of the World Health Organization:

“(aa) The volume of drugs of importance to human medicine.

“(bb) The volume of drugs not of importance to human medicine.

“(II) As practicable, the Secretary shall segregate amounts reported into the following 2 amounts:

“(aa) The volume of drugs labeled or eligible for use in food-producing animals.

“(bb) The volume of drugs that are not labeled or are ineligible for use in food-producing animals.

“(III) In any cross-tabulation of the amounts reported with any reporting category, the Secretary shall include the categories ‘Not Independently Reported’ and ‘Not Independently Reported Export’.”

(b) REISSUANCE.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall reissue the summary reports issued before 2012 under section 512(l)(3)(E) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360b(l)(3)(E)) using the format designed for the 2012 summary report. The Secretary shall publish the reissued reports in one combined publication.

SEC. 305. IMPLEMENTATION AND PUBLICATION OF ANTIMICROBIAL RESISTANCE DATA COLLECTION STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, acting through the Commissioner, shall implement an Antimicrobial Data Collection Strategy, based on information received in the comments to the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking entitled “Antimicrobial Animal Drug Distribution Reporting” (77 Fed. Reg. 44177 (July 27, 2012)) and any research program developed under section 303.

(b) REEVALUATION.—Not less than every 5 years after the implementation of the Antimicrobial Data Collection Strategy under subsection (a), the Secretary shall reevaluate such Strategy and propose modifications as such Secretary determines appropriate, based on scientific data.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall—

(1) submit to Congress the Strategy implemented under subsection (a), and any modification made to such Strategy pursuant to subsection (b); and

(2) make such Strategy and any such modification available to the public.

SEC. 306. ACTION BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

(a) PUBLICATION OF FINAL GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish a final version of the draft Voluntary Guidance #213 of the Food and Drug Administration (entitled “New Animal Drugs and New Animal Drug Combination Products Administered in or on Medicated Feed or Drinking Water of Food-Producing Animals: Recommendations for Drug Sponsors for Voluntarily Aligning Product Use Conditions with GFI #209”).

(b) REPORT BY GAO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the publication of the final guidance described in subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall commence a study to evaluate—

(A) the voluntary approach used by the Food and Drug Administration to eliminate injudicious use of antimicrobial drugs in food-producing animals; and

(B) the effectiveness of the data collection activities conducted by the Food and Drug Administration regarding antimicrobial resistance.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after commencing the study described in paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that describes the results of such study.

SA 2008. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be

proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3204, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—PATIENT MEDICATION INFORMATION FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Cody Miller Initiative for Safer Prescriptions Act”.

SEC. 302. PATIENT MEDICATION INFORMATION FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

Chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 505E the following:

“SEC. 505F. PATIENT MEDICATION INFORMATION FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue regulations regarding the authorship, content, format, and dissemination requirements for patient medication information (referred to in this section as ‘PMI’) for drugs subject to section 503(b)(1).

“(b) CONTENT.—The regulations promulgated under subsection (a) shall require that the PMI with respect to a drug—

“(1) be scientifically accurate and based on the professional labeling approved by the Secretary and authoritative, peer-reviewed literature; and

“(2) includes nontechnical, understandable, plain language that is not promotional in tone or content, and contains at least—

“(A) the established name of drug, including the established name of such drug as a listed drug (as described in section 505(j)(2)(A)) and as a drug that is the subject of an approved abbreviated new drug application under section 505(j) or of an approved license for a biological product submitted under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act, if applicable;

“(B) drug uses and clinical benefits;

“(C) general directions for proper use;

“(D) contraindications, common side effects, and most serious risks of the drug, especially with respect to certain groups such as children, pregnant women, and the elderly;

“(E) measures patients may be able to take, if any, to reduce the side effects and risks of the drug;

“(F) when a patient should contact his or her health care professional;

“(G) instructions not to share medications, and, if any exist, key storage requirements, and recommendations relating to proper disposal of any unused portion of the drug; and

“(H) known clinically important interactions with other drugs and substances.

“(c) TIMELINESS, CONSISTENCY, AND ACCURACY.—The regulations promulgated under subsection (a) shall include standards related to—

“(1) performing timely updates of drug information as new drugs and new information becomes available;

“(2) ensuring that common information is applied consistently and simultaneously across similar drug products and for drugs within classes of medications in order to avoid patient confusion and harm; and

“(3) developing a process, including consumer testing, to assess the quality and effectiveness of PMI in ensuring that PMI promotes patient understanding and safe and effective medication use.

“(d) ELECTRONIC REPOSITORY.—The regulations promulgated under subsection (a) shall provide for the development of a publicly accessible electronic repository for all PMI documents and content to facilitate the availability of PMI.”

SEC. 303. PUBLICATION ON INTERNET WEBSITE.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall publish on the Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration a link to the Daily Med website (<http://dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed>) (or any successor website).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 30, 2013, at 11 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership: Achieving the Potential.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 30, 2013, at 9:15 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 30, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 30, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Nominations.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 30, 2013, at 2 p.m., in room SR-418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, INSURANCE, AND INVESTMENT

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 30, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The Jobs Act at a Year and a Half: Assessing Progress and Unmet Opportunities.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator MENENDEZ, I ask unanimous consent that Christopher Landberg, a detailee from the State Department and the Foreign Relations Committee, be granted floor privileges for the consideration of the nomination of Jacob Lew.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT REFERRAL—RHEA SUN SUH NOMINATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent as in executive session that the nomination of Rhea Sun Suh, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, sent to the Senate by the President on October 30, 2013, be referred jointly to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHIMP ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 228, S. 1561.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1561) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve provisions relating to the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “CHIMP Act Amendments of 2013”.

SEC. 2. SANCTUARY SYSTEM FOR SURPLUS CHIMPANZEES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 404K(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 283m(g)) is amended—

(1) *in paragraph (1)—*

(A) *by striking “and each subsequent fiscal year” and inserting “through fiscal year 2023”;*

(B) *by inserting after “\$30,000,000” the following: “, unless the Secretary determines that reserving additional funds would enable the Na-*

tional Institutes of Health to operate more efficiently and economically by decreasing the overall Federal cost of supporting and maintaining chimpanzees from fiscal year 2014 through fiscal year 2023. Such a determination shall be reported to Congress by the Secretary and shall include a report, to be updated biennially, regarding the care and maintenance of the chimpanzees and costs related to such care and maintenance”; and

(C) *by striking the last sentence; and*

(2) *in paragraph (3), by striking “board of directors” and inserting “Secretary, in consultation with the board of directors”.*

(b) *GAO STUDY.*—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an independent evaluation, and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report, regarding chimpanzees owned or supported by the National Institutes of Health. Such report shall review and assess—

(1) *the research status of National Institutes of Health-owned or supported chimpanzees;*

(2) *the cost for the care and maintenance of such chimpanzees, including the cost broken down by research or retirement status, location and for transportation, as appropriate;*

(3) *the extent to which matching requirements have been met pursuant to section 404K(e)(4) of the Public Health Service Act; and*

(4) *any options for cost-savings for the support and maintenance of such chimpanzees that may be identified.*

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1561), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION EXTENSION ACT OF 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3190.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3190) to provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the United States Parole Commission is scheduled to expire tomorrow. After significant bicameral negotiations, 2 weeks ago, the House of Representatives passed by unanimous consent a bipartisan bill, H.R. 3190, to reauthorize the commission for 5 years. Public safety demands that we pass this legislation swiftly and I urge the Senate to support its immediate enactment. We should have passed this bill weeks ago,

but a single Republican hold has placed us in the precarious position of seeking passage on the eve of expiration. This is not the way to protect public safety.

The Parole Commission is responsible for granting or denying parole for Federal and District of Columbia prisoners who were sentenced before the Federal and DC Governments abolished parole. The commission was created to consider the requests of these "old law" Federal and DC inmates, but it also has jurisdiction over more recent DC offenders who are on supervised release from prison. In addition, the commission supervises some military law offenders, State offenders in the witness protection program, and foreign-law offenders serving sentences in the United States.

The consequences of failing to reauthorize the commission would be dire. "Old law" Federal and DC inmates are required by law to receive periodic parole hearings. If the commission were unavailable to hold these hearings and declare that certain inmates should not be paroled, around 3,500 inmates would be released. Potentially dangerous individuals would be allowed to simply walk free without any assessment of the risk to public safety if this reauthorization does not pass the Senate immediately.

Failure to reauthorize the commission would have particularly harsh consequences for the District of Columbia. The commission currently sets the conditions of supervision for DC offenders and determines when those conditions have been violated. If the commission were to cease operations, around 9,000 offenders would no longer receive adequate supervision. These include extremely dangerous criminals, such as murderers and rapists.

Congress has consistently recognized the importance of the commission, reauthorizing it on 6 prior occasions. We last reauthorized the commission 2 years ago. At that time, the Republican-led House of Representatives unanimously passed a bill to extend the commission for 3 years, but a single Senator blocked the bill and insisted on only a 2-year extension.

So we are here now, 2 years later, and the House has appropriately passed a bipartisan 5-year extension. I have been working with the House since July on this straightforward reauthorization. As the House recognizes, the need for the commission will not cease within the next 5 years. In fact, it is estimated that Federal "old-law" offenders will require parole decisions for the next 35 years.

I hope we can agree to this 5-year extension, which includes extensive annual reporting requirements that will allow Congress to conduct oversight of the commission. All of the reporting requirements from the last reauthorization are included, along with new requirements related specifically to the

District of Columbia. There is nothing objectionable in this bill, and there is no substantive reason for anyone to block it.

The events of the past few weeks have shown deep divisions in the House Republican caucus. But one thing on which all 232 House Republicans agree is that the Parole Commission should be reauthorized for another 5 years. They all agreed that releasing potentially dangerous prisoners was a bad idea. This bill is not controversial.

As I have mentioned before, Senator PAUL and I and others are working in a bipartisan manner on sentencing reform. We believe that judges should have more discretion in sentencing when a mandatory minimum sentence is unnecessary and counterproductive. The extension of the Parole Commission is quite a different matter, however. If the commission is not reauthorized, there will be no one to decide whether thousands of offenders are ready for parole. These inmates will simply be released.

I want to commend the sponsor of the House bill, Congressman STEVE CHABOT, along with co-sponsors Chairman BOB GOODLATTE and Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS of the House Judiciary Committee, and Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER and Ranking Member BOBBY SCOTT of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigations. They understood the urgency and imminent consequences of inaction. Unfortunately, some in the Senate did not share that position and now we are up against the final deadline. It is time to end these petty games and to let Congress do its job. We must pass this bill now.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3190) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SCHOOL BUS SAFETY MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 278, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 278) designating October 2013 as "School Bus Safety Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 278) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL RECESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H. Con. Res. 62, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 62) providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 62) was agreed to.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, October 31, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the Watt nomination, with the time until 12 noon equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. At noon, Senator-elect Booker will be sworn in, so I ask unanimous consent that following the swearing-in of Senator-elect Booker, there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form prior to a cloture vote on the Watt nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. The first rollcall vote will be at approximately 12:10 p.m. tomorrow on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of MEL WATT to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:43 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 31, 2013, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

JOSEPH S. HEZIR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE STEVEN JEFFREY ISAKOWITZ, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

NANI A. COLORETTI, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, VICE DANIEL M. TANGHERLINI, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

JONATHAN ELKIND, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS), VICE DAVID B. SANDALOW, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

RHEA SUN SUH, OF COLORADO, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE, VICE THOMAS L. STRICKLAND, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CHARLES HAMMERMAN RIVKIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS AFFAIRS), VICE JOSE W. FERNANDEZ, RESIGNED.

ROBERT C. BARBER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ICELAND.

BATHSHEBA NELL CROCKER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS), VICE ESTHER BRIMMER, RESIGNED.

MARK GILBERT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO NEW ZEALAND.

TINA S. K Aidanow, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE COORDINATOR FOR COUNTERTERRORISM, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR AT LARGE, VICE DANIEL BENJAMIN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

THEODORE REED MITCHELL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF EDUCATION, VICE MARTHA J. KANTER.

MASSIE RITSCH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE PETER CUNNINGHAM.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

WILLIAM A. LAPLANTE, JR., OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE SUE C. PAYTON.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

STANTON J. J. APPLONE
CORY L. BAKER
ERICKA R. BRIGGS
XAVIER V. BRUCE
LEA ANN CALDERWOOD
CHARLES F. CAMBRON, JR.
TANYA M. DEAR
GEORGE A. DELANEY, JR.
JUSTIN J. EDER
RONALD B. ELLER
JEFFREY S. FEWELL
PETER B. FRENCH
JENNIFER H. GARRISON
CARISSA E. GRANT
MICHAEL T. HAMILTON
JOSEPH G. INDOMENICO, JR.
PAUL J. JONES
MICHAEL J. KERSTEN
SHAUNDRA D. KNIGHT
STACEY C. KRISHNA
JOHN A. LANE
THOMAS WARREN LESNICK
JOHN P. MCFARLANE
LAURIE R. MCKENNA

CHARLES R. MONIZ
KATHY A. NAYLOR
RICHARD A. PALMER
CHRISTOPHER M. PALUMBO
JAMES W. PAYETTE
VICKY V. PRATT
JASON P. RICHTER
JAMES MARINUS ROBERTSON, JR.
SILVIA E. ROBLEDO
REGINALD L. SENNIE
DAVID E. TATUM
DAVID C. THOMPSON II
SHARON K. WILLIAMS
STEPHENIE D. WILLIAMS
DANIEL P. ZABLOTSKY
RICHARD J. ZAVADIL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

JAMES D. ATHNOS
KETH ALLEN BILLMAN, JR.
MICHAEL D. BRIDGES
MIMI BYRD
TRICIA C. CAIN
RICHARD H. CAMPBELL
EDUARDO CERVANTES
DANIEL CHAVEZ
SCOTT D. COOK
MELISSA R. COPELAND
JOSHUA S. CURTIS
MIKE DAVIDQUINTERO
COURTNEY E. DAY
JOHN J. DECATALDO, JR.
DONELLA D. DENT
ARETHA Q. DIX
MARSHA M. DOLDRON BRYAN
EDGARDO DONOVAN
JASON L. DONOVANT
JASON M. ESTES
STACEY P. FACKELMAN
REGINALD JAMES FICKLIN, JR.
WENDY M. FRANKE
MONICA M. GOMEZ ARENAS
MATTHEW J. GROSS
BRETT R. HADLEY
CODY JOHN HESS
JILL M. HIBBERT
JESSICA A. HILL
MICHAEL S. JOHNSON
OCTAVIA LORRAINE JONES
JACKIELOU E. KIM
TONY G. LAWRENCE
MICHAELA C. LEWIS
WILLIAM CALEB LUNSFORD
JAMES E. MCDANIEL
CHRISTOPHER P. MCMILLIAN
ANDREA MOORE
EDWARD J. MORRIS
THOMAS PATRICK NAUGHTON
CLINTON H. NAWROCKI
MICHAEL ANDREW OETJENS
HIRAM J. ORTIZ
JOSHUA D. PETER
REBECCA LYNN POWERS
JENNIFER ANN PREYER
KIMBERLY T. PRICE
JANELLE JUST QUINN
CANDIDO RAMIREZ
BEATA H. ROSSON
JOSEPH L. SANCHEZ, JR.
CHRISTINE A. SANDERS
AMBER C. SCHINDELE
DUANE P. SCHREIBER
WILLIAM DAVID SHERMAN
CHRISTY J. SNOW
SARA M. SPEARING
JEFFERY ALAN TAYLOR, JR.
KRIS E. WALKER
SARAH MONROE WHITSON
STEPHEN M. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

PAIGE T. ABBOTT
JOSEPH A. ASCHERL
WILLIAM MARLIN BARRETT
JOHN HARRISON BONDHUS
CLARENCE LEONARD BOROWSKI
SCOTT C. BRIDGERS
STEPHEN H. BUNTING
SCOTT PHILIP CHAMBERS
WILLIAM D. CLARK
RICHARD LEE COFFEY III
LYNN E. COLE
MICHAEL LAWRENCE CORNELL
PATRICK K. COTTER
ROBERT E. CULCASI
RICHARD C. DAVISON
RONALD D. DEAL
CURTIS R. DEKEYREL
ANTHONY T. DICARLO
MICHAEL F. DONNELLY
JOHN DOWLING
FREDERICK W. DYSON
MARY A. ENGES
SHAWN D. FORD
THOMAS F. FORRESTER
JOSEPH EDMOND FRANCOEUR

JED J. FRENCH
SHAWN J. GAFFNEY
MICHAEL R. GIRARDIN
THOMAS J. GOBLIRSCH
MARK A. GOODWILL
THOMAS F. GRABOWSKI
ROBERT TIMOTHY GREGORY
LARRY WILLIAM GRIFIN, JR.
MARK RENE GROVES
JOSEPH R. HARRIS II
THOMAS B. HATLEY
MARK THOMAS HAYES
LARS R. HERTIG
GREGG J. HESTERMAN
BRADLEY GENE HINKLE
KELLY J. HUGHES
RHONDA M. JAHNS
STEVEN FRANCE JAMISON
STANLEY L. JONES
BRENDA J. C. JORDAN
KIM R. JOYE
DAVID MATTHEW KEELY
BRIAN D. KELLY
JEFFREY SCOTT KING
ROBERT CHRISTOPHER KORTE
EDWARD H. KRAFFT
SHAROLYN K. LANGE
MICHAEL R. LIGHTNER
SIGURD A. LOKENSGARD
COREY MCBETH LOVE
MICHAEL J. LOVELL
KURT M. MALLORY
THOMAS HAROLD MCKENNA
SUSAN L. MELTON
GORDON R. MEYER
JOHN C. MIGET
BRIAN DAVID MILLER
JOHN RODNEY MINER
DAVID J. MOUNKES
JAMES JULIUS MUSCATELLO
JAMES RICHARD NICHOLS
MARVIN E. NIELSEN, JR.
JAMES WILLIAM NOLAN
JOHN FITZGERALD O'CONNELL
REBECCA L. O'CONNOR
FREDERICK W. OLISON
DAVID A. OLSON
ERIC J. OSWALD
DUKE M. OTA, JR.
RONALD CHRISTOPHER PARKER
RICHARD WAYNE POPLIN
BRIAN D. PORTER
FRANK A. RODMAN
WILLIAM G. ROGERS, SR.
MICHAEL D. RUMSEY
WANDA E. RUSHTON
JAMES P. RYAN
JEFFREY L. RYAN
TORRENCE W. SAXE
MEREDITH LEE SHAW
KEVIN R. SHOMIN
JON J. SHOWALTER
THOMAS E. SHULER
VICTOR STARY SIKORA
CHRISTOPHER LEE SMITH
JOHN J. SMITH
MICHAEL W. STINSON
CHRISTIANE M. TABATZKY
VICTOR LEE TEAL, JR.
PETER MERRITT THALHEIMER
BRUCE J. THERIAULT
JEFFREY J. TIDWELL
BRIAN J. TOLLEFSON
ROBERT ANDERSON UNDERWOOD
DAVID S. URE
RICHARD D. VATT
MICHAEL T. VENERDI
CHARLES M. WALKER
JAMES E. WALKER
JUSTIN R. WALRATH
DAVID W. WALTER
KEITH Y. WARD
DOUGLAS S. WESKAMP
BRYAN S. WHITE
DAVID WILLIAM WILEY
JEFFREY L. WILKINSON
JERALD K. WILLIAMS
MISTY MICHELLE ZELK
RENO JOSEPH ZISA

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

STEVEN T. GREINER
MARGERY M. HANFELT
JAMES F. KOTERSKI
PEDRO J. RICO
CHERYL D. SOFALY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

STANLEY T. BREUER
ERICA R. CLARKSON
DEYDRE S. TEYHEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

KIMBERLEE A. AIELLO
WILLIAM P. ARGO
ERIC E. BAILEY
STEPHEN A. BARNES
CARLENE A.S. BLANDING
JAMIE A. BLOW
MICHAEL D. BRENNAN
MICHAEL F. BRESLIN
AMY C.S. BRINSON
EVA K. CALERO
DAVID J. CARPENTER, JR.
KEVIN E. COOPER
SOO L. DAVIS
DENIS G. DESCARREAU
ERIC S. EDWARDS
ROBERT F. HOWE
DENNIS B. KILIAN
HEATHER A. KNESS
KAREN M. KOPYDLOWSKI
AMY K. KORMAN
KERRY A. LEFRANCIS
KENNETH A. LEMONS
RICHARD S. LINDSAY III
JOHN A. MCMURRAY
JOHN J. MELTON
KEVIN K. PITZER
JOSEPH C. RHENEY

KEVIN W. ROBERTS
PHILIP E. SHERIDAN
RACHELE M. SMITH
THOMAS C. TIMMES
JOHN D. VIA
KEITH A. WAGNER
JEFFREY S. YARVIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

ROBIN M. ADAMSMASSENBURG
CARLOS C. AMAYA
RICHARD A. BEHR
MARGARET A. COLLIER
TAMARA L. CRAWFORD
SPENCER D. DICKENS, JR.
TONYA F. DICKERSON
TERESA A. DUQUETTEFRAME
LORI A. FRITZ
MICHAEL W. GREENLY
SHAROYN L. HARRIS
DIANA J. HEINZ
MELISSA J. HOFFMAN
CHRISTINE M. KRAMER
DAVID MENDOZA
TAMMIE W.H. MORTON
MICHELLE L. MUNROE
ELIZABETH A. MURRAY
JENNIFER ROBINSON
LETICIA SANDROCK

REBEKAH J. SARSFIELD
ALLEN D. SMITH
VERONICA A. VILLAFRANCA

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 30, 2013:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ALAN F. ESTEVEZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

INTERNATIONAL BANKS

JACOB J. LEW, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

KATHERINE ARCHULETA, OF COLORADO, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, October 30, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAMER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 30, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KEVIN CRAMER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

MILITARY BUDGET WOES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day in America when Army Secretary John McHugh says that, in today's fiscal environment, the best case scenario for our military's budget is treacherous. Army Chief of Staff Ray Odierno said budget cuts hamper the military's ability to train its own troops.

While there is waste and overlap in every Federal agency—the Pentagon's budget not excluded—there is much to be said for Congress' doing its primary job of governing: passing a budget. For the last 4 years, we have seen the constraints that continuing resolution after continuing resolution have placed on our military.

Earlier this year, we saw the rigid requirements that harmed the Department of Defense when President Obama's sequester took place. Before these cuts, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said our defense program was already underfunded by 5 percent with modernization underfunded by 10 percent. Thankfully, Con-

gress took quick action that allowed the DOD to operate under a budget in order to meet all of their fiscal requirements and have more flexibility as they absorbed the across-the-board sequester cuts.

General Odierno revealed this week that just two Army brigades are combat-ready and that training has come to a halt. This is a terrifying reality given that only 2 months ago President Obama addressed Congress and the public, asking for support for a military attack on Syria. We absolutely cannot send our troops who are not trained, not equipped, and not prepared into harm's way. Our military readiness should never, ever be threatened like this. As the world's superpower, our Armed Forces must be ready to deploy thousands of troops should the need arise.

As the military continues finding ways to operate under current spending levels, it is also downsizing in Afghanistan and is preparing for future programs with no certainty of any financial stability. Our Nation has serious financial problems. Our deficit is growing; our spending is increasing; and it seems that, in nearly every budget battle, our military is thrown in as a bargaining chip. This is not the American way, and it must become a thing of the past. Other government agencies have bloated budgets with wasteful, overlapping programs, fraudulent spending, and blatant abuse of taxpayer dollars. All the while, our military budget is being stripped to its bare bones.

The last time I checked, Mr. Speaker, we were still a Nation at war. Now is not the time to gut essential programs for our warriors and their families. We owe it to our military to have them operate under regular order, pass and conference our appropriations bills so our fighters can continue to be the best and the most prepared in the world.

Texas' 25th District is home to Fort Hood, the Army's premier installation to train and deploy heavy forces, and it is one of the largest military installations in the world. Fort Hood ranks highest in terms of future capability and support, and it can sustain more than 50,000 soldiers and their families.

I urge my colleagues in Congress to honor our commitment to these troops and to put an end to the financial uncertainty in the military. Let's simply do just the right thing.

May God bless our troops. May God bless America.

And always in God we trust.

BUDGET CONFEREES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, budget conferees are now meeting—or will be meeting shortly—to negotiate a budget for the remainder of this fiscal year, and they have a real opportunity to look beyond that mission and to lay the groundwork for a long-term solution to our deficits that is balanced and restores certainty to our economy.

What we do not need are more gimmicks and partisan games like we will have today, frankly. We are going to have a vote on the resolution which is disapproving of the raising of the debt limit. Everybody knows that is not a real vote, and almost everybody on this floor knows that, if we pursued that policy, it would be damaging to America, to the military, as was just brought up, and to our Nation. Every Republican leader has said that not increasing the debt limit is an alternative that ought to be pursued. Yet, we have this vote. That resolution has already been rejected by the Senate, and it stands no chance of surviving a Presidential veto. It is, frankly, simply political cover and a waste of our time.

The keys to any budget solution, Mr. Speaker, must be compromise and a seriousness of purpose. Americans want to see that seriousness, and they want to see much, much, much less of the political gamesmanship, some of which we will practice today, unfortunately.

Republicans and Democrats, I believe, in looking beyond a small fix and toward negotiating a long-term solution, will find that we actually agree on many things. We agree that gradual reforms are better than sudden ones. We agree that sequestration is not a sensible approach to achieving deficit savings.

Let me say as an aside: no matter how many times it is said on this floor that the sequester is President Obama's policy, it will not make it fact. It is dead, flat wrong.

The sequester is incorporated in the Republican budget that was passed in this House just some months ago. No Democrat voted for that budget, because they believed the sequester—as the previous speaker said, but he voted for the budget which implemented the sequester—is harming our national security and harming our domestic security and harming our economy and harming the growth of jobs.

In fact, sequestration—which I point out to people starts with “s,” which

stands for “stupid”—is a terrible approach that was never meant to come into practice. Many of us all agree that, in replacing the sequester, we will need to find savings through revenue policies and reforms to mandatory spending that could pay dividends for the budget and the economy in the future.

The key to compromise, of course, is balance. Every American understands that. Every husband, every wife, every parent understands that compromise is essential within a family, within a business, within a community, and, yes, within a country. The key to compromise is balance, which is what both the Domenici-Rivlin and Bowles-Simpson bipartisan commissions embraced as a framework for agreement.

A balanced compromise is critical because Democrats and Republicans are going to have to work together to pass any agreement through both Chambers and have it signed into law. Democrats are ready to make the tough decisions necessary to set our fiscal house in order, but we have made it clear that we will not allow the most vulnerable Americans to carry the burden of deficit reduction, and it is not necessary that they do so.

Our goal remains a balanced approach to deficit reduction and an agreement that restores certainty to our economy. My Republican colleagues and friends said much about restoring certainty, particularly in the 2010 election. Unfortunately, for our economy, for our businesses, for our people, we have done anything but restore certainty. In fact, we have governed by crisis—30 days, 90 days, 180 days, a year. Arbitrary deadlines were put in place, which brought the country to the brink of default and to the brink of closing down government. In fact, of course, just recently, we did, in fact, shut down the government.

Now, my Republican colleagues say we wanted that to happen on our side of the aisle. Ironically, 198 Democrats voted to open the government. That is to say, every Democrat who was voting on this floor voted to open government. Of my colleagues who say they didn't want to shut down government, 144 of them voted to keep the government shut down, Mr. Speaker, and 87 of them voted to open up the government.

So the American public is not fooled as to who wanted to shut down government, but it was a bad policy, and it led to uncertainty in our economy. Reaching an agreement only for this fiscal year, in addition, will mean more left to do, more of sequester left to replace, and more confidence to instill.

I hope the conferees will take a broader view and will send us a budget worthy of this Nation, worthy of the Nation it will serve—one that reflects our priorities to grow our economy, creates jobs, gives opportunity to our people, ensures that our national secu-

rity is protected and that our Nation's long-term competitiveness is enhanced.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we ought to do. That is what the American people expect us to do. That is what the American people hope we will do. Let's warrant the faith and confidence of the American people by keeping faith with them and with our country.

LOWER LEVEL OPERATIVES TO BLAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, is the administration aware of the actions that are taking place in the administration?

A little history:

Fast and Furious:

Everyone knows the President did not know about this tactic until he heard about it through the news media.

A quote from White House Press Secretary Jay Carney.

So lower level operatives blamed. No accountability.

Benghazi: 5 days after the attack, the administration still blamed it on a video. We learned later that the White House was told that this was a terrorist attack within 3 days of the attack.

So when did the President find out this was a terrorist attack?

In any event, no accountability. Video blamed. No one in the administration was held accountable, and the killers have not been brought to justice.

The Department of Justice's wiretapping of the Associated Press:

Other than press reports, we have no knowledge of any attempt by the Justice Department to seek phone records of the Associated Press.

Once again, this was from White House Press Secretary Jay Carney.

Lower level operatives blamed. No accountability.

The IRS scandal: The investigation was not a matter that should be conveyed to the President.

That was Jay Carney once again.

Lower level operatives blamed. No accountability.

ObamaCare Web site disaster: Secretary Sebelius claims the President was not aware of the Web site problems until the Web site was launched.

Once again, lower level operatives blamed. No accountability.

NSA spying on foreign leaders? U.S. officials claimed the President did not know about this. The President refuses to say whether he knew or not.

But anyway, lower level operatives officially blamed.

NSA spying on Americans: The President claims he did not know the extent of the spying on Americans.

Lower level operatives blamed. No accountability.

Mr. Speaker, exactly who is running the country—lower level operatives? Has the government gone wild? Is there a shadow government operating without the knowledge of the White House? Is the President out of tune with what is taking place in his own administration or is he aware of those actions?

If the President were unaware of all of this, the White House needs to hold people accountable, to hold these lower level operatives accountable for their actions—their improper actions, their bungling, their incompetence. The White House needs to fix this out-of-control government immediately.

The White House needs to take responsibility for the actions of his administration and quit blaming others and lower level operatives. That is the White House's responsibility. After all, to quote the constitutional law professor, “The buck stops with me.”

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1015

SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last night, I was at National Airport awaiting Delta Flight 3395, 9:52 p.m.

Shortly after 10 p.m., Janis Shenwari, his wife, and two small children emerged to be greeted by Captain Matt Zeller. They had been kept under wraps as they made their way from Afghanistan to the United States. There was just one television camera there to record this happy ending as Captain Zeller wrapped Janis in a big bear hug.

It was a happy ending to a story with many ups and downs, all too familiar for those of us who had been working with the Special Immigrant Visa program to secure the flight to safety from Iraq and Afghanistan for those foreign nationals who worked with Americans as drivers, as interpreters, as guides. Janis was an interpreter who saved the life of Captain Matt Zeller in a firefight.

He, for 5 years, has been stuck in sort of a bureaucratic limbo as Captain Zeller dedicated his time and energy to secure the release of a man he referred to as his brother. It happened—despite the fact that there was a false start where Janis had been given the visa, sold his possessions, prepared his family, only to have it revoked at the last minute—we think because the Taliban learned of this and leaked false information that he was, in fact, a collaborator.

His arrival to safety in the United States was testimony to a little bipartisan cooperation—some people in the much maligned faceless bureaucracy who went the extra mile, who administered a couple of polygraph tests to

him and, within 3 hours after the end of the government shutdown, reissued the visa and sent Janis and his family on their way to safety. They woke up this morning in their own little apartment in Arlington to a new life, but thousands who risked their lives for Americans are still held hostage, at risk themselves in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Earlier this month, in the midst of all the chaos surrounding the government shutdown and the harsh rhetoric on the floor, we were able to keep alive the visa program for Iraqis. We brought it back to life after it expired September 30. I would hope the same show of bipartisan support and bureaucratic activity, cooperation, and tenacity necessary to protect the visa program, and to make it work in the case of Janis, could be brought to bear to make sure that this program is extended for several years to allow escape to safety for other Iraqis in Afghanistan; that we can smooth the working of the agencies to expedite the granting of these visas from a trickle of a few dozen to a steady stream for the thousands whose lives are at risk because they helped Americans and they put their trust in us.

I think, as important as the lives of these people and their families are, and keeping our word, there is also a larger lesson, illustrating what can happen if we here in Congress are willing to work together. Yesterday, former House Minority Leader Bob Michel harkened back to an earlier era of extraordinary cooperation and civility that he enjoyed with Speaker Tom Foley.

Last night at the airport, I saw an example in this one family alive and well and safe of that same civility and cooperation. Who knows where that example might lead us next if we are willing to follow it?

REMEMBERING OUR NATION'S VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, Monday, November 11, will be Veterans Day. Veterans Day is very, very special to all Americans, but more so to me.

I am a veteran. Part of the reason I ran for Congress was I wanted to talk about veterans' issues. I was concerned about the VA. I was concerned about the claims that have gone so long. I was concerned about, particularly, the Vietnam veterans that have their claims in a stack that haven't been addressed and yet the clock is ticking. They are dying. In 5 years, some insurance person can probably tell you how many of those Vietnam veterans are going to be dead.

We have an obligation in this House as Americans to look after those that gave so much for our country, those

that gave their lives, people in this House here that gave their limbs, they have been wounded, still carry shrapnel in their body, still have a cloth and have NyQuil and wake up with a nightmare dreaming about a firefight in a way, or the DMZ, or what have you. The memories never go away.

We have an obligation to all Americans because, quite frankly, we are going to have another war in the future—I hope it is not in my lifetime—but there is always going to be a conflict, and we are going to call upon the military to do their job, and they will do their job. It is our responsibility to make sure we take care of those men and women that have given so much for their country.

Many, many years ago, in a place far, far away, I was a platoon commander. I had a lot of marines, great troops. Many of them never came back. Lance Corporal Borey, Lance Corporal Doran—I can go on and on. I am not here to impress you with my memory because it is no great feat. It is something when you were there with those people and you saw what happened; you realize the significance of Veterans Day and how we can never forget those people that gave so much.

So other than that day that is coming up very, very shortly, if you see a veteran, if you see somebody in the military, just say to them, thank you, because you care and you also remember.

REMEMBERING SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a week ago Monday, October 21, was the 1-year anniversary of the death of my friend, Senator George McGovern of South Dakota.

We shared the same last name, but we weren't related. I interned for him when I was in college and he was in the United States Senate. I embraced his liberalism. I admired his service to our country in World War II, where he served as a bomber pilot, and I respected very much his politics, the way he did politics, understanding the importance of reaching across the aisle, of working to build coalitions to solve big problems. In particular, I admired the work that he did to end hunger, working with people like Senator Bob Dole, a Republican from Kansas. He even worked with President Richard Nixon, who defeated him in the 1972 election, winning 49 States over Senator McGovern.

President Nixon held the first and only White House conference on food and nutrition. That conference helped spur a whole bunch of legislative activity aimed at improving nutrition for

everybody in this country and aimed at ending hunger, which was a problem. George McGovern and Bob Dole, and even Richard Nixon, believed that in the richest country in the history of the world nobody ought to go hungry. I think of Senator McGovern often, especially now when I see what is happening in this Congress.

On Friday, November 1, a couple of days from now, the moneys that were put into the SNAP program, formerly known as food stamps, to help provide additional resources for people to buy food in this country, those reinvestment moneys will come to an end. There will be a \$5 billion cut in the SNAP program on Friday. Every single beneficiary will see a reduction in their food benefit. That includes 22 million kids, 9 million elderly people and disabled, and it includes 900,000 veterans.

We say we want to support our veterans, but many of them have come back and found it difficult to find a job or found it difficult to find a job that pays a living wage, and they rely on the SNAP program so they can put food on the table for their families. Yet, on Friday, 900,000 veterans who are on the SNAP program will see a reduction in their benefit. A family of three will see a reduction of about \$30 per month in their benefit. That is about 16 meals a month for a family of three.

That is an awful thing that is about to happen, but what is more awful is what is coming down the road. This House of Representatives passed a farm bill that includes, on top of this \$5 billion cut, an additional \$40 billion in cuts in the SNAP program. That would mean 3.8 million people currently receiving the benefit will be thrown off the program.

Hundreds of thousands of children who rely on the free breakfast and lunch program will lose that benefit. I have been to many schools where I have seen kids staring off into space because they haven't had anything to eat. You can't learn if you are hungry.

That \$40 billion cut that this House of Representatives voted for would throw 170,000 veterans off the program entirely.

Today, we are going to have the first meeting of the conference committee on the farm bill. I am privileged enough to be one of the conferees. I am going to tell my colleagues that I want very much for there to be a farm bill. I represent a lot of agriculture in Massachusetts. My farmers want a farm bill. Farmers all across the country want a farm bill. We need a farm bill for this country. I am willing to be flexible and I am willing to compromise and I am willing to accept things that maybe I don't like entirely because that is the way you compromise.

What I am not willing to do, and what every Member of this House

should not be willing to do, is to support a farm bill that makes hunger worse in this country. As we speak, there are 50 million Americans who are hungry—50 million; 17 million are kids. We all should be ashamed.

Who is to blame for this? We all share the blame because hunger is a political condition. We can solve this. We know what to do. We just don't have the political will. We kind of turn a blind eye to the problem of hunger in America.

It is a problem, by the way, that not only costs dearly in terms of human suffering, but it costs us all in terms of kids who can't learn in school and avoidable health care costs.

We need a farm bill, Mr. Speaker, but let the price of that farm bill not be to increase hunger in America. Let's remember George McGovern, let's remember Bob Dole, let's remember people who understood the importance of combating hunger in America.

SUGAR VALLEY AIRPORT'S SPIRIT OF AVIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the poem "Impressions of a Pilot" opens with the line: "Flight is freedom in its purest form."

How perfectly that captures the allure of sky and space for so many who dreamed to conquer that frontier. Freedom and flight are inextricably linked.

This past Saturday, many young North Carolinians got to experience that freedom in a brand new way at Davie County Sugar Valley Airport. What a joy it was to be there.

A dedicated team of volunteers at the airport hosted "The Spirit of Aviation: The Next Generation" to introduce local students to the many career and recreational opportunities available to them through aviation.

Children and teens from local counties spent the day exploring aircraft, trying their hand at flight simulators, listening to aviation innovators, and even taking flight themselves in "young eagle" flight expeditions.

□ 1030

Their faces were alight with excitement as they experimented with the physics of flight and felt the contagious enthusiasm of skilled aviators who, after years, still find freedom in the blue's high tide.

The Spirit of Aviation Day at Sugar Valley revealed to young people new career possibilities for their lives, and didn't just stoke the dream of aviation, but presented a step-by-step path students might take to see aviation dreams become a reality.

What stands out to me more than anything else is that this day of dis-

covery and imagination was made possible by a community independently committed to encouraging the next generation of aerial pioneers—whether pilots, mechanics, or engineers.

Yes, the spirit of volunteerism and community service is alive and well in North Carolina. In fact, it is thriving; and every time I am home visiting nonprofits and meeting the people who make up their various support networks, I am proud of the Tar Heel State. The initiative and benevolent entrepreneurialism displayed by Carolinians contributes new chapters often to the collective record of American service.

The accomplishment of volunteers at the Sugar Valley Airport is just one example.

In 2010, a group of North Carolinians came together through Winston-Salem's nonprofit Human Service Alliance and bought the Sugar Valley Airport. Their hope was that the airport would facilitate the promotion of aviation, both as a sport and career field ripe with competitive jobs.

In 3 short years, with a dedicated team of volunteers supplying 100 percent of the vision, manpower, support, and direction, the airport has come to serve as a hub for flight enthusiasts and learning center for those considering the pursuit of pilot or mechanic work. In any given week, the airport may host Boy Scouts, civil air patrol cadets, experimental aviation enthusiasts, leading women pilots, and aviation ground school students.

North Carolinians take great pride in our "first in flight" distinction. It was on our Outer Banks that Wilbur and Orville Wright pushed the limits of gravity and completed history's first recorded controlled powered airplane flights.

With the commitment of the team at the Sugar Valley Airport, I can confidently say that our State, the home of Kitty Hawk, is intent on being the home of great aviators and pioneering aviation contributions for years to come.

Guidance and encouragement from Sugar Valley's seasoned pilots, mechanics, and generous volunteers will continue to open a new world of opportunity to children in North Carolina.

In this world above the clouds, our children are free to dream, free to soar, and free to conquer the wild blue yonder and much, much more.

THANK YOU, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, last week the Export-Import Bank transferred to the United States Treasury more than \$1 billion. The Export-Import Bank does not draw on the U.S.

Treasury; it contributes to it. The Export-Import Bank has never drawn on the U.S. Treasury.

Instead, the Export-Import Bank does the following: it creates jobs. By independent assessment, more than 255,000 jobs are created by the bank, jobs that otherwise would not exist. The Export-Import Bank helps small businesses. Indeed, 87 percent of all transactions of the bank directly benefit small businesses.

But I ask you not to take my word for it. I would invite each and every Member of the House to go to the Web site and check the data about the number of transactions in their State and in their congressional district, and how that has helped to grow the economy.

The fact of the matter is that every single developed or developing nation in the world has some form of export assistance, be it direct loan guarantee or direct loans. And theirs, by the way, are proportionally larger as a percent of GDP on average than ours. If we were to discontinue it, it would be the equivalent of unilaterally disarming in an increasingly competitive global economy.

So, one more time: last week, the Export-Import Bank reduced our Nation's deficit by more than \$1 billion. The Export-Import Bank creates jobs. It helps small businesses. The Export-Import Bank makes America stronger.

Thank you, Export-Import Bank.

STOP BUREAUCRACY FROM CRUSHING OUR OPPORTUNITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, first, I appreciate being recognized for these 5 minutes, although it is always dangerous when a Member starts walking towards the microphone and they are doing it because something hit their desk and it annoyed them.

We have been working on something in our office to try to explain an intense frustration I have, and that is Washington and its embracing of delusional math. Look, I have only been here 3 years, and I have come to the conclusion that the single biggest problem I see is not the right-left continuum, but those who own calculators and those who don't; those who live in a world where math actually has a value. And this will make sense, hopefully, in a moment.

I am right now holding a CBO report, the "2013 Long-Term Budget Outlook." Yet I have not heard someone else come to this microphone, but there is just the beginning of a paragraph that should terrify you:

Federal debt as a percentage of GDP in 2038 under the extended baseline is projected to be about twice as large as the amount estimated in last year's report.

Do you understand what this report is saying? That because of the policies from this administration, the policies coming out of our bureaucracies and the things we need to actually deal with in this House, the numbers are almost twice as bad as they were last year. That is the speed we are going to hit 100 percent of debt to GDP. And the thing you need to understand is that it is worse than in the long-term budget outlook forecast because there are delusions built into that, because we here as a body instruct the Congressional Budget Office saying, Follow current law; that's what you need to budget off of.

How many of us here come January when the SGR is up, and many of you will know it as "doc fix," are going to hold the numbers, hold the current law with the understanding at the end of about a dozen years, doctors who see Medicare patients are going to be paid 73 percent less. So we will walk onto the floor here probably in December or January and fix the SGR so doctors are compensated so they continue to see their Medicare patients, and we blow up the numbers in the long-term budget forecast, and we do that on lots of things. So when you actually do the adjustment for math reality, policy reality, the long-term budget numbers are much, much worse than we talk about around here.

And now to my point.

A year and a half ago, we actually did something bipartisan. We did something called the JOBS Act. In the scale of things, it was small; but there were some neat things in there. One of the things I fixated on was something called "crowdfunding," an opportunity to help the truly little entrepreneur. This was only up to \$1 million, and it was using this thing called the Internet to be able to raise money so if you are the cupcake shop or the mechanic shop, or you have some idea where you can begin getting some angel investment and get going, well the SEC took a year and a half to do what was supposed to be a simple rule set, so they are a year late.

And here is what they brought us: this is the law, these handful of pages, six, seven pages is the crowdfunding portion of the JOBS Act. Here is the 550-page proposed rule-set.

So if we are in a world where we have crushing debt screaming towards us, and some of that is coming now because we are being told that the new normal is a 2 percent GDP growth, we need to be doing things that accelerate that economic growth, or we are in incredible trouble.

So as the House, bipartisan, we passed the JOBS Act, which is one of the little increments that is supposed to reach out and help grow the economy, and then the bureaucracy hands us crushing rules that make it almost impossible to use.

So for whoever is listening, watching, caring about things like the crowd-funding rules that are before the SEC, you have 90 days from now. Please go online, make comments, help them understand that this is supposed to be helping the next generation of small entrepreneurs in this country, and don't make it 550 pages of bureaucratic legalese. It can be simpler. We can handle this. We can do great things in this country, but we can't do it if the bureaucracy continues to crush our opportunities.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we close out the month to recognize October as Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

Even as Congress has struggled with the basic task of funding our Federal Government, we are mindful that we have pressing problems and important work to do to raise awareness and help women survive this deadly disease.

Over the last few decades, these public efforts have helped educate people and promote awareness about breast cancer, but we must remain vigilant in the fight because there is so much more to be done.

The statistics are sobering: one in eight women will get breast cancer in her lifetime. This disease strikes women—and some men—of all backgrounds, races, ethnicities, and ages. While all women are at risk, many still think it can't happen to them, especially young women. But I know all too well that it can. In 2007, when I was just 41 years old, I learned I had breast cancer.

While we have made significant advances on some fronts, recent studies show that more and more young women are being diagnosed with breast cancer, and metastasis rates are not going down.

I believe we have a responsibility as Members of Congress to take Breast Cancer Awareness Month one step further and turn awareness into action. We must take action to implement the Affordable Care Act and continue to ensure that every single person in this country has access to the information they need to make informed decisions about their health.

We must take action to ensure women get the preventative services and screenings they need, while understanding their risks and treatment options.

With this in mind, in 2009 I sponsored the Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act, or the EARLY Act. The EARLY Act focus on equipping young women with the tools they need to take charge of their health.

Currently, the Centers for Disease Control is developing evidence-based interventions and working with advocacy organizations on programs that provide support services for young breast cancer survivors and their families, as well as a national education and awareness campaign to help young women understand their risk and take charge of their health.

Even with the CDC's work under the EARLY Act, we must do more to assist those women who survive breast cancer, and I am developing new legislative efforts on this front. I am working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Young cancer survivors face very different life challenges than older survivors—from fertility preservation issues to the long-term health and neurocognitive effects of cancer treatments. With cancer care, one size does not fit all. The young face many more years as survivors and have unique challenges that arise that are not experienced by survivors who are diagnosed later in life.

There was good news from the Supreme Court earlier this year when they took some action to help improve our ability to detect, diagnose, and treat breast cancer. This past June, the Justices ruled unanimously that a company cannot patent naturally occurring genes. This decision paves the way for more companies to offer genetic tests for gene mutations that significantly increase the risk of developing diseases like breast or ovarian cancer. Thanks to this ruling, more women will have access to affordable testing and second-opinion testing about their risks and courses of treatment.

Like many others before me, when I was diagnosed with breast cancer and later identified as a BRAC2 gene mutation carrier, I had to make life-altering decisions without the benefit of a second opinion or even a second test. That will now be a thing of the past thanks to the Supreme Court decision.

Again, though, there is still so much more to be done. We must work to guarantee that insurers, including programs like Medicare, cover testing where appropriate and preventative surgery where necessary.

And there is still work left to be done to fully implement the Affordable Care Act. While implementation of any major change comes with great changes—and we have certainly had some of those—it also comes with great reward. For example, I am thrilled that this coming January, with the opening of the health insurance marketplaces, no woman will ever have to worry again about being dropped from her health coverage when battling breast cancer.

□ 1045

Before the Affordable Care Act, too many Americans were just one diagnosis away from having to face cancer

without affordable, quality coverage that could not be taken away.

A case in point is my friend Mary Ann Wasil of the Get in Touch Foundation. She wrote me a few weeks ago to say her life literally depends on the Affordable Care Act. Mary Ann is battling advanced breast cancer. She is currently on COBRA insurance. When that runs out, she would surely be uninsurable without the Affordable Care Act. Mary Ann's chemotherapy treatment for the month of July alone was \$110,000. Simply put, without coverage she could not afford the treatment she needs. Her note to me said: "This is real for me. It is life or death for me."

This is why the Affordable Care Act is so important for breast cancer warriors like Mary Ann.

I have had so many women come up to me, Mr. Speaker, and confess that they haven't had a mammogram in years because before the Affordable Care Act, they could not afford the expensive copays and deductibles or feared the prohibitive costs of treatment. They were literally afraid to get a diagnosis because they were worried they couldn't afford treatment.

That worry is a thing of the past. Education and awareness is only half the battle. For breast cancer or any serious disease, access to affordable, quality health insurance is a necessity. It is not a privilege. It is a right for every American. Looking forward, we must work together to help women know their risks, discover cancer early, and access the best treatment possible.

As we continue to learn more and help more young women, let us commemorate Breast Cancer Awareness Month with a renewed dedication to support our mothers, sisters, daughters, and sister-friends. Together, let's eradicate breast cancer once and for all.

THE AMERICAN HELLENIC INSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the American Hellenic Institute, known as AHI.

This year, AHI will be holding its 12th annual conference in my hometown of Miami. The conference provides an opportunity for the Greek American community to reflect on its role in American society and to advance and, indeed, strengthen U.S.-Greek relations.

This will also include an awards banquet in which two members of the Miami area will be recognized for their service to the south Florida community and for promoting Hellenic ideals and values. This year's recipients of the Hellenic Heritage Public Service Award are Gus Andy and John Haralambides.

John, who passed away, sadly, earlier this year, was the embodiment of all that AHI stands for. His legacy will forever live on through his deeds and through the school that he founded, the Archimedean Academy. I have had the privilege of being at that school, and I can account for its academic curriculum, which is simply outstanding.

I congratulate the American Hellenic Institute, Gus Andy, and the family and friends of John for this important and meaningful recognition.

IN RECOGNITION OF TONY ARGIZ

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and congratulate my good friend, Tony Argiz, who has been selected by the American Jewish Committee in south Florida to receive its 2013 National Human Relations Award.

Tony has been an active member of our south Florida community for many years, so this honor is well deserved. He continues to play a vital role in enhancing and promoting the important relationship between the United States and Israel.

This Human Relations Award is presented to leaders whose work within the community reflects the mission of the AJC, building bridges of understanding, and promoting freedom and democracy throughout the world. As Tony Argiz understands, in this dangerous time, we must stand together with our ally, the Democratic Jewish State of Israel, and continue to work together to preserve this oasis of freedom in a desert of oppression.

Congratulations to Tony Argiz and to the American Jewish Committee in south Florida.

PROTECTING WOMEN AND GIRLS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, involved citizens help our communities on important issues in order to raise awareness on human trafficking and help put an end to domestic violence.

Domestic violence and human trafficking are widespread human rights violations that continue to plague our world, cutting across racial lines, ethnic lines, geographic borders. As a wife, mother, grandmother, and a female Member of Congress, I realize the profound responsibility that I have to work together with my congressional colleagues to pass legislation in a bipartisan manner that would speak to the very heart of each and every woman.

As long as young girls and women across the globe continue to struggle to break through the shame and the silence that surrounds domestic violence and sexual trafficking, we must continue to put these issues on every national and global agenda. This year, Congress reauthorized the Trafficking Victims Protection Act and the Violence Against Women Act, two critical pieces of legislation to address the needs of these vulnerable members of our global society.

I recently cosponsored two important resolutions to raise awareness on the need to protect women from the horrible attacks that they face. I will soon introduce legislation to amend current U.S. law that unintentionally facilitates domestic violence by forcing the return of a child in international child abduction cases despite a recognized risk to the child or the parent.

But the reality is, Mr. Speaker, that government alone cannot combat these horrendous crimes against girls and women. We need your help. As a community, we have the obligation to fight these crimes and protect girls and women from domestic violence and human trafficking. Awareness is key in stopping these human rights abuses. These crimes are on the rise, but together we can make a difference. We must make a difference.

Be the difference today in your community.

THE HOMEOWNER FLOOD INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act, a bipartisan bill to delay further implementation of flood insurance rate increases that took effect on October 1, 2013, under the National Flood Insurance Program.

Congress last year, on a bipartisan basis, passed the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012. The measure included long overdue reforms to strengthen the financial solvency and administration efficiency of the National Flood Insurance Program. The rationale for the 2012 law was the need for the National Flood Insurance Program to more accurately reflect flood risk.

Historically, most low-risk States subsidize high-risk coastal States. Similarly, low-risk areas within States tended to subsidize those areas with higher risk, which were more prone to flooding.

The linchpin of the 2012 law was to use true actuarial rates in order to prevent very low-risk areas from subsidizing moderate- to high-risk areas.

The unintended consequence has been drastic premium increases for those plans that were traditionally subsidized by the National Flood Insurance Program. Under the 2012 law, Congress mandated that the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, complete an affordability study to further evaluate any unintended consequences as a result of the changes. This study was to be completed before the rate increases went into effect, which was crucial to understanding the full scope of the new risk model.

FEMA has failed to complete the affordability study that was required

under the law. Additionally, it remains a huge concern that FEMA does not have the data it needs to accurately determine risk under this new policy regime and is incapable of creating a new mapping system that truly reflects true actuarial rates.

While 80 percent of policyholders will not see increases as a result of the new policy, a small portion of properties are being hit with staggering increases. This is a serious concern for communities and individuals across the country, including many from the Fifth District of Pennsylvania, which I am proud to represent.

I joined yesterday with colleagues on both sides of the aisle as an original cosponsor of the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act, legislation to delay, for 2 years, the higher rates brought on by the 2012 law until there is an affordability study completed by FEMA. The bill also makes structural changes at FEMA to assure that there is an advocate for homeowners when flood maps are drawn or adjusted.

Mr. Speaker, improving the financial viability of the Nation's Flood Insurance Program while ensuring that the program protects those it was designed to support is something every Member of Congress should support. I encourage my colleagues to join in this common-sense effort to protect and improve our Nation's Flood Insurance Program by cosponsoring the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Once again, we come to ask wisdom, patience, peace, and understanding for the Members of this people's House.

On this day, we ask Your blessing on the men and women, citizens all, whose votes have populated this people's House. Each Member of this House has been given the sacred duty of representing them.

Today, we mourn the loss of former Congressman Ike Skelton, a true public servant and staunch supporter of our

military. May he and his family find solace and peace at this time. Bring each of us, at last, to that place where our hearts will rest in You.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause one, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LANKFORD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

AMERICANS DESERVE BETTER

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in 2009, President Obama made a promise his administration had no intention of keeping:

If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor, period. If you like your health plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away, no matter what.

Today's Washington Post bestows upon this moment of rhetorical splendor, and others like it, four Pinocchios for the grievousness and frequency of their erring.

It turns out, by design, the Affordable Care Act is diminishing private health insurance plans, particularly in the individual market.

The Post concludes:

The President's promise apparently came with a very large caveat: "If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan—if we deem it to be adequate."

For millions, Washington has deemed their personal health care preferences deficient, and come January they won't have access to the plans they had before.

Americans deserve better.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

(Ms. SINEMA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

My first real job back in 1993 was at a domestic violence shelter. I was in college studying to become a social worker. During my time at the shelter, I helped women and children at our shelter escape the cycle of abuse. Some women came through our doors again and again before finally getting free.

That is why I worked hard to pass the Violence Against Women Act for these very families. Yet too often, women in our country escape their abusers for only a short time. Some abusers track down women and children in order to keep the cycle of abuse going.

VAWA helps these families stay safe from their abusers, like Jane, who lives in Phoenix with her three kids. Jane and her kids fled their home State and moved to Arizona to escape their abuser. He had been chasing Jane and the kids for years, following them from home to shelter to their next home. Jane couldn't get away from him. When she came to Arizona, Arizona's Address Confidentiality Program provided her with an alternative address to use legally instead of her real address. It prevented her abuser from finding her. Thanks to VAWA Jane is safe.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will all double down to end domestic violence in this country.

HONORING RUTH HERRINK

(Mr. WITTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory and the spirit of a true community leader, Ruth Herrink. Ruth served as the editor and publisher of the King George Journal in King George County, Virginia.

Ruth passed away on Saturday, October 12, at the age of 87 after decades of service to her community.

Ruth was "indomitable," in the words of her daughter, Jessica, and "always wanted to promote things that were positive for the community."

The communities in and around King George County and our great Commonwealth of Virginia have lost an eminent spirit that connected and energized those around her.

Ruth's daughter, Jessica, will assume her mother's duties at the King George Journal and no doubt has a difficult, yet wonderful, challenge ahead of her to continue in the spirit of Ruth's intentions for the community.

My condolences extend to Ruth's family and the entire community of King George County.

To truly honor Ruth, we can all learn from her example and her passion to truly improve her community and the lives of those around her.

PROTECT THE ECONOMY AND SUPPORT AMERICAN JOBS

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare for the district work period, I urge my colleagues to dial down the partisan rhetoric that shut down our government and take the time to listen to the folks you came to Washington to represent.

Americans have been saying they want us to do all we can to protect the economy and support American jobs, not threaten them.

This week, I introduced H.R. 3327, the Veterans Work Opportunity Act, and H.R. 3328, the American Work Opportunity Act, which aim to get more veterans and unemployed Americans back to work by offering tax credits to businesses who will hire them.

Next week, I will be meeting with small business owners, manufacturers, and constituents around my district as part of my Second Congressional District Economic Development Tour. Here we will discuss what Congress can do to support our communities and grow American jobs.

The family businesses I represent in Kankakee and the manufacturers I represent in Chicago both say the same thing: "Business as usual in Washington doesn't help business back home." I couldn't agree more.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 3327 and H.R. 3328 and work civilly to get our economy back on track.

OBAMACARE WEB SITE

(Mr. LANKFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the ObamaCare Web site has been a nuisance. People spend hours of wasted time trying to get on it, trying to get information they cannot get information on.

This has moved far beyond just a nuisance of trying to get on a Web site. Now people are discovering the new cost increases that are happening, and over a million people have already received a cancellation notice for their insurance.

Let me just give you a couple of those from my district:

The Evans Law Firm has 17 people involved in their small law firm. That firm received a cancellation notice, not because their insurance was not up to

the standards that the President has set, but because it grouped together with other policies, and now that is no longer going to be available to them, so they have to go out on the market. The cheapest they have found so far is a 25 percent increase to them.

Another business owner has notified me they are going to pay a 13.5 percent increase in their insurance next year because their current insurance doesn't have pediatric care in it. None of the employees there have children, so of course they haven't had insurance for pediatric care. This would be the equivalent of having a car in your driveway and waking up the next morning and some government official has switched the car to a better car and you get the bill for the more expensive car because they didn't like your car.

This does not help the families at home.

OBAMACARE WEB SITE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have heard some of the testimony of Secretary Sebelius and to understand that we should be in this business, all of us, in serving the American public to fix problems and make, in essence, things work—put the wheels on.

We are going to ensure that this Web site is fixed by the end of November, the beginning of December—the same kind of problems that happened with Medicare part D.

In actuality, rather than using anecdotal stories, let me tell you that the President was, in fact, right that you can grandfather and keep your same insurance. But if your same medical insurance was similar to a subprime mortgage loan that had no value whatsoever, as most Americans know, and you are getting an improved medical coverage insurance, then you get new insurance.

As in California and other places where States have their own insurance exchange, we have seen a 29 percent decrease in insurance premiums.

The real issue is what we are doing in sequester and budgeting and the loss of the researchers at the NIH. It is a disgrace. We need to get to work on serious issues so that we can put this country back to work.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. JOYCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Speaker, October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month. As a former prosecutor, I believe we should do everything in our power to

raise the awareness of domestic violence and to protect and empower the victims of these crimes.

In the seven counties I represent in northeast Ohio, over 1,500 people sought shelter last year to escape domestic violence. Sadly, some of them were children.

For these women and children, it is crucial that we in Congress pass laws to protect them. That is why I was one of the first supporters of the Violence Against Women Act earlier this year. It is a bill that provides critical services for victims of violence and provides law enforcement officials the resources to better protect and assist them.

Together we must stand up against domestic violence and enforce a zero tolerance policy both here in Washington and at home in our communities.

I thank my colleagues for joining me in this bipartisan effort to raise the awareness of this important issue.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solemn recognition of October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

While we have made great strides in fighting domestic violence, we still have a long way to go. Over one-third of women have experienced rape, violence, or stalking by an intimate partner in their lifetime.

As a former prosecutor, who has worked with hundreds of women victims of domestic violence, I know that holding their batterer responsible is important to them, but almost more important is making sure that we have the victim services necessary after the batterer is held responsible. That is more important for their pathway to healing.

I am proud to support the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization. Back home in the East Bay, we are fortunate to have places for women to go for those victim services. For example, Ruby's Place, in Hayward, California, is a shelter helping hundreds of domestic violence survivors. I visited Ruby's Place in April. I saw the care, compassion, and concern that the employees there showed to women and families who are desperately in need of assistance.

Shelters like Ruby's Place provide a lifeline to women across the country, and those places count on the Federal Government to help them.

Hopefully, recognizing October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month is one important step to helping places like Ruby's Place.

OBAMACARE: AMERICANS DESERVE BETTER

(Mr. SMITH of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today, the Secretary of Health and Human Services said to Americans that we deserve better than what we have gotten with ObamaCare. America sure does deserve better.

This is the first time in the history of our country that American citizens have been forced to purchase a product that they do not want and which they cannot afford on a Web site that does not work. But let me say, it is not just the ObamaCare Web site that is broken.

President Obama has repeatedly told American families: If you like your current health insurance, you can keep your coverage. Just this week, it was revealed that President Obama and his staff have known for over 3 years that millions of Americans will lose their current health insurance because of ObamaCare.

Furthermore, families in my district and across the country are feeling the sticker shock from soaring premiums. They are seeing reduced benefits, and they are being forced to make difficult financial decisions. Mr. Speaker, my constituents and families across America do indeed deserve better.

□ 1215

FAKE VOTES PUT POLITICS AHEAD OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, later today the House of Representatives will vote on legislation that would reject the debt ceiling increase that was passed by Congress earlier this month. This vote makes no sense.

Make no mistake, voting to reject the debt ceiling increase is a vote to default, and these are the same Members who just a couple of weeks ago decried the notion of America defaulting on its obligations and voted earlier this year for a budget resolution that spends \$700 billion more than it takes in in revenue. The logical consequence of this action is to raise the debt ceiling.

Mr. Speaker, to achieve growth, the American economy needs stability and certainty, not fake votes that put politics ahead of the American people. Let's end this nonsense and get back to the work of creating jobs and nation-building right here in America.

OBAMACARE WEB SITE

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, folks back home are frustrated, confused and, quite frankly, scared about this disastrous health care law.

Last week, Stephen from Plano sent me an email sharing his firsthand experience with the marketplace exchange. In short, operators on the 1-800 line had no answers to his questions. They simply reiterated he should wait until later that evening or the next day to apply since the systems were having technical issues.

Unfortunately, the problems go far beyond an unworkable Web site. Even with 3 years of preparation and spending more than 1 billion taxpayer dollars, ObamaCare has failed to give the American people what they were promised.

Mr. Speaker, the American people were promised affordable health care, not for a select few, but for all. Now more than ever, we must work together to delay this law. Americans want, need, and deserve better.

STOP THE OBSTRUCTION AND BE PART OF THE SOLUTION

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the healthcare.gov Web site glitches are truly unacceptable, and they must be fixed as quickly as possible.

However, the majority party is not talking about fixing the Web site. They are fixated on criticizing the Affordable Care Act instead of helping the American public understand the act and receive the benefits of true affordable care.

Countless hours in committees, over 40 votes to repeal and delay, and millions of taxpayer dollars have been spent on delaying, defunding and undermining this law. Throwing sticks into the spokes of the law will not help to make it better. I urge my colleagues to stop the obstruction and to be part of the solution.

STANDING AGAINST RELIGIOUS FREEDOM VIOLATIONS

(Mr. DUFFY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, last week Egyptian gunmen attacked a wedding at the Coptic Christian Church of the Virgin Mary, killing four and wounding many others. Among those killed were two young girls, a 12-year-old and an 8-year-old. As a father of six, I can't imagine the horror and pain of those families having to bury their two young children.

We have to ask: What was their offense? What was their crime, this 12-year-old and this 8-year-old? Their crime was, their offense was that they were practicing their faith, that they were Christians.

Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks, Secretary John Kerry is going to be visiting Egypt. I call on Secretary Kerry to highlight during his visit the religious freedom abuses that have been occurring throughout Egypt. The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom has already named Egypt as a country of particular concern for religious freedom violations.

I call on every Member of this House to stand up against those who are attacking Christians around the world. It is our duty to stand with those who have been abused for practicing their faith.

CONGRATULATING MINNESOTA LYNX WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to the Minnesota Lynx basketball team. We are so proud that they, for the second time in 3 years, won the 2013 Women's National Basketball Association championship.

They swept the playoffs, winning every game decisively. And I was glad that ESPN broadcast the finals so everyone could see Olympian Maya Moore sink some beautiful three-point shots. She was joined in outstanding play by two other gold medal-winning Olympians, Seimone Augustus and Lindsay Whalen.

Former Gopher Janel McCarville's no-look behind-the-back pass and between the legs backwards-bounce-pass assist were two of the most exciting plays of the season.

I am proud of the Minnesota Lynx, but I am even more proud of Title IX. In 1973, this country made sure of equality for women in education, and that includes sports. The result is women in athletics that are amazing and entertaining.

I congratulate the Minnesota Lynx.

HONORING MAYOR JAMES R. BUCK

(Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say thank you to a friend of mine, Mayor James R. Buck, who has dedicated 45 years of service to the city of Grandville in the Second District; and the last 29 he served as mayor.

Mayor Buck has been recognized countless times for his leadership and commitment to west Michigan. Most

recently, he received the Michigan Municipal League's Michael A. Guido Leadership and Public Service Award.

In addition to his role as mayor, Jim serves as the chairman of the Grand Valley Metro Council, which plays a leading role in fostering public and private cooperation to enhance quality of life in west Michigan.

Under the steady leadership of Mayor Buck, Grandville has grown and thrived. Grandville would not be the city it is today without Jim, and his impact will be felt forever and be recognized by all.

I want to personally thank my friend, Jim Buck, for his dedication and service to our community. Your long days and hard hours have helped put Grandville on the map as a destination to do business, visit and, most importantly, live. Mayor Buck, thank you for what you have done, not only for Grandville, not only for west Michigan, but for all of Michigan and our country. Enjoy the time off. Thanks, Jim.

SUPPORTING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. In the past, no group has been more negatively impacted by rising health care costs than seniors.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, some of the financial burdens have been alleviated. The Affordable Care Act has already helped to close the Medicare part D doughnut hole by saving 6.6 million seniors more than \$7 billion on prescription drugs. It also provides a free annual wellness visit and coverage for key preventive services that many seniors avoid because of high cost.

As for waste and fraud in Medicare, the Affordable Care Act strengthens the system and gives more effective tools to identify and remove the unnecessary costs.

The Affordable Care Act not only provides essential quality care; it does so while lowering costs for our aging population. I am proud to stand with my colleagues and the President to support the Affordable Care Act.

TRAIN WRECK OF PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE PLAN CONTINUES

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the train wreck of the President's health care plan continues. The President promised that "if you like your plan, you can keep it," period. But millions of Amer-

icans are getting cancelation letters this month.

Mia from Taneytown in Carroll County wrote my office saying:

I recently became aware that my insurance will terminate the plan I currently participate in. I was told to find another insurance plan that fits my budget and needs. The problem is none of the insurance carriers can compare to the quality and cost of my current insurance. However, I am being told that I am being forced by law to pick a new plan, or else I will be penalized by the U.S. Government. I have never been more disgusted with my government than I am now. My husband and I work very hard for the money we have. We have a daughter who is 8 months old, but my premium costs to cover myself and her will almost triple. How is this affordable? It is hard enough to pay a mortgage, gas, and day-to-day living.

Mr. Speaker, the President misled the American people. Mia lost her plan, and her insurance costs tripled. Americans deserve better.

RECOGNIZING VALIANT SERVICE OF WORLD WAR II MERCHANT MARINERS

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the passage of H.R. 2189, a bipartisan bill that will finally recognize the valiant service of Merchant Mariners that operated domestically during World War II.

It has been my honor for the past three Congresses to introduce legislation that would recognize these brave Americans and correct an injustice that has remained for over 70 years.

I would like to congratulate a wonderful North Carolinian, Mr. Don Horton, who has been the driving force behind my legislative effort for the past three Congresses. Tragically, Don's commitment to this legislation was due to the loss of his brother, William Lee Horton, Jr., on 31 March 1942 as a result of a German U-boat attack on his tugboat off the coast of Virginia.

Many of the Horton family served on these tugboats and barges during World War II in support of the war. Don Horton has become the foremost expert on this forgotten segment of World War II and has worked tirelessly to see mariners like his brother gain the recognition as veterans that they rightly deserve and earned through service to their country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, after 70 long years, these mariners have a chance to receive the recognition they deserve for their service to our country. I implore my colleagues in the Senate to consider this legislation as quickly as possible and support its passage.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are looking for results from Washington, D.C. Even though we have a divided government, I still believe we can and must work together to solve the many challenges facing our great Nation.

More than anything, we must work together in the coming months to help put more Americans back to work and kick-start our sluggish economy. We can work together to reform our Tax Code and make it simpler and easier to understand and comply with. We can work together to build a national energy policy that safely utilizes all of America's resources, putting people to work and keeping energy costs down.

We can work together to support education, research, infrastructure, immigration reform. Yes, and even pass a farm bill.

We can work together to reform important programs like Medicare and Social Security so we can preserve and protect them for the future generations while balancing our budget and controlling spending.

Today, our economy may be stagnant, but our optimism and determination have never been greater. Let's work together to renew the prosperity and opportunity for all Americans in our great Nation.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month. Unconscionably, domestic violence has reached pandemic proportions, affecting one out of every three women in the United States.

As an emergency medicine doctor, I have witnessed firsthand the devastating effects of domestic violence. I have treated the beaten and bruised bodies of countless women who were victims of domestic violence, and I have been inspired by their unbroken spirits.

I am proud of the work that many are doing to prevent domestic violence and keep women safe throughout my district and our country, like Shelter from the Storm in the Coachella Valley.

Domestic violence is a leading threat for women. On average, four women are murdered by their intimate partner every day in the United States. A woman is battered in the U.S. every 15 seconds. That equals 240 domestic violence episodes in one hour.

No woman should ever suffer domestic violence, and those who are victimized should know that they have access to the care and services they need to

seek justice. We must continue to work together to take steps to prevent domestic violence, stand up for those who are victims, and hold perpetrators accountable to the full extent of the law.

To my patients in my district and women victims across the country, please, never give up.

□ 1245

KEEPING OUR COMMITMENT TO OUR VETERANS

(Mr. MEADOWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today having come from a hearing in which we heard about some of the issues with Veterans Affairs, such as \$762,000 spent on a conference while our veterans had to wait for their disability claims to be processed.

In my home State of North Carolina, the delay is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker. We are having families that are having to wait almost 2 years to have their claims processed. This is unacceptable. If it were just an extravagant conference, we could overlook it, yet a senior official in an email says, "Well, bottom line, you don't have to worry about a thing."

Mr. Speaker, it has come to the time where we can tell our veterans they don't have to worry about a single thing, where their claims are processed, and where we truly keep our commitment to our veterans.

VETERANS EDUCATION COUNSELING ACT

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, more than 2.5 million Americans have served our country in Iraq and Afghanistan. They placed themselves in harm's way so we could live safely at home.

The benefits veterans receive for their service hardly repays them for the sacrifices that they have made. Nonetheless, they need the help. This is why we must ensure veterans can access every benefit they have earned, benefits like educational counseling.

While the VA does a great job providing vocational rehab, many veterans aren't aware of the educational counseling they are entitled to as part of their GI benefits. That is why I am introducing the Veterans Education Counseling Act. It directs the VA to differentiate between these two benefits and makes the application process available online. This helps every veteran make the right choice for their lives and their future.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in passing this bill.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, much attention has been focused recently on the flawed rollout of ObamaCare. Sadly, a potential bigger problem has now emerged.

Once consumers battle their way through the glitchy Web site, much of the highly sensitive personal information sent to the insurers is wrong. According to The Washington Post and Wall Street Journal, the ObamaCare Web site is sending garbled data to insurers, claiming, for example, that some enrollees have three spouses or that someone has signed up for three separate insurance plans or has enrolled and then unenrolled and then reenrolled multiple times in one day. In short, you could fight your way through the Web site, fill out all the forms correctly, and end up with the wrong insurance, the wrong subsidy, and the wrong coverage.

Now is the time to end this madness. The individual mandate must be delayed by a year, and President Obama and Senator REID must be willing to sit down with Republicans and discuss real reforms to what is quickly becoming a national disaster.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT ENROLLMENT

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here first to salute those who advocate against domestic violence and those who advocate for more stroke awareness—health care issues.

I also stand here not only as a Member of Congress, but as a person who has navigated the online health care insurance marketplace system, so let me note some facts.

Yes, there have been problems. Unfortunately, the Web site was not prepared to handle the huge volume of interest, but President Obama has made it clear that the delays on the Web site are unacceptable and they will be fixed.

Since the marketplace has opened, healthcare.gov has had over 20 million unique visitors. And while the site is being improved, consumers should keep in mind what we haven't heard from my colleagues, that there are four ways they can apply for coverage: by phone, online, by mail with a paper application, or with the help of an in-person assistant.

I say to you, let us not forget the point that millions of Americans are now able to choose an insurance plan that will make the most sense for them and for their family.

POLICE SHOOTINGS IN NEW MEXICO

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank the brave men and women in law enforcement who risk their lives every day to keep us safe.

In the past week alone, seven law enforcement officials in New Mexico have been shot and wounded. It is a pattern of senseless violence that has become all too familiar in this Nation.

On Saturday, in Albuquerque, a man armed with an assault rifle and a bulletproof vest ambushed officers, stole a police cruiser, and led them on a dangerous chase. Three Albuquerque police officers and a Bernalillo County sheriff's deputy were shot. Thankfully, they are all expected to make a full recovery.

But from that terrifying situation, stories of immense heroism and courage emerged. Officers sprang into action to resolve the situation quickly, prevent more harm, and help their brothers and sisters who had been shot; firefighters from a nearby station ran into danger to help the injured; and New Mexicans have stepped up to donate thousands of dollars to help the officers and their families during this difficult time.

To the first responders in New Mexico and all over the Nation, from the bottom of our hearts, thank you.

LET'S GET TOGETHER

(Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, we have a couple of things going on today.

Number one, the House will be discharged at the end of the day to go back to a district work period, and we know what we are going to hear at home. What we are going to hear is: Why can't you people do your jobs? Why can't you get together and come together and come up with a budget so that American businesspeople can plan, so that Americans can decide what to do with their futures, instead of doing what has been happening for years on end, these continuing resolutions and things like the sequester? The sequester alone is going to cost 1 million jobs next year in this country if we don't replace it.

The other thing that is going on today is the opening of the work of the conference committee on the budget. Twenty-nine Senators and Representatives from this House are getting together and trying to do just that—come up with a budget, come up with something sensible, and forge the compromises that Americans expect us to reach.

I say, let us speed them on their work. Good luck to them. Let's hope they come up with something Americans can appreciate.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT ACT

(Ms. MENG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly urge my colleagues' support for the Early Childhood Education Professional Improvement Act, H.R. 3357, which I introduced earlier this week with Congressman JARED POLIS. Our bill would establish a framework of incentives and standards for the much-needed education and development of pre-K teachers.

Equality of opportunity cannot be achieved without ensuring that all American children have access to high-quality pre-K. By the age of 2, affluent children already know 30 percent more words than low-income children. These disparities are then exacerbated when affluent children attend high-quality pre-Ks and poorer ones don't even attend pre-K at all.

Senior military leaders, budget wonks, economists, and education advocates all agree that pre-K reform is essential and necessary for a strong and prosperous America. Furthermore, it is the most cost-effective investment in education we can make.

Let's do this now, and let's do this right. Let's work together for high-quality pre-K for our children.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE DEMOCRACY PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 5, One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, and the order of the House on January 3, 2013, of the following Members to the House Democracy Partnership:

Mr. ROSKAM, Illinois, Chairman
Mr. FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
Mr. BOUSTANY, Louisiana
Mr. CONAWAY, Texas
Mr. BUCHANAN, Florida
Mr. CRENSHAW, Florida
Mr. WILSON, South Carolina
Mrs. BROOKS, Indiana
Mr. LATHAM, Iowa
Mrs. BLACK, Tennessee
Mr. RIBBLE, Wisconsin

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January

3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

Mr. PITTS, Pennsylvania
Mr. ADERHOLT, Alabama
Mr. GINGREY, Georgia
Mr. BURGESS, Texas

SWAPS REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 391, I call up the bill (H.R. 992) to amend provisions in section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act relating to Federal assistance for swaps entities, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 391, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 992

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act".

SEC. 2. REFORM OF PROHIBITION ON SWAP ACTIVITY ASSISTANCE.

Section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 8305) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking "insured depository institution" and inserting "covered depository institution"; and
(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) COVERED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term 'covered depository institution' means—

"(A) an insured depository institution, as that term is defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

"(B) a United States uninsured branch or agency of a foreign bank.";

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the heading for such subsection, by striking "INSURED" and inserting "COVERED";

(B) by striking "an insured" and inserting "a covered";

(C) by striking "such insured" and inserting "such covered"; and

(D) by striking "or savings and loan holding company" and inserting "savings and loan holding company, or foreign banking organization (as such term is defined under Regulation K of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (12 C.F.R. 211.21(o)))";

(3) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

"(d) ONLY BONA FIDE HEDGING AND TRADITIONAL BANK ACTIVITIES PERMITTED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any covered depository institution that limits its swap and security-based swap activities to the following:

"(A) HEDGING AND OTHER SIMILAR RISK MITIGATION ACTIVITIES.—Hedging and other similar risk mitigating activities directly related to the covered depository institution's activities.

"(B) NON-STRUCTURED FINANCE SWAP ACTIVITIES.—Acting as a swaps entity for swaps or

security-based swaps other than a structured finance swap.

"(C) CERTAIN STRUCTURED FINANCE SWAP ACTIVITIES.—Acting as a swaps entity for swaps or security-based swaps that are structured finance swaps, if—

"(i) such structured finance swaps are undertaken for hedging or risk management purposes; or

"(ii) each asset-backed security underlying such structured finance swaps is of a credit quality and of a type or category with respect to which the prudential regulators have jointly adopted rules authorizing swap or security-based swap activity by covered depository institutions.

"(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

"(A) STRUCTURED FINANCE SWAP.—The term 'structured finance swap' means a swap or security-based swap based on an asset-backed security (or group or index primarily comprised of asset-backed securities).

"(B) ASSET-BACKED SECURITY.—The term 'asset-backed security' has the meaning given such term under section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).";

(4) in subsection (e), by striking "an insured" and inserting "a covered"; and

(5) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking "an insured depository" and inserting "a covered depository"; and

(B) by striking "the insured depository" each place such term appears and inserting "the covered depository".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 992, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, America's economy remains stuck in the slowest, weakest, nonrecovery recovery of modern times. Millions of our fellow countrymen remain unemployed, underemployed. Many because of ObamaCare just had their hours cut, and millions lie awake at night wondering how they will make ends meet.

Regrettably, those who create jobs in America for our constituents are drowning in a sea of red tape which is preventing them from hiring new workers. I still vividly remember the day

when one of my constituents in east Texas came to me as he shut down his small business due to red tape and he said, Congressman, it got to the point where I just thought my government didn't want me to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to ensure that businesses succeed in America, succeed in hiring new workers. Today, just like yesterday, Mr. Speaker, Republicans and Democrats can again pass bipartisan legislation that will help grow our economy. This legislation is H.R. 992, and I commend the bipartisan group of members who introduced the bill: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. MALONEY.

As chairman of the Financial Services Committee, I also want to thank the members of the committee who joined together and approved this bill on an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 53-6. Mr. Speaker, the vote was 53-6. This bipartisan bill will relieve manufacturers, farmers, ranchers, and Main Street businesses of unintended consequences of one section of the Dodd-Frank Act.

Many Americans may not realize it, but farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and other employees use a financial product called a derivative to manage risk and protect themselves from extreme fluctuations in the price of things like fuel, fertilizer, and commodities.

For example, a company like John Deere will do an interest rate swap as they finance a tractor for a farmer in east Texas in my district, and that derivative is directly linked to the cost of that tractor for my constituent.

Companies like Southwest Airlines who operate in my hometown of Dallas, Texas, they will use derivatives to lock in cheaper fuel prices when the price of crude oil is on the rise. This keeps the cost of flying more affordable for customers, like the grandmother in Mesquite, Texas, who travels to visit her grandchildren in Kansas City.

Perhaps a farmers co-op in Nebraska will use derivatives to finance fixed-price diesel for truckers who haul cattle. Perhaps a hospital in Los Angeles may use derivatives to hedge against the rising interest rates when financing a big investment like more beds or new lifesaving technology.

Although not one single patient, not one single farmer, not one single grandmother, not one single trucker caused the financial crisis, they were all swept into section 716 of Dodd-Frank.

Section 716 requires financial institutions to push out almost all of their derivatives business into separate entities. This not only increases transaction costs, which are ultimately paid by the consumers, it also makes our financial system less secure by forcing swap trading out of regulated institutions.

□ 1245

In fact, Mr. Speaker, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said section 716 "would make the U.S. financial system less resilient, weaken our financial stability, and make our economy more susceptible to systemic risk."

To those who are loath to ever amend Dodd-Frank, no less of an authority than Barney Frank himself, former chairman of the committee, said: "It addresses the valid criticisms of section 716 without weakening the financial reform laws, important derivative safeguards or prohibitions on bank proprietary trading."

So again, Mr. Speaker, no law is perfect. We would be derelict in our duty if we didn't put the American people back to work and pass this law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentlelady.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 992, commonly known as the swap push-out bill. This bill would effectively gut important financial reforms and put taxpayers potentially on the hook for big banks' risky behavior.

In 2008, I voted against the TARP because I didn't think the Federal Government should be bailing out the mess both regular banks and so-called investment banks like Goldman Sachs got themselves into with derivatives trading.

Section 716 of the Dodd-Frank law ensures that, hopefully, we won't find ourselves in that situation again. The provision is a modest measure designed to prevent the Federal Government from bailing out or subsidizing bank activity that is not related to the business of banking.

Originally, section 716, a Senate provision, would have forced banks to spin all of their swap activity into a separate affiliate. The House version of Dodd-Frank had no such requirement.

In a compromise, the final version of section 716 allows the banks to hold on to swaps for hedging purposes and swaps related to the business of banking, primarily, interest rate swaps and foreign exchange swaps.

Under Dodd-Frank, banks are required to move commodity swaps, including energy and agriculture swaps, non-cleared, non-investment grade credit default swaps, credit default swaps on asset-backed securities, and equity swaps to a separate affiliate. This represents barely 10 percent of the world of the swap market. So banks can keep 90 percent in the bank.

Apparently this isn't good enough for some of these big banks, which is why we are here today with H.R. 992, trying to gut the Dodd-Frank provisions and keep playing in 99 percent of the swap

market, which is pretty much the status quo.

H.R. 992 also makes it easier for banks to hide commodity manipulation from regulators. In recent months, we have seen JPMorgan charged with settling cases of alleged energy market manipulation and the start of an investigation of Goldman Sachs for aluminum manipulation.

The Federal Reserve is even reconsidering its decision letting banks get involved with owning commodities. Until the big banks are held accountable for the activities in the commodity swaps market, I am reluctant to repeal limits Congress already has put in place.

Since the passage of Dodd-Frank, it is clear that Wall Street has not learned its lesson. The loss experienced by JPMorgan through derivatives trading in the "London Whale" incident is proof of that. At some point, another bank is going to find itself in similar trouble and run to the government with its hands out for assistance.

Frankly, I think the American people are sick and tired of the banks asking for taxpayer help when they get in trouble from risky trading activities.

In the past, I have joined our Democratic Agriculture Committee members in support of legislation to change Dodd-Frank, and I have supported those efforts because those bills reaffirmed what Congress intended with the original law, like protecting derivatives end-users.

Well, these end-users also share my concerns. The Commodity Markets Oversight Coalition, representing commodity-dependent industries, businesses and end-users that rely on functional, transparent and competitive commodity derivative markets as a hedging and price discovery tool, they also oppose H.R. 992.

H.R. 992 repeals a key, if modest, reform component of Dodd-Frank. My colleagues are certainly free to vote as they wish, but I urge them to be careful because people will remember this vote.

I urge my colleagues, if they are smart, to oppose H.R. 992 so we don't put our taxpayer dollars at risk for bank swap activities that are not related to their banking business.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased now to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the chief Republican sponsor of the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act which, again, passed our committee on a strong bipartisan basis of 53-6.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today with tremendous pride, not because the bill we are debating is my own, but because we have the chance to help Main Street businesses and roll back one of the unintended consequences of Dodd-Frank.

From its first addition, the Lincoln amendment, also called the swaps

push-out or spin-off provision, has been hotly debated. Section 716 of Dodd-Frank initially prohibited all swaps activities. However, the conference process yielded some measure of compromise by exempting foreign exchange and interest rate swaps back in.

By doing this, the conferees acknowledged that swaps are not inherently disruptive. In fact, swaps are a prudent and necessary activity for many businesses.

When oil prices spike or corn prices plummet, farmers and manufacturers rely on financial products like swaps to weather the uncertainty. Many of these businesses use banks as counterparties, where they have longstanding relationships with trusted institutions. Limiting banks' ability to serve their customers will cost these customers more as they are forced to find new, less stable partners.

Section 716, as it stands now, would force certain swaps out of Federal, prudential regulators' supervision and push them into affiliated entities that are not subject to the same oversight and regulation. This is why some of the loudest critics of the push-out provision have been Federal regulators, like the Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke and Paul Volcker.

I know Ranking Member WATERS and many members of the House from both sides of the aisle share these concerns. Moving swaps out of banks, while intended to reduce risk, may actually increase it.

This is one of the reasons I introduced H.R. 992. The Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act leaves the most opaque swaps spun-off to affiliates, the kind of swaps that exacerbated the 2008 crisis. Those are still forced out.

However, banks will be allowed to provide other types of swap contracts to their customers, such as equity, credit, and commodity swaps, which are very important to my home State, Illinois.

All of these activities are subject to the new swaps regime created by title VII, including reporting and registration requirements, clearing, margin, and business conduct standards. These activities would also be subject to a finalized Volcker Rule, meaning they would generally be for legitimate hedging purposes or client facing, not proprietary.

In the committee report from the last Congress, former Chairman Barney Frank, Ranking Member WATERS, and other minority members of the committee noted that this bill "addresses the valid criticisms of section 716 without weakening the financial reform law's important derivative safeguards or prohibitions on bank proprietary trading."

This is every bit as true of the bill we are considering today as it was in the last Congress. H.R. 992 addresses the valid criticisms of section 716, "con-

cerns . . . about whether pushing . . . swaps out of banks is the best way to mitigate against future system failure," to quote Ranking Member WATERS.

This bill strengthens regulatory oversight of these products. H.R. 992 does not weaken title VII's derivatives safeguards or the prohibition of bank proprietary trading.

H.R. 992 will keep costs lower for Main Street businesses that use swaps to hedge risks. H.R. 992 will help prevent derivatives market displacement and help promote U.S. competitiveness.

This bill addresses nonpartisan concerns with a bipartisan solution. I thank my Democratic colleagues for being willing to consider targeted fixes to Dodd-Frank. We can find common ground on financial regulation. We can work together for the American people, and we can fix Dodd-Frank without dismantling its important accomplishments.

So I ask my colleagues to support this bill. Talk to your hospitals, bankers, and farmers. They will tell you that swaps are an important, common business tool. Forcing higher costs on these transactions will only stifle job creation and economic growth.

H.R. 992 is a sound bill and strikes, in the words of Ranking Member WATERS, the "right balance."

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The financial crisis of 2008 wreaked untold havoc on the U.S. economy. This disaster, which was intensified by the use of derivatives, set back hard-working Americans for generations. At the same time, it bailed out many of the Nation's largest banks.

The Dodd-Frank Act sought to put our financial markets back together by, for example, creating comprehensive oversight and reforms for derivatives markets, as well as prohibitions on banks betting with taxpayers' resources.

H.R. 992 would undo some of these reforms before our regulators, Wall Street's cops, have a chance to finish them, especially the Volcker Rule. Congress passed the Volcker Rule to stop banks from using customer deposits, backed by the taxpayer, for trades intended to only benefit the bank and not its customers. The rule, when finalized, will define legitimate bank activities like hedging and market making, but prevent other behavior that would leave the taxpayer and the economy hurting.

In the same vein, Congress passed the Lincoln amendment, the provision that H.R. 992 would gut, to insulate the taxpayer by "pushing out" certain derivatives from the insured bank, while also making broad exceptions for swaps that bank customers overwhelmingly use.

The Bipartisan Policy Center also recognized a connection between the

Volcker Rule and the Lincoln amendment, noting that a "well-executed Volcker Rule would simultaneously accomplish the intended goal of the Lincoln amendment."

In case America forgets, JPMorgan reminded all of us of the importance of setting limits on bank activity. In 2012, 4 years after the crisis, JPMorgan Chase's "London Whale" caused the bank to lose more than \$6 billion in a few months. What were purportedly hedges using complicated derivatives transactions were later transformed by the bank's focus on profit into what would likely be banned under Volcker.

The sense of urgency to separating the taxpayer-supported bank from the investment bank is shared across the aisle. Let me just tell you, in March of this year, Representative JEB HENSARLING said that, "Certainly, we have to do a better job ring-fencing, fire-walling, whatever metaphor you want to use, between an insured depository institution and a noninsured investment bank."

Yet, 3 years after the passage of Dodd-Frank, and 5 years after the financial crisis, we still do not have a ban on the very behavior that hurt our economy.

Instead, H.R. 992 eliminates one taxpayer protection, the Lincoln amendment, by now allowing banks to engage in 99 percent of the swaps market without the taxpayer knowing how robust the monitoring and oversight of such activities will be.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 992 is a step backward in repairing our economy. This view is shared by the Commodity Markets Oversight Coalition, a nonpartisan alliance of American industries, businesses, consumers, and derivatives users.

Similarly, the White House, the AFL-CIO, CalPERS, the Teamsters, Public Citizen, and Americans for Financial Reform all strongly oppose H.R. 992.

Former Republican chairman of the FDIC, Sheila Bair, who strongly defended taxpayers during the crisis, noted immediately after the Financial Services Committee passed H.R. 992, "Repeal of section 716 moves in the wrong direction. In an area as complex as this, I wish, I just wish Congress would at least wait for the regulators."

I do too. Vote "no" on H.R. 992.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me just simply say, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, my subcommittee has oversight over the SEC

and is charged with funding the SEC; and their budget has increased about 200 percent over the last 10 years. That is more than most agencies. That is a lot of money, and a lot of that is caused by all of the rules and regulations that they are asked to pass over and over again. Dodd-Frank is part of that problem.

I think this bill seeks to alleviate that problem by saying, look, we can protect investors. We can have orderly and fair capital markets; but we don't need to go overboard on regulation. Certainly derivatives are complicated financial instruments. They need regulation. But that is what this bill provides. And I would say that the great overwhelming majority are not responsible for the financial crisis.

If we pass this legislation, we can help save those people that use these instruments. We can also help the SEC not have to draft so many unnecessary rules and regulations, and that will save taxpayers as well.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative LYNCH, the ranking member of the subcommittee on the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I want to associate myself with her earlier remarks on this bill, as well as the remarks of Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 992, the misleadingly named Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act. If you need to know one thing about this bill, it is that a vote for this bill is a vote to provide taxpayer funding and backing for the kind of reckless derivative trading that brought our economy to the brink of catastrophic collapse. It is as simple as that.

The bill before us today would repeal the provision in the Dodd-Frank reform law that requires too-big-to-fail banks to push their risky derivative dealings out of banks that receive taxpayer support and into separately capitalized subsidiaries.

This bill is not a regulatory improvement. It is a giveaway to Wall Street, and it is an abdication of the duty of this body to protect taxpayers from Wall Street speculators.

I want to point out a couple of things that have been, I think, misleading here. Dodd-Frank already allows banks to keep derivatives that they use for bona fide hedging purposes or for traditional banking activities within the insured bank. Interest rate and foreign exchange swaps, which make up 90 percent of swaps volume, are the most likely to be used by end-users to manage their risk; and those are already exempt from the push-out under section 716. So end-users can already benefit from 90 percent of the swaps that are out there.

Moving risky derivatives activity outside of the insured banks will ensure that the risks to the banks—those that are traditional and measurable—and the speculative derivative risks, which are totally unmeasured and unexpected, those are not commingled, which make bank risks easy to understand for regulators and actually leads to better regulation.

Finally, I want to call my colleagues' attention to an article about this very bill that appeared yesterday in *The New York Times* on the front page of the Business section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WATERS. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. LYNCH. I appreciate that.

Go read yesterday's *New York Times*. It says on the front page of the Business section, To Wall Street, Washington, D.C., "might seem like enemy territory. But even as Federal regulators and prosecutors extract multi-billion-dollar penalties from the Nation's biggest banks, Wall Street can rely on at least one ally here" in Washington. And that ally is the House of Representatives.

We ought to change our position, stand with the taxpayers, stand with the investors, stand with the people that we were elected here to represent and tell Wall Street where to go on this. They get enough breaks as it is. We ought to stand up for the American people and protect them for a change.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets and GSEs.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the chairman.

I think the compromise language we are considering today strikes the right balance, and I urge my colleagues to support that approach, and I thank the Members for working together to help us to get to this point.

Mr. Speaker, those are not my words. Those are the words of the ranking member last year when similar language and similar legislation was coming down and she supported this legislation. So I want to associate myself with her support of this legislation.

And why did she do so? Well, because she also said, The provision that we are talking about was something in the bill with section 716 that said "the House Members were able to consider less carefully than other sections of Dodd-Frank, since the provision didn't come through under regular order in our Chamber."

In other words, she recognized the fact that this provision in the bill was added late in the dead of night and had never come through committee for consideration.

She also realized, and I quote again, that "legitimate concerns have been

raised about whether pushing a significant portion of swaps out of banks is the best way to mitigate against future systemic risk."

So, again, I wish to associate myself with those words of the ranking member who, in the past, has supported the very same legislation that we have here before us today.

And why do she and I both support this legislation? Because it is good for Main Street. It is good for farmers. It is good for small ranchers. It is good for small businesses. She recognized then, as I do now, that what we need to do is to try to spur on our economy, make sure that there are not impediments, that we don't overly complicate things in the banking sector, in the financial sector and what have you—that would do what? That would put our country at a competitive disadvantage with other countries around the world and, by so doing, make it harder—yes, harder—for our farmers, ranchers, Main Street businesses, and the like to be able to get the credit they need and to pay their bills and what have you.

So I concur with her that we need to pass this legislation today.

Ms. WATERS. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker and Members, the gentleman talked about being in step with me and what I supposedly said when we first dealt with this issue in the Financial Services Committee. And he is correct.

But when do you learn? After JPMorgan, am I to understand that nobody has learned a lesson? When do they learn that Volcker is still not in place yet? So all I will say is that I have an opinion that must be recognized.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), who happens to be the cochair of the Progressive Caucus of Congress, is the deputy whip, and also serves on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, we are a day in front of Halloween, and here we are handing out treats to the likes of JPMorgan Chase, Citi, and Bank of America.

You know, it is fitting on this day that we should be doing the people's business. Yet here we are handing out treats and goodies to huge banks so that they can be allowed—large financial institutions that never were held accountable—so that these institutions can be allowed to use cheap, federally supported, guaranteed, bank-backed deposits to invest in derivatives, very similar to what got our economy in this mess in the first place.

Wasn't the Great Recession scary enough? Weren't we in enough trouble? Didn't we learn anything from the "London Whale" fiasco?

This bill, the swaps push-out bill, undermines key sections of the Wall

Street Reform bill, the so-called Dodd-Frank bill, under section 716.

Now, this bill, which is supposed to protect investors and consumers—in fact, right now, it seems like the ink is barely dry on it, and here they are trying to weaken it already. Congress passed and the President signed this law to ensure that investment banks use their own money, not the people's money, to buy derivatives, invest in hedge funds, or other risky activities.

Why did we make that requirement? Well, it wasn't to punish anyone. It was to safeguard the public trust. We made this change because we wanted to protect Americans from what I would call a zombie market, given the Halloween theme here, from destructive economic rampages like the global financial crisis which lost us 12 million jobs and over \$16 trillion in wealth. We are still experiencing anemic economic growth following the Great Recession, and we do not need more trouble like this swaps bill.

Vote "no."

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to help my colleagues, who apparently haven't found time to read the underlying section 716, subsection (i), which reads in part:

No taxpayer funds shall be used to prevent the receivership of any swap entity resulting from swap or security-based swap activity of the swaps entity.

I would encourage my colleagues to actually read the bill.

Now I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the volunteer State of Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER).

Mr. FINCHER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 992, the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act. Simply put, we do not want to make the consumer pay more. That is what will happen if we force banks to push out certain swaps into separate nonbank affiliates.

Chairman Bernanke was right about section 716: it increases costs. Section 716 will also drive businesses overseas where foreign regulators have not passed similar rules for derivatives, taking with them American jobs and revenue.

We must weigh the costs and benefits of every rule or regulation and ensure we do not destabilize markets or place American consumers, end-users, and financial institutions at a competitive disadvantage.

With that, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 992.

Ms. WATERS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am now very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to do something I don't ordinarily do. I am going to read something:

I just want to reassure people, passing this bill—particularly as amended—will not in

any way, shape, or form reduce sensible regulation of derivatives. It will not increase any exposure to the financial system from derivatives. It was an unnecessary and, I think, somewhat unwise amendment. The bill before us, particularly as amended, will restore this to what I think is the appropriate balance.

Not my words. Not the words of the gentleman from Texas. Not even the words of Mr. Bernanke, Mr. Volcker, or one of my colleagues' favorite economists, Mark Zandi. Those are the words of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Frank), the guy whose name is on the bill, who supported this exact same initiative in the last Congress.

There is plenty for us to disagree about, Mr. Speaker. Why we continue to fight about things that pass out of committee 53-6, that will pass here today on the floor by an overwhelming margin, I have no idea. But there should be some things that we could come together and agree on. And this, H.R. 992, is certainly one of them, and I encourage full support of the bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a statement from Ms. Sheila Bair who formerly chaired the FDIC. She said:

Derivatives have many legitimate functions, but they can be high risk and poorly understood because of their complexity by bank managers and even regulators, as we saw with the "London Whale" debacle. So keeping them outside of insured banks and making the market fund them is the way to go. This will increase market discipline and protect the FDIC.

She said:

I'm concerned that Members of Congress act on these issues without full understanding of the ramifications. If we are going to revisit derivatives regulation, I'd go in the direction of more market discipline and disclosure, rather than letting big derivatives dealers use insured deposits to support their high-risk operations.

The Executive Office of the President sent over a statement that includes these words:

Wall Street Reform represents the most comprehensive set of reforms to the financial system since the Great Depression, and its derivatives provisions constitute an important part of the reforms being put in place to strengthen the Nation's financial system by improving transparency and reducing risks for market participants.

Again, let me refer you to Representative HENSARLING who said:

Certainly, we have to do a better job ring-fencing, fire-walling—whatever metaphor you want to use—between an insured depository institution and a noninsured investment bank.

I ask for a "no" vote on this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, again, I continue to be amazed at those who wish to decry the possibility of a Federal bailout in debating this bill. I wonder where their voices were yesterday when all of them, seemingly—the voices we hear today—defended the Federal Housing Administration from

actually receiving a taxpayer bailout, the first in history.

□ 1315

So when taxpayers actually have to pay, we hear choruses of "Que Sera, Sera." But when a private institution loses their money that the taxpayers didn't have to pay for, all of a sudden the sky is falling.

I understand that the ranking member, obviously, has the opportunity to change her mind; but clearly she was for it before she was against it.

When I hear many of my colleagues decry the lack of bipartisan legislation, I don't understand why Members would try to oppose it now. It passed overwhelmingly, 53-6.

For those who say this is somehow gutting Dodd-Frank, apparently they didn't consult with the former chairman of this committee, Barney Frank, who is on record saying that this addresses the valid criticisms of section 716 without weakening the financial reform law's important derivatives safeguards.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, to get America back to work. It is time to make commonsense, bipartisan reforms. I respect every right of every Member to change their mind, but I hope something that passed 53-6 to put America back to work, that soon this full House will pass this legislation; and I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act, H.R. 922, is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that changes the application of Dodd-Frank, but does not undermine the systemic protections the law was intended to create. H.R. 992 amends section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Act to correct an unintended consequence of a poorly vetted provision that was dropped into the Senate version of the bill late in the process, with no notice and no debate.

Section 716 prevents banks that write certain types of swaps from utilizing any type of Federal banking assistance, including accessing the Federal Reserve's discount window and obtaining FDIC insurance. It would have the practical effect of requiring banks to push important swap activity into special-purpose, separately capitalized entities.

While in theory section 716 may seem like a reasonable response to the 2008 financial collapse, in practice, these entities are less well capitalized, less well regulated, and unable to officially reduce risks by netting the effects of multiple hedging transactions.

Across our Nation, farmers, ranchers, and other businesses rely on the risk-mitigating tools of the financial industry. Commodity price exposure, interest rate risks, and other business uncertainties are routinely managed

through swaps and other derivatives products. Requiring banks to separate some of these swaps into special-purpose, affiliate institutions will wind up costing the end-users who rely on these tools more for no actual reduction in system-wide risk.

Moreover, the swap push-out requirements adopted in section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Act have not been considered in any other foreign jurisdiction, putting our banks and end-users who rely on them at a competitive advantage throughout the global economy.

H.R. 992 restores an appropriate balance to risk-mitigation services allowed by banks. It continues to prohibit structured finance swaps—like those that were made famous by AIG—from the books of banks, but it ends the need for banks to push commodity and other swaps with significantly lower risk profiles into separate legal entities.

As I said earlier, H.R. 992 has broad bipartisan support. I would like to thank two members of my subcommittee and coauthors of this bill, Congressman RICHARD HUDSON and Congressman SEAN PATRICK MALONEY, for their good work in finding a bipartisan solution to this significant problem. I wish that all of Congress was as hardworking, deliberative, and cordial as the members of the Ag Committee.

As I close, I would like to do so with the words of one of our former colleagues and a man who is widely regarded as knowing a thing or two about Dodd-Frank, former Financial Services Committee Chairman Barney Frank.

In remarks made about an earlier version of this legislation, he said:

I want to reassure people passing this bill, particularly as amended, will not in any way, shape, or form reduce sensible regulation in derivatives; it will not increase any exposure to the financial system from derivatives.

If this legislation made good sense to the coauthor of Dodd-Frank, it ought to be a no-brainer for this House to pass. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation that will put an end to the needless uncertainty that section 716 is causing our farmers, ranchers, and small businessmen across this Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the ranking Democratic member of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets and also the former chairman of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee on the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 992. This bill passed overwhelmingly out of the Financial Services Com-

mittee earlier this year with broad bipartisan support with a vote of 53-6.

The whole point of the Dodd-Frank reforms was to improve the safety and soundness of our financial system; and H.R. 992, the bill before us, will help us do just that.

This bill does not expose the taxpayer to any additional risk. In fact, it includes a ban on taxpayer bailout of any swaps or any use of taxpayer money. Under H.R. 992, truly risky swaps will still be pushed out of commercial banks while at the same time bank regulators can see all of the bank's swaps activities.

As well intended as section 716 is, it turns out it would actually hinder the oversight of regulators of the derivatives market. That is why Barney Frank, the former chairman of the Financial Services Committee and, of course, the Frank in Dodd-Frank, said during the debate in the last Congress of this same bill that is before us now, H.R. 922:

It will not in any way, shape, or form reduce sensible regulation of derivatives; it will not increase any exposure to the financial system from derivatives.

The economist of Moody's, Mark Zandi, also supports this bill and has said that section 716, as written, actually increases systemic risk and creates major inefficiency in the markets.

Even Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke opposed section 716, as written, stating that the way it forces these activities out of insured depository institutions "would weaken both the financial stability and strong regulation of derivative activities."

So Ben Bernanke has said that our bill before us will protect safety and soundness. Barney Frank agrees. Mark Zandi of Moody's agrees. I agree. And I urge my colleagues to agree with us and support safety and soundness of our financial institutions by supporting H.R. 992.

MINORITY VIEWS 112TH CONGRESS

The Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act requires, for the first time, the regulation of over-the-counter derivatives, previously opaque transactions that helped bring our financial system to the brink of disaster. The vast majority of derivatives must now be centrally cleared and publicly reported, and be backed by margin and capital to ensure that swap dealers and major swap users can honor their commitments. In addition, the reform law also prohibits banks from placing bets with federally insured deposits through the "Volcker Rule". Both measures serve as important safeguards as we rebuild trust in our financial system. As amended, H.R. 1838 would repeal portions of Section 716 of the financial reform law, also known as the "push-out provision." Section 716 prohibits banks from engaging in several types of derivatives. Questions have been raised about this provision by economists and regulators including FDIC's Sheila Bair, who are concerned that it might interfere with a bank's ability to use derivatives to diminish risk. Section 716

was not part of the original House-passed version of the financial reform law. During the Full Committee markup, Democrats worked with the Majority to amend H.R. 1838 to continue the prohibition of complex swaps employed by AIG with devastating effect. H.R. 1838, as amended, addresses the valid criticisms of Section 716 without weakening the financial reform law's important derivative safeguards or prohibitions on bank proprietary trading.

Barney Frank, Wm. Lacy Clay, Gwen Moore, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, André Carson, Gary L. Ackerman, Al Green, Stephen F. Lynch, David Scott, Maxine Waters, Carolyn B. Maloney, Melvin L. Watt, Luis V. Gutiérrez, Gary C. Peters, Ed Perlmutter, Michael E. Capuano, and Gregory W. Meeks.

NOVEMBER 14, 2011.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
*Chairman, House Financial Services Committee,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN BACHUS, As the Committee considers legislation proposing changes to the financial reform law, I wanted to bring your attention to a specific concern in Title VII and share my views on the related legislation. As I noted at the time of its passage, and have stated since, I believe the Dodd-Frank reforms were important measures taken to strengthen elements of our financial system and bring more confidence into the markets and institutions. While some of the reforms are currently in place, many still need to be finalized in the rule-making process. With any measure as far-reaching and robust as this law is, refinements to it can prove necessary over time, especially given the broad array of complex issues addressed.

The Title VII provisions in Dodd-Frank are among the most meaningful reforms but with far-reaching implications to the economy. Greater transparency in derivatives transactions and clearing requirements are notable improvements that will be realized as they become operational. How financial institutions interact with their counterparties to provide access to capital and manage risk is a critical feature of our system for all market participants.

As the legislation was being considered, one provision that was among the more notable was—Section 716, or the Lincoln swaps push-out proposal. This part of the law effectively requires that financial firms conduct certain derivatives transactions outside of the bank institution and in some other entity within the company. I have significant concerns with this part of the law because of its potential to increase systemic risk, create major inefficiencies in markets, and likely have a major impact on U.S. competitiveness.

One of the primary objectives of the financial reforms enacted after the 2008 failures was to provide for a way to resolve large financial firms should a similar crisis develop in the future. The resolution authority section of the law was crafted to do so, but Section 716 works against that goal. It does so because it causes firms to segment the derivatives with individual counterparties and requires that another entity be created to engage in the pushed-out transactions. Creating new operations, and expending additional capital to make them robust enough, is in contrast to the resolution planning objectives of eliminating entities and simplifying structure. During the winding down of either the financial institution or of the

counterparty, the breaking up of the derivatives activities creates additional risks because separate entities will not be able to net their exposures as they can if they are facing one entity only. As noted by some of the prudential regulators in letters objecting to this provision, Section 716 would create significant complications and counter the efforts to resolve such firms in an orderly manner.

For those who argue the Lincoln provision is needed to guard against any future taxpayer bailout based on derivatives, it is important to note that this goal is accomplished by the resolution authority section of the law, thus making Section 716 unnecessary. Indeed, many provisions in the law limit derivatives risk without the need for the push-out provision. The entirety of Title VII is intended to create central counterparties to remove bilateral risk, to create extensive margin requirements on uncleared swaps where bilateral risk may still exist, and to fully enhance risk management of derivatives. Additionally, there are prohibitions on the Federal Reserve creating any assistance program that does not have broad-based applicability—so the regulators cannot subjectively choose one entity any more for any sort of capital infusion.

With respect to competitiveness, no other foreign jurisdiction has indicated it will likely consider a measure like Section 716. As such, U.S. financial firms will most certainly be at a competitive disadvantage relative to their foreign competitors because Section 716 does not apply to those foreign firms. U.S. firms transacting with counterparties in this country and abroad provide critical risk management tools through derivatives transactions that are much needed and will not disappear. It is wise for firms with greater regulatory supervision to play a role in this system. However, the ability to net such transactions off each other will be lost because the counterparties will have to interact with a different entity once these derivatives are pushed out. Counterparties will face higher costs and greater operational inefficiencies that will tie up capital. The likely result will be a substantial loss of market share for U.S. firms as these transactions would be shifted to foreign banks.

As the Committee examines legislation related to the derivatives reforms, I strongly urge consideration and support legislation that would repeal Section 716 as a way to address these concerns. I appreciate your attention to this matter and would welcome any further discussion on the topic if you would find that helpful.

Sincerely,

MARK ZANDI.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), my colleague on the Ag Committee and coauthor of the bill.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, given the bicameral and bipartisan support for our bill and the overwhelming consensus about the systemic risk created by the section we are working to reform today, I am genuinely surprised we are even here debating this today.

Nevertheless, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 992, the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act, which my Democrat friend from New York, SEAN PATRICK MALONEY, and I have worked together on in the House Agriculture Committee.

As my colleagues are aware, our bipartisan bill amends a provision in the Dodd-Frank Act which was included at the 11th hour to “get 60 votes in the Senate” as former House Financial Services Chairman Barney Frank indicated during a markup of the bill back in February, 2012.

This section we reform with our bill was mischaracterized as an effort to prevent “risky” swaps activities in the bank. While we believe this provision was proposed in good faith, it simply does not prevent the risk that its authors intended. Moreover, this provision of the bill will cause many American financial institutions to operate at a significant disadvantage to their foreign competitors.

Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke and former Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker have both publicly raised concerns about section 716.

In the 112th Congress, the House Financial Services Democrats, including Chairman Frank and current Ranking Member MAXINE WATERS, endorsed H.R. 1838, agreeing that this measure addressed the valid criticisms of section 716 without “weakening the financial reforms law’s important derivative safeguards or prohibitions on bank proprietary trading.”

The bill before us today is virtually identical to H.R. 1838 from the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, to echo what Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said at a hearing on February 27:

Section 716, as drafted, will not reduce risk and will likely increase costs of people who use the derivatives and make it more difficult for the bank to compete with foreign competitors who can provide a more complete set of services.

It is crystal clear: this section needs to be reformed.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill and look forward to my Senate colleague, KAY HAGAN, passing her companion bill in the Senate so we can get this commonsense reform completed.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2010.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing,
and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have asked for my views on section 716 of S. 3217. This section would prevent many insured depository institutions from engaging in swaps-related activities to hedge their own financial risks or to meet the hedging needs of their customers, and would prohibit nonbank swaps entities, including swap dealers, clearing agencies and derivative clearing organizations, from receiving any type of Federal assistance.

The Federal Reserve has been a strong proponent of changes to strengthen the regulatory framework and infrastructure for over-the-counter (OTC) derivative markets to reduce systemic risks, promote transparency, and enhance the safety and soundness of banking organizations and other financial institutions. Title VII and Title VIII

of S. 3217 include important provisions designed to achieve these goals. For example, Title VII would require most derivative contracts to be cleared through central clearinghouses and traded on exchanges or open trading facilities, require information concerning all other derivatives contracts to be reported to trade repositories or regulators, and provide the regulatory agencies significant new authorities to ensure that all swaps dealers and major swap participants are subject to strong capital, margin, and collateral requirements with respect to their swap activities. Title VIII also includes provisions designed to help ensure that centralized market utilities for clearing and settling payments, securities, and derivatives transactions (financial market utilities), which are critical choke points in the financial system, are subject to robust and consistent risk management standards—including collateral, margin, and robust private-sector liquidity arrangements—and do not pose a systemic risk to the financial system.

I have also frequently made clear that we must end the notion that some firms are “too-big-to-fail.” For that reason, the Federal Reserve has advocated the development of enhanced and rigorous prudential standards for all large, interconnected financial firms, and the enactment of a new resolution regime that would allow systemically important financial firms to be resolved in an orderly manner, with losses imposed on the Federal Reserve to provide emergency, secured credit to nondepository institutions only through broad-based liquidity facilities designed to address serious strains in the financial markets, and not to bail out any specific firm.

S. 3217 makes important contributions to the goals of reducing systemic risk, eliminating the too-big-to-fail problem, and strengthening prudential supervision. I am concerned, however, that section 716 is counter-productive to achieving these goals.

In particular, section 716 would essentially prohibit all insured depository institutions from acting as a swap dealer or a major swap participant—even when the institution acts in these capacities to serve the commercial and hedging needs of its customers or to hedge the institution’s own financial risks. Forcing these activities out of insured depository institutions would weaken both financial stability and strong prudential regulation of derivative activities.

Prohibiting depository institutions from engaging in significant swaps activities will weaken the risk mitigation efforts of banks and their customers. Depository institutions use derivatives to help mitigate the risks of their normal banking activities. For example, depository institutions use derivatives to hedge the interest rate, currency, and credit risks that arise from their loan, securities, and deposit portfolios. Use of derivatives by depository institutions to mitigate risks in the banking business also provides important protection to the deposit insurance fund and taxpayers as well as to the financial system more broadly. In addition, banks acquire substantial expertise in assessing and managing interest rate, currency, and credit risk in their ordinary commercial banking business. Thus, banks are well situated to be efficient and prudent providers of these risk management tools to customers.

Importantly, banks conduct their derivatives activities in an environment that is subject to strong prudential Federal supervision and regulation, including capital regulations that specifically take account of a

bank's exposures to derivative transactions. The Basel Committee on Banking Supervision has recently proposed tough new capital and liquidity requirements for derivatives that will further strengthen the prudential standards that apply to bank derivative activities. Titles I, III, VI, VII and VIII of S.3217 all add provisions further strengthening the authority of the Federal banking agencies and other supervisory agencies to address the risks of derivatives. Section 716 would force derivatives activities out of banks and potentially into less regulated entities or into foreign firms that operate outside the boundaries of our Federal regulatory system. The movement of derivatives to entities outside the reach of the Federal supervisory agencies would increase, rather than reduce the risk to the financial system. In addition, foreign jurisdictions are highly unlikely to push derivatives business out of their banks. Accordingly, foreign banks will have a competitive advantage over U.S. banking firms in the global derivatives marketplace, and derivatives transactions could migrate outside the United States.

More broadly, section 716 would prohibit the Federal Reserve from lending to any swaps dealer or major swap participant—regardless of whether it is affiliated with a bank—even under a broad-based 13(3) liquidity facility in a financial crisis. Experience over the past two years demonstrates that such broad-based facilities can play a critical role in stemming financial panics and addressing severe strains in the financial markets that threaten financial stability, the flow of credit to households and businesses, and economic growth. These facilities will be less effective if participants must choose between continuing (or unwinding) derivatives positions and participating in the market-liquifying facility.

I am concerned that section 716 in its present form would make the U.S. financial system less resilient and more susceptible to systemic risk and, thus, is inconsistent with the important goals of financial reform legislation. We look forward to continuing to work with the Congress as you work to enact strong regulatory reform legislation that both addresses the weaknesses in the financial regulatory system that became painfully evident during the crisis, and positions the regulatory system to meet the inevitable challenges that lie ahead in the 21st century.

Sincerely,

BEN BERNANKE.

New York, NY, May 6, 2010.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: A number of people, including some members of your Committee, have asked me about the proposed restrictions on bank trading in derivatives set out in Senator Lincoln's proposed amendment to Section 716 of S. 3217. I thought it best to write you directly about my reaction.

I well understand the concerns that have motivated Senator Lincoln in terms of the risks and potential conflicts posed by proprietary trading in derivatives concentrated in a limited number of commercial banking organizations. As you know, the proposed restrictions appear to go well beyond the prescriptions on proprietary trading by banks that are incorporated in Section 619 of the reform legislation that you have proposed. My understanding is that the prohibitions already provided for in Section 619, specifically including the Merkley-Levin amended language clarifying the extent of the prohibition on proprietary trading by commercial banks, satisfy my concerns and those of many others with respect to bank trading in derivatives.

In that connection, I am also aware of, and share, the concerns about the extensive reach of Senator Lincoln's proposed amendment. The provision of derivatives by commercial banks to their customers in the usual course of a banking relationship should not be prohibited.

In sum, my sense is that the understandable concerns about commercial bank trading in derivatives are reasonably dealt with in Section 619 of your reform bill as presently drafted. Both your Bill and the Lincoln amendment reflect the important concern that, to the extent feasible, derivative transactions be centrally cleared or traded on a regulated exchange. These are needed elements of reform.

I am sending copies of this letter to Secretary Geithner and to Senators, Shelby, Merkley, Levin and Lincoln.

Sincerely,

PAUL VOLCKER.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), who is also the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, not everyone supports this legislation. Ranking Member WATERS was mentioned. But she spoke eloquently today as to why she opposes H.R. 992. Mr. Frank is not here to speak for himself. So we cannot say that he, today, would support H.R. 992.

It may be that we have the AFL-CIO opposing H.R. 992, as well Public Citizen, and the Commodity Markets Oversight Coalition. It may be that we have them opposing it because we understand, as do many others, that this weekend marks the 84th anniversary of the stock market crash of 1929. It was that stock market crash that gave us Glass-Steagall in 1933.

Glass-Steagall provided the firewall between commercial banking and investment banking. It didn't let you use tax dollars in the sense that they are insured by FDIC to engage in investment banking.

Well, it seems ironic that it took us 66 years to repeal Glass-Steagall, 66 years to repeal that firewall that separated commercial banking from investment banking, and has taken us now little more than 3 years to repeal, by way of evisceration, section 716 of Dodd-Frank.

Section 716 provides a firewall. It is the firewall to protect investors—taxpayers, if you will—from those investors who engage in derivatives. This derivatives market that we are talking about is \$600 trillion to approximately \$1.2 quadrillion. No one really knows. Only God knows how big it is.

But what we are doing is exposing tax dollars to this derivatives market, and it is my hope that we will not pass this legislation because it will set us back.

Let's give section 716 an opportunity to function. Glass-Steagall functioned for 66 years. Let's not repeal section 716 in a little more than 3 years.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), also a member of the committee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act.

As a lifelong farmer and small business owner, I understand the need for farm cooperatives and manufacturing companies to manage their risks. H.R. 992 reforms section 716 of Dodd-Frank to ensure businesses can manage their long-term commodity and equity risks.

Missouri is the Show Me State, and I ask the opposition to show me how section 716 benefits my constituents and decreases overall risk in the U.S. financial markets.

Since the beginning, Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke and Treasury Secretary Geithner have opposed section 716 of Dodd-Frank. Show me how section 716 decreases overall risk to the financial markets when Chairman Bernanke clearly stated:

It's not evident why section 716 makes the company as a whole safer. And what we do see is that it will likely increase the costs of people who use the derivatives.

□ 1330

Since Dodd-Frank became law, no equivalent provisions have been adopted in any other foreign jurisdictions that are working through their own derivatives reforms.

Show me how placing U.S. firms at a competitive disadvantage with international banks will ultimately benefit manufacturers in my district managing their interest rate risks.

H.R. 992, however, would prevent financial institutions from forcing much of the derivatives business outside the bank.

Show me why banks, which are a more heavily regulated and a more highly capitalized entity than a stand-alone affiliate, are not a better platform for regulators to monitor swap activity and to protect U.S. financial markets.

Farmers in Missouri must contend with a multitude of weather and financial risks. They use swaps to manage their long-term price risks on everything from the crops they grow to the fuel that runs their equipment.

Show me why we should allow section 716 to increase the costs to my farmers, who merely want to manage their long-term price risks through commodity swaps so they can focus on their real job—feeding America.

H.R. 992 is a much-needed change that improves the U.S. financial system for small businesses, farmers, and job creators. Again, I support H.R. 992, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation. Together, let's show the American people we are for smart reforms in order to allow manufacturers, businesses, and farmers to manage their risks in a commonsense way.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut, Representative JIM HIMES, a leader on the Financial Services Committee and the chief Democratic cosponsor of this bill.

Mr. HIMES. I want to thank Mr. SCOTT for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, derivatives are complicated things. They are probably one of the more complicated things that we deal with in this Chamber, so it is worth describing in simple terms what H.R. 992 does.

It abides by principles that I think we can all agree make some sense, which are those things which contributed to the meltdown of 2008—the terrible mortgages, the derivatives that were based on those mortgages, the proprietary trading. Those things that contributed to the meltdown of 2008 should be either made unlawful or should be much more closely regulated than they were in the past; but those things that were not related in any way, shape, or form and that did not contribute to the meltdown of 2008 we should take a little lighter hand on.

H.R. 992 says that those derivatives—the currency derivatives, the commodity derivatives, the equity swaps, all of these complicated things that weren't anywhere close to the meltdown of Bear Stearns and Lehman Brothers and the challenges at Citibank and at JPMorgan Chase—will not be subject to a very aggressive measure saying that banks cannot trade in those derivatives.

Now, banks trade in derivatives because they support their clients and trade. I emphasize “trade” because one of their clients will borrow \$100 million to build in Japan. That exposes him to yen risk. Maybe I don't want to take yen risk, and maybe the same guy who lent me the money can help me offload that risk. That is the idea.

H.R. 992 in no way allows for the risky derivatives—the collateralized bond obligations, all of those real estate derivatives—to come back into the banking environment, and it in no way permits, as the chairman has said a number of times, a bailout of banks because of derivatives.

Even though we have spent a lot of time on this today, it makes sense to spend a second on the history of this bill:

Section 716 requires the full push-out of derivatives. Regulators recognize that this is dangerous, and they are very vocal about it. Then-Ranking Member Barney Frank takes a suggestion from then-Representative Nan Hayworth to repeal section 716. The then-ranking member says, Let's not repeal it. Let's allow for the plain vanilla, common derivatives to remain in the banks and push out the dangerous ones. The Democratic staff helps draft this amendment, and I am personally asked to offer this amendment to Nan

Hayworth's bill. She accepts it. A voice vote is passed, and the bill is passed in the last Congress. The minority views supported it. We all supported it. This year, exactly the same bill comes before us, and we have ginned up the press, and we have ginned up the bloggers. This has become a gift to Wall Street.

What is different? What is different from what passed happily and in a bipartisan fashion in the last Congress relative to this Congress—the London Whale? JPMorgan claims that they were hedging. Hedging is permitted whether we pass this or not. The London Whale has nothing to do with this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, what has changed is that we no longer do the hard work of finding finely balanced regulation like we do in water or in air. In financial services—in Dodd-Frank today—we have a morality play: either you repeal Dodd-Frank in its entirety because it is awful or you may not touch a word in the law.

Folks, we are about finding that balance. In as much as we go in front of each other and say that this is a giveaway to Wall Street, that doesn't help explain whether we should allow commodity swaps or not. What that does is impugn our motives as individuals, and it does not inform the debate. This is well-balanced regulation that passed overwhelmingly bipartisanship. Let's get away from this morality play and do our jobs by finding finely balanced regulation.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), a member of the committee.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my colleagues for standing here on this floor today to talk about this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 992. It has been introduced by my friends RICHARD HUDSON from North Carolina and RANDY HULTGREN from the great State of Illinois.

I cannot respond to my colleagues who ask about what happened here in the last term, because I wasn't here; but I can tell you from my seat here in the U.S. House that this bill is a good bill and needs to be passed. It seeks to fix yet another unintended consequence of Dodd-Frank while still protecting against risky derivatives activities. This bill amends section 716, also known as the Dodd-Frank push-out provision.

If implemented, section 716 would actually force banks to push out certain derivatives like ag-based swaps and equity swaps, which are very important to my agricultural-based district, and

it would effectively drive up transaction costs. According to Ben Bernanke, this would actually make the U.S. financial system riskier.

This bipartisan legislation passed the Ag Committee 31-14 and the Financial Services Committee 53-6. Let me repeat that. This bipartisan legislation passed 31-14 out of the House Ag Committee, and it passed 53-6 out of Financial Services. This is commonsense legislation that will help all Americans.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, Representative BRAD SCHNEIDER. He is a member of the Small Business Committee, and he certainly understands the value of this legislation to Main Street businesses.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 992 resolves a widely recognized, unintended consequence in section 716 of Dodd-Frank. I join in asking my colleagues to support this bill in an effort to strengthen Dodd-Frank and to actually improve transparency and oversight in our financial system.

The overall goal of Dodd-Frank is to provide a sound, robust financial system following the upheaval of our financial markets in 2008. I support Dodd-Frank, and I am fully committed to realizing its goals, but no piece of legislation is perfect. This body has recognized that and has passed measures to correct adverse, unintended consequences that were identified after Dodd-Frank was signed into law, and that is what we are doing again here today.

This bill does not undermine the intent or overall implementation of Dodd-Frank. However, section 716, as it is currently written, could impede those very efforts. By indiscriminantly pushing out routine swap trades from heavily regulated banks to separate, less regulated firms, section 716 actually inserts more risk into our system. It could also make the use of certain risk-mitigating derivatives so expensive that businesses will stop using them to hedge uncertainty, resulting in higher costs for consumers and more financial instability.

Former FDIC Chairwoman Sheila Bair, former Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker, and, most recently, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke have all stated that this provision, as written, is problematic. If our foremost experts have concerns with it, why must we maintain this unduly risky provision?

This bill provides the soundness Dodd-Frank intended for our banking system while still prudently limiting the risks and costs. It also ensures manufacturers and our farmers still have the ability to hedge against price fluctuations—a practice that is integral to their operations and also benefits consumers.

I thank the gentlemen for their work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this legislation.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is left on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 4¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONAWAY. I now yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to the intent of section 716 to reduce risk in the financial system, it does exactly the opposite. It creates more risk, and it places an undue burden on financial institutions for conducting legitimate hedging activities. This legislation would take an important step to ensure that Dodd-Frank is living up to its goal to reduce systemic risk, a goal on which both parties agree.

Even former Financial Services Committee Chairman Barney Frank—the namesake of the bill in question—endorsed this bill last Congress, saying that it will not in any way, shape, or form reduce sensible regulation in derivatives. I rarely agreed with Congressman Frank, but I certainly share the goal of regulating the financial system in a sensible way, and I think that is the key.

H.R. 992 would prevent financial institutions from forcing their derivatives business outside the banking structure to an entity that is far less regulated than the bank. So, while some may believe that section 716 provides more regulation, they are mistaken. Again, it is the other way around. All we are asking is to allow financial institutions to mitigate their risks so we can have a stronger banking system.

A stronger financial system makes America more competitive economically; it creates jobs; and it provides stability for the consumer. I urge my colleagues to support this common-sense legislation.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I am ready to close, and I ask my colleague, Mr. CONAWAY, if he has any more speakers.

Mr. CONAWAY. I have no further requests for time. I will be the final speaker.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in closing, we have before us perhaps the most single important bill facing the viability, the financial security, and the stability of the financial system within the United States and throughout the world. We are dealing here with a \$712 trillion piece of the world economy.

Now, my friends who are in opposition to this certainly have some legitimate points. There is no question

about that. We had a meltdown. Banks and members on Wall Street did wrongdoing, but this isn't the bill with which to punish them for doing that wrongdoing. We punish them for wrongdoing by working with the regulators and by putting, in fact, in motion not just civil penalties and not just financial penalties but criminal action, but we do that in another place, at another time. We have already approached that with the CFTC—to use criminal actions if any of these kinds of shenanigans happen again.

We are here to make sure that our banking system and that our economy, which have to work on the world stage, have not a disadvantage. If you push out these commodity swaps or the security swaps, we are doing a great disservice not just to the banks but to our end users.

Take commodities. When you look at them, Mr. Speaker, commodities are things like aluminum. They are agribusiness products. In 40 out of our 50 States, the largest part of their economies is agribusiness. Let us take something like Coca-Cola. The Coca-Cola Company has to deal with aluminum for cans—or Pepsi Cola or any of those in our beverage industry. They have to mitigate their risks. If you push them out of where they have to do their business in the same banks with interest rate swaps—by the way, the interest rate swaps are the critical pivot swap to mitigate that risk.

□ 1345

You are going to push commodities out. You are going to push the farmers out. You are going to push all the manufacturers, the automobile industry. All of these people that use commodities will not be able to do business in that same bank where the interest rates are, where the currency fluctuation rates are.

When you have that, you are putting us at a great disadvantage. This is why Chairman Bernanke said that this is a problem. This adds to the systemic risk when you push out these individual commodities into another area. It creates uncertainty.

The other thing that it does: it puts our banking system at a huge disadvantage competitively because these foreign banks, they are not pushing their swaps out, and that means that the United States banking system could see a migration of swap activities out in the world. We are the leader of the world. We have got to act like that.

That is what H.R. 992 will do. It will be that force that will help our banking system be the true leader in this world and not at a disadvantage.

With great respect to those in opposition to this, it is written into law in section 716 that no taxpayer money can be used for bailouts.

You talk about the FDIC. You cannot use that because that is the bank's

money that they put up to ensure deposits. None of that goes into swaps. Certainly we can't use proprietary trading. The Volcker Rule settles that where they cannot make any kind of money or make profit on the deposits of ordinary citizens. Nowhere is there any taxpayer liability.

This is a good bill. I urge everybody in this House of Representatives to realize our economic security is at stake and let's pass H.R. 992.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my good friend, DAVID SCOTT, who is ranking member on the committee that he and I lead, for the good work on this bill, supporting it today, as well as the other work that we have done with respect to our committee. I also want to thank RICHARD HUDSON and SEAN MALONEY for their work on bringing this together.

A couple of points, and then I will close.

One, the “London Whale” has been mentioned more than one time as a reason why we should not go forward with H.R. 992. That shows a fundamental misunderstanding of the trades associated with the “London Whale.” Those trades are on cleared exchanges and occur within the bank and would have been unaffected by section 716 had it, in fact, been implemented.

One of the telling points is the prudential regulators on this particular section of the law have put off the actual implementation of this law until at least July of 2015. So if time is of the essence, if the disaster is around the corner, then I think the prudential regulators would have recognized that and would have moved a little more hastily than to put it off for 2 years.

There is no bogeyman here, Mr. Speaker. This is good sense, bipartisan—we hope it will be bicameral—legislation that corrects a really unintended consequence—poorly drafting a bill in 2010, when Dodd-Frank was passed. It didn't intend to have these kind of consequences, and this simply addresses that.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the bill. Let's pass this on and get it done over in the Senate.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, another day, another attempt to weaken the Dodd-Frank Act. Just 5 years ago, the financial industry required a \$700 billion taxpayer bailout and nearly destroyed our economy. We learned in the aftermath that risky derivative products, like swaps, were a major factor contributing to the crisis. As a result, Congress passed common sense reforms to prevent American taxpayers from once again being on the hook for trading losses by the country's largest banks. One of these new reforms was embodied in section 716, known as the “swaps push out rule.” Banks can no longer

use federally-insured deposits to recklessly gamble in the most exotic types of derivatives.

Unfortunately, H.R. 992 would roll back these reforms and simply restore the status quo for Wall Street. This is ill advised and wrong for American taxpayers. If we need proof that swaps push out is necessary, look no further than last year's "London Whale" incident which cost JP Morgan \$6 billion and could have been much worse.

I ask my colleagues to oppose H.R. 992.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 992, the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act.

Part of the problem that led to the 2008 financial meltdown was that banks were taking huge risks by exposing themselves to risky swaps and derivatives. We passed the Dodd-Frank Act in part to address this problem by forcing depository institutions to spin off their swaps and derivatives activities to separately capitalized affiliates. H.R. 992, if passed, would nullify that part of Dodd-Frank and again allow banks to engage in the type of reckless behavior that caused the gravest economic calamity since the Great Depression.

Voting in favor of H.R. 992 is tantamount to unlearning the lessons of the recent past. I find it absolutely appalling that five years on, we're considering legislation to permit the very type of bad behavior that necessitated the Dodd-Frank Act in the first place. I urge my colleagues to vote down H.R. 992, if only out of good common sense.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, while I recognize the many legitimate uses of derivatives in today's financial marketplace, I also believe it is critically important that derivatives be properly regulated so that end-users and consumers can reap their benefits without putting the larger economy at risk. For that reason, I think we need to tread carefully before making material modifications to the regulatory regime for derivatives established in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act—and this note of caution is equally applicable to what might be described as piecemeal changes to Title VII of Dodd-Frank, given the inherently complex and interrelated nature of these sophisticated financial instruments.

In that regard, the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act would substantially revise Section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Act to permit a broader array of derivatives transactions—including those involving commodity swaps, equity swaps and certain credit default swaps—to occur inside federally backed financial institutions, rather than in separately capitalized subsidiaries as required under current law. Impacted institutions argue that this existing "push out" requirement for these categories of derivatives places them at a disadvantage relative to their foreign competition by increasing the cost of those transactions and by effectively preventing the netting of positions between themselves and their customers. Additionally, proponents of H.R. 992 argue that Section 716 confers no meaningful additional protection to taxpayers in light of the stronger capital, margin and clearing requirements created by Dodd-Frank, and that it might even work at cross purposes with the Orderly Liquidation Authority created in Title II of the legislation.

I am not opposed to making commonsense adjustments to improve the real world work-

ability of the Dodd-Frank law. I want our financial institutions to be able to compete effectively for customers everywhere they operate. And I am not in favor of regulation that is either unnecessary or not accomplishing its intended objective in a cost-effective way.

It is possible that Section 716 will prove to be that kind of regulation, but right now it is too soon to tell. Of particular importance when evaluating the ultimate value of Section 716 is the final scope of the forthcoming Volcker rule. If the final Volcker rule provides a strict definition of what activities constitute bona fide "hedging" and "market making", then proponents' arguments for this legislation will be strengthened. If, on the other hand, the final Volcker rule includes an overly broad definition of these activities, then the protections intended by Section 716 could become more important.

Accordingly, I will be voting "no" on today's legislation, but remain open to revisiting this issue once the Volcker rule and other relevant rulemakings are finalized and in place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 391, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 992, to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 4, after line 15, insert the following:

SEC. 3. PREVENTING OIL AND BIOFUEL PRICE MANIPULATION.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall limit the authority of the bank regulatory agencies and other regulators to examine a covered depository institution's compliance with laws prohibiting the manipulation of commodity markets, particularly the excessive speculation and manipulation of oil and biofuel prices, and to limit the activities of covered depository institutions in such markets.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

Mr. CONAWAY. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 992, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment is a simple, straightforward improvement that I believe both sides can agree is absolutely necessary and that I believe is also supported by the majority of the American people.

If my amendment passes, it will ensure that the American people, consumers, families, and businesses are protected from reckless speculation that is driving up the price of gas at the pump.

Specifically, my amendment ensures that nothing in this act would limit the ability of regulators to go after excessive speculation and manipulation of oil and biofuels. It simply clarifies that bank regulators have the authority to stop manipulation in the commodity markets.

This amendment also protects the wallets and pocketbooks of all Americans by ensuring that banks will not be given a free pass to destabilize commodity markets and drive up energy prices for all Americans at the pump.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, speculation in the energy sector is a very real, a very present, and a very serious problem. Volatility in oil markets since 2008, and more recently in biofuels, leads to dramatic price swings, causing pain for every American who depends on gasoline at the pump.

In September, The New York Times reported that prices for biofuel credits had recently surged 20-fold in just 6 months.

Because of these problems, many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have called for investigations in both oil and biofuel price manipulation.

In fact, just last week, on October 22, 15 of our colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, asked the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission to look into whether fraud and manipulation was playing a role in the biofuel credit price swings.

The concerns of many Americans extend far beyond biofuels.

Earlier this year, both the E.U. and U.S. authorities began looking at oil price manipulation, which not only affects the price at the pump but also artificially increases prices on everything from food to manufactured goods.

According to the Energy Information Agency, 71 percent of the price of a gallon of gas and 63 percent of the price of diesel is directly related to the price of crude oil. Thus, there is no doubt that speculators who drive up the price of

crude oil are impacting the price at the pump.

Every time there is a gas hike, it hurts working families struggling to make ends meet. It hurts commuters driving to work and to school, including most of my constituents in Ventura County. It hurts small, mid-size, and large businesses, driving up the price of doing business and impacting their ability to invest in new equipment and hire new workers. It hurts our military, including those at Naval Base Ventura County, costing more to move troops and supplies. It hurts seniors, many of whom live on fixed incomes and cannot afford an increase in retail grocery prices. It hurts the specialty crop growers in my district, including the strawberry, avocado, citrus, and lettuce growers, whose bottom line is so closely tied to the price of energy. It also hurts our overall national economy and threatens to slow job creation.

That is why it is so important that regulators retain the authority to prevent bad actors from taking excessive, or even manipulative positions, using swaps.

I believe that many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle are honestly concerned about speculation in our energy markets. Let's do something today to stop it.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I don't really understand the motion to recommit because regulators already have the power that is described here. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I find the matter to be irrelevant and not a particularly good use of the House's time. For those reasons alone, it ought to be opposed.

It is getting in the way of one of the strongest, most bipartisan pieces of legislation that has come to the House. It passed the Financial Services Committee by an overwhelming vote of 53-6. It will help grow the economy. It will put people back to work. It will reduce systemic risk.

I want to thank all of the sponsors, especially the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HULTGREN, for his leadership on this very valuable piece of legislation.

It is time to oppose the motion to recommit and it is time to pass the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and passage of House Joint Resolution 99.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 223, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 568]

YEAS—190

Andrews	Green, Al	Nolan
Barber	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Barrow (GA)	Grijalva	Owens
Bass	Gutierrez	Pallone
Beatty	Hahn	Pascarell
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Perlmuter
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Peters (CA)
Blumenauer	Himes	Peters (MI)
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Honda	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Bustos	Huffman	Quigley
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Capps	Jeffries	Rangel
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Jones	Ruiz
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Linda
Chu	Kildee	T.
Clarke	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kind	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kuster	Schiff
Cohen	Langevin	Schneider
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Costa	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Levin	Scott, David
Crowley	Lewis	Serrano
Cuellar	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	Loeb sack	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Sinema
DeFazio	Lowe y	Sires
DeGette	Lujan, Ben Ray	Slaughter
Delaney	(NM)	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lynch	Speier
DelBene	Maffei	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Maloney,	Takano
Dingell	Carolyn	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	Matheson	Titus
Duckworth	Matsui	Tonko
Edwards	McCollum	Tsongas
Ellison	McDermott	Van Hollen
Engel	McGovern	Vargas
Enyart	McIntyre	Veasey
Eshoo	McNerney	Vela
Esty	Meeks	Velázquez
Farr	Meng	Visclosky
Fattah	Michaud	Walz
Foster	Miller, George	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Schultz
Fudge	Moran	Waters
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Watt
Gallego	Nadler	Welch
Garamendi	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Garcia	Neal	Yarmuth
Grayson	Negrete McLeod	

NAYS—223

Amash	Bachus	Barton
Amodei	Barletta	Benishak
Bachmann	Barr	Bentivolio

Bilirakis	Harris	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Black	Hastings (WA)	Radel
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Reed
Boustany	Hensarling	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Holding	Renacci
Bridenstine	Hudson	Ribble
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Roby
Buchanan	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Bucshon	Hurt	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Calvert	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Capito	Jordan	Rooney
Carter	Joyce	Ros-Lehtinen
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Chabot	King (IA)	Ross
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Rothfus
Coble	Kingston	Royce
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Runyan
Cole	Kline	Ryan (WI)
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Salmon
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Sanford
Conaway	Lamborn	Scalise
Cook	Lance	Schock
Cotton	Lankford	Schweikert
Cramer	Latham	Scott, Austin
Crawford	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Sessions
Culberson	Long	Shimkus
Daines	Lucas	Shuster
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
Dent	Lummis	Smith (MO)
DeSantis	Marchant	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	Marino	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Smith (TX)
Duffy	McCarthy (CA)	Southerland
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Stewart
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Stivers
Ellmers	McHenry	Stockman
Farenthold	McKeon	Stutzman
Fincher	McKinley	Terry
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Thompson (PA)
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Thornberry
Fleming	Meadows	Tiberi
Flores	Meehan	Tipton
Forbes	Messer	Turner
Fortenberry	Mica	Upton
Fox	Miller (FL)	Valadao
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Wagner
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Walberg
Gardner	Mullin	Walden
Garrett	Mulvaney	Walorski
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Webster (FL)
Gibson	Noem	Wenstrup
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Nunes	Whitfield
Gosar	Nunnelee	Williams
Gowdy	Olson	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Palazzo	Wittman
Graves (GA)	Paulsen	Wolf
Graves (MO)	Pearce	Womack
Griffin (AR)	Perry	Woodall
Griffith (VA)	Petri	Yoder
Grimm	Pittenger	Yoho
Guthrie	Pitts	Young (AK)
Hall	Poe (TX)	Young (IN)
Harper	Pompeo	

NOT VOTING—17

Aderholt	Hanna	Pelosi
Campbell	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Cárdenas	Israel	Tierney
Ciilline	Keating	Waxman
Cooper	Lujan Grisham	
Davis, Rodney	(NM)	
Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1419

Messrs. RENACCI, BILIRAKIS, COFFMAN, and SMITH of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mrs. CAPPS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 568 I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 568 I was unavoidably detained and would have voted "no" on Motion to Recommit.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 568 I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 292, noes 122, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 569]

YEAS—292

Amash	Cook	Graves (GA)
Amodei	Cotton	Graves (MO)
Bachmann	Cramer	Griffin (AR)
Bachus	Crawford	Griffith (VA)
Barber	Crenshaw	Grimm
Barletta	Crowley	Guthrie
Barr	Cuellar	Hall
Barrow (GA)	Culberson	Hanabusa
Barton	Daines	Harper
Beatty	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Benishke	Delaney	Hartzler
Bentivolio	Denham	Hastings (WA)
Bera (CA)	Dent	Heck (NV)
Bilirakis	DeSantis	Heck (WA)
Bishop (GA)	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Himes
Black	Duckworth	Hinojosa
Blackburn	Duffy	Holding
Blumenauer	Duncan (SC)	Horsford
Boustany	Ellmers	Hoyer
Brady (TX)	Engel	Hudson
Bridenstine	Esty	Huelskamp
Brooks (AL)	Farenthold	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Fincher	Hultgren
Broun (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Hunter
Brown (FL)	Fleischmann	Hurt
Buchanan	Fleming	Issa
Bucshon	Flores	Jeffries
Burgess	Forbes	Jenkins
Butterfield	Fortenberry	Johnson (GA)
Calvert	Foster	Johnson (OH)
Camp	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Franks (AZ)	Jordan
Capito	Frelinghuysen	Joyce
Carney	Fudge	Kelly (IL)
Carter	Galleo	Kelly (PA)
Cassidy	Garcia	Kilmer
Chabot	Gardner	Kind
Chaffetz	Garrett	King (NY)
Clarke	Gerlach	Kingston
Clyburn	Gibbs	Kinzing (IL)
Coble	Gibson	Kirkpatrick
Coffman	Gingrey (GA)	Kline
Cole	Gohmert	Kuster
Collins (GA)	Goodlatte	Labrador
Collins (NY)	Gosar	LaMalfa
Conaway	Gowdy	Lamborn
Connolly	Granger	Lance

Lankford	Paulsen	Sessions
Larsen (WA)	Pearce	Sewell (AL)
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Sherman
Latham	Perry	Shimkus
Latta	Peters (CA)	Shuster
Lipinski	Peters (MI)	Simpson
LoBiondo	Petri	Sinema
Long	Pittenger	Sires
Lowey	Pitts	Smith (MO)
Lucas	Poe (TX)	Smith (NE)
Luetkemeyer	Polis	Smith (NJ)
Lummis	Pompeo	Smith (TX)
Maffei	Posey	Southerland
Maloney	Price (GA)	Stewart
Carolyne	Quigley	Stivers
Maloney, Sean	Radel	Stockman
Marchant	Rahall	Stutzman
Marino	Rangel	Terry
Matheson	Reed	Thompson (PA)
McCarthy (CA)	Reichert	Thornberry
McCaul	Renacci	Tiberi
McClintock	Ribble	Tipton
McHenry	Rice (SC)	Turner
McIntyre	Richmond	Upton
McKeon	Rigell	Valadao
McKinley	Roby	Vargas
McMorris	Roe (TN)	Veasey
Rodgers	Rogers (AL)	Wagner
Meadows	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
Meehan	Rogers (MI)	Walden
Meeks	Rohrabacher	Walorski
Meng	Rokita	Wasserman
Messer	Rooney	Schultz
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Weber (TX)
Miller (FL)	Roskam	Webster (FL)
Miller (MI)	Ross	Wenstrup
Miller, Gary	Rothfus	Westmoreland
Moore	Royce	Whitfield
Moran	Runyan	Williams
Mullin	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)
Mulvaney	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (SC)
Murphy (FL)	Salmon	Wittman
Murphy (PA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Wolf
Neugebauer	Sanford	Womack
Noem	Scalise	Woodall
Nugent	Schneider	Yoder
Nunes	Schock	Yoho
Nunnelee	Schweikert	Young (AK)
Olson	Scott, Austin	Young (IN)
Owens	Scott, David	
Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	

NOES—122

Andrews	Garamendi	Nolan
Bass	Grayson	O'Rourke
Becerra	Green, Al	Pallone
Bishop (NY)	Green, Gene	Pascarella
Bonamici	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	Payne
Braley (IA)	Hahn	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Pingree (ME)
Bustos	Higgins	Pocan
Capps	Holt	Price (NC)
Capuano	Honda	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Ruiz
Cartwright	Huckabee Lee	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Castro (TX)	Jones	Schakowsky
Chu	Kaptur	Schiff
Clay	Kennedy	Schrader
Cleaver	Kildee	Schwartz
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Costa	Levin	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lewis	Slaughter
Cummings	Liebsack	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Takano
DeGette	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
DeBene	(NM)	
Deutch	Lynch	
Dingell	Massie	
Doggett	Matsui	
Doyle	McCollum	
Duncan (TN)	McDermott	
Edwards	McGovern	
Ellison	McNerney	
Enyart	Michaud	
Eshoo	Miller, George	
Farr	Nadler	
Fattah	Napolitano	
Frankel (FL)	Neal	
Gabbard	Negrete McLeod	

NOT VOTING—16

Aderholt	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Campbell	Israel	Sánchez, Linda
Cárdenas	Keating	T.
Cicilline	King (IA)	Tierney
Cooper	McCarthy (NY)	Watt
Hanna	Pelosi	

□ 1427

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 569, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION RELATING TO DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 99) relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as submitted under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 on October 17, 2013, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 191, answered "present" 2, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 570]

YEAS—222

Amash	Cramer	Griffin (AR)
Amodei	Crawford	Griffith (VA)
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Grimm
Bachus	Culberson	Guthrie
Barletta	Daines	Hall
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Harper
Barrow (GA)	Denham	Harris
Barton	DeSantis	Hartzler
Benishke	DesJarlais	Hastings (WA)
Bentivolio	Diaz-Balart	Hensarling
Bilirakis	Duffy	Holding
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Blackburn	Duncan (TN)	Huelskamp
Boustany	Ellmers	Huizenga (MI)
Brady (TX)	Farenthold	Hultgren
Bridenstine	Fincher	Hunter
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick	Hurt
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Jenkins
Broun (GA)	Fleming	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Flores	Johnson, Sam
Bucshon	Forbes	Jones
Burgess	Fortenberry	Jordan
Calvert	Fox	Joyce
Camp	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (PA)
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Capito	Gardner	Kingston
Carter	Garrett	Kinzing (IL)
Cassidy	Gerlach	Kline
Chabot	Gibbs	Labrador
Chaffetz	Gibson	LaMalfa
Clarke	Coble	Lamborn
Clyburn	Coffman	Lance
Coble	Cole	Lankford
Coffman	Collins (GA)	Latham
Cole	Collins (NY)	Latta
Collins (GA)	Conaway	LoBiondo
Collins (NY)	Cook	Long
Conaway	Cotton	Lucas

Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts

Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Massie

Ribble

NOT VOTING—15

Aderholt
Bass
Black
Campbell
Cicilline
Cooper
Green, Gene
Hanna
Herrera Beutler
Israel
Keating
McCarthy (NY)
Pelosi
Rush
Tierney

□ 1436

Mr. SMITH of Texas changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was passed.

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 570, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 62

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Wednesday, October 30, 2013, Thursday, October 31, 2013, or Friday, November 1, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, November 12, 2013, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 2. (a) The Speaker or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the House to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the House adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the House shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF THE LATE ISAAC NEWTON SKELTON

(Mr. CLEAVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago, what one newspaper called perhaps one of the gentlemen of Congress, Ike

Skelton, died here in Washington. For those of us here in the Missouri delegation, as well as those who were involved with Congressman Skelton on the Armed Services Committee, we are here to convey to the body that our colleague, our friend, has, indeed, died, and we who had the opportunity to know and serve with him are, of course, very saddened by his unexpected death.

Ike Skelton was 81 years old. He served here for 34 years and served all of that time on the Armed Services Committee and, of course, becoming the chair of Armed Services. He was a man of great humility, a man of great distinction, and was to be honored in 2 weeks at the Truman Library in Kansas City.

We think that he has been such a significant player in Washington that we, indeed, had to stand up and express our pain over his passing.

Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL is here from the other side, and we are asking, at this time, for the Members to stand in silence in memory of Isaac Newton Skelton.

A MOMENT OF TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF THE HON- ORABLE ISAAC SKELTON

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have just observed a moment of silence for Isaac Skelton. My good friend, EMANUEL CLEAVER, Ike's good friend, Senator MCCASKILL, LACY CLAY, and others who are here from the Missouri delegation, I want to rise with them, not in a moment of silence, but in a moment of tribute. We will perhaps have an opportunity to speak a longer time.

Yesterday, many of us had the opportunity to participate in a memorial service for Tom Foley. Tom Foley was the Speaker of this House.

A gentleman spoke who is, I think, one of the most revered members that has served in this body, Robert Michel. Bob Michel was Tom Foley's friend. Bob Michel was the leader of the Republican side of the aisle. They were friends, colleagues, and cooperated with one another to the benefit of this institution and its Members, and the Dean of the House adds, correctly, to the benefit of our country and all its citizens.

Bob Michel observed the civility that each one of them displayed and the willingness to reach out across the aisle and to make things happen positively for our country and for our citizens.

We lost another individual within the last weeks, Bill Young, who was a similar personality, and added luster to this Congress by his service and his civility.

Major Owens was another whom we lost. Four people who made this institution a better place.

Andrews
Barber
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr

NAYS—191

Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijaiva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei

Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmuter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter

Ike Skelton was my brother. He and I were Sigma Chi's. His son was a Sigma Chi. His father was a Sigma Chi. So we had a very special bond to start out with.

In addition, his first wife, Susan, who died too early, as mine did, came out and knocked on doors for me, Mr. Speaker, in Bowie, Maryland, just down the road here a piece. So I had a special bond with Ike, but also an extraordinary great respect for the way he conducted himself as a representative of the people of his district in Missouri, and the respect that he gave to each of us and the respect that he received in return.

How sad it is that these giants, Tom Foley, Bill Young, Ike Skelton, and, yes, Major Owens, passed from this body, passed from this life, but how joyful it is the extraordinary contributions each of them made to this House, which we should revere and love, the people's House.

Ike Skelton was of the people, for the people, and certainly by the people.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. WOLF. I want to just thank the gentleman for speaking. Ike lived in northern Virginia when he was here, and I would see him many times on the weekend. The second when it crossed the screen that he had died, I felt very, very badly.

To second what the gentleman said, many nights as I was driving home, I would see a car, Ike Skelton and Bill Emerson. They carpooled together. Bill Emerson, a Republican Member from our side, Ike from your side. They carpooled together. They were the best of friends. Ike was one of the finest people that I have served with since I have been in this House.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

□ 1445

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE MONTH

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the most important person in my life, my grandmother, always told me that you never hurt somebody you claim you love. This simple, but powerful, statement is one to reflect on this month, October, Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

When I came to Congress, I met a remarkable woman named Yvette Cade from Maryland who was the victim of horrible domestic abuse. After being denied a protective order by a judge, Yvette's estranged husband came into her place of employment, poured gasoline on her, and set her on fire. This in-

cident changed her life forever but does not hold her back, and now she advocates for other domestic abuse victims.

Domestic violence affects all races, religions, and economic groups. I am working along with my friend from California, JIM COSTA of the Victims' Rights Caucus, to make sure that Congress deals with this issue not just in October but every month of the year. Domestic violence is never the fault of the victim. It is the fault of the perpetrator.

Mr. Speaker, you never hurt somebody you claim you love.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TADEUSZ MAZOWIECKI, PREMIER OF POLAND

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it is with gratitude but heavy heart that I, on behalf of the people of the United States, the Polish Caucus of this House, and our region of Ohio, in particular, extend deepest sympathy to the people of Poland on the passing of ex-Premier of Poland Tadeusz Mazowiecki.

During his exceptional and transformative life, Premier Mazowiecki played a leading role in ushering in the first era of liberty that Poland had been afforded in modern history. Poland has assumed a pivotal and leading role in the European Union. History is still recording its rich, elegiac, and poignant history in the struggle to defeat tyranny and give rebirth to freedom.

As The New York Times reported this week, Premier Mazowiecki became the first non-Communist to head an Eastern Bloc nation since the late 1940s. Solidarity in Poland grew with his engagement as Poland led the anti-Communist movement in occupied Europe. Premier Mazowiecki's leadership of Poland at a time of critical change toward a democratic state has secured for him a permanent place in the history of a free Poland in Europe. He lived to see Poland's admission to NATO and Poland's growing cooperation within the world of nations.

An accomplished literary figure, intellectual, and Roman Catholic thinker and writer, Premier Mazowiecki embodied the meaning of a renaissance man. His imprisonment by the Communist Party for his progressive beliefs never dampened his spirit. He was a freedom fighter in word and deed.

Mr. Speaker, may his legacy inspire future generations to live with the courage and intellectual rigor he demonstrated in each decade of his life; and may white eagles fly over his memory and Poland's historic accomplishments as she walks with free nations in liberty's march.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 28, 2013]

TADEUSZ MAZOWIECKI, EX-PREMIER OF POLAND, DIES AT 86
(By Douglas Martin)

Tadeusz Mazowiecki, who went from editing small Roman Catholic intellectual publications to becoming prime minister of Poland—and the first non-Communist to head an Eastern bloc nation since the late 1940s—died on Monday in Warsaw. He was 86.

The Polish government announced the death. President Bronislaw Komorowski, ordered flags on government buildings to be flown at half-staff.

Mr. Mazowiecki, a journalist by profession, worked quietly for years to ease restrictions on individual rights and helped form the Solidarity trade union movement, which gained the leadership of Poland's national legislature in August 1989. By the end of that year, the Berlin Wall had fallen, Communist governments in Moscow's other satellite states had collapsed and the Cold War division of Europe was over.

In a message of condolences, Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany, who grew up in Communist East Germany, said that Mr. Mazowiecki made "an unforgotten contribution to overcoming authoritarian injustice and to the unity of Europe."

In the summer of 1980, a chain of labor disturbances rocked Poland. The focus was the Gdansk shipyard, where Lech Walesa led a strike to demand higher pay and the restitution of a fired worker. Mr. Mazowiecki (his full name is pronounced tah-DAY-oosh mah-zoh-VYET-skee) helped broaden it into an antibureaucratic social movement that became known as Solidarity.

He and his friend Bronislaw Geremek, a historian, persuaded 64 leading intellectuals, scholars, scientists and cultural figures to sign a petition that read in part: "In this struggle the place of the entire progressive intelligentsia is at their side. That is the Polish tradition, and that is the imperative of the hour."

Mr. Walesa thanked Mr. Mazowiecki and told him that he had a continued need for help from intellectuals in addressing government officials. Mr. Mazowiecki helped write the historic Aug. 31 agreement that ended the strike and established Solidarity by guaranteeing workers' rights to form independent trade unions with the right to strike.

The Communist government nonetheless felt threatened by Solidarity's mounting influence, and declared martial law on Dec. 13, 1981, making Solidarity and other pro-democracy groups illegal. As tanks rolled through Warsaw, Mr. Mazowiecki was arrested and imprisoned for more than a year. After his release, he was again one of Mr. Walesa's closest advisers.

The Polish economy worsened, and in 1988 Mr. Walesa and Mr. Mazowiecki coordinated a strike at the Gdansk shipyard. That strike brought no concessions. But a second, bigger strike brought the Communists to the negotiating table.

The Polish primate, Cardinal Jozef Glemp, appointed Mr. Mazowiecki a mediator, and he arranged the series of talks between the Communists and Solidarity that led to plans for quasi-free parliamentary elections in which a newly legal Solidarity would be allowed to participate.

In the June 1989 vote, Solidarity won overwhelmingly in the districts it was allowed to contest and, after parliamentary maneuvering with minor parties, was able to form a government. Gen. Wojciech Jaruzelski, head of the Communist government, asked

Mr. Walesa for three candidates, of which he would select one as a Solidarity prime minister. He chose Mr. Mazowiecki. Many believed the Vatican influenced his choice, given Mr. Mazowiecki's role as an influential editor of Catholic weeklies and monthlies that promoted the social gospel underlying Solidarity's ideology.

Mr. Mazowiecki's V-for-victory sign to the chamber on appointment became the symbol of Poland's triumph over Communism.

The Communists retained control of the armed services, the police and the secret service, and Mr. Mazowiecki had to pledge to keep Poland in the Warsaw Pact, Moscow's military alliance. Still, he said in 2004, "I had this very strong conviction that we will make it, that we will be able to build the foundations for a democratic state."

He promised no "witch hunts" against the old government, saying it was "right and wise" to offer democracy to all Poles. When asked if he would be a Catholic prime minister or a prime minister of Solidarity, he replied: "Is there any contradiction between the two? I would like to reconcile the two."

At first, Mr. Mazowiecki told an interviewer, he was "terrified." With Poland facing staggering foreign debt, hyperinflation and a bankrupt treasury, he had reason to be. He had no choice but to accept harsh, unpopular conditions—including a wage freeze and an end to consumer subsidies—to secure a \$700 million loan from the International Monetary Fund.

With no economic experience and little charisma, he was defeated when he ran for president in 1990. Mr. Walesa was elected.

Tadeusz Mazowiecki was born on April 18, 1927, in the city of Plock, in central Poland. His brother died in a Nazi concentration camp in World War II.

Mr. Mazowiecki studied law at the University of Warsaw but did not graduate. In 1953 he began editing a Catholic weekly, but was eventually fired because of his opposition to the Communist government. He started an organization of Catholic intellectuals and a new Catholic monthly.

In 1961 he was elected to the Polish Parliament, where he led the opposition to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 and unsuccessfully pushed for an investigation of the police massacre of striking Gdansk shipyard workers in 1971. As a result, he was barred from running for re-election in 1972. He then devoted himself to building alliances between the intelligentsia of the left and the fledgling Polish labor movement.

Mr. Mazowiecki, a tall, gaunt man with large, sad eyes, went on to hold various official and unofficial posts in Poland's government. In 1992 he was appointed envoy of the United Nations to war-torn Bosnia. He resigned in 1995 over what he regarded as the international community's insufficient response to atrocities there.

He was married twice; both wives died. He had three sons, Wojciech, Adam and Michal.

NEW HEALTH CARE REFORM PRODUCTS

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months, I have come to the House floor to sound the alarm regarding the emptiness of the promises the President made when he sold his health care law, promises such as: if you like

your health care plan, you can keep it, and that premiums would drop by \$2,500. Those promises, Mr. Speaker, are now on the ash heap of history.

Here is what I am hearing from my district: a woman from Allegheny County recently showed me the letter she got from her insurance company. The letter begins, "This is to inform you that we will discontinue your health care plan on December 31, 2013."

A father in the north hills of Pittsburgh tells me his family's coverage is also being terminated next year.

Another woman from the north hills wrote to tell me that she gets insurance through her employer, a small business, but that her share of the premiums are tripling.

When a product comes with a promise that is broken, you take it back and look for a new product. The Empowering Patients First Act and the American Health Care Reform Act are just some examples of possible new health care reform products that we can look at. There are solutions that empower consumers and not Washington elites, and they are a good place to start.

CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my colleagues in offering condolences on the passing of the gentleman from Missouri, Ike Skelton. He was a wonderful Member, a mentor, and a dear friend. And let me say how much he will sadly be missed. He is in our thoughts and prayers, as is his family, in this difficult time.

Mr. Speaker, as cochair of the Congressional Cybersecurity Caucus, today I rise to commend the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security, the National Cybersecurity Alliance, the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center, and other organizations working to improve cybersecurity in the United States on the 10th anniversary of National Cybersecurity Awareness Month.

Throughout October, these organizations and public and private sector partners have worked tirelessly to create events and initiatives across the country to educate Americans about cybersecurity and increase the resiliency of our Nation's cyber-infrastructure.

Cyberspace today is inextricably linked to every aspect of our daily lives; and efforts such as these are crucial to creating a safe, secure, and resilient cyber-environment. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating all who have made Cybersecurity Awareness Month a success.

CONGRATULATING MARY PATRICIA HECTOR

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an everyday hero, a young constituent of mine who has set an example we would all do well to follow.

Mary Patricia Hector, a 15-year-old from Lithonia, Georgia, refused to sit idly by while children across the Nation died in playgrounds, while funerals outnumbered graduation ceremonies, and where violence beget more violence.

Mary Pat channeled her outrage into a campaign to combat youth gun violence aptly named Think Twice. Her campaign encourages youths to think twice before picking up a gun. Mary Pat's work earned her the Peace First Prize, a prestigious peace-making award. I am proud of her achievements, and I am glad to have the privilege of representing her.

Like those before me, I also pray that my good friend from Missouri, former Chairman Ike Skelton, rest in peace.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition and the Safe Climate Caucus, I rise to call for urgent congressional action on climate change.

We must follow the examples of my home State of California, Washington, Oregon, and British Columbia. These leaders came together Monday and signed the Pacific Coast Action Plan on Climate and Energy. The action plan will help them to collectively reduce carbon pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, which will not only help the environment and public health but will also strengthen our economy.

This is a small, but significant step to act on climate change. These leaders are taking these important steps because they know the consequences of inaction. They recognize that the effects of climate change cross borders freely. Republicans and Democrats should follow this good example of action, and our leadership should move forward to combat climate change.

I, too, want to give my sympathy and my prayers with the loss of a great leader, Chairman Ike Skelton. And I know on behalf of my predecessor, my former boss, my colleague Congressman Skelton was a personal friend, and I know that he would want me to say today that he misses him.

May his soul rest in peace.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

BENGHAZI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, last week, a new national poll was released by a respected pollster, Patrick Caddell, a Democrat, and John McLaughlin, a Republican, making clear that the American people still don't feel they know the truth about what happened in Benghazi nearly 14 months ago.

According to the poll commissioned by Secure America Now, 63 percent of Americans "think the Obama administration is covering up the facts about Benghazi"; and only 29 percent of registered voters say the Obama administration has been honest about Benghazi. Think about that for a moment. A supermajority of Americans believe they have been misled by their government about what happened in Benghazi. This is remarkable.

The American people know how significant it is that Ambassador Stevens, the President's personal envoy to Libya, was the first Ambassador killed in the line of duty in four decades on September 11, 11 years to the day that nearly 3,000 people were killed by al Qaeda terrorists.

The American people intuitively understand that a plot of this scale was not spontaneously inspired, as claimed by the administration's now infamous talking points. The American people also know that it is remarkable that no effort was made by Washington to rescue the Americans in Benghazi or dispatch a hostage rescue team after the Ambassador went missing that night.

I think the American people also wonder just what the CIA was doing in Benghazi. Was it involved in the collection and transfer of weapons to foreign countries? Possibly to support the Syrian rebels? And could some of those weapons have fallen into the wrong hands, like the Syrian jihadists?

It is too easy to say that this is "classified information" and expect the American people to look away. Four Americans were killed that night, several were wounded, and no one came to help them.

□ 1500

Was it because the CIA was conducting a covert operation and if something went wrong, that was just the price of doing business? Were the CIA activities in Benghazi part of the reason the consulate and annex were targeted?

These are legitimate questions the American people are asking that deserve clear answers.

The McLaughlin-Caddell poll also found that 62 percent of the American people support creating a "special bipartisan committee with broad powers to get to the truth about the attacks in Benghazi."

Eighty percent of Republicans and 58 percent of independents support the idea. Notably, nearly half of Democrats said it was important to create a bipartisan committee to learn the truth.

The bottom line is Americans from across the political spectrum recognize that not only are they not being told the truth, but they feel Congress needs to change its approach to the investigation by creating a special committee.

Why is it that, despite more than a year of investigations in five separate committees, the American people feel they still don't know the truth about what happened?

Perhaps it is because, despite more than a year of investigations by five committees, most of the questions raised about that night remain unanswered.

Perhaps it is because, despite more than a year of investigations by five committees, hardly any of the key witnesses responsible for the government's response that night—or lack thereof—have publicly testified.

Perhaps it is because, despite more than a year of investigations, none of the survivors that could help answer key questions have publicly testified before Congress.

Perhaps it is because, despite more than a year of investigations, so few committee hearings have been held publicly.

Or perhaps it is because, despite more than a year of investigations, what little the American people have learned has come from news reports from CNN, CBS, FOX, and other news organizations and not from congressional hearings or testimony.

I think all these factors have contributed to the sense among the American people that Congress has failed in its oversight responsibility.

The American people know they haven't been told the full story about what happened that night, and they believe they have been intentionally misled by the administration.

I have come to the floor today to once again call on my leadership to create a House select committee on Benghazi.

I am often asked what is holding up the creation of this select committee. The simple answer is because the Speaker has not agreed to it. I like the Speaker. He has a tough job, and he may have good reasons for not wanting to establish a select committee, but I don't know what it is. And more importantly, I don't think the American people know what it is.

Let me be clear: my criticism is not with the chairmen of committees that are looking into this. They are all good men. They have worked very hard. Their hands are tied. They are required, though, to stay within their jurisdictional lanes, examining only what they are allowed to investigate according to their committee charter.

What happened in Benghazi is interrelated. The "lanes" crisscross. The White House, the State Department, the CIA, and the Defense Department were all involved, resulting in overlapping, but uncoordinated, investigations.

Benghazi was a terrorist attack. We need a team effort to find out what happened, why it happened, and how we are going to bring the perpetrators to justice. Any of these chairmen would be capable of leading the select committee, and other members of their committees would be very good to serve as well. They would do a good job. I have confidence in them.

And let me be clear: I have no intention of chairing or serving on the select committee. I will not serve on the select committee. I just want to learn the truth, just like the American people.

There is a history in Congress that when things overlap between committees and transcend jurisdictions, select committees were established. Two well-known examples are Watergate and Iran Contra. And I will submit a list of the past select committees over the past 50 years at the end of my statement.

A select committee would take members from each committee with their individual expertise—and many of the members from these various committees have tremendous expertise—and have them work on this investigation day in and day out, with no other distractions. It would also prevent the administration from saying one thing to one committee of jurisdiction and something else to another.

I am reminded of the poem "Blind Men and the Elephant," which is said to originate in India. In the poem, six blind men touch a part of an elephant and each has a different description of what the elephant must look like. They argue at great length among themselves. The poem ends by saying that while each is partly right, they are all wrong.

The moral of the poem is that, independently, people may think their understanding of the situation is correct; yet they don't know the truth until the full picture comes into focus.

Each of the five committees may not be seeing the entire picture of what happened that night. Regular order has limited the committees from going beyond their jurisdictions. One group ought to have the responsibility to get to the bottom of all parts of this tragedy. One group needs to lay out a roadmap to obtaining and reporting that

information to the American people so we can restore confidence that Congress has a serious oversight plan on Benghazi.

Remember, the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. We need to see the whole of this tragedy.

My bill to create a select committee, H. Res. 36, now has 178 cosponsors—more than three-quarters of the Republican Conference and more than a supermajority of the majority.

Nearly three-quarters of the Republican members who serve on the committees already investigating Benghazi now support a select committee. That means a plurality of the members who have been directly involved in committee investigations believe a select committee would be a more effective approach.

The bill has been endorsed by the American Legion, representing so many vets who have sacrificed and given their time and effort to serve this country; the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, which represents the diplomatic security agents that were present in Benghazi—the people who represent them and who were present in Benghazi support the select committee; groups representing the highly respected Special Ops community, who serve this Nation so well; and the editorial page of *The Wall Street Journal*.

Perhaps, most important, it is being endorsed by some of the family members of the Benghazi victims, like Sean Smith's mother and Ty Woods' father, who want to know the truth about what happened to the children that night and why their country fell short in its response.

Nothing will bring their children back, but we can at least provide them with the clear answers and assign accountability for those responsible for intelligence failures and the inept response that night.

The best way to do this is to break down the stovepipes between the five committees, hold public hearings, and issue subpoenas to all the survivors from Benghazi, those who were in Tripoli, and those who were in Washington responding that night.

We need a public hearing with the principals involved in the decision-making process in Washington on September 11, 2012, including former Secretary Panetta, former Secretary of State Clinton, former CIA Director Petraeus, former White House adviser and current CIA Director John Brennan, and former AFRICOM Commander General Ham, as well as the White House.

We also need a similar hearing with each of their deputies and others who were witness to the calls for help and the decisions surrounding the response not to help.

Unless we hear from these people publicly, the American people will

never learn the truth about whether there were warnings prior to the attack, what calls for help were made that night, whether the CIA security team was in fact delayed in leaving to respond to the initial attack at the consulate, and what the response was from Washington, among many other questions.

Also, the American people should know of the bravery of the men who were there in Benghazi.

Until these key individuals are sitting side by side at the witness table answering questions under oath in public, we will never get a clear picture of who made the decisions that night and why.

Again, the hearings must be in public. The American people can handle the truth. Failure to get these answers means there will never be any accountability, which further erodes public confidence in government.

Absent a select committee, the Congress will fail to learn the truth about what happened that night because the administration will continue to use the jurisdictional barriers between each committee to continue to slow-walk or deny information.

There are a number of new developments in recent weeks that make a select committee more timely than ever.

First, our colleague, MIKE ROGERS, chairman of the Intelligence Committee, confirmed earlier reports, telling Fox News that the plot against the consulate and the CIA annex in Benghazi appears to have been weeks, if not months, in the making and that at least two of the plot's leaders had close connections to senior al Qaeda leadership.

Nearly a year ago, I circulated a memo to all members prepared by respected terrorist analyst Thomas Joscelyn detailing the apparent connections and likely coordination between al Qaeda affiliates in Libya, Egypt, Tunisia, and Yemen that resulted in threats and attacks on U.S. diplomatic facilities in those countries the week of September 11, 2012. Unfortunately, the committees have not held public hearings looking at the connection between these threats.

Last week, Fox News' Catherine Herridge first reported that:

At least two of the key suspects in the Benghazi terror attacks were at one point working with al Qaeda senior leadership, the sources familiar with the investigation tell Fox News. The sources said one of the suspects was believed to be a courier for the al Qaeda network and the other a bodyguard in Afghanistan prior to the 2001 terror attacks.

Catherine Herridge went on and said:

The direct ties to the al Qaeda senior leadership undercut earlier characterizations by the Obama administration that the attackers in Benghazi were isolated extremists—not al Qaeda terrorists—with no organizational structure or affiliation.

And then, on Sunday, CBS' "60 Minutes" aired a segment by Lara Logan,

further explaining what happened that night and the increasingly clear connection to al Qaeda. And I am very grateful for "60 Minutes" covering this story.

Logan reported:

Just a few weeks ago, Abu Anas al-Libi was captured for his role in the Africa bombings and the U.S. is still investigating what part he may have played in Benghazi. We've learned that this man, Sufian bin Qumu, a former Guantanamo Bay detainee and a longtime al Qaeda operative, was one of the lead planners, along with Furaj al-Chalabi, whose ties to Osama bin Laden go back more than 15 years. He is believed to have carried documents from the compound to the head of al Qaeda in Pakistan.

It is particularly notable how al-Chalabi reportedly delivered documents from U.S. facilities in Benghazi to the head of the al Qaeda in Pakistan, establishing a direct link between the Benghazi attacks and the most senior leadership of al Qaeda.

Among the other revelations in the "60 Minutes" segment was that al Qaeda stated its intent to attack Americans in Benghazi, along with the Red Cross and the British mission, well in advance of September 11.

Lieutenant Colonel Andy Wood, the top American security official in Libya in the months leading up to the attack, told CBS that both the State Department and the Defense Department were well aware of the threat and the attacks on the Red Cross and British missions. He said it was obvious to the Americans in Libya that it was only a matter of time until an attack on the U.S. facilities.

□ 1515

When the terrorists stormed the consulate property they said, "We're here to kill Americans, not Libyans," and they spared the lives of Libyan guards.

Confirmation of that information I detailed on the House floor in July, noting:

A quick reaction force from the CIA annex ignored orders to wait, and raced to the compound, at times running and shooting their way through the streets just to get there.

The Americans faced a "professional enemy" as they encountered waves of intense fighting on the CIA annex in Benghazi during the early morning of September 12. Mortars fired during the final wave of the assault hit the roof of the annex three times in the dark. Lieutenant Colonel Wood described hitting a target like that as "getting the basketball through the hoop over your shoulder" and that it took "coordination, planning, training, and experienced personnel" to pull off such a "well-executed attack."

Two Delta Force operators who fought at the CIA annex, apparently as part of the impromptu team that flew in from Tripoli with Glen Doherty during the attack without permission from Washington, have "been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross and

the Navy Cross—two of the military's highest honors." We owe them a debt of gratitude.

The U.S. already knew that senior al Qaeda leader Abu Anas al Libi was in Libya and was "tasked by the head of al Qaeda to establish a clandestine terrorist network inside the country; al Libi was already wanted for his role in bombing two U.S. Embassies in Africa" where constituents from my congressional district were killed. Notably, the administration made no mention of his connection to the Benghazi attacks in its announcement of his capture last month.

Some of the key questions that remain unanswered are why the CIA security team was ordered not to respond to the attack at the consulate and "why no larger military response ever crossed the border into Libya—something U.S. Deputy Chief of Mission Greg Hicks realized wasn't going to happen just an hour into the attack."

It is particularly noteworthy that Logan addressed the pressure on witnesses she encountered during her investigation, saying:

An extraordinary amount of pressure on the people involved not to talk and an extraordinary amount of pressure on anyone in the government—the military side, the political side—not to say anything out of official channels.

This is consistent with the concerns I have repeatedly raised on the House floor about efforts by this administration to silence survivors and witnesses to the Benghazi attacks and response.

What are they afraid of these witnesses sharing with the American people, and how can the Congress stand by and allow this to happen knowing full well it is taking place?

CNN in July reported:

Since January, some CIA operatives involved in the Agency's mission in Libya have been subjected to frequent—even monthly—polygraph examinations, according to a source with deep inside knowledge of the Agency's workings. The goal of the questioning, according to sources, is to find out if anyone has been talking to the media or to Congress.

That was reported by CNN in July.

In a separate piece in July, FOX News reported:

At least five CIA employees were forced to sign additional nondisclosure agreements this past spring in the wake of the Benghazi attack.

That is what FOX News said in July of this year.

As someone who represents thousands of Federal employees and contractors, including many who work for the CIA, the FBI, the State Department, and the Defense Department, I know from years of firsthand experience how agencies can sometimes use various forms of pressure and intimidation to keep employees from sharing information of concern with Congress.

I know the Benghazi survivors and other witnesses that night from those

agencies need the protection of a "friendly subpoena" to compel their testimony before Congress, particularly on matters as sensitive as this, in order to protect them. So far, the committees have failed to provide this protection to allow survivors and other witnesses to share their stories publicly so the American people can hear them.

Based on disclosures in recent news reports, I now believe that the Benghazi plot represents a significant intelligence failure by the United States at several levels. Understanding these failures, as well as the government's inexplicable response during and after the attack, is critical to preventing future attacks.

I want to outline a number of the apparent intelligence failures leading up to the attack, which I believe a select committee investigation would confirm:

First: The State Department and CIA failed in their assessments of the militia groups working for the Americans in Benghazi, including the February 17 Martyrs Brigade, responsible for guarding the consulate property which abandoned the Americans and may have even facilitated access to the compound for the terrorists;

According to a May 21 article by Eli Lake at the Daily Beast:

CIA officers were responsible for vetting the February 17 Martyrs Brigade, the militia that was supposed to be the first responders on the night of the attack, but melted away when the diplomatic mission was attacked;

Second: The State Department, the Defense Department, and the CIA apparently failed to adjust their security postures to support the Americans in Benghazi based on the growing number of attacks on Western targets in Benghazi during the summer of 2012;

To date, no one has explained or been held accountable for why the U.S. submission was so poorly secured despite pleas for assistance by the Embassy staff in Tripoli to Washington;

No one has adequately explained why the Defense Department's emergency response team was on a routine training mission in Croatia during the week of September 11 when it should have been on alert to respond, especially given the threats to the U.S. Embassies in Cairo and Egypt earlier in the day before the Benghazi attack. So the emergency response team was on a training mission in Croatia at the very time and on the very date that everyone knows, September 11. Given the threats to the Embassy, it is shocking that this is the case;

Third: The intelligence community apparently failed to understand the size and scope of the attack brewing in Benghazi in the months leading up to September 11;

As Chairman ROGERS acknowledged to FOX News' Catherine Herridge last week, this was a well-coordinated at-

tack that was many weeks, if not months, in the making;

Earlier this year, CNN reported on the number of foreign fighters who arrived in Benghazi to participate in the attack in the days leading up to September 11. A witness in the "60 Minutes" report noted how black al Qaeda flags were openly flying in the months before the attack, and he also noted the announced threat against U.S., British, and Red Cross facilities;

How did the government miss these warnings or were they just simply ignored?

Fourth: The intelligence community seems to have more broadly failed to understand and anticipate how al Qaeda was metastasizing in North Africa;

This administration has been quick to take credit for the raid that killed Osama bin Laden in May 2011, and declared throughout the 2012 Presidential campaign that as a result of its efforts that "core al Qaeda" has been decimated. However, the facts don't support the administration's narrative;

In a CNN report on Monday:

Terrorist attacks hit a record high in 2012, and "more than 8,500 terrorist attacks killed more than 15,500 people last year as violence tore through Africa, Asia, and the Middle East." Increasingly, this includes North African countries likely Libya;

CNN also said:

"Despite the death of Osama bin Laden and the capture of other key al Qaeda leaders, the group has exported its brand of terrorism to other militant Muslims." These groups include affiliates like Ansar al Sharia in Libya;

Additionally, following a report on Benghazi, CBS' Lara Logan noted earlier this week:

It became evident to us during the course of our research—this is what she said—that very little is known publicly about the true nature of al Qaeda's network in Libya, and that has consequences beyond Benghazi and beyond Libya. It has consequences that speak to the national security interests of the United States of America;

Most of these affiliate terrorist groups have sworn an allegiance to al Qaeda and appear to closely coordinate their activities and plots with the core al Qaeda leadership, including Ayman al-Zawahiri, bin Laden's successor.

To dismiss or minimize the relationship with al Qaeda's senior leadership is misguided and, I believe, dangerous as we have seen over the last several years. I fear that this administration's insistence in treating core al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan differently than groups like Ansar al Sharia in Libya has led to a dangerous mischaracterization of the threat and that it has apparently resulted in the failure to anticipate attacks like the one that was carried out in Benghazi;

Fifth: It appears that documents were taken from the consulate and CIA annex in Benghazi in the wake of the attacks;

As I said earlier, “60 Minutes” reported that terrorist Faraj al Chalabi, whose ties to bin Laden go back nearly two decades, is “believed to have carried documents from the compound to the head of al Qaeda in Pakistan.”

What was taken from the consulate and annex and given to al Qaeda’s leadership? We don’t know;

Additionally, as Lara Logan noted following the report:

We did not expect that we would find the U.S. compound in the state that we found it. There was still debris and ammunition boxes and a whiteboard that had the day’s assignments for the security personnel at the compound as of September 11, 2012;

Clearly, in the chaos of the fighting and evacuation that night, information was left behind at the facilities that may have consequences for Americans operating in the region.

I also believe the administration’s response to the Benghazi attack over the last year has been nothing short of shameful and that it also merits a full investigation by a select committee.

From the first hours of the attack, when it became apparent that no help was coming to assist those under attack—either from U.S. forces or from our allies in the region—to the failure of the FBI to gain access to key suspects in Tunisia and Egypt over the last year, this administration has sent a signal to terrorists that the U.S. will not strongly respond to an attack on Americans abroad.

The failure to either arrest or kill any of the scores of terrorists responsible for the attacks more than a year later is inexcusable and reflects an unwillingness by this administration to bring diplomatic pressure to bear on countries harboring these terrorists.

I am increasingly convinced that this administration is more comfortable in using the ongoing FBI investigation as an excuse not to answer questions than it is in bringing these terrorists to justice.

As I said on the House floor in July of last year, Tunisia detained the first suspect in the Benghazi terrorist attacks, Ali Harzi, after he was deported from Turkey in the weeks following the attacks.

Tunisia, despite being a beneficiary of more than \$300 million of U.S. foreign aid—American taxpayer money of over \$300 million goes to Tunisia—refused to allow the FBI access to this suspect for nearly 5 weeks.

□ 1530

It was only after congressional threats to cut off the aid that the government of Tunisia reconsidered its position.

Ultimately, the FBI interrogation team returned to Tunisia and was allowed just 3 hours to interview Harzi with his lawyer and a Tunisian judge present.

Not long after the FBI interview, Harzi was inexplicably released by Tu-

nisian authorities, and his release was celebrated by Ansar al Sharia terrorists.

Last month, it was confirmed that Harzi has been involved in at least one assassination of a Tunisian political leader.

In another equally concerning case in Egypt, the FBI has been denied access to Mohammed Jamal, an al Qaeda-connected terrorist who ran training camps in Egypt and eastern Libya prior to the Benghazi attack.

Several of Jamal’s associates are believed to have participated in the Benghazi plot, and terrorism analysts believe that Jamal may have communicated directly with Zawahiri and al Qaeda leadership about this and other terrorist attacks.

Although Jamal has been in Egyptian custody for more than a year on other terrorism-related charges, the U.S. has never been provided access to him under both the Morsi government and now the current military government.

I personally delivered a letter to former Ambassador Patterson in Cairo asking then-President Morsi to provide the FBI access to Jamal and his documents. I don’t believe the Ambassador ever delivered the letter, and if she did, she never told me. That in itself is very, very troubling.

Jamal’s connection to the Benghazi attack is particularly noteworthy given that both the U.S. and the United Nations formally, both the U.S. and the United Nations, formally designated him as a terrorist earlier this month.

However, in another example of this administration’s aversion to discussing terrorist connections to the Benghazi attack, the U.N. designation clearly notes Jamal’s connection to the Benghazi attack, whereas the State Department designation omits it. So the U.N. designation clearly notes Jamal’s connection to the Benghazi attack; the State Department omits it. The UN says, and our State Department omits it?

I believe there has been pressure from the administration to omit this type of information from U.S. intelligence products, sending conflicting signals to both our allies and to countries that may have Benghazi suspects of interest to the FBI. I have a lot of confidence in the FBI if they are just allowed to do their job.

But if we are unwilling to identify their involvement in the attacks, it further erodes U.S. credibility in asking for access to these individuals. This willful blindness is disingenuous and, I believe, ultimately dangerous.

In early January, when I offered an amendment to create a select committee to the House rules package for the 113th Congress, Speaker BOEHNER told the Republican Conference that he didn’t believe that we had “reached the

threshold” for a select committee. He suggested that we might get to the threshold, but the committees of jurisdiction just needed more time.

That may have been the case in January, but nearly 11 months later, I think the broad support that has built up over the last year makes it clear we have more than passed the threshold for a select committee now.

I believe, and I believe the American people believe, that the threshold has clearly been reached in terms of co-sponsors, endorsements, and new revelations from the press reports, and a deep concern the American people have for this issue.

I was particularly struck by the comments made by Ambassador Stevens’ deputy, Greg Hicks, in the 60 Minutes segment on Sunday:

For us, for the people that go out onto the edge to represent our country, we believe that if we get in trouble, they are coming to get us, that our back is covered. To hear that it is not, it is a terrible, terrible experience.

It is not enough for the administration to just say there is nothing more that could have been done, especially given that evidence indicates that they didn’t try much at all to assist the Americans under fire in Benghazi.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for a unified, bipartisan select committee. Let’s get to the truth once and for all so we can find out what happened and restore the American people’s confidence in congressional oversight and confidence in government.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUSE SELECT AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES (1963–PRESENT)

House Select and Special Committees	Date of creation
Select Committee on Government Research	September 11, 1963
Select Committee to Study the Factors Relating to the General Welfare and Education of Congressional Pages	September 30, 1964
Select Committee on Standards and Conduct	April 3, 1967
Select Committee on the Seating of Adam Clayton Powell in the 90th Congress	January 10, 1967
Select Committee on the House Beauty Shop	December 6, 1967
Select Committee to Regulate Parking on the House Side of the Capitol	March 13, 1969
Select Committee on Crime	July 1, 1968
Select Committee on the House Restaurant	July 10, 1969
Select Committee to Investigate All Aspects of United States Military Involvement in Southeast Asia	June 8, 1970
Select Committee on Committees I (Bolling)	January 31, 1973
Permanent Select Committee on Aging	October 2, 1974
Select Committee on Intelligence (Nedzi and Pike)	February 19, 1975
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence	July 14, 1977
Select Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf (Ad Hoc)	January 11, 1977
Select Committee to Study the Problem of United States Servicemen Missing in Action in Southeast Asia	September 11, 1975
Select Committee on Professional Sports	May 18, 1976
Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control	July 29, 1976
Select Committee on Assassinations	September 17, 1976
Select Committee on Ethics	March 9, 1977
Select Committee on Congressional Operations	March 28, 1977
Select Committee on Energy (Ad Hoc)	April 21, 1977
Select Committee on Population	September 28, 1977
Select Committee on Committees II (Patterson)	March 20, 1979
Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families	September 29, 1982
Select Committee on Hunger	February 22, 1984
Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran	January 7, 1987
Select Committee to Investigate Fire Safety in the Capitol and House Office Building	May 10, 1988
Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People’s Republic of China	June 18, 1988
Select Bipartisan Committee to Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina	September 15, 2005
Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming	March 8, 2007

HOUSE SELECT AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES
(1963–PRESENT)—Continued

House Select and Special Committees	Date of creation
Select Committee to Investigate the Voting Irregularities.	August 2, 2007

Source: Committees in the U.S. Congress 1947–1992 by Garrison Nelson;
Committees in the U.S. Congress 1993–2010 by Garrison Nelson.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS
MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, ending domestic violence is not a quixotic quest; it is a noble calling. This is why we have filed H. Res. 392, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of October as National Domestic Violence Awareness Month, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should continue to raise awareness of domestic violence and its devastating effects on individuals, families, and communities, and support programs designed to end domestic violence in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to tell you that we will have a number of speakers.

At this time, I yield to the Congresswoman from the Fourth District of Maryland, the Honorable DONNA EDWARDS. She serves on Science, Space, and Technology; Transportation and Infrastructure; she cochairs the Women's Caucus; and she is the chair of the Democratic Women's Working Group. She also cofounded the National Network to End Domestic Violence in 1994. She was its executive director.

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman. I know that you join with your colleague, Mr. POE of Texas, in hosting this hour so that we can have an opportunity to remember why it is that we identify and commemorate Domestic Violence Awareness Month, and to make a commitment from this day forward, and from this coming year to the next time we have this observance, to do what we can to end domestic violence. I think, after all, that is the goal.

I can't remember, Mr. GREEN, when I first became interested in domestic violence, or even aware of domestic violence, but I look back to the times when I was growing up. I grew up in a military family. We lived in very close quarters. We shared a wall in that military family housing with our neighbor. In our neighbor's house, there was clearly something going on. My sister and I shared a bedroom, and we could hear what was going on, and it was violent. It was clearly violent.

I don't know that I understood that at the time, Mr. Speaker, but I have come to understand it as an adult. It

frames my commitment, lifelong commitment, to ending domestic violence.

I remember at that time the military police being called. They would come and they would drive the gentleman around the block, and then he would be delivered right back home. Then a few nights later, the exact same thing would happen again.

I remember my sister and I seeing the woman who lived next door, and we were friends with their children, and I remember seeing her. I was always intrigued by her dark glasses and her great makeup and the scarves that she wore around her neck. It wasn't until later that I understood that she was covering her black eye, she was covering the bruises on her neck, she was covering the bruises on her face from having been a victim of domestic violence. It was many, many years, in fact, as an adult where I came to really process and understand what was going on.

I think because domestic violence affects so many around the country, and most particularly it affects women, that there is almost a chance that in any given family or at a family reunion or family gathering, if you probe just enough, you will find someone who has experienced domestic violence.

Very sadly, you will also find many young children who have witnessed domestic violence. I think that we have only to look at the children who are growing up in homes where mostly their mothers are being abused, and then we wonder why it is that when we look at the population of young people who are incarcerated, and when you ask them one by one—and I have done this, I have visited incarcerated youth—almost to a one they will tell you that either they have been the victims of violence or they grew up in a violent home.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it must resonate with us that we have to ask ourselves why it is that we continue to have violence, and what it is that we can do to get to the root cause of that violence.

So in addition, during Domestic Violence Awareness Month, to identify the fact that we lose about \$8 billion a year in productivity that is lost because of domestic violence—lost time off of work, medical expenses, and the rest—we know that it is a social ill that is very pervasive.

We also know that there are other kinds of crimes that are associated with domestic violence—stalking is one of those, sexual assault within a relationship.

Mr. Speaker, we also are aware that our young women, ages 16 to 24, are more likely than not to experience some form of violence in those relationships.

So earlier this year—and it took us some time to get there, Mr. Speaker—we did finally reauthorize the Violence

Against Women Act. The Violence Against Women Act, which was first authorized in 1994—I was a part of that, helped to lead that effort on the outside, where our leaders in Congress were leading on the inside, leaders like our now Vice-President JOE BIDEN, who was in the Senate and who took this bull by the horns and led us to the passage of the first Violence Against Women Act that was signed into law by President Clinton.

It was the first time ever that the Federal Government came forward and said, we have a real commitment to ending domestic violence by providing resources for shelters and services, training law enforcement, making sure that our judges were equipped to handle these cases in court, providing advocacy services for those who are experiencing violence, and going through the system.

Over each successive couple of years, we have reauthorized the Violence Against Women Act. We did that just recently. As I have said, in these tough economic times, it has been very difficult. All of a sudden, domestic violence became partisan and political.

I am glad to say, Mr. Speaker, that we did finally reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act again. We are providing those resources to those who experience violence.

But it should also come as no surprise that as we engage in the fiscal debates that we have here in the Congress, that because of sequester and shutting down the government even, that many of those shelters and services and programs are, in fact, experiencing a really difficult time at the same time that they are experiencing more demand.

I don't say that, Mr. Speaker, to call out one side or the other, but I am glad we are back at a point where in this Domestic Violence Awareness Month, we take the politics out of domestic violence, and we say to women, whether you are Republicans, Democrats, or Independents, or you don't think about politics at all, that we care about ending domestic violence, we care about the fact, Mr. Speaker, that more women are placed in a much more dangerous circumstance when there is a weapon in the home and that weapon is used to either kill or harm or threaten the lives of those who are in the home. That is something that we can do something about.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, this last year, we lost a really powerful advocate for those who experience domestic violence. When Senator Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey died earlier this year, we remembered him in a lot of ways as a leader, Mr. Speaker, but on this Domestic Violence Awareness Month, I would like the Nation to remember Senator Lautenberg because he was the one who spearheaded the domestic violence firearm prevention

that said that if you are committing domestic violence and you have a domestic violence offense, that you cannot purchase or possess a weapon. The Federal Government and the Congress recognized the importance of removing a weapon from a home where there is domestic violence. Senator Lautenberg was the champion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close—I know that we have other speakers—and just say that this Member of Congress, and I know that our colleagues here today, remain committed to ending domestic violence, to making sure that women can achieve their fullest potential by living in a home that is free of violence.

□ 1545

And, in fact, as we look around the world, whether it is in Afghanistan or Iraq or it is in South or Central America or in Africa, in many nations women experience violence in relationships in their homes. But, Mr. Speaker, if we can end that violence in the home, then we would do a lot to make certain that children are growing up healthy and able to have healthy relationships and that women are able to achieve their fullest potential.

So I join you today in calling attention to Domestic Violence Awareness Month and to redoubling our commitment to end domestic violence. I say a special thank you and salute to an organization that I started—now I don't know—15 to 20 years ago, the National Network to End Domestic Violence, and all of the networks of advocates around the country who are committed to the same things that we are. And if only we can provide the resources that they need to do their work, I am convinced that we can end this scourge.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank you very much for your testimony. Actually, it is something that I believe will benefit a good many persons who are viewing this today.

I would like to share just a few stories, if I may. Mr. Speaker, I practiced law in Houston, Texas, and my practice was one that involved a good deal of civil work. In the early 1970s, I can recall females coming to my office to receive assistance from a lawyer to file charges based upon abuse that had been imposed upon them.

In some of the cases, the damage done to the person was physical and immediately seen; but as you talked to the person, you could see that this person had been suffering for years. Literally years of suffering would emerge from this person in a 30-minute, 1 hour, 1½ hour visit. And they would plead with me, Please help me get the charges filed. The plea was there because at that time it was considered a family issue. When women would go in to file charges, the police would say, Well, we will look at it. We will see if we can get somebody out there. But

they didn't always respond to the evident need. The need was evident because of what the eye could see.

Many of the women who would come in would bring a minister or some other person to corroborate the story. There was this belief that your physical appearance alone was not enough evidence to support the filing of charges.

Unfortunately, society had so developed at that time that we would take this victim to intake and we would help with the filing of the charges and we would help get charges filed. The unfortunate circumstance was that the culture at that time was such that other family members would visit with the victim and encourage the victim to drop the charges; family members seeing and knowing about the abuse not only on this occasion for which charges were being filed, but also the abuse that had occurred through the years. And family members would quite often prevail; and, as a result, charges would sometimes be dropped.

I regret that we went through this time in our history where women were not treated with the dignity and respect that they should be accorded. A lot of that has gone away, and I will say more about a lot of this in just a moment, but there is still enough of it for us to band together and for us to answer the clarion call for help that these women present to us on a daily basis.

I am honored to tell you that we have with us now another Member of Congress from the 40th District of California. She serves on the Appropriations Committee, and I am honored to yield to the Honorable LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by commending Congressman GREEN for his leadership in helping to highlight the tragedy of domestic violence in our country and for arranging today's Special Order.

While it is true that we have made some progress toward addressing violence against women, the fact remains that nearly one-third of women in the United States still report being physically or sexually abused by a partner in their lifetime. Domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking lead to severe social health and economic consequences for women and our communities, with the estimated cost of violence exceeding \$70 billion each year.

Our Nation's economic crisis has hammered home the sad truth that financial concerns often keep victims in abusive relationships. Studies indicate that economic independence is a key predictor of whether a victim will be able to break the cycle of violence and leave her abuser.

Far too often, it is difficult for victims to maintain employment in the aftermath of domestic violence, espe-

cially if they require time off for medical appointments, court appearances, and for their own safety. As a result, women who experience domestic violence are more likely than other women to be unemployed, to suffer from health problems that impact employability and job performance, to report lower personal income, and to rely on welfare. These poor economic outcomes often perpetuate the abuse.

For the last 16 years, I have introduced legislation that would help ensure victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking have the financial independence they need to break free from their abusers.

The Security and Financial Empowerment Act, or SAFE Act, would allow survivors to take unpaid time off from work to make necessary court appearances, seek legal assistance, and get help with safety planning without the fear of losing their job. The SAFE Act would prohibit employers or insurance providers from basing hiring or insurance coverage decisions on an individual's history of abuse, and ensure eligibility for unemployment benefits should a survivor be forced to leave her job due to circumstances stemming from domestic violence.

The SAFE Act empowers victims of domestic violence with greater employment protections and increased economic stability to break the all-too-common cycle of dependence and abuse.

As Domestic Violence Awareness Month comes to an end, let us not forget the victims of domestic violence. I ask my colleagues to join me in ensuring financial freedom for those suffering from domestic abuse by cosponsoring the SAFE Act, and I encourage my colleagues to support Congressman GREEN's H. Res. 392 to make sure that we continue to highlight this tragedy of domestic violence in our country so that one day there will be no domestic violence; it will be unnecessary for us to be here in the Halls of Congress talking about this tragedy.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank the gentlelady. I want to thank the gentlelady for the work she has done here in Congress over the years to eliminate domestic violence.

This has been a bipartisan effort, Mr. Speaker. I am proud to tell you that S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, this bill passed the House of Representatives with bipartisan support. In the House the vote was 286-138. It passed the Senate with bipartisan support. It was 78-22. The bill had this bipartisan support because it embraced women not only who are known to us as people from our communities, but also there were some communities that were embraced that have not been traditionally a part of the bill.

It helped American Indian women because at one time tribal courts could

not take on persons who had sexually assaulted women because they were non-Indians. Well, the bill addressed this. It also addressed the LGBT community which had not been included. It doesn't matter what your sexual preference is, domestic violence can be imposed upon you. And when you are hurt, you need help. This bill provided the help needed for women regardless of race, creed, color, origin. Regardless of your sexual preference, you can get help pursuant to S. 47, which received bipartisan support.

I wanted to tell you that annually my friend from the State of Texas, the Honorable TED POE, works with me and I with him. We alternate years of taking the lead on this issue. He has had a career that has paralleled mine. When he was a prosecutor, I was a defense attorney. He became a district court judge in Texas right around the time I became the judge of a justice court. Here in Congress, we have sought to work together on many bills and many pieces of legislation, but I am proudest of what we do on domestic violence.

Domestic Violence Awareness Month is one where he and I have collaborated to work together to make sure that we get this issue exposed to the public so we can continue the process of elimination. I am proud to tell you that he represents the Second Congressional District of Texas, serves on Foreign Affairs as well as the Judiciary Committee, and I am proud to tell you that I consider him a friend, not in the sense that we politely say it here in Congress when we say "my friend." I consider him a friend in the sense that he and I have developed a real kinship and relationship. Although we don't always agree, we always try to work together for the good of our State, city, and for the good of women who are being impacted by domestic violence.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate those comments.

It is true, Congressman GREEN, you and I, our careers have mirrored. We spent time at the courthouse together, you as a defense lawyer, me as a prosecutor. We became judges at about the same time. We got elected to Congress at the same time. We have known each other now almost 40 years, and I want to thank you for all that time you have been serving the community of Texas. And our districts match each other in the Houston area. We share the same common boundary.

I also think it is appropriate that we are wearing purple ties. If I remember correctly, if you take red and you take blue and you mix them together, you get purple. How appropriate because this is a bipartisan endeavor where we are trying to show the horrors of domestic violence nationwide. It is not a Democrat issue; it is not a Republican.

It is an American issue. And I guess it is a purple issue, if we can use that phrase.

As you have mentioned, spending time at the courthouse, I saw a lot of these types of cases, and we have come a long way. And, yes, it is true, I remember the days when domestic violence, when some spouse would beat up another spouse, no matter how bad the injuries, unless it was death, many times the police would say, This is a family problem. It is not a criminal problem; it is not a public problem. It is a family problem. They have to deal with it.

Because of that, many women, primarily, were rejected from prosecuting their spouse when they beat them up. As Congressman GREEN mentioned, the days of spouse filing charges and then being pressured by sometimes the batterer or family members to drop the charges, and then charges would be dropped. I found that frustrating as a prosecutor, and you found it frustrating when you were trying to help those women get those cases filed.

We finally did something in Texas that made a whole lot of sense. We took the spouse, the victim, out of the prosecution process. So it was the State of Texas versus the guy, and the spouse really had no control over the prosecution. The spouse certainly couldn't drop the charges. It took it off of her burden, and made those people who wanted the case dropped to deal with the State rather than the victim. That was a good thing because then those people started getting prosecuted.

□ 1600

JIM COSTA, a Democrat from California, he and I started the Victims' Rights Caucus when I came to Congress. It is a bipartisan caucus, a purple caucus, of both sides that advocate on the part of victims with about 85, 90 members.

One of the things that we are very concerned about, of course, is spouses that are victims of crime. I say that because when somebody beats up someone in the family, it is not the fault of the victim; it is the fault of the person that does the assaulting. The victim is not to blame. We have to get it through to our culture—and I think we are gradually doing that—to understand it is not the victim's fault. It is the person who commits the crime, commits the assault.

The most influential person in my life was my grandmother. God bless her. She lived to 99 years of age. She told me a lot of things and was very wise.

You would be glad to know, Congressman GREEN, she was an old-fashioned Texas Yellow Dog Democrat. She never forgave me for being a Republican. Anyway, we got past that.

She said that you never hurt somebody you claim you love. That was a

true statement when she told me, and it is still a true statement. You never hurt somebody you claim you love, especially in the family situation. That is something that we need to live by and hold people accountable when they violate that important rule of life.

You mentioned the Violence Against Women Act. That is a good piece of legislation. I supported that for the reasons you mentioned, but also it does something else. It helps the immigrant community. Too often we find in Houston, where we have a lot of immigrants from all over the world, that someone that is in the United States, if they are assaulted by someone else that is in the United States, both undocumented, the batterer tells the victim, If you call the police, I am going to send you back to where you came from. He can't do that, but she thinks he can do that, so she doesn't call the police, and this guy gets away with hurting her. Plus, she continues to be victimized.

We changed that law because of VAWA. They can come forward. They can get a special visa. They can testify. This person can get prosecuted as they should. It is a good piece of legislation, and we certainly should be enforcing the rules under the VAWA law.

People that I have come in contact with over the years have impacted me. Of course, many of those have been victims of crime, many of those victims of domestic violence. One that I met after I came here to Congress was a wonderful lady that lives real close to us. She lives over in Maryland, Yvette Cade. She has made her story public, so I will use her name.

Yvette Cade was estranged from her husband. Her husband was under a protective order to leave her alone. She didn't have a lawyer. She didn't have someone like you, Mr. GREEN, representing her. She had to represent herself. When the protective order came to be renewed, she represented herself in the courtroom, and the judge denied the protective order. It was withdrawn.

Soon after the judge made that horrible decision, the estranged husband found her over at the video store where she worked supporting herself. He walked in carrying a jar of gasoline, and he poured it over Yvette Cade, and he set her on fire, that wonderful, precious lady. It is all on videotape from the store.

I don't know how she did it, but she survived. A passerby saw what happened. He helped her. He put the fire out. She has had numerous surgeries, and she is alive. Today, she advocates on behalf of victims who are abused in the family. She is quite a remarkable person, and she is a victim of crime.

Our culture needs to treat these people in a special way, whether it is to prosecute the criminal or to take care of them when their physical and mental needs need to be met. We are doing

a better job of that. This month, we recognize those wonderful people who have been abused.

We still have the problem of convincing them that the crime is not their fault. They are embarrassed so often. As I told victims of crime as a prosecutor and even as a judge: You don't need to be embarrassed for what happened to you. The person who did it needs to be embarrassed.

It was part of our responsibility, I think, in the criminal justice system to make sure that happened. I won't go into all those types of cases that you are familiar with in unique sentencing, Mr. GREEN, but we made sure that the criminal knew that he was to blame and the victim was not to blame for that conduct.

After hearing 25,000 felony cases at the courthouse—and, Congressman GREEN, I am not going to relate all 25,000 of them, but I would like to mention another one. When we think of domestic violence, we need to remember not only the spouse, but we need to think about the children that are involved, too, because many times they are the victims of domestic violence.

There was a young girl who was a second-grader, and, like a lot of kids today, she rode the bus back and forth to elementary school. I will call her "June." One afternoon, she is riding the schoolbus home, and she wouldn't get off the bus. She just sat there, and she was literally gripping that bar that is on the seat in front of you. Finally, the schoolbus driver came back and tried to talk to her and asked her, Why won't you get off the bus? This is your home. This is where you live.

June replied, I don't want to get off, because I am only safe when I am on the bus going to school, at school, and when I am on the bus going home. Bad things happen when I get off the bus.

You see, she went back into a situation where she was constantly battered by the "live-in boyfriend" is what I am going to call him. Because of the bus driver and doing what she did, they called the police and an investigation took place. That person was prosecuted; but, more importantly, June is safe and her mother is safe.

We need to understand that victims of domestic violence live, many times, quiet lives of desperation and fear. It is our responsibility as Congress to eliminate that the best we can, to provide services for victims, to let them understand that crime is not their fault, that it is the fault of the perpetrator. On the other end, we need to make sure those perpetrators get the justice that they deserve at the courthouse and they are held accountable for those actions that they commit against someone in their family.

Mr. Speaker, Grandma was right. You never hurt somebody you claim you love.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague very much, and I thank you

for your many words expressing what you actually witnessed. Yours was a testimony, not just a recitation, from something that was accorded you by some other person. You were there to see what happened, and you and I know that there is still great work to be done.

In our State of Texas, in 2012, domestic violence caused 11,994 adults to need shelter, Mr. Speaker. It caused 14,534 children to need shelter, Mr. Speaker. It caused 36,831 adults to need nonresidential services, counseling, legal assistance. It caused 15,694 children to need nonresidential services. Unfortunately, 26.2 percent of the adults were denied shelter because of a lack of space.

Mr. Speaker, there is still great work to be done, and I am honored to ask, at this time, another colleague to speak. However, would you kindly advise me as to the amount of time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOH). The gentleman from Texas has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask so that Members may be aware. We have a few Members left to speak, and we want to make sure that every Member has some time.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to ask the Honorable BARBARA LEE to move to the podium and consume an appropriate amount of time. She is my very dear friend from the great State of California, the 13th Congressional District, who sits on Appropriations and who has been a longtime champion of protecting women and protecting people and is truly a champion for the least, the last, and the lost.

I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that she was the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, and I was proud to serve under her leadership.

Ms. LEE of California. First, let me thank Congressman AL GREEN for that very humbling introduction, for your tremendous leadership, and for bringing us all together with, of course, Congressman POE, and for really pulling together this Special Order in recognition of October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month. It is so critical that we continue to raise the level of awareness in a bipartisan manner until we rid our country and the world of abuse and domestic violence.

As someone who unfortunately understands domestic violence on a very personal level, a deeply personal level, I know how traumatic the experience is, and, yes, I know what the support system and how important the support system is needed to emerge as a survivor. I also know that domestic violence is not only physical, but it is also emotional. It is brutal. It is dehumanizing to the battered and the batterer, and without strong and enforceable criminal laws and services, one's life can be shattered and destroyed. I know this from personal experience.

Also, as a psychiatric social worker by profession, battered women's syndrome will totally destroy a woman's life if we don't address the counseling and mental health services that will really help women rid themselves of the syndrome which comes as a result of a lifetime of abuse.

As a member of the California Legislature, I was very proud to write California's Violence Against Women Act and many domestic violence bills that were actually signed into law, Congressman GREEN, by a Republican Governor, Governor Pete Wilson, and I continue to make this a priority in my congressional work.

In my district, there are several agencies, such as A Safe Place, which is a victim-centered agency. Agencies such as this, they do wonderful work on a minimum budget on issues and services and housing related to and for victims of abuse; and we need to enhance and raise the level of funding because they do wonderful work, as I said, with minimal resources.

We know that staying in a shelter or working with an advocate significantly improves the victim's quality of life. It is my hope that we use Domestic Violence Awareness Month to recommit ourselves to fighting the scourge of domestic violence against men and women.

We have made accomplishments over the decades on this issue, including the passage of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act and the Violence Against Women Act, which we fought hard to get reauthorized earlier this year under the bold and tremendous leadership of Congresswoman GWEN MOORE and Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI.

These pieces of legislation have led to an increase of nearly 51 percent in domestic violence reporting by women and a 37 percent increase in reporting for men. This is truly a significant impact. Yet, sadly, challenges remain.

Around the world, nearly one in three women have been beaten, coerced into sex, or otherwise abused in her lifetime. Here in the United States, as many as one in four American women report being physically or sexually abused by a husband or a boyfriend at least once in their lives.

In my home State of California, the statistics are even more staggering. According to the Women's Health Survey, approximately 40 percent of California women experience physical, intimate partner violence in their lifetime. Of these women, three out of four of them had children under the age of 18 at home.

Children who see or experience domestic violence have a much greater chance to either become victims or perpetrators as adults. They are also more likely to attempt suicide, abuse drugs and alcohol, run away from home, engage in teenage prostitution, and commit other crimes.

Beyond the cost to children, domestic violence affects the economy with as many as half of domestic violence victims reporting the loss of a job due at least in part to domestic violence. In fact, domestic violence costs employers in the United States as much as \$13 billion each year, and it costs our health care system upwards of \$5.8 billion, including \$4 billion in direct health care expenses.

When we talk about the state of employment and the cost of health care, especially for women, the economic impacts of domestic violence and what we must do to eradicate it must be part of that conversation.

□ 1615

We must prioritize investments in programs that domestic violence survivors rely on when escaping their abuser, including domestic violence programs and other programs of the safety net.

When we fail to make the proper investments, women bear the consequences. Thousands of requests for domestic violence services go unmet. Thousands of calls to the National Domestic Violence Hotline go unanswered. In times of economic downturn, the rates of domestic violence tend to increase. That is why this reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act was so very important.

Not only were we able to increase outreach to victims on college campuses and expand protections for victims living on tribal lands, but for the first time, first time, we extended access to protections for immigrant and LGBT victims.

So as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am going to continue to fight for robust funding at all levels, so that we can continue to provide victims with the services they need. With strong investments, we can address this crisis and end domestic violence, once and for all.

Although we have made great progress, we cannot claim victory. October is a critical time to raise awareness of what continues to be a pervasive issue in our country.

But we must remember that for women, children and men who are experiencing or who have experienced domestic violence, every day must be a day of awareness. So we must support all of the legislation and funding efforts that will indicate that finally, mind you, finally, we will not need Domestic Violence Awareness Month ever again because we have put an end to domestic violence.

Thank you again, Mr. GREEN.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank you—and I also thank you for raising the issue of domestic violence against men. We talk quite often about it being against women, and there is good reason. The overwhelming empirical evidence connotes that women are the

largest group of victims of domestic violence, so I thank you for broadening the issue for us. Thank you very much.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to tell you that we have a Congressman from the State of Florida—I was reared in Florida, went to Florida A&M University.

He serves the 18th District of Florida, serves on Financial Services, and he is committed to working across the aisle. He makes a concerted effort to achieve bipartisanship. He is a champion for fair play.

I also want you to know that he understands that, as we do this, as we try to end this scourge on society known as domestic violence, that it is more than simply an issue of violence; it also has economic components to it. He has tried to cause us to understand some of these components, but also, that it is a moral issue.

I would now ask my friend, who accorded me this tie that is purple—the color purple in the tie, as I understand it, represents courage, survival, honor and dedication, dedication to ending domestic violence. Of course, purple is being worn today to spread awareness of domestic violence.

I now yield as much time as he may consume to my friend, the Honorable PATRICK MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Thank you, Mr. GREEN, for organizing this special hour.

I also want to thank Mr. POE, Ms. EDWARDS and Mrs. ELLMERS for their leadership on this important issue.

I rise today to speak out against domestic violence and to demand that Congress act in a bipartisan manner to fight back against this plague on our country. The domestic violence statistic rates in our country are staggering. One out of every three women will be the victim of domestic violence in their lifetime. Four are murdered by their intimate partner every day in the United States.

Further, a woman is battered in the United States every 15 seconds. You do the math; that is 240 incidents every hour.

We, as a society, have a responsibility to work to protect the most vulnerable among us, and must do everything we can to address these unacceptable rates of domestic violence. That is why one of the first pieces of legislation I cosponsored as a Member of Congress was the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

Protecting people from violence by their partners should not be a partisan issue, and it was appalling in the last Congress that such vital legislation got caught up in this partisan gridlock.

With that in mind, I am thrilled to see Members from both sides of the aisle speaking today on this important issue. You will notice both Democrats and Republicans wearing purple pins or purple ties to highlight October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Domestic violence is not a partisan issue, and not just a woman's issue. It is a family issue, it is a community issue, it is an economic issue and a moral issue. That is why I specifically recruited male colleagues to participate in this Special Order hour, and you will see many of them here today wearing purple ties.

We, as men, can help draw awareness not only to how important it is to work toward ending domestic violence, but also to the fact that domestic violence is an issue that we have a responsibility to engage and not to dismiss as only a women's issue.

As role models and other males, we have a crucial part in this fight, and stopping domestic violence will only occur when the main perpetrators of these crimes, which are men, learn to stop hurting their partners. We, as men, not only can, but we must make addressing this issue a priority.

On International Women's Day, I hosted a roundtable discussion at a shelter in my district called SafeSpace, where I heard from both survivors and advocates about the challenges they face to keep women and children safe, and the importance of Federal funding to keep these programs operating. This roundtable highlighted the urgency of working together to address this pressing issue.

I am honored to have Jill Borowicz, the CEO of the shelter that hosted this important roundtable, here in attendance with us today and want to take this opportunity to thank her for her work on behalf of all the survivors of domestic abuse.

Unfortunately, what we are doing here today almost was not able to take place, due to the government shutdown. Jill knows all too well what the shutdown did back home and what the effects of it were on our district and across the country.

One of the less-talked about effects of the shutdown was its impact on shelters and services like SafeSpace that were forced to close their doors and suspend services for more than a week because VAWA funds were inaccessible.

Let me repeat: the government shutdown directly prevented women and children who were facing the threat of domestic violence from receiving services and shelter. This is unconscionable.

While the crisis may have been manufactured, the shutdown was very real, and the consequences were also real. It has shown that partisanship and dysfunction in Congress are a serious threat to the prevention of domestic violence. I hope we can all agree that this should no longer be tolerated.

I look forward to working together with my colleagues, both male and female, and Members from both parties to continue to fund important programs that help provide assistance and

shelter to the victims of domestic violence, resources to law enforcement to help them adequately address these issues on the ground, and investments in programs that can help stop and break the vicious cycle of domestic violence in our communities.

Again, I want to thank Mr. GREEN for his leadership on this issue. It is important we bring this to the forefront. No matter where you are from or what party you are from, this is something that needs to be discussed.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank my fellow Floridian. I, of course, am from Texas now, but my roots are in Florida, and I thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored at this time to recognize another Texan, a Texan from the 23rd District, who served 22 years, Mr. Speaker, in the State house, a Texan who serves on the Agriculture Committee, a Texan who is a strong supporter of domestic awareness, who voted for the reauthorization of the VAWA, and I might say, a Texan who started his career in Congress extending his hand across the aisle. He is one who not only preaches bipartisanship, he practices it.

I am honored to yield as much time as he may consume to my friend, the Honorable PETE GALLEGGO.

Mr. GALLEGGO. Thank you so much. I appreciate very much, Congressman GREEN, your leadership on this issue. It is incredibly important.

As I listened to Congressman MURPHY and others talk on this issue, and you realize that one out of every three women will feel the impact of domestic violence in her lifetime, you have to realize that, even among the people in this room, we know people who have been impacted by domestic violence.

All of us have a mom. Many of us have sisters. Domestic violence can impact anyone. Even though it is not openly spoken about many times, even though it is not openly addressed in our society, and even though many feel that it is something that could never happen to them, the truth is, it could happen to anybody, and it could happen to people other than women. Fourteen percent of the victims of domestic violence are men.

In 2012, in Texas alone, 114 people were killed. In the district that I represent, from El Paso to San Antonio, there were eight cases of domestic violence.

Everyone here, many of you have met my son, who has become the center of my universe. I will tell you that children are incredibly important. They are certainly important to me and to the Members of this Chamber, the Members of this body.

The truth is that kids are also impacted by violence because, many

times, the child is also assaulted. In fact, according to a Task Force report, in several instances, the young children at the scene of the crime were also attacked, and, in fact, they were stabbed or strangled or shot or kidnapped, or some violence was committed on the children.

These numbers are heartbreaking. There are far too many people impacted. The sad part is that most of the time there are many signs of trouble. You can see it. There is a time in the life of every problem where it is big enough to see but still small enough to solve.

Researchers and service providers have already identified some common characteristics that help predict the risk factor as a precursor to intimate partner murders. Stalking, for example.

Stalking ranks as a top indicator of risk. Nationally, 76 percent of those cases involve at least one episode of stalking within a year prior to the murder. One in six women report having experienced stalking which made them feel very fearful or believe that they or someone close to them would be harmed or killed.

Intimate partner violence manifests itself from dehumanizing attitudes and beliefs, and it results in cruelty, brutality, degradation of the victims' physical, mental and spiritual well-being.

Ninety-nine percent of all women who have died as a result of domestic violence never stayed in a shelter. Ninety-five percent had no contact with a certified domestic violence center within 5 years of their death.

There is help out there. We just need to get people to the help, and the only way that we can do that is if more people are aware of the resources that are available to victims of domestic violence.

As I said, all of us, statistically, we are going to know someone who has been impacted by domestic violence, and it is very important that we all work together to make sure that they all have the help that they need.

On any given day in the U.S., over 60,000 women and kids—60,000, think about that—60,000 women and kids are residing in domestic violence shelters. The shelters provide a critical, critical, critical service. It is up to us, our States, our communities and our fellow citizens to make a difference, to make sure that we step up to the plate and keep these resources available, keep the help where we need the help, so that we can stop those hearts from breaking, we can mend those lives, and we can help those kids.

I had the great privilege, as Mr. GREEN alluded to, of serving in the Texas Legislature for a long time, including service as chairman of the committee of jurisdiction, the Committee on Criminal Jurisprudence, and

I carried a lot of legislation for victims of domestic violence.

I am very proud of those activities. I am very proud of that opportunity to be of service, and I hope that all 435 Members of this body and the 100 Members on the other side of this building will, all together, in a very bipartisan fashion, stand up and say, Let's put an end to domestic violence.

Thank you so much for your time.

□ 1630

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague from the State of Texas.

I would also mention to my colleague that, unfortunately, one study concluded that 10,401 domestic violence victims reached out for help but were turned away because of a lack of resources. There is still great work to be done, and I thank you for continuing to do this great work. God bless you.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, we have another Texan, from the 18th Congressional District in Houston, Texas, who serves on Homeland Security as well as Judiciary. We are going to ask that our friend, the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE, move to the podium.

And how much time remains, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I ask that Members govern themselves accordingly, with 6 minutes left.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman from Texas for his service and for his commitment to an issue that is so vital and important to the Nation, and that is, the protection of all Americans from domestic violence. There is a long history of the journey of this Congress to responding to the cry of women and men, both in the civilian life and in the United States military.

I rise today to acknowledge and commemorate Domestic Violence Prevention Month. I remember the journey that we took in getting to the Violence Against Women Act with our former colleague, the late chair of the Judiciary Committee, Chairman Hyde. I remember in the early stages of the 1990s the attempt to reauthorize this legislation.

The good news was that Chairman Hyde, a Republican, Ranking Member CONYERS, and Senators on both sides of the aisle joined together in one big room to come together and acknowledge the importance of protecting women; and then, of course, to acknowledge that violence, domestic violence, is a disease, an epidemic that spreads beyond the question of whether you are male or female.

The loss of life that has come about because people have not found a refuge is staggering. And for those of us who have heard firsthand stories—as a member of the Houston area Women's

Center, the board that, if you will, had supervision over local Women's Centers, where women could go. I have known and have seen stories that would argue so vigorously for more funding and more recognition and more laws that would protect these women.

So I am glad that even though the journey was even longer to get the Violence Against Women Act passed in the last Congress that we ultimately, after the many petitions that we were involved in, saw a bipartisan vote in the House and the Senate—much longer in the House—that allowed it to go to the President's desk.

So my remarks, as I summarize, are to say that this is an ongoing cause. Domestic violence comes from tension and pressure, but it results in violence that culminates with the loss of life. Time after time, women and children suffer a loss of life through violence by a spouse or a loved one; and, of course, we know that it occurs with men. Time after time, women in the United States military suffer from the act of violence, domestic violence, or violence against women.

So I want to thank the gentleman for giving me the opportunity to at least acknowledge that this is a somber occasion, and there is great need for continued support.

My last sentence, Mr. GREEN: you mentioned resources. I hope as we leave this floor that we will all reinforce the elimination of the sequester and a budget process that will allow the funding of vital programs like the Violence Against Women Act.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman.

And because time is of the essence, I will move quickly to the gentleman from the 41st District of California, the Honorable MARK TAKANO.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I stand today with my colleagues in recognizing Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

The unfortunate reality is that domestic violence is something that affects every community in America, as it touches every race, class, gender, and sexual orientation. Millions of domestic violence incidents are reported each year, and many more go unreported. Too often, domestic violence remains within the confines of the household, as many victims do not contact law enforcement or go public, often out of fear.

When it was first observed 26 years ago, Domestic Violence Awareness Month sought to shine a light on this tragic reality by educating the public, empowering the victims, and punishing the offenders. And in the 26 years since, we have made great progress, partly due to the Violence Against Women Act, which provides critical support to programs for victims and their fami-

lies, as well as resources for law enforcement and community organizations.

With a 51 percent increase in reporting by women and a 37 percent increase in reporting by men, the results have been nothing short of incredible. Domestic violence is wrong, and no victim should be hesitant to report it. I encourage every American who feels threatened or who knows someone in a dangerous situation to contact law enforcement or a community organization. Together, we can strive to end domestic violence abuse in our communities.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do thank you for your indulgence. You have been liberal with the time.

And I want to remind persons that while we do this on an annual basis in the month of October, we do want to make domestic violence awareness an everyday activity.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HEALTH CARE AND VOTER REGISTRATION ENROLLMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this has been an interesting week for a number of reasons. I would like to call to attention a letter that was written by Chairman DARRELL ISSA, my friend from California, to Secretary Kathleen Sebelius at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services this week.

The first paragraph, after saying, "Dear Madam Secretary" says:

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is investigating the insurance exchange application, online at www.healthcare.gov, established by the Department of Health and Human Services. As part of this investigation, we are writing to request information related to voter registration data collected during the application process.

On further down, the letter says:

While HHS and its contractors continue to struggle with the task of processing applications for health insurance coverage, the agency uses the Web site to collect voter registration information. Once an applicant completes the online application for health care coverage, a dialogue box appears asking, "Would you like to register to vote?" In light of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, also known as the Motor Voter Act, which requires any agency that provides public assistance to provide individuals with an opportunity to register to vote, the Department decided to include the voter registration option on the health care application. The inclusion of this voter registration may give applicants the impression that registering to vote is somehow tied to receiving health care benefits, such as insurance subsidies.

Given the well-documented flaws with the health care application process, the public lacks confidence that HHS has the ability to

safeguard applicants' voter information. Documents reviewed by the committee show that applicants may submit personal information over the Internet during the application process without encryption, potentially exposing personally identifiable information to interception and abuse.

Further down it says:

Further, it is unclear how HHS uses the voting information it collects once a user submits this data on the Web site. Applicants rightly expect that only State election officials will have access to their information. Voter registration contains important personal details that are valuable to various individuals and organizations.

Toward the end, Chairman ISSA says:

These facts raise questions as to what happens when the same individual expresses the desire to register to vote multiple times. HHS does not appear to have the capacity to differentiate between duplicates and first-time applicants.

In short, it is unclear what happens to voter registration information once HHS receives it. Applicants have an expectation that the Federal Government is not transmitting private information to third parties, knowingly or unknowingly.

But interesting questions were raised by my friend Chairman ISSA. It should also be noted that the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, my friend from Utah, JASON CHAFFETZ, also signed that letter. So that has certainly caused some digging in my office to find out what this was about.

And then we find information about www.demos.org. They have a report by Lisa J. Danetz called "Building a Healthy Democracy: Registering 68 Million People To Vote Through Health Benefit Exchanges."

Well, that is interesting. It makes you wonder what they are up to. They are involved in this www.healthcare.gov, apparently. And their own information from demos.org says they are going to use the health benefit exchanges, apparently, to try to register 68 million people to vote.

So while people in America—and I have talked to many who are just scared because they have got someone sick in their family. They have lost their insurance that the President promised they could keep. They are scared about the superhigh deductibles they have gotten. They are scared that under ObamaCare they have been sentenced to go from full-time work to part-time work, which means, as I have heard from some, that, gee, that means we have now had to go on public assistance because I never wanted welfare, didn't need welfare until the so-called Affordable Care Act forced us into it.

So people are concerned all over America. The majority want ObamaCare gone. The Web site is not working.

And then we find out that, actually, the Web site seems to be as concerned about getting people registered to vote and getting their invaluable voter information as they are about dealing with the crisis in American lives involving their health care and their health insurance.

You have got people with ulterior motives. They are apparently not just signing people up from the goodness of their hearts because Demos makes clear in their own information, We are going to use the health benefit exchanges to register voters.

Well, now, who would they be registering to vote? Because we are all in favor of people eligible to vote voting. Although we know that the Attorney General has sued States like Texas, even though the Supreme Court has made clear that Indiana's law requiring a photo ID, the Attorney General's rules that require a photo ID to get in to see him, the Democratic National Committee requiring photo IDs to get into their convention, having to have a photo ID to get alcohol or cigarettes or basically to get on a plane or get on most any conveyance in interstate commerce, you have got to have a photo ID. And States like Texas have said, If you can't afford it, then just fill out the oath, and we will take care of it for you.

□ 1645

So, on the one hand, we have an Attorney General and Department of Justice doing everything they possibly can, even in the face of a Supreme Court decision saying photo ID requirements are okay. They still are going after States, which I would humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, disenfranchises legitimate voters when the Attorney General of the United States takes action to prevent States from preventing fraudulent votes.

I was shocked when people called out for international observers to come watch our own election process. This is America. We don't need international observers to watch our process, so I thought. And yet international observers watched our process of voting and were absolutely shocked that we were so cavalier about who got to vote.

No identification requirements. Clearly, people were in a position to vote more than once if they wanted to. People were in a position to vote who were not U.S. citizens, and people could vote multiple times.

I know in Iraq, I was over there right after their first election, and those people had to dip their fingers in permanent ink that they wore around for weeks until it finally wore off. But it made sure that, even in Iraq, they were protecting the integrity of their voting system further than what we are doing here.

Well, this demos.org, they are going to register, they say, 68 million to vote through health benefit exchanges. So the thing to do, it seemed to me, was to get their annual report.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is what I got—Demos' annual 2012 report—to see who these people are that are going to register voters. I am sure they would be fair and register voters from all walks of life.

And then here we see the president is Miles Rapoport. Being the president, he has got a nice Letter from the President, the board chair.

So then you look up a little background. Well, who is this Miles Rapoport? An article from keywiki said Miles S. Rapoport is the leftist president and CEO of New York-based think tank Demos.

It goes on to say:

While studying at Harvard in the late 1960s, Miles Rapoport was active in the radical Students for Democratic Society, SDS.

Mr. Speaker, it seems like I have in the back of my mind SDS evolved into something called—some of them did—the Weather Underground that Bill Ayers would know a great deal about, being that he held the first fundraiser for the man who is now our President.

But the article goes on to say:

Harvard SDS campaigned against U.S. military involvement in Vietnam—

Obviously, a lot of people did.

—and the presence of Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or ROTC, on campus. In an April 7, 1969, letter to the Harvard Crimson opposing Harvard President Pusey's support for the ROTC, Miles Rapoport and fellow SDSers Naomi Schapiro, Carlin Meyer, Rick Brown wrote, "to conclude, President Pusey, they support the U.S. military and the policies it carries out. We feel that ROTC must go because we oppose the policies of the United States and we oppose the military that perpetuates them. The lines are clearly drawn. The time to take sides is now.

Well, that was Miles Rapoport, the president of Demos, that is going to register 68 million people through health benefit exchanges that most of us thought were actually just going to be trying to help people get health insurance. They are going to gather their most personal information and allegedly get them registered to vote. And you can't help but wonder what people like former SDS leader Miles Rapoport want to do with people's personal identification information.

So looking on further back in the Demos Annual 2012 Report, see what kind of fundraisers they have had. Well, they had a "2012 Transforming America Awards and Gala Celebration." So we look down and who were the honorary chairs?

There is Bertha Lewis. Some may remember she was head of something called ACORN. So the former head of ACORN is honorary chairman, helping Demos that is going to register 68 million people through the health benefits exchanges.

There is Richard Trumka, the president of the AFL-CIO. Oh, and here are our friends at Service Employees International Union, SEIU, and, of course, the international union UAW.

So that gives us a little feel about what Demos is doing, but it caused a little further examination as to who is it that is gathering this very personal information that Demos wants to use to get 68 million people registered to

vote through the health benefit exchanges.

There are a lot of issues and questions that need to be answered—not only about how are they using the personal information of people that just wanted to protect their families or themselves with insurance.

So who is it that is actually gathering this information to help Demos in their efforts?

There is an article here from PJ Media by David Steinberg, "Draining the Swamp: Top 40 Troubling Listings from the ObamaCare Navigator/Assister Security Nightmare: The article said:

Last week, we reported that the "honor system" is being used to confirm the identity and certification of navigators/assisters. The "find local help" feature on healthcare.gov refers consumers to potential predators.

We have since reviewed, State by State, every single navigator/assister that healthcare.gov currently displays to the public via "find local help."

This search revealed two additional dangers of the navigator/assister system.

It is not just a defunct or a problematic Web site. There is a problem with who is doing this, who is gathering information, who is this nightmare and train wreck of a Web site sending people to.

This says:

Number 1. The consumer is vulnerable, but so is the taxpayer. The program is rife with organizations that have advocated for "open borders," have helped illegal immigrants dodge apprehension, and have attempted to give illegal immigrants access to additional taxpayer-funded resources.

Such organizations are obvious risks to fraudulently register illegal immigrants for subsidized health insurance and, as such, have no business being included in the government-funded navigator/assister program.

Number 2. Regulations require navigator/assisters to be "unbiased." However, many organizations that were founded partly or entirely to advocate for politically left-leaning policies—including causes such as "universal health care," "single-payer," and ObamaCare itself—are nonetheless part of the program.

Many of these groups already receive government funding, which further raises the obvious conflict of interest issues. As many will be paid according to the number of consumers successfully registered for an ObamaCare plan, such groups have several incentives to steer consumers away from free-market plans that may be superior options.

Outside of the below list, only a handful of suspicious "open borders" or politically biased organizations have yet been exposed nationally. Below, a list of 40 to spur the much-needed discussion.

This list is divided into three categories. Some listings may fit more than one category, but all are listed only according to the primary concern regarding each.

Number 1. Open Borders Groups. These groups exist in part or in whole to secure greater Federal benefits for illegal immigrants. As such, all are obvious risks to fraudulently register illegals for subsidized insurance.

Number 2. Politically Biased Organizations. ObamaCare regulations require all

registered help to be “unbiased.” Yet these groups include leftist political advocacy as a primary part of their mission, presenting conflict of interest problems. Additionally, they have financial incentives to steer consumers away from free-market plans.

Number 3. Suspicion Regarding Legitimacy. Of great concern, considering healthcare.gov does not guarantee the legitimacy of any listings. While some of these listings may be legitimate, healthcare.gov saw fit to expose these suspicious listings to consumers with no further information to assist with their choice.

A final note: These listings are certainly incomplete. Community health centers have generally been excluded from it, though the sector has generally been supportive of the push for ObamaCare. If included, this list would be several times longer.

Also, a part 2 of this article is forthcoming.

Open Borders Group.

Number 1. Campesinos Sin Fronteras: “Farmworkers Without Borders.” This open-borders organization has participated in countless rallies and activity advocating for the decriminalization of illegal immigration. For just one example, read of Director Emma Torres’ organization of a March in 2006:

The 5-mile walk was marked by chanting, the waving of American and Mexican flags, and showing placards of opposing Senator Sensenbrenner’s proposal to criminalize undocumented immigrants and those who help them.

Emma Torres, adviser at the Institute of Mexicans Living Abroad and director of Farm Workers Without Borders, stated that a committee had recently been formed to plan the May 1 event. Around 30 people formed a committee in order to invoke a boycott of commercial goods and services and a walkout of jobs and schools.

The purpose of the committee, said Torres, is for the United States to feel the weight of the contribution of immigrants because “a lot of people deny the contribution that we make as legal or illegal immigrants and they don’t want to see that we have so much power in the economy.”

Number 2. Hispanic Women’s Organization of Arkansas. This group’s Web site boasts of being an affiliate of leading radical open-borders organization La Raza.

The success of HWOA and events also lies in its affiliations with local, State, and national organizations. In 2001, HWOA was selected to participate in the Emerging Latino Communities Initiative of the National Council of La Raza. Since October 1, 2004, HWOA has been an affiliate of NCLR, whose mission is to reduce poverty and discrimination, and improve life opportunities for Hispanic Americans.

It sounds nice, but they certainly are not unbiased.

Again, Mr. Speaker, these are organizations that are listed at healthcare.gov, apparently, to be navigators or assisters to help people with their health care choices. But, obviously, these organizations seem to have other motivations.

□ 1700

Number 3 is the Center for Pan Asian Community Services: This organization has expressed its support of just about every attempt to legalize the U.S. illegal population and has additionally expressed displeasure with the Voter ID law. They rallied against the Supreme Court decision in *Shelby v.*

Holder, inviting members to participate in a “voter suppression update teleconference.” They approved of the Associated Press’ decision to remove “illegal immigrant” from their style guide. They frequently and enthusiastically expressed their support for the passage of ObamaCare.

In 2007, when the idea of a \$10,000 fine instead of deportation for illegal immigrants was floated in Washington, D.C., CPACS Executive Director Chaiwon Kim gave the following statement:

People who are in the country illegally tend to be among the poorest clients at the Center for Pan Asian Community Services, said Chaiwon Kim, executive director of the Doraville nonprofit. So she doubts many could pay a fine beyond a couple thousand dollars.

“Most of the undocumented, they are really underpaid,” she said. “In a way, they’ve already paid society.”

Number 4, another group, is the Puerto Rican Cultural Center: The first thing that appears on the Web site (as of last week) is a statement from the organization Centro Sin Fronteras.

Centro Sin Fronteras is involved in the struggle to stop deportations and having a moratorium. We march and fight for the rights of immigrants. We march to stop the deportations and separations of our families. We are asking Obama to stop the deportations now, but instead, while the Senate is debating to pass an immigration reform, they are deporting and separating even more families than before.

In 2010, PRCC Executive Director Jose E. Lopez “was awarded the prestigious 2010 Health Award from the Health and Medicine Policy Research Group. The Health and Medicine Policy Research Group is an independent policy center promoting social justice and health care equality for the past 29 years”—and I just feel like there ought to be a drum roll—“in Chicago.”

Now, it is important to understand that we welcome immigration, and we need immigration in this country—it is freshwater flowing into this country—but it has got to be pursuant to the rule of law, and it has got to be legal. Even 60-plus percent of Hispanic adults agree that we need to secure the border before we do anything else in the way of reform.

It is also worth noting that, if a group like this had its way, we would never be able to deport terrorists. We had some who overstayed their visas and should have been deported. This group would be against that, which means they would be allowed to stay in the country and carry out the 9/11 attacks, which they did. Some of us have been pushing that the law be followed and that, if people overstay their visas, then legal action will be taken, and people will be deported, and it would be properly followed up.

This administration has not and even the prior administration had not been doing that or the Clinton administration, but it is something that needs to be done if we are going to be a Nation of laws. Yet these are the very people who are out there assisting people with their healthcare.org filings and getting their personal voter information.

Gee, after the IRS was weaponized and began targeting, wouldn’t it be

nice if conservative groups were allowed to register people for healthcare.org and to gather all of this personal information. I am being facetious, Mr. Speaker, because, under the law, to be a navigator or assister, you are supposed to be unbiased, and there is nothing but bias that we are seeing so far.

Number 5. Hispanic Liaison of Chatham County: This group operates a Victim’s Assistance program—that is great—which helps crime victims concerned about pursuing justice due to their illegal status.

Oh, we are back to that.

Our bilingual Victim’s Assistance program began in 1997 with funding from the North Carolina Governor’s Crime Commission. This program has been successful due to the trust we have developed with the Latino population and our collaborative relationship with community agencies. Several factors limit Latinos’ access to law enforcement and emergency services, including fear of the unknown, fear of documentation checks, and a lack of awareness that victims do not have to pay for an attorney.

Number 6. World Relief Chicago: This organization’s position on illegal immigration appears clear: they are currently assisting “children of illegal immigrants in delaying their deportation through the DACA program.” Their Twitter account links to an article, titled, “Undocumented Migrants in U.S. Gaining Improved Access to Higher Education.”

Number 7. Alliance of Filipinos for Immigrant Rights and Empowerment: From their site’s Civic Reflection page:

A recently formed Chicago advocacy group for immigrant rights, the Alliance of Filipinos for Immigrant Rights and Empowerment, supports comprehensive immigration reform and more just treatment of undocumented immigrants. Since late last year, AFIRE has been using conversation about readings by Pablo Neruda, Franz Kafka, Toni Cade Bambara, and others to develop its organizational structure and mission.

So it is interesting. We have got so many groups, and they are trying to help people who are illegally in the country. They are helping people illegally in the country, and Demos is a part of this, and their stated goal is to get 68 million new voters registered. This goes on and on, Mr. Speaker.

We have got 40 organizations like Planned Parenthood. They are in here and are registering voters as, apparently, part of the navigators or assisters. I guess they were helping with Demos. We need to know about these things.

A lot of these are politically active: the Arab American Action Network, the Arab American Family Services, the Campaign for Better Health Care, the CFL Workers Assistance Committee, Southern United Neighborhoods. It just goes on and on: In-Affordable Housing, Inc., Chatman, Inc., Chatman, LLC, the Family Health Care Foundation, Canaide, Inc., 2Hurt2Cry, Cutting Edge Health Options, Homebound Services, New Beginnings Medical Services, Village Communicator, Metro-east Area Communities for Empowerment.

We have got a bunch of folks who are supposed to be assisting in navigating for people who aren't able to get through the healthcare.org. They have political motivation. Their goal is to register 68 million new voters. No wonder this Web site is failing. If that is the case that it was being used for political purposes, what a disaster. People are scared about their health care, and these people just want to further their own political interests.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we worried about Americans and were against fraudulent voting and got America back on track to survive for years to come and flourish.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT DIRECTOR, THE HONORABLE CANDICE S. MILLER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Karen Czernel, District Director, the Honorable CANDICE S. MILLER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

KAREN CZERNEL,
District Director.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SUDAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-70)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within the 90-day period prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision,

I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the Sudan emergency is to continue in effect beyond November 3, 2013.

The crisis constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan that led to the declaration of a national emergency in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, and the expansion of that emergency in Executive Order 13400 of April 26, 2006, and with respect to which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13412 of October 13, 2006, has not been resolved. These actions and policies are hostile to U.S. interests and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Sudan and maintain in force the sanctions against Sudan to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 30, 2013.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY,
NOVEMBER 1, 2013

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today on a motion offered pursuant to this order, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Friday, November 1, 2013, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 62, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, November 1, 2013, at 10 a.m., unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 62, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3438. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Wisconsin [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0075] received October 23, 2013, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3439. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cold Treatment for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables; MidAmerica St. Louis Airport, Mascoutah, IL [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0089] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3440. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Avocados Grown in South Florida; Change in Minimum Grade Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0067; FV13-915-1 FR] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3441. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Temporary Change to the Handling Regulations and Reporting Requirements for Yellow Fleshed and White Types of Potatoes [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0067; FV13-946-2 IR] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3442. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0041; FV13-922-2 FR] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3443. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Kiwifruit Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No.: AMS-FV-13-0071; FV13-920-2 IR] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3444. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Suspension of Handling Regulations [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0040; FV13-922-1 IR] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3445. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0055; FV13-932-1 IR] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3446. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin; Revising Handler Reporting and Grower Diversion Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0030; FV13-930-2 IR] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3447. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Organic Program (NOP); Sunset Review (2013) [Document Number: AMS-NOP-11-0003; NOP-10-13FR] (RIN: 0581-AD13) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3448. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States Standards for Condition of Food Containers [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-08-0027; FV-05-332] (RIN: 0581-AC52) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3449. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Paper and Paper-Based Packaging Promotion, Research and Information Order; Referendum Procedures [Document Number: AMS-FV-11-0069; FR-B] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3450. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Relaxing Size and Grade Requirements on Valencia and Other Late Type Oranges [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0009; FV13-905-2 FIR] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3451. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Potato Research and Promotion Plan; Amend the Administrative Committee Structure and Delete the Board's Mailing Address [Document Number: AMS-FV-13-0027] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3452. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No.: AMS-FV-13-0053; FV13-987-1 IR] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3453. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Change in Reporting and Assessment [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0071; FV13-955-1 FIR] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3454. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Blueberry Promotion, Research and Information Order; Assessment Rate Increase [Document Number: AMS-FV-12-0062] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3455. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cranberries Grown in States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Long Island in the State of New York; Revising Determination of Sales History [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0042; FV12-929-2 FR] received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3456. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Citrus Canker, Citrus Greening, and Asian Citrus Psyllid; Interstate Movement of Regulated Nursery Stock [Docket Number: APHIS-2010-0048] (RIN: 0579-AD29) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3457. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Manufactured Housing: Revision of Notification, Correction, and Procedural Regulations [Docket No.: FR-5238-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AI84) received October 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3458. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; Correction to Standards Governing Prohibited Financial Interests [Docket No.: FR-5722-F-01] (RIN: 2501-AD61) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3459. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Records of Failed Insured Depository Institutions (RIN: 3064-AD99) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3460. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Suspended Counterparty Program (RIN: 2590-AA60) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3461. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Safety Standard for Cigarette Lighters; Adjusted Customs Value for Cigarette Lighters received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3462. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulations and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Certain Consumer Products and Commercial and Industrial Equipment [Docket No.: EERE-2013-BT-NOA-0047] (RIN: 1904-AD08) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3463. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products and Certain Commercial and Industrial Equipment: Test Procedures for Showerheads, Faucets, Water Closets, Urinals, and Commercial Prerinse Spray Valves [Docket No.: EERE-2011-BT-TP-0061] (RIN: 1904-AC65) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3464. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Generator Requirements at the Transmission Interface [Docket No.: RM12-16-000; Order No. 785] received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3465. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Ejection Mitigation [Docket No.: NHTSA-2013-0097] (RIN: 2127-AL40) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3466. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Modifications to Renewable Fuel Standard Program [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0233; FRL-9900-89-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR87) received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3467. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia; Removal of Obsolete Regulations and Updates to Citations to State Regulations Due to Recodification; Correction [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0955; FRL-9901-40-Region 3] received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3468. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards and State Board Requirements [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0499; FRL-9901-35-Region 3] received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3469. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0828; FRL-9901-53-Region 5] received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3470. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Dayton-Springfield, Steubenville-Weirton, Toledo, and Parkersburg-Marietta; 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0136, EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0215, EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0344, EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0378; FRL-9901-61-Region 5] received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3471. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Canton-Massillon Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard and the 2006 24-Hour Standard for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0564; FRL-9901-63-Region 5] received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3472. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan; Illinois; Redesignation of the Chicago Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0899; FRL-9901-44-Region 5] received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3473. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0307; FRL-9396-6] received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3474. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0912; FRL-9399-6] received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3475. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sedaxane; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0885; FRL-9397-8] received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3476. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0392; FRL-9901-83-Region 3] received October 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3477. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Determinations of Attainment of the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Standards for the Liberty-Clairton Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0769; FRL-9901-81-Region 3] received October 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3478. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Permitting Authority and Tailoring Rule [EPA-R01-OAR-2011-0148; A-1-FRL-9901-71-Region 1] received October 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3479. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revised Ambient Air Quality Standards for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0594; FRL-9901-80-Region 3] received October 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3480. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants, State of Iowa; Control of Emissions From Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerator Units, Negative Declaration and 111(d) Plan Rescission; Approval and Promulgation of Operating Permits Program, State of Iowa [EPA-R07-OAR-2012-0410; FRL-9901-65-Region 7] received October 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3481. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California; South Coast; Contingency Measures for 1997 PM_{2.5} Standards [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0384; FRL-9901-77-Region 9] received October 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3482. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Idaho: State Board Requirements [EPA-R010-OAR-2013-0548; FRL-9901-76-Region 10] received October 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3483. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Perfluoroalkyl Sulfonates and Long-Chain Perfluoroalkyl Carboxylate Chemical Substances; Final Significant New Use Rule [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2010-026 8; FRL-9397-1] received October 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3484. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Revision to Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Utah [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-0727; FRL-9901-92-Region 8] received October 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3485. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — An Inquiry Into the Commission's Policies and Rules Regarding AM Radio Service Directional Antenna Performance Verification [MM Docket No.: 93-177] received October 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3486. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Cedar Rapids, Iowa) [MB Docket No.: 13-182] [RM-11701] received October 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3487. A letter from the Chief, Satellite Division, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Comprehensive Review of Licensing and Operating Rules for Satellite Services [IB Docket No.: 12-267] received October 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3488. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Decommissioning of Nuclear Power Reactors; Regulatory Guide 1.184, Revision 1 received October 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3489. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period April 1, 2013 through May 31, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3490. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department

of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the heading "Loan Guarantees to Israel" in Chapter 5 of Title I of the Emergency War-time Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Pub. L. 108-11); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3491. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report entitled "Report of U.S. Citizen Expropriation Claims and Certain Other Commercial and Investment Disputes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3492. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report entitled "Report to Congress on Iran-Related Multilateral Sanctions Regime Efforts" covering the period from February 17, 2013 to August 17, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3493. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the June 20, 2013 — August 18, 2013 reporting period including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq, pursuant to Public Law 107-243, section 4(a) (116 Stat. 1501); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3494. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. RSAT-13-3643); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3495. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Pilot Program for Enhancement of Contractor Employee Whistleblower Protections [FAC 2005-70; FAR Case 2013-015; Item I; Docket 2013-0015, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM56) received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3496. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-70; Introduction [Docket: FAR 2013-0076, Sequence6] received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3497. A letter from the Chairman and President, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, transmitting the Center's audited financial statements for the years ending September 30, 2012 and October 2, 2011, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 761(c); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3498. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's report entitled, "Federal Student Loan Repayment Program CY 2012", pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5379(a)(1)(B) Public Law 106-398, section 1122; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3499. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Public Service Commission Agency Fund for Fiscal Year 2011"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3500. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of Non-District Resident Students Enrolled in Public Schools"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3501. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Public Service Commission Agency Fund for Fiscal Year 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3502. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Public Service Commission Agency Fund for Fiscal Year 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3503. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Public Service Commission Agency Fund for Fiscal Year 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3504. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Department of Employment Services Adult Career and Technical Education Programs"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3505. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Department of Employment Services Workforce Development Monitoring and Quality Assurance Procedures"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3506. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the DC Department of Parks and Recreation Facility Use and Permit Process"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3507. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's annual financial statement audit for FY 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3508. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Minerals Management: Adjustment of Cost Recovery Fees [L13100000 PP0000 LLW0310000; L1990000 PO0000 LLW0320000] (RIN: 1004-AE32) received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3509. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Early Seasons; and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds in the Contiguous United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2013-0057] (RIN: 1018-AY87) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3510. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2013-14 Early Season [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2013-0057] (RIN: 1018-AY87) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3511. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department

of the Interior, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Frameworks for Early-Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2013-0057] (RIN: 1018-AY87) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3512. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2013-2014 Late Season [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2013-0057] (RIN: 1018-AY87) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3513. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Late Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2013-0057] (RIN: 1018-AY87) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3514. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Framework for Late-Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2013-0057] (RIN: 1018-AY87) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3515. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing Endangered Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Species Status for 15 Species on Hawaii Island [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2012-0070] (RIN: 1018-AY09) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3516. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat of the Fluted Kidneyshell and Slabside Pearlymussel [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2013-0026] (RIN: 1018-AZ48) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3517. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for the Fluted Kidneyshell and Slabside Pearlymussel [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2012-0004] (RIN: 1018-AY06) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3518. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for Spring Pygmy Sunfish [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2012-0068] (RIN: 1018-AY19) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3519. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Foreign Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Blue-throated Macaw [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2012-0034; 450 003

0115] (RIN: 1018-AY68) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3520. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for *Chromolaena frustata* (Cape Sable Thoroughwort), *Consolea corallicola* (Florida Semaphore Cactus), and *Harrisia aboriginum* (Aboriginal Prickly-Apple) [Docket No.: FWS-ES-R4-2012-0076] (RIN: 1018-AY08) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3521. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing Endangered Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Critical Habitat for the Comal Springs Dryopid Beetle, Comal Springs Riffle Beetle, and Peck's Cave Amphipod [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2012-0082] (RIN: 1018-AY20) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3522. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; 2013-2014 Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf King Mackerel in Western Zone [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XC868) received October 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3523. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Shortraker Rockfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3418-02] (RIN: 0648-XC876) received October 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3524. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Arrowtooth Flounder in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC816) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3525. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fisheries Management Plan; Northern Red Hake Quota Harvested [Docket No.: 110816505-2148-03] (RIN: 0648-XC793) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3526. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC831) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3527. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC832) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3528. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sharks in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3418-02] (RIN: 0648-XC872) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3529. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC873) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3530. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; "Other Rockfish" in the Aleutian Island Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3418-02] (RIN: 0648-XC869) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3531. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC851) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3532. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 130104009-3416-02] (RIN: 0648-XC815) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3533. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Red Snapper Management Measures [Docket No.: 130627573-3796-02] (RIN: 0648-BD39) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3534. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule —

Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Fisheries; California Drift Gillnet Fishery; Sperm Whale Interaction Restriction [Docket No.: 130802674-3749-01] (RIN: 0648-BD570) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3535. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Queen Conch Fishery of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands; Regulatory Amendment 2 [Docket No.: 130402313-3748-02] (RIN: 0648-BD15) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3536. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Commercial Shark Fisheries [Docket No.: 110831548-3536-02] (RIN: 0648-XC836) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3537. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC850) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3538. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC817) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3539. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska Management Area [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC856) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3540. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC875) received October 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3541. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Main Hawaiian Islands Deep 7 Bottomfish Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures for 2013-14 [Docket No.: 130625564-3821-02] (RIN: 0648-XC736) received October 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3542. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC882) received October 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3543. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Bigeye Tuna Catch Limit in Longline Fisheries for 2013 and 2014 [Docket No.: 130104012-3777-02] (RIN: 0648-BC88) received October 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3544. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic [Docket No.: 120403251-3787-02] (RIN: 0648-BB70) received October 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3545. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Groupers Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 19 [Docket No.: 130403321-3803-02] (RIN: 0648-BD16) received October 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3546. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to Implement the Patent Law Treaty [Docket No.: PTO-P-2013-0007] (RIN: 0651-AC85) received October 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3547. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General; Office of Legal Policy, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Certification Process for State Capital Counsel System [Docket No.: 1540; AG Order No. 33992013] (RIN: 1121-AA77) received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3548. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's decision not to appeal the decision of the district court in the case of Cooper-Harris, et al. v. United States, No. 2:12-00887-CBM (C.D. Cal.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3549. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Regulatory Exception to Permit Compliance with the United Nations Headquarters Agreement and Other International Obligations and Clarification of Definition of "Immediate Family" for Certain Nonimmigrant Visa Certification received October 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3550. A letter from the Auditor, Congressional Medal of Honor Society, transmitting the annual financial report of the Society for

calendar year 2012, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(19) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3551. A letter from the General Counsel, Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Architectural Barriers Act Accessibility Guidelines; Outdoor Developed Areas (RIN: 3014-AA22) received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3552. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Information Required in Notices and Petitions Containing Interchange Commitments [Docket No.: EP714] received October 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3553. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0983; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-001-AD; Amendment 39-17457; AD 2013-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3554. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Aircraft Equipped with Rotax Aircraft Engines 912 A Series Engine [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0738; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-022-AD; Amendment 39-17568; AD 2013-17-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3555. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Inc. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0349; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-058-AD; Amendment 39-17576; AD 2013-18-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3556. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls Royce plc (RR) Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2007-28059; Directorate Identifier 2007-NE-13-AD; Amendment 39-17526; AD 2013-15-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3557. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0463; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-165-AD; Amendment 39-17584; AD 2013-19-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3558. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0186; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-11-AD; Amendment 39-17571; AD 2013-17-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3559. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell ASCA Inc. Emergency Locator Transmitters Installed on Various Transport Category Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0707; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-158-AD; Amendment 39-17582; AD 2013-18-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3560. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; AgustaWestland S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0350; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-050-AD; Amendment 39-17583; AD 2013-19-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3561. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0097; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-243-AD; Amendment 39-17572; AD 2013-17-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3562. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0301; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-025-AD; Amendment 39-17575; AD 2013-18-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3563. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0119; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-034-AD; Amendment 39-17541; AD 2013-16-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3564. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PIAGGIO AERO INDUSTRIES S.p.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0527; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-014-AD; Amendment 39-17577; AD 2013-18-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3565. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0270; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-113-AD; Amendment 39-17570; AD 2013-17-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3566. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0399; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-064-AD; Amendment 39-17574; AD 2013-18-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3567. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Air-

worthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0398; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-065-AD; Amendment 39-17578; AD 2013-18-05] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3568. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0143; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-06-AD; Amendment 39-17561; AD 2013-2013-16-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3569. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0094; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-160-AD; Amendment 29-17573; AD 2013-17-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3570. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0239; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-087-AD; Amendment 39-17552; AD 2013-16-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3571. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0240; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-060-AD; Amendment 39-17565; AD 2013-17-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3572. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0364; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-114-AD; Amendment 39-17562; AD 2013-16-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3573. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Corrections and Response to Administrative Appeals (HM-215K, HM-215L, HM-218G and HM-219) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2013-0041] (RIN: 2137-AF01) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3574. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0379; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-26-AD; Amendment 39-17580; AD 2013-18-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3575. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc.

Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0535; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-018-AD; Amendment 39-17489; AD 2013-13-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3576. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0400; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-48-AD; Amendment 39-17579; AD 2013-18-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3577. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Wasatch, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0528; Airspace Docket No. 13-ANM-16] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3578. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Bryant AAF, Anchorage, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0433; Airspace Docket No. 12-AAL-5] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3579. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Battle Mountain, NV [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0530; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-9] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3580. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment and Modification of Class E Airspace; Oakland, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0457; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-5] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3581. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Everett, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0434; Airspace Docket No. 13-ANM-1] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3582. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30918; Amdt. No. 3553] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3583. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30919; Amdt. No. 3554] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3584. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30916; Amdt. No. 3551] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3585. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30917; Amdt. No. 3552] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3586. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Dayton, TN, Establishment of Class E Airspace; Cleveland, TN, and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Bradley Memorial Hospital, Cleveland, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0073; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASO-2] October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3587. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Umatilla, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0002; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-46] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3588. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airspace Designations; Incorporation By Reference [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0709; Amendment No. 71-45] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3589. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Washington, DC [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0339; Airspace Docket No. 12-AEA-15] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3590. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment, Modification and Cancellation of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Northeast United States [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0504; Airspace Docket No. 13-AEA-3] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3591. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Santa Monica, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0611; Airspace Docket No. 11-AWP-11] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3592. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Wrightstown, NJ [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0565; Airspace Docket No. 13-AEA-11] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3593. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Stockton, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0274; Airspace Docket No. 13-ACE-2] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3594. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Harlingen, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1140; Airspace Docket No.: 12-ASW-11] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3595. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Fort Polk, LA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0267; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASW-11] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3596. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Enhanced Enforcement Procedures — Resumption of Transportation [Docket No.: PHMSA-2012-0259 (HM-258B)] (RIN: 2137-AE98) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3597. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Highway-Rail Grade Crossing; Safe Clearance [Docket Numbers: PHMSA-2010-0319 (HM-255) & FMCSA-2006-25660] (RIN: 2137-AE69 & 2126-AB04) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3598. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials Regulations: Penalty Guidelines [Docket No.: PHMSA-2013-0045 (HM-258C)] (RIN: 2137-AF02) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3599. A letter from the FMCSA Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Implement Certain Provisions of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) (RIN: 2126-AB60) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3600. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0931; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-128-AD; Amendment 39-17555; AD 2013-16-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3601. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0341; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-025-AD; Amendment 39-17557; AD 2013-16-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3602. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0887; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-02-AD; Amendment 39-17551; AD 2013-16-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3603. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH (ECD) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0020; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-107-AD; Amendment 39-17558; AD 2013-16-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3604. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0092; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-067-AD; Amendment 39-17560; AD 2013-16-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3605. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1076; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-274-AD; Amendment 39-17556; AD 2013-16-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3606. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0335; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-187-AD; Amendment 39-17549; AD 2013-16-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3607. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Martin Corporation/Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1078; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-012-AD; Amendment 39-17534; AD 2013-15-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3608. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0808; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-170-AD; Amendment 39-17380; AD 2013-05-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3609. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0424; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-014-AD; Amendment 39-17564; AD 2013-16-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3610. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0422; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-097-AD; Amendment 39-17567; AD 2013-17-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3611. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Alexander Schleicher GmbH & Co. Segelflugzeugbau Sailplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0450; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-010-AD; Amendment 39-17543; AD 2013-16-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3612. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30922; Amdt. No. 3557] received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3613. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0459; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-044-AD; Amendment 39-17569; AD 2013-17-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3614. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1003; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-064-AD; Amendment 39-17563; AD 2013-16-25] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3615. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Early Warning Reporting, Foreign Defect Reporting, and Motor Vehicle and Equipment Recall Regulations [Docket No.: NHTSA-2012-0068; Notice 2] (RIN: 2127-AK72) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3616. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — VA Dental Insurance Program-Federalism (RIN: 2900-AO85) received October 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3617. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Annual Report On Child Welfare Outcomes 2008-2011, pursuant to Public Law 105-89, section 203(a) (111 Stat. 2127); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3618. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "2012 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3619. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applications of the Segregation Rules to Small Shareholders [TD 9638] (RIN: 1545-BK03) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3620. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — November 2013 (Rev. Rul. 2013-22) received October 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3621. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Temporary Shelter for Individuals Displaced by Severe Storms, Flooding, Landslides, and Mudslides in Colorado [Notice 2013-63] received October 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3622. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 2013-2014 Special Per Diem Rates [Notice 2013-65] received October 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3623. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting the 21st report in a series on Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (CBERA): Impact on U.S. Industries and Consumers and on Beneficiary Countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3624. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; FY 2014 Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems: Changes to Certain Cost Reporting Procedures Related to Disproportionate Share Hospital Uncompensated Care Payments [CMS-1599-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AR53) received October 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

3625. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; FY 2014 Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems: Changes to Certain Cost Reporting Procedures Related to Disproportionate Share Hospital Uncompensated Care Payments [CMS-1599-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AR53) received October 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 982. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information regarding the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos; and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2655. A bill to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Ethics. In the Matter regarding the arrests of Members

of the House during a protest outside the United States Capitol on October 8, 2013 (Rept. 11–256). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 3380. A bill to delay any increases in premium rates for flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Program until the Federal Emergency Management Agency completes a comprehensive review and updating of all flood insurance rate maps and the Army Corps of Engineers reviews and certifies that such maps include all flood mitigation and flood control projects completed by the Corps; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 3381. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 3382. A bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 3383. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to all veterans with a serious service-connected injury eligibility to participate in the family caregiver services program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO (for himself, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 3384. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that veterans may attend pre-apprenticeship programs using certain educational assistance provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JONES, Mr. OLSON, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESTY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ENYART, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 3385. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide for the purchase of paper United States savings bonds with tax refunds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 3386. A bill to require Certificates of Citizenship and other Federal documents to

reflect name and date of birth determinations made by a State court and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENISHEK, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 3387. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the mental health treatment provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to veterans who served in classified missions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 3388. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to provide a grant to assist Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies in the rapid recovery of missing individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COTTON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. PITTENGER):

H.R. 3389. A bill to repeal the Consumer Financial Civil Penalty Fund and to deposit existing amounts in such Fund into the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 3390. A bill to provide for environmental restoration activities and forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation or shipment of quagga mussels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Agriculture, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COLE, Mr. COOK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 3391. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income payments under the Indian Health Service Loan Repayment Program and certain amounts received under the Indian Health Professions Scholarships Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 3392. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a PDP safety program to prevent fraud and abuse in the dispensing of controlled substances under part D of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 3393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the work opportunity tax credit permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit for hiring veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LATTA, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 3396. A bill to provide for the issuance of a Veterans Health Care Stamp; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 3397. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to develop guidelines regarding the use by the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of unofficial sources of information to determine the eligibility of a member or former member of the Armed Forces for benefits and decorations when the member's service records are incomplete because of damage to the records, including records damaged by a 1973 fire at the National Personnel Records Center in St. Louis, Missouri; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 3398. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COOK, and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 3399. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain clarifications and improvements in the academic and vocational counseling programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mrs. NOEM):

H.R. 3400. A bill to adopt the North American bison as the national mammal of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3401. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow a local educational agency that receives a subgrant under section 2121 of such Act to use the funds to provide professional development activities that train school personnel about restorative justice and conflict

resolution; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 3402. A bill to improve the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act by explicitly barring debt collectors from bringing legal action on a debt in which the statute of limitations has expired against any consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. COTTON):

H.R. 3403. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow motor carriers to use hair testing as a method of detecting the use of controlled substances by operators of commercial motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 3404. A bill to require that every mammography summary delivered to a patient after a mammography examination, as required by section 354 of the Public Health Service Act (commonly referred to as the "Mammography Quality Standards Act of 1992"), contain information regarding the patient's breast density and language communicating that individuals with more dense breasts may benefit from supplemental screening tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 3405. A bill to better connect current and former members of the Armed Forces with employment opportunities by consolidating duplicative Federal Government Internet websites into a single portal, to conserve resources by merging redundant and competing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. BARR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. COLE, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. AMASH, Mr. MICA, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 3406. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to ensure that individuals can keep their health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 3407. A bill to establish the National Center for the Right to Counsel; to the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. ELLMERS (for herself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. PITTINGER):

H.R. 3408. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to educate certain staff of the Department of Veterans Affairs and to inform veterans about the Injured and Amputee Veterans Bill of Rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 3409. A bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to require that any expansion of a national wildlife refuge must be expressly authorized by statute; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 3410. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to secure critical infrastructure against electromagnetic pulses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 3411. A bill to provide for an exchange of land between the United States Department of Agriculture and the Sabine River Authority of Texas; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOWDY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3412. A bill to establish the Higher Education Regulatory Reform Task Force, to expand the experimental sites initiative under the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reduce college costs for students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 3413. A bill to require a study and report by the Comptroller General regarding the restart provision of the Hours of Service Rules for Commercial Truck Drivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 3414. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 with respect to ecosystem restoration in the lower Columbia River and Tillamook Bay estuaries; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 3415. A bill to facilitate planning, permitting, administration, implementation,

and monitoring of pinyon-juniper dominated landscape restoration projects within Lincoln County, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 3416. A bill to amend titles 5, 10, and 32, United States Code, to require congressional approval before any change may be made to the oaths required for enlistment in the Armed Forces, appointment to an office in the civil service or uniformed services, or appointment as a cadet or midshipman at a military service academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3417. A bill to prohibit the consideration of any bill by Congress unless a statement on tax transparency is provided in the bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 3418. A bill to establish a demonstration program to provide rental assistance and supportive housing for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain small businesses from the employer health insurance mandate and to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of such mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3420. A bill to require any communication using Federal funds to advertise or educate the public on certain provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Healthcare and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 to state that such communication was produced at taxpayer expense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (for herself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 3421. A bill to remove use and disposal restrictions on property located in the City of Winslow, Navajo County, Arizona; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. COOK, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 3422. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for veteran first-time homebuyers and for adaptive housing and mobility improvements for disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BASS, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 3423. A bill to ensure the safety and well-being of adopted children; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition

to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 3424. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for facilities using a qualified methane conversion technology to provide transportation fuels and chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. SINEMA, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. BARBER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. VELA, and Mr. GARCIA):

H.R. 3425. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to delay the individual health insurance mandate and any penalties for violating the individual mandate until after there is a certification that the healthcare.gov website is fully operational, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 3426. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 3427. A bill to amend the Crime Control Act of 1990 to require certification of State and law enforcement agency reports related to missing children, to require that certain information be provided to individuals reporting a missing child, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. ENYART):

H.R. 3428. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an increased credit for development and to extend and simplify the credit for increasing research; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself and Mr. LANKFORD):

H.R. 3429. A bill to protect personal and financial information by requiring certain certifications by entities awarded funds under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act for the operation of a Navigator program or certain other Exchange activities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mrs. NEGRET MCLEOD):

H.R. 3430. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage hiring unemployed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 3431. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to promote family unity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 3432. A bill to expedite the planning and implementation of salvage timber sales

as part of Forest Service and Department of the Interior restoration and rehabilitation activities for lands within the Gila and Lincoln National Forests and for Bureau of Land Management lands in New Mexico adversely impacted by the 2012 and 2013 fire seasons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOEBACK, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3433. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to invest in innovation for education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 3434. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to require a State to deny assistance under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families to a parent, caretaker relative, or legal guardian of a child who is not attending enough school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. CHU, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. NEGRET MCLEOD, Mr. POLIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BASS, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 3435. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to create a demonstration project to fund additional secondary school counselors in troubled title I schools to reduce the dropout rate; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. AMASH, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 3436. A bill to require the Director of the National Security Agency and the Inspector General of the National Security Agency to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 3437. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate, with modifications, the Hope Scholarship Credit, the Lifetime Learning Credit, and the American

Opportunity Tax Credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. FOSTER, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 3438. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize use of grants under the Urban Area Security Initiative and the State Homeland Security Grant Program to work in conjunction with a Department of Energy national laboratory; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 3439. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the permanent application of the new markets tax credit for the redevelopment of communities impacted by realignment or closure of military installations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3440. A bill to designate a peak in the State of Nevada as Maude Frazier Mountain; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3441. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry scholarship to include spouses of members of the Armed Forces who die in the line of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3442. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to eligible non-profit entities to establish clearinghouses for local information about employment opportunities and services for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. DELANEY, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 3443. A bill to amend titles 38 and 37, United States Code, to expand eligibility for certain caregiver services provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and to modify the Department of Defense special compensation program to make eligible members of the uniformed services with serious injuries or illnesses and to exempt payments of such compensation from taxation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3444. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide flexibility in the manner in which beds are counted for purposes of determining whether a hospital may be designated as a critical access hospital under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ):

H.R. 3445. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow deductions for the payment of compensatory and punitive damages to a government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.J. Res. 100. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.J. Res. 101. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of consecutive terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODALL:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (for herself, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COLE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COOK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution honoring the service of Native American Indians in the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H. Res. 395. A resolution recognizing Birmingham, Alabama, as home to the first and longest-running celebration of Veterans Day and home of the National Veteran Award; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 396. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of November as National Alzheimer's Disease Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LEWIS):

H. Res. 397. A resolution recognizing the 40th anniversary of the independence of the Bahamas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LOEBBACH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. HAHN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BARBER, Ms. CHU, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. WATT,

Mr. FARR, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. POLIS, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H. Res. 398. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 2013 as "National Anti-Bullying Month"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H. Res. 399. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Cyber Security Awareness Month and raising awareness and enhancing the state of cybersecurity in the United States; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H. Res. 400. A resolution honoring the life and work of Commander M. Scott Carpenter, the second American to orbit the Earth; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. ESTY, Mr. LOEBBACH, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. CHU, Mr. POLIS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KIND, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO):

H. Res. 401. A resolution expressing support for designation of the third Tuesday of November as "National Entrepreneurs Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

151. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to House Resolution No. 731 appealing to the Members of Congress to exercise sound judgement and urge them to responsibility assume their duty of settling their disagreements regarding the budget; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 3380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 3381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States government are carried out to support the national security interests of the United States, to support and assist the armed forces of the United States, and to support the President

in the execution of the foreign policy of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in pertinent part, that "Congress shall have power . . . to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States"; ". . . to raise and support armies . . ."; "To provide and maintain a Navy"; "To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces"; and "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 3382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Per Article 1, Section 8, Clause 9, and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution and the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, Congress has the power to enact this proposed legislation to make reforms to federal criminal sentencing. The proposed legislation conforms to the norms of the Fifth Amendment with respect to due process.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 3383.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 3384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 12; "The Congress shall have the power to . . . raise and support armies . . .

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 13;

"To provide and maintain a navy"

And, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 3386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution enumerating congressional authority "to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization."

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 3387.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to raise and support Armies and provide and maintain a Navy, as well as make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 3388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 3389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 1: All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States

Article I Section 9 Clause vii: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 3390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 3391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 3393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debt and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8; and Amendment XVI.
By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8; and Amendment XVI.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached bill is constitutional under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian

Tribes" as well as Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 3397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 3398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7: No money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 3399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 3400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Paragraph 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The changes made by this bill to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are within Congress' authority under Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate foreign and interstate commerce).

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 3403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 3405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. DeSANTIS:

H.R. 3406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution (Interstate Commerce Clause)

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 3407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 3408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Clause 12 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 3409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, which states:

"The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 3410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution which states that Congress shall have power to . . . provide for the common defense.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 3411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution states that "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . ." Under the authority of the Constitution, the Sabine National Forest Land Exchange Act authorizes the disposal of federal land through exchange or sale of federal land.

By Mr. GOWDY:

H.R. 3412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is enumerated in Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 3414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 3415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 16 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5, Clause 2

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 3418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 1 and Article 1, section 8, and clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excise shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have the Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by This Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article I, Section 9: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 3421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, "The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 3422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 3423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 3424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 3426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause I and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 3429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 3430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 3431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8. The Congress shall have the Power to establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 3432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 3433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 3435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 3436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, Section 2, Clause 2, which states that the President "... shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint . . . all other officers of the United States . . ."

[Appointments Clause]

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 3437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 3438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18; Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 3439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 3444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof . . .

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.J. Res. 100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Clause 9, Section 7

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.J. Res. 101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to propose constitutional amendments.

Article V: The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which in either Case, shall be

valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this, Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 24: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 38: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 164: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 227: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 259: Mr. GOWDY and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 311: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 351: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 383: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 455: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 465: Mr. JONES and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 503: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 530: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 533: Mr. GUTHRIE and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 535: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 541: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 647: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 683: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 685: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 721: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BARBER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 764: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 800: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 831: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 846: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 847: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 863: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 875: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 901: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 921: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 938: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 946: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 1000: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1015: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1037: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1074: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1091: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1095: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 1105: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1186: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 1199: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1201: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1209: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 1212: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1239: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1250: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1281: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 1291: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1296: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1331: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1333: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 1339: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DELANEY, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1342: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 1395: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1428: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 1501: Mr. JONES and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1563: Mr. TURNER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1566: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1616: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1661: Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1666: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1701: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1725: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1726: Mr. HONDA and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1731: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1750: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1755: Mr. RUIZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1787: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 1795: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1803: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 1812: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1814: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1832: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1918: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1921: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1992: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1998: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2001: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2018: Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 2023: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2041: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 2084: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 2085: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 2134: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2178: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2182: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 2283: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2288: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2302: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2309: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 2333: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 2358: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2368: Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2376: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2415: Mr. PAYNE and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2429: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2430: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 2453: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2502: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FARR, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2504: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 2540: Mr. YODER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2543: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 2548: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2582: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 2591: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 2606: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2607: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2666: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 2675: Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 2692: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 2725: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2728: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2778: Mr. JONES and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2780: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. DOGETT.
H.R. 2785: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 2805: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2810: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2822: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 2827: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2918: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2939: Mr. OWENS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COOK, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2943: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 2955: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2959: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. LONG, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. BARTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2962: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 2967: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2983: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 3040: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 3086: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 3108: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3116: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 3118: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3121: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 3125: Mr. RUSH, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 3143: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3146: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3179: Mr. HARPER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 3199: Mr. HALL, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 3212: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 3219: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 3279: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 3299: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 3301: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3305: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3308: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DENT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MICA, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. RADEL, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 3309: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3310: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 3318: Mr. COLE and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3319: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 3333: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 3346: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3348: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 3349: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 3350: Mr. CAMP, Mr. COOK, Mr. COTTON, Ms. FOXX, Mr. JONES, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DAINES, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. BARR, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr.

DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. REED, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LABRADOR, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3351: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3353: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. CHU, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3356: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 3358: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 3359: Mr. COLE, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 3361: Mr. ENYART, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 3363: Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HANNA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MEAD-

OWS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. RADEL, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 3364: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3370: Mr. RUNYAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. MENG, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SANFORD, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CHU, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. LANCE.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. KIND.

H.J. Res. 56: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. RUSH.

H.J. Res. 64: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H. Res. 109: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. YODER.

H. Res. 153: Mr. JONES.

H. Res. 190: Mr. RICHMOND.

H. Res. 231: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms.

DELBENE, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. MASSIE.

H. Res. 254: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 281: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. FLORES.

H. Res. 284: Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H. Res. 365: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H. Res. 394: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MR. WILBURN C.
ROWDEN

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Wilburn C. Rowden for his service to our country in the Army Air Corps during World War II. His service commenced on January 7, 1943 at Jefferson Barracks, and he went on to become a member of the 392nd Bomb Crew, serving as a radio operator on the B-17 Flying Fortress "Sleepy Time Gal".

During a mission over Berlin on March 8, 1944, the aircraft Mr. Rowden was serving on was damaged by enemy air fire. The crew was ordered to bail out, during which Mr. Rowden was wounded by gunfire. Following this, Mr. Rowden was taken prisoner by armed German Air Force troops. Mr. Rowden was held as a Prisoner of War in a German prison for 14 months.

On November 2, 1945, Mr. Rowden was honorably discharged with the rank of a Technical Sergeant in San Antonio, TX. Beginning in June 1947, he worked as a technician for the Missouri National Guard. He retired from the Missouri National Guard in April 1983 as Chief Warrant Officer, 4th grade, receiving a retirement certificate crediting him with 38 years of service to his country.

The medals, ribbons, and awards Mr. Rowden has received are numerous. He was awarded a Purple Heart, Meritorious Service Award, and Silver Start Patriotic Service Award—just to name a few. Mr. Rowden has been married to Launa for 68 years and they are residents of Jefferson City, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in honoring Wilburn C. Rowden for his service to our country. It is an honor to represent him in the United States Congress.

RECOGNIZING THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORLANDO UNION RESCUE MISSION

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the 65th anniversary of the Orlando Union Rescue Mission, one of Orlando's oldest and largest homeless service providers. Since 1948, the Orlando Union Rescue Mission has provided both physically and spiritually for the homeless community of Central Florida.

The Orlando Union Rescue Mission programs meet the needs of homeless men, women and children. Those who seek refuge

at the Mission are provided nutritious meals, safe shelter, and discipleship programs that equip them to lead fulfilling, self-sufficient lives. In celebration of their 65th anniversary, the Orlando Union Rescue Mission is featuring 65 individuals who, upon successful completion of the Mission's programs, have been freed of the burdens of homelessness.

On behalf of the citizens of Central Florida, it is a privilege to recognize the Orlando Union Rescue Mission for their exemplary compassion and generosity.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RUSTY KEEBLE FOUNDATION AND ITS GANGFREE AMERICA CAMPAIGN

HON. AARON SCHOCK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the Rusty Keeble Foundation (RKF), which is dedicated to increasing gang awareness and reducing gang violence around the country. The RKF has launched an initiative entitled the GANGFREE America Campaign, which seeks to raise awareness by recognizing November as GANGFREE Illinois Month. This innovative initiative is aimed at fostering safe environments in communities across Illinois, including in Peoria, so that the children in those communities can continue to grow, learn, and reach their full potential free from the negative influences of gangs.

Gang violence has been a blight on our communities for far too long. Currently, more than 1.4 million young people are involved with gangs, up 40 percent since 2009. In many areas across the United States, gang violence accounts for almost 50 percent of all violent crimes, and in some cities and suburban areas, that percentage is even higher.

These staggering statistics are one representation of the effect of gangs on our communities and country, but the more potent manifestation of these numbers is the lost potential of the young people who get involved. Across our country, too many young men and women are seeing their future possibilities narrow into one act of violence, one drug deal, one prison term, after another.

Initiatives like the GANGFREE America Campaign are taking the steps needed to correct our nation's gang-related problems and working to ensure brighter futures for our youth. The GANGFREE America Campaign's community-focused approach employs schools as well as law enforcement to unify and empower citizens against the formation and spread of gangs in towns and cities across Illinois as well as the entire country. It is my hope that with the help of organizations like the Rusty Keeble Foundation, we can eradicate the gang epidemic in the United States,

and I am honored to rise today to recognize their courageous efforts.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE WARREN J. BAKER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the dedication of the Warren J. Baker Center for Science and Mathematics in honor of my dear friend President Emeritus Warren J. Baker.

The dedication of the Warren J. Baker Center for Science and Mathematics is a testimony to President Baker's legacy and tireless work on behalf of STEM education for over 30 years at Cal Poly. Under his leadership, several of Cal Poly's programs have become known as some of the best in the country including engineering, architecture and agriculture. His outstanding service to the students and vision for the campus will be felt for decades to come through the work of the Baker Center.

The Center's location in the heart of the campus symbolizes the role of mathematics and science at the nexus of Cal Poly's curriculum. The state-of-the-art center will exemplify the University's "Learn by Doing" educational philosophy by providing an environment that inspires innovation, collaboration and practical application. Not only will the center enhance the education of countless students that will pass through its doors, but our community will owe a great debt of gratitude for providing a strong workforce for the future. Simply put, the Baker Center will transform the way science and mathematics are taught and will no doubt play a prominent role in many promising academic careers for years to come.

RECOGNIZING JOHN "JACK" HESS, Ph.D.

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today honoring John "Jack" Hess, Ph.D. for receiving the Longs Peak Council Distinguished Eagle Scout Award. His academic and professional contributions to the field of geology should serve as an example to all Americans of how one's career can serve and improve his or her community.

A former Eagle Scout, Jack has served as a Congressional Science Fellow for Senator

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HARRY REID and currently serves as a member of the United States Commission for UNESCO, the United States National Committee for Geological Sciences, and the Science Committee for the National Natural Landmarks Program. In 2000, Jack was bestowed the Silver Antelope Award, the highest award the western region can provide.

Since his arrival in Colorado in 2001, Jack has served on the Board of Directors and as a chair for the Longs Peak Council. As the representative of Colorado's second congressional district, home to incredible geological structures such as The Flatirons, I am honored to recognize Jack for his vast contribution to this country and my district.

**SUPPORTING NATIONAL DAY OF
THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA**

HON. JIM BRIDENSTINE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the upcoming National Day of the Republic of China (Taiwan); an important day which led to the establishment of the Republic of China in 1912.

Taiwan and the United States have been good friends and strong security and economic partners for many years. Both countries believe that Human Rights, Democracy and Rule of Law are critical to maintaining a flourishing society.

Taiwan is not only an economic player in the Pacific, it also plays an important role in the U.S. economy. In 2012, Taiwan was the 11th largest U.S. trading partner and it's the 7th largest market for U.S. agricultural products. In light of this, I encourage the Administration to solidify a bilateral investment agreement with Taiwan, as it would boost both trade and investments for both parties.

Taiwan is a vital part of the Asian economy and an APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation) member. I would like to see Taiwan joining the Trans Pacific Partnership as soon as possible. I encourage my colleagues to support Taiwan in their efforts to join the TPP.

**RECOGNIZING BETHANY CHRISTIAN
SERVICES OF WINTER GARDEN,
FLORIDA**

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to recognize Bethany Christian Services of Winter Garden, Florida. Bethany Christian Services is a global nonprofit organization dedicated to caring for orphans and vulnerable children.

Founded in 1944, Bethany Christian Services is the largest adoption agency in the United States serving in over a hundred offices in more than thirty states. Their mission is to demonstrate the love and compassion of Jesus Christ by protecting and enhancing the

lives of children and families worldwide. In striving toward a world where every child has a loving family and support system, Bethany Christian Services provides programs and services to families and vulnerable children of all ages including, adoption, foster care, refugee assistance, family support and preservation, sponsorships and counseling.

Recently, I had the pleasure of meeting with Cheri Williams and Taniya Lall Jimenez from Bethany Christian Services of Winter Garden, Florida. Their spirit of dedication, commitment and leadership to children and families is to be commended. Bethany Christian Services is a shining example of the fruits of selflessness demonstrated by those who devote themselves to our future generations by investing in lives of families and children in Central Florida. I was pleased to recognize and honor them with the 2013 Angels in Adoption award from the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute.

The community and families of Central Florida are blessed to have a prominent leader in social services such as Bethany Christian Services. I commend them for their compassion and services to children and families worldwide. May their investment in social services inspire others to follow in their footsteps.

**COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF THE FLORIDA SEA-
FOOD FESTIVAL**

HON. STEVE SOUTHERLAND II

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the people of Franklin County, Florida, who are celebrating the 50th annual Florida Seafood Festival, a two-day event that draws tens of thousands of visitors to the historic city of Apalachicola.

First held in 1914, the Florida Seafood Festival did not become an annual tradition until 1963. This non-profit, volunteer-driven event celebrates not only the finest seafood in America, but also the dedicated men and women of the seafood industry who serve as the backbone of Franklin County's economy and rich history.

This year's milestone celebration comes at a time of both economic and ecological hardship for Franklin County's oyster industry. However, with all challenges come new opportunities, and I am confident this close-knit community will persevere in the face of adversity as it has time and again.

In closing, I congratulate the people of Franklin County for hosting the 2013 Florida Seafood Festival and expect a tremendous turnout that reflects the support we all have for North Florida's seafood industry and the people of Franklin County.

**HONORING BISHOP THOMAS
LANIER HOYT, JR.**

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of Bishop Thomas Lanier Hoyt, Jr., the 48th Bishop of the Christian Methodist Episcopal (CME) Church and presiding prelate of the seventh Episcopal district who recently passed away. While I am deeply saddened by his passing, I know his legacy will live through his message of faith and his dedication to his ministry.

Bishop Hoyt, a native son of Alabama, was installed as the senior CME bishop on June 30, 2010. His journey in leadership with the denomination began in 1994 when he was first elected to the Episcopacy. Throughout his tenure he took on countless leadership roles in the denomination. He pastored several CME churches in New York and North Carolina during the course of his career and until his death, Bishop Hoyt remained at the forefront of the CME church's efforts to change lives throughout the Nation.

Bishop Hoyt was also an accomplished theological scholar. He earned various degrees including a Ph.D. from Duke University and a Doctor of Divinity from Trinity College. Bishop Hoyt was a professor of theology for more than 25 years. His academic career included stints at the Interdenominational Theological Center, The School of Religion at Howard University and Hartford Seminary. His best known lectures were the Lyman Beecher Lectures at the Yale Divinity School in 1993.

Bishop Hoyt furthered his academic pursuits through extensive research and writing. He wrote and published more than 40 articles for professional journals and publications throughout his lifetime. He also co-authored and partnered with other scholars to publish various books including "Stony the Road we Trod: An African-American Biblical Interpretation."

As a result of his extraordinary accomplishments, Bishop Hoyt received numerous awards and honors which included a visit to Pope John Paul II with a delegation from the National Council of Churches. He also served as a delegate to the World Council of Churches in Porto, Alegre, Brazil and as the CME representative at the World Council of Churches meeting on Faith and Order in Spain.

On behalf of my home state of Alabama, and a grateful Nation, I am honored to pay tribute to Bishop Hoyt. This extraordinary Man of God was indeed a good and faithful servant. His life was a perfect illustration of his passion for ministry and leadership. Through the years, he was guided by his faith and his commitment to the CME church and we are indeed grateful for all that he has left us. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of Bishop Thomas Lanier Hoyt, Jr.

HONORING THE LATE JOHN F.
KUFFNER, OHIO VETERANS HALL
OF FAME INDUCTEE

HON. JIM JORDAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, the Ohio Veterans Hall of Fame will hold a ceremony in Columbus next week to mark the induction of its 2013 class. I am honored to commend to the House one of these inductees: the late John F. "Jack" Kuffner of St. Marys, who served as an aerographer in the United States Navy from 1946 to 1948.

An attorney for more than a half century, Mr. Kuffner served the people of Auglaize County as assistant prosecuting attorney and later as prosecuting attorney. He was subsequently elected to the Auglaize County Common Pleas Court, receiving the Ohio Supreme Court's Award for Superior Judicial Service. Judge Kuffner was past president of the Auglaize County Bar Association, an honorary lifetime member of the Ohio State Bar Association, and a 50-year member of the American Bar Association.

Judge Kuffner's devotion to community service provides us with an outstanding model of civic participation. President of the local Jaycees and member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles Lodge 767, he was a charter member of the St. Marys Kiwanis Club, founded in 1956. He received Mason of the Year honors in 2008 and was a 50-year member of Mercer Lodge No. 121. A life member of VFW Post 9289 and American Legion Post 323, he also held numerous offices through the years at Zion Lutheran Church in St. Marys.

Mr. Speaker, selection for the Hall of Fame is a high honor accorded to no more than 20 Ohioans each year. To be considered for induction, individuals must not only serve the nation honorably in the military, but also reflect the high value of service to others in their post-military careers.

I am pleased to join in the accolades for Judge Jack Kuffner and his inestimable record of service as he is inducted posthumously into the Ohio Veterans Hall of Fame.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE CITY OF
RIDGECREST

HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the founding of the City of Ridgecrest in my district.

Located in the southern portion of the Indian Wells Valley, Ridgecrest embodies what makes America exceptional—love of country, hard work, and dedication. The roots of Ridgecrest began much earlier than 1963, when the city was incorporated. In 1912, local dairymen James and Robert Crum established a small farming settlement named Crumville.

As more farming families settled the Naval Ordnance Testing Station was created, the community continued to grow. By 1963, the town was officially incorporated as Ridgecrest and experienced exponential growth as the demand for expertise in the naval station's programs for weapons development increased during the Cold War. Today, the Naval Ordnance Test Station is now the Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake (NAWS) and home to the Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division.

Growing together with China Lake, the Ridgecrest community also grew, supporting the tireless mission of our nation's defense with zeal. One of the most patriotic communities in America, Ridgecrest remains dedicated to the defense of American ideals and helping members of the armed forces.

Ridgecrest boasts a rich historic and educational history. The city has many cultural and recreational activities, such as the Maturango Museum, the China Lake Naval Museum of Armament and Technology, and the Petroglyph Canyons. Boasting National Blue Ribbon and California Distinguished Schools, Ridgecrest schools, served by the Sierra Sands Unified School District, consistently perform at the highest academic levels. Additionally, with the establishment of Cerro Coso Community College in 1973, Ridgecrest carries a statewide reputation for hosting one of the top community colleges in California, serving over 8,500 students.

Over half a century, Ridgecrest remains a California jewel, honoring and supporting America's great warfighter, and sharing in the success of one of the Navy's premier research, testing, development, and evaluation installations. Such success cannot be replicated without the hardworking people and the close-knit community that is unique to Ridgecrest. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me and my friends in the Ridgecrest community as we celebrate the 50th anniversary of its incorporation as a city in the great state of California.

CELEBRATING THE CHRISTENING
OF THE USS "GERALD R. FORD,"
CVN 78

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the christening of the USS *Gerald R. Ford*, CVN 78, the first in a new class of supercarriers. The ship will be officially christened November 9th by the former President's only daughter, who is the ships sponsor, at Newport News Shipyard in Virginia.

It is a fitting tribute to the life and legacy of our 38th President that this new ship, which will be the most powerful warship to ever sail the seas, carries his name.

The USS *Gerald R. Ford* is over 1100 ft long, has a flight deck of approximately 4 acres, displaces 100,000 tons with a complement of 4,660 Sailors. It is a magnificent vessel which will serve the nation for the next

50 years; proudly carrying the name of our former President from my home state of Michigan.

As a former Lieutenant Commander in the U.S. Navy Reserve, I know that this upcoming ceremony will be a great day for our nation, this House where President Ford served for 25 years, our Navy, and the State of Michigan as a favorite son is afforded his rightful place in naval history.

The USS *Gerald R. Ford* is scheduled to enter active service to the Navy in 2015 after completion of construction by our friends the master shipbuilders in Newport News, VA.

RECOGNIZING THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
DAUGHTERS OF THE NILE

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Daughters of the Nile on its 100th anniversary and congratulate its members, in particular the more than 400 members of the Shimron Temple No. 133, Pensacola, Florida, on their years of service to Northwest Florida and communities throughout North America.

Founded in 1913 by Mabel Krows in Seattle, Washington, the Daughters of the Nile is an international fraternal organization for adult women related by birth or marriage to a Shriner, Master Mason, a Daughter of the Nile or a member in good standing of a Masonic organization for girls. On February 20, 1913, Mabel Krows invited wives of the Nile Temple to discuss creating a club modeled after the Zuhrah's Ladies in Minneapolis, of which Mrs. Krows' mother belonged, following the disbanding of the Daughters of Isis in Tacoma, Washington. The Ladies of the Nile expanded to include the wives, daughters, mothers, widows and sisters of Nobles of any Masonic Temple, and the officers for the first Daughters of the Nile were elected on October 16, 1913. Over one hundred years after its founding, the Daughters of the Nile membership has grown to over 26,000 women in 139 cities throughout the United States and Canada.

As proud supporters of Shriners Hospitals for Children, the Daughters of the Nile donates over \$1.7 million annually to Shriners, amounting to more than \$50 million since 1924. Its contributions to the medical care and rehabilitation of children at twenty-two hospital locations, however, spread well beyond its financial support. The members of Daughters of the Nile are also generous with their time and talent, volunteering over 150,000 hours each year. Their efforts include sewing clothing and quilts, providing toys, books, and other educational and recreational items, as well as helping to organize functions and outreach events for the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am pleased to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Daughters of the Nile and congratulate its members on this important milestone. My wife Vicki joins me in wishing its membership many more years of continued success.

RECOGNIZING DON TUTTLE AS
CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Don Tuttle, who is being honored, along with his wife Andrea, as the Humboldt County DCC Citizen of the Year, an award he richly deserved.

Don Tuttle's long career with the Humboldt County Public Works Department's Natural Resources Division and his deep involvement in key resource, energy and historical issues has been a great benefit to Humboldt County and California's North Coast. His expertise and meticulous chronicling of events continues to be an asset on which the community relies.

Don Tuttle's positions as administrator of the Eel-Russian River Commission from 1978 to 1988, and as a member of the Trinity River Task Force Technical Advisory Committee, helped shape the recovery of two essential North Coast rivers. As chairman of the Humboldt Bay Harbor Safety Commission, he was instrumental in developing the Humboldt Bay Deepening Project, which allows the harbor to act as a deep-water port and ensures the safety of all mariners. As a longtime member of the Humboldt County Historical Society, and president of the society from 1989 to 1992, Don Tuttle has painstakingly worked to preserve the county's rich history.

Among the vital efforts in which Don Tuttle was instrumental are helping secure funding from Congress for a bank protection project to shield King Salmon from wave and tidal action; assisting in recapturing water diverted from the Eel River for the benefit of salmon and steelhead; developing a mitigation bank in conjunction with the Fay Slough Wildlife Area north of Eureka; and the creation of a vast data bank of aerial photographs, maps, and documents used by many professionals in Humboldt County.

Mr. Speaker, Don Tuttle's tremendous efforts to preserve and protect the Humboldt County community and its natural resources are worthy of recognition. I urge my colleagues to join me in extending our congratulations for his selection as Citizen of the Year.

HONORING PATRICK W. EMERY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Patrick W. Emery, who, along with his law partners at Abbey, Weitzenberg, Warren & Emery, is a recipient of the Sonoma County Bar Association's 2013 Career of Distinction Award. This is the highest honor presented by the Association and it is, indeed, well deserved.

Mr. Emery has been a trial lawyer in Sonoma County for 38 years and is one of the leading plaintiff's attorneys in Northern California specializing in wrongful death, product

failures, medical negligence and consumer class action litigation. He has won some of the largest jury verdicts ever awarded in Sonoma County.

For his work, Mr. Emery has consistently been recognized as a Northern California Super Lawyer. Super Lawyers is a rating service that selects outstanding lawyers from more than 70 practice areas who have attained a high degree of peer recognition and professional achievement. The selection process is multi-phased and includes independent research, peer nominations and peer evaluations.

Mr. Emery has served as President of the Sonoma County Bar Association and as a Judge Pro Tem of the Sonoma County Superior Court.

He is a frequent continuing education lecturer on civil litigation and has taught Trial Practice at Empire College of Law in Santa Rosa and currently teaches in the Trial Advocacy Workshop at Stanford Law School.

Mr. Emery's community involvement includes service as the President of the Sonoma County Fair and the Volunteer Center of Sonoma County as well as the Chair of the Sonoma County Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Speaker, Patrick Emery has been an outstanding attorney in Sonoma County for 38 years. He is respected and held in high esteem by his peers as is reflected in the honor he has received from the Sonoma County Bar Association. It is therefore appropriate that we honor him today.

HONORING JANE DAVIS

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of one of my constituents, Jane A. Davis, of Greensburg, Indiana.

Jane was a longtime resident of Greensburg, working in manufacturing at PrintPack for 33 years before her retirement in 1999. On a personal note, my brother Rich and I have very fond memories of summer evenings spent at Jane's house after days playing ball and riding bikes with her son Chad. Their friendships, and the friendship of their entire family, were a very important part of our childhood. Those memories will never be forgotten.

I ask the entire 6th District to keep Jane's children, Kim, Tammy, Lee Ann, Jodi, Brad, and Chad, along with the entire extended Davis family in your thoughts and prayers.

HONORING JOHN J. DIPPEL

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to John J. Dippel of Westfield, Indiana. He passed away on September 21, 2013, at the age of 75. John was an outstanding civil servant who served both

Westfield and the state of Indiana with integrity.

A graduate of Sacred Heart High School in Indianapolis, now Roncalli High School, John Dippel began his service to our great nation in the United States Army, where he served in the 82nd Airborne Division for two years. After his military service, he began working for Indiana Bell/Ameritech for over thirty years before his retirement in 1994. John then began a second career in advertising promotions before being elected to the Westfield Town Council, later the Westfield City Council, in 2007.

In 2008, Westfield was officially recognized as a city. John was an instrumental part of this significant change for the community he loved. He also assisted with the planning and implementation of Grand Park as a member of the Financial Committee and the Westfield Sport Commission. This 400-acre sports campus will host athletic competitions, local, regional and national sports tournaments, and community sporting events.

John J. Dippel was a community leader and a patriot. I am proud that exceptional citizens and public servants, such as John, call my district home and am honored to recognize his life's work today. My condolences and well wishes go out to his wife of 52 years, Marcyann; his sons, Nick, Joe and Daniel and daughters, Maura Kautsky and Andrea Doran; 14 grandchildren; one great-grandchild; and his sister, Mary Heisig. My thoughts and prayers are with the family during this difficult time.

RECOGNIZING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF NAVAL AIR WEAPONS
STATION CHINA LAKE

HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 70th anniversary of America's premier weapons development center, the Naval Air Weapons Station (NAWS) China Lake, which is located in Ridgecrest, California, which I represent.

China Lake was originally established as the Naval Ordnance Test Station (NOTS) in the Indian Wells Valley of California to serve the needs of the Navy-Caltech wartime rocket program. This location was chosen due to its near-perfect flying weather and incredible visibility. Testing began a month after NOTS was formally established and shortly thereafter the Secretary of the Navy expanded its mission to lead the Navy in research, development, and testing of weapons, a mission China Lake still carries out to this day.

Since being founded during World War II, China Lake has been critical in the development of our nation's defense capabilities in every major conflict, including the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. One of China Lake's notable developments occurred in 1950, when scientists and engineers developed the air-intercept missile (AIM). Known more commonly as the Sidewinder, the AIM has become the world's most recognized air-to-air missile and is one of many weapons that have been developed or tested at China Lake. Other prominent rockets and missiles developed or tested

at China Lake include the Mighty Mouse, Zuni, Shrike, Joint Stand-off Weapon (JSOW) and Joint Direct-Attack Munition (JDAM), all of which have given and continue to give our military the capabilities needed to maintain combat superiority over current and future threats.

Spanning over three counties and covering more than 1,100,000 acres, Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake is currently home to several commands and detachments that work together each day in support of our warfighters. These include: the Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division (NAWCWD), which serves within the Naval Air Systems command to maintain the highest standards of excellence in weapons development for the Navy; the Air Test and Evaluation Squadron THREE ONE (VX-31) and the Air Test and Evaluation Squadron NINE (VX-9), which provide the essential expertise needed to plan and execute ground and flight tests, air-to-ground weapons, air-to-air weapons, sensors, electronic warfare systems, and developmental weapons and weapons systems testing; the Marine Aviation Detachment (MAD), which focuses on the development of cutting-edge technologies for weapons systems; the Explosive Ordnance Disposal Detachments, which are forces comprised of highly-trained technicians who specialize in explosives, diving, and parachuting; the Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) Southwest China Lake Detachment, which is responsible for the public works, planning, engineering design, construction, real estate, and environmental services of the facilities and real estate at NAWS China Lake. Together, these tenants are made up of the hardworking men and women of the China Lake community, who work each day to maintain a reputation of excellence for the U.S. Navy and the Department of Defense.

For the past 70 years, NAWS has been critical to ensuring our military men and women have the latest cutting-edge technology to protect and defend America when called into harm's way. The weapons and weapons systems developed at China Lake help ensure these brave individuals complete their mission and return safely to their families. I have had the privilege to meet with the amazing individuals at China Lake who are responsible for these incredible innovations in American technology. Their dedication, commitment, and pride in the work they perform are unparalleled. This same commitment is reflected in the Ridgecrest community, where many of the men and women who work at this installation live and raise their families.

Mr. Speaker, NAWS China Lake is a beacon of innovation and excellence in the military community and an important part of my community and my district. I am honored to represent so many individuals, active-duty military and civilians, who go to work each day for the purpose of maintaining and strengthening both the warfighter and this nation's defense. I look forward to another 70 years of amazing achievements, and I ask my colleagues to join me today in wishing the Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake a very happy 70th anniversary.

RECOGNIZING ANDREA TUTTLE AS CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Andrea Tuttle, who is being honored, along with her husband Don, as the Humboldt County DCC Citizen of the Year, an award she richly deserves.

Andrea Tuttle's extensive work in forestry and climate issues around the world has made her an expert whose knowledge is invaluable in Humboldt County and around the globe. The expertise she has gained in her considerable academic and administrative experience has guided conservation, forestry and climate projects in California, the Pacific Northwest and in Asia.

Earning undergraduate and Ph.D. degrees at the University of California at Berkeley and a master's degree at the University of Washington, Andrea Tuttle was also appointed by Gov. Jerry Brown to the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board from 1976 to 1984; worked as staff for Sen. Barry Keene on the state Senate Select Committee on Forest Resources from 1987 to 1991; was appointed by Assembly Speaker Cruz Bustamante to the California Coastal Commission from 1997 to 1999; and was appointed by Gov. Gray Davis as Director of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection from 1999 through 2004.

Andrea Tuttle is currently an independent consultant on forest and climate policy, the chairwoman of the Pacific Forest Trust and an observer on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change with a focus on reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. Andrea Tuttle has published in a wide variety of scientific publications on timber management and forest carbon issues, among others. Her years of teaching as an instructor in science and natural resources at Humboldt State University, the College of the Redwoods and at UC Berkeley highlight Andrea Tuttle's desire to share what she has learned for the improvement of the local and global communities.

Mr. Speaker, Andrea Tuttle's dedication to conservation and natural resources at home in Humboldt County and abroad is commendable and worthy of recognition. I urge my colleagues to join me in extending our congratulations for her selection as Citizen of the Year.

IN RECOGNITION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month, during which we take actions to address domestic abuse and encourage people to speak up and seek help. It is when everyone can join in the efforts led by the National Coalition Against

Domestic Violence to end the violence and keep our communities safe.

Domestic violence is a major issue that affects our society as a whole. Many families live day to day with some form of abuse as their reality. Millions of domestic violence incidents are reported each year, and many more go undocumented. While domestic violence is not gender specific, women are the most common group affected by domestic abuse. One in four women experience domestic violence in their life and in New York State alone, 85 percent of the victims of domestic violence in 2010 were women.

In New York City, the NYPD responded to more than 263,000 domestic violence calls last year. To put that into perspective that would be about 700 reports of domestic violence a day or one every two minutes. I am dedicated to making the community safer for my constituents; recently I co-sponsored the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, which was signed into law by President Obama on March 7, 2013. The law addresses the major issue of domestic violence and makes huge strides to help put an end to it. Through the renewal of the 1994 legislation, victims of abuse will have access to resources they need to find help, and law enforcement will be better prepared to respond faster than ever. It is important that we foster an environment where people do not fear to leave an abusive situation.

I commend the outstanding work of our community organizations in addressing this problem: The Harlem Community Justice Center, New York City Family Justice Centers, STEPS to End Family Violence, Sanctuary for Families, The New York Latinas Against Domestic Violence, The New York City Human Resources Administration/Department of Social Services (24-Hour Hotline: 1-800-621-HOPE), The Center against Domestic Violence of New York (24-Hour Hotline: 1-718-439-1000), The Office for the Prevention of Domestic Violence (New York State Hotline: 1-800-942-6906, and Safe Horizon (800)-621-HOPE (4673), have all done incredible work in providing invaluable assistance to the victims of domestic violence and in raising awareness.

If you are a victim of domestic violence please raise your voice and get help. Please do not hesitate to reach out to any of the resources listed above. We as a community support you and we will fight domestic violence together.

COMMENDING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF BELTON, TX MAYOR JIM COVINGTON

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the great public service of Belton, TX Mayor Jim Covington. Jim is dedicated to making Belton's beauty, amenities, and growth his top priority.

Located deep in the heart of Texas, Belton is a unique city with friendly people and a rich

history. Founded in 1850, Belton serves as the county seat of Bell County, one of the fastest growing areas in Texas. Belton is located on the famous Chisholm Trail, where millions of cattle were driven from Texas to rail heads in Kansas. Texas' state sport is celebrated daily at Belton's Texas Rodeo Cowboy Hall of Fame.

A Sooner who as a young boy made his way south and took up roots in the Lone Star State, Jim is now a proud Texan. Developing leadership abilities in his youth, he settled in Belton to raise his family and realized he wanted to be a part of making the city a better place.

Jim has been instrumental in infrastructure and park improvements and has kept his eye on managing growth. A proud part of the larger Fort Hood community, he's been involved in troop support for years. Jim stays grounded by balancing his mayoral duties with his work at his wife's real estate firm and by being a devoted father and grandfather.

Jim Covington is an asset to Belton and I'm proud he's Mayor. Under his stewardship, Belton is on the right track.

RECOGNIZING THE MARRIAGE OF JOSHUA DELGADO AND MARVIN TUCKER

HON. MARK TAKANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great joy that I recognize the marriage of two outstanding, loving Riverside residents, Joshua Delgado and Marvin Tucker, who have waited 19 years for their union to be recognized.

Shortly after the Supreme Court struck down Proposition 8, California's marriage equality ban, and the Defense of Marriage Act, the federal law that barred same-sex couples from receiving federal marriage benefits, Josh and Marvin decided to get married. Now, with the legal recognition of the State of California and the guarantee of federal protections, Josh and Marvin will be married equally, as their peers have been for years.

Serving the United States Air Force for more than thirty years, Marvin Tucker currently works as the Emergency Management at March Air Reserve Base in Riverside, where he's served since 1997. Finding comfort in a familiar place, Josh and Marvin hosted their wedding at the March Air Reserve Base Chapel on August 3, 2013.

Although Josh and Marvin aren't the first same sex couple in the Air Force, their wedding is the first same sex union with the 452nd Air Mobility Wing, the first on March Air Reserve Base, and the first in the Air Force Reserve Command.

It is with great honor that I wish peace, joy, and happiness to Joshua Delgado and Marvin Tucker in matrimony.

RECOGNIZING THE TEN-YEAR ANNI- VERSARY OF THE NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION, WATER FOR SOUTH SUDAN, FOR ITS EF- FORTS TO ELIMINATE CONTAMI- NATED DRINKING WATER AND IMPROVE THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING OF THE SOUTH SU- DANESE PEOPLE

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my esteemed honor to recognize the ten-year anniversary of the non-profit organization, Water for South Sudan, and commend this Rochester-based organization for its tireless efforts in the fight against contaminated water use in the South Sudan region. I also want to recognize and congratulate the founder of Water for South Sudan, Salva Dut, and his staff for drilling 177 wells in the South Sudan since October 2003. It is an honor to represent the district in which Water for South Sudan was founded.

Water for South Sudan has exhibited immense devotion to the Sudanese population over its ten-year history, and has served 400,000 people to date. Not only does Water for South Sudan provide clean water to the world's youngest nation, the organization also works to alleviate poverty and rebuild communities in one of the most economically depressed nations in the world.

Following a devastating twenty-year civil war, the South Sudanese were left without clean water and protection from deadly diseases, including malaria. With child mortality rates, poverty, and starvation at extreme highs, and educational levels and social and gender equality at extreme lows, there was a need for global action to help the South Sudanese people recover. When many only saw hopelessness in South Sudan, Salva Dut saw promise and stepped in to help lead his nation forward.

At the young age of 11, Salva Dut was forced to leave his family and flee South Sudan in an effort to escape the outbreak of violence and destruction resulting from the civil war. Facing rapidly spreading diseases, hunger, and the threat of attack, Dut's strength led himself and others away from imminent danger. During this time Dut showed admirable leadership by helping 1,500 "Lost Boys" like himself reach a United Nations-regulated camp. After more than half a decade living there, he was finally able, along with 3,800 other Lost Boys, to come to America. Dut settled in the welcoming community of Rochester, NY and established the roots that would become Water for South Sudan.

After being separated for 16 years, Dut was able to finally reconnect with his father in South Sudan in 2002. During that trip, he witnessed the devastating effects of parasite and disease-ridden water, as it took hold of his ill father. Dut then decided that he would dedicate his life to bringing clean water to the South Sudan region. This young man, who came to the United States with very little education and a language barrier, went on to be-

come a college student, an American citizen, and the founder of one of the most respected charity organizations to date.

I am very proud of Water for South Sudan, its founder Salva Dut, his dedicated staff, and the supportive residents of the 25th Congressional district. Instead of walking away, Salva Dut and Water for South Sudan have marched forward, meeting the dire need for sustainable and safe water for the South Sudanese.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating, honoring, and thanking Water for South Sudan for its work. I am honored to represent an organization that inspires change on a global level.

HONORING JOHN HALLÉ

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize John Hallé, President and Chief Executive Officer of Cate Street Capital and recipient of Spurwink Services' 2013 Humanitarian of the Year Award.

Since 1987, Spurwink Services, a non-profit organization that provides mental health and educational services throughout New England, has presented its annual Humanitarian Award to an individual who works to improve the lives of others within the community and state of Maine. Spurwink made an excellent choice in presenting its 2013 Humanitarian of the Year award to John Hallé, who has displayed his deep commitment to the health and wellbeing of the people of Maine through raising funds and awareness for this important organization.

In addition to his outstanding fundraising efforts, John has positively impacted the state of Maine through his business ventures and forward-looking vision. In 2009, after 25 years with a number of high-growth financial companies, John founded Cate Street Capital, which invests in sustainable and innovative technologies that not only create jobs but also help to preserve and protect the environment for future generations.

More recently, John and Cate Street Capital have focused much of their efforts on reviving Great Northern Paper in East Millinocket, Maine. John's efforts have helped restore one of Maine's proudest and most iconic industries and led to the creation of more than 250 jobs.

On November 9, 2013, John Hallé will be honored as Spurwink Services' 2013 Humanitarian of the Year at a dinner gala and award ceremony at the Portland Marriott at Sable Oaks in South Portland, Maine. I am looking forward to being in attendance as John receives this much deserved award.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating John Hallé on being named Spurwink Services' Humanitarian of the Year and recognizing his tremendous contributions to the state of Maine.

IN RECOGNITION OF KEITH SHAPIRO'S OUTSTANDING SERVICE

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Keith Shapiro for his outstanding legal career, but more importantly, his leadership and service to the Jewish community.

Keith's legal career speaks for itself. Having practiced in Chicago for 30 years, Keith is the Chairman and Co-Founder of the Chicago office of Greenberg Traurig and serves as the Vice President of the 1,750-lawyer worldwide firm. His success as an attorney in the practice of global business reorganization and financial restructuring earned him recognition as one of America's 100 Top Global Turn-around Professionals. He continues to serve the legal community as part of the Law Advisory Board of the Emory University School of Law. However, his legal career may only be surpassed by his service to his community.

On November 4, 2013, the American Jewish Committee will award Keith with the Judge Learned Hand Human Relations Award, given annually to a person who, in the words of Judge Hand, does not "ration justice," thereby safeguarding the rights of individuals in our democracy.

I could think of no more deserving recipient, as Keith Shapiro exemplifies service through action. A strong advocate for U.S.-Israel relations, Keith has served on the Executive Council of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee for many years. For over a decade, he has served on the Board of Directors of the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago. His is a member of the Board of Trustees of The Jewish Theological Seminary, Vice Chairman of The Anti-Defamation League's Midwest Region, and Chairman of the Anti-Defamation League's Jerold Solovy First Amendment Freedom Award event.

A proud husband and father, Keith continues to pass along his spirit of service to his three sons and future generations. Keith Shapiro is a model public servant and is deserving of this prestigious honor. Congratulations, Keith.

EL CONCILIO'S 45TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JERRY MCNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 45th anniversary of El Concilio, Council for the Spanish Speaking. Since 1968, El Concilio has worked in Stockton, California, and throughout the San Joaquin Valley to provide assistance to the Spanish-speaking community. El Concilio offers programs that assist with a wide range of services, including immigration assistance, education, English language skills, and financial literacy.

El Concilio is the perfect example of an organization that is committed to working with

and for the community to improve the lives of others. By partnering with local and corporate businesses and other organizations, El Concilio is able to engage with the public on a large scale and focus its efforts where they are needed most.

El Concilio's efforts and influence have been instrumental in assisting the Spanish-speaking community. El Concilio has helped unite neighborhoods, foster communication, and provide an anchor in the community where families can receive trustworthy advice and support. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing El Concilio and its staff for their invaluable contributions over the past 45 years.

HONORING THE WORK OF HARKER HEIGHTS, TX MAYOR MIKE AYCOCK

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work of Harker Heights, TX Mayor Mike Aycock. He's proudly carrying on his family's contributions to public service.

Harker Heights, just over 50 years old, is part of the larger Fort Hood community. One of the fastest growing cities in Texas, Harker Heights offers numerous recreational opportunities for residents and visitors.

The son of Bell County Commissioner Joe Aycock, Mike is part of a proud family that's been in Bell County since after the Civil War. Mike settled for good in Harker Heights after college. Nurtured by citizen activists and former mayor Ed Mullen, Aycock rose to the mayor's post and has developed a reputation as a courteous and dedicated public servant who remains focused on doing what's right for Harker Heights.

The relatively young city of Harker Heights deserves a mayor with energy and enthusiasm to tackle the challenges of the future. It has one in Mike Aycock. I'm glad he's there and I look forward to seeing great things happen for Harker Heights.

HONORING PALMER PLACE RESTAURANT & BIERGARTEN'S 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Palmer Place Restaurant & Biergarten in La Grange, Illinois on its 30th Anniversary. For the past three decades, Palmer Place has been the keystone of downtown La Grange as it has grown into one of the most vibrant communities in suburban Chicago. Since its founding, Palmer Place has served delicious food and quality beers in a warm and welcoming atmosphere.

In 1982, Ruth Palmer returned home from a trip to Germany with the inspiration to open what would be the first Biergarten in Chicago's

western suburbs. Despite the risky business circumstances, in 1983, Ruth and Mike Palmer founded Palmer Place Restaurant & Biergarten. In the past 30 years the Palmer family has been monumental in reviving downtown La Grange, and helping to make it the thriving business district it is today.

Though the restaurant has grown from 8 employees to 126, Palmer Place remains family owned and operated by Ruth Palmer, and after the passing of Mike Palmer in 1990, their sons Phil and Steve Palmer. Now, the third generation of Palmer's has begun work in the family business: Kyle Palmer, Merle Palmer, and Robert Palmer. The family's commitment to the community has been extraordinary over the past 30 years. In 2012 alone, Palmer Place donated over \$50,000 in gift-certificates to local charities in addition to the family conducting and contributing to numerous charitable events. The family's commitment is further illustrated in the active role they have played in the La Grange Business Association, West Suburban Chamber of Commerce, and the Illinois Restaurant Association.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Palmer Place Restaurant & Biergarten on its 30th Anniversary. The Palmer Family's flourishing restaurant is a shining example of the positive influence that local businesses can have on their communities. May it continue to thrive in La Grange and serve as an example to all small business entrepreneurs.

HONORING W. BARTON WEITZENBERG

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor W. Barton Weitzenberg, who, along with his law partners at Abbey, Weitzenberg, Warren & Emery, is a recipient of the Sonoma County Bar Association's 2013 Career of Distinction Award. This is the highest honor presented by the Association and it is, indeed, well deserved.

Mr. Weitzenberg has been a practicing attorney in Sonoma County for 35 years and he, along with his law firm, has won more large recoveries for his clients than any other attorney in Sonoma County. Mr. Weitzenberg specializes in representing individuals in their claims against insurance companies and large corporations.

For his work, Mr. Weitzenberg has consistently been recognized as a Northern California Super Lawyer. Super Lawyers is a rating service that selects outstanding lawyers from more than 70 practice areas who have attained a high degree of peer recognition and professional achievement. The selection process is multi-phased and includes independent research, peer nominations and peer evaluations.

He is also recognized as one of the Best Lawyers in America according to Best Lawyers, the oldest and most respected peer-review publication in the legal profession. A listing in Best Lawyers conferred on a lawyer by

his or her peers is widely regarded by both clients and legal professionals as a significant honor.

Mr. Weitzenberg has served as President of the Redwood Empire Trial Lawyers Association, the Sonoma County Trial Lawyers Association, the Consumer Attorneys of Sonoma County, the Richard Sangster Inn of American Inns of Court and has been a member of the American Board of Trial Advocates.

He is an instructor in Trial Advocacy with the Stanford School of Law and the Empire School of Law in Santa Rosa, California.

Mr. Weitzenberg's community involvement includes board membership on the Sonoma County YMCA, the Redwood Empire Blood Bank and the California Water Fowl Association.

Mr. Speaker, Barton Weitzenberg has been an outstanding attorney in Sonoma County for 35 years. He is respected and held in high esteem by his peers as is reflected in the honor he has received from the Sonoma County Bar Association. It is therefore appropriate that we honor him today.

RECOGNIZING FARMEDHERE FOR BEING NAMED A TOP 10 "UP-AND-COMER" FOR THE 12TH ANNUAL CHICAGO INNOVATION AWARDS

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize FarmedHere, a revolutionary vertical farming facility in Bedford Park, IL for being named a Top 10 "Up-and-Comer" for the 12th Annual Chicago Innovation Awards.

In March 2013, FarmedHere opened the world's largest indoor vertical farming operation. At a repurposed warehouse, FarmedHere uses cutting-edge technological advances in aquaponics and aeroponics to supply Chicagoland residents and restaurants with chemical-, herbicide- and pesticide-free herbs, vegetables, and fish. As FarmedHere's operation continues to expand and become more efficient, they are proving that sustainable urban farming is a viable option for Chicagoans.

In providing locally sourced food throughout Chicago, FarmedHere exemplifies environmentally responsible business practices. Instead of expanding horizontally over hundreds of acres, FarmedHere's fields are stacked on top of each other. This vertical growing technology coupled with local distribution reduces energy use, travel time, and costs. FarmedHere extends its green-thinking to its paper packaging, which uses 90 percent less plastic than traditional supermarket boxes. Recently, FarmedHere, in partnership with The Resource Center, a non-profit environmental education organization, established a program that allows FarmedHere to convert all of its organic waste into compost. This compost is then used at other urban farms throughout the Chicago area, helping these farms continue to grow and thrive.

In addition to providing residents with local and environmentally-friendly products,

FarmedHere positively affects the Chicago community. FarmedHere provides life changing opportunities for non-violent ex-offenders by hiring and training them to work in their vertical farm. FarmedHere also aims to expand its operations and bring 200 new jobs to the Chicago community by 2014, which will help bolster the local economy.

I was pleased to hear that all of this great work has resulted in FarmedHere's recognition by the Chicago Innovation Awards. Each year the Chicago Innovation Awards recognize the most innovative new products and services in the region across all industries and sectors. By honoring Chicagoland's most creative, the Awards strengthen the region's economic future and spread the spirit of innovation. Chosen from a record-breaking pool of 562 applicants, FarmedHere was named one of ten "Up-and-Comer" award winners this year. The "Up-and-Comer" award recognizes Chicago's premier start-up organizations and provides these organizations with connections to capital, mentors, and business resources. FarmedHere's prizes include an invitation to ring the NASDAQ Bell in New York City, advertising exposure with the Chicago Transit Authority, invitations to attend meetings with Mayor Rahm Emanuel and Governor Pat Quinn, and a profile in Crain's Chicago Business. As the greatest source of new jobs for the U.S. economy, start-ups like FarmedHere deserve this praise and support.

FarmedHere and vertical farms alike are beneficial for the economy and the environment, and I am proud that this one-of-a-kind facility is located in the 3rd District of Illinois. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the entire FarmedHere family on their recent honor and to wish them many years of continued success.

RUNAWAY REPORTING IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that each year in the United States 1.6 million children and youth run away or are thrown out of their homes. Every child reported to have run away is required by law to be listed in the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) database as a missing person. This cooperative effort of federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies aids in information-sharing and promotes cooperation in investigating and resolving multi-jurisdictional cases. The NCIC database is an important part of the puzzle because it can be accessed by virtually every law enforcement officer in the United States. Without an NCIC entry, officers in one part of the country have no way to know that a child is missing at all.

Sadly, an estimated 16 percent of reported runaways are never entered in the NCIC database as missing persons. Without an NCIC entry, law enforcement officers will not share information or resources, and are far less able to discover or protect a missing child because

law enforcement doesn't know to look for him or her.

To help address this problem, my colleague Rep. TED POE and I are introducing the Runaway Reporting Improvement Act. This legislation would require law enforcement agencies to certify that they are complying with the law and entering all runaway children into the NCIC database. Additionally, agencies would be required to give parents or guardians of missing children information about the help available through the 24-hour, toll-free phone numbers for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and the National Runaway Safeline. These two organizations provide referral services and counseling to the parents or guardians of missing children.

The necessary resources are already in place. We simply must do better by our children. The Runaway Reporting Improvement Act will help ensure that existing processes are used to find and protect those most vulnerable.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE ONE YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF SUPERSTORM SANDY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today as our nation commemorates the one year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy, we remember the 117 victims and their loved ones. Countless lives were affected by this storm, as well as homes, and businesses that were ruined all along Mid-Atlantic shores. Thousands of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut residents were displaced, and to this day they are still working very hard get back on their feet.

For many, it may still feel like it was just yesterday that Superstorm Sandy made landfall, wreaking havoc along its path. I am proud to say that during the immediate aftermath many people, especially in our congressional district, pulled together to help provide aid to all those who were hit the hardest. There are still many families who have not fully recovered from the damages that were incurred and need assistance. Last year, I, along with members of state and federal legislators, came together to push forward the Hurricane Sandy Tax Relief Act of 2012, which was a big step forward on a long road to restoration. We will continue to work hard to ensure the recovery of all those affected by the storm.

Many thanks go out to the rescue workers and first responders who worked around-the-clock to save lives, restore power, and deal with the aftermath of the storm. I know we are a resilient nation and hope for a swift recovery for all those affected by Hurricane Sandy.

IN HONOR OF THE MONTGOMERY
COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincere congratulations to the students of the Montgomery County School District for their academic achievement, as evidenced by their top 12 percent ranking in Kentucky's Unbridled Learning assessment and accountability system.

I would also like to congratulate the leadership of this school district, the principals, the teachers, and the involved parents for a job well done. They are a true example of a public school system that is working to the best of its abilities.

I know how hard everyone involved labored to improve their District, and now, their dedication to reforms and unprecedented approach to student achievement has produced incredible results.

This achievement is an example of the leadership and determination that proves Kentucky to be a Commonwealth of Excellence.

It is truly an honor to serve as their Congressman in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Keep up the good work, Montgomery County!

IN RECOGNITION OF COMMAND
SERGEANT MAJOR WILLIAM
ZITO JR., UNITED STATES ARMY

HON. RICHARD B. NUGENT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is an honor for me to rise today in recognition of the forthcoming retirement of Command Sergeant Major William Zito Jr. on January 31, 2014.

CSM William Zito Jr. has served the United States Army with honor and distinction for 22 years. A career of such longevity in support of our national security is, in itself, an accomplishment worthy of recognition. In the case of CSM Zito, his stoic demeanor masks the extraordinary achievements accumulated during an exceptional career that demands more than simply the recognition of a grateful nation. He has earned the respect of thousands of soldiers who have directly benefited from his leadership and the adulation of millions whom he has never met, but profited from his wisdom nonetheless.

William Zito's combat arms occupational specialty took him directly into harm's way numerous times, deploying to the most dangerous battlefields of his generation. As First Sergeant, he deployed first to Kuwait for Operation Enduring Freedom in 2002 and the invasion of Iraq in March of 2003, then returned again in 2005 to 2006. In 1st Battalion, 9th Field Artillery, 3rd Infantry Division, First Sergeant Zito's leadership guided the actions of 130 soldiers whose teamwork under his stew-

ardship received the Presidential and Meritorious Unit awards.

After returning to complete the Sergeants Major Course in 2007, now CSM Zito once again met our nation's call and deployed the 2nd Battalion, 12th Field Artillery, 2nd Infantry Division to Operation Iraqi Freedom. During this time, CSM Zito was responsible for designing and implementing command policies and training for an 800 member Task Force. CSM Zito successfully managed all of the Task Force's Joint Security Stations as well as partnering with two Iraqi Army Brigades, an Iraqi Police Division and the Kadamiyah Shrine Police. The lives of thousands of American and Iraqi soldiers depended on the leadership of CSM Zito.

Upon his return from foreign battlefields, CSM Zito continued to dedicate himself to the betterment of our nation by graciously allowing Congress to glean what we could from his wisdom. A remarkably small portion of the military are assigned to the unenviable task of explaining the impact on end-users of our legislative ideas. CSM Zito was among the hand-selected cadre, first as Defense Fellow to Representative John Carter and then as Legislative Liaison of the Department of the Army. During these two positions, CSM Zito was responsible for providing guidance on matters relating to military legislation as well as serving as the primary point of contact for enlisted issues. As an effective spokesman, CSM Zito strengthened the Army's relationship with our nation's lawmakers.

Over the course of his 22 years of dedicated service, CSM Zito has repeatedly demonstrated honor and dedication indicative of a great American hero. His valiant efforts both across oceans in enemy territory as well as here domestically have helped to protect and shape our nation. On behalf of the United States Congress and the American people we represent, I extend my deep appreciation to Command Sergeant Major William Zito Jr. for his service to our country. My best wishes on a happy retirement and continued success.

HONORING DR. LINDA RUSHTON
SELMAN

HON. TIM GRIFFIN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Linda Rushton Selman, whose strong intellect, work ethic, and determination are being recognized through the creation of the Dr. Linda Elizabeth Rushton Selman and Jo Ann Rushton Endowed English Scholarship.

Linda hails from Magnolia, Arkansas, my hometown. She graduated first in her class at Magnolia High School. Her talents, drive and work ethic took her to Sullins College in Virginia, where she earned her Associate of Arts degree and, once again, graduated first in her class. She pursued further education at the University of Arkansas, where she was a ROTC Cadet Colonel, named an Arkansas Traveler and was voted a Razorback Beauty. At UA, she pledged Chi Omega and earned

both her Bachelor's and Master's degrees, with Phi Beta Kappa honors.

Throughout her life, Linda has been steadfast in her commitment to educating and teaching. She has taught at the University of Arkansas and Southern Methodist University, and has spent the majority of her career at Southern Arkansas University in Magnolia, where she recently began her 38th year in the university's English department. In 1983, she earned her Ph.D. from the University of Arkansas, and while teaching at SAU, she raised four children.

Linda has continued to support the University of Arkansas, with numerous gifts to Fulbright College, the Alumni Association, the graduate school and the English department. She remains active in Chi Omega and is a life member of the Arkansas Alumni Association. She has been a 27-year contributor to the Razorback Foundation and Arkansas Athletics, where she sits in the very same seats at Razorback Stadium and War Memorial Stadium as she did when she rooted for the Razorbacks over 50 years ago.

Through Linda's tenacity and vigor she has made good on the promise she made to her younger sister, Jo Ann, who passed away from a kidney infection in 1952 at the age of two. Linda, who was 11 at the time, promised her dying sister that she would live her life for both of them. Without question, she has honored that promise.

The scholarship in Linda's honor has been established by her husband, Dr. Frank Selman, in an effort to preserve Jo Ann's memory and to honor Linda. I am proud to call Frank and Linda my longtime friends.

On behalf of Arkansans and Americans everywhere, I congratulate Linda Selman for being a leader in education and for the establishment of this scholarship in her name.

HONORING THE EXTRAORDINARY
LIFE OF EUGENE BICCARD GLICK

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Eugene (Gene) Biccard Glick of Indianapolis, Indiana. He passed away on October 2, 2013, at the age of 92. Gene was an exceptional philanthropist and businessman who served both Indianapolis and his country with integrity.

A lifelong Hoosier and resident of Indianapolis, Gene graduated from Shortridge High School and later from Indiana University in December of 1942. He bravely served in the 179th Regiment of the 45th Infantry Division of the U.S. Army during World War II and saw action in Italy, France and Germany. While in Germany, Gene, an American Jew, helped liberate the Dachau Concentration Camp. The photographs he took provided evidence of Nazi atrocities and are part of the collection at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum located here in Washington, D.C. For his service, Gene received every European Theater ribbon awarded, in addition to the Bronze Star and the Combat Infantryman's Badge.

After his tour of duty, Gene returned to Indianapolis, working at People's Bank issuing GI loans. Seeing the housing shortage for returning veterans starting families, he founded the Gene B. Glick Company. Under Gene's guidance, his small company grew to become what is today one of the largest privately held real estate development firms in the nation. Gene Glick exemplified the best of the Hoosier spirit: hard work, determination and entrepreneurship.

Gene Glick was not only a dedicated soldier and a business leader, but also a philanthropist and community activist. In 1982, he and his beloved wife, Marilyn, established the Eugene and Marilyn Glick Family Foundation, one of the largest private foundations in the state of Indiana. Gene also established the Glick Fund of the Central Indiana Community Foundation, the Glick Fund of the Jewish Federation of Greater Indianapolis, the Glick Eye Institute at the Indiana University School of Medicine, the Indianapolis Cultural Trail and the Indiana Authors Award. Gene was a tireless advocate for Indiana's Jewish community and for disadvantaged youth across the state. His generosity and humanitarian spirit touched thousands of lives in Indianapolis and beyond.

Throughout his incredible life, Gene was awarded numerous awards and honors. He was inducted into the National Housing Hall of Fame and was a Central Indiana Business Hall of Fame Laureate. He received an honorary Doctor of Laws degree from Butler University in 1989. He was recognized as a Sagamore of the Wabash—the highest award given by the Hoosier state—from Indiana governors Robert Orr (1982), Evan Bayh (1992) and Joe Kernan (2005). Gene was named an Indiana Living Legend by the Indiana Historical Society in 2002.

Gene Glick was a patriot and an irreplaceable pillar of the Indianapolis community whose legacy will continue to inspire Hoosiers for generations to come. I am proud that exceptional leaders and public servants, such as Gene, have called my District home and am honored to recognize his life's work today. My condolences and well wishes go out to his four daughters, Marianne Glick, Arlene Grande, Alice Meshbane and Lynda Schwartz, and several grandchildren and great-grandchildren. My thoughts and prayers are with the family during this difficult time.

IN MEMORY OF JOHNNY A.
BURKES

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my friend, Mr. Johnny A. Burkes of Pleasanton, California, who passed away last Wednesday, October 23rd, at the age of 83.

During his life, Johnny was known as a family man who was dedicated to serving the community around him. He chose a career field where he felt he could make a long lasting, and positive impact: that of financial planning. For over 50 years, through his work,

Johnny helped countless individuals and corporations plan for their future.

Johnny was always willing to take time out of his busy career and family life to serve his community. He was a member of several service organizations, including the Native Sons of California, Elks Club, Rotary International, Masons, and Shriners. He also served for three years as a member of the Board of Trustees for the ValleyCare Charitable Foundation, which helps contribute to state-of-the-art healthcare in the Tri-Valley.

During his life, Johnny enjoyed hunting and sports, and he was an avid fan of the San Francisco Giants and the San Francisco 49ers. He is survived by his high school sweetheart and wife of 65 years, Maxine; his four sons: Michael, Terry, Joey, and Lane; and, his five grandchildren. Johnny will be missed by many.

MEDAL OF HONOR FOR DONALD P.
SLOAT

HON. JIM BRIDENSTINE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 28, 2013, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3304, a bill to authorize and request the President of the United States to award the Medal of Honor to Bennie G. Adkins and Donald P. Sloat of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam Conflict and to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to certain other veterans who were previously recommended for award of the Medal of Honor. I am a proud original co-sponsor of H.R. 3304.

The late Mr. Donald P. Sloat was a constituent in the First District of Oklahoma. Then-Specialist Four Donald P. Sloat served our country during the Vietnam Conflict. On January 17, 1970, then-Specialist Four Donald Sloat, a machinegunner with Company D, 2nd Battalion, 1st Infantry Regiment, 196th Light Infantry, Americal Division was killed saving the lives of three of his fellow soldiers by shielding them from a grenade blast with his own body.

For his gallantry and intrepidity, then-Secretary of Defense Robert Gates determined that Mr. Sloat's actions merited the Medal of Honor. I submit the following letter from Secretary Gates to Representative Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. In his letter, Secretary Gates notes that the Medal of Honor must be awarded "within three years after the date of the act justifying the award." Congress must waive the time limit before the President of the United States can award the Medal of Honor to Mr. Sloat. By passing H.R. 3304, the House of Representatives took the first step in ensuring that Mr. Sloat receives the honor he so richly deserves.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
1000 DEFENSE PENTAGON,

Washington, DC, January 11, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in response to requests from Senator Tom Coburn

and Representative John Sullivan for award of the Medal of Honor (MoH) to then-Specialist Four (SP4) Donald P. Sloat under the provisions of title 10, U.S.C., section 1130, of "Consideration of proposals for decorations not previously submitted in timely fashion: procedures for review."

I reviewed the proposal for award of the MoH to then-SP4 Sloat for saving the lives of three of his fellow soldiers by shielding them from a grenade blast with his own body on January 17, 1970, during the Vietnam conflict. After giving the nomination careful consideration, I believe then-SP4 Sloat's actions merit award of the MoH. However, title 10, U.S.C., section 3744, requires that the MoH be awarded "within three years after the date of the act justifying the award." Therefore, a statutory time waiver to title 10, U.S.C., section 3744, is required before the President of the United States may, if he so chooses, award the MoH to then-SP4 Sloat.

The final award authority for the MoH rests solely with the President of the United States. My favorable determination in no way presumes what the President's decision might be.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs. A similar letter is being sent to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, Senator Tom Coburn, and Representative John Sullivan.

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. GATES,
Secretary of Defense.

RECOGNIZING THE MEMBERS OF
HILLSBORO VFW POST 9094

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the members of Hillsboro VFW Post 9094 for their patriotism and volunteerism.

This week, Post 9094 celebrates their 75th anniversary, which is a testament to the lasting commitment these veterans have to helping fellow veterans and non-veterans in Highland County.

The Korean War Memorial is inscribed "Our nation honors her sons and daughters who answered the call to defend a country they never knew and a people they never met."

In conflicts around the globe, the members of VFW Post 9094 answered this call.

Southern Ohio and our nation are eternally grateful to them for their service, and deeply grateful that these dedicated veterans continue to answer the call to support and protect all veterans and families in need in Highland County, as Post 9094 has now done for 75 years.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL
WILDLIFE REFUGE EXPANSION
LIMITATION ACT OF 2013

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my bill, the National Wildlife Refuge

Expansion Limitation Act of 2013, which requires that any expansion of a national wildlife refuge be approved by Congress. Currently, there is little Congressional oversight of the Federal Government's ability to arbitrarily designate land as biologically necessary for increasing a public land management unit. While I'm a firm believer in ensuring our environment is flourishing with wildlife, this is not the path to follow. Washington purchasing up private lands will have long term consequences.

Mr. Speaker, by introducing this bill, I hope to prevent the Federal Government from creating instability in economically depressed rural regions by drawing arbitrary acquisition boundaries around private land and creating hundreds of disconnected, protected refuge areas. Aggressively creating islands of "hold-out parcel" farmland surrounded by environmentally protected refuge lands has shown to be disruptive to economically important rural industries. Whether by regulation or the Federal Government passively forcing out landowners by excessive regulation and poor refuge maintenance, the private landowners lose.

My district is a prime example of the Federal Government's unwanted advances. In the Eighth District of Tennessee, the Fish & Wildlife Service is attempting to purchase 120,000 additional acres of land, which equates to over 1,000 privately owned parcels along 49 miles of the Mississippi River and 106 miles of the Hatchie River. This land grab is on top of the existing 27,947 acres already purchased and protected by the federal government. Even more alarming, the Fish & Wildlife Service has not even completed purchasing lands within the existing refuge designation.

This expansion equates to the largest refuge east of the Mississippi, impacting our crop production, tax base, freedom of land use, and people's way of life. At a time of government shut downs, sequestration, fiscal cliffs, debt debates, and legislative stalemates, rapid expansion projects seem extremely short sighted. Under-funded, under-maintained refuges lead to a loss of realistic recreational use, productive farm land, and tax revenue for county rolls across the country.

Under current law, it does not require an Act of Congress to spend the \$22 million collected each year from waterfowl hunters who must buy an annual federal duck stamp. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to support me in passing the National Wildlife Refuge Expansion Limitation Act of 2013, in order to ensure that Americans who do not want the Federal Government next door have a voice in Congress for wildlife refuge expansion oversight.

TRIBUTE TO KILLEEN MAYOR DAN CORBIN

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the great work of Killeen Mayor Dan Corbin. This experienced leader and Vietnam veteran is the right man to work on behalf of the home of Fort Hood.

A railroad town since the 1880s, Killeen weathered the Great Depression and later became the proud home of Camp Hood in 1942. Recommissioned as Fort Hood eight years later, it's now the largest military base in the world. "The Great Place" is so much a part of daily life in Killeen that the town's motto is "Tanks for the memories."

Dan was born and raised on a dairy and hog farm in northwestern Illinois. A Vietnam veteran, he rose to the rank of Lt. Colonel in the National Army Reserves. During his time in the Army, he earned the Meritorious Service Medal, two Bronze Stars, and three Army Commendation Medals. Knowing firsthand the importance of our veterans, he's active in the American Legion, VFW, and the Fort Hood Area Veterans Advisory Committee. Dan's ability to relate to both enlistees and officers has added an extra dimension to his skills as a public servant. He knows how to be lead and how to lead.

As mayor, Dan has embraced new technology and the internet as part of public service and constituent outreach. His tenure on the Water Sewage and Drainage Committee allows him to use his expertise on critical Texas water issues. He's looking toward a bright future of water reuse, new water treatment capacity, repairs to south sewage treatment plant, and implementing a citywide recycling program. Dan has fostered developments to downtown, work on homeless shelters, and better code enforcement.

As the proud representative of Fort Hood, I'm glad civic-minded leaders like Mayor Dan Corbin are working hard to improve their community. The people of Killeen deserve no less.

WAKE TECH'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Wake Technical Community College on its 50th Anniversary.

In the late 1950s, the North Carolina General Assembly launched an innovative concept in higher education and provided funding for new industrial education centers that would train adults with the vocational and technical skills needed in the region for emerging industries.

In 1958, Wake Technical Community College, then named Wake County Industrial Education Center, started offering a few classes to about 70 students. By 1963, the new institution had found a home, and the W.W. Holding Industrial Education Center officially opened in October 1963, with 34 full-time students and an additional 270 students taking classes at community sites. Today, Wake Tech has expanded to five campuses, and is soon to develop a sixth. The college also operates two centers and dozens of community sites throughout Wake County. It offers 180 associate degrees, diplomas and certificates, preparing students for immediate employment and increasingly serving as a gateway to four-year institutions. Enrollment has grown to nearly 70,000 students this year, making

Wake Tech the largest community college in North Carolina. It is the second fastest growing community college in all of America!

For years, North Carolina's leaders have recognized the critical role that technical and community colleges play as drivers of economic growth and renewal. Visionaries such as Governor Terry Sanford understood that community colleges could help lift generations of North Carolinians out of poverty, and that they could be a powerful magnet drawing new businesses and industries to our state. Nowhere has the success of this vision been more prominent than in the "Research Triangle." Education has been the catalyst for this economic transformation, and our region's community colleges—Wake Tech in particular—have served as its engine.

Wake Tech has produced world-class business leaders and entrepreneurs, as well as highly capable workers, and has done so while constantly reinventing itself as industries have evolved or given way to new ones. I commend Wake Tech on its ability to recruit and retain quality faculty, and its ability to maintain flexible, accessible, customized educational and training programs for North Carolina citizens. Its effective and beneficial community partnerships, outstanding ability to identify the workforce needs of the region, and commitment to measuring resource allocation and quality outcomes are only part of what make Wake Tech such an asset to the region. Fifty years after opening its doors, Wake Tech is still leading the way in world-class training, education, and workforce development.

In honor of its 50th anniversary, Wake Tech has launched a new logo, featuring a torch to symbolize the role Wake Tech plays in helping students find their way along the path of higher education. The new motto, "Lead the Way" speaks to students' ability to take charge of their lives as they learn and grow, as well as to lead and inspire others. It is also fitting as an allusion to the innovation and focus on the future that have been a hallmark of Wake Tech programs and services for the last 50 years.

I extend my congratulations to Wake Technical Community College on their fiftieth anniversary and look forward to the 50 years to come!

NATIONAL INFANT MORTALITY AWARENESS MONTH

HON. DONNA F. EDWARDS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, last month was National Infant Mortality Awareness Month. With the theme A Healthy Baby Begins with You and You and You, the month is established to highlight the tragic occurrences of infant deaths across the nation, and to bring attention to programs that can help save lives and ensure our children are healthy. Measured as a rate of infant deaths per 1,000 live births, infant mortality refers to deaths that occurred during infancy, in the first year of life, or from a live birth to age one.

Not all infant deaths are preventable, but with the passage of the Affordable Care Act

(ACA), we can begin to reduce the risk of infant death. The ACA is an investment in both the health of women and the health of newborns. Health care for women, preconception health, reproductive health, and maternity and well child care are covered benefits. One in five women of childbearing age is currently uninsured. With the enactment of this law, approximately 17 million women will have an increased opportunity to access and receive regular preventive services and prenatal care.

Although the overall infant mortality rate (IMR) in the United States declined steadily for several decades, it has leveled off for the past several years. In 2011, the rate of infant deaths before age one for the U.S. was 6.05 per 1,000 live births. According to the Centers for Disease Control & Prevention, the U.S. IMR continues to be higher than the rates in most other developed countries, and the gap between the U.S. IMR and the rates for the countries with the lowest infant mortality appears to be widening.

In Maryland, infant mortality profoundly impacts women and their families. The most recent Maryland Vital Statistics numbers indicate an overall IMR in our State of 6.3 in 2012. The average IMR dropped from 9.5 to 8.6 in Prince George's County during 2012, while it rose from 5.1 in 2011 to 6.4 in 2012 in Anne Arundel County.

While Prince George's County experienced a decline in the African-American IMR last year—from 10.5 to 9.3—the rate remains significantly higher than the white IMR of 6.4. Likewise, while Anne Arundel County experienced a steep drop in the African-American IMR—from 13.0 in 2011 to 9.0 in 2012—the rate remains nearly double that of the white rate, which in 2012 increased to 5.5. And, in nearby Montgomery County, the IMR was reduced to 5.1 last year but the African-American rate stood at 8.2, almost double the rate for white infants at 4.2. This alarming and ongoing disparity across our region challenges us to continue seeking answers and solutions.

National Infant Mortality Month provides us a chance to raise public education and awareness about the levels at which this problem continues to affect our communities, and to educate women about ways they may reduce infant mortality with good health care during the mother's pregnancy and the early years of the child's life. A number of federal programs strive to reduce the IMR, by improving the health status of low-income women and children. These federal programs include Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grants, Medicaid, and Healthy Start. Local organizations and clinics like Bright Beginnings of Prince George's County, Mary's Center, Anne Arundel County Department of Health, and Stork's Nest in Anne Arundel County, and Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services and SMILE in Montgomery County offer a number of approaches to reduce infant mortality and help mothers and children live long and healthy lives.

I will continue to support and bring awareness to programs that improve access to health care and increase the quality of prenatal and newborn care to prevent the causes of infant mortality. Communities can play an important role in this endeavor by encouraging women to seek care before they become

pregnant and during their first trimester. Also, we can all share information about some of the factors that affect infant mortality including smoking, substance abuse, poor nutrition, lack of prenatal care, and sudden infant death syndrome. We must ensure that our babies get a healthy start, to celebrate their first birthday and beyond, and bring much needed attention and awareness to the importance of reducing our infant mortality rate.

THE AMERICAN AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY AND THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the three million Americans whose jobs are directly or indirectly connected to our nation's domestic automotive industry and the importance of our trade negotiators to address longstanding concerns with Japan's closed auto market.

This spring, the government of Japan announced it was going to join the United States and ten other Pacific Rim nations in negotiations in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), a proposed comprehensive and high-standard free trade agreement with the aim of liberalizing nearly all goods and services within the member countries.

I am a strong proponent of increasing American exports. Exports are vital to expanding our economy, providing new opportunities for our nation's industries and entrepreneurs, and growing the number of well-paying, middle class jobs that are the backbone of our nation's strength.

Nevertheless, I have very strong reservations with Japan's longstanding barriers for auto exporters into its market. Japan has the third largest auto market in the world. At the same time, it ranks last among all advanced economies in terms of auto market import penetration at under six percent.

The barriers Japan places on auto imports are many and longstanding, including currency manipulation, onerous certification and regulatory standards, and anti-competitive networks between Japanese automakers, dealers, and parts suppliers, better known as the *kieretsu* system.

It is imperative that the Administration and this Congress take action to ensure that Japan will open its auto market to American-made cars and trucks before lowering our tariffs and opening our market even more to Japanese auto imports.

There are several protections our negotiators should secure from our Japanese allies before finalizing this trade deal, including strong and enforceable currency disciplines aimed at preventing TPP countries from using currency to gain a competitive advantage, seeing to it that Japanese automakers fully honor internationally recognized labor standards and allow workers to organize and collectively bargain, and apply strong and effective tariff "snapbacks" that will come into force in the event of a trade violation.

Congress should also act by passing the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act, which I have proudly co-sponsored for the past three Congresses, and would give the Treasury Department and other federal agencies additional tools to combat currency manipulation.

I fear that our domestic auto manufacturers and the hundreds of thousands of American families whose livelihoods rely on our auto industry will be gravely harmed if the Administration and Congress allow our tariffs on Japanese autos to be lowered even further without giving equal access to American-made cars and trucks.

The well-respected Center for Automotive Research found last year that Japan's inclusion in TPP, combined with the on-going currency manipulation Japan has been doing, would result in the loss of 225,000 cars and trucks being made in the U.S. and the loss of nearly 100,000 American jobs.

Failing to open Japan's auto market will only increase our trade deficit, which now stands at \$76 billion a year, with \$53 billion of the deficit comes from autos alone.

Mr. Speaker, it is our duty, as the elected representatives of the American people, to make sure that trade with Japan is truly two-way and Japan will open its markets to American products as we've opened our markets to their imports.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF HAMPTON

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a legacy of faith in Virginia's Third Congressional District. This year, First Baptist Church of Hampton is celebrating its 150th anniversary, and I would like to take a moment to reflect on the history of this esteemed institution and its contributions to the greater Hampton Roads community.

The history of many African American churches in existence today developed from a small band of worshippers who sat in the "designated section" of a white church. In this respect, First Baptist Church of Hampton is no exception and was borne out of worshippers at the Hampton Baptist Church located a short distance away from the present church site. With Reverend Zechariah Evans as its first pastor, First Baptist Church of Hampton came into its own and built its own building to house services.

The Church continued to grow and prosper, but in September 1944, a catastrophic fire destroyed the church building. Members of the community and sister churches rallied to support First Baptist Church. With generous support from the Hampton Baptist Church and other supporters in the community, the sanctuary was restored and the facility was improved and expanded.

Over the years the Church grew in its capacity, its membership, and its mission. Community outreach became an integral part of the work of the Church. The accomplishments

of First Baptist Church of Hampton are far too many to list, but among them are the founding of the People's Building and Loan Association under Reverend Richard Spiller and the organization of the Big Brothers of America in Hampton under the leadership of Reverend Seymour J. Gaines.

On July 6, 2006, First Baptist Church officially elected Reverend Dr. Richard W. Wills, Sr. as its tenth and current pastor and he has continued to lead the church in its strong tradition, dedicated to fellowship and social action.

Over the years, the First Baptist community has continued to grow and flourish. The church now offers programs to increase healthy living through its Health Ministry program, hosts voter registration drives, provides housing for the homeless through "A Night's Welcome," and remains steadfast in providing for the least of these, through its efforts in meal service and food distribution.

On Saturday, October 26th, I was honored to join Reverend Wills and everyone at First Baptist for their anniversary celebration banquet, which featured Reverend Al Sharpton and many other luminaries from across the Commonwealth of Virginia and across the country. President Barack Obama also provided a celebratory letter commemorating the church's rich history and its 150th anniversary. The banquet was truly an event to remember and offered a chance for the celebration, reflection, and hope that such a monumental anniversary invokes.

As First Baptist Church of Hampton continues to celebrate this historic milestone, the church can truly remember its past, celebrate its present, and focus on its future as "[a] place on the harbor where haven meets heaven." I would like to congratulate Reverend Wills and all of the members of First Baptist Church of Hampton on the occasion of its 150th Anniversary. I wish them many more years of dedicated service to the community.

RECOGNIZING MOHAMED ALI, RECIPIENT OF THE CHAMPION OF CHANGE AWARD

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Mohamed Ali from Federal Way, Washington, who serves as Co-Chair of the King County Somali Health Board and Program Coordinator for the Hepatitis B Coalition of Washington at WithinReach. Mohamed was recently honored by the White House as a Champion of Change.

The White House presented Ali with the Champion of Change Award for his heroic efforts during a winter storm in the Puget Sound region last year. Mr. Ali's proactive approach to the dangers of carbon monoxide within his community helped save lives and protect vulnerable families trying to heat their homes in the winter.

By acting as a liaison between King County Public Health and the local Somali community, Mohamed ensured that safety warnings for carbon monoxide were translated for individ-

uals who do not speak English and that the community was informed about the risks of burning fuel indoors during power outages.

In addition, Mohamed worked with volunteers at a local mosque to establish a hotline for the community to ask questions about the storm and request aid. He was also instrumental in coordinating the establishment of a nearby aid station that offered heat and hot meals. As a result of Ali's and others' efforts, King County reported zero deaths and ninety percent fewer hospitalizations than during the region's last major winter storm.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I congratulate Mohamed Ali for being honored with the Champion of Change award and recognize his service to the King County community.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT WALTER CRENSHAW, THE OLDEST LIVING TUSKEGEE AIRMAN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I salute and congratulate Sergeant Walter Crenshaw, a fellow veteran, on reaching this milestone celebrating his 104th birthday. As the oldest living Tuskegee Airman, he has lived a truly inspiring life and for that I commend him.

From Mr. Crenshaw's induction into the United States Army Air Corps in October 1942 where he ultimately attained the rank of Sergeant, until now, he has been an example of what hard work and devotion can do. I am particularly thankful for his dedication to our country in the face of strife racism, paving the way for myself and fellow African-American and minority servicemen. Mr. Crenshaw and the Tuskegee Airmen persevered through racial, military, and political barriers to become the first African American military aviators in the United States Armed Forces, showing that there is strength in unity and support.

A leader is one who knows the way, follows that path, and shows others the course to take. Walter Crenshaw's life is a demonstration of true leadership, and as he celebrates 104 years of life may he take pride in the contributions he has made through his service.

OBAMACARE

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is more than a website. That's the comforting assurance President Obama is giving to the American people as the continuing train wreck of the law's implementation grinds on.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the President. The law is more than a website. Unfortunately, that means its flaws extend past the website as well. Simply put, its bad technology mixed with bad policy.

From broken websites to broken promises this law is taking on water and sinking fast, taking hardworking Americans with it.

Last Friday, I spoke with a self-employed father of two in my district who is feeling the harmful effects of the ACA head on. He received a notice in the mail that said his insurance—which he liked—was going to triple. The same plan, just hundreds more. I think he put it best when he said, "the President guaranteed, 'If you like your plan you can keep it'. Well the fact is, I can keep my plan, I just can't afford my plan now . . ."

News reports now say that over two million people will lose the health plan they currently have, even after hearing the President's promise for three years.

This is unacceptable.

That's why I am supporting legislation that actually allows people to keep their coverage under the ACA—even as the President's new regulations and mandates try and take it away.

Furthermore, I will continue in joining members from both parties in both chambers, in asking the President to delay the individual mandate of the ACA. President Obama said he would negotiate once government was fully funded and operational—now is the time for him to address bipartisan ideas for improvement that help out the American people.

HONORING BILL DAVIS

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Indiana State Representative Bill Davis. After serving House District 33 for 9 years, State Representative Davis will begin the next chapter of his career, serving the State as the Executive Director of the Office of Community and Rural Affairs.

During his time in the State legislature, Bill Davis served on the House Ways and Means Committee, where he helped craft balanced budgets that included no tax increases for Hoosiers. As a legislator, Bill Davis was committed to efficient government that used the taxpayers' money wisely. Bill served as Chairman of the Committee on Public Policy and was a leader on issues affecting Hoosier farmers and teachers.

Bill's leadership in business and government will greatly benefit Hoosiers as he serves as the Executive Director of the Office of Community and Rural Affairs. On a personal note, Bill and I served together in the Indiana General Assembly. He was a great colleague and an even better friend.

I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in honoring Bill Davis for his years of service in the Indiana General Assembly and in congratulating him on his next role as Executive Director of the Office of Community and Rural Affairs.

HONORING THE VETERANS OF THE
OCTOBER 31, 2013 HONOR FLIGHT
OF THE QUAD CITIES

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, over 90 Iowa veterans of World War II and the Korean War will travel to our Nation's capital. For many of these veterans, tomorrow will be the first time they will see the National World War II Memorial and the Korean War Veterans Memorial that were built in their honor.

They will travel to Washington as part of an Honor Flight. These flights demonstrate that we as a State and as a country will never forget the debt we owe those who have worn our Nation's uniform.

We truly owe these heroes a debt of gratitude for their selfless service to our great Nation. On the eve of their visit, I rise to humbly thank these Iowa and American heroes for their service to our country.

Their sacrifices and determination in the face of great threats to our way of life are truly humbling and continue to inspire us today. Their generations and our country did not seek to be tested. But, when called upon to do so, they defended our Nation abroad and rebuilt our Nation here at home to make it even stronger. They rose to defend not just our Nation, but the freedoms, democracy, and values that make our country the greatest Nation on earth.

Their patriotism, service, and sacrifice not only defined their generation—they stand as a testament to the fortitude of our Nation and the American people. Their legacy endures today.

I am tremendously proud to welcome the Honor Flight of the Quad Cities and Iowa's veterans of World War II and the Korean War to our Nation's capital. On behalf of every Iowan I represent, I thank them for their service to our great Nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF BARBARA
ARO-VALLE

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize Barbara Aro-Valle of Hayward, California, who recently left her position as the Executive Director for New Haven Schools Foundation. Barbara will be honored for her outstanding service to the foundation during a luncheon November 14, 2013.

Barbara was born and raised in Hayward, California, where she graduated from James Logan High School. Barbara and her husband, Richard, married in 1979 and together they have two children, Monica and Andrew.

After high school, Barbara worked for ten years as a dental assistant before taking a job at California State University Hayward (CSU-H) as the Director of Facilities Reservations and Special Events. While working full time

and caring for her children, Barbara earned a bachelor's degree in human development from CSU-H, now called California State University East Bay.

While her children attended school in the New Haven Unified School District, Barbara became actively involved as a parent volunteer in the band and color guard programs. In 2002, Barbara was elected to the New Haven School Board. During her time on the board, Barbara assisted in hiring a new school superintendent and successfully negotiated a three-year contract with the school's teachers union.

Five years later, in 2007, Barbara accepted a position as Executive Director of the New Haven Schools Foundation. Barbara has been integral to the foundation's evolution, starting from the very beginning.

Under her direction, the foundation has expanded its scholarship program, reinstated the Annual Scholarship Luncheon, and planned the annual casino night gala. Additionally, she helped bring indispensable funds to support grant programs. These programs allowed the school district to ward off significant cuts to co-curricular programs in recent years.

I thank Barbara for her unparalleled dedication to the New Haven Schools Foundation, which has assisted students, teachers, and the community as a whole. I wish Barbara the best in her future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO SALADO MAYOR
DANNEY McCORT

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the committed public service of Salado Mayor Danney McCort. This proud native Texan is not afraid to roll up his sleeves to improve his community.

Salado is a picturesque, historic village on Salado Creek just east of Interstate Highway 35 between Waco and Austin in southern Bell County. The clear, bubbling springs of the creek, which made it a favorite camping ground for Indians thousands of years before Spanish explorers arrived in Texas, have had much to do with the development of the area. The town is the proud home to the Stagecoach Inn, the oldest continuously running hotel in Texas.

Growing up on a farm cultivated a work ethic in Danney that has served him well both professionally and personally. His career as a builder and engineer with the Veterans Administration, along with his love of home repair and do-it-yourself projects, fostered in Danney a can-do spirit that is a reflection of the Salado Community.

Mayor since 2012, Danney's worked to annex the I-35 corridor, obtain a sewer system for downtown Salado, and foster music and culture in his thriving city. Along with his engineering knowledge, he knows firsthand the importance of water to Texas communities, farms, and livestock.

Salado deserves great leadership and Mayor Danney McCort is delivering. I look forward to continuing my longstanding and productive relationship with him.

HONORING ANTONIO MACIAS

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Antonio Macias, a World War II veteran and an exceptional El Pasoan. Listening to the story of Antonio and other World War II veterans reminds me why we call theirs the "greatest generation."

In 1943, while still a United States resident, Mr. Macias volunteered for the Second World War. He served in Pacific Theatre in Okinawa as a U.S. Navy Sailor and completed his service as a "Motor Machinist's Mate Third Class." As the war ended, he was honorably discharged in 1945. After completing his service, Mr. Macias returned home to El Paso, Texas, where he worked as a rancher, a sheet metal worker, and at the local Phelps Dodge Refinery for 33 years. He retired in 1978 and became the owner of a small business specializing in landscaping. Now, at the age of 95, Mr. Macias continues to reside in El Paso with his wife of over 65 years and is a tireless advocate for improving services for El Paso's many veterans. Mr. Macias is an exceptional asset to the community, and as one of my staffers put it "he is an inspiration to El Paso."

Like so many other individuals from his generation, Mr. Macias put his life on the line for his country. We are grateful for his service and appreciate that he continues to be a vital part of the El Paso community. Thank you, Antonio Macias, for making El Paso, Texas, and the nation proud.

CENTENNIAL OF FEDERAL DEPOSITORY
LIBRARY AT CASE WESTERN

HON. MARCIA L. FUDGE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Kelvin Smith Library at Case Western Reserve University, which celebrates this year 100 years of service as a congressionally-designated Federal Depository Library. As one of the Nation's more than 1,200 Federal Depository Libraries, Case Western Reserve serves students, faculty, and the constituents of Ohio's 11th Congressional District with free access to the publications of all three branches of government.

In its 100 years as a Federal Depository Library, Case Western Reserve has made government information available in a variety of formats, from ink on paper to the latest digital technologies. In the mid-1990s, Case Western Reserve was one of a handful of libraries nationally which pioneered making online government information freely available through a partnership between the Government Printing Office, which administers the Federal Depository Library Program, and the Cleveland Free Net. The University Libraries have maintained an outstanding retrospective collection of government publications, and have provided

countless hours of expert assistance to researchers.

Throughout its 100 year history as a Federal Depository Library, Case Western Reserve has been recognized by the Government Printing Office for providing outstanding expert service to its primary clientele and to the residents of my Congressional district. I would like to recognize the library staff and Associate Provost and University Librarian Arnold Hirshon as they mark the 100th anniversary of depository designation. I wish them much success as they enter their second century of Keeping America Informed.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,081,509,219,228.50. We've added \$6,454,632,170,315.42 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING RICHARD W. "DICK" ABBEY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Richard W. "Dick" Abbey, who, along with his law partners at Abbey, Weitzenberg, Warren & Emery, is a recipient of the Sonoma County Bar Association's 2013 Career of Distinction Award. This is the highest honor presented by the Association and it is, indeed, well deserved.

Mr. Abbey has been a member of the law firm of Abbey, Weitzenberg, Warren & Emery since 1973. Over the course of those 40 years, he has specialized in real estate, commercial and corporate law as well as in financial institution litigation and transactions. In recent years he has focused on representing businesses within the wine industry.

As a mediator, he has successfully achieved a number of simple and multi-party mediations that have involved a wide range of business and real estate matters.

Mr. Abbey has consistently been recognized as a Northern California Super Lawyer. Super Lawyers is a rating service that selects outstanding lawyers from more than 70 practice areas who have attained a high degree of peer recognition and professional achievement. The selection process is multi-phased and includes independent research, peer nominations and peer evaluations.

Mr. Abbey has also been a member of the County Bar Association for 40 years and served a term as president of the organization.

He has also been a Professor of Law at Empire College of Law in Santa Rosa, a member of both the State Bar of California and the American Bar Association, President and Member of the Board of the Sonoma County Family YMCA and a Member of the Board of the Redwood Empire Food Bank.

Mr. Speaker, Richard "Dick" Abbey has been an outstanding attorney in Sonoma County for 40 years. He is respected and held in high esteem by his peers, which is reflected in this honor he has received from the Sonoma County Bar Association. It is therefore appropriate that we honor him today.

ON THE PASSING OF CONGRESSMAN IKE SKELTON

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, my sincere condolences go out to the family and loved ones of my dear friend and colleague, Congressman Ike Skelton, a man whose contributions to this country reflected his devotion to service and his love for this nation.

Ike's passing is one that hits close to home as I reflect on the 34 years he spent in Congress, representing the state of Missouri, and building his reputation as an expert in military defense. As Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Ike showed a great concern for those who fought to defend, and was recognized by the U.S. Navy Memorial Foundation for his support of the Navy and military during his years in Congress. Offering words of advice, and showing a genuine sense of care for humanity, Ike was a mentor and a friend, advocating for those who dedicated their lives to serve their community and this country.

To lose yet another leader who embodied the spirit of selflessness and compassion towards his work and the people he served, is deeply saddening. Although words cannot help to ease the loss we bear, may we all take comfort in knowing that Congressman Skelton lived a life that will forever be remembered in our hearts.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BIPARTISAN STUDENT AND FAMILY TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, education is key to the economic well-being of our citizens and our democracy. Today, I am pleased to join my colleague, DIANE BLACK from Tennessee, in introducing the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act. This bipartisan bill simplifies our tax code and dramatically strengthens our investment in students and their families, expanding aid for the lowest-income students.

Tax-based aid represents more than half of all non-loan federal aid, playing an important

role in promoting college affordability, access, and completion. As partners in the Ways and Means Education and Family Benefits Tax Working Group, Congressman BLACK and I heard from dozens of experts about the need to improve education tax benefits. There was surprising agreement among politically-diverse stakeholders about the problems of and promising reforms to tax-based education benefits. The Student and Family Tax Simplification Act is a bipartisan effort to implement stakeholder recommendations for reform.

Education tax experts described current education tax benefits as complex and poorly targeted. The greatest agreement centered on creating one credit for current education costs to improve the simplicity, awareness, and use of tax benefits. Stakeholders highlighted that the complexity of multiple benefits makes it difficult for taxpayers to understand whether they qualify for a benefit and which benefit best meets their needs. Indeed, a study by the Government Accountability Office showed that 1.5 million tax filers who qualified for either the Tuition and Fees Deduction or the Lifetime Learning Credit in 2009 did not claim the credit or deduction; another 237,000 did not claim optimal benefits. To improve the effectiveness of the American Opportunity Tax Credit (AOTC), both conservative and progressive stakeholders urged policymakers to target benefits to low- and moderate-income taxpayers whose college enrollment and persistence decisions are more sensitive to cost.

The Student and Family Tax Simplification Act simplifies education benefits by consolidating the Hope Tax Credit, the Tuition and Fees Deduction, and the Lifetime Learning Credit into the AOTC, creating a single credit for current educational expenses. The bill also extends the AOTC permanently rather than allowing it to expire in 2017 and preserves the value of the credit over time by adjusting for inflation starting in 2018, an important provision given that college expenses have risen much quicker than inflation for many years.

In addition, the bill creates an improved, more robust education tax benefit for low-income students in multiple ways. It adopts the upper phase-out limits for the Hope tax credit adjusted for inflation, which focuses aid on families whose incomes are in the bottom 80% of income distribution. The bill also doubles the current phase-out range for single and joint filers to create a more gradual phase-out of the benefit and to reduce the effective marginal tax rate associated with the phase-out. These changes phase-out the credit for single tax filers between \$43,000 to \$63,000 (\$86,000 to \$126,000 for joint tax filers).

The bill expands aid to low-income students by increasing the amount of credit available and removing obstacles to claiming the credit. This bill increases the maximum refundable credit from \$1,000 to \$1,500. It also changes the process of awarding the credit from covering a proportion of total eligible expenses to covering the first qualified expenses. Currently, a family would have to have \$4,000 in expenses to claim the \$1,000 refundable credit; under the new bill, low-income families could claim the full \$1,500 refundable credit after only \$1,500 in eligible expenses, greatly enhancing the effectiveness of the credit for low-income families.

The bill also allows students to combine Pell grants and AOTC to address unmet financial need. Due to poor coordination between Pell grants and the tax code, an estimated 1 million college students with unmet financial need do not receive any benefit from the AOTC, with the vast majority of these students attending low-cost institutions such as community colleges. The bill improves coordination between the AOTC and Pell without double counting the same expenses as well as excludes Pell grants from taxation to simplify compliance.

In closing, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act will help streamline education tax benefits, making it easier for students and families to understand and take advantage of education tax benefits. Further, it will substantially increase federal assistance for education for the lowest-income students and families, improving the affordability of higher education.

HONORING JO ANN GORA

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ball State University President Jo Ann Gora. After serving as President of Ball State for 10 years, President Gora announced she will be retiring from the position in June of 2014.

After serving as Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at Old Dominion University and then as Chancellor of the University of Massachusetts, Boston, Jo Ann Gora became the fourteenth President of Ball State in 2004. She is the first woman to serve as president of a public university in the history of the state of Indiana.

President Gora's dynamic leadership brought transformative improvements to the Ball State community. During her tenure as president, Ball State University undertook massive renovation and construction projects dramatically transforming the campus. The University raised more philanthropic funds than in the history of the institution. President Gora also oversaw the raising of admissions standards, and numerous academic programs achieved national rankings and recognition under her leadership.

I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in honoring President Jo Ann Gora for her service as the president of Ball State University. I am confident she will bring the same tenacity and leadership to the next chapter of her life.

CELEBRATING THE WORK OF TEMPLE MAYOR DANNY DUNN

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the work of Temple Mayor Danny Dunn. This eighth generation Texan honors

his home state's illustrious past yet looks forward to its even brighter future.

Founded as a railroad construction camp in the 1880s, Temple quickly became home to hospitals, industry, and higher education. Over the years, the Temple area became an ideal place for military personnel to move to for their retirement.

A native son of Temple, Danny got his love of public service as a young boy attending civic events when others were playing flag football. His dreams of becoming Temple's Mayor came true in 2012 and he's made the most of his time in office. He's focused his energies on building and improving his hometown through strategic growth and development, while maintaining Temple's current infrastructure.

As a licensed Texas real estate broker, Danny knows the importance of making sure Temple offers the best of small town living with the best of big city amenities. Danny relies on an extensive network of community activists, ranging from former mayors, Rotary Club members, and faith leaders, to guide him on how to best work for Temple.

Mayor Danny Dunn is lucky enough to know you don't have to leave home to know that's where you belong. I join the people of Temple who are glad he's stayed and is working to make his city a great place to live.

"ANTI-CHRISTIAN TERROR IS EVERYONE'S CONCERN"

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call my colleagues' attention to a recent op-ed written by Steven Nasatir, president of the Jewish United Fund/Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago. "Anti-Christian Terror is Everyone's Concern," (The Washington Post, October 24, 2013) is a call to end religious persecution, and I join Mr. Nasatir in his demand for that action.

All of us who believe in the need for tolerance should be concerned about the attacks on Christian minorities around the world. Passage of H.R. 301, bipartisan legislation to create a Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, is one important step we can take.

I want to thank Steve Nasatir for his leadership in the fight for religious and human rights and for this article, which reminds us that we each have a responsibility to speak out when we see persecution and work to end it.

ANTI-CHRISTIAN TERROR IS EVERYONE'S CONCERN

An Egyptian woman mourns during the funeral of several Copt Christians who were killed in Warraq's Virgin Mary church in Cairo, Egypt, Monday, Oct. 21, 2013. Egypt's Christians were stunned Monday by a drive-by shooting in which masked gunmen sprayed a wedding party outside a Cairo church with automatic weapons fire, killing several, including two young girls, in an attack that raised fears of a nascent insurgency by extremists after the military's

ousting of the president and a crackdown on Islamists.

The persecution of any religious minority anywhere by anyone is an evil injustice. It requires all persons of conscience to speak out and, when possible, take action.

The upcoming 75th anniversary of Kristallnacht makes this an auspicious time to raise awareness about the contemporary violence targeting religious minorities and their places of worship. Of particular concern are attacks against Christian minorities that have occurred with alarming frequency from Syria to Egypt, from Iraq to Pakistan, and from Kenya to Sudan.

November 9 marks 75 years since the pogrom against Jews committed by mobs throughout the Nazi Reich. Often called Kristallnacht, or the "Night of Broken Glass," when rioters killed or injured hundreds of Jews; burned over 1,000 synagogues; destroyed 7,000 Jewish-owned shops and businesses; vandalized cemeteries and schools; and sent 30,000 Jews to German concentration camps. It marked a turning point in the escalating campaign of persecution culminating in the Holocaust.

These events, seared into Jewish collective memory, make us doubly aware—and duty bound—to raise our voices when the deadly brew of religious bigotry and wanton violence are mixed.

Today in Syria, a once thriving Christian population—a community nearly as ancient as that country's once great Jewish community—has been depopulated by 25 percent, according to an estimate the Patriarch Melkite Greek Catholic Patriarch Gregorios III Laham shared with the BBC.

In September, The Associated Press reported that Syrian Christians in Maaloula—a community dating to the birth of Christianity and that still speaks Aramaic—were driven out or forcibly converted to Islam by rebels aligned with al-Qaeda.

"It is chaos, it is violence, it is blood, it is death. Life has been paralyzed. We have lost everything," said Archbishop Theophile Georges Kassab of Homs.

In Egypt, some supporters of ousted President Mohammed Morsi last summer unleashed their rage against that nation's Christians, a historic community constituting 20 percent of the country's population. Mobs burned dozens of Christian schools, convents, monasteries, institutions, and churches of any, and all Christian denominations. And just days ago, gunmen on a motorcycle opened fire outside a Coptic Christian church during a wedding, murdering four, including an 8-year-old girl.

"It never happened before in history that such a big number of churches were attacked on one day," Bishop Thomas, a Coptic Orthodox bishop in Assiut told Al Jazeera. "We normally used to have attacks once a month or so."

As Kristallnacht teaches, the burning of houses of worship can be a red alert that worse is yet to come. September saw the horrific Taliban bombing of Anglican worshippers in Pakistan, which took 85 lives, and, according to accounts shared by witnesses, the targeting for murder of Kenyan Christians—deliberately separated from others in a chilling reminder of Nazi "selections"—by al Shabaab terrorists in a Nairobi shopping mall.

Attacks like these have contributed to a decline in the Christian population in the Middle East and North Africa from 9.5 percent to 3.8 percent of the total population from 1910 to 2010, according to a Pew Forum report on Global Christianity.

Tellingly, Israel is the only Middle East country where the Christian population has grown in the last half century, from 34,000 to 158,000, in large measure, according to many observers, because of the religious freedoms enjoyed there.

As a Jew, I'm proud of the status of religious minorities in the Jewish state. As an American, I'm especially proud to live in a society where people of different faiths (and no faith) share the values of tolerance and coexistence. Despite isolated though sometimes deadly instances of religiously-inspired terror during the past few decades, ours is a nation where no Christian, Jew, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Sikh, or person of any other faith must live in fear because of who they are.

It is time to sound the alarm about the religious persecutions of Christians and others. Let us raise our voices, and call on our elected representatives to take action. People of all faiths should support passage of H.R. 301, legislation that would direct our President to appoint a State Department Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

The bill will facilitate U.S. government responses to human rights violations, combat acts of religious intolerance and incitement targeting religious minorities, and help address the needs of religious minorities.

Further, we must demand that international institutions designed to protect human rights, especially the United Nations, must actually do so without prejudice.

For people of conscience, for people of all faiths, now is not the time to be silent.

INTRODUCING A RESOLUTION IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE BAHAMAS

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the independence of The Bahamas, which took place on July 10, 2013.

The proud history and rich culture of the Bahamian people date back centuries, having evolved amid significant influences from foreign settlers and traders who were drawn to their islands' beauty, resources, and strategic location. The very islands were inhabited as early as 300 to 400 AD, and settled by the Lucayan Indians from 900 AD to 1500 AD. In 1492, Christopher Columbus made landfall in the New World on San Salvador and, within 25 years, about 40,000 natives were sent to work in the mines of Hispaniola.

British settlement began in 1648 with the arrival of English Puritans led by Captain William Sayle, known as "Eleutheran Adventurers," who sought religious freedom. The capital of The Bahamas, Nassau, was established around 1670 as a commercial port, and experienced several decades of conflict between Spanish, French, and British military forces, as well as privateers and pirates. By 1718, the King of England appointed Captain Woodes Rogers to serve as the first Royal Governor

and restore order in The Bahamas, now a crown colony.

Following the American War of Independence, the British issued land grants to American Loyalists who went into exile in The Bahamas. With them they brought slaves and forced the Spanish to retreat from the region. Today, the majority of Bahamians trace back their roots to the thousands of West Africans who were enslaved and brought to the islands in order to work on cotton plantations by those loyal to the British Crown. When Britain abolished its slave trade in 1807, thousands of liberated Africans from foreign slave ships were resettled as free persons in The Bahamas. During the early 19th century, hundreds of American slaves and Black Seminoles escaped from Florida and settled primarily on Andros Island in The Bahamas.

Bahamians were granted self-rule in 1964, and became members of the Commonwealth of Nations in 1969. In December 1972, the Government of The Bahamas, headed by Prime Minister the Rt. Hon. Lynden Pindling and the Opposition headed by Sir Kendal Isaacs, led a delegation to London to discuss the Independence Constitution. Less than a year later, on July 10, 1973, The Bahamas became a free and sovereign country, ending 325 years of peaceful British rule. Nowadays, Bahamians typically commemorate their independence with a week-long celebration beginning on July 3rd consisting of a number of "Junkanoo" street parades, fireworks, political speeches, and other events.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the people of The Bahamas and the Bahamian diaspora worldwide in commemorating the 40th anniversary of their independence. This resolution reaffirms the strong friendship and partnership between our two countries, which are united by a shared history, common values, and a commitment to democracy and human rights.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF MRS. JOHNNIE JACQUELINE YOUNG MIMS SANDERS

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mrs. Johnnie Jacqueline Young Mims Sanders who will celebrate her 100th birthday on October 31, 2013. I ask my colleagues to join me in offering best wishes to Mrs. Sanders on this most historic occasion.

Mrs. Sanders was born on the last day of October in 1913 in my Congressional District in Vance County in the City of Henderson, North Carolina. She has dedicated her life to improving the lives of generations of North Carolinians through teaching, ministry, and community involvement.

Mrs. Sanders graduated from Henderson Institute in 1932. The Institute was established in 1887 and was the only secondary school in Vance County that was open to African Americans. She continued her education at my alma mater of North Carolina Central University—then North Carolina College for Negroes—ulti-

mately graduating with three degrees including a Bachelor of Arts in 1942, Bachelor of Science in 1946, and a Master's Degree in Elementary Education in 1951.

Drawn to educating and shaping young minds, Mrs. Sanders served as an educator for 46 years. She was a teacher at Kittrell Grade School and Eaton-Johnson Elementary School. Following that, she served as a Media Specialist at both Eaton-Johnson and E.M. Rollins Elementary Schools and also coordinated the organization of the Enrichment Center while working in the Vance County Schools' Central Office.

There is no doubt that Mrs. Sanders positively influenced the lives of countless young people while in the classroom. Outside the classroom, she has and continues to be one of the cornerstones of Shiloh Baptist Church in Henderson, where, "Mother Sanders," as she is known, helps to mentor and advise young and old alike. For the past 93 years she has dedicated herself to her church and has been part of many ministries including teaching at the Baptist Training Union and singing in the Chancel Choir, often performing solos.

Mrs. Sanders' kindness and dedication to her community reached far beyond the classroom and church. Over the last century, Mrs. Sanders has helped young people and adults continue their education, sponsored trips to state and national church conventions, and organized and funded recreational trips across the United States. She has even helped people in the community start businesses without ever expecting anything in return. She is a true humanitarian and Vance County, the City of Henderson, and our great state of North Carolina are privileged to count her as one of their own.

For the majority of the last century, Mrs. Sanders has helped to improve the lives of her friends, neighbors, and strangers alike through her work with countless civic organizations. She has been a member of the Progressive National Baptist Convention, Foreign Missionary Convention of North Carolina, and the General Baptist State Convention just to name a few. And, even at the age of 100, she continues to serve others through her work with the Golden Age Club, the North Carolina Association of Educators, and as a representative for the Senior Health Insurance Program.

Mr. Speaker, for the past century, Mrs. Sanders has lived a life worthy of emulating. Her dedication to education, her church, and her community deserve our highest praise. I ask that my colleagues join me in expressing our deep appreciation for the selfless way with which she has led her life.

HONORING CLARENCE E. SASSER

HON. BILL FLORES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor the heroism of Specialist Fifth Class Clarence E. Sasser of the United States Army.

Specialist Fifth Class Clarence E. Sasser was a private in the 3rd Battalion, 60th Infantry Regiment, 9th Infantry Division and when

he earned the U.S. military's highest decoration, the Medal of Honor, for his selfless and courageous acts on January 10, 1968, in Vietnam.

As a combat medic in Vietnam, Specialist Sasser served our country above and beyond the call of duty.

On January 10th, 1968, his company was making an air assault when it took fire from enemy positions on three sides of the landing zone.

While under enemy fire, Specialist Sasser helped drag a wounded soldier to cover, all while refusing medical treatment for a wound in his left shoulder. He then returned to help more of his fellow soldiers. He quickly treated soldiers in need and then continued to search for other wounded.

Near the end of the action, even with two additional wounds immobilizing his legs, he crawled through mud toward another soldier 100 meters away, and while faint from blood loss and in agonizing pain, he continued treating soldiers for hours until they were all evacuated.

Specialist Sasser received the Medal of Honor from President Richard Nixon in 1969 and on November 7, 2013, he will become the eighth Texas Aggie to be added to Texas A&M University's Medal of Honor Hall of Honor.

Specialist Sasser was born in Chenango, Texas, and following his military service he attended Texas A&M University on a scholarship offered by then President James Earl Rudder in August 1969.

After attending Texas A&M, he began working at an oil refinery for more than five years before going on to work at the United States Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it is such a great privilege that Specialist Sasser's Medal of Honor and associated citation will be housed and showcased on the campus of Texas A&M University, which I am honored to represent.

Specialist Sasser's sacrifice and heroic efforts will never be forgotten. It is for his fearless courage, heroism and true dedication to our country that Texas A&M is proud to remember and honor the actions of Specialist Fifth Class Clarence E. Sasser.

I would like to close by asking all Americans to please pray for our country and for our brave American men and women who serve in the military to protect her.

TRIBUTE TO ARMY SPECIALIST WESLEY ACUNA

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Army Specialist Wesley Acuna of Round Rock, TX who was recently awarded the Expert Field Medical Badge. This symbol of excellence is a sign of his technical and tactical proficiency.

With only a 17-percent pass rate, the Expert Field Medical Badge remains one of the most prestigious and coveted awards a medical professional can obtain in the Army. The testing

process, which mirrors the dynamic role medics play in operations today, emphasizes tactical combat casualty care, evacuation, communication, and warrior skills. The security of America permits no compromise when it comes to upholding these high standards.

Inspired by the support from both his section and his unit, Spc. Acuna excelled through these challenging tests and finally persevered through the grueling final stages of the qualifying event, a 12 mile march in full combat load in the blazing Kuwaiti desert. Under harsh and stressful conditions, he proved himself as both expert medical professional and skilled warrior. That he was one of 21 elite soldiers to be awarded the Expert Field Medical Badge speaks volumes about his excellence, professionalism, and determination.

Despite his tremendous accomplishment, Spc. Acuna has no time to rest on his laurels. He is currently deployed to the Middle East with the 36th Combat Aviation Brigade in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. The needs of his mission and his country continue.

Spc. Wesley Acuna's commitment to excellence not only displays the best values of central Texas, but is a reflection of the greatness of the men and women of our armed forces. I commend his achievements and celebrate his commitment and perseverance.

OCTOBER AS THE 26TH ANNIVERSARY OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize this October as the 26th anniversary of Domestic Violence Awareness Month in the United States. Every day women across our nation live in fear of being abused by a partner. An estimated 1.5 million people in the United States fall victim to domestic abuse each year and one in four women will experience domestic violence at some point in her life. Like a cancer, this abuse knows no limits and crosses all ethnic, socioeconomic, and party lines.

For years, the consequences of domestic violence were ignored or minimized, but our nation has since witnessed many advances to protect and support victims of domestic abuse. The reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), passed into law this year, will be critical in strengthening the ability of governments, law enforcement, and service providers to combat domestic violence.

But the effects of domestic violence are far-reaching and plague generation after generation, so we must continue to work hard to intervene in ways that fit individual victims' needs and prevent future violence. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting stronger public policy initiatives to meet the overwhelming need that remains for victim services and a range of domestic violence programs. As community leaders, we must pursue every opportunity for domestic violence education, advocacy, and prevention services. These are the means by which we can help

turn domestic violence victims into survivors and prevent future domestic abuse.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL WORK AND FAMILY MONTH

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Work and Family Month.

As a mother of three school-aged children, I know how difficult it is to juggle a demanding career while caring for a family. Despite our best attempts, our schedules are never entirely predictable—fevers, flight delays, and life's unexpected surprises have a way of throwing off the schedules we planned so meticulously. As we try to navigate life's twists and turns, a big part of our success hinges on the flexibility in our work environments.

Advances in technology are making greater workplace flexibility possible, but there is still a lot more we can do to make a healthy work-life balance become the norm rather than the exception.

The importance of employers promoting policies that support their employees' success within and outside the workplace must not be underestimated. Study after study shows that employers who offer effective work-life balance programs are able to attract and retain more talented employees and also maintain a healthier and happier workforce. Workers who have more input and flexibility with their schedules, such as accommodating work hours and paid sick leave, are able to care for their dependents without worrying about their job security—whether that means caring for a sick child home from school with the flu, a husband or wife recovering from a surgery, or an elderly parent who needs help getting to the doctor. Workers who can successfully manage their personal lives are less stressed, which results in a more productive workforce and lower costs associated with employee turnover.

More and more children are now growing up in a household with two full-time working parents, or are being raised by a single parent who works. For the sake of healthy children and families, employers must update their practices to reflect 21st century realities.

Investing in the health and wellbeing of our nation's workforce is not just smart for business; it's smart for our nation's long-term success. As research shows, increased parental involvement is associated with greater academic achievement and lower dropout rates for children, some of whom will become our nation's next generation of leaders.

So as we recognize National Work and Family Month, I encourage my fellow policy makers, employers, and employees to come together to create workplaces that are more flexible and supportive of our nation's hard working families.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for votes on Tuesday, October 29, 2013, due to the death of a very close family friend. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

H.R. 2374—"To amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes," Amendment No. 1. Vote: "no"

Motion to Recommit H.R. 2374, with Instructions: Vote: "no"

H.R. 2374—"To amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes." Vote: "yes"

CONGRATULATING THE FULBRIGHT-HAYES DOCTORAL DISSERTATION RESEARCH ABROAD GRANT RECIPIENTS FROM DUKE UNIVERSITY

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Duke University students Ms. Sarah Jones Dickens, Ms. Caroline Garriott, and Ms. McKenzie Johnson for being recognized by the U.S. Department of Education as 2013 Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad (DDRA) Grant recipients.

Since 1961, the Department of Education has provided funding for the Fulbright-Hays Program, which seeks to improve relations and understanding between the United States and foreign countries. Fulbright-Hays DDRA Grants are awarded on an annual basis to outstanding graduate students who wish to conduct research in foreign countries for periods of six to twelve months. Ms. Dickens plans to conduct her research in Cambodia; Ms. Garriott plans to research in South America and Europe; and Ms. Johnson plans to research in South Sudan.

Duke University students received three of the 80 Fulbright-Hays DDRA Grants awarded this year. The Department of Education awarded \$3 million to students on a competitive basis from 34 different institutions of higher education for the program in 2013. These achievements are a tribute to the exceptional academic accomplishments of these students and the innovative and quality academic environment at Duke University.

Mr. Speaker, I commend these students and the faculty at Duke University for their commitment to academic excellence. The global approach toward education and the understanding of other cultures demonstrated by these gifted students is essential for achievement and success in today's competitive worldwide economy. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring and celebrating these students' great achievement by being recognized

as 2013 Fulbright-Hays DDRA Grant recipients.

HONORING SARAH (SALLY) LEONHARD

HON. DONNA F. EDWARDS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Dr. Sarah Leonhard, who retired last month after more than 18 years of dedicated service to the Greater Baden Medical Services (GBMS) and the surrounding community of Southern Maryland.

Sally, as she is known to many, received a bachelor's degree from Loyola University in New Orleans, a medical degree from the University of Miami School of Medicine, and a law degree from the University of Maryland in Baltimore.

Few people can claim to embody the spirit of compassion and community engagement as completely as Sally. An active participant in the Regional Primary Care Coalition, she was also the president of the Community Health Integrated Partnership. Sally is licensed by both the Maryland Board of Physicians and the Maryland State Bar.

The state of Maryland has long benefited from Sally's tenure in the health care field. In addition to serving as the Chief Executive Officer of GBMS for the past 12 years, she previously served as the Medical Director for the multi-site Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC). Under her leadership, the FQHC has grown to provide primary health care services to more than 15,000 patients annually in Prince George's, Charles, and St. Mary's counties.

Sally has played a pivotal role in ensuring uninsured and underserved individuals and families throughout Southern Maryland have access to affordable primary care, and her leadership will be greatly missed. Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Dr. Sarah Leonhard on an exceptional career in the field of public health. On behalf of all Marylanders, I wish her the best in all future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WHITE MEMORIAL MEDICAL CENTER

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the White Memorial Medical Center. Since its beginnings in 1913, the White Memorial Medical Center has shown a deep commitment to providing health services to the residents of Los Angeles. The Seventh-day Adventist Church founded the hospital with the guiding principles of efficiency, honesty, compassion and respect. The hospital was named after Ellen G. White, a Seventh-day Adventist pioneer, who had the vision of integrating healing, healthy living and whole-person care.

Initial treatments were administered at White Memorial Medical Center's First Street Clinic. Since then, the hospital has seen major growth and expansion. In 1950, the hospital expanded by adding a new wing that doubled the number of beds and added a radiation laboratory, an electroencephalography unit, a psychiatric ward and comprehensive emergency facilities. Recently, the hospital undertook a \$250 million project to renovate and modernized its facilities. Funding from the Federal Emergency Management Agency for seismic upgrades and \$30 million in community support made these renovations possible.

Today, White Memorial Medical Center along with its physicians and community partners provides valuable services to the community of Boyle Heights and the greater County of Los Angeles. The hospital serves over 126,000 patients each year and is staffed by 462 physicians, 86 residents, 1,879 employees and nearly 700 volunteers. Services offered include behavioral medicine, diabetes care, cardiac and vascular care, intensive and general medicine care, oncology, orthopedic care, rehabilitation, specialized and general surgery, stroke care and specialized medical services for women and children.

As a major teaching hospital, White Memorial Medical Center plays a significant role in training physicians, nurses and other medical professionals. Training programs focus on teaching doctors to care for the underserved and deliver culturally competent care to its neighboring communities. The hospital also serves the international community by sponsoring medical mission teams around the world and sending supplies to its adopted sister hospital in Zambia, Africa.

I salute the White Memorial Medical Center on the occasion of its centennial celebration. I wish it continued success in its ongoing effort to serve as a teaching hospital and its work with local community-based organizations to bring health, safety and wellness programs to the residents of Los Angeles. Happy Birthday White Memorial! May the next 10 years be even better and brighter.

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHILD SAFETY NETWORK

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 25th Anniversary of the Child Safety Network. As the nation's largest distributor of child safety information, CSN has tirelessly fought to make our nation a safer place for children by preventing child abuse, abduction, injury, and exploitation.

Through the youth violence prevention and intervention initiatives, as well promoting the safety of all children who ride public school buses, CSN's efforts to safeguard children and educate parents are impressive and imperative. For instance, adding free extended driving training to the 2,700 school districts that currently use CSN's endorsed training courses has reduced preventable accidents by over 30 percent.

CSN has worked with schools and schools districts in CA-17, and have worked extensively with the California State PTA and the National PTA Association. Throughout the past several years, CSN has provided free child safety information, including the free CSN Safe Family CD to thousands of parents in CA-17. The Safe Family CD and the CSN website provide child safety and health information, immunization schedules for children, child product recall information, and several new child safety programs which include School Bus Safety and driver training, extending Drug Free School Zones to Bus Stops, child nutritional information, preventing child bullying, and many other issues.

As the Representative of California's 17th district, as an educator of over 30 years, a parent and a grandparent, I am grateful to the countless CSN staff and volunteers who are committed to raising safer and healthier children. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the Child Safety Network for their admirable work these last 25 years in my district, California, and our nation—and I extend my warmest wishes in their next 25 years.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GLORIA JOHNSON

HON. SCOTT H. PETERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to the life of Gloria Johnson, a nationally recognized activist and San Diego community leader who worked tirelessly for more than 50 years for social justice and civil rights. With Gloria's passing this September, it is fitting we honor her as a strong-willed, compassionate, loyal, and tenacious trailblazer whose legacy will continue through those she mentored and in the communities she nurtured. Gloria will be remembered as a champion for women, the LGBT community, and progressive values.

Gloria was born on August 26 and took immense pride in the fact she shared her birthday with Women's Equality Day, and she lived in accordance with its principles. Gloria was a member of the National Organization for Women for more than 40 years, including serving as a state board member and president of the local chapter. She campaigned for the Equal Rights Amendment, even receiving jail time for civil disobedience after protesting the measure's defeat. In addition to campaigning ardently for women leaders including Hilary Clinton, Nancy Pelosi, and many in our local and state legislatures, Gloria served as a mentor to many young women and was appointed to the Governor's Committee on Women's Issues and inducted into the county's Women's Hall of Fame, thus promoting women's rights in multiple forums.

Gloria worked for the County of San Diego for thirty years, serving as a champion for the LGBT community. During the latter half of her tenure, and at the onset of the AIDS epidemic, she was one of the first social workers in San Diego to work with individuals suffering from the disease in the county's AIDS Case Man-

agement Program. Gloria took immense pride in that work, for which San Diego's LGBT community is profoundly grateful. Additionally, she served as cochair of a committee created to defeat a 1978 California state initiative that would have banned gays and lesbians from teaching in public schools.

While she most recently served as cochair of the California Democratic Party LGBT Caucus, Gloria's extensive political activism and leadership began many years prior. In 1977, she joined the newly formed San Diego Democratic Club (now Democrats for Equality), became president of the club in 1980, and remained a sitting board member until her death. Named one of The Advocate's top 400 U.S. gay leaders in 1984, she also served as founding member of Lesbian Rights Task Force and board member of the National Stonewall Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to the life of Gloria Johnson. Gloria's active leadership, steadfast beliefs, pioneering character, and inclusive spirit will be missed by many.

HONORING BRAD STUTZMAN

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished career of journalist Brad Stutzman. With his retirement approaching, he will soon begin the next chapter of his life.

Brad began his newspaper career 35 years ago in his hometown of Binghamton, N.Y. where he worked as a copy boy. Moving to Texas in 1981, Brad quickly put his stamp on journalism in the Lone Star State writing news and feature articles along with editorials and columns. His commentaries also appear in the Pflugerville Pflag, Cedar Park-Leander Statesman, Bastrop Advertiser, and Smithville Times. Brad Stutzman has served as editor for the Round Rock Leader, my hometown paper, since 2005.

Brad's writing, which can be both funny and informative, brings to life the words of fellow journalist John Grogan of The Philadelphia Inquirer, "In the English language, it all comes down to this: Twenty-six letters, when combined correctly, can create magic. Twenty-six letters form the foundation of a free, informed society." Fortunately for the people of central Texas, Brad used his tremendous gifts in service of superb journalism.

I've been friends with Brad for a long, long time. People in politics always seem to have trouble with reporters and editors in many instances. Yet I've always found him to be a fair and impartial reporter and his editorial policies were intelligent and well written and in most cases I agreed with him. I consider Brad a friend and I'll miss him. I'm sorry to see him go.

Retirement is something to be celebrated and enjoyed. It is not the end of a career, but rather the beginning of a new adventure. Both Erika and I wish Brad and his wife Ellen only the best in the years ahead.

HONORING DR. ROBERT M. WHITE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the first Federal Coordinator for Meteorology and the first Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Dr. Robert M. White.

Fifty years ago, the Bureau of the Budget issued a Circular to propose policy and procedures for the coordination of Federal meteorological services. In October of 1963, President John F. Kennedy appointed Dr. White to be chief of the U.S. Weather Bureau. Shortly thereafter in January of 1964, he became the first Federal Coordinator for Meteorology. Dr. White was the first and only Administrator of the Environmental Sciences Services Administration (ESSA) from 1965 to 1970, and served as the founding Administrator of NOAA from 1970 to 1977.

Dr. White made groundbreaking contributions to the federal coordination of meteorology in the United States. He advocated for the expansion of numerical weather prediction techniques and advanced the practical use of global weather observing technology through the launch of the first two operational meteorological satellites. He advanced weather radar research and development on Doppler technology, providing the foundation for our current NEXRAD radar system. Furthermore, he led U.S. participation in the Global Atmospheric Research Program (GARP) and directed research essential to the modernization and association restructuring of the National Weather Service.

In 1978, at the request of the World Meteorological Organization, he chaired the first World Climate Conference in Geneva. After leaving Federal service, he was elected President of the National Academy of Engineering. He was awarded the Tyler Prize for Environmental Achievement in 1992 for his contributions to global environmental science.

I commend Dr. White for the profound vision he brought to his government service, which furthered our understanding of meteorology and the natural environment, including the oceans and marine resources.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for

printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 31, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

NOVEMBER 5

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine housing finance reform, focusing on protecting small lender access to the secondary mortgage market.

SD-538

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the online Federal health insurance marketplace, focusing on enrollment challenges and the path forward.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts

To hold hearings to examine if limiting the scope of civil discovery will diminish accountability and leave Americans without access to justice.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Subcommittee on Conservation, Forestry and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine wildfires.

SR-328A

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security

To hold hearings to examine the United States aviation industry and jobs, focusing on keeping American manufacturing competitive.

SR-253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Oversight

To hold hearings to examine methane emissions from oil and gas operations.

SD-406

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

NOVEMBER 6

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Bureau of Prisons and cost-effective strategies for reducing recidivism.

SD-226

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Sloan D. Gibson, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Secretary, Linda A. Schwartz, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary for Policy and Planning, and Constance B. Tobias, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SR-418

2:15 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine transportation, focusing on independence for seniors.

SD-562

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the "America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education, and Science Act" (America COMPETES), focusing on science and the United States economy.

SR-253

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Relations, and the District of Columbia

To hold hearings to examine the ongoing recovery from Hurricane Sandy one year later.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.

SD-226

NOVEMBER 7

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the impact of sequestration on the national defense; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217, following the open session.

SD-G50

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Draft Regional Recommendation regarding the Columbia River Treaty.

SD-366

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

NOVEMBER 14

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Steven Croley, of Michigan, to be General Counsel, and Christopher Smith, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, both of the Department of Energy, and Esther Puakela Kia'aina, of Hawaii, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Insular Areas.

SD-366

NOVEMBER 20

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining

To hold hearings to examine S. 182, to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city of Anchorage, Alaska, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversion interest to the City, S. 483, to designate the Berryessa Snow Mountain National Conservation Area in the State of California, S. 771, to provide to the Secretary of the Interior a mechanism to cancel contracts for the sale of materials CA-20139 and CA-22901, S. 776, to establish the Columbine-Hondo Wilderness in the State of New Mexico, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of National Forest System land in the State, S. 841, to designate certain Federal land in the San Juan National Forest in the State of Colorado as wilderness, S. 1305, to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado, S. 1341, to modify the Forest Service Recreation Residence Program as the program applies to units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain by implementing a simple, equitable, and predictable procedure for determining cabin user fees, S. 1414, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, S. 1415, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and S. 1479, to address the forest health, public safety, and wildlife habitat threat presented by the risk of wildfire, including catastrophic wildfire, on National Forest System land and public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to expedite forest management projects relating to hazardous fuels reduction, forest health, and economic development.

SD-366

SENATE—Thursday, October 31, 2013

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord, thank You for the total access You have given us to approach Your throne in prayer.

Today, equip our Senators to do Your will, helping them to grasp the wonder of Your purposes. Lord, give them the ability, power, and resources to complete Your mission on Earth, thereby achieving the destiny You have for their lives. Help them to seek not what they can get from You but what Your power can enable them to do for You. Fill their hearts with Your unalterable, unconditional, and unending love.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 31, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of Senator

McCONNELL, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Congressman WATT to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency. The time until noon will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees. At noon, Senator-elect BOOKER will become a U.S. Senator. Following the swearing in, there will be a cloture vote on the Watt nomination.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY WISHES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, October 31 has always been a special day for me, since it marks the admission of the great State of Nevada to the Union. There are always parades and celebrations at home, many of which I have sadly missed in recent years because of my responsibilities here.

But October 31 is special for another reason, and not just that it is Halloween. It is my brother's birthday—my youngest brother, 22 months younger than I. My brother Larry, who lives in Searchlight, celebrates another birthday today. It is my pleasure to wish both my brother and the Silver State of Nevada a very happy birthday.

Nevada Day is particularly special as it marks the beginning of a year-long celebration of our 150th anniversary of the Battle Born State's entrance into the Union.

For thousands of years Nevada was the home to Nevada American peoples. I have in my office across the hall a wonderful painting by a Nevadan which shows the first non-Indian to see the Las Vegas Valley. You can see there the Sunrise Mountain and glimpses of the oases that were there. There were a number of them in that valley. He was the first non-Indian to see the valley a long time ago. He is in the picture mounted on his beautiful horse with all his fancy regalia. But the fact is the picture doesn't begin to show what Rafael Rivera looked on that day, because he had been lost. He was with the Spanish Expedition and he was lost. He was there by accident. It is a wonderful picture, and we honor Rafael Rivera in Nevada. So it is a special day for us in Nevada.

On October 31, 1864, right in the middle of the Civil War, Nevada became the 36th State of the Union. Nevada is only one of two States to join the Union during the war. The first was West Virginia, which seceded from Virginia to form a new State and remain part of the Union. It gained its statehood before Nevada, on June 30, 1863.

Union sympathizers had rushed to finalize Nevada's statehood in order to

ensure Lincoln's reelection—because, remember, this is right before his reelection. In fact, they were so eager to mint a State they telegraphed the new Nevada constitution to Congress. At that time, it was the longest telegram ever sent—coming in at 16,543 words and costing \$59,294.92. Eight days later, President Lincoln was reelected President of the United States.

Nevada is only one of two States to significantly expand its borders after its admission to the Union. Eastern and southern Nevada joined the State in the late 1860s after gold was discovered in the regions. Many Nevadans believe the State was only allowed to join the Union so its mineral riches could help fund the northern war effort, but in truth that is a myth. It is not true. The tale probably stems from the fact that the Nevada Territory was created in 1861 so its gold and silver could be used to help the Union rather than the Confederacy. So the State's slogan, Battle Born—a reference to the war—and an erroneous episode of “Bonanza,” which depicted a constitutional convention in Carson City I guess helped cement the legend.

The 150th anniversary of our admission to the Union is a wonderful time to study and reflect in this shared history we have as States and as a nation. It is also time to build a foundation for another 150 years of innovation and accomplishment for our State.

Nevada—from the mountains and high deserts of the east, to the geothermal wells of the north, including Lake Tahoe to the west, of course, to southern Nevada with the Las Vegas strip, from Indian Country to the mining towns and ranching communities—is a unique State in today's modern Union.

I like to say that people don't understand Nevada is more than the bright lights of Las Vegas. From the glittering waters of Lake Tahoe, Nevada is the most mountainous State in the Union, except for Alaska. We have more than 300 mountain ranges. Other than Alaska, it is the most dangerous place to fly a private plane because of the weather patterns which develop so quickly. I have been involved as I have flown in some of the smaller airplanes around the State.

We have magnificent wildlife. We have the famous bighorn sheep, we have mountain goats, the largest antelope range in the world. We have 1 mountain almost 14,000 feet high, and we have 32 mountains over 11,000 feet high. It is a magnificent State, and I am so fortunate to be able to represent that State—the State where I was born.

So today and throughout this special year we should celebrate everything that makes Nevada extraordinary and successful.

Happy Nevada Day, Nevadans.

CONGRATULATING CARL FRITTER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute to congratulate a man who has been part of the Senate for a long time. With more than four decades of service to the Federal Government and some 32 years here in the Senate, a man by the name of Carl Fritter will retire today. He began his career at the Government Printing Office and gave 44 years of service to the Federal Government. He is respected by his colleagues in the Secretary's Office and admired throughout the Senate community for his craftsmanship. Carl learned the art of bookbinding as an apprentice in the Government Printing Office. He received special training in bookbinding from experts across the globe.

In 1977, Carl was detailed to the Senate Library, where he eventually became Director of the Office of Conservation and Preservation. My son, during one of the summers, worked in that office, and that was a great experience. There he got to know Carl.

In addition to binding and repairing books, he has built many beautiful boxes and other things. He is a modern-day artisan. It is amazing the things he has built and can build. He has built, for example, boxes to contain gavels, books, and other works of art. Later today when we swear in the new junior Senator from New Jersey, the oath book Vice President BIDEN will use to swear in Senator-elect BOOKER was made by Carl Fritter.

I wish him the very best in his retirement. He is going to go to Key West, FL, where he wants to spend more time there with his wife Bunny and his children and grandchildren. I thank Carl for his decades of dedicated service to this institution and the Federal Government, and congratulate him on a career of success building and preserving artifacts here in the U.S. Capitol.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO CARL FRITTER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words of thanks this morning to a member of the Senate family who is leaving us today. After 44 years of government service, including 32 here in the Senate, Carl Fritter has decided it is time to go.

Carl has been a real friend to my office over the years, through his work in the Office of Conservation and Preservation, and we are sorry to see him leave us. But before he does, I want to say how grateful we are for his outstanding work over the years.

Carl learned the art of bookbinding in an apprentice program at the Government Printing Office many years ago. He says he never saw himself as a bookbinder, but after working outside one January during the construction of the Kennedy Center, he started thinking about getting a job indoors, and his supervisors over at the GPO gave him the opportunity. Carl would learn his trade from bookbinders from all over the world, each of whom taught him different techniques, which he put to good use in the Senate Library for many years.

In 1990, the Office of Conservation and Preservation was created. Carl was named Director 4 years later.

In addition to binding and repairing books, Carl taught himself a lot of other crafts. I am told he makes some pretty amazing decorative boxes, bowls, gavels, and books. One of Carl's most memorable projects was a fall-down box that he built as a gift for Margaret Thatcher. It was a box that opened to reveal a plate in the middle, with two congressional resolutions on either side. I am sure Prime Minister Thatcher loved it.

Carl, thank you for lending us your talents for so long and for giving so much of your life to this institution. We wish you and Bunny all the best in your retirement. I am sure you will enjoy passing down your skills to your grandkids. They will have a great teacher. But the entire Senate community will miss your craftsmanship and your commitment to excellence, and we will miss your friendship.

Carl, thank you very much.

FAMILY FRIENDLY AND WORKPLACE FLEXIBILITY ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, given that October is National Work and Family Month, I wish to take the opportunity to discuss an issue that has become increasingly important to working families, and that is the need for workplace flexibility.

Yesterday my colleague Senator AYOTTE and I introduced the Family Friendly and Workplace Flexibility Act of 2013, which we hope will provide America's workers with the flexible work arrangements they need. Countless Americans have become increasingly familiar over the past several years with the same reality: more and more to do, with less and less time to do it. And while Congress can't legislate another hour in the day, we can help working Americans better balance the demands of work and family.

The Family Friendly and Workplace Flexibility Act is a commonsense

measure Congress can pass to help alleviate that burden for millions of families by providing greater flexibility in managing their time. We all know working moms who are stretched between a job and supporting their kids, and baby boomers with elderly parents who require care and attention. A 2010 study conducted by the White House Council of Economic Advisers found that work flexibility programs can "reduce turnover and improve recruitment, [increase] the productivity of an employer's workforce, and are associated with improved employee health and decreased absenteeism."

Another study conducted by the Society for Human Resource Managers found that women's responsibilities have increased at work and men's responsibilities have increased at home, resulting in 60 percent of wage and salaried employees believing they do not have enough time to spend with their loved ones. The American workplace has evolved dramatically since the industrial workplace of the post-Depression era. Yet the labor laws written during this time period are still in place today and the makeup of our workforce has also changed dramatically.

Today, 60 percent of working households have two working parents. Sixty-six percent of single moms and 79 percent of single dads work as well. American workers have had to adapt to keep pace with this changing environment. So should our laws. Instead of sticking with an antiquated labor law, I believe we need to update the Fair Labor Standards Act to actually meet the changing needs of workers.

That is why I am introducing the Family Friendly and Workplace Flexibility Act.

This bill will allow flexible workplace arrangements such as compensatory time and flexible credit hour agreements, which are currently available to employees working for the Federal Government—Federal employees already have this—to be extended to businesses regulated by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Currently, the FLSA prohibits employers from offering compensatory time or comptime to their hourly employees. This bill would amend the FLSA to allow private employers to offer comptime to employees at a rate of 1½ hours for every hour of overtime work. I should add that this would be a completely voluntary process. An employee could still choose to receive monetary payments as their overtime compensation. This bill simply allows the option for employees to choose paid time off over work instead. There is no need for Washington to stand in the way of families earning the time that they need.

This bill also institutes a flexible credit-hour program under which the employer and employee can enter into

agreements that allow the employee to work excess hours, beyond the typical number of hours he or she is typically required to work, in order to accrue hours to be taken off at a later time. This option is for employees who do not get the opportunity to work overtime, but still want a way to build up hours to use as paid leave. Like comptime, this program is voluntary and may not affect collective bargaining agreements that are in place.

Under this legislation, employers would not be mandated to offer flexible workplace arrangements, just as employees are not mandated to choose their benefits, rather than direct compensation for overtime work. Both parties are free to choose what works best for them.

I would like to take a moment to focus on some of the protections in the bill. Under this bill, an employee may accrue up to 160 hours of comptime per year. At any point in the year, a participating employee may request to revert back to receiving traditional overtime compensation in exchange for their accrued comptime, essentially cashing out their banked time. Further, the bill also requires employers to provide monetary payment at the end of the year for any unused comptime or flextime.

I have also included a provision that safeguards unpaid comptime and flextime in the case of bankruptcy. Thus, the bill takes steps to protect against any potential for lost wages in these kinds of circumstances.

If anyone understands the benefits of comptime, it is our public employees. That is because flexible work arrangements have been available to Federal employees since 1978. If the Federal law already provides these beneficial workplace arrangements to Federal and State workers, why should we not make them available to all employees? Public employees enjoy these arrangements so much that the unions representing them frequently fight for comptime arrangements when negotiating collective bargaining agreements.

It is very important to note this legislation does not do anything to alter the 40-hour work week. Let me repeat that: This bill in no way alters a 40-hour work week or how overtime is calculated.

Another way in which the Family Friendly and Workplace Flexibility Act protects employees is by prohibiting employers from coercing employees into accepting or rejecting comptime or flextime arrangements.

When we look at today's modern workplace, we see some companies such as Dell, Bank of America, and GE that already provide flexible workplace arrangements to their salaried employees who are not subject to the rules under FLSA. Perhaps it is no coincidence that workplaces such as these

are also among the highest-ranked companies at which to work.

Now is the time to allow private companies to provide the benefits of flexible arrangements like comptime to their nonexempt workers as well. After all, it is not just workers at some places of employment who are parents or family members who need to be able to take time off to attend a function for their child's school, to see a son or daughter's supporting event, or to care for an aging parent. It is workers at all places of employment.

A report by the White House Council of Economic Advisers shows that nearly one-third of all American workers consider work-life balance and flexibility to be the most important factor in considering job offers.

Let me say that again. Nearly one-third of all American workers consider work-life balance and flexibility to be the most important factor in considering job offers.

It also shows that 66 percent of human resource managers cite family-supportive policies and flexible hours as the single most important factor in attracting and retaining employees. These numbers are pretty telling.

I am pleased that the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce has endorsed this legislation. I also thank my friend Congresswoman MARTHA ROBY for her leadership and dedication in advancing this cause over in the House. She introduced a bill to accomplish similar ends as the Family Friendly and Workplace Flexibility Act and actually saw her bill to passage. Now it is time for the Senate to act.

The effort to provide greater flexibility and support for families in the workplace is one I have long supported. I have previously supported legislation allowing flexible workplace arrangements. This is the fifth time I have sponsored legislation to establish comptime, and I am proud to continue that fight today.

I consider myself very fortunate to be joined by Senator AYOTTE in this effort. I suspect her predecessor, former Senator Judd Gregg, would be proud to see her leadership on this issue as well. Senator Gregg was a champion for flexible work arrangements throughout his entire Senate career, I was thankful to work with him on the issue in the past, and I am gratified to work with Senator AYOTTE on this issue moving forward.

Yesterday Senator LEE introduced a similar measure that seeks to provide for comptime for American workers. Senator LEE is helping with the effort, working with conservatives to find out-of-the-box solutions to the challenges Americans face today. I applaud Senator LEE for his commitment to this effort and look forward to working with him in the future on this issue.

In closing, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this

commonsense bill because it is the right thing to do for working families.

MILLETT NOMINATION

Finally, I will be voting against cloture on the Millett nomination, and I would like to discuss why. Ms. Millett is no doubt a fine person. This is nothing personal.

Peter Keisler, of course, is a fine person too. But our Democratic colleagues pocket-filibustered his nomination to the D.C. Circuit for 2 years on the grounds that the court's workload did not warrant his confirmation. They did so despite his considerable skill as a lawyer and his personal qualities. His nomination languished until the end of the Bush administration. He waited almost 1,000 days for a vote that never came.

The criteria our Democratic friends cited to block Mr. Keisler's nomination then clearly show the court is even less busy now. For example, the seat to which Ms. Millett is nominated is not a judicial emergency—far from it. The number of appeals at the court is down almost 20 percent, and the written decisions per active judge are down almost 30 percent.

In addition to these metrics, the D.C. Circuit has provided another. The chief judge of the court, who was appointed to the bench by President Clinton, provided an analysis showing that oral arguments for each active judge are also down almost 10 percent since Mr. Keisler's nomination was blocked.

These analyses show that not only is the court less busy in absolute terms now than it was then, it is less busy in relative terms as well, when one takes into account the number of active judges serving on the court. The court's caseload is so low, in fact, that it has canceled oral argument days in recent years because of lack of cases. After we confirmed the President's last nominee to the D.C. Circuit just a few months ago—and by the way we confirmed him unanimously—one of the judges on the court said that if more judges were confirmed there would not be enough work to go around. So if the court's caseload clearly does not meet their own standards for more judges, why are Senate Democrats pushing to fill more seats on a court that doesn't need them? What is behind this push to fill seats on the court that is canceling oral argument days for lack of cases, and according to the judges who serve on it will not have enough work to go around if we do?

We don't have to guess. Our Democratic colleagues and the administration's supporters have been actually pretty candid about it. They have admitted they want to control the court so it will advance the President's agenda. As one administration ally put it, "The President's best hope for advancing his agenda is through executive action, and that runs through the D.C. Circuit."

Let me repeat, the reason they want to put more judges on the D.C. Circuit is not because it needs them, but because "The President's best hope for advancing his agenda is through executive action, and that runs through the D.C. Circuit."

Another administration ally complained that the court "has made decisions that have frustrated the President's agenda." Really? The court is evenly divided between Republican and Democratic appointees. According to data compiled by the Federal courts, the D.C. Circuit has ruled against the Obama administration in administrative matters less often than it ruled against the Bush administration.

Let me say that again. According to data compiled by the Federal courts, the D.C. Circuit has ruled against the Obama administration in administrative matters less often than it ruled against the Bush administration. So it is not that the court has been more unfavorable to President Obama than it was to President Bush. Rather, the administration and its allies seem to be complaining that the court has not been favorable enough. Evidently they do not want any meaningful check on the President. You see, there is one in the House of Representatives, but the administration can circumvent that with aggressive agency rulemaking. That is if the D.C. Circuit allows it to do so.

A court should not be a rubberstamp for any administration, and our Democratic colleagues told us again and again during the Bush administration that the Senate confirmation process should not be a rubberstamp for any administration. For example, they said President Bush's nomination of Miguel Estrada to the D.C. Circuit was "an effort to pack the Federal courts." And they filibustered his nomination—seven times, in fact.

We have confirmed nearly all of President Obama's judicial nominees. As I said, we confirmed a judge to the D.C. Circuit unanimously just a few months ago. This year we have confirmed 34 circuit and district court judges. At this time in President Bush's second term the Senate had confirmed only 14.

Let me say that again. This year we have confirmed 34 circuit and district court judges. At this time in President Bush's second term the Senate had confirmed only 14 of those nominees. In fact, we confirmed President Obama's nominees even during the Government shutdown.

In writing to then-Judiciary Committee Chairman Arlen Specter to oppose the nomination of Peter Keisler, Senate Democrats said:

Mr. Keisler should under no circumstances be considered—much less confirmed . . . before we first address the very need for the judgeship . . . and deal with the genuine judicial emergencies identified by the judicial conference.

That course of action ought to be followed here too. Senator GRASSLEY has legislation that will allow the President to fill seats on courts that actually need judges. The Senate should support that legislation, not transparent efforts to politicize a court that doesn't need judges in an effort to create a rubberstamp for the administration's agenda.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MELVIN WATT TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of MELVIN L. WATT, of North Carolina, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The assistant majority leader.

LETTER OF RESIGNATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that an official letter of resignation as mayor of Newark, NJ, from Senator-elect CORY BOOKER of New Jersey be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWARK, NJ,
October 30, 2013.

ROBERT P. MARASCO,
City Clerk, City of Newark, Broad Street, Newark, NJ.

DEAR MR. MARASCO: Serving as the mayor of Newark, New Jersey has been one of the greatest honors of my life. Since taking office more than seven years ago, I've had the privilege to work closely with countless residents, municipal employees, elected officials, community leaders and others to move Newark forward. It was not easy, but together, we have brought incredible positive change to our city and set the stage for this momentum to continue in the coming years.

On Thursday, October 31, 2013 at noon, I will be sworn in as one of New Jersey's United States Senators. Therefore, effective Thursday, October 31, 2013 at 12:00 a.m., I am officially resigning as mayor of Newark.

While I am leaving one position, I am not leaving Newark. I am proud to be able to now represent Newark and our entire state as a United States Senator. My level of dedication, passion and service will not falter as I serve New Jersey. Our best days lie ahead,

and together, we will continue to achieve great things.

The work goes on.

Sincerely,

CORY A. BOOKER,
Mayor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I listened carefully to the statement that was just made by the Republican leader. It is a shame what is about to occur on the Senate floor if he has his way. The President has submitted the name of a nominee to serve on the D.C. Circuit Court. This is not just another court. Some view it as the second most important court in the land. Some of the most technical and challenging legal cases come before this court. The judges who serve there are called on not just to do routine things but to do extraordinary things on a regular basis. That is why the appointments to this court are so critically needed when it comes to maintaining the integrity of our Federal judiciary.

What I heard from the Senate Republican leader was a statement that he would vote against the nomination of Patricia Ann Millett, President Obama's nominee for the vacancy on the court.

There are 11 judges authorized for this court. Currently, only eight are serving. There are three vacancies. Ms. Millett is being suggested for the ninth seat out of the 11 that are authorized. I am not going to go back into the history of our exchanges when it comes to the appointment of judges. I can make as compelling a case, if not more compelling, than that just made by the Senator from Kentucky.

At the end of the day those who are witnessing this will say it is another he said versus he said. What are these politicians up to? Who is right? Who is wrong? What I would suggest is, don't take my word for it and don't take the word of the Senator from Kentucky. Take the word of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

On April 5 the Judicial Conference of the United States, led by Chief Justice John Roberts, made its Federal judgeship recommendations for this Congress. The Judicial Conference is not Republican or Democratic; it is non-partisan. According to its letter, its recommendations reflect the judgeship needs of the Federal judiciary. The Judicial Conference, which judges the caseload and workload in the Federal courts, did not reach the same conclusion as the Senator from Kentucky. They didn't tell us we need fewer judges on the D.C. Circuit Court—not at all. It is incumbent upon us to fill those vacancies, and that is where we should be today.

Let me add one additional note. What is especially troubling about what they are going to do to this fine woman is the fact that she is so extraordinarily well qualified. She may hold a record of having been an advocate and argued

before the U.S. Supreme Court some 32 times. She has received the endorsement of both Democratic and Republican Solicitors General. Those are the lawyers who represent the United States of America before that Court across the street, and her nomination is strongly supported by prominent former Republican Solicitors General.

So the notion that the Senator from Kentucky suggests—that this is some partisan gambit—is completely destroyed by her letters of recommendation from Republicans as well as Democrats who have served as Solicitor General and have witnessed her fine work. This is about putting the right person in the job on one of the most important courts in the land, and sadly, unless the position of the minority leader of the Senate is not the position of all Republican Senators, she may suffer from this partisan approach to the appointment of this vacancy. What a sad outcome for a fine woman who has done so well as a professional advocate before appellate courts, has been recommended on a bipartisan basis—the highest recommendations—and now, after languishing on the calendar, is going to be dismissed. She didn't fit into the political game plan. That is awful.

The men and women who step forward and submit their applications to become part of our Federal judiciary know they are going to be carefully scrutinized and criticized for some things in their past, but they do it anyway in the name of public service. What I hear from the Senator from Kentucky is that she doesn't fit into the political game plan on the other side of the aisle. I hope there are enough Republican Senators who will disagree with the Senator from Kentucky. We should give Patricia Ann Millett an opportunity to serve on the D.C. Circuit Court as quickly as possible.

I know there are others on the floor, and I want to make sure everyone has time to say what is on their mind today because there are important issues before us, but I do want to make one brief comment about another issue.

EXPIRATION OF STIMULUS FUNDS FOR SNAP

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, 2 days ago Kate Maehr of the Greater Chicago Food Depository came to visit me in my office. Kate is one of my favorite people. Kate runs this huge network of food distribution in the Chicagoland area. Her warehouses are huge, and they are filled with foodstuffs, much of which is donated by companies that produce food so that it can be distributed in food pantries and other sources all around the Chicagoland area. Kate is one of the best, and I look forward to her visits each year because I know the fine work she does to feed the hungry.

Two days ago she came into my office very sad.

She said: I don't know what we are going to do.

I said: What is the matter?

She said: This Friday the increase in food stamps, or SNAP benefits, for the poor people who live in the greater Chicagoland area is going to be cut. It may be only \$10 or \$15, but I know these people, I know many of them personally, and they live so close to the edge. It will call for some sacrifice on their part, and many of them will be hard-pressed to make that sacrifice, and I can't make up the difference. With all of the donations and all of the charitable contributions, I just can't make up the difference.

I thought about it for a minute. I thought, how would you approach a Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives and say: You know, this cutback of \$15 a month will really hurt. It is hard for us, in our positions in life, to really understand or identify with the plight and the struggle of those who are not certain where their next meal is coming from.

Most of those people have the benefit of the SNAP program, the food stamp program. Well, who are these people? Who are these 48 million Americans who receive benefits from this program? Almost 1 million of them are veterans. Veterans who are not sure where their next meal is coming from get food stamps—SNAP benefits. Almost half of the 48 million are children. There are 22 million children and another 9 million who are elderly and disabled. When we talk about cuts in the SNAP program, we are talking about these people—the veterans, children, the elderly, and the disabled.

Right now there are two proposals before us. One proposal is from the Senate, and that cuts back spending on this program to the tune of \$4 billion over 10 years. I supported it because I think it closes the potential for abuse. I don't want to waste a penny of Federal taxpayers' money on any program in any way, shape, or form. Senator STABENOW, chairman of the Senate agriculture committee, made this change in the food stamp program that will save us \$4 billion and will not create hardship. In fact, it closes what may be a loophole.

Now comes the House of Representatives, and their view is much different. They want to cut some \$40 billion—10 times as much—over the next 10 years. When we take a look at the approach they are using for these cuts—10 times the amount cut by the Senate—we understand how they get their so-called savings. They take almost 4 million—3.8 million—people out of the program: children, single mothers, unemployed veterans, and Americans who get temporary help from the food stamp program. The House would cut \$19 billion and 1.7 million people from SNAP by eliminating the authority of Governors of both political parties to ask for waivers so that low-income childless adults under 50 can still receive bene-

fits beyond the 3 months they do ordinarily. This says that Governors looking at their States with high unemployment understand that there are people in need.

It is hard for Members of Congress in the House or the Senate—it is hard for me too—to really appreciate the lifestyle of someone living from paycheck to paycheck, but that is a reality for millions of Americans. Many of the people who are receiving food stamps are working. That may come as a shock to people, but they are not making enough money to feed their families.

I went on a tour of a food warehouse in Champaign, IL, and had a number of people explain the importance of not only their work with food pantries but the importance of the food stamp program. I noticed one young woman who was part of the tour. I didn't quite understand why she was there. She was an attractive young mother who was dressed well. She explained that she had two children. I later learned why she was there. She is a food stamp recipient. She has a part-time job with the local school district—not a full-time job—and her income is so low, she still qualifies for food stamps, SNAP benefits. She was there to thank me. She wanted to thank me not just for the food stamp program but because we changed the law a couple of years ago and allow mothers like her to take their kids to farmers markets and use their food stamps to buy fresh produce.

She said: It is almost like a trip to Disneyland for my kids. They have come to know the farmers, and they look forward to meeting them each week. The farmers give them an extra apple or tomato or this or that, and I just want to thank you. My kids are getting good food from farmers markets, and it helps us make ends meet.

This is a single working mom with two kids. Those are the types of people who are receiving food stamps and benefits. The notion that they are somehow lazy welfare queens—go out and meet them. Meet the woman at the Irving Park United Methodist Church food pantry I met who is trying to live in the city of Chicago on a Social Security check that pays her \$800 a month. I challenge any Member in the Senate or House to try to get by on \$800 a month in the city of Chicago. She makes it because she has two food pantries that give her 3 or 4 days of food each and she has food stamps.

I will conclude by saying that what we are talking about as far as food stamps is really a matter of basic hunger of children, veterans, elderly, and disabled who get this helping hand that makes a difference in their lives.

We are a great and caring nation. I am so proud to represent a great State in that Nation. We are a caring people, and caring people do not turn their backs on hungry kids or hungry elderly

people. We better take care, when it comes to this food stamp program, that we don't make cuts that are going to make their lives more difficult.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all speakers on the Democratic side prior to noon be limited to 5 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I don't know whether Senator BOXER was to be recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I will take 5 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I understand that Senator BOXER wants 5 minutes, and I will yield to the fine chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee for 5 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that Senators on the Republican side be allocated 10 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the ranking member on the Budget Committee. I know he has a lot on his plate. He and I work well together, and I thank him.

Mr. President, I want to put on the RECORD my strong support for Congressman MEL WATT to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency. May I do that.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I hope we have a resounding vote for MEL WATT. He is a terrific person. He has the heart, intelligence, and the experience.

Mr. President, as critical decisions are being made about the future of the housing finance system, it is time that we place permanent leadership at the head of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, FHFA. Congressman MEL WATT has both the experience and the expertise to help create a system that ensures access to safe and affordable credit and other housing options for all Americans.

Congressman WATT brings with him over 40 years of experience in housing, real estate, and other financial services issues. From 1970 to 1992, he ran a law practice focusing on business, real estate, municipal bonds, and community development, learning the details of housing finance from the ground level. He was first elected to represent the 12th district of North Carolina in 1992 and has served over 20 years on the House Financial Services Committee. In addition, his work on the House Subcommittees on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, and on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit has given him the necessary policy expertise to run the agency that oversees Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

Congressman WATT's experience and expertise made him one of the first policymakers to recognize how predatory underwriting practices were threatening the larger housing market and economy as a whole. Years before the foreclosure crisis began, Congressman WATT, along with Congressman Brad Miller, introduced the Prohibit Predatory Lending Act in 2004. They reintroduced it every Congress after that until it was adopted as part of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. In March 2007, only 2 months after the Democrats became the majority party in Congress, Congressman WATT joined Chairman Barney Frank in introducing a bill to reform regulation of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The bill passed both the House and the Senate with bipartisan support and now called the Housing and Economic Recovery Act, HERA, was signed into law by President Bush in July 2008.

Congressman WATT also brings with him the experience and balance in vision to represent all stakeholders fairly, and has broad support from both industry and consumer groups.

"The National Association of Realtors has long appreciated Representative WATT's proven ability and willingness to engage the industry, stakeholders, and consumers throughout his service in the House of Representatives. WATT has always aimed to craft policy that is fair, garners wide consensus, and allows all parties to move forward, all of which are vital qualities for the Director of the FHFA."

The Mortgage Bankers of America said, "Congressman WATT would bring considerable experience to the post of Director [and] a strong base of understanding on a wide variety of public policy issues related to housing finance. . . . [W]e would urge the Senate to approve his nomination."

The Center for Responsible Lending said, "WATT brings to FHFA an ability to work with a variety of stakeholders, with many competing interests and perspectives. He has a track record of crafting practical solutions and alliances for a complex, dynamic marketplace. He is consistently thoughtful, fair, and respectful of all opinions, and his policies have been guided by a concern for all Americans."

The National Association of Home Builders said, "We applaud the nomination of Representative WATT to this important position. After four years in conservatorship, the future of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac stands at a crossroad. Rep. WATT brings years of experience to this position at a pivotal moment as our nation's housing market recovers. NAHB looks forward to working closely with Rep. WATT to help address the many complex challenges facing the U.S. housing finance system upon his confirmation by the U.S. Senate."

The Center for American Progress said, "We believe that Mr. WATT has the vision, expertise, and experience necessary to provide strong leadership for FHFA. His personal background and professional experience have provided him with a deep commitment to affordable housing and sustainable credit, which not only support a robust housing market, but also provide shelter and opportunity for America's families and spur economic growth for the nation as a whole."

The United States Conference of Mayors said, "It is not surprising that Representative WATT has bipartisan support in the Senate. His record shows that he can work across the political aisle finding solutions to complex problems. Time and time again, mayors have been impressed with his thoughtful approach in developing solutions that are mindful of all stakeholders. As the nation's housing market climbs back as a major part of our economy, we need such a leader as MEL WATT at the head of FHFA."

Mr. President, I ask to speak as in morning business for the rest of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am so pleased to be on the floor with some very good news out of California and how ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, is working in our great State. People are phoning. People are going online. People are talking with insurance agencies, with health insurance companies. They are getting health care coverage, some for the very first time, and for many for the first time it is affordable; all good policies—good policies that will be there when they are needed.

We know a small percentage of people, as the President addressed yesterday, are being told their old policies are not going to be offered to them anymore, but all of those folks know they can get better policies. They can't be turned away. There will be competition for their business. Many of them will get subsidies. So at the end of the day, this health care story, although quite bumpy, as we know the prescription drug launch was years ago—we know it is bumpy, and we are angry on both sides of the aisle that it is bumpy—but at the end of the day, I think it is going to be good.

I wish to read some of the comments made by people who have logged in to "Covered California," which is coveredCA.com. Here is one who just got an affordable health care policy:

Thank you so much, President Obama! And everyone who works there.

This was soooo much easier than I thought it would be! I am soooo grateful to get medical insurance! Thank you!

Another:

Great phone support, thank you. No wait time, the assistant answered all my questions clearly.

Another:

GREAT JOB! EASY! WHAT'S ALL THE FUSS ABOUT?

Another:

Wow. This was easy and my monthly premiums are significantly less than my previous employer's health care coverage before the Affordable Care Act.

One who I thought truly summed it up:

Thank God Almighty I'm free at last!

These are the real people. These are not people who have a political agenda. They are real people. They are Democrats. They are Republicans. They are Independent voters. They have had a hard time getting health insurance and, because of the Affordable Care Act, with all of its glitches on the national Web site—and we acknowledge them—it is working. It is working in our State, and eventually, once that national Web site is fixed, it will work for everybody.

I wish to put some real numbers on this: 180,000 Californians have begun the process of signing up for coverage—180,000 families. Imagine the relief they have. Over 2 million unique visitors have been to coveredCA.com. There have been 200,000 calls to coveredCA.com's call centers. The average wait time is under 4 minutes and the average total call time is less than 16 minutes for Californians enrolling in coverage and asking questions. We have 4,000 insurance agents and clinic workers trained so far and certified. They have their badges so they can offer, in person, help to those who are looking to enroll.

Very recently I went to a clinic in my home county and I can tell my colleagues the excitement there is palpable. The doctors, the nurses, the assistants, the people in the waiting room, everybody knowing they can get either insurance on the exchange or insurance through an expanded Medi-Cal Program. We have millions of people who will be able to sign up on the exchanges. We have about 1.4 million people who could sign up for the expanded Medi-Cal Program.

Do I have any time remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 5 seconds remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. Five seconds. I hope we get these two wonderful nominees on the way to confirmation today.

I hope we will be patient and that we will all work together to fix the problems with health care. I think, at the end of the day, it is going to be great.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to share some thoughts about the filling of the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals judgeships. I have

been involved in that issue for well over a decade. We started looking at the case numbers when President Clinton was in office. I, along with Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, both Republicans, blocked President Bush from filling a vacancy, because that court did not need another judge and they wanted to fill it. Let's be frank. Presidents want to fill the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals because they think they can shift the balance there and be able to advance their agenda throughout the judicial process because a lot of key cases are filed there, and lobbyists and outside forces that care about judges want the Presidents to put their kind of people in those positions—maybe even their law partner or their friend or their political buddy on that court. But there are some great judges on the court. But I am Ranking Republican on the Budget Committee also. I serve on the Judiciary Committee and on the Budget Committee. We have no money in this country to fund a judgeship that is not needed.

The last time we were able to move one of those judges to the Ninth Circuit where the position was needed. Today, it is clear that the caseload for the D.C. Circuit continues to fall. The number of cases per judge in the D.C. Circuit continues to decline. Senator GRASSLEY has been a champion of this issue for years. He chaired the court subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. I chaired it after he did. We have seen these numbers.

Senator DURBIN says, Oh, it is a shame. It is a shame these nominees don't get confirmed. As Senator MCCONNELL noted, it was a shame that Peter Keisler, a fabulous nominee, didn't get confirmed. But, in all honesty, the court didn't need that slot filled and they don't need any of the three slots today that are vacant. They do not need to be filled. Congress has no responsibility to fill a vacancy that is not needed, and we shouldn't do it. Each one costs about \$1 million a year. That is what it costs to fill a judgeship.

We have needs around the country. We have certain needs around the country, and we are going to have to add judges. Why would we fill slots with judges we don't need and not fill slots with judges we do need? That is my fundamental view about it. I will just say this: It is not going to happen. We are not going to fill these slots. This country is in deep financial trouble.

The majority basically is saying: Oh, the Budget Control Act and, oh, we have cut to the bone. We can't find another dime in savings. Do you know what the problem is, America? You haven't sent us enough money. If you would just send more money to Washington, we could spread it around and everything would be fine.

This is basically what we are hearing from the leadership: No more cuts. In

fact, the Budget Control Act reduced spending too much. Oh, this is critically important. Every dollar we spend is critically important and we can't reduce a dime of it or even the growth of it. That is what we have been hearing: Send more money to Washington. We want to raise taxes. We are open about demanding increases in taxes to fund whatever it is we want to spend.

Is there any waste and abuse in this government? There absolutely is. Look at this chart. Senator DURBIN is on the Judiciary Committee. He has been involved in this. He knows these numbers. There is nothing phony about what I am showing my colleagues today. This is absolute fact: Total appeals filed per active judge. These are the judges on the court today. The D.C. Circuit has eight judges. They have eight judges. The number of appeals filed per judge in their court is 149, and the average per circuit judge in America is 383. The average is 2½ times that number. We do not need to fill these slots.

Look at the Eleventh Circuit. They have vacancies, but at this point they are doing almost 800 cases per judge per year. Think about that. In the Second Circuit, which is Manhattan—a very important circuit with very complex cases—there are more than 2½ times the number of cases than the D.C. Circuit. Remember, this is the current number of judges, I say to my colleagues. This isn't if we were to add three more judges. If we added three more judges, it would be a little over 100 cases per judge, not 149. This is absolute fact. They take the entire summer off. No other circuit does this. They have canceled oral arguments they had scheduled because there were no cases to argue. They take the summer off.

I talked to one circuit judge in another circuit who said: At least one of the judges in the D.C. Circuit goes around the country sometimes and helps out, but none of our judges can because we are so busy we don't have time to do it.

Most of our judges are working very hard. I am a total believer in the integrity and the value of the Federal judiciary. I respect them greatly. They do important work. But it has just so happened in the course of our American system that the D.C. Circuit is at a point where it has the lowest caseload per judge in decades, of any circuit and it needs to be fixed and the number of cases continues to decline.

So what I would say to my colleagues is I believe we should give deference to the President in the nomination of judges. I voted for, I am sure, close to 90 percent of the nominations the President has submitted. I voted for almost 90 percent, I would suggest. But I am not going to support three judges we don't need. The last thing we need to be doing is burning on the Mall of

the United States of America \$3 million a year to fund judgeships we don't need. There are other places in this government we can cut wasteful spending as well, but this one highlights the situation.

I suggest to my colleagues this is a test to this Senate. This is a test for all of the Members of the Senate. If we say there is no place to save money in Washington; if we say we have found every bit of waste, fraud, and abuse there is—well, look at this court.

I am not condemning any of the nominees. I am not complaining about their quality or their ability. I am saying the taxpayers of America should not have extracted from them another \$3 million a year to fund three judges that absolutely are not needed, particularly when we have legitimate needs in other courts around the country that need more judges.

Look at the Eleventh Circuit, my circuit: Almost 800 cases per judge filed. This circuit, the D.C. Circuit, 149, and they want three more judges—not so.

I believe we have a 10-minute limit. How much time remains?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. So, in conclusion, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. It looks as though we will vote on the Millett nomination maybe later today. With no personal criticism of that nominee in any way, I think it is important for us to say we just don't need these slots. We are not going to fill them. Not one of the three needs to be filled. We are not going to fill any of them. We are going to honor the finances of the American people.

Once again, I express my appreciation to Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, who has led the fight on this issue for a number of years. I have worked with him on it. We have legislation to transfer these judgeships to other places. That is what we should be doing, moving them to where they are needed. It has been great to work with Senator GRASSLEY.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about Congressman MEL WATT.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for an inquiry, under the UC were we going to divide 30 minutes per side? Was that the intent of the unanimous consent request I made earlier?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time until noon is equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. SESSIONS. In the usual form. All right.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about Congressman

MEL WATT, who is a champion for middle class families in my home State of North Carolina. MEL WATT is the President's nominee to be the next Director of our Federal Housing Finance Agency.

Congressman WATT is a true North Carolinian. He was born in North Carolina. He attended the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and he has spent much of his distinguished career working for the people of North Carolina.

Congressman WATT is an outstanding choice to lead the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

Over his 20 years on the House Financial Services and Judiciary Committees, Congressman WATT has been a steadfast advocate for affordable housing in North Carolina and across the country. He has worked tirelessly to protect families from predatory and deceptive lending practices.

He has been willing to work across the aisle to find common ground on issues that promote economic opportunity for the middle class.

Well before the housing crisis, Congressman WATT raised concerns that predatory lending practices were harming consumers and putting our housing market at risk. He was instrumental in enacting Dodd-Frank and in supporting its antipredatory lending provisions. He will be a tremendous asset to our housing market and economy moving forward.

In a letter to the Senate this week, 54 community and advocacy organizations called for Congressman WATT's confirmation, saying:

Representative WATT has the depth to grasp the problems that plague Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and has the skills to work with everyone involved to get the housing market back on track.

I agree. I was proud to join my North Carolina colleague Senator RICHARD BURR in introducing Congressman WATT at his confirmation hearing earlier this year, and I am pleased that the Banking Committee approved his nomination.

The bipartisan support for Congressman WATT from our delegation in North Carolina is representative of his longtime ability to work across the aisle.

During his distinguished tenure in Congress, Congressman WATT worked with Republican Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE and Representative LAMAR SMITH to pass legislation that addressed Patent and Trademark Office backlogs. And he worked with Representative BLAINE LUETKEMEYER on legislation that ensured adequate transparency for ATM fees while eliminating excessive regulatory burdens.

Congressman WATT's long congressional career builds on more than two decades in the private sector as a small business owner and a legal expert.

With experience in the private sector and more than two decades of service on the House Financial Services Committee, Congressman WATT has the background, the skills, and the history of bipartisan cooperation necessary to confront the challenges facing our recovering housing market.

His nomination is supported by industry leaders such as the National Association of Realtors president Gary Thomas and the National Association of Home Builders chairman Rick Judson. He is supported by the Mortgage Bankers Association and the United States Conference of Mayors. And he is supported by Erskine Bowles, cochair of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, and the former Bank of America chairman and CEO Hugh McColl.

In fact, I ask unanimous consent that these letters from the National Association of Realtors, the National Association of Home Builders, and Mr. McColl be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF REALTORS®,
Washington, DC, October 29, 2013.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the one million members of the National Association of Realtors® (NAR), their affiliates, homebuyers, and homeowners, I strongly urge the United States Senate to expeditiously confirm Representative Mel Watt as the next Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA).

The National Association of Realtors® has long appreciated Representative Watt's proven ability and willingness to engage the industry, stakeholders, and consumers throughout his service in the U.S. House of Representatives. Watt has always aimed to craft policy that is fair, garners wide consensus, and allows all parties to move forward, all of which are vital qualities for the Director of the FHFA.

The extended conservatorship of the government-sponsored enterprises, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, is one of the most pressing issues facing the housing sector. This requires that the FHFA be led by a permanent Director, who looks for measured and comprehensive solutions that will protect both the housing market and taxpayers. Representative Watt has clearly demonstrated through his extended service and involvement with key housing issues before the House Financial Services Committee that he has a keen understanding of the importance of housing finance to the nation's economy.

The FHFA Director plays a critical role in the future of our nation's housing finance system and must weigh the costs of action and inaction with the benefits of protecting the taxpayer and ensuring the continued recovery of housing. Representative Watt has the experience and skill necessary to work with Congress and the Administration to ensure that both costs and benefits are handled in a manner that benefits our nation. As our economy continues its slow recovery from the Great Recession, we must focus on sensible and commonsense policies that foster strong growth and stability. Representative Watt has the experience, knowledge, and ability to bring that much needed focus to the FHFA.

In short, we know that Representative Watt will not only be an asset to FHFA but also to the Congress and the Administration as we work together to restore strength to the housing and mortgage markets. The National Association of Realtors® urges confirmation of Representative Watt, and stands ready to work with FHFA and Congress to facilitate a strong housing and economic recovery.

Sincerely,

GARY THOMAS,
2013 President, National Association of
Realtors®.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF HOME BUILDERS,
Washington, DC, October 29, 2013.

Hon. HARRY REID, Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC,
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: On behalf of the 140,000 members of the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB), I am pleased to offer NAHB's strong support for the nomination of Representative Mel Watt as the next Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA). I urge you to support his nomination when it is considered by the full Senate later this week.

Today's mortgage finance system is in a state of uncertainty. The ongoing conservatorship of the government sponsored enterprises (GSEs), Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, continues to be one of the most challenging issues facing the housing industry today. With the path forward for comprehensive housing finance reform taking shape, and with that outcome still very uncertain, having a permanent FHFA Director will be critical to ensure the safety and soundness of the housing GSEs, as well as promote a stable and liquid residential mortgage financing system for our nation's housing market. NAHB believes that the confirmation of Representative Mel Watt will bring much-needed certainty to the U.S. housing finance system as we transition from the current state of conservatorship to a new and stronger system of housing finance.

Representative Watt will bring years of experience to this position at a pivotal moment in the recovery of our nation's housing market. During Representative Watt's tenure on the House Financial Services Committee, he has proven to be a thoughtful leader on housing policy. The FHFA needs a permanent director with his leadership capabilities.

NAHB looks forward to working closely with Representative Watt to help address the many complex challenges still facing the housing finance system and the recovery of the housing market. We hope that the Senate will move quickly to approve his nomination.

Best regards,

RICK JUDSON,
2013 NAHB Chairman of the Board.

Charlotte, NC, October 25, 2013.

To: The Editor

TIME TO ACT ON THE MEL WATT NOMINATION

Given the need to have more economic activity, it appears to me that the Senate should move now to confirm Congressman Mel Watt as Director of FHFA. There seems to be no reason not to approve Mr. Watt's nomination other than he has been nominated by the President.

I have known Mel Watt for 40-some odd years, both as a lawyer and as a US Congressman. I know him to be highly intelligent, a man of impeccable character, and a straight shooter. While Chairman of the Board of the Bank of America, I consulted with him on many occasions about banking legislation. We did not always agree with each other, but I always knew that I was getting an honest opinion and one that was well thought out.

Mr. Watt has been a real estate lawyer in one of the fastest growing cities in America—Charlotte, NC, and he is very much aware of the need for housing loans for people from all economic segments. Most of his more than 20 years in Congress were spent on the House Financial Services Committee.

It is worth reminding people that Congressman Watt has a business degree from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and a law degree from Yale University. Without question, he is well educated. No doubt he is smart, and there is no doubt that we need somebody like him in charge.

I hope Senator Burr and Senator Hagan from North Carolina will push for his confirmation. The Country needs him.

Sincerely,

HUGH L. MCCOLL, JR.

Mrs. HAGAN. Congressman WATT's strong record of working with industry leaders, consumer advocates, Democrats and Republicans proves that he can deliver results for middle class families across the country and in North Carolina.

We need Congressman WATT at the Federal Housing Finance Agency. I know he will work successfully with Congress to strengthen the backbone of our current housing finance system, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting his nomination later today. I yield the floor.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, just a parliamentary inquiry: I have 10 minutes allocated to me?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TOOMEY. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I rise to address the candidacy of Congressman MEL WATT to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency as well.

Let me preface my comments by making it very clear. I know Congressman MEL WATT. He is a good man. I served with him in the House. We served on the Banking Committee together. I know for many years he has been and continues to be a passionate advocate for increasing taxpayer subsidies for housing finance, and I have never once doubted his sincerity, his commitment, or his passion for working for his constituents and also for disadvantaged people generally. Having said that, while MEL WATT is certainly a good man, I think this is the wrong job for this good man, and I want to explain why.

I think it is useful to first consider the massive size of the institutions that the Federal Housing Finance

Agency, the FHFA, regulates. Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, the Federal Home Loan Banks combined are enormous.

Fannie and Freddie together hold 48 percent of all the outstanding mortgages in the United States of America. Last year, they guaranteed almost 80 percent of all the new mortgages that were issued. Combined, Fannie and Freddie have assets that are nearly \$5.2 trillion—this is much larger than the Federal Reserve—which have just made themselves into an enormous institution. Combined, Fannie and Freddie are more than twice as big as JPMorgan Chase, the biggest bank in America. In addition to being very large, they are enormously complex, and they are at the center—in fact, they are the housing finance market of the United States of America.

So they are enormously large, they are enormously complex. And the post we are talking about here—the directorship of the regulator—has virtually unchecked powers. The legislation that creates this post, that creates this agency and the head of this agency, empowers the Director enormously. Let me quote from the statute. The Director's powers include “all rights, titles, powers, and privileges of the regulated entity, and of any stockholder, officer, or director” of the entity. In plain English that means this person has the power of the entire board of directors, the CEO and all the management, and the regulatory agency that controls it all. There is no parallel in our country for an institution where so much power is concentrated in one person.

In addition, there is no congressional oversight. The FHFA does not depend on Congress for appropriations. It gets its money from fees from the entities it regulates. So Congress has no control, no authority, once a person is confirmed in this post, and they are confirmed for a 5-year term and can only be removed for cause. So it is unchecked power on an enormous scale.

Now, precisely because of the unchecked power over these enormously large, important, powerful, and complex institutions—precisely for that reason—the statute stipulates very clearly that the person holding this post has to be someone who is technically competent because of their own history, because they have been a practitioner in this field. The legislation demands that, and for good reason. Specifically, the law insists that the Director shall have a “demonstrated understanding of financial management or oversight, and have a demonstrated understanding of capital markets, including the mortgage securities markets and housing finance.”

So we are not talking about being automatically qualified by virtue of being a Member of Congress. One needs to be a practitioner. I will give you one quick example of many why central to

the management of the enormous complexity of these institutions is the use of complex derivatives, which manage the interest rate risk inherent in these portfolios. Fannie and Freddie are the world's biggest users of derivatives for this risk management purpose. Understanding how these work, the risks that are inherent in them, and how it affects the broader capital markets is absolutely essential. Yet in December 2011, MEL WATT said this. I quote Congressman WATT:

For all of the last term of Congress, I sat in the Financial Services Committee, and a lot of these arguments that I am hearing today are the same arguments that I heard about derivatives. Well, I didn't know a damn thing about derivatives. I am still not sure I do.

Derivatives are central to the management of these institutions.

There is another reason why this statute insists on an experienced practitioner and a technocrat rather than a politician, and that is because pursuing a political agenda at these institutions is enormously dangerous. Look at the damage that it did the last time. Congressman WATT was an advocate for all of the policies that helped to drive Fannie and Freddie into the conservatorship that cost taxpayers so much money. He supported lower capital standards, lower downpayments, lower underwriting standards, loan forgiveness. He was opposed to tougher regulations, even when it was becoming clear that these institutions were on a downward spiral and soon would need a massive bailout.

Unfortunately, Congressman WATT still supports these policies. And if he were confirmed as the Director, with all of these powers, he could unilaterally reinstitute these policies.

Now, fortunately, at the moment, we have a Director who understands that his obligation to the taxpayer precludes these misguided policies. I am deeply concerned that if confirmed, Congressman WATT would reverse that practice and reinstitute some of these very damaging and dangerous policies.

So for these reasons and, I would say, in respect and in honoring the clear language of the statute, we have an obligation to not confirm Congressman MEL WATT. While I know he is a very good man, I think he is the wrong person for this job. So I would urge my colleagues to vote no on cloture later today.

I yield the floor.

THE NOMINATION OF MEL WATTS

• Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, while not many people know about the Federal Housing Finance Agency, it has become one of the most powerful and important government agencies. Following the financial crisis and massive bailouts of Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and all the big banks, the Federal Government took a primary position in the mortgage market. Right now, 48 per-

cent of all outstanding U.S. mortgages and 77 percent of those issued last year were guaranteed by the Federal Government. This is a problem in and of itself, but the FHFA is the agency that oversees all of them.

MEL WATTS is the guy President Obama has nominated to lead the agency. I know MEL from my time both in the House and the Senate, and I am deeply concerned that he will push the Federal Government further into the mortgage business, instead of moving us away from it. He has shown his colors during his time here in Washington, and he is not the right guy to lead the agency. I am opposed to his nomination and urge my colleagues to oppose him.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to any motion to invoke cloture on nominees to the D.C. Circuit. I am somewhat disappointed that the Senate majority wants to turn to a very controversial nomination next rather than to continue on a path of cooperative confirmations or other important Senate business. It seems to me that scheduling such a controversial vote in the closing weeks of this session of Congress is designed simply to heat up the partisanship of judicial nominations.

My opposition is based on a number of factors.

First, an objective review of the court's workload makes clear that the workload simply does not justify adding additional judges, particularly when additional judgeships cost approximately \$1 million—\$1 million—every year per judge.

Second, given that the caseload does not justify additional judges, you have to ask why the President would push so hard to fill these seats. It appears clear that the President wishes to add additional judges to this court in order to change judicial outcomes.

Third, the court is currently comprised of four active judges appointed by a Republican President and four active judges appointed by a Democratic President. There is no reason to upset the current makeup of the court, particularly when the reason for doing so appears to be ideologically driven.

I will start by providing my colleagues with a little bit of history regarding this particular seat on the D.C. Circuit.

It may come as a surprise to some, but this seat has been vacant for over 8 years. It became vacant in September 2005, when John Roberts was elevated to Chief Justice.

In June of 2006, President Bush nominated an eminently qualified individual for this seat, Peter Keisler. Mr. Keisler was widely lauded as a consensus bipartisan nominee. His distinguished record of public service included service as Acting Attorney Gen-

eral. Despite his broad bipartisan support and qualifications, Mr. Keisler waited 918 days for a committee vote. The vote never happened.

When he was nominated, Democrats objected to even holding a hearing for the nominee based upon concerns about the workload of the D.C. Circuit.

First, I would like to remind my colleagues that in 2006 Democrats argued that the D.C. Circuit caseload was too light to justify confirming any additional judges to the bench. Since that time, do you know what happened. The caseload has continued to decrease.

In terms of raw numbers, the D.C. Circuit has the lowest number of total appeals filed annually among all the circuit courts of appeals. In 2005 that number was 1,379. Last year it was 1,193—a decrease of 13.5 percent.

There are a lot of different ways to look at these numbers, but perhaps the best numbers to examine are the workload per active judge. The caseload has decreased so much since 2005 that even with two fewer active judges, the filing levels per active judge are practically the same. In 2005, with 10 active judges, the court had 138 appeals filed per active judge. Today, with only 8 active judges, it has 149. This makes the D.C. Circuit caseload levels the lowest in the Nation and less than half the national average.

It has been suggested that there are other circuits, namely the Eighth and the Tenth, that have lighter caseloads than the D.C. Circuit. That is inaccurate. The D.C. Circuit has fewer cases filed and fewer cases terminated than either the Eighth or the Tenth Circuit.

Cases filed and cases terminated measure the amount of appeals coming into the court and being resolved. Some of my colleagues have been arguing that the Eighth and the Tenth Circuits are similar to the D.C. Circuit based upon the comparison of pending cases. But cases pending does not measure how many cases are being added and removed from the docket.

When looking at how many cases are added or filed per active judge, the D.C. Circuit is the lowest with 149. It is lower than the Eighth Circuit's 280 and the Tenth Circuit's 217. When looking at the number of cases being terminated by each court, the D.C. Circuit is once again the lowest at 149. Again, the Eighth Circuit and the Tenth Circuit courts are much higher at 269 and 218.

Let me mention one other important point about pending appeals and the statistics my colleagues use. Several of my colleagues said on the floor yesterday that in 2005 there were only 121 pending appeals per active judge. That number seemed a little odd to me, so we looked into it a bit further, what the situation was in 2005. In order to arrive at that number, my colleagues appear to be taking the total appeals for 12 months ending June 30, 2005, and dividing them by 11 active judges.

As it turns out, there were only 9 active judges for almost that entire 12-month period. Janice Rogers Brown was sworn in on June 10, 2005, and Judge Griffith was sworn in June 29, 2005. As a result, during that 12-month period there were 10 active judges for a total of only 19 days. There were 11 active judges on the D.C. Circuit for a grand total of 1 day.

A few months later in 2005, the court was back down to nine after Judge Roberts was elevated to the Supreme Court and Judge Edwards took senior status.

This is how hard pressed the other side is to refute what everyone knows to be true: The caseload of the D.C. Circuit is lower now than it was back in 2005. In order to have a statistic that supports their judgment, the other side is claiming there were 11 active judges for that 12-month period, while that claim was true for only a total of 1 day.

The bottom line is this: The objective data clearly indicates the D.C. Circuit caseload is very low and that the court does not need additional active judges. That is especially true if you use the standard Senate Democrats established when they blocked Mr. Keisler.

In addition to the raw numbers, in order to get a firsthand account, several months ago I invited the current judges of that court to provide a candid assessment of their caseload. What they said should not surprise anyone who has looked at this closely. The judges themselves confirmed that the workload on the D.C. Circuit is exceptionally low, stating, "The court does not need additional judges." And, "If any more judges were added now, there wouldn't be enough work to go around."

Those are powerful statements from the sitting judges in that circuit. Given these concerns, it is difficult to see why we would be moving forward with additional nominations, especially in a time when we are operating under budget constraints. Unfortunately, the justification for moving forward with additional D.C. Circuit nominees appears to be a desire and an intent to stack the court in order to determine the outcome of cases this court hears.

It is clear the President wants to fill this court with ideological allies for the purposes of reversing certain policy outcomes. This is not just my view. It has been overtly stated as an objective of this administration.

I would quote along this line a Washington Post article, "Giving liberals a greater say on the D.C. Circuit is important for Obama as he looks for ways to circumvent the Republican-led House and a polarized Senate on a number of policy fronts through executive order and other administrative procedures."

We have a President who says: If Congress will not, I will. How do you stop that? The courts are the check on

that. Even a member of the Democratic leadership admitted on the Senate floor that the reason they need to fill these seats was because, as he saw it, the D.C. Circuit was "wreaking havoc with the country."

This is perplexing, given the current makeup of the court. Currently, there are four Republican-appointed judges, and, with the most recent confirmation, there are now four Democratic-appointed judges. Apparently some on the other side want to make sure they get a favorable outcome of this court.

I have concerns regarding filling seats on this court which clearly has a very low caseload. I have greater concerns about this President's agenda to stack the court and to upset the current makeup simply in order to obtain favorable judicial outcomes because: If Congress will not, I will.

Given the overwhelming lack of a need to fill these seats based upon caseload and especially considering the cost to the taxpayers of over \$1 million per judge per year, I cannot support this nomination and urge my colleagues to reject it as well.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, since I was first elected, the Senate has considered more than 1700 nominations to Article III federal courts. In nearly every case, the focus was on the individual nominee and whether he or she was qualified for judicial service. The nominee before us today is one of the rare exceptions. The focus here is on the court to which she and two others have been nominated, the US Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. I cannot support any of these nominees because no one, no matter who they are and no matter what their qualifications, should be appointed to this court at this time.

It would be difficult to make a more compelling case that the D.C. Circuit needs no more judges. The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts is the keeper of the caseload facts and ranks the D.C. Circuit last among all circuits in appeals filed and appeals terminated per judicial panel. In fact, the AO ranks the D.C. Circuit last even in the catch-all category of "other caseload per judgeship." And Chief D.C. Circuit Judge Merrick Garland recently confirmed that the number of D.C. Circuit cases scheduled for oral argument has declined by almost 20 percent in the last decade.

Here is another way to look at this issue. In July 2006, Democrats on the Judiciary Committee signed a letter to then-Chairman Arlen Specter opposing more D.C. Circuit appointments for two reasons. First, they used specific caseload benchmarks to conclude that the court's caseload had declined. Second, they said that filling vacancies labeled judicial emergencies by the Judicial Conference was more important.

I am not aware that my Democratic colleagues on the Judiciary Committee

have said either that they used the wrong standard in 2006 or that their 2006 standard should not be used today. I do not want to accuse anyone of using different standards for nominees of different political parties, so it is fair to apply the same standard that Democrats used to oppose Republican D.C. Circuit nominees.

Democrats opposed more D.C. Circuit nominees because total appeals filed had declined. According to the AO's most recent data, total appeals filed have declined 18 percent further since 2006. Democrats opposed more D.C. Circuit nominees because written decisions per active judge had declined. The AO's data show that written decisions per active judge have declined 27 percent further since 2006. Democrats opposed more D.C. Circuit nominees because there were nominees to only 60 percent of the 20 existing judicial emergency vacancies. Today, the Senate has pending nominees to only 49 percent of the 37 current judicial emergency vacancies. These are the facts. New appeals filed and written decisions per active judge in the D.C. Circuit are both 76 percent below the national average and 50 to 60 percent below the next busiest circuit.

I hope that my colleagues get the point. No matter how you slice it or dice it, the D.C. Circuit has the lowest caseload of any circuit in the country and its caseload continues to decline. The very same standards that Democrats used to oppose Republican nominees to the D.C. Circuit in 2006 show conclusively that the court needs no more judges today. As I said, none of my Democratic colleagues—and 4 who signed that 2006 letter are on the Judiciary Committee today—have said they were wrong in 2006 or attempted to explain why their 2006 standard is inappropriate today.

The Senate evaluates the vast majority of judicial nominees on their own merits. These current D.C. Circuit nominees are the rare exception because they have been chosen for a court that needs no more judges at all. The better course would be to enact S. 699, the Court Efficiency Act, which would move two of these unnecessary D.C. Circuit seats to circuits that need them.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING THE BOSTON RED SOX

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, before I start, I want to recognize the Boston Red Sox team for an outstanding historic season and to congratulate Red

Sox Nation on their third World Series Championship in 10 years. Go Sox.

The Red Sox mean so much to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and to our communities throughout New England, particularly this year. They have been a symbol of Boston's strength and resilience. From their historic one-season turnaround to their win in front of the Fenway faithful for the first time since 1918, to their scruffy beards, this team will be remembered forever for its heart and for its success. Like all of us in Massachusetts, they have shown what it means to be Boston strong.

I also want to congratulate the St. Louis Cardinals on their 97-win season and their extraordinary achievement for winning 4 pennants in 10 years. Really amazing.

I am honored every day to represent the people of Massachusetts and the values we stand for. I am especially proud to congratulate the Red Sox today.

Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of Congressman MEL WATT's nomination to serve as the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

In many areas of Massachusetts and around the country, housing markets have recovered, but in too many other areas the housing market is plagued by underwater mortgages and foreclosures. A wounded housing market continues to drag down our economy and it leaves millions of families struggling to rebuild economic security.

One of the people who can make an important difference in helping the housing market back to full health is the Director of FHFA. The FHFA oversees Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Between them, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac back the vast majority of mortgages in the country, which means right now the FHFA has enormous influence over the American housing market.

The FHFA has the tools to help homeowners who continue to struggle following the 2008 financial crisis. It has the tools to help accelerate our economic recovery. For 4 years now, the FHFA has been led by an acting director. The time has come for some permanence and for some certainty. It is time for the FHFA to have a director, and Congressman MEL WATT is the right man for the job.

He has decades of relevant experience. He spent 22 years as a practicing lawyer, working with middle-income and lower income families on real estate closings and other housing issues. He then spent the next 21 years in Congress as a member of the House Financial Services Committee where he dealt firsthand with housing finance as a policymaker.

When it comes to housing, Congressman WATT has seen it all. Congressman WATT has shown good judgment throughout it all. Several years before

the housing market collapse in 2008, Congressman WATT introduced the Prohibit Predatory Lending Act in an effort to stop mortgage lenders from taking advantage of homebuyers. The act would have helped Congress address the underlying cause of the financial crisis by making it harder for lenders to push families toward mortgages they could not repay and too often did not understand.

After that crisis hit, MEL built on his earlier legislation to craft laws that reduced risky mortgage lending and gave homeowners additional protection. Congressman WATT has worked hard to level the playing field for consumers. But he is no ideologue. I have worked with him for many years now. I have seen firsthand that he is a thoughtful policymaker. He can see problems coming, and when he does he seeks common ground and works hard to develop real solutions.

As Congress looks at ways to fix Freddie and Fannie to steady the housing market, Congressman WATT's practical approach is exactly what FHFA needs. The people who know him best, the Senators from his home State of North Carolina, the business leaders in his congressional district in Charlotte, support his nomination without reservation.

So what I want to know is this: Why would anyone in Congress try to block MEL from receiving a simple up-or-down vote? Why would they not want strong leadership in an agency that has been thrust into such a critical role in the economy? It does not make sense, not to the people who know MEL and not to the people who want to put this economy back on track.

MEL's work will help restore the housing market, help lift the economy, and most of all, help strengthen America's families.

It is time for obstruction for obstruction's sake to end, and it is time for the Senate to move forward with an up-or-down vote to confirm Congressman WATT so that he can get to work at the FHFA serving the American people.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF PATRICIA ANN MILLETT TO THE D.C. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to say a few words about the appointment of Patricia Millett to the D.C. Circuit. The D.C. Circuit is an 11-member appellate court that hears some of the greatest and most serious administrative appeals in this country.

Most of them are complicated, somewhat convoluted, and they do take serious expertise.

The court is an 11-member court. It currently has eight members. Three of the eight are women, and there are three vacancies on the court. Patricia Millett has been nominated by the President to fill one of those vacancies. What is interesting about this debate is that no one questions her qualifications or her temperament. She graduated summa cum laude from the University of Illinois in 1985 and magna cum laude from Harvard Law School in 1988. Even Senator CRUZ from Texas has pointed out how superbly qualified she is. Yet there is a good chance that there will not be the votes to allow us to proceed to a vote on her qualifications and therefore confirm the nomination.

I wish to state some of her qualifications. She clerked for Judge Thomas Tang on the Ninth Circuit in Phoenix, AZ, for 2 years. She worked in the Solicitor General's office for 11 years, in the Justice Department's civil Appellate Section for 4 years. She leads the Supreme Court and appellate practice at the law firm Akin Gump. She has argued 32 cases in the Supreme Court, placing her in the top 10 of all attorneys from 2000 to 2012. She has also argued dozens of cases in other appellate courts.

She is known as a superb appellate lawyer. She is known as someone with sterling qualifications, and she has received the unanimous rating of "well qualified" from the ABA—the highest rating the ABA gives. She has received numerous awards from the Department of Justice and strong support across the aisle, including from all three Solicitors General who served in the Bush administration. She is not only an outstanding lawyer, she is also an exceptional person with a work ethic, a morality, and a history of faithful service that is truly admirable.

She is the mother of two children, David and Elizabeth. She earned a black belt in Tae Kwon Do after taking classes with her husband and their children. I am not sure how important that is, but I assume she is physically very fit.

She is a military spouse. Her husband Bob served in the Navy and the Navy Reserve until his retirement in 2012, and he was deployed to Kuwait in 2004.

Anyone who has read the *Bars and Stripes* article on her cannot but look at this woman and say she is the model American woman. Yet we may not even be able to vote on her today.

During that time, Patricia was also one of so many military spouses who shouldered the burden of parenting while her husband was overseas. She understands the sacrifices military families make to keep our country safe. "Pattie did the job of two parents while Bob was away. . . . During Bob's

nine-month deployment [to Kuwait], Pattie was still working at the Solicitor General's office and handling a heavy Supreme Court caseload," which is very special if one thinks about what it means. "She argued one Supreme Court case and briefed five more while juggling her solo-parenting duties." According to this article, Tom Goldstein, a distinguished appellate practitioner and the founder of the popular scotus Web site, said "Through it all, he never saw Pattie complain about these sacrifices for her country."

She has also made a long-time commitment to work on behalf of the homeless. The Bars and Stripes article says:

The project most near and dear to Pattie's heart is Mondloch House, a group of homeless shelters and individuals that Pattie has been involved with for many years. Each week, Pattie coordinates fruit and vegetable deliveries . . . to make sure the shelters have fresh produce.

Judge Thomas Ambro of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals said it best:

Pattie is a really good human being. And, as everyone knows, she's in the first rank of appellate practitioners in this country. She combines talent, hard work, judgment, and focus; she's the complete package.

The question is, Why is there opposition to this nomination? Some on the Republican side have said the D.C. Circuit, which today has eight judges and three vacancies, doesn't need any new judges. They said President Obama is trying to pack the court. I disagree. Only 7 or 8 years ago my Republican colleagues were arguing to confirm President Bush's nominees to fill vacancies on the 9th seat, the 10th seat, and the 11th seat on the D.C. Circuit. They even threatened to invoke the nuclear option to fill these seats. The caseload isn't much different than it was then. In fact, it is greater in some measures today. The number of pending appeals per active judge on the D.C. Circuit is greater than the number when all four of President Bush's D.C. Circuit nominees were confirmed. In addition, while the raw filings per active judge are lower on the D.C. Circuit than some other circuits, there is good reason for that. The D.C. Circuit's caseload is different because of the substantial docket of complex administrative agency appeals.

In fact, statistics published by the Judicial Conference of the United States show that—without counting immigration appeals—43 percent of D.C. Circuit cases were administrative appeals. The average in all other circuits combined is only 1.7 percent. That is a huge difference.

If you look at the published opinions from the first six months of this year, the D.C. Circuit's published cases took just as long—and in many cases longer—than did the published decisions of many other circuits. The median time from filing to disposition is 11.8 months—28 percent above average among the circuits.

And, many of those D.C. Circuit cases involved highly complex administrative appeals with important questions of Federal law and regulation.

Chief Justice Roberts wrote about this in a 2006 law review article called *What Makes the D.C. Circuit Different?* He cited the Court's jurisdiction to review decisions of numerous important agencies, such as the FCC, the EPA, the NLRB, the FTC, and the FAA. And he wrote: "Whatever combination of letters you can put together, it is likely that jurisdiction to review that agency's decision is vested in the Circuit."

And, as former D.C. Circuit Judge Patricia Wald wrote in the *Washington Post*, "These cases can require thousands of hours of preparation by the judges, often consuming days of argument, involving hundreds of parties and interveners, and necessitating dozens of briefs and thousands of pages of record—all of which culminates in lengthy, technically intricate legal opinions."

So, the caseload does support the confirmation of new judges to the D.C. Circuit.

I would also like to take a moment to address this notion of "court packing," a term that originated with a plan by President Franklin Roosevelt to authorize new seats on the Supreme Court when he was not getting decisions he favored.

This is not about creating new seats. This is about filling seats that exist, seats that have been authorized by Congress for many years, seats that the Judicial Conference continues to recommend be filled, and seats that my Republican colleagues pushed to fill not so many years ago. This is not "court packing."

Now, I remember how the D.C. Circuit looked after President Bush's last appointee was confirmed in 2006. The Court had seven Republican appointees and three Democratic appointees. Other circuits were similarly lopsided as well. Some might see that as packing the courts.

But I do not see it that way. A President must do his or her job making nominations to ensure that the judicial business of the American people gets done over time, long after that President leaves office. That is how our system works.

I supported two of President Bush's D.C. Circuit nominees, John Roberts and Thomas Griffith, and I supported cloture on a third, Brett Kavanaugh. I supported other controversial Bush circuit court nominees, sometimes to the chagrin of many on my own side. I did so because I believed those nominees were qualified and could be fair. I believe very deeply that the judiciary is too important to play partisan games with. That is exactly what is going on. Why should I continue, as a member of the Judiciary Committee with the sec-

ond most seniority, when the administration changes, to step out and support any new Republican's nominees? I have done it in the past. I hoped to break this deadlock of partisanship. I had hoped we could vote when a nominee is qualified regardless of party. This nominee, if a motion to close off debate is not granted, shows me that the atmosphere is such that this can never be the case and that I, as someone on the Judiciary Committee who has been willing to cross party lines to vote for a qualified nominee, should cease and desist in this regard. That is the message of this nominee to me.

Think of this woman and her history: Army wife, mother of two, appellate lawyer, Solicitor General's office, and the tenth greatest number of Supreme Court appearances in the last 12 years. She is going to be denied, and no one has cast any blemish on her academic ability or her moral ethic. So the only thing I am left with is intense partisanship.

Please, let there be some Republicans who want to change the nature of this place and begin that change with the recognition that we have a superior woman. In a country where the majority of people are women, the number of women on this court is in the minority, and there is a need for bright, informed, legal talent. This woman is one of them. I hope she will survive cloture.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from Bars and Stripes be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Bars and Stripes, Oct. 21, 2013]

FAITH & FAMILY: THE CENTER OF A MILITARY SPOUSE D.C. CIRCUIT NOMINEE

(By Reda Hicks)

Patricia Millett (Pattie to her friends) is the complete package. From the beginning of her career, Pattie had all the markings of a legal rock star. Top of her classes at University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and Harvard Law School. Prestigious clerkship for the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Appellate staff of the Department of Justice Civil Division. Assistant to the Solicitor General, serving equal time under Presidents Bush and Clinton. Head of Akin Gump's Supreme Court practice. More than 30 cases argued before the Supreme Court. Sky-high stack of professional accolades. "Unanimously Well Qualified" ABA Rating. Seven Solicitors General support her nomination to the D.C. Circuit.

But somewhere in that rocket-propelled career, Pattie fell in love with a Sailor. And became a mom. And earned a black belt. All while living a genuine, intentional, faith-based life of success. And these qualities and experiences, even more than her legal fame, are what make her the complete package.

Her long-time friend and fellow appellate attorney Tom Goldstein knows that all too well: "Pattie is an outstanding talent, an incredibly hard worker, and the best legal writer I have ever had the good fortune to work with. But her success comes from a complete commitment to a core set of values, to family, God, and country that really drive all of her decisions."

Pattie met Bob King in 1995, in Washington, D.C., while he was serving at the Pentagon in the U.S. Navy. They met at a Washington Street United Methodist Church singles event Bob reluctantly attended at the urging of his roommate. Bob knew right away that Pattie was the one; he felt like they had been together forever because their core values were so in step from the very beginning. Bob and Pattie were married a year later in June 1996, in the same church where they had first met.

Three years later, when it looked like Bob's next assignment would send him far from Pattie, they made the decision that Bob would transition to the Navy Reserves, where he served until his retirement in 2012. Commitment to family is a top priority for Bob and Pattie, who work together to make their children David and Elizabeth the center of their lives.

Like so many other military spouses, Pattie did the job of two parents while Bob was away on reserve duty, and eventually in 2004 he was called on to deploy. "It was really hard for her, working sixty hour weeks and keeping our family together in my absence with a three-year-old and six-year-old to handle at home," he says. "But she did an amazing job!"

During Bob's nine-month deployment, Pattie was still working at the Solicitor General's office and handled a heavy Supreme Court caseload. She argued one Supreme Court case and briefed five more while juggling her solo-parenting duties. Tom Goldstein says through it all, he never saw Pattie complain about these sacrifices for her country.

"She was proud of Bob's service, and was completely committed to her family as her first priority." Pattie might have made it look easy, but her associate Hyland Hunt knows differently. Hyland, also a military spouse, has been working with Pattie at Akin Gump for two years.

"Pattie has been a tremendous encouragement to me," says Hyland. "Other things pulling at us can sometimes make it very hard to focus on work, but watching Pattie helps me know that it can be done." But it doesn't just happen. "If Pattie has taught me anything, it's that you have to live intentionally in each part of your life."

Pattie served as a mentor for Hyland on the law, but has also been a sounding board as she navigates the difficult choices military spouses have to make when balancing career and a spouse's military service. Helping others is a practice familiar to those who know her, as Pattie is held in high esteem as much for being a good person as for being a good lawyer.

"Pattie is a really good human being," says Judge Thomas Ambro of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. "And, as everyone knows, she's in the first rank of appellate practitioners in this country." Judge Ambro met Pattie in 2000, when a friend suggested she would make a good addition to an appellate panel he was working on. The success of the first panel led to many more, and Pattie now speaks to Judge Ambro's Georgetown undergraduates each year about how to manage all of the things tugging at their time and balance. It's a message that really resonates with them.

"[She] combines talent, hard work, judgment, and focus; she's the complete package," Judge Ambro notes. "And she does it all without being nasty."

"The thing that amazes me, knowing how much stress she is under, is that she is incredibly kind and unfailingly humble and

gracious," says associate Hyland Hunt. "You never hear her snap at opposing counsel. She keeps an equanimity that is remarkable."

For Pattie, this kindness goes hand in hand with her and Bob's core principles. From that first fateful day when Bob and Pattie met at Washington Street United Methodist, they have been committed to putting service and faith at the center of their family.

"We firmly believe that we are here to serve," Bob says, "and we are very intentional about teaching that to our children." Today, the whole family is involved in various ministries. David worked on the Highland Support Project in Guatemala, bringing running water to remote areas. Elizabeth's service started when she raised \$1,800 selling lemonade to raise money for children living in a garbage dump in Cambodia. And both kids have been on mission trips to West Virginia, where they worked with the Jeremiah Project to help repair and rebuild low-income housing. Next summer, says Bob, they are very excited to be going on a mission trip together for the first time, working with the White Mountain Apache Tribe in Ft. Apache, Arizona.

The project most near and dear to Pattie's heart is Mondloch House, a group of homeless shelters for families and individuals that Pattie has been involved with for many years. Each week, Pattie coordinates fruit and vegetable deliveries, organizing volunteers for pick-ups and drop-offs to make sure the shelters have fresh produce to serve. Hyland Hunt says Pattie's family has a well-known tradition of serving dinners together at one of the homes, called Hypothermia Shelter.

Pattie, Bob, and the kids love to do things together. In fact, Bob says spending time, all four of them together, is Pattie's favorite thing to do. That's why, many years ago when their daughter joined her older brother in taekwondo lessons, Bob and Pattie decided to start taking lessons, too.

"We wanted something to do together that was active," says Bob. "It is a fun family activity, but it also teaches each of us basic self-defense skills, which are very important." Now, all four of them are black belts; in fact, Pattie is a second degree black belt, surpassing her husband and nearly catching up to her son David's third degree belt.

Pattie's colleagues say unequivocally that her passion for the law takes a backseat to her husband and their two children. Maintaining balance between family and a demanding legal field is probably also one of her greatest career challenges. But she has a champion in her biggest fan, her husband.

"Seventeen years is no short amount of time, but I have loved every minute with her," he says. "She still amazes me with how she can juggle everything and keep her sanity."

From her very first Supreme Court argument, Bob wanted to be in the gallery cheering Pattie on. But Pattie refused. "I don't want you to see me crash and burn!" she would say, although Bob knew that she certainly would not.

It took Bob five years to convince Pattie to let him come watch her argue, and when she finally agreed, Bob was blown away. Now, Bob goes to watch her every chance he gets. "I've seen four or five arguments now, and I'm just amazed every time because you have to be so fast on your feet! I could never do that. She's one of the best! I know I'm not objective on that, but it's true!"

Watching Pattie before the Supreme Court, Bob says it is clear she has earned the re-

spect of the Justices. "They know what they will get when Pattie comes before them, because she is always prepared." That might be an understatement.

Before an argument, Pattie spends weeks studying the record, going through moot court arguments until she knows her case inside and out. Tom Goldstein calls Pattie a "ferocious preparer, committed to leaving no stone unturned, and thinking of every possible nuance and counter argument to the counter argument." Says Hyland Hunt, "It always amazes me how she can digest and know the record," but Pattie's is the kind of knowledge that comes from plain and simple diligence.

Pattie's hard work, focus, and tenacity have made her a great advocate. Her kindness, wisdom and graciousness have made her a highly respected professional. But her strong center, built on family, faith, and service make her the complete package.

Military spouses forging their own careers can learn a lot from Pattie's example. Whatever our professional pursuits, true success starts at the core; build a strong one, then hold on to it tightly.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I will be opposing cloture on the nominations of Melvin Watt to be the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency and Patricia Millett to be a U.S. circuit court judge for the District of Columbia Circuit. I do so because I believe that neither candidate should be affirmed by the Senate at this time.

I have been privileged many times to be a part of groups of Senators who were able to come together and negotiate agreements to end the gridlock surrounding nominees, avert the nuclear option, and allow the Senate to move forward with our work on behalf of the American people. My work in these groups—often referred to as "gangs"—has won me both praise and condemnation and has often put me at odds with my party.

In 2005 when the Republicans were in the majority and we were about to exercise a nuclear option on President Bush's judicial nominees who were being filibustered by the other side that was in the minority, part of the agreement addressed future nominees, an agreement which has held all these years. I quote from the agreement:

Signatories will exercise their responsibilities under the Advice and Consent Clause of the United States Constitution in good faith. Nominees should only be filibustered under extraordinary circumstances, and each signatory must use his or her own discretion and judgment in determining whether such circumstances exist.

As to both of the nominees we are considering today, I find and it is my judgment as a Senator that extraordinary conditions exist. The agreements I have entered into, including to begin on the motion to proceed, including last July on the NLRB nominations, have all included preserving the right of individual Senators to exercise their rights.

If we go to the nuclear option—which I understand some of my colleagues are now frustrated to the point where they would like to—meaning that 51 votes will now determine either nominees or other rules of the Senate, we will destroy the very fabric of the Senate; that is, that it requires a larger than numerical majority in order to govern.

I understand the frustration of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. It is interesting that well over half of my colleagues in the Senate have been here less than 6 or 7 years. The majority of my friends on the other side have not been in the minority. The majority of my colleagues on this side have not been in the majority. I have been in both. When this side was in the majority, I watched how out of frustration we wanted to curtail the 60-vote criteria and go to 51 because we were frustrated over the appointment of judges. That was back in 2005. I watched my colleagues on the other side want to go to 51 votes because of their frustration over the motion to proceed. I have watched and understand the frustration the majority feels because they feel it is their obligation to make this body function efficiently.

The truth is, this body does not function efficiently nor was it particularly designed to. Is there more gridlock than there used to be? In many respects, yes. And I believe with all my heart that what we just did to the American people in the shutdown of the government may motivate colleagues of mine on this side as well as the other side not to do this kind of thing again. Our approval rating with the American people has sunk to all-time lows and they are going to see another expression of gridlock when we take these votes today. But the cure is going to have repercussions for generations to come in this body.

There is no reason to have a House and Senate if we go to a simple 51-vote rule in this body. My colleagues should understand that someday—someday—this side of the aisle will be in the majority and this side of the aisle will feel frustration, as we did once before when we were in the majority because of blockage from the other side of the aisle.

I urge patience on the part of the majority leader. I urge patience on the part of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Most of all I urge the kind of comity between leadership on both sides and individuals on both sides.

I see the Senator from Virginia is here, and he has been one who has worked very hard to engender that in this body. Can't we work some of these things out without having a showdown on this floor every single time?

This dispute won't affect the American people. What we just did in the shutdown certainly injured the lives and well-being of millions of innocent Americans. Maybe we have learned

from that, but I urge my colleagues to understand the votes being taken on these two issues are in keeping with the agreement I joined in with 13 of my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, back in 2005. That agreement stated that "signatories"—those who made the agreement—"will exercise their responsibilities under the advice and consent clause of the United States Constitution in good faith."

In good faith. I am acting, with my vote, in good faith.

I see my friend the majority leader on the floor of the Senate, and I hope he understands this action is being taken in good faith. But I also understand the frustration my friend the majority leader feels. So I urge my colleagues, when we get through this, to sit down, have some more conversations and negotiations so we can avoid this kind of cliff experience which has earned us the strong, profound, and well-justified disapproval of the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, very briefly, I want to respond to my friend from Arizona.

I have worked with the senior Senator from Arizona on many things over these many years we have been in Congress together, and I heard what he said. I appreciate his suggesting we have a conversation about what is going to happen in the next couple of days and I am always willing to do that.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I also to want speak to the judicial nomination, but I want to first respond as well to the Senator from Arizona. Let me first of all say there are few people in this body I have more respect for, and there are few people in this body who have time and again shown the political courage he has to put country ahead of party. I share a lot of his views. It is odd, but I feel sometimes that I work in the only place in America where being a gang member is considered a good thing.

I have not served here during these times when my party was in the minority, and intellectually I understand Senator MCCAIN's point, but I guess what I can't understand and what I can't explain to the folks all across Virginia when they ask me: Why can't you guys get anything done, is that on any historical basis, looking at the number of times these procedures have been used in the past—and clearly they have been used by both parties—it seems at some point, while the rights of the minority need to be protected, there has to be some level of common agreement for not exercising these tools to the extent they have been so that this institution becomes so dys-

functional we allow ourselves to do something that in my tenure both in public and private life was never as stupid as what we did during the first 3 weeks of October.

So I do appreciate the Senator's comments. And although I now want to speak to the extraordinary qualifications of Patricia Millett, someone from Virginia, I wanted to state that I believe in the Senator's good faith and I also hope we can avoid the kind of further breakdown that would further disappoint the American people. I thank him for his comments.

I do want to take a couple of moments to talk about something other Senators have come out to speak on, and that is the nomination the President has made of a fellow Virginian, Patricia Millett, to be part of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.

I have had the opportunity as Governor to appoint people to the bench, and I took that responsibility very seriously in terms of reviewing the qualifications of the candidates. I had the opportunity as a Senator to recommend individuals to the courts for the President's consideration, and I can't think of a candidate who brings more qualifications, more evidence of bipartisan support, more deserving of appointment, than Patricia Millett.

We all know the D.C. Circuit plays an incredibly important role in our judicial system. We also know the court currently has 3 of its 11 seats vacant. I recognize that in the past this court has been the focus of some debate and discussion, but the idea that we are going to somehow change the rules midstream seems inappropriate. If there is a legislative reason why we should change the D.C. Circuit Court from 11 to some fewer number of judges, that ought to be fully debated, but we should not hold up the confirmation of an individual whose credentials I believe are impeccable.

Ms. Millett currently chairs the Supreme Court practice at Akin Gump. She went to the University of Illinois and Harvard Law School. She clerked on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and she worked on the appellate staff of the civil division of the U.S. Department of Justice.

She has spent over a decade in the U.S. Solicitor General's office, serving both Democratic and Republican administrations. During her time there she was awarded the Attorney General's Distinguished Service Award, and as has been mentioned by my other colleagues, during her career she has argued 32 times before the Supreme Court, which until recently was the highest number of cases argued by any woman in our history.

What is also remarkable—and the Senator from Arizona mentioned we need to move past some of these partisan divisions—is that this is an individual who is supported by both Democrats and Republicans.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter indicating that support.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 3, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Dirksen Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, Dirksen Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: We are former Solicitors General of the United States, and we write in support of the nomination of Patricia Millett for a seat on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Each of us has substantial first-hand knowledge of Ms. Millett's professional skills and personal integrity. It is our uniform view that she is supremely qualified for this important position.

Ms. Millett served for 15 years in the United States Department of Justice—first as an appellate attorney in the Civil Division during the George H. W. Bush Administration and then for 11 years in the Solicitor General's office, during the Clinton and George W. Bush Administrations. Since leaving the Department, she has co-led and then led the Supreme Court practice at Akin Gump. Over the course of her distinguished career, Ms. Millett has argued 32 cases in the Supreme Court and many more in the courts of appeals—in matters that span a broad range of federal-law issues, from constitutional challenges to administrative review, statutory-interpretation disputes, and commercial and criminal law questions. With deep experience in both private and government practice, she will bring an appreciation of both sides of the many important disputes before the District of Columbia Circuit.

Within the Bar, Ms. Millett has been a leader among her peers, and a mentor to many other lawyers, through her teaching visits to law schools and her work with a number of professional associations, including the Coke Appellate Inn of Court, the Supreme Court Institute, and the Opperman Institute for Judicial Administration.

Ms. Millett has a brilliant mind, a gift for clear, persuasive writing, and a genuine zeal for the rule of law. Equally important, she is unfailingly fair-minded.

We understand there is an ongoing debate about the optimal number of active judges for the District of Columbia Circuit, and this letter takes no position on that issue. But if additional judges are to be confirmed, we think Ms. Millett's qualifications and character make her ideally suited for a position on that distinguished Court. Please do not hesitate to contact any of us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

KENNETH W. STARR,
(Solicitor General, 1989–1993).

DREW S. DAYS III,
(Solicitor General, 1993–1996).

WALTER E. DELLINGER,
(Acting Solicitor General, 1996–1997).

SETH P. WAXMAN,
(Solicitor General, 1997–2001).

THEODORE B. OLSON,

(Solicitor General, 2001–2004).

PAUL D. CLEMENT,
(Solicitor General, 2005–2008).

GREGORY G. GARRE,
(Solicitor General, 2008–2009).

Mr. WARNER. Ms. Millett served seven former Solicitors General from all ends of the political spectrum. In the letter I just referred to, her nomination is supported by Democrats such as Walter Dellinger as well as Republicans such as Ted Olson and Ken Starr.

She has also been recognized by the National Law Journal as one of the hundred most influential lawyers in America, and has received the endorsement of the American Bar Association.

As mentioned by the Senator from California already, she has a remarkable personal story as well. She is active in our community in Virginia, she is a resident, and actually attends church in my home city of Alexandria. We saw earlier the picture of her and her husband, and as was mentioned before a picture is worth a thousand words. Her husband was deployed a number of times as a naval reservist in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and earlier this month the Military Spouse J.D. Network recognized Ms. Millett for her professional service and for her service as a spouse of an Active-Duty participant.

So this incredible lawyer, this incredible community servant, this individual who has the support of both Republicans and Democrats, should not be denied her appointment to the D.C. Circuit.

Again, I have not been here when we were in the minority, but as has been mentioned time and again, when John Roberts—who is now, obviously, our Supreme Court Chief Justice—was nominated for the D.C. Circuit, he was confirmed unanimously. Even though many Democrats did not share his judicial views, they viewed his qualifications as impeccable.

I heard constantly the same from my colleagues on the other side, that this is not a question of Ms. Millett's qualifications. Why should this individual be denied her appropriate representation on the D.C. Court of Appeals? So I hope, my colleagues, that we can avoid further threats and counterthreats. Let's vote this individual based upon her qualifications. On any indication of qualifications, Patricia Millett is ably qualified, uniquely qualified to serve on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, and I urge my colleagues to vote for her confirmation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I strongly support the nomination of Pattie Millett, of Alexandria, VA, to the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. Ms. Millett is extremely well qualified for this position, in

terms of her legal expertise, experience, character, and integrity. The Senate should invoke cloture on and confirm her nomination.

As one of the Nation's leading appellate lawyers, Ms. Millett possesses remarkable legal expertise in this area. She has litigated appellate cases extensively, including 32 arguments and many briefs before the U.S. Supreme Court, and 35 arguments spanning 12 of the Federal Circuit Courts of Appeal (including the D.C. Circuit). Her cases have spanned the spectrum of legal issues that the D.C. Circuit confronts, including constitutional law, administrative law, civil and criminal procedure, commercial disputes, national security, and civil rights. Ms. Millett also has many years of experience in the public sector, having worked in the Office of the Solicitor General for over 11 years, and in the Appellate Section, Civil Division of the Department of Justice for 4 years. It's important to note that her service to the United States was bipartisan, spanning both Democratic and Republican administrations.

Ms. Millett graduated from Harvard Law School, magna cum laude, in 1988 and she clerked for the Honorable Thomas Tang of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit for 2 years.

I believe Ms. Millett possesses the character and integrity necessary for a nomination of this caliber. She is an active member of Aldersgate United Methodist Church, where she teaches Sunday school and visits the hospitalized and home-bound. For many years she has also participated in the Hypothermia Homeless Shelter, which operates during the winter months on the Route 1 corridor in Alexandria, preparing meals.

As a military spouse, Ms. Millett and her family have also sacrificed for our Nation. Ms. Millett's husband was deployed during Operation Iraqi Freedom, so she brings a unique understanding of veterans' issues and the stress of deployment on soldiers and their families.

I know there have been issues raised regarding the caseload for the D.C. Circuit. These issues do not concern me. With respect to the size of the D.C. Circuit, Congress removed a seat under the Court Security Improvement Act of 2007. Today, three of the D.C. Circuit's eleven existing seats are vacant. And three other circuits currently have lower caseloads per active judge than the D.C. Circuit. Yet, just this year, the Senate confirmed nominees to two of these other circuit courts—the Eighth and Tenth Circuit.

As Governor of Virginia, I chose two members of the Supreme Court of Virginia and have thought deeply about qualities that make for a strong appellate judge. I believe Ms. Millett is superbly qualified for a position on the

D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. I hope the Senate invokes cloture on her nomination today, and that she is confirmed for a position on the D.C. Circuit.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr President, I wish to speak briefly about an outstanding candidate nominated to serve on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. On June 4, 2013, President Obama nominated Patricia Millett to be a United States Circuit Judge.

Patricia's qualifications to be a United States Circuit Judge are impeccable. She is a graduate of Harvard Law School and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Patricia practiced at Miller & Chevalier and worked as a law clerk for Judge Thomas Tang, on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Following 4 years in the appellate section of the Department of Justice's Civil Division, Patricia served as assistant to the Solicitor General for more than a decade.

After her public service, Patricia joined Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP, where she heads the firm's Supreme Court practice and is co-leader of its national appellate practice. She has extensive experience arguing cases before the Supreme Court—32 in all and is without question one of the Nation's leading appellate lawyers. Patricia's experience, education, and character have earned her praise from colleagues and clients alike. Following her nomination, the American Bar Association rated her unanimously well qualified to serve as a United States Circuit Judge.

Patricia is also a military spouse, having steadfastly stood by her husband's side as he served his country in uniform for 22 years. As she awaits Senate confirmation, I am proud to say Patricia's nomination is supported by Blue Star Families, by veterans, and active-duty members of the Armed Forces, who today stand with her as she prepares to serve her country once more. Their support is a testament to Patricia's character and to the integrity with which she will serve as a federal judge.

I rise today to not only speak in strong support of Patricia's nomination, but also to decry the decision by Senate Republicans to once again play politics with President Obama's nominees and to place partisanship above all else.

I rise today because my colleagues in the minority have declared it unnecessary to fill the three vacancies on the D.C. Circuit, including the seat to which Patricia has been nominated. The Senate Republicans on the Judiciary Committee propose eliminating the 9th, 10th, and 11th seats on the D.C. Circuit, rather than confirming nominees put forward by this President. Now, of course, my Republican colleagues dispute any partisan motiva-

tion. Instead, they claim a diminished caseload on the D.C. Circuit simply does not warrant confirmation of President Obama's nominees. This might be a persuasive argument were it not belied by Senate Republicans' confirmation of President Bush's nominees to these same seats and by the fact that the D.C. Circuit caseload has been consistent over the past decade and has even increased in recent years.

In fact, when John Roberts, now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, last held the seat Patricia would occupy, his caseload was lower than the pending caseload Patricia will encounter on her first day as a judge. Let me be clear, the fight over this confirmation has nothing to do with Patricia—instead it has everything to do with the fact that a Democrat, rather than a Republican, now controls the White House. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing everything they can to prevent confirmation of this President's nominees.

Truly, the stakes are too high for this type of political gamesmanship. The D.C. Circuit is often called the second most important court in the United States, and for good reason. The D.C. Circuit handles some of the most complicated cases that enter the Federal court system, and its decisions touch the lives of Americans each and every day. From decisions affecting our clean air and water, to decisions having broad implications for labor relations, elections, and how we interpret and apply the Americans with Disabilities Act—decisions by the D.C. Circuit impact not only the quality of our lives today, but also our children's lives tomorrow.

Most importantly for our men and women in uniform, for our veterans, and for their families, the D.C. Circuit has jurisdiction over the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs. Its decisions matter to our servicemembers, to our veterans, and to their families—which is why it is shameful that Senate Republicans would rather play politics than allow a clean up or down vote on Patricia's nomination. The American people expect more from us. They deserve more from us.

I urge my colleagues to set aside partisanship and politics and allow an up or down vote on Patricia's nomination. Through her distinguished career and public service, Patricia Millett has earned not only our admiration and respect, but our support. Join me in supporting this nominee who is eminently qualified to serve as a United States Circuit Judge.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the nomination of Patricia Millett to be a Circuit Judge for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

As my colleagues have noted, Patricia Millett will bring a wealth of expe-

rience and skill to the bench. She is a nationally recognized appellate attorney. She has argued 35 cases in nearly all of the Federal appellate courts and 32 cases at the Supreme Court. Patricia Millett is unquestionably qualified to serve as a judge on the D.C. Circuit Court.

I am proud to serve on the Senate Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs Committees, and I have been moved by Patricia Millett's experience as part of a military family.

Her husband, Robert King, served in the Navy and as a Navy reservist until his retirement last year. In 2004, he was deployed to Kuwait as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom, and was called up again in the fall of 2009 for Afghanistan, while Patricia cared for their 2 children, maintained the household, and continued her career, arguing before the Supreme Court.

Patricia and her husband have faced what so many military families have, the difficulties of deployment, the challenges of separation and single parenting at home, and the process of reintegration when a servicemember returns. They have shown the deepest commitment to serving our Nation.

Patricia Millett will bring these important experiences and the devotion to this country unique to military families with her to the bench, a vital contribution to the D.C. Circuit given the distinct role it plays in adjudicating military and defense issues.

Much of Patricia's life has been devoted to public service, and her desire to serve as an appellate judge for the important D.C. Circuit is a reflection of that commitment to serve in the public interest. I am disappointed that our colleagues have blocked a vote to confirm Ms. Millett. I urge Senators to reconsider and support her nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The majority leader.

SENATOR-ELECT CORY BOOKER

Mr. REID. Madam President, in a few minutes we are going to have the good fortune of welcoming a fine young man to be the next Senator from the State of New Jersey. I trust that serving in the Senate will be among the most rewarding experiences of his life, and he has had many of them.

I urge my fellow Senators, Democrats and Republicans, to get to know this good man. I feel so elated that he is going to be here. Of course, I loved Frank Lautenberg. We served together for all those many years. But we are going to find that CORY BOOKER is going to be a great asset to this Nation and to the Senate.

He has had a tough time the last few months. His parents moved to Las Vegas in early August. And as things happen in life, his dad was stricken with a very violent stroke. His aunt lives there, his mom's sister. She is a retired dentist from California. I was there because of the August recess and

I had the good fortune of meeting all three of them. His dad, of course, was not able to communicate and, sadly, he died not too long after that. But this was right before his election was completed, and it was very difficult for Senator-elect Booker going to Nevada, campaigning with all the national publicity he had in that election, but he, during this time of fire, did extremely well. I am very proud of him.

He had a demanding year, no doubt, with all the things he was doing and his deciding to run for the Senate. But he traveled to Nevada on various occasions, as I indicated, to be with his family and to support them. This quality he has was apparent early in life—his love of family and dedication to his parents, now especially his mom, who is going to be here today. He is not only a devoted son but a brilliant scholar and a dedicated public servant.

Think about this man's academic record: Stanford undergraduate, senior class president at Stanford. That fine institution also allowed him to study even more there and he earned a master's degree in sociology, which has served him well in the work he has done. His having this advanced degree in sociology helped him in his work with the people of the State of New Jersey and the city of Newark. But with him, one Stanford degree wasn't enough; he got two. And then, if that weren't enough—and it wasn't—he was chosen to be a Rhodes scholar and then got another advanced degree at Oxford.

If that wasn't enough, he went to Yale Law School. This is quite a record. He has been a city councilman and mayor for more than a decade. He has lived with his constituents and kept in touch with them like no mayor with whom I have ever come in contact. We are so fortunate to have him here. He has been with his constituents in the inner city of Newark. I commend him for his dedicated service to the people of New Jersey and the people of Newark.

Part of his job was to highlight the difficulties of working poor families, and he did that and he did it very well. He has done everything he can to highlight to everyone who would listen to him and watch him to indicate that many Newark residents are struggling to know where their next meal will come from. At a time in the history of this country when we have so many people needing so much, where the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer and the middle class is being squeezed, we are very fortunate to have this good man in the Senate. I am confident he will treasure his memories in this historic legislative body and serve his Nation and State with distinction.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Before we have this ceremony, I wish to say one thing about CORY BOOKER. I have talked about his great academic record. But for me, a frustrated wannabe athlete, his most impressive qualification, as far as I am concerned, is that he was a tight end for one of the great Stanford football teams.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a Certificate of Election to fill the vacancy created by the death of Senator Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey. The certificate, the Chair is advised, is in the form suggested by the Senate. If there is no objection, the reading of the certificate will be waived and it will be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the sixteenth day of October, 2013, Cory Booker, was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Jersey, a Senator for the unexpired term ending at noon on the 3rd day of January, 2015, to fill the vacancy in the representation from said State in the Senate of the United States caused by the death of Frank Lautenberg.

Given, under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of New Jersey, this twenty-eighth day of October two thousand and thirteen.

By the Governor:

CHRIS CHRISTIE,
Governor.

[State Seal Affixed]

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-elect will now present himself at the desk, the Chair will administer the oath of office.

The Senator-designee, escorted by Mr. MENENDEZ, advanced to the desk of the Vice President, the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President, and he subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations, Senator. Welcome.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MELVIN L. WATT TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding we are going to move now to the nomination of Mr. WATT. I yield back the time for the majority and the Republicans.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of MELVIN L. WATT, of North Carolina, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

Harry Reid, Tim Johnson, Mark Begich, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Martin Heinrich, Patty Murray, Bernard Sanders, Jeanne Shaheen, Benjamin L. Cardin, Al Franken, Sherrod Brown, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Thomas R. Carper, Sheldon Whitehouse, Bill Nelson, Charles E. Schumer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of MELVIN L. WATT, of North Carolina, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency for a term of 5 years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 226 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Franken	Menendez
Baucus	Gillibrand	Merkley
Begich	Hagan	Mikulski
Bennet	Harkin	Murphy
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Murray
Booker	Heitkamp	Nelson
Boxer	Hirono	Portman
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Pryor
Burr	Kaine	Reed
Cantwell	King	Rockefeller
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sanders
Carper	Landrieu	Schatz
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Coons	Levin	Shaheen
Donnelly	Manchin	Stabenow
Durbin	Markey	Tester
Feinstein	McCaskill	

Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)

Warner
Warren

Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—42

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Chambliss
Coats
Coburn
Cochran
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
Crapo
Enzi

Fischer
Flake
Graham
Grassley
Hatch
Heller
Hoeven
Isakson
Johanns
Johnson (WI)
Kirk
Lee
McCain
McConnell

Moran
Murkowski
Paul
Reid
Risch
Roberts
Rubio
Scott
Sessions
Shelby
Thune
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Cruz

Inhofe

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote the yeas are 56, the nays are 42. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having not voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the Watt nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is entered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Patricia Ann Millett, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, John D. Rockefeller IV, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jon Tester, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mark R. Warner, Patty Murray, Mazie Hirono, Angus S. King, Jr., Barbara Boxer, Jeanne Shaheen, Robert Menendez, Bill Nelson, Debbie Stabenow, Richard Blumenthal

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual format.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Patricia Millett is unquestionably qualified to be the next judge on the D.C. Circuit. The Senate will soon vote to end debate on her nomination and I hope that the rank partisanship that shut down our Government earlier this month will not be on display again with this upcoming vote. I hope the moderates who prided themselves in finding a solution to the shutdown will agree that Ms. Millett is an extraordinary nominee who should not be filibustered.

Over the last few weeks, I have heard those who want to filibuster Ms.

Millett make some unfounded claims to justify their partisan agenda. First they asserted that the President is somehow packing the court by nominating judges to vacant seats. No student of history can honestly say that nominating candidates to existing vacancies is court-packing.

Next, they claimed that because the last of President Bush's nominees to this court was not confirmed, Ms. Millett should be filibustered as payback. These partisans fail to note that by the time Peter Keisler was nominated, four of President Bush's nominees to the D.C. Circuit had been confirmed. Only one of President Obama's nominees to this court has been confirmed and another has been filibustered.

Mr. Keisler was nominated to the 11th seat on the D.C. Circuit—and would have marked the fifth time a President Bush nominee was confirmed the court and the second time a Bush nominee was confirmed to be the 11th judge on the court. At that time, Democrats noted the hypocrisy of Republicans pushing to confirm a second judge to the 11th seat on the D.C. Circuit after they had blocked Merrick Garland's nomination in 1996 to be the 11th judge. Judge Garland's nomination was held up until another judge retired and he was confirmed to be the 10th judge on the court. Patricia Millett, however, is nominated to be the 9th judge. Those who are determined to filibuster this highly qualified nominee should at least get their facts straight.

For all the discussion about the D.C. Circuit's caseload, you would think that it had the lowest caseload of any circuit court in the country. But you would be wrong. The circuit court with the lowest caseload is actually the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, which as of June 30, 2013, has 1,341 total pending appeals and 134 pending appeals per active judge. In contrast, the D.C. Circuit has 1,479 total pending appeals and 185 pending appeals per active judge.

Despite the lower caseload on the Tenth Circuit, the Senate has continued to confirm nominees to that court without any complaints from Republicans about the workload. Just this past year, we confirmed Robert Bacharach of Oklahoma to be the ninth judge on the Tenth Circuit and Gregory Phillips of Wyoming to be the tenth judge on the Tenth Circuit. We also recently held a hearing for Carolyn McHugh of Utah to be the eleventh judge on the Circuit. And in the next few weeks, we will hold a hearing for Nancy Moritz of Kansas to be the twelfth judge on the Tenth Circuit. If Ms. McHugh and Ms. Moritz are both confirmed, the Tenth Circuit will be at full strength with 12 active judges. Again, in all the hearings and votes we have had for these Tenth Circuit nominees, I cannot recall a single instance

where Republican senators questioned the need for judges on that court.

Some have also cited the D.C. Circuit's six senior judges as a reason to filibuster Patricia Millett's nomination. Of course, the Tenth Circuit has 10 senior judges, and yet, we never hear this cited as a reason for not confirming nominees to existing vacancies in the Tenth Circuit. I hope the Senators from Oklahoma, Wyoming, Utah, and Kansas will hold Patricia Millett to the same standard that the circuit nominees from their home state were held to or which they expect to be held to.

Today's Washington Post editorial calls for Patricia Millett to be confirmed and concludes that Republicans "shouldn't insist on altering the size of a court only when it's a Democratic president's turn to pick judges or filibuster highly qualified nominees on that pretext." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

Patricia Millett is an outstanding nominee who deserves to be treated on her merits. No argument has been lodged against her that would rise to the level of an extraordinary circumstance. If the Republican caucus finds that despite her stellar legal reputation and commitment to her country that somehow a filibuster is warranted, I believe this body will need to consider anew whether a rules change should be in order. That is not a change that I want to see happen but if Republican Senators are going to hold nominations hostage without consideration of their individual merit, drastic measures may be warranted. I hope it does not come to that. I hope that the same Senators who stepped forward to broker compromise when Republicans shut down the Government, will decide here to put politics aside and vote on the merits of this exceptional nominee. I also hope the same Senators who have said judicial nominees should not be filibustered barring extraordinary circumstances will stay true to their word.

Ten years ago John Roberts, President Bush's nominee received a voice vote by the Senate. Today President Obama's nominee to that same seat, Patricia Millett, is being filibustered. What has changed in 10 years? The caseload of that court under any measure has remained constant or gone up slightly in the past 10 years so that is just a partisan pretext.

Let us treat this extraordinary nominee based on her qualifications. Patricia Millett has honorably served this Nation for so many years and we are better off for it. I urge my fellow Senators to vote for cloture. Do not filibuster this brilliant lawyer, this military spouse, this exceptional nominee.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 30, 2013]

STRIPPING A COURT AS A POLITICAL PLOY

It would have been hard for President Obama to nominate a less controversial person to join the U. S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the second-most-important court in the land. So why are a lot of Republicans probably going to vote against moving forward with Patricia Millett's nomination on Thursday?

Ms. Millett is one of three people the president picked to fill three open slots on the court, a high-profile perch in the judiciary that reviews weighty matters such as regulation of Wall Street and the environment. A lawyer who has extensive experience arguing cases before the Supreme Court, she has gold-plated bipartisan credentials, having served in the Justice Department under the presidencies of Bill Clinton and George W. Bush. A raft of legal luminaries has endorsed her, including conservative former solicitors general Ted Olson, Paul Clement and Kenneth Starr. Even conservative GOP senators admit she is well-qualified.

But instead of being judged on her merits, Ms. Millett may well end up a victim of a GOP campaign against allowing any more of Mr. Obama's nominees onto the D.C. Circuit. Though Republicans pushed to fill its 11 seats when George W. Bush was president, they now argue that it doesn't need more than its current eight judges, and that Mr. Obama is trying to "pack" the court. Some have backed a bill from Sen. Charles E. Grassley (R-Iowa) that would strip the court of its vacancies rather than consider the president's duly appointed picks to fill them. A war of dueling numbers on the D.C. Circuit's workload has ensued. Republicans insist that it doesn't take as many cases as other appeals courts do. Democrats respond that the D.C. Circuit must consider more complex cases than others.

But the answer doesn't matter. Even if Republicans are right, they shouldn't insist on altering the size of a court only when it's a Democratic president's turn to pick judges or filibuster highly qualified nominees on that pretext. These moves are transparently self-serving, and would encourage similar behavior by Democrats against Republican presidents.

The recent history of the confirmation process is a steady descent into unreasonable partisanship; if acted upon, the Republicans' position would be another step down. It might also provoke another unnecessary battle over Senate rules, which could reshape the chamber in ways both parties would regret.

If Republicans are genuinely concerned that the D.C. Circuit has too many slots allotted to it, the fair way to trim it down would be to limit future presidents from filling seats that come open in the next presidential term and thereafter. In the meantime, President Obama's picks deserve the same fair treatment and respect as any others. Under that standard, Ms. Millett should fly through confirmation on Thursday.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I want to illustrate why this seat doesn't need to be filled. These are the other circuits. The average of those other circuits is 383 caseloads. The D.C. Circuit has 149, so workload doesn't demand it.

Secondly, we are in a situation where this administration has said: "If Con-

gress won't, I will." He is going to do it by executive order. This is a court that can rule for or against the executive orders of this administration. We need to maintain checks and balances of the government.

Also, each one of these seats costs \$1 million, and not just for 1 year, but every year for the rest of the life of those judges who are serving full time. I ask that my colleagues vote against this cloture motion.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 more minutes equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I am sure the Senator is concerned about costs. Yet, the same Senators blocking Patricia Millett's confirmation were not concerned when an unnecessary shutdown of the government cost the taxpayers billions of dollars.

I also note that under President Bush, there were 11 judges on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals with a lower caseload. Now there are 8 judges with a higher caseload. The numbers are the numbers.

President Obama is being treated differently than President Bush was. Patricia Millett is being treated differently than John Roberts was. It is not fair, it is not an extraordinary circumstance, and there is no justification for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. What that doesn't take into consideration is that there are six senior status judges on this court. Chief Judge Garland told us that their workload is the equivalent of 3¼ judges. So presently there are enough judges to go around and that would equal 11¼ judges. There are 8 judges there now plus the 3¼ that have senior status. There are plenty of reasons not to fill any more seats on this court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Patricia Ann Millett, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS (when his name was called). "Present."

Mr. HATCH (when his name was called). "Present."

Mr. ISAKSON (when his name was called). "Present."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Sen-

ator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 227 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murkowski	
Hagan	Murphy	

NAYS—38

Alexander	Flake	Portman
Ayotte	Graham	Reid
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Heller	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Johanns	Scott
Coats	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Coburn	Kirk	Shelby
Cochran	Lee	Thune
Corker	McCain	Toomey
Cornyn	McConnell	Vitter
Crapo	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Chambliss	Hatch	Isakson
-----------	-------	---------

NOT VOTING—4

Boxer	Enzi
Cruz	Inhofe

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 38, and 3 Senators responded "Present." Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the nomination of Ms. Millett.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I was unable to attend the rollcall vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Patricia Ann Millett, of Virginia, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea." •

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 2 p.m., and that at 2 p.m. the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for debate only until 6 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands in recess until 2 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:59 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. HEITKAMP).

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

CONGRATULATING THE BOSTON RED SOX

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I come to the floor to discuss the first policy-focused legislation I am introducing as a Senator. I believe it will be a win for Massachusetts and a win for the Nation. But before I do so, I would like to comment briefly about another win last night for Massachusetts and for Red Sox Nation everywhere.

Behind the mighty bat of Big Papi, the tireless and tough arms of Jon Lester, John Lackey, and Koji Uehara, and the incredible power of the beard, this unlikely Red Sox team took us from last in the division to first in the world.

For many of us in Massachusetts, this was not just about baseball. Because on Patriots' Day, when the Sox play in the morning and New England comes together for a celebration, evil visited our city at the Boston Marathon this year.

While this team cannot bring back the lives we lost or heal the wounds inflicted, it did what no other team besides the Red Sox can do: It reaffirmed our common bond in Massachusetts, in New England, and with Red Sox Nation fans everywhere.

It is often said that baseball is a game of inches. But it is also a game that can span miles, bringing people together across entire communities and cultures, bridging differences and building friendships. That is what Red Sox baseball did for Boston, for Massachusetts, and for New England this year, when we needed it the most. The Red Sox gave us the chance to all raise our hands in triumph once again together as one.

The Red Sox came back to win in dozens of games. They never gave up. They fought to the last pitch in every game, showing the resilience that reflected the response of an entire city and region after the marathon tragedy, and in doing so they gave us so much more than entertainment. They gave us hope, something to cheer for, and something else to talk about at a time of deep sadness in our region.

As the song says: "Don't worry about a thing, 'cause every little thing gonna be all right." Watching the celebrations last night in and around Fenway and especially on Boylston Street, just

a brief distance from the marathon finish, reminds me of how proud I am to represent this great city and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the Senate.

The Sox team that won the World Series in 2004 allowed us to release 86 years of disappointment. This year's team allowed us to cheer again after months of mourning. For that, we congratulate and thank the 2013 World Series champions, the Boston Red Sox.

(The remarks of Mr. MARKEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1627 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. MARKEY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I offer my congratulations to the Senator from Massachusetts for the World Series victory by the Boston Red Sox, and I know it is a happy day in his State.

D.C. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I wish to return to the issue of the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, because even though we had an earlier cloture vote where the Senate decided to continue debate and not close off debate on this issue, I anticipate the majority leader will bring to the Senate floor the other two nominees which have now cleared the Senate Judiciary Committee for the three seats President Obama has said he wants to fill and is asking for the advice and consent of the Senate.

I wanted to make sure we all understand exactly what this debate is about. At this very moment, there are plenty of U.S. appellate courts that urgently need judges to handle their existing caseload. As my friend, the distinguished Presiding Officer, knows as a former attorney general, there are a lot of district courts around the country, Federal district courts, that could use additional personnel because they are what are called judicial emergencies because they have such heavy caseloads. They need more help. So why in the world would we want to add more judges to a court that does not have enough work for them to do? That is exactly what this debate is all about. It is not about the specific nominees. It is not an ideological battle that we are all familiar with so much as it is one of practical economics.

Between 2005 and 2013, the total number of written decisions per active judge on the D.C. Circuit declined by 27 percent. From 2005 to 2013, the number of written decisions per active judge went down by almost one-third, 27 percent. The number of appeals filed with the court went down by 18 percent.

As of September 2012, both the total number of appeals filed with the D.C.

Circuit and the total number of appeals decided by the D.C. Circuit per active judge were 61 percent below the national average. You can see from this chart that has been prepared by the office of the ranking member, Senator GRASSLEY, how the 13 circuit courts of appeals compare when it comes to the number of cases or appeals filed per active judge.

In red is the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, the lowest caseload, the fewest number of cases of any circuit court in the Nation. Conversely, the 11th Circuit out of Atlanta has 778 cases or appeals filed per active judge. So I do not know why you would want to take three new judges and assign them to the court with the lowest caseload per active judge. It makes absolutely no sense.

By the way, the average for the circuit courts, all 13 circuit courts, is 383 cases or appeals filed per active judge; again, the average for the entire Nation being 383 appeals per active judge. The D.C. Circuit, to which President Obama wants to add 3 additional new judges, is 149, almost one-third.

One other sort of unique thing about the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals is while many of these courts are very busy and, indeed, are overworked relative to the other circuit courts, the D.C. Circuit Court is perhaps the only court in the Nation that literally took a 4-month break between May and September of this year because they could. They did not have enough work to do, so they took a break. They took 4 months off between May and September.

The bottom line is that this court is not one that needs more judges. In fact, one of the current members of the D.C. Circuit told Senator GRASSLEY, our colleague from Iowa, "If anymore judges are added now, there won't be enough work to go around."

So what is this all about? Why are my friends across the aisle ignoring the needs of other appellate courts and other jurisdictions around the country that have, as the judicial administration office terms it, judicial emergencies because they have so much work to do that they need help? Why are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle ignoring those courts where there are needs in favor of a court where there is no demonstrated need?

Here is perhaps one reason why: The D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, being located in Washington, DC, does have a unique caseload. I would say the types of cases they consider are not particularly more complicated. I do not buy that argument. Many of them are administrative appeals, which, as the Presiding Officer knows, are highly deferential to the administration. It is usually an abuse-of-discretion standard, which is, as I say, very deferential.

But the reason why the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals is the subject of so

much focus, whether it is a Republican President or a Democratic President, is because it is often called the second most important court in the Nation by virtue of its docket, the kinds of cases it decides.

Indeed, this was a court that, before the Supreme Court held portions of the Affordable Care Act unconstitutional, actually affirmed the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act, primarily because they did not feel it was their prerogative to hold it unconstitutional, rather than—and defer to the Supreme Court which ultimately had the ability to overrule old cases and reach that result.

But this court wields tremendous influence over regulatory and constitutional matters. The truth is, I will show you a few quotes here in a moment that Senator REID and the President hope that by adding three more judges to the court, they can transform it into a rubberstamp for the Obama administration agenda.

Right now there is a balance on the court. There are four judges who were nominated by a Republican President, there are four judges on the court nominated by a Democratic President. Yet my friends across the aisle have been condemning the D.C. Circuit Court without justification, in my view. They have been condemning it as a bastion of partisanship, extreme ideology.

The facts do not bear that out. As I said, remember, this is the same court that actually upheld the President's health care law as constitutional. It is the same court that twice upheld the President's executive order on embryonic stem cell research. It is the same court that has ruled in favor of the Obama administration in the majority of environmental cases that have come before it, including ones related to the regulation of greenhouse gasses, ethanol-blended gasoline, and mountain-top removal coal mining. That does not sound like a radical, ideological court to me. It sounds like it is a court doing its job without fear or favor, in an impartial way, administering justice, not engaging in crass partisanship or tilting at ideological windmills.

Of course, the critics of the court do not mention those decisions I mentioned when they are criticizing the court. Instead, they point to three separate rulings where the Obama administration did not fare so well.

The first one of those was a ruling that struck down the Securities and Exchange Commission proxy access rule which has to do with corporate governance. I know that sounds like a lot of mumbo jumbo, but basically the court found that the agency had failed to conduct a proper cost-benefit analysis. We all understand what that means. The statute actually requires the agency to conduct a cost-benefit analysis, but the agency did not do it. It ignored the letter of the law, and the

D.C. Circuit ordered the administrative agency to follow the law and engage in that kind of cost-benefit analysis.

The second ruling that the critics of the recent court point out came in August of 2012 when the court invalidated the EPA's cross-State air pollution rule, saying it would impose massive emissions reduction requirements on certain States without regard to the limits imposed by the statutory text. In other words, when an administrative agency such as the EPA issues rules and regulations, they do not do so in a vacuum or in a void. They are necessarily guided by the authority given to them and the limitations imposed upon them by the laws that Congress writes. They are free, within that statutory mandate, to write rules and regulations, but they are not free to ignore them or to engage in rulemaking that basically goes counter to the direction of Congress.

So in this case, one that is cited by some of the critics, the court held the Clean Air Act does not give the EPA boundless authority or unlimited authority to regulate emissions. A court requiring an administrative agency to work within its legal authority I think is common sense. Otherwise, you would have administrative agencies free to chart their own path without regard to any kind of guidance or legitimacy conferred by Congress in terms of regulation.

Remember, these administrative agencies are very powerful entities. Some say they are the fourth branch of government. There is a lot of concern that I have, that many people have, about overregulation and its damage to our economy. The very least the courts ought to do is make sure that they are operating within their mandate and the limitations imposed upon them by Congress. That is what the court did in this cross-State air pollution rule.

By the way, Texas was caught up in this rulemaking process without even having an opportunity to be heard and to challenge the modeling of the EPA. Due process is a pretty fundamental notion in our laws, in our jurisprudence. Texas, in that instance, was denied any opportunity for basic due process of law, another reason why the court made the right ruling.

The third case that has drawn the ire of some critics across the aisle on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals has to do with two Presidential recess appointments. Every President basically has made recess appointments, but no President has done what this President has done. It violated the Constitution when doing so. In other words, basically President Obama said: Notwithstanding the fact that the Constitution gives advice and consent responsibility to the Senate—that is in the Constitution—the President basically in this instance decided when Congress was going to be in recess, for the purposes

of invoking this extraordinary power, basically said the President was going to decide when we were in recess.

Essentially, as some pundits said, basically the President was claiming an authority to be able to appoint judges using the recess appointment power when we are “taking a lunch break.” That cannot be the law. It is not the law. That is what the D.C. Circuit Court said. So the D.C. Circuit Court said President Obama's legal rationale for appointments and the role of the Senate in advice and consent and the confirmation proceedings would “eviscerate the Constitution's separation of powers.”

That is what the D.C. Circuit said about President Obama's claim to have the extraordinary power to make recess appointments and bypass the confirmation of the Senate in the Constitution.

You might wonder if the court has actually been pretty evenhanded in terms of its decisionmaking process, you might wonder if it has the lightest caseload per judge in the Nation and there are other courts that need help a lot more, you might wonder what is going on here. Why does President Obama feel so strongly, why does Senator REID feel so strongly, why does the distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee that I serve on feel so strongly that they want to move these three judges through, even though there is no need for these judges on the D.C. Circuit Court?

Well, I am sorry to reach the conclusion, but I think the evidence is overwhelming that what the President is trying to do by nominating these unneeded judges to this critical court, the second most powerful court in the Nation, is he is trying to pack the court in order to affect the outcomes.

I know my friends across the aisle do not like that term, court packing. Students of history remember when Franklin Delano Roosevelt claimed the power to appoint additional Supreme Court Justices. That was held to be an unconstitutional court packing. But I do not know what else you would call this, if you are going to try to jam three additional judges on this court that are not needed, the second most important court in the Nation, in order to change the outcome of those decisions and to rubberstamp the administration's expansive policies. I do not know what else you would call it other than court packing. I think a fair interpretation or fair definition of court packing is when you add judges to a court for the explicit purpose of securing favorable rulings.

That is exactly what Democrats are trying to do with these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. I wish to quote our friend Senator REID, the majority leader of the Senate. His candor is, again, remarkable and very clear. He said:

We are focusing very intently on the D.C. Circuit. We need at least one more.

By that he means one more judge. Continuing:

There are three vacancies. We need at least one more and that will switch the majority.

When the court sits en banc, when all judges decide to sit on the most important cases, then President Obama will have a majority of nominees on that court. They will be able to outvote the Republican nominees on the court.

Senator SCHUMER is complaining about some of the cases I mentioned a moment ago, and he concludes: "We will fill up the D.C. Circuit one way or another."

I believe that the evidence is overwhelming that the motivation at play here is one to make sure that this court becomes a rubberstamp for the big government policies of this administration. That is why they are ignoring appellate courts that actually need the help, and they are trying to stack the court in the second highest court in the land. That is why they are also threatening—we heard a little bit of that today, rattling that saber once again—the nuclear option to try to confirm judges with a simple majority rather than the 60-vote cloture requirement under the Senate rules.

We have a good-faith solution. This is Senator GRASSLEY's bill, which would allocate these three unneeded judges to places where they are actually needed. This is the kind of idea that our colleagues across the aisle embraced repeatedly when one of the judges from the D.C. Circuit was reallocated to the Ninth Circuit in 2007.

If our friends across the aisle continue to move ahead with their court-packing gambit, it will make this Chamber even more polarized than it already is. I only hope they choose a different course. This is why we are committed on this side of the aisle to stopping these nominations to these unneeded judges in this court and making sure that judges are placed where they are needed so they can engage in a fair and efficient administration of justice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I wish to enter into a colloquy with my great friend from Missouri, Senator BLUNT.

I wish to make a comment, if my colleague will excuse me. I have to say I am amazed to hear that we are court packing when what we are talking about is trying to fill three vacancies on a court. I hadn't heard that before with other Presidents. Hopefully, we can fill vacancies and try to do it in a bipartisan way.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I very much wish to thank a great friend and colleague, Senator BLUNT, for joining me today on the floor and in leadership on some very important community mental health legislation.

We have an opportunity to get something done with this issue.

I ask unanimous consent to proceed with the colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. We wish to do this today because today marks the 50th anniversary to the day that President John F. Kennedy signed into law the Community Mental Health Act. The good news is he signed this act. The unfortunate news is it was the last act he signed in his life.

Today we want to recognize what that has meant to so many people across the country. This put in place the ability to serve people in the community who have mental health issues, rather than only being in institutions, being able to serve people closer to home, at home or to be able to give them the opportunity to get the help they need and still be active and successful in the community.

I think so many of us have been touched by mental health issues, which is part of physical—it is not mental and physical health. I think it is about time. I know my friend would agree that we stop treating illnesses above the neck differently than illnesses below the neck. It is all about comprehensive health care. We have all been touched in some way.

My father went undiagnosed with a bipolar disorder for 10 years when I was growing up. When he finally received the help he needed, the medication he needed, he was able to work and be successful for the rest of his life. I wish to make sure every family has that opportunity.

I know for President Kennedy it was his younger sister Rosemary who was institutionalized in the early 1940s and that brought him to this issue as well as to other passionate concerns that he had. President Kennedy saw a way to improve the lives of people such as his sister living with a mental illness by providing service in the community and, frankly, lowering the stigma on mental health. We still have a long way to go on reducing the stigma and understanding that it is, in most occasions, a physiological change in the brain, a chemical imbalance, something that needs to be treated appropriately, and that is certainly not a choice by an individual.

President Kennedy thought we needed to make sure we were providing the very best for the people in this community. In his statement to Congress he wrote:

We need a new type of health facility, one which will return mental health care to the

mainstream of American medicine, and at the same time, upgrade mental health services.

We have worked together in a bipartisan way since then. The Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act was championed by our friends and colleagues, Senators Pete Domenici, Paul Wellstone, Ted Kennedy, and Congressman Patrick Kennedy in the House, and it became law. It said we have to have parity in how insurance companies treat mental health and physical health.

I was pleased to get those provisions into health reform, but there is more to do and that is why we are here.

I wish to turn to my friend from Missouri, who has been a great partner and ask, as we go forward, what his thoughts are on this day and what we should continue to do to continue with this legacy.

Mr. BLUNT. I wish to say it is a very important topic, and it is a moment when there are many reasons, as the Senator said, that we should keep returning to it.

It was this day 50 years ago when President Kennedy signed the Community Mental Health Act. He called it a "bold new approach." Frankly, while some things happened in the 50 years since then and now, there haven't been that many bold new approaches in the last 50 years.

This is a topic that for whatever reason our society hasn't dealt with in ways that have been satisfactory in making great changes. In fact, some of what we have done in other areas has made it harder for communities and families to work with people who have behavioral challenges, to find out the information that person does not want to share with them.

All of us can probably think of some family where this has happened, where someone still has an ongoing commitment to an adult son or daughter, mom or dad, and are part of what they are doing. They are paying some bills or whatever. The information that people would benefit from knowing is hard to get to or the requirement that somebody follow up on a court-ordered procedure is difficult to enforce and make that happen.

This is one of the times when we really need to be thinking what do we need to do to make this challenging work better.

First, it is a widespread problem, but it is not a problem that is untreatable. There is one statistic I have seen from the National Institutes of Mental Health: "One in four adults suffers from a diagnosable mental disorder" that is diagnosable and, in virtually every case, treatable—one in four.

This is not a stigma. This is not something where you are the only person this has ever happened to or to your loved ones, that this is the only person this has ever happened to. This

is something that many families understand. Many people have a challenge that never gets diagnosed, frankly.

Creating a way for that to happen, where we make it easier, we make it more comfortable, and we make it affordable—whatever we are doing to allow that, in almost every case, the treatable problem to be diagnosed and treatable is important.

One of the topics the Senator and I started talking about almost at the very first of this year—we have been talking about this for almost 10 months. Of course, it was after the tragedy at Newtown. One thing we know is that somebody who has a mental health problem is much more likely to be the victim of a crime than they are to be the perpetrator of a crime.

The other thing we know is that as we look at these tragedies we have seen happen in the last few years, the one common denominator—whether it was in Newtown, Aurora, Tucson, the Navy Yard or Virginia Tech, whether it was at a supermarket, at a theater or on a college campus—what we saw in every case was this was somebody who had a behavioral problem, a mental health problem that hadn't been dealt with in the right way. In many ways this has turned the attention of the country back to a problem that, for whatever reason, we would just as soon apparently not talk about.

In fact, when the Senate committee that deals with mental health had a hearing in January of this year on mental health, it was the first time since 2007 that there had been such a hearing devoted to this topic—a topic that the National Institutes of Health said one of four adults is challenged by and the Senate, in 6 years, hadn't talked about it in any kind of official, focused way. This is why Senator STABENOW and I have been working to try to take advantage of the moment.

In the principal piece of legislation we have been working on, the Excellence in Mental Health Act, we also have a model that works. A couple of different things were done. One, of course, was to expand the federally qualified health center concept, if they wanted, to add behavioral health, and they could under the same rules and regulations. Frankly, people would be walking through the same door as their neighbors.

We also created ways for community health centers—the very health centers that President Kennedy's legislation created—to add some of the advantages to be in a federally qualified center, to be in a community mental health center.

Certainly the Senator's efforts—and I know we both have other stories to tell about other things we are working on as well, but we have had great response from the community mental health centers and great response from veterans.

The Senator may wish to talk about that a little bit because I know she has been engaged in many discussions with veterans' groups who say if only our veterans had a place to go that was close and where their neighbors were going perhaps for some other kind of behavioral health. We have a wide swath of support from our veterans' groups as well as our health care groups.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. I wish to go back to what the Senator from Missouri has indicated. Our veterans are coming home. We know that at least 200,000 of our veterans coming home will go into the community.

I see our distinguished chair of the Senate veterans' committee on the floor. I thank the Senator for all of his good work.

In addition to the VA system, where we are strengthening mental health services, we know that many will come home to the communities and be looking to an outpatient clinic or somewhere in the community for help. The reason we have strong support from the Iraq and Afghanistan veterans' organizations is because our Excellence in Mental Health Act legislation, which creates a behavioral health clinic model based on what has been done in community health that has worked so well, will create an opportunity for those veterans coming home to get support and help in the community.

One of the most difficult statistics to talk about is that 22 of our veterans are committing suicide every day—22 every day. That is unacceptable.

We need to make sure families and veterans have the support that they need so that when they come home they can receive the help they need. I am very proud of the fact we have about 50 organizations supporting the Excellence in Mental Health Act, such as sheriffs and police officers. Most likely, if somebody needs help, they are placed in a jail or in the emergency room. They don't go to a mental health facility.

What we are proposing is something that would provide 24-hour emergency psychiatric delivery, coupled with high quality community mental health services. The time is now to do this.

We have seen the need increase as states over the years have cut funding for in-patient mental health services and have not replaced them with services in the community.

Too often, people who need mental health treatment end up not getting the treatment they need, and end up in the emergency room or, worse, in jail. The ER and jail are not the place to treat mental illness.

It is fair to say that our need now is greater than ever.

Too many people who need treatment don't get it, including one-third of all people living with mood disorders and more than half of those with severe mental disorders.

Tragically, 22 American veterans commit suicide every day. At least 25 percent of returning veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan are in need of some form of mental health treatment.

We know that people suffering from mental illness are more likely to be the victims of violence than the perpetrators.

However, we have seen too many examples of what happens when people don't get the treatment they need around the country and right here in Washington, DC, where we've seen two tragic examples in the past 2 months, including the shootings at the Navy Yard and the woman who tried to drive her car into the White House and the Capitol.

What can we do to improve the way we treat mental health issues in this country? How can we improve people's lives?

We need to take the final step in mental health parity by strengthening access to quality mental health services in communities across America. That is why we need to pass the Excellence in Mental Health Act that the Senator from Missouri and I have sponsored together.

This bill would expand access to community mental health care by making sure more providers are available to treat mental health issues and can offer a broad range of mental health services, such as the 24-hour crisis psychiatric services, integrated preventive screenings, integrated treatment for mental illness and substance abuse, and expanded peer support and counseling services for patients and families.

This bill can help fulfill the legacy of President Kennedy's Community Mental Health Act and the Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act.

There will be health care legislation coming to the floor before the end of this year to address physician payments, and that would be a natural place to address the Excellence in Mental Health Act.

I hope our colleagues will join us in supporting critical efforts to address mental health care in this country, and I hope they will join us in moving this proposal forward so we can get closer to this goal.

I wish to turn to my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Missouri for closing remarks. He has been a true champion for mental health and a wonderful partner to me and for his views on how we can work together to improve mental health treatment in America.

Mr. BLUNT. I would just say that both our States have led in this area.

Missouri has clearly been a pioneer in mental health efforts. Our community health centers—many of them—have added behavioral health in the last few years. There are other pieces of legislation out there that add to this mental health first aid, where people, particularly dealing with young people, can take a course. And they do not become people who can deal with your problem, but they may help you recognize if you have a problem and that somebody needs to deal with this.

In 2011, Missouri pioneered a program for Medicaid beneficiaries with severe mental illness that is based in community mental health centers and provides care coordination and disease management to address the “whole person,” including both mental illness and chronic medical conditions. This combination saves money.

I have worked closely with the Missouri Coalition of Community Health Centers, which just celebrated their 35th anniversary and they are very excited about how this legislation could benefit the population they are serving.

I also co-sponsored the Mental Health First Aid Act of 2013 to help people identify, understand and respond to the signs of mental illnesses and addiction disorders through a pilot program for mental health first aid training. In my State, we are already benefitting from this program and in August over 100 new mental health first aiders were certified during Missouri's first large-scale mental health first aid training.

In addition, I co-sponsored the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Act to improve access to mental health services for people in the criminal justice system. This bill would give law enforcement officers the tools they need to identify and respond to mental health issues, while continuing to support mental health courts and crisis intervention teams.

These bills—all of which have garnered bipartisan support—are steps in the right direction.

I hope Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID will allow stand-alone votes on mental health legislation, and I hope President Obama will work with members from both parties to improve our Nation's policies before another mental health crisis results in senseless loss.

I agree with Senator STABENOW that the time is now. We are actually probably beyond the time we should have done this. But we would be ill-advised to go further down this road without looking at this system and figuring out how we can improve it. There are many bipartisan ideas in the Senate, and I believe the Excellence in Community Health Act is right at the top of that list. But we need to look at this, do it, and do it now. I look forward to seeing something happen on this between now and the end of the year.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I again thank my friend from Missouri for his commitment and for working with so many colleagues across the aisle on a bipartisan basis. I believe we will get this done and we will now, on this 50th anniversary of President Kennedy's signing the Community Mental Health Act, complete the circle in terms of mental health parity in our country.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

THE BUDGET

Mr. SANDERS. First of all, I congratulate the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Missouri for touching on what is obviously a very serious national issue; that is, how we deal with the crisis of mental health in this country. I thank both of them for the work they are doing.

I would like to say a few words as a member of the conference committee on the budget, which is hoping to avert another government shutdown and come up with a sensible long-term budget for our country.

The first point I would make is that when I return from Vermont and come here to Capitol Hill, I am always amazed at how different the world view is here as opposed to the real world—whether it is Vermont or when I travel to other States around the country. It almost seems as if we are living on two separate planets.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I understand, as do the American people, that a \$17 trillion national debt and a \$700 billion deficit is a serious issue that must be addressed. The American people know that, but what they also understand is that there is an even more important issue out there; that is, real unemployment today is close to 14 percent. Youth unemployment—an issue Pope Francis is beginning to talk about a great deal—in this country is approximately 20 percent. African-American youth unemployment is over 40 percent.

The American people are saying: Yes, deal with the deficit, but do not forget that we continue to have a major economic crisis with millions of Americans unemployed. And for many other Americans who are working, their wages are deplorably low. We have millions of folks working for \$8 or \$9 an hour who cannot take care of their families under those wages.

While the middle class is disappearing and the number of people living in poverty is at an alltime high, we also have another dynamic we don't talk about too much here for obvious reasons; that is, the wealthiest people are doing phenomenally well, corporate profits are at recordbreaking levels, and the gap between the very wealthy and everybody else is growing wider and wider. We are surrounded by lobby-

ists representing the wealthy and large corporations, and they don't really like that discussion, so we don't talk about that too much, but it remains absolutely true.

When I go home and talk to Vermonters or when I go around the country, people tell me—and the polls tell me—that the American people—regardless of political persuasion, by the way—are in significant agreement about a lot of issues. We don't see that reflected here, but the American people are in significant agreement. If we ask the American people, I suspect, in North Dakota, Vermont, Maryland, or anywhere else whether they think we should cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, they would overwhelmingly say no.

These are tough economic times. Poverty is going up among seniors. People are worried about health care costs, and these programs are vital to the survival of so many people. So do not cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. That is not what BERNIE SANDERS is saying; that is what the American people are saying. That is what Democrats are saying, that is what Republicans are saying, that is what Independents are saying, and that is what people who agree with the tea party are saying. There is not a whole lot of dispute outside of Washington, but inside Washington the picture becomes a little different. We have virtually all Republicans talking about cutting Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. We have the President talking about cutting Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. We have some Democrats talking about it. But that is not what the American people believe.

According to the latest poll I have seen on this issue—the National Journal/United Technologies poll—81 percent of the American people do not want to cut Medicare, 76 percent of the American people do not want to cut Social Security, and 60 percent of the American people do not want to cut Medicaid. So I have a very radical idea for my colleagues. What about occasionally—we don't have to overdo it—listening to the people who sent us here? What they are saying is they do not want to cut these terribly important programs.

Second of all, what do the American people want? What they want is for us to invest in our infrastructure and create the millions of jobs we desperately need. According to a Gallup poll of March 3, 2013, 75 percent of the American people—that includes 56 percent of Republicans, 74 percent of Independents, and 93 percent of Democrats—support “a federal jobs creation law [that would spend government money for a program] designed to create more than 1 million new jobs.”

The American people are saying: Yes, the deficit is important, but what is more important is creating jobs, and

rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure is one way to do it, but don't cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

What else are the American people saying? Well, not too surprisingly, when we see so much income and wealth inequality in America, the American people believe that when 95 percent of all new income in the last few years has gone to the top 1 percent, given the fact that the wealthy are doing phenomenally well, maybe they should be asked to pay a little more in taxes, and maybe we should end all of the corporate loopholes that currently exist.

Again, that is not BERNIE SANDERS. According to a January 29, 2013, poll by Hart Research Associates, 66 percent of the American people believe the wealthiest 2 percent should pay more in taxes and 64 percent of the American people believe large corporations should pay more in taxes than they do today.

The American people are giving us a solution to the major crises facing the American people. They want to invest in our economy, they want to create jobs, they want to ask the wealthy and large corporations to pay more in taxes, and they do not want to cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. That is the real world, but then when we come back to Washington, what are people saying? Let's cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid; let's not invest in our infrastructure and create jobs; and, in fact, let's give more tax breaks to the wealthy and large corporations. This is an "Alice in Wonderland" world. The American people are saying one thing and the lobbyists around here and many Members of Congress are saying something very different.

The deficit is an important issue, and we should be proud, by the way, that we have cut the deficit in half in the last few years. We have more to go, but we should take some credit for that. But when we talk about the deficit, it is very important for us to remember how we got to where we are today—a \$17 trillion national debt and a \$650 billion-or-so deficit.

I find it interesting that some of those people who were most active in causing the deficit are now standing up saying: Oh, I am really worried about this deficit that I helped cause; therefore, we have to cut all these programs that working people and children and the elderly need. So let's take a brief look back into the recent past and find out how we got to where we are today and who voted for those programs.

As I hope most Americans know, in January 2001 when President Clinton left office and President Bush took over, this country had a \$236 billion surplus—a \$236 billion surplus. That is quite a large surplus. The Congressional Budget Office projected that the

10-year budget surplus would be \$5.6 trillion; that there would be a huge increase in our budget surplus. The projections were very strong. In fact, they projected that we could erase the national debt by 2011. Imagine that. That was where we were heading.

Well, President Bush took office and a number of things happened. We went to war in Afghanistan and Iraq. I voted for the war in Afghanistan; I strongly opposed the war in Iraq. But be that as it may, many of my friends, who are great deficit hawks, forgot to pay for those wars. Those wars are estimated to cost somewhere around \$6 trillion. So folks who are standing up today saying: Gee, we just can't afford nutrition programs for children, they didn't have a problem voting for two wars and not paying for them. They also did not have a problem voting for huge tax breaks that went to the wealthiest people in this country, and they also did not have a problem voting for a Medicare Part D prescription drug program—written by the insurance companies, by the way, by the pharmaceutical industry—which also added to the deficit.

The point I am making is that many of the folks who are standing here demanding cuts in Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid voted for two wars, tax breaks for the rich, and an unfunded Medicare Part D program. Then on top of all that, we had the Wall Street crash, which resulted in less revenue coming in to the Federal Government. Add all that stuff up and you have a large deficit.

Let me conclude by simply saying at a time when we have massive wealth and income inequality in America, which is something we should focus on from both a moral perspective as well as an economic perspective; at a time when the middle class is disappearing and millions of people are working longer hours for lower wages, at a time when we have the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world, at a time when senior poverty is increasing, at a time when we have 20 percent youth unemployment in this country, in my humble opinion, we do not balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable people in this country—working people, the elderly, the children, the sick, and low-income people. That is not what we do.

What we should do is go to those people who are doing very well and say to them: You know what. Welcome to the United States of America. You are part of our country, and you are part of our economy. This country has problems now. You, if you are a large corporation—one out of four large corporations paying nothing in Federal income taxes—you are going to have to start paying your taxes. You can't just stash your money in the Cayman Islands and in other tax havens. And if you are an extremely wealthy person doing well,

you are going to have to contribute more in tax revenue.

The bottom line is that we need to create jobs in this country, we need to protect the most vulnerable people in this country, and we need to do it in a way which is morally right and which makes good economic sense.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

COST OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, this afternoon I joined with Senator WARNER and Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator CASEY to point out just how much harm is caused to this country because we are governing from one manufactured crisis to another. The cost of the government shutdown, the cost of coming so close to defaulting on our obligations, the fact that we are governing through automatic across-the-board cuts known as sequestration, is hurting our economy.

This has been particularly difficult for the people in the State of Maryland, the State I represent. In our region we have so many Federal workers, so many Federal facilities—10 percent of our workforce works for the Federal Government—that we saw many small businesses in our communities that depend upon the Federal workforce literally having nobody in their restaurants and in their shops. Consumer confidence was at an alltime low.

There have been estimates as to the amount of harm caused by the government shutdown. Standard & Poor's said \$24 billion was taken out of our economy as a result of the government shutdown. Add that to the extra cost because we came so close to defaulting on the debt. Add that to the fact that since 2011 we have been living under sequestration. The estimate is we have lost about 900,000 jobs from this self-inflicted crisis management.

I could give many examples, but I will give a few.

I am very proud that the National Institutes of Health is based in the State of Maryland. Their impact is all over this country, including in the State of Massachusetts. As a result of sequestration and then the government shutdown, hundreds of grants could not be awarded. I think it was 700 by sequestration alone.

What does that mean? That means young researchers don't get a grant. They may stay with research, they may go to a different field, they may go to a different country. It means that maybe the cure for Alzheimer's will be put back a little bit or the influenza vaccine will be put back a little bit. Literally, lives are at risk. But also, our economy is at risk because the research supports so many private sector jobs. I could give the same example at FDA, NIST, Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, or Fort Meade. We have

many examples of how our country has been harmed. We cannot govern from one manufactured crisis to another.

My message is I hope we will get a budget agreement—I know the budget conferees met this week—which will give some predictability to our economy, eliminate sequestration, a progrowth budget so we can invest in education, research, and modern roads, bridges, and transit systems.

I am very optimistic about America's ability to globally compete if we stop these self-inflicted crises. I have been doing a "made in Maryland" tour throughout the State where I have visited many businesses. I give credit to my colleague in the House, Congressman HOYER, whose saying, "Make it in America" has really caught on. So I took my friend Congressman HOYER's suggestion, and I went around Maryland to meet with different companies. Maryland businesses are the best in the world. I know I am a little biased about Maryland, but they are the best in the world on innovation and creativity. I will give a few examples which may not be self-evident.

The Paul Reed Smith Guitar Factory is located on the eastern shore of Maryland in a small community called Stevensville. Over 200 people work there, and they produce the best guitars in the world and are sold all over the world. Santana's guitar was produced there. It is now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, it is such an incredible instrument—not only in beauty, but in sound—and was made right here in Maryland, USA.

Another company I visited during my "Made in Maryland" tour was the Volvo Mack truck plant located in Hagerstown, MD, one of the largest employers in western Maryland, with good-paying jobs. They make the most efficient truck engine in the world and it is produced right in Maryland, in the United States of America, the most innovative and creative ways to deal with the problem of efficiency in trucks.

I visited Ernest Maier, which makes brick pavers with concrete. It is very close to the Nation's capital. We can do manufacturing in America and we can compete in manufacturing. They are developing the technology for pervious concrete. It is critically important to our environment.

I take great pride in the Chesapeake Bay and the work we are doing to clean up the Chesapeake Bay. One of the major sources of pollution comes every time we have a storm and all of the runoff goes into the tributaries that lead into the Chesapeake Bay, causing a lot of pollutants to come into the bay, creating dead zones. If we have pervious concrete, allowing the water to seep rather than to flow, it cuts down dramatically the amount of pollution. The Ernest Maier Company is doing something about cleaning up our

environment as well as selling a product that is well received around the country.

We have Marlin Steel located in Baltimore. It is a small specialty steel company. Their jobs are growing. One hundred percent of the ingredients come from the United States, and their product—steel, manufactured in Maryland—is exported around the world because it is a quality product.

Atlas Container is another Maryland manufacturer with a national market. I visited them. They are doing great. Their sales are up, their employment is up.

An area which I think is particularly important to the Presiding Officer is the craft beer industry. I have been up to Massachusetts and enjoyed some of their craft beers. There are over 100,000 jobs in the craft beer industry in this country, and it is growing. Times have been tough—but not in the craft beer industry. It is growing.

I visited Flying Dog in Frederick and Heavy Seas in Baltimore. They are coming out with new and seasonal beers, which is keeping a market growing, using creativity, besides having a very fine product.

It is not just in the craft beer industry, it is also in the wine industry. We have about 64 wineries in our State. I visited one in Montgomery County, MD. I don't know if most people know that Montgomery County, MD, produces one of the best wines in this country and can compete internationally. We are very proud of what is done at Sugarloaf Mountain Winery in Montgomery County, MD.

I wish to talk about some of the high-tech jobs done here. Brain Scope has developed a portable device available in the battlefield which can tell the severity of a head wound, as to whether the warrior needs immediate attention in order to save his life because of a brain injury or whether they can take a little more time before treatment. It is inexpensive in its operations and gives the data necessary to determine brain waves and the severity of the head injury. I think the total cost was about \$10 million to develop. The military is very appreciative of this discovery. Think about the lives it will save, and think about the application of this technology to our community life. I think we are always nervous when we see our children and grandchildren on the playing field at sporting events, knowing how common head injuries are. This technology can be used on the playing field to determine the severity—whether a person who suffers a head injury needs to seek immediate medical attention because it is life threatening or whether they just need to sit out for a while.

This is the type of innovation and creativity taking place in Maryland. I can name dozens more small innovative companies working in biosciences, life sciences, and cyber security areas.

At Brain Scope they started with two employees. They now have over 20. This is a common story. These are good-paying jobs created here in Maryland, in the United States of America.

Lions Brothers in Owings Mills, MD. If you have ever seen a uniform with emblems on it, it was most likely done at Lions Brothers. They have figured out a way in which they can produce this product—which is used not only for sports gear, but the U.S. Government for uniforms, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts.

What is common in each of these companies? They are innovators. They find creative ways to create and expand markets. They are creating more jobs, and they are creating good-paying jobs.

We could name every State in this country where we have seen this creativity. We have duplicated this throughout our country. But the message is clear: Our country can take off, but we have to give predictability to our businesses. That is why the work being done in the conference committee on the budget is so important. We can't go through another manufactured crisis, another shutdown, another threatened default on our debt, the continuation of sequestration. It needs to end. We need to have a budget which allows for the type of government partnership for that type of economic growth—the basic research, the educated workforce, the modern roads and infrastructure and energy systems. That is what we need to have so the companies I mentioned can continue to lead the world in innovation, creativity, and creating the jobs we need—the good-paying jobs in America.

If we act, I am confident America will compete and win the global competition. "Made in Maryland" has been a huge success and has been duplicated all over our country. Let us act and get our work done so we truly can make it in America.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL LANDSBERRY

Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I rise today to address the public revelations regarding classified government surveillance programs. But before I do so, I would like to take a moment to honor Mike Landsberry, who died a hero's death in Sparks, NV, last week.

After spotting a student with a gun at Sparks Middle School, Mr. Landsberry moved directly in harm's

way to protect his students and others from danger. He was fatally shot.

Mr. Landsberry was an Alabama native, a graduate of McQueen High School in Sparks, a University of Nevada-Reno graduate, and a decorated master sergeant Nevada Guard airman.

To his students, he was a coach, a teacher, and also a mentor. To his community, Mr. Landsberry was a patriot, a father, and a friend. Master Sergeant Landsberry leaves behind a legacy of self-sacrifice and service to his country and community. He will continue to be remembered as a great and honorable man and a father.

USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. HELLER. I would also like to briefly discuss current National Security Agency practices, including its bulk data collection programs and the implication these programs have for the privacy of Nevadans and millions of other law-abiding citizens.

Due to published reports in newspapers around the world, Nevadans are well aware that the Federal Government has been collecting phone data of law-abiding citizens without their knowledge through a process known as bulk collection. These practices are mostly authorized by section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

Specifically, section 215 permits the FBI to seek a court order directing a business to turn over certain records when there are reasonable grounds to believe the information sought is relevant to an authorized investigation of international terrorism.

"Relevance" has been found by the courts to be a broad standard that, in effect, allows large volumes of data to be collected. These same records can be combed through in order to identify smaller amounts of information that are relevant to an ongoing investigation. In other words, it has been established that section 215 allows for massive amounts of data to be collected in order to find the tiny amount of data that would solve an investigation regarding international terrorism. The court's reasoning that this is permitted is because, when submitted, it is likely that the data will produce information that will then help the FBI.

Millions of Americans' call records are collected and stored by the NSA because a few numbers may solve an authorized investigation. Supporters of bulk collection practices have defended this program as an important tool in the fight against terror. They have said this is a mechanism to access the logs quickly, and they are not actually listening to the content.

President Obama even said:

When it comes to telephone calls, nobody is listening to your telephone call. Instead, the government was just sifting through this so-called metadata.

The President is correct. They are not listening to the actual calls like

the FBI conducting a wiretap, but let me outline that the government can figure out what is going on from those call logs.

For example, they will know that an American citizen in Ely, NV, received a call from the local NRA office and then called their Representative and Senators. But they claim that the content of that call remains safe from government intrusion or they will also know that a Nevadan from Las Vegas called a suicide prevention hotline and spoke to an individual for 12 minutes, but they will not know what that person discussed.

The question I have is this: Why does the Federal Government have to house this data? I believe it is because Congress has authorized a massive surrender of our constituents' privacy.

I want to be clear: I share the concerns of all Americans that we must protect ourselves against threats to the homeland. I also believe we must continue to understand that terrorism is very real and that the United States is the target of those looking to undermine the freedoms we hold as a core of our national identity. Are we sacrificing our own freedoms in the process? Are we sacrificing our constitutional rights that are afforded under the Fourth Amendment? If so, this is a steep price to pay to protect Americans from terrorism.

So the next question must be: If the price to protect Americans from terrorism is an incredible loss of individual privacy, what are the results of this program?

What has the bulk collection program provided in tangible results that justifies a privacy intrusion of this level?

The answer is that two cases have been solved in the collection of millions of records through the use of the program authorized by section 215. We know that because on October 2, 2013, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, asked the NSA Director Keith Alexander the following question:

At our last hearing, the deputy director, Mr. Ingliss, stated that there's only really one example of a case where, but for the use of Section 215, both phone records collection, terrorist activity was stopped. Was Mr. Ingliss right?

To which Director Alexander responded, "He's right. I believe he said two, Chairman."

Congress has authorized the collection of millions of law-abiding citizens' telephone metadata for years, and it has only solved two ongoing FBI investigations. Of those two investigations, the NSA has publicly identified one. In fact, that case would have easily been handled by obtaining a warrant and going to that telephone company. The case involved an individual in San Diego who was convicted of sending \$8,500 to Somalia in support of al-

Shabaab, the terrorist organization claiming responsibility for the Kenyan mall attack. The American phone records allowed the NSA to determine that a U.S. phone was used to contact an individual associated with this terrorist organization.

I am appreciative that the NSA was able to apprehend this individual, but it does not provide overwhelming evidence that this program is necessary. As Senator RON WYDEN from Oregon noted, the NSA could have gotten a court order to get the phone records in question.

In essence, Congress has authorized a program that invades the privacy of millions of Americans with little to show for it. The results simply do not justify this massive invasion of our privacy, and that is why I want to end bulk collection practices authorized under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

I joined Senator LEAHY to introduce the bipartisan, bicameral USA Freedom Act. This legislation, among other things, will rein in the dragnet collection of data by the National Security Agency. It will stop the bulk collection of Americans' communication records by ending the authorization provided by section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

Some in this Chamber will argue this removes a massive tool for the NSA to assist the FBI. I disagree with that. All this legislation does is shut down the collection of millions of Americans' metadata by the NSA. If the FBI needs a telephone number, they can go to a FISA judge and get a warrant. The phone company can still provide that data. Chances are a major phone provider will have that data as they keep all detailed records for at least 1 year.

When talking broadly about how certain technological developments should be incorporated in our justice system, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court William Douglas once said:

The privacy and dignity of our citizens are being whittled away by sometimes imperceptible steps. Taken individually, each step may be of little consequence. But when viewed as a whole, there begins to emerge a society quite unlike any we have seen—a society in which government may intrude into the secret regions of a person's life.

Here in the Congress it is our responsibility to take great care to acknowledge each possible step that could whittle away our privacy. We must examine its necessity carefully and reasonably. In this case, I do not believe such practices are warranted.

We can continue to protect Americans from threats of terrorism without infringing on individual privacy that the Constitution protects under the Fourth Amendment. We should shut down bulk collection practices.

With that, I thank the Chair, yield the floor, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The minority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I recently received a disturbing note from a constituent in Burlington, KY. Unfortunately, I suspect a lot of my colleagues have been receiving notes just like it.

This gentleman said that after receiving several letters from his insurer, it became clear to him that the President was being misleading when he said if you like the plan you have—if you like the plan you have—you can keep it. That is because he found out his policy, which came into effect just 2 months after the law's arbitrary cutoff date for grandfather plans, will be discontinued next year. He is not happy about this at all, especially given the fact that a plan on the ObamaCare exchanges will dramatically drive up his insurance costs, from \$400 a month to more than \$700 a month, with zero subsidies available.

Here is what he had to say:

My wife and I are 54. We don't need maternity care and we don't need ObamaCare.

He is right to be upset. This is simply not in keeping with the spirit of the President's oft repeated promise.

Perhaps the administration would like to tell him he should have just done a better job of keeping up with its regulatory dictates. But what about the millions who purchased their plans relying on the President's promise that they could keep them? What about the husbands and wives across Kentucky who suffered when two of our largest employers had to drop spousal coverage? What about the folks who lost coverage at work? What about all the smaller paychecks and lost jobs? What about the part-timeization of our economy?

This law is a mess. It is a mess. As Secretary Sebelius said herself yesterday: "The system is not functioning."

Maybe she was referring to no more than the narrow problems with healthcare.gov. But as the President keeps reminding us over and over, ObamaCare is about more than just a Web site. He is right about that. That is why, if the system is not functioning, it is just another sign that ObamaCare itself is simply not working. The President and his Washington Democratic allies understand this. That is why the White House is so eager to enroll everybody—other than themselves—into the exchanges. It is why they handed out a yearlong delay to businesses, and that is why the

Washington Democrats' Big Labor allies are looking for their own special carve-outs.

What about everybody else? What about the middle class? Where is their carve-out? So far, Washington Democrats have resisted every attempt to exempt the struggling constituents whom we all represent.

The folks who rammed this partisan bill through know it is not ready for prime time, and they seem to want no part of it themselves. But for you out there, the middle class, it seems to be tough luck—tough luck.

We have even seen some of the same folks try to stamp out innovations that would help folks get out from under some of ObamaCare's more crushing burdens. That is why they have launched a crusade against small businesses that dare to experiment with self-insurance and other pioneering ideas. Maybe the administration does not like self-insurance because it represents a free market alternative to ObamaCare. But the fact is nearly 100 million Americans are already availing themselves of it. I am sure most of them like the greater flexibility and affordability it provides.

So it is time these folks spent their energy working with us to look after the middle class and to bring about the kind of reforms that will actually lower costs and that our constituents want, because they should not have to wake up to news such as this: "Florida Blue is dropping 300,000 customers."

"Hundreds of thousands of New Jerseyans opened the mail last week to find their health insurance plan would no longer exist in 2014"—out of existence.

"Half of the roughly 600,000 people in [my State of] Kentucky's private insurance market will have their current insurance plans discontinued."

Mr. President, 300,000 Kentuckians will have their current insurance plans discontinued.

This is not fair. It is not what Americans were promised, and Republicans intend to keep fighting for middle-class families suffering under this law. I hope more of our Democratic colleagues will join us in this battle in the future.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL JONATHAN FARNHAM

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute

to retired BG Jonathan Farnham, who is retiring after having honorably served his community, State and country for 34 years in the Vermont National Guard.

Jon was commissioned in 1981 through the Reserve Officer Training Corps at the University of Vermont where he earned a Bachelor of Science in economics. Prior to receiving his commission, he served as an enlisted member of the 1st Battalion, 86th Field Artillery of the Vermont Army National Guard.

From his first assignment with the 86th Field Artillery, to his role as Director of the Afghan National Security Forces Development Assistance Bureau, to his nearly 3 years as a civilian employee serving as the Vice Director of the Guard's Joint Staff, Jon has served under 6 Governors and 4 Adjutant Generals. As each of them undoubtedly would agree, his wealth of experience and knowledge has been invaluable to the State and Nation as he has risen through the ranks, serving at nearly every level of command in the Army Guard.

He also served as a fellow in the office of Senator Jim Jeffords, and I have personally benefitted from Jon's legacy, having had the privilege of employing his daughter Lily in my Burlington office during the summer of 2010.

Jon will be remembered for his keen sense of humor, dedication to duty, and deep love and appreciation for the State of Vermont.

I am grateful that the Vermont National Guard was able to benefit from Jon's lifetime of service, and Marcelle and I send our best wishes to him in the retirement he has certainly earned.

HAITI AND ARMENIA REFORESTATION ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is an unfortunate reality—perhaps bordering on negligence—that Congress has been unable to do something about climate change.

How will our grandchildren look back at our inaction when they inherit a changed planet—one that we found too politically inconvenient to help avoid?

Thankfully, this President has shown leadership on this issue, but we must do more.

Recently, I offered a simple piece of legislation—one that has traditionally been very bipartisan—that can help take another common sense step and at the same time improve the lives of millions overseas.

The bill helps two friends of the United States overcome the devastating impacts of deforestation: Haiti and Armenia.

Our forests provide resources for almost two-thirds of all species on the planet, offering shelter, food, fresh water, and medicines. Forests help

with biodiversity, water conservation, soil enrichment, and climate regulation.

Forests cover 30 percent of the world's land area, but we still lose swaths the size of entire countries—about 12–15 million hectares—each year.

In fact, approximately 76 percent of our world's original primary forests have been destroyed or degraded. And deforestation alone accounts for up to 20 percent of the global greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global warming.

That is because forests take carbon out of the air, and in turn, replenish the atmosphere with oxygen. Forests help settle out or trap dust, ash, smoke, and other harmful pollutants. They offer water through an evaporation process and shade to hundreds of thousands of species.

If deforestation continues at this staggering level, we lose one of the planet's most important weapons in stabilizing the global climate.

And deforestation in Haiti and Armenia hurts far more than the global climate—deforestation is a factor in economic, agricultural, health, and environmental problems.

An already struggling country, Haiti was hit hard by the massive, January 2010 earthquake.

More than 200,000 people were killed, and an estimated 1.5 million were displaced. A staggering number of houses and buildings simply collapsed.

The subsequent cholera outbreak claimed over 8,000 lives and infected hundreds of thousands more.

While Americans and people from all over the world donated money, organized shipments of medicines and supplies, and even traveled to Haiti as emergency relief workers helped rescue and treat victims, there is an important piece of the puzzle that has been receiving little attention—the role of deforestation.

When you look at the lush green of the Dominican Republic and compare it to the stark desolation on Haiti's side of the border, it is easy to see why Haiti is so much more vulnerable to soil erosion, landslides, and flooding than its neighbor.

In 1923, Haiti's tropical forest covered 60 percent of the country. Today, less than 2 percent of those forests remain.

Deforestation induces soil erosion and landslides, making land more vulnerable to floods and mudslides. In a place such as Haiti, already scarce agricultural land is rendered all the less productive.

These issues are exacerbated by natural disasters such as the 2010 earthquake or the many tropical storms Haiti has faced in recent years.

I remember on a previous visit to Haiti that there was a strong rain during the evening in the capitol of Port au Prince. I mentioned the rain cas-

ually to our Haitian hotel host and she said that in the morning several people would be dead from the rain.

I was puzzled—from the rain?

Yes, the mountains around Port au Prince have been so deforested that a simple downpour leads to deadly mudslides.

Former Haitian Prime Minister, Michele Pierre-Louis, said it so aptly:

“The whole country is facing an ecological disaster. We cannot keep going on like this. We are going to disappear one day. There will not be 400, 500 or 1,000 deaths [from hurricanes]. There are going to be a million deaths.”

Mr. President, when I visited Armenia last year, I found a similar problem. I had the opportunity to drive through the Armenian countryside for several hours en route from Georgia. What I saw in this otherwise proud country was devastating.

While archaeological data suggests that approximately 35 percent of Armenia was originally forested, less than 8 percent of its forests remain today.

In recent years, increasing bouts of heavy rainfall, landslides, and floods have endangered hundreds of communities in Armenia and cost millions in damages. On the other hand, record droughts have threatened more than two-thirds of the nation by desertification as natural tree cover continues to diminish.

Groups such as the Armenia Tree Project have focused on reforestation efforts in northern Armenia because it suffered a significant loss of forest cover in the early 1990s.

Mr. President, deforestation is brought on by a number of reasons—making land available for urbanization, plantation use, logging, mining—and illegal logging and mining—and others.

Poverty and economic pressures also play significant roles; 80 percent of the population of Haiti and 36 percent of the population of Armenia live below the poverty line, and wood and charcoal produced from cutting down trees accounts for a major—and relatively cheap—supply toward the energy sectors of both nations.

But the implications of deforestation are disastrous. These forests, if protected and regrown, would fight the destructive effects of soil erosion.

They would help protect freshwater sources from contaminants, would safeguard irrigable land, and would save lives during natural disasters. Helping these nations deal with their deforestation problem—one that impacts the entire planet given the rise in greenhouse gas emissions—is not only the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to go with our limited assistance dollars.

Every dollar we put into reforestation in these hard-hit countries pays itself back in economic, health, and environmental returns.

That is why Senators BROWN, CARDIN, FEINSTEIN, and WHITEHOUSE have joined me in introducing the Haiti and Armenia Reforestation Act to help address the deforestation challenge.

The bill aims to restore within 20 years the forest cover of Haiti to at least seven percent and the forest cover of Armenia to at least 12 percent, about each country's respective levels in 1990.

Within 7 years of enactment, the bill also aims to restore the social and economic conditions for the recovery of 35 percent of both countries' land surfaces and to help improve sustainable management of key watersheds.

A number of groups and organizations are already on the ground working toward these goals in Haiti, and a few in Armenia such as the Armenia Tree Project I mentioned earlier, but more needs to be done to help support these efforts in a coordinated manner and with backing from both the Governments of Haiti and Armenia and of the United States.

While it is important to start putting trees in the ground, this bill is about more than just planting trees. Our government has tried that approach in the past and it has proven to be ineffective.

This bill empowers the U.S. Government to work with Haiti and Armenia to develop forest-management programs based on proven, market-based models.

These models will be tailored to help both countries manage their conservation and reforestation efforts in ways that can be measured.

The bill encourages cooperation and engagement with local communities and organizations, provides incentives to protect trees through income-generating growth, and authorizes debt-for-nature swaps, focusing on sustainable restoration of forests, watersheds, and other key land surface areas.

Most importantly, the bill does not authorize any new funds. It will help make sure such existing funds are spent wisely and productively.

It will help the people of Haiti and Armenia rebuild their critical ecosystems, which in turn will have tremendous long-term impacts on their qualities of life.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

TRIBUTE TO CARMEN VELÁSQUEZ

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to thank Carmen Velásquez of Chicago, who is retiring as executive director of Alivio Medical Center, for her many years of service to the Latino Community and the city of Chicago.

As a community leader, civil rights activist, health and education advocate, and one of my personal “she-ros,” Carmen Velásquez has dedicated her life to justice and equitable health access for all. As one of the original

founders of the Alivio Medical Center, she has served the community for 25 years, helping grow one community health center to a network of 6 clinics, with plans to open two new sites this year.

Carmen is the daughter of Mexican immigrants—her father harvested beets in South Dakota before coming to Illinois to start a successful jukebox business. Carmen went on to earn degrees from Loyola University Chicago and the University of the Americas in Puebla, Mexico.

In her professional career, Carmen dedicated her talents and energy to universal health care and immigration reform as a community organizer. She was a social worker and bilingual education specialist, who quickly became a pillar of Chicago's Latino community.

As a member of Chicago's Board of Education, she realized that more needed to be done not only to address the needs of the Latino community in schools, but also in health clinics.

In 1988, Carmen's mission was clear; she needed to find a place to address the too often neglected medical needs of her community. While walking through Chicago's Pilsen neighborhood in search of clinic space, Carmen came upon a muffler shop parking lot littered with rusting old trucks. She went inside the shop and asked its owner if the lot was for sale.

His response? "Offer me something."

Carmen Velásquez made an offer, and with that, she began her active campaign to raise \$2.1 million for construction of the first of Alivio's community health centers.

Carmen's passion and tenacity turned her dream into a reality. Alivio Medical Center opened its doors 1 year later in 1989, as a bilingual, bicultural nonprofit community health center. Alivio has since grown to become a respected advocacy organization that is also an essential safety net provider for many low-income and vulnerable residents of Chicago.

Because of Carmen Velásquez's hard work and dedication, Alivio continues to meet the primary health care needs of over 20,000 Spanish-speaking, predominantly Mexican immigrants who fall through the cracks of the health care system every year. The residents of the Pilsen, Little Village and Back of the Yards neighborhoods who come to the clinic every year know that, regardless of their income level or insurance coverage, they can expect the very best quality care.

Carmen's commitment to her community has not gone unnoticed. She has been recognized for excellence in her work throughout the years. She was recently recognized at halftime by the Chicago Bears with the National Football League's, NFL, Hispanic Heritage Leadership Award, and she has been honored with the MALDEF Life-

time Achievement Award, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Community Health Leadership Award, and Premio Ohtli, the highest honor bestowed by the Government of Mexico on an individual for service to Mexicans living abroad. Illinois Governor Pat Quinn has also honored Carmen as the Latino Heritage Month "Trailblazer of the Day."

I was fortunate to meet Carmen and her family early in my Senate career. On so many occasions I have counted on Carmen's wise counsel and caring heart to help me through the challenges we face. If I could make one phone call before facing a tough decision on an issue of social justice, particularly in the Hispanic community, I would call Carmen Velásquez and know that her life experience, caring heart, and street-level wisdom would never disappoint me.

Carmen's perseverance and her indomitable spirit are tremendous. Her willingness to stand up as a voice for the community during her tenure as Alivio's executive director has left an incredible legacy to Chicago's Latino community enormously.

Congratulations to Carmen on a spectacular career. I thank Carmen for all her years of distinguished service. I know I speak for Alivio's professional staff, the thousands of families that have benefited from her caring leadership, and all of Chicago when I say she will be sorely missed.

I wish her the best as she opens the next chapter in her life.

WORLD WAR II VETERANS VISIT

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President. In October of 2013, Veterans in the Last Frontier and Alaska-Golden Heart hubs of Honor Flight will be traveling to Washington, DC, to visit their memorials. I would like to welcome these heroes to our Nation's capital and take this time to recognize their service to our Nation.

I would like to record the individual names of the World War II veterans selected for this trip: Mr. Jacob Knapp, Army; Mr. Stanley Coleman, Navy; Mr. John Collins, Army; Mr. William Field, Navy; Mr. Alvin Hershberger, Army; Mr. Norman Hogg, Army; Mr. Howard Hunt, Army; Mr. Alfred Kehl, Army; Mr. George Miller, Air Force; Mr. Manuel Norat, Army; Mr. Leonard Nugent, Navy; Mr. Dale Parker, Navy; Mr. Fredrick Samsun, Marines and Air Force; Mr. Marshall Solberg, Navy; Mr. Lafton Wells, Navy; Ms. Ellen White, Air Force; Ms. Juliana Wilson, Navy; Mr. Allen Woodward, Navy; Mr. Edward Young Jr., Air Force; Mr. James Brewster, Navy; Mr. Elvin Brush, Air Force; Mr. Arnold Booth, Army; Mr. Conrad Ryan, Army; Mr. William Miller, Army; Mr. Louis Palmer, Navy; Mr. James Dodge, Marines; Mr. Roy Helms, Army; Mr. Nelson McBirney, Navy and Mr. Wenzel Raith, Navy.

These veterans from Alaska join over 90,000 other veterans from across the country, who, since 2005, have traveled to our Nation's capital to visit and reflect at memorials built here in their honor. This Honor Flight trip was made possible by generous public donations and contributions from those who wish to honor these heroes.

We owe a great deal to our servicemen and veterans who put themselves in harm's way for our Nation and for our security. The sacrifices made by these heroes are truly incredible and without their honor, courage, commitment, and sacrifice, we would not enjoy the freedoms we cherish today.

Each of these veterans have my thanks for their service, and I very appreciate the staff, volunteers and supporters of the Honor Flight program who make these trips happen. Again, thank you to all Alaska veterans and the volunteers for their dedication, commitment, and service.

ESTEVEZ NOMINATION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, yesterday, I voted to confirm Alan Estevez to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense. In this important position, the second highest ranking acquisition official at DOD, Mr. Estevez will help oversee hundreds of billions of dollars in procurement during his tenure.

I am eager to work with Mr. Estevez on an issue important to my State and our overall security strategy. Like my colleagues Senators BLUMENTHAL and CORNYN have discussed, it is unacceptable to me that the Department of Defense is continuing the procurement of Mi-17 helicopters from Rosoboronexport, Russia's official arms export firm.

The reasons to stop this procurement are numerous, and, by contrast, the logic behind the continuation of this procurement is flawed.

Not only is Rosoboronexport at the heart of an industry that Russia's own chief military prosecutor publicly stated is corrupt, but this company is also supplying the Assad regime in Syria. We are handing money—tax dollars from my constituents in Connecticut—to a company that is propping up a regime that is committing atrocities against its own people.

I was outraged to learn that earlier this year that DOD awarded Rosoboronexport a \$572 million contract for the procurement of 30 Mi-17 helicopters for the Afghan Special Mission Wing, completely ignoring the recommendation of the Special Inspector General for Afghan Reconstruction, SIGAR, to halt this procurement.

Even if DOD thinks that this procurement should go forward in light of the SIGAR recommendation, there is no credible reason that these helicopters should not be made in America. My constituents are tired of our procurement dollars going to overseas

firms, and this particular example is one of the most egregious.

We have spent over \$100 billion on equipment from overseas manufacturers in the last several years. When I talk to manufacturers in Connecticut who are churning out the most reliable and rugged military equipment in the world, including helicopters, they just can not understand why we are paying a corrupt Russian arms dealer for equipment we already make at home.

I look forward to making my feelings known to Mr. Estevez and, as we did last year during the consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act, making it clear that this body does not approve of this Mi-17 procurement.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE S. ARTHUR SPIEGEL

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor a friend and fellow Cincinnati, Judge S. Arthur Spiegel, on the occasion of his 94th birthday and would also like to recognize him for his service to our community and our Nation.

On April 5, 1980, Judge Spiegel was appointed as a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio by President Jimmy Carter. He was confirmed on May 20, 1980, and began his duty on June 5, 1980.

With 33 years of Federal judicial service, including as Chief United States District Court Judge for the Southern District of Ohio and by designation on the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, he took senior status on June 5, 1995. He continues to serve on the Court as Cincinnati's oldest sitting judge and continues to handle a full docket and hundreds of cases a year.

Judge Spiegel served his country valiantly in World War II in the Pacific campaigns while serving as a flying artillery spotter in an unarmed light aircraft. He was a United States Marine Corps captain from 1942 to 1946 in the First Marine Division.

Judge Spiegel received a B.A. from the University of Cincinnati in 1942 and obtained his LL.B. from Harvard University in 1948—postgraduate University of Cincinnati, 1949. In addition, he was awarded an honorary degree, Doctor of Humane Letters, by Hebrew Union College, Jewish Institute of Religion in 1996 and a Distinguished Alumni Award, College of Arts & Sciences from the University of Cincinnati in 1997.

Judge Spiegel has served as a role model to many lawyers in private practice and on the bench. His intelligence and strength of character have been revered by many and he has set the highest standards of professionalism for those appearing in his courtroom. He was a cofounder of the Potter Stewart American Inn of Court in Cincinnati,

which was one of the first establishments of this kind, and serves to mentor and teach professionalism and trial techniques to law students and young lawyers.

Judge Spiegel is a member of the American Bar Association, the Ohio Bar Association, the Cincinnati Bar Association, and the Federal Bar Association. He was a lecturer on labor law, debtor/creditor rights, and appellate advocacy at the University of Cincinnati College of Law from 1970 through 1975. He was also a delegate, Sixth Circuit Judicial Conference, from 1967 through 1970; a life member, Sixth Circuit Judicial Conference beginning in 1971; and was a district judge representative for the Sixth Circuit, United States Judicial Conference in 1996 and 1997.

He has served on numerous boards of trustees in his community. He served on the Mayor's Friendly Relations Committee from 1961 to 1965 and the Cincinnati Human Relations Commission from 1967 to 1973, including serving as its first chairman from 1965 to 1967. He was also a board trustee for Bowling Green State University from 1973 to 1981 and has been a trustee and trustee emeritus for the National Conference for Community and Justice since 1973.

In recent years, Judge Spiegel has served on the Roundtable of the Black Lawyers Association of Cincinnati, which aims to broaden the opportunities in the legal profession for minorities. He regularly meets with students of local high schools regarding the role of the courts in our society and also conducts naturalization ceremonies in the local schools. He received the Award of Recognition from the Black Lawyers Association of Cincinnati in 1995.

A civil rights advocate both on and off the bench, Judge Spiegel served as the first chairman of the Cincinnati Human Relations Commission, an organization with the mission of helping the community overcome prejudice and discrimination. As an active participant in the civil rights movement, Spiegel worked to calm tensions after race riots in the late 1960s.

A true renaissance man, Judge Spiegel is a pilot, painter, tennis player, writer, horseback rider, and self-taught mechanic.

He is married to Louise Wachman Spiegel, and they have four sons, Thomas, Arthur M., Andrew, and Roger, and seven grandchildren.

Today, I would like to recognize my friend and an Ohio icon and commend him for the many contributions he has made to our community and to the legal profession.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATING CSU—GLOBAL CAMPUS

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, in an increasingly global economy, we must find ways to promote innovation, increase college access, and make college affordable so that our students can remain competitive. In light of today's Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee hearing which focused on these important topics, I want to recognize Colorado's own Colorado State University—Global Campus for their impressive work in this area. This year marks CSU—Global Campus' 5-year anniversary, and I would also like to congratulate them on reaching that milestone.

CSU—Global Campus, and its president, Dr. Becky Takeda-Tinker, have demonstrated a remarkable commitment to ensuring a quality education at an affordable price. As the first and only 100 percent online, fully accredited public, nonprofit institution in America, students enrolling at CSU—Global today will not see any tuition increases as long as they take at least one class per year, even if tuition rates increase five years down the road. CSU—Global does this because it wants students entering today to be able to plan their education and anticipate the full cost of graduation.

CSU—Global Campus has been at the forefront of new innovative approaches to learning, including offering competency-based courses. Students have access to CSU—Global's full course content online for free and can receive academic credit for passing an exam with a score of 70 percent or better. A 3-credit exam costs \$250 and a 1-credit costs \$150; the fee covers 2 exam attempts in 12 months. There is no additional fee for students to access the materials, faculty, and resources during their study period leading up to the exam. Many of these resources are innovations themselves and include a 24-7 online tutoring service, 24-7 tech support, and a virtual library.

Its students' progress are carefully tracked electronically and student support is a priority. Students partner with faculty or receive other student support if it seems they have struggled in a certain class. Students at CSU—Global are given the flexibility needed to accommodate the many demands on their time, but are still counseled through to completion.

Thirty-four percent of CSU—Global's students are first-generation college students and 23 percent are from the underserved population. Finally, at a time when our country continues to recover financially, 95 percent of CSU—Global graduates are working for pay as of February 2013.

As the cost of college continues to rise, CSU—Global Campus is an innovative alternative. After repaying its \$12

million start-up loan a year ahead of schedule in 2012, it now operates a sustainable model without future appropriations from the State of Colorado.

Mr. President, in April 2013, CSU—Global ranked seventh in U.S. News & World Report's ranking of the Best Online Bachelor's Programs. On the occasion of its fifth anniversary, I congratulate CSU—Global on its tremendous achievements.●

TRIBUTE TO JAMES BUCK

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am delighted to honor the contributions of a loyal and dedicated public servant, Mayor James Buck. In November, Mayor Buck will retire after 4½ decades of public service, 29 years of which he served as mayor of Grandville, MI. Through his vision and tireless advocacy, Mayor Buck has helped to make sure this fine city continues to be a wonderful place to raise a family and for businesses to thrive.

Jim Buck began his career in public service as an appointed member of the Grandville Park & Recreation Board in 1968. Three years later, in 1971, he was elected to the Grandville city council. After a successful stint on the city council, Jim was elected mayor of Grandville in 1984 and has gone on to serve eight consecutive terms.

Although the position of mayor of Grandville is part time, Mayor Buck has always approached it as a full-time responsibility. He has devoted himself to his work as mayor and is visible at community events throughout the year. He is committed to economic and residential development, and has made decisions that have brought businesses and residents to Grandville. He has been a pillar of integrity and a consensus builder. Under Mayor Buck's stewardship, the city of Grandville has maintained sound financial footing despite immense economic challenges.

Mayor Buck is a firm believer that a strong sense of community is vital and improves the quality of life of its residents. Throughout his 45 years on the Grandville Park & Recreation Board, which he has chaired for decades, the city has created new trails and parks and revitalized existing ones. During his tenure, the Park & Recreation Board has turned Grandville's 4th of July Celebration into a major regional event and a beloved community tradition.

An avid tennis player, Jim Buck has enjoyed many successful years of competition, including at the Senior Olympics in recent years. He has been assistant coach to the Grandville High School tennis team for the last 17 years. This year, the team won the OK Red Conference and Regional Championships. It is no coincidence that Grandville has some of the best tennis courts of any city its size in Michigan.

A dedicated and visionary leader, Mayor Buck has not only been

Grandville's strongest advocate but also an active civic leader on regional and State levels. He is an honorary life member of the Michigan Municipal League (MML), chair of the MML Foundation Board, member of the West Michigan Strategic Alliance, and the long-time chairman of the Grand Valley Metropolitan Council.

But more than the list of boards and commissions to his credit, Jim Buck is a man of his community. He works long hours attending events, meeting with residents, visiting schools, and listening to and appreciating the people of Grandville. He has created a standard of community engagement that will be an inspiration to his successors. Indeed, Mayor Buck has made a tremendous contribution to the lives of residents of the city of Grandville now and for generations to come.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the dedicated public service of one of the finest locally elected officials in Michigan, Jim Buck. He has dedicated himself to the betterment of his community. On behalf of the people of Michigan, I wish Jim and his wonderful wife, Kathryn (Kitty) Buck the very best for a well-deserved retirement.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 992. An act to amend provisions in section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act relating to Federal assistance for swaps entities.

H.J. Res. 99. Joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as submitted under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 on October 17, 2013.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3190. An act to provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania, Mr. ADERHOLT of Alabama, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 992. An act to amend provisions in section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act relating to Federal assistance for swaps entities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the second time, and placed on the calendar, pursuant to Sec. 1002 of Public Law 113-46:

H.J. Res. 99. Joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as submitted under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 on October 17, 2013.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3391. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cold Treatment for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables; MidAmerica St. Louis Airport, Mascoutah, IL" (Docket No. APHIS-2012-0089) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3392. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Wisconsin" (Docket No. APHIS-2012-0075) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3393. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Citrus Canker, Citrus Greening, and Asian Citrus Psyllid; Interstate Movement of Regulated Nursery Stock" ((RIN0579-AD29) (Docket No. APHIS-2010-0048)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3394. A communication from the Associate Administrator, National Organic Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Organic Program (NOP); Sunset Review (2013)" ((RIN0581-AD13) (Docket No. AMS-NOP-11-0003; NOP-10-13FR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3395. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing

Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Change in Reporting and Assessment Requirements" (Docket No. AMS-FV-12-0071; FV13-955-1 FIR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3396. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Paper and Paper-Based Packaging Promotion, Research and Information Order; Referendum Procedures" ((RIN0581-AD21) (Docket No. AMS-FV-11-0069; FR-B) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3397. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, California; Decreased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0053; FV13-987-1 IR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3398. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Potato Research and Promotion Plan; Amend the Administrative Committee Structure and Delete the Board's Mailing Address" (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0027) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3399. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Relaxing Size and Grade Requirements on Valencia and Other Large Type Oranges" (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0009; FV13-905-2 FIR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3400. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Avocados Grown in South Florida; Change in Minimum Grade Requirements" (Docket No. AMS-FV-12-0067; FV13-915-1 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3401. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cranberries Grown in States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Long Island

in the State of New York; Revising Determination of Sales History" (Docket No. AMS-FV-12-0042; FV12-929-2 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3402. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "United States Standards for Condition of Food Containers" ((RIN0581-AC52) (Docket No. AMS-FV-08-0027; FV-05-332)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3403. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tart Cherries Grown in the State of Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin; Revising Handler Reporting and Grower Division Requirements" (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0030; FV13-930-2 IR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3404. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0010; FV13-946-1 FIR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3405. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0055; FV13-923-1 IR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3406. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Suspension of Handling Regulations" (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0040; FV13-922-1 IR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3407. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Kiwifruit Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0071; FV13-920-2 IR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3408. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Increased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0041; FV13-922-2 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3409. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Temporary Change to Handling Regulations and Reporting Requirements for Yellow Fleshed and White Types of Potatoes" (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0067; FV13-946-2 IR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3410. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "VA Dental Insurance Program-Federalism" (RIN2900-A085) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-3411. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13413 with respect to blocking the property of persons contributing to the conflict taking place in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3412. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Certain Consumer Products and Commercial and Industrial Equipment" (RIN1904-AD08) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 23, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3413. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products and Certain Commercial and Industrial Equipment: Test Procedures for Showerheads, Faucets, Water Closets, Urinals, and Commercial Prerinse Spray Valves" (RIN1904-AC65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 23, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3414. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mississippi Regulatory Program" (Docket No. MS-023-FOR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3415. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants, State of Iowa; Control of Emissions From Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerator Units, Negative Declaration and 111(d) Plan Rescission; Approval and Promulgation of Operating Permits Program, State of Iowa" (FRL No. 9901-65-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3416. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Frameworks for Early-Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations" (RIN1018-AY87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3417. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Early Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds in the Contiguous United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands" (RIN1018-AY87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3418. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2013-14 Early Season" (RIN1018-AY87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3419. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2013-14 Late Season" (RIN1018-AY87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3420. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Late Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds" (RIN1018-AY87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3421. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Frameworks for Late-Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations" (RIN1018-AY87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24,

2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3422. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for Spring Pygmy Sunfish" (RIN1018-AY19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3423. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for the Fluted Kidneyshell and Slabside Pearlymussel" (RIN1018-AY06) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3424. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for *Chromolaena frustata* (Cape Sable Thoroughwort), *Consolea corallicola* (Florida Semaphore Cactus), and *Harrisia aboriginum* (Aboriginal Prickly-Apple)" (RIN1018-AY08) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3425. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Critical Habitat for the Comal Springs Dryopid Beetle, Comal Springs Riffle Beetle, and Peck's Cave Amphipod" (RIN1018-AY20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3426. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Species Status for 15 Species on Hawaii Island" (RIN1018-AY09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3427. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Blue-throated Macaw" (RIN1018-AY68) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3428. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Fluted Kidneyshell and Slabside Pearlymussel"

(RIN1018-AZ48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3429. A communication from the Chairman, Board of Trustees and the President, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial report in accordance with Section 8G(h) of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-3430. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Government Contracting, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Small Business Subcontracting" (RIN3245-AG22) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-3431. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Government Contracting, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Small Business Size and Status Integrity" (RIN3245-AG23) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-3432. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Size Standards, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Small Business Size Standards: Support Activities for Mining" (RIN3245-AG44) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-3433. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Size Standards, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Small Business Size Standards: Finance and Insurance and Management of Companies and Enterprises" (RIN3245-AG45) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-3434. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Size Standards, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Small Business Size Standards: Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting" (RIN3245-AG43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-3435. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Size Standards, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Small Business Size Standards: Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation" (RIN3245-AG36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 24, 2013; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-3436. A communication from the Deputy Under Secretary and Deputy Director, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes to Implement the Patent Law Treaty" (RIN0651-AC85) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3437. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 19" (RIN0648-BD16) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3438. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the State of New York" (RIN0648-XC878) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3439. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Bigeye Tuna Catch Limit in Longline Fisheries for 2013 and 2014" (RIN0648-BC88) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3440. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic" (RIN0648-BB70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3441. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fisheries Management Plan; Northern Red Hake Quota Harvested" (RIN0648-XC793) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3442. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; 2013-2014 Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf King Mackerel in Western Zone" (RIN0648-XC868) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3443. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sharks in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XC872) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3444. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fish-

eries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XC873) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3445. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Other Rockfish in the Aleutian Island Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XC869) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3446. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer" (RIN0648-XC815) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3447. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XC851) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3448. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XC832) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3449. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XC831) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3450. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Arrowtooth Flounder in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XC816) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3451. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trip Limit Adjustments for the Common Pool Fishery" (RIN0648-XC823) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3452. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XC882) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3453. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XC875) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3454. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Shortraker Rockfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XC876) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3455. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2013 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Snowy Grouper" (RIN0648-XC733) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3456. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Atlantic Aggregated Large Coastal Shark (LCS), Atlantic Hammerhead Shark, Atlantic Blacknose Shark, and Atlantic Non-Blacknose Small Coastal Shark (SCS) Management Groups" (RIN0648-XC881) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3457. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Bay Swim VI, Presque Isle Bay, Erie, PA" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0311) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3458. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

"Nontank Vessel Response Plans and Other Response Plan Requirements" ((RIN1625-AB27) (Docket No. USCG-2008-1070)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3459. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Baltimore Harbor, Baltimore's Inner Harbor; Baltimore, MD" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0767)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3460. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Information Required in Notices and Petitions Containing Interchange Commitments" (RIN2140-AB13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3461. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Standard for Cigarette Lighters; Adjusted Customs Value for Cigarette Lighters" (16 CFR Part 1210) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3462. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; Cedar Rapids, Iowa" (MB Docket No. 13-182, DA 13-1882) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3463. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; San Diego Bayfair; Mission Bay, San Diego, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0476)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3464. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "An Inquiry Into the Commission's Policies and Rules Regarding AM Radio Service Directional Antenna Performance Verification" (FCC 13-115) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3465. A communication from the Chief of the Satellite Division, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "In the Matter of Comprehensive Review of Licensing and Operating Rules for Satellite Services" (IB Docket No. 12-267, FCC 13-111) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 268. A resolution condemning the September 2013 terrorist attack at the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, and reaffirming United States support for the people and Government of Kenya, and for other purposes.

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 42. A bill to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, without amendment:

S. 1631. A bill to consolidate the congressional oversight provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN from the Committee on Armed Services.

*Kenneth L. Mossman, of Arizona, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2016.

*Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

*Jamie Michael Morin, of Michigan, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, Department of Defense.

*Michael D. Lumpkin, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Cox, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Jill J. Nelson, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Hector Lopez, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Keith D. Jones, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Col. Garrett P. Jensen, to be Brigadier General.

*Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Robert B. Brown, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Robert L. Walter, Jr., to be Major General.

*Army nomination of Maj. Gen. William C. Mayville, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

*Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Stephen R. Lanza, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Capt. Bruce L. Gillingham, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of Brian J. Hood, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with John P. Schumacher and ending with Paul C. Robinson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2013.

Air Force nominations beginning with Scott P. Irwin and ending with Dave C. Prakash, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2013.

Air Force nomination of Gregory L. Koontz, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Nga T. Do, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Richard L. Piontkowski, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Sary O. Beidas and ending with Gerry R. Gerry, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2013.

Army nomination of Benjamin P. Donham, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Anthony P. Clark and ending with Karen L. Ryan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2013.

Army nomination of Robert F. Pleczkowski, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Milton L. Shipman and ending with Robert W. Stewart, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 7, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with John C. Anderson and ending with Alexis M. Wells, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 7, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with James L. Brisson, Jr. and ending with David A. Vanderjagt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 7, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with James D. Brown and ending with Leslie D. Maloney, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 7, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Laurence J. Bazer and ending with John E. Trunzo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 7, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Brian M. Adelson and ending with Brian G. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 7, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Kenneth E. Brandt and ending with Wiley R. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 9, 2013.

Navy nomination of Justin R. Hodges, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of George P. Byrum, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Sennay M. Stefanos, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Jessica Y. Lin, to be Lieutenant Commander.

By Mr. JOHNSON, of South Dakota, for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

*Katherine M. O'Regan, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

*Wanda Felton, of New York, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2017.

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Frank A. Rose, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Verification and Compliance).

*Tomasz P. Malinowski, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

*Gregory B. Starr, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Diplomatic Security).

*Anne W. Patterson, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Ambassador, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Near Eastern Affairs).

*Rose Ellene Gottemoeller, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

*Crystal Nix-Hines, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

*Pamela K. Hamamoto, of Hawaii, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Pamela K. Hamamoto.

Post: U.S. Representative to the Office of the UN and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with rank of Ambassador.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date and donee:

1. Self: \$1,000, 10/15/09, Democratic National Committee; \$1,000, 4/27/10, Democratic National Committee; \$5,000, 6/4/11, Tim Kaine for Virginia; \$2,500, 6/7/11, Obama for America via Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$2,500, 9/8/11, Obama for America via Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$2,500, 9/8/11, DNC via Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$1,000, 10/30/12, DNC via Obama Victory Fund 2012.

2. Spouse: Kurtis Kaull: No contributions.

3. Children and Spouses: Justin Kaull (son): No contributions. Jessica Kaull (daughter): No contributions.

4. Parents: Howard Hamamoto (father): \$2,400, 8/14/09, Daniel K. Inouye for US Senate; \$400, 8/14/09, Daniel K. Inouye for US Senate; \$1,000, 8/24/09, Republican Party of Hawaii; \$1,000, 9/14/09, Charles Djou for Hawaii; \$1,000, 4/27/10, Friends of Mazie Hirono; \$500, 8/23/10, Colleen Hanabusa for Hawaii; \$500, 10/27/10, Friends of Mazie Hirono; \$500, 10/28/10, Colleen Hanabusa for Hawaii; \$500, 7/14/11, Republican Party of Hawaii; \$500, 10/17/12, Friends of Mazie Hirono; \$1,000, 4/10/13, Brian Schatz for Senate. Joanne Hamamoto (mother): \$1,000, 5/26/09, Friends of Mazie Hirono; \$1,000, 2/9/10, Daniel K. Inouye for US Senate; \$2,500, 7/25/12, Linda Lingle Senate Committee.

5. Grandparents: Ralph Russell: Deceased; Lela Russell: Deceased; Hakumasa Hamamoto: Deceased; Hanako Kwai: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: David Hamamoto (brother): \$2,400, 12/16/09, Friends of Schumer; \$500, 3/10/10, Bill Binnie for US Senate; \$35,800, 4/12/11, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$35,800, 3/19/12, Obama Victory Fund 2012. Martha Hamamoto (brother's spouse): \$35,800, 4/12/11, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$35,800, 3/19/12, Obama Victory Fund 2012. Mark Hamamoto (brother): No contributions. Paul Hamamoto (brother): No contributions.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

*Adam M. Scheinman, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the rank of Ambassador.

*James Walter Brewster, Jr., of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

Nominee: James Walter Brewster Jr.

Post: U.S. Ambassador, Dominican Republic.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, date, amount, and donee: 1. 01/02/09, \$1000, Presidential Inaugural Committee; 2. 02/05/09, \$500, Fritchey for U.S. Congress; 3. 02/27/09, \$1000, Democratic National Committee; 4. 03/25/09, \$2300, Alexi Giannoulas for Illinois; 5. 05/12/09, \$1000, Democratic National Committee; 6. 06/22/09, \$1000, Eddie Bernice Johnson for Congress; 7. 06/24/09, \$500, Bill Foster for Congress; 8. 07/15/09, \$5000, Democratic National Committee; 9. 08/28/09, \$500, Alexi Giannoulas for Illinois; 10. 11/15/09, \$500, Patrick Murphy for Congress; 11. 01/15/10, \$500, Martha Coakley for Senate; 12. 03/01/10, \$1900, Alexi Giannoulas for Illinois; 13. 03/31/10, \$250, Bill Foster for Congress; 14. 05/16/10, \$300, Patrick Murphy for Congress; 15. 06/14/10, \$500, Dan Seals for Congress; 16. 06/28/10, \$500, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; 17. 08/23/10, \$5000, Democratic National Committee; 18. 09/15/10, \$500, Alexi Giannoulas for Illinois; 19. 09/23/11, \$1000, Schakowsky for Congress; 20. 09/24/10, \$250, Eddie Bernice Johnson for U.S. Representative; 21. 09/26/10, \$1000, Schakowsky for Congress; 22. 09/28/10, \$500, Kendrick Meeks for Florida; 23. 10/14/10, \$250, Eddie Bernice Johnson for Congress; 24. 10/24/10, \$1900, Alexi Giannoulas for Illinois; 25. 10/25/10, \$500, Fisher for Ohio; 26. 03/02/11, \$1000, Schakowsky for Congress; 27. 03/03/11, \$250, Gillibrand for Senate; 28. 04/07/11, \$1500, Friends of Dick Durbin; 29. 04/04/11, \$35800, Obama Victory Fund; 30. 06/13/11, \$1000, Schakowsky for Congress; 31. 06/21/11, \$2500, Kaine for Virginia; 32. 09/22/11, \$500, Bill Foster for Congress; 33. 09/30/11, \$500, Tammy Baldwin for Senate; 34. 12/29/11, \$9200, Swing State Victory Fund; 35. 03/14/12, \$30800, Swing State Victory Fund; 36. 05/08/12, \$2300, Hillary Clinton for President; 37. 05/25/12, \$1000, Quigley for Congress; 38. 05/31/12, \$500, Friends of Dick Durbin; 39. 06/13/12, \$2000, Tammy Baldwin for Senate; 40. 06/25/12, \$250, Joe Kennedy for Congress; 41. 06/25/12, \$2500, Cicilline Committee; 42. 06/27/12, \$1000, Schakowsky for Congress; 43. 06/28/12, \$2500, McCaskill for Missouri; 44. 07/19/12, \$1000, Bill Foster for Congress; 45. 07/27/12, \$500, Carmona for Arizona; 46. 09/04/12, \$500, Tim Kaine for U.S. Senate; 47. 09/14/12, \$5000, Committee for Charlotte; 48. 09/27/12, \$1000, Schakowsky for Congress; 49. 12/10/12, \$300, Quigley for Congress; 50. 01/10/13, \$5000, Presidential Inaugural Committee; 51. 01/24/13, \$1000, Al Franken for U.S. Senate; 52. 02/28/13, \$250, Jeff Merkley for Congress.

Spouse: N/A.

Children and Spouses: N/A.

Parents: James Walter Brewster, none; Patsy Ruth Brewster—deceased.

Grandparents: deceased.

Brothers and Spouses: N/A.

Sisters and Spouses: Patti Susanne Fox, none.

*Brian A. Nichols, of Rhode Island, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Peru.

Nominee: Brian Andrew Nichols.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Peru.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

1. Self: \$1250, 02/14/2008, Obama, Barack, via Obama for America.

2. Spouse: Geraldine K. Kam: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Alexandra E. Nichols (minor, no spouse): None. Sophia E. Nichols (minor, no spouse).

4. Parents: Charles H. Nichols, father (deceased). Mildred T. Nichols, mother: \$100.00, 01/09/08, Obama for America; \$25.00, 01/10/08, Obama for America; \$50.00, 01/25/08, Obama for America; \$50.00, 02/01/08, Obama for America; \$50.00, 02/07/08, Obama for America; \$50.00, 02/28/08, Obama for America; \$50.00, 03/19/08, Obama for America; \$30.00, 04/06/08, Obama for America; \$100.00, 04/30/08, Obama for America; \$50.00, 05/21/08, Obama for America; \$50.00, 05/28/08, Obama for America; \$100.00, 07/02/08, Obama for America; \$50.00, 07/09/08, Obama for America; \$50.00, 07/30/08, Obama for America; \$100.00, 08/12/06, Obama for America; \$100.00, 08/25/08, Obama for America; \$100.00, 09/12/08, Obama for America; \$100.00, 10/18/08, Obama for America; \$100.00, 11/03/08, \$50.00, 11/22/08, Obama Transition Project. \$50.00, 12/08/08, Hillary Clinton Committee. \$120.00, 12 Monthly \$10.00 Contributions, Democratic National Committee. \$50.00, 10/12/08, Democratic National Committee. \$50.00, 05/22/08, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; \$35.00, 06/28/08, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; \$35.00, 08/25/08, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; \$50.00, 08/29/08, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; \$50.00, 09/13/08, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. \$25.00, 06/27/08, Democracy for America. \$25.00, 08/18/08, 21st Century Democrats. \$50.00, 07/09/10, Tarryl Clark Minnesota House Race—Friends of Tarryl Clark; \$25.00, 09/17/10, Tarryl Clark Minnesota House Race—Friends of Tarryl Clark. \$250.00, 03/01/2012, Rhode Island Senate Victory 2012. \$300.00, 05/24/2011, Obama, Barack, via Obama for America; \$250.00, 08/04/2011, Obama, Barack, via Obama for America. \$250.00, 12/05/2011, Cicilline, David N. via Cicilline committee; \$250.00, 05/21/2012, Cicilline, David N. via Cicilline committee. \$250.00, 05/30/2011, Cicilline, David N. via Cicilline committee.

Joint Fundraising Contributions.

These are contributions to committees who are raising funds to be distributed to other committees. The breakdown of these contributions to their final recipients may appear below.

\$1000.00, 09/24/2011, Obama Victory Fund, 2012; \$250.00, 06/30/2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$500.00, 10/15/2010, Rhode Island Victory.

These are the Final Recipients of Joint Fundraising Contributions.

\$250.00, 03/01/12, Whitehouse, Sheldon II via Whitehouse for Senate. \$250.00, 10/15/2010, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. \$1000.00, 09/24/2011, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$250.00, 06/30/2012, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$500.00, 09/07/2012, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$250.00, 10/15/2010, Cicilline, David N. via Cicilline Committee. \$200.00, 09/09/2012, Cicilline, David N. via Cicilline Committee.

5. Grandparents: Charles H. Nichols, Sr. (deceased); Julia King Nichols (deceased); Thomas E. Thompson (deceased); Lillian Clark Thompson (deceased).

6. Brothers and Spouses: David G. Nichols (brother): \$200.00, 04/28/2008, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$208, 08/18/2011, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$250, 09/27/2011, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$208, 11/28/2011, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$208, 04/01/2012, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$208, 05/02/2012, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$208, 06/01/2012, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$208, 07/01/2012, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$208, 08/01/2012, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$208, 02/01/2012, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$208, 03/01/2012, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$208, 11/01/2012, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$208, 11/04/2012, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$208.00, 09/01/2012, Obama, Barack via Obama for America. \$208.00, 10/01/2012, Obama, Barack via Obama for America.

David Nichols contributions are designed to contribute the maximum to the Obama campaign (i.e. \$2500 each for the primary and general election). He states that he contributed \$208 per month x 12 months for the primary and \$208 x 12 months for the general election. He is not able to provide further detail. The donations above are those that appear on the FEC website.

\$500.00, 11/14/2009, Mikulski, Barbara via Mikulski for Senate Committee. Mayme Boyd (spouse of David Nichols): \$500.00, 07/07/2010, Kratovil, Frank M. Mr. Jr. via Frank Kratovil, for Congress. Keith F. Nichols (Brother), Michele Pitts Nichols (Spouse of Keith Nichols): \$35, 02/13/2011, Emily's List. \$15, 05-13-11, Democratic Senate Campaign Committee. \$25, 05-28-10, Democratic Senate Campaign Committee. \$225.00, 09/26/2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012. \$225.00, 09/26/2012, Obama, Barack via Obama for America.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

*Mark Bradley Childress, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Republic of Tanzania.

Nominee: Mark B. Childress.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Tanzania.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$500, 9/7/2012, Tim Kaine.
2. Spouse: Katherine Childress: \$1,000, 6/3/2013, Kay Hagan; \$1000, 10/22/2012, Tim Kaine; \$500, 1/13/2012, Tim Kaine; \$500, 9/7/2012, Tim Kaine; \$250, 3/31/2010, Charles Schumer.

3. Children and Spouses: none.

4. Parents: Gran Childress, none; Gayle Childress, none.

5. Grandparents: Gaylord Hancock, none; Alice Hancock, none.

6. Brothers and Spouses: none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Susan McCracken, none; Randy McCracken, none; Leesa Sluder, \$50.00, 3/27/2012, DCCC; \$50.00, 6/30/2010, DCCC; \$50.00, 5/18/2010, DCCC; Todd Sluder, none.

*Carlos Roberto Moreno, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belize.

Nominee: Carlos Roberto Moreno.

Post: Belize.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I

have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$2500, 9/1/12, Obama Victory Fund; \$1000, 1/14/12, Obama Victory Fund; \$100, 5/20/12, Feinstein 2012.

2. Spouse: \$2500, 9/1/12, Obama Victory Fund.

3. Children and Spouses: Keiko Moreno, none; Nicholas Ray Moreno, none; Heather Rose Moreno, none.

4. Parents: Jesus Moreno—deceased (1975); Luisa Brucklmaier—deceased (1975).

5. Grandparents—all deceased: Karl & Luisa Brucklmaier; Pedro & Anastasia Moreno.

6. Brothers and Spouses: William Moreno—deceased; Peter Louis Moreno, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Lupe Bobadilla—deceased; Gloria Hidalgo, none.

*John Hoover, of Massachusetts, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Sierra Leone.

Nominee: John F. Hoover.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Sierra Leone:

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions: amount, date, donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Terrence Lin Hoover: None. Patrick David Hoover: None.

4. Parents: Terrence David Hoover: \$50, 2012 Democratic Governor's Association; Ann Hoover: \$75, 2012 Obama campaign; \$25, 2012 Democratic Senate Committee.

5. Grandparents: Jacob Hoover: deceased; Louise Hoover: deceased; Catherine Fockler: deceased; Frederick Fockler: deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: David Hoover: None. Marion Proud: None. Andrew Hoover: \$200, 2012 Obama campaign. Kay Clarke: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Elizabeth Hoover: None.

*Timothy M. Broas, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Nominee: Timothy M. Broas.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and Donee:

1. Self: \$2400, 3/2/09, Friends of Byron Dorgan; \$2400, 3/31/09, Patrick Murphy for Congress; \$500, 9/17/09, Friends of Patrick Kennedy Inc; \$500, 10/27/09, Campaign for Our Country; \$15200, 2/3/10, Democratic National Committee; \$1000, 2/28/10, John Kerry for Senate; \$1000, 6/22/10, John Kerry for Senate; \$500, 6/22/10, Friends of Schumer; \$15200, 7/30/10, Democratic National Committee; \$2400, 8/9/10, Bennet for Colorado; \$25, 8/16/10, Democratic National Committee; \$1000, 9/30/10, Alexi for Illinois; \$1000, 9/30/10, Perriello for

Congress; \$2400, 10/25/10, Patrick Murphy for Congress; \$2800, 12/22/10, John Kerry for Senate; \$35800, 4/8/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$30800, 4/8/11, Democratic National Committee, via The Obama Victory Fund; \$5000, 4/8/11, Obama for America; \$2500, 5/2/11, Kaine for Virginia; \$1000, 5/14/11, Campaign for Our Country 2012; \$2500, 5/12/11, Klobuchar for Minnesota; \$1500, 5/25/11, Montanans for Tester; \$2500, 6/17/11, Setti Warren for Senate; \$2500, 11/30/11, Kaine for Virginia; \$1000, 3/6/12, Friends of John Delaney; \$2500, 3/27/12, Andrei for Arizona; \$1000, 3/28/12, Elizabeth for MA Inc.; \$1000, 3/29/12, Hoyer's Majority Fund; \$2500, 3/28/12, Joseph Kennedy III for Congress; \$30,800, 3/31/12, Obama Victory Fund; \$30,800, 3/31/12, Democratic National Committee, via The Obama Victory Fund; \$1000, 04/01/13, Common Ground PAC; \$1000, 02/04/13, Ed Markey for US Senate; \$4000, 06/05/13, Common Ground PAC; \$500, 07/16/13, Udall for Colorado.

Spouse: Julie McAree Broas: \$2500, 10/17/12, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$2500, 10/17/12, Obama for America via Obama Victory Fund 2012.

3. Children: Emily Broas: \$2500, 10/12/11, Obama for America, via Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$2500, 10/17/12, Obama for America via Obama Victory Fund 2012; Allison Broas: \$2500, 10/17/12, Obama for America via Obama Victory Fund 2012; Madeline Broas: \$2500, 10/17/12, Obama for America, via Obama Victory Fund 2012.

4. Parents: none.

5. Grandparents: none.

6. Brothers and Spouses: none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: none.

*Donald Lu, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Albania.

Nominee: Donald Lu.

Post: Albania.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: Ariel C. Ahart: none.

3. Children and Spouses: Kipling I. Lu, none; Aliya A. Lu, none.

4. Parents: David S. Lu, none; Allena Kaplan, none.

5. Grandparents: Abbie Fong, none.

6. Brothers and Sisters: Gene and Terry Lu, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Bonnie and Douglas Morgan, none.

Robert A. Sherman, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Portuguese Republic.

Nominee: Robert A. Sherman.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Portuguese Republic.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

1. Self: \$5,000.00, 10/22/2012, Obama Victory Fund; \$5,000.00, 10/22/2012, Obama Victory

Fund; \$5,000.00, 10/22/2012, Obama Victory Fund; \$2,500.00, 10/13/2012, Win Virginia 2012 (Tim Kaine); \$533.00, 09/28/2012, Toward Tomorrow PAC; \$1,000.00, 09/28/2012, Toward Tomorrow PAC; \$10,000.00, 6/30/2012, Obama Victory Fund; \$2,500.00, 03/31/2012, Joe Kennedy for Congress; \$2,500.00, 03/28/2012, Debbie Wasserman Schultz for Congress; \$2,500.00, 01/30/2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$5,000.00, 01/05/2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$5,000.00, 12/23/2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$5,000.00, 12/23/2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$1,000.00, 12/21/2011, RO for Congress, Inc.; \$500.00, 12/20/2011, Whitehouse for Senate; \$1,000.00, 12/13/2011, Christie Vilsack for Iowa; \$5,000.00, 08/10/2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$2,500.00, 08/10/2011, Obama Victory Fund; \$2,500.00, 06/30/2011, Khazei for Massachusetts; \$1,000.00, 06/29/2011, Menendez for Senate; \$2,500.00, 06/29/2011, Kaine for Virginia; \$1,000.00, 12/13/2010, John Kerry for Senate; \$1,000.00, 12/13/2010, John Kerry for Senate; \$1,000.00, 09/29/2010, Friends of Blanche-Lincoln; \$1,000.00, 09/16/2010; Sestak for Senate; \$250.00, 09/16/2010, Tommy Sowers for Congress; \$500.00, 06/23/2010, Patrick Murphy for Congress; \$250.00, 05/24/2010, Gillibrand for Senate; \$250.00, 05/24/2010, Mark Critz for Congress; \$1,000.00, 02/08/2010, Hodes for Senate; \$1,400.00, 02/08/2010, Hodes for Senate; \$5,000.00, 12/31/2009, DNC Serv Corp/Democratic Nat Comm; \$1,000.00, 12/22/2009, Martha Coakley for Senate Committee; \$250.00, 11/23/2009, Patrick Murphy for Congress; \$500.00, 06/30/2009, Dem Senatorial Campaign Comm; \$500.00, 04/21/2009, NY-20 Victory Fund; \$1,000.00, 03/13/2009, Hodes for Senate.

2. Spouse: Kim Sawyer; \$2,500.00, 09/18/2012, Joe Kennedy for Congress; \$500.00, 09/28/2010, Emily's List; \$1,500.00, 04/13/2010, Obama Victory Fund; \$2,400.00, 10/08/2009, Martha Coakley for Senate.

3. Children and Spouses: Matthew Sherman (son) single, not married: None; Stephanie Sherman (daughter) single, not married: None.

4. Parents: Samuel Sherman (father): deceased; Rose Sherman (mother) deceased.

5. Grandparents: deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

*Robert O. Blake, Jr., of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Indonesia.

Nominee: Robert O. Blake, Jr.

Post: Jakarta, Indonesia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, donee, date, amount:

1. Self: Whitehouse, Sheldon II, via Whitehouse for Senate, 09/27/2011, 2500.00; Whitehouse, Sheldon II, via Whitehouse for Senate, 09/27/2011, 2500.00.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: None (children are ages 11, 9 and 6 and did not make contributions).

4. Parents: Father Robert Blake (Sr), Whitehouse, Sheldon II, via Whitehouse for Senate, 01/31/2011, 1000.00; Obama, Barack, via Obama for America, 04/19/2007, 2300.00; 09/30/2008, 2300.00; via Ocegueda for Congress, 09/02/2012, 1000.000; Brown, Charles, via Brown for Congress, 09/04/2008, 1000.00; Whitehouse, Sheldon II, via Whitehouse for Senate, 03/30/

2011, 2500.00; Bennet, Michael F, via Bennet for Colorado, 08/04/2010, 250.00, Shafroth, William G, via Shafroth for Congress, 08/04/2008, 500.00; Whitehouse, Sheldon II, via Whitehouse for Senate, 05/07/2012, 2500.00; Reid, Harry, via Friends for Harry Reid, 10/12/2009, 2400.00, 10/12/2009, 2400.00; Tester, Jon, via Montanans for Tester, 06/10/2011, 1000.00; Boxer, Barbara, via Friends of Barbara Boxer, 06/30/2009, 250.00; Boxer, Barbara, via Friends of Barbara Boxer, 09/01/2010, 500.00.

Sister Lucy Blake's husband Steven Nightingale: Heinrich, Martin Trevor, via Martin Heinrich for Senate.

*Thomas Frederick Daughton, of Arizona, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Namibia.

Nominee: Thomas F. Daughton.

Post: Ambassador to Namibia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None

2. Spouse: Melinda C. Burrell; \$200.00, 04/21/13, Democratic Party Cmte Abroad; \$26.15, 12/20/12, Feminist Maj'y Fnd; \$175.00, May-Nov/12, Brown, Sherrod; \$100.00, 09/04/12, Obama, Barack; \$50.00, 06/14/12, Color of Change; \$100.00, 05/16/12, McNeil for DCCC; \$250.00, 10/08/10, Perriello, Tom; \$1000.00, 4/24/2011, Democratic Party Cmte Abroad; \$500.00, 11/10/09, Perriello, Tom.

3. Children and Spouses: None.

4. Parents: Donald F. Daughton; \$150.00, 10/26/12, Save Our Judges; \$250.00, 09/29/12, Carmona, Richard; \$200.00, 05/02/12, Walsh, James P.; \$500.00, 12/31/11, Bivens, Don. Helen M. Daughton: None.

5. Grandparents: Fred J. Daughton—deceased; Ethel E. Daughton—deceased; Tom B. Rollow—deceased; Helen K. Rollow—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Andrew M. Daughton, none; Theresa S. Daughton, none; James P. Daughton, none; Karyn Panitch Daughton, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Erin E. Daughton; \$68.00, Jul-Nov/12, Obama for America; \$5.00, 09/21/12, Act Blue MA; \$25.00, 10/26/12, Act Blue MA. Garth Katner, none.

*Philip S. Goldberg, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career-Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Philippines.

Nominee: Philip S. Goldberg.

Post: Republic of the Philippines.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: None—deceased.

5. Grandparents: None—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Donna Goldberg Eskind; \$2500, 6/20/2011, James Cooper for

Congress; Jeffrey B. Eskin, MD; \$1000, 7/9/2010, Tennessee Democratic Party.

*Michael Stephen Hoza, of Washington, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cameroon.

Nominee: Michael S. Hoza.

Post: Embassy Yaounde, Cameroon.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Paul M. Hoza (single): None; Christopher Hoza (single): None.

4. Parents: Helen B. Hoza: None; Paul P. Hoza (deceased): None.

5. Grandparents: Stephen Hoza (deceased): None; Mary R. Hoza (deceased): None.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Paula K. Hoza; \$27.50, 6/25/2012, Act Blue; \$25.00, 8/30/2012, Obama for America; \$25.00, 9/30/2012, Obama for America; \$25.00, 10/29/2012, Act Blue; \$35.00, 10/29/2012, People for the American Way. John Canary: None.

*Eunice S. Reddick, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member at the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Niger.

Nominee: Eunice S. Reddick.

Post: Niamey, Republic of Niger.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date and donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Son, Gregory Wall: None; Spouse, Rona Cohen: None; Daughter, Sarah Wall: None.

4. Parents: Mother, Carrie Reddick: Deceased; Father Ellsworth Reddick: Deceased.

5. Grandparents (Maternal): Grandmother, Sarah Crawford: Deceased; Grandfather, Henry Crawford: Deceased. (Father's parents unknown and long deceased).

6. Brothers and Spouses: Names: N/A.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Helen Luchars: Deceased; Spouse, Robert Luchars: Deceased.

*Karen Clark Stanton, of Michigan, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste.

Nominee: Karen Clark Stanton.

Post: Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of East Timor.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. William Stanton (spouse): none.
 3. Children and Spouses: Katherine Stanton: none however she was a volunteer Hub Director for the Falls Church VA office of the Obama campaign in 2008; Elizabeth Stanton: none.

4. Parents: Lillian (mother): \$50, 2008, Obama; Nicholas Kopetzki: \$50, 2012, Obama; Clifford Clark (father): none; Arlene Clark (father's spouse): \$25, 5/2012, Obama; \$25, 9/2012, Obama.

5. Grandparents: Boise and Margaret Clark: Charles and Ruth Gibbons: All grandparents are deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Douglas (brother) and Karen Clark: \$15, 2012, Obama. Doug also reports that he paid around \$500 to a local printer to print and place Obama Biden signs in St. Clair County Michigan in 2008. David (brother) and Christine Clark: none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: none.

*Matthew T. Harrington, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Lesotho.

Nominee: Matthew T. Harrington.

Post: Lesotho.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: None.
3. Children and Spouses: None.
4. Parents: Tracy/Judy Harrington: \$75, 2012, Obama campaign; \$20.35, 2012, Dem. Cong. Campaign Committee.
5. Grandparents: None.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Luke/Margaret Harrington: \$235, 2012, Obama Campaign.
7. Sisters and spouses: None.

*Dwight L. Bush, Sr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Morocco.

Nominee: Dwight Lamar Bush, Sr.

Post: Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: 2,500, 06/29/11, Joanne Dowdell For Congress; 2,400, 06/20/10, Andre Williams For Congress; 2,000, 03/19/13, The Markey Committee; 1,000, 03/12/09, Hillary Clinton For President; 35,800, 05/17/11, Obama Victory Fund; 35,800, 06/28/12, Obama Victory Fund; 1,000, 04/12/12, Friends of Doug Gansler; 1,000, 09/15/10, Vincent Gray For Mayor; 1,000, 06/20/10, Kwame Brown City Council; 2,000, 3/15/13, Mary Landrieu.
2. Spouse: 500, 12/31/12, ACTBLUE; 1,000, 09/26/11, Kaine for VA; 250, 03/12/10, Kendrick Meek For Florida INC; 500, 10/04/11, Dan Inouye For US Senate; 500, 5/18/12, Friends of Sherrod Brown; 1,000, 07/31/12, John Kerry For Senate; 1,500, 10/31/11, Klobuchar For MN; 500, 08/09/11, Leahy For U.S. Senate CMTE; 500, 07/31/12, Leahy For U.S. Senate CMTE; 1,000, 04/10/12, Elizabeth For MA INC; 500, 09/23/11, Friends of Maria Cantwell; 500, 08/21/12,

Friends of Maria Cantwell; 250, 08/18/10, Citi-zens For Eleanor Holmes Norton; 2,400, 7/31/90, Jessie Jackson Jr For Congress; 500, 05/04/10, Jessie Jackson For Congress; 500, 02/23/12, Jessie Jackson For Congress; 35,800, 6/29/11, Obama Victory Fund.

3. Children and Spouses: Dwight Lamar Bush Jr.: None; Jacqueline Dibble Bush: None.

4. Parents: Charlie W. Bush: None. Jessie Mae Bush: 2,500, 06/30/11, Obama Victory Fund; Mercer Cook: 1,000, 09/19/12, Obama For America; Ann Jordan: 250, 10/09/09, Leahy For U.S. Senate; Vernon E. Jordan, Jr.: 500, 02/15/11, Klobuchar For MN; 1,000, 10/26/11, Maria Cantwell; 1,000, 03/22/10, Richard Blumenthal; 1,000, 03/02/09, Byron Dorgan; 500, 05/03/10, Barbara Mikulski; 500, 10/24/10, Michael Bennett; 2,000, 09/15/11, Dianne Feinstein; 500, 07/29/10, Patty Murray; 1,000, 06/29/12, Tim Kaine; 1,000, 10/15/12, Heidi Heitkamp; 1,000, 06/16/09, Harry Reid; 500, 05/18/10, Blanche Lincoln; 1,000, 03/15/13, Mary Landrieu; 500, 06/16/11, Sheldon Whitehouse II; 500, 08/11/2010, Barbara Mikulski; 2,400, 10/12/10, Charles Schumer; 1,000, 04/30/10, DNC; 1,000, 08/29/11, Obama For America; 1,000, 05/03/10, Terri Sewell; 1,000, 12/31/11, Debbie Wasserman; Schultz; 250, 12/01/10, Eleanor Holmes Norton; 1,000, 02/28/12, Democratic Campaign Committee; 225, 07/24/12, Democratic Campaign Committee; 500, 10/11/10, Chet Edwards; 1,000, 07/24/09, James Clyburn; 300, 02/14/11, Charles Rangel; 500, 08/19/11, Charles Rangel; 1,000, 06/14/12, Charles Rangel; 213, 07/31/10, Democratic Congressional Campaign CMTE; 1,000, 10/20/10, Democratic Congressional Campaign CMTE; 1,000, 06/30/11, Democratic Congressional Campaign CMTE; 1,000, 09/24/10, AMERIPAC; 1,000, 07/26/12, AMERIPAC; 2,500, 09/10/12, Obama For America; 34,800 11/29/11, Obama Victory Fund; 32,500, 09/28/12, Obama Victory Fund.

5. Grandparents: None.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Itez Bush: None; Darryl Bush: None; Althea Bush: None; Mercer Cook III: 250, 07/30/12, Obama For America; Janice Cook Roberts: 2,500, 09/23/11, Jared Polis; 500, 11/05/12, Sean Patrick Maloney; 1,000, 08/13/11, Joanne Dowdell; Richard Roberts: 250, 12/19/11, Obama For America; 250, 07/09/09, Terri Sewell.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Janice Cook Roberts: 2,500 09/23/11, Jared Polis; 500, 11/05/11, Sean Maloney; 1,000, 08/13/11, Joanne Dowdell; Richard Roberts: 250, 12/19/11, Obama For America; 250, 07/09/09, Terri Sewell.

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Robert Leon Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Brian J. Davis, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Timothy L. Brooks, of Arkansas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas.

James Donato, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California.

Beth Labson Freeman, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California.

Pedro A. Delgado Hernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1627. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a Federal renewable electricity standard for retail electricity suppliers and a Federal energy efficiency resource standard for electricity and natural gas suppliers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1628. A bill to provide Federal death and disability benefits for contractors who serve as firefighters of the Forest Service, Department of the Interior agencies, or any State or local entity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1629. A bill to require the disclosure of determinations with respect to which Congressional staff will be required to obtain health insurance coverage through an Exchange; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. LEE, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 1630. A bill to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1631. A bill to consolidate the congressional oversight provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and for other purposes; from the Select Committee on Intelligence; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1632. A bill to protect 10th Amendment rights by providing special standing for State government officials to challenge proposed regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. JOHANNES, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1633. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1634. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to provide certain exemptions relating to the taking of migratory game birds; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1635. A bill to amend the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 to extend the period during which supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits are temporarily increased; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1636. A bill to redesignate certain facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space

Administration; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 1637. A bill to better connect current and former members of the Armed Forces with employment opportunities by consolidating duplicative Federal Government Internet websites into a single portal, to conserve resources by merging redundant and competing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1638. A bill to promote public awareness of cybersecurity; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. COATS):

S.J. Res. 27. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Internal Revenue Service of the Department of the Treasury relating to liability under section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for the shared responsibility payment for not maintaining minimum essential coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 279. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Red Ribbon Week during the period of October 23 through October 31, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. Res. 280. A resolution recognizing the 40th anniversary of the withdrawal of United States combat troops from the Vietnam War and expressing renewed support for United States veterans of that conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. Res. 281. A resolution expressing the sense of the United States Senate that President Obama should issue a statement regarding spying on His Holiness, Pope Francis; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. JOHANNES):

S. Res. 282. A resolution commemorating the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Corporation for National and Community Service; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID:

S. Res. 283. A resolution to constitute the majority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. PAUL):

S. Res. 284. A resolution calling on the Government of Iran to immediately release

Saeed Abedini and all other individuals detained on account of their religious beliefs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 138

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 138, a bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex or gender, and for other purposes.

S. 209

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 209, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 314

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 651

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 651, a bill to provide for the withdrawal and protection of certain Federal land in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes.

S. 699

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes.

S. 931

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr.

KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 931, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to raise awareness of, and to educate breast cancer patients anticipating surgery, especially patients who are members of racial and ethnic minority groups, regarding the availability and coverage of breast reconstruction, prostheses, and other options.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 942, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1012

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1012, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve operations of recovery auditors under the Medicare integrity program, to increase transparency and accuracy in audits conducted by contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 1088

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1187

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1187, a bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1351

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1351, a bill to provide for fiscal gap and generational accounting analysis in the legislative process, the President's budget, and annual long-term fiscal outlook reports.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1590

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1590, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges.

S. 1592

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1592, a bill to provide for a delay of the individual mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until the American Health Benefit Exchanges are functioning properly.

S. 1595

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1595, a bill to establish a renewable electricity standard, and for other purposes.

S. 1610

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1610, a bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

S. 1614

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1614, a bill to require Certificates of Citizenship and other Federal documents to reflect name and date of birth determinations made by a State court and for other purposes.

S. 1626

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1626, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide employees in the private sector with an opportunity for compensatory time off, similar to the opportunity offered to Federal employees, and a flexible credit hour program to help balance the de-

mands of work and family, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 203

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 203, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding efforts by the United States to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution.

S. RES. 268

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 268, a resolution condemning the September 2013 terrorist attack at the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, and reaffirming United States support for the people and Government of Kenya, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1627. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a Federal renewable electricity standard for retail electricity suppliers and a Federal energy efficiency resource standard for electricity and natural gas suppliers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, as for the other win for Massachusetts, today I am introducing my first major piece of legislation as a Senator. My bill, the American Renewable Energy and Efficiency Act, will allow every single American to have access to clean energy and money-saving efficiency.

In our slow economic recovery, there has been one very bright spot in Massachusetts and the national economy, the incredible growth of clean energy, energy efficiency, and the jobs that come with these industries.

According to the Massachusetts Clean Energy Center, our State alone has gained 20,000 jobs in these sectors since 2010, with another 10,000 new jobs expected in the next year alone. Massachusetts has become the Nation's most energy-efficient State. Boston is ranked as the Nation's most energy-efficient city. Our shores will host the first offshore wind farm, with a new construction terminal built in New Bedford, allowing our fishermen to work alongside our wind energy workers. Massachusetts is No. 7 in the Nation in deploying solar energy, even though we are more well known for the "Perfect Storm" than perfectly sunny days.

These advances, these jobs, these technologies have flourished in Massachusetts because we have set the right

policies and encouraged our companies to lead.

Massachusetts Gov. Deval Patrick set high goals for clean energy deployment in our State, and we have already surpassed them. Boston Mayor Tom Menino wanted Boston to be known as green for just more than the Green Monster in Fenway Park, and he has delivered. Boston is now the greenest city in the United States. That is why I am introducing my first bill as a Senator to take our Massachusetts leadership and make it national.

My bill would require that electricity sold to American consumers increasingly be generated using renewable sources such as wind, solar, hydro, geothermal, and biomass. By 2025, the bill would require 25 percent of our electricity to come from the free fuel of the Sun, the wind, and the Earth.

Since the cheapest and the cleanest powerplant is the one we never have to build, my bill would also require utilities to put people to work on large-scale energy efficiency programs.

My bill would build on the efforts of Massachusetts and the 30 other States that already require utilities to provide customers with minimal amounts of renewable electricity and ensure that America joins the 118 other nations that have already established renewable energy goals.

My bill would quadruple renewable energy production in the United States. It would create more than 400,000 new jobs. We can put steelworkers and ironworkers and electricians back to work building the new energy backbone for America, from Massachusetts to Montana.

The energy efficiency measures in my bill would save the average household \$39 per year on utility bills, and it would reduce carbon dioxide pollution by the equivalent output of 120 coal-fired powerplants, helping our efforts to battle the advancing tide of dangerous climate change.

A renewable electricity standard passed the House of Representatives twice while I was a Member of the body—as recently as 2009—and it has passed the Senate three times since 2002. Before it was held hostage over the Affordable Care Act, the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill showed there is real bipartisan support for energy efficiency in the Senate. These are policies that should be embraced and not blocked.

If we do not take these steps, we will lose the international race to dominate the multitrillion-dollar clean energy sector. Right now, China has already overtaken the United States as the No. 1 most attractive place to invest in renewable energy. Sixty percent of all new companies going public in the clean energy sector are doing so in China. More than 100,000 clean energy jobs are being created there annually. China now has more wind capacity installed than any other country, and

they produce two-thirds of the world's solar panels.

It is time for our country to scale up our clean energy deployment and innovation. It is also time to take a look at revolutionary approaches to driving that innovation. All too often we are unable to move clean energy-related discoveries and breakthroughs out of the labs and into the marketplace.

That is the problem my clean tech consortia legislation addresses. I have included this bill as part of the Manufacturing Jobs for America Initiative, launched this week by Senator COONS and some of my Democratic colleagues. My bill would fertilize America's innovation ecosystems so that scientific breakthroughs can more effectively navigate the so-called valley of death between the lab and the factory and reach their commercial potential.

America's universities and research institutions are truly national treasures, and our venture capitalists and entrepreneurs are the sharpest in the world. When we sprinkle the right mix of scientific brainpower and capitalist drive, we get something uniquely American and extremely potent in terms of its economic impact.

My clean tech consortia bill, which I will soon be introducing, will link inventors with investors, professors with producers and get clean energy out of the laboratories and into the factories. That is the type of partnership we need with the private sector right now in our country.

The other bill I have included in this package, the Manufacturing Jobs for America Initiative, and which I will also be introducing soon, is called the Build America Bonds Initiative. Here is how it works and here is what it does.

When a State or local government wants to build and renovate schools, bridges, roads, and hospitals, they need financing, and they issue a bond. Investors buy those bonds, giving the State capital to hire workers and update infrastructure, and investors get a return in the form of interest. Build America Bonds say to State and local governments: We will help with the interest payments and help put more Americans back to work.

From the inception of this program in April 2009 to when it expired at the end of 2010, there were 2,275 separate bonds issued nationwide, which supported more than \$181 billion of financing for new public capital infrastructure projects, such as bridges, schools, and hospitals.

Build America Bonds were a huge success in Massachusetts. My State issued close to \$5 billion in bonds. Build America Bonds helped finance Massachusetts' Accelerated Bridge Program, which repaired and rebuilt hundreds of structurally deficient bridges.

Other examples of projects include a new laboratory at UMass Amherst, a

new courthouse in Salem, and a new building at the Worcester State Hospital—improving energy efficiency and reducing costs.

I plan to work with my good friends Senator WYDEN and Congressman NEAL—both leaders on this issue—to ensure we continue to invest in both our infrastructure and our future.

These are the kinds of programs that will put America back to work. I want American workers to build and export wind turbines and solar panels that say "Made in America," instead of the American economy importing millions of barrels of oil a day that say "Made by OPEC."

I want American inventors dreaming up the newest energy technologies that convert patent applications for a prototype into job applications on the factory floor. I want American workers repairing our crumbling bridges, roads, and schools.

We are in a terrestrial technology and manufacturing race as important as the celestial race President Kennedy began 50 years ago. These are three of the programs that will put America into a new economic orbit, looking down on our competitors. We should pass all three and put America back to work.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1636. A bill to redesignate certain facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to commemorate one of our nation's greatest heroes, Neil Armstrong, by redesignating the Dryden Flight Research Center at Edwards Air Force Base as the Neil A. Armstrong Flight Research Center.

The legislation will also rename the Western Aeronautical Test Range at Edwards Air Force Base as the Hugh L. Dryden Aeronautical Test Range, as a tribute to Dr. Dryden's enduring legacy.

There are few men in history who have made such substantial contributions to our understanding of aeronautics and our solar system.

Neil Armstrong took the most important steps in the history of mankind when he stepped off Apollo 11.

Dr. Dryden shaped the principles and policies that led to the development of the nation's first high speed aircraft.

Their work in the Antelope Valley, outside Los Angeles, helped create one of our nation's most productive high-skilled manufacturing hubs. Their legacy remains today, and it is fitting that their names are attached to these outstanding facilities.

Dr. Hugh Dryden was one of our Nation's first and most prominent scholars in the fields of high speed aeronautics and aerodynamics.

Dr. Dryden began his distinguished career at the Bureau of Standards and quickly rose to become the Associate Director by 1934.

During World War II, Dr. Dryden dedicated his considerable talents to serving armed forces as a scientific advisor, working on aeronautical matters and guided missiles. For his work on these issues, Dr. Dryden received the Medal of Freedom from the Army in 1946 and Presidential Certificate of Merit in 1948—two of our nation's highest honors for civilian service.

Following the war, Hugh Dryden became the Director of the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, NACA. Eventually, when the advisory committee was formalized in 1958 and became the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, Dr. Dryden served as its first Deputy Director.

Neil Armstrong is another man that inspired Americans to look to the skies. He may have been born in Ohio, but his life's work was done in California.

In his early years he was stationed in San Diego as a Naval Aviator. Although he left the state to pursue an undergraduate degree, he returned shortly thereafter to become a test pilot at Edwards Air Force Base.

As a NASA test pilot, Armstrong flew more than 200 different models of aircraft. His experience included work with jets, helicopters, rockets and gliders, and he became one of the best known pilots of the X-15 test plane.

Even before he became an astronaut, Armstrong reached unbelievable heights and speeds. While working with the X-15 from November 1960 to July 1962, he reached a top altitude of 207,500 feet and a top speed of 3,989 mph.

Neil Armstrong logged an incredible 2,400 flight hours as a test pilot at Dryden Flight Research Center before setting his sights even higher.

In 1962, Neil Armstrong became an Astronaut.

His career as an Astronaut began with Gemini 8 in 1966. The mission began with a landmark success—Neil Armstrong and his partner David Scott successfully docked their Gemini capsule with the Agena satellite in orbit. It was the first time two spacecraft linked up in space.

However, shortly after the docking, the spacecraft began to spin out of control. After the spacecraft separated, Gemini and its astronauts were rolling at a revolution per second. The violent revolutions threatened the vision and consciousness of Armstrong and Scott, and so Armstrong made the controversial decision to abort the mission. Gemini 8 splashed down in the Atlantic Ocean safely, but only part of its mission had been accomplished.

As a veteran astronaut, Armstrong was an obvious choice for the Apollo missions.

His first assignment was Apollo 11; it was the fifth manned Apollo mission

and the first manned landing on the lunar surface. Accompanying Armstrong on the mission were Buzz Aldrin and Michael Collins—both accomplished astronauts in their own right.

The Apollo 11 crew launched atop a Saturn V rocket from Cape Canaveral on July 16, 1969. It took more than four days for the crew to reach the lunar surface. Armstrong and Aldrin approached the lunar surface while Collins manned the command vehicle in orbit.

The goal was to find a safe landing zone, which proved more difficult than expected. With only 25 seconds of fuel remaining, the "Eagle" landed on July 20, 1969, at the Sea of Tranquility.

As he stepped off Apollo 11, Armstrong uttered his famous words, "That's one small step for [a] man, one giant leap for mankind."

Armstrong and Aldrin spent two and a half hours on the lunar surface. They took photographs, inspected the condition of the lander, and planted the American Flag to commemorate their incredible achievement.

It was the first and last time Armstrong would visit the moon. Shortly after Apollo 11's safe return to Earth, Armstrong announced that he did not intend to fly in space again.

But his time in public life was not quite finished. Armstrong toured the world as a celebrity on the "Giant Leap" tour. He visited the Soviet Union to meet with the Premier and joined Bob Hope on a USO tour in Vietnam.

Upon his return, Armstrong completed his Master of Science in Aerospace Engineering at the University of Southern California.

He worked briefly for the Advanced Research Projects Agency, or ARPA, and served as Deputy Associate Administrator for Aeronautics at NASA.

In 1971, he returned to Ohio to teach the next generation of engineers at the University of Cincinnati. By the end of his career, Armstrong had been decorated by 17 countries and received many notable honors, including: the Presidential Medal of Freedom; the Congressional Gold Medal; the Congressional Space Medal of Honor; the Explorers Club Medal; the Robert H. Goddard Memorial Trophy; the NASA Distinguished Service Medal; the Harmon International Aviation Trophy; the Royal Geographic Society's Gold Medal; the Federation Aeronautique Internationale's Gold Space Medal; the American Astronautical Society Flight Achievement Award; the Robert J. Collier Trophy; the AIAA Astronautics Award; the Octave Chanute Award; and the John J. Montgomery Award.

His long list of accolades demonstrates just how incredible and inspirational Armstrong was, not only for California and our nation, but around the world as well.

Tragically, we lost Neil A. Armstrong on August 25 last year. But his

legacy will live on and continue to inspire the next generation of engineers, scientists, and astronauts.

In a fitting tribute, NASA Administrator Charlie Bolden said that: "As long as there are history books, Neil Armstrong will be included in them, remembered for taking humankind's first small step on a world beyond our own."

Neil Armstrong's work, career, and legacy have inspired many accomplishments and discoveries beyond his own personal achievements. It is only fitting that the Dryden Flight Research Center, which is located at the base where his career quite literally took off, be renamed in his honor.

This is a simple bill that will help to appropriately pay tribute to two individuals who have helped shape and define the space and aeronautical industries. I urge my colleagues to support this bill to re-designate the Dryden Flight Research Center as the Neil A. Armstrong Flight Research Center and the Western Aeronautical Test Range as the Hugh L. Dryden Aeronautical Test Range.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1636

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REDESIGNATION OF DRYDEN FLIGHT RESEARCH CENTER.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Hugh L. Dryden Flight Research Center in Edwards, California, is redesignated as the "NASA Neil A. Armstrong Flight Research Center".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the flight research center referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "NASA Neil A. Armstrong Flight Research Center".

SEC. 2. REDESIGNATION OF WESTERN AERONAUTICAL TEST RANGE.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Western Aeronautical Test Range in California is redesignated as the "NASA Hugh L. Dryden Aeronautical Test Range".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the test range referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "NASA Hugh L. Dryden Aeronautical Test Range".

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. COATS):

S.J. Res. 27. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Internal Revenue Service of the Department of the Treasury relating to liability under section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for the shared responsibility payment for not

maintaining minimum essential coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES 27

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Internal Revenue Service of the Department of the Treasury relating to liability under section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for the shared responsibility payment for not maintaining minimum essential coverage (published at 78 Fed. Reg. 53646 (August 30, 2013)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 279—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF RED RIBBON WEEK DURING THE PERIOD OF OCTOBER 23 THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 2013

Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 279

Whereas the Red Ribbon Campaign was started to commemorate the service of Enrique "Kiki" Camarena, an 11-year special agent of the Drug Enforcement Administration who was murdered in the line of duty in 1985 while engaged in the battle against illicit drugs;

Whereas the Red Ribbon Campaign has been nationally recognized since 1988 to preserve the memory of Special Agent Camarena and further the cause for which he gave his life;

Whereas the Red Ribbon Campaign is the oldest and largest drug prevention awareness program in the United States, reaching millions of young people each year during Red Ribbon Week;

Whereas the Drug Enforcement Administration has been committed throughout its 40-year history to aggressively targeting organizations involved in the growing, manufacturing, and distribution of controlled substances and has been a steadfast partner in commemorating Red Ribbon Week;

Whereas State Governors and attorney generals, the National Family Partnership, parent teacher associations, Boys and Girls Clubs of America, Young Marines, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and hundreds of other organizations throughout the United States annually celebrate Red Ribbon Week during the period of October 23 through October 31;

Whereas the objective of Red Ribbon Week is to promote the creation of drug-free communities through drug prevention efforts, education programs, parental involvement, and community-wide support;

Whereas, according to the National Survey on Drug Use and Health, in 2012 an estimated 23,900,000 Americans, or 9.2 percent of the population aged 12 and older, used illicit drugs;

Whereas drug abuse is 1 of the major challenges to securing a safe and healthy future for people and families in the United States;

Whereas drug abuse and alcohol abuse contribute to domestic violence and sexual assault and place children at risk;

Whereas, although public awareness of illicit drug use is increasing, emerging drug threats and growing epidemics demand attention, with particular focus on synthetic drugs and the nonmedical use of prescription drugs, the second most abused drug by young people in the United States;

Whereas, the majority of teenagers abusing prescription drugs get the drugs from family, friends, and the home medicine cabinet;

Whereas the Drug Enforcement Administration will host a National Take Back Day on October 26, 2013, for the public to safely dispose of unused or expired prescription drugs that can lead to accidental poisoning, overdose, and abuse;

Whereas synthetic drugs, including those popularly known as “K2” or “Spice”, have acknowledged dangerous health effects and have become especially popular among teens and young adults;

Whereas in 2012, poison centers across the United States responded to approximately 5205 calls related to synthetic drugs;

Whereas 2012 National Survey on Drug Use and Health data revealed that heroin use doubled between 2007 and 2011 and in 2012 there were 669,000 heroin users compared to 373,000 in 2007;

Whereas 2012 National Survey on Drug Use and Health data revealed a 50 percent increase in daily marijuana use among individuals aged 12 and over and a 25 percent increase in marijuana use by the general population; and

Whereas parents, young people, schools, businesses, law enforcement agencies, religious institutions and faith-based organizations, service organizations, senior citizens, medical and military personnel, sports teams, and individuals throughout the United States will demonstrate their commitment to healthy, productive, and drug-free lifestyles by wearing and displaying red ribbons during this week-long celebration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Red Ribbon Week during the period of October 23 through October 31, 2013;

(2) encourages children, teens, and other individuals to choose to live drug-free lives; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to promote the creation of drug-free communities and to participate in drug prevention activities to show support for healthy, productive, and drug-free lifestyles.

SENATE RESOLUTION 280—RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WITHDRAWAL OF UNITED STATES COMBAT TROOPS FROM THE VIETNAM WAR AND EXPRESSING RENewed SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES VETERANS OF THAT CONFLICT

Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 280

Whereas the United States Armed Forces supported the cause of freedom in South Vietnam between October 1955 and May 7, 1975, beginning with the commencement of the Military Assistance Advisory Group, Vietnam, with many servicemembers making the ultimate sacrifice;

Whereas the United States carried out its first combat mission in Vietnam on January 12, 1962;

Whereas a total of 8,744,000 personnel served worldwide during the Vietnam War era, including 4,368,000 in the United States Army, 1,842,000 in the United States Navy, 794,000 in the United States Marine Corps, and 1,740,000 in the United States Air Force;

Whereas the number of United States servicemembers deployed in theater rose to a peak of 543,482 in April 1969;

Whereas 1,857,304 men entered military service through the Selective Service System between August 1964 and February 1973;

Whereas, of the 58,220 casualties of United States personnel, 47,434 were battle deaths;

Whereas 153,303 wounded United States servicemembers required hospital care;

Whereas an additional 150,341 wounded United States servicemembers did not require hospital care;

Whereas 2,646 United States servicemembers went missing in action during the Vietnam War, of whom 1,645 are still unaccounted for;

Whereas 725 United States servicemembers were taken as prisoners of war, with 64 dying while in internment;

Whereas the Paris Peace Accords, signed on January 27, 1973, put an end to the direct intervention of the United States in the Vietnam War; and

Whereas the last United States combat troops left South Vietnam 2 months later in the spring of 1973: Now, therefore, be it *Resolved*, That—

(1) the Senate honors the 40th anniversary of the withdrawal of United States combat troops from the Vietnam War;

(2) the Senate renews its support for United States veterans of that conflict; and

(3) when the Senate adjourns today, the Senate will stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of United States servicemembers who have given their lives in the name of service to the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 281—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE THAT PRESIDENT OBAMA SHOULD ISSUE A STATEMENT REGARDING SPYING ON HIS HOLINESS, POPE FRANCIS

Mr. PAUL submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Select Committee on Intelligence:

S. RES. 281

Whereas public news reports this week indicate that the United States National Security Agency monitored millions of phone calls in Italy in late 2012 and early 2013;

Whereas these reports indicate that the National Security Agency monitored telephone calls made to and from a residence in Rome where then Archbishop Jorge Mario Bergoglio stayed during the conclave selecting Bergoglio, now known as His Holiness Pope Francis, to succeed Pope Benedict XVI;

Whereas this story has been widely reported in the American and international media;

Whereas the National Security Agency has reportedly denied the allegations; and

Whereas these allegations are serious and President Obama should personally address these reports;

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

President Obama should directly address the serious allegation whether his administration monitored the calls of Pope Francis or the conclave selecting the Pope.

SENATE RESOLUTION 282—COMMEMORATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Mr. NELSON (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. JOHANNES) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 282

Whereas the Corporation for National and Community Service (in this preamble referred to as the “CNCS”) was established under section 191 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12651), as added by section 202 of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–82; 107 Stat. 873);

Whereas, since 1993, the CNCS has operated as an independent Federal agency, overseeing all national and community service programs authorized by the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12501 et seq.) and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4950 et seq.);

Whereas the CNCS connects people of all ages and backgrounds with opportunities to give back to their communities and the United States;

Whereas programs conducted by the CNCS strive to address national and local needs, while renewing an ethic of civic responsibility and community spirit in the United States by encouraging citizens to participate in service;

Whereas, since 1993, millions of people in the United States have served in AmeriCorps, Senior Corps, Learn and Serve America, and other CNCS programs, addressing the most pressing challenges facing the United States, from helping students graduate and supporting veterans and military families to preserving the environment and helping communities recover from natural disasters;

Whereas participants serve in tens of thousands of locations across the country, bolstering the civic, neighborhood, and faith-based organizations that are so vital to the economic and social well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas national service expands economic opportunity by creating more sustainable, resilient communities and providing education, career skills, and leadership abilities for those who serve;

Whereas national service represents a partnership between public and private organizations, invests in community solutions, and

leverages State and local resources to strengthen community impact;

Whereas, in 2009, Congress passed the Serve America Act (Public Law 111-13; 123 Stat. 1460), authorizing the expansion of national service, expanding opportunities to serve, increasing efficiency and accountability, and strengthening the capacity of organizations and communities to solve problems through the Social Innovation Fund, the Volunteer Generation Fund, and other initiatives;

Whereas AmeriCorps and Senior Corps support the military community by engaging veterans in service, helping veterans readjust to civilian life, and providing support to military families;

Whereas more than 17,000 veterans have served as AmeriCorps members and have helped veterans and military families access benefits and services, conduct job searches, and provide safe and affordable housing;

Whereas the CNCS is working to increase the number of veterans and military families served by and engaged in programs supported by the CNCS;

Whereas, since 1994, CNCS programs and members have provided critical services to millions of people in the United States who have been affected by floods, fires, hurricanes, tornadoes, and other disasters and emergencies, helping families and communities rebuild their lives;

Whereas the CNCS has partnered with the Federal Emergency Management Agency to launch FEMA Corps, which strives to strengthen the disaster response capacity of the United States, increase the reliability and diversity of the disaster response workforce, promote an ethic of service, and prepare young people for careers in emergency management; and

Whereas the Task Force on Expanding National Service established in July 2013 is working to expand national service opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Corporation for National and Community Service;

(2) recognizes that, for 20 years, the Corporation for National and Community Service has worked to improve lives, strengthen communities, expand economic opportunity, foster innovation and civic engagement, and engage millions of people in the United States in solving critical problems through national service;

(3) recognizes that, since the inception of AmeriCorps in 1994, more than 820,000 people have served as AmeriCorps members, serving approximately 1,000,000,000 hours, mobilizing millions of volunteers, and improving the lives of countless people in the United States;

(4) welcomes the efforts of the Corporation for National and Community Service to increase the involvement of veterans and military families in national service and to expand services to the military community;

(5) recognizes the goal of the Serve America Act (Public Law 111-13; 123 Stat. 1460) to increase the number of approved national service positions to 250,000 by 2017; and

(6) recognizes and thanks all those who have served in AmeriCorps, Senior Corps, and other programs conducted by the Corporation for National and Community Service for demonstrating commitment, dedication, and patriotism through their service to the people of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 283—TO CONSTITUTE THE MAJORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN

Mr. REID submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 283

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the majority party's membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Rockefeller (Chairman), Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Nelson, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Pryor, Mrs. McCaskill, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Warner, Mr. Begich, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Schatz, Mr. Markey, Mr. Booker.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mrs. Boxer (Chairman), Mr. Baucus, Mr. Carper, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Udall of New Mexico, Mr. Merkley, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Booker.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Ms. Landrieu (Chairman), Mr. Levin, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Pryor, Mr. Cardin, Mrs. Shaheen, Mrs. Hagan, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Markey, Mr. Booker.

SENATE RESOLUTION 284—CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN TO IMMEDIATELY RELEASE SAEED ABEDINI AND ALL OTHER INDIVIDUALS DETAINED ON ACCOUNT OF THEIR RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. PAUL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 284

Whereas, in September 2012, Saeed Abedini, a resident of the State of Idaho and a minority Christian with dual Iranian–United States citizenship, was arbitrarily detained in the Islamic Republic of Iran, held in solitary confinement, physically beaten, denied access to necessary medical treatment as a result of that abuse, and denied access to his lawyer until just before his trial;

Whereas, in January 2013, an Iranian court accused Saeed Abedini of attempting to undermine the national security of Iran by gathering with fellow Christians in private homes;

Whereas Saeed Abedini was tried in a non-public trial before a judge who had been sanctioned by the European Union for repeated violations of human rights, including issuing long prison sentences to peaceful protestors following the 2009 election;

Whereas, during the trial, Saeed Abedini and his Iranian attorney were barred from attending portions of the trial in which the prosecution provided and the judge received evidence through witness testimony;

Whereas the Iranian court sentenced Saeed Abedini to 8 years in prison;

Whereas, in August 2013, the 36th branch of the Tehran appeals court denied Saeed Abedini's appeal and affirmed his 8-year sentence;

Whereas the Government of Iran continues to indefinitely imprison Saeed Abedini for peacefully exercising his faith;

Whereas the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights declares that every individual has “the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion”, which includes the “freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance”, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights echoes that declaration;

Whereas the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights holds that every individual shall be free from arbitrary arrest and detention, and that every individual bears the right to have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his defense and to be present during the duration of his trial;

Whereas the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights further guarantees every individual the right to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent, and impartial tribunal;

Whereas Iran is a member of the United Nations and a signatory to both the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights without reservation;

Whereas articles 13 and 23 through 27 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran provide for freedom of expression, assembly, and association, as well as the freedom to practice one's religion;

Whereas Iran is a religiously diverse society and the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran reports that religious minorities, including Nematullahi Sufi Muslims, Sunnis, Baha'is, and Christians, face human rights violations in Iran;

Whereas, in recent years, there has been an increase in the number of incidents of Iranian authorities raiding religious services, detaining worshipers and religious leaders, and harassing and threatening minority religious members;

Whereas the United Nations Special Rapporteur reports that Iranian intelligence officials are known to threaten Christian converts with arrest and apostasy charges if they do not return to Islam; and

Whereas President Barack Obama has called on President Hassan Rouhani to demonstrate the commitment of Iran to individual human rights through the release of all prisoners of conscience: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that freedom of religious belief and practice is a universal human right and a fundamental freedom of every individual, regardless of race, sex, country, creed, or nationality, and should never be arbitrarily abridged by any government;

(2) recognizes that governments have a responsibility to protect the fundamental rights of their citizens; and

(3) calls on the Government of Iran to immediately release Saeed Abedini and all other individuals detained on account of their religious beliefs.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2009. Mr. REID (for Mrs. BOXER) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3080, to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2009. Mr. REID (for Mrs. BOXER) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3080, to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Water Resources Development Act of 2013”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definition of Secretary.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCE PROJECTS

Sec. 1001. Purposes.

Sec. 1002. Project authorizations.

Sec. 1003. Project review.

Sec. 1004. Future project authorizations.

TITLE II—WATER RESOURCES POLICY REFORMS

Sec. 2001. Purposes.

Sec. 2002. Safety assurance review.

Sec. 2003. Continuing authority programs.

Sec. 2004. Continuing authority program prioritization.

Sec. 2005. Fish and wildlife mitigation.

Sec. 2006. Mitigation status report.

Sec. 2007. Independent peer review.

Sec. 2008. Operation and maintenance of navigation and hydroelectric facilities.

Sec. 2009. Hydropower at Corps of Engineers facilities.

Sec. 2010. Clarification of work-in-kind credit authority.

Sec. 2011. Transfer of excess work-in-kind credit.

Sec. 2012. Credit for in-kind contributions.

Sec. 2013. Credit in lieu of reimbursement.

Sec. 2014. Dam optimization.

Sec. 2015. Water supply.

Sec. 2016. Report on water storage pricing formulas.

Sec. 2017. Clarification of previously authorized work.

Sec. 2018. Consideration of Federal land in feasibility studies.

Sec. 2019. Planning assistance to States.

Sec. 2020. Vegetation management policy.

Sec. 2021. Levee certifications.

Sec. 2022. Restoration of flood and hurricane storm damage reduction projects.

Sec. 2023. Operation and maintenance of certain projects.

Sec. 2024. Dredging study.

Sec. 2025. Non-Federal project implementation pilot program.

Sec. 2026. Non-Federal implementation of feasibility studies.

Sec. 2027. Tribal partnership program.

Sec. 2028. Cooperative agreements with Columbia River Basin Indian tribes.

Sec. 2029. Military munitions response actions at civil works shoreline protection projects.

Sec. 2030. Beach nourishment.

Sec. 2031. Regional sediment management.

Sec. 2032. Study acceleration.

Sec. 2033. Project acceleration.

Sec. 2034. Feasibility studies.

Sec. 2035. Accounting and administrative expenses.

Sec. 2036. Determination of project completion.

Sec. 2037. Project partnership agreements.

Sec. 2038. Interagency and international support authority.

Sec. 2039. Acceptance of contributed funds to increase lock operations.

Sec. 2040. Emergency response to natural disasters.

Sec. 2041. Systemwide improvement frameworks.

Sec. 2042. Funding to process permits.

Sec. 2043. National riverbank stabilization and erosion prevention study and pilot program.

Sec. 2044. Hurricane and storm damage risk reduction prioritization.

Sec. 2045. Prioritization of ecosystem restoration efforts.

Sec. 2046. Special use permits.

Sec. 2047. Operations and maintenance on fuel taxed inland waterways.

Sec. 2048. Corrosion prevention.

Sec. 2049. Project deauthorizations.

Sec. 2050. Reports to Congress.

Sec. 2051. Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act conforming amendment.

Sec. 2052. Invasive species review.

Sec. 2053. Wetlands conservation study.

Sec. 2054. Dam modification study.

Sec. 2055. Non-Federal plans to provide additional flood risk reduction.

Sec. 2056. Mississippi River forecasting improvements.

Sec. 2057. Flexibility in maintaining navigation.

Sec. 2058. Restricted areas at Corps of Engineers dams.

Sec. 2059. Maximum cost of projects.

Sec. 2060. Donald G. Waldon Lock and Dam.

Sec. 2061. Improving planning and administration of water supply storage.

Sec. 2062. Crediting authority for Federally authorized navigation projects.

Sec. 2063. River basin commissions.

Sec. 2064. Restriction on charges for certain surplus water.

TITLE III—PROJECT MODIFICATIONS

Sec. 3001. Purpose.

Sec. 3002. Chatfield Reservoir, Colorado.

Sec. 3003. Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee expenses reimbursement.

Sec. 3004. Hurricane and storm damage reduction study.

Sec. 3005. Lower Yellowstone Project, Montana.

Sec. 3006. Project deauthorizations.

Sec. 3007. Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-basin, New Jersey.

Sec. 3008. Red River Basin, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana.

Sec. 3009. Point Judith Harbor of Refuge, Rhode Island.

Sec. 3010. Land conveyance of Hammond Boat Basin, Warrenton, Oregon.

Sec. 3011. Metro East Flood Risk Management Program, Illinois.

Sec. 3012. Florida Keys water quality improvements.

Sec. 3013. Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt, Iowa.

Sec. 3014. Land conveyance, Craney Island Dredged Material Management Area, Portsmouth, Virginia.

Sec. 3015. Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California.

Sec. 3016. Oakland Inner Harbor Tidal Canal, California.

Sec. 3017. Redesignation of Lower Mississippi River Museum and Riverfront Interpretive Site.

Sec. 3018. Louisiana Coastal Area.

Sec. 3019. Four Mile Run, City of Alexandria and Arlington County, Virginia.

Sec. 3020. East Fork of Trinity River, Texas.

Sec. 3021. Seward Waterfront, Seward, Alaska.

TITLE IV—WATER RESOURCE STUDIES

Sec. 4001. Purpose.

Sec. 4002. Initiation of new water resources studies.

Sec. 4003. Applicability.

TITLE V—REGIONAL AND NONPROJECT PROVISIONS

Sec. 5001. Purpose.

Sec. 5002. Northeast Coastal Region ecosystem restoration.

Sec. 5003. Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program.

Sec. 5004. Rio Grande environmental management program, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas.

Sec. 5005. Lower Columbia River and Tillamook Bay ecosystem restoration, Oregon and Washington.

Sec. 5006. Arkansas River, Arkansas and Oklahoma.

Sec. 5007. Aquatic invasive species prevention and management; Columbia River Basin.

Sec. 5008. Upper Missouri Basin flood and drought monitoring.

Sec. 5009. Upper Missouri Basin shoreline erosion prevention.

Sec. 5010. Northern Rockies headwaters extreme weather mitigation.

Sec. 5011. Aquatic nuisance species prevention, Great Lakes and Mississippi River Basin.

Sec. 5012. Middle Mississippi River pilot program.

Sec. 5013. Idaho, Montana, rural Nevada, New Mexico, rural Utah, and Wyoming.

Sec. 5014. Chesapeake Bay oyster restoration in Virginia and Maryland.

Sec. 5015. Missouri River between Fort Peck Dam, Montana and Gavins Point Dam, South Dakota and Nebraska.

Sec. 5016. Operations and maintenance of inland Mississippi River ports.

Sec. 5017. Remote and subsistence harbors.

Sec. 5018. Multiagency effort to slow the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi River and Ohio River basins and tributaries.

Sec. 5019. Release of use restrictions.

Sec. 5020. Rights and responsibilities of Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma regarding W.D. Mayo Lock and Dam, Oklahoma.

Sec. 5021. Upper Mississippi River protection.

Sec. 5022. Arctic Deep draft port development partnerships.

Sec. 5023. Greater Mississippi River Basin severe flooding and drought management study.

Sec. 5024. Cape Arundel Disposal Site, Maine.

TITLE VI—LEVEE SAFETY

Sec. 6001. Short title.

Sec. 6002. Findings; purposes.

Sec. 6003. Definitions.

Sec. 6004. National levee safety program.

Sec. 6005. National levee safety advisory board.

Sec. 6006. Inventory and inspection of levees.

Sec. 6007. Reports.

Sec. 6008. Effect of title.

Sec. 6009. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE VII—INLAND WATERWAYS

Sec. 7001. Purposes.

- Sec. 7002. Definitions.
- Sec. 7003. Project delivery process reforms.
- Sec. 7004. Major rehabilitation standards.
- Sec. 7005. Inland waterways system revenues.
- Sec. 7006. Efficiency of revenue collection.
- Sec. 7007. GAO study, Olmsted Locks and Dam, Lower Ohio River, Illinois and Kentucky.
- Sec. 7008. Olmsted Locks and Dam, Lower Ohio River, Illinois and Kentucky.

TITLE VIII—HARBOR MAINTENANCE

- Sec. 8001. Short title.
- Sec. 8002. Purposes.
- Sec. 8003. Funding for harbor maintenance programs.
- Sec. 8004. Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund prioritization.
- Sec. 8005. Harbor maintenance trust fund study.

TITLE IX—DAM SAFETY

- Sec. 9001. Short title.
- Sec. 9002. Purpose.
- Sec. 9003. Administrator.
- Sec. 9004. Inspection of dams.
- Sec. 9005. National Dam Safety Program.
- Sec. 9006. Public awareness and outreach for dam safety.
- Sec. 9007. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE X—INNOVATIVE FINANCING PILOT PROJECTS

- Sec. 10001. Short title.
- Sec. 10002. Purposes.
- Sec. 10003. Definitions.
- Sec. 10004. Authority to provide assistance.
- Sec. 10005. Applications.
- Sec. 10006. Eligible entities.
- Sec. 10007. Projects eligible for assistance.
- Sec. 10008. Activities eligible for assistance.
- Sec. 10009. Determination of eligibility and project selection.
- Sec. 10010. Secured loans.
- Sec. 10011. Program administration.
- Sec. 10012. State, tribal, and local permits.
- Sec. 10013. Regulations.
- Sec. 10014. Funding.
- Sec. 10015. Report to Congress.
- Sec. 10016. Use of American iron, steel, and manufactured goods.

TITLE XI—EXTREME WEATHER

- Sec. 11001. Definition of resilient construction technique.
- Sec. 11002. Study on risk reduction.
- Sec. 11003. GAO study on management of flood, drought, and storm damage.
- Sec. 11004. Post-disaster watershed assessments.
- Sec. 11005. Authority to accept and expend non-Federal amounts.

TITLE XII—NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE OCEANS

- Sec. 12001. Short title.
- Sec. 12002. Purposes.
- Sec. 12003. Definitions.
- Sec. 12004. National Endowment for the Oceans.
- Sec. 12005. Eligible uses.
- Sec. 12006. Grants.
- Sec. 12007. Annual report.
- Sec. 12008. Tulsa Port of Catoosa, Rogers County, Oklahoma land exchange.

TITLE XIII—MISCELLANEOUS

- Sec. 13001. Applicability of Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule.
- Sec. 13002. America the Beautiful National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass program.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

In this Act, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Army.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCE PROJECTS

SEC. 1001. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are—

- (1) to authorize projects that—
 - (A) are the subject of a completed report of the Chief of Engineers containing a determination that the relevant project—
 - (i) is in the Federal interest;
 - (ii) results in benefits that exceed the costs of the project;
 - (iii) is environmentally acceptable; and
 - (iv) is technically feasible; and
 - (B) have been recommended to Congress for authorization by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works; and
- (2) to authorize the Secretary—
 - (A) to review projects that require increased authorization; and
 - (B) to request an increase of those authorizations after—
 - (i) certifying that the increases are necessary; and
 - (ii) submitting to Congress reports on the proposed increases.

SEC. 1002. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

The Secretary is authorized to carry out projects for water resources development, conservation, and other purposes, subject to the conditions that—

- (1) each project is carried out—
 - (A) substantially in accordance with the plan for the project; and
 - (B) subject to any conditions described in the report for the project; and
- (2)(A) a Report of the Chief of Engineers has been completed; and
- (B) after November 8, 2007, but prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works has submitted to Congress a recommendation to authorize construction of the project.

SEC. 1003. PROJECT REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For a project that is authorized by Federal law as of the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may modify the authorized project cost set under section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280)—

- (1) by submitting the required certification and additional information to Congress in accordance with subsection (b); and
- (2) after receiving an appropriation of funds in accordance with subsection (b)(3)(B).

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMISSION.—

(1) CERTIFICATION.—The certification to Congress under subsection (a) shall include a certification by the Secretary that—

(A) expenditures above the authorized cost of the project are necessary to protect life and safety or property, maintain critical navigation routes, or restore ecosystems;

(B) the project continues to provide benefits identified in the report of the Chief of Engineers for the project; and

(C) for projects under construction—

(i) a temporary stop or delay resulting from a failure to increase the authorized cost of the project will increase costs to the Federal Government; and

(ii) the amount requested for the project in the budget of the President or included in a work plan for the expenditure of funds for the fiscal year during which the certification is submitted will exceed the authorized cost of the project.

(2) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The information provided to Congress about the project under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum—

(A) a comprehensive review of the project costs and reasons for exceeding the authorized limits set under section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280);

(B) an expedited analysis of the updated benefits and costs of the project; and

(C) the revised cost estimate level for completing the project.

(3) APPROVAL OF CONGRESS.—The Secretary may not change the authorized project costs under subsection (a) unless—

(A) a certification and required information is submitted to Congress under subsection (b); and

(B) after such submission, amounts are appropriated to initiate or continue construction of the project in an appropriations or other Act.

(c) DE MINIMIS AMOUNTS.—If the cost to complete construction of an authorized water resources project would exceed the limitations on the maximum cost of the project under section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280), the Secretary may complete construction of the project, notwithstanding the limitations imposed by that section if—

(1) construction of the project is at least 70 percent complete at the time the cost of the project is projected to exceed the limitations; and

(2) the Federal cost to complete construction is less than \$5,000,000.

(d) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The authority of the Secretary under this section terminates on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1004. FUTURE PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) POLICY.—The benefits of water resource projects designed and carried out in an economically justifiable, environmentally acceptable, and technically sound manner are important to the economy and environment of the United States and recommendations to Congress regarding those projects should be expedited for approval in a timely manner.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The procedures under this section apply to projects for water resources development, conservation, and other purposes, subject to the conditions that—

(1) each project is carried out—

(A) substantially in accordance with the plan identified in the report of the Chief of Engineers for the project; and

(B) subject to any conditions described in the report for the project; and

(2)(A) a report of the Chief of Engineers has been completed; and

(B) after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works has submitted to Congress a recommendation to authorize construction of the project.

(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A bill shall be eligible for expedited consideration in accordance with this subsection if the bill—

(A) authorizes a project that meets the requirements described in subsection (b); and

(B) is referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(2) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 31st of the second session of each Congress, the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate shall—

(i) report all bills that meet the requirements of paragraph (1); or

(ii) introduce and report a measure to authorize any project that meets the requirements described in subsection (b).

(B) FAILURE TO ACT.—Subject to subparagraph (C), if the Committee fails to act on a bill that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) by the date specified in subparagraph (A), the bill shall be discharged from the Committee and placed on the calendar of the Senate.

(C) EXCEPTIONS.—Subparagraph (B) shall not apply if—

(i) in the 180-day period immediately preceding the date specified in subparagraph (A), the full Committee holds a legislative hearing on a bill to authorize all projects that meet the requirements described in subsection (b);

(ii)(I) the Committee favorably reports a bill to authorize all projects that meet the requirements described in subsection (b); and (II) the bill described in subclause (I) is placed on the calendar of the Senate; or

(iii) a bill that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) is referred to the Committee not earlier than 30 days before the date specified in subparagraph (A).

(D) TERMINATION.—The procedures for expedited consideration under this section terminate on December 31, 2018.

TITLE II—WATER RESOURCES POLICY REFORMS

SEC. 2001. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are—

(1) to reform the implementation of water resources projects by the Corps of Engineers;

(2) to make other technical changes to the water resources policy of the Corps of Engineers; and

(3) to implement reforms, including—

(A) enhancing the ability of local sponsors to partner with the Corps of Engineers by ensuring the eligibility of the local sponsors to receive and apply credit for work carried out by the sponsors and increasing the role of sponsors in carrying out Corps of Engineers projects;

(B) ensuring continuing authority programs can continue to meet important needs;

(C) encouraging the continuation of efforts to modernize feasibility studies and establish targets for expedited completion of feasibility studies;

(D) seeking efficiencies in the management of dams and related infrastructure to reduce environmental impacts while maximizing other benefits and project purposes, such as flood control, navigation, water supply, and hydropower;

(E) clarifying mitigation requirements for Corps of Engineers projects and ensuring transparency in the independent external review of those projects; and

(F) establishing an efficient and transparent process for deauthorizing projects that have failed to receive a minimum level of investment to ensure active projects can move forward while reducing the backlog of authorized projects.

SEC. 2002. SAFETY ASSURANCE REVIEW.

Section 2035 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2344) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to a safety assurance review conducted under this section.”.

SEC. 2003. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAMS.

(a) SMALL RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.—Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “\$35,000,000” and inserting “\$50,000,000”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “\$7,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000”.

(b) SHORE DAMAGE PREVENTION OR MITIGATION.—Section 111(c) of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 426i(c)) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000”.

(c) REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)(C), by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000”; and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking “\$30,000,000” and inserting “\$50,000,000”.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—Section 2037 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1094) is amended by added at the end the following:

“(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not apply to any project authorized under this Act if a report of the Chief of Engineers for the project was completed prior to the date of enactment of this Act.”.

(d) SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.—Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) is amended in the third sentence by striking “\$7,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000”.

(e) PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF ENVIRONMENT.—Section 1135(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a(d)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking “Not more than 80 percent of the non-Federal may be” and inserting “The non-Federal share may be provided”; and

(2) in the third sentence, by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000”.

(f) AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.—Section 206(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330(d)) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000”.

(g) FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES.—Section 206(d) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) is amended by striking “\$15,000,000” and inserting “\$50,000,000”.

SEC. 2004. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM PRIORITIZATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM PROJECT.—In this section, the term “continuing authority program” means 1 of the following authorities:

(1) Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

(2) Section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 426i).

(3) Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330).

(4) Section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a).

(5) Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577).

(6) Section 3 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g).

(b) PRIORITIZATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register and on a publicly available website, the criteria the Secretary uses for prioritizing annual funding for continuing authority program projects.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register and on a publicly available website, a report on the status of each continuing authority program, which, at a minimum, shall include—

(1) the name and a short description of each active continuing authority program project;

(2) the cost estimate to complete each active project; and

(3) the funding available in that fiscal year for each continuing authority program.

(d) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—On publication in the Federal Register under subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a copy of all information published under those subsections.

SEC. 2005. FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 906 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the first sentence—

(I) by inserting “for damages to ecological resources, including terrestrial and aquatic resources, and” after “mitigate”; and

(II) by inserting “ecological resources and” after “impact on”; and

(III) by inserting “without the implementation of mitigation measures” before the period; and

(ii) by inserting before the last sentence the following: “If the Secretary determines that mitigation to in-kind conditions is not possible, the Secretary shall identify in the report the basis for that determination and the mitigation measures that will be implemented to meet the requirements of this section and the goals of section 307(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2317(a)(1)).”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “DESIGN” and inserting “SELECTION AND DESIGN”; and

(ii) by inserting “select and” after “shall”; and

(iii) by inserting “using a watershed approach” after “projects”; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, at a minimum,” after “complies with”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking clause (iii);

(II) by redesignating clauses (iv) and (v) as clauses (v) and (vi), respectively; and

(III) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) for projects where mitigation will be carried out by the Secretary—

“(I) a description of the land and interest in land to be acquired for the mitigation plan;

“(II) the basis for a determination that the land and interests are available for acquisition; and

“(III) a determination that the proposed interest sought does not exceed the minimum interest in land necessary to meet the mitigation requirements for the project;

“(iv) for projects where mitigation will be carried out through a third party mitigation arrangement in accordance with subsection (i)—

“(I) a description of the third party mitigation instrument to be used; and

“(II) the basis for a determination that the mitigation instrument can meet the mitigation requirements for the project.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) PROGRAMMATIC MITIGATION PLANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may develop 1 or more programmatic mitigation plans to address the potential impacts to ecological resources, fish, and wildlife associated with existing or future water resources development projects.

“(2) USE OF MITIGATION PLANS.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, use programmatic mitigation plans

developed in accordance with this subsection to guide the development of a mitigation plan under subsection (d).

“(3) NON-FEDERAL PLANS.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable and subject to all conditions of this subsection, use programmatic environmental plans developed by a State, a body politic of the State, which derives its powers from a State constitution, a government entity created by State legislation, or a local government, that meet the requirements of this subsection to address the potential environmental impacts of existing or future water resources development projects.

“(4) SCOPE.—A programmatic mitigation plan developed by the Secretary or an entity described in paragraph (3) to address potential impacts of existing or future water resources development projects shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

“(A) be developed on a regional, ecosystem, watershed, or statewide scale;

“(B) include specific goals for aquatic resource and fish and wildlife habitat restoration, establishment, enhancement, or preservation;

“(C) identify priority areas for aquatic resource and fish and wildlife habitat protection or restoration;

“(D) encompass multiple environmental resources within a defined geographical area or focus on a specific resource, such as aquatic resources or wildlife habitat; and

“(E) address impacts from all projects in a defined geographical area or focus on a specific type of project.

“(5) CONSULTATION.—The scope of the plan shall be determined by the Secretary or an entity described in paragraph (3), as appropriate, in consultation with the agency with jurisdiction over the resources being addressed in the environmental mitigation plan.

“(6) CONTENTS.—A programmatic environmental mitigation plan may include—

“(A) an assessment of the condition of environmental resources in the geographical area covered by the plan, including an assessment of recent trends and any potential threats to those resources;

“(B) an assessment of potential opportunities to improve the overall quality of environmental resources in the geographical area covered by the plan through strategic mitigation for impacts of water resources development projects;

“(C) standard measures for mitigating certain types of impacts;

“(D) parameters for determining appropriate mitigation for certain types of impacts, such as mitigation ratios or criteria for determining appropriate mitigation sites;

“(E) adaptive management procedures, such as protocols that involve monitoring predicted impacts over time and adjusting mitigation measures in response to information gathered through the monitoring;

“(F) acknowledgment of specific statutory or regulatory requirements that must be satisfied when determining appropriate mitigation for certain types of resources; and

“(G) any offsetting benefits of self-mitigating projects, such as ecosystem or resource restoration and protection.

“(7) PROCESS.—Before adopting a programmatic environmental mitigation plan for use under this subsection, the Secretary shall—

“(A) for a plan developed by the Secretary—

“(i) make a draft of the plan available for review and comment by applicable environmental resource agencies and the public; and

“(ii) consider any comments received from those agencies and the public on the draft plan; and

“(B) for a plan developed under paragraph (3), determine, not later than 180 days after receiving the plan, whether the plan meets the requirements of paragraphs (4) through (6) and was made available for public comment.

“(8) INTEGRATION WITH OTHER PLANS.—A programmatic environmental mitigation plan may be integrated with other plans, including watershed plans, ecosystem plans, species recovery plans, growth management plans, and land use plans.

“(9) CONSIDERATION IN PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND PERMITTING.—If a programmatic environmental mitigation plan has been developed under this subsection, any Federal agency responsible for environmental reviews, permits, or approvals for a water resources development project may use the recommendations in that programmatic environmental mitigation plan when carrying out the responsibilities of the agency under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(10) PRESERVATION OF EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this subsection limits the use of programmatic approaches to reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(i) THIRD-PARTY MITIGATION ARRANGEMENTS.—

“(1) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—In accordance with all applicable Federal laws (including regulations), mitigation efforts carried out under this section may include—

“(A) participation in mitigation banking or other third-party mitigation arrangements, such as—

“(i) the purchase of credits from commercial or State, regional, or local agency-sponsored mitigation banks; and

“(ii) the purchase of credits from in-lieu fee mitigation programs; and

“(B) contributions to statewide and regional efforts to conserve, restore, enhance, and create natural habitats and wetlands if the Secretary determines that the contributions will ensure that the mitigation requirements of this section and the goals of section 307(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2317(a)(1)) will be met.

“(2) INCLUSION OF OTHER ACTIVITIES.—The banks, programs, and efforts described in paragraph (1) include any banks, programs, and efforts developed in accordance with applicable law (including regulations).

“(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—In carrying out natural habitat and wetlands mitigation efforts under this section, contributions to the mitigation effort may—

“(A) take place concurrent with, or in advance of, the commitment of funding to a project; and

“(B) occur in advance of project construction only if the efforts are consistent with all applicable requirements of Federal law (including regulations) and water resources development planning processes.

“(4) PREFERENCE.—At the request of the non-Federal project sponsor, preference may be given, to the maximum extent practicable, to mitigating an environmental impact through the use of a mitigation bank, in-lieu fee, or other third-party mitigation arrangement, if the use of credits from the mitigation bank or in-lieu fee, or the other third-party mitigation arrangement for the project has been approved by the applicable Federal agency.

“(j) USE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary may use funds made available for preconstruction

engineering and design prior to authorization of project construction to satisfy mitigation requirements through third party mechanisms or to acquire interests in land necessary for meeting the mitigation requirements of this section.”

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not apply to a project for which a mitigation plan has been completed as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance to States and local governments to establish third-party mitigation instruments, including mitigation banks and in-lieu fee programs, that will help to target mitigation payments to high-priority ecosystem restoration actions.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In providing technical assistance under this subsection, the Secretary shall give priority to States and local governments that have developed State, regional, or watershed-based plans identifying priority restoration actions.

(3) MITIGATION INSTRUMENTS.—The Secretary shall seek to ensure any technical assistance provided under this subsection will support the establishment of mitigation instruments that will result in restoration of high-priority areas identified in the plans under paragraph (2).

SEC. 2006. MITIGATION STATUS REPORT.

Section 2036(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2283a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) INFORMATION INCLUDED.—In reporting the status of all projects included in the report, the Secretary shall—

“(A) use a uniform methodology for determining the status of all projects included in the report;

“(B) use a methodology that describes both a qualitative and quantitative status for all projects in the report; and

“(C) provide specific dates for and participants in the consultations required under section 906(d)(4)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(d)(4)(B)).”

SEC. 2007. INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW.

(a) TIMING OF PEER REVIEW.—Section 2034(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2343(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) REASONS FOR TIMING.—If the Chief of Engineers does not initiate a peer review for a project study at a time described in paragraph (2), the Chief shall—

“(A) not later than 7 days after the date on which the Chief of Engineers determines not to initiate a peer review—

“(i) notify the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives of that decision; and

“(ii) make publicly available, including on the Internet the reasons for not conducting the review; and

“(B) include the reasons for not conducting the review in the decision document for the project study.”

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PANELS.—Section 2034(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2343(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) CONGRESSIONAL AND PUBLIC NOTIFICATION.—Following the identification of a project study for peer review under this section, but prior to initiation of the review by the panel of experts, the Chief of Engineers shall, not later than 7 days after the date on which the Chief of Engineers determines to conduct a review—

“(A) notify the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives of the review; and

“(B) make publicly available, including on the Internet, information on—

“(i) the dates scheduled for beginning and ending the review;

“(ii) the entity that has the contract for the review; and

“(iii) the names and qualifications of the panel of experts.”

(C) RECOMMENDATIONS OF PANEL.—Section 2034(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2343(f)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY AND SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—After receiving a report on a project study from a panel of experts under this section, the Chief of Engineers shall make available to the public, including on the Internet, and submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives—

“(A) a copy of the report not later than 7 days after the date on which the report is delivered to the Chief of Engineers; and

“(B) a copy of any written response of the Chief of Engineers on recommendations contained in the report not later than 3 days after the date on which the response is delivered to the Chief of Engineers.

“(3) INCLUSION IN PROJECT STUDY.—A report on a project study from a panel of experts under this section and the written response of the Chief of Engineers shall be included in the final decision document for the project study.”

(d) APPLICABILITY.—Section 2034(h)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2343(h)(2)) is amended by striking “7 years” and inserting “12 years”.

SEC. 2008. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION AND HYDROELECTRIC FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 314 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2321) is amended—

(1) by striking the heading and inserting the following:

“SEC. 314. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION AND HYDROELECTRIC FACILITIES.”;

(2) in the first sentence, by striking “Activities currently performed” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Activities currently performed”;

(3) in the second sentence, by striking “This section” and inserting the following:

“(b) MAJOR MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS ALLOWED.—This section”;

(4) in subsection (a) (as designated by paragraph (2)), by inserting “navigation or” before “hydroelectric”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) EXCLUSION.—This section shall not—

“(1) apply to those navigation facilities that have been or are currently under contract with a non-Federal interest to perform operations and maintenance as of the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2013; and

“(2) prohibit the Secretary from contracting out future commercial activities at those navigation facilities.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in section 1(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4604) is amended by striking the item relating to section 314 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 314. Operation and maintenance of navigation and hydroelectric facilities.”

SEC. 2009. HYDROPOWER AT CORPS OF ENGINEERS FACILITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) in April 2012, the Oak Ridge National Laboratory of the Department of Energy (referred to in this section as the “Oak Ridge Lab”) released a report finding that adding hydroelectric power to the non-powered dams of the United States has the potential to add more than 12 gigawatts of new generating capacity;

(2) the top 10 non-powered dams identified by the Oak Ridge Lab as having the highest hydroelectric power potential could alone supply 3 gigawatts of generating capacity;

(3) of the 50 non-powered dams identified by the Oak Ridge Lab as having the highest hydroelectric power potential, 48 are Corps of Engineers civil works projects;

(4) promoting non-Federal hydroelectric power at Corps of Engineers civil works projects increases the taxpayer benefit of those projects;

(5) the development of non-Federal hydroelectric power at Corps of Engineers civil works projects—

(A) can be accomplished in a manner that is consistent with authorized project purposes and the responsibilities of the Corps of Engineers to protect the environment; and

(B) in many instances, may have additional environmental benefits; and

(6) the development of non-Federal hydroelectric power at Corps of Engineers civil works projects could be promoted through—

(A) clear and consistent lines of responsibility and authority within and across Corps of Engineers districts and divisions on hydroelectric power development activities;

(B) consistent and corresponding processes for reviewing and approving hydroelectric power development; and

(C) developing a means by which non-Federal hydroelectric power developers and stakeholders can resolve disputes with the Corps of Engineers concerning hydroelectric power development activities at Corps of Engineers civil works projects.

(b) POLICY.—Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States that—

(1) the development of non-Federal hydroelectric power at Corps of Engineers civil works projects, including locks and dams, shall be given priority;

(2) Corps of Engineers approval of non-Federal hydroelectric power at Corps of Engineers civil works projects, including permitting required under section 14 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 408), shall be completed by the Corps of Engineers in a timely and consistent manner; and

(3) approval of hydropower at Corps of Engineers civil works projects shall in no way diminish the other priorities and missions of the Corps of Engineers, including authorized project purposes and habitat and environmental protection.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee

on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that, at a minimum, shall include—

(1) a description of initiatives carried out by the Secretary to encourage the development of hydroelectric power by non-Federal entities at Corps of Engineers civil works projects;

(2) a list of all new hydroelectric power activities by non-Federal entities approved at Corps of Engineers civil works projects in that fiscal year, including the length of time the Secretary needed to approve those activities;

(3) a description of the status of each pending application from non-Federal entities for approval to develop hydroelectric power at Corps of Engineers civil works projects;

(4) a description of any benefits or impacts to the environment, recreation, or other uses associated with Corps of Engineers civil works projects at which non-Federal entities have developed hydroelectric power in the previous fiscal year; and

(5) the total annual amount of payments or other services provided to the Corps of Engineers, the Treasury, and any other Federal agency as a result of approved non-Federal hydropower projects at Corps of Engineers civil works projects.

SEC. 2010. CLARIFICATION OF WORK-IN-KIND CREDIT AUTHORITY.

(a) NON-FEDERAL COST SHARE.—Section 7007 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1277) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “, on, or after” after “before”; and

(B) by inserting “, program,” after “study” each place it appears;

(2) in subsections (b) and (c)(1), by inserting “, program,” after “study” each place it appears; and

(3) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) TREATMENT OF CREDIT BETWEEN PROJECTS.—The value of any land, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas and the costs of planning, design, and construction work provided by the non-Federal interest that exceed the non-Federal cost share for a study, program, or project under this title may be applied toward the non-Federal cost share for any other study, program, or project carried out under this title.”

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with any relevant agencies of the State of Louisiana, shall establish a process by which to carry out the amendments made by subsection (a)(3).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) take effect on November 8, 2007.

SEC. 2011. TRANSFER OF EXCESS WORK-IN-KIND CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary may apply credit for in-kind contributions provided by a non-Federal interest that is in excess of the required non-Federal cost-share for a water resources study or project toward the required non-Federal cost-share for a different water resources study or project.

(b) RESTRICTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except for subsection (a)(4)(D)(i) of that section, the requirements of section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b) (as amended by section 2012 of this Act) shall apply to any credit under this section.

(2) **CONDITIONS.**—Credit in excess of the non-Federal cost-share for a study or project may be approved under this section only if—

(A) the non-Federal interest submits a comprehensive plan to the Secretary that identifies—

(i) the studies and projects for which the non-Federal interest intends to provide in-kind contributions for credit that is in excess of the non-Federal cost share for the study or project; and

(ii) the studies and projects to which that excess credit would be applied;

(B) the Secretary approves the comprehensive plan; and

(C) the total amount of credit does not exceed the total non-Federal cost-share for the studies and projects in the approved comprehensive plan.

(c) **ADDITIONAL CRITERIA.**—In evaluating a request to apply credit in excess of the non-Federal cost-share for a study or project toward a different study or project, the Secretary shall consider whether applying that credit will—

(1) help to expedite the completion of a project or group of projects;

(2) reduce costs to the Federal Government; and

(3) aid the completion of a project that provides significant flood risk reduction or environmental benefits.

(d) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority provided in this section shall terminate 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) **REPORT.**—

(1) **DEADLINES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and once every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives an interim report on the use of the authority under this section.

(B) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a final report on the use of the authority under this section.

(2) **INCLUSIONS.**—The reports described in paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a description of the use of the authority under this section during the reporting period;

(B) an assessment of the impact of the authority under this section on the time required to complete projects; and

(C) an assessment of the impact of the authority under this section on other water resources projects.

SEC. 2012. CREDIT FOR IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 221(a)(4) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b(a)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i) by inserting “or a project under an environmental infrastructure assistance program” after “law”;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking “In any case” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:

“(i) **CONSTRUCTION.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—In any case in which the non-Federal interest is to receive credit under subparagraph (A) for the cost of construction carried out by the non-Federal interest before execution of a partnership agreement and that construction has not

been carried out as of the date of enactment of this subparagraph, the Secretary and the non-Federal interest shall enter into an agreement under which the non-Federal interest shall carry out such work prior to the non-Federal interest initiating construction or issuing a written notice to proceed for the construction.

“(II) **ELIGIBILITY.**—Construction that is carried out after the execution of an agreement to carry out work described in subclause (I) and any design activities that are required for that construction, even if the design activity is carried out prior to the execution of the agreement to carry out work, shall be eligible for credit.

“(ii) **PLANNING.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—In any case in which the non-Federal interest is to receive credit under subparagraph (A) for the cost of planning carried out by the non-Federal interest before execution of a feasibility cost sharing agreement, the Secretary and the non-Federal interest shall enter into an agreement under which the non-Federal interest shall carry out such work prior to the non-Federal interest initiating that planning.

“(II) **ELIGIBILITY.**—Planning that is carried out by the non-Federal interest after the execution of an agreement to carry out work described in subclause (I) shall be eligible for credit.”;

(3) in subparagraph (D)(iii), by striking “sections 101 and 103” and inserting “sections 101(a)(2) and 103(a)(1)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(a)(2); 33 U.S.C. 2213(a)(1)(A))”;

(4) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (H);

(5) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) **ANALYSIS OF COSTS AND BENEFITS.**—In the evaluation of the costs and benefits of a project, the Secretary shall not consider construction carried out by a non-Federal interest under this subsection as part of the future without project condition.

“(F) **TRANSFER OF CREDIT BETWEEN SEPARABLE ELEMENTS OF A PROJECT.**—Credit for in-kind contributions provided by a non-Federal interest that are in excess of the non-Federal cost share for an authorized separable element of a project may be applied toward the non-Federal cost share for a different authorized separable element of the same project.

“(G) **APPLICATION OF CREDIT.**—To the extent that credit for in-kind contributions, as limited by subparagraph (D), and credit for required land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations provided by the non-Federal interest exceed the non-Federal share of the cost of construction of a project other than a navigation project, the Secretary shall reimburse the difference to the non-Federal interest, subject to the availability of funds.”; and

(6) in subparagraph (H) (as redesignated by paragraph (4))—

(A) in clause (i), by inserting “, and to water resources projects authorized prior to the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662), if correction of design deficiencies is necessary” before the period at the end; and

(B) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) **AUTHORIZATION IN ADDITION TO SPECIFIC CREDIT PROVISION.**—In any case in which a specific provision of law authorizes credit for in-kind contributions provided by a non-Federal interest before the date of execution of a partnership agreement, the Secretary may apply the authority provided in this

paragraph to allow credit for in-kind contributions provided by the non-Federal interest on or after the date of execution of the partnership agreement.”.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—Section 2003(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b) is amended—

(1) by inserting “, or construction of design deficiency corrections on the project,” after “construction on the project”; and

(2) by inserting “, or under which construction of the project has not been completed and the work to be performed by the non-Federal interests has not been carried out and is creditable only toward any remaining non-Federal cost share,” after “has not been initiated”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) take effect on November 8, 2007.

(d) **GUIDELINES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall update any guidance or regulations for carrying out section 221(a)(4) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b(a)(4)) (as amended by subsection (a)) that are in existence on the date of enactment of this Act or issue new guidelines, as determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(2) **INCLUSIONS.**—Any guidance, regulations, or guidelines updated or issued under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum—

(A) the milestone for executing an in-kind memorandum of understanding for construction by a non-Federal interest;

(B) criteria and procedures for evaluating a request to execute an in-kind memorandum of understanding for construction by a non-Federal interest that is earlier than the milestone under subparagraph (A) for that execution; and

(C) criteria and procedures for determining whether work carried out by a non-Federal interest is integral to a project.

(3) **PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION.**—Before issuing any new or revised guidance, regulations, or guidelines or any subsequent updates to those documents, the Secretary shall—

(A) consult with affected non-Federal interests;

(B) publish the proposed guidelines developed under this subsection in the Federal Register; and

(C) provide the public with an opportunity to comment on the proposed guidelines.

(e) **OTHER CREDIT.**—Nothing in section 221(a)(4) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b(a)(4)) (as amended by subsection (a)) affects any eligibility for credit under section 104 of the Water Resources Development of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2214) that was approved by the Secretary prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2013. CREDIT IN LIEU OF REIMBURSEMENT.

Section 211(e)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 701b-13(e)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **STUDIES OR OTHER PROJECTS.**—On the request of a non-Federal interest, in lieu of reimbursing a non-Federal interest the amount equal to the estimated Federal share of the cost of an authorized flood damage reduction project or a separable element of an authorized flood damage reduction project under this subsection that has been constructed by the non-Federal interest under this section as of the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may provide the non-Federal interest with a credit in that amount, which the non-Federal interest may

apply to the share of the cost of the non-Federal interest of carrying out other flood damage reduction projects or studies.”.

SEC. 2014. DAM OPTIMIZATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF OTHER RELATED PROJECT BENEFITS.—In this section, the term “other related project benefits” includes—

(1) environmental protection and restoration, including restoration of water quality and water flows, improving movement of fish and other aquatic species, and restoration of floodplains, wetlands, and estuaries;

(2) increased water supply storage (except for any project in the Apalachicola-Chat-tahoochee-Flint River system and the Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa River system);

(3) increased hydropower generation;

(4) reduced flood risk;

(5) additional navigation; and

(6) improved recreation.

(b) PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out activities—

(A) to improve the efficiency of the operations and maintenance of dams and related infrastructure operated by the Corps of Engineers; and

(B) to maximize, to the extent practicable—

(i) authorized project purposes; and

(ii) other related project benefits.

(2) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—An eligible activity under this section is any activity that the Secretary would otherwise be authorized to carry out that is designed to provide other related project benefits in a manner that does not adversely impact the authorized purposes of the project.

(3) IMPACT ON AUTHORIZED PURPOSES.—An activity carried out under this section shall not adversely impact any of the authorized purposes of the project.

(4) EFFECT.—

(A) EXISTING AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this section—

(i) supersedes or modifies any written agreement between the Federal Government and a non-Federal interest that is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) supersedes or authorizes any amendment to a multistate water-control plan, including the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

(B) WATER RIGHTS.—Nothing in this section—

(i) affects any water right in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(ii) preempts or affects any State water law or interstate compact governing water; or

(iii) affects any authority of a State, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, to manage water resources within that State.

(5) OTHER LAWS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An activity carried out under this section shall comply with all other applicable laws (including regulations).

(B) WATER SUPPLY.—Any activity carried out under this section that results in any modification to water supply storage allocations at a reservoir operated by the Secretary shall comply with section 301 of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b).

(c) POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall carry out a review of, and as necessary modify, the policies, regulations, and guidance of the Secretary to carry out the activities described in subsection (b).

(d) COORDINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(A) coordinate all planning and activities carried out under this section with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and those public and private entities that the Secretary determines may be affected by those plans or activities; and

(B) give priority to planning and activities under this section if the Secretary determines that—

(i) the greatest opportunities exist for achieving the objectives of the program, as specified in subsection (b)(1), and

(ii) the coordination activities under this subsection indicate that there is support for carrying out those planning and activities.

(2) NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—Prior to carrying out an activity under this section, the Secretary shall consult with any applicable non-Federal interest of the affected dam or related infrastructure.

(e) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the actions carried out under this section.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a schedule for reviewing the operations of individual projects; and

(B) any recommendations of the Secretary on changes that the Secretary determines to be necessary—

(i) to carry out existing project authorizations, including the deauthorization of any water resource project that the Secretary determines could more effectively be achieved through other means;

(ii) to improve the efficiency of water resource project operations; and

(iii) to maximize authorized project purposes and other related project benefits.

(3) UPDATED REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall update the report entitled “Authorized and Operating Purposes of Corps of Engineers Reservoirs” and dated July 1992, which was produced pursuant to section 311 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4639).

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The updated report described in subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) the date on which the most recent review of project operations was conducted and any recommendations of the Secretary relating to that review the Secretary determines to be significant; and

(ii) the dates on which the recommendations described in clause (i) were carried out.

(f) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may use to carry out this section amounts made available to the Secretary from—

(A) the general purposes and expenses account;

(B) the operations and maintenance account; and

(C) any other amounts that are appropriated to carry out this section.

(2) FUNDING FROM OTHER SOURCES.—The Secretary may accept and expend amounts from non-Federal entities and other Federal agencies to carry out this section.

(g) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies and non-Federal entities to carry out this section.

SEC. 2015. WATER SUPPLY.

Section 301 of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) The Committees of jurisdiction are very concerned about the operation of

projects in the Apalachicola-Chat-tahoochee-Flint River System and the Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa River System, and further, the Committees of jurisdiction recognize that this ongoing water resources dispute raises serious concerns related to the authority of the Secretary of the Army to allocate substantial storage at projects to provide local water supply pursuant to the Water Supply Act of 1958 absent congressional approval. Interstate water disputes of this nature are more properly addressed through interstate water agreements that take into consideration the concerns of all affected States including impacts to other authorized uses of the projects, water supply for communities and major cities in the region, water quality, freshwater flows to communities, rivers, lakes, estuaries, and bays located downstream of projects, agricultural uses, economic development, and other appropriate concerns. To that end, the Committees of jurisdiction strongly urge the Governors of the affected States to reach agreement on an interstate water compact as soon as possible, and we pledge our commitment to work with the affected States to ensure prompt consideration and approval of any such agreement. Absent such action, the Committees of jurisdiction should consider appropriate legislation to address these matters including any necessary clarifications to the Water Supply Act of 1958 or other law. This subsection does not alter existing rights or obligations under law.”.

SEC. 2016. REPORT ON WATER STORAGE PRICING FORMULAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) due to the ongoing drought in many parts of the United States, communities are looking for ways to enhance their water storage on Corps of Engineer reservoirs so as to maintain a reliable supply of water into the foreseeable future;

(2) water storage pricing formulas should be equitable and not create disparities between users; and

(3) water pricing formulas should not be cost-prohibitive for communities.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate an assessment of the water storage pricing formulas of the Corps of Engineers, which shall include an assessment of—

(A) existing water storage pricing formulas of the Corps of Engineers, in particular whether those formulas produce water storage costs for some beneficiaries that are greatly disparate from the costs of other beneficiaries; and

(B) whether equitable water storage pricing formulas could lessen the disparate impact and produce more affordable water storage for potential beneficiaries.

(2) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the assessment carried out under paragraph (1).

SEC. 2017. CLARIFICATION OF PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED WORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out measures to improve fish species habitat within the footprint and downstream of a water resources project constructed by the Secretary that includes a fish hatchery if the Secretary—

(1) has been explicitly authorized to compensate for fish losses associated with the project; and

(2) determines that the measures are—

(A) feasible;

(B) consistent with authorized project purposes and the fish hatchery; and
(C) in the public interest.

(b) COST SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the non-Federal interest shall contribute 35 percent of the total cost of carrying out activities under this section, including the costs relating to the provision or acquisition of required land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations.

(2) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal interest shall contribute 100 percent of the costs of operation, maintenance, replacement, repair, and rehabilitation of a project constructed under this section.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For each fiscal year, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$30,000,000.

SEC. 2018. CONSIDERATION OF FEDERAL LAND IN FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

At the request of the non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall include as part of a regional or watershed study any Federal land that is located within the geographic scope of that study.

SEC. 2019. PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES.

Section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-16) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “or other stakeholder working with a State” after “cooperate with any State”; and

(ii) by inserting “, including plans to comprehensively address water resources challenges,” after “of such State”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “, at Federal expense.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “subsection (a)(1)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (a)”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) CONTRIBUTED FUNDS.—The Secretary may accept and expend funds in excess of the fees established under paragraph (1) that are provided by a State or other non-Federal public body for assistance under this section.”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$30,000,000”; and

(ii) by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$5,000,000 in Federal funds”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”.

SEC. 2020. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT POLICY.

(a) DEFINITION OF NATIONAL GUIDELINES.—In this section, the term “national guidelines” means the Corps of Engineers policy guidelines for management of vegetation on levees, including—

(1) Engineering Technical Letter 1110-2-571 entitled “Guidelines for Landscape Planting and Vegetation Management at Levees, Floodwalls, Embankment Dams, and Appurtenant Structures” and adopted April 10, 2009; and

(2) the draft policy guidance letter entitled “Process for Requesting a Variance from Vegetation Standards for Levees and Floodwalls” (77 Fed. Reg. 9637 (Feb. 17, 2012)).

(b) REVIEW.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall carry out a comprehensive review of the national guidelines in order to

determine whether current Federal policy relating to levee vegetation is appropriate for all regions of the United States.

(c) FACTORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the review, the Secretary shall consider—

(A) the varied interests and responsibilities in managing flood risks, including the need—

(i) to provide for levee safety with limited resources; and

(ii) to ensure that levee safety investments minimize environmental impacts and provide corresponding public safety benefits;

(B) the levee safety benefits that can be provided by woody vegetation;

(C) the preservation, protection, and enhancement of natural resources, including—

(i) the benefit of vegetation on levees in providing habitat for endangered, threatened, and candidate species; and

(ii) the impact of removing levee vegetation on compliance with other regulatory requirements;

(D) protecting the rights of Indian tribes pursuant to treaties and statutes;

(E) the available science and the historical record regarding the link between vegetation on levees and flood risk;

(F) the avoidance of actions requiring significant economic costs and environmental impacts; and

(G) other factors relating to the factors described in subparagraphs (A) through (F) identified in public comments that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(2) VARIANCE CONSIDERATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the review, the Secretary shall specifically consider whether the national guidelines can be amended to promote and allow for consideration of variances from national guidelines on a Statewide, tribal, regional, or watershed basis, including variances based on—

(i) soil conditions;

(ii) hydrologic factors;

(iii) vegetation patterns and characteristics;

(iv) environmental resources, including endangered, threatened, or candidate species and related regulatory requirements;

(v) levee performance history, including historical information on original construction and subsequent operation and maintenance activities;

(vi) any effects on water supply;

(vii) any scientific evidence on the link between levee vegetation and levee safety;

(viii) institutional considerations, including implementation challenges;

(ix) the availability of limited funds for levee construction and rehabilitation;

(x) the economic and environmental costs of removing woody vegetation on levees; and

(xi) other relevant factors identified in public comments that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(B) SCOPE.—The scope of a variance approved by the Secretary may include a complete exemption to national guidelines, as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(d) COOPERATION AND CONSULTATION; RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out the review under this section in consultation with other applicable Federal agencies, representatives of State, regional, local, and tribal governments, appropriate nongovernmental organizations, and the public.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Chief of Engineers and any State, tribal, regional, or local entity may submit to the Secretary any recommendations for vegetation management policies for levees that conform with Federal

and State laws, including recommendations relating to the review of national guidelines under subsection (b) and the consideration of variances under subsection (c)(2).

(e) PEER REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the review, the Secretary shall solicit and consider the views of the National Academy of Engineering and the National Academy of Sciences on the engineering, environmental, and institutional considerations underlying the national guidelines, including the factors described in subsection (c) and any information obtained by the Secretary under subsection (d).

(2) AVAILABILITY OF VIEWS.—The views of the National Academy of Engineering and the National Academy of Sciences obtained under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) made available to the public; and

(B) included in supporting materials issued in connection with the revised national guidelines required under subsection (f).

(f) REVISION OF NATIONAL GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) revise the national guidelines based on the results of the review, including—

(i) recommendations received as part of the consultation described in subsection (d)(1); and

(ii) the results of the peer review conducted under subsection (e); and

(B) submit to Congress a report that contains a summary of the activities of the Secretary and a description of the findings of the Secretary under this section.

(2) CONTENT; INCORPORATION INTO MANUAL.—The revised national guidelines shall—

(A) provide a practical, flexible process for approving Statewide, tribal, regional, or watershed variances from the national guidelines that—

(i) reflect due consideration of the factors described in subsection (c); and

(ii) incorporate State, tribal, and regional vegetation management guidelines for specific areas that have been adopted through a formal public process; and

(B) be incorporated into the manual proposed under section 5(c) of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes”, approved August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n(c)).

(3) FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINES.—If the Secretary fails to submit a report by the required deadline under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a detailed explanation of—

(A) why the deadline was missed;

(B) solutions needed to meet the deadline; and

(C) a projected date for submission of the report.

(g) CONTINUATION OF WORK.—Concurrent with the completion of the requirements of this section, the Secretary shall proceed without interruption or delay with those ongoing or programmed projects and studies, or elements of projects or studies, that are not directly related to vegetation variance policy.

(h) INTERIM ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Until the date on which revisions to the national guidelines are adopted in accordance with subsection (f), the Secretary shall not require the removal of existing vegetation as a condition or requirement for any approval or funding of a

project, or any other action, unless the specific vegetation has been demonstrated to present an unacceptable safety risk.

(2) **REVISIONS.**—Beginning on the date on which the revisions to the national guidelines are adopted in accordance with subsection (f), the Secretary shall consider, on request of an affected entity, any previous action of the Corps of Engineers in which the outcome was affected by the former national guidelines.

SEC. 2021. LEVEE CERTIFICATIONS.

(a) **IMPLEMENTATION OF FLOOD PROTECTION STRUCTURE ACCREDITATION TASK FORCE.**—In carrying out section 100226 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (42 U.S.C. 4101 note; 126 Stat. 942), the Secretary shall—

(1) ensure that at least 1 program activity carried out under the inspection of completed works program of the Corps of Engineers provides adequate information to the Secretary to reach a levee accreditation decision for each requirement under section 65.10 of title 44, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulation); and

(2) to the maximum extent practicable, carry out activities under the inspection of completed works program of the Corps of Engineers in alignment with the schedule established for the national flood insurance program established under chapter 1 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011 et seq.).

(b) **ACCELERATED LEVEE SYSTEM EVALUATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—On receipt of a request from a non-Federal interest, the Secretary may carry out a levee system evaluation and certification of a federally authorized levee for purposes of the national flood insurance program established under chapter 1 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011 et seq.) if the evaluation and certification will be carried out earlier than such an evaluation and certification would be carried out under subsection (a).

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—A levee system evaluation and certification under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) at a minimum, comply with section 65.10 of title 44, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act); and

(B) be carried out in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, may establish.

(3) **COST SHARING.**—

(A) **NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), the non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out a levee system evaluation and certification under this subsection shall be 35 percent.

(B) **ADJUSTMENT.**—The Secretary shall adjust the non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out a levee system evaluation and certification under this subsection in accordance with section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)).

(4) **APPLICATION.**—Nothing in this subsection affects the requirement under section 100226(b)(2) of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (42 U.S.C. 4101 note; 126 Stat. 942).

SEC. 2022. RESTORATION OF FLOOD AND HURRICANE STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION PROJECTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out any measures necessary to repair or restore federally authorized flood and hurricane and storm damage reduction projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers to au-

thorized levels (as of the date of enactment of this Act) of protection for reasons including settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum, if the Secretary determines the necessary work is technically feasible, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.

(b) **COST SHARE.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of construction of a project carried out under this section shall be determined as provided in subsections (a) through (d) of section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213).

(c) **OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of operations, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation for a project carried out under this section shall be 100 percent.

(d) **ELIGIBILITY OF PROJECTS TRANSFERRED TO NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.**—The Secretary may carry out measures described in subsection (a) on a water resources project, separable element of a project, or functional component of a project that has been transferred to the non-Federal interest.

(e) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 8 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the implementation of this section, including—

(1) any recommendations relating to the continued need for the authority provided in this section;

(2) a description of the measures carried out under this section;

(3) any lessons learned relating to the measures implemented under this section; and

(4) best practices for carrying out measures to restore flood and hurricane and storm damage reduction projects.

(f) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority to carry out a measure under this section terminates on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$250,000,000.

SEC. 2023. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF CERTAIN PROJECTS.

The Secretary may assume operation and maintenance activities for a navigation channel that is deepened by a non-Federal interest prior to December 31, 2012, if—

(1) the Secretary determines that the requirements under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 204(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2232(f)) are met;

(2) the Secretary determines that the activities carried out by the non-Federal interest in deepening the navigation channel are economically justified and environmentally acceptable; and

(3) the deepening activities have been carried out on a Federal navigation channel that—

(A) exists as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) has been authorized by Congress.

SEC. 2024. DREDGING STUDY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in conjunction with other relevant Federal agencies and applicable non-Federal interests, shall carry out a study—

(1) to compare domestic and international dredging markets, including costs, technologies, and management approaches used in each respective market, and determine the impacts of those markets on dredging needs and practices in the United States;

(2) to analyze past and existing practices, technologies, and management approaches used in dredging in the United States; and

(3) to develop recommendations relating to the best techniques, practices, and management approaches for dredging in the United States.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the study under this section are—

(1) the identification of the best techniques, methods, and technologies for dredging, including the evaluation of the feasibility, cost, and benefits of—

(A) new dredging technologies; and

(B) improved dredging practices and techniques;

(2) the appraisal of the needs of the United States for dredging, including the need to increase the size of private and Corps of Engineers dredging fleets to meet demands for additional construction or maintenance dredging needed as of the date of enactment of this Act and in the subsequent 20 years;

(3) the identification of any impediments to dredging, including any recommendations of appropriate alternatives for responding to those impediments;

(4) the assessment, including any recommendations of appropriate alternatives, of the adequacy and effectiveness of—

(A) the economic, engineering, and environmental methods, models, and analyses used by the Chief of Engineers and private dredging operations for dredging; and

(B) the current cost structure of construction contracts entered into by the Chief of Engineers;

(5) the evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of past, current, and alternative dredging practices and alternatives to dredging, including agitation dredging; and

(6) the identification of innovative techniques and cost-effective methods to expand regional sediment management efforts, including the placement of dredged sediment within river diversions to accelerate the creation of wetlands.

(c) **STUDY TEAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a study team to assist the Secretary in planning, carrying out, and reporting on the results of the study under this section.

(2) **STUDY TEAM.**—The study team established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be appointed by the Secretary; and

(B) represent a broad spectrum of experts in the field of dredging and representatives of relevant State agencies and relevant non-Federal interests.

(d) **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) make available to the public, including on the Internet, all draft and final study findings under this section; and

(2) allow for a public comment period of not less than 30 days on any draft study findings prior to issuing final study findings.

(e) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and subject to available appropriations, the Secretary, in consultation with the study team established under subsection (c), shall submit a detailed report on the results of the study to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(f) **FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINES.**—If the Secretary does not complete the study under this section and submit a report to Congress under subsection (e) on or before the deadline described in that subsection, the Secretary shall notify Congress and describe why the study was not completed.

SEC. 2025. NON-FEDERAL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish and implement a pilot program to evaluate the cost-effectiveness and project delivery efficiency of allowing non-Federal interests to carry out flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage reduction, coastal harbor and channel inland navigation, and aquatic ecosystem restoration projects.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the pilot program are—

(1) to identify project delivery and cost-saving alternatives that reduce the backlog of authorized Corps of Engineers projects;

(2) to evaluate the technical, financial, and organizational efficiencies of a non-Federal interest carrying out the design, execution, management, and construction of 1 or more projects; and

(3) to evaluate alternatives for the decentralization of the project management, design, and construction for authorized Corps of Engineers water resources projects.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the pilot program, the Secretary shall—

(A) identify a total of not more than 15 projects for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage reduction (including levees, floodwalls, flood control channels, and water control structures), coastal harbor and channels, inland navigation, and aquatic ecosystem restoration that have been authorized for construction prior to the date of enactment of this Act, including—

(i) not more than 12 projects that—

(I)(aa) have received Federal funds prior to the date of enactment of this Act; or

(bb) for more than 2 consecutive fiscal years, have an unobligated funding balance for that project in the Corps of Engineers construction account; and

(II) to the maximum extent practicable, are located in each of the divisions of the Corps of Engineers; and

(ii) not more than 3 projects that have not received Federal funds in the period beginning on the date on which the project was authorized and ending on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) notify the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the identification of each project under the pilot program;

(C) in collaboration with the non-Federal interest, develop a detailed project management plan for each identified project that outlines the scope, budget, design, and construction resource requirements necessary for the non-Federal interest to execute the project, or a separable element of the project;

(D) on the request of the non-Federal interest, enter into a project partnership agreement with the non-Federal interest for the non-Federal interest to provide full project management control for construction of the project, or a separable element of the project, in accordance with plans approved by the Secretary;

(E) following execution of the project partnership agreement, transfer to the non-Federal interest to carry out construction of the project, or a separable element of the project—

(i) if applicable, the balance of the unobligated amounts appropriated for the project, except that the Secretary shall retain sufficient amounts for the Corps of Engineers to carry out any responsibilities of the Corps of

Engineers relating to the project and pilot program; and

(ii) additional amounts, as determined by the Secretary, from amounts made available under subsection (h), except that the total amount transferred to the non-Federal interest shall not exceed the updated estimate of the Federal share of the cost of construction, including any required design; and

(F) regularly monitor and audit each project being constructed by a non-Federal interest under this section to ensure that the construction activities are carried out in compliance with the plans approved by the Secretary and that the construction costs are reasonable.

(2) DETAILED PROJECT SCHEDULE.—Not later than 180 days after entering into an agreement under paragraph (1)(D), each non-Federal interest, to the maximum extent practicable, shall submit to the Secretary a detailed project schedule, based on estimated funding levels, that lists all deadlines for each milestone in the construction of the project.

(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—On the request of a non-Federal interest, the Secretary may provide technical assistance to the non-Federal interest, if the non-Federal interest contracts with and compensates the Secretary for the technical assistance relating to—

(A) any study, engineering activity, and design activity for construction carried out by the non-Federal interest under this section; and

(B) expeditiously obtaining any permits necessary for the project.

(4) COST-SHARE.—Nothing in this section affects the cost-sharing requirement applicable on the day before the date of enactment of this Act to a project carried out under this section.

(e) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report detailing the results of the pilot program carried out under this section, including—

(A) a description of the progress of non-Federal interests in meeting milestones in detailed project schedules developed pursuant to subsection (c)(2); and

(B) any recommendations of the Secretary concerning whether the program or any component of the program should be implemented on a national basis.

(2) UPDATE.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives an update of the report described in paragraph (1).

(3) FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.—If the Secretary fails to submit a report by the required deadline under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a detailed explanation of why the deadline was missed and a projected date for submission of the report.

(f) ADMINISTRATION.—All laws and regulations that would apply to the Secretary if the Secretary were carrying out the project shall apply to a non-Federal interest carrying out a project under this section.

(g) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to commence a project under this

section terminates on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to any amounts appropriated for a specific project, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out the pilot program under this section, including the costs of administration of the Secretary, \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

SEC. 2026. NON-FEDERAL IMPLEMENTATION OF FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish and implement a pilot program to evaluate the cost-effectiveness and project delivery efficiency of allowing non-Federal interests to carry out feasibility studies for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage reduction, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and coastal harbor and channel and inland navigation.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the pilot program are—

(1) to identify project delivery and cost-saving alternatives to the existing feasibility study process;

(2) to evaluate the technical, financial, and organizational efficiencies of a non-Federal interest carrying out a feasibility study of 1 or more projects; and

(3) to evaluate alternatives for the decentralization of the project planning, management, and operational decisionmaking processes of the Corps of Engineers.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On the request of a non-Federal interest, the Secretary may enter into an agreement with the non-Federal interest for the non-Federal interest to provide full project management control of a feasibility study for a project for—

(A) flood risk management;

(B) hurricane and storm damage reduction, including levees, floodwalls, flood control channels, and water control structures;

(C) coastal harbor and channel and inland navigation; and

(D) aquatic ecosystem restoration.

(2) USE OF NON-FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A non-Federal interest that has entered into an agreement with the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1) may use non-Federal funds to carry out the feasibility study.

(B) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall credit towards the non-Federal share of the cost of construction of a project for which a feasibility study is carried out under this section an amount equal to the portion of the cost of developing the study that would have been the responsibility of the Secretary, if the study were carried out by the Secretary, subject to the conditions that—

(i) non-Federal funds were used to carry out the activities that would have been the responsibility of the Secretary;

(ii) the Secretary determines that the feasibility study complies with all applicable Federal laws and regulations; and

(iii) the project is authorized by any provision of Federal law enacted after the date on which an agreement is entered into under paragraph (1).

(3) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—After the date on which an agreement is executed pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary may transfer to the non-Federal interest to carry out the feasibility study—

(i) if applicable, the balance of any unobligated amounts appropriated for the study, except that the Secretary shall retain sufficient amounts for the Corps of Engineers to

carry out any responsibilities of the Corps of Engineers relating to the project and pilot program; and

(ii) additional amounts, as determined by the Secretary, from amounts made available under subsection (h), except that the total amount transferred to the non-Federal interest shall not exceed the updated estimate of the Federal share of the cost of the feasibility study.

(B) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The Secretary shall include such provisions as the Secretary determines to be necessary in an agreement under paragraph (1) to ensure that a non-Federal interest receiving Federal funds under this paragraph—

(i) has the necessary qualifications to administer those funds; and

(ii) will comply with all applicable Federal laws (including regulations) relating to the use of those funds.

(4) **NOTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall notify the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the initiation of each feasibility study under the pilot program.

(5) **AUDITING.**—The Secretary shall regularly monitor and audit each feasibility study carried out by a non-Federal interest under this section to ensure that the use of any funds transferred under paragraph (3) are used in compliance with the agreement signed under paragraph (1).

(6) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—On the request of a non-Federal interest, the Secretary may provide technical assistance to the non-Federal interest relating to any aspect of the feasibility study, if the non-Federal interest contracts with the Secretary for the technical assistance and compensates the Secretary for the technical assistance.

(7) **DETAILED PROJECT SCHEDULE.**—Not later than 180 days after entering into an agreement under paragraph (1), each non-Federal interest, to the maximum extent practicable, shall submit to the Secretary a detailed project schedule, based on full funding capability, that lists all deadlines for milestones relating to the feasibility study.

(d) **COST-SHARE.**—Nothing in this section affects the cost-sharing requirement applicable on the day before the date of enactment of this Act to a feasibility study carried out under this section.

(e) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report detailing the results of the pilot program carried out under this section, including—

(A) a description of the progress of the non-Federal interests in meeting milestones in detailed project schedules developed pursuant to subsection (c)(7); and

(B) any recommendations of the Secretary concerning whether the program or any component of the program should be implemented on a national basis.

(2) **UPDATE.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives an update of the report described in paragraph (1).

(3) **FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.**—If the Secretary fails to submit a report by the re-

quired deadline under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a detailed explanation of why the deadline was missed and a projected date for submission of the report.

(f) **ADMINISTRATION.**—All laws and regulations that would apply to the Secretary if the Secretary were carrying out the feasibility study shall apply to a non-Federal interest carrying out a feasibility study under this section.

(g) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority to commence a feasibility study under this section terminates on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(h) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—In addition to any amounts appropriated for a specific project, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out the pilot program under this section, including the costs of administration of the Secretary, \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

SEC. 2027. TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

Section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(B)—

(A) by striking “The ability” and inserting the following:

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The ability”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) **DETERMINATION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2013, the Secretary shall issue guidance on the procedures described in clause (i).”; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking “2012” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 2028. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN INDIAN TRIBES.

The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with 1 or more federally recognized Indian tribes (or a designated representative of the Indian tribes) that are located, in whole or in part, within the boundaries of the Columbia River Basin to carry out authorized activities within the Columbia River Basin to protect fish, wildlife, water quality, and cultural resources.

SEC. 2029. MILITARY MUNITIONS RESPONSE ACTIONS AT CIVIL WORKS SHORELINE PROTECTION PROJECTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may implement any response action the Secretary determines to be necessary at a site where—

(1) the Secretary has carried out a project under civil works authority of the Secretary that includes placing sand on a beach;

(2) as a result of the project described in paragraph (1), military munitions that were originally released as a result of Department of Defense activities are deposited on the beach, posing a threat to human health or the environment.

(b) **RESPONSE ACTION FUNDING.**—A response action described in subsection (a) shall be funded from amounts made available to the agency within the Department of Defense responsible for the original release of the munitions.

SEC. 2030. BEACH NOURISHMENT.

Section 156 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5f) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 156. BEACH NOURISHMENT.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (b)(2)(A), the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, may provide

periodic beach nourishment for each water resources development project for which that nourishment has been authorized for an additional period of time, as determined by the Secretary, subject to the condition that the additional period shall not exceed the later of—

“(1) 50 years after the date on which the construction of the project is initiated; or

“(2) the date on which the last estimated periodic nourishment for the project is to be carried out, as recommended in the applicable report of the Chief of Engineers.

“(b) **EXTENSION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (3), before the date on which the 50-year period referred to in subsection (a)(1) expires, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers—

“(A) may, at the request of the non-Federal interest and subject to the availability of appropriations, carry out a review of a nourishment project carried out under subsection (a) to evaluate the feasibility of continuing Federal participation in the project for a period not to exceed 15 years; and

“(B) shall submit to Congress any recommendations of the Secretary relating to the review.

“(2) **PLAN FOR REDUCING RISK TO PEOPLE AND PROPERTY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The non-Federal interest shall submit to the Secretary a plan for reducing the risk to people and property during the life of the project.

“(B) **INCLUSION IN REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary shall submit to Congress the plan described in subparagraph (A) with the recommendations submitted in paragraph (1)(B).

“(3) **REVIEW COMMENCED WITHIN 2 YEARS OF EXPIRATION OF 50-YEAR PERIOD.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary of the Army commences a review under paragraph (1) not earlier than the period beginning on the date that is 2 years before the date on which the 50-year period referred to in subsection (a)(1) expires and ending on the date on which the 50-year period expires, the project shall remain authorized after the expiration of the 50-year period until the earlier of—

“(i) 3 years after the expiration of the 50-year period; or

“(ii) the date on which a determination is made as to whether to extend Federal participation in the project in accordance with paragraph (1).

“(B) **CALCULATION OF TIME PERIOD FOR EXTENSION.**—Notwithstanding clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) and after a review under subparagraph (A) is completed, if a determination is made to extend Federal participation in the project in accordance with paragraph (1) for a period not to exceed 15 years, that period shall begin on the date on which the determination is made.”.

SEC. 2031. REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT.

Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326) (as amended by section 2003(c)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or used in” after “obtained through”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(C), by inserting “for the purposes of improving environmental conditions in marsh and littoral systems, stabilizing stream channels, enhancing shorelines, and supporting State and local risk management adaptation strategies” before the period at the end;

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(B)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “clause (ii)” and inserting “clauses (ii) and (iii)”; and

(B) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

(C) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) **REDUCTION IN NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—The Secretary may reduce the non-Federal share of the costs of construction of a project if the Secretary determines that, through the beneficial use of sediment at another Federal project, there will be an associated reduction or avoidance of Federal costs.”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking the subsection designation and heading and inserting the following:

“(d) **SELECTION OF DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL METHOD FOR PURPOSES RELATED TO ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION OR STORM DAMAGE AND FLOOD REDUCTION.**—”; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “in relation to” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “in relation to—

“(A) the environmental benefits, including the benefits to the aquatic environment to be derived from the creation of wetlands and control of shoreline erosion; or

“(B) the flood and storm damage and flood reduction benefits, including shoreline protection, protection against loss of life, and damage to improved property.”; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) cooperate with any State or group of States in the preparation of a comprehensive State or regional sediment management plan within the boundaries of the State or among States.”.

SEC. 2032. STUDY ACCELERATION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) delays in the completion of feasibility studies—

(A) increase costs for the Federal Government as well as State and local governments; and

(B) delay the implementation of water resources projects that provide critical benefits, including reducing flood risk, maintaining commercially important flood risk, and restoring vital ecosystems; and

(2) the efforts undertaken by the Corps of Engineers through the establishment of the “3-3-3” planning process should be continued.

(b) **ACCELERATION OF STUDIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), a feasibility study initiated after the date of enactment of this Act shall—

(A) be completed not later than 3 years after the date of initiation of the study; and

(B) have a maximum Federal cost share of \$3,000,000.

(2) **ABILITY TO COMPLY.**—On initiating a feasibility study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) certify that the study will comply with the requirements of paragraph (1);

(B) for projects the Secretary determines to be too complex to comply with the requirements of paragraph (1)—

(i) not less than 30 days after making a determination, notify the non-Federal interest regarding the inability to comply; and

(ii) provide a new projected timeline and cost; and

(C) if the study conditions have changed such that scheduled timelines or study costs will not be met—

(i) not later than 30 days after the study conditions change, notify the non-Federal interest of those changed conditions; and

(ii) present the non-Federal interest with a new timeline for completion and new projected study costs.

(3) APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—All timeline and cost conditions under this section shall be subject to the Secretary receiving adequate appropriations for meeting study timeline and cost requirements.

(B) **NOTIFICATION.**—Not later than 60 days after receiving appropriations, the Secretary shall notify the non-Federal interest of any changes to timelines or costs due to inadequate appropriations.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that describes—

(1) the status of the implementation of the “3-3-3” planning process, including the number of participating projects;

(2) the amount of time taken to complete all studies participating in the “3-3-3” planning process; and

(3) any recommendations for additional authority necessary to support efforts to expedite the feasibility study process for water resource projects.

SEC. 2033. PROJECT ACCELERATION.

Section 2045 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2348) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 2045. PROJECT ACCELERATION.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.**—The term ‘environmental impact statement’ means the detailed statement of environmental impacts of water resource projects required to be prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(2) **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘environmental review process’ means the process of preparing an environmental impact statement, environmental assessment, categorical exclusion, or other document under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) for a water resource project.

“(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘environmental review process’ includes the process for and completion of any environmental permit, approval, review, or study required for a water resource project under any Federal law other than the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(3) **FEDERAL JURISDICTIONAL AGENCY.**—The term ‘Federal jurisdictional agency’ means a Federal agency with jurisdiction delegated by law, regulation, order, or otherwise over an approval or decision required for a water resource project under applicable Federal laws (including regulations).

“(4) **LEAD AGENCY.**—The term ‘lead agency’ means the Corps of Engineers and, if applicable, any State, local, or tribal governmental entity serving as a joint lead agency pursuant to section 1506.3 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

“(5) **WATER RESOURCE PROJECT.**—The term ‘water resource project’ means a Corps of Engineers water resource project.

“(b) **POLICY.**—The benefits of water resource projects designed and carried out in an economically and environmentally sound manner are important to the economy and environment of the United States, and recommendations to Congress regarding those projects should be developed using coordinated and efficient review and cooperative efforts to prevent or quickly resolve disputes

during the planning of those water resource projects.

“(c) **APPLICABILITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The project planning procedures under this section apply to proposed projects initiated after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2013 and for which the Secretary determines that—

“(A) an environmental impact statement is required; or

“(B) at the discretion of the Secretary, other water resource projects for which an environmental review process document is required to be prepared.

“(2) **FLEXIBILITY.**—Any authorities granted in this section may be exercised, and any requirements established under this section may be satisfied, for the planning of a water resource project, a class of those projects, or a program of those projects.

“(3) **LIST OF WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall annually prepare, and make publicly available, a separate list of each study that the Secretary has determined—

“(i) meets the standards described in paragraph (1); and

“(ii) does not have adequate funding to make substantial progress toward the completion of the planning activities for the water resource project.

“(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The Secretary shall include for each study on the list under subparagraph (A) a description of the estimated amounts necessary to make substantial progress on the study.

“(4) **IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE.**—The Secretary shall prepare, in consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality and other Federal agencies with jurisdiction over actions or resources that may be impacted by a water resource project, guidance documents that describe the coordinated review processes that the Secretary will use to implement this section for the planning of water resource projects, in accordance with the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers and all applicable law.

“(d) **WATER RESOURCE PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall develop and implement a coordinated review process for the development of water resource projects.

“(2) **COORDINATED REVIEW.**—The coordinated review process described in paragraph (1) shall require that any analysis, opinion, permit, license, statement, and approval issued or made by a Federal, State, or local governmental agency or an Indian tribe for the planning of a water resource project described in subsection (b) be conducted, to the maximum extent practicable, concurrently with any other applicable governmental agency or Indian tribe.

“(3) **TIMING.**—The coordinated review process under this subsection shall be completed not later than the date on which the Secretary, in consultation and concurrence with the agencies identified under subsection (e), establishes with respect to the water resource project.

“(e) **IDENTIFICATION OF JURISDICTIONAL AGENCIES.**—With respect to the development of each water resource project, the Secretary shall identify, as soon as practicable, all Federal, State, and local government agencies and Indian tribes that may—

“(1) have jurisdiction over the water resource project;

“(2) be required by law to conduct or issue a review, analysis, or opinion for the water resource project; or

“(3) be required to make a determination on issuing a permit, license, or approval for the water resource project.

“(f) STATE AUTHORITY.—If the coordinated review process is being implemented under this section by the Secretary with respect to the planning of a water resource project described in subsection (c) within the boundaries of a State, the State, consistent with State law, may choose to participate in the process and to make subject to the process all State agencies that—

“(1) have jurisdiction over the water resource project;

“(2) are required to conduct or issue a review, analysis, or opinion for the water resource project; or

“(3) are required to make a determination on issuing a permit, license, or approval for the water resource project.

“(g) LEAD AGENCIES.—

“(1) FEDERAL LEAD AGENCY.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Corps of Engineers shall be the lead Federal agency in the environmental review process for a water resource project.

“(2) JOINT LEAD AGENCIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—At the discretion of the Secretary and subject to any applicable regulations under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), including the concurrence of the proposed joint lead agency, an agency other than the Corps of Engineers may serve as the joint lead agency.

“(B) NON-FEDERAL INTEREST AS JOINT LEAD AGENCY.—A non-Federal interest that is a State or local governmental entity—

“(i) may, with the concurrence of the Secretary, serve as a joint lead agency with the Corps of Engineers for purposes of preparing any environmental document under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

“(ii) may prepare any environmental review process document under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) required in support of any action or approval by the Secretary if—

“(I) the Secretary provides guidance in the preparation process and independently evaluates that document

“(II) the non-Federal interest complies with all requirements applicable to the Secretary under—

“(aa) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

“(bb) any regulation implementing that Act; and

“(cc) any other applicable Federal law; and

“(III) the Secretary approves and adopts the document before the Secretary takes any subsequent action or makes any approval based on that document, regardless of whether the action or approval of the Secretary results in Federal funding.

“(3) DUTIES.—The Secretary shall ensure that—

“(A) the non-Federal interest complies with all design and mitigation commitments made jointly by the Secretary and the non-Federal interest in any environmental document prepared by the non-Federal interest in accordance with this subsection; and

“(B) any environmental document prepared by the non-Federal interest is appropriately supplemented under paragraph (2)(B) to address any changes to the water resource project the Secretary determines are necessary.

“(4) ADOPTION AND USE OF DOCUMENTS.—Any environmental document prepared in accordance with this subsection may be adopted or used by any Federal agency making

any approval to the same extent that the Federal agency could adopt or use a document prepared by another Federal agency under—

“(A) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

“(B) parts 1500 through 1508 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

“(5) ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITY OF LEAD AGENCY.—With respect to the environmental review process for any water resource project, the lead agency shall have authority and responsibility—

“(A) to take such actions as are necessary and proper and within the authority and responsibility of the lead agency to facilitate the expeditious resolution of the environmental review process for the water resource project; and

“(B) to prepare or ensure that any required environmental impact statement or other environmental review document for a water resource project required to be completed under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) is completed in accordance with this section and applicable Federal law.

“(h) PARTICIPATING AND COOPERATING AGENCIES.—

“(1) INVITATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall identify, as early as practicable in the environmental review process for a water resource project, any other Federal or non-Federal agencies that may have an interest in that project and invite those agencies to become participating or cooperating agencies, as applicable, in the environmental review process for the water resource project.

“(B) PROCEDURES.—Section 1501.6 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2013) shall govern the identification and the participation of a cooperating agency under subparagraph (A).

“(C) DEADLINE.—An invitation to participate issued under subparagraph (A) shall set a deadline by which a response to the invitation shall be submitted, which may be extended by the lead agency for good cause.

“(2) FEDERAL COOPERATING AGENCIES.—Any Federal agency that is invited by the lead agency to participate in the environmental review process for a water resource project shall be designated as a cooperating agency by the lead agency unless the invited agency informs the lead agency, in writing, by the deadline specified in the invitation that the invited agency—

“(A)(i) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the water resource project;

“(ii) has no expertise or information relevant to the water resource project; or

“(iii) does not have adequate funds to participate in the water resource project; and

“(B) does not intend to submit comments on the water resource project.

“(3) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—Designation as a participating or cooperating agency under this subsection shall not imply that the participating or cooperating agency—

“(A) supports a proposed water resource project; or

“(B) has any jurisdiction over, or special expertise with respect to evaluation of, the water resource project.

“(4) CONCURRENT REVIEWS.—Each cooperating agency shall—

“(A) carry out the obligations of that agency under other applicable law concurrently and in conjunction with the required environmental review process, unless doing

so would impair the ability of the Federal agency to conduct needed analysis or otherwise carry out those obligations; and

“(B) formulate and implement administrative, policy, and procedural mechanisms to enable the agency to ensure completion of the environmental review process in a timely, coordinated, and environmentally responsible manner.

“(i) PROGRAMMATIC COMPLIANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue guidance regarding the use of programmatic approaches to carry out the environmental review process that—

“(A) eliminates repetitive discussions of the same issues;

“(B) focuses on the actual issues ripe for analyses at each level of review;

“(C) establishes a formal process for coordinating with cooperating agencies, including the creation of a list of all data that is needed to carry out an environmental review process; and

“(D) complies with—

“(i) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

“(ii) all other applicable laws.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(A) as the first step in drafting guidance under that paragraph, consult with relevant Federal and State agencies, Indian tribes, and the public on the appropriate use and scope of the programmatic approaches;

“(B) emphasize the importance of collaboration among relevant Federal agencies, State agencies, and Indian tribes in undertaking programmatic reviews, especially with respect to including reviews with a broad geographical scope;

“(C) ensure that the programmatic reviews—

“(i) promote transparency, including of the analyses and data used in the environmental review process, the treatment of any deferred issues raised by Federal, State, or tribal agencies, or the public, and the temporal and special scales to be used to analyze those issues;

“(ii) use accurate and timely information in the environmental review process, including—

“(I) criteria for determining the general duration of the usefulness of the review; and

“(II) the timeline for updating any out-of-date review;

“(iii) describe—

“(I) the relationship between programmatic analysis and future tiered analysis; and

“(II) the role of the public in the creation of future tiered analysis; and

“(iv) are available to other relevant Federal and State agencies, Indian tribes, and the public;

“(D) allow not fewer than 60 days of public notice and comment on any proposed guidance; and

“(E) address any comments received under subparagraph (D).

“(j) COORDINATED REVIEWS.—

“(1) COORDINATION PLAN.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall, after consultation with and with the concurrence of each cooperating agency for the water resource project and the non-Federal interest or joint lead agency, as applicable, establish a plan for coordinating public and agency participation in, and comment on, the environmental review process for a water resource project or a category of water resource projects.

“(ii) INCORPORATION.—The plan established under clause (i) shall be incorporated into

the project schedule milestones set under section 905(g)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282(g)(2)).

“(2) COMMENT DEADLINES.—The lead agency shall establish the following deadlines for comment during the environmental review process for a water resource project:

“(A) DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.—For comments by Federal and States agencies and the public on a draft environmental impact statement, a period of not more than 60 days after publication in the Federal Register of notice of the date of public availability of the draft environmental impact statement, unless—

“(i) a different deadline is established by agreement of the lead agency, the non-Federal interest, as applicable, and all participating and cooperating agencies; or

“(ii) the deadline is extended by the lead agency for good cause.

“(B) OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESSES.—For all comment periods established by the lead agency for agency or public comments in the environmental review process of an action within a program under the authority of the lead agency other than for a draft environmental impact statement, a period of not more than 30 days after the date on which the materials on which comment is requested are made available, unless—

“(i) a different deadline is established by agreement of the lead agency, the non-Federal interest, and all cooperating agencies; or

“(ii) the deadline is extended by the lead agency for good cause.

“(3) DEADLINES FOR DECISIONS UNDER OTHER LAWS.—In any case in which a decision under any Federal law relating to a project, including the issuance or denial of a permit or license, is required to be made by the date described in subsection (k)(6)(B)(ii), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives—

“(A) as soon as practicable after the 180-day period described in subsection (k)(6)(B)(ii), an initial notice of the failure of the Federal agency to make the decision; and

“(B) every 60 days thereafter until such date as all decisions of the Federal agency relating to the project have been made by the Federal agency, an additional notice that describes the number of decisions of the Federal agency that remain outstanding as of the date of the additional notice.

“(4) INVOLVEMENT OF THE PUBLIC.—Nothing in this subsection reduces any time period provided for public comment in the environmental review process under applicable Federal law (including regulations).

“(k) ISSUE IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION.—

“(1) COOPERATION.—The lead agency, the cooperating agencies, and any participating agencies shall work cooperatively in accordance with this section to identify and resolve issues that could delay completion of the environmental review process or result in the denial of any approval required for the water resource project under applicable laws.

“(2) LEAD AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall make information available to the cooperating agencies and participating agencies as early as practicable in the environmental review process regarding the environmental and socioeconomic resources located within the water resource project area and the general locations of the alternatives under consideration.

“(B) DATA SOURCES.—The information under subparagraph (A) may be based on existing data sources, including geographic information systems mapping.

“(3) COOPERATING AND PARTICIPATING AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—Based on information received from the lead agency, cooperating and participating agencies shall identify, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding the potential environmental or socioeconomic impacts of the water resource project, including any issues that could substantially delay or prevent an agency from granting a permit or other approval that is needed for the water resource project.

“(4) INTERIM DECISION ON ACHIEVING ACCELERATED DECISIONMAKING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the close of the public comment period on a draft environmental impact statement, the Secretary may convene a meeting with the non-Federal interest or joint lead agency, as applicable, relevant resource agencies, and relevant Federal and State agencies to establish a schedule of deadlines to complete decisions regarding the water resource project.

“(B) DEADLINES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The deadlines referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be those established by the Secretary, in consultation with and with the concurrence of the non-Federal interest or joint lead agency, as applicable, and other relevant Federal and State agencies.

“(ii) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In establishing a schedule, the Secretary shall consider factors such as—

“(I) the responsibilities of cooperating agencies under applicable laws;

“(II) the resources available to the non-Federal interest, joint lead agency, and other relevant Federal and State agencies, as applicable;

“(III) the overall size and complexity of the water resource project;

“(IV) the overall schedule for and cost of the water resource project; and

“(V) the sensitivity of the natural and historical resources that could be affected by the water resource project.

“(iii) MODIFICATIONS.—The Secretary may—

“(I) lengthen a schedule under clause (i) for good cause; and

“(II) shorten a schedule only with concurrence of the affected non-Federal interest, joint lead agency, or relevant Federal and State agencies, as applicable.

“(C) FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.—If the agencies described in subparagraph (A) cannot provide reasonable assurances that the deadlines described in subparagraph (B) will be met, the Secretary may initiate the issue resolution and referral process described under paragraph (5) before the completion of the record of decision.

“(5) ACCELERATED ISSUE RESOLUTION AND ELEVATION.—

“(A) AGENCY ISSUE RESOLUTION MEETING.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A cooperating agency or non-Federal interest may request an issue resolution meeting to be conducted by the Secretary.

“(ii) ACTION BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall convene an issue resolution meeting under clause (i) with the relevant cooperating agencies and the non-Federal interest, as applicable, to resolve issues that could—

“(I) delay completion of the environmental review process; or

“(II) conflict with the ability of a cooperating agency to carry out applicable Federal laws (including regulations).

“(iii) DATE.—A meeting requested under this subparagraph shall be held not later than 21 days after the date on which the Secretary receives the request for the meeting, unless the Secretary determines that there is good cause to extend that deadline.

“(iv) NOTIFICATION.—On receipt of a request for a meeting under this subparagraph, the Secretary shall notify all relevant cooperating agencies of the request, including the issue to be resolved and the date for the meeting.

“(v) DISPUTES.—If a relevant cooperating agency with jurisdiction over an action, including a permit approval, review, or other statement or opinion required for a water resource project under applicable law determines that the relevant information necessary to resolve the issue has not been obtained and could not have been obtained within a reasonable time, but the Secretary disagrees, the resolution of the dispute shall be forwarded to the heads of the relevant agencies for resolution.

“(vi) CONVENTION BY LEAD AGENCY.—The Secretary may convene an issue resolution meeting under this subsection at any time, at the discretion of the Secretary, regardless of whether a meeting is requested under clause (i).

“(vii) EXCEPTION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The issue resolution and referral process under this subparagraph shall not be initiated if the applicable agency—

“(aa) notifies, with a supporting explanation, the lead agency, cooperating agencies, and non-Federal interest, as applicable, that—

“(AA) the agency has not received necessary information or approvals from another entity in a manner that affects the ability of the agency to meet any requirements under Federal, tribal, State, or local law;

“(BB) significant new information, including from public comments, or circumstances, including a major modification to an aspect of the water resource project, requires additional analysis for the agency to make a decision on the water resource project application; or

“(CC) the agency lacks the financial resources to complete the review under the scheduled time frame, including a description of the number of full-time employees required to complete the review, the amount of funding required to complete the review, and a justification as to why there is not enough funding available to complete the review by the deadline; and

“(bb) establishes a new deadline for completion of the review.

“(II) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—If the applicable agency makes a certification under subclause (I)(aa)(CC), the Inspector General of the applicable agency shall conduct a financial audit to review that certification and submit a report on that certification within 90 days to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

“(B) ELEVATION OF ISSUE RESOLUTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If issue resolution is not achieved by not later than 30 days after the date on which a relevant meeting is held under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall notify the heads of the relevant cooperating agencies and the non-Federal interest that an issue resolution meeting will be convened.

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall identify the issues to be addressed at the

meeting and convene the meeting not later than 30 days after the date on which the notice is issued.

“(C) SUBMISSION OF ISSUE RESOLUTION.—

“(i) SUBMISSION TO COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—If a resolution is not achieved by not later than 30 days after the date on which an issue resolution meeting is held under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall submit the matter to the Council on Environmental Quality.

“(II) MEETING.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Council on Environmental Quality receives a submission from the Secretary under subclause (I), the Council on Environmental Quality shall hold an issue resolution meeting with the lead agency, the heads of relevant cooperating agencies and the non-Federal interest.

“(III) ADDITIONAL HEARINGS.—The Council on Environmental Quality may hold public meetings or hearings to obtain additional views and information that the Council on Environmental Quality determines are necessary, consistent with the time frames described in this paragraph.

“(ii) REMEDIES.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which an issue resolution meeting is convened by the Council on Environmental Quality under clause (i)(II), the Secretary shall—

“(I) publish findings that explain how the issue was resolved and recommendations (including, where appropriate, a finding that the submission does not support the position of the submitting agency); or

“(II) if the resolution of the issue was not achieved, submit to the President for action—

“(aa) the submission;

“(bb) any views or additional information developed during any additional hearings under clause (i)(III); and

“(cc) the recommendation of the Council on Environmental Quality.

“(6) FINANCIAL PENALTY PROVISIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A Federal jurisdictional agency shall complete any required approval or decision on an expeditious basis using the shortest existing applicable process.

“(B) FAILURE TO DECIDE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a Federal jurisdictional agency fails to render a decision under any Federal law relating to a water resource project that requires the preparation of an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment, including the issuance or denial of a permit, license, statement, opinion, or other approval by the date described in clause (ii), the amount of funds made available to support the office of the head of the Federal jurisdictional agency shall be reduced by an amount of funding equal to the amounts specified in subclause (I) or (II) and those funds shall be made available to the division of the Federal jurisdictional agency charged with rendering the decision by not later than 1 day after the applicable date under clause (ii), and once each week thereafter until a final decision is rendered, subject to subparagraph (C)—

“(I) \$20,000 for any water resource project requiring the preparation of an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement; or

“(II) \$10,000 for any water resource project requiring any type of review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) other than an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.

“(ii) DESCRIPTION OF DATE.—The date referred to in clause (i) is the later of—

“(I) the date that is 180 days after the date on which an application for the permit, license, or approval is complete; and

“(II) the date that is 180 days after the date on which the Federal lead agency issues a decision on the water resource project under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(C) LIMITATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—No transfer of funds under subparagraph (B) relating to an individual water resource project shall exceed, in any fiscal year, an amount equal to 1 percent of the funds made available for the applicable agency office.

“(ii) FAILURE TO DECIDE.—The total amount transferred in a fiscal year as a result of a failure by an agency to make a decision by an applicable deadline shall not exceed an amount equal to 5 percent of the funds made available for the applicable agency office for that fiscal year.

“(iii) AGGREGATE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each fiscal year, the aggregate amount of financial penalties assessed against each applicable agency office under title II of the Water Resources Development Act of 2013 and any other Federal law as a result of a failure of the agency to make a decision by an applicable deadline for environmental review, including the total amount transferred under this paragraph, shall not exceed an amount equal to 9.5 percent of the funds made available for the agency office for that fiscal year.

“(D) NO FAULT OF AGENCY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A transfer of funds under this paragraph shall not be made if the applicable agency described in subparagraph (A) notifies, with a supporting explanation, the lead agency, cooperating agencies, and non-Federal interest, as applicable, that—

“(I) the agency has not received necessary information or approvals from another entity in a manner that affects the ability of the agency to meet any requirements under Federal, State, or local law;

“(II) significant new information, including from public comments, or circumstances, including a major modification to an aspect of the water resource project, requires additional analysis for the agency to make a decision on the water resource project application; or

“(III) the agency lacks the financial resources to complete the review under the scheduled time frame, including a description of the number of full-time employees required to complete the review, the amount of funding required to complete the review, and a justification as to why there is not enough funding available to complete the review by the deadline.

“(ii) LACK OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES.—If the agency provides notice under clause (i)(III), the Inspector General of the agency shall—

“(I) conduct a financial audit to review the notice; and

“(II) not later than 90 days after the date on which the review described in subclause (I) is completed, submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the notice.

“(E) LIMITATION.—The Federal agency from which funds are transferred pursuant to this paragraph shall not reprogram funds to the office of the head of the agency, or equivalent office, to reimburse that office for the loss of the funds.

“(F) EFFECT OF PARAGRAPH.—Nothing in this paragraph affects or limits the application of, or obligation to comply with, any Federal, State, local, or tribal law.

“(1) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a program to measure and report on progress made toward improving and expediting the planning and environmental review process.

“(m) MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENTS FOR EARLY COORDINATION.—

“(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

“(A) the Secretary and other Federal agencies with relevant jurisdiction in the environmental review process should cooperate with each other, State agencies, and Indian tribes on environmental review and water resource project delivery activities at the earliest practicable time to avoid delays and duplication of effort later in the process, prevent potential conflicts, and ensure that planning and water resource project development decisions reflect environmental values; and

“(B) the cooperation referred to in subparagraph (A) should include the development of policies and the designation of staff that advise planning agencies and non-Federal interests of studies or other information foreseeably required for later Federal action and early consultation with appropriate State and local agencies and Indian tribes.

“(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—If requested at any time by a State or non-Federal interest, the Secretary and other Federal agencies with relevant jurisdiction in the environmental review process, shall, to the maximum extent practicable and appropriate, as determined by the agencies, provide technical assistance to the State or non-Federal interest in carrying out early coordination activities.

“(3) MEMORANDUM OF AGENCY AGREEMENT.—

If requested at any time by a State or non-Federal interest, the lead agency, in consultation with other Federal agencies with relevant jurisdiction in the environmental review process, may establish memoranda of agreement with the non-Federal interest, Indian tribe, State and local governments, and other appropriate entities to carry out the early coordination activities, including providing technical assistance in identifying potential impacts and mitigation issues in an integrated fashion.

“(n) LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this section preempts, supersedes, amends, modifies, repeals, or interferes with—

“(1) any statutory or regulatory requirement, including for seeking, considering, or responding to public comment;

“(2) any obligation to comply with the provisions any Federal law, including—

“(A) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

“(B) the regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality or any other Federal agency to carry out that Act; and

“(C) any other Federal environmental law;

“(3) the reviewability of any final Federal agency action in a court of the United States or in the court of any State;

“(4) any practice of seeking, considering, or responding to public comment; or

“(5) any power, jurisdiction, responsibility, duty, or authority that a Federal, State, or local governmental agency, Indian tribe, or non-Federal interest has with respect to carrying out a water resource project or any other provision of law applicable to water resource projects.

“(o) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall—

“(A) survey the use by the Corps of Engineers of categorical exclusions in water resource projects since 2005;

“(B) publish a review of the survey that includes a description of—

“(i) the types of actions that were categorically excluded or could be the basis for developing a new categorical exclusion; and

“(ii) any requests previously received by the Secretary for new categorical exclusions; and

“(C) solicit requests from other Federal agencies and non-Federal interests for new categorical exclusions.

“(2) NEW CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, if the Secretary has identified a category of activities that merit establishing a categorical exclusion that did not exist on the day before the date of enactment of this subsection based on the review under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall publish a notice of proposed rulemaking to propose that new categorical exclusion, to the extent that the categorical exclusion meets the criteria for a categorical exclusion under section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulation).

“(p) REVIEW OF WATER RESOURCE PROJECT ACCELERATION REFORMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

“(A) assess the reforms carried out under this section; and

“(B) not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that describes the results of the assessment.

“(2) INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT.—The Inspector General of the Corps of Engineers shall—

“(A) assess the reforms carried out under this section; and

“(B) submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate—

“(i) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, an initial report of the findings of the Inspector General; and

“(ii) not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, a final report of the findings.

“(q) AUTHORIZATION.—The authority provided by this section expires on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.”.

SEC. 2034. FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

Section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) DETAILED PROJECT SCHEDULE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall determine a set of milestones needed for the completion of a feasibility study under this subsection, including all major actions, report submissions and responses, reviews, and comment periods.

“(2) DETAILED PROJECT SCHEDULE MILESTONES.—Each District Engineer shall, to the maximum extent practicable, establish a detailed project schedule, based on full funding capability, that lists all deadlines for milestones relating to feasibility studies in the District developed by the Secretary under paragraph (1).

“(3) NON-FEDERAL INTEREST NOTIFICATION.—Each District Engineer shall submit by certified mail the detailed project schedule under paragraph (2) to each relevant non-Federal interest—

“(A) for projects that have received funding from the General Investigations Account of the Corps of Engineers in the period beginning on October 1, 2009, and ending on the date of enactment of this section, not later than 180 days after the establishment of milestones under paragraph (1); and

“(B) for projects for which a feasibility cost-sharing agreement is executed after the establishment of milestones under paragraph (1), not later than 90 days after the date on which the agreement is executed.

“(4) CONGRESSIONAL AND PUBLIC NOTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first full fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

“(A) submit an annual report that lists all detailed project schedules under paragraph (2) and an explanation of any missed deadlines to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) make publicly available, including on the Internet, a copy of the annual report described in subparagraph (A) not later than 14 days after date on which a report is submitted to Congress.

“(5) FAILURE TO ACT.—If a District Engineer fails to meet any of the deadlines in the project schedule under paragraph (2), the District Engineer shall—

“(A) not later than 30 days after each missed deadline, submit to the non-Federal interest a report detailing—

“(i) why the District Engineer failed to meet the deadline; and

“(ii) a revised project schedule reflecting amended deadlines for the feasibility study; and

“(B) not later than 30 days after each missed deadline, make publicly available, including on the Internet, a copy of the amended project schedule described in subparagraph (A)(ii).”.

SEC. 2035. ACCOUNTING AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On the request of a non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall provide to the non-Federal interest a detailed accounting of the Federal expenses associated with a water resources project.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall contract with the National Academy of Public Administration to carry out a study on the efficiency of the Corps Engineers current staff salaries and administrative expense procedures as compared to using a separate administrative expense account.

(2) CONTENTS.—The study under paragraph (1) shall include any recommendations of the National Academy of Public Administration for improvements to the budgeting and administrative processes that will increase the efficiency of the Corps of Engineers project delivery.

SEC. 2036. DETERMINATION OF PROJECT COMPLETION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall notify the non-Federal interest when construction of a water resources project or a functional portion of the project is completed so the non-Federal interest may commence responsibilities, as applicable, for operating and maintaining the project.

(b) NON-FEDERAL INTEREST APPEAL OF DETERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 7 days after receiving a notification under subparagraph (a), the non-Federal interest may appeal the completion determination of the Secretary in writing with a detailed explanation of the basis for questioning the com-

pleteness of the project or functional portion of the project.

(2) INDEPENDENT REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On notification that a non-Federal interest has submitted an appeal under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall contract with 1 or more independent, non-Federal experts to evaluate whether the applicable water resources project or functional portion of the project is complete.

(B) TIMELINE.—An independent review carried out under subparagraph (A) shall be completed not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary receives an appeal from a non-Federal interest under paragraph (1).

SEC. 2037. PROJECT PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall contract with the National Academy of Public Administration to carry out a comprehensive review of the process for preparing, negotiating, and approving Project Partnership Agreements and the Project Partnership Agreement template, which shall include—

(1) a review of the process for preparing, negotiating, and approving Project Partnership Agreements, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) an evaluation of how the concerns of a non-Federal interest relating to the Project Partnership Agreement and suggestions for modifications to the Project Partnership Agreement made by a non-Federal interest are accommodated;

(3) recommendations for how the concerns and modifications described in paragraph (2) can be better accommodated;

(4) recommendations for how the Project Partnership Agreement template can be made more efficient; and

(5) recommendations for how to make the process for preparing, negotiating, and approving Project Partnership Agreements more efficient.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit a report describing the findings of the National Academy of Public Administration to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2038. INTERAGENCY AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT AUTHORITY.

Section 234 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2323a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “other Federal agencies,” and inserting “Federal departments or agencies, nongovernmental organizations,”;

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting “or foreign governments” after “organizations”;

(3) in subsection (c), by inserting “and restoration” after “protection”; and

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “There is” and inserting “(1) IN GENERAL.—There is”; and

(ii) by striking “2008” and inserting “2014”; and

(B) in the second sentence—

(i) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting “(2) ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary”; and

(ii) by striking “other Federal agencies” and inserting “Federal departments or agencies, nongovernmental organizations”.

SEC. 2039. ACCEPTANCE OF CONTRIBUTED FUNDS TO INCREASE LOCK OPERATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, after providing public notice, shall establish a pilot program for the acceptance and expenditure

of funds contributed by non-Federal interests to increase the hours of operation of locks at water resources development projects.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—The establishment of the pilot program under this section shall not affect the periodic review and adjustment of hours of operation of locks based on increases in commercial traffic carried out by the Secretary.

(c) **PUBLIC COMMENT.**—Not later than 180 days before a proposed modification to the operation of a lock at a water resources development project will be carried out, the Secretary shall—

(1) publish the proposed modification in the Federal Register; and

(2) accept public comment on the proposed modification.

(d) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that evaluates the cost-savings resulting from reduced lock hours and any economic impacts of modifying lock operations.

(2) **REVIEW OF PILOT PROGRAM.**—Not later than September 30, 2017 and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that describes the effectiveness of the pilot program under this section.

(e) **ANNUAL REVIEW.**—The Secretary shall carry out an annual review of the commercial use of locks and make any necessary adjustments to lock operations based on that review.

(f) **TERMINATION.**—The authority to accept funds under this section shall terminate 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2040. EMERGENCY RESPONSE TO NATURAL DISASTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5(a)(1) of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes”, approved August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n(a)(1)), is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by inserting “and subject to the condition that the Chief of Engineers may include modifications to the structure or project” after “work for flood control”; and

(2) by striking “structure damaged or destroyed by wind, wave, or water action of other than an ordinary nature when in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers such repair and restoration is warranted for the adequate functioning of the structure for hurricane or shore protection” and inserting “structure or project damaged or destroyed by wind, wave, or water action of other than an ordinary nature to the design level of protection when, in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, such repair and restoration is warranted for the adequate functioning of the structure or project for hurricane or shore protection, subject to the condition that the Chief of Engineers may include modifications to the structure or project to address major deficiencies or implement nonstructural alternatives to the repair or restoration of the structure if requested by the non-Federal sponsor”.

(b) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and every

2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report detailing the amounts expended in the previous 5 fiscal years to carry out Corps of Engineers projects under section 5 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes”, approved August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n).

(2) **INCLUSIONS.**—A report under paragraph (1) shall, at a minimum, include a description of—

(A) each structure, feature, or project for which amounts are expended, including the type of structure, feature, or project and cost of the work; and

(B) how the Secretary has repaired, restored, replaced, or modified each structure, feature, or project or intends to restore the structure, feature, or project to the design level of protection for the structure, feature, or project.

SEC. 2041. SYSTEMWIDE IMPROVEMENT FRAMEWORKS.

A levee system shall remain eligible for rehabilitation assistance under the authority provided by section 5 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes” (33 U.S.C. 701n) as long as the levee system sponsor continues to make satisfactory progress, as determined by the Secretary, on an approved systemwide improvement framework or letter of intent.

SEC. 2042. FUNDING TO PROCESS PERMITS.

Section 214 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-541; 33 U.S.C. 2201 note) is amended by striking subsections (d) and (e) and inserting the following:

“(d) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall ensure that all final permit decisions carried out using funds authorized under this section are made available to the public in a common format, including on the Internet, and in a manner that distinguishes final permit decisions under this section from other final actions of the Secretary.

“(2) **DECISION DOCUMENT.**—The Secretary shall—

“(A) use a standard decision document for evaluating all permits using funds accepted under this section; and

“(B) make the standard decision document, along with all final permit decisions, available to the public, including on the Internet.

“(3) **AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary shall make all active agreements to accept funds under this section available on a single public Internet site.

“(e) **REPORTING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall prepare an annual report on the implementation of this section, which, at a minimum, shall include for each district of the Corps of Engineers that accepts funds under this section—

“(A) a comprehensive list of any funds accepted under this section during the previous fiscal year;

“(B) a comprehensive list of the permits reviewed and approved using funds accepted under this section during the previous fiscal year, including a description of the size and type of resources impacted and the mitigation required for each permit; and

“(C) a description of the training offered in the previous fiscal year for employees that is funded in whole or in part with funds accepted under this section.

“(2) **SUBMISSION.**—Not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall—

“(A) submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives the annual report described in paragraph (1); and

“(B) make each report received under subparagraph (A) available on a single publicly accessible Internet site.”.

SEC. 2043. NATIONAL RIVERBANK STABILIZATION AND EROSION PREVENTION STUDY AND PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **DEFINITION OF INLAND AND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY.**—In this section, the term “inland and intracoastal waterway” means the inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States described in section 206 of the Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 1978 (33 U.S.C. 1804).

(b) **PILOT PROGRAM.**—The Secretary—

(1) is authorized to study issues relating to riverbank stabilization and erosion prevention along inland and intracoastal waterways; and

(2) shall establish and carry out for a period of 5 fiscal years a national riverbank stabilization and erosion prevention pilot program to address riverbank erosion along inland and intracoastal waterways.

(c) **STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal, State, local, and nongovernmental entities, shall carry out a study of the options and technologies available to prevent the erosion and degradation of riverbanks along inland and intracoastal waterways.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The study shall—

(A) evaluate the nature and extent of the damages resulting from riverbank erosion along inland and intracoastal waterways throughout the United States;

(B) identify specific inland and intracoastal waterways and affected wetland areas with the most urgent need for restoration;

(C) analyze any legal requirements with regard to maintenance of bank lines of inland and intracoastal waterways, including a comparison of Federal, State, and private obligations and practices;

(D) assess and compare policies and management practices to protect surface areas adjacent to inland and intracoastal waterways applied by various Districts of the Corps of Engineers; and

(E) make any recommendations the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(d) **RIVERBANK STABILIZATION AND EROSION PREVENTION PILOT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall develop a pilot program for the construction of riverbank stabilization and erosion prevention projects on public land along inland and intracoastal waterways if the Secretary determines that the projects are technically feasible, environmentally acceptable, economically justified, and lower maintenance costs of those inland and intracoastal waterways.

(2) **PILOT PROGRAM GOALS.**—A project under the pilot program shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

(A) develop or demonstrate innovative technologies;

(B) implement efficient designs to prevent erosion at a riverbank site, taking into account the lifecycle cost of the design, including cleanup, maintenance, and amortization;

(C) prioritize natural designs, including the use of native and naturalized vegetation or

temporary structures that minimize permanent structural alterations to the riverbank;

(D) avoid negative impacts to adjacent communities;

(E) identify the potential for long-term protection afforded by the innovative technology; and

(F) provide additional benefits, including reduction of flood risk.

(3) **PROJECT SELECTIONS.**—The Secretary shall develop criteria for the selection of projects under the pilot program, including criteria based on—

(A) the extent of damage and land loss resulting from riverbank erosion;

(B) the rate of erosion;

(C) the significant threat of future flood risk to public or private property, public infrastructure, or public safety;

(D) the destruction of natural resources or habitats; and

(E) the potential cost-savings for maintenance of the channel.

(4) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program in consultation with—

(A) Federal, State, and local governments;

(B) nongovernmental organizations; and

(C) applicable university research facilities.

(5) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the first fiscal year for which amounts to carry out this section are appropriated, and every year thereafter, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report describing—

(A) the activities carried out and accomplishments made under the pilot program since the previous report under this paragraph; and

(B) any recommendations of the Secretary relating to the program.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2019.

SEC. 2044. HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION PRIORITIZATION.

(a) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to provide adequate levels of protection to communities impacted by natural disasters, including hurricanes, tropical storms, and other related extreme weather events; and

(2) to expedite critical water resources projects in communities that have historically been and continue to remain susceptible to extreme weather events.

(b) **PRIORITY.**—For authorized projects and ongoing feasibility studies with a primary purpose of hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, the Secretary shall give funding priority to projects and ongoing studies that—

(1) address an imminent threat to life and property;

(2) prevent storm surge from inundating populated areas;

(3) prevent the loss of coastal wetlands that help reduce the impact of storm surge;

(4) protect emergency hurricane evacuation routes or shelters;

(5) prevent adverse impacts to publicly owned or funded infrastructure and assets;

(6) minimize disaster relief costs to the Federal Government; and

(7) address hurricane and storm damage risk reduction in an area for which the President declared a major disaster in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford

Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170).

(c) **EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF CURRENTLY AUTHORIZED PROJECTS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a list of all—

(A) ongoing hurricane and storm damage reduction feasibility studies that have signed feasibility cost share agreements and have received Federal funds since 2009; and

(B) authorized hurricane and storm damage reduction projects that—

(i) have been authorized for more than 20 years but are less than 75 percent complete; or

(ii) are undergoing a post-authorization change report, general reevaluation report, or limited reevaluation report;

(2) identify those projects on the list required under paragraph (1) that meet the criteria described in subsection (b); and

(3) provide a plan for expeditiously completing the projects identified under paragraph (2), subject to available funding.

(d) **PRIORITIZATION OF NEW STUDIES FOR HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION.**—In selecting new studies for hurricane and storm damage reduction to propose to Congress under section 4002, the Secretary shall give priority to studies—

(1) that—

(A) have been recommended in a comprehensive hurricane protection study carried out by the Corps of Engineers; or

(B) are included in a State plan or program for hurricane, storm damage reduction, flood control, coastal protection, conservation, or restoration, that is created in consultation with the Corps of Engineers or other relevant Federal agencies; and

(2) for areas for which the President declared a major disaster in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170).

SEC. 2045. PRIORITIZATION OF ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION EFFORTS.

For authorized projects with a primary purpose of ecosystem restoration, the Secretary shall give funding priority to projects—

(1) that—

(A) address an identified threat to public health, safety, or welfare;

(B) preserve or restore ecosystems of national significance; or

(C) preserve or restore habitats of importance for federally protected species, including migratory birds; and

(2) for which the restoration activities will contribute to other ongoing or planned Federal, State, or local restoration initiatives.

SEC. 2046. SPECIAL USE PERMITS.

(a) **SPECIAL USE PERMITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may issue special permits for uses such as group activities, recreation events, motorized recreation vehicles, and such other specialized recreation uses as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be in the best interest of the Federal Government.

(2) **FEES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may—

(i) establish and collect fees associated with the issuance of the permits described in paragraph (1); or

(ii) accept in-kind services in lieu of those fees.

(B) **OUTDOOR RECREATION EQUIPMENT.**—The Secretary may establish and collect fees for the provision of outdoor recreation equipment and services at public recreation areas located at lakes and reservoirs operated by the Corps of Engineers.

(C) **USE OF FEES.**—Any fees generated pursuant to this subsection shall be—

(i) retained at the site collected; and

(ii) available for use, without further appropriation, solely for administering the special permits under this subsection and carrying out related operation and maintenance activities at the site at which the fees are collected.

(b) **COOPERATIVE MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **PROGRAM.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may enter into an agreement with a State or local government to provide for the cooperative management of a public recreation area if—

(i) the public recreation area is located—

(I) at a lake or reservoir operated by the Corps of Engineers; and

(II) adjacent to or near a State or local park or recreation area; and

(ii) the Secretary determines that cooperative management between the Corps of Engineers and a State or local government agency of a portion of the Corps of Engineers recreation area or State or local park or recreation area will allow for more effective and efficient management of those areas.

(B) **RESTRICTION.**—The Secretary may not transfer administration responsibilities for any public recreation area operated by the Corps of Engineers.

(2) **ACQUISITION OF GOODS AND SERVICES.**—The Secretary may acquire from or provide to a State or local government with which the Secretary has entered into a cooperative agreement under paragraph (1) goods and services to be used by the Secretary and the State or local government in the cooperative management of the areas covered by the agreement.

(3) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The Secretary may enter into 1 or more cooperative management agreements or such other arrangements as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, including leases or licenses, with non-Federal interests to share the costs of operation, maintenance, and management of recreation facilities and natural resources at recreation areas that are jointly managed and funded under this subsection.

(c) **FUNDING TRANSFER AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary determines that it is in the public interest for purposes of enhancing recreation opportunities at Corps of Engineers water resources development projects, the Secretary may transfer funds appropriated for resource protection, research, interpretation, and maintenance activities related to resource protection in the areas at which outdoor recreation is available at those Corps of Engineers water resource development projects to State, local, and tribal governments and such other public or private nonprofit entities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(2) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—Any transfer of funds pursuant to this subsection shall be carried out through the execution of a cooperative agreement, which shall contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary in the public interest.

(d) **SERVICES OF VOLUNTEERS.**—Chapter IV of title I of Public Law 98–63 (33 U.S.C. 569c) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting “, including expenses relating to uniforms, transportation, lodging, and the subsistence of those volunteers, without regard to the place of residence of the volunteers,” after “incidental expenses”; and

(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following: “The Chief of Engineers may also provide awards of up to \$100 in value to volunteers in recognition of the services of the volunteers.”

(e) **TRAINING AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES.**—Section 213(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2339) is amended by striking “at” and inserting “about”.

SEC. 2047. OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE ON FUEL TAXED INLAND WATERWAYS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall have responsibility for 65 percent of the costs of the operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement of any flood gate, as well as any pumping station constructed within the channel as a single unit with that flood gate, that—

(1) was constructed as of the date of enactment of this Act as a feature of an authorized hurricane and storm damage reduction project; and

(2) crosses an inland or intracoastal waterway described in section 206 of the Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 1978 (33 U.S.C. 1804).

(b) **PAYMENT OPTIONS.**—For rehabilitation or replacement of any structure under this section, the Secretary may apply to the full non-Federal contribution the payment option provisions under section 103(k) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(k)).

SEC. 2048. CORROSION PREVENTION.

(a) **GUIDANCE AND PROCEDURES.**—The Secretary shall develop guidance and procedures for the certification of qualified contractors for—

(1) the application of protective coatings; and

(2) the removal of hazardous protective coatings.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), the Secretary shall use certified contractors for—

(1) the application of protective coatings for complex work involving steel and cementitious structures, including structures that will be exposed in immersion;

(2) the removal of hazardous coatings or other hazardous materials that are present in sufficient concentrations to create an occupational or environmental hazard; and

(3) any other activities the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(c) **EXCEPTION.**—The Secretary may approve exceptions to the use of certified contractors under subsection (b) only after public notice, with the opportunity for comment, of any such proposal.

SEC. 2049. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1001(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **LIST OF PROJECTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 3003 of Public Law 104-66 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note; 109 Stat. 734), each year, after the submission of the list under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a list of projects or separable elements of projects that have been authorized but that have received no obligations during the 5 full fiscal years preceding the submission of that list.

“(B) **ADDITIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—On submission of the list under subparagraph (A) to Congress, the Secretary shall notify—

“(i) each Senator in whose State and each Member of the House of Representatives in whose district a project (including any part of a project) on that list would be located; and

“(ii) each applicable non-Federal interest associated with a project (including any part of a project) on that list.

“(C) **DEAUTHORIZATION.**—A project or separable element included in the list under subparagraph (A) is not authorized after the last date of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the list is submitted to Congress, if funding has not been obligated for the planning, design, or construction of the project or element of the project during that period.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **MINIMUM FUNDING LIST.**—At the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a list of—

“(A) projects or separable elements of projects authorized for construction for which funding has been obligated in the 5 previous fiscal years;

“(B) the amount of funding obligated per fiscal year;

“(C) the current phase of each project or separable element of a project; and

“(D) the amount required to complete those phases.

“(4) **REPORT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2013, the Secretary shall compile and publish a complete list of all uncompleted, authorized projects of the Corps of Engineers, including for each project on that list—

“(i) the original budget authority for the project;

“(ii) the status of the project;

“(iii) the estimated date of completion of the project;

“(iv) the estimated cost of completion of the project; and

“(v) any amounts for the project that remain unobligated.

“(B) **PUBLICATION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall submit a copy of the list under subparagraph (A) to—

“(I) the appropriate committees of Congress; and

“(II) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(ii) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Not later than 30 days after providing the report to Congress under clause (i), the Secretary shall make a copy of the list available on a publicly accessible Internet site, in a manner that is downloadable, searchable, and sortable.”.

(b) **INFRASTRUCTURE DEAUTHORIZATION COMMISSION.**—

(1) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this subsection are—

(A) to establish a process for identifying authorized Corps of Engineers water resources projects that are no longer in the Federal interest and no longer feasible;

(B) to create a commission—

(i) to review suggested deauthorizations, including consideration of recommendations of the States and the Secretary for the deauthorization of water resources projects; and

(ii) to make recommendations to Congress;

(C) to ensure public participation and comment; and

(D) to provide oversight on any recommendations made to Congress by the Commission.

(2) **INFRASTRUCTURE DEAUTHORIZATION COMMISSION.**—

(A) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established an independent commission to be known as the “Infrastructure Deauthorization Commission” (referred to in this paragraph as the “Commission”).

(B) **DUTIES.**—The Commission shall carry out the review and recommendation duties described in paragraph (5).

(C) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall be composed of 8 members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate according to the expedited procedures described in clause (ii).

(ii) **EXPEDITED NOMINATION PROCEDURES.**—

(I) **PRIVILEGED NOMINATIONS; INFORMATION REQUESTED.**—On receipt by the Senate of a nomination under clause (i), the nomination shall—

(aa) be placed on the Executive Calendar under the heading “Privileged Nominations—Information Requested”; and

(bb) remain on the Executive Calendar under that heading until the Executive Clerk receives a written certification from the Chairman of the committee of jurisdiction under subclause (II).

(II) **QUESTIONNAIRES.**—The Chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate shall notify the Executive Clerk in writing when the appropriate biographical and financial questionnaires have been received from an individual nominated for a position under clause (i).

(III) **PRIVILEGED NOMINATIONS; INFORMATION RECEIVED.**—On receipt of the certification under subclause (II), the nomination shall—

(aa) be placed on the Executive Calendar under the heading “Privileged Nomination—Information Received” and remain on the Executive Calendar under that heading for 10 session days; and

(bb) after the expiration of the period referred to in item (aa), be placed on the “Nominations” section of the Executive Calendar.

(IV) **REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE OF JURISDICTION.**—During the period when a nomination under clause (i) is listed under the “Privileged Nomination—Information Requested” section of the Executive Calendar described in subclause (I)(aa) or the “Privileged Nomination—Information Received” section of the Executive Calendar described in subclause (III)(aa)—

(aa) any Senator may request on his or her own behalf, or on the behalf of any identified Senator that the nomination be referred to the appropriate committee of jurisdiction; and

(bb) if a Senator makes a request described in paragraph item (aa), the nomination shall be referred to the appropriate committee of jurisdiction.

(V) **EXECUTIVE CALENDAR.**—The Secretary of the Senate shall create the appropriate sections on the Executive Calendar to reflect and effectuate the requirements of this clause.

(VI) **COMMITTEE JUSTIFICATION FOR NEW EXECUTIVE POSITIONS.**—The report accompanying each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by any committee shall contain an evaluation and justification made by that committee for the establishment in the measure being reported of any new position appointed by the President within an existing or new Federal entity.

(iii) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—Members of the Commission shall be knowledgeable about Corps of Engineers water resources projects.

(iv) **GEOGRAPHICAL DIVERSITY.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the members of the Commission shall be geographically diverse.

(D) **COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which the member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

(ii) **FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.**—All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(iii) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of service for the Commission.

(3) **STATE WATER RESOURCES INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, each State, in consultation with local interests, may develop and submit to the Commission, the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, a detailed statewide water resources plan that includes a list of each water resources project that the State recommends for deauthorization.

(4) **CORPS OF ENGINEERS INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Commission, the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a detailed plan that—

(A) contains a detailed list of each water resources project that the Corps of Engineers recommends for deauthorization; and

(B) is based on assessment by the Secretary of the needs of the United States for water resources infrastructure, taking into account public safety, the economy, and the environment.

(5) **REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION COMMISSION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—On the appointment and confirmation of all members of the Commission, the Commission shall solicit public comment on water resources infrastructure issues and priorities and recommendations for deauthorization, including by—

(i) holding public hearings throughout the United States; and

(ii) receiving written comments.

(B) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress a list of water resources projects of the Corps of Engineers for deauthorization.

(ii) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In carrying out this paragraph, the Commission shall establish criteria for evaluating projects for deauthorization, which shall include consideration of—

(I) the infrastructure plans submitted by the States and the Secretary under paragraphs (3) and (4);

(II) any public comment received during the period described in subparagraph (A);

(III) public safety and security;

(IV) the environment; and

(V) the economy.

(C) **NON-ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.**—The following types of projects shall not be eligible for review for deauthorization by the Commission:

(i) Any project authorized after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-303; 110 Stat. 3658), including any project that has been reauthorized after that date.

(ii) Any project that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, is undergoing a review by the Corps of Engineers.

(iii) Any project that has received appropriations in the 10-year period ending on the date of enactment of this Act.

(iv) Any project that, on the date of enactment of this Act, is more than 50 percent complete.

(v) Any project that has a viable non-Federal sponsor.

(D) **CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL.**—Any water resources project recommended for deauthorization on the list submitted to Congress under subparagraph (B) shall be deemed to be deauthorized unless Congress passes a joint resolution disapproving of the entire list of deauthorized water resources projects prior to the date that is 180 days after the date on which the Commission submits the list to Congress.

(6) **APPLICATION.**—For purposes of this subsection, water resources projects shall include environmental infrastructure assistance projects and programs of the Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 2050. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall complete and submit to Congress by the applicable date required the reports that address public safety and enhanced local participation in project delivery described in subsection (b).

(b) **REPORTS.**—The reports referred to in subsection (a) are the reports required under—

(1) section 2020;

(2) section 2022;

(3) section 2025;

(4) section 2026;

(5) section 2039;

(6) section 2040;

(7) section 6007; and

(8) section 10015.

(c) **FAILURE TO PROVIDE A COMPLETED REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (d), if the Secretary fails to provide a report listed under subsection (b) by the date that is 180 days after the applicable date required for that report, \$5,000 shall be reprogrammed from the General Expenses account of the civil works program of the Army Corps of Engineers into the account of the division of the Army Corps of Engineers with responsibility for completing that report.

(2) **SUBSEQUENT REPROGRAMMING.**—Subject to subsection (d), for each additional week after the date described in paragraph (1) in which a report described in that paragraph remains uncompleted and unsubmitted to Congress, \$5,000 shall be reprogrammed from the General Expenses account of the civil works program of the Army Corps of Engineers into the account of the division of the Secretary of the Army with responsibility for completing that report.

(d) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For each report, the total amounts reprogrammed under subsection (c) shall not exceed, in any fiscal year, \$50,000.

(2) **AGGREGATE LIMITATION.**—The total amount reprogrammed under subsection (c) in a fiscal year shall not exceed \$200,000.

(e) **NO FAULT OF THE SECRETARY.**—Amounts shall not be reprogrammed under subsection (c) if the Secretary certifies in a letter to the applicable committees of Congress that—

(1) a major modification has been made to the content of the report that requires additional analysis for the Secretary to make a final decision on the report;

(2) amounts have not been appropriated to the agency under this Act or any other Act to carry out the report; or

(3) additional information is required from an entity other than the Corps of Engineers and is not available in a timely manner to complete the report by the deadline.

(f) **LIMITATION.**—The Secretary shall not reprogram funds to reimburse the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works for the loss of the funds.

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000.

SEC. 2051. INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION AND EDUCATION ASSISTANCE ACT CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 106(k) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450j-1(k)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(13) Interest payments, the retirement of principal, the costs of issuance, and the costs of insurance or a similar credit support for a debt financing instrument, the proceeds of which are used to support a contracted construction project.”.

SEC. 2052. INVASIVE SPECIES REVIEW.

The Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and other applicable heads of Federal agencies, shall—

(1) carry out a review of existing Federal authorities relating to responding to invasive species, including aquatic weeds, aquatic snails, and other aquatic invasive species, that have an impact on water resources; and

(2) based on the review under paragraph (1), make any recommendations to Congress and applicable State agencies for improving Federal and State laws to more effectively respond to the threats posed by those invasive species.

SEC. 2053. WETLANDS CONSERVATION STUDY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study to identify all Federal programs relating to wetlands conservation.

(b) **REPORT.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report based on the study under subsection (a) describing options for maximizing wetlands conservation benefits while reducing redundancy, increasing efficiencies, and reducing costs.

SEC. 2054. DAM MODIFICATION STUDY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall, in consultation with the Corps of Engineers, the Southeastern Power Administration, Federal hydropower customers, downstream communities, and other stakeholders, carry out a study to evaluate the structural modifications made at Federal dams in the Cumberland River Basin beginning on January 1, 2000.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The study under subsection (a) shall examine—

(1) whether structural modifications at each dam have utilized new state-of-the-art design criteria deemed necessary for safety purposes that have not been used in other circumstances;

(2) whether structural modifications at each dam for downstream safety were executed in accordance with construction criteria that had changed from the original construction criteria;

(3) whether structural modifications at each dam assured safety;

(4) any estimates by the Corps of Engineers of consequences of total dam failure if state-of-the-art construction criteria deemed necessary for safety purposes were not employed; and

(5) whether changes in underlying geology at any of the Federal dams in the Cumberland River Basin required structural modifications to assure dam safety.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report based on the study under subsection (a) with findings on whether, with respect to structural modifications at Federal dams in the Cumberland River Basin, the Corps of Engineers has selected and implemented design criteria that rely on state-of-the-art design and construction criteria that will provide for the safety of downstream communities.

SEC. 2055. NON-FEDERAL PLANS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FLOOD RISK REDUCTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If requested by a non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall construct a locally preferred plan that provides a higher level of protection than a flood risk management project authorized under this Act if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the plan is technically feasible and environmentally acceptable; and

(2) the benefits of the plan exceed the costs of the plan.

(b) **NON-FEDERAL COST SHARE.**—If the Secretary constructs a locally preferred plan under subsection (a), the Federal share of the cost of the project shall be not greater than the share as provided by law for elements of the national economic development plan.

SEC. 2056. MISSISSIPPI RIVER FORECASTING IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, the Director of the United States Geological Survey, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Director of the National Weather Service, as applicable, shall improve forecasting on the Mississippi River by—

(1) updating forecasting technology deployed on the Mississippi River and its tributaries through—

(A) the construction of additional automated river gages;

(B) the rehabilitation of existing automated and manual river gages; and

(C) the replacement of manual river gages with automated gages, as the Secretary determines to be necessary;

(2) constructing additional sedimentation ranges on the Mississippi River and its tributaries; and

(3) deploying additional automatic identification system base stations at river gage sites.

(b) **PRIORITIZATION.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall prioritize the sections of the Mississippi River on which additional and more reliable information would have the greatest impact on maintaining navigation on the Mississippi River.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the activities carried out by the Secretary under this section.

SEC. 2057. FLEXIBILITY IN MAINTAINING NAVIGATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, determines it to be critical to maintaining safe and reliable navigation within the authorized Federal navigation channel on the Mississippi River, the Secretary may carry out only those activities outside the authorized Federal navigation channel along the Mississippi River, including the construction and operation of maintenance of fleeting areas, that are necessary for safe and reliable navigation in the Federal channel.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 60 days after initiating an activity under this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(1) a description of the activities undertaken, including the costs associated with the activities; and

(2) a comprehensive description of how the activities are necessary for maintaining safe and reliable navigation of the Federal channel.

SEC. 2058. RESTRICTED AREAS AT CORPS OF ENGINEERS DAMS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **RESTRICTED AREA.**—The term “restricted area” means a restricted area for hazardous waters at dams and other civil works structures in the Cumberland River basin established pursuant to chapter 10 of the regulation entitled “Project Operations: Navigation and Dredging Operations and Maintenance Policies”, published by the Corps of Engineers on November 29, 1996, and any related regulations or guidance.

(2) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the applicable agency of the State (including an official of that agency) in which the applicable dam is located that is responsible for enforcing boater safety.

(b) **RESTRICTION ON PHYSICAL BARRIERS.**—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, in the establishing and enforcing restricted areas, shall not take any action to establish a permanent physical barrier to prevent public access to waters downstream of a dam owned by the Corps of Engineers.

(c) **EXCLUSIONS.**—For purposes of this section, the installation and maintenance of measures for alerting the public of hazardous water conditions and restricted areas, including sirens, strobe lights, and signage, shall not be considered to be a permanent physical barrier under subsection (b).

(d) **ENFORCEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Enforcement of a restricted area shall be the sole responsibility of a State.

(2) **EXISTING AUTHORITIES.**—The Secretary shall not assess any penalty for entrance into a restricted area under section 4 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes”, approved December 22, 1944 (16 U.S.C. 460d).

(e) **DEVELOPMENT OR MODIFICATION OF RESTRICTED AREAS.**—In establishing a new restricted area or modifying an existing restricted area, the Secretary shall—

(1) ensure that any restrictions are based on operational conditions that create hazardous waters; and

(2) publish a draft describing the restricted area and seek and consider public comment on that draft prior to establishing or modifying any restricted area.

(f) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), this section shall apply to the establishment of a new restricted area or the modification of an existing restricted area on or after August 1, 2012.

(2) **EXISTING RESTRICTIONS.**—If the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, has established a new restricted area or modified an existing restricted area during the period beginning on August 1, 2012, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) cease implementing the restricted area until the later of—

(i) such time as the restricted area meets the requirements of this section; and

(ii) the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) remove any permanent physical barriers constructed in connection with the restricted area.

SEC. 2059. MAXIMUM COST OF PROJECTS.

Section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280) is amended—

(1) by striking “In order to” and inserting the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **CONTRIBUTED FUNDS.**—Nothing in this section affects the authority of the Secretary to complete construction of a water resources development project using funds contributed under section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h).”.

SEC. 2060. DONALD G. WALDON LOCK AND DAM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Development Authority is a 4-State compact comprised of the States of Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee;

(2) the Tennessee-Tombigbee Authority is the regional non-Federal sponsor of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway;

(3) the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, completed in 1984, has fueled growth in the United States economy by reducing transportation costs and encouraging economic development; and

(4) the selfless determination and tireless work of Donald G. Waldon, while serving as administrator of the waterway compact for 21 years, contributed greatly to the realization and success of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that, at an appropriate time and in accordance with the rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the lock and dam located at mile 357.5 on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway should be known and designated as the “Donald G. Waldon Lock and Dam”.

SEC. 2061. IMPROVING PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER SUPPLY STORAGE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out activities to enable non-Federal interests to anticipate and accurately budget for annual operations and maintenance costs and, as applicable, repair, rehabilitation, and replacements costs, including through—

(1) the formulation by the Secretary of a uniform billing statement format for those storage agreements relating to operations and maintenance costs, and as applicable, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement costs, incurred by the Secretary, which, at a minimum, shall include—

(A) a detailed description of the activities carried out relating to the water supply aspects of the project;

(B) a clear explanation of why and how those activities relate to the water supply aspects of the project; and

(C) a detailed accounting of the cost of carrying out those activities; and

(2) a review by the Secretary of the regulations and guidance of the Corps of Engineers relating to criteria and methods for the equitable distribution of joint project costs across project purposes in order to ensure consistency in the calculation of the appropriate share of joint project costs allocable to the water supply purpose.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the findings of the reviews carried out under subsection (a)(2) and any subsequent actions taken by the Secretary relating to those reviews.

(2) **INCLUSIONS.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall include an analysis of the feasibility and costs associated with the provision by the Secretary to each non-Federal interest of not less than 1 statement each year that details for each water storage agreement with non-Federal interests at Corps of Engineers projects the estimated amount of the operations and maintenance costs and, as applicable, the estimated amount of the repair, rehabilitation, and replacement costs, for which the non-Federal interest will be responsible in that fiscal year.

(3) **EXTENSION.**—The Secretary may delay the submission of the report under paragraph (1) for a period not to exceed 180 days after the deadline described in paragraph (1), subject to the condition that the Secretary submits a preliminary progress report to Congress not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2062. CREDITING AUTHORITY FOR FEDERALLY AUTHORIZED NAVIGATION PROJECTS.

A non-Federal interest for a navigation project may carry out operation and maintenance activities for that project subject to all applicable requirements that would apply to the Secretary carrying out such operations and maintenance, and may receive credit for the costs incurred by the non-Federal interest in carrying out such activities towards that non-Federal interest's share of construction costs for a federally authorized element of the same project or another federally authorized navigation project, except that in no instance may such credit exceed 20 percent of the costs associated with construction of the general navigation features of the project for which such credit may be received pursuant to this section.

SEC. 2063. RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS.

Section 5019 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1201) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) **AUTHORIZATION TO ALLOCATE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall allocate funds from the General Expenses account of the civil works program of the Army Corps of Engineers to the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin to fulfill the equitable funding requirements of the respective interstate compacts on an annual basis and in amounts equal to the amount determined by Commission in accordance with the respective interstate compact.

“(2) **LIMITATION.**—Not more than 1.5 percent of funds from the General Expenses account of the civil works program of the Army Corps of Engineers may be allocated in carrying out paragraph (1) for any fiscal year.

“(3) **REPORT.**—For any fiscal year in which funds are not allocated in accordance with paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that describes—

“(A) the reasons why the Corps of Engineers chose not to allocate funds in accordance with that paragraph; and

“(B) the impact of the decision not to allocate funds on water supply allocation, water quality protection, regulatory review and permitting, water conservation, watershed planning, drought management, flood loss reduction, and recreation in each area of jurisdiction of the respective Commission.”.

SEC. 2064. RESTRICTION ON CHARGES FOR CERTAIN SURPLUS WATER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—No fee for surplus water shall be charged under a contract for surplus water if the contract is for surplus water stored on the Missouri River.

(b) **OFFSET.**—Of the amounts previously made available for “Corps of Engineers-Civil, Department of the Army, Operations and Maintenance” that remain unobligated as of the effective date of this Act, \$5,000,000 is hereby rescinded.

(c) None of the funds under subsection (b) may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

TITLE III—PROJECT MODIFICATIONS

SEC. 3001. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to modify existing water resource project authorizations, subject to the condition that the modifications do not affect authorized costs.

SEC. 3002. CHATFIELD RESERVOIR, COLORADO.

Section 116 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2009 (123 Stat. 608), is amended in the matter preceding the proviso by inserting “(or a designee of the Department)” after “Colorado Department of Natural Resources”.

SEC. 3003. MISSOURI RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE EXPENSES REIMBURSEMENT.

Section 5018(b)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1200) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—Subject to the availability of funds, the Secretary may reimburse a member of the Committee for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for an employee of a Federal agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in performance of services for the Committee.”.

SEC. 3004. HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY.

With respect to the study for flood and storm damage reduction related to natural disasters to be carried out by the Secretary and authorized under the heading “INVESTIGATIONS” under title II of division A of Public Law 113-2, the Secretary shall include specific project recommendations in the report developed for that study.

SEC. 3005. LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT, MONTANA.

Section 3109 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1135) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary may” and inserting the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **LOCAL PARTICIPATION.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with, and consider the activities being carried out by—

“(1) other Federal agencies;

“(2) conservation districts;

“(3) the Yellowstone River Conservation District Council; and

“(4) the State of Montana.”.

SEC. 3006. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) **GOOSE CREEK, SOMERSET COUNTY, MARYLAND.**—The project for navigation, Goose Creek, Somerset County, Maryland, carried out pursuant to section 107 of the Rivers and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), is realigned as follows: Beginning at Goose Creek Channel Geometry Centerline of the 60-foot-wide main navigational ship channel, Centerline Station No. 0+00, coordinates North 157851.80, East 1636954.70, as stated and depicted on the Condition Survey Goose Creek, Sheet 1 of 1, prepared by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, July 2003; thence departing the aforementioned centerline traveling the following courses and distances: S. 64 degrees 49 minutes 06 seconds E., 1583.82 feet to a point, on the outline of said 60-foot-wide channel thence binding on said out-line the following four courses and distances: S. 63 degrees 26 minutes 06 seconds E., 1460.05 feet to a point, thence; N. 50 degrees 38 minutes 26 seconds E., 973.28 feet to a point, thence; N. 26 degrees 13 minutes 09 seconds W., 240.39 feet to a point on the Left Toe of the 60-foot-wide main navigational channel at computed Centerline Station No. 42+57.54, coordinates North 157357.84, East 1640340.23. Geometry Left Toe of the 60-foot-wide main navigational ship channel, Left Toe Station No. 0+00, coordinates North 157879.00, East 1636967.40, as stated and depicted on the Condition Survey Goose Creek, Sheet 1 of 1, prepared by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, August 2010; thence departing the aforementioned centerline traveling the following courses and distances: S. 64 degrees 49 minutes 12 seconds E., 1583.91 feet to a point, on the outline of said 60-foot-wide channel thence binding on said out-line the following eight courses and distances: S. 63 degrees 25 minutes 38 seconds E., 1366.25 feet to a point, thence; N. 83 degrees 36 minutes 24 seconds E., 125.85 feet to a point, thence; N. 50 degrees 38 minutes 26 seconds E., 805.19 feet to a point, thence; N. 12 degrees 12 minutes 29 seconds E., 78.33 feet to a point thence; N. 26 degrees 13 minutes 28 seconds W., 46.66 feet to a point thence; S. 63 degrees 45 minutes 41 seconds W., 54.96 feet to a point thence; N. 26 degrees 13 minutes 24 seconds W., 119.94 feet to a point on the Left Toe of the 60-foot-wide main navigational channel at computed Centerline Station No. 41+81.10, coordinates North 157320.30, East 1640264.00. Geometry Right Toe of the 60-foot-wide main navigational ship channel, Right Toe Station No. 0+00, coordinates North 157824.70, East 1636941.90, as stated and depicted on the Condition Survey Goose Creek, Sheet 1 of 1, prepared by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, August 2010; thence departing the aforementioned centerline traveling the following courses and distances: S. 64 degrees 49 minutes 06 seconds

E., 1583.82 feet to a point, on the outline of said 60-foot-wide channel thence binding on said out-line the following six courses and distances: S. 63 degrees 25 minutes 47 seconds E., 1478.79 feet to a point, thence; N. 50 degrees 38 minutes 26 seconds E., 1016.69 feet to a point, thence; N. 26 degrees 14 minutes 49 seconds W., 144.26 feet to a point, thence; N. 63 degrees 54 minutes 03 seconds E., 55.01 feet to a point thence; N. 26 degrees 12 minutes 08 seconds W., 120.03 feet to a point on the Right Toe of the 60-foot-wide main navigational channel at computed Centerline Station No. 43+98.61, coordinates North 157395.40, East 1640416.50.

(b) LOWER THOROUGHFARE, DEAL ISLAND, MARYLAND.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary is no longer authorized to carry out the portion of the project for navigation, Lower Thoroughfare, Maryland, authorized by the Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 630, chapter 382) (commonly known as the “River and Harbor Act of 1910”), that begins at Lower Thoroughfare Channel Geometry Centerline of the 60-foot-wide main navigational ship channel, Centerline Station No. 44+88, coordinates North 170435.62, East 1614588.93, as stated and depicted on the Condition Survey Lower Thoroughfare, Deal Island, Sheet 1 of 3, prepared by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, August 2010; thence departing the aforementioned centerline traveling the following courses and distances: S. 42 degrees 20 minutes 44 seconds W., 30.00 feet to a point, on the outline of said 60-foot-wide channel thence binding on said out-line the following four courses and distances: N. 64 degrees 08 minutes 55 seconds W., 53.85 feet to a point, thence; N. 42 degrees 20 minutes 43 seconds W., 250.08 feet to a point, thence; N. 47 degrees 39 minutes 03 seconds E., 20.00 feet to a point, thence; S. 42 degrees 20 minutes 44 seconds E., 300.07 feet to a point binding on the Left Toe of the 60-foot-wide main navigational channel at computed Centerline Station No. 43+92.67, coordinates North 170415.41, 1614566.76; thence; continuing with the aforementioned centerline the following courses and distances: S. 42 degrees 20 minutes 42 seconds W., 30.00 feet to a point, on the outline of said 60-foot-wide channel thence binding on said out-line the following four courses and distances: N. 20 degrees 32 minutes 06 seconds W., 53.85 feet to a point, thence; N. 42 degrees 20 minutes 49 seconds W., 250.08 feet to a point, thence; S. 47 degrees 39 minutes 03 seconds W., 20.00 feet to a point, thence; S. 42 degrees 20 minutes 46 seconds E., 300.08 feet to a point binding on the Left Toe of the 60-foot-wide main navigational channel at computed Centerline Station No. 43+92.67, coordinates North 170415.41, 1614566.76.

(c) THOMASTON HARBOR, GEORGES RIVER, MAINE.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary is no longer authorized to carry out the portion of the project for navigation, Georges River, Maine (Thomaston Harbor), authorized by the first section of the Act of June 3, 1896 (29 Stat. 215, chapter 314), and modified by section 317 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-541; 114 Stat. 2604), that lies northwesterly of a line commencing at point N87,220.51, E321,065.80 thence running northnortheasterly about 125 feet to a point N87,338.71, E321,106.46.

(d) WARWICK COVE, RHODE ISLAND.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary is no longer authorized to carry out the portion of the project for navigation, Warwick Cove, Rhode Island, authorized by section 107 of the River and Harbor

Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) that is located within the 5 acre anchorage area east of the channel and lying east of the line beginning at a point with coordinates N220,349.79, E357,664.90 thence running north 9 degrees 10 minutes 21.5 seconds west 170.38 feet to a point N220,517.99, E357,637.74 thence running north 17 degrees 44 minutes 30.4 seconds west 165.98 feet to a point N220,676.08, E357,587.16 thence running north 0 degrees 46 minutes 0.9 seconds east 138.96 feet to a point N220,815.03, E357,589.02 thence running north 8 degrees 36 minutes 22.9 seconds east 101.57 feet to a point N220,915.46, E357,604.22 thence running north 18 degrees 18 minutes 27.3 seconds east 168.20 feet to a point N221,075.14, E357,657.05 thence running north 34 degrees 42 minutes 7.2 seconds east 106.4 feet to a point N221,162.62, E357,717.63 thence running south 29 degrees 14 minutes 17.4 seconds east 26.79 feet to a point N221,139.24, E357,730.71 thence running south 30 degrees 45 minutes 30.5 seconds west 230.46 feet to a point N220,941.20, E357,612.85 thence running south 10 degrees 49 minutes 12.0 seconds west 95.46 feet to a point N220,847.44, E357,594.93 thence running south 9 degrees 13 minutes 44.5 seconds east 491.68 feet to a point N220,362.12, E357,673.79 thence running south 35 degrees 47 minutes 19.4 seconds west 15.20 feet to the point of origin.

(e) CLATSOP COUNTY DIKING DISTRICT NO. 10, KARLSON ISLAND, OREGON.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary is no longer authorized to carry out the Diking District No. 10, Karlson Island portion of the project for raising and improving existing levees in Clatsop County, Oregon, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h).

(f) NUMBERG DIKE NO. 34 LEVEED AREA, CLATSOP COUNTY DIKING DISTRICT NO. 13, CLATSOP COUNTY, OREGON (WALLUSKI-YOUNGS).—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary is no longer authorized to carry out the Numberg DiKE No. 34 leveed area, Clatsop County Diking District, No. 13, Walluski River and Youngs River dikes, portion of the project for raising and improving existing levees in Clatsop County, Oregon, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h).

(g) PORT OF HOOD RIVER, OREGON.—

(1) EXTINGUISHMENT OF PORTIONS OF EXISTING FLOWAGE EASEMENT.—With respect to the properties described in paragraph (2), beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the flowage easement identified as Tract 1200E-6 on the Easement Deed recorded as Instrument No. 740320 is extinguished above elevation 79.39 feet (NGVD 29) the Ordinary High Water Line.

(2) AFFECTED PROPERTIES.—The properties referred to in paragraph (1), as recorded in Hood River County, Oregon, are as follows:

(A) Instrument Number 2010-1235

(B) Instrument Number 2010-02366.

(C) Instrument Number 2010-02367.

(D) Parcel 2 of Partition Plat #2011-12P.

(E) Parcel 1 of Partition Plat 2005-26P.

(3) FEDERAL LIABILITIES; CULTURAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND OTHER REGULATORY REVIEWS.—

(A) FEDERAL LIABILITY.—The United States shall not be liable for any injury caused by the extinguishment of the easement under this subsection.

(B) CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATORY ACTIONS.—Nothing in this subsection establishes any cultural or environmental regulation relating to the properties described in paragraph (2).

(4) EFFECT ON OTHER RIGHTS.—Nothing in this subsection affects any remaining right

or interest of the Corps of Engineers in the properties described in paragraph (2).

(h) EIGHTMILE RIVER, CONNECTICUT.—

(1) The portion of the project for navigation, Eightmile River, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the Act of June 25, 1910 (commonly known as the “River and Harbor Act of 1910”) (36 Stat. 633, chapter 382), that begins at a point of the existing 8-foot channel limit with coordinates N701002.39, E1109247.73, thence running north 2 degrees 19 minutes 57.1 seconds east 265.09 feet to a point N701267.26, E1109258.52, thence running north 7 degrees 47 minutes 19.3 seconds east 322.32 feet to a point N701586.60, E1109302.20, thence running north 90 degrees 0 minutes 0 seconds east 65.61 to a point N701586.60, E1109367.80, thence running south 7 degrees 47 minutes 19.3 seconds west 328.11 feet to a point N701261.52, E1109323.34, thence running south 2 degrees 19 minutes 57.1 seconds west 305.49 feet to an end at a point N700956.28, E1109310.91 on the existing 8-foot channel limit, shall be reduced to a width of 65 feet and the channel realigned to follow the deepest available water.

(2) Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary is no longer authorized to carry out the portion of the project beginning at a point N701296.72, E1109262.55 and running north 45 degrees 4 minutes 2.8 seconds west 78.09 feet to a point N701341.18, E1109217.98, thence running north 5 degrees 8 minutes 34.6 seconds east 180.14 feet to a point N701520.59, E1109234.13, thence running north 54 degrees 5 minutes 50.1 seconds east 112.57 feet to a point N701568.04, E1109299.66, thence running south 7 degrees 47 minutes 18.4 seconds west 292.58 feet to the point of origin; and the remaining area north of the channel realignment beginning at a point N700956.28, E1109310.91 thence running north 2 degrees 19 minutes 57.1 seconds east 305.49 feet west to a point N701261.52, E1109323.34 north 7 degrees 47 minutes 18.4 seconds east 328.11 feet to a point N701586.60, E1109367.81 thence running north 90 degrees 0 minutes 0 seconds east 7.81 feet to a point N701586.60, E1109375.62 thence running south 5 degrees 8 minutes 34.6 seconds west 626.29 feet to a point N700962.83, E1109319.47 thence south 52 degrees 35 minutes 36.5 seconds 10.79 feet to the point of origin.

(i) BURNHAM CANAL.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary is no longer authorized to carry out the portion of the project for navigation, Milwaukee Harbor Project, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, known as the Burnham Canal, beginning at channel point #415a N381768.648, E2524554.836, a distance of about 170.58 feet, thence running south 53 degrees 43 minutes 41 seconds west to channel point #417 N381667.728, E2524417.311, a distance of about 35.01 feet, thence running south 34 degrees 10 minutes 40 seconds west to channel point #501 N381638.761, E2524397.639 a distance of about 139.25 feet, thence running south 34 degrees 10 minutes 48 seconds west to channel point #503 N381523.557, E2524319.406 a distance of about 235.98 feet, thence running south 32 degrees 59 minutes 13 seconds west to channel point #505 N381325.615, E2524190.925 a distance of about 431.29 feet, thence running south 32 degrees 36 minutes 05 seconds west to channel point #509 N380962.276, E2523958.547, a distance of about 614.52 feet, thence running south 89 degrees 05 minutes 00 seconds west to channel point #511 N380952.445, E2523344.107, a distance of about 74.68 feet, thence running north 89 degrees 04 minutes 59 seconds west to channel point #512 N381027.13, E2523342.91, a distance of about 533.84 feet, thence running north 89 degrees

05 minutes 00 seconds east to channel point #510 N381035.67, E2523876.69, a distance of about 47.86 feet, thence running north 61 degrees 02 minutes 07 seconds east to channel point #508 N381058.84, E2523918.56, a distance of about 308.55 feet, thence running north 36 degrees 15 minutes 29 seconds east to channel point #506 N381307.65, E2524101.05, distance of about 199.98 feet, thence running north 32 degrees 59 minutes 12 seconds east to channel point #504 N381475.40, E2524209.93, a distance of about 195.14 feet, thence running north 26 degrees 17 minutes 22 seconds east to channel point #502 N381650.36, E2524296.36, a distance of about 81.82 feet, thence running north 88 degrees 51 minutes 05 seconds west to channel point #419 N381732.17, E2524294.72 a distance of about 262.65 feet, thence running north 82 degrees 01 minutes 02 seconds east to channel point #415a the point of origin.

(j) WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary is no longer authorized to carry out the portion of the project for flood protection on Walnut Creek, California, constructed in accordance with the plan authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-645; 74 Stat. 488) that consists of the culvert on the San Ramon Creek constructed by the Department of the Army in 1971 that extends from Sta 4+27 to Sta 14+27.

SEC. 3007. RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NEW JERSEY.

Title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105-62; 111 Stat. 1327) is amended by striking section 102.

SEC. 3008. RED RIVER BASIN, OKLAHOMA, TEXAS, ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to reassign unused irrigation storage within a reservoir on the Red River Basin to municipal and industrial water supply for use by a non-Federal interest if that non-Federal interest has already contracted for a share of municipal and industrial water supply on the same reservoir.

(b) NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—A reassignment of storage under subsection (a) shall be contingent upon the execution of an agreement between the Secretary and the applicable non-Federal interest.

SEC. 3009. POINT JUDITH HARBOR OF REFUGE, RHODE ISLAND.

The project for the Harbor of Refuge at Point Judith, Narragansett, Rhode Island, adopted by the Act of September 19, 1890 (commonly known as the “River and Harbor Act of 1890”) (26 Stat. 426, chapter 907), House Document numbered 66, 51st Congress, 1st Session, and modified to include the west shore arm breakwater under the first section of the Act of June 25, 1910 (commonly known as the “River and Harbor Act of 1910”) (36 Stat. 632, chapter 382), is further modified to include shore protection and erosion control as project purposes.

SEC. 3010. LAND CONVEYANCE OF HAMMOND BOAT BASIN, WARRENTON, OREGON.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CITY.—The term “City” means the city of Warrenton, located in Clatsop County, Oregon.

(2) MAP.—The term “map” means the map contained in Exhibit A of Department of the Army Lease No. DACW57-1-88-0033 (or a successor instrument).

(b) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall convey to the City by quitclaim deed, and without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of land described in subsection (c).

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the land referred to in subsection (b) is the parcel totaling approximately 59 acres located in the City, together with any improvements thereon, including the Hammond Marina (as described in the map).

(2) EXCLUSION.—The land referred to in subsection (b) shall not include the site provided for the fisheries research support facility of the National Marine Fisheries Service.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file in the Portland District Office of the Corps of Engineers.

(d) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of the conveyance under subsection (b), the City shall agree in writing—

(A) that the City and any successor or assign of the City will release and indemnify the United States from any claims or liabilities that may arise from or through the operations of the land conveyed by the United States; and

(B) to pay any cost associated with the conveyance under subsection (b).

(2) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may impose such additional terms, conditions, and requirements on the conveyance under subsection (b) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interest of the United States, including the requirement that the City assume full responsibility for operating and maintaining the channel and the breakwater.

(e) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the land conveyed under this section ceases to be owned by the public, all right, title, and interest in and to the land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(f) DEAUTHORIZATION.—After the land is conveyed under this section, the land shall no longer be a portion of the project for navigation, Hammond Small Boat Basin, Oregon, authorized by section 107 of the Rivers and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577).

SEC. 3011. METRO EAST FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, ILLINOIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following projects shall constitute a program, to be known as the “Metro East Flood Risk Management Program, Illinois”:

(1) Prairie du Pont Drainage and Levee District and Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District, Illinois, authorized by—

(A) section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h); and

(B) section 5070 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-114; 121 Stat. 1220).

(2) East St. Louis, Illinois, authorized by—

(A) section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h); and

(B) Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 1988 (Public Law 100-202; 101 Stat. 1329-104).

(3) Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Illinois, authorized by—

(A) section 4 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes”, approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1218); and

(B) section 1001(20) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-114; 121 Stat. 1053).

SEC. 3012. FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS.

Section 109 of title I of division B of the Miscellaneous Appropriations Act, 2001 (114 Stat. 2763A-221, 121 Stat. 1217) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and unincorporated communities” after “municipalities”; and

(2) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) PRIORITY.—In providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to projects sponsored by—

“(1) the State of Florida;

“(2) Monroe County, Florida; and

“(3) incorporated communities in Monroe County, Florida.”.

SEC. 3013. DES MOINES RECREATIONAL RIVER AND GREENBELT, IOWA.

The boundaries for the project referred to as the Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt, Iowa under the heading “CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL” in chapter IV of title I of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1985 (Public Law 99-88, 99 Stat. 313) are revised to include the entirety of sections 19 and 29, situated in T89N, R28W.

SEC. 3014. LAND CONVEYANCE, CRANEY ISLAND DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT AREA, PORTSMOUTH, VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the conditions described in this section, the Secretary may convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia, by quitclaim deed and without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to 2 parcels of land situated within the project for navigation, Craney Island Eastward Expansion, Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Hampton Roads, Virginia, authorized by section 1001(45) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Pub. L. 110-114; 121 Stat. 1057), together with any improvements thereon.

(b) LANDS TO BE CONVEYED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The 2 parcels of land to be conveyed under this section include a parcel consisting of approximately 307.82 acres of land and a parcel consisting of approximately 13.33 acres of land, both located along the eastern side of the Craney Island Dredged Material Management Area in Portsmouth, Virginia.

(2) USE.—The 2 parcels of land described in paragraph (1) may be used by the Commonwealth of Virginia exclusively for the purpose of port expansion, including the provision of road and rail access and the construction of a shipping container terminal.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Land conveyed under this section shall be subject to—

(1) a reversionary interest in the United States if the land—

(A) ceases to be held in public ownership; or

(B) is used for any purpose that is inconsistent with subsection (b); and

(2) such other terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions that the Secretary determines to be necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(d) LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and legal description of land to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(e) CONVEYANCE COSTS.—The Commonwealth of Virginia shall be responsible for all costs associated with the conveyance authorized by this section, including the cost of the survey required under subsection (d) and other administrative costs.

SEC. 3015. LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CALIFORNIA.

The project for flood control, Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California, authorized by section 101(b) of the Water Resources

Development Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-640; 104 Stat. 4611), as modified, is further modified to authorize the Secretary to include, as a part of the project, measures for flood risk reduction, ecosystem restoration, and recreation in the Compton Creek watershed.

SEC. 3016. OAKLAND INNER HARBOR TIDAL CANAL, CALIFORNIA.

Section 3182(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-114; 121 Stat. 1165) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, or to a multicounty public entity that is eligible to hold title to real property” after “To the city of Oakland”; and

(2) by inserting “multicounty public entity or other” before “public entity”.

SEC. 3017. REDESIGNATION OF LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER MUSEUM AND RIVERFRONT INTERPRETIVE SITE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(c)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4811) is amended by striking “Lower Mississippi River Museum and Riverfront Interpretive Site” and inserting “Jesse Brent Lower Mississippi River Museum and Riverfront Interpretive Site”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the museum and interpretive site referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Jesse Brent Lower Mississippi River Museum and Riverfront Interpretive Site”.

SEC. 3018. LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA.

(a) INTERIM ADOPTION OF COMPREHENSIVE COASTAL MASTER PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-114; 121 Stat. 1270) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (d) through (f) as subsections (e) through (g), respectively;

(B) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) INTERIM ADOPTION OF COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN.—Prior to completion of the comprehensive plan described under subsection (a), the Secretary shall adopt the plan of the State of Louisiana entitled ‘Louisiana’s Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast’ in effect on the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2013 (and subsequent plans), authorized and defined pursuant to Act 8 of the First Extraordinary Session of the Louisiana State Legislature, 2005, for protecting, preserving, and restoring the coastal Louisiana ecosystem until implementation of the comprehensive plan is complete.”; and

(C) in subsection (g)(1) (as so redesignated), by striking “1 year” and inserting “10 years”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (f) (as so redesignated) is amended by striking “subsection (d)(1)” and inserting “subsection (e)(1)”.

(b) Section 7006 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-114; 121 Stat. 1274) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) to examine a system-wide approach to coastal sustainability, including—

“(i) flood and storm damage protection;

“(ii) coastal restoration; and

“(iii) the elevation of public and private infrastructure.”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(E), by striking “at Myrtle Grove” and inserting “in the vicinity of Myrtle Grove”.

(c) EFFECT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section or an amendment made by this section authorizes the construction of a project or program associated with a storm surge barrier across the Lake Pontchartrain land bridge (including Chef Menteur Pass and the Rigolets) that would result in unmitigated induced flooding in coastal communities within the State of Mississippi.

(2) REQUIRED CONSULTATION.—Any study to advance a project described in paragraph (1) that is conducted using funds from the General Investigations Account of the Corps of Engineers shall include consultation and approval of the Governors of the States of Louisiana and Mississippi.

SEC. 3019. FOUR MILE RUN, CITY OF ALEXANDRIA AND ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

Section 84(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-251; 88 Stat. 35) is amended by striking “twenty-seven thousand cubic feet per second” and inserting “18,000 cubic feet per second”.

SEC. 3020. EAST FORK OF TRINITY RIVER, TEXAS.

The portion of the project for flood protection on the East Fork of the Trinity River, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1185), that consists of the 2 levees identified as “Kaufman County Levees K5E and K5W” shall no longer be authorized as a part of the Federal project as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3021. SEWARD WATERFRONT, SEWARD, ALASKA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The parcel of land included in the Seward Harbor, Alaska navigation project identified as Tract H, Seward Original Townsite, Waterfront Park Replat, Plat No 2012-4, Seward Recording District, shall not be subject to the navigation servitude (as of the date of enactment of this Act).

(b) ENTRY BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—The Federal Government may enter upon any portion of the land referred to in subsection (a) to carry out any required operation and maintenance of the general navigation features of the project.

TITLE IV—WATER RESOURCE STUDIES

SEC. 4001. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to authorize the Secretary to study and recommend solutions for water resource issues relating to flood risk and storm damage reduction, navigation, and aquatic ecosystem restoration.

SEC. 4002. INITIATION OF NEW WATER RESOURCES STUDIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b), (c), and (d), the Secretary may initiate a study—

(1) to determine the feasibility of carrying out 1 or more projects for flood risk management, storm damage reduction, aquatic ecosystem restoration, navigation, hydropower, or related purposes; or

(2) to carry out watershed and river basin assessments in accordance with section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a).

(b) CRITERIA.—The Secretary may only initiate a study under subsection (a) if—

(1) the study—

(A) has been requested by an eligible non-Federal interest;

(B) is for an area that is likely to include a project with a Federal interest; and

(C) addresses a high-priority water resource issue necessary for the protection of human life and property, the environment, or the national security interests of the United States; and

(2) the non-Federal interest has demonstrated—

(A) that local support exists for addressing the water resource issue; and

(B) the financial ability to provide the required non-Federal cost-share.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL.—

(1) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Prior to initiating a study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Environment and Public Works and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Appropriations of the House—

(A) a description of the study, including the geographical area addressed by the study;

(B) a description of how the study meets each of the requirements of subsection (b); and

(C) a certification that the proposed study can be completed within 3 years and for a Federal cost of not more than \$3,000,000.

(2) EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS.—No funds may be spent on a study initiated under subsection (a) unless—

(A) the required information is submitted to Congress under paragraph (1); and

(B) after such submission, amounts are appropriated to initiate the study in an appropriations or other Act.

(3) ADDITIONAL NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall notify each Senator or Member of Congress with a State or congressional district in the study area described in paragraph (1)(A).

(d) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a project for which a study has been authorized prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) NEW STUDIES.—In each fiscal year, the Secretary may initiate not more than—

(A) 3 new studies in each of the primary mission areas of the Corps of Engineers; and

(B) 3 new studies from any 1 division of the Corps of Engineers.

(e) TERMINATION.—The authority under subsection (a) expires on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2017.

SEC. 4003. APPLICABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title authorizes the construction of a water resources project.

(b) NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUIRED.—New authorization from Congress is required before any project evaluated in a study under this title is constructed.

TITLE V—REGIONAL AND NONPROJECT PROVISIONS

SEC. 5001. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to authorize regional, multistate authorities to address water resource needs and other non-project provisions.

SEC. 5002. NORTHEAST COASTAL REGION ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall plan, design, and construct projects for aquatic ecosystem restoration within the coastal waters of the Northeastern United States from the State of Virginia to the State of Maine, including associated bays, estuaries, and critical riverine areas.

(b) GENERAL COASTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, the Governors of the coastal States from Virginia to

Maine, nonprofit organizations, and other interested parties, shall assess the needs regarding, and opportunities for, aquatic ecosystem restoration within the coastal waters of the Northeastern United States.

(2) **PLAN.**—The Secretary shall develop a general coastal management plan based on the assessment carried out under paragraph (1), maximizing the use of existing plans and investigation, which plan shall include—

(A) an inventory and evaluation of coastal habitats;

(B) identification of aquatic resources in need of improvement;

(C) identification and prioritization of potential aquatic habitat restoration projects; and

(D) identification of geographical and ecological areas of concern, including—

(i) finfish habitats;

(ii) diadromous fisheries migratory corridors;

(iii) shellfish habitats;

(iv) submerged aquatic vegetation;

(v) wetland; and

(vi) beach dune complexes and other similar habitats.

(c) **ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.**—The Secretary may carry out an aquatic ecosystem restoration project under this section if the project—

(1) is consistent with the management plan developed under subsection (b); and

(2) provides for—

(A) the restoration of degraded aquatic habitat (including coastal, saltmarsh, benthic, and riverine habitat);

(B) the restoration of geographical or ecological areas of concern, including the restoration of natural river and stream characteristics;

(C) the improvement of water quality; or

(D) other projects or activities determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(d) **COST SHARING.**—

(1) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The management plan developed under subsection (b) shall be completed at Federal expense.

(2) **RESTORATION PROJECTS.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project carried out under this section shall be 35 percent.

(e) **COST LIMITATION.**—Not more than \$10,000,000 in Federal funds may be allocated under this section for an eligible project.

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section (including funds for the completion of the management plan) \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 5003. CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

Section 510 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-303; 110 Stat. 3759; 121 Stat. 1202) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “pilot program” and inserting “program”; and

(ii) by inserting “in the basin States described in subsection (f) and the District of Columbia” after “interests”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **FORM.**—The assistance under paragraph (1) shall be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related resource protection and restoration projects affecting the Chesapeake Bay estuary, based on the comprehensive plan under subsection (b), including projects for—

“(A) sediment and erosion control;

“(B) protection of eroding shorelines;

“(C) ecosystem restoration, including restoration of submerged aquatic vegetation;

“(D) protection of essential public works;

“(E) beneficial uses of dredged material; and

“(F) other related projects that may enhance the living resources of the estuary.”;

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2013, the Secretary, in cooperation with State and local governmental officials and affected stakeholders, shall develop a comprehensive Chesapeake Bay restoration plan to guide the implementation of projects under subsection (a)(2).

“(2) **COORDINATION.**—The restoration plan described in paragraph (1) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consider and avoid duplication of any ongoing or planned actions of other Federal, State, and local agencies and nongovernmental organizations.

“(3) **PRIORITIZATION.**—The restoration plan described in paragraph (1) shall give priority to projects eligible under subsection (a)(2) that will also improve water quality or quantity or use natural hydrological features and systems.

“(4) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The Federal share of the costs of carrying out paragraph (1) shall be 75 percent.”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “to provide” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “for the design and construction of a project carried out pursuant to the comprehensive Chesapeake Bay restoration plan described in subsection (b).”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “facilities or resource protection and development plan” and inserting “resource protection and restoration plan”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **PROJECTS ON FEDERAL LAND.**—A project carried out pursuant to the comprehensive Chesapeake Bay restoration plan described in subsection (b) that is located on Federal land shall be carried out at the expense of the Federal agency that owns the land on which the project will be carried out.

“(4) **NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.**—A Federal agency carrying out a project described in paragraph (3) may accept contributions of funds from non-Federal entities to carry out that project.”;

(4) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) **COOPERATION.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall cooperate with—

“(1) the heads of appropriate Federal agencies, including—

“(A) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

“(B) the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration;

“(C) the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

“(D) the heads of such other Federal agencies as the Secretary determines to be appropriate; and

“(2) agencies of a State or political subdivision of a State, including the Chesapeake Bay Commission.”;

(5) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

“(f) **PROJECTS.**—The Secretary shall establish, to the maximum extent practicable, at least 1 project under this section in—

“(1) regions within the Chesapeake Bay watershed of each of the basin States of Delaware, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia; and

“(2) the District of Columbia.”;

(6) by striking subsection (h); and

(7) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (h).

SEC. 5004. RIO GRANDE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, COLORADO, NEW MEXICO, TEXAS.

Section 5056 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1213) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “2008” and inserting “2014”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “and an assessment of needs for other related purposes in the Rio Grande Basin, including flood damage reduction” after “assessment”;

(2) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) by striking “an interagency agreement with” and inserting “1 or more interagency agreements with the Secretary of State and”; and

(B) by inserting “or the U.S. Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission” after “the Department of the Interior”; and

(3) in subsection (f), by striking “2011” and inserting “2024”.

SEC. 5005. LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER AND TILLAMOOK BAY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OREGON AND WASHINGTON.

Section 536(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2661) is amended by striking “\$30,000,000” and inserting “\$75,000,000”.

SEC. 5006. ARKANSAS RIVER, ARKANSAS AND OKLAHOMA.

(a) **PROJECT GOAL.**—The goal for operation of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, Arkansas and Oklahoma, shall be to maximize the use of the system in a balanced approach that incorporates advice from representatives from all project purposes to ensure that the full value of the system is realized by the United States.

(b) **MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), the Secretary shall establish an advisory committee for the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, Arkansas and Oklahoma, project authorized by the Act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 635, chapter 595).

(2) **DUTIES.**—The advisory committee shall—

(A) serve in an advisory capacity only; and

(B) provide information and recommendations to the Corps of Engineers relating to the efficiency, reliability, and availability of the operations of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system.

(3) **SELECTION AND COMPOSITION.**—The advisory committee shall be—

(A) selected jointly by the Little Rock district engineer and the Tulsa district engineer; and

(B) composed of members that equally represent the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system project purposes.

(4) **AGENCY RESOURCES.**—The Little Rock district and the Tulsa district of the Corps of Engineers, under the supervision of the southwestern division, shall jointly provide the advisory committee with adequate staff assistance, facilities, and resources.

(5) **TERMINATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), the advisory committee shall terminate

on the date on which the Secretary submits a report to Congress demonstrating increases in the efficiency, reliability, and availability of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system.

(B) RESTRICTION.—The advisory committee shall terminate not less than 2 calendar years after the date on which the advisory committee is established.

SEC. 5007. AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES PREVENTION AND MANAGEMENT; COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish a program to prevent and manage aquatic invasive species in the Columbia River Basin in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington.

(b) WATERCRAFT INSPECTION STATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall establish watercraft inspection stations in the Columbia River Basin to be located in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington at locations, as determined by the Secretary, with the highest likelihood of preventing the spread of aquatic invasive species into reservoirs operated and maintained by the Secretary.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—Locations identified under paragraph (1) may include—

- (A) State border crossings;
- (B) international border crossings; and

(C) highway entry points that are used by owners of watercraft to access boat launch facilities owned or managed by the Secretary.

(3) COST-SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of operating and maintaining watercraft inspection stations described in paragraph (1) (including personnel costs) shall be 50 percent.

(4) OTHER INSPECTION SITES.—The Secretary may establish watercraft inspection stations using amounts made available to carry out this section in States other than those described in paragraph (1) at or near boat launch facilities that the Secretary determines are regularly used by watercraft to enter the States described in paragraph (1).

(c) MONITORING AND CONTINGENCY PLANNING.—The Secretary shall—

(1) carry out risk assessments of each major public and private water resources facility in the Columbia River Basin;

(2) establish an aquatic invasive species monitoring program in the Columbia River Basin;

(3) establish a Columbia River Basin watershed-wide plan for expedited response to an infestation of aquatic invasive species; and

(4) monitor water quality, including sediment cores and fish tissue samples, at facilities owned or managed by the Secretary in the Columbia River Basin.

(d) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall consult and coordinate with—

- (1) the States described in subsection (a);
- (2) Indian tribes; and
- (3) other Federal agencies, including—
 - (A) the Department of Agriculture;
 - (B) the Department of Energy;
 - (C) the Department of Homeland Security;
 - (D) the Department of Commerce; and
 - (E) the Department of the Interior.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$30,000,000, of which \$5,000,000 may be used to carry out subsection (c).

SEC. 5008. UPPER MISSOURI BASIN FLOOD AND DROUGHT MONITORING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of the Na-

tional Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Director of the United States Geological Survey, and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, shall establish a program to provide for—

(1) soil moisture and snowpack monitoring in the Upper Missouri River Basin to reduce flood risk and improve river and water resource management in the Upper Missouri River Basin, as outlined in the February 2013 report entitled “Upper Missouri Basin Monitoring Committee—Snow Sampling and Instrumentation Recommendations”;

(2) restoring and maintaining existing mid- and high-elevation snowpack monitoring sites operated under the SNOTEL program of the Natural Resources Conservation Service; and

(3) operating streamflow gages and related interpretive studies in the Upper Missouri River Basin under the cooperative water program and the national streamflow information program of the United States Geological Service.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$11,250,000.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available to the Secretary under this section shall be used to complement other related activities of Federal agencies that are carried out within the Missouri River Basin.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Secretary, shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) identifies progress made by the Secretary and other Federal agencies to implement the recommendations contained in the report described in subsection (a)(1) with respect to enhancing soil moisture and snowpack monitoring in the Upper Missouri Basin; and

(2) includes recommendations to enhance soil moisture and snowpack monitoring in the Upper Missouri Basin.

SEC. 5009. UPPER MISSOURI BASIN SHORELINE EROSION PREVENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide planning, design, and construction assistance to not more than 3 federally-recognized Indian tribes in the Upper Missouri River Basin to undertake measures to address shoreline erosion that is jeopardizing existing infrastructure resulting from operation of a reservoir constructed under the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin Program (authorized by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (commonly known as the “Flood Control Act of 1944”) (58 Stat. 891, chapter 665)).

(2) LIMITATION.—The projects described in paragraph (1) shall be economically justified, technically feasible, and environmentally acceptable.

(b) FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL COST SHARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Federal share of the costs of carrying out this section shall be not less than 75 percent.

(2) ABILITY TO PAY.—The Secretary may adjust the Federal and non-Federal shares of the costs of carrying out this section in accordance with the terms and conditions of section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)).

(c) CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may provide the assistance described in subsection (a) only after—

(1) consultation with the Department of the Interior; and

(2) execution by the Indian tribe of a memorandum of agreement with the Secretary that specifies that the tribe shall—

(A) be responsible for—

(i) all operation and maintenance activities required to ensure the integrity of the measures taken; and

(ii) providing any required real estate interests in and to the property on which such measures are to be taken; and

(B) hold and save the United States free from damages arising from planning, design, or construction assistance provided under this section, except for damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or its contractors.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For each Indian tribe eligible under this section, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not more than \$30,000,000.

SEC. 5010. NORTHERN ROCKIES HEADWATERS EXTREME WEATHER MITIGATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary shall establish a program to mitigate the impacts of extreme weather events, such as floods and droughts, on communities, water users, and fish and wildlife located in and along the headwaters of the Columbia, Missouri, and Yellowstone Rivers (including the tributaries of those rivers) in the States of Idaho and Montana by carrying out river, stream, and floodplain protection and restoration projects, including—

(1) floodplain restoration and reconnection;

(2) floodplain and riparian area protection through the use of conservation easements;

(3) instream flow restoration projects;

(4) fish passage improvements;

(5) channel migration zone mapping; and

(6) invasive weed management.

(b) RESTRICTION.—All projects carried out using amounts made available to carry out this section shall emphasize the protection and enhancement of natural riverine processes.

(c) NON-FEDERAL COST SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the costs of carrying out a project under this section shall not exceed 35 percent of the total cost of the project.

(d) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary—

(1) shall consult and coordinate with the appropriate State natural resource agency in each State; and

(2) may—

(A) delegate any authority or responsibility of the Secretary under this section to those State natural resource agencies; and

(B) provide amounts made available to the Secretary to carry out this section to those State natural resource agencies.

(e) LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this section invalidates, preempts, or creates any exception to State water law, State water rights, or Federal or State permitted activities or agreements in the States of Idaho and Montana or any State containing tributaries to rivers in those States.

(f) EFFECT OF SECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section replaces or provides a substitute for the authority to carry out projects under section 3110 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1135).

(2) FUNDING.—The amounts made available to carry out this section shall be used to carry out projects that are not otherwise

carried out under section 3110 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1135).

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$30,000,000.

SEC. 5011. AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES PREVENTION, GREAT LAKES AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to implement measures recommended in the efficacy study authorized under section 3061 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1121) or in interim reports, with any modifications or any emergency measures that the Secretary determines to be appropriate to prevent aquatic nuisance species from dispersing into the Great Lakes by way of any hydrologic connection between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River Basin.

(b) **REPORTS.**—The Secretary shall report to the Committees on Environment and Public Works and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Appropriations of the House of Representatives any emergency actions taken pursuant to this section.

SEC. 5012. MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVER PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with the project for navigation, Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers (Regulating Works), Missouri and Illinois, authorized by the Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 631, chapter 382) (commonly known as the “River and Harbor Act of 1910”), the Act of January 1, 1927 (44 Stat. 1010, chapter 47) (commonly known as the “River and Harbor Act of 1927”), and the Act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 918, chapter 847), the Secretary shall carry out a pilot program to restore and protect fish and wildlife habitat in the middle Mississippi River.

(b) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—As part of the pilot program carried out under subsection (a), the Secretary may carry out any activity along the Middle Mississippi River that is necessary to improve navigation through the project while restoring and protecting fish and wildlife habitat in the middle Mississippi River if the Secretary determines that the activity is feasible.

(c) **COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The maximum Federal share of the cost of carrying out a project under this section shall be 65 percent.

(2) **AMOUNT EXPENDED PER PROJECT.**—The Federal share described in paragraph (1) shall not exceed \$10,000,000 for each project.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 5013. IDAHO, MONTANA, RURAL NEVADA, NEW MEXICO, RURAL UTAH, AND WYOMING.

Section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-53; 113 Stat. 383) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) **FORM OF ASSISTANCE.**—Assistance under this section may be in the form of—

“(1) design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development in Idaho, Montana, rural Nevada, New Mexico, rural Utah, and Wyoming, including projects for—

“(A) wastewater treatment and related facilities;

“(B) water supply and related facilities;

“(C) environmental restoration; and

“(D) surface water resource protection and development; and

“(2) technical assistance to small and rural communities for water planning and issues relating to access to water resources.”; and

(2) by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

“(h) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section for the period beginning with fiscal year 2001 \$450,000,000, which shall—

“(1) be made available to the States and locales described in subsection (b) consistent with program priorities determined by the Secretary in accordance with criteria developed by the Secretary to establish the program priorities; and

“(2) remain available until expended.”.

SEC. 5014. CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RESTORATION IN VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND.

Section 704(b) of Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2263(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$50,000,000” and inserting “\$70,000,000”; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(B) **FORM.**—The non-Federal share may be provided through in-kind services, including—

“(i) the provision by the non-Federal interest of shell stock material that is determined by the Secretary to be suitable for use in carrying out the project; and

“(ii) in the case of a project carried out under paragraph (2)(D) after the date of enactment of this clause, land conservation or restoration efforts undertaken by the non-Federal interest that the Secretary determines provide water quality benefits that—

“(I) enhance the viability of oyster restoration efforts; and

“(II) are integral to the project.”.

SEC. 5015. MISSOURI RIVER BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM, MONTANA AND GAVINS POINT DAM, SOUTH DAKOTA AND NEBRASKA.

Section 9(f) of the Act of December 22, 1944 (commonly known as the “Flood Control Act of 1944”) (58 Stat. 891, chapter 665; 102 Stat. 4031) is amended by striking “\$3,000,000” and inserting “\$5,000,000”.

SEC. 5016. OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE OF INLAND MISSISSIPPI RIVER PORTS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **SHALLOW DRAFT.**—The term “shallow draft” means a project that has a depth less than 14 feet.

(2) **INLAND MISSISSIPPI RIVER.**—The term “inland Mississippi River” means the portion of the Mississippi River that begins at the confluence of the Minnesota River and ends at the confluence of the Red River.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall carry out dredging activities on shallow draft ports located on the Inland Mississippi River to the respective authorized widths and depths of those inland ports, as authorized on the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—For each fiscal year, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$25,000,000.

SEC. 5017. REMOTE AND SUBSISTENCE HARBORS.

Section 2006 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2242) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting “or Alaska” after “Hawaii”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “community” and inserting “region”; and

(ii) by inserting “, as determined by the Secretary based on information provided by the non-Federal interest” after “improvement”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **PRIORITIZATION.**—Projects recommended by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be given equivalent budget consideration and priority as projects recommended solely by national economic development benefits.

“(d) **CONSTRUCTION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may plan, design, or construct projects for navigation in the noncontiguous States and territories of the United States if the Secretary finds that the project is—

“(A) technically feasible;

“(B) environmentally sound; and

“(C) economically justified.

“(2) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In evaluating and implementing a project under this section, the Secretary shall allow the non-Federal interest to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with the criteria established for flood control projects in section 903(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4184) if the detailed project report evaluation indicates that applying that section is necessary to implement the project.

“(3) **COST.**—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out a project under this section shall not exceed \$10,000,000.

“(4) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out projects initiated by the Secretary under this subsection \$100,000,000 for fiscal years 2014 through 2023.”.

SEC. 5018. MULTIAGENCY EFFORT TO SLOW THE SPREAD OF ASIAN CARP IN THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND OHIO RIVER BASINS AND TRIBUARIES.

(a) **MULTIAGENCY EFFORT TO SLOW THE SPREAD OF ASIAN CARP IN THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI AND OHIO RIVER BASINS AND TRIBUARIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in coordination with the Chief of Engineers, the Director of the National Park Service, and the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall lead a multiagency effort to slow the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries by providing high-level technical assistance, coordination, best practices, and support to State and local governments in carrying out activities designed to slow, and eventually eliminate, the threat posed by Asian carp.

(2) **BEST PRACTICES.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the multiagency effort shall apply lessons learned and best practices such as those described in the document prepared by the Asian Carp Working Group entitled “Management and Control Plan for Bighead, Black, Grass, and Silver Carps in the United States”, and dated November 2007, and the document prepared by the Asian Carp Regional Coordinating Committee entitled “FY 2012 Asian Carp Control Strategy Framework” and dated February 2012.

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than December 31 of each year, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in coordination with the Chief of Engineers, shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee

on Appropriations and the Committee on Environmental and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the coordinated strategies established and progress made toward goals to control and eliminate Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) any observed changes in the range of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries during the 2-year period preceding submission of the report;

(B) a summary of Federal agency efforts, including cooperative efforts with non-Federal partners, to control the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries;

(C) any research that the Director determines could improve the ability to control the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries;

(D) any quantitative measures that Director intends to use to document progress in controlling the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries; and

(E) a cross-cut accounting of Federal and non-Federal expenditures to control the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries.

SEC. 5019. RELEASE OF USE RESTRICTIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Tennessee Valley Authority shall, without monetary consideration, grant releases from real estate restrictions established pursuant to section 4(k)(b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 831c(k)(b)) with respect to tracts of land identified in section 4(k)(b) of that Act; provided that such releases shall be granted in a manner consistent with applicable TVA policies.

SEC. 5020. RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CHEROKEE NATION OF OKLAHOMA REGARDING W.D. MAYO LOCK AND DAM, OKLAHOMA.

Section 1117 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4236) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1117. W.D. MAYO LOCK AND DAM, OKLAHOMA.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma has authorization—

“(1) to design and construct 1 or more hydroelectric generating facilities at the W.D. Mayo Lock and Dam on the Arkansas River in the State of Oklahoma, subject to the requirements of subsection (b) and in accordance with the conditions specified in this section; and

“(2) to market the electricity generated from any such hydroelectric generating facility.

“(b) **PRECONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Cherokee Nation shall obtain any permit required by Federal or State law before the date on which construction begins on any hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a).

“(2) **REVIEW BY SECRETARY.**—The Cherokee Nation may initiate the design or construction of a hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a) only after the Secretary reviews and approves the plans and specifications for the design and construction.

“(c) **PAYMENT OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION COSTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Cherokee Nation shall—

“(A) bear all costs associated with the design and construction of any hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a); and

“(B) provide any funds necessary for the design and construction to the Secretary prior to the Secretary initiating any activities relating to the design and construction of the hydroelectric generating facility.

“(2) **USE BY SECRETARY.**—The Secretary may—

“(A) accept funds offered by the Cherokee Nation under paragraph (1); and

“(B) use the funds to carry out the design and construction of any hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a).

“(d) **ASSUMPTION OF LIABILITY.**—The Cherokee Nation—

“(1) shall hold all title to any hydroelectric generating facility constructed under this section;

“(2) may, subject to the approval of the Secretary, assign that title to a third party;

“(3) shall be solely responsible for—

“(A) the operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation of any such facility; and

“(B) the marketing of the electricity generated by any such facility; and

“(4) shall release and indemnify the United States from any claims, causes of action, or liabilities that may arise out of any activity undertaken to carry out this section.

“(e) **ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may provide any technical and construction management assistance requested by the Cherokee Nation relating to the design and construction of any hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a).

“(f) **THIRD PARTY AGREEMENTS.**—The Cherokee Nation may enter into agreements with the Secretary or a third party that the Cherokee Nation or the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out this section.”.

SEC. 5021. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER PROTECTION.

(a) **DEFINITION OF UPPER ST. ANTHONY FALLS LOCK AND DAM.**—In this section, the term “Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam” means the lock and dam located on Mississippi River mile 853.9 in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

(b) **ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report regarding the impact of closing the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam on the economic and environmental well-being of the State of Minnesota.

(c) **MANDATORY CLOSURE.**—Notwithstanding subsection (b) and not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall close the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam if the Secretary determines that the annual average tonnage moving through the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam for the preceding 5 years is not more than 1,500,000 tons.

(d) **EMERGENCY OPERATIONS.**—Nothing in this section prevents the Secretary from carrying out emergency lock operations necessary to mitigate flood damage.

SEC. 5022. ARCTIC DEEP DRAFT PORT DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may provide technical assistance, including planning, design, and construction assistance, to non-Federal public entities, including Indian tribes (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)), for the development, construction, operation, and maintenance of channels, harbors, and related infrastructure associated with deep draft ports

for purposes of dealing with Arctic development and security needs.

(b) **ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS.**—The Secretary is authorized to accept and expend funds provided by non-Federal public entities, including Indian tribes (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)), to carry out the activities described in subsection (a).

(c) **LIMITATION.**—No assistance may be provided under this section until after the date on which the entity to which that assistance is to be provided enters into a written agreement with the Secretary that includes such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate and in the public interest.

(d) **PRIORITIZATION.**—The Secretary shall prioritize Arctic deep draft ports identified by the Army Corps, the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Defense.

SEC. 5023. GREATER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN SEVERE FLOODING AND DROUGHT MANAGEMENT STUDY.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **GREATER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN.**—The term “greater Mississippi River Basin” means the area covered by hydrologic units 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11, as identified by the United States Geological Survey as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER.**—The term “lower Mississippi River” means the portion of the Mississippi River that begins at the confluence of the Ohio River and flows to the Gulf of Mexico.

(3) **MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.**—The term “middle Mississippi River” means the portion of the Mississippi River that begins at the confluence of the Missouri River and flows to the lower Mississippi River.

(4) **SEVERE FLOODING AND DROUGHT.**—The term “severe flooding and drought” means severe weather events that threaten personal safety, property, and navigation on the inland waterways of the United States.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out a study of the greater Mississippi River Basin—

(1) to improve the coordinated and comprehensive management of water resource projects in the greater Mississippi River Basin relating to severe flooding and drought conditions; and

(2) to evaluate the feasibility of any modifications to those water resource projects, consistent with the authorized purposes of those projects, and develop new water resource projects to improve the reliability of navigation and more effectively reduce flood risk.

(c) **CONTENTS.**—The study shall—

(1) identify any Federal actions that are likely to prevent and mitigate the impacts of severe flooding and drought, including changes to authorized channel dimensions, operational procedures of locks and dams, and reservoir management within the greater Mississippi River Basin, consistent with the authorized purposes of the water resource projects;

(2) identify and make recommendations to remedy challenges to the Corps of Engineers presented by severe flooding and drought, including river access, in carrying out its mission to maintain safe, reliable navigation, consistent with the authorized purposes of the water resource projects in the greater Mississippi River Basin; and

(3) identify and locate natural or other physical impediments along the middle and

lower Mississippi River to maintaining navigation on the middle and lower Mississippi River during periods of low water.

(d) **CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.**—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with appropriate committees of Congress, Federal, State, tribal, and local agencies, environmental interests, agricultural interests, recreational interests, river navigation industry representatives, other shipping and business interests, organized labor, and nongovernmental organizations;

(2) to the maximum extent practicable, use data in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(3) incorporate lessons learned and best practices developed as a result of past severe flooding and drought events, including major floods and the successful effort to maintain navigation during the near historic low water levels on the Mississippi River during the winter of 2012–2013.

(e) **COST-SHARING.**—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out the study under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) **REPORT.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study carried out under this section.

(g) **SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Nothing in this section impacts the operations and maintenance of the Missouri River Mainstem System, as authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 897, chapter 665).

SEC. 5024. CAPE ARUNDEL DISPOSAL SITE, MAINE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in concurrence with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, is authorized to reopen the Cape Arundel Disposal Site selected by the Department of the Army as an alternative dredged material disposal site under section 103(b) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1413(b)) (referred to in this section as the “Site”).

(b) **DEADLINE.**—The Site may remain open under subsection (a) until the earlier of—

(1) the date on which the Site does not have any remaining disposal capacity;

(2) the date on which an environmental impact statement designating an alternative dredged material disposal site for southern Maine has been completed; or

(3) the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—The use of the Site as a dredged material disposal site under subsection (a) shall be subject to the conditions that—

(1) conditions at the Site remain suitable for the continued use of the Site as a dredged material disposal site; and

(2) the Site not be used for the disposal of more than 80,000 cubic yards from any single dredging project.

TITLE VI—LEEVE SAFETY

SEC. 6001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “National Levee Safety Program Act”.

SEC. 6002. FINDINGS; PURPOSES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) there is a need to establish a national levee safety program to provide national leadership and encourage the establishment of State and tribal levee safety programs;

(2) according to the National Committee on Levee Safety, “the level of protection and robustness of design and construction of levees vary considerably across the country”;

(3) knowing the location, condition, and ownership of levees, as well as understanding

the population and infrastructure at risk in leveed areas, is necessary for identification and prioritization of activities associated with levees;

(4) levees are an important tool for reducing flood risk and should be considered in the context of broader flood risk management efforts;

(5) States and Indian tribes—

(A) are uniquely positioned to oversee, coordinate, and regulate local and regional levee systems; and

(B) should be encouraged to participate in a national levee safety program by establishing individual levee safety programs; and

(6) States, Indian tribes, and local governments that do not invest in protecting the individuals and property located behind levees place those individuals and property at risk.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this title are—

(1) to promote sound technical practices in levee design, construction, operation, inspection, assessment, security, and maintenance;

(2) to ensure effective public education and awareness of risks involving levees;

(3) to establish and maintain a national levee safety program that emphasizes the protection of human life and property; and

(4) to implement solutions and incentives that encourage the establishment of effective State and tribal levee safety programs.

SEC. 6003. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **BOARD.**—The term “Board” means the National Levee Safety Advisory Board established under section 6005.

(2) **CANAL STRUCTURE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “canal structure” means an embankment, wall, or structure along a canal or manmade watercourse that—

(i) constrains water flows;

(ii) is subject to frequent water loading; and

(iii) is an integral part of a flood risk reduction system that protects the leveed area from flood waters associated with hurricanes, precipitation events, seasonal high water, and other weather-related events.

(B) **EXCLUSION.**—The term “canal structure” does not include a barrier across a watercourse.

(3) **FEDERAL AGENCY.**—The term “Federal agency” means a Federal agency that designs, finances, constructs, owns, operates, maintains, or regulates the construction, operation, or maintenance of a levee.

(4) **FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION SYSTEM.**—The term “flood damage reduction system” means a system designed and constructed to have appreciable and dependable effects in reducing damage by floodwaters.

(5) **FLOOD MITIGATION.**—The term “flood mitigation” means any structural or non-structural measure that reduces risks of flood damage by reducing the probability of flooding, the consequences of flooding, or both.

(6) **FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT.**—The term “floodplain management” means the operation of a community program of corrective and preventative measures for reducing flood damage.

(7) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(8) **LEEVE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “levee” means a manmade barrier (such as an embankment, floodwall, or other structure)—

(i) the primary purpose of which is to provide hurricane, storm, or flood protection re-

lating to seasonal high water, storm surges, precipitation, or other weather events; and
(ii) that is normally subject to water loading for only a few days or weeks during a calendar year.

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term “levee” includes a levee system, including—

(i) levees and canal structures that—

(I) constrain water flows;

(II) are subject to more frequent water loading; and

(III) do not constitute a barrier across a watercourse; and

(ii) roadway and railroad embankments, but only to the extent that the embankments are integral to the performance of a flood damage reduction system.

(C) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term “levee” does not include—

(i) a roadway or railroad embankment that is not integral to the performance of a flood damage reduction system;

(ii) a canal constructed completely within natural ground without any manmade structure (such as an embankment or retaining wall to retain water or a case in which water is retained only by natural ground);

(iii) a canal regulated by a Federal or State agency in a manner that ensures that applicable Federal safety criteria are met;

(iv) a levee or canal structure—

(I) that is not a part of a Federal flood damage reduction system;

(II) that is not recognized under the National Flood Insurance Program as providing protection from the 1-percent-annual-chance or greater flood;

(III) that is not greater than 3 feet high;

(IV) the population in the leveed area of which is less than 50 individuals; and

(V) the leveed area of which is less than 1,000 acres; or

(v) any shoreline protection or river bank protection system (such as revetments or barrier islands).

(9) **LEEVE FEATURE.**—The term “levee feature” means a structure that is critical to the functioning of a levee, including—

(A) an embankment section;

(B) a floodwall section;

(C) a closure structure;

(D) a pumping station;

(E) an interior drainage work; and

(F) a flood damage reduction channel.

(10) **LEEVE SAFETY GUIDELINES.**—The term “levee safety guidelines” means the guidelines established by the Secretary under section 6004(c)(1).

(11) **LEEVE SEGMENT.**—The term “levee segment” means a discrete portion of a levee system that is owned, operated, and maintained by a single entity or discrete set of entities.

(12) **LEEVE SYSTEM.**—The term “levee system” means 1 or more levee segments, including all levee features that are interconnected and necessary to ensure protection of the associated leveed areas—

(A) that collectively provide flood damage reduction to a defined area; and

(B) the failure of 1 of which may result in the failure of the entire system.

(13) **LEEVED AREA.**—The term “leveed area” means the land from which flood water in the adjacent watercourse is excluded by the levee system.

(14) **NATIONAL LEEVE DATABASE.**—The term “national levee database” means the levee database established under section 9004 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303).

(15) **PARTICIPATING PROGRAM.**—The term “participating program” means a levee safety program developed by a State or Indian

tribe that includes the minimum components necessary for recognition by the Secretary.

(16) **REHABILITATION.**—The term “rehabilitation” means the repair, replacement, reconstruction, removal of a levee, or reconfiguration of a levee system, including a setback levee, that is carried out to reduce flood risk or meet national levee safety guidelines.

(17) **RISK.**—The term “risk” means a measure of the probability and severity of undesirable consequences.

(18) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers.

(19) **STATE.**—The term “State” means—

(A) each of the several States of the United States;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

(D) Guam;

(E) American Samoa;

(F) the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;

(G) the Federated States of Micronesia;

(H) the Republic of the Marshall Islands;

(I) the Republic of Palau; and

(J) the United States Virgin Islands.

SEC. 6004. NATIONAL LEEVE SAFETY PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, shall establish a national levee safety program to provide national leadership and consistent approaches to levee safety, including—

(1) a national levee database;

(2) an inventory and inspection of Federal and non-Federal levees;

(3) national levee safety guidelines;

(4) a hazard potential classification system for Federal and non-Federal levees;

(5) research and development;

(6) a national public education and awareness program, with an emphasis on communication regarding the residual risk to communities protected by levees and levee systems;

(7) coordination of levee safety, floodplain management, and environmental protection activities;

(8) development of State and tribal levee safety programs; and

(9) the provision of technical assistance and materials to States and Indian tribes relating to—

(A) developing levee safety programs;

(B) identifying and reducing flood risks associated with residual risk to communities protected by levees and levee systems;

(C) identifying local actions that may be carried out to reduce flood risks in leveed areas; and

(D) rehabilitating, improving, replacing, reconfiguring, modifying, and removing levees and levee systems.

(b) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall appoint—

(A) an administrator of the national levee safety program; and

(B) such staff as is necessary to implement the program.

(2) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The sole duty of the administrator appointed under paragraph (1)(A) shall be the management of the national levee safety program.

(c) **LEEVE SAFETY GUIDELINES.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and in coordination with State

and local governments and organizations with expertise in levee safety, shall establish a set of voluntary, comprehensive, national levee safety guidelines that—

(A) are available for common, uniform use by all Federal, State, tribal, and local agencies;

(B) incorporate policies, procedures, standards, and criteria for a range of levee types, canal structures, and related facilities and features; and

(C) provide for adaptation to local, regional, or watershed conditions.

(2) **REQUIREMENT.**—The policies, procedures, standards, and criteria under paragraph (1)(B) shall be developed taking into consideration the levee hazard potential classification system established under subsection (d).

(3) **ADOPTION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—All Federal agencies shall consider the levee safety guidelines in activities relating to the management of levees.

(4) **PUBLIC COMMENT.**—Prior to finalizing the guidelines under this subsection, the Secretary shall—

(A) issue draft guidelines for public comment; and

(B) consider any comments received in the development of final guidelines.

(d) **HAZARD POTENTIAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary shall establish a hazard potential classification system for use under the national levee safety program and participating programs.

(2) **REVISION.**—The Secretary shall review and, as necessary, revise the hazard potential classification system not less frequently than once every 5 years.

(3) **CONSISTENCY.**—The hazard potential classification system established pursuant to this subsection shall be consistent with and incorporated into the levee safety action classification tool developed by the Corps of Engineers.

(e) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND MATERIALS.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and in coordination with the Board, shall establish a national levee safety technical assistance and training program to develop and deliver technical support and technical assistance materials, curricula, and training in order to promote levee safety and assist States, communities, and levee owners in—

(A) developing levee safety programs;

(B) identifying and reducing flood risks associated with levees;

(C) identifying local actions that may be carried out to reduce flood risks in leveed areas; and

(D) rehabilitating, improving, replacing, reconfiguring, modifying, and removing levees and levee systems.

(2) **USE OF SERVICES.**—In establishing the national levee safety training program under paragraph (1), the Secretary may use the services of—

(A) the Corps of Engineers;

(B) the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(C) the Bureau of Reclamation; and

(D) other appropriate Federal agencies, as determined by the Secretary.

(f) **COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL PUBLIC EDUCATION AND AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Board, shall establish a national public education and awareness campaign relating to the national levee safety program.

(2) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the campaign under paragraph (1) are—

(A) to educate individuals living in leveed areas regarding the risks of living in those areas;

(B) to promote consistency in the transmission of information regarding levees among government agencies; and

(C) to provide national leadership regarding risk communication for implementation at the State and local levels.

(g) **COORDINATION OF LEEVE SAFETY, FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT, AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and in coordination with the Board, shall evaluate opportunities to coordinate—

(1) public safety, floodplain management, and environmental protection activities relating to levees; and

(2) environmental permitting processes for operation and maintenance activities at existing levee projects in compliance with all applicable laws.

(h) **LEEVE INSPECTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out a one-time inventory and inspection of all levees identified in the national levee database.

(2) **NO FEDERAL INTEREST.**—The inventory and inspection under paragraph (1) does not create a Federal interest in the construction, operation, or maintenance any levee that is included in the inventory or inspected under this subsection.

(3) **INSPECTION CRITERIA.**—In carrying out the inventory and inspection, the Secretary shall use the levee safety action classification criteria to determine whether a levee should be classified in the inventory as requiring a more comprehensive inspection.

(4) **STATE AND TRIBAL PARTICIPATION.**—At the request of a State or Indian tribe with respect to any levee subject to inspection under this subsection, the Secretary shall—

(A) allow an official of the State or Indian tribe to participate in the inspection of the levee; and

(B) provide information to the State or Indian tribe relating to the location, construction, operation, or maintenance of the levee.

(5) **EXCEPTIONS.**—In carrying out the inventory and inspection under this subsection, the Secretary shall not be required to inspect any levee that has been inspected by a State or Indian tribe using the same methodology described in paragraph (3) during the 1-year period immediately preceding the date of enactment of this Act if the Governor of the State or tribal government, as applicable, requests an exemption from the inspection.

(i) **STATE AND TRIBAL LEEVE SAFETY PROGRAM.**—

(1) **GUIDELINES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and in coordination with the Board, the Secretary shall issue guidelines that establish the minimum components necessary for recognition of a State or tribal levee safety program as a participating program.

(B) **GUIDELINE CONTENTS.**—The guidelines under subparagraph (A) shall include provisions and procedures requiring each participating State and Indian tribe to certify to the Secretary that the State or Indian tribe, as applicable—

(i) has the authority to participate in the national levee safety program;

(ii) can receive funds under this title;

(iii) has adopted any national levee safety guidelines developed under this title;

(iv) will carry out levee inspections;

(v) will carry out, consistent with applicable requirements, flood risk management and any emergency action planning procedures the Secretary determines to be necessary relating to levees;

(vi) will carry out public education and awareness activities consistent with the national public education and awareness campaign established under subsection (f); and

(vii) will collect and share information regarding the location and condition of levees.

(C) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Prior to finalizing the guidelines under this paragraph, the Secretary shall—

(i) issue draft guidelines for public comment; and

(ii) consider any comments received in the development of final guidelines.

(2) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a program under which the Secretary shall provide grants to assist States and Indian tribes in establishing participating programs, conducting levee inventories, and carrying out this title.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to receive grants under this section, a State or Indian tribe shall—

(i) meet the requirements of a participating program established by the guidelines issued under paragraph (1);

(ii) use not less than 25 percent of any amounts received to identify and assess non-Federal levees within the State or on land of the Indian tribe;

(iii) submit to the Secretary any information collected by the State or Indian tribe in carrying out this subsection for inclusion in the national levee safety database; and

(iv) identify actions to address hazard mitigation activities associated with levees and leveed areas identified in the hazard mitigation plan of the State approved by the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

(C) MEASURES TO ASSESS EFFECTIVENESS.—Not later than 1 year after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall implement quantifiable performance measures and metrics to assess the effectiveness of the grant program established in accordance with subparagraph (A).

(j) LEVEE REHABILITATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, shall establish a program under which the Secretary shall provide assistance to States, Indian tribes, and local governments in addressing flood mitigation activities that result in an overall reduction in flood risk.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to receive assistance under this subsection, a State, Indian tribe, or local government shall—

(A) participate in, and comply with, all applicable Federal floodplain management and flood insurance programs;

(B) have in place a hazard mitigation plan that—

(i) includes all levee risks; and

(ii) complies with the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-390; 114 Stat. 1552);

(C) submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require; and

(D) comply with such minimum eligibility requirements as the Secretary, in consultation with the Board, may establish to ensure that each owner and operator of a levee under a participating State or tribal levee safety program—

(i) acts in accordance with the guidelines developed in subsection (c); and

(ii) carries out activities relating to the public in the leveed area in accordance with the hazard mitigation plan described in subparagraph (B).

(3) FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT PLANS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of execution of a project agreement for assistance under this subsection, a State, Indian tribe, or local government shall prepare a floodplain management plan in accordance with the guidelines under subparagraph (D) to reduce the impacts of future flood events in each applicable leveed area.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—A plan under subparagraph (A) shall address potential measures, practices, and policies to reduce loss of life, injuries, damage to property and facilities, public expenditures, and other adverse impacts of flooding in each applicable leveed area.

(C) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of completion of construction of the applicable project, a floodplain management plan prepared under subparagraph (A) shall be implemented.

(D) GUIDELINES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, shall develop such guidelines for the preparation of floodplain management plans prepared under this paragraph as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(E) TECHNICAL SUPPORT.—The Secretary may provide technical support for the development and implementation of floodplain management plans prepared under this paragraph.

(4) USE OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Assistance provided under this subsection may be used—

(i) for any rehabilitation activity to maximize overall risk reduction associated with a levee under a participating State or tribal levee safety program; and

(ii) only for a levee that is not federally operated and maintained.

(B) PROHIBITION.—Assistance provided under this subsection shall not be used—

(i) to perform routine operation or maintenance for a levee; or

(ii) to make any modification to a levee that does not result in an improvement to public safety.

(5) NO PROPRIETARY INTEREST.—A contract for assistance provided under this subsection shall not be considered to confer any proprietary interest on the United States.

(6) COST-SHARE.—The maximum Federal share of the cost of any assistance provided under this subsection shall be 65 percent.

(7) PROJECT LIMIT.—The maximum amount of Federal assistance for a project under this subsection shall be \$10,000,000.

(8) OTHER LAWS.—Assistance provided under this subsection shall be subject to all applicable laws (including regulations) that apply to the construction of a civil works project of the Corps of Engineers.

(K) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section—

(1) affects the requirement under section 100226(b)(2) of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (42 U.S.C. 4101 note; 126 Stat. 942); or

(2) confers any regulatory authority on—

(A) the Secretary; or

(B) the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, including for the purpose of setting premium rates under the national flood insurance program established under chapter 1 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011 et seq.).

SEC. 6005. NATIONAL LEVEE SAFETY ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, shall establish a board, to be known as the “National Levee Safety Advisory Board”—

(1) to advise the Secretary and Congress regarding consistent approaches to levee safety;

(2) to monitor the safety of levees in the United States;

(3) to assess the effectiveness of the national levee safety program; and

(4) to ensure that the national levee safety program is carried out in a manner that is consistent with other Federal flood risk management efforts.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) VOTING MEMBERS.—The Board shall be composed of the following 14 voting members, each of whom shall be appointed by the Secretary, with priority consideration given to representatives from those States that have the most Corps of Engineers levees in the State, based on mileage:

(A) 8 representatives of State levee safety programs, 1 from each of the civil works divisions of the Corps of Engineers.

(B) 2 representatives of the private sector who have expertise in levee safety.

(C) 2 representatives of local and regional governmental agencies who have expertise in levee safety.

(D) 2 representatives of Indian tribes who have expertise in levee safety.

(2) NONVOTING MEMBERS.—The Secretary (or a designee of the Secretary), the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (or a designee of the Administrator), and the administrator of the national levee safety program appointed under section 6004(b)(1)(A) shall serve as nonvoting members of the Board.

(3) CHAIRPERSON.—The voting members of the Board shall appoint a chairperson from among the voting members of the Board, to serve a term of not more than 2 years.

(c) QUALIFICATIONS.—

(1) INDIVIDUALS.—Each voting member of the Board shall be knowledgeable in the field of levee safety, including water resources and flood risk management.

(2) AS A WHOLE.—The membership of the Board, considered as a whole, shall represent the diversity of skills required to advise the Secretary regarding levee issues relating to—

(A) engineering;

(B) public communications;

(C) program development and oversight;

(D) with respect to levees, flood risk management and hazard mitigation; and

(E) public safety and the environment.

(d) TERMS OF SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A voting member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of 3 years, except that, of the members first appointed—

(A) 5 shall be appointed for a term of 1 year;

(B) 5 shall be appointed for a term of 2 years; and

(C) 4 shall be appointed for a term of 3 years.

(2) REAPPOINTMENT.—A voting member of the Board may be reappointed to the Board,

as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(3) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(e) STANDING COMMITTEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall be supported by Standing Committees, which shall be comprised of volunteers from all levels of government and the private sector, to advise the Board regarding the national levee safety program.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Standing Committees of the Board shall include—

(A) the Standing Committee on Participating Programs, which shall advise the Board regarding—

(i) the development and implementation of State and tribal levee safety programs; and

(ii) appropriate incentives (including financial assistance) to be provided to States, Indian tribes, and local and regional entities;

(B) the Standing Committee on Technical Issues, which shall advise the Board regarding—

(i) the management of the national levee database;

(ii) the development and maintenance of levee safety guidelines;

(iii) processes and materials for developing levee-related technical assistance and training; and

(iv) research and development activities relating to levee safety;

(C) the Standing Committee on Public Education and Awareness, which shall advise the Board regarding the development, implementation, and evaluation of targeted public outreach programs—

(i) to gather public input;

(ii) to educate and raise awareness in leveed areas of levee risks;

(iii) to communicate information regarding participating programs; and

(iv) to track the effectiveness of public education efforts relating to levee risks;

(D) the Standing Committee on Safety and Environment, which shall advise the Board regarding—

(i) operation and maintenance activities for existing levee projects;

(ii) opportunities to coordinate public safety, floodplain management, and environmental protection activities relating to levees;

(iii) opportunities to coordinate environmental permitting processes for operation and maintenance activities at existing levee projects in compliance with all applicable laws; and

(iv) opportunities for collaboration by environmental protection and public safety interests in leveed areas and adjacent areas; and

(E) such other standing committees as the Secretary, in consultation with the Board, determines to be necessary.

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall recommend to the Secretary for approval individuals for membership on the Standing Committees.

(B) QUALIFICATIONS.—

(i) INDIVIDUALS.—Each member of a Standing Committee shall be knowledgeable in the issue areas for which the Committee is charged with advising the Board.

(ii) AS A WHOLE.—The membership of each Standing Committee, considered as a whole, shall represent, to the maximum extent practicable, broad geographical diversity.

(C) LIMITATION.—Each Standing Committee shall be comprised of not more than 10 members.

(f) DUTIES AND POWERS.—The Board—

(1) shall submit to the Secretary and Congress an annual report regarding the effectiveness of the national levee safety program in accordance with section 6007; and

(2) may secure from other Federal agencies such services, and enter into such contracts, as the Board determines to be necessary to carry out this subsection.

(g) TASK FORCE COORDINATION.—The Board shall, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate the activities of the Board with the Federal Interagency Floodplain Management Task Force.

(h) COMPENSATION.—

(1) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Each member of the Board who is an officer or employee of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to compensation received for the services of the member as an officer or employee of the United States, but shall be allowed a per diem allowance for travel expenses, at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of the duties of the Board.

(2) NON-FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—To the extent amounts are made available to carry out this section in appropriations Acts, the Secretary shall provide to each member of the Board who is not an officer or employee of the United States a stipend and a per diem allowance for travel expenses, at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in performance of services for the Board.

(3) STANDING COMMITTEE MEMBERS.—Each member of a Standing Committee shall—

(A) serve in a voluntary capacity; but

(B) receive a per diem allowance for travel expenses, at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in performance of services for the Board.

(i) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACAA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Board or the Standing Committees.

SEC. 6006. INVENTORY AND INSPECTION OF LEVEES.

Section 9004(a)(2)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “and, for non-Federal levees, such information on levee location as is provided to the Secretary by State and local governmental agencies” and inserting “and updated levee information provided by States, Indian tribes, Federal agencies, and other entities”.

SEC. 6007. REPORTS.

(a) STATE OF LEVEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary in coordination with the Board, shall submit to Congress a report describing the state of levees in the United States and the effectiveness of the national levee safety program, including—

(A) progress achieved in implementing the national levee safety program;

(B) State and tribal participation in the national levee safety program;

(C) recommendations to improve coordination of levee safety, floodplain management, and environmental protection concerns, including—

(i) identifying and evaluating opportunities to coordinate public safety, floodplain

management, and environmental protection activities relating to levees; and

(ii) evaluating opportunities to coordinate environmental permitting processes for operation and maintenance activities at existing levee projects in compliance with all applicable laws; and

(D) any recommendations for legislation and other congressional actions necessary to ensure national levee safety.

(2) INCLUSION.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include a report of the Board that describes the independent recommendations of the Board for the implementation of the national levee safety program.

(b) NATIONAL DAM AND LEVEE SAFETY PROGRAM.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, to the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary, in coordination with the Board, shall submit to Congress a report that includes recommendations regarding the advisability and feasibility of, and potential approaches for, establishing a joint national dam and levee safety program.

(c) ALIGNMENT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS RELATING TO LEVEES.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on opportunities for alignment of Federal programs to provide incentives to State, tribal, and local governments and individuals and entities—

(1) to promote shared responsibility for levee safety;

(2) to encourage the development of strong State and tribal levee safety programs;

(3) to better align the national levee safety program with other Federal flood risk management programs; and

(4) to promote increased levee safety through other Federal programs providing assistance to State and local governments.

(d) LIABILITY FOR CERTAIN LEVEE ENGINEERING PROJECTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that includes recommendations that identify and address any legal liability associated with levee engineering projects that prevent—

(1) levee owners from obtaining needed levee engineering services; or

(2) development and implementation of a State or tribal levee safety program.

SEC. 6008. EFFECT OF TITLE.

Nothing in this title—

(1) establishes any liability of the United States or any officer or employee of the United States (including the Board and the Standing Committees of the Board) for any damages caused by any action or failure to act; or

(2) relieves an owner or operator of a levee of any legal duty, obligation, or liability incident to the ownership or operation of the levee.

SEC. 6009. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title—

(1) for funding the administration and staff of the national levee safety program, the Board, the Standing Committees of the Board, and participating programs, \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2023;

(2) for technical programs, including the development of levee safety guidelines, publications, training, and technical assistance—

(A) \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018;

(B) \$7,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 and 2020; and

(C) \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2023;

(3) for public involvement and education programs, \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2023;

(4) to carry out the levee inventory and inspections under section 9004 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303), \$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018;

(5) for grants to State and tribal levee safety programs, \$300,000,000 for fiscal years 2014 through 2023; and

(6) for levee rehabilitation assistance grants, \$300,000,000 for fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

TITLE VII—INLAND WATERWAYS

SEC. 7001. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are—

(1) to improve program and project management relating to the construction and major rehabilitation of navigation projects on inland waterways;

(2) to optimize inland waterways navigation system reliability;

(3) to minimize the size and scope of inland waterways navigation project completion schedules;

(4) to eliminate preventable delays in inland waterways navigation project completion schedules; and

(5) to make inland waterways navigation capital investments through the use of prioritization criteria that seek to maximize systemwide benefits and minimize overall system risk.

SEC. 7002. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND.**—The term “Inland Waterways Trust Fund” means the Inland Waterways Trust Fund established by section 9506(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) **QUALIFYING PROJECT.**—The term “qualifying project” means any construction or major rehabilitation project for navigation infrastructure of the inland and intracoastal waterways that is—

(A) authorized before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) not completed on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(C) funded at least in part from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 7003. PROJECT DELIVERY PROCESS REFORMS.

(a) **REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFYING PROJECTS.**—With respect to each qualifying project, the Secretary shall require—

(1) formal project management training and certification for each project manager;

(2) assignment as project manager only of personnel fully certified by the Chief of Engineers; and

(3) for an applicable cost estimation, that—

(A) the estimation—

(i) is risk-based; and

(ii) has a confidence level of at least 80 percent; and

(B) a risk-based cost estimate shall be implemented—

(i) for a qualified project that requires an increase in the authorized amount in accordance with section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4183), during the preparation of a post-authorization change report or other similar decision document;

(ii) for a qualified project for which the first construction contract has not been awarded, prior to the award of the first construction contract;

(iii) for a qualified project without a completed Chief of Engineers report, prior to the completion of such a report; and

(iv) for a qualified project with a completed Chief of Engineers report that has not yet been authorized, during design for the qualified project.

(b) **ADDITIONAL PROJECT DELIVERY PROCESS REFORMS.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) establish a system to identify and apply on a continuing basis lessons learned from prior or ongoing qualifying projects to improve the likelihood of on-time and on-budget completion of qualifying projects;

(2) evaluate early contractor involvement acquisition procedures to improve on-time and on-budget project delivery performance; and

(3) implement any additional measures that the Secretary determines will achieve the purposes of this title and the amendments made by this title, including, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate—

(A) the implementation of applicable practices and procedures developed pursuant to management by the Secretary of an applicable military construction program;

(B) the establishment of 1 or more centers of expertise for the design and review of qualifying projects;

(C) the development and use of a portfolio of standard designs for inland navigation locks;

(D) the use of full-funding contracts or formulation of a revised continuing contracts clause; and

(E) the establishment of procedures for recommending new project construction starts using a capital projects business model.

(c) **PILOT PROJECTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may carry out 1 or more pilot projects to evaluate processes or procedures for the study, design, or construction of qualifying projects.

(2) **INCLUSIONS.**—At a minimum, the Secretary shall carry out pilot projects under this subsection to evaluate—

(A) early contractor involvement in the development of features and components;

(B) an appropriate use of continuing contracts for the construction of features and components; and

(C) applicable principles, procedures, and processes used for military construction projects.

(d) **INLAND WATERWAYS USER BOARD.**—Section 302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2251) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) **DUTIES OF USERS BOARD.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Users Board shall meet not less frequently than semiannually to develop and make recommendations to the Secretary and Congress regarding the inland waterways and inland harbors of the United States.

“(2) **ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS.**—For commercial navigation features and components of the inland waterways and inland harbors of the United States, the Users Board shall provide—

“(A) prior to the development of the budget proposal of the President for a given fiscal year, advice and recommendations to the Secretary regarding construction and rehabilitation priorities and spending levels;

“(B) advice and recommendations to Congress regarding any report of the Chief of Engineers relating to those features and components;

“(C) advice and recommendations to Congress regarding an increase in the authorized cost of those features and components;

“(D) not later than 60 days after the date of the submission of the budget proposal of the President to Congress, advice and recommendations to Congress regarding construction and rehabilitation priorities and spending levels; and

“(E) a long-term capital investment program in accordance with subsection (d).

“(3) **PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAMS.**—The chairperson of the Users Board shall appoint a representative of the Users Board to serve on the project development team for a qualifying project or the study or design of a commercial navigation feature or component of the inland waterways and inland harbors of the United States.

“(4) **INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT.**—Any advice or recommendation made by the Users Board to the Secretary shall reflect the independent judgment of the Users Board.”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (f); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **DUTIES OF SECRETARY.**—The Secretary shall—

“(1) communicate not less than once each quarter to the Users Board the status of the study, design, or construction of all commercial navigation features or components of the inland waterways or inland harbors of the United States; and

“(2) submit to the Users Board a courtesy copy of all reports of the Chief of Engineers relating to a commercial navigation feature or component of the inland waterways or inland harbors of the United States.

“(d) **CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary, in coordination with the Users Board, shall develop, and submit to Congress a report describing, a 20-year program for making capital investments on the inland and intracoastal waterways, based on the application of objective, national project selection prioritization criteria.

“(2) **CONSIDERATION.**—In developing the program under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall take into consideration the 20-year capital investment strategy contained in the Inland Marine Transportation System (IMTS) Capital Projects Business Model, Final Report published on April 13, 2010, as approved by the Users Board.

“(3) **CRITERIA.**—In developing the plan and prioritization criteria under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that investments made under the 20-year program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) are made in all geographical areas of the inland waterways system; and

“(B) ensure efficient funding of inland waterways projects.

“(4) **STRATEGIC REVIEW AND UPDATE.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and not less frequently than once every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary, in conjunction with the Users Board, shall—

“(A) submit to Congress a strategic review of the 20-year program in effect under this subsection, which shall identify and explain any changes to the project-specific recommendations contained in the previous 20-year program (including any changes to the prioritization criteria used to develop the updated recommendations); and

“(B) make such revisions to the program as the Secretary and Users Board jointly consider to be appropriate.

“(e) PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLANS.—The chairperson of the Users Board and the project development team member appointed by the chairperson under subsection (b)(3) shall sign the project management plan for the qualifying project or the study or design of a commercial navigation feature or component of the inland waterways and inland harbors of the United States.”.

SEC. 7004. MAJOR REHABILITATION STANDARDS.

Section 205(1)(E)(ii) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2327(1)(E)(ii)) is amended by striking “\$8,000,000” and inserting “\$20,000,000”.

SEC. 7005. INLAND WATERWAYS SYSTEM REVENUES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) there are approximately 12,000 miles of Federal waterways, known as the inland waterways system, that are supported by user fees and managed by the Corps of Engineers;

(2) the inland waterways system spans 38 States and handles approximately one-half of all inland waterway freight;

(3) according to the final report of the Inland Marine Transportation System Capital Projects Business Model, freight traffic on the Federal fuel-taxed inland waterways system accounts for 546,000,000 tons of freight each year;

(4) expenditures for construction and major rehabilitation projects on the inland waterways system are equally cost-shared between the Federal Government and the Inland Waterways Trust Fund;

(5) the Inland Waterways Trust Fund is financed through a fee of \$0.20 per gallon on fuel used by commercial barges;

(6) the balance of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund has declined significantly in recent years;

(7) according to the final report of the Inland Marine Transportation System Capital Projects Business Model, the estimated financial need for construction and major rehabilitation projects on the inland waterways system for fiscal years 2011 through 2030 is approximately \$18,000,000,000; and

(8) users of the inland waterways system are supportive of an increase in the existing revenue sources for inland waterways system construction and major rehabilitation activities to expedite the most critical of those construction and major rehabilitation projects.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the existing revenue sources for inland waterways system construction and rehabilitation activities are insufficient to cover the costs of non-Federal interests of construction and major rehabilitation projects on the inland waterways system; and

(2) the issue described in paragraph (1) should be addressed.

SEC. 7006. EFFICIENCY OF REVENUE COLLECTION.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall prepare a report on the efficiency of collecting the fuel tax for the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, which shall include—

(1) an evaluation of whether current methods of collection of the fuel tax result in full compliance with requirements of the law;

(2) whether alternative methods of collection would result in increased revenues into the Inland Waterways Trust Fund; and

(3) an evaluation of alternative collection options.

SEC. 7007. GAO STUDY, OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, LOWER OHIO RIVER, ILLINOIS AND KENTUCKY.

As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General

of the United States shall conduct, and submit to Congress a report describing the results of, a study to determine why, and to what extent, the project for navigation, Lower Ohio River, Locks and Dams 52 and 53, Illinois and Kentucky (commonly known as the “Olmsted Locks and Dam project”), authorized by section 3(a)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013), has exceeded the budget for the project and the reasons why the project failed to be completed as scheduled, including an assessment of—

(1) engineering methods used for the project;

(2) the management of the project;

(3) contracting for the project;

(4) the cost to the United States of benefits foregone due to project delays; and

(5) such other contributory factors as the Comptroller General determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 7008. OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, LOWER OHIO RIVER, ILLINOIS AND KENTUCKY.

Section 3(a)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013) is amended by striking “and with the costs of construction” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “which amounts remaining after the date of enactment of this Act shall be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury.”.

TITLE VIII—HARBOR MAINTENANCE

SEC. 8001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund Act of 2013”.

SEC. 8002. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are—

(1) to ensure that revenues collected into the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are used for the intended purposes of those revenues;

(2) to increase investment in the operation and maintenance of United States ports, which are critical for the economic competitiveness of the United States;

(3) to promote equity among ports nationwide;

(4) to ensure United States ports are prepared to meet modern shipping needs, including the capability to receive large ships that require deeper drafts; and

(5) to prevent cargo diversion from United States ports.

SEC. 8003. FUNDING FOR HARBOR MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) TOTAL BUDGET RESOURCES.—The term “total budget resources” means the total amount made available by appropriations Acts from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for a fiscal year for making expenditures under section 9505(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) LEVEL OF RECEIPTS PLUS INTEREST.—The term “level of receipts plus interest” means the level of taxes and interest credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund under section 9505 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for a fiscal year as set forth in the President’s budget baseline projection, as determined under section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907) for that fiscal year submitted pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) MINIMUM RESOURCES.—

(1) MINIMUM RESOURCES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The total budget resources made available to the Secretary from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund shall be not less than the lesser of—

(i) (I) for fiscal year 2014, \$1,000,000,000;

(II) for fiscal year 2015, \$1,100,000,000;

(III) for fiscal year 2016, \$1,200,000,000;

(IV) for fiscal year 2017, \$1,300,000,000;

(V) for fiscal year 2018, \$1,400,000,000; and

(VI) for fiscal year 2019, \$1,500,000,000; and

(ii) the level of receipts plus interest credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for that fiscal year.

(B) FISCAL YEAR 2020 AND SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—For fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter, the total budget resources made available to the Secretary from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund shall be not less than the level of receipts plus interest credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for that fiscal year.

(2) USE OF AMOUNTS.—The amounts described in paragraph (1) may be used only for harbor maintenance programs described in section 9505(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) IMPACT ON OTHER FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), subsection (b)(1) shall not apply if providing the minimum resources required under that subsection would result in making the amounts made available for the applicable fiscal year to carry out all programs, projects, and activities of the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers, other than the harbor maintenance programs, to be less than the amounts made available for those purposes in the previous fiscal year.

(2) CALCULATION OF AMOUNTS.—For each fiscal year, the amounts made available to carry out all programs, projects, and activities of the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers shall not include any amounts that are designated by Congress—

(A) as being for emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)(i)); or

(B) as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(D)).

(3) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply if—

(A) amounts made available for the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers for a fiscal year are less than the amounts made available for the civil works program in the previous fiscal year; and

(B) the reduction in amounts made available—

(i) applies to all discretionary funds and programs of the Federal Government; and

(ii) is applied to the civil works program in the same percentage and manner as other discretionary funds and programs.

SEC. 8004. HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND PRIORITIZATION.

(a) POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States that the primary use of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is for maintaining the constructed widths and depths of the commercial ports and harbors of the United States, and those functions should be given first consideration in the budgeting of Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund allocations.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) PRIORITIZATION.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) CONSTRUCTED WIDTH AND DEPTH.—The term ‘constructed width and depth’ means the depth to which a project has been constructed, which shall not exceed the authorized width and depth of the project.

“(B) GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION SYSTEM.—The term ‘Great Lakes Navigation System’ includes—

“(i)(I) Lake Superior;
 “(II) Lake Huron;
 “(III) Lake Michigan;
 “(IV) Lake Erie; and
 “(V) Lake Ontario;

“(ii) all connecting waters between the lakes referred to in clause (i) used for commercial navigation;

“(iii) any navigation features in the lakes referred to in clause (i) or waters described in clause (ii) that are a Federal operation or maintenance responsibility; and

“(iv) areas of the Saint Lawrence River that are operated or maintained by the Federal Government for commercial navigation.

“(C) HIGH-USE DEEP DRAFT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘high-use deep draft’ means a project that has a depth of greater than 14 feet with not less than 10,000,000 tons of cargo annually.

“(ii) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘high-use deep draft’ does not include a project located in the Great Lakes Navigation System.

“(D) LOW-USE PORT.—The term ‘low-use port’ means a port at which not more than 1,000,000 tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

“(E) MODERATE-USE PORT.—The term ‘moderate-use port’ means a port at which more than 1,000,000, but fewer than 10,000,000, tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

“(2) PRIORITY.—Of the amounts made available under this section to carry out projects described in subsection (a)(2) that are in excess of the amounts made available to carry out those projects in fiscal year 2012, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall give priority to those projects in the following order:

“(A)(i) In any fiscal year in which all projects subject to the harbor maintenance fee under section 24.24 of title 19, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) are not maintained to their constructed width and depth, the Secretary shall prioritize amounts made available under this section for those projects that are high-use deep draft and are a priority for navigation in the Great Lakes Navigation System.

“(ii) Of the amounts made available under clause (i)—

“(I) 80 percent shall be used for projects that are high-use deep draft; and

“(II) 20 percent shall be used for projects that are a priority for navigation in the Great Lakes Navigation System.

“(B) In any fiscal year in which all projects identified as high-use deep draft are maintained to their constructed width and depth, the Secretary shall—

“(i) equally divide among each of the districts of the Corps of Engineers in which eligible projects are located 10 percent of remaining amounts made available under this section for moderate-use and low-use port projects—

“(I) that have been maintained at less than their constructed width and depth due to insufficient federal funding during the preceding 6 fiscal years; and

“(II) for which significant State and local investments in infrastructure have been made at those projects during the preceding 6 fiscal years; and

“(ii) prioritize any remaining amounts made available under this section for those projects that are not maintained to the minimum width and depth necessary to provide sufficient clearance for fully loaded commercial vessels using those projects to maneuver safely.

“(3) ADMINISTRATION.—For purposes of this subsection, State and local investments in

infrastructure shall include infrastructure investments made using amounts made available for activities under section 105(a)(9) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(9)).

“(4) EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary may prioritize a project not identified in paragraph (2) if the Secretary determines that funding for the project is necessary to address—

“(A) hazardous navigation conditions; or

“(B) impacts of natural disasters, including storms and droughts.

“(5) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than September 30, 2013, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes, with respect to the preceding fiscal year—

“(A) the amount of funds used to maintain high-use deep draft projects and projects at moderate-use ports and low-use ports to the constructed depth and width of the projects;

“(B) the respective percentage of total funds provided under this section used for high use deep draft projects and projects at moderate-use ports and low-use ports;

“(C) the remaining amount of funds made available to carry out this section, if any; and

“(D) any additional amounts needed to maintain the high-use deep draft projects and projects at moderate-use ports and low-use ports to the constructed depth and width of the projects.”.

(c) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—Section 101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “45 feet” and inserting “50 feet”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES DEFINED.—

“(A) SCOPE OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations and guidelines) and subject to subparagraph (B), for purposes of this subsection, operation and maintenance activities that are eligible for the Federal cost share under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(i) the dredging of berths in a harbor that is accessible to a Federal channel, if the Federal channel has been constructed to a depth equal to the authorized depth of the channel; and

“(ii) the dredging and disposal of legacy-contaminated sediments and sediments unsuitable for ocean disposal that—

“(I) are located in or affect the maintenance of Federal navigation channels; or

“(II) are located in berths that are accessible to Federal channels.

“(B) LIMITATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, subject to section 210(c)(2), subparagraph (A) shall only apply—

“(I) to the amounts made available under section 210 to carry out projects described in subsection (a)(2) of that section that are in excess of the amounts made available to carry out those projects in fiscal year 2012; and

“(II) if, in that fiscal year, all projects identified as high-use deep draft (as defined in section 210(c)) are maintained to their constructed width and depth.

“(ii) STATE LIMITATION.—For each fiscal year, the operation and maintenance activities described in subparagraph (A) may only be carried out in a State—

“(I) in which the total amounts collected pursuant to section 4461 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 comprise not less than 2.5 percent annually of the total funding of the

Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund established under section 9505 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

“(II) that received less than 50 percent of the total amounts collected in that State pursuant to section 4461 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in the previous 3 fiscal years.

“(iii) PRIORITIZATION.—In allocating amounts made available under this paragraph, the Secretary shall give priority to projects that have received the lowest amount of funding from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in comparison to the amount of funding contributed to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in the previous 3 fiscal years.

“(iv) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The total amount made available in each fiscal year to carry out this paragraph shall not exceed the lesser of—

“(I) amount that is equal to 40 percent of the amounts made available under section 210 to carry out projects described in subsection (a)(2) of that section that are in excess of the amounts made available to carry out those projects in fiscal year 2012; and

“(II) the amount that is equal to 20 percent of the amounts made available under section 210 to carry out projects described in subsection (a)(2) of that section.

“(4) DONOR PORTS AND PORTS CONTRIBUTING TO ENERGY PRODUCTION.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) CARGO CONTAINER.—The term ‘cargo container’ means a cargo container that is 1 Twenty-foot Equivalent Unit.

“(ii) ELIGIBLE DONOR PORT.—The term, ‘eligible donor port’ means a port—

“(I) that is subject to the harbor maintenance fee under section 24.24 of title 19, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation);

“(II)(aa) at which the total amounts collected pursuant to section 4461 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 comprise not less than \$15,000,000 annually of the total funding of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund established under section 9505 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

“(bb) that received less than 25 percent of the total amounts collected at that port pursuant to section 4461 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in the previous 5 fiscal years; and

“(III) that is located in a State in which more than 2,000,000 cargo containers were unloaded from or loaded on to vessels in calendar year 2011.

“(iii) ELIGIBLE ENERGY TRANSFER PORT.—The term ‘eligible energy transfer port’ means a port—

“(I) that is subject to the harbor maintenance fee under section 24.24 of title 19, Code of Federal Regulation (or successor regulation); and

“(II)(aa) at which energy commodities comprised greater than 25 percent of all commercial activity by tonnage in calendar year 2011; and

“(bb) through which more than 40 million tons of cargo were transported in calendar year 2011.

“(iv) ENERGY COMMODITY.—The term ‘energy commodity’ includes—

“(I) petroleum products;

“(II) natural gas;

“(III) coal;

“(IV) wind and solar energy components; and

“(V) biofuels.

“(B) ADDITIONAL USES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to appropriations, the Secretary may provide to eligible

donor ports and eligible energy transfer ports amounts in accordance with clause (ii).

“(ii) LIMITATIONS.—The amounts described in clause (i)—

“(I) made available for eligible energy transfer ports shall be divided equally among all States with an eligible energy transfer port; and

“(II) shall be made available only to a port as either an eligible donor port or an eligible energy transfer port.

“(C) USES.—Amounts provided to an eligible port under this paragraph may only be used by that port—

“(i) to provide payments to importers entering cargo or shippers transporting cargo through an eligible donor port or eligible energy transfer port, as calculated by U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

“(ii) to dredge berths in a harbor that is accessible to a Federal channel;

“(iii) to dredge and dispose of legacy-contaminated sediments and sediments unsuitable for ocean disposal that—

“(I) are located in or affect the maintenance of Federal navigation channels; or

“(II) are located in berths that are accessible to Federal channels; or

“(iv) for environmental remediation related to dredging berths and Federal navigation channels.

“(D) ADMINISTRATION OF PAYMENTS.—If an eligible donor port or eligible energy transfer port elects to provide payments to importers or shippers in accordance with subparagraph (C)(i), the Secretary shall transfer the amounts that would be provided to the port under this paragraph to the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to provide the payments to the importers or shippers.

“(E) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal years 2014 through 2024, if the total amounts made available from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund exceed the total amounts made available from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in fiscal year 2012, there is authorized to be appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to carry out this paragraph the sum obtained by adding—

“(I) \$50,000,000; and

“(II) the amount that is equal to 10 percent of the amounts made available under section 210 to carry out projects described in subsection (a)(2) of that section that are in excess of the amounts made available to carry out those projects in fiscal year 2012.

“(ii) DIVISION BETWEEN ELIGIBLE DONOR PORTS AND ELIGIBLE ENERGY TRANSFER PORTS.—For each fiscal year, amounts made available shall be divided equally between eligible donor ports and eligible energy transfer ports.”

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9505(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996” and inserting “as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund Act of 2013”.

SEC. 8005. HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND STUDY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LOW-USE PORT.—The term “low-use port” means a port at which not more than 1,000,000 tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

(2) MODERATE-USE PORT.—The term “moderate-use port” means a port at which more than 1,000,000, but fewer than 10,000,000, tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Com-

troller General of the United States shall carry out a study and submit to Congress a report that—

(1) evaluates the effectiveness of activities funded by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in maximizing economic growth and job creation in the communities surrounding low- and moderate-use ports; and

(2) includes recommendations relating to the use of amounts in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to increase the competitiveness of United States ports relative to Canadian and Mexican ports.

TITLE IX—DAM SAFETY

SEC. 9001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Dam Safety Act of 2013”.

SEC. 9002. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title and the amendments made by this title is to reduce the risks to life and property from dam failure in the United States through the reauthorization of an effective national dam safety program that brings together the expertise and resources of the Federal Government and non-Federal interests in achieving national dam safety hazard reduction.

SEC. 9003. ADMINISTRATOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467 et seq.) is amended by striking “Director” each place it appears and inserting “Administrator”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2 of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(3) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ‘Administrator’ means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.”

SEC. 9004. INSPECTION OF DAMS.

Section 3(b)(1) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467a(b)(1)) is amended by striking “or maintenance” and inserting “maintenance, condition, or provisions for emergency operations”.

SEC. 9005. NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.

(a) OBJECTIVES.—Section 8(c) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) develop and implement a comprehensive dam safety hazard education and public awareness program to assist the public in preparing for, mitigating, responding to, and recovering from dam incidents.”

(b) BOARD.—Section 8(f)(4) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f(f)(4)) is amended by inserting “, representatives from nongovernmental organizations,” after “State agencies”.

SEC. 9006. PUBLIC AWARENESS AND OUTREACH FOR DAM SAFETY.

The National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 11, 12, and 13 as sections 12, 13, and 14, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 10 (33 U.S.C. 467g–1) the following:

“SEC. 11. PUBLIC AWARENESS AND OUTREACH FOR DAM SAFETY.

“The Administrator, in consultation with other Federal agencies, State and local governments, dam owners, the emergency management community, the private sector, nongovernmental organizations and associations, institutions of higher education, and any other appropriate entities shall carry out a nationwide public awareness and outreach program to assist the public in pre-

paring for, mitigating, responding to, and recovering from dam incidents.”

SEC. 9007. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.—

(1) ANNUAL AMOUNTS.—Section 14(a)(1) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467j(a)(1)) (as so redesignated) is amended by striking “\$6,500,000” and all that follows through “2011” and inserting “\$9,200,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018”.

(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF ALLOCATION.—Section 14(a)(2)(B) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467j(a)(2)(B)) (as so redesignated) is amended—

(A) by striking “The amount” and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) FISCAL YEAR 2014 AND SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—For fiscal year 2014 and each subsequent fiscal year, the amount of funds allocated to a State under this paragraph may not exceed the amount of funds committed by the State to implement dam safety activities.”

(b) NATIONAL DAM INVENTORY.—Section 14(b) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467j(b)) (as so redesignated) is amended by striking “\$650,000” and all that follows through “2011” and inserting “\$500,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018”.

(c) PUBLIC AWARENESS.—Section 14 of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467j) (as so redesignated) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (f) as subsections (d) through (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) PUBLIC AWARENESS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 11 \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.”

(d) RESEARCH.—Section 14(d) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (as so redesignated) is amended by striking “\$1,600,000” and all that follows through “2011” and inserting “\$1,450,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018”.

(e) DAM SAFETY TRAINING.—Section 14(e) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (as so redesignated) is amended by striking “\$550,000” and all that follows through “2011” and inserting “\$750,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018”.

(f) STAFF.—Section 14(f) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (as so redesignated) is amended by striking “\$700,000” and all that follows through “2011” and inserting “\$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018”.

TITLE X—INNOVATIVE FINANCING PILOT PROJECTS

SEC. 10001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2013”.

SEC. 10002. PURPOSES.

The purpose of this title is to establish a pilot program to assess the ability of innovative financing tools to—

(1) promote increased development of critical water resources infrastructure by establishing additional opportunities for financing water resources projects that complement but do not replace or reduce existing Federal infrastructure financing tools such as the State water pollution control revolving loan funds established under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.) and the State drinking

water treatment revolving loan funds established under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12);

(2) attract new investment capital to infrastructure projects that are capable of generating revenue streams through user fees or other dedicated funding sources;

(3) complement existing Federal funding sources and address budgetary constraints on the Corps of Engineers civil works program and existing wastewater and drinking water infrastructure financing programs;

(4) leverage private investment in water resources infrastructure;

(5) align investments in water resources infrastructure to achieve multiple benefits; and

(6) assist communities facing significant water quality, drinking water, or flood risk challenges with the development of water infrastructure projects.

SEC. 10003. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) **COMMUNITY WATER SYSTEM.**—The term “community water system” has the meaning given the term in section 1401 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f).

(3) **FEDERAL CREDIT INSTRUMENT.**—The term “Federal credit instrument” means a secured loan or loan guarantee authorized to be made available under this title with respect to a project.

(4) **INVESTMENT-GRADE RATING.**—The term “investment-grade rating” means a rating of BBB minus, Baa3, bbb minus, BBB (low), or higher assigned by a rating agency to project obligations.

(5) **LENDER.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “lender” means any non-Federal qualified institutional buyer (as defined in section 230.144(a) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), known as Rule 144A(a) of the Securities and Exchange Commission and issued under the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.)).

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term “lender” includes—

(i) a qualified retirement plan (as defined in section 4974(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that is a qualified institutional buyer; and

(ii) a governmental plan (as defined in section 414(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that is a qualified institutional buyer.

(6) **LOAN GUARANTEE.**—The term “loan guarantee” means any guarantee or other pledge by the Secretary or the Administrator to pay all or part of the principal of, and interest on, a loan or other debt obligation issued by an obligor and funded by a lender.

(7) **OBLIGOR.**—The term “obligor” means an eligible entity that is primarily liable for payment of the principal of, or interest on, a Federal credit instrument.

(8) **PROJECT OBLIGATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “project obligation” means any note, bond, debenture, or other debt obligation issued by an obligor in connection with the financing of a project.

(B) **EXCLUSION.**—The term “project obligation” does not include a Federal credit instrument.

(9) **RATING AGENCY.**—The term “rating agency” means a credit rating agency registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission as a nationally recognized statistical rating organization (as defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a))).

(10) **RURAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT.**—The term “rural water infrastructure project” means a project that—

(A) is described in section 10007; and

(B) is located in a water system that serves not more than 25,000 individuals.

(11) **SECURED LOAN.**—The term “secured loan” means a direct loan or other debt obligation issued by an obligor and funded by the Secretary in connection with the financing of a project under section 10010.

(12) **STATE.**—The term “State” means—

(A) a State;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(D) any other territory or possession of the United States.

(13) **STATE INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING AUTHORITY.**—The term “State infrastructure financing authority” means the State entity established or designated by the Governor of a State to receive a capitalization grant provided by, or otherwise carry out the requirements of, title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et. seq.) or section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12).

(14) **SUBSIDY AMOUNT.**—The term “subsidy amount” means the amount of budget authority sufficient to cover the estimated long-term cost to the Federal Government of a Federal credit instrument, as calculated on a net present value basis, excluding administrative costs and any incidental effects on governmental receipts or outlays in accordance with the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.).

(15) **SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION.**—The term “substantial completion”, with respect to a project, means the earliest date on which a project is considered to perform the functions for which the project is designed.

(16) **TREATMENT WORKS.**—The term “treatment works” has the meaning given the term in section 212 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1292).

SEC. 10004. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary and the Administrator may provide financial assistance under this title to carry out pilot projects, which shall be selected to ensure a diversity of project types and geographical locations.

(b) **RESPONSIBILITY.**—

(1) **SECRETARY.**—The Secretary shall carry out all pilot projects under this title that are eligible projects under section 10007(1).

(2) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The Administrator shall carry out all pilot projects under this title that are eligible projects under paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (8) of section 10007.

(3) **OTHER PROJECTS.**—The Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, may carry out eligible projects under paragraph (7) or (9) of section 10007.

SEC. 10005. APPLICATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—To receive assistance under this title, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary or the Administrator may require.

(b) **COMBINED PROJECTS.**—In the case of an eligible project described in paragraph (8) or (9) of section 10007, the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, shall require the eligible entity to submit a single application for the combined group of projects.

SEC. 10006. ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.

The following entities are eligible to receive assistance under this title:

(1) A corporation.

(2) A partnership.

(3) A joint venture.

(4) A trust.

(5) A Federal, State, or local governmental entity, agency, or instrumentality.

(6) A tribal government or consortium of tribal governments.

(7) A State infrastructure financing authority.

SEC. 10007. PROJECTS ELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE.

The following projects may be carried out with amounts made available under this title:

(1) A project for flood control or hurricane and storm damage reduction that the Secretary has determined is technically sound, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable, including—

(A) a structural or nonstructural measure to reduce flood risk, enhance stream flow, or protect natural resources; and

(B) a levee, dam, tunnel, aqueduct, reservoir, or other related water infrastructure.

(2) 1 or more activities that are eligible for assistance under section 603(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1383(c)), notwithstanding the public ownership requirement under paragraph (1) of that subsection.

(3) 1 or more activities described in section 1452(a)(2) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12(a)(2)).

(4) A project for enhanced energy efficiency in the operation of a public water system or a publicly owned treatment works.

(5) A project for repair, rehabilitation, or replacement of a treatment works, community water system, or aging water distribution or waste collection facility (including a facility that serves a population or community of an Indian reservation).

(6) A brackish or sea water desalination project, a managed aquifer recharge project, or a water recycling project.

(7) Acquisition of real property or an interest in real property—

(A) if the acquisition is integral to a project described in paragraphs (1) through (6); or

(B) pursuant to an existing plan that, in the judgment of the Administrator or the Secretary, as applicable, would mitigate the environmental impacts of water resources infrastructure projects otherwise eligible for assistance under this section.

(8) A combination of projects, each of which is eligible under paragraph (2) or (3), for which a State infrastructure financing authority submits to the Administrator a single application.

(9) A combination of projects secured by a common security pledge, each of which is eligible under paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), or (7), for which an eligible entity, or a combination of eligible entities, submits a single application.

SEC. 10008. ACTIVITIES ELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE.

For purposes of this title, an eligible activity with respect to an eligible project includes the cost of—

(1) development-phase activities, including planning, feasibility analysis (including any related analysis necessary to carry out an eligible project), revenue forecasting, environmental review, permitting, preliminary engineering and design work, and other preconstruction activities;

(2) construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, and replacement activities;

(3) the acquisition of real property or an interest in real property (including water

rights, land relating to the project, and improvements to land), environmental mitigation (including acquisitions pursuant to section 10007(7)), construction contingencies, and acquisition of equipment;

(4) capitalized interest necessary to meet market requirements, reasonably required reserve funds, capital issuance expenses, and other carrying costs during construction; and

(5) refinancing interim construction funding, long-term project obligations, or a secured loan or loan guarantee made under this title.

SEC. 10009. DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY AND PROJECT SELECTION.

(a) **ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.**—To be eligible to receive financial assistance under this title, a project shall meet the following criteria, as determined by the Secretary or Administrator, as applicable:

(1) **CREDITWORTHINESS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), the project shall be creditworthy, which shall be determined by the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, who shall ensure that any financing for the project has appropriate security features, such as a rate covenant, to ensure repayment.

(B) **PRELIMINARY RATING OPINION LETTER.**—The Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, shall require each project applicant to provide a preliminary rating opinion letter from at least 1 rating agency indicating that the senior obligations of the project (which may be the Federal credit instrument) have the potential to achieve an investment-grade rating.

(C) **SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN COMBINED PROJECTS.**—The Administrator shall develop a credit evaluation process for a Federal credit instrument provided to a State infrastructure financing authority for a project under section 10007(8) or an entity for a project under section 10007(9), which may include requiring the provision of a preliminary rating opinion letter from at least 1 rating agency.

(2) **ELIGIBLE PROJECT COSTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), the eligible project costs of a project shall be reasonably anticipated to be not less than \$20,000,000.

(B) **RURAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.**—For rural water infrastructure projects, the eligible project costs of a project shall be reasonably anticipated to be not less than \$5,000,000.

(3) **DEDICATED REVENUE SOURCES.**—The Federal credit instrument for the project shall be repayable, in whole or in part, from dedicated revenue sources that also secure the project obligations.

(4) **PUBLIC SPONSORSHIP OF PRIVATE ENTITIES.**—In the case of a project carried out by an entity that is not a State or local government or an agency or instrumentality of a State or local government or a tribal government or consortium of tribal governments, the project shall be publicly sponsored.

(5) **LIMITATION.**—No project receiving Federal credit assistance under this title may be financed or refinanced (directly or indirectly), in whole or in part, with proceeds of any obligation—

(A) the interest on which is exempt from the tax imposed under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

(B) with respect to which credit is allowable under subpart I or J of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code.

(b) **SELECTION CRITERIA.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, shall establish

criteria for the selection of projects that meet the eligibility requirements of subsection (a), in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) **CRITERIA.**—The selection criteria shall include the following:

(A) The extent to which the project is nationally or regionally significant, with respect to the generation of economic and public benefits, such as—

(i) the reduction of flood risk;

(ii) the improvement of water quality and quantity, including aquifer recharge;

(iii) the protection of drinking water; and

(iv) the support of international commerce.

(B) The extent to which the project financing plan includes public or private financing in addition to assistance under this title.

(C) The likelihood that assistance under this title would enable the project to proceed at an earlier date than the project would otherwise be able to proceed.

(D) The extent to which the project uses new or innovative approaches.

(E) The amount of budget authority required to fund the Federal credit instrument made available under this title.

(F) The extent to which the project—

(i) protects against extreme weather events, such as floods or hurricanes; or

(ii) helps maintain or protect the environment.

(G) The extent to which a project serves regions with significant energy exploration, development, or production areas.

(H) The extent to which a project serves regions with significant water resource challenges, including the need to address—

(i) water quality concerns in areas of regional, national, or international significance;

(ii) water quantity concerns related to groundwater, surface water, or other water sources;

(iii) significant flood risk;

(iv) water resource challenges identified in existing regional, State, or multistate agreements; or

(v) water resources with exceptional recreational value or ecological importance.

(I) The extent to which assistance under this title reduces the contribution of Federal assistance to the project.

(3) **SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN COMBINED PROJECTS.**—For a project described in section 10007(8), the Administrator shall only consider the criteria described in subparagraphs (B) through (I) of paragraph (2).

(c) **FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.**—Nothing in this section supersedes the applicability of other requirements of Federal law (including regulations).

SEC. 10010. SECURED LOANS.

(a) **AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraphs (2) through (4), the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, may enter into agreements with 1 or more obligors to make secured loans, the proceeds of which shall be used—

(A) to finance eligible project costs of any project selected under section 10009;

(B) to refinance interim construction financing of eligible project costs of any project selected under section 10009; or

(C) to refinance long-term project obligations or Federal credit instruments, if that refinancing provides additional funding capacity for the completion, enhancement, or expansion of any project that—

(i) is selected under section 10009; or

(ii) otherwise meets the requirements of section 10009.

(2) **LIMITATION ON REFINANCING OF INTERIM CONSTRUCTION FINANCING.**—A secured loan

under paragraph (1) shall not be used to refinance interim construction financing under paragraph (1)(B) later than 1 year after the date of substantial completion of the applicable project.

(3) **FINANCIAL RISK ASSESSMENT.**—Before entering into an agreement under this subsection for a secured loan, the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and each rating agency providing a preliminary rating opinion letter under section 10009(a)(1)(B), shall determine an appropriate capital reserve subsidy amount for the secured loan, taking into account each such preliminary rating opinion letter.

(4) **INVESTMENT-GRADE RATING REQUIREMENT.**—The execution of a secured loan under this section shall be contingent on receipt by the senior obligations of the project of an investment-grade rating.

(b) **TERMS AND LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A secured loan provided for a project under this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and contain such covenants, representations, warranties, and requirements (including requirements for audits), as the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, determines to be appropriate.

(2) **MAXIMUM AMOUNT.**—The amount of a secured loan under this section shall not exceed the lesser of—

(A) an amount equal to 49 percent of the reasonably anticipated eligible project costs; and

(B) if the secured loan does not receive an investment-grade rating, the amount of the senior project obligations of the project.

(3) **PAYMENT.**—A secured loan under this section—

(A) shall be payable, in whole or in part, from State or local taxes, user fees, or other dedicated revenue sources that also secure the senior project obligations of the relevant project;

(B) shall include a rate covenant, coverage requirement, or similar security feature supporting the project obligations; and

(C) may have a lien on revenues described in subparagraph (A), subject to any lien securing project obligations.

(4) **INTEREST RATE.**—The interest rate on a secured loan under this section shall be not less than the yield on United States Treasury securities of a similar maturity to the maturity of the secured loan on the date of execution of the loan agreement.

(5) **MATURITY DATE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The final maturity date of a secured loan under this section shall be not later than 35 years after the date of substantial completion of the relevant project.

(B) **SPECIAL RULE FOR STATE INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING AUTHORITIES.**—The final maturity date of a secured loan to a State infrastructure financing authority under this section shall be not later than 35 years after the date on which amounts are first disbursed.

(6) **NONSUBORDINATION.**—A secured loan under this section shall not be subordinated to the claims of any holder of project obligations in the event of bankruptcy, insolvency, or liquidation of the obligor of the project.

(7) **FEES.**—The Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, may establish fees at a level sufficient to cover all or a portion of the costs to the Federal Government of making a secured loan under this section.

(8) **NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—The proceeds of a secured loan under this section may be used to pay any non-Federal share of project costs required if the loan is repayable from non-Federal funds.

(9) MAXIMUM FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), for each project for which assistance is provided under this title, the total amount of Federal assistance shall not exceed 80 percent of the total project cost.

(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any rural water project—

(i) that is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary of the Interior;

(ii) that includes among its beneficiaries a federally recognized Indian tribe; and

(iii) for which the authorized Federal share of the total project costs is greater than the amount described in subparagraph (A).

(c) REPAYMENT.—

(1) SCHEDULE.—The Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, shall establish a repayment schedule for each secured loan provided under this section, based on the projected cash flow from project revenues and other repayment sources.

(2) COMMENCEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Scheduled loan repayments of principal or interest on a secured loan under this section shall commence not later than 5 years after the date of substantial completion of the project.

(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR STATE INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING AUTHORITIES.—Scheduled loan repayments of principal or interest on a secured loan to a State infrastructure financing authority under this title shall commence not later than 5 years after the date on which amounts are first disbursed.

(3) DEFERRED PAYMENTS.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION.—If, at any time after the date of substantial completion of a project for which a secured loan is provided under this section, the project is unable to generate sufficient revenues to pay the scheduled loan repayments of principal and interest on the secured loan, the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, subject to subparagraph (C), may allow the obligor to add unpaid principal and interest to the outstanding balance of the secured loan.

(B) INTEREST.—Any payment deferred under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) continue to accrue interest in accordance with subsection (b)(4) until fully repaid; and

(ii) be scheduled to be amortized over the remaining term of the secured loan.

(C) CRITERIA.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Any payment deferral under subparagraph (A) shall be contingent on the project meeting such criteria as the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, may establish.

(ii) REPAYMENT STANDARDS.—The criteria established under clause (i) shall include standards for reasonable assurance of repayment.

(4) PREPAYMENT.—

(A) USE OF EXCESS REVENUES.—Any excess revenues that remain after satisfying scheduled debt service requirements on the project obligations and secured loan and all deposit requirements under the terms of any trust agreement, bond resolution, or similar agreement securing project obligations may be applied annually to prepay a secured loan under this section without penalty.

(B) USE OF PROCEEDS OF REFINANCING.—A secured loan under this section may be prepaid at any time without penalty from the proceeds of refinancing from non-Federal funding sources.

(d) SALE OF SECURED LOANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), as soon as practicable after the date of substantial completion of a project and after providing a notice to the obligor, the Sec-

retary or the Administrator, as applicable, may sell to another entity or reoffer into the capital markets a secured loan for a project under this section, if the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, determines that the sale or reoffering can be made on favorable terms.

(2) CONSENT OF OBLIGOR.—In making a sale or reoffering under paragraph (1), the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, may not change the original terms and conditions of the secured loan without the written consent of the obligor.

(e) LOAN GUARANTEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, may provide a loan guarantee to a lender in lieu of making a secured loan under this section, if the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, determines that the budgetary cost of the loan guarantee is substantially the same as that of a secured loan.

(2) TERMS.—The terms of a loan guarantee provided under this subsection shall be consistent with the terms established in this section for a secured loan, except that the rate on the guaranteed loan and any prepayment features shall be negotiated between the obligor and the lender, with the consent of the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable.

SEC. 10011. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, shall establish a uniform system to service the Federal credit instruments made available under this title.

(b) FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, may collect and spend fees, contingent on authority being provided in appropriations Acts, at a level that is sufficient to cover—

(A) the costs of services of expert firms retained pursuant to subsection (d); and

(B) all or a portion of the costs to the Federal Government of servicing the Federal credit instruments provided under this title.

(c) SERVICER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, may appoint a financial entity to assist the Secretary or the Administrator in servicing the Federal credit instruments provided under this title.

(2) DUTIES.—A servicer appointed under paragraph (1) shall act as the agent for the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable.

(3) FEE.—A servicer appointed under paragraph (1) shall receive a servicing fee, subject to approval by the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable.

(4) ASSISTANCE FROM EXPERTS.—The Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, may retain the services, including counsel, of organizations and entities with expertise in the field of municipal and project finance to assist in the underwriting and servicing of Federal credit instruments provided under this title.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS.—Section 513 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1372) applies to the construction of a project carried out, in whole or in part, with assistance made available through a Federal credit instrument under this title in the same manner that section applies to a treatment works for which a grant is made available under that Act.

SEC. 10012. STATE, TRIBAL, AND LOCAL PERMITS.

The provision of financial assistance for project under this title shall not—

(1) relieve any recipient of the assistance of any obligation to obtain any required

State, local, or tribal permit or approval with respect to the project;

(2) limit the right of any unit of State, local, or tribal government to approve or regulate any rate of return on private equity invested in the project; or

(3) otherwise supersede any State, local, or tribal law (including any regulation) applicable to the construction or operation of the project.

SEC. 10013. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, may promulgate such regulations as the Secretary or Administrator determines to be appropriate to carry out this title.

SEC. 10014. FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to each of the Secretary and the Administrator to carry out this title \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, to remain available until expended.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Of the funds made available to carry out this title, the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, may use for the administration of this title, including for the provision of technical assistance to aid project sponsors in obtaining the necessary approvals for the project, not more than \$2,200,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

SEC. 10015. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report summarizing for the projects that are receiving, or have received, assistance under this title—

(1) the financial performance of those projects, including a recommendation as to whether the objectives of this title are being met; and

(2) the public benefit provided by those projects, including, as applicable, water quality and water quantity improvement, the protection of drinking water, and the reduction of flood risk.

SEC. 10016. USE OF AMERICAN IRON, STEEL, AND MANUFACTURED GOODS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the amounts made available under this Act may be used for the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of a project eligible for assistance under this title unless all of the iron, steel, and manufactured goods used in the project are produced in the United States.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply in any case or category of cases in which the Secretary finds that—

(1) applying subsection (a) would be inconsistent with the public interest;

(2) iron, steel, and the relevant manufactured goods are not produced in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available quantities and of a satisfactory quality; or

(3) inclusion of iron, steel, and manufactured goods produced in the United States will increase the cost of the overall project by more than 25 percent.

(c) PUBLIC NOTICE.—If the Secretary determines that it is necessary to waive the application of subsection (a) based on a finding under subsection (b), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a detailed written justification as to why the provision is being waived.

(d) INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.—This section shall be applied in a manner consistent

with United States obligations under international agreements.

TITLE XI—EXTREME WEATHER

SEC. 11001. DEFINITION OF RESILIENT CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUE.

In this title, the term “resilient construction technique” means a construction method that—

- (1) allows a property—
 - (A) to resist hazards brought on by a major disaster; and
 - (B) to continue to provide the primary functions of the property after a major disaster;
- (2) reduces the magnitude or duration of a disruptive event to a property; and
- (3) has the absorptive capacity, adaptive capacity, and recoverability to withstand a potentially disruptive event.

SEC. 11002. STUDY ON RISK REDUCTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences to carry out a study and make recommendations relating to infrastructure and coastal restoration options for reducing risk to human life and property from extreme weather events, such as hurricanes, coastal storms, and inland flooding.

(b) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—The study under subsection (a) shall include—

- (1) an analysis of strategies and water resources projects, including authorized water resources projects that have not yet been constructed, and other projects implemented in the United States and worldwide to respond to risk associated with extreme weather events;
- (2) an analysis of—
 - (A) historical extreme weather events;
 - (B) the ability of existing infrastructure to mitigate risks associated with extreme weather events; and
- (C) the reduction in long-term costs and vulnerability to infrastructure through the use of resilient construction techniques.
- (3) identification of proven, science-based approaches and mechanisms for ecosystem protection and identification of natural resources likely to have the greatest need for protection, restoration, and conservation so that the infrastructure and restoration projects can continue safeguarding the communities in, and sustaining the economy of, the United States;
- (4) an estimation of the funding necessary to improve infrastructure in the United States to reduce risk associated with extreme weather events;
- (5) an analysis of the adequacy of current funding sources and the identification of potential new funding sources to finance the necessary infrastructure improvements referred to in paragraph (3); and
- (6) an analysis of the Federal, State, and local costs of natural disasters and the potential cost-savings associated with implementing mitigation measures.

(c) **COORDINATION.**—The National Academy of Sciences may cooperate with the National Academy of Public Administration to carry out 1 or more aspects of the study under subsection (a).

(d) **PUBLICATION.**—Not later than 30 days after completion of the study under subsection (a), the National Academy of Sciences shall—

(1) submit a copy of the study to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives; and

(2) make a copy of the study available on a publicly accessible Internet site.

SEC. 11003. GAO STUDY ON MANAGEMENT OF FLOOD, DROUGHT, AND STORM DAMAGE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a study of the strategies used by the Corps of Engineers for the comprehensive management of water resources in response to floods, storms, and droughts, including an historical review of the ability of the Corps of Engineers to manage and respond to historical drought, storm, and flood events.

(b) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—The study under subsection (a) shall address—

(1) the extent to which existing water management activities of the Corps of Engineers can better meet the goal of addressing future flooding, drought, and storm damage risks, which shall include analysis of all historical extreme weather events that have been recorded during the previous 5 centuries as well as in the geological record;

(2) whether existing water resources projects built or maintained by the Corps of Engineers, including dams, levees, floodwalls, flood gates, and other appurtenant infrastructure were designed to adequately address flood, storm, and drought impacts and the extent to which the water resources projects have been successful at addressing those impacts;

(3) any recommendations for approaches for repairing, rebuilding, or restoring infrastructure, land, and natural resources that consider the risks and vulnerabilities associated with past and future extreme weather events;

(4) whether a reevaluation of existing management approaches of the Corps of Engineers could result in greater efficiencies in water management and project delivery that would enable the Corps of Engineers to better prepare for, contain, and respond to flood, storm, and drought conditions;

(5) any recommendations for improving the planning processes of the Corps of Engineers to provide opportunities for comprehensive management of water resources that increases efficiency and improves response to flood, storm, and drought conditions;

(6) any recommendations on the use of resilient construction techniques to reduce future vulnerability from flood, storm, and drought conditions; and

(7) any recommendations for improving approaches to rebuilding or restoring infrastructure and natural resources that contribute to risk reduction, such as coastal wetlands, to prepare for flood and drought.

SEC. 11004. POST-DISASTER WATERSHED ASSESSMENTS.

(a) **WATERSHED ASSESSMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In an area that the President has declared a major disaster in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170), the Secretary may carry out a watershed assessment to identify, to the maximum extent practicable, specific flood risk reduction, hurricane and storm damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, or navigation project recommendations that will help to rehabilitate and improve the resiliency of damaged infrastructure and natural resources to reduce risks to human life and property from future natural disasters.

(2) **EXISTING PROJECTS.**—A watershed assessment carried out paragraph (1) may identify existing projects being carried out under 1 or more of the authorities referred to in subsection (b) (1).

(3) **DUPLICATE WATERSHED ASSESSMENTS.**—In carrying out a watershed assessment under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall use all existing watershed assessments and related information developed by the Secretary or other Federal, State, or local entities.

(b) **PROJECTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may carry out 1 or more small projects identified in a watershed assessment under subsection (a) that the Secretary would otherwise be authorized to carry out under—

(A) section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s);

(B) section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 426i);

(C) section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330);

(D) section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a);

(E) section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577); or

(F) section 3 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g).

(2) **EXISTING PROJECTS.**—In carrying out a project under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) to the maximum extent practicable, use all existing information and studies available for the project; and

(B) not require any element of a study completed for the project prior to the disaster to be repeated.

(c) **REQUIREMENTS.**—All requirements applicable to a project under the Acts described in subsection (b) shall apply to the project.

(d) **LIMITATIONS ON ASSESSMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A watershed assessment under subsection (a) shall be initiated not later than 2 years after the date on which the major disaster declaration is issued.

(2) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out a watershed assessment under subsection (a) shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

SEC. 11005. AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT AND EXPEND NON-FEDERAL AMOUNTS.

The Secretary is authorized to accept and expend amounts provided by non-Federal interests for the purpose of repairing, restoring, or replacing water resources projects that have been damaged or destroyed as a result of a major disaster or other emergency if the Secretary determines that the acceptance and expenditure of those amounts is in the public interest.

TITLE XII—NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE OCEANS

SEC. 12001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “National Endowment for the Oceans Act”.

SEC. 12002. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are to protect, conserve, restore, and understand the oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes of the United States, ensuring present and future generations will benefit from the full range of ecological, economic, educational, social, cultural, nutritional, and recreational opportunities and services these resources are capable of providing.

SEC. 12003. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **COASTAL SHORELINE COUNTY.**—The term “coastal shoreline county” has the meaning given the term by the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for purposes of administering the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.).

(2) **COASTAL STATE.**—The term “coastal State” has the meaning given the term “coastal state” in section 304 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453).

(3) **CORPUS.**—The term “corpus”, with respect to the Endowment fund, means an amount equal to the Federal payments to such fund, amounts contributed to the fund from non-Federal sources, and appreciation from capital gains and reinvestment of income.

(4) **ENDOWMENT.**—The term “Endowment” means the endowment established under subsection (a).

(5) **ENDOWMENT FUND.**—The term “Endowment fund” means a fund, or a tax-exempt foundation, established and maintained pursuant to this title by the Foundation for the purposes described in section 12004(a).

(6) **FOUNDATION.**—The term “Foundation” means the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation established by section 2(a) of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act (16 U.S.C. 3701(a)).

(7) **INCOME.**—The term “income”, with respect to the Endowment fund, means an amount equal to the dividends and interest accruing from investments of the corpus of such fund.

(8) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given that term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(9) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Commerce.

(10) **TIDAL SHORELINE.**—The term “tidal shoreline” has the meaning given that term pursuant to section 923.110(c)(2)(i) of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, or a similar successor regulation.

SEC. 12004. NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE OCEANS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary and the Foundation are authorized to establish the National Endowment for the Oceans as a permanent Endowment fund, in accordance with this section, to further the purposes of this title and to support the programs established under this title.

(b) **AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary and the Foundation may enter into such agreements as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

(c) **DEPOSITS.**—There shall be deposited in the Fund, which shall constitute the assets of the Fund, amounts as follows:

(1) Amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to carry out this title.

(2) Amounts earned through investment under subsection (d).

(d) **INVESTMENTS.**—The Foundation shall invest the Endowment fund corpus and income for the benefit of the Endowment.

(e) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Any amounts received by the Foundation pursuant to this title shall be subject to the provisions of the National Fish and Wildlife Establishment Act (16 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), except the provisions of section 10(a) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3709(a)).

(f) **WITHDRAWALS AND EXPENDITURES.**—

(1) **ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.**—Each fiscal year, the Foundation shall, in consultation with the Secretary, allocate an amount equal to not less than 3 percent and not more than 7 percent of the corpus of the Endowment fund and the income generated from

the Endowment fund from the current fiscal year.

(2) **EXPENDITURE.**—Except as provided in paragraph (3), of the amounts allocated under paragraph (1) for each fiscal year—

(A) at least 59 percent shall be used by the Foundation to award grants to coastal States under section 12006(b);

(B) at least 39 percent shall be allocated by the Foundation to award grants under section 12006(c); and

(C) no more than 2 percent may be used by the Secretary and the Foundation for administrative expenses to carry out this title, which amount shall be divided between the Secretary and the Foundation pursuant to an agreement reached and documented by both the Secretary and the Foundation.

(3) **PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In any fiscal year in which the amount described in subparagraph (B) is less than \$100,000,000, the Foundation, in consultation with the Secretary, may elect not to use any of the amounts allocated under paragraph (1) for that fiscal year to award grants under section 12006(b).

(B) **DETERMINATION AMOUNT.**—The amount described in this subparagraph for a fiscal year is the amount that is equal to the sum of—

(i) the amount that is 5 percent of the corpus of the Endowment fund; and

(ii) the aggregate amount of income the Foundation expects to be generated from the Endowment fund in that fiscal year.

(g) **RECOVERY OF PAYMENTS.**—After notice and an opportunity for a hearing, the Secretary is authorized to recover any Federal payments under this section if the Foundation—

(1) makes a withdrawal or expenditure of the corpus of the Endowment fund or the income of the Endowment fund that is not consistent with the requirements of section 12005; or

(2) fails to comply with a procedure, measure, method, or standard established under section 12006(a)(1).

SEC. 12005. ELIGIBLE USES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Amounts in the Endowment may be allocated by the Foundation to support programs and activities intended to restore, protect, maintain, or understand living marine resources and their habitats and ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources, including baseline scientific research, ocean observing, and other programs and activities carried out in coordination with Federal and State departments or agencies, that are consistent with Federal environmental laws and that avoid environmental degradation, including the following:

(1) Ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes restoration and protection, including the protection of the environmental integrity of such areas, and their related watersheds, including efforts to mitigate potential impacts of sea level change, changes in ocean chemistry, and changes in ocean temperature.

(2) Restoration, protection, or maintenance of living ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources and their habitats, including marine protected areas and riparian migratory habitat of coastal and marine species.

(3) Planning for and managing coastal development to enhance ecosystem integrity or minimize impacts from sea level change and coastal erosion.

(4) Analyses of current and anticipated impacts of ocean acidification and assessment of potential actions to minimize harm to ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes ecosystems.

(5) Analyses of, and planning for, current and anticipated uses of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes areas.

(6) Regional, subregional, or site-specific management efforts designed to manage, protect, or restore ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources and ecosystems.

(7) Research, assessment, monitoring, observation, modeling, and sharing of scientific information that contribute to the understanding of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes ecosystems and support the purposes of this title.

(8) Efforts to understand better the processes that govern the fate and transport of petroleum hydrocarbons released into the marine environment from natural and anthropogenic sources, including spills.

(9) Efforts to improve spill response and preparedness technologies.

(10) Acquiring property or interests in property in coastal and estuarine areas, if such property or interest is acquired in a manner that will ensure such property or interest will be administered to support the purposes of this title.

(11) Protection and relocation of critical coastal public infrastructure affected by erosion or sea level change.

(b) **MATCHING REQUIREMENT.**—An amount from the Endowment may not be allocated to fund a project or activity described in paragraph (10) or (11) of subsection (a) unless non-Federal contributions in an amount equal to 30 percent or more of the cost of such project or activity is made available to carry out such project or activity.

(c) **CONSIDERATIONS FOR GREAT LAKES STATES.**—Programs and activities funded in Great Lakes States shall also seek to attain the goals embodied in the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Plan, the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration Strategy, the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, or other collaborative planning efforts of the Great Lakes Region.

(d) **PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR LITIGATION.**—No funds made available under this title may be used to fund litigation over any matter.

SEC. 12006. GRANTS.

(a) **ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Foundation shall establish the following:

(A) Application and review procedures for the awarding of grants under this section, including requirements ensuring that any amounts awarded under such subsections may only be used for an eligible use described under section 12005.

(B) Approval procedures for the awarding of grants under this section that require consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior.

(C) Eligibility criteria for awarding grants—

(i) under subsection (b) to coastal States; and

(ii) under subsection (c) to entities including States, Indian tribes, regional bodies, associations, non-governmental organizations, and academic institutions.

(D) Performance accountability and monitoring measures for programs and activities funded by a grant awarded under subsection (b) or (c).

(E) Procedures and methods to ensure accurate accounting and appropriate administration grants awarded under this section, including standards of record keeping.

(F) Procedures to carry out audits of the Endowment as necessary, but not less frequently than once every 5 years.

(G) Procedures to carry out audits of the recipients of grants under this section.

(2) APPROVAL PROCEDURES.—

(A) SUBMITTAL.—The Foundation shall submit to the Secretary each procedure, measure, method, and standard established under paragraph (1).

(B) DETERMINATION AND NOTICE.—Not later than 90 days after receiving the procedures, measures, methods, and standards under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

(i) determine whether to approve or disapprove of such procedures, measures, methods, and standards; and

(ii) notify the Foundation of such determination.

(C) JUSTIFICATION OF DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary disapproves of the procedures, measures, methods, and standards under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall include in notice submitted under clause (ii) of such subparagraph the rationale for such disapproval.

(D) RESUBMITTAL.—Not later than 30 days after the Foundation receives notification under subparagraph (B)(ii) that the Secretary has disapproved the procedures, measures, methods, and standards, the Foundation shall revise such procedures, measures, methods, and standards and submit such revised procedures, measures, methods, and standards to the Secretary.

(E) REVIEW OF RESUBMITTAL.—Not later than 30 days after receiving revised procedures, measures, methods, and standards resubmitted under subparagraph (D), the Secretary shall—

(i) determine whether to approve or disapprove the revised procedures, measures, methods, and standards; and

(ii) notify the Foundation of such determination.

(b) GRANTS TO COASTAL STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (3) and (4), the Foundation shall award grants of amounts allocated under section 12004(e)(2)(A) to eligible coastal States, based on the following formula:

(A) Fifty percent of the funds are allocated equally among eligible coastal States.

(B) Twenty-five percent of the funds are allocated on the basis of the ratio of tidal shoreline miles in a coastal State to the tidal shoreline miles of all coastal States.

(C) Twenty-five percent of the funds are allocated on the basis of the ratio of population density of the coastal shoreline counties of a coastal State to the population density of all coastal shoreline counties.

(2) ELIGIBLE COASTAL STATES.—For purposes of paragraph (1), an eligible coastal State includes—

(A) a coastal State that has a coastal management program approved under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.); and

(B) during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2018, a coastal State that had, during the period beginning January 1, 2008, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act, a coastal management program approved as described in subparagraph (A).

(3) MAXIMUM ALLOCATION TO STATES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), not more than 10 percent of the total funds distributed under this subsection may be allocated to any single State. Any amount exceeding this limit shall be redistributed among the remaining States according to the formula established under paragraph (1).

(4) MAXIMUM ALLOCATION TO CERTAIN GEOGRAPHIC AREAS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), each geographic area described in

subparagraph (B) may not receive more than 1 percent of the total funds distributed under this subsection. Any amount exceeding this limit shall be redistributed among the remaining States according to the formula established under paragraph (1).

(B) GEOGRAPHIC AREAS DESCRIBED.—The geographic areas described in this subparagraph are the following:

(i) American Samoa.

(ii) The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(iii) Guam.

(iv) Puerto Rico.

(v) The Virgin Islands.

(5) REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT PLANS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, a coastal State shall submit to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall review, a 5-year plan, which shall include the following:

(i) A prioritized list of goals the coastal State intends to achieve during the time period covered by the 5-year plan.

(ii) Identification and general descriptions of existing State projects or activities that contribute to realization of such goals, including a description of the entities conducting those projects or activities.

(iii) General descriptions of projects or activities, consistent with the eligible uses described in section 12005, applicable provisions of law relating to the environment, and existing Federal ocean policy, that could contribute to realization of such goals.

(iv) Criteria to determine eligibility for entities which may receive grants under this subsection.

(v) A description of the competitive process the coastal State will use in allocating funds received from the Endowment, except in the case of allocating funds under paragraph (7), which shall include—

(I) a description of the relative roles in the State competitive process of the State coastal zone management program approved under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.) and any State Sea Grant Program; and

(II) a demonstration that such competitive process is consistent with the application and review procedures established by the Foundation under subsection (a)(1).

(B) UPDATES.—As a condition of receiving a grant under this subsection, a coastal State shall submit to the Secretary, not less frequently than once every 5 years, an update to the plan submitted by the coastal State under subparagraph (A) for the 5-year period immediately following the most recent submittal under this paragraph.

(6) OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.—In determining whether to approve a plan or an update to a plan described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (5), the Secretary shall provide the opportunity for, and take into consideration, public input and comment on the plan.

(7) APPROVAL PROCEDURE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the opportunity for public comment on a plan or an update to a plan of a coastal State under paragraph (6), the Secretary shall notify such coastal State that the Secretary—

(i) approves the plan as submitted; or

(ii) disapproves the plan as submitted.

(B) DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary disapproves a proposed plan or an update of a plan submitted under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (5), the Secretary shall provide notice of such disapproval to the submitting coastal State in writing, and include in such notice the rationale for the Secretary's decision.

(C) RESUBMITTAL.—If the Secretary disapproves a plan of a coastal State under subparagraph (A), the coastal State shall resubmit the plan to the Secretary not later than 30 days after receiving the notice of disapproval under subparagraph (B).

(D) REVIEW OF RESUBMITTAL.—Not later than 60 days after receiving a plan resubmitted under subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall review the plan.

(8) INDIAN TRIBES.—As a condition on receipt of a grant under this subsection, a State that receives a grant under this subsection shall ensure that Indian tribes in the State are eligible to participate in the competitive process described in the State's plan under paragraph (5)(A)(v).

(c) NATIONAL GRANTS FOR OCEANS, COASTS, AND GREAT LAKES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Foundation may use amounts allocated under section 12004(e)(2)(B) to award grants according to the procedures established in subsection (a) to support activities consistent with section 12005.

(2) ADVISORY PANEL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Foundation shall establish an advisory panel to conduct reviews of applications for grants under paragraph (1) and the Foundation shall consider the recommendations of the Advisory Panel with respect to such applications.

(B) MEMBERSHIP.—The advisory panel established under subparagraph (A) shall include persons representing a balanced and diverse range, as determined by the Foundation, of—

(i) ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes dependent industries;

(ii) geographic regions;

(iii) nonprofit conservation organizations with a mission that includes the conservation and protection of living marine resources and their habitats; and

(iv) academic institutions with strong scientific or technical credentials and experience in marine science or policy.

SEC. 12007. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR ANNUAL REPORT.—Beginning with fiscal year 2014, not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Foundation shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the operation of the Endowment during the fiscal year.

(b) CONTENT.—Each annual report submitted under subsection (a) for a fiscal year shall include—

(1) a statement of the amounts deposited in the Endowment and the balance remaining in the Endowment at the end of the fiscal year; and

(2) a description of the expenditures made from the Endowment for the fiscal year, including the purpose of the expenditures.

SEC. 12008. TULSA PORT OF CATOOSA, ROGERS COUNTY, OKLAHOMA LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 87 acres of land situated in Rogers County, Oklahoma, contained within United States Tracts 413 and 427, and acquired for the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas Navigation System.

(2) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term “non-Federal land” means the approximately 34 acres of land situated in Rogers County, Oklahoma and owned by the Tulsa Port of Catoosa that lie immediately south and east of the Federal land.

(b) LAND EXCHANGE.—Subject to subsection (c), on conveyance by the Tulsa Port of

Catoosa to the United States of all right, title, and interest in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to the Tulsa Port of Catoosa, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(C) CONDITIONS.—

(1) DEEDS.—

(A) DEED TO NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The Secretary may only accept conveyance of the non-Federal land by warranty deed, as determined acceptable by the Secretary.

(B) DEED TO FEDERAL LAND.—The Secretary shall convey the Federal land to the Tulsa Port of Catoosa by quitclaim deed and subject to any reservations, terms, and conditions that the Secretary determines necessary to—

(i) allow the United States to operate and maintain the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System; and

(ii) protect the interests of the United States.

(2) LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—The exact acreage and legal descriptions of the Federal land and the non-Federal land shall be determined by surveys acceptable to the Secretary.

(3) PAYMENT OF COSTS.—The Tulsa Port of Catoosa shall be responsible for all costs associated with the land exchange authorized by this section, including any costs that the Secretary determines necessary and reasonable in the interest of the United States, including surveys, appraisals, real estate transaction fees, administrative costs, and environmental documentation.

(4) CASH PAYMENT.—If the appraised fair market value of the Federal land, as determined by the Secretary, exceeds the appraised fair market value of the non-Federal land, as determined by the Secretary, the Tulsa Port of Catoosa shall make a cash payment to the United States reflecting the difference in the appraised fair market values.

(5) LIABILITY.—The Tulsa Port of Catoosa shall hold and save the United States free from damages arising from activities carried out under this section, except for damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or a contractor of the United States.

TITLE XIII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 13001. APPLICABILITY OF SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this title:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) FARM.—The term “farm” has the meaning given the term in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(3) GALLON.—The term “gallon” means a United States liquid gallon.

(4) OIL.—The term “oil” has the meaning given the term in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(5) OIL DISCHARGE.—The term “oil discharge” has the meaning given the term “discharge” in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(6) REPORTABLE OIL DISCHARGE HISTORY.—The term “reportable oil discharge history” has the meaning used to describe the legal requirement to report a discharge of oil under applicable law.

(7) SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.—The term “Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule” means the regulation, including amendments, promulgated by the Administrator

under part 112 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(b) CERTIFICATION.—In implementing the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to any farm, the Administrator shall—

(1) require certification of compliance with the rule by—

(A) a professional engineer for a farm with—

(i) an individual tank with an aboveground storage capacity greater than 10,000 gallons;

(ii) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity greater than or equal to 20,000 gallons; or

(iii) a reportable oil discharge history; or

(B) the owner or operator of the farm (via self-certification) for a farm with—

(i) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity not more than 20,000 gallons and not less than the lesser of—

(I) 6,000 gallons; or

(II) the adjustment described in subsection (d)(2); and

(ii) no reportable oil discharge history of oil; and

(2) not require a certification of a statement of compliance with the rule—

(A) subject to subsection (d), with an aggregate aboveground storage capacity of not less than 2,500 gallons and not more than 6,000 gallons; and

(B) no reportable oil discharge history; and

(3) not require a certification of a statement of compliance with the rule for an aggregate aboveground storage capacity of not more than 2,500 gallons.

(c) CALCULATION OF AGGREGATE ABOVEGROUND STORAGE CAPACITY.—For purposes of subsection (b), the aggregate aboveground storage capacity of a farm excludes—

(1) all containers on separate parcels that have a capacity that is 1,000 gallons or less; and

(2) all containers holding animal feed ingredients approved for use in livestock feed by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

(d) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months of the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall conduct a study to determine the appropriate exemption under subsection (b)(2)(A) and (b)(1)(B) to not more than 6,000 gallons and not less than 2,500 gallons, based on a significant risk of discharge to water.

(2) ADJUSTMENT.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the study described in paragraph (1) is complete, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall promulgate a rule to adjust the exemption levels described in subsection (b)(2)(A) and (b)(1)(B) in accordance with the study.

SEC. 13002. AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL NATIONAL PARKS AND FEDERAL RECREATIONAL LANDS PASS PROGRAM.

The Secretary may participate in the America the Beautiful National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass program in the same manner as the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Reclamation, including the provision of free annual passes to active duty military personnel and dependents.

NOTICES OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, intend to object to proceeding to the

nomination of Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, dated October 31, 2013.

I, Senator BARBARA BOXER, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, dated October 31, 2013.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing was previously scheduled for Thursday, October 10, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building; and will now be held on Thursday, November 7, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this oversight hearing is to consider the Draft Regional Recommendation regarding the Columbia River Treaty.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by e-mail to Lauren Goldschmidt @energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Dan Adamson at (202) 224-2871, Cisco Minthorn at (202) 224-4756 or Lauren Goldschmidt at (202) 224-5488.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on Thursday, November 14, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing to consider the nominations of Mr. Steven P. Croley to be the General Counsel of the Department of Energy, Christopher A. Smith to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy, Fossil Energy, and Ms. Esther P. Kia'aina to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, for Insular Areas.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by email to Abigail_Campbell@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224-7571 or Abigail Campbell at (202) 224-4905.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining. The hearing will be held on Wednesday, November 20, 2013, at 3:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills:

S. 182, to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city of Anchorage, Alaska, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversion interest to the City;

S. 483, to designate the Berryessa Snow Mountain National Conservation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes;

S. 771, to provide to the Secretary of the Interior a mechanism to cancel contracts for the sale of materials CA-20139 and CA-22901, and for other purposes;

S. 776, to establish the Columbine-Hondo Wilderness in the State of New Mexico, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of National Forest System land in the State, and for other purposes;

S. 841, to designate certain Federal land in the San Juan National Forest in the State of Colorado as wilderness, and for other purposes;

S. 1305, to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado;

S. 1341, to modify the Forest Service Recreation Residence Program as the program applies to units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain by implementing a simple, equitable, and predictable procedure for determining cabin user fees, and for other purposes;

S. 1414, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians;

S. 1415, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and;

S. 1479, to address the forest health, public safety, and wildlife habitat threat presented by the risk of wildfire, including catastrophic wildfire, on National Forest System land and public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to expedite forest management projects relating to hazardous fuels reduction, forest health, and economic development, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC, 20510-6150, or by email to John_Assini@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact please contact Meghan Conklin (202) 224-8046, or John Assini (202) 224-9313.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO
MEETCOMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN
AFFAIRS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 31, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN
AFFAIRS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 31, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Housing Finance Reform: Essential Elements of a Government Guarantee for Mortgage-Backed Securities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 31, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 31, 2013, at 10:15 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Syria".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 31, 2013, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled "Attaining a Quality Degree: Innovations to Improve Student Success" on October 31, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 31, 2013, at 10 a.m. to con-

duct a hearing entitled "The Navy Yard Tragedy: Examining Government Clearances and Background Checks."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 31, 2013, at 10 a.m. SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 31, 2013, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION
ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO
PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 184.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 815) to prohibit the employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 184, S. 815, a bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

Richard J. Durbin, Tom Harkin, Jeff Merkley, Benjamin L. Cardin, Michael F. Bennet, Barbara Mikulski, Charles E. Schumer, Martin Heinrich, Patrick J. Leahy, Robert Menendez, Barbara Boxer, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Mazie Hirono, Tammy Baldwin, Amy Klobuchar, Jack Reed, Harry Reid.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed

to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 357; that the nomination be confirmed; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Marcel J. Lettre II, of Maryland, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this is a fine young man. He worked for me, did my intelligence work. He is an outstanding person. We are so fortunate that good people like him are in public service. He speaks well of everyone who is a public servant in our country.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, November 4, 2013, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 328, 329; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceeded to vote, with no intervening action or debate, on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 224, H.R. 3080, that the substitute amendment, which is at the desk, which is the text of S. 601, as passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the dis-

agreeing votes of the two Houses and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on part of the Senate with ratio of 5 to 3; all of the above without any action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2009) was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 3080), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

SCHOOL ACCESS TO EMERGENCY EPINEPHRINE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 229.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2094) to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements.)

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2094) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

C.W. BILL YOUNG DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Veterans' Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3302 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3302) to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Bay Pines, Florida, as the "C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the bill be read three times, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3302) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

COMMEMORATING THE TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 282, submitted earlier today by Senator NELSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 282) commemorating the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 282) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MAJORITY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP FOR 113TH CONGRESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 283, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 283) to constitute the majority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 283) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, November 4, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be

deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved until later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 815, the Employee Non-Discrimination Act; that at 5 p.m. the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar Nos. 328 and 329, under the previous order; finally, that following disposition of the Brown nomination and when the Senate resumes legislative session, there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form prior to the

cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 815.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be up to three rollcall votes on Monday beginning at 5:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
NOVEMBER 4, 2013, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the

Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:08 p.m., adjourned until Monday, November 4, 2013, at 2 p.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 31, 2013:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MARCEL J. LETTRE II, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

SENATE—Monday, November 4, 2013

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, help us to so live that the generations to come will know of Your mighty acts. Today, give our lawmakers the singularity of heart to seek, find and follow Your will, so that their legacy will be exemplary. Lord, guide them in the path You have created, inspiring them with the potency of Your powerful presence. May they trust You in times of adversity and prosperity, knowing that they will reap a productive harvest if they persevere. Keep them from underestimating the power of Your great Name. And, Lord, we ask that You would sustain the victims and families of the Los Angeles airport shooting.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish to tell the Senate that following my remarks and those of Senator McCONNELL, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 815, the Employee Non-Discrimination Act. At 5 o'clock today the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the nominations of Gregory Woods to be United States district judge in New York and Debra Brown to be United States district judge in Mississippi. After debate on those two nominations, at 5:30 there will be up to three rollcall votes. I hope one of them will go by voice, but we will have to wait and see. We will have votes on the confirmation of the Woods and Brown nominations and then the vote on the motion to proceed to ENDA, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act.

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Springfield, MA, police officer Michael Carney fought for 2½ years to get his job back—and he won. After he took a medical leave of absence, Springfield officials refused to reinstate Officer Carney because the veteran officer had revealed he was gay. But Officer Carney was determined to return to the force. Because he lived in Massachusetts, one of only 17 States to protect employees against discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity, Officer Carney is now back on the job, serving and protecting the people of Springfield, MA. I am also pleased to say Nevada law also includes robust protections against this type of discrimination. Officer Carney testified before the House of Representatives in 2007 and shared his story. This is what he said:

I'm a good cop, but I have lost 2½ years of employment fighting to get that job back because I am gay. I never would have been able to do that had I not lived in Massachusetts or one of the handful of other States that protect . . . employees from discrimination.

Sadly, not everyone is able to fight back like Officer Carney. In 33 States, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people can be fired and harassed just for being who they are.

West Virginia coal miner Sam Hall was terrorized by his coworkers for 7 years because he was gay. Mr. Hall just wanted to make a living, but supervisors told him he would have to endure the persecution if he wanted to keep his job. West Virginia is one of 33 States with no protections against this type of oppression. That is why I so admire JOE MANCHIN for recognizing that this is an issue which is important to everyone.

A patchwork of State laws that excludes tens of millions of Americans from basic protection against discrimination is simply not good enough. It is time for Congress to pass a Federal law so that all Americans, regardless of where they live, can go to work unafraid to be who they are. As long as hardworking, qualified Americans can be denied job opportunities, fired or harassed because of their sexual orientation or gender identity, all workers are at risk.

This week the Senate will begin debate on the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, which would simply afford all Americans the same protections from discrimination based on prejudice. In fact, 4 out of 5 Americans mistakenly believe that these protections already exist. Two-thirds of Americans, including a majority of Republicans,

support Federal protections against discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in the workplace. Once again, Republicans in Congress are out of step with Republicans in the rest of the country. House Speaker JOHN BOEHNER this morning said he does not support this legislation, but the Speaker should take his cue from the 56 percent of Republicans nationwide who support ENDA and bring this legislation up for a vote.

Corporations also agree non-discrimination policies are good for business. Most Fortune 500 companies already prohibit this kind of persecution, and more than 100 of the nation's largest businesses, more than 80 national civil rights, labor, religious, civic, and professional organizations, and faith leaders from many denominations have spoken in support of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act.

But there is more, much more, and a more important reason to support this legislation than popular support. It is the right thing to do. Here is what Harvey Milk, the murdered California politician and gay rights activist once said:

It takes no compromise to give people their rights. . . . It takes no money to respect the individual. It takes no political deal to give people freedom. It takes no survey to remove repression.

All Americans, regardless of what they look like, where they live or who they choose to love, deserve to be treated with the same respect and dignity while they earn a living. An employee should not be judged on matters that really are unimportant. We are talking about fairness. Employees should be judged on the quality of their work and on their talents and performance, and not on their sexual orientation or gender identity.

I urge my colleagues to vote tonight supporting the legislation that 81 percent of Americans approve, to begin debate on a bill that would affirm the equal rights and freedoms of every American and to do so simply because it is the right thing to do.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday I read an excellent column in the New York Times by Nicholas Kristof, the complete text of which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 2, 2013]

THIS IS WHY WE NEED OBAMACARE

(By Nicholas D. Kristof)

The biggest health care crisis in America right now is not the inexcusably messy rollout of Obamacare.

No, far more serious is the kind of catastrophe facing people like Richard Streeter, 47, a truck driver and recreational vehicle repairman in Eugene, Ore. His problem isn't Obamacare, but a tumor in his colon that may kill him because Obamacare didn't come quite soon enough.

Streeter had health insurance for decades, but beginning in 2008 his employer no longer offered it as an option. He says he tried to buy individual health insurance but, as a lifelong smoker in his late 40s, couldn't find anything affordable—so he took a terrible chance and did without.

At the beginning of this year, Streeter began to notice blood in his bowel movements and discomfort in his rectum. Because he didn't have health insurance, he put off going to the doctor and reassured himself it was just irritation from sitting too many hours.

"I thought it was driving a truck and being on your keister all day," he told me. Finally, the pain became excruciating, and he went to a cut-rate clinic where a doctor, without examining him, suggested it might be hemorrhoids.

By September, Streeter couldn't stand the pain any longer. He went to another doctor, who suggested a colonoscopy. The cheapest provider he could find was Dr. J. Scott Gibson, a softhearted gastroenterologist who told him that if he didn't have insurance he would do it for \$300 down and \$300 more whenever he had the money.

Streeter made the 100-mile drive to Dr. Gibson's office in McMinnville, Ore.—and received devastating news. Dr. Gibson had found advanced colon cancer.

"It was heartbreaking to see the pain on his face," Dr. Gibson told me. "It got me very angry with people who insist that Obamacare is a train wreck, when the real train wreck is what people are experiencing every day because they can't afford care."

Dr. Gibson says that Streeter is the second patient he has had this year who put off getting medical attention because of lack of health insurance and now has advanced colon cancer.

So, to those Republicans protesting Obamacare: You're right that there are appalling problems with the website, but they will be fixed. Likewise, you're right that President Obama misled voters when he said that everyone could keep their insurance plan because that's now manifestly not true (although they will be able to get new and better plans, sometimes for less money).

But how about showing empathy also for a far larger and more desperate group: The nearly 50 million Americans without insurance who play health care Russian roulette as a result. FamiliesUSA, a health care advocacy group that supports Obamacare, estimated last year that an American dies every 20 minutes for lack of insurance.

It has been a year since my college roommate, Scott Androes, died of prostate cancer, in part because he didn't have insurance and thus didn't see a doctor promptly. Scott fully acknowledged that he had made a terrible mistake in economizing on insurance, but, in a civilized country, is this a mistake that people should die from?

"Website problems are a nuisance," Dr. Gibson said. "Life and death is when you need care and can't afford to get it."

The Institute of Medicine and the National Research Council this year ranked the United States health care system last or near last in several categories among 17 countries studied. The Commonwealth Fund put the United States dead last of seven industrialized countries in health care performance. And Bloomberg journalists ranked the United States health care system No. 46 in efficiency worldwide, behind Romania and Iran.

The reason is simple: While some Americans get superb care, tens of millions without insurance get marginal care. That's one reason life expectancy is relatively low in America, and child mortality is twice as high as in some European countries. Now that's a scandal.

Yet about half the states are refusing to expand Medicaid to cover more uninsured people—because they don't trust Obamacare and want it to fail. The result will be more catastrophes like Streeter's.

"I am tired of being the messenger of death," said Dr. Gibson. "Sometimes it's unavoidable. But when people come in who might have been saved if they could have afforded care early on, then to have to tell them that they have a potentially fatal illness—I'm very tired of that."

Streeter met with a radiologist on Thursday and is bracing for an arduous and impoverishing battle with the cancer. There's just one bright spot: He signed up for health care insurance under Obamacare, to take effect on Jan. 1.

For him, the tragedy isn't that the Obamacare rollout has been full of glitches, but that it may have come too late to save his life.

Mr. REID. The editorial tells the story of a number of people, but one is about Richard Streeter, a truck driver who is very ill with colon cancer. Why? Because he couldn't afford insurance; he couldn't afford health insurance. Kristof writes:

The biggest health care crisis in America right now is not the inexcusably messy rollout of Obamacare. No, far more serious is the kind of catastrophe facing people like Richard Streeter.

Mr. Streeter is a resident of Eugene, OR. His problem is not ObamaCare but a tumor in his colon that is going to kill him unless there is a miracle. He could have been treated had he had health insurance. For him, ObamaCare did not come quite soon enough.

Kristof's column is an important reminder that the rollout of ObamaCare is about more than a defective Web site, it is about saving lives, lots of lives. Kristof is reminding Republicans that they should have empathy for "the nearly 50 million Americans without insurance who play health care Russian roulette [every day] as a result."

He urges them, the Republicans, to remember that every 20 minutes an American dies. Why? They lack health insurance.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 815, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 184, S. 815, a bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today marks another step forward in the progress of the United States of America in making sure that all of our citizens are treated fairly and equitably under the law, that each citizen of this country will know he or she cannot be discriminated against because of race, religion, sex, or national origin. That was all covered in the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In 1990 I was proud to stand at this very desk when we took another step forward when we said we were going to extend civil rights to cover people with disabilities. Today I stand here to mark another step forward when we will have a vote on proceeding to the debate to end discrimination in employment because of a person's sexual orientation. It is a huge step forward, one too long in coming.

I was here in 1996 when we voted on the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, the bill that is now before the Senate. We lost by one vote—50 to 49. That was a dark day. We have been trying to get it before the Senate ever since, and we have finally done so. I am proud to say that we got it through the HELP Committee this summer on a strong bipartisan vote, and we now have it before the Senate.

People should understand this is a momentous day in the development of our country, ensuring that every person is recognized for their individual worth and for what they contribute to society, not for the color of their skin or race or religion or national origin or whether they have a disability. Today we also say: We will make sure you cannot be discriminated against because of your sexual identity or whom you love.

It has been 17 years since Ted Kennedy, who chaired the committee at the time, brought this bill to the floor in 1996, and it was, again, one vote shy

of passage. In the meantime, over those 17 years, the attitudes in this country have changed dramatically about the rights of gay, lesbian, transsexual, and transgender Americans. In a nutshell, I think the vast majority of Americans believe that individuals ought to have the right to earn a living free from discrimination and that they should be judged on their performance in the workplace based on their talent, their ability, and their qualifications.

Interestingly enough, since 1996, 17 States—including my State of Iowa—have passed legislation that includes basic employment protections for all LGBT Americans. I will use that acronym or those letters to explain lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans.

Eighty-eight percent of Fortune 500 businesses have included protections in their nondiscrimination policies, as have the majority of small businesses. Over 100 major businesses, including pharmaceutical and technology companies, banks, manufacturing companies, and chemical companies have announced their support for this bill. In fact, there are polls that show 8 out of 10 Americans already believe that discrimination against people because of their sexual orientation is already illegal; for example, that it is illegal to fire someone for being gay or for being a lesbian.

Why are we here today? Twenty-three years ago I stood at this desk as the manager of the Americans with Disabilities Act. That bill was to extend nondiscrimination clauses to people with disabilities. At that time a lot of people said: What is the problem?

Here is the problem in a nutshell. Let's say you are an African American—or a woman or Jewish or Catholic or anything else—and you applied for a job for which you were fully qualified and the prospective employer said: No, I am not hiring African Americans. I don't want any Black people working here. No, you are Jewish; get out of here. Do you know what you could do? You could turn right around, walk out the door, go down to the courthouse, and the courthouse door would be open for you. You can go into that courthouse and take that case to court.

When I stood here 23 years ago, I said: Until the President signs that bill into law, a person with a disability—for example, someone bound to a wheelchair—could be turned down in spite of being qualified for the job. The prospective employer could say: Get out of here; I don't hire cripples. If you then went down to the courthouse, the door was locked. You had no recourse under law for the violation of your civil rights. That is true today for gays, lesbians, bisexual, and transgender Americans. They could be fired just because of that. If they go down to the courthouse door, it is

locked. They have no recourse under law.

As I said, 17 States have State laws, some municipalities have municipal laws, but the vast majority of Americans live in States in which there is no civil rights law governing LGBT people. The majority of Americans—more than 56 percent—live in States in which it is perfectly legal to fire or refuse to hire someone because of who they are—lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender. They have no recourse under law. As I said, most people in America think they are covered. They think you can't discriminate against someone because of that. The fact is that it is still perfectly legal to do so in most States in the United States.

As I said, I think we have changed quite a bit in the 17 years since we last considered this bill. That last vote was 49 to 50. We lost by one vote, and there were no amendments. At that time a majority of Senators would have been enough to pass it. All we needed was one more vote. I remember Vice President Al Gore was sitting in the chair, but we were one vote short.

Today, however, as times have changed, we know we need 60 votes to pass bills. Just think about that—17 years ago 51 votes would have passed this bill; now we have to have 60 votes. I won't get into the necessity of having to change the rules of the Senate. We need 60 votes before we can even bring up the bill. It is a tribute to the leadership of the bill's sponsors, Senator JEFF MERKLEY and Senator MARK KIRK, that we have now reached 60 votes. As of last week we only had about 57 or 58 votes, and then 2 more people decided to support the bill. Now that Senator HELLER of Nevada has announced his support for the bill, we have 60 votes. We have 60 votes, and I predict we will get more than 60 votes. Once we reach the critical mass, I think my colleagues will understand that this is another step in the direction of opening America and making our society more inclusive rather than exclusive.

Senator KIRK, who is managing the bill for the minority, had been a supporter of this legislation before he was elected to the House. Senator MERKLEY, who is the sponsor of the bill, was the leader of this effort when he was in the Oregon State Legislature. One Republican and one Democrat were champions of this bill before they came to Congress. They both played a critical role in ensuring the bill was brought before our committee. Even though Senator MERKLEY left our committee to join the Appropriations Committee, he always kept on top of this. With their help, we voted it out of our HELP Committee in July with a strong bipartisan vote of 15 to 7. I thank the present occupant of the Chair, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, for all of his help and sup-

port for getting this bill through. We had the support of three Members of the minority as well. The vote was 15 to 7. It was a great vote.

Despite the passage of laws at the State and local levels, discrimination in the workplace continues to be all too real. Forty-two percent of lesbian, gay, and bisexual workers report having experienced some form of discrimination at work. Even with the progress that has been made at the State and local levels, as I mentioned, too many hard-working Americans, whether employed by private companies or public entities, are judged not by their ability and qualifications but by their sexual orientation or gender identity.

Consider the example of Michael Carney, who was denied reinstatement as a police officer three times before successfully using the protections of State law to get his job back. This is a job in which he has now served with distinction for many years.

Consider Sam Hall, a West Virginia miner who suffered destruction of property and verbal harassment from coworkers because of his identity as a gay person. Sam is one of those millions of Americans who currently have no legal recourse without this law.

Discrimination against transgender Americans is even more common, with 78 percent reporting harassment at work. I was fortunate enough to hear from Kylar Broadus, who was a witness at our HELP Committee hearing last year. Kylar faced intense harassment at work as he transitioned from female to male. He has never fully recovered financially from the loss of his well-paid position.

Allyson Robinson also provided written testimony to the committee regarding the painful separation from her family that she endured because of financial hardships while she searched for her first job as an openly transgender female.

Again, too many of our fellow citizens are being judged not by what they can contribute to the workplace but by who they are and whom they choose to love. Unfortunately, we can cite countless cases of bigotry and blatant job discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity. Equal opportunity is not just an abstract principle or a matter of statistics. Every day, decent hard-working Americans are being hurt by this form of discrimination.

It has been almost 50 years since we first took steps to eliminate discrimination at work and 23 years since we passed the Americans with Disabilities Act to eliminate discrimination against people with disabilities. We still have a long way to go, but our country is a far better place because of laws against discrimination based on race and sex and national origin and religion and age and, yes, disability. At long last, it is time for us to also prohibit discrimination on the basis of

sexual orientation and gender identity. Such discrimination is fundamentally wrong and cannot be tolerated any longer in our country.

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans deserve the same civil rights protections as all other Americans. This bill will accomplish that. It will say to millions of LGBT Americans that they are full and welcome members of our American family and that they deserve the same civil rights protections as every other American.

The bill is very simple. It is very clear. It states that private businesses, public employers, and labor unions cannot make employment decisions—hiring, firing, promotion or compensation—because of a person's actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity. There are exemptions for small businesses and religious organizations, and current rules that are applicable to the Armed Forces are not affected. The bill expressly prohibits disparate impact claims. I wish to repeat that. The bill expressly prohibits disparate impact claims. It is modeled on title VII of the Civil Rights Act. That law has been in place, as I said, since 1964. This bill also incorporates many suggestions from members of both sides, Republicans and Democrats, on our HELP Committee, and I am glad we could work on a bipartisan basis to improve the bill and get it through our committee.

ENDA, as it is known—the Employment Non-Discrimination Act—has unprecedented support from major American businesses, including Dow Chemical, General Electric, Hilton Hotels, GlaxoSmithKline, Chevron, Wells Fargo, Marriott Hotels, Coca-Cola, Cisco, Kaiser, and on and on.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this list of over 100 companies that support the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS COALITION FOR WORKPLACE
FAIRNESS

The majority of United States businesses have already started addressing workplace fairness for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender employees. But we need a federal standard that treats all employees the same way.

The Business Coalition for Workplace Fairness is a group of leading U.S. employers that support the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, a federal bill that would provide the same basic protections that are already afforded to workers across the country.

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender employees are not protected under federal law from being fired, refused work or otherwise discriminated against. ENDA would do just that.

LEADING EMPLOYERS THAT SUPPORT WORK-
PLACE FAIRNESS AND THE PASSAGE OF THE
FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION
ACT

Accenture Ltd., New York, NY; AIG, New York, NY; Alcoa Inc., New York, NY; Amer-

ican Eagle Outfitters Inc., Pittsburgh, PA; American Institute of Architects, Washington, DC; Ameriprise Financial Inc., Minneapolis, MN; Amgen Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA; AMR Corp. (American Airlines), Fort Worth, TX; Apple, Cupertino, CA; Bank of America Corp., Charlotte, NC; The Bank of New York Mellon Corp. (BNY Mellon), New York, NY; Barclays, New York, NY; BASF Corp., Florham Park, NJ; Bausch & Lomb Inc., Rochester, NY; Best Buy Co. Inc., Richfield, MN; Bingham McCutchen LLP, Boston, MA; Biogen Idec Inc., Weston, MA; BMC Software Inc., Houston, TX; BNP Paribas, New York, NY; Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals Inc., Ridgefield, CT; BP America Inc., Warrenville, IL; Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., New York, NY; Broadridge Financial Solutions Inc., Lake Success, NY; CA Technologies Inc., Islandia, NY; Caesars Entertainment Corp., Las Vegas, NV; Capital One Financial Corp., McLean, VA; Cardinal Health Inc., Dublin, OH; CareFusion Corp., San Diego, CA.

CC Media Holdings Inc. (Clear Channel), San Antonio, TX; Charles Schwab & Co., San Francisco, CA; Chevron Corp., San Ramon, CA; Choice Hotels International Inc., Silver Spring, MD; Chubb Corp., Warren, NJ; Cisco Systems Inc., San Jose, CA; Citigroup, New York, NY; Clorox Co., Oakland, CA; The Coca-Cola Co., Atlanta, GA; Corning Inc., Corning, NY; Darden Restaurants Inc., Orlando, FL; Delhaize America Inc., Salisbury, NC; Dell Inc., Round Rock, TX; Deloitte LLP, New York, NY; The Depository Trust & Clearing Corp., New York, NY; Deutsche Bank, New York, NY; Diageo North America, Norwalk, CT; Dow Chemical Co., Midland, MI; E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Co. (DuPont), Wilmington, DE; Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, NY; Electronic Arts Inc., Redwood City, CA; Eli Lilly & Co., Indianapolis, IN; EMC Corp., Hopkinton, MA; Ernst & Young LLP, New York, NY; Expedia Inc., Bellevue, WA; Gap Inc., San Francisco, CA; General Electric Co., Fairfield, CT; General Mills Inc., Minneapolis, MN; General Motors Corp., Detroit, MI; GlaxoSmithKline, Philadelphia, PA; Goldman Sachs Group Inc., New York, NY; Google Inc., Mountain View, CA.

Groupon Inc., Chicago, IL; Hanover Direct Inc., Weehawken, NJ; Herman Miller Inc., Zeeland, MI; The Hershey Co., Hershey, PA; Hewlett-Packard Co., Palo Alto, CA; Hillshire Brands Co., Downers Grove, IL; Hilton Worldwide, McLean, VA; Hospira Inc., Lake Forest, IL; HSBC—North America, Prospect Heights, IL; Hyatt Hotels Corp., Chicago, IL; Integrity Staffing Solutions Inc., Wilmington, DE; Intel Corp., Santa Clara, CA; InterContinental Hotels Group Americas, Atlanta, GA; International Business Machines Corp., Armonk, NY; Jenner & Block LLP, Chicago, IL; JPMorgan Chase & Co., New York, NY; Kaiser Permanente, Oakland, CA; KeyCorp, Cleveland, OH; Kimpton Hotel & Restaurant Group, San Francisco, CA; KPMG LLP, New York, NY; Levi Strauss & Co., San Francisco, CA; Marriott International Inc., Bethesda, MD; Marsh & McLennan Companies Inc., New York, NY; Merck & Co. Inc., Whitehouse Station, NJ; Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA; MillerCoors Brewing Co., Chicago, IL.

Mitchell Gold + Bob Williams, Taylorsville, NC; Moody's Corp., New York, NY; Morgan Stanley, New York, NY; Motorola Inc., Schaumburg, IL; Nationwide, Columbus, OH; The Nielsen Co., Schaumburg, IL; Nike Inc., Beaverton, OR; Oracle Corp., Redwood City, CA; Orbitz Worldwide Inc., Chicago, IL; Pfizer Inc., New York, NY; PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, New York,

NY; Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, OH; QUALCOMM Inc., San Diego, CA; RBC Wealth Management, Minneapolis, MN; Replacements Ltd., McLeansville, NC; Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi LLP, Minneapolis, MN; Self-Help Credit Union, Durham, NC; SUPERVALU Inc., Eden Prairie, MN; Target Corp., Minneapolis, MN; Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association—College Retirement Equities Fund, New York, NY; Tech Data Corp., Clearwater, FL; Texas Instruments Inc., Dallas, TX; Thomson Reuters, New York, NY; Time Warner Inc., New York, NY; Travelers Companies Inc., New York, NY; UBS AG, Stamford, CT; US Airways Group Inc., Tempe, AZ; WellPoint Inc., Indianapolis, IN; Wells Fargo & Co., San Francisco, CA; Whirlpool Corp., Benton Harbor, MI; Wynn Resorts Ltd., Las Vegas, NV; Xerox Corp., Stamford, CT; Yahoo! Inc., Sunnyvale, CA.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, in the course of our hearings on this bill, we heard from executives from Nike and General Mills, among others. Asked why they had chosen to implement strong nondiscrimination policies themselves, the Nike executive testified:

ENDA is good for business because teams thrive in an open and welcoming work environment, where individuals are bringing their full selves to work.

The bill we are debating specifically protects religious liberty with a substantial exemption that allows specific religious organizations to continue to take sexual orientation and gender identity into account when making employment decisions in their religious organizations. I might point out this bill is supported by 60 faith-based organizations, including congregations and organizations ranging from the Presbyterian Church of America, the Episcopal Church, the Progressive National Baptist Convention, the Union of Reform Judaism, the Union Synagogue of Conservative Judaism, the Islamic Society of North America, and many others.

Among other things, polls show that 67 percent of American Catholics support basic workplace protections for LGBT workers. Almost 70 percent in that poll of evangelical Christians supports LGBT employment protections. So there is overwhelming support for this bill, as I said, amongst people of faith and religious-based organizations.

Again, I acknowledge the leadership of Senator KIRK, as well as the bill's lead sponsor, Senator JEFF MERKLEY of Oregon, who has championed this bill and without whom, I dare say, we would not be starting this debate today. In addition, we are fortunate the lead Democratic sponsor of the bill in the House in previous Congresses is now a Member of the Senate and a member of our HELP Committee, that is Senator TAMMY BALDWIN of Wisconsin. I hope she will soon be able to say she helped pass this bill in both the House and the Senate.

I look forward to the vote later today when we will vote to proceed to this

bill. As we all know, under the rules of the Senate, after cloture is invoked, we will have up to 30 hours of debate and then the bill will be on the floor and open. We had several amendments filed in committee that members of the HELP Committee reserved to try to bring to the floor. So I am confident we can work with those if they are offered again. I hope all amendments that are offered will be directed at improving this important civil rights legislation. I hope amendments that are focused on unrelated matters can wait for another time, another day, perhaps when that issue is on the floor. This is just too important—this major step forward in expanding our concept of civil rights laws—too important to be dragged down by spurious amendments that have nothing to do with the bill whatsoever. I hope we do not get bogged down with that.

As I said, it has been a long time coming for this bill, when we think about it. Seventeen years ago we voted on it and lost by one vote. Attempts have been made periodically to get it back to the floor again and it has just never happened, but now we have the opportunity. We reported it out of committee, as I said, with a good bipartisan vote.

ENDA is a critically needed bill. It is commonsense legislation. It has overwhelming support from corporate America, from religious groups, from small and large businesses all across the country. As I said, 8 out of 10 Americans already think it is the law. So let's make sure those 8 in 10 Americans who already think it is the law will now know it is the law, and we can pass it, send it to the House. Hopefully, the House will pass it and the President can sign it into law as soon as possible.

No American should be turned away or have to fear the loss of their job or their means of support or fear of not being hired, even though they are eminently qualified, for any reasons other than their ability to do that job. People shouldn't be fired and shouldn't be discriminated against in hiring because of the color of their skin, their race, their religion, their sex, national origin, disability. That is already in the law; now we put this next piece in place—no one should be denied a job, an opportunity to work because they are gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender. That is what this bill does.

I encourage all Senators to join with us in passing this important civil rights legislation and continuing our Nation's advance toward freedom and inclusion for everyone in our society. Let's say this is a bright day for America. We are finally bringing it to the floor. As I said, we will have the vote later today. We have 60 people who have said they will vote for it; I hope we have more. Sometime later this

week—I don't know if we will use the 30 hours but, hopefully, sometime later this week, we can finally pass it. As I said, I think this week will be one that will be an uplifting week. We have had a lot of problems around this place over the last couple of months. I know from the polls that Members of Congress, in both the House and the Senate, are probably about as popular as a toothache with the general public right now. But this week we can show the American people we can come together and we can lift our eyes above the haze and the smoke on the horizon, and we can make this country a better place for all of us by passing this bill. Let's do this, and let's bring to the American people what they think they have already and what they now want. That is, a society free of discrimination.

I yield the floor and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I just returned from spending a weekend in my home State of Wyoming, traveling around the State and visiting with people in Natrona County and Casper as well as in Rock Springs, WY. I attended a marvelous event held every year in Sweetwater County called Cowboys Against Cancer. There were 700 people there to celebrate successes and remember those whom we have lost in these battles. I was there along with Senator ENZI as well as our Governor and others talking about an issue facing the Nation—an issue, of course, that is on everyone's mind—the health care law. This has been a very rough 5 weeks for hard-working Americans who are concerned about their health, and this obviously came up for significant discussion at the Cowboys Against Cancer event Saturday night in Wyoming.

Many people were hoping the Democrats' health care law would actually help decrease costs; that it would actually help increase access to quality health care. But all America knows that hasn't happened. On October 1, the Obama administration launched its health care exchange. This was to be the biggest moment of the President's signature achievement in office. It was one where people were looking forward to the opening of the exchanges, and it flopped. It completely flopped. The Web site crashed and fell right on the heads of the people who were already anxious about their health care. People all across the country saw this collapse,

and even the late-night comedians have made a lot of jokes about the incompetence and the mismanagement of the Obama administration.

But I have to say the failure of the exchange is no laughing matter, because this is much more than a failed Web site. Real people are facing real health care problems and are being hurt because of this administration's failed health care law. Because of this law, millions of people are getting letters saying their insurance has been canceled. I talked to some of them this past weekend in Wyoming. There are at least 3½ million people impacted by this across the country, and the number continues to climb every day. The Obama administration says that is no big deal. They say only 3½ million people are losing the insurance plans they have now. But this administration's goal—their goal—was just 7 million people covered in the exchanges. So why does the White House think 3½ million Americans losing their coverage is no big deal when their goal this year was to cover 7 million Americans?

President Obama and Democrats in Congress promised over and over: If you like your insurance, you can keep it. But that wasn't true. The Washington Post Fact Checker looked into the President's claim. These are the folks who decide if something is truthful or not truthful. They gave the President the full four Pinocchios for completely false claims.

The Fact Checker wrote:

The President's promise apparently came with a very large caveat: "If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan—if we deem it to be adequate."

Well, the President never said that. If the White House had been honest about people losing their health insurance, this law would never have passed. But the law did pass and people across the country are learning how much it is going to actually hurt them personally.

For millions of people who are losing the insurance they have, they are finding the options available under the Democrats' health care law much more limited and much more expensive. The rates are higher, the deductibles are higher, their copays are higher. It is not the kind of reform people wanted or needed, but that is what the Washington Democrats gave them.

The cost increases and the canceled insurance policies are just the beginning. A lot of people are now starting to realize they are no longer going to have access to their family's doctor. It wasn't supposed to happen this way. President Obama said this in 2009:

We will keep this promise: If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. Period.

That is what President Obama said. If the White House had been honest

about how many families were going to lose access to their doctors, this health care law would never have passed. But the White House did make that promise, Democrats did pass that law, and American families all across the country are suffering as a result.

Coming back from Wyoming this morning I picked up USA Today. The editorial page of this newspaper supported the President's health care law, but their view today is:

Coverage cancellations belie Obama's promise. Obamacare is starting to resemble a patient bleeding from self-inflicted wounds. A month after launch, the online health exchanges where individuals are supposed to shop for insurance remain slow or unusable, except in states that opted to run their own marketplaces and did a more competent job than the administration.

States were more competent than the administration.

Continuing to quote the article:

As if that weren't trouble enough, critics are justifiably mocking President Obama for his repeated, untrue promise that if people liked their health plans, they could keep them.

The editorial on the opinion page of today's USA Today says:

Oops. Hundreds of thousands of people are getting termination notices from plans that don't meet the strict new requirements of the Affordable Care Act. Presumably, not all those people disliked their plans.

Referring to the President, they go on to say:

Now he can't seem to admit he overpromised and oversimplified. He and his aides compound their credibility problem by suggesting that people whose plans are being canceled "just shop around in the new marketplace"—a laughable impossibility while HealthCare.gov is plagued by bugs.

So that is what I read in this morning's USA Today as I was coming back from Wyoming. Then I picked up the Wall Street Journal and turned to another column, and this is a guest column: "You Also Can't Keep Your Doctor."

You also can't keep your doctor. And there is a little subheadline that reads: "I had great cancer doctors and health insurance. My plan was cancelled. Now I worry how long I'll live."

I am sorry the Senate Chamber isn't full of all those people who voted for this health care law as this woman worries how long she will live. The Wall Street Journal says it is an absolutely devastating piece by one woman who is suffering because of the health care law. Her name is Edie Littlefield Sundby. She wrote about her experience fighting stage 4 gallbladder cancer. She had a health care plan with affordable access to good doctors who she points out saved her life.

As a doctor, I will tell you stage 4 gallbladder cancer has a very small chance of success and survival. She has beaten the odds because of those taking care of her. But now she has been told that the plan she has is being can-

celed because of the President's health care law. Here is what she wrote:

What happened to the President's promise, you can keep your health plan? Or the promise that, you can keep your doctor? Thanks to the law, I have been forced to give up a world-class health plan. The exchange would force me to give up a world-class physician.

She has had some of the best physicians in the world—MD Anderson in Texas and California at Stanford, as well as in her home community of San Diego.

Washington Democrats knew their law would harm people such as Edie Littlefield Sundby who writes today in the Wall Street Journal. They knew that people like her all across the country would lose their insurance and lose their doctors. They just didn't want the American people to know it.

It was in the regulations that they wrote and they supported. The issue has to do with a section of the health care law that says that anyone who had an insurance policy on March 23, 2010, and continued to renew it, could keep it even after the ObamaCare exchange is launched. It is called a grandfather clause, and it is to protect people from the law's new rules and mandates—to let people, if they had something they liked, keep what they had.

But less than 3 months after the President signed his health care law, the administration issued a regulation setting very specific criteria these health plans had to meet in order to be grandfathered. The regulation dismantled the section of the law by placing unreasonably tight restrictions on grandfathered policies. Now, any routine change made to a grandfathered insurance plan immediately breaks the Democrats' promise that Americans can keep their health insurance.

A lot of consumers want the freedom and flexibility to increase their plan deductible, or copayments, rather than face a higher monthly premium. It is natural that people want to do it—with their health insurance, car insurance, or homeowners insurance. Looking and making decisions for you and your family is just part of being responsible. The Obama administration's regulations took away that choice.

Republicans saw this train wreck coming, and we tried to stop it. My colleague Senator ENZI from Wyoming in 2010 brought S.J. Res. 39 to this floor. This was a Resolution of Disapproval, which would have immediately overturned the administration's burdensome grandfather regulations.

What Senator ENZI brought to the floor for a vote of the entire body would have, if passed, allowed everyone to keep the insurance they had if they liked it—basically, to uphold the President's promise.

Republicans supported this resolution. Senate Democrats voted against it in lockstep. Absolutely every one of them said no. They kept the regulation

on the books and made sure people would not be able to keep the insurance policy they had if they liked it.

Now Democrats don't want to hear about people like Edie with stage 4 gallbladder cancer. Republicans do want to hear about people like her—people who are losing their coverage because of this health care law. We want people to tell us their stories by tweeting with the hashtag "YourStory." We want to make sure that nobody in the Obama administration forgets that these are real people and they have been hurt by this health care law which the President has continued to, on party lines, force down the throats of the American people in its passage, and then continue to deliberately deceive the American people with his quotes, not very long ago, and repeated so many times: If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan.

Republicans support real health care reform. We support ideas such as allowing people to buy insurance across State lines. That would increase access to coverage and to care, not decrease it. That would increase competition and bring down prices—not raise them. But the Democrats' health care law is doing just that. That would be a reform that would help the American people. But the Obama health care law took the exact opposite approach.

Here is how Edie Littlefield Sundby put it in her story. She wrote:

Before the Affordable Care Act, health-insurance policies could not be sold across state lines; now policies sold on the Affordable Care Act exchanges may not be offered across county lines.

That should change. President Obama and Washington Democrats wanted a political win. They were willing to do anything and say anything—to say whatever they needed—to get that win, whether it was true or not. If they had been honest with the American people, they would have never gotten this law passed. But the Democrats' health care law today in America is hurting people, hurting families, hurting Americans. This must end.

The President should come to the table. He should work with Republicans to pass real reform, to help the American people who have been hurt and continue to be hurt by his health care law.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to talk about a bipartisan effort to advance

uniquely American values: freedom, fairness, and opportunity. The Employment Non-Discrimination Act, or ENDA, has at its foundation these core values. It is about freedom, the freedom to realize our founding belief that all Americans are created equal under the law. It is about fairness, about whether lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans deserve to be treated just as their family members, their friends, their neighbors, and fellow workers. It is about opportunity, about whether every American gets to dream the same dreams, chase the same ambitions, and have the same shot at success.

One year ago this week the people of Wisconsin elected me to the Senate. The citizens of Wisconsin made history, electing our State's first woman to the U.S. Senate, and electing the first out gay or lesbian person to the U.S. Senate in the history of our great Nation. But I didn't run to make history, I ran to make a difference, a difference that would give everyone a fair shot at achieving their dreams.

I couldn't be more proud of the bipartisan effort to make a difference with the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. I thank and recognize my colleagues Senators MARK KIRK, JEFF MERKLEY, SUSAN COLLINS, and TOM HARKIN for their leadership working across party lines and moving this legislation forward. I take great pride at being a part of this effort. I think it shows great promise of what can be achieved if we work together in a bipartisan way to get work done for the American people.

I also want to take the time to recognize the 55 cosponsors of this bill, both Democrats and Republicans, who made a commitment to ending discrimination against our fellow citizens simply because of who they are and who they love. I realize that for some this is not an easy vote. I understand for some they may believe it is not good politics. But I want to say that I have a deep respect for those who choose to stand on the side of progress for our country this week. For those who stand this week and answer the call for courage, I can say with confidence your courage will be respected and remembered when the history of this struggle is written.

In June I had the opportunity to speak at the Department of Justice during its Pride Month observations. It was fitting that we gathered in a building that bears the name of Robert F. Kennedy. He became Attorney General at a time of rapid progress in the area of civil rights, progress that thrilled many Americans and frightened others. Kennedy knew, however, that America should be on the side of progress. He traveled to Georgia, at the time unfriendly territory for a civil rights reformer, to make his first formal speech at the University of Georgia law

school. He did not shy away from the Kennedy administration's commitment to equal opportunity, "For on this generation of Americans," he explained, "falls the full burden of proving to the world that we really mean it when we say that all men are created free and equal before the law."

He backed his words with actions, not only by vigorously enforcing the laws and court orders that advanced the cause of civil rights but by holding the Kennedy administration itself accountable, demanding that the Justice Department and other government entities prioritize diversity in the workplace. Of course, as much progress as that generation made in fulfilling the promises America makes about fairness and equality, there was plenty to do for the generations that have followed.

Today we continue that work, guided by the belief that everyone deserves a fair shot at the American dream and that our LGBT family members, friends, and neighbors deserve to be treated as everyone else in the United States. Every American deserves the freedom to work free of discrimination. Passing the Employment Non-Discrimination Act strengthens this freedom by recognizing the right to be judged based on your skills, talents, loyalty, character, integrity, and work ethic.

My home State of Wisconsin was the first State in the Nation to add sexual orientation to its antidiscrimination laws. At the time, back in 1982, only 41 municipalities and 8 counties in the United States offered limited protections against discrimination based on sexual orientation. Wisconsin's efforts to pass the Nation's first sexual orientation antidiscrimination statute were supported by a broad and bipartisan coalition, including members of the clergy, various religious denominations, medical and professional groups. The measure was signed into law by our Republican Governor, Lee Sherman Dreyfus, who based his decision to support the measure on the success of municipal ordinances providing similar protections against discrimination.

Since Wisconsin passed its statute in 1982, 20 States and the District of Columbia, representing nearly 45 percent of our Nation's population, have passed similar antidiscrimination measures. Sixteen States and the District of Columbia also protect their citizens on the basis of gender identity. However, 76 million American workers have to contend with the ugly reality that in over two dozen States it is legal to discriminate against LGBT employees. That is simply wrong and this legislation seeks to right that wrong.

The business community understands this. That is why a majority of Fortune 500 companies have sexual orientation and gender identity nondiscrimination policies in place, and more than 100

companies have endorsed this bill. It is time to level the playing field and extend these protections to all Americans. But we don't just want to live in a country where our rights are respected under the law; we want to live in a country where we are respected for who we are, where we enjoy freedom and opportunity because that is who we are as Americans.

More than 5 years after he spoke at the University of Georgia law school, half a world away at Cape Town University, in South Africa, Robert F. Kennedy said, "Few will have the greatness to bend history, but each of us can work to change a small portion of the events and then the total—all of these acts—will be written in the history of this generation."

The change we work for today can add up to incredible progress in our lifetime. This generation can be the one in which we fulfill the promises of freedom and equality for all, in which America finally becomes a place where everyone's rights are respected at work and every family's love and commitment can be recognized and respected and rewarded under the law.

I am hopeful that we can now move this Employment Non-Discrimination Act forward, to build a tomorrow that is more equal, not less, for all Americans.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I am pleased to be a longtime supporter and original cosponsor of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, known more commonly as ENDA. This bill will affirm the principle that individuals in the workplace should be judged on their skills and abilities and not on extraneous criteria, such as sexual orientation.

In 2002, more than 10 years ago, I was proud to join Senator Ted Kennedy, whom we all remember as a lifelong champion of civil rights, as the cosponsor of ENDA. I am pleased to support this important bill again today, but I am dismayed that so many years have gone by—more than a decade—and this bill still has not become law. It is time for us to enact this important legislation.

I wish to recognize the efforts of the chief sponsors of this bill, Senators MERKLEY and KIRK, who took up this cause and moved this bill forward. I also acknowledge the work of chairman TOM HARKIN in bringing this bill to the Senate floor. He, too, has been a champion of civil rights throughout his long

career, and I hope that when he retires at the end of this Congress, this bill will be one more of his accomplishments.

The time to pass it has come. All Americans deserve a fair opportunity to pursue the American dream. Over the years, we have rightly taken a stand against workplace discrimination based on race, sex, national origin, religion, age, and disability. It is past time that we ensure that all employees are judged solely based on their talents, abilities, hard work, and capabilities by closing an important gap in Federal employment law as it relates to sexual orientation. The right to work is fundamental. How can we in good conscience deny that right to any LGBT American who is qualified and willing to work? Especially in today's economy, job security has taken on an even greater importance to all Americans. How can we, in good conscience, tell one segment of Americans that they are not entitled to that security because of whom they love?

Equal rights in the workplace is neither a new nor a revolutionary concept. Much of corporate America has already embraced LGBT protections. Why? Because it allows them to attract the best and the brightest employees and to retain talented employees. Nearly 90 percent of Fortune 500 companies already have sexual orientation nondiscrimination policies in place, and many Maine businesses and businesses associated with the State of Maine have such policies. They include IDEXX Laboratories, L.L. Bean, Maine Medical Center, the Warren Center in Bangor, Hannaford Supermarkets, Bath Ironworks, and Unum, a large insurance company. There are many more. I ask unanimous consent that a list of leading Maine employers that support workplace fairness and the passage of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

In addition, ENDA is very similar to current law in nearly two dozen States, including, I am proud to say, the great State of Maine.

But in spite of how far we have advanced the cause of civil rights in this country, it still remains legal in 29 States to fire or to refuse to hire someone simply because he or she is lesbian, gay, or bisexual. Most businesses don't discriminate. They simply want to hire the best worker for the job, regardless of sexual orientation. But in others, high-performing LGBT employees can be and still are legally discriminated against.

When I discuss this issue with many of my constituents, they are shocked to learn it is legal under Federal law—not Maine law but Federal law—for them to refuse to hire or to fire someone solely because of their sexual orientation. They find that shocking. They just assume our civil rights laws,

which protect people from discrimination based on race, gender, religion, and age, also protect individuals based on sexual orientation. Of course, because they are operating in the State of Maine, they cannot legally discriminate against an individual based on sexual orientation. I am proud to say the vast majority of Maine's businesses would never think of discriminating based on sexual orientation. They simply want to hire and retain the best person for the job.

Along with former Senator Joe Lieberman of Connecticut, I worked hard to repeal the military's discriminatory policy of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell." That policy prevented gay and lesbian servicemembers from being open about their sexual orientation. My view was that if they were willing to put on the uniform of our country, be deployed to distant lands, and risk their lives for our freedom, we should be thanking them, not trying to exclude them from serving in the military. Now that "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" has been repealed, I think it is significant that the implementation of repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" has gone so smoothly. It has gone very well, contrary to the dire predictions of some of the opponents. We hear some of the same kinds of predictions today as we debate this bill. I would say that, just as the repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" has been implemented quite smoothly, we will see ENDA implemented smoothly as well if we stand, do what is right, and pass this bill.

The bill before the Senate deserves support as a matter of fairness and as a matter of civil rights. It is a commonsense solution consistent with existing Federal civil rights laws, and it will not place an undue burden on American employers. We would not see so many companies voluntarily adopting nondiscrimination policies if it were somehow burdensome to do so. They are doing so because it is in their own best interests, because they want the most qualified employees and to retain the most talented employees, regardless of their sexual orientation. That is not relevant to their ability to do the job.

Finally, it is simply right to pass this bill. We cannot in this day and age countenance legal discrimination against qualified employees and applicants. It is time that we enact this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support ENDA, and I am hopeful we will get more than the 60 votes needed this evening to proceed to this important bill.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN—MAINE

HEADQUARTERED COMPANIES AND ORGANIZATIONS WITH GENDER IDENTITY AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICIES

Brewer Medical Center, Capehart Community Health Center, Eastern Maine AIDS Network, Extended Care Services, Helen Hunt Health Center, Hope House, IDEXX Laboratories Inc., L.L. Bean Inc., Maine Medical Center, MaineGeneral Medical Center, Penobscot Community Health Care, Summer Street Health Center, Warren Center.

OTHER COMPANIES AND ORGANIZATIONS WITH GENDER IDENTITY AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICIES

Adecco North America, LLC, American Eagle Outfitters, American Institute of Architects, Bank of America Corp., Best Buy, Charles Schwab & Co., Choice Hotels International, Corning, CVS, Darden Restaurants, Dollar Tree, Gap, General Dynamics (Bath Ironworks), General Electric, Hannaford Supermarket, Home Depot, ING Financial, InterContinental Hotels Group Americas, J C Penney, KeyCorp, Levi Strauss & Co., Lowe's.

Marriott, Marsh & McLennan Companies, McKesson Technologies, Merck & Co., Mitchell Gold + Bob Williams, Morgan Stanley, New Balance, Nike, Olive Garden, Pizza Hut, RBC Wealth Management, Rite-Aid, Ryder Systems, Subway, SUPERVALU, Target, TD Bank, Texas Instruments, Time Warner, UnumProvident, UPS, Walmart.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WITH GENDER IDENTITY AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICIES

Bangor Theological Seminary, Bates College, Maine Media College, Bowdoin College, Colby College, University of Maine System (7 campuses).

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WITH GENDER IDENTITY AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICIES

State of Maine.

BUSINESS COALITION FOR WORKPLACE FAIRNESS

The majority of United States businesses have already started addressing workplace fairness for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender employees. But we need a federal standard that treats all employees the same way.

The Business Coalition for Workplace Fairness is a group of leading U.S. employers that support the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, a federal bill that would provide the same basic protections that are already afforded to workers across the country.

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender employees are not protected under federal law from being fired, refused work or otherwise discriminated against. ENDA would do just that.

LEADING EMPLOYERS THAT SUPPORT WORKPLACE FAIRNESS AND THE PASSAGE OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT

Accenture Ltd., New York, NY; Alcoa Inc., New York, NY; American Eagle Outfitters Inc., Pittsburgh, PA; American Institute of Architects, Washington, DC; Ameriprise Financial Inc., Minneapolis, MN; Amgen Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA; AMR Corp. (American Airlines), Fort Worth, TX; Bank of America Corp., Charlotte, NC; The Bank of New York Mellon Corp. (BNY Mellon), New York, NY; Barclays, New York, NY; BASF Corp., Florham Park, NJ; Bausch & Lomb Inc., Rochester, NY; Best Buy Co. Inc., Richfield,

MN; Bingham McCutchen LLP, Boston, MA; Biogen Idec Inc., Weston, MA; BMC Software Inc., Houston, TX; BNP Paribas, New York, NY; Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals Inc., Ridgefield, CT; BP America Inc., Warrenville, IL; Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., New York, NY; Broadridge Financial Solutions Inc., Lake Success, NY; CA Technologies Inc., Islandia, NY; Caesars Entertainment Corp., Las Vegas, NV; Capital One Financial Corp., McLean, VA; Cardinal Health Inc., Dublin, OH; CareFusion Corp., San Diego, CA.

CC Media Holdings Inc. (Clear Channel), San Antonio, TX; Charles Schwab & Co., San Francisco, CA; Chevron Corp., San Ramon, CA; Choice Hotels International Inc., Silver Spring, MD; Chubb Corp., Warren, NJ; Cisco Systems Inc., San Jose, CA; Citigroup, New York, NY; Clorox Co., Oakland, CA; The Coca-Cola Co., Atlanta, GA; Corning Inc., Corning, NY; Darden Restaurants Inc., Orlando, FL; Dell Inc., Round Rock, TX; Deloitte LLP, New York, NY; The Depository Trust & Clearing Corp., New York, NY; Deutsche Bank, New York, NY; Diageo North America, Norwalk, CT; Dow Chemical Co., Midland, MI; Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, NY; Electronic Arts Inc., Redwood City, CA; Eli Lilly & Co., Indianapolis, IN; EMC Corp., Hopkinton, MA; Ernst & Young LLP, New York, NY; Expedia Inc., Bellevue, WA; Gap Inc., San Francisco, CA; General Electric Co., Fairfield, CT; General Mills Inc., Minneapolis, MN; General Motors Corp., Detroit, MI; GlaxoSmithKline, Philadelphia, PA; Goldman Sachs Group Inc., New York, NY; Google Inc., Mountain View, CA.

Groupon Inc., Chicago, IL; Hanover Direct Inc., Weehawken, NJ; Herman Miller Inc., Zeeland, MI; Hewlett-Packard Co., Palo Alto, CA; Hillshire Brands Co., Downers Grove, IL; Hilton Worldwide, McLean, VA; Hospira Inc., Lake Forest, IL; HSBC—North America, Prospect Heights, IL; Hyatt Hotels Corp., Chicago, IL; Integrity Staffing Solutions Inc., Wilmington, DE; InterContinental Hotels Group Americas, Atlanta, GA; International Business Machines Corp., Armonk, NY; Jenner & Block LLP, Chicago, IL; JPMorgan Chase & Co., New York, NY; Kaiser Permanente, Oakland, CA; KeyCorp, Cleveland, OH; Kimpton Hotel & Restaurant Group, San Francisco, CA; KPMG LLP, New York, NY; Levi Strauss & Co., San Francisco, CA; Marriott International Inc., Bethesda, MD; Marsh & McLennan Companies Inc., New York, NY; Merck & Co. Inc., Whitehouse Station, NJ; Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA; MillerCoors Brewing Co., Chicago, IL.

Mitchell Gold + Bob Williams, Taylorsville, NC; Moody's Corp., New York, NY; Morgan Stanley, New York, NY; Motorola Inc., Schaumburg, IL; Nationwide, Columbus, OH; The Nielsen Co., Schaumburg, IL; Nike Inc., Beaverton, OR; Oracle Corp., Redwood City, CA; Orbitz Worldwide Inc., Chicago, IL; Pfizer Inc., New York, NY; PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, New York, NY; Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, OH; QUALCOMM Inc., San Diego, CA; RBC Wealth Management, Minneapolis, MN; Replacements Ltd., McLeansville, NC; Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi LLP, Minneapolis, MN; Self-Help Credit Union, Durham, NC; SUPERVALU Inc., Eden Prairie, MN; Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association—College Retirement Equities Fund, New York, NY; Tech Data Corp., Clearwater, FL; Texas Instruments Inc., Dallas, TX; Thomson Reuters, New York, NY; Time Warner Inc., New York, NY; Travelers Companies Inc., New York, NY; UBS AG, Stamford, CT; US Air-

ways Group Inc., Tempe, AZ; WellPoint Inc., Indianapolis, IN; Wells Fargo & Co., San Francisco, CA; Whirlpool Corp., Benton Harbor, MI; Xerox Corp., Stamford, CT; Yahoo! Inc., Sunnyvale, CA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Maine for her statement. This is not a partisan issue. Senator MARK KIRK, my Republican colleague from Illinois, is a cosponsor of this issue as well.

When it comes to discrimination, neither party has a monopoly on opposing discrimination. We should be working together. So I thank the Senator from Maine for speaking as she has so often for the kinds of liberties and values which we all should share in this country.

If we ask most Americans this very basic question: Is it legal to discriminate against someone because they are gay—to say I won't hire you, I won't promote you, I won't give you a raise—80 percent of Americans say, of course not. That can't be legal in America. The reality is that in more than half of the States it is legal, and in more than two-thirds of the States it is legal to discriminate based on gender identity. That which we take for granted as part of the ordinary course of life and business in America turns out not to be true. This ENDA bill, which is going to be considered on a procedural vote in about an hour, is an effort to establish a national standard of tolerance, a national standard against discrimination.

I come from a background—and I think most people do—that believes each person deserves a chance to prove themselves and that we shouldn't hold it against them if they happen to be a man or a woman, a person who is of one religious faith or another, or because of a person's national origin, race, or religion. We shouldn't discriminate against people based on that. It really strikes me as fundamental to what we are as Americans to say that everyone deserves a chance to be judged on the merits, on the basis of their performance. This Employment Non-Discrimination Act, on which we will consider a procedural vote in about an hour, is an effort to enshrine that into law at the Federal level.

Some of the critics say: Why are you doing this? The House of Representatives will never take this up; they will never consider it. Well, I think it is our responsibility to speak out in favor of doing the right thing. I am hoping that, as we saw with the statement from the Senator from Maine, Republicans will step up and realize that this shouldn't be a partisan issue, and that the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, where the Republicans have the majority, will actually stand and speak against this form of discrimination.

As many as 48 percent of lesbian, gay, or bisexual Americans and 59 per-

cent of transgender Americans have no legal protection against discrimination in the workplace. In 29 States, lesbian, gay, and bisexual Americans have no legal protection. In three States, transgender Americans have no protection. Between 15 percent and 43 percent of LGBT people have experienced discrimination or harassment in the workplace as a result of their sexual orientation. Twenty-six percent of transgender people report having been fired from a job because of gender identity, and 90 percent reported experiencing harassment, mistreatment, or discrimination.

Those are terrible statistics, but there is a ray of hope. We found it on the issue of marriage equality, and we found it when it comes to discrimination based on sexual orientation, and here is what is most hopeful: Younger people don't feel this way. The newer generation across America looks at the older folks, scratches their heads, and says: What are you doing? Why would you possibly discriminate against someone because of their sexual orientation?

There are some who will decry this as the deterioration of American values. Not me. I think it is an indication that each generation has an opportunity to expand opportunity, an opportunity to expand freedom, and to put to rest discrimination. How many times has it happened throughout our history? We waged a Civil War over the issue of race and slavery, and in our Constitution women were treated as second class citizens and not allowed to vote until the 20th century. We have seen similar discrimination against groups throughout our history. We know it happened in the early days when it came to discrimination against those who were disabled and faced other disabilities. All of that is changing for the better. We are moving toward a society that really judges people based on what they do with their lives, how they conduct themselves.

When we extend Federal employment discrimination protections currently provided based on race, religion, sex, national origin, age, and disability to sexual orientation and gender identity, we will be moving forward on this Employment Non-Discrimination Act, which is known as ENDA. In this measure, we prohibit public and private employers with more than 15 employees, employment agencies, and labor unions from using an individual's sexual orientation or gender identity as the basis for employment discrimination such as hiring, firing, promotion or compensation. We apply to Congress and the Federal Government as well as employees of State and local governments the same basic protection.

This bill reflects what the business community is largely already doing. A majority of Fortune 500 companies have sexual orientation and gender

identity nondiscrimination policies in place. More than 100 companies have already endorsed this bill.

Recent polling has shown the majority of small businesses have sexual orientation and gender identity nondiscrimination policies in place. One might say: If so many businesses are already moving in this direction, why do we need it? Well, the vast majority of American businesses didn't discriminate based on race, but to protect people looking for jobs, and others, we wanted to make sure everyone was protected in the Civil Rights Act.

The business community from Wall Street to Main Street understands that hiring the best and brightest, without considering irrelevant characteristics such as sexual orientation and gender identity, is the best way to compete in our global economy.

ENDA would extend the protections already offered by the majority of businesses to level the playing field and ensure that all Americans have equal protection against employment discrimination.

We do not get many chances in this job to make a mark in history. This will be our chance in the Senate. In just an hour we will have this procedural vote. We need 60. We have 55 Democrats, but we need 5 Republicans to step up and join us. I believe we will have them, and I hope many more.

Let's make this a solid bipartisan effort, a solid stand against discrimination. That ought to be one issue that brings both parties together. With a solid vote coming out of the Senate, I hope our friends on the opposite side of the Rotunda will follow our lead and they will consider and pass this important and historic legislation.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF GREGORY HOWARD WOODS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

NOMINATION OF DEBRA M. BROWN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider

the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Gregory Howard Woods, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York and Debra M. Brown, of Mississippi, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today, we are voting on the nominations of Debra Brown and Gregory Woods to fill vacancies on the District Courts of Mississippi and New York. If confirmed, Ms. Brown would be the first African-American woman to serve as a Federal judge in Mississippi. I am proud that together we will reach a landmark moment in diversity on the Federal bench, and I commend President Obama, Senator WICKER, and Senator COCHRAN for their important efforts.

These nominations come at a trying time for the Federal courts. We have more than 90 judicial vacancies, and 37 of these vacancies have been designated as emergency vacancies due to high caseloads by the nonpartisan Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. While it is a sign of progress that we will vote to confirm two additional judges today, it is essential that the Senate move faster to confirm those judges that the Federal judiciary so urgently needs.

Last week, when debating whether we would be allowed to have an up-or-down vote on the nomination of Patricia Millett to the D.C. Circuit, there was a lot of talk by Senate Republicans that Senate Democrats should be concerned with filling judicial emergency vacancies rather than the D.C. Circuit, which they claim does not need more judges. We all know that their arguments about the D.C. Circuit have nothing to do with caseload and everything to do with the political party of the President nominating. As one of only three members of my caucus who have served in the Senate since the 1970s, and having served both in the majority and the minority, I have cautioned against changing the rules. However, if the filibuster rules continue to be abused by my Republican colleagues I will have no option but to reconsider my longstanding opposition to such a change.

I also find the Senate Republicans' newfound concern about judicial emergency vacancies particularly rich with irony given their role in preventing this President from filling many of those vacancies. In fact, nearly half of the emergency vacancies are empty because of Republican obstruction. First, there are 15 judicial nominees pending before the full Senate, including 7

nominees who would fill judicial emergency vacancies if the Republicans would allow us to vote on them today: Elizabeth A. Wolford, to be U.S. district judge for the Western District of New York; Brian Morris, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Montana; Susan P. Watters, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Montana; Brian J. Davis, to be U.S. district judge for the Middle District of Florida; James Donato, to be U.S. district judge for the Northern District of California; Beth Labson Freeman, to be U.S. district judge for the Northern District of California; and Pedro A. Delgado Hernandez, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Puerto Rico. Instead, Republicans continue to force many of these nominees to wait needlessly on the Senate floor.

Moreover, Republicans are obstructing nominees from filling these judicial emergency vacancies in other ways that the public is less aware. Much of these delay tactics occur earlier in the process, and include the refusal to return blue slips and the refusal to provide recommendations to the President for district court nominees from their State that they would be willing to support. In fact, there are judicial emergency vacancies that have persisted for years because certain Republican Senators refuse to either return their blue slip or provide a recommendation to the President. So I take these hollow accusations about focusing on judicial emergency vacancies from Senate Republicans with a grain of salt. This is advice I will heed once Senate Republicans demonstrate through their actions that they care about filling vacancies.

It is good news for New York and Mississippi that the Senate will vote today to confirm two excellent nominees. Yet I believe that the Senate should have acted sooner on these nominations. These nominees are uncontroversial and have remained on the Senate floor for far too long. The unnecessary and irresponsible government shutdown did serious harm to our Federal courts, which was already operating on fumes as a result of sequestration and the high levels of judicial vacancies.

Gregory Woods is nominated to a vacancy on the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York. Since 2012, Mr. Woods has served as the general counsel for the U.S. Department of Energy. He previously served for 3 years as deputy general counsel at the Department of Transportation, and in private practice for 11 years at Debevoise & Plimpton LLP, first as an associate, and later as a partner. Following law school, he worked for 4 years as a trial attorney in the Commercial Litigation Branch of the Civil Division at the Department of Justice. Mr. Woods earned his B.A., with honors, from Williams College and his J.D.

from Yale Law School. He has the support of both of his home State Senators, Senator SCHUMER and Senator GILLIBRAND. The Judiciary Committee approved his nomination by voice vote more than 3 months ago.

Debra Brown is nominated to a vacancy on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi. Since 2012, Debra Brown has been a shareholder in the law firm Wise Carter Child & Caraway. She previously worked at the law firm Phelps Dunbar LLP for over 15 years, first as an associate, then as a partner, and finally as a counsel. While earning a reputation as an excellent litigator, she stayed involved in her community, providing pro bono legal services through the Mississippi Volunteer Lawyers Project and serving on the Board of Directors for the Mississippi Center for Justice. Ms. Brown earned her B.A. from Mississippi State University, and her J.D. from the University of Mississippi School of Law. Her nomination has the support of both her home State Senators, Senator WICKER and Senator COCHRAN. The Judiciary Committee approved her nomination by voice vote more than 3 months ago.

To me, the path forward is simple. Nominees such as the ones being voted on today and the other uncontroversial, qualified nominees currently pending before the full Senate should be confirmed immediately so that they can get to work for the American people. Now that this shutdown has ended, we must work together to make sure that our Federal judiciary, a coequal and independent branch of government, has the resources it needs to be working at full strength and with a full complement of judges. Only then will we have a judicial system worthy of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I am pleased to support the confirmation of Ms. Debra Brown to be a U.S. district court judge for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Ms. Brown graduated from the Mississippi State University School of Architecture in 1987, where she served as a member of the school's advisory council. She worked as an architect in Washington, DC, where she participated in the renovation and restoration of municipal and historic buildings and in the construction of commercial and residential properties as well.

She received her law degree from the University of Mississippi School of Law in 1997, where she served as associate editor and articles editor of the Mississippi Law Journal. Ms. Brown became the only lawyer in Mississippi with degrees in both architecture and law.

In 1997 she joined the Phelps Dunbar law firm in Jackson, MS, where she be-

came a partner and remained until January 2012, when she joined, as a shareholder, the Jackson law firm of Wise Carter Child & Caraway. Both of these firms are highly respected.

During her almost 16 years in private practice, Ms. Brown has had the opportunity to be involved in numerous civil cases in a wide range of subjects. Her specialty was commercial construction and civil liability litigation. She is a member of the American Bar Association, the National Bar Association, and the Federal Bar Association, as well as a member of the Mississippi State Bar, the Magnolia Bar Association, and the Mississippi Women Lawyers Association, where she has served as president. She is a fellow of the Mississippi Bar Foundation. In 2004 Ms. Brown received the Jackson Young Lawyers Outstanding Service Award, and in 2008 she was recognized by the Mississippi Business Journal as one of Mississippi's leading businesswomen.

Her nomination was approved unanimously by the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary. I am very pleased to support this nomination. Ms. Debra Brown is very well qualified for this important responsibility, and I am confident she will serve with distinction as a U.S. district court judge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I rise this afternoon, joining my colleague from Mississippi, in strong support of Debra Brown's confirmation to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi. Ms. Brown was nominated in May by President Obama to fill the seat held by my friend, the late district court judge Allen Pepper.

As one of Mississippi's two U.S. Senators, I enthusiastically recommend Ms. Brown based upon her qualifications. In addition, I am thrilled and honored to be part of this historic moment for our State. If confirmed, Ms. Brown will become the first female African-American U.S. district judge in Mississippi. Making history, however, would be just the latest achievement in Ms. Brown's admirable career, which has reflected a longtime commitment to excellence—the kind of excellence her parents expected of her and her four sisters throughout their childhood. Ms. Brown would go on to make her parents proud and to be a credit to her hometown.

Sharing in this special moment today is Ms. Brown's native Yazoo City, MS. It is worth mentioning that along with Federal judges William Barbour and Carlton Reeves, Debra Brown now becomes the third district court judge in recent memory from the small town of Yazoo City.

Ms. Brown is a proven trailblazer. As my colleague just stated, she was the second African-American female to graduate from the School of Architec-

ture at Mississippi State University and the first member of her family to earn a law degree, which she completed in 1997 from the University of Mississippi School of Law. So her confirmation today will be a source of justifiable pride for two of Mississippi's great universities. Not many lawyers in the country have degrees in architecture and in law, and indeed Debra Brown is reportedly the only practicing lawyer in Mississippi with an architectural background.

Following law school, Ms. Brown rose to become a partner in the law office of Phelps Dunbar in Jackson, MS. Since last year she has been a shareholder in the law firm of Wise Carter Child & Caraway, where she has handled a wide variety of commercial litigation matters before both Federal and State courts.

According to press reports, Ms. Brown's friends expect her to be very coordinated, very detailed, and very prepared as a judge. Ms. Brown's college dean at Mississippi State University recalled that her key character traits are perseverance, diligence, and focus. He noted that she overcame early struggles, winning the top architecture student honor—the Alpha Rho Chi Medal—in her senior year.

It is clear that Ms. Brown will bring a unique perspective to the court, drawing upon a diverse professional and educational background. I am confident her service will be good for our country, our State, and especially good for the city of Greenville, where she will preside. Having a judge who is also an architect would be particularly serendipitous for Greenville. The Federal courthouse there is woefully inadequate. The court is in desperate need of a new state-of-the-art courthouse. I am hopeful Ms. Brown's tenure will coincide with its construction.

Although Ms. Brown's law career has focused primarily on civil litigation, her dedication to her profession goes far beyond casework. From 2003 to 2004 she served as president of the Mississippi Women Lawyers Association. She was also named by the Mississippi Business Journal as one of Mississippi's 50 leading businesswomen. In addition to pro bono work, Ms. Brown serves on the board of the Mississippi Center for Justice, a public interest law firm that combats discrimination and poverty in Mississippi, and Operation Shoestring, which empowers families and children in the Jackson community. She has been endorsed by a number of prestigious organizations, including the Magnolia Bar Association, which represents minorities and other lawyers and judges throughout the State of Mississippi.

Our country needs judges who have a record of professional excellence, integrity, and public service. Ms. Brown has demonstrated this throughout her career. I urge my colleagues to vote for

her confirmation for the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I am told the Senator from Illinois is waiting to speak. I know the time has been reserved for me on these judges, but of course I would be willing to yield to him.

I ask the Chair, how long does the Senator from Illinois need?

Mr. KIRK. A very brief time.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I will yield to him.

I do want to tell my two friends from Mississippi that I agree with what they have said about their nominee. I was proud to vote for her in the Senate Judiciary Committee, proud to put her name on the agenda, and proud to have the hearing for her.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to deliver my remarks while seated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT

Mr. KIRK. Madam President, I have been silent for the last 2 years due to having a stroke a little under 2 years ago. I have come to speak because I believe so passionately in the ENDA statute. This is not a major change to law. It is already law in 21 States.

I think it is particularly appropriate for an Illinois Republican to speak on behalf of this measure, in the true tradition of Everett McKinley Dirksen and Abraham Lincoln, men who gave us the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 13th Amendment to the Constitution.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, would I be in order to speak about judges who are going to be voted on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator would be in order.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I rise in support of the nominations of Debra M. Brown to be U.S. district judge for the Northern District of Mississippi and Gregory Howard Woods to be U.S. district judge for the Southern District of New York.

Before we vote on these nominations, I want to inform my fellow Senators and the American people once again on the excellent progress we have made on nominations and the fair treatment of

President Obama's nominees. With these confirmations today, the Senate will have confirmed 38 lower court article III judicial nominees this year.

Despite what I frequently hear—that this President is being treated differently than President Bush—President Obama is clearly ahead of where President Bush was at a similar time-frame, meaning at this time in his second term. The 38 confirmations this year is more than 2½ times the number confirmed at a similar stage in President Bush's second term, when only 14 judicial nominees had been confirmed. In fact, for the entire fifth year of President Bush's term, only 21 lower court judges were confirmed. Again, in President Obama's fifth year we will have confirmed 38 nominees after today's votes.

In addition to the robust pace of activity on the floor, the committee has had an aggressive schedule of hearings and business meetings taking action on many more nominees. In total, the Senate will have confirmed 207 lower court article III judges. We have voted against three nominees. So 207 to 3 being defeated is a success rate for the President of 99 percent of his nominees. I think that is a pretty outstanding record not just for President Obama but for any President. So I reject the continuing rhetoric regarding how Republicans are obstructing President Obama's judicial nominees.

Again, I congratulate the nominees on their anticipated confirmations.

Debra M. Brown is nominated to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi. She received her B.Arch. from Mississippi State University in 1987. She worked as an associate in architectural firms until starting law school in 1994. She received her J.D. from University of Mississippi School of Law in 1997. Upon graduation, she joined Phelps Dunbar LLP as an associate, focusing on commercial litigation primarily in the financial and insurance context representing commercial clients such as banks, mortgage companies, property and casualty insurers and commercial property managers. She became partner in 2004, and handled matters concerning construction-related litigation for construction sureties, general contractors and some subcontractors. In 2012, she moved to Wise Carter Child & Caraway, P.A. There, she continues to handle construction litigation, as well as representation of owners in construction matters, and representation of hospitals and medical providers in the context of employment law and medical malpractice. She has participated in 12 trials, two as sole counsel, and one as chief counsel.

The ABA has given Ms. Brown a rating of "Unanimous Qualified".

Gregory Howard Woods is nominated to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York. He

received his B.A. from Williams College in 1991 and his J.D. from Yale Law School in 1995. After graduating from law school, Mr. Woods joined the Department of Justice as a trial attorney in the civil division. While at DOJ, his practice included investigating and litigating cases under the False Claims Act. In 1998, Mr. Woods joined Debevoise & Plimpton as an associate and was made an equity partner in 2004. At Debevoise & Plimpton his practice was focused almost exclusively on corporate transactional law. As a partner, he devoted his practice principally to finance and restructuring matters.

In August 2009 he was named Deputy General Counsel for the Department of Transportation. In 2012, after Senate confirmation, he was appointed by President Obama to be General Counsel of the Department of Energy.

The ABA has given Mr. Woods a rating of "Majority Qualified, Minority Well Qualified".

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I won't go on so much on the numbers, but I did hear my friend say there is a question whether President Obama has been treated differently than President Bush. I would note that when President Bush nominated John Roberts for the ninth seat to the D.C. Circuit, he was confirmed by every single Republican and Democrat voting for him.

Patricia Millett, with exactly the same credentials as he for the Ninth seat, was filibustered by the Republicans. Were they treated differently? Yes. That happened last week, so it is fresh in our memories. But I wish to talk about a different issue.

Today, Senators are finally going to have a chance to cast their vote and put on the record where every Senator stands on the fundamental issue of fairness. The Employment Non-Discrimination Act will help bring this great Nation one step closer to the goal of equal rights for all Americans.

I have long believed that American workers should be evaluated based on how they perform, not on irrelevant considerations such as gender, race, gender identity, or sexual orientation, but on how they do the job. If they do the job, they ought to be praised for it. In these difficult economic times, ensuring equal protection in the workplace is even more critical. We have to do better. We shouldn't question if people should be treated the same in the workplace, but that is what has happened in parts of this country. Maintaining the status quo would keep in place a system that supports a second class of workers in a majority of States. This runs counter to the values on which America was founded. It has to end.

The Employment Non-Discrimination Act would prohibit workplace discrimination and make it illegal to fire,

refuse to hire, or refuse to promote employees simply based on an individual's sexual orientation or gender identity. Currently, Federal law protects against employment discrimination on the basis of race, gender, religion, national origin, or disability—as it should. But it doesn't stop discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity. It is long overdue for Congress to extend these protections to all American workers.

I am a native of Vermont. I am proud to represent the State of Vermont, as I have for almost four decades, in this body. One reason I am proud to represent Vermont is our State has led the country on so many civil rights issues. Vermonters believe in individual rights, in fairness, and in equality. More than two decades ago, our State of Vermont added sexual orientation to the list of protected categories in its antidiscrimination employment law, and Vermont expanded its protections to include gender identity protection 6 years ago. Yet in 29 States, an employer can fire employees based on their sexual orientation, and in 33 States, they can be fired based on their gender identity. This is not right. I might also point out, Vermont has one of the lowest unemployment rates of any State in the country.

Many employers have taken this issue into their own hands, making up for Congress's inaction by implementing important antidiscrimination policies. As of April of this year, 88 percent of the Fortune 500 companies had nondiscrimination policies that included sexual orientation, and 57 percent had policies including gender identity.

I wish to mention two Vermont companies in particular, Fletcher Allen Health Care and Green Mountain Coffee Roasters, for showing real leadership on this issue; they banned discrimination in the workplace based on gender identity and sexual orientation.

I also applaud companies such as IBM, Microsoft, General Electric, and Time Warner for doing the right thing. Two of these companies have a major presence in Vermont. These corporations know that treating all their employees equally is not only fair—it also makes good business sense. They know that. It is time that we in Congress know that too.

Workplace discrimination hurts families, and the hatred that drives discrimination has no place in a nation continually striving to form a more perfect union. So I thank Chairman HARKIN for making this bipartisan legislation a priority in his committee, and for conducting the groundwork in creating the record we need to ensure this important bill's passage. The bipartisan team of Senator MERKLEY and Senator COLLINS brought together Members by their thoughtfulness and tenacity.

A dear friend of mine used to sit in the back, and was in the Senate when I came here. I learned so much from him. I am speaking of Ted Kennedy. I have to think he is looking down on this Chamber tonight as we try to pass legislation he worked so hard to craft in his final years in the Senate. I was happy to work on this civil rights legislation with him then and with his partner on this effort, a former Vermont Senator, Jim Jeffords. We honor their leadership tonight with this vote.

I am encouraged States and employers are moving forward where we have not. But I believe ending discrimination must also be a priority for Congress. I look at the distinguished Presiding Officer, and I think of her predecessor—another dear friend of mine for nearly four decades—and the discrimination he faced when he came out of the service, having lost an arm, and having received the Medal of Honor for this country, and was still told in some places in America that he couldn't walk into their establishment. I am sure each of us can think of times of discrimination of all sorts.

Let's pass legislation that bans all discrimination in the workplace, whatever it is. Until we do that, we will fail to achieve the motto engraved in Vermont marble above the Supreme Court building that declares "Equal Justice Under Law." Let's make sure all Americans have the equal rights they deserve.

I urge my fellow Senators to come together and support this important bipartisan bill without delay, and the other body to have the courage to stand up for America—standing up for all Americans, every single American—and vote for this legislation.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, is there time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Gregory Howard Woods, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON BROWN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Debra M. Brown, of Mississippi, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi?

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 228 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Franken	Mikulski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson
Baucus	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Harkin	Portman
Bennet	Hatch	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Reid
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Boxer	Hirono	Roberts
Brown	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Inhofe	Rubio
Cardin	Isakson	Sanders
Carper	Johanns	Schatz
Casey	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Coats	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Cochran	Kaine	Sessions
Collins	King	Shaheen
Coons	Kirk	Shelby
Corker	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cornyn	Landrieu	Tester
Crapo	Leahy	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Donnelly	Levin	Udall (CO)
Durbin	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Enzi	Markey	Warner
Feinstein	McConnell	Whitehouse
Fischer	Menendez	Wicker
Flake	Merkley	Wyden

NOT VOTING—10

Blunt	McCain	Vitter
Burr	McCaskill	Warren
Chambliss	Moran	
Coburn	Murkowski	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 815.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, the Senate is about to take another historic step. Think about it. In 1964 we had the Civil Rights Act. In 1990—23 years ago—I stood here when we passed the Americans with Disabilities Act, which extended civil rights to people with disabilities.

Today we are taking one more step to make the American family more inclusive and once and for all ban employment discrimination against gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender Americans.

This is a historic opportunity for the Senate once again to say that we are all members of the American family. No one should be discriminated against because of race, sex, religion, or national origin. They should not be discriminated against because of who they love, who they are or whether they are gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender.

This is a historic step for the Senate to take today.

I urge a yea vote on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. REID. Madam President, I yield back time on the motion to invoke cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time has been yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 184, S. 815, a bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

Richard J. Durbin, Tom Harkin, Jeff Merkley, Benjamin L. Cardin, Michael F. Bennet, Barbara Mikulski, Charles E. Schumer, Martin Heinrich, Patrick J. Leahy, Robert Menendez, Barbara Boxer, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Mazie Hirono, Tammy Baldwin, Amy Klobuchar, Jack Reed, Harry Reid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to

proceed to S. 815, a bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close.

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 61, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 229 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Ayotte	Harkin	Nelson
Baldwin	Hatch	Portman
Baucus	Heinrich	Pryor
Begich	Heitkamp	Reed
Bennet	Heller	Reid
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rockefeller
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Boxer	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Kirk	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Landrieu	Tester
Casey	Leahy	Toomey
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Markey	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	
Hagan	Murray	

NAYS—30

Alexander	Fischer	McConnell
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Coats	Grassley	Roberts
Cochran	Hoeven	Rubio
Corker	Inhofe	Scott
Cornyn	Isakson	Sessions
Crapo	Johanns	Shelby
Cruz	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Enzi	Lee	Wicker

NOT VOTING—9

Blunt	Coburn	Moran
Burr	McCain	Murkowski
Chambliss	McCaskill	Vitter

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 61, the nays are 30. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

(Disturbance in the visitors gallery.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No expressions of approval are permitted in the gallery.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank my colleagues who led this effort on this non-discrimination bill, which is historic, and I am pleased we had a bipartisan

vote to make America more accepting and a just place. It is a work-in-progress, and I am very pleased we could find the support on this floor to do that. Now the bill goes to the House, and I urge my colleagues in my congressional delegation and others to look at this bill with an open mind and an open heart and end discrimination in the workplace. I urge them to support this bill.

(The further remarks of Ms. LANDRIEU pertaining to the introduction of S. 1642 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMPLOYEE BENEFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate the Employee Benefit Research Institute on its 35th anniversary this year.

As chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, I know how important it is for policymakers to have access to quality data on our health and retirement systems. And for 35 years, EBRI has been providing just that kind of information. For instance, EBRI is a major source of information on how health plan coverage has evolved over the years and how employers have responded to market changes. EBRI is also a unique resource on both 401(k) and IRA ownership, and during the Enron crisis of several years ago, EBRI was one of the only sources of data on what was happening with company stock in 401(k) plans. Because of their expertise and reliability, we in Congress frequently ask EBRI's experts to testify at our hearings, since we know we can trust what they have to say.

Health and retirement coverage for American families is critically important to our Nation's future. We are fortunate to have such a respected and reliable source as EBRI to tell us what is happening with employee benefits, and I commend them on their anniversary.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JO KENNEY

• Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I would like to honor in the RECORD Ms. Jo Kenney of Atlanta, GA.

Jo has continually demonstrated leadership in both her profession of real estate and her local community. She serves on the DeKalb Association of REALTORS® board of directors and its executive, nominating and Pinnacle Award committees. She is also the former president of the Women's Council DeKalb chapter. Jo also serves on the board of directors for the Decatur Kiwanis Club, is a cofounder of the Atlanta Independent Women's Network and regularly serves as a mentor to other REALTORS®.

Jo has received numerous awards throughout her career for her efforts. Jo received the 2009 Businesswoman of the Year Award from the DeKalb chapter of the Women's Council of REALTORS®, the 2010 Member of the Year Award from the Georgia Chapter of the Women's Council of REALTORS®, the 2013 REALTOR® of the Year Award from the DeKalb Association of REALTORS®, the 2013 Five Star Professional Award and the Mary Nelson Spirit Award.

On November 9, 2013, Jo Kenney will be installed as the 2014 national president of the Women's Council of REALTORS®, which is an affiliate of the National Association of REALTORS® and the 12th largest women's professional organization in the United States. Jo will be the third person from my home State of Georgia to serve as president of this national organization. Through Jo's strong leadership, dedication and guidance, I know that she will be successful in her role as president of the National Women's Council of REALTORS®, and I wish her the best in her endeavors.●

REMEMBERING VICENTE OJINAGA

• Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, in less than 1 week our Nation will commemorate Veterans Day. It is a day that we set aside to honor the men and women who have served in our Armed Forces, those who are still among us, as well as those who, sadly, have left us.

Today I wish to pay tribute to an American hero, Vicente Ojinaga, who passed away on September 30 at the age of 95. Mr. Ojinaga was a valiant soldier, a member of the Army's 200th Coast Artillery Regiment, a defender of Bataan and Corregidor, and a survivor of the Bataan Death March.

During World War II, the courageous defenders of Bataan were an inspiration for an embattled nation. The Japanese attack on the Philippines in December of 1941 came just hours after Pearl Harbor. The Battling Bastards of

Bataan were outnumbered and outsupplied, but for 4 intense months they fought on against all odds. In holding off the enemy forces longer than expected, they bought the Allies precious time to regroup. They were, and always will be, an inspiring reminder of the grit and determination of both Americans and Filipinos.

The courage and sacrifice of those brave troops should never be forgotten. Their number included 1800 New Mexicans. Many of them were also Hispanic, deployed to the Philippines because of their ability to speak Spanish. They were dedicated to defending the freedoms that we all hold dear, at a time when they themselves were treated as second-class citizens.

For Mr. Ojinaga and his fellow soldiers, even worse was yet to come after the surrender. Those who survived the Bataan Death March faced 3½ years of horrific conditions and forced labor in Japanese prisons.

In an interview with the Santa Fe New Mexican, Mr. Ojinaga's daughter, Teri Gonzales, recalled that her father would sometimes tell his family about his experience during the war, but not in detail. "We didn't want him to relive the horrible things," Mrs. Gonzales explained. "He said what kept him alive was faith and prayer and his family, knowing he was going to come back to his family."

Vicente Ojinaga was born on January 22, 1918, in Santa Rita, NM. After graduation from high school, he worked as a carpenter in the copper mine. When his country called, on the brink of World War II, he answered that call, unequivocally and with a powerful sense of duty. With his passing, we say goodbye to a courageous veteran of the legendary New Mexican survivors of Bataan. Our Nation is forever in their debt.

As his daughter said, despite the horrendous circumstances of his captivity, Mr. Ojinaga held on to his faith and held on to his hope that someday he would return home, that someday he would see his family again. By the war's end, his body bore the weight of his suffering. When he was finally released, he weighed only 95 pounds.

Like so many of the Bataan survivors, Mr. Ojinaga served his country at war but also in peacetime. He married Celia Presciado and together they raised five children. He and his wife purchased a home, with the help of the GI bill, in the Casa Solana subdivision of Santa Fe. They would live there together for over half a century. Mr. Ojinaga graduated from the University of New Mexico in 1950 with a degree in business administration. He worked for the Internal Revenue Service and then for the New Mexico Bureau of Revenue until his retirement in 1978.

His daughter recalled to the New Mexican that after his retirement Mr. Ojinaga was busy with his family and

with community service. He was a Little League coach, volunteered to provide tax counseling to the elderly, was president of the Guadalupe Credit Union, and served as a Eucharistic minister at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church. Mr. Ojinaga was blessed with a long and eventful life, and he dedicated his life to his country, to his family, and to his community.

Our Nation has lost a brave soldier. We extend to the family our deepest sympathy and our enduring gratitude for his service.●

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 3204. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1639. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to provide guidance and limitations regarding the integration of unmanned aircraft systems into United States airspace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1640. A bill to facilitate planning, permitting, administration, implementation, and monitoring of pinyon-juniper dominated landscape restoration projects within Lincoln County, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CARDIN, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1641. A bill to establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1642. A bill to permit the continuation of certain health plans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1643. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a two-year extension of the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Res. 285. A resolution authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to prepare a revised edition of the Standing Rules of the Senate as a Senate document; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 264

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 264, a bill to expand access to community mental health centers and improve the quality of mental health care for all Americans.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 526

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill to improve the retirement of American families by strengthening Social Security.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 658

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 658, a bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to enhance capabilities to prepare for and respond to cyber emergencies, and for other purposes.

S. 769

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 769, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 809

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 809, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that genetically engineered food and foods that contain genetically engineered ingredients be labeled accordingly.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to prohibit the employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

S. 886

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 886, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 1023

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1023, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to conduct an interagency review of and report on ways to increase the competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign investment.

S. 1118

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1118, a bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent sex trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

S. 1155

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1155, a bill to provide for advance appropriations for certain information technology accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to include mental health professionals in training programs of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1226

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 1226, a bill to promote industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker training, retention, and advancement, and for other purposes.

S. 1258

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1258, a bill to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to First Lieutenant Alonzo H. Cushing for acts of valor during the Civil War.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1318

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1318, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 1416

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1416, a bill to protect miners from pneumoconiosis (commonly known as black lung disease), and for other purposes.

S. 1446

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1446, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the affordability of the health care tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1505

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1505, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to certain sporting good articles, and to exempt those articles from definition under that Act.

S. 1557

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1557, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1562, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 1575

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1575, a bill to correct inconsistencies in the definitions relating to Native Americans in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1581

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1581, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide counseling and treatment for sexual trauma to members of the Armed Forces, to require the Secretary to screen veterans for domestic abuse, to require the Secretary to submit reports on military sexual trauma and domestic abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 1586

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1586, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve dental health care for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1610

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1610, a bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

S. 1614

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1614, a bill to require Certificates of Citizenship and other Federal documents to reflect name and date of birth determinations made by a State court and for other purposes.

S. 1617

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Alabama

(Mr. SHELBY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1617, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to ensure that individuals can keep their health insurance coverage.

S. 1622

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1622, a bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

S. 1630

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1630, a bill to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture.

S. 1632

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1632, a bill to protect 10th Amendment rights by providing special standing for State government officials to challenge proposed regulations, and for other purposes.

S. 1635

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 1635, a bill to amend the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 to extend the period during which supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits are temporarily increased.

S. RES. 269

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 269, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on United States policy regarding possession of enrichment and reprocessing capabilities by the Islamic Republic of Iran.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1642. A bill to permit the continuation of certain health plans; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wish to speak about a bill I plan to introduce in a few moments, and hopefully we will have a chance or an opportunity in the future to debate it because it is a very important fix, if you will, to the Affordable Care Act.

We debated this bill for literally years—months in committee for hours and hours, in daylight and during the evening sessions. There were hundreds of amendments. This bill was built with Democratic input and support and Republican input. The Republicans did not vote for the bill, but they most certainly had a tremendous amount of impact in the amendment process.

Building a new health care system for this Nation has been very difficult, but it holds a great deal of promise. The Affordable Care Act—and the easiest way to explain it—was somewhere between what some people on the left wanted, which was a government-run system, something like Medicare for all—it is appealing, but it is very expensive. We couldn't figure out a cost-effective way to provide that. Members on the right, the more conservative-leaning in this body, wanted to provide savings accounts. This works beautifully for people who have money to save in the account, but people who live paycheck to paycheck and have no money to save would never get any account to be able to provide for their health insurance.

Between those two bookends, we debated for a long time about how to provide a market-based approach to insurance. No nation in the world has attempted this. This is a big effort, but it is an important effort because we are a developed nation. We need to have a healthy workforce. It is about as simple as that. We can't be No. 1 in the world and we can't be the strongest economic power in the world if our people are sick and weak. It is as simple as that. We can't be the strongest economic power in the world if our health care system is sapping so much money out of our economic power—19 percent of the GDP, when Japan is 8 percent. We can't expect to beat Japan in economics if we are paying almost twice as much for health care and getting less results.

We had to change. We did, and we built a market-based approach, contrary to what all of the opponents of the Affordable Care Act say. We built a market-based approach that basically said that if people are over 65, they will be on Medicare. We are continuing to reform and strengthen Medicare. There are some very good parts of it, and then there are some weaker parts or difficult parts that need to be corrected. Over time we will continue to streamline, save money, provide better service, more choice, et cetera.

People who are among the poorest members of our country—133 percent of poverty, which is an income of about

\$15,000 or less—potentially may not be able to find a good-paying full-time job or perhaps didn't receive the education others received, perhaps have some disability, they would go on Medicaid. Then everyone in between the lowest income and under the age of 65 is in a private health care system, which is a market-based system, with competition driving prices down.

The idea would be that there would be 20, 30, 40 health care plans offered in every State. People could choose what they want with a minimum bronze, silver, or gold plan with many choices. That is the promise; that is the hope; that is the idea. The great promise of this is that if someone has cancer, they can't be dropped. If they have diabetes, they can't be turned away. Everyone is covered, the risk is spread, the price comes down, and the free market operates. We would never know that based upon the criticism we hear on television and radio all day long, but this is the truth.

One of the important components of that bill that many of us talked about was the fact that if someone had individual insurance on the market, they could keep it. What is happening now, unfortunately, because of the grandfather provision in the Affordable Care Act, in my view—this may not be shared by everyone on the floor—it was not written as tightly as it should have been, as clearly as it should have been. The bill I am introducing today, Keeping the Affordable Care Act Promise Act, will clarify this grandfather clause in the Affordable Care Act so that it will clearly say that if a person has an insurance plan they like, if it is what they want and can afford, they can keep it. This bill, if it passes, will help anywhere from 5 to 7 million people who are getting notices in the mail every day like the one I will read into the RECORD, which was sent to someone in my State.

Thank you for your support of Vantage Health Plan, Inc. ("Vantage") over recent years. It has been our pleasure to serve you and we hope that you have been satisfied as a Vantage member.

In light of recent changes in the health insurance industry, Vantage will be discontinuing our offering of Grandfathered Individual plans, effective January 4, 2014. This discontinuance will affect your policy.

Vantage is pleased to announce the availability of several new individual products in 2014:

Beginning in January 2014, you will have the option to enroll into a new plan through the Health Insurance Marketplace (or the Exchange). Members enrolling into Individual plans through the Marketplace may be eligible for premium and/or cost sharing subsidies.

This is because everyone in Louisiana with a family income of up to \$90,000 a year will have some sort of premium support, which will be a great help to many of our middle-class families.

Continuing:

Many of the Marketplace plans will provide you with more generous coverage than your current Grandfathered Individual plan. We invite you to visit Vantage online at www.VantageHealthPlan.com/marketplace to review our Exchange plan offerings. You may also enroll online at www.Healthcare.gov, by calling (800) 318-2596 or by contacting your agent or broker.

In addition to the Exchange plan offerings, Vantage will have several new plan offerings available outside of the Exchange for 2014. These plans are similar to your current Freedom or High Deductible plan. We will have more information on those plan options later this Fall.

This is the letter thousands of people are receiving. This letter should have never gone out. We said to people that if they have insurance they like, they can keep it. We didn't say that if they have insurance they like that doesn't meet the standards or that meets the minimum standards, they can keep it. We said and the President said over and over that if people have insurance and they like the insurance they have, they can keep it. That is my bill. That is the single focus of my bill. It is not to undermine the Affordable Care Act; it is to strengthen it and to keep our promise to the millions of Americans to whom we said if they have insurance, they can keep what they have. If they don't, there is a new marketplace where they and their families can go and choose among a variety of different plans.

Depending on their income, they may have support from their community or from the government. If someone is extremely poor, we can provide options for them through Medicaid. It is not as desirable as through private insurance, but many Governors, including some Republican Governors, are being very creative with their Medicaid plans and actually changing them into more of a private-like insurance model. There is great flexibility in how Governors who have good hearts and good intentions are using their Medicaid dollars wisely.

Having said that, having reread the grandfather clause, having looked at it very closely, I have determined that this is the best course to introduce this bill, which I will do later this evening to actually file it. Again, it has two simple directives:

No. 1, all insurance companies shall continue to offer grandfather plans that were in effect prior to a certain date.

No. 2, every insurance company that provided those grandfather plans has to explain to those policyholders how their current plan falls short of the new standard on the market and what might be available to them that is better, but they are not forced to buy it.

So I hope we can debate this. Unlike many on the other side who want to tear the act down and repeal it, to defund it—they even took the whole Federal Government hostage and the whole economy of the United States hostage because of it—or that is what

they tried to do. They failed, thank goodness, and the hostages have been released. The government is back up and operating. There are some of us who are sincere about supporting the concepts of this bill, the promise of this bill, which is extraordinary and historic. We recognize there are some pieces of it that need to be fixed or tightened or tweaked to make sure it is going to work in the future as we have said.

Again, that is simply what my bill does. I am happy to introduce it. I have one cosponsor, Senator MANCHIN of West Virginia, but many others have expressed their interest in working with me, and I look forward to bringing this before the committee for full debate and hopefully to the Senate floor in some way in the near future for debate and hopefully for passage.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1643. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a two-year extension of the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce bipartisan legislation to reauthorize the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education, a panel that provides much needed assistance to our Nation's veterans by advising the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on existing VA education benefit programs, new education initiatives, and long-range education planning and development. This legislation is entitled the Veterans Advisory Committee on Education Improvement Act, and I wish to thank my colleague, Senator INHOFE, for joining me in this effort.

I am proud to introduce this companion bill to House-passed legislation which was introduced by Representatives JOHN DELANEY and JIM RENACCI and 12 other Members. This bill will reauthorize the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education through December 31, 2015, and it expands the make-up of the Committee to include post 9/11 veterans. Absent Congressional action, the Advisory Committee's authority will sunset on December 31, 2013. In addition to preserving its traditional role, our bill will require the Advisory Committee to expand its reach to include veterans who served after September 11, 2001. Currently, the Committee only provides assistance for veterans who served through the Persian Gulf War. The Committee is particularly interested in ensuring that educational opportunities are available to eligible veterans and enabling them to readjust to civilian life and become members of a highly educated and productive work force. The Committee focuses on improving the benefits provided by the GI Bill.

I believe that a true marker of our Nation's worth is our willingness to

serve those who have served us. As we continue to wind down our commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan after a decade of war, we need to gear up our commitment to our veterans. This legislation will ensure that the brave men and women who serve our country in the armed services receive the most effective education and training opportunities available. I am proud of the support that organizations have provided in this effort. The Military Officers Association of America, MOAA, Students Veterans Association, SVA, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, IAVA, and Veterans of Foreign Wars, VFW, have provided invaluable insight in crafting this.

I am committed to making sure that our veterans receive the services and benefits they earned, and the support they were promised and deserve. The United States is the strongest nation in the world and we owe veterans our gratitude and our respect. This legislation is just a small token of how Congress can help veterans have all the tools they need, including education and job training, to ensure an easier transition to civilian life. By making sure that post 9/11 veterans have a voice at the VA this legislation encourages more effective and efficient government.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1643

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Veterans’ Advisory Committee on Education Improvement Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF VETERANS’ ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

Section 3692 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “31,” after “30,”; and

(B) by striking “and the Persian Gulf War” and inserting “the Persian Gulf War, and the post-9/11 operations in Iraq and Afghanistan”;

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting “31,” after “30,”; and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 285—AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO PREPARE A REVISED EDITION OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 285

Resolved,

SECTION 1. PRINTING THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE.

(a) AUTHORIZATIONS.—The Committee on Rules and Administration shall prepare a revised edition of the Standing Rules of the Senate and such standing rules shall be printed as a Senate document.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, 1,750 additional copies shall be printed for use by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2010. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 287, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the definition of homeless veteran for purposes of benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2011. Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 815, to prohibit the employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2010. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 287, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the definition of homeless veteran for purposes of benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 11, strike line 25 and insert the following: homelessness pursuant to such partnerships.

“(f) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to enter into partnerships under this section as described in subsection (a) shall expire on December 31, 2016.”

On page 13, strike lines 3 through 18 and insert the following:

SEC. 10. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR PROGRAM OF REFERRAL AND COUNSELING SERVICES FOR VETERANS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS WHO ARE TRANSITIONING FROM CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS.

Section 2023 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b);

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “To the extent practicable, the program” and inserting “The program”;

(3) in subsection (d), by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2017”;

(4) in subsection (e)(2), by striking “provided under the demonstration program”; and

(5) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively.

On page 14, strike lines 2 through 14 and insert the following:

(a) TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION FOR SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL AND HOMELESS VETERANS.—Section 2031(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “December 31,”

Beginning on page 14, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 15, line 7, and insert the following:

(f) TRAINING ENTITIES FOR PROVISION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES IN PERMANENT HOUSING.—Section 2044(e)(3) of such title is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2014”.

On page 15, strike lines 8 through 12.

On page 16, line 7, strike “March 31, 2018” and insert “August 31, 2017”.

SA 2011. Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 815, to prohibit the employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 18. NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT.—

(1) RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES.—Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 157) is amended by striking “except to” and all that follows through “authorized in section 8(a)(3)”.

(2) UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES.—Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “: Provided, That” and all that follows through “retaining membership”;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “or to discriminate” and all that follows through “retaining membership”; and

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking “covered by an agreement authorized under subsection (a)(3) of this section”; and

(C) in subsection (f), by striking clause (2) and redesignating clauses (3) and (4) as clauses (2) and (3), respectively.

(b) AMENDMENT TO THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT.—Section 2 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 152) is amended by striking paragraph Eleven.

(c) APPLICATION OF SEVERABILITY CLAUSE.—For purposes of section 16, any reference in such section to a provision of this Act includes an amendment made by subsection (a) or (b).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section, and the amendments made by this section, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sergio Plaza and Warren Erickson of my staff be granted floor privileges for the duration of today’s session and that Katrina Rogachevsky be granted floor privileges for the duration of this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES— H.R. 3080

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I understand the Chair is ready to announce the conferees for H.R. 3080, the water resources bill.

The Presiding Officer appointed Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. BARRASSO conferees on the part of the Senate.

CRIMINAL ANTITRUST ANTI- RETALIATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 233, S. 42.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 42) to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Criminal Anti-Retaliation Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO ACPERA.

The Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-237; 15 U.S.C. 1 note) is amended by adding after section 215 the following:

"SEC. 216. ANTI-RETALIATION PROTECTION FOR WHISTLEBLOWERS.

"(a) WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS FOR EMPLOYEES, CONTRACTORS, SUBCONTRACTORS, AND AGENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—No employer may discharge, demote, suspend, threaten, harass, or in any other manner discriminate against a covered individual in the terms and conditions of employment of the covered individual because—

"(A) the covered individual provided or caused to be provided to the employer or the Federal Government information relating to—

"(i) any violation of, or any act or omission the covered individual reasonably believes to be a violation of the antitrust laws; or

"(ii) any violation of, or any act or omission the covered individual reasonably believes to be a violation of another criminal law committed in conjunction with a potential violation of the antitrust laws or in conjunction with an investigation by the Department of Justice of a potential violation of the antitrust laws; or

"(B) the covered individual filed, caused to be filed, testified, participated in, or otherwise assisted an investigation or a proceeding filed or about to be filed (with any knowledge of the employer) relating to—

"(i) any violation of, or any act or omission the covered individual reasonably believes to be a violation of the antitrust laws; or

"(ii) any violation of, or any act or omission the covered individual reasonably believes to be a violation of another criminal law committed in conjunction with a potential violation of the antitrust laws or in conjunction with an investigation by the Department of Justice of a potential violation of the antitrust laws.

"(2) LIMITATION ON PROTECTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any covered individual if—

"(A) the covered individual planned and initiated a violation or attempted violation of the antitrust laws;

"(B) the covered individual planned and initiated a violation or attempted violation of another criminal law in conjunction with a violation or attempted violation of the antitrust laws; or

"(C) the covered individual planned and initiated an obstruction or attempted obstruction of an investigation by the Department of Justice of a violation of the antitrust laws.

"(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(A) ANTITRUST LAWS.—The term 'antitrust laws' means section 1 or 3 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 1, 3).

"(B) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'covered individual' means an employee, contractor, subcontractor, or agent of an employer.

"(C) EMPLOYER.—The term 'employer' means a person, or any officer, employee, contractor, subcontractor, or agent of such person.

"(D) PERSON.—The term 'person' has the same meaning as in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12(a)).

"(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The term 'violation', with respect to the antitrust laws, shall not be construed to include a civil violation of any law that is not also a criminal violation.

"(b) ENFORCEMENT ACTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered individual who alleges discharge or other discrimination by any employer in violation of subsection (a) may seek relief under subsection (c) by—

"(A) filing a complaint with the Secretary of Labor; or

"(B) if the Secretary has not issued a final decision within 180 days of the filing of the complaint and there is no showing that such delay is due to the bad faith of the claimant, bringing an action at law or equity for de novo review in the appropriate district court of the United States, which shall have jurisdiction over such an action without regard to the amount in controversy.

"(2) PROCEDURE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—A complaint filed with the Secretary of Labor under paragraph (1)(A) shall be governed under the rules and procedures set forth in section 42121(b) of title 49, United States Code.

"(B) EXCEPTION.—Notification made under section 42121(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, shall be made to any individual named in the complaint and to the employer.

"(C) BURDENS OF PROOF.—A complaint filed with the Secretary of Labor under paragraph (1)(A) shall be governed by the legal burdens of proof set forth in section 42121(b) of title 49, United States Code.

"(D) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—A complaint under paragraph (1)(A) shall be filed with the Secretary of Labor not later than 180 days after the date on which the violation occurs.

"(E) CIVIL ACTIONS TO ENFORCE.—If a person fails to comply with an order or preliminary order issued by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the procedures in section 42121(b), the Secretary of Labor or the person on whose behalf the order was issued may bring a civil action to enforce the order in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the violation occurred.

"(c) REMEDIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered individual prevailing in any action under subsection (b)(1) shall be entitled to all relief necessary to make the covered individual whole.

"(2) COMPENSATORY DAMAGES.—Relief for any action under paragraph (1) shall include—

"(A) reinstatement with the same seniority status that the covered individual would have had, but for the discrimination;

"(B) the amount of back pay, with interest; and

"(C) compensation for any special damages sustained as a result of the discrimination including litigation costs, expert witness fees, and reasonable attorney's fees.

"(d) RIGHTS RETAINED BY WHISTLEBLOWERS.—Nothing in this section shall be deemed to diminish the rights, privileges, or remedies of any covered individual under any Federal or State law, or under any collective bargaining agreement."

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent the committee-reported amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 42), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RECOGNIZING THE FESTIVAL OF DIWALI

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 277, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 277) recognizing the religious and historical significance of the festival of Diwali.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 277) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of October 30, 2013, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

AUTHORIZING REVISED EDITION OF THE STANDING RULES

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 285, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 285) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to prepare a revised edition of the Standing Rules of the Senate as a Senate document.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 285) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE READ THE FIRST
TIME—H.R. 3204

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I understand that H.R. 3204 has been received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3204) to amend the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding

and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

Mr. BENNET. I ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY,
NOVEMBER 5, 2013

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, November 5, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 815, the Employee Non-Discrimination Act postcloture, and that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly

caucus meetings; and finally, that all time during adjournment, recess, and morning business count postcloture on the motion to proceed to S. 815.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:12 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, November 5, 2013, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 4, 2013:

THE JUDICIARY

GREGORY HOWARD WOODS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

DEBRA M. BROWN, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, November 5, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

NOVEMBER 6

10 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine health insurance exchanges, focusing on an update from the Administration.

SD-215

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 994, to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, S. 1611, to require certain agencies to conduct assessments of data centers and develop data center consolidation and optimization plans, S. 1499, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 278 Main Street in Chadron, Nebraska, as the "Sergeant Cory Mracek Memorial Post Office", S. 1512, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the "Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office", and the nominations of William Ward Nooter, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, and Tony Hammond, of Missouri, and Nanci E. Langley, of Hawaii, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Bureau of Prisons and cost-effective strategies for reducing recidivism.

SD-226

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Sloan D. Gibson, of the Dis-

trict of Columbia, to be Deputy Secretary, Linda A. Schwartz, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary for Policy and Planning, and Constance B. Tobias, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SR-418

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Carolyn Hessler Radelet, of Virginia, to be Director of the Peace Corps, and Michael G. Carroll, of New York, to be Inspector General, United States Agency for International Development.

SD-419

2:15 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine transportation, focusing on independence for seniors.

SD-562

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the "America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education, and Science Act" (America COMPETES), focusing on science and the United States economy.

SR-253

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Relations, and the District of Columbia

To hold hearings to examine the ongoing recovery from Hurricane Sandy one year later.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michelle T. Friedland, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Christopher Reid Cooper, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, Gerald Austin McHugh, Jr., and Edward G. Smith, both to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and M. Douglas Harpool, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

SD-226

NOVEMBER 7

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the impact of sequestration on the national defense; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217, following the open session.

SD-G50

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Draft Regional Recommendation regarding the Columbia River Treaty.

SD-366

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine housing finance reform, focusing on essential elements to provide affordable options for housing.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance

To hold hearings to examine patent assertion entities, focusing on demand letters and consumer protection.

SR-253

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine Social Security disability benefits, focusing on if judges, doctors, and lawyers abused programs, part II.

SD-342

11 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Heather Anne Higginbottom, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Secretary for Management and Resources, Sarah Sewall, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights, and Richard Stengel, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

1:30 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Oversight, Federal Rights and Agency Action

To hold hearings to examine rules delayed on auto safety and mental health.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

NOVEMBER 13

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law

To hold hearings to examine "The Surveillance Transparency Act of 2013".

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the current economic outlook.

SH-216

NOVEMBER 14

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Steven Croley, of Michigan, to be General Counsel, and Christopher Smith, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, both of the Department of Energy, and Esther

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Puakela Kia'aina, of Hawaii, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Insular Areas.

SD-366

NOVEMBER 20

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining

To hold hearings to examine S. 182, to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city of Anchorage, Alaska, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversion interest to the City, S. 483, to designate the Berryessa Snow Mountain National Conservation Area in the State of California, S. 771, to provide to the Secretary of the Inte-

rior a mechanism to cancel contracts for the sale of materials CA-20139 and CA-22901, S. 776, to establish the Columbine-Hondo Wilderness in the State of New Mexico, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of National Forest System land in the State, S. 841, to designate certain Federal land in the San Juan National Forest in the State of Colorado as wilderness, S. 1305, to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado, S. 1341, to modify the Forest Service Recreation Residence Program as the program applies to units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain by implementing a simple, equitable, and predictable procedure for determining cabin user fees, S. 1414, to provide for the conveyance of

certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, S. 1415, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and S. 1479, to address the forest health, public safety, and wildlife habitat threat presented by the risk of wildfire, including catastrophic wildfire, on National Forest System land and public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to expedite forest management projects relating to hazardous fuels reduction, forest health, and economic development.

SD-366

SENATE—Tuesday, November 5, 2013

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's opening prayer will be offered by the Reverend Gregory Knox Jones of the Westminster Presbyterian Church in Wilmington, DE.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Mighty God, creator of all that is, we give thanks for this great Nation, for its bounteous resources, its diversity of people, and for its principles of liberty and justice for all, not only for the privileged, not only for the powerful, but for all because each of us is one of Your beloved children.

Call forth the best in these servants, that they may bring honor to themselves and instill confidence in those who have entrusted them with breath-taking responsibility. Banish from this historic hall small-mindedness and mean-spiritedness that parade as purity. Instead, bless these men and women with that rare and priceless virtue of humility.

Holy Wisdom, bolster their courage that they may always refrain from hollow rhetoric and selfish gain and instead strive for decisions that bring great promise to all people. Enable them to glimpse Your vision of a world where those who are ill are cared for by the compassionate and the hungry are filled because the well-off are generous. Embolden each Member in this Chamber with a burning desire to do the hard work of governing, that each may become a true servant of Yours and of this Nation, so that they may become a model of inspiration to our children and grandchildren and lead us to a future of promise.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of Senator

McCONNELL, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 815, the Employee Non-Discrimination Act postcloture. The Senate will recess from 12:30 to 2:15 p.m. for weekly caucus meetings. If we can reach agreement, we will move forward on the bill today.

Mr. President, I am wondering whether my friend from Delaware wishes to make a speech regarding the guest Chaplain. If so, I will be happy to yield to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

SENATE PRAYERS

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, my thanks to the majority leader this morning. Before I say a few words about Rev. Gregory Knox Jones, I want to go back in time for a couple of minutes. I was talking to the pages out in the hall behind the leader about how when our country was first settled folks came here from all over the world. They came here in part in pursuit of religious freedom. They were people of different faiths. They wanted to be able to worship God as they saw fit.

When it got really tough in Philadelphia at the Constitutional Convention—trying to wrestle with issues such as slavery, rights of women, whether there should be little States, big States, how we were going to be represented here—many times the Founding Fathers hit the pause button and they called in a person of faith to pray, to help them to find a way to progress, and they did again and again.

When George Washington was inaugurated—not here but in New York City—at the end of the day they did not go off and have big parties; they actually went to church. In the early days of our country, worship services were actually held here, as some of us know. We start every day here in the Senate with a prayer, oftentimes delivered by retired Navy ADM Barry C. Black, our Chaplain, and today with a special guest, my pastor, Gregory Knox Jones from Westminster Presbyterian Church.

Our leader HARRY REID has run a number of marathons. As it happens, so has our guest. He is a long-distance runner, literally and figuratively. He just ran his 10th marathon. He ran the New York Marathon on Sunday—I might say in good time. He won in the category of White men over 50 who pastor large Presbyterian churches on the east coast and who were former team

captains from the Kansas State University football team. That category he won hands down. I congratulate him, and I am sure my colleagues do as well.

He reminds us every Sunday of the idea that we have a moral imperative to look out for the least of those in our society, people who are hungry and need to be fed, people who have no health care. We have an obligation to look after them. He reminds us every Sunday that we have an obligation to look out for not only those who are in our community in Wilmington, DE, but way beyond our borders, such as those in Guatemala and also those who live in Israel and the West Bank of Jordan, to make sure justice is done in those places as well.

He reminds us every Sunday of the Golden Rule for our neighbor: Treat others the way we want to be treated. We have to focus on the poor, widows and the orphans, and those who are in need. He reminds us to not just talk a good game but to actually deliver on our words. What does it say in James 2? You show me your faith by your words, I will show you my faith by my deeds. He reminds us of that every Sunday.

To my colleagues, he reminds us we are servants. There is a great sermon in Mark chapter 10. The words are, as I recall—I will paraphrase him—for those who want to be a leader, you have to be a slave to all. For those who want to become first, you must become last.

We thank you for those remembrances.

Every week I go to a Bible study led by our Chaplain. On Sundays I try to show up in our own church. It reminds me of a double shot. You and I, Mr. President, are about the same age. We remember the days of Motown, the great song called “Double Shot of My Baby’s Love.” Every week I get a double shot of God’s love from these two, my pastor and our Chaplain.

To his life partner Camilla and three children and six grandchildren, we are honored you are here.

I want to close with the way he closes our sermons every Sunday, colleagues. He does it with these words. I hope I have them right. It goes something like this. When he lets us go and dismisses his flock he says these words: May the love of God, the grace of Christ, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit bless you, those you love, and the ones that no one loves.

And the ones that no one loves. He sends us on our way. Those are great words for us today as well. We welcome him.

I thank the leader for allowing me to say these words this morning.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE
CALENDAR—H.R. 3204

Mr. REID. I am told that H.R. 3204 is at the desk and ready for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3204) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings at this time regarding this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed upon the calendar.

UPCOMING SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have spoken to the Republican leader on more than one occasion, but I want to make sure all the Members understand that we have a 4-week work period. This is the second week of a 4-week work period, and we have certain work we have outlined that needs to get accomplished. I hope everyone understands what we have to get done this week, next week, and the week after.

The reason we are pressing so much work into this limited work schedule is, first of all, it is necessary for a number of reasons and, second, this Senate has worked over the last number of years really hard during holidays. I have traveled, trying to get home for Christmas. I was here on Christmas Eve; I have done that twice. It has been extremely difficult for Christmas, Thanksgiving, and, of course, New Year's.

It is wonderful to be able to go home to our families, our friends, but we also have work to do. We represent our States, and there is work we cannot do when we can only go home for weekends. Some of us live a long ways away—it takes a day to get there and a day to get back—so it really is more complicated for those who live west of the Mississippi.

The whole point is to communicate to everyone that we are going to try to take Thanksgiving week off and the week after. The Republican leader and I really want to get that done, but we cannot do it if we are held up on procedural matters that are unnecessary.

I have outlined what we need to get done. I have explained this to the Republican leader and explained it to my caucus on more than one occasion. The issue at hand is this: We have a few weekends left. We are going to be out Monday because it is Veterans Day. But all weekends until we leave here for Thanksgiving are going to be work weekends in order to get our work done.

I know people have schedules, but understand that you better keep them

pretty loose; otherwise, you are going to be missing some votes around here.

We voted on EDNA last night, and we were able to move that, get past the cloture aspect of that. We have a way of going forward. There is no reason to eat up the whole 30 hours that are postcloture.

I am just telling everybody who is in effect forcing us to do this that it may impinge upon the holidays, the situation dealing with Thanksgiving. I hope we can get out of here on the Friday before Thanksgiving, but it is up to people who I think have gotten into the habit of having unnecessary delays. I need not say more. I really would like, for myself personally and for the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, to have those two weekends off.

ENDNA

Take a look at where we are postcloture on a motion to proceed to ENDNA, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act.

I was disappointed to read yesterday that Speaker BOEHNER opposes the Employment Non-Discrimination Act because he believes it will result in frivolous lawsuits. But coming from a man whose caucus spent \$3 million in taxpayer dollars defending the unconstitutional defense of marriage law in court, that is pretty rich.

Still, I thought it was important to investigate the Speaker's claim that protecting lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans from being denied job opportunities, fired or harassed because of their sexual orientation or gender identity, would risk American jobs. To the contrary, according to a study by the U.S. Government Accountability Office—non-partisan—in 21 States that have some protection against this kind of discrimination, relatively few lawsuits have resulted. Almost every State with an antidiscrimination law that prevents workplace discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender individuals had fewer than 10 lawsuits filed between 2007 and 2012, according to the study. In fact, the lack of one clear and consistent Federal standard protecting against this harassment actually creates more confusions for businesses and local government.

So I was also stunned when the Speaker said today that he wasn't even going to bring it up for a vote. Yesterday he said he didn't like it. Today he said he was not going to bring it up for a vote. If it came up for a vote in the House, it would pass. We can look at a number of different examples of this litigation aspect he raised.

Take the example of Kile Nave, a veteran police officer who was fired from the Audubon Park Police Department in Louisville, KY, after 3 years of being terrorized by his supervisors. After speaking up against the harassment, he was fired.

Kentucky is 1 of 33 States with no statute preventing discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity. But Louisville has a local nondiscrimination ordinance, and the department had a written policy against sexual harassment, although it did not expressly protect against discrimination based on sexual orientation.

So Officer Nave has filed two separate legal complaints against his former employer. Those complaints are still pending.

If there was one Federal law protecting all Americans from discrimination instead of a patchwork of ineffective and inefficient State and local laws, it would be simpler and less confusing for businesses and employees alike. That is one reason more than 100 of the Nation's largest companies support the Employment Non-Discrimination Act and why most Fortune 500 companies already prohibit persecution based on sexual orientation or gender identity. These companies know that to recruit the best and brightest employees and remain competitive, they must foster an environment where all workers can reach their full potential.

Not only is Speaker BOEHNER's claim that ENDNA would hurt business untrue, it is also callous. It fails to take into account the heartbreaking suffering—not to mention lost wages and productivity—that workplace discrimination causes every year.

When Kile Nave was hired by the Audubon Police Department, he already served 20 years—two decades—as a police officer with other departments. This is what Kile said yesterday:

I've been a law enforcement officer since 1989 and I had never experienced anything like what I experienced with my previous employer. . . . But I wasn't going to let them push me out of a job I loved.

So for 3½ years Kile endured torture at the hands of two of his supervisors, including the chief and the deputy chief. Although coworkers described Officer Nave's on-the-job performance as exemplary, his supervisors called him derogatory names, told gay jokes in front of him and about him, and directed profanity-laced rants toward him. This is the chief and the assistant chief.

This is what Officer Nave remembers about trying to get through the ordeal:

Each day I kept thinking, 'It's going to get better today.' But it didn't. As a police officer you're supposed to have thick skin. But it never got any better.

Then, last year, 2 weeks after Officer Nave filed a formal complaint with his chief, he was fired based on charges of insubordination—somebody who had basically been a police officer for one-quarter of a century.

For the first time since he was 16 years old, Kile Nave was unemployed, as he is right now. He is still unemployed. Although Kile would love to return to police work and to doing the

job he loves—and he did it for a long time—no department will hire him with a termination on his resume.

With one simple Federal law in place, which is the ENDA bill, people such as Kile could go to work without fearing such torment—and it was torment. Every American deserves that right and that protection. Every employee deserves to be judged on the quality of his or her work instead of on their sexual orientation or gender identity.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

RIGHT-TO-WORK

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, almost 1 year ago now, Michigan's Governor Rick Snyder signed historic right-to-work legislation into law. At the time he said he viewed it "as an opportunity to stand up for Michigan's workers, to be pro-worker."

The union bosses, the entrenched special interests, and the professional left may have stood in united, militant disagreement, but Michigan's soft-spoken Governor was right. The more venom Big Labor directed at him, the more it seemed to confirm the suspicions of many of the middle-class workers Snyder was trying to help. He was, in fact, on their side.

The truth is, over the years, Big Labor has come to care more about its own perks and power than the workers it was charged with protecting. Snyder knew that and he knew it was time to tip the scales back in favor of workers. He is not alone.

In the Senate, Senator PAUL and I share Governor Snyder's commitment to helping restore worker rights. That is why yesterday we filed an amendment that would enact similar forward-looking reforms at the Federal level.

Our right-to-work amendment is simple enough. It merely calls for repealing the discriminatory clauses in Federal law that allow, as a condition of employment, forcing workers to join a union or forcing workers to pay union dues. In practical terms, here is what that would mean for middle-class folks in Kentucky and across America: If you want to join a union, you can. If you don't want to join a union, you don't have to. That is it. That is all this is about.

This is just common sense. It is basic fairness. According to one survey, about 80 percent of unionized workers agree that employees should be able to decide whether joining a union is for them. But this amendment isn't just about ending institutional discrimination against workers; it is also about job creation, economic growth, and making America more competitive in the 21st century.

Consider the fact that manufacturing employment is one-third higher in States with right-to-work laws or that, according to a recent study, States with right-to-work saw improvements in real personal income and average annual employment compared to what they would have seen without such laws or that many of our Nation's labor laws were passed in an earlier era, in some cases before many folks even had television sets.

America's labor regulations are antiquated and they need to be updated for the modern world. That is what the flextime legislation I introduced last week sought to achieve, and that is what right-to-work seeks to achieve as well.

Protecting the rights of workers, creating jobs, growing the economy, and keeping pace with the modern world is what right-to-work is all about. It is just common sense. If States such as Michigan, with proud traditions of organized labor, can look their problems in the face and act, then it is time for the Federal Government to act too.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator PAUL and me in supporting this important amendment.

OBAMACARE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about ObamaCare as well.

I wish to remind my colleagues that the President is absolutely correct. He is correct when he says ObamaCare is about so much more than some flawed Web site. It is about people. People such as the California woman with stage 4 gallbladder cancer whose story we read about in the Wall Street Journal just this past weekend. I will read some of what she wrote:

I am a determined fighter and extremely lucky. But this luck may have just run out: My affordable, lifesaving medical insurance policy has been canceled effective December 31.

Here are the impossible choices she says she is left with. She can either get coverage through the exchange and lose access to her cancer doctors or she can pay up to 50 percent more for, as she put it, "the privilege of starting over with an unfamiliar insurance company and impaired benefits."

That is just not right. It is not what the President promised, and it is not the kind of health care reform Americans asked for.

So we should keep our focus where it belongs—on the real people getting hurt by this law.

But that doesn't mean we should stop asking questions about healthcare.gov too. Because if the government can't even run a Web site that it had 3 years—3 years—and hundreds of millions of dollars to create, can Americans entrust the same bureaucracy with even more power over their health care?

The calamitous rollout reminds us that we do not even know if data being submitted over this Web site is 100 percent secure. In today's age of digital scammers, that is a real concern for our constituents. Identity theft is about the last problem Americans need to be dealing with right now, especially with everything else this economy and this law have been throwing right at them. They are already mad enough about the President's repeated, unequivocal claims of, "If you like it, you can keep it."

The White House keeps trying to message its way out of this whopper, but no matter what they say, the reality remains: People are getting hurt. People are getting hit with premiums they can't afford and millions are losing the coverage they like. In my home State of Kentucky alone, 130,000 individual policies and 150,000 small group policies will be canceled. Remember, the President assured Americans up and down this wasn't going to happen.

I read about one DC woman who just lost her plan. She found something comparable on the exchange, but it cost a lot more than what she had before. Here is what she said: "[It's] just not fair. [It's] ridiculous."

She is not alone.

So I will say again it is time for Washington Democrats to work with Republicans to start working for their constituents instead of thinking that their first priority is to protect the President and his namesake legislation.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 815, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 184, S. 815, a bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNIONS IN AMERICA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will speak as in morning business before addressing the matter that is pending before the Senate. I will speak in morning business on two issues, to respond

to the Republican leader who just left the floor, as he spoke on two issues; first is the issue of unions in America. History shows us that after World War II, when labor organizations across the United States were at their peak organizing workers, giving them an opportunity to bargain collectively in the workplace for wages, benefits, safety, retirement, and health care, that was one of the most amazing periods in America history. The growth of the American middle class was unprecedented as men and women—some fresh from serving in the war—came home and had a chance to earn a livelihood, to build a family, to build neighborhoods, communities, and literally build the middle class in America. It is no coincidence that when the workers were given this voice and this strength through the collective bargaining process, they prospered and America prospered.

Today, we are in a much more difficult and challenging situation, when so many workers are living paycheck to paycheck while their productivity gains, when it comes to our economy, are well documented. While the companies they work for are showing unprecedented levels of profit, when the individuals who are managing these companies are being compensated at the highest levels in our history, many of these men and women working every day are falling further and further behind. If we look to the state of unionism, I think the facts speak for themselves. Those in the private sector who are in organized labor—part of a labor union—are in very low percentage.

I think there is a parallel that can be drawn. At a time when workers had a voice in the process, when their rights and their futures were within their control at a bargaining table, they prospered and America prospered. Today, without that strength at the bargaining table, many of these same families are falling further and further behind, despite the profitability of the companies they work for. So those who want to eliminate the opportunity for collective bargaining and make it more difficult for workers to stand and speak for themselves in the workplace, frankly, are going to condemn us to a much slower growing economy and much more injustice when it comes to compensation.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Secondly, the Republican leader spoke to the whole issue of the Affordable Care Act, which is characterized by some as ObamaCare. It is ironic that the Commonwealth of Kentucky is one of the top three States that is the most successful in signing up people for this new approach to health insurance. Some 31,000 people have signed up already through the Affordable Care Act. Governor Beshear was on television just about 10 days ago talking about the opportunities for Kentuckians to

finally have an opportunity for affordable health insurance, some of them for the first time in their lives. It is an opportunity which I voted for and I support. I will make no excuses for the dismal rollout of this Web site, and I hope it is fixed soon so people across the country will have ready access to the information they need about their health insurance. But I will not apologize for standing up for 40 or 50 million Americans who have no health insurance today.

Those of us who have gone through life experiences as a father with a sick child and no health insurance will never forget it as long as we live. To sit in a waiting room of a hospital in Washington, DC, with your baby and wonder who is going to walk through the door and take care of her because you do not have insurance—you just have to hope that the charity care being offered in that hospital will be good care—that is a feeling no one should ever have.

I have lived it. I do not want others to have to live it. We have to give to every American family a chance for health insurance.

Let me say a word about this notion of canceled policies. The market of insurance we are talking about here are people who are buying individual health insurance, not the group plans at most places of employment. It is a small segment but an important segment of our population. If you look at the facts you will find that almost two-thirds of the people who are in the individual health insurance market buying their own plans for their family—through a broker, for example—almost two-thirds of those plans are literally changed and canceled every 2 years. There is a lot of flux and change in this market, and prices continue to go up.

At the end of the day, here is what we are facing: Some 2, 3, or 4 million people may find themselves in a more difficult position because the policy they once had does not meet the standards which have now been established in law for minimum health insurance coverage in America.

What are those standards that we say should be in every health insurance policy?

No. 1, you cannot discriminate against people because of a preexisting condition. Is there a person alive in America today—any family who does not have someone with a preexisting condition? It can be something as basic as asthma, diabetes, high blood pressure, cholesterol issues, mental illness. These things literally disqualified people from coverage in health insurance. We have changed that law and said you cannot discriminate based on preexisting conditions. That is basic.

Second, we have said you cannot put a lifetime limit on how much the insurance policy will pay. Who knows—who knows—whether they are one diagnosis

or one accident away from needing health insurance that costs way beyond what we can even imagine. Mr. President, \$100,000, \$200,000 is not an unusual charge for what used to be considered somewhat routine. We say you cannot cap the coverage in a health insurance policy because life is unpredictable and our medical future is unpredictable. That is one of the provisions that has to be built into the policy.

We also say you cannot discriminate against people in selling health insurance because they happen to be women. And there was rank discrimination against women in America when it came to the issuance of health insurance before this new law.

We go on to say that 80 percent of the premiums you collect have to be paid into medical services, not taken out in profit and marketing.

We also say that if you have a health insurance policy, your son or daughter can stay under it until they reach the age of 26. That is important to every family with a graduating college student or someone looking for a job in the household. They may not find a job, or if they do, it may not have benefits. Don't you want the peace of mind as a parent to know that up to age 26 you can keep them on the family policy?

I have just given you five parts of so-called ObamaCare, five parts that have to be written now into every health insurance policy and five reasons why many companies are saying: We have to cancel the old policy and reissue a new one consistent with these five principles, with these five protections. That is why many of these policies are being rewritten. The President should have been more expansive in his explanation, but the fact is that is the story. That is what the Affordable Care Act does.

I hear the Senator from Kentucky tell us that 120,000 people may face a new policy. I would like to ask, what is the normal turnover in health insurance policies in his State or other States. It happens with some frequency. It is estimated that 17 million Americans are going to have help in paying for their health insurance because of the Affordable Care Act. That means some will qualify for Medicaid. That means others will receive tax credits and tax benefits to help with their health insurance payments.

We are moving toward a society that has health insurance protection for all, and that is good, not just for the peace of mind of each and every individual and family affected by it but also because the system becomes more just, more fair. Uninsured people get sick. They go to the hospital. They go to the doctor. They incur bills, many of which they cannot pay, and that burden is shifted to everyone else in America.

Let's accept the personal responsibility of health insurance. Let's move

forward as the Presiding Officer's State of Massachusetts has already done. Some 98 percent, I understand, has health insurance protection in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, thanks to the leadership of Governor Mitt Romney and the cooperation of both political parties. Massachusetts has shown us the way. Let's follow that now. Let's not turn our back on it.

The last point I will make on this issue is that I keep hearing from the Republican side they have a better idea. What is it? I would like to see the proposal from the Republican side that they would put up against the Affordable Care Act. You will never see it because they basically believe: Let the market work its will. The market working its will has resulted in 40 to 50 million uninsured Americans. The number is growing, and it should not, it will not, under the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. President, I would like to address the business pending before the Senate: the Employment Non-Discrimination Act.

It was about 20 years ago that I first heard the name Margaret Cammermeyer. I had no idea who she was, but I read about her, and it turned out she was a remarkable woman. She started off during the Vietnam era as a combat nurse in the Air Force. She risked her life in Vietnam to save the lives of those who were in battle and those who were injured and wounded. Then, after the war, she rose through the ranks and became a colonel in the U.S. Air Force.

There came a time when she had to make a disclosure, a regular disclosure, and in that disclosure she said, for the first time publicly, she was gay. Margaret Cammermeyer, a colonel in the Air Force, conceded she was gay. As a result of that concession and statement, she was discharged from the Air Force. Had she done anything wrong? Not a single thing. She had done everything right, including risking her life as a combat nurse in the Air Force and moving up through the ranks with a stellar record. But her admission that she was gay in those days, 20 years ago, was grounds for her discharge from the U.S. Air Force.

I never met her, but I heard her story and thought: That is just plain wrong. She served our country and served it well, and to discharge her from the military because of this admission is just unfair.

The first time I ever saw her was a few years ago. President Barack Obama was signing into law the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. I was in the audience when that signing ceremony took place, and they called the name: Margaret Cammermeyer, for her to come up and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance. It was the first time I had ever seen her.

I remember that day also because there was a rabbi who gave an invoca-

tion. He said in this invocation that if you look into the eyes of another and you do not see the face of God, at least see the face of another human being. How apropos that Margaret Cammermeyer would lead the Pledge of Allegiance and the rabbi that invocation because it really calls into sharp focus what is pending on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

We waste too many hours and too many days and too many weeks on Capitol Hill with government shutdowns, threats of defaulting on our debt, but every once in a while this Senate and this Congress can rise to the challenge and do something of a historic nature. Yesterday was one of those days. Yesterday, on the floor of the Senate, with 61 votes, we voted to move forward on the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. Here is what it says: that you cannot discriminate against a person because of their sexual orientation or sexual identity.

What I thought was unfair about Margaret Cammermeyer—dismissing her not for anything she had done but for who she was—can happen now in more than half of the States. In more than half of the States, there is no protection against discrimination based on a person's sexual orientation or sexual identity. It means that in those States, you can literally be fired, denied a promotion, denied a raise, simply because of your sexual orientation. That is not right.

Hiring, promoting and retaining employees based on performance is not only the right thing to do, it helps American business attract and retain the best and brightest employees.

Attracting and keeping the best and the brightest employees is essential to succeeding in a global economy. That is why 88 percent of Fortune 500 companies already have policies preventing discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

More than 100 companies have already endorsed this bill, including a number of leading companies in my home State of Illinois such as Motorola, GroupOn, Hyatt Hotels, BP America, Orbitz, Nielsen, Miller Coors, HSBC North America, and others.

It is time that Federal law caught up with the best practices that have already been adopted by leading companies across the country.

Luckily, we had bipartisan support last night. Seven Republicans joined us in voting to move forward on this bill. I came to the floor yesterday to thank one of them who spoke, Senator COLLINS of Maine. Her statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is an important one for everyone to read.

But I would like to call attention, as well, to my colleague Senator MARK KIRK of Illinois, a Republican, who came to the floor of the U.S. Senate yesterday and gave his first speech on the floor in 2 years. You see, my col-

league suffered a stroke, and as a consequence he has gone through a lengthy rehab and hospitalization, and he has really made a remarkable comeback.

I was here on the day when he walked up the steps of the Capitol to the Senate, and there were people of both political parties, Senators cheering him on, as they should. I have watched his progress ever since, and it is remarkable. His determination to serve our State and Nation continues.

Yesterday, he gave his first speech on the floor in 2 years. That speech was brief, but it was important. I would like to quote from my colleague's speech. This is from Senator KIRK's statement yesterday in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I think it is particularly appropriate for an Illinois Republican to speak on behalf of this measure—Speaking of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act—in the true tradition of Everett McKinley Dirksen and Abraham Lincoln, men who gave us the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 13th Amendment to the Constitution.

It was a brief statement but it was important. Senator KIRK joined in a bipartisan effort to move this bill forward. I searched the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I searched the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday to look for one statement in opposition to the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. There is not one. There was a specific opportunity given for anyone opposed to that measure to stand and speak. Senator TOM HARKIN of Iowa supported it. He spoke eloquently from this desk yesterday before the vote, and then time was allocated to those in opposition. No one stood to speak. But then 30 voted against it.

So what I would like to do is encourage my colleagues to take, in the spirit of Senator KIRK and Senator COLLINS, this opportunity for us to truly do something in a bipartisan way. Let us move this Employment Non-Discrimination Act forward, and let us do it with dispatch. We know it is the right thing to do. America is not a stronger nation when there is discrimination anywhere—anywhere—including the workplace, and this bill will end that form of discrimination.

There are those who say: Well, you are just wasting your time, Senator, because Speaker JOHN BOEHNER of Ohio has already announced that he not only opposes this, he will not let it see the light of day in the House of Representatives.

The Presiding Officer served there for many years; I did as well. The Speaker has lots of control in the House. He can decide what is going to come to the floor and what will not come to the floor. Unless a majority of the Members of the House overrule him with a discharge petition, he usually has his way. But if we can show a strong bipartisan vote, even beyond the vote yesterday, when seven Republicans joined

the Democrats in trying to end this form of discrimination, then perhaps we can prevail on the House of Representatives to move forward in what Senator HARKIN characterized as a historic achievement putting an end to discrimination.

There was a time in our country when it was perfectly acceptable to refuse to hire or even interview someone based solely on the color of their skin, their religion or gender. It wasn't easy, but Congress ultimately corrected this wrong by passing title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

At one time, employers could fire someone solely because of their age. Congress recognized this was wrong and passed the Age Discrimination in Employment Act to put an end to age discrimination.

There was also a time in our country when an employee could be passed over for a promotion solely because they were living with a disability, even if they were the most qualified person for the position. The Americans with Disabilities Act put an end to this type of discrimination.

We now have an opportunity to outlaw one of the last vestiges of discrimination in the workplace. All Americans deserve an equal opportunity to succeed or fail in their jobs based solely on their ability and performance.

This is our opportunity to take a historic stand against discrimination. Passing ENDA is our chance to get on the right side of history and close an embarrassing loophole in our Nation's employment laws.

I urge my colleagues to support the Employment Non-Discrimination Act so that all Americans have an opportunity to excel in the workplace based on their job performance—not who they are or who they love.

We will be a better nation for it. Both political parties should gather together all the political strength and support they have to make this a reality.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. I see my colleague from Maryland is here. I promise I will not take all of that time.

During the debate over ObamaCare back in 2009 and 2010, the President repeatedly and unequivocally promised his fellow Americans that if they liked their current health care plan, they could keep it. By one account, there were as many as 29 different times where the President was captured on videotape making that same unequivocal commitment. This was not an off-the-cuff remark or a casual throwaway comment, it was essential to the Presi-

dent's entire argument selling ObamaCare.

I heard the distinguished majority whip from Illinois talking about the reasons why ObamaCare was so important, suggesting that you could not cover preexisting conditions or even young adults up to the age of 26 unless you accepted the whole package, the whole enchilada, as we would say in Texas. Well, that is not true. The truth is we are committed to dealing with preexisting conditions, we are committed to helping people be able to buy and afford health care coverage. What the President sold in 2009 and 2010 was basically sold under false pretenses, as it turns out. If Americans had known that ObamaCare would result in them losing their current coverage which they like, it never would have become law. According to one estimate, as many as 3.5 million people will lose their current health insurance coverage.

I have heard the revisionist history here on the floor and elsewhere. They are trying to change the commitment. Rather than: You can keep your current coverage if you like it, period, which is what I know the President said at the American Medical Association and many other times, now they are trying to tweak that and say: If it is not otherwise changed or canceled by our insurance company.

Well, that is not what the President said then. That is not what the American people heard. That is not the basis upon which ObamaCare was sold to the American people in 2009 and 2010. When President Obama campaigned for reelection in 2012, he reiterated his promise from 2009 and 2010, again a remarkably consistent message from the President. He said: If you liked your existing plan and you wanted to keep it, you had nothing to worry about.

Here is the exact statement the President made on June 28, 2012, at a White House press conference. "If you are one of the more than 250 million Americans who already have health insurance, you will keep your health insurance." That is a direct quote, no qualifiers, no caveats—a simple unequivocal promise. However, way back in 2010 we now learn that the Obama administration itself issued the very regulations which have made, keeping this promise impossible. Indeed, the 2010 ObamaCare regulations acknowledged that between 40 to 67 percent of all policies in the individual market would lose their grandfathered status by 2014 and must be required to meet the costly mandates in ObamaCare. In other words, at the same time the President was making the promise, his own administration acknowledged that the regulations they were passing would make it impossible to keep it.

Well, as you can imagine, people are increasingly frustrated by these broken promises.

I recently set up a Web site in my office where my constituents can let me know how their personal health care coverage has been affected by the implementation of ObamaCare. I hope if others who perhaps may hear my comments on the floor this morning have stories they would like for us to be able to tell to explain how these broken promises have resulted in their inability to keep what they have, they will let us know on our Web site. It is cornyn.senate.gov. I plan to forward these stories to the President.

One woman from Livingston, TX, over in East Texas, writes:

My health insurance is being canceled due to the Affordable Care Act. My insurance company offered a plan . . . that I can keep until 2014. Guess what? It's 19 percent more a month than my current plan and drops coverage for laboratory and imaging studies.

So not only is it more expensive, it actually reduces the coverage. Going on, she said:

In December 2014, I'll have to change it again. Premiums for myself and my husband at that time will increase 100 percent each, which will equal just about half—50 percent—of our gross monthly income. What exactly are we supposed to do?

Another woman from Pampa, TX, up in the Texas Panhandle, writes that her monthly health insurance premiums have increased by 30 percent already over last year, and now her policy is being canceled altogether because of ObamaCare, so she has to purchase a new health insurance policy that will cost, in her words, "much more" than her existing coverage.

As her letter indicates, many of the folks losing their insurance will be forced to buy a new ObamaCare-approved policy from an online exchange which does not even work yet. It is no wonder that a growing number of our friends across the aisle are beginning to wonder: Why did the administration not extend the open enrollment period beyond March 2014? They realize they were marching in lockstep with the President when he made these promises, and the fact that these promises are not being kept is a political liability for them. At the very least it is a hardship for their constituents that they would like to see rectified.

Why is the ObamaCare Web site malfunctioning? It is an important question. But it is again just the tip of the iceberg. Remember, ObamaCare became the law of the land more than 3½ years ago. I think most people are astonished to learn that. Some news reports I have read said that people thought ObamaCare had already been fully implemented, we have been talking about it for so long. But by design, it was created to be implemented over a many-year period of time. I think that was a terrible mistake, because the political accountability that comes with implementing a law and then having to live with the political consequences of not delivering on your promises has now been delayed.

But 3½ years ago the administration should have gotten prepared to roll out its signature legislative achievement. According to CBS News, one of President Obama's top outside health care advisors sent the White House a memo back in May of 2010 warning them that ObamaCare was spiraling out of control. This memo came from Harvard economist David Cutler and reads in part:

I do not believe the relevant members of the Administration understand the President's vision or have the capability to carry it out. . . . You need to have people who have the understanding of the political process, people who understand how to work within an Administration, and people who understand how to start and to build a business, and unfortunately, nationally they just didn't get all of those people together.

Republicans have for years been warning that this government takeover of one-sixth of our economy, this central planning scheme, social engineering, if you will, would not work. At the very least, the Federal Government has proven itself incompetent on making something this big and this complicated and this expensive work as advertised, it is becoming increasingly clear. We spent years warning that ObamaCare would force many Americans to lose their existing coverage. We spent years warning that ObamaCare would limit patient choices and reduce health options. We have spent years warning that the law itself would prove to be unworkable. Now it appears that many of those warnings have come true. We are reiterating our call to dismantle ObamaCare and to replace it with patient-centered reforms that will help bring down the cost, will not limit patient choices, and which will address most of the biggest problems in our broken health care system.

There are other areas such as pre-existing conditions, young adult coverage, that we could readily agree on. Those are not debatable. I think the fact that the distinguished majority whip has suggested you have to have ObamaCare in order to get those is a gross exaggeration.

Remember, ObamaCare was sold as a policy that would expand health care coverage without raising costs, and without disrupting anyone's existing health care arrangement. It has proven to be a false promise on both of those counts. Despite the promises made in 2009 and 2010, promises that were repeated on the campaign trail in 2012, it is becoming increasingly evident that ObamaCare is making it harder for Americans to get or to keep the insurance coverage they already have, and which they want.

By the way, ObamaCare was sold to the American people as a way to get everybody covered with insurance. The Congressional Budget Office has documented that as many as 30 million Americans will remain uncovered even after ObamaCare is fully implemented.

So you have not met the goal of universal coverage, the CBO says.

We are finding that rather than your costs going down, they are going up; you are finding that if you like what you have, you cannot keep it. Well, as Republicans have said all along, there are much better ways to expand health insurance coverage. I heard the majority whip this morning say they would like to hear our plan. Well, either their memory is faulty or they just were not listening.

ObamaCare regulations are incompatible with the genuine marketplace in health care insurance. They are incompatible with cost control. I think perhaps the best example I can think of is where the market actually works in conjunction with a government program, such as Medicare prescription drug coverage.

Remember when the Medicare prescription drug coverage plan was adopted, Medicare Part D, true competition in the market was created and vendors competed for the business of beneficiaries when it came to selling them their prescription drug plan. Lo and behold, due to the discipline and the competition, not only did quality of service go up and cost go down, we have seen that actually there is a 40-percent reduction, or I should say the cost of the plan is 40 percent under what was originally projected. That is something we could use with ObamaCare, which has been completely rejected. But that is why we believe we can replace ObamaCare with reforms that will make it easier for people to acquire or keep a health insurance plan that meets their actual individual needs.

My friends across the aisle continue to say we have not offered a practical alternative, but that is not true. Just to remind them, some of the alternatives we offered include equalizing the tax treatment of health care so individuals purchasing insurance on their own are on the same level playing field as those who have employer-provided coverage. We would let Americans buy their health insurance coverage across State lines, something that is now not currently permitted, which would increase competition and increase consumer choice. So if I found a policy I needed from Maryland or Massachusetts or anywhere else around the country, I could buy it. So could my 26 million constituents. We would let individuals in small businesses form risk pools in the individual market, which is the most expensive part of the insurance market, helping to bring costs down. We would make price and quality information more transparent, again to increase that discipline known as market forces, which would help improve consumer choice and, in the process, bring down cost, while improving quality of service.

We would also expand the power of individuals to control their own health

care spending through tax-free health savings accounts, which also have the additional benefit of providing skin in the game for consumers. One of the reasons why our health care spending is so high and so worrisome is that for too long our health care coverage was like a credit card that each of us, or many of us—not all of us—85 percent of us had in our pocket, where we could continue to charge and charge, but we would never see the bill. Well, that is a recipe for a runaway system, which is the reason we do need true health insurance reform.

Part of that reform would be to control frivolous malpractice lawsuits that help drive up costs by increasing the incentives for defensive medicine, doctors treating patients not because they think it is called for based on clinical guidelines but, rather in their effort to say: I have conducted every test, I have done everything possible so I cannot get sued successfully. We would use high-risk pools to ensure that people with preexisting conditions could get coverage. We would give the States a lot more flexibility in how to manage Medicaid.

I read with interest that a lot of the increased coverage since ObamaCare passed is not in the exchanges but it is Medicaid, the Medicaid expansion. Well, in my State, Medicaid pays a doctor about 50 cents on the dollar for what private insurance pays that doctor. So only about one-third of doctors will actually see a new Medicaid patient, because the cost of doing so eats into their profit, and, indeed, may make their doing so completely unprofitable and nonviable. But we could improve Medicaid by creating more flexibility in the States to manage that beneficiary population and to expand coverage.

Then we would expand provider competition and patient choice and Medicare.

Those are nine different reform proposals we have been making since 2009 when ObamaCare was first being debated, but it is clear our colleagues across the aisle were so concentrated on this huge takeover of our health care system—one-sixth of our economy, in a way that we now know is not going to work—that they weren't even listening. I hope they will now.

While the reforms I have described enjoy broad support among Republicans on Capitol Hill, my hope is whether you were a critic of ObamaCare, as I was, or you were a skeptic and thought, well, maybe it will work but I am not sure it will, or whether you were one of its biggest cheerleaders—now that we are seeing these promises that were made by the President and others in order to sell this to the American people are not true, I am hopeful Democrats and Republicans can come together to try to fix our broken health care system.

After witnessing ObamaCare's disastrous rollout and its long trail of broken promises, I think most Americans would agree it is time for something different.

I have read that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results. ObamaCare is not going to get any better by continuing to do the same thing over and over. I hope we will learn from our mistakes, and we will work together to improve access and the price of health care to the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, the legislation that is currently pending before this body, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, S. 815, provides a historic opportunity for us to advance civil rights in this country and end employment discrimination against lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgenders, the LGBT community.

The United States has shown international leadership against discrimination, promoting better understanding and tolerance around the globe. That has made the security of countries better. It has provided opportunities for minority communities. The United States has been in the forefront of those efforts. We have shown leadership internationally and we have done that because we have taken action in our own country to protect against discrimination. Action at home helps us provide that credibility for our international leadership. Passage of S. 815, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, would demonstrate that action, that we have taken the right action at home and, therefore, we have the standing to promote better understanding globally.

The U.S. leadership has been shown in many different ways. I am very proud that one of the primary organizations the United States has participated in that has advanced human rights is the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. Our local arm in participating is the Helsinki Commission. I have the honor of chairing the Helsinki Commission, which includes Members of both the House and the Senate, along with members of the administration. We have used that role in the Helsinki Commission to promote an international agenda to deal with best practices to end discrimination on ethnic communities, religious communities, and racial discrimination. As a result of U.S. leadership, we have made a difference. We made a difference in Europe, we made a difference in North America, and we made a difference around the world.

Today there are special representatives under the OSCE to promote tolerance in regard to minority commu-

nities on race, the Muslim community, and Jewish communities. We have made a difference in the Roma population in Europe, which has been badly discriminated against. We have had conferences to deal with anti-Semitism to help the Jewish communities of Europe, and we have helped religious minorities around the region.

U.S. leadership is needed to help the LGBT community. We have seen countries in Europe take discriminatory actions to marginalize lesbians, gays, and those who, because of their sexual orientation or gender identity, have been discriminated against. In order to do that, we need to pass the legislation before us to give us the moral ground and to promote the core values of our country. America's core values are based upon equal rights for all citizens, and that is what we need to promote by the passage of this legislation.

I must tell you it also is important for economic advancements. If we are going to be able to adequately compete globally, we need to empower all of the people of this country. We can't leave anyone behind.

I am proud of what has happened in my own State of Maryland. Maryland has had a proud history of advancing civil rights for all of its citizens. Two weekends ago I had the opportunity to join in the 25th anniversary of Equality Maryland. In 25 years, they have changed the landscape in regard to the LGBT community in my State of Maryland. We passed many laws that have advanced protection for all of our citizens in our State.

The State of Maryland has passed laws. We have had local governments pass law. Baltimore City has passed a law, Baltimore County, Montgomery County, Howard County, and the list goes on. In Maryland, not only did our legislature pass marriage equality, it was a petition to referendum and the voters of Maryland approved marriage equality. We have taken steps in our State to advance the rights of all of our citizens, including the LGBT community.

It has been nearly half a century since we passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 prevents discrimination in employment based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. That has been our law for almost half a century. ENDA, the legislation before us, would expand that to sexual orientation and gender identity.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 has worked. It has worked. It has provided enforcement mechanisms for those who have been discriminated against in their employment because of their race or because of their religion or because of their national origin or because of their sex. It has worked. ENDA would expand that protection for sexual orientation and gender identity. It is time we do this. Twenty-one States have al-

ready acted, including my State of Maryland. We have passed laws. Seventeen States include gender identity. Federalism has worked.

What do I mean by that? We have seen that there is a national law. The law is the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It set up the framework so that everyone understands we won't tolerate discrimination in the workplace. It has had a workable way where those who are victimized can get remedy, but the real remedy we want is equal employment opportunity for all the citizens of this country. It has worked.

Our States have said we can go farther, we can protect the LGBT community. They have and it has worked. Those who have said: Look, we are going to have problems because of religious organizations or we are going to have problems because of this group—that has not been the case.

Federalism has demonstrated it is now time to pass a national law to protect against those who discriminate in employment on a person's sexual orientation or gender identity. We need a national law.

I can give you many specific examples that have been shared with us. We could talk the numbers. We know the numbers. I want to speak about specific cases and to mention two people.

Kimya has a master's degree in social work and nearly two decades of experience in the field. She was the manager of a unit of a long-term care facility for those suffering from Alzheimer's and dementia. She enjoyed her job and was good at it but suffered through nearly a year of threatening messages, vandalism to her car, and slurs uttered in the halls. In 2003, she was fired, her supervisors telling her: "This would not be happening if you were not a lesbian."

Next is the case of Linda. Linda is an attorney who relocated to this region when her partner accepted a faculty position with a local university. Linda was invited for a second interview with a local law firm. During the interview, Linda was asked why she was moving to this region, and she replied that her spouse had taken a position at a local university. The law firm asked Linda to come back for a final interview, which would include a dinner with all the partners and their spouses "to make sure we all got along." At that point, Linda told one of the partners at the law firm that her spouse was a woman. Soon after, Linda was told that the firm would not hire a lesbian and she should not bother coming in for the third interview.

In Kimya's and Linda's cases, they live in States that do not have protection for the LGBT community, and therefore there was no way to address this wrong.

The legislation before us has been endorsed by the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights that represents over 200 civil rights, religious,

labor, and women's rights organizations. It has broad support. It is supported by the American people. It is the right thing to do. It represents our core values.

Our former colleague Senator Ted Kennedy said civil rights was the great unfinished business of America. We are on that path. The passage of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act would be a major step forward to making us a more perfect union.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Maryland, who has argued so well that the time has come to take a bold step in favor of equality, in favor of fairness in passing employment nondiscrimination. I too rise to speak to the importance of this action.

The Declaration of Independence in its second paragraph says, in words that are famous and well-known to all Americans:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.

Certainly that vision of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness is infused into everything we pursue in this Nation in the success of individuals, the success of our families, the success of our communities, and the success of our Nation. The debate on which we are about to embark is deeply connected to this issue because certainly the ability to be free from discrimination in the pursuit of a job and to be free from discrimination in the course of employment is central to that pursuit of happiness. It is central to the issue of liberty.

I rise today to say how important and vital this is to millions of Americans for whom discrimination has blocked and compromised the vision laid out in the Declaration of Independence. This bill, this framework for ending discrimination in employment, S. 815, is born with a lot of bipartisan partners whom I wish to thank at this moment.

It was back in 2009, my first year in the Senate, that Senator Kennedy and his team asked me to take the leadership of this bill that he had held near and dear to his heart and to carry the torch forward in fighting for fairness in employment, fighting for an end to discrimination. Since that time, many have stepped forward to be partners in this journey.

Senator COLLINS was the first chief cosponsor on the Republican side, stepping forward and taking her voice, her energy, her experience, and her insight in bringing that to bear. After 2 years, she passed the baton to Senator MARK

KIRK, who had been a long-time champion of the vision of fairness and equality for all Americans. Both of them have done an outstanding and extraordinary job in forwarding this dialogue.

On the Democratic side we have, first and foremost Senator Kennedy, who carried the leadership for many years, including back in 1996 when we had this on the floor of the Senate—and I will return to that in due course. He was a champion for civil rights in many different parts of our world, including race discrimination, gender discrimination, and discrimination against the LGBT community.

Senator HARKIN, who chairs the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, carried this bill forward through two hearings in 2009 and 2012, and then brought it to markup this past year and is prepared to send it to the floor. So I thank Senator HARKIN for his leadership.

Senator TAMMY BALDWIN, who came to us with her own personal story and her experience with leadership in the House, has extended the conversation here in the Senate and has carried on so many individual meetings to speak to these core issues of equality, fairness, and opportunity.

So I thank all the bipartisan sponsors, and I thank all of those who last night said, yes, we should debate this issue. We should debate this issue of discrimination and blocking full opportunity for millions of Americans. So shortly we will be engaged in that debate.

After the Declaration of Independence, we had the preamble to the Constitution. This also is well known to Americans across our land.

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish the Constitution of the United States of America.

So here we have this core concept of justice and the blessings of liberty for that generation and the generations that would follow. But what exactly is liberty? What is freedom?

President Johnson, in 1965, at a commencement address at Howard University, said:

Freedom is the right to share, share fully and equally, in American society—to vote, to hold a job, to enter a public place, to go to a school. It is the right to be treated in every part of our national life as a person equal in dignity and promise to all others.

I think that is a pretty good description of what liberty and freedom mean—a right to participate fully in American society in every respect: at the voting booth, in the job place, and in the public square, as you would choose to participate.

So the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, which ends discrimination against our LGBT community, is root-

ed in the best of American values. It is rooted in the concepts of liberty and freedom in our founding documents and in our founding vision. It is rooted in the concept of fundamental fairness.

How unfair is it if an individual who is seeking to apply for a job cannot have the full opportunity for that job, the full opportunity to thrive because of discrimination? How fair is it that because of who you are outside of the workplace you are fired from the workplace?

Let us think of the Golden Rule. We all learned this early in life—that we should treat others according to how we would want to be treated. And we all want to be treated with the respect and dignity President Johnson referred to.

It is the vision of equality that was in the Declaration of Independence, and it is the vision of opportunity that is rooted so deeply in the American Dream—the idea that in America, if you work and study hard, you can do just about anything. That is the vision my father gave me when he took me to the schoolhouse doors when I was small and said: If you go through those doors and you study hard, here in America you can do just about anything.

But discrimination takes away from that vision of opportunity. It says: If you study hard, here in America you can do just about anything, unless you have a certain color of skin, unless you are a certain gender, unless you have a certain gender identity or sexual orientation.

We have struck down many of those barriers. We have advanced on this vision of equality, but we have further to go. That is what this debate is about. In 29 States, an individual can still be fired from their job, they can still be told not to apply in the first place because of their sexual orientation or their gender identity—in 29 States. It should not be the case that the vision of equality and fairness and opportunity happens to occur on one side of a State line but it is destroyed if you cross that State line. This vision of opportunity and fairness and equality in the Constitution and in the Declaration of Independence didn't say the vision is only if you live in particular States, only if you live in the 21 States that have protections for our lesbian, gay, and bisexual community; only if you live in the 17 States that have employment protection for our transgender community.

The journey of this legislation began in 1974. It was a year after Stonewall. It was 39 years ago that Bella Abzug and Ed Koch introduced in the House of Representatives legislation that would ban job discrimination. It took another 19 years before such legislation was introduced here in the Senate and where hearings were held in the Labor and Human Resources Committee in 1994. It was 2 years later the bill was debated

here in this Chamber—right here in this very room. The outcome was 49 for and 50 against, with Vice President Gore sitting in the presiding chair where the Senator from Hawaii now sits.

Vice President Gore had already clarified where he stood, so we were missing one Senator and one vote, and the result was that it took 17 years to again hold this conversation in this Chamber—17 years of discrimination in so many States across America. It is time to end that discrimination and enhance the vision of equality and fairness.

Today, we have a bill before us with 55 cosponsors. When we think about that 49-50 vote 17 years ago, we might think: Well, isn't this a done deal? There are 55 cosponsors and you only need 51 or 50 plus the Vice President to pass a bill in the Senate. But it is not a done deal. Because in the last decade and a half, the Senate has gone from being a simple majority Chamber, as envisioned in the Constitution, to being a Chamber where every action takes a supermajority vote.

We needed a supermajority of 60 to get on to the bill last night, and everyone anticipates we will need 60 votes to get off the bill; that is, to close debate and have a final vote. That is not the Senate of the past 200 years, but it is the Senate of the last 10 years, where the courtesy of extended debate has been turned into the veto of a supermajority. That is where we stand right now. Therefore, we need 60 votes.

We had 61 votes last night to get onto this debate, and I thank every one of those 61 Senators who stood up and said: Yes, after 17 years it is time to debate this issue; yes, it is right to consider the core issue of fairness to millions of Americans; yes, it is right to recognize that we should have a debate about the impact of discrimination on the ability of the individual to have full opportunity in our Nation.

Have no doubt. Discrimination is alive and well. I will share with you the story of Laura from Portland, OR, before Oregon had nondiscrimination clauses, which we adopted in 2007. Laura wrote that from 1980 to 1996 she worked for the Josephine County Sheriff's Office in Grants Pass, OR. She had the rank of sergeant. She was promoted often. She worked in a variety of capacities, including as a SWAT team commander, as a detective of the major crimes unit, and in the narcotics task force. During her 16 years, she says: I received numerous commendations, including commendations for removing an automobile accident victim from a burning vehicle, delivering a baby alongside a roadside, and disarming an armed man intent on harming himself. She was awarded for her expertise and diligence shown in a number of complicated criminal cases. She was named Deputy of the Year in

1994. She taught law enforcement classes at Rogue Community College and at the Oregon Police Academy. She had a distinguished employment record.

On Labor Day 1995, Laura was in a remote area when a police dog attacked her and did some damage to her leg and she was put on administrative leave. During the month that followed, her storage unit was broken into. Out of that break-in of her storage unit came information she was a transgender individual, and because of that she was fired. She had a stellar career in every aspect, but a break-in into her storage unit, plus discrimination, ended that career.

She ends her commentary by saying: Had employment nondiscrimination laws been in effect, I likely would have continued serving the citizens of Josephine County to this day.

We know from her employment record she would have served well. But that was before Oregon adopted antidiscrimination legislation.

Many people have written to share their stories. Terri from Aloha wrote:

Thank you for continuing the fight against discrimination. I am retired now, but I did lose a job when I was young, for being a lesbian. Until later in life, I stayed deep in the closet after that to keep from losing another job. All of the non-discrimination bills help us define who we are as a people and underscores our belief in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for every American.

By one survey, far more than a third of LGBT individuals have experienced some form of harassment or discrimination in the workplace. That has a tremendous impact on the pursuit of happiness. That is a tremendous shrinking of freedom and liberty as envisioned in our founding documents, our vision for this Nation.

There are a number of issues which have been raised as colleagues have talked about this bill before it comes to the floor, and I wish to address some of them.

First, this bill is fully inclusive. It includes the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community. It should be fully inclusive because discrimination is wrong. Discrimination shrinks opportunity. Discrimination is an offense against liberty and freedom in our Nation and full participation in society. So of course this bill should be fully inclusive, as it is in 17 of the 21 States that have laws on their books right now.

A second issue has been concern about lawsuits. We heard this yesterday from the Speaker of the House. But we have all of these pilots, if you will, with 21 States with measures on the books with all kinds of experience. So I asked the General Accounting Office to do an updated study on the issue of lawsuits, and what did we find? There has been no abuse. There has been no extraordinary stream of unfounded lawsuits against businesses, no damage to business, none at all.

In Oregon, LGBT discrimination claims are less than 2 percent of the total number of employment discrimination claims. That is less than 1 out of 50. In other States it has ranged from 2 to 6 percent. That is a small number, and that is why the business community has remained so supportive. In fact, close to 90 percent of the Fortune 500 companies have nondiscrimination practices they have adopted on their own. They have adopted them because it is good business.

Nike, in my home State of Oregon, says that "ENDA is good for business, for our employees, and for our communities."

The Nike statement continues: Inclusive, nondiscrimination policies "enable us to attract and retain the best and brightest people around the world."

That is why Fortune 500 companies have lined up to adopt nondiscrimination provisions—because what is good for liberty and what is good for opportunity is good for business. And the GAO study shows that any claim that there has been a problem with excessive lawsuits is simply false.

A third concern is about the religious exemption. The religious exemption in this bill is deeply founded on title VII of the Civil Rights Act, so there is a whole history of interpretation and understanding exactly where the boundaries are. This is the same religious exemption that was voted in favor of in the U.S. House of Representatives by a measure of 420 to 25. Mr. President, 420 to 25 said this is the right foundation to make sure we create the balance for religious organizations.

There are others who are concerned that, simply, the American people are not ready for this discussion—despite the fact that it has been adopted in 21 States, despite the fact that we have had many related issues before the American public up for discussion, including hate crimes. We have the Matthew Shepard hate crimes act; we had don't ask, don't tell; we had a Supreme Court discussion about marriage equality. Certainly Americans are well familiar with this. In fact, 80 percent of Americans think we have already done this.

I was explaining to my daughter Brynne about this bill, this fight against discrimination and its terrible impacts on liberty, freedom, and opportunity.

She said: But, Dad, people can't fire others because they are lesbian or gay, right? That is not possible.

I said: Sweetie, it was possible right here in Oregon until a couple years ago when in 2007 we adopted nondiscrimination policies and nondiscrimination statutes for our State.

She just shook her head.

It took me back to when I was in high school and I was hearing about Jim Crow and discrimination against

those with dark skin instead of lighter skin, and I thought that is not possible, not under our vision of opportunity and equality in our Constitution and our pursuit of happiness. It is not possible.

But it was possible, and it was very real well after I was born. But we ended that discrimination, and it is time to end this discrimination.

This is about the individual, but it is about our Nation as well. It is certainly about the vision of the Declaration of Independence, which has the promise of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as the founding motivation. It certainly is about our Constitution, which says that the core purpose is to secure the blessings of liberty because certainly you do not have liberty if you do not have the full opportunity to participate in the workplace across America.

Senator Ted Kennedy carried this battle until days before his death. The quote I am about to share is from August 5, 2009. He died just 20 days later. This may well have been one of his last public comments and introducing the 2009 bill may well have been one of his last legislative acts. He said:

The promise of America will never be fulfilled as long as justice is denied to even one among us.

I urge my colleagues, take a stand for equality. Take a stand for fundamental fairness. Take a stand for the vision of the pursuit of happiness embedded in our Constitution. Take a stand for justice for all. Support this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, among the many promises the President made when he and congressional Democrats enacted their unpopular health care law nearly 4 years ago—which, by the way, was enacted without any bipartisan input or support—there is one thing in particular Americans definitely have not forgotten. It was the promise President Obama repeated over and over again to the American people at rally after rally. You can't turn on the TV or radio or pick up a newspaper these days without this promise the President made so definitively being played over and over again because it was so ingrained in the thoughts of the American people:

If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period.

By saying "period" behind it, it is like he puts a stamp on it: That is it. No disagreement.

If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep it. Period.

Well, here are the facts. The ObamaCare online marketplace has

been in place for 1 month and a couple of days. Already, at least 3.5 million Americans have received cancellation notices from their insurance companies. Lord knows how many more letters are in the mail or will be in the mail, arriving in Americans' mailboxes in the coming weeks and months ahead. So when the President says: If you like your health care plan, you can keep it—already 3.5 million Americans have been told: No, actually you can't keep your health care plan.

Thousands of Hoosiers are receiving those letters, and many more will receive them as well.

Rebecca from Muncie received a letter saying that her individual health care plan will be canceled. She also learned that the premiums in the government-approved plans are double and triple what she is paying now. Do you remember when the administration said "This won't cost one penny more"?

Dwight from Indianapolis wrote to me and shared a similar story. Dwight also received notice in the mail that his health care plan is being terminated. When he started looking for an alternative government-approved plan he experienced sticker shock: dramatic increases in the premiums he would have to pay for having to buy an ObamaCare plan now that his plan has been terminated.

That sticker shock was felt by Garth in Marion, IN, as well. Garth told me his family's health insurance costs will be more than three times as much under ObamaCare as they are paying now.

Rebecca, Dwight, Garth, and tens of thousands of other Hoosiers now have found out that the promise the President made is a broken promise.

But despite the repeated promise by the President for several years to the American people—that you can keep your health care plan if you like it, period—we have now learned the administration knew all along this wasn't true. For at least the past 3 years the administration has known that millions of Americans would receive cancellation notices and lose their current health care coverage. Yet the President has continued to package this flawed product with false advertising and apparently deliberate dishonesty to sell it to the American people. We wonder why Americans are losing confidence in their government? We wonder why there is such an alarming trust deficit in the country today?

As Washington Post writer Chris Cillizza wrote recently, "When you're the President, words matter."

Mr. President, words matter. Your words were: If you like your health care plan, you can keep it, period. Mr. President, that was a false promise, and it has undermined the confidence and trust of the American people in this President and in this government.

The fact is that you can only keep your health care plan if the Obama administration likes that plan, and apparently there are millions of plans already that they don't like. The ones they do like are their own creation, with multiple doubles and triples of premium costs.

In 2009 the President also said:

We will keep this promise: If you like your doctor, you'll be able to keep your doctor, period.

The President keeps enunciating his promises with a period. That means that is it, final, nothing else to say about it. The fact is that under ObamaCare many individuals are not going to have access to the doctors they have trusted for years. If the White House had been honest with Americans, would the administration have promised people could keep doctors they like?

Many individuals and families are seeing higher premiums, higher copays, and higher deductibles under ObamaCare. If the White House had been honest with Americans, would it have told the public the health care law would save families up to \$2,500? We haven't seen any of those stories yet.

What is the President's response to all of this and to the millions of Americans who have had their insurance coverage canceled? He says: Just shop around.

Well, first of all, maybe the President has forgotten that Americans can't even shop around because his Web site doesn't work. Maybe the President hasn't tried shopping around himself because he and his political appointees are not required to join ObamaCare. That is right. Everybody else is forced into ObamaCare but not the President nor his appointees and his team. They think it is good enough for the American people, but they are not going to be forced to join it as the rest of us are—including Members of Congress. Congress and the administration should be forced to join ObamaCare because if we are going to impose this on the American people, it needs to be imposed on us so that we feel the pain just as they are feeling the pain. But the President? He exempted himself. The President's appointees? Exempted. What kind of leadership is that?

Individuals and families who have been able to shop around are finding that many of the Obama-approved health care policies are going to cost them more money, not less. Middle-class families are getting hit with massive premium increases and outrageous deductibles. Remember, the point of health care reform was to lower the cost of health care and increase access, but we are seeing just the opposite of what the President promised. I think it is now clear that if the White House had been honest with the American people, this law would never have been passed in the first place.

It was Abraham Lincoln who said:

If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all of the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all of the time; but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

Unfortunately, today many Americans believe they have been fooled by a series of promises by this administration and its supporters that were simply not true. Given the many problems and broken promises with ObamaCare, given the law's negative impact on American families, the sensible course of action at this time is to take a timeout from implementation of this law. Recent polling shows that nearly three in four American voters now support delaying ObamaCare's individual mandate. In September I introduced a bill to delay that mandate for 1 year. The House has already passed similar legislation offered by my Indiana colleague, TODD YOUNG, to delay both the employer—and the individual—mandate. By the way, 22 House Democrats supported it.

The first step we should take today is to pass this legislation to delay the ObamaCare mandates and put people over politics. There is a lot of work ahead to deliver real health care reform. We need to bring down the cost of health care, not raise it. We need to put patients in control of their health care decisions, not Washington bureaucrats. We need to increase competition, reform medical malpractice, allow people to buy insurance across State lines, create risk pools, and a number of other initiatives that have been put forward that would make it an affordable health care reform and not the unaffordable, overpromised and underdelivered health care plan that the American people got from this administration.

Delaying the individual mandate will give the American people an opportunity to voice their displeasure over this false information by the President and the chance to start over with a real, honest approach to health care reform. It is time to start now.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, recently, President Obama made the comment that ObamaCare is not just a web site, it is much more. I could not agree more

with that statement. His health care law is also a list of broken promises that harm middle-class Americans. While he was trying to sell ObamaCare to the American people, President Obama repeatedly stated that "if you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period."

He did not say that if you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan unless your health care plan changes or if you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan unless your health care plan gets canceled. He didn't say that you can only keep your health care plan if the White House likes your health care plan. He said, "If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period."

It is pretty emphatic, I would argue, when the President of the United States says something such as that. Yet just 1 month after the ObamaCare exchange rollout, at least 3.5 million Americans have received insurance cancellation notices, according to the Associated Press. That number just reflects the number of dropped plans in about 25 States. There are about 25 other States that have not reported their numbers yet.

A report by the American Action Forum cites that this number is expected to dramatically increase in the coming months. On Sunday, former White House Press Secretary Robert Gibbs conceded that it was certainly wrong for the President to claim that "if you like your plan, you can keep it."

The Washington Post fact checker even gave the President four Pinocchios for his oft-repeated pledge that no one will ever take away your health care plan. We are now learning it is actually only if the White House likes your plan that you are going to be able to keep your plan.

We are also learning the White House knew people would be losing their coverage. After ObamaCare was signed into law, the President's administration released regulations that would invalidate grandfathered health care plans if they made routine changes. This information was buried in 2010 regulation and, despite the fact that the administration had posted this regulation, the President continued to state, "If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan."

At the time this regulation was released, the administration issued estimates stating that 40 to 67 percent of Americans who purchased insurance in the individual market would lose their coverage. The administration also stated in that regulation that by the year 2013, 39 to 69 percent of businesses, large and small, would lose their grandfathered plans.

What the President blatantly left out of his promise was the caveat that if

the Federal Government approves of your health care plan, then you can keep it—not if you like it you can keep it, but if the Federal Government likes it, then you can keep it. But what we are finding is the opposite is true. It is a completely broken promise—completely. What makes this issue even more startling is that in 2010 Senate Democrats voted along party lines to reaffirm that those Americans who like their plan can only keep it if it receives a government seal of approval.

In September of 2010, Senator MIKE ENZI from Wyoming proposed a resolution to block the way the administration was planning to handle plan cancellations. On a party-line vote, Democrats killed the resolution, effectively endorsing the administration's proposal to cancel plans individuals have and like. After breaking his oft-repeated promise, the President is now telling millions of Americans who had their insurance canceled that they should just shop around for policies that can be more costly on a Web site that does not function.

It is clear the administration has misled Americans with their promises. Jerry Buckley of Marion, AR, says he did not pay attention to any of that because the President kept telling you this will not affect you if you like what you have. Despite being assured he could keep his plan, Mr. Buckley received a letter from Arkansas Blue Cross Blue Shield saying his policy did not comply with the new regulations under ObamaCare. A comparable plan has a higher premium, higher out-of-pocket costs, and less coverage.

As the leader of our country, the President's words matter. He needs to be held accountable for these millions of insurance plans he promised the American people they could keep. Simply having administration officials apologize for a broken Web site is not a solution. The issues run much deeper than anything any IT expert can fix. This is fundamentally about the flaws in this law. That is why the cancellation notices continue to go out despite the President's assertions and promises that if you like your plan, you can keep it.

In addition to the cancellation notices, consumers are experiencing sticker shock when they see what plans are available to them this next year. Forbes reports that premiums in 41 States are going to increase under ObamaCare. My home State of South Dakota ranks seventh on that list, with premiums rising 77 percent, on average. In four States, insurance premiums are expected to rise over 100 percent. A Washington Post headline from the weekend reads:

For consumers whose health premiums will go up under the new law, sticker shock leads to anger.

The article cites an anecdote by an area lawyer, Deborah Persico. Ms.

Persico recently found out her insurance is being canceled due to ObamaCare. Under a comparable plan with the new law, her premium is going to increase by 55 percent and her deductible will double. She expects this new plan will cost her at least \$5,000 a year more than she pays under her current plan.

There are millions of middle-class Americans just like Deborah whose health care costs are skyrocketing under ObamaCare. The rising premiums are affecting both Americans who buy their insurance in the individual market and those who have employer-provided health care as well. In an effort to avoid these higher costs, small businesses are renewing their plans early to avoid requirements imposed by ObamaCare. Insurance brokers told USA Today that 60 to 80 percent of small businesses with less than 50 employees are scrambling to renew their policies before the year's end to avoid paying the ObamaCare prices for 1 more year.

With our still sluggish economy and unacceptably high unemployment rate, Americans cannot afford ObamaCare. This catastrophic law is leading to canceled policies, higher costs, and less coverage.

Senate Republicans want to hear your stories. If you had a plan of your choice canceled, visit Republicans.senate.gov/yourstory.

It is now evident that after supporting the rule that led to insurance cancellations, nervous Democrats are beginning to recommend a delay in the individual mandate. It is clear that even those who supported this law in 2009 and 2010 are having second thoughts, but second thoughts are not enough. We need to work together to repeal this law and replace it with policies that actually lower the cost of care and allow individuals to keep the plans and the doctors they like.

Republicans will continue to fight to protect as many Americans as possible from this train wreck, and we hope the Democrats in the Senate will work with us.

Over the weekend we saw more examples, including a story in the Wall Street Journal from yesterday, about a lady who lost her coverage and can't use her doctors. She is a stage 4 cancer survivor, and she has used health care facilities in her own State of California that have done wonderful things for her in treating her illness. Yet under the ObamaCare policies that are currently in place, she is losing that coverage and losing access to her doctor.

The promise that "you can keep your plan if you like it" and the promise that "you can keep your doctor if you like your doctor" are broken promises that cannot be fulfilled. The President of the United States, over and over, said, "If you like your health care plan, you can keep it." We know that

is not true, and we know it is never going to be true. We know now, going back to 2010, they knew it wasn't going to be true. They were predicting that there were going to be cancellations and sticker shock. Yet never once did the President modify his statement. He consistently said, "If you like your health care plan today, you can keep it, period"—completely misleading. Millions of Americans who have received cancellation notices and who are seeing skyrocketing premiums are in peril in their ability to cover themselves and their family.

There is a better way. There was a better way back then and there is a better way today of bringing down health care costs and making it more affordable for more Americans, allowing them to have access to the health care plan they like and the doctor they choose. Yet if we stay on this current path, we are headed for a train wreck. We have time to turn the train around before this is fully implemented, and I hope to find bipartisan cooperation because health care is an important issue to millions of Americans. It is a pocketbook issue that affects so many families across this country, and their ability to provide affordable coverage for themselves and their families is an economic issue and something everybody talks about at the kitchen table.

We can come up with a better solution. We should come up with a better solution. If we don't, not only will we see millions of Americans with canceled coverage and millions of Americans with dramatic increases in the amount they are paying for health insurance coverage today, we will also see the impact this will have on jobs as more and more employers find it more difficult to retain their employees and hire more workers. The chronically high unemployment rate we see today, as well as the historically low labor participation rate, the reduced take-home pay we have seen for middle-class Americans, those will become a permanent state for the American people. I think the American people want to see us work on policies that will improve their standard of living, improve their quality of life, get more Americans back to work, and increase take-home pay for middle-class Americans.

This policy takes us backward. This policy takes us down a track that leads to broken promises and unfulfilled expectations for the American people. It is high time we change that. We can do that. I hope we will find the bipartisan cooperation here and hopefully the engagement of the President of the United States who, after all, made the promise that "if you like your plan, you can keep it, period," repeatedly, over and over—a broken promise. It is not too late to do the right thing. I hope we will be able to find the bipartisan cooperation to do that.

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING SENIOR PASTOR JASPER W. WILLIAMS, JR.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, we get to do a lot as Members of the Senate on the floor of this great body. We make great speeches and we have great debates. Periodically, from time to time, we pay tribute to someone in our State who has done great work for many people. I take this opportunity to do exactly that on the floor of the Senate.

This Sunday night, at 5 p.m., at the Salem Baptist Church in Atlanta, GA, the Reverend Jasper W. Williams will be honored for his 50th year of continued service at the Salem Baptist Church. I have been privileged to know Jasper for 20 of those 50 years. I have been a member of that church and I heard his sermons. I have heard him preach the Gospel. I have seen him teach others and I have seen him save people's lives. I have heard and I have seen him reach out into the community to bring children together for daycare, to watch him help to mend the sick and the poor, and doing everything that is expected of a church and doing so without any expectation of benefit to himself, except for the self-satisfaction of serving the Lord and serving his church.

He has a great church at Salem Baptist. They have two sites, as a matter of fact, and two large congregations.

He succeeded his father as a minister and learned the ministry from his father. He went to Salem Baptist Church to preach as a guest on Easter Sunday in 1963. And in November of that year, at the age of 19, that church offered Jasper the pastorate of Salem Baptist, and he has been there every day since.

His two sons also preach in the Salem Baptist Church community to carry on the tradition of the Jasper Williams family.

He is a graduate of Morehouse College, the leading Black institution in Atlanta at the Atlanta University complex. He is a great citizen of our city, a great citizen of our State, and a great citizen of our country.

So I take a privilege at this time on the floor of the U.S. Senate to pay tribute to my friend, Jasper W. Williams, Jr., to thank him and to thank the Lord for his service to the people of Atlanta, GA, and to the Baptist Church.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask to be recognized to speak on behalf of the passage of ENDA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I rise today in support of equal treatment for all Americans. The Employment Non-Discrimination Act, or ENDA, is aimed at protecting all lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans from workplace discrimination based on their sexual orientation or gender identity. All Americans deserve to be free from discrimination in the workplace, and ENDA is a crucial step to ensuring equal treatment.

I have been a cosponsor of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act every time it was introduced in Congress since the bill was first drafted in 1994. Two years later, in 1996, I was one of only 67 Members of the House of Representatives to vote against the Defense of Marriage Act. That seems like ancient history now—so long ago.

I am proud to say that the Employment Non-Discrimination Act has its roots in my home State of Massachusetts. Back in 1994, it was originally written by two titans of Massachusetts politics: Congressman Gerry Studds in the House of Representatives and Senator Ted Kennedy here in the U.S. Senate. We are coming up now close to 20 years since those bills were introduced first in the House and in the Senate.

While neither of these visionary leaders is with us today, their tireless work for equality lives on. They helped pave the way for this debate by challenging the pervasive view that LGBT people do not need or deserve the same legal rights and protections as everyone else.

We began debating this actually in the Massachusetts State legislature in the mid-1970s. In Massachusetts, in the 1970s, a law like this could not pass. But in 1989 Massachusetts became the second State in the Nation to adopt a law prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation in employment, public accommodation, housing, and credit services.

In 2004 Massachusetts became the first State in the Nation to extend marriage equality to same-sex couples. Massachusetts is again paving the way with the passage of one of the first transgender equal rights laws in the Nation.

The people of Massachusetts know that when some of our citizens are being discriminated against, the liberty of all people is diminished.

From schoolrooms to boardrooms, members of the Massachusetts LGBT community have made stunning progress toward full legal equality. Simply put, equality works in Massachusetts, and it works for Massachusetts. By ensuring that LGBT individuals have the same employment protections as everyone else, we have made the light of liberty in our State burn even more brightly.

The same basic civil rights protections that have been extended to LGBT residents of Massachusetts should be extended to LGBT people across the entire Nation.

For the last two decades, the people of Massachusetts have supported a national employment nondiscrimination law because we cannot allow our Nation to have one standard in States that pass laws that protect people from discrimination and have other States that do not. We cannot have the careers of people, the dreams of people, to be in fear of prosecution as people move from State to State. There should be a national standard which we establish—a standard that ensures that every person knows that wherever they are in the United States of America, they are going to be protected, that they were created by God, and they have a right to these protections in every State in our country.

Today the number of States that have adopted their own antidiscrimination laws is basically increasing. I applaud the progress that has been made to advance the cause of equality on the State level. However, 29 States still do not have these critical protections in place. That is 29 States too many that still refuse to provide those protections.

In the end, it comes down to this: We should treat others as we would like to be treated ourselves. The LGBT community is made up of our friends, our neighbors, our coworkers, and our families. We all deserve the same rights regardless of who we are, regardless of where we live in our great Nation. That is what is truly exceptional about America. Despite our challenges, we remain the brightest beacon of freedom, opportunity, and equality in the world.

I have a great deal of pride in our Nation and our people. I truly believe that despite our differences, we can come together with one voice to say that discrimination is wrong. So let's here, this week, all stand together for a future without discrimination in the workplace. It will make America more productive. It will make us more wealthy but, most importantly, it will ensure that we have removed that stigma of discrimination that puts fear into the hearts of American citizens unnecessarily. This is a huge, historic week that we are about to see unfold in our Nation's capital. I pray we can pass this bill and send it over to the House of Representatives so we can have this

full debate in our Nation for equality for every person who lives within our boundaries.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:31 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask to be allowed to address the Senate for a brief period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. SANDERS. This afternoon I wish to touch on two issues. One is the issue of Social Security, which is life-and-death for many millions of Americans, and the other is the issue of Medicare and Medicaid.

The main point I would like to make—and I make this as a member of the budget conference committee—is that the American people, regardless of their political persuasion—Democratic, Republican, Independent, conservative, progressive, whatever—are quite united in stating they do not want cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid and they do not believe we should balance the budget on the backs of some of the most vulnerable people in this country.

According to the latest National Journal/United Technologies poll, 81 percent of the American people do not want to cut Medicare benefits at all, 76 percent of the American people do not want to cut Social Security benefits at all, and 60 percent of the American people do not want to cut Medicaid benefits at all. This is only one of many polls that are out.

What the American people understand is that millions of people are hurting in today's economy. The number of people living in poverty is at an alltime high, and median family income is going down. Unemployment is much too high. People are hurting, and we cannot make devastating cuts to the social safety net that is literally life-and-death for so many of our people.

I did want to mention that I worked on a petition drive with a number of grassroots organizations throughout this country. They include CREDO, Daily Kos, Campaign for America's Future, Social Security Works, Democracy for America, Progressives United,

MoveOn, Other98, USAction, and the Alliance for Retired Americans. In a pretty short time—less than 1 week—we received over 500,000 names on a petition that says very clearly: Do not cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Do not balance the budget on the backs of some of the most vulnerable people in this country.

The other point I would make when we talk about the budget is that at the end of the day people do believe the deficit is too high. We should be proud, by the way, that in the last 4 years we have cut the deficit in half, but it is too high. But what the American people also say is that what is much more significant to them is the economy and the fact that we have so many people who are unemployed.

I would point out, as somebody who believes very strongly—and I speak as a former mayor of Burlington, VT—who believes absolutely that when your infrastructure—your roads, bridges, and rail system—is in need of enormous investment, where we can create millions of decent-paying jobs rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure, what the American people are saying is, yes, we have to create jobs. According to a March 3, 2013, Gallup poll, 75 percent of the American people—including 56 percent of Republicans, 74 percent of Independents, and 93 percent of Democrats—support “a federal jobs creation law” that would spend government money for a program “designed to create more than 1 million new jobs.”

Again, of course, people say we are divided in America. In many ways we are not quite so divided. The American people say don't cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. The American people say the most important issue facing our country is creating jobs. They want the Federal Government to do that. In this body we are divided, but among the American people, on these issues, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents are not quite so divided.

When we talk about unemployment, an issue that does not get anywhere near the kind of discussion we need is youth unemployment in America. As horrendous as unemployment is for anybody of any age, it is terrible for the young people who are graduating high school and graduating college. All of us say to the young people in this country: Don't stand on street corners. Don't do drugs. Go out and get a job, create a career, and make it into the middle class.

Yet real unemployment for young people in this country, for youth in this country, is somewhere around 20 percent. Among African-American young people it is over 40 percent. I don't hear the discussion in the Senate about the need to create the millions of jobs our young people desperately need so when they leave school they can go out and create a career for themselves

and make it into the middle class. I worry very much about those young people who don't have that opportunity.

In an interview published October 1, 2013, Pope Francis said:

The most serious of the evils that afflict the world these days are youth unemployment and the loneliness of the old.

He is not, of course, only talking about America; he is talking about what is going on throughout the world.

Continuing:

The old need care and companionship; the young need work and hope but have neither one nor the other, and the problem is they don't even look for them anymore.

I couldn't agree more.

We cannot turn our backs on the elderly. We cannot cut Social Security and Medicare. We cannot turn our backs on the young people. They need to be given the opportunity to have decent jobs and make a life for themselves.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT

I would also like to say a few words about a piece of legislation that just passed the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee. I am the chairperson of the Subcommittee on Primary Health and Aging. I thank Chairman HARKIN and Ranking Member ALEXANDER, who are cosponsors of the Older Americans Act legislation that only last week came out of committee. This is a bill some of us have been working on for several years.

The Older Americans Act is an enormously important piece of legislation for senior citizens all over this country. The bill that came out of committee in a very strong bipartisan way has the strong support of over 50 national organizations representing tens of millions of Americans, including AARP, the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, the National Council on Aging, the Alzheimer's Association, and the Meals On Wheels Association of America.

I won't go into all of what this bill does, as I don't have the time to do that, but it deals with the very important issue of elder abuse and making sure that seniors in nursing homes get the care and respect to which they are entitled. It deals with the Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program. It places an increased emphasis on evidence-based programs. It addresses the changing nature of senior centers in America, prevents fraud and abuse, and it focuses on home care and nutrition services. There is a lot in this bill that I believe is quite good, and it is a step forward.

One of the problems we have—Senator BURR of North Carolina raised it, and appropriately so—the issue is that we are seeing in this country in general a migration of folks from northern parts of the country to the South—this is not a new issue—including many seniors. What Senator BURR was argu-

ing is that he thinks the current formula is unfair and that it does not take into account that kind of migration. I think he has a valid point, which we want to address.

The other point and the most important point is that since 2006—the last year in which the Older Americans Act was authorized—the U.S. elder population has grown by over 20 percent. As the baby boomers age, every single State in this country has seen its senior population grow. The important point is that Federal funding for this legislation is the same today as it was in 2006—\$1.8 billion. Funding for the act in terms of real inflation-accounted-for dollars has decreased by more than \$250 million during that period of time.

We have a growth in the senior population and a decline in real dollars going into the needs of seniors through the Older Americans Act, and this is a very serious problem. We compound that problem with the migration from the North in some States to the South.

What is the solution? I believe the solution is very simple. If we understand that the Older Americans Act is an enormously cost-effective act—one doesn't need to be a gerontologist or a physician who deals with senior citizens to understand that when a senior is malnourished and doesn't get the nutrition he or she needs, that senior is more likely to break a hip by falling, that senior is more likely to get sick, go to the emergency room, and go to the hospital at great cost. Everybody knows that. There is no debate about that. When seniors have the companionship and the nutrition they need, they are less likely to go to the emergency room, they are less likely to go to the hospital, and we can save money.

Study after study shows that investing in programs such as the Older Americans Act—that is, the Meals On Wheels program, the congregate meal program, employment opportunities for seniors, dealing with elder abuse—when we invest in those programs, we save money. We not only from a moral perspective make life better for seniors, we actually save Federal money by preventing other bad things from happening.

I hope our committee and Members of the Senate can work together to say that increasing funding for the Older Americans Act is not only the right thing to do for millions of Americans, it is also the cost-effective way to go. If we can increase funding, we can deal with some of the issues Senator BURR has raised.

What I will not support is making drastic cuts in certain States, such as Iowa, New York, or Massachusetts, in order to increase funding in other States. We have to protect every State in this country because there is no State in which programs like the Meals

On Wheels program don't already have long waiting lines. What we need to do is invest in these programs. When we do, we will have done something that is very important for seniors all over this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNES. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. JOHANNES. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about the health care law. We have reached the 1-month milestone of the embarrassing rollout of healthcare.gov, and it doesn't work. There is no shortage of headlines about the issues.

CNBC: "99 percent of Obamacare applications hit a wall."

Bloomberg: "Insurers Getting Faulty Data From U.S. Health Exchanges."

Consumer Reports: "Stay away from HealthCare.gov for at least another month if you can."

Forbes: "Now She Tells Us: Sebelius Says Obamacare's Exchange Website Needed Six Years of Development, Instead Of Two."

The Associated Press: "... government memo shows ... a lack of testing posed a high security risk ..."

Nebraskans have relayed the same frustrating messages to me and to my office. One Nebraskan from Ogallala shared that she was on the Web site from 9 a.m. until 3 p.m. and was not able to set up an account. She said that after 6 hours the Web site screen read: "The account couldn't be created at this time." Another Nebraskan from Norfolk said he couldn't get the Web site to work, so he contacted a Web site official, who actually said he could not help him. Instead, the official directed him back to the nonworking Web site.

The accounts from people who have experienced page crashes, hours and hours of slow service, no service, and information errors goes on and on. Yesterday, I launched a page on my Web site for Nebraskans to share their ObamaCare stories. In just the first 24 hours, nearly all of the stories I have received are heart-wrenching accounts about the law's negative impact.

Despite the headlines and stories flooding in across the country, the President continues his all-too-familiar cheerleading act. Rather than offering Americans the accountability and the transparency they deserve, the President claims, "the product is working; it's really good."

Top HHS officials reflected the President's poor leadership in their hearings today and last week. They dodged questions, they withheld critical information, and they delivered more promises that won't be kept. Strikingly, the

ObamaCare enrollment site was actually down as the HHS Secretary testified for the first time about the Web site's troubled rollout and even assured Americans the Web site is working and that it is just slow and unreliable.

Americans are understandably frustrated with this failed effort and, most importantly, this failed law. Last week I cosponsored legislation that requires HHS to provide weekly reports to Congress and to the public about healthcare.gov. This ensures Americans, who have paid over \$400 million for this exchange, will actually receive the transparency they deserve. While enacting this bill is one worthwhile step, the issues with this law aren't just about the Web site. The reality is there are much larger issues—issues that no fix to the Web site can solve.

Not surprisingly, the law's botched implementation is mimicking the clumsy passage. I was here. I saw it—2,700 pages written behind closed doors, passed on party-line votes, full of unrealistic promises and filled with pork. It indeed has been a recipe for disaster since day 1. We received clear warnings in 2009 that a lack of transparency, missed deadlines, and broken promises were to be the legacy of this law. And now, almost 4 years later, we are seeing just the start of the real-life consequences of this irresponsible process and policy.

A number of stories I have heard from Nebraskans reflect what is happening on a large-scale basis across this great country. A widowed mother from Kearney pays for her family's health insurance out of her own wages. She is extremely disappointed because her existing plan won't be offered next year. The President's repeated promise to her and to others that "if you like your plan, you can keep it" is not true for that mother in Kearney or for millions of Americans.

So this Nebraskan is stuck with two options: She can choose a plan with a similar premium, but her coinsurance will go up, her deductible will increase to \$1,500, and her family out-of-pocket limit will increase to \$9,700. Her second option is to select a plan with similar coverage that costs an additional \$200 per month. That is \$2,400 more per year. She said in her letter:

I don't find this to be affordable health care. I had affordable health care.

This woman is not alone, according to figures released by the Nebraska Department of Insurance about the exchange in our State. Nebraska's insurance director said:

Basically, the rates are going up.

Family coverage for a single mom with 3 children in Hastings, NE, will increase 21 percent. A single male in Lincoln will see a 144 percent increase. Let me repeat that—a 144 percent increase.

A Manhattan Institute study found that Nebraska would be one of the

worst-hit States for rate hikes, specifically citing young males and middle-aged women.

A practicing physician in Nebraska wrote to me saying Obamacare will "destroy" our health care system. She says the law means "more paperwork, less time with patients, doctors outright quitting or retiring early, and fewer students willing to invest time and money to become doctors."

This fall Nebraska grocers came to my office to discuss ObamaCare. They shared that small grocery stores are hiring fewer people and are cutting back hours. As we all know, the employer mandate requires businesses with over 50 employees to provide coverage for all of their employees or pay a \$2,000 penalty for each employee. Even though the mandate was delayed, grocers shared, "The labor force is fundamentally changing already." I might add, not for the better.

I find it amazingly contradictory that the Obama administration is granting a delay that provides private businesses temporary relief from an employer mandate. Yet American families will be subject to the individual mandate. It is even more inconsistent and unfair to punish American families by imposing a penalty for not enrolling on a Web site that isn't working.

Last week I signed on to legislation to delay the individual mandate until 6 months after the Web site is verifiably fixed. I have also signed on to a bill that delays the mandate for 1 year and another bill that would repeal it entirely. I firmly oppose the mandate. I hope to repeal it. But at the very least, I believe the American people should have the same protection our Nation's businesses have been promised. Because the reality is this law has put goodwill and hardworking Americans, who are playing by the rules, in the most frustrating and heartbreaking situations.

When it comes to this law, I have already said I believe the people of Nebraska and the citizens of our great country deserve so much better. They deserve a law that addresses the rising cost of care. They deserve a government that fosters economic growth so that families can confidently make a downpayment on a house, send their kids to college, grow their businesses or start a new one. Instead, because of their government, Americans are more uncertain than ever. They simply can't make sense of the 2,700-page law or its 20,000 pages of regulations and what that means for their families. You would need a cadre of lawyers to figure that out.

The administration's failed Web site launch only deepens Americans' concern about what more could come. ObamaCare was never ready for prime time. It wasn't ready that Christmas Eve when it was passed on a pure party-line vote. Sadly, we all knew this

when it passed, but now we are beginning to see that you reap what you sew.

Today we find ourselves at a crossroads, and it is time to listen to the American people and repeal the law. That would deliver the single biggest solution to removing the uncertainty, anxiety, and burden upon our economy. History will harshly judge those who defend, for political reasons, a law that is so clearly inflicting so much harm.

Lately, a few of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle have begun to admit the problems and admit they are real and substantial. There is tremendous pressure on them not to break ranks. Yet several are beginning to speak for the people instead of the party. Some are rightly beginning to refuse to defend promises that have now proven to be lies. Most importantly, some are now signaling a willingness to support legislative solutions.

Maybe there is a crack in the armor, but we need more than the current few to stand with the American people. We need 15 Democrats to join our 45 Republican Senators to actually repeal or amend any section of this ill-advised law. It is a worthwhile endeavor, and it is one we must pursue.

I believe that, ultimately, history will commend those who rise above the political fray to recognize that at this moment in time true statesmen, true public servants must stand with the American people.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I wish to begin by thanking a number of my colleagues for their leadership, including Senators MERKLEY and HARKIN and others in this body who have championed the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, known as ENDA, over many years with great passion and constancy. Now we are literally on the verge of approving this historic measure in this body and hopefully in the House of Representatives.

I have heard from numerous organizations that represent America's workforce, such as the Service Employees International Union and the United Auto Workers Union, that—and I am quoting the UAW—“this legislation represents a step in the right direction toward providing equal opportunity for all Americans.” That message is also carried on by America's faith leaders,

our business community, generally, and many others who have fought over the years for civil rights and civil liberties. It is one of the paramount civil rights issues of our time and I am proud to be fighting for it.

I wish to mention some of the American businesses that have stepped forward to endorse this legislation: Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals of Ridgefield, CT; Diageo North America of Norwalk, CT; UBS AG of Stamford, CT; and Xerox Corporation, also of Stamford, CT. There are many others around Connecticut, big and small.

The reason the business community is steadfastly and strongly behind this bill is that it is good for America's working men and women and it is good for the business community. It has attracted bipartisan support in this body and around the Nation. America is moving toward this kind of guarantee against discrimination.

This bill is many years in the making. The last time the Senate voted on this issue in 1995 the bill couldn't even attain 50 votes. Our Nation has made tremendous progress since then, of course—not only on this bill but on a range of LGBT civil rights issues. This bill is important because it is inclusive. “Inclusive” is the word that ought to characterize our society.

In the 18 years since the Senate last voted on ENDA, 14 States, which together are home to almost one-third of the Nation's population, have come to recognize same-sex marriage. This is, of course, an increase from zero in 1995.

Over the past two decades, we have seen a string of landmark Supreme Court cases, from *Romer v. Evans* to *Lawrence v. Texas*, to this year's hugely important and inspirational ruling in *Windsor v. United States*. But this issue is about more than just legal reasoning and rulings. It is about real people. It is about members—millions of them—of the LGBT community who are now just beginning to enjoy full freedom and equality that is guaranteed to them by our Constitution as citizens. It is about their moms and dads, brothers and sisters, sons and daughters, members of their families from all over, as well as their coworkers in the places where discrimination will be banned and who are supporting this legislation. They deserve nothing less than full equality, which is what this bill would give to them. They should not be victims of discrimination because of whom they love. That is the simple idea behind this historical potential law.

Still, we have a lot more work to do on this bill. The House certainly will not be an easy battle. We need to make sure, very simply, that the House is given an opportunity to vote. Because if it is given that opportunity—if the House votes—it will approve this bill, just as it did the Violence Against Women Act, after the Speaker initially

denied that opportunity. The last time this bill came to a vote in the House was in 2007, when 35 Republicans joined Democrats to pass the bill, but it did not pass the Senate.

I understand Speaker BOEHNER may have reservations. He has expressed them already. I understand the politics for other Members may be difficult. But this vote is about the future of our Nation, about what kind of America we are going to be. It transcends in importance a lot of the measures we undertake. It is about real people's lives in the workplace, in their homes, and what kind of life they have, what kind of opportunities they have to fulfill all of their potential as human beings. That is why America is so special. It guarantees people an equal opportunity.

In 29 States, LGBT Americans live without any protections against discrimination in private sector employment. They have those protections in 21 States across the country. Between 15 percent and 43 percent of all LGBT Americans have experienced discrimination or harassment in their workplaces because of their sexual orientation or gender identity, and that number rises to a staggering 90 percent for transgendered Americans in particular, with more than one-quarter—25 percent—reporting they have been fired. These kinds of troubling statistics have no place in the America of the 21st century.

We have an opportunity in this same bill to ban discrimination against our veterans. I would suggest—and I will propose it in an amendment—that similar protections be afforded to them. Hiring a veteran is a good investment for any business. Veterans have unique qualities, including dedication and discipline, which make them qualified for many civilian jobs. Unfortunately, too many veterans are unable to find work today, most especially our younger veterans who experience higher unemployment rates than their contemporaries who have not made the sacrifice and have not given the service they have in uniform. For them to be unemployed at higher rates is a disgrace. It is an outrage that the greatest Nation in the history of the world whose citizens volunteer to serve and sacrifice, preserving our freedom, have higher unemployment rates when they come home than others.

The evidence is—and I have heard it and seen it from veterans as well as others—that they are sometimes victims of discrimination. That ought to be outlawed. That is what I believe this law can do, in addition to seeking equality and opportunity for all Americans and banning discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity.

I wish to express my gratitude to AMVETS, Veterans of Foreign Wars,

and the National Guard Association of the United States, which have supported this initiative prohibiting discrimination against veterans. When I introduced S. 1281, the Veterans and Servicemembers Employment Rights and Housing Act of 2013, they supported it, and I am grateful to them. I think this kind of amendment would be a welcome companion to ENDA, the landmark legislation the Senate is moving forward toward passing.

MANUFACTURING REINVESTMENT ACCOUNT ACT

When it comes to the workplace—on a separate, unrelated piece of legislation—I wish to thank Senator COONS for his leadership in the manufacturing initiative area he has spearheaded and speak on a particular measure that will help manufacturers grow and invest, the Manufacturing Reinvestment Account Act. This legislation was cosponsored by my colleague from Connecticut, Senator MURPHY, as well as sponsored in the House by another Connecticut colleague, ROSA DELAURO, to create a new type of an account that manufacturers can use to help save and eventually make investments in their businesses.

I am proud the Manufacturing Reinvestment Account Act is part of the Senate's manufacturing American jobs agenda led by Senator COONS. Under this initiative, several of my colleagues have come together to make sure we move away from manufacturing crises and toward manufacturing jobs. That is what we should be doing, helping to create jobs, not create crises, especially when they result in self-inflicted wounds.

This bill will allow manufacturers to put up to \$500,000 a year in these special manufacturing reinvestment accounts, much like people put away money in IRAs. It would give them 7 years to use the money they deposit for qualified manufacturing expenses. Essentially, these manufacturers can use these funds for investments in physical capital such as equipment and new facilities or human capital such as job training and workforce development. They then would be able to withdraw the funds from their accounts at a low 15-percent tax rate.

This bill is a Connecticut original. I am very proud I sponsored it last session and I am proud to do so again now. I wish to thank in particular Jamie Scott of Air Handling Systems in Woodbridge, CT, for the key role he played in developing this idea. He came to me with the basic concept and we developed it into a bill which is so eminently qualified for support. It makes such clear common sense, and it shows what happens when industry leaders and their elected representatives work together to devise innovative ideas to grow the economy. We not only produce in Connecticut and make the best manufactured products in the world, but we also make ideas, which is

why this Yankee ingenuity has produced a bill that favors reinvestment accounts to enable investment at low tax rates and spur and incentivize job creation.

With the support of Mr. Scott and Congresswoman DELAURO, it has been reintroduced on the House side. I have been happy to introduce this legislation in the Senate. I hope it will provide real encouragement for manufacturers to grow and invest and expand job training, taking this money from profits and putting it away so it can be saved without taxation, and then using it at lower rates of taxation is a basic principle that makes eminent good sense. I think it comes at an important time as we all grapple—economists, experts, businesspeople—with how to recognize and spur a manufacturing renaissance throughout the United States. What is needed is dollars and capital and the commitment to make sure we create jobs and use people for those jobs who are not only willing but eager to work.

I also thank our community colleges, such as Asnuntuck and others around the State, that have done so much to provide job training in the skills that are needed, matching skills to jobs that exist and jobs that will be created. Asnuntuck Community College's manufacturing technology program is just one example among all of our community colleges which have trained more than 1,000 students who have transitioned successfully to private sector jobs that make use of the cutting-edge skills they learned on machinery, often donated by businesses, so Asnuntuck can teach those students so they can be matched to those businesses' needs. I have seen those students in action during my visits to Delta Industries in East Granby and ATI Stowe Machining in Windsor. Both of these companies have hired many students from Asnuntuck and are looking to hire more as they grow and expand in Connecticut.

So these programs serve a profoundly important public good for our whole country that should bring us together on a bipartisan basis. We want to work together, not divide ourselves over false crises and unnecessary partisan division. I am confident, if we pass this legislation, our manufacturers will use this innovative tool and the manufacturing reinvestment account will help us to double down on growing America. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to

speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUDGET CONFERENCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, earlier this year, a man named William, who is from Gig Harbor, WA, wrote to me to express his frustration with what he saw happening here in Congress. William served in the Navy. He now works for a tech company that supports Navy communications in the Pacific Northwest.

Like so many Americans in recent years, he has witnessed hiring freezes and cutbacks and furloughs and layoffs. He said a couple of years ago he was hoping for a promotion, but now he considers himself just lucky to have a job. He is not even sure how long he can count on that.

Well, William is not alone. The partisanship and the gridlock here in Washington, DC, have been devastating for families such as his in my home State of Washington and across the country.

The government shutdown and the debt limit brinkmanship last month were just the latest examples. But Congress has been lurching from crisis to crisis to crisis for years and it has got to end. So today I am going to share a few stories from families who have been paying the price for the dysfunction here in Congress. I have worked very hard to make sure that voices such as theirs are heard loudly and clearly in the budget process. I am going to keep fighting to make sure their interests are represented every day as we work now toward a balanced and bipartisan budget agreement.

Seven months ago the House and the Senate each passed their budget. The Senate budget that we passed here was built on three principles. First of all, our highest priority was investing in jobs and economic growth and prosperity that is built from the middle out, not from the top down.

Secondly, the deficit has been now cut in half and we built on the \$2½ trillion in deficit reduction we have passed now since 2011 to continue to tackle this challenge fairly and responsibly.

Third, our budget keeps the promises that we have made to our seniors and our families and our communities.

The budget that passed the House reflects different values and priorities. But it was our job to get in a room, make some compromises with them, and find a way to bring those two budgets together. Although I had hoped we could start this bipartisan budget negotiation far sooner and avoided last month's crisis, the budget conference has now begun—started last week—and offers us now the opportunity to break this cycle of gridlock and dysfunction and start moving our country back in the right direction. We have a chance now to turn our attention back to

where it belongs, strengthening our economy and creating jobs, continue making responsible spending cuts while closing wasteful tax loopholes that are used by the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations, and to finally show the American people that Congress can work together. We can compromise and alleviate the uncertainty and the pain that families across the country are facing.

The effect of these years of gridlock is clear in places such as the Denise Louie Education Center in Seattle. I visited that Head Start Program earlier this year where pre-K students from low-income families can learn their ABCs and take part in story time and benefit from health and nutrition programs. Even before the major cuts to Head Start that took effect last month, that center had a waiting list. Now the director of the school has had to drop kids from that program because of these tight budget constraints.

They are far from alone. Another Head Start in Everett, WA, a program that has served needy kids since the 1970s, had to completely shut its doors this summer because Congress could not work together. That one facility alone was helping 40 kids prepare for kindergarten. Nationwide, these cuts have forced tens of thousands of children out of Head Start as well.

That is not all. The senseless cuts for sequestration have impacted education programs all across the country. Researchers and scientists who are working on cures for cancer and other diseases have lost their jobs. Programs such as Meals On Wheels that deliver food to seniors have been cut.

There is so much more. The ripples from the so-called sequester have been felt in our homes and in our businesses and across our fragile economy.

The across-the-board cuts have also had, of course, serious impact on defense programs and workers. Earlier this year I heard from one of my constituents whose family was impacted by this very directly. His name is Bob. He is from Bremerton, WA, and is an engineer at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard. He told me every day highly skilled employees come into his office, often in tears, and tell him they do not know how they are going to manage to make ends meet if they are furloughed or laid off. They are worried now. They have felt the pain for months. They know it could get worse. Because if these automatic cuts are not replaced in a bipartisan deal, another \$20 billion is scheduled to be cut from defense spending in January, just a few short months from now. That would make more furloughs and layoffs much more likely. It would mean continued and deeper cuts to combat training.

It does not have to be this way, because something both Democrats and Republicans agree on is that the very least this budget conference should be

able to accomplish, at an absolute minimum, is finding a path to replace these terrible sequester cuts and set a budget level for at least the short term.

Republican Congressman HAL ROGERS, the House Appropriations Committee chairman, said, “Sequestration—and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.”

Even House Speaker JOHN BOEHNER said the cuts would “hollow out” our military.

Just recently the House Armed Services Committee Republicans sent me and Chairman RYAN a letter urging us to replace the sequester, saying it was “never intended to be policy.”

That is exactly right. Sequester was intended to be so bad it would drive both sides to the table to be willing to make some compromises, to replace it with smarter savings. I am very glad that more and more of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle are stepping up to try and find a solution. So the question now is not whether we should replace the across-the-board sequester cuts, but how we do it.

The House and the Senate budgets both deal with sequester, just in different ways. The House budget fully replaces the defense cuts and lifts the BCA cap. It pays for that by cutting even more deeply into key domestic investments. Our Senate budget, on the other hand, replaces all of the automatic cuts and pays for it with an equal mix of responsible spending cuts and revenue that we raise by closing wasteful tax loopholes.

Finding a bipartisan solution will not be easy. We all know that. It will require compromise from both sides. As I mentioned at our first budget committee conference last week, I am going into this process ready to offer some tough spending cuts that, unlike the sequester caps that disappear in 2022, would be permanently locked into law. I know there are many Republicans who would be very interested in swapping some of the inefficient and damaging cuts in the sequester with structural changes to programs that would save many multiples of the cuts to be replaced in the coming decades.

In short, I am willing to compromise. I am ready to listen to Republican ideas, as long as their proposals are fair for seniors and families. I am prepared to make some tough concessions to get this deal done. But I cannot negotiate by myself. Compromise has to run both ways. That means in addition to the responsible spending cuts, Republicans need to work with us to close wasteful tax loopholes and special-interest subsidies, because it would be unfair and unacceptable to put the entire burden of deficit reduction on the backs of our seniors and our families. It should not be difficult for Republicans to agree to put just a few of the

most egregious, wasteful loopholes and special-interest carveouts on the table to get a balanced and bipartisan deal.

If the choice is between closing a wasteful loophole and lurching to another crisis, I hope every one of my colleagues will put their constituents before special interests. Over the last few years people across the country have lost a great deal of confidence in Congress's ability to work together for the good of our Nation, people such as Naani King, who, as the New York Times recently reported, serves as a registered nurse at Madigan Army Medical Center in my home State of Washington. During the shutdown last month, she worked without pay. Without a paycheck, she had to dip into her retirement account to make her monthly mortgage payment. Now, even though the shutdown is over, her family cannot take any chances. She told the Times, “We just have too much to lose.”

We here in Congress owe it to her family and to families all over this country to work to find a path forward. So let's put an end to this gridlock. Let's put an end to these crises. Let's show the American people we are listening to them. In fact, let's show them that their stories are more important than sticking to party lines or staying in ideological corners.

We have got to rebuild some trust and we can do that. We need to find a path to compromise. We need to work together to strengthen our economy and create jobs. I am ready to do that in this budget conference. I am hopeful that over the coming weeks every one of my colleagues on that committee will make it clear that they are as well.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am very proud to be here today speaking in support of historic legislation that will move us one step closer to the day when who you love has absolutely nothing to do with the rights that you are afforded as a citizen of the greatest country in the world.

Frankly, the passage of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act is embarrassingly long overdue. In my State of Connecticut we have had anti-discrimination laws on the books for over 20 years. In 1991, Connecticut became the 4th State to formally protect LGBT workplace rights, and in 2011 we became the 15th State to offer similar protections to our transgender citizens.

So it is funny, because my constituents assume that all across this country it is already illegal to fire somebody for whom they love and for who they are. But, of course, as we know, that is just not the case across most of the country.

Right now, in some States, you can be fired from your job simply because of having a little photograph of your partner on your desk at work. While ENDA has been a commonly accepted civil rights protection in my State, you may hear some express opposition to this legislation on this floor by vaguely citing what are commonly referred to as the "concerns of the business community." I am not sure what businesses they are referring to, because in my State we have some of the biggest and most successful multistate and multinational businesses in the world; and they know that nondiscrimination isn't just the right thing to do, it is also really good for business.

Companies such as United Technologies, General Electric, and Xerox want the best and the brightest people to work in an inclusive team environment—not having their employees hiding from each other who they really are. Companies such as BI Pharmaceuticals and Aetna haven't folded under the weight of having these State-based workplace protections. In fact, they are thriving in Connecticut, across the country, and all around the world.

So in speaking with companies from all over Connecticut, none, to me, has ever argued that equal protection in Connecticut is something that is holding their businesses back. They have been living under this law for decades now. And it is not just Connecticut's largest employers. Connecticut's law actually goes further than ENDA does in prohibiting discrimination even among businesses with fewer than 15 employees. Our small business community understands that, far from inhibiting commerce, nondiscrimination policies actually help make our companies—big and small—stronger.

So even though a majority of American businesses oppose employment discrimination, some argue this legislation is going to harm businesses whose leaders have very strong religious beliefs. However, I think it is important to note the religious exemption in this legislation is even broader—remarkably broader, I would argue—than the exemption that is in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, and it represents a compromise that doesn't go as far as some Members of this body, including myself, would like.

In an op-ed that was published this summer, the former head of the NAACP, Julian Bond, equated these religious concerns with the arguments he heard from opponents of the civil rights movement in the 1960s. Here is what Bond wrote.

In response to the historic gains of the Civil Rights movement in the 1960s, opponents argued that their religious beliefs prohibited integration. To be true to their religious beliefs, they argued they couldn't serve African-Americans in their restaurants or accept interracial marriages.

It would be shocking to hear somebody make a similar argument today about the treatment of African-Americans in our society. Frankly, I think it will be just as shocking 40 or 50 years from now for people to read that this argument is being made today about the treatment of LGBT Americans. There are, in fact—interesting to point out—numerous Christian and Jewish organizations and denominations that have taken a strong stand in favor of this legislation because they understand that unequal treatment under the law is at odds with their faith.

Others on this floor have made the argument that passage of ENDA will lead to frivolous lawsuits from fired workers. So let me give my State's perspective on this. Again, we have been living under this law since 1991. We have had protections that we are debating today for two decades and we simply haven't seen frivolous lawsuits. And again, we have big companies that employ thousands of people across the State and across the Nation. Let me cite the statistics from 2009 to 2010, which is the most recent year for which we have data available.

Out of a total of 1,740 employment-based discrimination complaints that were filed in the State that year, only 53 were based on sexual orientation discrimination. Just as a means of comparison, 464 complaints were filed based on age discrimination. We went back a number of years, and in not a single year over the last half decade that we looked at were there more than about 40 or 50 complaints.

My State has been a test case for these protections for sexual orientation and gender identity. The parade of horrible consequences opponents of this bill say will happen just have not happened in Connecticut.

What we are doing here is pretty simple. We are not trampling on the First Amendment. We are not dictating morality. We are not harming the economy. We are not undermining the religious community. We are just saying that you can't discriminate against people in the workplace because of whom they choose to love or who they are inside.

The simplicity of this bill is why two-thirds of the American public support it, and it is why I believe that 50 years from now history is going to judge no less harshly those who vote against this act as it now judges those who voted against some of the civil rights acts of the 1950s and 1960s. Whom you love, who you are inside, and what you feel should never, ever be a reason for discrimination.

I was on the House floor 6 years ago when the House passed ENDA, and I

still remember listening to Congressman Barney Frank's closing argument. He welled up as he was giving it, and there were a lot of tears shed on the floor as well. I just want to close by quoting what he said, and I won't try to do his accent. Barney Frank said:

I used to be someone subject to this prejudice. And through luck and circumstance, I got to be a big shot. I am now above that prejudice. But I feel an obligation to 15-year-olds dreading to go to school because of the torment they endure, to people who fear they will lose their job at a gas station if somebody finds out whom they love. I feel an obligation to use the status that I have been lucky enough to get to help them. I make a personal appeal to my colleagues, please don't turn your back on them.

We are all big shots here. We have been lucky enough to get elected to the greatest deliberative body in the world, and there is an obligation and a responsibility that comes with the job we have to stick up for people who are being discriminated against because of who they are. The greatest moments of this body have been when we have joined together, Republican and Democrat, to stand against that kind of discrimination.

Our ability to rise to Congressman Frank's challenge—"please, don't turn your back on them"—can be this week, another great chapter in the history of this great body.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. We are on the motion to proceed to S. 815.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak 10 minutes as in morning business.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about how we can avoid another shutdown of our government and also, even more important, avoid another shutdown or slowdown of our economy. That is how we in the Congress, both sides of the aisle, both sides of the dome, need to work to arrive at a budget agreement and then an appropriations agreement for the rest of the fiscal year.

Earlier today on the floor we heard from the distinguished chair of the Budget Committee, the Senator from Washington State, **PATTY MURRAY**, who talked about the budget and what was going on. I come here today to support her efforts and the work of the budget

conferees as they work to reach an agreement on the funding levels that will invest in America's future—creating jobs, repairing infrastructure, keeping us safe in our communities and making sure our children are well educated for the 21st century.

The budget conference is absolutely important to America's future because it is about how much we should invest in America's future: What should we do in terms of revenue? How do we close corporate loopholes and corporate welfare and also have them step up to their patriotic responsibility? Also, what is the best way to approach the funding for this government?

There is no doubt we need to reduce public debt, but austerity alone is not the answer. We have seen it in Europe where, yes, they have reduced their public debt, but they have not been pro-growth. The agenda I stand for—and I know the chair of the Budget Committee does and many of us on both sides of the aisle do—is we not only want to reduce public debt, we also want to reduce unemployment, and we also want to reduce statistics such as crime rates.

We need to be able to work together. My goals for the conference committee that is meeting are simple and straightforward. I would like to see the Budget Committee come up with not only a 1-year framework but a 2-year framework, giving a top-line funding level for 2014 and 2015 and replacing the sequester policy for at least 2 years and do that with increased revenues and strategic cuts—a balanced approach.

Let me say why this is important, because many people do not understand the difference between the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee. The Budget Committee looks at the entire budget of the government of the United States of America, money out and money in. It looks at money out in two categories. Discretionary spending, that is the Appropriations Committee; mandatory spending, that is Social Security, that is Medicare, that is veterans benefits. Then the other is revenue in, either through trust fund contributions or through fees or through taxes.

The so-called top line is what discretionary spending is, what they allow for discretionary spending. In the budget it is under an act called section 302(a) of the budget. In order to do my job as the chair of the Appropriations Committee, I need the Budget Committee, with the concurrence of the Congress, to give my counterparts in the House—Congressman ROGERS and NITA LOWEY—and myself and Senator SHELBY, my vice chairman on the other side of the aisle, the so-called top line. Then we work through our 12 subcommittees. This is absolutely crucial because we cannot do discretionary spending for fiscal year 2014 until we hear from the Budget Committee.

We do not want another CR. We do not want another shutdown. We do not want another slowdown. We are ready to go to work. We have already done our due diligence. We have already worked our way through the 12 subcommittees, looking at what public investments should be made and, by the way, how we can be more frugal, how do we get rid of what is dated, what is duplicative, and what is dysfunctional.

As the chair of the subcommittee, again with Senator SHELBY, the distinguished Senator from Alabama, my vice chairman, we asked the committee to look at what is it we need to spend and what is it we can get rid of. We have done a great job this year. I am very proud of them. By August 1 all of my subcommittees were marked up, but we need to have this agreement. So we say we need to have this agreement and we need to have it sooner rather than later.

In the deal, the Budget Committee is to report out to the Congress, and therefore to the Appropriations Committee, by December 15. My committee and my counterparts in the House are to produce an appropriations omnibus by January 15. I do not want to get lost in words and the weeds. But essentially as it stands now, Congress will only be in session 8 days from December 15 to January 15 because of the holiday. Eight days—it is an awful lot to ask BARBARA MIKULSKI and RICHARD SHELBY and HAROLD ROGERS and NITA LOWEY and our wonderful subcommittees to produce a bill. We will do it if we have to. But we would prefer sooner rather than later.

We believe so strongly about it that my House counterpart, Congressman HAL ROGERS, a distinguished gentleman from Kentucky—and I say gentleman in the true sense of the word: civil, candid, straightforward, courteous. We have talked about issues, the differences in fiscal approach and so on. But we know how to get the job done. Where we differ we know how to resolve the conflicts and we are ready to go.

We have sent a letter to the chair of the Budget Committee on both sides, to Senator MURRAY and to PAUL RYAN, asking that they report to the Congress before the Thanksgiving recess—before the Thanksgiving recess. This was unprecedented. We didn't talk about dollars—that is the Budget Committee. We will take our pot of discretionary money, called the top line, and get it done.

What both the House chairman and I are very worried about is that if we do not act, sequester kicks in January 15. What an awful way to do business in our government. You heard me say our subcommittee chairmen have worked to get rid of what is dated, what is duplicative, and what is dysfunctional. That is not just meant to be an alliterative, clever throwaway line. That was

a governing policy, both sides of the aisle, scrutinizing.

I am worried. When I look at defense, funding for defense would be \$54 billion lower than the Senate's version in both defense and military construction. According to the military chiefs, the readiness of our force has been degraded under existing sequesters. Eighty-five percent of Army brigade combat teams will not be fully trained to deploy. The Navy and our Marine Corps will only have one carrier strike group and one amphibious ready group. They are always going to be *semper fi*, but we have to be *semper fi* too and always faithful to getting the job done. The Air Force will have to cut aircraft and possibly an entire fleet.

This is a dangerous time in the world with numerous threats to our security. We cannot operate our military on the cheap.

Just to give a sense of what furlough meant, over 650,000 national security employees were initially furloughed in defense and intelligence and in other security positions in key government agencies. This is unacceptable. We cannot protect the country and run the government like that.

I chair the commerce, justice subcommittee. That is the committee that funds Federal law enforcement, FBI, drug enforcement, U.S. Marshals, the U.S. attorneys who actually move this, the bureau of alcohol and firearms that keeps us safe from terrorism, catches child predators, prosecutes drug dealers, and gangs.

Think of how the FBI went after the Boston Marathon killers. The CJS bill adds \$2.3 billion above sequester levels to allow Federal law enforcement to do their jobs. U.S. Marshals track down violent fugitives and sex offenders. DEA goes after not only drug dealers but international drug cartels, so it doesn't make it to the playground or to the school room.

The new FBI Director recently announced that if sequester continued, the FBI will have to furlough people up to 10 days over the next year. This is not good. In the long term CR at the sequester level, a continuing resolution will fund—they will keep a hiring freeze of over 3,000 positions. We cannot have the kind of law enforcement we need at those levels.

We have a big job to do. We have to do it sooner rather than later. I ask the support of the Congress for the Budget Committee for them to be able to bring a budget to the floor. Let's try to do it before the Thanksgiving break. Let's look at how we can look at a balanced approach between strategic cuts—and we on the Appropriations Committee are ready to keep on doing the job we started almost 7 years ago under Senator Byrd, our wonderful, most beloved leader of West Virginia, and Senator Inouye and Senator Stevens. We need to keep on doing that, but we need the Budget Committee to do their job.

The impact on national security is significant. The impact on our domestic economy is significant. We need to step to the plate and not only avoid a crisis such as a shutdown, we also have to avoid the crisis of confidence that is occurring in our government: Can they govern? Can they get the job done? Are there significant pragmatists who will look at what is the must-do list we have around spending, of which I think security for our country is at the top of the list. I believe we can do it.

I know the Presiding Officer was part of a bipartisan group during the shutdown to try to find a compromise. That group, I salute them. They changed the tone, showed civility, showed bipartisanship, and I think their initial effort was enough to stimulate and encourage coming to the final resolution that we did. That is the kind of spirit we need in this body.

I would say to my colleagues, let's have the Budget Committee act sooner rather than later. Let's support them in a balanced approach to not only look at austerity but also growth, and that also means closing corporate loopholes.

I welcome the Presiding Officer to the Chair. I think that concludes what I wanted to say today. As we get ready to approach the holidays, I want the American people to have confidence in their government. I want the American people to have confidence in those of us who have been elected.

This is a big election day all over America. I recall this time last year—the reelection of President Obama and the election of the Senator from Massachusetts who is now the Presiding Officer. It was a big day. It was a big deal. Twenty women came to the Senate—a new Democratic woman and the distinguished Senator from the State of Nebraska. When they came, they were filled with excitement and passion to serve the Nation, represent the views of the people of their State, and to get something done, not only to do it with the lowest common denominator but also to be able to work together for the common good and worry about the next generation, not the next election. That is what we did. Let's recall how we felt this time last year. Let's get our act together and press on.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I was so excited talking about my topic, I forgot to note the absence of a quorum, so I hereby note the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, in 2005—May of that year—the

Senate faced a crisis that seems very familiar and very much like the one we face today in this body. Very simply, the Senate was unable to approve judges, which threatened to incapacitate a coequal branch of our government, the U.S. judiciary, and it confronted the threat of what came to be called the nuclear option, a change in the rules that would have wrecked the collegiality and civility that have characterized this body.

Members of both parties recognized that the situation was untenable, and they recognized as well that the American court system was too important for the Senate to simply stop approving judges and suspend that very important constitutional responsibility on behalf of this body.

At the time, 14 Senators came together to find a solution. They came to be known as the Gang of 14—7 Republicans and 7 Democrats. I want to read their names for the record because I think their conduct characterized what is really perhaps best about this institution. They were Senators Robert Byrd of West Virginia, Lincoln Chafee of Rhode Island, SUSAN COLLINS of Maine, Mike DeWine of Ohio, LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina, Daniel Inouye of Hawaii, MARY LANDRIEU of Louisiana, Joseph Lieberman of Connecticut, JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona, Ben Nelson of Nebraska, MARK PRYOR of Arkansas, Ken Salazar of Colorado, Olympia Snowe of Maine, and John Warner of Virginia.

What they devised was a quite simple solution. They were grappling with the same question that confronts us now: What can justify a Member of the U.S. Senate voting to block consideration—in other words, to filibuster a nominee to the judicial branch? Their idea, simple as it was, had tremendous power. They agreed they would oppose a judicial nominee only in “extraordinary circumstances.” That was the gist of the agreement. There were other features to it, but their spirit and intent in this short phrase had profoundly meaningful impact. In fact, for the remainder of the Bush Presidency, there were no more filibusters on judicial nominees, and those Senators, with that short phrase, accomplished a historic impact.

What did they mean by it? One of them said at the time:

Ideological attacks are not an “extraordinary circumstance.” It would have to be a character problem, an ethics problem, some allegations about the qualifications of a person, not an ideological bent.

An ethics problem, a character problem, some allegations about the qualifications of a person.

Today, I ask for a renewed and revived commitment to the spirit of that agreement, a reinvigorated effort to apply that standard, and offer to work with my colleagues to revive that spirit of opposing a nominee and blocking

that individual only in an extraordinary circumstance.

I come to the floor today because we have heard objections to a number of nominees on the basis of claims that clearly cannot constitute an extraordinary circumstance. Opposed through that 60-vote threshold filibuster just last week were a couple of nominees who clearly have the qualifications to serve on the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

I rise in support today of another: Cornelia Pillard. Whatever has been said about this process, we have heard no extraordinary circumstance to oppose any of these nominees and certainly not Ms. Pillard. Senators can always disagree about exactly what our courts should do and how we should divide and allocate resources, and the claim has been made here that the reason to oppose those nominees is that there is insufficient workload to justify them. The fact is this Congress has approved the positions that are vacant and they have been nominated to fill.

I know a lot of my colleagues have opinions on how to structure the courts and what the workloads should be, but I would assume these differences of opinion do not amount to extraordinary circumstances. They happen all the time. We debate what the workloads of the courts should be, and certainly the job of this Senate and of every Senator is to advise and consent on judicial nominations. If we refuse to consider the qualifications of a nominee and if we make the judgment based on irrelevant considerations, we are failing to advise and consent. We can debate about the structure and workload and number of cases before a court, but they are not extraordinary circumstances.

The fact is that the workload of this court well justifies these nominations. In fact, it has grown in number since nominees were last approved. The waiting time for decisions on cases makes it eighth out of 12 circuit courts. The cases themselves cannot be judged only by the numbers, by the sheer volume of the caseload; the Senate, in my view, has to look also to the complexity and difficulty of the cases.

I have argued before this circuit court and I participated in cases such as the Microsoft appeal, which took months—in fact, years—to resolve from start to finish and involved precedent-setting issues and decisions by the circuit court and literally hours of argument. So the argument about workload and about the need to fill or leave vacant, as the opponents say, those vacancies is incorrect and wrong.

Agreeing with me are the Judicial Conference and a majority of their colleagues, who also say the vacancies should be filled, as do judges from across the political spectrum and appointees of a lot of different Presidents.

But the point is that disagreement or even the claim that the workload does not justify it is not an extraordinary circumstance, and that ought to be the standard, consistent with the Gang of 14's agreement.

I happen to believe Cornelia Pillard is almost the ideal nominee. If you were to design someone to sit on the court—if you had that ability—on the basis of record and talent and temperament, I do not think you could do much better.

The D.C. court is said to be the second highest court in the country. I think they are all the second highest court. I do not think any one of them is better than the others.

But what we want is an individual in each of these judgeships who is worthy of the immense responsibility because for most litigants the circuit court is the last stop on the litigation course.

Nina Pillard brings to this nomination not only brilliance in an academic sense but a variety of experiences and a record of thoughtful engagement with diverse views and a dedication to excellence and to public service. She has spent time in the classroom as well as the courtroom, and she is a civil rights hero as well as a public servant and an expert on the judicial system. In other words, if you had to design someone with a record and experience that is ideal for this court or any of the other circuit courts, you would pick Nina Pillard.

Now, I am going to come back to the floor. I am going to speak about her, I am going to speak about this court, I am going to speak about the Gang of 14, and I am going to speak about what should justify blocking a nominee of the President of the United States to serve in the courts. But for now let me just say about her that I hope my colleagues will see her qualifications, listen to her story, and listen to the better angels of their nature.

The present situation cannot stand. If we continue on the present course, we will arrive at the same juncture that existed in May of 2005 when the Gang of 14 helped to save the Senate from a crisis. It would have been a crisis for the collegiality and civility of this institution. It would have also been a crisis for the country. I hope we can again avoid it if we permit this process to move forward and recognize there is no extraordinary circumstance for any of these nominees that should block their approval by the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I request permission to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, this morning in the HELP Committee

we had an opportunity to hear from the administrator of the health exchanges, Ms. Tavenner, who came before the committee to talk about where we are in the process now with the exchanges that have been set up through the Affordable Care Act. It was an opportunity, in the 5 minutes we have allocated to each of us, to pose questions and to speak to the situation in Alaska as it relates to the exchanges.

I come to the floor this afternoon because there was so much that I as one Senator had to say that you cannot possibly condense into a 5-minute exchange. But it did cause me to want to take a moment to speak about what is happening on the ground in the State of Alaska.

I think it is probably not an unfair assessment to say that most of the constituents I am hearing from are not supportive of the Affordable Care Act and have been very skeptical about what benefits may come to our State.

We are a high-cost State—high cost when it comes to health care and high cost when it comes to our insurance premiums. Right now we are No. 2 in the Nation in terms of the premiums that Alaskans pay. So as much as Alaskans might not like the Affordable Care Act, I hear very clearly their expressions of concern about making sure we are working actively and aggressively to reduce the cost of health care, to increase access to providers, and to increase access to insurance that is affordable.

But affordability is such a key factor in what we face. I had a chance to query Ms. Tavenner about the situation we are seeing in the State of Alaska right now with regard to enrollments within the exchange. The State of Alaska has opted not to have its own State exchange. They are part of the Federal exchange, an organization called Enroll Alaska which was established to provide for outreach, education, and enrollment of Alaskans into the federally facilitated marketplace.

I met with a representative from Enroll Alaska about 10 days or so ago. It was October 27, I believe. At that point in time, I was informed that there was one Alaskan who had been successfully enrolled. I met with the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, United Way, and Enroll Alaska. They confirmed that no one had been successfully enrolled at that point in time.

Moving forward to yesterday. As of yesterday, it has been confirmed that Enroll Alaska, the entity that has been set up specifically to advance enrollment within the exchanges, has been able to enroll just three individuals and has not been able to confirm that anyone else in the State has been successfully enrolled. So as folks are talking in different parts of the country about what is happening, they are using numbers: several thousand, sev-

eral hundred initially. But it has been not only surprisingly slow, astonishingly slow, to the point where people are saying: Is it even open?

Let me suggest that in Alaska things are not open right now. Enroll Alaska made a determination last week that—they had discovered that the FFM, the federally facilitated marketplace, was calculating the subsidy for Alaskans incorrectly, so due to this they suspended all their enrollments until this issue was resolved.

I brought this up with the Administrator in committee this morning. She acknowledged that, in fact, they had learned that perhaps the calculation was incorrect and that they were “working on it.” Well, in the meantime, you have folks who are interested in signing up, wanting to avail themselves of the Affordable Care Act, or one of the 5,600 who received a letter on Friday telling them that their insurance with Premera was going to be canceled at year end and being told: Well, you can, in fact, sign up for what Premera is going to offer. But in looking at this, they are learning that not only are their premiums going to increase, but in many cases they may double and the deductible will increase.

So they want to know: Am I going to get a better deal on the exchange? Our problem is not being able to access, to utilize, to gain the information, when the entity that has been set up to help facilitate this says they have suspended all enrollments until this issue is resolved, and further going into their letter that was received last week, they say: We asked for the Obama administration to pull the Web site down, rebuild it, and redeploy it.

Again, these are entities that are banking on the exchanges to work. They want to help facilitate it. Things are so confused and complicated and, quite honestly, a mess with the exchange up north that they are saying: We are not going to push further if we are not certain that the subsidy is being calculated correctly. It is not right to tell people that you can sign up in the State of Alaska right now.

So the exchanges, we recognize, are a mess. They need to be addressed. I think we have recognized that at some point in time they will be addressed, they will be corrected. The Administrator has indicated that between 1 a.m. and 5 a.m. eastern standard time the exchanges are going to be down so they can work on them, so they can be addressing these software glitches.

Well, 1 a.m. to 5 a.m. eastern standard time, for those of us who are living on the west coast, is about the time when the dinner dishes are done, the kids' homework is done, they are in bed, you can actually sit down at your computer and go online and try to figure out what might be the best option for you on an exchange. But we are being told that the exchange is going

to be down between the time that most Alaskans, and certainly Hawaiians, who are a 5 hour time difference instead of just the 4 hours Alaskans are, are not even going to be able to go on line to address it there.

That is one aspect of where we are with the exchanges and what that is going to mean if we are still going to continue with the deadlines that have been put in place by the administration in terms of when you have to sign up by, and when you may be assessed a fine or a penalty for failure to successfully enroll.

I mentioned that on Friday there were some 5,600 Alaskans who actually—excuse me, 5,360 Alaskans who received discontinuation notices from Premiera. Premiera is the largest health insurer in Alaska. This represents about 60 percent of the folks whom Premiera insures within the State in terms of its individual members. So when you think about these folks who have now received their letters this weekend, recognize that the policies they have had for a period of time are not going to be available to them, they read in the news and they see on the evening news that the ability to get on line and to better understand what is going on with the exchange is not available to them because the exchanges are down while they are working on them here in Washington, DC, or wherever they are working on them, and that the entities, the navigator, the Enroll Alaska, those who have been put out there to help them navigate this process, are effectively saying: We cannot enroll you right now and we will not until there is a greater assurance that the system is up and running and working.

The Administrator has confirmed to us today that, well, we are working on it. But in the meantime, we still have these deadlines that folks are facing. The emails that have been coming to my office of late, though, have not been concerned with the exchanges themselves. What we have seen in the past few weeks has been a concern, an outcry, about what people will be expected to pay for their insurance once all aspects of the Affordable Care Act come into play. I mentioned already that Alaska faces the second highest premiums in the country. We are high for a lot of things, though. Our energy costs are some of the highest in the Nation. Our transportation costs are some of the highest in the Nation. Our food costs are some of the highest in the Nation. Our health care costs are some of the highest in the Nation. Now our premiums are going to be some of the highest in the Nation.

But we recognize that to live in Alaska—it is expensive. So when you look at the average wages of an Alaskan, they are a little bit higher than you might see in other parts of the country. That is a good thing. That is going

to help you pay for your transportation, for your fuel, for your food. But when we are talking about any level of subsidy, this is a concern we are seeing around the State. The higher income levels are going to kick you out of being eligible for any level of subsidy. So we have got Alaskans who are trying to be diligent about their health care and the insurance, wanting to be able to provide for their family. They are trying to figure out: Well, where do I go?

I have got a letter here from a gentleman in Fairbanks. He runs a small knife and tool shop there. He has indicated that he was on Premiera. He got the notice that they were not going to continue his coverage. The new policy with them, the least expensive he could get, was going to cost \$1,260, up from \$575. This is over a 60-percent increase he is going to experience. On top of that, his deductible is also going up from \$5,000 to \$6,000, an increase of about \$2,700.

We got an e-mail from a woman who is in the 55-and-above age bracket, she said. She says: We make a decent income, so we will not be eligible for the subsidies. We have looked at this. But she said they are going to be seeing premiums of over \$1,500 a month. She says: This is more than our mortgage. This is like taking on a second mortgage. And also in her situation, she says: My deductible has gone from \$5,000 to \$6,300. So deductibles are going up, premiums are escalating.

This woman said: You know, am I going to be in a situation where it is just going to be cheaper for me to pay the fine?

So I started going back through the binder I have utilized to collect the emails from Alaskans over the past few weeks here. A woman in Anchorage says her rates are going to increase 23 percent from last year. A woman from Talkeetna says: It is an increase of 47 percent with 1 fewer member in the family insured, a \$10,000 deductible. But she is going up by 47 percent.

Out in Wasilla, this woman has indicated: I calculated we are expected to have an increased monthly premium of 224 percent. Our premiums will be exceeding our mortgage by more than \$300 a month.

William in Anchorage says his health insurance has gone up 115 percent. Out in Anchorage, a woman is facing an increase in premiums of 45 percent. Again, she has indicated that she has been informed she is not going to be eligible for any level of subsidy.

The gentleman in this email, Anthony, out of Valdez, has said he is looking at an 85-percent increase in his premium, and that is just over the past 4 months when he started out. He is a single guy. He is 41 years old. He says: I am healthy. I have got money in my health savings account. But he has got a situation where he is going to be pay-

ing an 85-percent increase in his medical insurance premiums.

I go through these. These are not statistics. These are addressed to—I know this is not about you, LISA MURKOWSKI, but about representation for the people of Alaska.

Address this. They are asking me to help them out because they can't afford the Affordable Care Act.

I go through each of these, the folks in Petersburg, such as the 25-year-old male, nonsmoker, who had a \$10,000 deductible. He was paying \$102 per month. Now he will have to pay \$281 with a \$6,300 deductible; a 35-year-old male, nonsmoker, paying \$159 per month now has to pay \$340; a 63-year-old male, nonsmoker, paying \$525 per month, as of January paying \$827. We go through these stories. These stories are people we represent, whether it is Tom or Wenda or Teresa or Chris or Mark, they are saying I thought what was coming our way with health care reform was reform that was going to increase my access and decrease my costs.

Frustration with the Web site is one thing, and I am hopeful we will get on the other side of that very soon. The people of Alaska are done holding their breath on this. They are basically saying call me when you have it fixed.

What they are concerned about is they are going to get that call, we will be up against the end of the year, and they have already received their notices saying: We are not going to continue this coverage. They are worried about what happens if we do have a family medical emergency in early January and this all hasn't knitted together. I didn't get a very satisfactory answer from the Administrator this afternoon in response to that question.

I want to be able to have the right answers for these people, but I am extraordinarily concerned that as we address the issues with the Web site, the issues that the people in Alaska, who already face some of the highest costs for living in the nation, are going to be seeing increased insurance costs that will be out of their range, out of their ability to pay. The subsidies that would make a difference are not available to them.

We have a great deal of work to do in this Congress to address health care reform. Alaskans are asking what are we going to do to address the concerns in my family when I am trying to figure out how I knit it all together. They want to know how have we reformed health care. How have we made our costs lower and increased our access?

I suggest we have much more work to do. I stand ready to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and in the other body. We can fight and argue about whether the Web site and the exchanges are going to work or are going to fail on their own or whether we need to push deadlines out. This is

only a part of what we are talking about.

We have to do a better job when it comes to reining in the cost of health care itself, and how we deal with the delivery system. We haven't addressed these issues or how we deal with rural markets, such as Alaska because we don't have a very attractive market—it certainly would help us if we could purchase our insurance across State lines—and how we work to make sure that when we have payment structures, the incentives are in the right place so we are encouraging efficiencies in our healthcare system.

I encourage us to not lose sight of what we have to do in resolving our issues to bring down the cost of health care.

I note that my colleague from Tennessee is on floor. I thank him for his leadership as the ranking member on the HELP Committee and the very thoughtful issues he raised this morning.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from Alaska for her excellent remarks. I was pleased I was able to hear them. The Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Massachusetts were at the hearing this morning when the head of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services talked about the health care law.

I thought the Senator from Alaska was especially cogent in pointing out the difficulties and the differences between those who live in Alaska and their inability to connect to the services in the new health care law. If I remember correctly, she said only three had been able to enroll and she pointed out the differences in time.

I wish to spend a few minutes reflecting on what happened this morning and what I said to Ms. Tavenner, the administration's witness. I began by telling her a story, a story about 16,000 Tennesseans who have insurance through something called CoverTN, a low-cost, narrow coverage State program. ObamaCare is canceling their policies, those 16,000 policies. CoverTN apparently is an example of what the President has called "bad apples," an insurance plan that Washington has decided isn't good enough for you.

I recently heard from one of those Tennesseans whose policy will be cancelled on January 1. Her name is Emilie, and she is 39 years of age. She has lupus and lives in Middle Tennessee. She told me:

I cannot keep my current plan because it does not meet the standards of coverage. This alone is a travesty. CoverTN has been a lifeline. . . . With the discontinuation of CoverTN, I am being forced to purchase a plan through the Exchange. . . . My insurance premiums alone will increase a staggering 410%. My out of pocket expense will increase by more than \$6,000.00 a year [in-

cluding subsidies]. Please help me understand how this is "affordable."

Our health care system makes up nearly 20 percent of our economy, touching the lives of every American. Today ObamaCare is pushing that 20 percent of our economy in the wrong direction.

As the President has said, this law is more than a Web site that will not work. It is a law transforming our health care system in the wrong direction by increasing premiums, canceling insurance plans, destroying patient relationships with doctors, raising taxes, forcing people into Medicaid, spending \$500 billion Medicare dollars on a new program instead of using the money to make Medicare more solvent, encouraging employers to reduce their employees to a 30-hour work week, and having the IRS fine Americans for failing to sign up for insurance on a Web site that doesn't work.

The President has promised—at this morning's hearing I read from an iPad on the White House Web site. The President's Web site says: "If you like your plan you can keep it and you don't have to change a thing due to the health care law."

It says, "If you like your plan, you can keep it, and you don't have to change a thing due to the health care law."

In fact, the law cancels millions of individual policies. For millions of others, employers are dropping insurance programs as they discover the added costs of ObamaCare. For these Americans, the new promise is if you want health care, go find it on a Web site that the administration says will not be working properly until the end of November. That is an unwelcome Christmas present, to have only 2 weeks to shop for and buy a new insurance policy by December 15 so people are covered next year when ObamaCare outlaws their policies.

This administration had 3½ years to set up the Web site. Millions of Americans will have 2 weeks to buy their insurance.

The President put Secretary Sebelius in charge of implementing this law. I have called on her to resign because this has hurt so many Americans.

Before the Internet, RCA could tell us every day how many records Elvis was selling. Ford could tell us every day how many cars they were selling. McDonald's would tell us every day how many hamburgers it sold. Congressman ISSA has put on his committee's Web site notes from meetings at an Obama administration war room where apparently they are telling each other how many people are enrolling in health care.

I asked Ms. Tavenner this morning if she knew how many people are enrolling, how many have tried, what level of insurance they are buying, and in what ZIP Code they live. Why don't you tell

us? Why don't you tell Congress? Why don't you tell the American people?

She said she would tell us by the end of the month—but we need to know every day. We need to know every week at least. Governors need to know. As they make decisions about expanding Medicaid, wouldn't it help to know how many of these new enrollees are going into Medicaid?

Members of Congress need to know. We have appropriated at least \$400 million for this Web site that doesn't work. The American people need to know. They might gain confidence in the system if they could see that every day more people were signing up for this or that.

I can't get over the fact that we are not being told how many are enrolled, how many trying, what kind of insurance they are buying, where they live. We have a right to know that.

Why doesn't the administration tell us that? One Senator has described the new health care law as an approaching train wreck. I know something about trains.

My grandfather was a railroad engineer in Newton, KS, when I was a little boy. I was sure he was probably the most important person in the world sitting in that big locomotive. His job was to drive a steam engine locomotive onto what they called a round table, turn the train around and head it in the right direction. That was the only way you could turn something that big that fast.

That is what our country needs to do. We need to turn this train around. We need to turn this law around and head it in the right direction.

ObamaCare is the wrong direction because it expands a health care delivery system that we already knew cost too much.

What is the right direction? The right direction is more choices and more competition that lowers costs so more Americans can afford to buy insurance.

Don't expect Republicans to show up on this Senate floor with our 3,000-page plan to move the health care delivery system in the way we think it ought to go. We don't believe in that approach. We are policy skeptics, one might say. We don't believe these big comprehensive plans are wise enough to do what needs to be done. Instead, we believe we should change our health care delivery system step-by-step.

I remember during the health care debate in 2010 I counted the number of times Republicans spoke on the floor about our step-by-step plan to take the health care delivery system in a different direction—173 times just during 2010.

These are some of the steps we suggested and still do suggest that we should take to turn the train around and head it in the right direction:

Make Medicare solvent. The trustees have said that in 13 years it will not

have enough money to pay hospital bills. I know plenty of Tennesseans who are counting on Medicare to pay their hospital bills.

Reform Traditional Medicare to compete on a level playing field with Medicare Advantage. That would provide competition and more choices for seniors. The Congressional Budget Office says it would save taxpayers money.

Make Medicaid flexible. When I was Governor of Tennessee in the 1980s, Medicaid was 8 percent of the State budget. Today it is 26 percent. As a result, Democratic and Republican Governors of Tennessee have been told by Washington to spend money on Medicaid that they instead would rather spend on higher education.

Make Medicaid more flexible. Perhaps we can cover more people and set our own priorities.

Encourage employee wellness incentives. We talk a good game in the Senate about that, but the administration's regulation actually limits the ability of employers to say to employees if you have a healthy lifestyle, your insurance will be cheaper. We should repeal that regulation and make it easier for employers to encourage that kind of behavior, and offer cheaper insurance.

Allow small businesses to pool their resources and offer insurance together. We call that small business health plans.

All of these steps, by the way, are in legislative form. They are bills we have introduced. They are steps we could take today if we had enough votes to pass them, turning the train around and heading it in a different direction.

Buy insurance across State lines. If Americans could look on the Internet and buy insurance across State lines that suited their needs, perhaps more Americans could afford insurance. Isn't that what we want to do? Change the 30-hour workweek to 40 hours. Both Democrats and Republicans support this idea. I am not sure where it ever came from, but it is one of the worst features of ObamaCare. It creates a big incentive to cause businesses to reduce the number of working hours from 40 to 30 so their employees will be part-time and the business won't be affected by the ObamaCare rule. That creates consternation within business, and it doesn't create good relations between the employer and the employee. Think about the employee. Think about the pay cut from 40 hours to 30 hours. Think about the employee going out to find another part-time job at, say, another restaurant. Why not give these employees a 33 percent pay increase? That would be a pretty good way to get up above the so-called minimum wage and give businesses a chance to have full-time employees again.

So these are all steps that would change the health care delivery system by changing its direction away from

expanding a health care system that we know already costs too much and sending it in the direction of choice and competition and finding ways to lower the cost of health care plans so more Americans can afford to buy insurance.

The 39-year-old Tennessee woman whom I talked about this morning to Ms. Tavenner, the woman named Emilie who is losing insurance because ObamaCare has decided that her plan isn't good enough for her, finished her story with these words:

This is one of the biggest betrayals our government has ever been committed on its citizens. I beg of you to continue to fight for those, like me, who would only ask to be allowed to continue to have what we already enjoy. A fair health insurance plan at a fair price. Please find a way to return to affordable health care.

One good way to do that is to put the President's words into law: "If you like your health plan, you can keep it." Senator JOHNSON of Wisconsin has offered that legislation. I have cosponsored it, as have others.

My message to Emilie is that I am going to do my best to turn this train around and head our health care delivery system in the right direction so that she can buy and keep health care insurance that she can afford.

I thank the Chair, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPLEMENTING BUDGETARY SAVINGS AND EFFICIENCIES

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, during this time of budget constraints, sequestration, and continuing resolutions, it is crucial that every Federal department and agency identify maximum cost savings and improve efficiencies to minimize the impact of reductions on critical programs and personnel. It is also the responsibility of Congress to encourage departments and agencies to consistently identify and implement such savings and efficiencies.

We do not have the luxury of allowing the continuation of programs that are no longer relevant, are redundant with other Federal programs, can be

done more cheaply, or that perpetuate past mistakes. Unfortunately it seems that the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development are not able to identify some potential savings. It takes outside watchdogs such as the inspectors general and the Government Accountability Office to review and independently evaluate department or agency programs and operations.

As chairman of the appropriations subcommittee that funds the State Department and USAID, I and ranking member LINDSEY GRAHAM have taken steps to avoid wasteful and unnecessary spending. We have reduced costs based on inspector general findings, directed the State Department to eliminate unnecessary overseas support staff and administrative expenses, and directed the Department and USAID to improve financial and contract management. We will continue to look for opportunities to reduce waste, terminate programs that are poorly designed or not meeting their goals, and save taxpayer dollars.

But this is not enough. The State Department, USAID, and other Federal agencies need to act proactively to identify efficiencies and reduce costs. Unfortunately, some of the inspector generals' findings are so obvious it is surprising, and troubling, that the State Department or USAID did not identify the savings on their own.

Here are just a few examples from fiscal year 2013 reports of the State Department and USAID inspectors general.

The State Department inspector general found that the Department has a team based in Frankfurt, Germany, that travels to posts in the former Yugoslavia and the countries of the former Soviet Union to train local staff and provide administrative support to posts. This might have made sense in the early 1990s, but it makes no sense 24 years after the fall of the Iron Curtain.

The inspector general determined that 80 percent of the Regional Information Management Center staff in Frankfurt does not need to be assigned overseas. Their work could be done in Washington, saving millions of dollars each year. According to the inspector general, an employee assigned overseas costs \$232,000 more each year than an employee based in the United States.

In Iraq, at one of our most oversized and expensive Embassies, the inspector general found that the Department hired and paid for 513 Baghdad security personnel when only 253 were actually used. The Department also paid \$20.6 million for an unnecessary airport security program that added 84 personnel.

The inspector general found that the Department had 955 expired grants with a total of \$81.9 million in unspent funds. The inspector general also found

that the Department had not closed out 1,421 expired grants each with a \$0 balance, costing \$97,069 each year in unnecessary administrative fees.

The USAID inspector general found that USAID added five overseas food storage warehouses but had not determined whether delivery times of food prepositioned overseas justifies the additional cost when compared with prepositioning food domestically. In fact, a cost-benefit analysis conducted in response to a 2007 Government Accountability Office recommendation found that food prepositioned overseas is seven times more costly than food prepositioned domestically and recommended that USAID consider increasing the amount of domestic prepositioned food. USAID has now agreed to compare the timeliness and cost of prepositioning food overseas versus domestically. We cannot afford to make decisions that expand programs or increase costs without some evidence that there is a benefit worth the additional expense.

The USAID inspector general found that in a 3-month period, September through November 2012, USAID paid \$64,000 for more than 300 mobile devices that had not been used for at least 1 month during that time period and \$48,000 for 267 devices that had not been used at all during those 3 months, and an average of 127 employees had excessive user charges of \$118,000 which USAID could not verify had been reviewed and accepted. While these are relatively small amounts, they add up.

And the list goes on.

I know that the employees of the State Department and USAID are dedicated, hard-working people. Most Americans have little if any idea of what they do to protect the interests of the United States around the world. But it is because their work is so important that we cannot afford to waste the money they need to do their jobs. Top officials at the State Department and USAID must identify and eliminate outdated, redundant, and ineffective programs and unnecessary operating expenses. We cannot wait for the inspectors general to do their job for them.

CRIMINAL ANTITRUST ANTI-RETALIATION ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I am pleased that the Senate passed yesterday bipartisan legislation that will improve the enforcement of the antitrust laws. The bipartisan Criminal Antitrust Anti-Retaliation Act extends whistleblower protections to employees who report criminal violations of the antitrust laws. These kinds of violations, which include price fixing, have a particularly pernicious impact on consumers.

This legislation represents a continuation of my partnership with Senator

GRASSLEY on whistleblower issues. Senator GRASSLEY has long been an advocate for protecting those who blow the whistle on wasteful or criminal conduct. Our bill is modeled on whistleblower protections that he and I authored as part of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. The Criminal Antitrust Anti-Retaliation Act does not provide employees with an economic incentive to report violations. The legislation simply makes whole employees who have been fired or discriminated against for blowing the whistle on criminal conduct.

Whistleblower protection was recommended by the Government Accountability Office, GAO, in a 2011 report to Congress. The GAO surveyed an array of stakeholders and found widespread support for the kind of basic protections contained in this legislation. The bill allows employees who have reported a criminal violation to file an action with the Department of Labor if they have been fired or otherwise discriminated against for disclosing the violation. While the remedies provided by the bill are limited, they are crucial in protecting employees from retaliation.

The antitrust laws exist to promote a free and open marketplace and serve to protect consumers. These laws can only be effective if they are vigorously enforced. The Criminal Antitrust Anti-Retaliation Act will aid in enforcement efforts and ensure that consumers are protected from harmful activity. I urge the House to act quickly to pass this important bill.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF KRISTALLNACHT

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today to remember those who perished and suffered during Kristallnacht, the Night of Broken Glass, 75 years ago on November 9 and 10 in Germany, German-occupied Austria, and German-occupied Czechoslovakia.

Earlier that year, in March 1938, Germany absorbed Austria—the so-called Anschluss. Then, at the September 1938 Munich conference, France, Britain, and Italy allowed Germany to annex the western rim of Czechoslovakia and to claim its 3 million Sudeten Germans as its own. In both acts, the concept of loyalty to the state was equated with ethnic identity.

Then, in October 1938, Germany expelled 17,000 Jews with Polish citizenship from Germany into Poland. These families were arrested at night, transported by train to the Polish border, and effectively left in limbo, as Poland initially refused to accept them. The son of two of these expellees, a Polish Jew in France, took revenge: He assassinated a German diplomat in Paris.

Propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels subsequently asserted that “World Jewry” was responsible for the assas-

sination and gave the signal for the start of the first large open pogrom in Germany: “The Führer,” he stated, “has decided that . . . demonstrations should not be prepared or organized by the Party, but insofar as they erupt spontaneously, they are not to be hampered.”

As described by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum:

The rioters destroyed 267 synagogues throughout Germany, Austria, and the Sudetenland. Many synagogues burned throughout the night, in full view of the public and of local firefighters, who had received orders to intervene only to prevent flames from spreading to nearby buildings. SA and Hitler Youth members across the country shattered the shop windows of an estimated 7,500 Jewish-owned commercial establishments, and looted their wares. Jewish cemeteries became a particular object of desecration in many regions. The pogrom proved especially destructive in Berlin and Vienna, home to the two largest Jewish communities in the German Reich. Mobs of SA men roamed the streets, attacking Jews in their houses and forcing Jews they encountered to perform acts of public humiliation. Although murder did not figure in the central directives, Kristallnacht claimed the lives of at least 91 Jews between the 9th and 10th of November. Police records of the period document a high number of rapes and of suicides in the aftermath of the violence.

Kristallnacht was thus a crucial turning point in the Holocaust—moving from a policy of removing Jews from Germany and German occupied lands, to murdering them. It also stands as an enduring example of the danger of associating citizenship with ethnicity, of tying loyalty to the state with blood identity.

Kristallnacht is but one example of how hate can proliferate and erode our societies and why I have worked tirelessly to advance global efforts to ensure atrocities such as this never happen again. In my capacity as a chair of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe and decades-long work as a Member of Congress, I have advanced efforts to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance and discrimination in North America and Europe.

This work has ranged from commission hearings to raise awareness of the continuing scourge of anti-Semitism to leading interparliamentary efforts to create personal representatives or high-level officials within the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe to combat Anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance. Sadly, the election of anti-Semitic political parties in Europe coupled with efforts to adopt circumcision, ritual slaughter, and other laws in Europe that would alter Jewish life and continuing incidents of anti-Semitic violence let us know that the work to eradicate anti-Semitism is not yet complete.

As we honor the 75th anniversary of Kristallnacht, I ask that you join me in honoring the victims and families of

that horrible tragedy and join me in fighting hate and bias in all its forms.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, due to unexpected family commitments, I was unable to cast a vote relative to rollcall vote No. 204 on the nomination of Todd Hughes to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on his nomination.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

WESTPORT ALL-STARS

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I wish to congratulate the Westport Little League team who made it all the way to the national Little League World Series finals earlier this year. The 11 phenomenal student players from Westport, CT comprised the first team from Connecticut to reach the final rounds of the Little League World Series since 1989.

The Westport Little League team came to the Little League World Series as New England champions and played against the reigning Northwest team from Washington State to make it to the finals. In this thrilling qualifier, Westport rallied from behind, winning 14 to 13 in the seventh inning with a single to left field. This game was the fourth time in Little League World Series history where both teams completed 27 runs and the third time in history to score a collective 30 hits.

Although these students from Westport did not win in the next few championship games, they never gave up. Even in their fight for third place against a team from Tijuana, Mexico, they played their hardest to the very end. Player Chad Knight hit two home runs and drove in seven more, making a Little League Series world record of nine runs.

After their great success, Connecticut welcomed them home with a parade through the streets of Westport and an afternoon at the Governor's mansion. The Westport Little League team was invited as a special guest of the Yankees and hosted by the Red Sox at Fenway Park.

I also wish to congratulate Tim Rogers, manager and head coach of the team, assistant coaches Brett Reiner and Tom Whelan, and the parents and loved ones of these inspiring young players. I am incredibly proud of their success, representing Connecticut as role models for student athletes around the country. They worked together as a team to reach the ultimate honor in youth baseball.●

EASTLAKE ALL-STARS

• Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I am pleased to congratulate the 2013 East-

lake Little League All-Star team from Chula Vista, CA on capturing the U.S. Championship at the 67th Little League World Series in Williamsport, PA. The determination, sportsmanship, and love of the game exhibited by these young athletes inspired people in Chula Vista and throughout California.

Since its establishment almost 75 years ago, Little League Baseball has grown from just three teams to become the world's largest youth sports program. This year's Little League World Series featured 8 regional champions from the United States and 8 international teams, representing the millions of children in 79 countries on 6 continents who take part in the great American pastime.

The Eastlake Little League All-Stars traveled a long road to Williamsport. In order to qualify for the Little League World Series, these extraordinary young players had to first defeat worthy opponents at the District 42 Championship in South Bay, the Section 7 Championship in Spring Valley, the Sub-Division III Championship in Corona, and the Division III Championship in Long Beach, before securing the West Region Championship in San Bernardino with a 3-to-1 tournament record.

Representing the West at the World Series, the Eastlake All-Stars showcased their talents with several impressive feats of athleticism. In a tense game against the Great Lakes All-Stars, Eastlake's Grant Holman became the first pitcher since 1979 to throw an extra-inning no-hitter at the Little League World Series. Later, Eastlake routed the New England All-Stars 12-to-1 to take the U.S. Championship. Reaching the World Series Championship game, Eastlake fought valiantly to take the lead before falling 6-to-4 to the talented team from Tokyo, Japan.

In Chula Vista, the Eastlake All-Stars received a hero's welcome at a community homecoming celebrating the new U.S. World Series Champions. In the spirit of international goodwill and sportsmanship that characterizes the Little League World Series, the Eastlake players were joined in Chula Vista by the neighboring team from the Municipal de Tijuana Little League of Tijuana, Mexico, who placed third in the World Series.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing all the members of the Eastlake Little League All-Star team on their extraordinary achievement: Micah Pietila-Wiggs, Ricky Tibbett, Rennard Williams, Dominic Haley, Patrick Archer, Kevin Bateman II, Jake Espinoza, Giancarlo Cortez, Grant Holman, Charly Peterson, Michael Gaines, and Nick Mora, along with the dedicated coaches, parents, and volunteers who contributed to their success.●

TRIBUTE TO KEVIN P. McDERBY

• Mr. COONS. Madam President, I wish to honor the service, dedication, and passion of an individual whose name is synonymous with law enforcement in Delaware, New Castle police chief Kevin P. McDerby. After more than 40 years of service to the people of Delaware, Chief McDerby embarked on a well-earned retirement at the end of last month. While known for his long and decorated career in law enforcement, Chief McDerby's tenure will be most remembered for his work with veterans and community groups, such as Delaware Concerns of Police Survivors, or C.O.P.S., and the Special Olympics Torch Run, as well as his efforts leading trips to the Nation's Capital to bring Delaware WWII and Korean veterans to visit national memorials and coordinating the establishment of the Delaware Law Enforcement Memorial on Legislative Mall in Dover.

Chief McDerby began his public safety career in Delaware on January 12, 1971, when he joined the Delaware State Police as a trooper working in the Criminal Investigation and Tactical Support Units. He quickly climbed the ranks, rising to sergeant in January 1979, to lieutenant and commander of Troop 6 in January 1986, to captain in February 1987, and finally to major in May 1989, where he took on the role of operations major for New Castle County.

Shortly after his retirement from the Delaware State Police in August 2000, McDerby was appointed chief of the New Castle Police Department, one of the oldest existing police departments in the Nation, established in 1672. As New Castle police chief, McDerby continued the department's proud legacy of dedication to duty and service with honor, established by a long line of distinguished officers who have served the department over five centuries.

Chief McDerby's dedication to service was a hallmark of his law enforcement career. A strong advocate for law enforcement families, he was a founding member of Delaware C.O.P.S., an organization dedicated to providing resources to assist surviving families of officers killed in the line of duty.

In his 40-plus years of law enforcement service to the people of New Castle and Delaware, Chief McDerby leaves behind not just a policing legacy but also an opportunity, a benchmark for his fellow officers to strive to reach. To follow Chief McDerby's example is to be more than just the best police officer you can be; it is to be a leader and a true ambassador for the law enforcement community in Delaware. On behalf of all Delawareans, I thank Chief McDerby for his tremendous service and wish him well in his retirement.●

REMEMBERING KATHY MULLEN

• Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of Kathleen Joy “Kathy” Mullen, a trailblazer in Fresno’s special abilities community who was beloved locally and beyond. Ms. Mullen passed away on July 18 at the age of 52.

Kathy was born with Down syndrome, but she never allowed it or anything else to keep her from fully pursuing her dreams. From an early age, Kathy loved performing for others, whether she was shadowing her sister practicing a gymnastics routine or staging her own performances in the family backyard.

Kathy’s love of athletics and performing drew her to competitive sports, where through focus and dedication, she made history as Fresno County’s first Special Olympian. Kathy was a gifted athlete who broke records as the only Special Olympian to receive State, national and world gold medals in four different sports—gymnastics, swimming, bowling, and ice skating.

In 1983, inspired by Kathy’s accomplishments and passion for athletics, her family founded Break the Barriers, a Fresno-based organization that enables athletes of all ages and physical abilities to hone their skills, train together, and establish bonds of understanding and respect. Thirty years later, Break the Barriers provides instruction and training to 3,000 people each year in a 32,000-square-foot, state-of-the-art facility.

To those fortunate enough to have known her, Kathy Mullen will be fondly remembered not just for her gold medals, but also for her infectious smile, character, resolve and remarkable ability to inspire everyone lucky enough to have known her. She will be missed.●

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3204. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3466. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Susan J. Helms, United States Air Force, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3467. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on

the approved retirement of Major General David H. Huntoon, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3468. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Private Sector Notification Requirements of In-Sourcing Actions” ((RIN0750-AI05) (DFARS Case 2012-D036)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3469. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: New Free Trade Agreement—Panama” ((RIN0750-AH79) (DFARS Case 2012-D044)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3470. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: New Designated Country—Croatia” ((RIN0750-AI09) (DFARS Case 2013-D031)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3471. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Only One Offer—Further Implementation” ((RIN0750-AH89) (DFARS Case 2013-D001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3472. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Approval of Rental Waiver Requests” ((RIN0750-AI03) (DFARS Case 2013-D006)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3473. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Imazapyr; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9401-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3474. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “D-Glucopyranose, oligomeric, decyl octyl glycosides; Exemption for the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 9901-95) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3475. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fomesafen; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9401-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3476. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards” (RIN3052-AC93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3477. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Assessment of Demand Response and Advanced Metering”; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3478. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Television Sets” (RIN1904-AC29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3479. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Removal of Gasoline Vapor Recovery from Southeast Wisconsin” (FRL No. 9900-17-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3480. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Columbus Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard for Fine Particulate Matter” (FRL No. 9902-00-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3481. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Atlanta, Georgia 1997 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area; Reasonable Further Progress Plan” (FRL No. 9902-19-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3482. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards” (FRL No. 9902-25-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3483. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of Significant New Uses of 1-Propene, 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-” (FRL No. 9901-97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3484. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant

to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cost-Benefit Analysis for Radwaste Systems for Light-Water-Cooled Nuclear Power Reactors" (Regulatory Guide 1.110, Revision 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 25, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3485. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries" (FRL No. 9902-22-OSWER) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3486. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Inpatient Hospital Deductible and Hospital and Extended Care Services Co-insurance Amounts for CY 2014" (RIN0938-AR59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3487. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Part A Premiums for CY 2014 for the Uninsured Aged and for Certain Disabled Individuals Who Have Exhausted Other Entitlement" (RIN0938-AR57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3488. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Medicare Part B Monthly Actuarial Rates, Premium Rate, and Annual Deductible Beginning January 1, 2014" (RIN0938-AR58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3489. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Conditions of Participation (CoPs) for Community Mental Health Centers" (RIN0938-AP51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3490. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Federal Student Loan Repayment Program Calendar Year 2012"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCHUMER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Report to accompany S. Res. 253, An original resolution authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the periods October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015 (Rept. No. 113-116).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. GRAM, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1644. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for preliminary hearings on alleged offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1645. A bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1646. A bill to amend subtitle IV of title 40, United States Code, regarding county additions to the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 1647. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal distributions for medicine qualified only if for prescribed drug or insulin; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1648. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to encourage the nationwide observance of two minutes of silence each Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1649. A bill to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1650. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to exempt certain Alaska Native articles from prohibitions against sale of items containing nonedible migratory bird parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1651. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow manufacturing businesses to establish tax-free manufacturing reinvestment accounts to assist them in providing for new equipment and facilities and workforce training; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. COATS):

S. 1652. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to provide guidance on utility energy service contracts used by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 1653. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to strengthen requirements related to nutrient information on food labels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1654. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny tax deductions for corporate regulatory violations; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. Res. 286. A resolution congratulating Oracle Team USA for winning the 34th America's Cup; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KING, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 287. A resolution congratulating the Boston Red Sox on winning the 2013 World Series; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 12

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 12, a bill to provide for the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign recipients.

S. 231

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 231, a bill to reauthorize the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 460, a bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

S. 520

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 520, a bill to strengthen Federal consumer protection and product traceability with respect to commercially marketed seafood, and for other purposes.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to prohibit attendance of an animal fighting venture, and for other purposes.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 795

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 795, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the publicly traded partnership ownership structure to energy power generation projects and transportation fuels, and for other purposes.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 862, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018.

S. 1115

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1115, a bill to treat payments by charitable organizations with respect to certain firefighters as exempt payments.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1187

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1187, a bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt.

S. 1208

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1208, a bill to require meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide certain substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes.

S. 1226

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1226, a bill to promote industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker training, retention, and advancement, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. JOHANNES, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1551

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1551, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 1595

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1595, a bill to establish a renewable electricity standard, and for other purposes.

S. 1599

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1599, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 1618

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1618, a bill to enhance the Office of Personnel Management background check system for the granting, denial, or revocation of security clearances or access to classified information of employees and contractors of the Federal Government.

S. 1623

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1623, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. COATS):

S. 1652. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to provide guidance on utility energy service contracts used by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1652

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Utility Energy Service Contracts Improvement Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal government is the largest consumer of energy in the United States;

(2) Federal agencies are expected to meet, by law, Executive order, and mandate, stringent energy efficiency and conservation targets;

(3) the utility energy service contract (referred to in this section as "UESC") was developed to provide Federal agencies an effective means to implement energy efficiency, renewable energy and water efficiency projects, and has been used successfully to invest nearly \$2,700,000,000 in property at Federal facilities;

(4) the General Services Administration, which manages more than 9,600 Federal properties and is the lead agency for procuring utility services for the Federal government, has determined that UESCs may extend beyond a 10-year period under the law;

(5) the Federal Energy Management Program, which oversees the UESC program and is a principal office guiding agencies to use funding more effectively in meeting Federal and agency-specific energy and resource management objectives, has determined that UESCs may extend beyond a 10-year period under the law;

(6) extensive precedent exists for Federal agencies to contract for energy saving services using contracts with term limits of more than 10 years but not to exceed 25 years;

(7) a number of Federal agencies, contrary to congressional intent, have sought to limit UESC term limits to periods of less than 10 years; and

(8) greater flexibility with UESCs will help reduce the operational cost of Federal agencies, ultimately saving money for taxpayers.

SEC. 3. UTILITY ENERGY SERVICE CONTRACTS.

Part 3 of title V of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act is amended by adding after section 553 (42 U.S.C. 8259b) the following:

"SEC. 554. UTILITY ENERGY SERVICE CONTRACTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal agency may use, to the maximum extent practicable, measures provided by law to meet energy efficiency and conservation mandates and laws, including through utility energy service contracts.

"(b) CONTRACT PERIOD.—The term of a utility energy service contract entered into by a

Federal agency may have a contract period that extends beyond 10 years, but not to exceed 25 years.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The conditions of a utility energy service contract entered into by a Federal agency shall include requirements for measurement, verification, and performance assurances or guarantees of the savings.”.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1654. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny tax deductions for corporate regulatory violations; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am introducing, along with Senator GRASSLEY, the Government Settlement Transparency and Reform Act. This bill closes a loophole that allows corporations to reap tax benefits from payments made to the government stemming from settling corporate misdeeds. So this bill aims to end the subsidization of illegal corporate behavior by taxpayers.

Corporations accused of illegal activity routinely settle legal disputes with the government out of court because it allows both the company and the government to avoid the time, expense, and uncertainty of going to trial. Under Federal law, money paid to settle corporate civil or criminal penalties is not deductible. But under the tax code, offending companies may often write off any portion of a settlement that is not paid directly to the government as a penalty or fine for violation of the law. Corporations exploit this provision by later characterizing settlement penalties as restitution and a tax-deductible business expense.

I think it is common sense that, for example, a corporation should not agree to pay the government \$500 million in criminal or civil fines and then when they file their taxes count those fines as a business expense and take a tax windfall. Corporations that do this are effectively using taxpayer money to subsidize their illegal behavior. In 2005, the Government Accountability Office found that of the 34 companies and \$1 billion in settlements they examined, 20 companies took a tax deduction for some or all of the money it paid to the government. Those settlements were silent on whether that \$1 billion to the government counted as penalties or restitution. According to GAO, in 2 of those settlements, company representatives said they made a mistake in deducting civil penalty payments totaling \$1.9 million and said they would amend their tax returns.

The Reed-Grassley bill would address these practices by amending 162(f) of the tax code and requiring the government and the settling party to reach pre-filing agreements on how the settlement payments should be treated for tax purposes. The bill also clarifies the rules about what settlement payments

are punitive and therefore non-deductible. Furthermore, it increases transparency by requiring the government to file a return at the time of settlement to accurately reflect the tax treatment of the amounts that will be paid by the offending party.

Over a 10 year budget window, this legislation is estimated to raise between \$200 to \$300 million in revenue.

With this legislation we can close this tax loophole that flies in the face of sensible and fair tax policy. The tax code should not be used to subsidize illegal activity by corporations—when a fine is levied that fine should not be construed as a legitimate business expense. Instead, it should be paid in full, with no tax deduction taken.

I want to thank Senator GRASSLEY for working with me on this legislation. I would also thank Chairman BAUCUS who introduced similar legislation in previous Congresses. They have long championed closing this loophole. I urge our colleagues to join us by co-sponsoring this legislation and seeking its passage.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 286—CONGRATULATING ORACLE TEAM USA FOR WINNING THE 34TH AMERICA'S CUP

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 286

Whereas the America's Cup is known as the oldest trophy in sports;

Whereas the United States has long maintained one of the most successful sailing traditions in the world, with its teams having won more America's Cup competitions than those of any other nation;

Whereas the America's Cup was hosted 13 times in New York City between 1870 and 1920, 12 times in Newport, Rhode Island, between 1930 to 1987, and 3 times in San Diego, California, between 1988 and 1995;

Whereas Newport, Rhode Island hosted the inaugural America's Cup World Series Season Championship, the final race in the new AC45 professional circuit in the lead-up to the 2013 finals, and is proud of its America's Cup heritage;

Whereas America's Cup World Series races were also held in San Diego and San Francisco, California;

Whereas on September 25, 2013, in San Francisco, California, Oracle Team USA won the 34th America's Cup, defeating Emirates Team New Zealand 9 races to 8;

Whereas this is the second consecutive America's Cup victory for Oracle Team USA, which previously won the 33rd America's Cup on February 14, 2010 in Valencia, Spain;

Whereas on September 18, 2013, Oracle Team USA had lost 8 of the first 11 races in the America's Cup finals to Emirates Team New Zealand, but refused to give up;

Whereas despite this deficit, skipper James Spithill declared: “We will keep fighting all the way to the end. There is still a lot of racing and I am still convinced that we can win

races. We will go out in every single race thinking we can win; we have to.”;

Whereas beginning on September 19, 2013, Oracle Team USA was able to win 7 consecutive races to set up a winner-take-all race on the San Francisco Bay course;

Whereas Oracle Team USA was able to accomplish one of the greatest comebacks in sporting history by winning the final race in decisive fashion and securing their second consecutive America's Cup;

Whereas Ben Ainslie, Darren Bundock, Simon Daubney, Dirk de Ridder, Shannon Falcone, Kinley Fowler, Murray Jones, Rome Kirby, John Kostecky, Kyle Langford, Jonathan Macbeth, Brian MacInnes, Matthew Mason, Will McCarthy, Matt Mitchell, Joe Newton, Sam Newton, Gilberto Nobili, Philippe Persti, Tom Slingsby, Joe Spooner, Simeon Tienpont, and Brad Webb came together to form one of the most exciting and skilled crews to have ever raced in the America's Cup; and

Whereas the partnership between the City and County of San Francisco and Oracle Team USA owner Larry Ellison produced the most visually stunning and publicly accessible series of races in the history of the America's Cup; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Oracle Team USA for winning the 34th America's Cup;

(2) recognizes the achievements of all the crew, coaches, and staff who contributed to the victory; and

(3) offers best wishes and support for the team as it prepares to defend its title once again in American waters.

SENATE RESOLUTION 287—CONGRATULATING THE BOSTON RED SOX ON WINNING THE 2013 WORLD SERIES

Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KING, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 287

Whereas, on October 30, 2013, the Boston Red Sox won the 2013 World Series by defeating the St. Louis Cardinals;

Whereas the Boston Red Sox won the World Series before the Fenway Faithful for the first time since 1918, igniting the city with pride;

Whereas the St. Louis Cardinals demonstrated sportsmanship, skill, and perseverance;

Whereas the St. Louis Cardinals are recognized for their phenomenal effort and success throughout the 2013 baseball season, posting a record of 97-65 and winning their fourth National League pennant in 10 years;

Whereas Boston's victory marks their third world title in 10 years and their 8th world title in the treasured and beloved Red Sox team's 113-year history;

Whereas the Red Sox players and staff showed the most advanced skill, heart, and grit through the entire regular season and postseason, winning the American League Division Series, the American League Championship Series, and the World Series;

Whereas the Red Sox made history and showed tremendous resilience in becoming the first team to win the World Series after losing at least 93 games the previous year;

Whereas the 2013 team will be remembered for the inspiration they drew from the city

of Boston, the joy they brought to the city and the region, and their embodiment of "Boston Strong";

Whereas the Red Sox players' beards will be remembered as a symbol of the 2013 Boston Red Sox's spirit and unity;

Whereas the Red Sox World Series victory paid tribute to former Red Sox legends, including Bobby Doerr, Joe Cronin, Johnny Pesky, Carl Yastrzemski, Ted Williams, Carlton Fisk, and Jim Rice;

Whereas Red Sox manager John Farrell has won his first World Series title at the helm of the Red Sox and assembled one of the greatest Red Sox teams of all time;

Whereas David Ortiz, a vital Red Sox and member of the 2004 and 2007 World Series championship teams and with 103 runs-batted-in (RBIs) during the season, was recognized as the Most Valuable Player in the 2013 World Series, batting .688, hitting two critical home runs, and cementing his reputation as one of the greatest postseason performers in baseball history;

Whereas John Lackey and Clay Buchholz dominated opposing batters throughout the American League Championship, and Jon Lester had an overpowering performance in Game 5 of the World Series, tying the Red Sox post-season record for wins with six;

Whereas Koji Uehara delivered unmatched relief pitching performances throughout the regular season, earning 21 saves with just a 1.09 earned run average and silenced opposing hitters during the playoffs;

Whereas Mike Napoli blasted a game-deciding home run in game 3 of the American League Championship Series and produced key hits and leadership for the Red Sox throughout the World Series;

Whereas Shane Victorino solidified his legend in postseason baseball lore by blasting a grand slam that drove the Red Sox past the Detroit Tigers in game 6 of the American League Championship Series, hitting a three run double in the World Series-clinching win at Fenway Park, and earning a Gold Glove award for his stellar performance in right field;

Whereas Dustin Pedroia, a sure-handed fielder, was awarded the Gold Glove for his unshakable defensive play at second base during the 2013 regular season, provided relentless leadership in the Red Sox clubhouse, and set an example for countless young baseball fans across our country;

Whereas the Boston Red Sox were led to the World Series by the determination of every Red Sox player this season, including Alfredo Aceves, Quintin Berry, Xander Bogaerts, Craig Breslow, Clay Buchholz, Mike Carp, Ryan Dempster, Jonathan Diaz, Felix Doubront, Stephen Drew, Jacoby Ellsbury, Jonny Gomes, Brock Holt, John Lackey, Ryan Lavarnway, Jon Lester, Will Middlebrooks, Franklin Morales, Mike Napoli, Daniel Nava, Jake Peavy, Dustin Pedroia, David Ortiz, David Ross, Jarrod Saltalamacchia, Junichi Tazawa, Koji Uehara, Shane Victorino, and Brandon Workman;

Whereas Red Sox owners John Henry and Tom Werner and Red Sox president and chief executive officer Larry Lucchino and general manager Ben Cherington deserve credit for building on the success of the 2004 and 2007 World Championship teams;

Whereas Bill James, the father of modern statistical analysis of baseball and a pioneer in the sabermetric movement, won his third World Series as a member of the Red Sox staff;

Whereas the Boston Red Sox have been serving charities throughout New England,

including the "Jimmy Fund" of the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute for 60 years and joining the fight against cancer; and

Whereas fans of the Red Sox, not only in Boston or New England but across the world, join together to triumphantly celebrate the win after mourning the tragic events of the 2013 Boston Marathon earlier this year; and

Whereas the Fenway Faithful and Red Sox Nation thank the Red Sox organization for their loyalty to the city and delivery of the 2013 World Series title: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates—
(A) the Boston Red Sox for bringing the World Series title back to Boston, and the players, manager, coaches, support staff, and owners whose dedication, commitment, and spirit made this season a historic success; and

(B) the St. Louis Cardinals for their accomplishments and dedication during the 2013 season and in winning the National League Championship; and

(2) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) Red Sox manager John Farrell;
(B) Red Sox general manager Ben Cherington;
(C) Red Sox president and chief executive officer Larry Lucchino;
(D) Red Sox principal owner John Henry; and
(E) Red Sox chairman Tom Werner.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 5, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Housing Finance Reform: Protecting Small Lender Access to the Secondary Mortgage Market."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 4, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 5, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD-106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "The Online Federal Health Insurance Marketplace: Enrollment Challenges and the Path Forward."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 5, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION OPERATIONS, SAFETY, AND SECURITY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 5, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, "The U.S. Aviation Industry and Jobs: Keeping American Manufacturing Competitive."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY AND THE COURTS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on November 5, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Changing the Rules: Will limiting the scope of civil discovery diminish accountability and leave Americans without access to justice?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION, FORESTRY, AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, Subcommittee on Conservation, Forestry, and Natural Resources, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 5, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR-328A of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Shortchanging Our Forest: How Tight Budgets and Management Decisions Can Increase the Risk of Wildlife."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oversight of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 5, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, "Fugitive Methane Emissions from Oil and Gas Operations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar Nos. 393 through 402 and 419, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; any statement be printed in the RECORD; and that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Cox

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Jill J. Nelson

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203;

To be brigadier general

Col. Hector Lopez

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Keith D. Jones

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Garrett P. Jensen

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C. section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Robert B. Brown

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Robert L. Walter, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade

indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William C. Mayville, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Stephen R. Lanza

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Bruce L. Gillingham

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert O. Blake, Jr., of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Indonesia.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN859 AIR FORCE nomination of Brian J. Hood, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 17, 2013.

PN860 AIR FORCE nominations (4) beginning JOHN P. SCHUMACHER, and ending PAUL C. ROBINSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 17, 2013.

PN861 AIR FORCE nominations (4) beginning SCOTT P. IRWIN, and ending DAVE C. PRAKASH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 17, 2013.

PN879 AIR FORCE nomination of Gregory L. Koontz, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 19, 2013.

PN880 AIR FORCE nomination of Nga T. Do, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 19, 2013.

IN THE ARMY

PN862 ARMY nomination of Richard L. Piontkowski, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 17, 2013.

PN863 ARMY nominations (2) beginning SARY O. BEIDAS, and ending GERRY R. GERRY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 17, 2013.

PN864 ARMY nomination of Benjamin P. Donham, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 17, 2013.

PN865 ARMY nominations (6) beginning ANTHONY P. CLARK, and ending KAREN L. RYAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 17, 2013.

PN912 ARMY nomination of Robert F. Pleczkowski, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 7, 2013.

PN913 ARMY nominations (2) beginning Milton L. Shipman, and ending Robert W. Stewart, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 7, 2013.

PN914 ARMY nominations (55) beginning JOHN C. ANDERSON, and ending ALEXIS

M. WELLS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 7, 2013.

PN915 ARMY nominations (14) beginning JAMES L. BRISSON, JR., and ending DAVID A. VANDERJAGT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 7, 2013.

PN916 ARMY nominations (5) beginning JAMES D. BROWN, and ending LESLIE D. MALONEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 7, 2013.

PN917 ARMY nominations (19) beginning LAURENCE J. BAZER, and ending JOHN E. TRUNZO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 7, 2013.

PN918 ARMY nominations (256) beginning BRIAN M. ADELSON, and ending BRIAN G. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 7, 2013.

PN922 ARMY nominations (8) beginning KENNETH E. BRANDT, and ending WILEY R. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 9, 2013.

IN THE NAVY

PN882 NAVY nomination of Justin R. Hodges, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 19, 2013.

PN883 NAVY nomination of George P. Byrum, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 19, 2013.

PN919 NAVY nomination of Sennay M. Stefanos, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 7, 2013.

PN920 NAVY nomination of Jessica Y. Lin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 7, 2013.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate resumes legislative session.

STREAMLINING CLAIMS PROCESSING FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES ACT

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent we now proceed to Calendar No. 231.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2747) to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask further the bill be read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2747) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CONGRATULATING ORACLE TEAM USA

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 286. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 286) congratulating Oracle Team USA for winning the 34th America's Cup.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 286) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

CONGRATULATING THE BOSTON RED SOX

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 287. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 287) congratulating the Boston Red Sox on winning the 2013 World Series.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 287) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. REID. Madam President, if it were in order, which it is not, I would ask that the RECORD be spread and this resolution be passed with the name "Tim Mitchell" on it.

I have followed baseball since the time I was a little boy, and I consider myself a fan of baseball, but I have never known a more rabid fan of a baseball team than Tim Mitchell, whom we depend on so very, very much to help us work through all that we do in the Senate. He is a fan bordering on illness in supporting this team. He has a Red Sox tie, a pen. I expect next to see, if he lifted up his shirt, that he would have a tattoo of the Red Sox.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, November 6, 2013; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the motion to proceed to S. 815, the Employee Non-Discrimination Act, be agreed to and the Senate begin consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:45 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, November 6, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 5, 2013:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. SAMUEL D. COX

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. JILL J. NELSON

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. HECTOR LOPEZ

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. KEITH D. JONES

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. GARRETT P. JENSEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ROBERT B. BROWN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ROBERT L. WALTER, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED

WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. MAYVILLE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN R. LANZA

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. BRUCE L. GILLINGHAM

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ROBERT O. BLAKE, JR., OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA.

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF BRIAN J. HOOD, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN P. SCHUMACHER AND ENDING WITH PAUL C. ROBINSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 17, 2013.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT P. IRWIN AND ENDING WITH DAVE C. PRAKASH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 17, 2013.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF GREGORY L. KOONTZ, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF NGA T. DO, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF RICHARD L. PIONTKOWSKI, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SARY O. BEIDAS AND ENDING WITH GERRY R. GERRY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 17, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BENJAMIN P. DONHAM, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY P. CLARK AND ENDING WITH KAREN L. RYAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 17, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ROBERT F. PLECZKOWSKI, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MILTON L. SHIPMAN AND ENDING WITH ROBERT W. STEWART, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON OCTOBER 7, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN C. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH ALEXIS M. WELLS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON OCTOBER 7, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES L. BRISSON, JR. AND ENDING WITH DAVID A. VANDERJAGT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON OCTOBER 7, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES D. BROWN AND ENDING WITH LESLIE D. MALONEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON OCTOBER 7, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LAURENCE J. BAZER AND ENDING WITH JOHN E. TRUNZO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON OCTOBER 7, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN M. ADELSON AND ENDING WITH BRIAN G. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON OCTOBER 7, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KENNETH E. BRANDT AND ENDING WITH WILEY R. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON OCTOBER 9, 2013.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF JUSTIN R. HODGES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GEORGE P. BYRUM, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF SENNAY M. STEFANOS, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JESSICA Y. LIN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

SENATE—Wednesday, November 6, 2013

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, every good and perfect gift comes from You alone, for with You there is no variation or shadow of turning. May we place our hope in You and never forget how You have sustained us in the past. Lord, give our Senators the wisdom to trust You in the small things, realizing that faithfulness with the least prepares them for fidelity with the much. May they trust You to do what is best for America in good times and in bad. Inspire each of us to stand for right even though the heavens fall.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the motion to proceed to S. 815, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, will be adopted and the Senate will begin consideration of the bill.

Senators will be notified when votes are scheduled.

OBAMACARE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Kimberly Cates is no stranger to the struggles that come with living without health insurance in America. She works at a health clinic that treats uninsured Kentuckians. The clinic does not provide its employees with health insurance. Over the last few years she has racked up \$15,000 in medical bills and recently filed for bankruptcy. Last week, after a month of considering her options, Mrs. Cates signed up for health insurance for the first time in many years. The plan will cost \$17 a month—I repeat, \$17 a month—and every hospital near her home will accept her new insurance. This is the difference ObamaCare is making, and Mrs. Cates is only one example of the success of Kentucky's new health insurance exchange created under the Affordable Care Act.

More than 1,000 Kentucky residents have signed up for affordable health insurance every single day since the exchange opened, according to the Huffington Post, which reported Mrs. Cates' story.

Across the country, in States such as Kentucky that have opened their own exchanges, Americans are signing up for quality, affordable, insurance plans, often for the first time in many years.

The national rollout of the ObamaCare Web site was rocky, to say the least. Problems with the site must and will be fixed. But we should not lose sight of important victories happening in living rooms and libraries and community centers across the country, victories like the one Mrs. Cates celebrated last week. ObamaCare is more than a Web site. For tens of millions of Americans who have been living without insurance, ObamaCare is a lifeline. But rather than work with Democrats to fix the problems in this landmark law, Republicans in Washington are busy complaining about it instead. Meanwhile, Republican Governors in States such as Nevada, Ohio, New Jersey, and Michigan are helping more residents of their States access health care by expanding Medicaid coverage.

One Nevada woman contacted my office saying that she is counting the days until January, 2014, when her new health insurance plan will take effect and she can finally go to the doctor.

In the past she has been denied health insurance because of a pre-existing condition, but now she qualifies for a plan she can afford under Nevada's Medicaid expansion, led by Republican Governor Brian Sandoval. Thanks to ObamaCare, Americans like her can no longer be denied insurance because they are a cancer survivor, a woman, a diabetic, or had acne when they were younger. That is one of the many benefits of this new law.

Under ObamaCare, insurance companies will no longer be allowed to cancel your policy when you get sick or because you are a woman or set an arbitrary limit on the care you receive. In Nevada alone, tens of thousands of seniors have saved tens of millions on medicine because ObamaCare closed the gap in prescription drug coverage.

More than 3 million young people, including 33,000 young adults, stayed on their parents' health insurance plans because of ObamaCare, and hundreds of thousands of businesses that already offer their employees health insurance are getting tax credits for doing the right thing because of ObamaCare.

A new study shows 17 million Americans have also qualified for tax credits

to purchase coverage and many more are eligible for Medicaid because of ObamaCare.

Unfortunately, 5 million people living in States that did not expand Medicaid eligibility are left out in the cold. It is shameful that Americans who simply want access to lifesaving medical care will be denied insurance for political reasons.

There is no better example of that than Texas. They have far more people who are eligible for Medicaid coverage who will not get it. That is unfortunate. We know that healthcare.gov is not perfect. I know that ObamaCare is not perfect. But ObamaCare is worth more than a Web site, and whenever Republicans are willing to stop complaining and are willing to start working to improve the law, Democrats are ready and willing to work with them.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Republican leader is recognized.

OBAMACARE

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, nearly every day we see evidence of more Americans losing their health coverage. Just take a look at this map right here to my right—105,000 losing their coverage in Idaho; 215,000 in Pennsylvania; 330,000 in Florida. Out in California it is getting close to 1 million. All of these people have lost their health coverage.

In my home State of Kentucky, which has been frequently referred to by some as a success story, let's get the facts straight: 280,000 people—probably on a per capita basis more than any other State in America—280,000 folks are losing their private insurance as a result of ObamaCare, despite the President's repeated promises that such a thing could not possibly happen. That compares, by the way, with only about 5,000 who have been able to sign up for new private care on the Kentucky exchange.

Let's go over that again. In my State, 280,000 people have lost their health care policies while 5,000 have signed up on the exchange. Most of the people in Kentucky who are signing up for something new are signing up for Medicaid, for free health care. I think we can stipulate that if you are giving out free health care, you are going to have more people sign up. But on the exchanges in Kentucky, 5,000 have signed up, and 280,000 have lost their

policies. In other words, so far about 56 times as many Kentuckians have lost their private insurance plans as have gotten new ones on the State exchange. That is hardly what most people would define as a success.

But, if ObamaCare has gotten off to a troubled start in Kentucky, the same is also true in many other parts of the country. That is why one of the most senior Democrats just said that ObamaCare is facing “a crisis of confidence.” I certainly agree with her.

She cited the “dysfunctional nature of the Web site” as just one reason for the ebbing confidence. She also pointed to the “cancellation of policies” and “sticker shock” as two additional points of concern—cancellation of policies and sticker shock.

She is right. Americans are far less concerned about a Web site than they are about the availability and affordability of their health care. The White House has tried to dismiss stories about folks losing insurance by saying they had lousy plans to begin with and that those Americans should be happy—they should be happy that the government is now forcing them to get a different one. In other words, the government is smarter than they are. You had a lousy plan to begin with, so I am going to make you get a different one.

But what so many have discovered is that ObamaCare is actually worse. Take Matthew Fleischer. He is 34 and recently wrote to the *Los Angeles Times* to share his experience with ObamaCare. Matthew recently found out he would be one of those 1 million or so Californians losing their health insurance. He says he is being funneled into an exchange plan that would drive his premiums up by more than 40 percent. Here is some of what he wrote:

My old plan was as barebones as they came, so I assumed that even though the new plan would cost more, my coverage would improve under ObamaCare, at least marginally. It did not.

Under my old plan my maximum possible out-of-pocket expense was \$4,900. Under the new plan, I'm on the hook for up to \$6,350. Copays for my doctor visits will double. For urgent care visits they will quadruple. Although slightly cheaper plans exist if I tried to shop around on the exchange, I will lose my dental coverage [if I choose] to switch. Needless to say, I am not pleased.

He is one of numerous people who have been blind-sided since ObamaCare's debut last month. Look, our constituents are worried. They feel deceived. They are very upset, and they should be—not only with the law itself but with the way the administration has basically brushed their concerns aside, just brushed their concerns aside, concerns it does not seem all that interested in solving.

If the past 2 weeks are any indication, the administration seems far more concerned with shifting the blame. That is why the President's PR

team has been scrambling to readjust his now-debunked promise, “If you like your plan, you can keep it.” How many times did we hear the President say that over the last 3 years? But every new variation basically amounts to this—this is what it really amounts to: If the President likes your plan, you can keep it. That is the truth. If the President likes your plan, you can keep it; not if you like your plan, you can keep it.

The truth is, all these rhetorical adjustments only prove the point. They are a tacit admission that the administration did in fact mislead the public about ObamaCare in order to pass it. Many of our friends on the Democratic side are starting to realize this too, and they are starting to panic. We have seen some of the most vulnerable Senators even putting forward proposals that might allow some folks to keep their plan.

From a policy perspective, we Republicans welcome that. We have long argued that Americans should be able to purchase the plans that suit their needs, not just the plans that meet with the President's approval. But the concern these Democrats are now showing seems hard to take seriously when you consider that they have continued to support ObamaCare for so long, even as Republicans, health officials, and policy experts across the country warned that exactly what is happening would happen. The fact is that back in 2010 the entire Democratic caucus voted against legislation that would have specifically allowed the Americans now losing their plans to keep them. I will say that again. Back in 2010 the entire Democratic caucus voted against legislation that would have specifically allowed the Americans now losing their plans to keep them.

This doesn't mean Republicans won't now consider good legislative proposals. Of course we will. But for Senators looking to absolve themselves of past ObamaCare mistakes, there is only one escape, and it begins with repealing ObamaCare, and it ends with working together on bipartisan reforms that can actually work.

The White House keeps promising Americans that once healthcare.gov is fixed, everybody's going to love ObamaCare, but it is hard to see how that could possibly happen. An IT guy is not going to give Americans their health care plans back. An IT guy is not going to make ObamaCare premiums any more affordable or its coverage any better. An IT guy is not going to allow Americans to keep seeing the same doctors they like or continue to go to hospitals that deliver the care they want. Let's not forget that there is no software fix for undoing the damage this law has already inflicted on the paychecks and lost hours of our constituents. There is

no string of code for repairing ObamaCare's harm to jobs and to our country.

The President could not be more right when he says ObamaCare is about more than a Web site. It sure is. I could not agree more. It is about people. It is about the people we represent, folks such as Matthew Fleischer and Edie Sundby, whom I mentioned. Edie is battling stage IV gallbladder cancer and says that because of ObamaCare she is about to lose access to the kind of affordable care she credits with keeping her alive for the past several years. It is about folks like a 40-year-old constituent of mine named Mark. Mark owns a small business and thought he would be able to keep his current insurance, but then he got a letter from his insurer terminating the plan anyway. After looking at his options on the Kentucky exchange, he discovered that his Kentucky premiums would rise by 300 percent. It is not right, and it is not fair.

Here is an important lesson: ObamaCare would not be law today if the President and his allies in Congress had told the truth about the consequences it would bring. People like Edie, Matthew, and Mark would not be in the troubling circumstances they are in now if the President had simply been honest about ObamaCare.

The President can keep talking about a Web site if he wants, but Republicans are going to keep fighting for the middle-class Americans who are suffering under this law because that is where the focus should be.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to S. 815 is agreed to, and the clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 815) to prohibit the employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Employment Non-Discrimination Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to address the history and persistent, widespread pattern of discrimination, including unconstitutional discrimination, on the bases of

sexual orientation and gender identity by private sector employers and local, State, and Federal Government employers;

(2) to provide an explicit, comprehensive Federal prohibition against employment discrimination on the bases of sexual orientation and gender identity, including meaningful and effective remedies for any such discrimination; and

(3) to invoke congressional powers, including the powers to enforce the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, and to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to section 8 of article I of the Constitution, in order to prohibit employment discrimination on the bases of sexual orientation and gender identity.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In this Act:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

(2) COVERED ENTITY.—The term “covered entity” means an employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee.

(3) DEMONSTRATES.—The term “demonstrates” means meets the burdens of production and persuasion.

(4) EMPLOYEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “employee” means—

(i) an employee as defined in section 701(f) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(f));

(ii) a State employee to which section 302(a)(1) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16b(a)(1)) applies;

(iii) a covered employee, as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301) or section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code; or

(iv) an employee or applicant to which section 717(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16(a)) applies.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The provisions of this Act that apply to an employee or individual shall not apply to a volunteer who receives no compensation.

(5) EMPLOYER.—The term “employer” means—

(A) a person engaged in an industry affecting commerce (as defined in section 701(h) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(h)) who has 15 or more employees (as defined in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B) of paragraph (4)) for each working day in each of 20 or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year, and any agent of such a person, but does not include a bona fide private membership club (other than a labor organization) that is exempt from taxation under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(B) an employing authority to which section 302(a)(1) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 applies;

(C) an employing office, as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 or section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code; or

(D) an entity to which section 717(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 applies.

(6) EMPLOYMENT AGENCY.—The term “employment agency” has the meaning given the term in section 701(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(c)).

(7) GENDER IDENTITY.—The term “gender identity” means the gender-related identity, appearance, or mannerisms or other gender-related characteristics of an individual, with or without regard to the individual’s designated sex at birth.

(8) LABOR ORGANIZATION.—The term “labor organization” has the meaning given the term in section 701(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(d)).

(9) PERSON.—The term “person” has the meaning given the term in section 701(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(a)).

(10) SEXUAL ORIENTATION.—The term “sexual orientation” means homosexuality, heterosexuality, or bisexuality.

(11) STATE.—The term “State” has the meaning given the term in section 701(i) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(i)).

(b) APPLICATION OF DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, a reference in section 701 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—

(1) to an employee or an employer shall be considered to refer to an employee (as defined in subsection (a)(4)) or an employer (as defined in subsection (a)(5)), respectively, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection; and

(2) to an employer in subsection (f) of that section shall be considered to refer to an employer (as defined in subsection (a)(5)(A)).

SEC. 4. EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.

(a) EMPLOYER PRACTICES.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

(1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise discriminate against any individual with respect to the compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment of the individual, because of such individual’s actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity; or

(2) to limit, segregate, or classify the employees or applicants for employment of the employer in any way that would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment or otherwise adversely affect the status of the individual as an employee, because of such individual’s actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity.

(b) EMPLOYMENT AGENCY PRACTICES.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employment agency to fail or refuse to refer for employment, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual because of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of the individual or to classify or refer for employment any individual on the basis of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of the individual.

(c) LABOR ORGANIZATION PRACTICES.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a labor organization—

(1) to exclude or to expel from its membership, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual because of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of the individual;

(2) to limit, segregate, or classify its membership or applicants for membership, or to classify or fail or refuse to refer for employment any individual, in any way that would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment, or would limit such employment or otherwise adversely affect the status of the individual as an employee or as an applicant for employment because of such individual’s actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity; or

(3) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this section.

(d) TRAINING PROGRAMS.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining, including on-the-job training programs, to discriminate against any individual because of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of the individual in admission to, or employment in, any program established to provide apprenticeship or other training.

(e) ASSOCIATION.—An unlawful employment practice described in any of subsections (a) through (d) shall be considered to include an action described in that subsection, taken against an individual based on the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of a person with whom the individual associates or has associated.

(f) NO PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT OR QUOTAS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed or interpreted to require or permit—

(1) any covered entity to grant preferential treatment to any individual or to any group because of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of such individual or group on account of an imbalance which may exist with respect to the total number or percentage of persons of any actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity employed by any employer, referred or classified for employment by any employment agency or labor organization, admitted to membership or classified by any labor organization, or admitted to, or employed in, any apprenticeship or other training program, in comparison with the total number or percentage of persons of such actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in any community, State, section, or other area, or in the available work force in any community, State, section, or other area; or

(2) the adoption or implementation by a covered entity of a quota on the basis of actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity.

(g) NO DISPARATE IMPACT CLAIMS.—Only disparate treatment claims may be brought under this Act.

(h) STANDARDS OF PROOF.—Except as otherwise provided, an unlawful employment practice is established when the complaining party demonstrates that sexual orientation or gender identity was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.

SEC. 5. RETALIATION PROHIBITED.

It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a covered entity to discriminate against an individual because such individual—

(1) opposed any practice made an unlawful employment practice by this Act; or

(2) made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this Act.

SEC. 6. EXEMPTION FOR RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS.

This Act shall not apply to a corporation, association, educational institution or institution of learning, or society that is exempt from the religious discrimination provisions of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) pursuant to section 702(a) or 703(e)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e-1(a), 2000e-2(e)(2)).

SEC. 7. NONAPPLICATION TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES; VETERANS’ PREFERENCES.

(a) ARMED FORCES.—

(1) EMPLOYMENT.—In this Act, the term “employment” does not apply to the relationship between the United States and members of the Armed Forces.

(2) ARMED FORCES.—In paragraph (1) the term “Armed Forces” means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

(b) VETERANS’ PREFERENCES.—This title does not repeal or modify any Federal, State, territorial, or local law creating a special right or preference concerning employment for a veteran.

SEC. 8. CONSTRUCTION.

(a) DRESS OR GROOMING STANDARDS.—Nothing in this Act shall prohibit an employer from requiring an employee, during the employee’s hours at work, to adhere to reasonable dress or grooming standards not prohibited by other provisions of Federal, State, or local law, provided that the employer permits any employee who has undergone gender transition prior to the time of employment, and any employee who has notified the employer that the employee has undergone or is undergoing gender transition after the time of employment, to adhere to the same dress or grooming standards as apply for the gender to which the employee has transitioned or is transitioning.

(b) **ADDITIONAL FACILITIES NOT REQUIRED.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require the construction of new or additional facilities.

SEC. 9. COLLECTION OF STATISTICS PROHIBITED.

The Commission and the Secretary of Labor shall neither compel the collection of nor require the production of statistics on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity from covered entities pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 10. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **ENFORCEMENT POWERS.**—With respect to the administration and enforcement of this Act in the case of a claim alleged by an individual for a violation of this Act—

(1) the Commission shall have the same powers as the Commission has to administer and enforce—

(A) title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.); or

(B) sections 302 and 304 of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16b and 2000e–16c),

in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such title, or of section 302(a)(1) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16b(a)(1)), respectively;

(2) the Librarian of Congress shall have the same powers as the Librarian of Congress has to administer and enforce title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such title;

(3) the Board (as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301)) shall have the same powers as the Board has to administer and enforce the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of section 201(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(1));

(4) the Attorney General shall have the same powers as the Attorney General has to administer and enforce—

(A) title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.); or

(B) sections 302 and 304 of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16b and 2000e–16c);

in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such title, or of section 302(a)(1) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16b(a)(1)), respectively;

(5) the President, the Commission, and the Merit Systems Protection Board shall have the same powers as the President, the Commission, and the Board, respectively, have to administer and enforce chapter 5 of title 3, United States Code, in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of section 411 of such title; and

(6) a court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction and powers as the court has to enforce—

(A) title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such title;

(B) sections 302 and 304 of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16b and 2000e–16c) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of section 302(a)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16b(a)(1));

(C) the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of section 201(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(1)); and

(D) chapter 5 of title 3, United States Code, in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of section 411 of such title.

(b) **PROCEDURES AND REMEDIES.**—Except as provided in section 4(g), the procedures and

remedies applicable to a claim alleged by an individual for a violation of this Act are—

(1) the procedures and remedies applicable for a violation of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such title;

(2) the procedures and remedies applicable for a violation of section 302(a)(1) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16b(a)(1)) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such section;

(3) the procedures and remedies applicable for a violation of section 201(a)(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(1)) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such section; and

(4) the procedures and remedies applicable for a violation of section 411 of title 3, United States Code, in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such section.

(c) **OTHER APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.**—With respect to a claim alleged by a covered employee (as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301)) for a violation of this Act, title III of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.) shall apply in the same manner as such title applies with respect to a claim alleged by such a covered employee for a violation of section 201(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(1)).

(d) **NO DOUBLE RECOVERY.**—An individual who files claims alleging that a practice is an unlawful employment practice under this Act and an unlawful employment practice because of sex under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) shall not be permitted to recover damages for such practice under both of—

(1) this Act; and

(2) section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a) and title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

(e) **MOTIVATING FACTOR DECISIONS.**—On a claim in which an individual proved a violation under section 4(h) and a respondent demonstrates that the respondent would have taken the same action in the absence of the impermissible motivating factor, the court—

(1) may grant declaratory relief, injunctive relief (except as provided in paragraph (2)), and attorney's fees and costs demonstrated to be directly attributable only to the pursuit of a claim under section 4(h); and

(2) shall not award damages or issue an order requiring any admission, reinstatement, hiring, promotion, or payment.

SEC. 11. STATE AND FEDERAL IMMUNITY.

(a) **ABROGATION OF STATE IMMUNITY.**—A State shall not be immune under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution from a suit brought in a Federal court of competent jurisdiction for a violation of this Act.

(b) **WAIVER OF STATE IMMUNITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **WAIVER.**—A State's receipt or use of Federal financial assistance for any program or activity of a State shall constitute a waiver of sovereign immunity, under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution or otherwise, to a suit brought by an employee or applicant for employment of that program or activity under this Act for a remedy authorized under subsection (d).

(B) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term "program or activity" has the meaning given the term in section 606 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d–4a).

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—With respect to a particular program or activity, paragraph (1) applies to conduct occurring on or after the day, after the date of enactment of this Act, on which a State first receives or uses Federal financial assistance for that program or activity.

(c) **REMEDIES AGAINST STATE OFFICIALS.**—An official of a State may be sued in the official ca-

capacity of the official by any employee or applicant for employment who has complied with the applicable procedures of section 10, for equitable relief that is authorized under this Act. In such a suit the court may award to the prevailing party those costs authorized by section 722 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988).

(d) **REMEDIES AGAINST THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, in an action or administrative proceeding against the United States or a State for a violation of this Act, remedies (including remedies at law and in equity, and interest) are available for the violation to the same extent as the remedies are available for a violation of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) by a private entity, except that—

(1) punitive damages are not available; and

(2) compensatory damages are available to the extent specified in section 1977A(b) of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a(b)).

SEC. 12. ATTORNEYS' FEES.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term "decisionmaker" means an entity described in section 10(a) (other than paragraph (4) of such section), acting in the discretion of the entity.

(b) **AUTHORITY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, in an action or administrative proceeding for a violation of this Act, a decisionmaker may allow the prevailing party, other than the Commission or the United States, a reasonable attorney's fee (including expert fees) as part of the costs, to the same extent as is permitted under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.), sections 302 and 304 of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16b and 2000e–16c), the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.), or chapter 5 of title 3, United States Code, whichever applies to the prevailing party in that action or proceeding. The Commission and the United States shall be liable for the costs to the same extent as a private person.

SEC. 13. POSTING NOTICES.

A covered entity who is required to post a notice described in section 711 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–10) may be required to post an amended notice, including a description of the applicable provisions of this Act, in the manner prescribed by, and subject to the penalty provided under, section 711 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require a separate notice to be posted.

SEC. 14. REGULATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d), the Commission shall have authority to issue regulations to carry out this Act.

(b) **LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.**—The Librarian of Congress shall have authority to issue regulations to carry out this Act with respect to employees and applicants for employment of the Library of Congress.

(c) **BOARD.**—The Board referred to in section 10(a)(3) shall have authority to issue regulations to carry out this Act, in accordance with section 304 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1384), with respect to covered employees, as defined in section 101 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1301).

(d) **PRESIDENT.**—The President shall have authority to issue regulations to carry out this Act with respect to covered employees, as defined in section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code, and applicants for employment as such employees.

SEC. 15. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.

This Act shall not invalidate or limit the rights, remedies, or procedures available to an individual claiming discrimination prohibited

under any other Federal law or regulation or any law or regulation of a State or political subdivision of a State.

SEC. 16. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or the application of the provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of the provision to any other person or circumstances shall not be affected by the invalidity.

SEC. 17. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act and shall not apply to conduct occurring before the effective date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 2012

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have an amendment to the committee-reported substitute at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. PORTMAN, for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. MCCAIN, proposes an amendment numbered 2012.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2013 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2012

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. TOOMEY, for himself and Mr. FLAKE, proposes an amendment numbered 2013 to amendment No. 2012.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the appropriate balance between protecting workers and protecting religious freedom)

In section 6, insert before "This Act" the following: "(a) IN GENERAL.—"

In section 6, insert at the end the following:

(b) IN ADDITION.—In addition, an employer, regardless of whether the employer or an employee in the employment position at issue engages in secular activities as well as religious activities, shall not be subject to this Act if—

(1) the employer is in whole or in substantial part owned, controlled, or managed by a particular religion or by a particular religious corporation, association, or society;

(2) the employer is officially affiliated with a particular religion or with a particular religious corporation, association, or society; or

(3) the curriculum of such employer is directed toward the propagation of a particular religion.

AMENDMENT NO. 2014

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have an amendment to the underlying bill which is at the desk.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2014 to the language proposed to be stricken by the committee substitute.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment that was just reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2015 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2014

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2015 to amendment No. 2014.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "3 days" and insert "4 days".

MOTION TO RECOMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2016

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have a motion to recommit S. 815, with instructions, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 2016.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 5 days after the enactment.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2017

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2017 to the instructions (amendment No. 2016) of the motion to recommit.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "5 days" and insert "6 days."

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2018 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2017

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2018 to amendment No. 2017.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "6 days" and insert "7 days".

DRUG QUALITY AND SECURITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 236, H.R. 3204.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the bill (H.R. 3204) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING IKE SKELTON

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, last week our Nation lost a true American hero. In the last 40 years no member of the Congress has been more dedicated to America's defense and those who defend it than my good friend and former colleague Ike Skelton.

Growing up in Lexington, MO, his dream of joining the military like his father was cut short when he was diagnosed with polio. A true sign of his determination occurred when he overcame this hardship and went on to serve his Nation in a way he could never have imagined as a young patient at Warm Springs, GA, at a center founded by President Franklin Roosevelt and focused on their common challenge of how to overcome polio.

Ike served in the Missouri State Senate for 4 years. He was encouraged by a family friend, another Missourian named Harry Truman, to represent Missouri at the national level. A few years after that encouragement he eventually followed President Truman's advice and was eventually elected to the House of Representatives, where he started to serve in 1977 and continued to fulfill his dream of protecting America.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, Ike Skelton successfully led an effort that transformed Whiteman Air Force Base to house one of the most iconic military aircraft in U.S. history, the B-2 Bomber. Fort Leonard Wood grew from a training base for the newly enlisted to a center

for many of our military schools and the Army Corps of Engineers. By ensuring military bases remained in Missouri, Ike Skelton's legacy continues to protect our Nation's military and provide hundreds of jobs in our home State.

From the time he was a young boy, Congressman Skelton loved our country and its history, and now after years of service he has earned his own spot in our Nation's history. It was truly a great privilege to serve Missouri in the Congress with him and to benefit from his friendship and advice.

HEALTH CARE

Madam President, I would like to talk about another topic. I am sure it is no surprise to anybody that it has been more than a month now since the embarrassing Web site rollout of the President's health care plan and it still is not working. The Obama administration has been forced to take down the Web site on numerous occasions, and it often didn't work at a critical moment when they were trying to explain how it was finally beginning to work. While reports have surfaced showing that only six people managed to enroll on the first day, the administration still refuses to put out any real numbers about how many people have actually signed up for coverage.

I have sponsored a bill demanding that we have more transparency and more answers about how \$400 million has been spent on an exchange that does not work. They had 3½ years to get ready, interjecting ourselves into 16 percent of the economy and everybody's health care coverage, and it is still not working. The administration acted surprised. President Obama claimed the system was temporarily overwhelmed by a large volume of interested shoppers. Another person in the administration estimated that there might have been hundreds of people online before the Web site crashed. In a time like this, the Web site crashing for any reason is really not a very good excuse.

Prior to the launch, HHS officials insisted that the exchanges were on track. They insisted they had been tested. They insisted it was working the way it was supposed to work, just as people are now insisting the President's health care plan is going to work the way it is supposed to work. At recent committee hearings in the House, Marilyn Tavenner, the Administrator for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and Secretary Sebelius each testified they were confident that these glitches, as they called them, would be improved by the end of November. These were the same people who were saying it would work on the 1st of October.

It is long overdue for the President and the administration to level with the American people. It is also important to understand that the Web site is

the easiest thing they are going to be asked to do.

The President recently said during his White House Rose Garden speech: ObamaCare is not just a Web site; it is much more. Well, I could not agree more. I will say again that the Web site is the easiest problem they will be asked to solve. It should not become a proxy for whether this plan should work, and I think most Americans are going to figure that out.

As Senator McConnell said earlier about the Kentuckians he has heard from, I heard from all kinds of Missourians who have seen their work hours reduced and their health care premiums rise. We know this is not good for the workforce. We have seen too many people responding with part-time work and trying to keep numbers under 50 so they don't have to comply with a law they don't think they have to comply with.

In 2009 the President famously promised: If you like your health plan, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. He was still saying that in 2012 when he said: If you already have health insurance, you can keep your health insurance.

Unfortunately, that is not the case for the 3.5 million people in the individual market who have already received letters saying they are not going to be able to keep their health insurance. The Washington Post's Fact Checker gave the President four Pinocchios for his repeated pledge that you can keep your policy if you like it, and maybe that is because five Pinocchios aren't possible and four is all they can give for a statement that turns out to not be correct. NBC News reported last week that 50 to 75 percent of at least 14 million consumers who buy their insurance individually can expect to receive a cancellation notice.

Now the administration comes up with a response such as, well, this only affects 5 percent of the people in the country. If it affects your family, it affects 100 percent of the people in your house. And if 5 percent of the people in the country is 14 million people and whoever is insured under their policy, we shouldn't act as though there is no consequence at all.

It is no surprise. They had plenty of time to prepare.

The Springfield News-Leader, my hometown newspaper, recently reported on Becky Supak, who is 63. She suffers from blood clots, and she had insurance through the Missouri high-risk pool. One of the things Republicans wanted to do, the conservatives wanted to do when this bill was passed was figure out a way to expand these high-risk pools. The idea that there were no other ideas out there is just wrong. The Missouri high-risk pool, as do all the others, will go out of existence as of December 31. Becky's insurance has been costing her premiums of

around \$650 a month. She has a pre-existing condition. She hadn't had insurance before she got into the high-risk pool, but she was in that pool and it was serving her needs. Now she has been told her insurance will cost her \$1,043 a month—a \$400 increase on a working salary—and that would allow her, she hopes, to keep the same doctors she has now.

One of my constituents said his wife, who had a preexisting condition, will lose her policy the same way. Thanks to what is happening here, they don't know whether they can get more coverage. They are going to have to close the high-risk pool, look for coverage other places, and it is almost certain that coverage is going to be higher than they had and almost certain to have less coverage than they had.

Greg, a pastor from Poplar Bluff, MO, said he received a letter from his health care provider of over 10 years announcing it will no longer be his health care provider as of January 2014. He was happy with his old insurance. He is now forced to find another plan. He wants to know why they canceled, but the only explanation he can get is the machine that says that due to health care regulations, they are being forced to drop some of their older clients.

Sara of Hannibal, MO, comes from a family of quintessential small business owners. If their business had been affected, their choice would have been to close the business. Sara recently received a letter stating that after this year her current choice of policies won't be available.

So it turns out that it is actually only if the White House likes your plan, you get to keep your plan. This idea that you should "just shop around," the idea that it is going to be less expensive, doesn't work.

This morning the Wall Street Journal talked about States that are beginning to tell insurance companies: No, you really need to offer these policies for at least another 3 months. And in California, if their insurance commissioner is right, 3 months of additional offering of the 115,000 policies that have already been canceled would mean those policyholders could save as much as \$28.6 million in 3 months. So whoever thinks these costs are going to go down, apparently the insurance commissioner in California says costs for these people are going to go up annually by over \$100 million. Maybe that is why we are going to find out a lot more once the Web site starts working.

In Missouri and in all States, we are seeing more Americans receiving cancellation letters announcing their dropped coverage. Some people will also be forced to pay higher premiums. I think we are going to find that most people will be forced to pay higher premiums.

Now is the time to work together. Now would be the time to start over

and come up with good plans to make the best health care system in the world work better. As my colleague from New Hampshire—a Senator and a mom—Senator AYOTTE has said as maybe only a mom can say it, it is time for a time-out for ObamaCare.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

END A

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, there is no shortage of reasons why I am proud to represent my home State of Washington. Our State is an economic leader. We are home to the American aerospace industry and a thriving agricultural sector. Dozens of companies create new products and new jobs with cutting-edge technology. We are a leader in protecting the environment and educating our children. Washington State is a place tens of thousands of servicemembers and veterans call home. I am here today because I wish to speak about another way Washington State has set an example for the entire country; that is, our State's proud history of protecting the rights of all of our citizens, including members of the LGBT community.

In 2006 Washington State passed one of our country's strongest anti-discrimination laws—one that serves as a model for the Federal legislation we are considering here today. In 2007 and 2008 we passed additional legislation to further protect the rights of same-sex couples, and 1 year ago today our State voted proudly to uphold landmark marriage-equality legislation. What we have to show for it is really two results. First, we have a thriving LGBT community made up of individuals and families who can feel safe and respected and valued as does anyone else. Second, we have a growing economy that is anchored by businesses that respect their employees and judge them by only that which matters: their hard work and ability.

I rise today to simply ask my colleagues who don't yet support this legislation to take a look at my home State of Washington because in places such as Seattle and Spokane, we are proving every day that protecting the rights of our LGBT friends and neighbors isn't just the right thing to do; it works and it makes our country stronger.

Some of my colleagues have said that extending employment protections for our LGBT friends and family members is too hard. Some of them said it will create problems for businesses and communities. Well, I invite them to come to Seattle and ask businesses there whether it has been problematic to respect their employees' rights. I would invite them to visit Amazon or Starbucks or Nordstrom or Microsoft—just a few of our State's successful businesses that have taken the lead in protecting the rights of their LGBT

employees. We know in Washington State that it is wrong to discriminate against people. We know that a person's race or religion or gender has nothing to do with their ability in the workplace, and we know that sexual orientation and gender identity don't either.

Most all of our constituents—four out of five Americans—falsely believe LGBT Americans already have the protections included in this bill, and most people believe that because denying Americans their rights doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense that some men and women can be fired from their jobs just because of who they are or whom they love. We know it is not fair in my home State of Washington, but people in every State—from Virginia and Mississippi to Arizona and Idaho—know the same.

Many of my colleagues have cited these statistics, but they are worth repeating. Two-thirds of all Americans, including a majority of Republicans, believe in protecting LGBT citizens from employment discrimination. Despite that, more than half our country lives in States in which their rights are not protected. I am proud my State does protect those rights, but we can't stop working until the same is true in all 50 States. So for any of my colleagues who still aren't convinced that LGBT Americans deserve the same rights as all of us, my invitation to visit Washington State stands because it is not enough that my constituents are free from discrimination, their constituents deserve the same.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BASIC FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. KING. Madam President, I rise this morning in high hopes but with deep concern. The high hopes are that a budget conference at long last is taking place, that representatives of the Senate and the House are meeting together—met last week and I know have been meeting informally this week—in order to try to achieve, finally, a budget for this fiscal year. My concern is that it has been so hard to get here, it has been so difficult, and that we are now in a process where we do not seem to be able to function.

I am worried about the country. I am worried about whether we are going to be able to address our problems. This is not a speech about subject matter. It is not about global climate change or employment or the minimum wage or health care, but it is about whether

this institution can function in order to confront any of those problems.

When I was a young man, there was a famous book. It was kind of a cult favorite called "Been Down So Long It Looks Like Up to Me." Sometimes I feel as though that is where we are here. This institution has been so compromised in its ability to function that it has become the norm and people have low expectations, even people who are here.

I remember being on the floor a few months ago when one of the Senators stood up and said: This amendment should be subject to the normal 60-vote requirement, and my head snapped back because there is no such thing as a normal 60-vote requirement. For 200 years, we did not function with a normal 60-vote requirement. That has become a rather new innovation. I am not going to talk about the filibuster or the 60-vote requirement, but the idea that this Senator asserted it was normal indicates a change in attitude about the way this place functions.

Another example is that, to my knowledge, the conference committees that are going on now on the budget and on the farm bill, I believe, are the first two conference committees convened in this entire year. I worked here as a staff member 40 years ago and remember going to conference committees rather frequently—walking through the Capitol with my boss and going to the meetings and seeing the Senators and the Congressmen sit down and argue and disagree and agree and compromise and reach settlements on legislation on a fairly regular basis.

It is cause for celebration. It took a government shutdown, in effect, to produce a simple conference committee. Statistically, I am told this is the least productive Congress in American history thus far—no budget in 4 years. A budget is the basic function of any government. I understand there has been 1 appropriations bill out of 48 in the last several years. The result has been a complete and total loss of confidence from the public.

That has significance. That is important because in our economy confidence is the mainspring. This is not an academic concern. I am not giving a lecture about civics. The lack of functionality of this institution is damaging the country. For example, we know from studies that just the shutdown cost our economy \$24 billion, for no purpose that I could discern. But there is an untold broader cost.

The reality is that two-thirds of the American economy is driven by consumer spending. Consumer spending is driven by confidence, by the millions of individual decisions that people make in their daily lives, based on how they feel about their future, how they feel about their country, how they feel about their personal situation.

Part of that is whether they feel they have representatives in Washington

who are representing their interests and, in fact, are capable of serving the needs of the country. Ironically, this lack of confidence that is generated by events such as the shutdown harms the economy and therefore makes the deficit worse. The very best way to solve the deficit problem is not necessarily taxes or cuts, it is growth in the economy. If the economy grows, the deficit shrinks. That was part of what happened in the late nineties, the last time we had a budget surplus, because the economy was roaring along.

It is also about national security. I was provoked to come to the floor by reading a speech made recently by Robert Gates, one of our most distinguished public servants, the former Secretary of Defense. He talked about the defense posture of the country and the national security situation. Here is what he said toward the end of his speech:

Let me close with a word about what I now regard to be the biggest threat to national security—

The biggest threat to U.S. national security.

the political dysfunction within the two square miles of Washington, D.C. encompassing the White House and Capitol Hill.

Those are strong words. He is not talking about Al Qaeda. He is not talking about a resurgent China. He is not talking about a world threat of terrorism. He is talking about us as the greatest threat to U.S. national security. He went on to say:

American politics has always been shrill and ugly business going back to the Founding Fathers. But as a result of several polarizing trends we now have lost the ability to execute even the basic functions of government, much less solve the most difficult and divisive problems facing this country.

Basic functions of government: passing a budget, operating the government itself, paying our bills—the basic functions of government. Secretary Gates said:

Looking ahead, it is unrealistic to expect partisanship to disappear or even dissipate. But when push comes to shove, when the future of our country is at stake, ideological zeal and short-term political calculation on the part of both Republicans and Democrats must yield to patriotism and the long-term national interest.

This lack of functionality, this chaos, if you will, also affects us internationally. Tom Friedman, this weekend, had a column. I thought the title was rather provocative. It was, “Calling America: Hello? Hello? Hello?”

“Few Americans,” Friedman says, “are aware of how much America has lost in this recent episode of bringing the American economy to the edge of a cliff. . . .”

People always looked up to America. He quotes a citizen of Singapore.

People always looked up to America as the best-run country, the most reasonable, the most sensible. And now people are asking: “Can America manage itself and what are

the implications. . . .” [for the rest of the world?]

Our Constitution has always been based upon two somewhat competing principles in tension with each other. One is the fundamental purpose of the Constitution, which is to create an effective government. The Constitution was not what ran this country immediately after the American Revolution. We experimented with something called the Articles of Confederation. It did not work. The chaos and the economic problems of that period is what led the Framers to draft the Constitution in that blessed summer of 1787.

But the one principle in the Constitution is right in the preamble: To form a more perfect Union, to establish justice, to provide for the common defense, to ensure domestic tranquility and promote the general welfare. That is government.

At the same time, the Framers were concerned about the ancient question of who will guard the guardians; how do we control the government we just created in order to protect ourselves from its own abuse?

They built this elaborate system of checks and balances. They had never heard of Rube Goldberg in 1787. But if they had, that is what they did. They created an elaborate, cumbersome, slow system. They wanted it to be that way in order to curb the excesses of the government they had created. They wanted it to be slow and cumbersome. They succeeded beyond their wildest imagination.

Those two principles, governing and checks and balances, as I say, are in tension in the Constitution. The problem is, we seem to have reached a moment in time where the governing part has been taken away and all we have left are checks and balances. We have a system that is ridiculously easy to monkey wrench if you do not have the basic commitment to governing. That is the problem we face today.

So what do we do? We have to do something. That brings me back to where I began at the budget conference. This budget conference is very important. This is not one of many conferences that are going on. This is a—I do not want to say a last chance, but it is one of our last chances to show the American people we can govern. It is almost less important what is in the deal than that there be a deal, that the parties show they can come together, that they can solve a problem.

Just the fact of the headline, “Congress passes a budget which the President signs” would electrify the country. It would be the most positive thing we could possibly do for the economy. By the same token, a headline that says, “Congress once more fails to act” will be one more weight on the future of the country, one more stone in the pile of evidence that we can no longer

function; that this system which has served us so well for so long can no longer serve us as it must.

What do we do to get there? As I say, we do something. I hope and pray and urge and support the chair of the Budget Committee, the House chair of the Budget Committee, the members of that conference to try to find solutions that will not make everybody happy, by definition, but at least will show we are able to do the most basic function of government.

How do we get there? We listen. We have a company in Maine that has a sign on the wall that I think we ought to put in this room. It says: All of us are always smarter than any of us. The wisdom of the group—there is tremendous experience and wisdom in this institution if we can bring that to bear, but it does not work if people are not listening. If people say: I know the answer, I have all the results, I do not need to listen, I do not have anything to learn, we will never get there if that is the idea.

When people say to you: I am not going to compromise, what they are saying is: I have all the answers. I am entirely right.

I have never known anyone that was entirely right. So we need to listen. Yes, we need to compromise. We need to remind ourselves of the pretty simple oath we take. The oath that we take when we come into this place is to the Constitution of the United States. It is not to a political party. It is not to an ideology. It is not to a particular issue, no matter how precious to us or our constituents, it is an oath to the Constitution of the United States.

I hope and pray that if we can hold to that and remind ourselves why we are here and the heavy weight of responsibility that we bear, we can find solutions, we can solve problems, we can begin to rebuild the trust the American people want to have in their government, if we can only prove ourselves worthy of it. It is a heavy responsibility. It is one, I believe, we can meet and do so with honor and good faith to that oath we all took.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I see the Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is on the floor. I would inquire, through the Chair, how long she is seeking to speak. We were about to proceed to the consideration of the amendment that has been filed by Senator PORTMAN and cosponsored by Senator AYOTTE, Senator HELDER, and Senator MCCAIN.

This is a rather complicated parliamentary situation. Then there is going to be a debate. If the Senator from Massachusetts is going to speak very briefly, I would withhold. If she is going to speak at length, then since we have Members on their way, I would proceed.

Ms. WARREN. I would tell the senior Senator from Maine, my plan had been to speak for less than 10 minutes. But if that does not work, I certainly will yield to the Senator from Maine and do what she requests.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I would ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts be permitted to speak for no longer than 10 minutes. If she were a little shorter than that, it would make me very happy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

END A

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I wish to thank the Senator from Maine. I will do my very best.

I rise to speak about the importance of passing the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, a bill I am proud to cosponsor and to support. It has taken us far too long to arrive at this day. For nearly 40 years, Members of Congress have worked to pass legislation that would protect LGBT Americans from discrimination in the workplace.

Much has changed since Bella Abzug introduced the Equality Act of 1974. Equal marriage is now the law in 14 States—21 States and the District of Columbia have enacted laws to protect against employment discrimination based on sexual orientation. Sixteen States and the District of Columbia also protect against gender identity discrimination.

The Supreme Court has rejected DOMA, a law that legalized discrimination against same-sex spouses by calling that law exactly what it was: unconstitutional. In the private sector, a majority of Fortune 500 companies have adopted policies to protect workers from discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Polling data shows that a majority of small businesses have similar policies in place.

By nearly every measure, we have made progress in a long march toward equality. Yet in the face of all of this progress, nearly one-half century since Congress first enacted title VII of the Civil Rights Act prohibiting employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin, we still have not extended these basic Federal protections to LGBT Americans.

The failure to treat all our citizens with the same dignity is shameful. In America, equal means equal.

Many have tried hard to reach this day, and our legislators from Massachusetts have long been leaders in this fight. Senator Ted Kennedy and Congressman Barney Frank both spent decades working on this issue. Senator Paul Tsongas from Massachusetts introduced the first Senate bill to prohibit employment discrimination against LGBT Americans all the way back in 1979.

Progress has been slow. The last time the full Senate voted on ENDA was 1 year ago, when a version of the law championed by Senator Kennedy failed to pass by one single vote, 49–50, back in 1996. In 2007, the House passed a version of ENDA introduced by Congressman Frank, but the bill made no progress in the Senate. Today, there are 55 cosponsors of ENDA in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, representing the broad majority of support for the bill and signaling the tremendous progress that has been made.

It is all the more shameful that it has taken us this long to arrive at this day because Americans believe in equality. According to one survey, some 80 percent of Americans believe it is already illegal to discriminate against workers based on their sexual orientation, gender, or identity. Unfortunately, however, this is one rare instance where the American people are giving Congress way too much credit, because the truth is we haven't acted yet. The consequences of congressional inaction remain all too real for millions of LGBT Americans.

Despite the successful efforts in many States to pass nondiscrimination measures, Americans living in over half the country can still be discriminated against in the workplace based on sexual orientation or gender identity. It happens. Between 15 and 43 percent of LGBT individuals have reported experiencing discrimination or harassment in the workplace. A quarter of transgender Americans have reported being fired from a job due to their gender identity, and a whopping 90 percent have reported experiencing harassment and mistreatment. There has been a lot of progress toward a more inclusive nation, but for LGBT workers a law to stop employment discrimination can't come fast enough.

The Employment Non-Discrimination Act pending in the Senate will protect LGBT individuals in the workplace, update the law to reflect what the vast majority of Americans already believe to be the law, and help fulfill our constitutional responsibility to protect equality in our Nation. ENDA doesn't provide any special rights to any particular group of Americans. It does not compel any religious organization to change its views. It just creates a level playing field for LGBT workers. It makes sure all workers are judged by the work they do, not by who they are or who they love.

America is ready for this day. An overwhelming majority of voters, both Democrats and Republicans, support the enactment of this law. They know it reflects the values of our Nation.

America's businesses are ready too. Recent polling shows that a large majority of small businesses support the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. As for big businesses, 88 percent of Fortune 500 companies have already imple-

mented policies prohibiting discrimination against gays and lesbians in the workplace.

Raytheon, one of the Nation's top defense contractors and a proud Massachusetts-based company, bars LGBT discrimination. One executive at Raytheon is quoted as saying the organization's "culture of inclusion absolutely gives us a recruiting edge" when it comes to hiring the best and the brightest.

Shortly before his death in March 2009, Senator Kennedy joined with Senators MERKLEY, COLLINS, and SNOWE in what would be his final attempt to push this bipartisan legislation over the finish line. At the time Senator Kennedy eloquently explained his continuing support for ENDA by noting that "the promise of America will never be fulfilled as long as justice is denied to even one among us."

Those words were true in 1974 when Bella Abzug introduced the Equality Act. Those words were true when the Senate came within one vote of passing ENDA in 1996, those words were true when Senator Kennedy offered them in 2009, and those words are true today. The promise of America will never be fulfilled so long as justice is denied to even one among us.

We deal with a lot of different kinds of legislation in the Senate. This week we have a chance to vote on a law that is a measure of who we are as a people and what kind of a world we want to build. I believe in a world where equal means equal, and that is why I will be voting to outlaw employment discrimination against my neighbors and my friends.

Senator Kennedy, Senator Tsongas, and Congresswoman Abzug are no longer with us, but, as so many others, they fought hard to get us here—to get us one step closer to equality for all of us. It has taken us far too long to arrive at this day, but we are here now, and we are not going back.

I thank the Senator from Maine for giving me this time.

Ms. COLLINS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2013

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of S. 815 and the pending Portman amendment; that the Toomey second-degree amendment be withdrawn; that the Senate proceed to a vote on the Portman amendment;

that upon disposition of the Portman amendment, the previously withdrawn Toomey amendment be made pending as a first-degree amendment to the committee-reported substitute; that a Reid second-degree amendment to the Toomey amendment, which is at the desk, be made pending; that following the reporting of the Reid second-degree amendment, the Senate resume the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 236, H.R. 3204, with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, S. 815 is pending, and amendment No. 2013 is withdrawn.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2012) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Toomey amendment is now pending.

AMENDMENT NO. 2020 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2013

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I call up Reid amendment No. 2020.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS], for Mr. REID, proposes an amendment numbered 2020 to amendment numbered 2013.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Reid amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ANTIRETALIATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I understand that an amendment was negotiated to clarify the exemption provided to religious organizations in this legislation. This is Senate amendment No. 2012.

I understand that the intent of the antiretaliation provision in the legislation is to strike a balance between providing important protections for religious organizations because of their exemption under section 6(a) of pending legislation and to ensure that this provision does not undermine in any way current or future Federal, State, or local civil rights protections, such as those protections afforded under the laws of my home State of Vermont.

The language of the antiretaliation provision states clearly that nothing in the provision can be construed "to invalidate any other federal, state, or local law or regulation that otherwise

applies to an employer" that is found exempt under section 6(a) of ENDA. As I understand it, this means that an exemption for a religious organization under ENDA does not equate to exemption from compliance with any other Federal, State, or local civil rights requirements.

In addition, this provision bars retaliation against a religious organization on the sole basis that the organization is exempt under ENDA. Application of Federal, State, or local civil rights protections to a religious organization exempt under Section 6(a) of ENDA may only be considered retaliation under Section 6(b) if the religious organization demonstrates that the application—through monitoring, enforcement or other means—is solely due to the religious organization's exempt status under ENDA.

Based on this understanding, I would like to ask Chairman HARKIN if anything in that amendment would modify the important nondiscrimination provision in the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act that this Congress passed with overwhelming bipartisan support earlier this year.

That provision was a critical component of the reauthorization, and I want to make sure that nothing here overrides what is currently the law of the land. I also want to make sure that States like Vermont can still enforce their own nondiscrimination laws for violations within their jurisdiction, regardless of whether an entity is exempt under the national ENDA legislation.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for his question. He is correct, nothing in this amendment would modify the nondiscrimination provision that was included in the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. What this amendment does is say that you cannot retaliate against an organization for discrimination in its hiring, firing, compensation, or other terms or conditions of employment if you are an organization that qualifies for the exemption under section 702(a) of title VII of the Civil Rights Act. ENDA's religious exemption does not create new grounds for liability or penalty.

DRUG QUALITY AND SECURITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate resumes consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 3204.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. That was an extremely complicated parliamentary request. Perhaps it would be helpful to my colleagues if I gave a little bit of explanation of what occurred.

The good news, in my judgment, is that the Senate has adopted by voice vote an amendment proposed by Senators PORTMAN, AYOTTE, HELLER, HATCH, and MCCAIN. I very much appre-

ciate their willingness to work with the cosponsors and sponsors of this legislation.

Many of the sponsors of this amendment are tied up in hearings, but I expect them to be coming to the floor very shortly to debate this amendment after the fact.

I wish to explain about what the Portman, Ayotte, Heller, Hatch, and McCain amendment does. The underlying bill, ENDA, includes a pretty broad exemption for religious organizations based on current law in title VII. What the Portman, et al., amendment does is it ensures that Federal, State and local government agencies will not be able to discriminate against these exempt organizations. For example, the amendment would ensure that exempt religious organizations cannot be denied grants or contracts for which they would otherwise qualify from government agencies. It also protects them from discrimination by government agencies from participating in government-sponsored activities.

I believe this amendment improves the bill. It ensures these organizations—these religious-based organizations that are exempt under ENDA—cannot be suddenly penalized for having that exemption by being denied grants, contracts, other licenses, fees, or whatever, that they would otherwise be entitled to just solely based on the fact they are exempt under ENDA.

I want to commend Senator PORTMAN, Senator AYOTTE, Senator HELLER, Senator HATCH, and Senator MCCAIN for making sure these important protections are in place, and that if an organization has a legitimate exemption under this bill, the Federal Government or State government cannot discriminate against that organization that is legitimately claiming an exemption under ENDA.

I believe this amendment improves the bill and provides a significant protection for exempt religious organizations, and I am very pleased it was accepted by a voice vote.

I know Senator PORTMAN and Senator AYOTTE are on their way and want to speak on the amendment we just adopted.

Let me explain the second part of the very complicated parliamentary action we just took. At least I will attempt to.

What we have done is to preserve Senator TOOMEY's right to get a vote on his amendment. It is my understanding that vote will require 60 votes of the Senate in order to be approved, but it essentially guarantees he is next up. He is next in line for a vote. So his amendment will be the pending amendment.

Again, I know this was a complicated process, and I want to thank the Chair who was presiding over the Senate, as well as the floor staff on both sides of the aisle, Senator REID's staff and Senator MCCONNELL's staff, in making sure

we protected everybody's rights in this debate. I think that is very important when we are talking about a bill as significant as ENDA.

Madam President, as I said, I know some of the sponsors are on their way. But since they have yet to reach the floor, rather than filibuster the successful conclusion of the Portman amendment, I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, first of all, I want to thank my colleagues, and I will start by thanking my colleague, the senior Senator from Maine, Senator SUSAN COLLINS, for the important work she has been doing on the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. I also want to thank my colleagues for supporting an amendment that was brought forward recently and passed by this body, the Portman-Ayotte-Heller-Hatch-McCain amendment, to strengthen the protections within the Employment Non-Discrimination Act for religious institutions.

I firmly believe people should be judged based upon the quality of their work. Discrimination has no place in the workplace. In my home State of New Hampshire, we have a long bipartisan tradition of working to advance commonsense policies, and New Hampshire already has in place a State law preventing discrimination based on sexual orientation. I appreciate that the Employment Non-Discrimination Act is legislation that is important in terms of who we are, our values, and making sure people are only judged based on the quality of their work in the workplace. I also appreciate the legislation on the floor right now includes important protections for religious institutions.

I have long been a strong supporter of the rights of conscience, of the rights under the First Amendment of the Constitution to religious freedom, and so these protections are very important within this bill. I was pleased to work with Members on both sides of the aisle to strengthen those protections by passing an amendment that will help ensure religious organizations cannot be retaliated against for exercising their religious freedoms.

Specifically, the Portman-Ayotte amendment affirms the critical importance of protecting religious freedom in the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. It ensures that government cannot penalize a religious employer because it qualifies as exempt from nondiscrimination requirements of the

Employment Non-Discrimination Act. The amendment protects religious institutions from adverse actions by the government on the basis of adhering to their religious tenets.

In practical terms, the government may not use activities protected by the religious exemption as a basis to deny a religious employer a government grant or tax-exempt status or any other benefit that may be conferred by the government.

I want to thank my colleagues for passing this amendment which will strengthen the protections for religious institutions within the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, and I thank the Chair for the opportunity to speak today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I again want to commend the Senator from New Hampshire, Senator AYOTTE, for her excellent work on this amendment. As I indicated earlier, I think the Portman-Ayotte amendment, which is cosponsored by several other colleagues as well, provides a very important protection against retaliation for those religious organizations that are legitimately exempted under ENDA.

I also salute them for broadening the purposes section of the bill to recognize not only the need to address a widespread pattern of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, but also they have added a new subsection to recognize that another purpose is to help strengthen civil society and preserve institutional pluralism by providing reasonable accommodations for religious freedom. I think both of those changes strengthen the bill, and I wish to commend the Senator for her leadership on this issue.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I have come to the floor to give my views on the Employment Non-Discrimination Act—better known as ENDA—because this is essentially a bill with a long history. It means a great deal to me personally because of the work I did in the city and county of San Francisco a long time ago.

Actually, nearly 40 years ago, in 1978, I was in my third term as president of the board of supervisors when an ordinance to prohibit discrimination in both housing and employment on the basis of sexual orientation was actually passed by the board. I think it was a vote of 10 to 1. I introduced the legis-

lation in my first few years as president of the board, and it was the first such legislation introduced in a major city anywhere in the United States. It was difficult to pass. There was a long debate. I look back on the press and it was a 2-hour debate, but it did pass back in 1978.

It is true that I at the time had some concerns. So I have watched the legislation implemented over the last four decades. It has protected people's jobs and livelihoods from unfair treatment. It has been good for people and for business. I had some concerns. Would there be a lot of objections?

Actually, in the time I was a supervisor and in the 9 years I was mayor, there were no objections. All of a sudden the city really came to see what equality meant. I knew then, and I know now, this legislation is the right thing to do, and it is not going to result in inappropriate behavior in the workplace or any of the other hobboblins that the legislation's opponents raise.

In 1996, ENDA came to this floor. An up-or-down vote on this bill was negotiated the same day the Defense of Marriage Act—or what we call DOMA—would have such a vote. These votes happened on September 10, 1996. The defense of marriage bill passed. I was one of 14 Senators to oppose it, 85 of my colleagues supported it, and President Clinton signed it into law. As we all know now, what it essentially did was say that any gay couple that was legally married could not access more than 1,100 Federal rights that were accorded to married couples. Now some 14 States have legalized gay marriage, and just recently it looks like Illinois is on its way to doing the same.

ENDA failed by a single vote back then. That was a vote of 49 to 50. Today things are very different, but there is still a long way to go. In an historic decision in June, the Supreme Court struck down the core piece of the Defense of Marriage Act. But DOMA is not yet fully repealed, and repealing it remains necessary. So, in my view, the Defense of Marriage Act must and will be one day repealed once and for all. Although such legislation as ENDA has been adopted in numerous States, there is still no Federal end to discrimination. That means that most gay, lesbian, and transgender individuals are without critical protections against employment discrimination. In fact, most people, over 56 percent of the population, live in the 29 States that have not enacted employment protections for gays and lesbians. Over 66 percent of people live in the 34 States that have not enacted such protections for transgender individuals.

There is no question, discrimination in the workplace against these groups remains a big problem. Let me give just a few examples. There is the case of Mia Macy, a case in which the Justice Department found that Ms. Macy's

transgender status played an impermissible role in the hiring process. She had, for 12 years, been a police detective in Phoenix, AZ. She was a veteran. She applied for an open position in an ATF ballistics lab to do ballistics imagery work that she was certified to do. She was told she could have the position, subject to a background check.

Then Macy revealed her transgender status to the government contractor staffing these positions. Her background check was ordered stopped by ATF soon thereafter. She received an email stating the position was no longer available because of funding cuts, even though there was no evidence that was the case.

It turns out that the number of positions available had hastily been cut from two to one, and the person hired for that one position lacked much of the experience Macy had.

Macy was, according to DOJ's decision, "very likely better qualified" than the individual actually hired for that position. So this is wrong. Ballistics matching can be the difference between a shooter in jail and a shooter, who might kill again, walking the streets of our neighborhoods. The person who was actually hired should be the person who can do the best job, period, regardless of whether the person is gay, straight, or transgender.

Another case involves a police officer from the city of St. Cloud, MN. According to a court opinion, the officer was an "excellent" officer. He was consistently awarded marks as "excellent" or "competent" on his performance reports. The officer got "letters of recognition and commendation for his accomplishments, including his work on the Community Crime Impact Team, his work against drunk driving, his performance in apprehending a sexual assault suspect, and for his work in recovering a stolen vehicle."

Then he came out as gay. After that, according to the officer, he almost immediately "was subject to increased scrutiny, increased disciplinary measures, excessively thorough documentation and surreptitiously recorded interventions" as well as "multiple internal investigations" and removal from assignments.

The Federal court found that "the almost immediate shift" in the treatment of this officer "supports an inference of unlawful discrimination" under the equal protection clause of the Constitution, which applies to State and local agencies. But if a private employer had discriminated like this, there likely would have been no Federal protection.

In a case out of Oregon, an individual who ran a production line for battery separators was subjected to harassment on the job. He was called "Tinker-bell" and "a worthless queer." He was described using other phrases that I simply will not say on the Senate

floor because they are graphic and beyond the pale. I think they would shock many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. This harassment occurred on a daily basis, sometimes in the presence of a supervisor. Then, 2 days after reporting the harassment to human resources, the individual was fired. In this case, the Federal court found the evidence credible enough to warrant a trial under Oregon law.

Sometimes discrimination is not as clear as it is in these cases. I am going to quote from a 93-year-old constituent of mine who called my office urging full support for this bill. This is what he said:

I don't usually take the time to call my Senator but this is important to me. I've lived in San Francisco almost my whole life, and at 93 years old I have seen a lot. Even in a liberal State like California, as a gay man I never felt equal to my colleagues.

This is a quote.

I used to work at a bank, and I kept working until I was 79, to earn my retirement. I was afraid to bring my husband to company parties, and I never wanted to seem too flamboyant to my supervisors. It seems so ridiculous when I think back on it, but people don't understand that this kind of discrimination is subtle.

It broke my heart when I watched the Senate fall one vote shy of passing ENDA back in the nineties. I hope the Senator remembers what it used to be like, and fights to pass ENDA today.

I do remember, and I do know that this bill will help stop discrimination in the workplace. The bill is simple. It says a person cannot be denied employment because of who that person is: Gay, straight or transgender. The bill provides no special privilege—no special privilege. It creates no quota. It creates no exemption from the codes of conduct or anything else. It does not allow inappropriate conduct in the workplace. In fact, the bill is narrower than title VII protections in certain respects. In my view, the bill does provide critical employment protections, and it is long past the time that it be signed into law.

Three years ago we recognized that a person's merit, not sexual orientation, is what matters for service in the military. The point is no different in this bill. If a person wants to be a ballistics expert, a police officer, a firefighter, a bank teller, a lawyer, a factory worker or anything else, the question should simply be, can the person do the job.

People have families, they have spouses, and they have children. They need to put food on the table. They have college expenses for their children, student loans to pay, and unforeseen medical expenses. They may have elderly parents that they care for and who need their assistance. All of this requires a job.

Should a person be denied that basic aspect of life, should a person's spouse or children or parents be hurt, simply because that person is gay or straight

or transgender? For me the answer is simple; it is no.

That person should not engage in any conduct that would be unseemly for one of a heterosexual couple. The conduct rules are also important. If this legislation is enacted, which I hope very much will happen, that will be the law of the land, and it will be long overdue.

I wanted to come to the floor and indicate some of the past and go back to 35 years ago when the first employment bill that would prohibit discrimination of this type was enacted. I am very proud to have introduced it, and to have been a vote for it on the board of supervisors in San Francisco.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I rise today to thank my colleagues for their support earlier today of an amendment that I offered strengthening the protections for religious liberty in the ENDA legislation, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. This amendment was cosponsored by Senators AYOTTE, HELLER, HATCH, and MCCAIN. I thank Senator COLLINS for the key role she played in its passage.

I firmly believe that no one should be subject to unjust discrimination, so I support the basic premise of ENDA, which is that people should be judged by their experience, their qualifications, and their job performance, not by their sexual orientation. The bottom line is people should not be able to be fired just because they are gay.

I believe the legislation currently before this body will help create that level playing field and ensure employment opportunities for all. But it does not mean it is a perfect bill. It should be improved and my amendment seeks to ensure that this legislation, designed to promote tolerance of one kind, doesn't enshrine intolerance of another kind.

Religious liberty is an important part of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act already. The underlying bill includes a significant exemption for religious employers. But we have to be certain that in pursuit of enforcing nondiscrimination, those religious employers are not subject to a different kind of discrimination that would be government retaliation. My amendment seeks to ensure the government cannot penalize a religious employer because it qualifies as exempt from the nondiscrimination requirements of ENDA. It protects a church or religious charity or religious school from adverse action by the government on the basis of adhering to its religious tenets, in a manner that would otherwise be unlawful under ENDA. In practical terms, this means the government cannot use activities protected by ENDA's religious exemption as a basis to deny religious employers government

grants, contracts, their tax-exempt status, or other benefit.

My amendment prohibits the government from punishing a religious institution for adhering to its deeply held beliefs and thereby seeks to keep the State from intervening in matters of faith.

It does something else important too. The underlying bill specifies certain broad purposes related to addressing employment discrimination. My amendment adds to this introductory section an explicit reference to the fundamental right of religious freedom. It establishes as a basic purpose of ENDA that workplace fairness must be balanced against and made consistent with religious liberty. I believe the principles of religious liberty and non-discrimination go hand-in-hand. When we think about nondiscrimination, many of us think about the great civil rights movements of the 20th century, but as we know the fight for tolerance goes back further than that, really to the very foundation of our Republic.

On my mom's side, some of my ancestors were Quakers. They came to this country as so many before them in search of religious freedom. At first that was something hard to find in this country. When they arrived, members of this new sect were often persecuted. Their views and practices were judged to be unorthodox, even strange. Sometimes they were imprisoned. Their books were burned. Some of the colonies did not want them inside their borders.

They knew a little bit about religious freedom, and they certainly knew something about discrimination. It was their experience and the experience of so many other groups of different faiths that made freedom of conscience a cornerstone of our founding documents. The First Amendment begins, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Religious freedom, therefore, is our first freedom and the amendment that protects it is really our first non-discrimination law. Any law we pass which seeks to prevent discrimination will not succeed if it does not at the same time protect religious liberty.

The religious liberty protections in ENDA are not perfect. My amendment makes them better, and that is why I appreciate my colleagues giving this amendment the support it deserves.

I am looking forward to the passage of this legislation with this amendment and, again, I appreciate the work of the Senator from Maine and others.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise to commend the Senator from Ohio for bringing forth this very worthwhile initiative, which the Senate passed without dissent just about an hour or

so ago. His amendment is a very important amendment. What it simply says is that if an organization is exempt from ENDA for religious reasons, then government cannot turn around and somehow retaliate against this employer based on his claiming or her claiming a legitimate religious exemption as provided by ENDA. That means that if the business or organization is entitled to compete for certain grants or contracts from the Federal, State or local government, that there cannot be this subtle discrimination against the employer for claiming the religious exemption, legitimately conferred, upon the business under ENDA.

I think that is really important. We do not want retaliation or discrimination or unfair treatment on either side. I commend Senator PORTMAN for coming forward with this amendment. I believe that it is consistent with the bill and that it strengthens the bill.

I congratulate him for his initiative. It has been a pleasure to work with him, Senator AYOTTE, and other Members of the Senate in support of this initiative.

OBAMACARE

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I rise to talk about the impact ObamaCare is having on the people of my State, the State of New Hampshire. It has been over 1 month since the health care exchanges opened, and in that short time we have already seen so many problems with ObamaCare. Frankly, it is a mess.

The failure of healthcare.gov is a travesty that has revealed deeply troubling incompetence in terms of implementing a Web site that people can use and have access to and is secure and protects their private information. Frankly, we are in a position where the Web site is merely the canary in the coal mine. The flaws in this law are much deeper than the Web site.

Even former supporters of ObamaCare are telling me it is not working. I am hearing from my constituents about this, and frankly I feel very badly for them because so much of what is happening to them is as a result of how the law was drafted years ago.

For example, I heard from Maryanne in Lisbon, NH. She said:

We hope this would be a solution. But instead it will be more of a financial drain.

The American people are the ones who are paying the price right now. They are getting cancellation notices, seeing their premiums go up, and losing their doctors.

Workers are suffering. Many of them have seen their hours cut to 29 hours because of an arbitrary mandate defining full-time workers as those who work 30 hours a week. Others are fearful they will lose their employer-sponsored coverage altogether. Business owners remain reluctant to expand—worried they will trigger the looming penalties from ObamaCare.

Most tragically, we now know that the law was sold to the American people under false pretenses. The President said: "If you like your insurance plan, you will keep it."

In fact, yesterday we checked the Web site and that claim is still on there. I am hearing every day from New Hampshire residents who are telling me they are seeing their health insurance policies canceled. In fact, in the newspaper this morning there was a headline in New Hampshire that announced that about 22,000 individuals will see coverage canceled at the end of the year.

Granite Staters have been writing to me. I wish to share their concerns with the entire country because I know this is not just happening to people in New Hampshire, but these are the real people who are being affected by ObamaCare.

Lynn in Greenland wrote:

The President was wrong. I can't keep my coverage if I like it and I can't keep my preferred hospital and his plans are the ones that are subpar . . . it's bringing me to tears on a daily basis. Please help.

Edward in Marlow is self-employed. I feel so badly when I receive letters such as this. He has a rare disease and a high-deductible plan. He wrote:

I received a notice from Anthem last week that they will be canceling this policy. Is this what President Obama meant when he said no one who currently has their own policy and likes it will lose it. . . . I am devastated that I will now have to go out and secure another policy somewhere which could cost me significantly more.

Jennifer in Canaan wrote:

I received a letter from Anthem Blue Cross stating that my current health insurance plan was being discontinued because it did not conform to the law under the Affordable Care Act. In other words, the plan I was promised I could keep was made illegal by Washington politicians.

Michael in Atkinson said:

Kelly, we have been told this would expand options. The fact is we are now being told what we can and what we cannot do and where we can go. To say that I am upset would not begin to describe how I feel.

Richard in Alton Bay said:

I am a small business owner in New Hampshire and have been with my health insurance provider for over 10 years. I was recently informed that the policy I have had for all of these years (and I like quite a bit) will be canceled due to the provisions in ObamaCare. When I contacted the company, they said they are planning to transition me into a plan that costs more and offers substantially less benefits and protection than my original plan. . . . I am outraged at this.

Jamie in Littleton wrote:

Today we received a letter from Anthem Blue Cross stating my husband's individual health care plan, which he's had for 15 years, will be changing to conform to ACA laws and will no longer be in effect come September 1, 2014.

Louis in Sunapee wrote:

What just happened? I received a cancellation notice from my insurance company . . .

and the coverage I am eligible for is MORE expensive? Help me!

President Obama has made the promise that “if you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor, period.”

For those who are seeing their plans canceled, we know that is simply not the case. There is another issue that New Hampshire is facing, and that is a matter of choice in keeping not only the doctor you want to keep but also going to the hospital you want to go to. In New Hampshire, there is only one insurer who is going to participate on the exchanges at this point, and to keep costs down, the insurer has decided to limit its network, so 10 of our 26 acute care hospitals are not part of the exchange and are excluded.

For example, the capital of New Hampshire is Concord. One of the hospitals that has been excluded is Concord Hospital. I worked in Concord for years. Concord Hospital is going to be excluded. All the people in that area who rely on that hospital and had their children and treatments there will now be excluded if they are on the exchanges. This is a real impact on people's lives, and I feel very badly for my constituents.

A doctor in Peterborough said he was once a supporter of ObamaCare. He described the consequences simply. In a letter to me he said his patients have one of three terrible options now, and that is because the hospital in his area has been excluded from the exchange.

First, they can switch doctors and drive a considerable distance to a hospital that Anthem does include in the exchange; two, they can purchase insurance outside of the exchange at considerably higher rates than they could this year; or, three, they can stick with their current doctor, risk having no insurance and pay the government a penalty for being uninsured.

With the hospital he is associated with excluded from the exchange, he said, it is the “Less Affordable Care Act” for his patients. This doctor gave me a troubling practical effect of what his hospital being left out would mean for his patients.

He used this example:

Consider the pregnant woman who has delivered all of her current children at our hospital. She is now expecting in February. She must now either drive our twisty New England roads, in the dead of Winter, to a hospital 55 minutes from her home to deliver her baby, or pay considerably higher insurance premiums to stay where she is comfortable and safe.

He is one of numerous citizens across New Hampshire who has expressed similar concerns about local hospitals being excluded from the exchange. I wish to share some of the other concerns that have been written from my constituents.

Vicki in Seabrook wrote:

The list of doctors and medical facilities that will take my insurance is limited and

my Massachusetts doctors are not on the list. . . . The one closest to me, Portsmouth Hospital, is not on the list.

Kathleen in New Castle wrote:

The exchange choice will not allow me to use my docs, including primary care who is affiliated with the Portsmouth Hospital. All oncology physicians are located in Boston, not covered.

Margaret in Strafford currently goes to Frisbie Memorial in Rochester, which is not part of the exchange.

She explained the impact in this way:

I would no longer be able to go to Frisbie Memorial Hospital, which is four miles away. I could no longer see the gynecologist whom I trust. I could no longer use the surgeon who saved my life when emergency surgery was required. I could no longer visit the same internist. If I were to develop heart problems, I could no longer go to Portsmouth Regional Hospital.

Gregory in Rochester said his primary care physician is at Frisbie. He said that means he will have to go to another hospital, he said, “I do not know and does not know my health condition.”

Robert in Strafford said he has gone to Frisbie for 40 years. He wrote:

I've had multiple different insurance companies but have always been able to keep the same doctors. Now because of ObamaCare, Frisbie is out of the loop. This is totally unfair to all the people who live in the area. What gives?

Teresa in Peterborough said that none of her current physicians, including her primary care physician and her OB/GYN, are in the exchange. She wrote:

The nearest providers in this network are 45 minutes west, 60 minutes east or 90 minutes north. This will be very costly to me in terms of time taken off to attend appointments at these distant offices/hospitals. And since I am self-employed, a day off to go to the doctor is one day without income.

A single mother also from Peterborough wrote:

If my 17-year-old son does get sick this winter, I will be required to take a minimum of ½ day off to bring my son to Keene or Manchester to find a primary care physician who will accept the insurance through affordable care (not that I can even afford that route).

I am also hearing heart-wrenching stories from New Hampshire citizens about how their premiums are going up. As you know, when this law was being sold, it was sold as premiums going down, but that is not what I am hearing from my constituents.

Christopher in Rindge wrote:

My insurance is going to double on January 1, 2014. Even the options that conform to the health act are double the amount I am paying today. It doesn't make any sense that my insurance would go up by double when this is called “affordable” health care.

Rick in Pembroke wrote:

Last year, the sum total of my family's health care cost \$2,300. . . . I have been looking at health insurance for my family. The lowest insurance will cost \$566.40 per month. The family deductible will be \$11,500. Even if

I spend the same as last year on actual health care, I will have to pay an additional \$6,800. This isn't fair and it isn't affordable. I don't know many people who can budget for an additional \$6,800 a year.

Brendan in Sanbornton said:

I am self-employed and my wife and I pay for our health insurance through Anthem that provides coverage for us and our 15 month old daughter. Presently, we pay about \$580 per month for a major deductible plan with a total family deductible of \$7,500. A couple of weeks ago, we received a letter from Anthem informing us that our “old” policies don't meet the requirements of the new ACA and therefore, we were going to be canceled. When researching new options on Anthem's Web site, we found that our deductible was now going to be \$12,000 per year at an increased cost of about \$150 per month! We feel as though the country has been misled about being able to “keep their current coverage.”

Holly in Charleston wrote me:

I buy an individual policy to cover myself, but my policy went up 25 percent on October 1st and one of the reasons stated in the letter I received from Blue Cross was to cover the implementation of ACA. As a result, I dropped down to a less expensive plan and guess what? I got a letter telling me I was okay until 2014 when that plan will no longer be available because it doesn't comply with the new rules and regs.

I heard from Patty in New Ipswich and she said that after her insurance company told her to find a plan, she signed up for the least expensive bronze plan available. She says:

Still not only will my premium be \$75 a month higher for a total of just under \$600 per month for me, but in addition to that, I have a \$5,400 annual deductible. Also, the prescription plan that Mr. Obama and Mrs. Pelosi mandated also has a \$5,400 deductible, so effectively that is not a prescription plan at all. In fact, this plan is basically a very expensive catastrophic plan and nothing more. It is not affordable and I am disgusted.

Barbara in Merrimack and her husband don't yet qualify for Medicare. Their existing plan is being phased out, so she checked the exchange. She wrote:

The product that was closest to what we currently have is Silver and is just too expensive. The cheapest coverage we could find is in the Bronze category and will cost \$1,228.32 per month and will have a deductible of \$5,950/individual and \$11,900/family. That means that all basic services and medications will be out of pocket. Medications will be covered at 40 percent of the copay. \$1,228.32 equals \$14,739.84 per year and it is more than my mortgage! . . . Unlike the government, I can't raise my debt ceiling.

Anita in Sutton wrote:

What was supposed to help people like my husband and I who are self-employed—and he has a chronic illness—only hurts us. Our premium went up \$2,287.70 per month and this is now with a \$4,000 single/\$8,000 family deductible . . . nothing like a 30 percent increase for one year . . . Having to hoist yourself up each day and go to work and try to carry on is hard enough with this chronic illness, now we have to pick and choose what bills we can afford to pay . . .

Jane in Troy said she tried to enroll her son in the Federal program, and this is what she wrote to me:

The quote was \$600 a month! Do you know of any 20 year old who can afford \$600 a month?

Tim in Merrimack wrote me:

Contrary to the original intent of the Affordable Care Act, individuals who obtain insurance on their own are paying radically escalating costs based on individual coverage for a healthy, non-smoking 51-year old male available for January 1, 2014, on the healthcare exchange in NH, the results are as follows: Premium—25 percent increase from \$4,200 to \$5,300. Deductible—20 percent increase from \$5,000 to \$6,000. 82 percent increase in less than 2 years—\$2,900 in June of 2012 to \$5,300 in January 2014.

Then I heard from Erik in Hancock. He said he has seen a 46-percent premium hike. He wrote to me:

What has been done to our health care system? This is the Unaffordable Care Act.

In some cases, the cost of insurance is rising because plans must include coverage for services that consumers don't want based on their individual situation or don't need based on their individual situation. For example, Jeff in Hudson says that his premiums will go up nearly 40 percent because of ObamaCare. He said:

It seems that some of the cost drivers are for coverages which my wife and I do not need or want, but are required to have due to the law. For instance, we must have maternity coverage even though we do not plan on having more children. (We are in our early 50s.) We must have pediatric dental insurance, even though we have no children under the age of 18.

Doug in Bedford wrote me:

The maternity issue is a trap for seniors.

Carol in Newport wrote:

Can anyone please explain to me why at 60 years of age I need an insurance plan that requires maternity provisions? Can anyone explain to me why I would be required to pay for pediatric standalone dental when I have no children? Since this is mandated by the government, why would I have to pay an insurer fee, exchange fee, and reinsurance fee?

She said the most affordable plan she has seen has been \$504.15 a month—which she can't afford—and a \$6,350 out-of-pocket deductible. Carol asks:

If I cannot afford the premium, how can I afford the deductible?

Others I have heard from are worried that their employers will drop their coverage, finding it cheaper to pay the fine than to provide coverage for their workers.

Benjamin in Greenville wrote:

My portion, currently about \$5,000 a year will jump to \$20,000+ per year to maintain my current coverage. I make "too much" money to be subsidized. Tell me senator, where do I find \$15,000 a year, \$1,250 a month, \$288 a week in my already tight budget?

He wrote me:

No more vacations. No more dance lessons for my kids. No more family date night once a month. No more Christmas presents.

Another theme I have heard in the letters I have received from my constituents is a feeling that those in the middle are being squeezed the most.

Donna in Newport wrote:

My employer is now canceling the company sponsored health plan as of January 2014, which costs me \$2,288 per year. In shopping for a new plan, I am seeing the possibility of a \$22 subsidy to help me with a monthly cost of \$400, an increase in my health care costs I cannot afford. I am the middle class, a tax paying and proud American that did not ask for this Act and now suffering because of it.

Cheryl in Acworth wrote:

Not only do I have to pay twice the premium, but it will be post-tax—a double hit. If I was poor, I would be okay or if I worked for a large employer I would be okay but for those of us trying to make a good living and be responsible productive citizens, we end up carrying this . . . This is not the American dream at all.

Joseph in Salem wrote to me:

On September 30th I received a letter from Anthem informing me that my new payment to keep my current plan which I have had for over 8 years will increase \$212.47 on January 1st. That is a \$2,548.80 increase for 2014. This is what ObamaCare is doing to the middle class.

Roberta in Nashua is like many of my constituents pleading for help. She wrote:

Please hear my plea and see what you can do to allow people like me and my husband to keep our care and not be forced into purchasing exchange insurance which is so costly and will be a financial hardship for us. IT IS NOT AFFORDABLE!

In addition to canceled policies, patients losing their doctors, and higher premiums, I have also heard about another aspect and consequence of ObamaCare from people who are working hard, trying to make ends meet, and those are workers who are seeing their hours cut. Under the law, employers must provide coverage for employees who work 30 hours or more per week. Many of these employers, not surprisingly, have decided to reduce hours rather than comply with this new mandate. So this is what my constituents are writing me about—these hard-working people trying to make a living.

I heard from an EMT from the Monadnock region who wrote to me and said:

My employer notified the 75 of us who work there that effective January 1st, our hours will be cut due to ObamaCare. So our incomes will drop and make it harder for us to buy our own insurance.

An educator from the Upper Valley wrote:

Our school district and surrounding ones are cutting back para-professional jobs to 29 hours. Many of these people were full time. Instead they hired several part-time people to cover the once full-time positions . . . Now they are no longer entitled to any benefits. Many of these individuals have worked 15 or more years with a school district as full-timers.

I have heard from business owners as well. They have told me that the looming mandates in the law are causing them to think about eliminating cov-

erage for their employees even though they don't want to do it. They want to do what is right for their employees.

Steven in Nashua wrote me:

I am a small employer. I would be very tempted to dump my plan for my employees, give them a few extra dollars and just get out of the health care business.

I have also heard time and time again about how looming penalties under ObamaCare are causing businesses to think twice about growing and adding new workers.

I heard from Matt on the seacoast. He wrote to me and said:

On a business level, I don't know if I will expand because I would not be able to pay the penalties or the health insurance for my staff members.

These are just some of the stories I am receiving from New Hampshire about hardships ObamaCare is causing for people who are working hard, who want to make ends meet, who want to keep the health care plans they have now. I feel terribly bad for these people. It breaks my heart.

I have worked hard. I have sponsored many efforts and voted to repeal this law. I have called repeatedly over the last several days for a timeout from ObamaCare. We do need a timeout because of the concerns I just talked about in this Chamber that I am hearing from my constituents and that I know many Members in this Chamber are hearing. We need the President to call a timeout.

I came to the floor several times during the government shutdown and I said it was wrong to shut down the government to try to defund ObamaCare because of the harmful impact of a government shutdown. I even took the step of calling on Members of my own party: Please, do not go forward and shut the government down.

Now it is time for the President to see the impact of this law and understand from someone who in some instances has stood up to her own party on the government shutdown—I am asking the President of the United States to hear from the people of this country who are being impacted negatively by the health care law, and I say: Call a timeout, Mr. President. It is not working. They are having difficulties with the Web site. They are worried that their personal information will not be protected on the Web site.

But, as I talked about today, the problems are much deeper, with people receiving cancellation notices, with people receiving premium hikes they cannot afford, with hours being cut for workers who want to work and make a living in this great country.

I would ask the President to call a timeout, to bring people together. This law was passed out of this Chamber on party lines. I would argue the best way to address health care in this country and to address real concerns I know people had with the status quo as well

is to bring a bipartisan group together because what we are seeing now is not working.

My constituents have also taken the time to point out to me—in addition to the major problems they see with ObamaCare, they have shared a few ideas with me as well about where they think we should go from here instead of ObamaCare. I want to share those ideas as well.

Many of them agree that competition in New Hampshire is effectively nonexistent. Let's face it. We have one insurer on the exchange. One suggestion I saw—and it is one I agree with—is to allow for the purchase of insurance across State lines. Why shouldn't insurance companies have to compete on a national basis?

I also agreed with a constituent who said we need to place our focus where it belongs: crafting legislation that reduces health care costs rather than trying to create an artificial health insurance marketplace.

Another constituent wisely pointed out that there should not be a cookie-cutter set of policies, such as the ones that result in seniors purchasing coverage that includes maternity care. Instead, people should be able to shop for coverage that suits their particular needs, and we should respect that different people have different needs in health care.

There are many other ideas that I know we could work on together. These are just some of the ones my constituents have written to me, and I know they have written me other great ideas as well.

Finally, an overarching theme I have heard is that Americans are tired of being victims of partisan gamesmanship, and I agree with them. We have had too much partisan gamesmanship on so many issues in the Congress. They are tired of the politics. They want us to work together to solve tough problems, and I agree with them.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I renew my call for a timeout on ObamaCare. Let's have both parties come to the table and find health care solutions that work for the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEQUESTRATION

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise today to speak in the midst of our budget conference about a topic that has consumed a lot of time here in this Chamber in the last number of months; that is, the effect of sequestration on

the national economy and in particular the effect that sequestration is having on defense.

This was the subject of my first speech, my maiden speech as a Senator on the 27th of February, talking about the particular effect of defense sequestration, cuts on Virginia and the Nation as a whole. I return to it today not just to be repetitive but because we now finally are at the table in a budget conference, and, as the Presiding Officer knows, I think this conference gives us an excellent opportunity to find a better path forward for the Nation.

Sequestration, which went into effect in early March, has caused major damage to our economy and the capacities of our Defense Department. Our Defense Department is the most capable fighting force the world has ever seen. It is vital to our security, and Virginians and citizens of Wisconsin and every other State understand that.

Sequester was designed to be so painful that it would force Democrats and Republicans to find an alternative. We know that did not happen, so the pain that was never intended to come into effect has been in effect. We have seen the impact it has had on our economy since early March.

Fortunately, while we did not compromise in order to avert sequester, there is still time to compromise. Now when we are doing the hard work of a budget conference for the first time in 5 years, when we are doing the hard work of a budget conference in a divided Congress for the first time since 1986, it is now time to address these damaging cuts.

Let me talk for a second about the effect these cuts have first on Virginia but then on our national defense and preparedness. Our Nation's Defense Department has been strung along prior to sequestration for a number of years, 3 years, with continuing resolutions. That is jargon that we understand here. For regular folks, it is as if you are into the next year in your household and you are told: We cannot make a decision so we will spend this year exactly what we spent last year.

Well, wait a minute. We had a child in college last year who is not in college. Well, still you have got to put money into tuition.

Well, what about a new need we have this year that we did not have last year? Well, you cannot do it. You are limited to only what you did last year.

That is what continuing resolutions for 3 years in a row have done to Defense, with the exception of some anomalies that are passed. It is required for Defense to spend on the same line items and not, for example, invest more in important priorities. The one I always think of is cyber security. If you do continuing resolutions and you just spend what you spent a few years ago, we know we have a big-

ger need for cyber security than we had a few years ago. There are attacks every day. No one thinks the need to be diligent about cyber security is constant. No, we ought to be spending more. Instead, the continuing resolution requires our Defense and other departments to spend at yesterday's line items—or 3-year-ago line items. That does not make much sense.

In hearing after hearing in our Budget Committee, in the Armed Services Committee and others, our Nation's uniformed and civilian military leaders have emphasized the damage sequestration is having on our military. In every meeting with generals, admirals, Pentagon officials, I am struck by their calls to us as Democrats and Republicans, as Senate and House Members, to end this foolish policy. The next hearing we will have tomorrow is in the Armed Services Committee, when we will be hearing again about the effect sequestration is having on military readiness.

In Virginia, to pick one State, my home State has been hit very hard, in fact harder than any other State due to the large Federal workforce and many military bases. When you add to the sequestration and CR the effect of the shutdown we saw in September and October—the first 2 weeks of October—Virginians really feel it.

Today, a total of 177,982 Virginians are employed because of Federal funding either directly with DOD or one of the service branches or through military contracts. For example, the talented men and women at the Newport News shipyard are private contractors, but they manufacture the largest items that are manufactured on planet Earth, nuclear aircraft carriers. They do it to keep American men and women safe. This summer over 70,000 DOD civilians in Virginia were furloughed. Construction training and maintenance on military bases was delayed, which affected private contractors. If sequester continues, as some are saying—some are fatalistic about it: Well, we cannot do anything about it—if sequester continues into 2014, 34 planned ship maintenance availabilities will be canceled in the new year. Each of these maintenance projects is massive and employs so many people. As many as 19 of these are on the east coast—34 is the national figure, 19 of these are on the east coast, including Virginia. This will hurt the ship repair industry in Hampton Roads, and could lead to a loss of about 8,000 jobs nationally in the ship repair industry.

Not only have these cuts flowing from sequestration affected my State's economy, but probably more to the point for all of us in this body, we ought to be concerned because they are affecting our national security and they are degrading the capability of our military to deal with challenges.

I wish I could say that since I was sworn in as a Senator with the Presiding Officer on January 3 the world has become a lot safer and more peaceful and less complicated. But to the contrary. In the 10 months we have been here, sadly, we have seen more instances of danger, more things to be concerned about, more problems we have to deal with. We are not in a static situation. We are shrinking our budget at the same time as the degree of challenges we have around the world is growing more dangerous.

Just this year, the sequestration cuts that went into effect in March have grounded one-third of our U.S. combat aircraft. Think about our Air Force and how important it is in today's defense and planning for warfare. One-third of our combat aircraft are grounded because of sequestration, hampering our ability to respond to global crises and maintain strategic advantages. If sequester goes forward, that one-third will grow. The Air Force will be forced to cut additionally, by as much as 15 percent. That would suggest that nearly 50 percent of America's combat aircraft will be grounded in 2014 due to the sequester. We have to ask ourselves: How can we not have an Air Force ready to respond to crises at a moment's notice?

Moving to the Navy. Our naval capabilities have also been significantly curtailed, reducing our normal levels of three carrier groups and three amphibious groups ready to respond to crisis within 1 week to only one of each. So, again, a two-thirds reduction in the availability of carrier forces or amphibious vehicle forces that can meet that 1-week response time in the event of an emergency.

Again, we have got to have a Navy that is ready to respond when there are crises.

Then moving to the Army. This year, because of the first year of the sequester—and it gets worse—the Army cancelled all—all—combat training center rotations for any nondeploying unit. So if a unit is being deployed, they are being trained, but then other units that do not have a regular assigned deployment stay trained as well to meet an emergency need. If we know we are going to be deploying a unit to Afghanistan to replace another unit that is coming back, then we will train that unit. But you do some training for the units you are not planning to deploy, just so they are ready if the need exists. But we have cancelled all of the training for nondeploying units. General Odierno has said that 85 percent of America's brigade combat teams cannot meet the current training requirements that are set in our defense strategy.

We have asked what that means. When folks come before us, we ask what does it mean, you are not getting the training? Does it mean you will not

go if there is a compelling security need or national emergency?

They say: No, of course we will go. If the Commander in Chief or Congress were to say we have to go, we will go. But what training means is we will go, but we will suffer more casualties. What training does is give us the edge to succeed. The absence of training means—it is almost immoral to think about it—that we have a training standard, but if you put people in harm's way who have not been able to meet that training standard, you almost guarantee that the casualties will be more significant. That is not something any of us can comfortably look in the mirror and tolerate.

So it is not hard to see that what was promised about sequester is, in fact, true. Sequestration is not strategic. It was never designed to be strategic. It was not designed to be the careful cutting of costs that you might do, that you should do, that every organization should do. It is not only not strategic, it is not sustainable in the outyears.

The House Armed Services Committee—Republican House, Republican majority—many Republicans have admitted “that sequestration of discretionary accounts was never intended to be policy.” Our colleagues in the House, in a bipartisan way, have called for a lifting of sequestration, in terms of its effects on defense.

Our Armed Services Committee in the Senate, the SASC, also in the NDAA that we are about to debate on the Senate floor, reached the same conclusion. We were sitting in a markup of the NDAA bill. I noticed at the time as a SASC member there was nothing in the bill about sequestration. All of our hearings, virtually, had touched on sequestration. So I put an amendment on the table, kind of on the fly: Let's just say sequestration is bad and we should get rid of it. We debated it right there as we were marking up the bill. I recall that the vote on the amendment was 23 to 3.

Overwhelmingly in a voice vote, the Armed Services Committee, Democrats and Republicans, were willing to embrace the proposition that sequestration was bad. Actually the language was, not only is it bad for the DOD accounts, it is also bad for the other accounts as well.

That is why I am calling, in connection with our meeting as budget conferees, for a sensible bipartisan approach to limit the negative impacts of sequestration.

General Dempsey was talking to a group of Senators yesterday on the readiness subcommittee. He said: What we need to deal with in sequestration is money, time, and flexibility. The cuts are too steep; they are too frontloaded in terms of the timing; and there is too little flexibility for our military command to be able to use the dollars to do the right thing to keep us safe.

We have to find a way to get out of the sequestration dead end and restore some of the cuts and provide both the timing and flexibility to make the management of them easier. If we reverse sequestration in this budget conference, that will create, by economists' estimates, 900,000 jobs at a time when our economy needs to get stronger and our unemployment rates to be dropped. It will add a whole percentage point to our gross domestic product, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

So now as the budget conference committee is meeting—our next meeting is next week—I felt our opening meeting was a positive one. It was mostly positive because as we went around the table, House Members and Senate, Democrats and Republicans, there was an absence of what I would call the “nonnegotiable” language. I listened carefully. Being new, I do not necessarily know all of the details. But I know when I hear lines in the sand being drawn: We will not do this; we will not do that. When you hear that, you know the negotiations are going to be very difficult.

I applaud the 29 conferees for having that opening meeting and not putting a lot of “not negotiable” language out on the table. When we meet next week, I hope that attitude continues because we need colleagues from both sides of the aisle, in both the House and Senate, to work toward a positive solution in this conference that will do a number of things: Help us grow the economy; help us deal with the debt in a responsible way, not an irresponsible way, but lift the effects of sequestration so that we can be confident we will be safe as a nation.

I pointed out during the budget conference that while the House budget under the leadership of Chairman RYAN and the Senate budget under the leadership of Chairwoman MURRAY are different in a lot of ways, in other ways you can step back from them and say: The differences are not so mammoth that they cannot be resolved. They are the kinds of differences that legislative bodies around the country, State legislators often resolve. The top line difference between the House and Senate budgets for the 2014 year is about 2.5 percent of the Federal budget. You could argue that both of the top line numbers had a little bit of wiggle room in them in negotiation. So the actual difference, I would argue, between the two budgets, top line for 2014, is probably about 1.5 percent.

Given the challenges in the world, given the challenges in our economy, given the American public's desire to see us work together to find a compromise, and the upside we can achieve, if we do, I cannot believe that 1.5-percent difference in the top line is an insuperable obstacle for us. We have hard decisions to make. We need to

make them with the interests of our own constituents but the entire country in mind, in particular, in this world where every day we hear of a new potential challenge that can threaten our security if we do not deal with it in a smart way.

We need to get past the continuing resolutions and the gimmickry and the shutdowns and sequestration, return to orderly budgeting, and do the hard work of finding compromise.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the budget conferees are working to reach agreement on the fiscal 2014 budget, and I compliment Senator MURRAY for the great work she has done. I want to join those who have expressed strong support for their efforts.

We all know what the consequences will be if they do not reach agreement on a budget. We will have draconian cuts to defense acquisitions and readiness, to social safety net programs, to infrastructure, to public schools, and to police. Every Federal program is going to suffer, and every American in my State and in the other 49 States, will feel the impact.

Having been in the Senate a long time, I know that anything that gets done around here happens as a result of compromise. Nobody gets everything he or she wants. When it comes to a budget agreement, it means you have to have additional savings, but you also need increased revenues. There is no other way. You have to do both.

I think back to the time when we not only had balanced budgets, but we also had a surplus; in the last Democratic administration, for example. We did not have these kinds of specialized tax cuts to those in the highest bracket. Ironically, those in the highest bracket made more money during that time because the whole economy was better.

Those who think it can be done by only cutting spending, or by only closing corporate tax loopholes, but not by doing both together, are legislators in name only. That is simply a recipe for continued gridlock and another year of sequestration, which would be a disaster.

It would allow everybody to go off and give rhetoric but not face reality. They could talk about what they want, but never have to vote on anything. The fact is that if you want to do this, you have to cast some tough votes.

The outcome of this budget conference will determine the extent to

which the Congress will play a meaningful role in Federal spending for the rest of this administration, and possibly well beyond.

I would advise my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—I have been here with both Republican and Democratic administrations. If the Congress is going to actually have a voice as an independent third branch of government in how the government is run and what we do, then we have to start facing up and doing real budgets and real appropriations bills; otherwise, just assume there is a top dollar level in there and the administration will do whatever it wants to do, Democratic or Republican. That is not what I believe I was elected to do. As one of 100 Senators, I should have a voice in what comes out of it.

As I said, the outcome of this budget conference will determine the extent to which the Congress can play a meaningful role in Federal spending not only for the rest of this administration but possibly well beyond, but there is no better way to illustrate what is at stake than to use concrete examples. I want to do that by comparing the impact of the fiscal year 2014 House and Senate versions of the bill that funds the Department of State and foreign operations. The choices are stark, and it puts things in perspective.

The House bill provides \$40 billion to fund the Department of State, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and our contributions to the World Bank, U.N. peacekeeping, and countless other organizations and programs that contribute to global security.

In contrast, the Senate bill would provide \$50 billion, 25 percent more than the House bill, for these same agencies and programs. But, lest anyone falsely accuse think the Senate of being big spenders, actually the Senate bill responds to the current budget climate—it is \$500 million below the fiscal year 2013 continuing resolution after sequestration and across-the-board reductions, and includes many budget reductions and savings.

Unlike the House bill, however, we are selective in how we do it. The Senate bill does not make draconian and reckless cuts that would weaken U.S. influence and cede U.S. leadership to our competitors.

Given the situations in Syria, North Africa, and other areas of conflict—areas of conflict that could evolve and engulf the United States at a moment's notice—as well as the unpredictability of natural disasters, funding for international crisis response and humanitarian relief is a matter of life and death for millions of the world's most vulnerable people who look to the wealthiest, most powerful nation on Earth.

The current demand for these programs—and certainly my mail shows they are strongly supported by the

American people—is unprecedented and growing. Yet the House bill cuts these programs \$1.6 billion below the Senate bill, and far below the fiscal year 2013 level.

One of the most troubling cuts in the House bill is for international organizations in which the United States plays a major role in addressing global threats to us and our allies—such as transnational crime, disease epidemics, and climate change—that no country can solve alone. Some of the most feared and most deadly diseases in the world today are not on our shores, but can be on our shores from other parts of the world in a matter of hours.

Aside from a total humanitarian reason, we have a good reason to do something to help combat those diseases. The House would end our support entirely for many of these organizations, create large arrears of money we are obligated by treaty to pay, and erode our influence with other major contributors and shareholders like the Europeans, China, India, and Brazil.

They are saying: OK, we agreed to pay this, but, sorry, we are the United States and we don't have to keep our word. I don't think most Americans want to hear that. Ask any of our international corporations, ask any of our organizations in this country—medical facilities or anything else that has to work around the world—if they really want the United States to give up its influence.

The House bill provides no funding—not one single dollar—for U.S. voluntary contributions to the United Nations Children's Fund, the United Nations Development Program, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, or the Montreal Protocol, which protects the ozone layer. The Senate bill includes \$355 million for this account, which is about the same level as five years ago. I would like more, but I don't want to go to the House level, which is nothing.

So while the House would end our participation in UNICEF and many other U.N. agencies, the Senate bill freezes spending for these organizations at the 2009 level.

The House bill provides \$746 million, which is nearly 50 percent less than the Senate bill, for assessed contributions—these are contributions we are required to pay—to international organizations such as NATO, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, and many others.

What we are saying is that if some disease breaks out in the world and comes across our borders, well, gosh, that would be terrible, but we can't give any money to the World Health Organization to try to stop it. What if there is a question of nuclear proliferation? Sorry, we can't give the money

we are required to give to the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Senate bill is \$72 million below the fiscal year 2009 level, and the House bill is \$783 million below the fiscal year 2009 level.

Does anybody actually believe that the needs of NATO or the International Atomic Energy Agency or the World Health Organization are less today than they were five years ago? All you have to do is watch the news. All you have to do is read some of the reports, some of the intelligence briefs every Senator can read, and you are not going to say: Well, the threat is less today than it was five years ago. You are going to say, as I do, as I read these reports: The threat is a great deal worse than it was five years ago. It defies logic, and it is dangerous. It is dangerous not to be involved in these organizations.

In fact, the House bill provides no funding not one dollar—for most of the international financial institutions, such as the Asian Development Bank, the African Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, or the International Fund for Agricultural Development. This would put us hundreds of millions of dollars in arrears, forfeiting our leadership in those institutions.

So they can say to us: OK, debtor nation—OK, United States—you agreed to these, but you are not paying your bill. We can't trust the United States, so we are not going to let you have any say in this. We are not going to let you have the leadership you have had in these institutions.

In fact, the House bill provides not even one dollar for the key multilateral environmental funds that support clean energy technology and protect forests and water resources, including the Global Environment Facility, the Clean Technology Fund, and the Strategic Climate Fund. It is bad enough that here in the Senate we have frozen these agencies at last year's level, but at least we have some money for them. The House has nothing. They do not provide a single dollar for the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program. The Senate bill provides \$135 million for this program—the same level as last year's continuing resolution—to help the poorest countries prevent chronic malnutrition and famine.

Mr. President, we all ask: Why can't we have countries developed so that they are not open to some of these terrorist organizations or fundamentalist organizations that step in? Well, we have a stake in helping them. It doesn't require much money; a tiny fraction—1 percent of our budget. To just walk away from them makes no sense from our strategic interest, but more than that, what does it say about our moral interest as the wealthiest, most powerful Nation on Earth? We have to speak to what is the moral value of the United States.

Frankly, what they have done in the other body does not speak well to our moral core—not the moral core of the America I know in my State from both Republicans and Democrats alike. We all understand the need for Federal departments and agencies to reduce costs and eliminate waste and find efficiencies. We do this. The Senate bill is \$500 million below the fiscal 2013 continuing resolution. But what we try to do is to say that at least the United States has to keep its word. At least the United States ought to show involvement in parts of the world where it counts.

Unfortunately, the House bill may make great sound bites, nice bumper-sticker politics, but it endangers the United States, endangers our security, and it gives the image that the United States is a country that cannot keep its word. We can't do that. It will end up costing taxpayers more in the long run and cause lasting damage to the country.

Let's move forward, get our budget resolution, and pass our appropriations bills, because right now everybody gets to vote maybe. Nobody has to vote yes or no. I have been here long enough to know that the people of my State expect me to vote yes or no, not maybe.

Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering a motion to proceed to H.R. 3204.

Has the time been divided in any fashion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MANUFACTURING JOBS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about jobs—about manufacturing jobs. As we all know, manufacturing jobs are high-quality jobs. Manufacturing jobs come with higher pay and higher benefits. Manufacturing jobs help create other local service sector jobs, and manufacturing jobs contribute more to the local economy than jobs in any other sector. Beyond that, manufacturers invest the most of any industry sector in research and development, which is critical to America's continued growth and our security as a leading innovation economy.

Last week 21 Senate colleagues and I joined in a new initiative called the Manufacturing Jobs for America to help create good manufacturing jobs here at home today and tomorrow. It

has grown out of 25 Senators who have all contributed different policy ideas. This is not one big megabill with dozens of sponsors, but just one bill. Instead, it is a constellation of 40 different proposals. Some of them have already been introduced as bills, and half of those that have been introduced are bipartisan. These bills illustrate some of our best ideas about how we can work together across the aisle to provide badly needed support for our growing manufacturing sector here in the United States.

There are 4 different areas these 40 different proposals fall into, and I wanted to talk about 1 of them today. Three of them are: How do we open markets abroad? How do we strengthen America's 21st century manufacturing workforce? How do we create a long-term environment for growth through a manufacturing strategy? The fourth is: How do we ensure access to capital?

Of the four I just mentioned, I want to speak about access to capital. As any business owner knows, you cannot ensure the long-term growth and vitality of your business unless you have capital to invest—whether in research and development, new workers, new products, or new equipment to expand into new markets. Access to capital is absolutely essential to manufacturing jobs for America.

The three bills I am going to talk about today, which are part of this constellation of 40 different proposals, would each expand access to capital for manufacturers in different ways.

Let me start with the Startup Innovation Credit Act. This is an existing bipartisan bill I have introduced, along with Senators ENZI, RUBIO, BLUNT, and MORAN, who are all Republicans, and Senators SCHUMER, STABENOW, and KAINE, all, like me, Democrats. Although we represent different parties, come from different parts of the country, and have different backgrounds, we have all come together to strengthen our economy and in particular to support innovation and entrepreneurship.

One way we do that now is to support private sector innovation and manufacturing through the research and development tax credit. The R&D tax credit generates new products and industries, benefiting other sectors. But there is a critical gap in the existing and long-standing R&D tax credit. It is not available to startups because they are not yet profitable. This is a tax credit you can only take if you have a tax liability and are profitable.

We worked together—Senator ENZI and I, and the other cosponsors—to fix this hole with a relatively simple tweak, and that is what the Startup Innovation Credit Act does. It allows companies to claim the R&D tax credit against their employment tax liability rather than in income tax liability—a corporate income tax liability. Supporting small innovative companies in

their critical early stages of research and development could unleash further innovations and unleash greater growth that would spur good job creation for Americans in the long run.

Between 1980 and 2005, all net new jobs created in the United States were created by firms 5 years old or less. In total, that was about 40 million jobs over those 25 years. This credit is specifically designed with those young firms in mind—those early-stage firms that are the font of the greatest source of creativity and jobs. It is limited to those companies that are 5 years old or less, and it is limited to being an offset against their W-2 liability so we can provide some access for early-stage startups to this R&D credit that encourages them to hire more folks and grow more quickly—just a part of Manufacturing Jobs for America.

The second bill I would like to talk about today is the Master Limited Partnership Parity Act. It levels the playing field as far as getting access credit. Instead of giving smaller, early-stage startup companies the same access to capital that larger, more mature firms have, this bill levels the playing field in the energy sector. It levels the playing field, in particular, for clean energy firms.

This is bipartisan as well. I introduced it with Democratic Senator DEBBIE STABENOW as my lead cosponsor and Republican Senators JIM MORAN and LISA MURKOWSKI. I am grateful for their persistent and engaged leadership on this bill. I am thrilled that in the last couple of days Democratic Senator MARY LANDRIEU and Republican Senator SUSAN COLLINS signed on as cosponsors as well.

The MLP Parity Act allows us to have an “all of the above” energy strategy. As I presided in my first 2 years—as I served on the Energy Committee—there are many Senators, Republican and Democrat, who think we should not pick winners and losers in technology and we should be promoting an “all of the above” energy strategy. This bill makes that possible in clean energy financing and in preserving a widely used tool for existing traditional energy financing. Oil and gas will play a significant role in our Nation’s energy picture for the foreseeable future, but right now we don’t have a level playing field between renewables and between oil and gas and pipelines.

For nearly 30 years, traditional non-renewable sources of energy have had access to master limited partnerships. MLPs give natural gas, oil, and coal companies access to private capital at a lower cost. That is something that capital-intensive projects, such as pipelines, badly need. I would argue that alternative energy products need that as well; in fact, in some ways more than ever.

Last night I spoke to a group of board members at the National Academies of Science, and what we spoke about was how much technology has developed and sped up in the clean energy space, but how financial innovation has not kept pace. This has held back renewable energy and investments in energy efficiency even as technology has made energy production and distribution and energy efficiency cheaper to achieve.

Expanding access through this broad bipartisan bill to low-cost, long-term capital would be an important step to letting new energy sources take off and letting them compete on a level playing field with all sources of energy. That is exactly what the MLP Parity Act intends to do.

Last but not least, I was proud to be able to join a number of other Senators in cosponsoring the Small Brew Act. Senators CARDIN and BEGICH, Senators COLLINS and MURKOWSKI, Democrats and Republicans, have worked together to give small brewers a leg up by lowering the excise tax they face on the beer they produce.

Small Brewers, such as Dogfish Head in my home State of Delaware, are big job creators in communities across the country. As Senator CARDIN said on the floor earlier this year, “While some people may think this is a bill about beer, it is really about jobs.” And I would say jobs in manufacturing.

Small and independent brewers today employ more than 100,000 Americans and pay more than \$3 billion in wages and benefits. Sam Calagione, the owner of Dogfish Head Brewery in my home State of Delaware, now employs 180 workers at their facility in Milton. Of course, what they are manufacturing is not a new or innovative or recently invented product. People have been brewing beer for thousands of years. Sam has done a remarkable job of coming up with a very broad range of different brews, and, in fact, of bringing back brews that are centuries or millennia old by recovering recipes for fantastic and tasty beers.

What I am focusing on today is about the expanse. This particular company has invested \$50 million in a state-of-the-art manufacturing facility. When I recently visited, I was struck at how different it is from the beer bottling plant of the past, from what some may have seen on “Laverne and Shirley” or what they would imagine a traditional manufacturing plant to look like.

Those folks who work on the manufacturing line at this particular facility have to be able to use programmable logic controls. They have to be able to do quality control and math, and to communicate as a team. They have to communicate in a way that puts them at the cutting edge of advanced manufacturing. This highlights some of the biggest challenges in manufacturing. It takes a lot of money to

invest in a plant and machinery in order to make them capable of competing as a modern-day plant. It takes access to capital.

We also need to change the public’s perception of what manufacturing is. It is a very different place to work—a manufacturing line—than it was 20 or 50 years ago. They are safe, clean, and well lit. These are decent, high-paying jobs. If we are going to win in the global competition for manufacturing, we need to strengthen the skills and the perceptions of manufacturing across our country.

Each of the three bills I have spoken about today will help create good manufacturing jobs here in America, and I believe are ready for consideration on a bipartisan basis by this Chamber. We need to take action together on a bipartisan basis to get our economy going again.

I will remind everyone: Manufacturing jobs are not just decent jobs, not just good jobs, they are great jobs. They are the jobs of today and tomorrow. They are the jobs that sustain and build the backbone of the American middle class.

We already have all the tools in this country to ensure its growth, but if we work together and put in place stronger and better Federal policies in partnership with the private sector, we can put jets on our manufacturing sector, and it can take off and grow again.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, every so often in between the crises and rancor and partisan fighting, we have an opportunity to make real progress in the Senate. This week we are considering the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. It is a bill that will put in place basic workplace protections for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans.

It has been a big year for equality nationally and in my home State of Delaware. The Delaware General Assembly legalized same-sex marriage in May, giving every Delawarean access to the full rights and responsibilities of marriage, no matter the orientation.

A month later, Delaware’s General Assembly built on its 3-year-old law by protecting LGBT people from workplace discrimination, adding protections for transgender Delawareans as well. These two laws are about dignity, respect, and basic fairness for our neighbors.

Of course, a month later, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down the Defense of Marriage Act, giving all married couples across our country access to the Federal benefits they are due. This has truly been a historic year for civil rights and for our country.

For all of our progress, much remains to be done. In 29 States it is still legal to fire someone just because they are gay, just because they are lesbian, or just because they are bisexual. That means that more than 4 million Americans across those States go to work

day in and day out with no protection against being fired summarily because of who they love. In 33 States, which include 5 million people, it is legal to fire someone because of their gender identity.

I thank my colleague, the Senator from Oregon, for his hard work and leading this fight here on the floor, and the Senator from Iowa for his long advocacy for this bill that should have passed years and years ago.

More than 40 percent of lesbian, gay, and bisexual Americans, and almost 80 percent of transgender Americans, say they have been mistreated in the workplace because of who they are or because of who they love. Clearly there is still work for us to do.

The Employment Non-Discrimination Act would provide basic protections against workplace discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity. It is a bill that is built on our Nation's historic civil rights laws, including the Civil Rights Act and the Americans With Disabilities Act. This is about basic fairness.

The overwhelming majority of Americans—in fact, more than 80 percent—think it is already against the law to fire someone just because they are gay. Most Fortune 500 companies already have policies preventing discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in place.

Some of Delaware's biggest employers and companies, including DuPont, Dow, Bank of America, TD Bank, Christiana Care, and the University of Delaware have led the way with their own policies to protect the rights of LGBT Delawareans and their employees.

There is real momentum behind these protections, and it is time for Congress to pass this law. Protecting Americans from discrimination is part of America's shared values, and it needs to be part of our laws as well.

No one here thinks it is OK to fire someone simply because they are African American or because they are a woman or because they are an older American. It is not OK to fire someone because they are gay or transgender either. Equality is a fundamental part of our shared American values: Do unto others; treat people with the respect and dignity with which you want them to treat you. Majorities in every State support putting these protections in place. Majorities of Democrats and of Republicans and of Independents support putting these protections in place. The majority of small business owners surveyed support putting these protections in place.

Freedom from discrimination is a fundamental American value that we don't just share, we cherish. Why not put these protections in place now, today, to ensure that gay, lesbian, bi-

sexual, and transgender Americans will be able to go to work, to earn a living, to provide for themselves and their families, without the fear of being fired just because of who they are.

The opportunity in front of every one of us is an important one. Leadership on civil rights in this Chamber has traditionally been bipartisan, and this period of partisanship on civil rights is only fairly recent and need not be permanent. In fact, this bill is cosponsored by two of our Republican colleagues, Senator COLLINS of Maine and Senator KIRK of Illinois. When he came to the floor to speak on ENDA earlier this week, Senator KIRK noted the importance of a Senator from his home State of Illinois being in a position of leadership on this civil rights issue. This really is a historic opportunity.

When the Senate votes on final passage on the Employment Non-Discrimination Act tomorrow, I hope we all will take advantage of this historic opportunity.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I so much appreciate the comments of my colleague from Delaware, first speaking to the importance of rebuilding our manufacturing sector, of creating living-wage jobs and how important that is to building the middle class and providing the foundation for families to thrive, and then speaking to the core issue we are debating today, that of ending significant discrimination against millions of American citizens. His words were well spoken, I say to the Senator from Delaware, and I thank him for his advocacy that will make this Nation work better for so many of our fellow citizens.

This issue of freedom from discrimination is a core issue of freedom. It is a core issue of liberty. It goes right to the heart of the founding of this country. Our Founders were often chafing under the heavy hand from the land they came from across the ocean, and they wanted to be able to forge their own world where they would be able to participate fully in society. So liberty and freedom became right at the heart of our founding documents.

Our Declaration of Independence says in its second paragraph:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights; that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.

That concept of liberty was echoed when we went to our U.S. Constitution. It started out saying, as Americans are well aware:

We, the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, ensure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

We, the people, sought in that year to establish a more perfect union, and we continue in our pursuit of a more perfect union—one with more complete blessings of liberty.

What, indeed, is liberty? That opportunity to participate fully in our society. This was well captured by President Lyndon Baines Johnson. He was speaking in 1965 to Howard University students at their commencement, and President Johnson said:

Freedom is the right to share fully and equally in American society; to vote, to hold a job, to enter a public place, to go to school.

President Johnson continued:

It is the right to be treated in every part of our national life as a person equal in dignity and promise to all others.

I think President Johnson captured well what freedom and liberty are all about, as have many of our major public citizens over time as they sought to examine this core premise of liberty and freedom and what it meant in this Nation, what it meant to create a more perfect union in this regard.

Eleanor Roosevelt spent a lot of time talking about human rights. She said:

Where, after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home, so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any map of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person, the neighborhood he lives in, the school or college he attends, the factory, farm or office where he works. Such are the places where every man, woman, and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere.

Indeed, today we are very much talking about the factory, farm, and office Eleanor Roosevelt spoke about, where, if rights do not have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere.

It has been long recognized that the opportunity to thrive for the individual is so fundamental to this notion of liberty and freedom, and it is also a powerful force for the good of our Nation as a whole. This is well captured by Theodore Roosevelt. He said:

Practical equality of opportunity for all citizens, when we achieve it, has two great results. First, every man will have a fair chance to make of himself all that in him lies, to reach the highest point to which his capacities, unassisted by special privilege of his own, unhampered by the special privilege of others, can carry him; to get for himself and his family substantially what he has earned.

Theodore Roosevelt continued:

Second, equality of opportunity means that the commonwealth will get from every citizen the highest service of which he is capable. No man who carries the burden of the special privileges of another can give to the commonwealth that service to which it is fairly entitled.

Theodore Roosevelt was speaking in the masculine, but he was talking about all citizens—men and women—equality of opportunity for the individual and for the benefit of society.

Senator Ted Kennedy summarized this concept much more succinctly. He

did so on August 5, 2009, when the bill that is before this body was introduced in that year, the 2009 version. He said:

The promise of America will never be fulfilled as long as justice is denied to even one among us.

So, again, the success of the individual in gaining full access to liberty and freedom, full opportunity to participate in society, builds a stronger community, a stronger State, and a stronger Nation.

The bill we have before us today is a simple concept: That an individual can pursue that place on the farm or in the factory or in the office without discrimination; that the LGBT citizen has full opportunity to fulfill their potential in the workplace.

Religious groups from across America have weighed in to say how important and valuable that is. Here is a sign-on letter—a letter that is signed by approximately 60 religious groups across America. It is addressed to each of us in this Chamber.

Dear Senator: On behalf of our organizations, representing a diverse group of faith traditions and religious beliefs, we urge you to support the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. As a nation, we cannot tolerate arbitrary discrimination against millions of Americans just because of who they are. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people should be able to earn a living, provide for their families, and contribute to our society without fear that who they are or who they love could cost them a job. ENDA is a measured, commonsense solution that will ensure workers are judged on their merits, not on their personal characteristics like sexual orientation or gender identity. We call on you to pass this important legislation without delay.

This letter from these roughly 60 religious organizations continues:

Many of our religious texts speak to the important and sacred nature of work . . . and demand in the strongest possible terms the protection of all workers as a matter of justice. Our faith leaders and congregations grapple with the difficulties of lost jobs every day, particularly in these difficult economic times. It is indefensible that, while sharing every American's concerns about the health of our economy, LGBT workers must also fear for their job security for reasons completely unrelated to their job performance.

Our faith traditions, the letter continues, hold different and sometimes evolving beliefs about the nature of human sexuality and marriage as well as gender identity and gender expression, but we can all agree on the fundamental premise that every human being is entitled to be treated with dignity and respect in the workplace. In addition, any claims that ENDA harms religious liberty are misplaced. ENDA broadly exempts from its scope houses of worship as well as religiously affiliated organizations. This exemption—which covers the same religious organizations already exempted from the religious discrimination provisions of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—should ensure that religious freedom concerns don't hinder the passage of this critical legislation.

Then this letter concludes:

We urge Congress to swiftly pass the Employment Non-Discrimination Act so that

lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans have an equal opportunity to earn a living and provide for themselves and their families.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the sign-on list associated with this letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sincerely,

Affirmation—Gay and Lesbian Mormons, African American Ministers in Action, American Conference of Cantors, American Jewish Committee, Anti-Defamation League, The Association of Welcoming & Affirming Baptists, Bend the Arc Jewish Action B'nai B'rith International, Brethren Mennonite Council for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Interests Call To Action, Central Conference of American Rabbis, DignityUSA, Disciples Home Missions, The Episcopal Church, Equally Blessed, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, The Evangelical Network, The Fellowship of Affirming Ministries, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Global Faith & Justice Project, Horizons Foundation.

The Global Justice Institute, Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc., Hindu American Foundation, The Interfaith Alliance, Integrity USA, Islamic Society of North America, Jewish Council for Public Affairs, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish Women International, Keshet, Methodist Federation for Social Action, Metropolitan Community Churches, More Light Presbyterians, Mormons for Equality, Mormons Building Bridges, Muslims for Progressive Values, Nehirim, New Ways Ministry, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Progressive National Baptist Convention.

The Rabbinical Assembly, Reconciling Works, Lutherans for Full Participation, The Reconstructionist Rabbinical Association, Reconstructionist Rabbinical College, Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, Religious Institute, Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund (SALDEF), Sojourners, Soulforce, Tru'ah Union for Reform Judaism, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries, United Church of Christ, Office for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Ministries, United Church of Christ, Wider Church Ministries, United Methodist, General Board of Church and Society, United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism, Women's Alliance for Theology, Ethics and Ritual (WATER), Women of Reform Judaism.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you, Mr. President. This is a list that Americans will well be familiar with, including Methodist groups, Lutheran groups, Jewish groups, and so on and so forth, from the spectrum of Protestant religions, Christian religions, and other religions. It is powerful and helpful that they have written to share their perspectives, and I thank them for doing so.

Business coalitions have also weighed in. I have here a letter from the Business Coalition for Workplace Fairness. Their letter is much shorter. It is signed by approximately 120 companies. I will read it for my colleagues now. It says:

The majority of United States businesses have already started addressing workplace

fairness for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender employees. But we need a federal standard that treats all employees the same way.

The Business Coalition for Workplace Fairness is a group of leading U.S. employers that support the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, a federal bill that would provide the same basic protections that are already afforded to workers across the country.

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender employees are not protected under federal law from being fired, refused work or otherwise discriminated against. ENDA would do just that.

These are companies that include American Eagle Outfitters to Morgan Stanley, Charles Schwab to Nike, General Mills to Xerox, and Hilton Worldwide to Apple, and so on and so forth.

Speaking of Apple, it might be interesting to hear the perspectives of the CEO of Apple, Tim Cook. He wrote an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal, and here is what he had to say. This was published, by the way, on November 3, just a few days ago. He said:

Long before I started work as the CEO of Apple, I became aware of a fundamental truth: People are much more willing to give of themselves when they feel that their selves are being fully recognized and embraced.

At Apple, we try to make sure people understand that they don't have to check their identity at the door. We're committed to creating a safe and welcoming workplace for all employees, regardless of their race, gender, nationality or sexual orientation.

As we see it, embracing people's individuality is a matter of basic human dignity and civil rights.

Tim Cook continues:

It also turns out to be great for the creativity that drives our business. We've found that when people feel valued for who they are, they have the comfort and confidence to do the best work of their lives.

Apple's antidiscrimination policy goes beyond the legal protections U.S. workers currently enjoy under federal law, most notably because we prohibit discrimination against Apple's gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender employees.

A bill now before the U.S. Senate—

Of course, this bill we are currently debating—

would update those employment laws, at long last, to protect workers against discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

We urge Senators to support the Employment Nondiscrimination Act, and we challenge the House of Representatives to bring it to the floor for a vote.

Protections that promote equality and diversity should not be conditional on someone's sexual orientation. For too long, too many people have had to hide that part of their identity in the workplace.

Those who have suffered discrimination have paid the greatest price for this lack of legal protection. But ultimately we all pay a price.

If our coworkers cannot be themselves in the workplace, they certainly cannot be their best selves. When that happens, we undermine people's potential and deny ourselves and our society the full benefits of those individuals' talents.

So long as the law remains silent on the workplace rights of gay and lesbian Americans, we as a nation are effectively consenting to discrimination against them.

Congress should seize the opportunity to strike a blow against such intolerance by approving the Employment Nondiscrimination Act.

Again, that is a letter from Tim Cook, the CEO of Apple, published in the Wall Street Journal.

So we see this long arch in pursuit of a vision of liberty and freedom, from our early settlers of North America, to the Declaration of Independence, to the opening words of our U.S. Constitution, to our leaders through a scope of time who recognized the power of liberty in fulfilling the potential of the individual and the potential of the Nation, to our current religious leaders and our current business leaders. It is time we take another bold stride in this long journey toward freedom and liberty for all Americans. In that regard, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation before us. It will make a difference in millions of lives, and it will make a difference in the strength and character of our Nation.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I spoke at some length on this bill, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, the other day, but as we move to end debate on the bill itself, I want to once again express the critical nature of the bill for ensuring equality in the workplace for all Americans.

I was just on the floor listening to Senator MERKLEY's very poignant remarks, and I want everyone to know that we would not be here at this point in time with this bill before us ready for passage tomorrow were it not for the leadership and the persistence of Senator MERKLEY from Oregon. He has been a champion of this issue since he served in the Oregon Legislature, and when he first came here he became a champion of this bill. He truly picked up the mantle of Senator Ted Kennedy in picking this bill out from sort of the ashes of 1996, the last time—the only time—we ever had a vote.

I say through the Chair to my friend from Oregon, we thank you for your doggedness on this issue and for working across the aisle, on both sides of the aisle, to bring it first to our committee and then getting it through the committee and now on the floor.

Again, I want the record to show that it was Senator MERKLEY who really spearheaded this effort, along with Senator MARK KIRK on the Republican side. The two of them fought very hard to get us to this point and to make sure we were actually debating it. So we are greatly indebted to the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his leadership on this issue.

We had an incredible vote the other night that demonstrated more clearly than anything I can say that the Members of this body believe in the message of equality and fairness that is em-

bodied in this bill. The commitment and good faith with which Members have negotiated and offered amendments has been a tribute to the Senate. What we are seeing here is how the Senate ought to work. This is sort of the Senate at its best. We can do business here and get important work done when we share a commitment to fairness and when we act in a spirit of compromise and good will.

I listened to the Senator from Oregon, who so eloquently pointed out that too many of our citizens are being judged not by what they can contribute to a business or an organization but by who they are or whom they choose to love. Well, the Senate is poised to take an important step toward changing that.

Quite frankly, I say with all candor, I think the American people have gotten way ahead of us on this one. The American people—a great majority—believe in the right of an individual to earn a living free from discrimination and to be judged in the workplace based on their integrity, their ability, and their qualifications. This bill ensures that the same basic employment protections against discrimination that already protect American workers on the basis of race, religion, ethnicity, gender, and disability also apply to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans.

It is rare to have before us a bill with such broad and deep support. ENDA is supported by some 60 faith-based organizations, including congregations and organizations varying from the Presbyterian Church and the Episcopal Church to the Progressive National Baptist Convention, the Union of Reform Judaism, the Union Synagogue of Conservative Judaism, and the Islamic Society of North America.

A poll showed that 76 percent of American Catholics support basic workplace protections for gay and transgender workers, and in the same poll almost 70 percent of evangelical Christians support employment protections for LGBT persons.

Over 100 businesses support the bill, everything from Pfizer, Levi Strauss, to Hershey, Capital One, Alcoa, Marriott Hotels, InterContinental Hotels, Texas Instruments, and on and on.

Seventy-four percent of Fortune 100 companies and nearly 60 percent of Fortune 500 companies already have sexual orientation and gender identity nondiscrimination policies in place.

In the course of our committee hearings on this bill, we heard from executives of Nike and General Mills, who both testified that “ENDA is good for business.” A Nike representative told the committee:

Teams thrive in an open and welcoming work environment, where individuals are bringing their full selves to work.

Since the Senate last considered a version of this bill in 1996, 17 States—

and I am proud to say, including my State of Iowa—have put legislation in place that includes these basic employment protections for LGBT citizens. Those laws have been implemented seamlessly and have not led to any significant increase in litigation. But certainly that is not to say what we are doing here is not necessary. The majority of Americans—56.6 percent—still live in States where it is perfectly legal to fire someone or refuse to hire them because of who they are—a lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender American.

Discrimination in the workplace is real. Forty-two percent of LGBT workers report having experienced some form of discrimination at work. Seven percent reported having lost a job as a result of their sexual orientation. Far too many hard-working Americans continue to be judged not by their ability and their qualifications but by their sexual orientation or gender identity.

I talked the other day about Sam Hall, a West Virginia miner who faced destruction of his property and verbal harassment from his workers because of his identity as a gay person. Sam is one of those millions of Americans who have no legal recourse without the law. I also talked about Kylar Broadus, who faced intense harassment at work as he transitioned from female to male and who has never recovered financially. I talked about Allyson Robinson, who was forced to live in a different State, apart from her family, because she could not find a job as an openly transgender female. This law will make a real difference for these Americans and for millions more like them.

I remember 23 years ago I stood at this podium, at this desk, as the sponsor of the Americans with Disabilities Act, as the chair then of the Subcommittee on Disability Policy. Senator Kennedy was the chair at that time. I talked about the necessity for the Americans with Disabilities Act in terms of a courthouse door.

I pointed out that as of that time, if you were an African American or a woman or let's say you were Jewish and you went down to get a job for which you were fully qualified and the employer said: I'm not hiring Black people; I don't hire Black people; I don't like you; get out of here; I don't hire Jews; get out of here, you could leave there and go right down the street to the courthouse, and the courthouse door was open to you because in 1964 we passed the Civil Rights Act that covered people that way. We said: You have recourse under law for violations of your inherent civil rights based on sex, national origin, religion, race.

But, as of 1990, if you were a person with a disability and you went down to the prospective employer to get a job for which you were fully qualified and

the prospective employer said: Get out of here; I don't hire cripples; get out of here, and you wheeled your wheelchair down the street to the courthouse, the doors were locked. You had no recourse under law for that violation of your civil rights because it was not a civil right. So in 1990 we passed the Americans with Disabilities Act, and now the courthouse door is open. If you are discriminated against because of your disability, you can go down to the courthouse. You have the law on your side.

I stand here today, 23 years later, saying that we have covered civil rights laws in this country for almost everyone—except for those for whom gender identity or sexual orientation is part of who they are. That is true.

As I pointed out, we have reams of records here: people fired because they were gay or lesbian—not because they could not do the job, not because they were not doing their job, they were fired just because of who they were. Guess what. That gay person walked down to that courthouse door. It was locked. It was locked, just as it was for people with disabilities before 1990, just as it was for African Americans before 1964, and for women.

I mean these young people working here, these young women, they do not realize in the lifetime of their parents, at least their grandparents anyway, you could fire someone because she was a woman or not hire someone because she was a woman. Guess what. The courthouse door was locked. You had no recourse.

Some States passed civil rights laws. So we had some States pass civil rights laws. As I said, we have 17 States in America that do have laws on the books that ban discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity. But how about the rest of the States? As I said, over 56 percent of American workers live in States in which there is no protection.

So in the long march of the American experiment, from the time of our founding and the Bill of Rights, from our Declaration of Independence which said “all people are created equal,” step-by-step, step-by-step, sometimes long, painfully—sometimes too long and too painfully—we have expanded this covenant to bring more people into the American family to recognize that people should not be judged on the basis of some externalities such as the color of their skin or their sex or their religion or national origin or disability or whether they are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender.

Everyone should have these civil rights, to be covered by civil rights so they will be judged on their contribution to society, by what they do, not by who they are. That is why this vote is so important. That is why this is a historic step again for the Senate.

You could look back and, yes, there were people who opposed the civil

rights bill in 1964. We had people here that opposed the Americans with Disabilities Act. But look back and see what they did for America. We are a stronger and a better country because of those laws that were passed, much better for everyone—for everyone, for our families, for the elderly, for everyone.

I hope that those who may be thinking: Gee, I do not want to support this; I am not a big fan of gay people or I may have some religious problems on that, we have religious exceptions in here. That is not the issue. The issue is whether that should be an allowable reason to be discriminated against in employment. As I said, we have said before that is not a legitimate reason for race, sex, national origin or disability; why should it be a reason based upon your sexual orientation or gender identity? I hope my fellow Senators will think about what they would have done had they been here to vote on the Civil Rights Act of 1964. What if they had been here just 23 years ago to vote on the Americans with Disabilities Act?

This Employment Non-Discrimination Act takes its place alongside all of those. That is why it is such a historically important vote. The bill's sponsors, Senator JEFF MERKLEY, Senator MARK KIRK, Senator TAMMY BALDWIN, Senator SUSAN COLLINS, have worked long and hard. They have worked closely with us in the committee over the last few days to continue to build support for this bill, to work through proposals to change and improve the bill.

We are finishing the debate tomorrow. We will have the final vote on this bill. Passing it with a resounding majority will send a clear message to the American people and to the House of Representatives that we have waited long enough. Think about this. This bill failed by only one vote in 1996—one vote. So here we are 27 years later. It is time to pass this. It is time now to end workplace discrimination against any member of our American family based on sexual orientation or gender identity.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I mentioned yesterday in my remarks on the floor that the Obama administration has had 3½ years to prepare for the rollout of the President's signature health care law. It has had 3½ years to get the Web site right and ready for its big debut. It has had 3½ years to take all of the necessary safeguards to protect privacy and the integrity of the Internet, particularly the Web site, and make sure it is not ripe for identity theft and other cyber attacks.

It has had 3½ years to get together a proper vetting system for the so-called navigators. But despite all of that, de-

spite all of that time, it is quite apparent that ObamaCare is not yet ready for prime time yet. In fact, it has been a slow-moving train wreck. The President is in Dallas today meeting with a number of the so-called navigators to thank them for their work.

I was able to ask Kathleen Sebelius, Secretary of Health and Human Services, about the navigators this morning. She admitted there is no background check done on the navigators, even though they will collect some of the most sensitive personal information one can have, including things such as your Social Security number, that can be then used to hack into your accounts; your health information, whether it is mental or physical, which is among the most sensitive personal information each of us has.

She admitted that since they do not do any background check, she could not guarantee that a convicted felon could not be a navigator. She said that was possible. I think that is something that grabbed a lot of people's attention because they just naturally assumed that sort of thing has been taken care of in the 3½ years leading up to the rollout of ObamaCare.

We know the more people find out about this law—I liken it to an onion. With each layer of the onion you peel back, it just keeps getting worse and worse and worse. The law is proving to be even more unworkable and even more disruptive than its biggest critics could have even imagined.

But I wanted to focus my remaining moments on the floor on two issues: privacy and security. The ObamaCare Web site went live on October 1. But according to CBS News, a deadline for final security plans was delayed three times this summer. A final top-to-bottom security check was never finished before the launch. That is pretty astonishing, something as big, as widely anticipated, and as long planned for as the rollout of ObamaCare and its Web site, a security check was not even completed before it was rolled out on October 1.

Just think what it means. It means the administration was encouraging Americans to enter sensitive personal information onto the ObamaCare Web site, even though it knew the Web site was not secure. Of course, we know the Web site is not functioning properly now. White House officials continue to refuse to even give Congress the number of people who successfully navigated the ObamaCare Web site and signed up under the exchanges.

You know what that must mean. That must mean the number is embarrassingly small. But they are also scrambling to do damage control. The President is urging people to contact their local ObamaCare navigators to sign up for health insurance and suggesting: Maybe you ought to do it by paper or by telephone.

We found out that the same queue or foulup that makes it impossible to sign up over the Internet is present with paper applications or telephone applications as well. As I said, the President met with some of the ObamaCare navigators in Dallas, TX, today. I trust that the overwhelming number of these navigators are people who can be trusted with some of the most sensitive personal information we Americans have.

But the problem is, we do not know for sure because they have not been vetted. There is not even a criminal background check required. Remember, the navigators are going to be collecting some of the most sensitive personal information you have, including your Social Security number, your protected health information such as your past, present or future physical or mental health.

We passed a law, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, known as HIPAA, to protect this information because we recognized how sensitive it can be. Of course, the navigators are also collecting information about your physical or e-mail address, tax information, because, of course, the Internal Revenue Service is going to be instrumental in the implementation of ObamaCare.

There is no Federal requirement for background checks for individuals serving as navigators. This has to be a glaring oversight, something I would hope even the most ardent advocates for ObamaCare would acknowledge is a big mistake and needs to be fixed. But in the absence of thorough background checks and reliable oversight mechanisms, the navigator program could easily become a magnet for fraud and abuse.

We know what a big problem identity theft is already and how much havoc it can present for people's personal financial affairs and information. We also know how vulnerable things such as Web sites can be to cyber attacks, where people can collect information unbeknownst to the consumer. We have already heard some anecdotal reports about ObamaCare navigators, including a woman who had an outstanding arrest warrant at the time she was hired, along with former members of an organization known as ACORN that has had its own share of problems with corruption and lawbreaking.

As I said a moment ago, those people will be allowed to collect some of the most sensitive personal information that we have as Americans. Thinking of sensitive information, the most important provisions of ObamaCare, including the individual mandates, the employer mandates and the premium subsidies, will be administered by, you guessed it, the Internal Revenue Service, words that strike fear and trepidation in the hearts of many Americans, especially given the scandals the Internal Revenue Service has been em-

broiled in and the bipartisan investigations that are ongoing into the cause and solution to these scandals.

I know I speak for many of my constituents back home in Texas and perhaps many other Americans when I say that the last thing we ought to be doing is giving the IRS additional responsibilities until we have gotten to the bottom of the current scandals we are investigating on a bipartisan basis. We do not need to be giving them vast new powers to intrude into the lives of families and small businesses. As a matter of fact, I have introduced legislation that would prevent the IRS from performing this act. The last thing we want to do when they are having problems, when they are already having problems doing what they should be doing, is to give them more to do without solving the underlying problem.

Unfortunately, our friends across the aisle have blocked that legislation that would ban the IRS from its current role in administering ObamaCare. I would like to remind them that even if we ignore the agency's harassment of conservative organizations and ordinary American citizens engaging in their constitutional right to participate in the political process, we know the IRS has already shown contempt for the law by announcing it will issue ObamaCare's premium subsidies through the Federal exchanges, even though the law makes clear that premium subsidies are not available in the Federal exchange but only through the State exchange.

That is only a minor technical detail to the IRS. They are going to paper that over even though Congress provided to the contrary.

At some point the President needs to concede that the costs of ObamaCare far outweigh its benefits. We can do better. The choice is not between ObamaCare and nothing; the choice is between ObamaCare and consumer-oriented alternatives that will increase competition, lower health care costs, and enable more people to be covered, together with reforms to Medicaid and perhaps even Medicare to make sure people have true access to health care coverage and not only a hollow promise.

At some point even the most ardent advocates for ObamaCare have to concede that it is broken beyond repair. I have to say that time is not on ObamaCare's side because each day brings a new revelation of more and more problems. Even some of our colleagues who voted in a party-line vote for ObamaCare and who voted in a party-line vote against any opportunity to reform ObamaCare are now saying—such as Senator MAX BAUCUS, one of the chief architects—hey, maybe we need to delay the penalties. Senator MARY LANDRIEU has or will introduce a bill saying we ought to enforce in law the President's promise that if you like

what you have, you can keep it, which we now know is not true. Indeed, HHS and the administration knew in 2010 that tens of millions of Americans who liked what they had would not be able to keep their health care plan because of restrictive grandfathering provisions.

When the moment comes that Democrats and Republicans have come together to try to solve this problem—not by shoring up this fatally flawed structure known as ObamaCare which will never work—when they are ready to work with us across the aisle to enact alternative health care reform that reduces costs, expands coverage, and improves equal access to care—I look forward to that debate and that opportunity. I only hope that day arrives sooner rather than later, before ObamaCare wreaks more havoc and causes more uncertainty and hardship on the American consumer.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today in support of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, also known as ENDA.

For my State it has been quite a year for equality. Last November we were the first State in the country to defeat a constitutional amendment banning marriage equality. Up to that point those amendments had passed. Then, just a few months later, earlier this year, Minnesota became the 12th State to allow full marriage equality—the 12th State in the country.

I am proud to represent our State. It has been a true civil rights pioneer. We can go back to the days of Hubert Humphrey, who once stood on this floor, and to his speech to the 1948 Democratic convention where he talked about standing for the people of this country, standing for people with disabilities, standing for the most vulnerable. That is the history of our State.

Before striking down the amendment banning marriage equality, Minnesota was one of the very first States to ban discrimination based on both sexual orientation and gender identity. That happened back in 1993. I would say that 20 years later it is time for the rest of the country to catch up.

That is not to say the country hasn't made great strides towards fairness and equality. I am proud of our progress. Through the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr., Hate Crimes Prevention Act we have made it a Federal crime to assault someone because of their sexual orientation or

gender identity. It wasn't that long ago we were debating the Matthew Shepard bill on this floor. The Presiding Officer had not yet arrived here in the Senate, but I remember we had that debate several times through many years. We came close so many times and finally were able to pass it. That bill was about hate crimes and assault. The fact that we have now reached this level where we are talking about the Employment Non-Discrimination Act is truly a tribute to change in this country—the people of this country pushing for change.

Since the repeal of don't ask, don't tell, our gay and lesbian servicemembers who serve this Nation with honor and distinction can serve openly. That is something else that happened in this Chamber, something else someone predicted would never happen. Just this year, the Supreme Court took a major step towards marriage equality by striking down key parts of the Defense of Marriage Act.

But there is more to be done in our Nation's pursuit of equality. The rest of DOMA needs to be eliminated, and that is why I am a cosponsor of S. 1236, the Respect for Marriage Act. Federal benefits need to be guaranteed for domestic partners of Federal employees in States that haven't yet adopted marriage equality, as my State of Minnesota has, and that is why I am a cosponsor of S. 1529, the Domestic Partnership Benefits and Obligations Act of 2013.

As we discuss policies affecting LGBT Americans, we also need better data. We need to better understand the disparities people experience because of their sexual orientation and gender identity. That is why I am working to strengthen our data collection in these areas. And, of course, we need to pass ENDA—the topic before us today.

The bill before the Senate would be a major step forward for equality. I urge my colleagues to support the Employment Non-Discrimination Act because protections against discrimination in the workplace need to be extended to all Americans, no matter their gender identity or sexual orientation.

Americans have many different views on sexual orientation and gender identity, but I think we can all agree every person deserves to be treated with dignity in the workplace. In 29 States across the country it is still legal to fire someone based on their sexual orientation. In 29 States it is still legal to fire someone because they are gay, and currently there is no Federal law prohibiting this from happening. That is why we need ENDA and why I am a proud cosponsor of this bill.

The Employment Non-Discrimination Act will provide basic and necessary protections against workplace discrimination—protections just like the ones we have had in place in Minnesota since 1993. ENDA will allow all

Americans to earn a living without fear that who they are or whom they love will cost them their job.

The law is not intended to give anyone any special treatment. It simply extends Federal employment discrimination protections such as the ones currently provided based on race or religion, and applies those now to sexual orientation and gender identity.

The American people are coming together behind this measure. More than two-thirds of people in this country, Democrats and Republicans alike, support a Federal law protecting LGBT individuals from discrimination in the workplace. The bill has the support of over 200 civil rights, religious, labor, and women's organizations. It upholds and protects religious liberty by exempting houses of worship and religiously affiliated organizations.

Companies and businesses big and small know that discrimination in the workplace hurts their bottom line. That is why, as the Senate chair of the Joint Economic Committee, I released a fact sheet on the economic consequences of workplace discrimination. It is easy to see why businesses are on the side of equality. A majority of the top 50 Fortune 500 companies say prodiversity policies increase profitability.

We have certainly seen that in Minnesota, where General Mills, a major company, came out this last year as a company—and their CEO—against the constitutional amendment that would have banned marriage equality. The CEO of St. Jude's—St. Jude, the company—did the same. The Carlson company—Radisson Hotels—did the same. You could go through a list of a number of large businesses in our States that say no to discrimination and yes to equality.

Why did they do that? I think many of them felt it was the morally right thing to do. But the other reason they did it is because it was good for business. One poll found that 63 percent of small businesses support greater legal protections for LGBT workers. Workplace discrimination, as we know, diminishes workforce morale, lowers productivity, and increases costs due to employee turnover.

In our State we want to attract the best workers. If you cut off a whole bunch of workers and tell them this isn't really a good place to be because we won't let you get married or we are going to discriminate against you, it ends up hurting that State.

The same is true as we look at the global economy. It is true of the world. We want to be a country that welcomes people of all races to our country. We want to be a country that welcomes people of all religions. We want to be a country that welcomes people of different sexual orientations. That cannot be a barrier to entry in our country.

That is another reason, as we look at why this bill is so important—why it is

important to business, why it is important to our economy—that we need to get this bill passed. When you treat people fairly and you focus on keeping and getting the best people, it is good for the bottom line.

The diverse coalition coming together in support of this bill reminds me of the people who came together in our State to defeat that divisive marriage amendment and to enact marriage equality. By bringing together civil rights organizations, religious groups, businesses, and Americans from across the Nation—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—we sent a clear message: Support fairness, support equality.

I hope my Senate colleagues will join me in supporting this important legislation, just as 61 of us did on the vote on Monday evening.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I want to follow my friend and colleague from Minnesota in explaining why I too support the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, known as ENDA.

As she has very well articulated, the notion that somehow or other discrimination of any kind against anybody should be allowed in our workplaces is something I hope we would be able to, on a bipartisan basis, come together on from all corners of the country and recognize this is not an acceptable direction, this is not a place or a process we should endorse.

As we all know, current law protects against discrimination in the workplace for many classes of individuals. Many of us have been involved in working to refine these laws that protect against discrimination—discrimination that affects employment practice not on the basis of the merit of one's work or qualifications, but solely on the basis of factors unrelated to an individual's work experience, such as race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, age, disability, and sex or gender. We have made sure to put in place these protections against discrimination in the workplace for these classes, these categories of individuals. But we now need to do the same for those in the LGBT community, for whom discrimination on the basis of sex does not apply. ENDA bridges that gap, and it is time that gap was closed. In fact, that separation that has been in place is eliminated here.

Discrimination should never be tolerated in any workplace. It just should not be tolerated in any workplace or,

really, anywhere for that matter. It is just pretty simple—no discrimination. I am a strong believer that individuals should be judged on the merit of their work and not how they look or how they are perceived to be.

Folks sometimes look at Alaska through a different lens. They think you are out of sight, out of mind up north. We have a small population with just a little over 700,000 people, but our communities across the State host a very significant LGBT community. In the three largest cities—Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau—by some estimates we are told we rank in the top half of cities around the country with 50 or more same-sex couples. So in the population centers in Alaska, we have what I would describe for a State with a small population a very significant and important part of our community, because the contributions that come to our community because of those within the LGBT community make us, quite honestly, a better place—a better place to live and work and raise a family. And I believe that strongly.

We have a diverse population. A lot of people don't recognize or think about our ethnic diversity up north. We actually have the most ethnically diverse neighborhood in the United States of America in my hometown of Anchorage, in the neighborhood of Mountain View. In the elementary school where my kids spent their early years, there were over 50 home languages of the students in that neighborhood school. It is a pretty diverse community. It is a very rich community because of our diversity. Part of that diversity comes to us through the LGBT community. And they are white, black, Hispanic, Native, urban, and rural; they are the active military and our veterans' population; they are young and they are old. They are very involved and very engaged in our workforce.

Several weeks ago, the National LGBT Chamber of Commerce hosted their president in Anchorage for their weekly chamber presentation. For our community's chamber, it was an interesting enough speaker that the local newspaper actually did an advanced story about it. There were some who were a little anxious and concerned that perhaps this would bring out some aspects of the community who would say: We don't want to see discrimination end in our workplace; we don't want to be welcoming of our LGBT community. As it turned out, it was exactly the opposite. The reception at the chamber meeting was one of inclusion and one of a desire to truly embrace the economic opportunities that come with a community which embraces all people, all genders, and truly all Americans.

When we were approaching the markup of ENDA in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, there

was considerable outflow of support and communications from constituents all over the State. They shared their stories of employment discrimination for a host of different reasons. They told that they were discriminated against because they were too gay, they were discriminated against because they were too feminine or too masculine for their place of employment, and in terms of the outcry from constituents in saying: Please finally address this, please ensure that in our workplaces there is no discrimination; there is not only a friendly workplace, but a workplace where we are free from any form of retaliation.

Like any proposed legislation that affects employers and employees alike, I believe we have to find appropriate balance. We have to strike that between protecting employees against discrimination in the workplace and making sure that employers are not unduly burdened with compliance costs. I think we recognize that. We have to find this appropriate balance among legal remedies and redress.

I am pleased the Senate has adopted Senator PORTMAN's amendment today, which I have supported, which protects religious employers from retaliation by the government when they adhere to their religious convictions and then also clarifies the importance of protecting religious freedom as part of ENDA. I think that is an improvement to the bill, and I am pleased we have been able to advance that.

I wish to recognize Senator MERKLEY for his leadership on this issue—I think from the very time he came here to the Senate, he has approached me in discussion about advancing the ENDA legislation, ensuring that from the perspective of our workplaces there is full equality, there is no discrimination within the workplace—and Senator KIRK, for his leadership in this initiative as well.

I am also pleased we are going to have an opportunity tomorrow to hopefully advance this bill fully and finally through the floor of the Senate. It is well past time that we, as elected representatives, ensure that our laws protect against discrimination in the workplace for all individuals, and we ensure those same protections for those within the LGBT community. I look forward to the vote tomorrow, and hope there is strong support for ensuring a level of fairness throughout our workplaces in this Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to thank the Senator from Alaska for her powerful endorsement of this bill. She is a member of the HELP Committee. Along with Senators MARK KIRK and ORRIN HATCH, she led the Republican support for this bill when it was being considered by the HELP Committee.

I believe the Senator from Alaska did an extraordinary job of outlining why this bill should pass and why it must pass. It is a matter of fairness, and it is a matter of demonstrating that there is simply no place in the workplace for discrimination.

It is significant that most of our large businesses and many of our smaller ones have voluntarily adopted antidiscrimination policies. They have done so because they want to attract and retain the best and brightest employees they can find. They know that sexual orientation and gender identity are irrelevant to an individual's ability to do a good job. What counts are qualifications, skills, hard work, and job performance. The legislation—which I am very hopeful we will pass tomorrow—will help ensure that is the focus in workplaces throughout America.

As the Senator from Alaska has pointed out, however, we were also very careful to respect religious freedom and liberty in this bill. I agree with her assessment that the amendment offered by Senator PORTMAN and his colleagues helps strengthen that part of the bill by prohibiting any retaliation against religious organizations or employers who legitimately qualify for an exemption under ENDA. We want to make sure those employers receive and are able to compete for Federal grants and contracts just as those employers and businesses which are not exempt under this bill can compete for Federal contracts and grants. So I believe the Portman language does strengthen the bill.

I hope we are on the verge of making history tomorrow by passing this bill with a strong vote. I then hope our colleagues on the House side will follow suit, and that we can see this bill signed into law.

But my purpose in rising once again today is to thank the Senator from Alaska for her strong support, and for making a very powerful argument and for sharing the experiences in her State. I am sure her words help reinforce the support for this highly significant legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I also thank the Senators who are gathered here today for their stalwart support. Senator MERKLEY, whom Senator MURKOWSKI mentioned, from the day he got to the Senate and actually before when he was in Oregon, has been working on this issue; and also Senator COLLINS for working with Senator KIRK and the leadership and the courage she has shown on nearly every issue that has come before this Chamber; and then Senator MURKOWSKI. I love that she can talk about Alaska's sense of independence and their belief that you treat people well and you don't discriminate against them, and the picture of her in her neighborhood with

all the diversity. I think a lot of people in other States don't expect that of Alaska but anyone who has visited there sees it firsthand.

Senator PORTMAN's amendment is a good amendment. The Presiding Officer is the other senator from Ohio. I was going through my Twitter feed while watching the election coverage last night and came across a tweet from Senator PORTMAN's son Will, who is in college. The tweet talked about his dad's vote on ENDA, and it said: Way to go, Dad. So I urge my colleagues or anyone who wants to get a tweet from their own kids or nieces, nephews, or grandkids—who seem to understand a little more quickly than some of our Members here how important it is to treat people fairly—that they too, if they vote with us, can get a tweet from some young person which says: Way to go, Senator.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. I want to take the opportunity to say a word or two while our colleagues from Alaska and Maine are here. These two colleagues, representing the far northwest and far northeast of the United States, have brought so much wisdom and so much determination to this topic of treating all citizens with respect, providing all citizens with a full measure of liberty to be deeply engaged in every aspect of American life. That certainly includes the workplace, and that topic, discrimination in the workplace, is before us today.

Senator COLLINS was the chief Republican sponsor for the first 2 years I was in the Senate. She passed on the baton to Senator KIRK but did not stop championing this bill, and late last night was working and has been holding meetings for the many days and weeks that have led up to this moment—and over the years that have led us to this moment. I say thank you very much to the senior Senator from Maine for her engagement and advocacy of fairness for all Americans.

My colleague from Alaska, it was a pleasure to exchange voice mails as we prepared for the Monday night, knowing that she would not be able to be here for that vote but was sending good wishes. We were uncertain whether we would have 60 votes that night or whether we would have the floor open until midnight or whether we would be voting the next day in order to have

her support be the support that put us over the top. But long before that vote occurred she too was talking to her colleagues, noting that freedom for American citizens means freedom to pursue your mission in life, your meaning in life through your work. Discrimination in the workplace diminishes the individual and diminishes the full potential of our Nation as well.

We are now all hoping that we will be able to have final votes on amendments and votes to close debate and to have a final vote sometime tomorrow. That work is not yet done. The path before us may still have unexpected challenges to be overcome. But as we overcome them and approach that final vote, it will be in large measure because of the terrific work of these two colleagues.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Delaware is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES A. "CHAZZ" SALKIN

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, my wife ran into one of our old colleagues the other day, a guy named Ted Kaufman. He was the interim Senator who succeeded JOE BIDEN and held down that slot for 2 years until Senator CHRIS COONS was elected on his own, not that long ago. One of the things I loved about Ted was, every month he would come to the floor and he would talk about a different Federal employee. Sometimes I heard our colleagues or would hear other people talk about Federal employees or State or local employees as nameless, faceless bureaucrats in a derivative way, uncomplimentary and, I expect, dispiriting.

The folks who serve in the Federal Government or State and local government do so usually not because it pays a lot of money or because they get huge bouquets and a lot of credit but because they want to do something constructive with their lives.

Ted used to do that every month when he would come to the floor. This is like a shout-out to him because I heard about a fellow in Delaware who decided to step down after a great career of public service and I want to take a few minutes, if I could, to talk about him. The person I have in mind today is the fellow who is stepping down as the director of our Delaware Division of Parks and Recreation. His name is Charles A. Salkin. We call him Chazz. He was appointed the director of the division a couple of months before I became Governor. He was appointed on June 1, 1992. He continued to serve with distinction in that capacity, leading the Division of Parks and Recreation for the 8 years I served as Governor, and then he went on to serve for two more Governors after me. He served Republican Governor Mike Castle before me, and a Democratic administration, for a total of four Governors.

That doesn't happen everyday in every State. When you get those kinds

of opportunities it must mean you are pretty good. In his case he was very good.

He is now retiring from the post after more than 35 years of service to the people of our State. For over three decades he has been a tremendous leader and real advocate for the educational, for the mental, for the physical benefits of State parks.

He is also a devoted husband to his wife of 40 years, a woman named Sue, who is very accomplished in her own right. She recently retired as deputy director of the Delaware Division of the Arts. They have a daughter Emily, who I believe is now grown.

It is kind of interesting to see where they pull up their anchors and sail off into the sunrise. But, Chazz and Sue, we thank them for the great service to the people of our State and wish them and Emily well. Their hard work and creativity and dedication will be missed a whole lot. We will remember for many years the tremendous contributions they have made.

Since 1978, Chazz has played an active role in the expansion of Delaware's open space areas and in the development of programs that introduce Delawareans and visitors of all ages to the historical and recreational benefits of our State parks. As he steps down from the position as director of the Delaware Division of Parks and Recreation, we give him our sincere thanks and thank his staff too for their diligent and longstanding efforts to maintain Delaware's reputation as having one of the most dynamic and innovative park systems in the Nation.

Throughout his career, Chazz has been a visionary whose creativity and forward thinking has changed the very nature of our State park system. From the institution of zip lines to kayak rentals, Chazz has done a tremendous job of inspiring the love of nature in just about all Delawareans. He has played an important role in securing Delaware's footprint in the national park system with the recent naming of the First State national monument.

Delaware was the first State to ratify the Constitution. William Penn came to America through Delaware. One of the oldest houses in all of North America is in Lewes, DE, apparently a Dutch settlement some 275 years ago. We were the first State to ratify the Constitution. We have done a lot of "firsts" for a little State.

We do not have a national park. We have been working on it for a number of years with Chazz, and now CHRIS COONS and JOHN CARNEY have taken up the mantle.

We have a First State national monument. We are thankful for that. Thank you, Vice President BIDEN.

We have been knocking on the door for a national park. Chazz and his people have been great laborers with us in that effort.

Chazz's research, his professional leadership, and personal membership in all kinds of organizations such as the National Association of State Park Directors and the National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers, have also supported Delaware's natural resources and emphasized our State parks' value to Delaware's financial success.

In places such as Oregon, Senator MERKLEY, the Presiding Officer from Ohio, Senator COLLINS, who is still on the floor—their States have wonderful national parks. As it turns out, the top destination, tourist destination for people who come to the United States from other countries is our national parks. We don't have one in Delaware. We want one. In the meantime our State parks have sort of filled the gap. We have some State parks of which we are real proud. One of the guys who worked very hard to make them something we can be proud of is Chazz Salkin.

He has undoubtedly left a legacy of achievement, persistence, and passion with the members of the Parks and Recreation team that included hundreds of people over the past 35 years. We in the State of Delaware are truly grateful for everything Chazz has done to protect our State's beauty and history.

On behalf of Senator CHRIS COONS, our colleague here in the Senate, on behalf of JOHN CARNEY, our lone Congressman over in the House, we wholeheartedly thank Chazz for 35 years of service to the State of Delaware. His model leadership and dedication have improved the quality of life for visitors and residents who come to our State from all over the world. We offer our sincere congratulations on a job well done and wish him and Sue and their family many happy and successful years to come.

We struggle at the Federal Government to pay for things. We struggle at the State level to have the revenues to pay for the kinds of services our citizens want. One of the things I especially admired in the work done by Chazz Salkin is a growing reliance, over time, on inviting people—could be young people, could be older people, could be retired, maybe not, could be students, could be senior citizens, but people who would like to volunteer some of their time to help in our national parks. It will be interesting to be able to look at the number of volunteer hours that have been amassed over the years in service to our national parks and compare that on a per-capita-basis to the rest of the country. I think we stack up pretty well.

One of the things we have done in our State, in no small part because of Chazz's leadership, is to invite volunteers to come in to help out, to make our parks better than they ever were before and to benefit from that by feel-

ing they helped us to accomplish something really good for now and for a long time in the future.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. CARPER. I will be happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of my friend from Delaware. He and I have been together for 31 years and I appreciate him. I wanted to make sure Senator COLLINS was on the floor.

Mr. President, I withdraw my motion to proceed to Calendar No. 236, H.R. 3204.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2013—Continued

Mr. REID. I ask the Chair what the pending business is now before the body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. S. 815 is now the pending question.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 815, a bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jeff Merkley, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Udall (NM), Mark Begich, Brian Schatz, Al Franken, Barbara Boxer, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Barbara Mikulski, Kirsten E. Gillibrand.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want the record to reflect also that Senator JEFF MERKLEY is on the floor, who has been instrumental in allowing us to get to the point we are on the bill.

I ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 815

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11:45 a.m. on Thursday, November 7, the motion to recommit and the pending amendments to the underlying bill be withdrawn; that the Reid of Nevada amendment No. 2020 be withdrawn; that no further motions to recommit or points of order be in order and the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the pending Toomey amendment; that the Toomey amend-

ment be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; and upon disposition of the Toomey amendment, the substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to; and the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 815, as amended; that if cloture is invoked, the time until 1:45 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that at 1:45 p.m., all postcloture time be yielded back, the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended; finally, if cloture is not invoked, I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate everyone's cooperation. This is how we should do legislation, work together. This is something we have done together and I appreciate everyone's work. It has not been easy for everyone. Not everybody is satisfied, but a lot of people are satisfied.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent we proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, until 7 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THANKING SENATOR MERKLEY

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Oregon leaves the floor, I wish to thank him for his leadership on this bill. He picked up the mantle from our dear late colleague Senator Ted Kennedy. Senator MERKLEY had worked on this issue in his home State before coming to the Senate, and we have worked very closely together as this bill has been on the floor. He has been very fair and open-minded. Although we were not able to work out agreements on everything, as I would have hoped, I do believe there was a good-faith effort which was evident in the passage of Senator PORTMAN's amendment.

I am very excited that tomorrow we will be reaching final passage, and Senator MERKLEY deserves an enormous amount of credit for his leadership. I wanted to thank him while he was still present on the floor and also tell him how much I appreciated his kind words earlier today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THANKING STAFF

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, tomorrow we will take a vote on Senator TOOMEY's amendment and on cloture and final passage. There may not be time, as we are wrapping up the work on this bill, for me to pay tribute to some very valuable individuals who worked very hard on this bill; that is, the members of the staff on both sides.

I wish to particularly commend three members of my staff—John Kane, Katie Brown, and Betsy McDonnell—who have literally worked night and day to try work out amendments and procedure with a wide variety of staff on both sides of the aisle.

Our staffs are often the unsung heroes of this institution, and in this case I was receiving emails from my staff—for instance last night at 1:46 a.m.—giving me the latest updates. I just wish to publicly thank them, the floor staff on both sides, the HELP Committee staff, and everyone who was involved but particularly the three members of my staff, John, Katie, and Betsy, who have literally devoted countless hours to this bill. I know they will be very happy when we reach final passage tomorrow.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY ACT OF 2013

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, this past Monday I visited a senior center in Youngstown, OH, and met with seniors and others, talking about what they hear as threats to Social Security. They hear some of the wise people in this town, if you will—some of the people on television and the political pundits and the economists and the newspaper editorial boards—saying that we need to restructure entitlements or reform entitlements, and that scares them because they don't get very specific. They often, in those statements about reforming entitlements, don't—the people saying it and the reporters asking the questions don't really

scratch underneath the surface and say: What does that really mean? It usually means cutting Social Security benefits, but more on that in a second.

I spoke with a woman named Gloria, a 70-year-old widow, currently living in subsidized housing. She has lived on Social Security since her husband's death. Her benefits barely cover the costs of housing and groceries, not to mention health care. She told me that without Social Security, she would not know what to do to be able to get along in her life.

We owe it to our children and our grandchildren to deal with this Nation's deficit. That means everything from eliminating farm subsidies—the directed payments we are doing in the farm bill, and Senator THUNE and I wrote the language to do that. It means closing the carried interest loophole for Wall Street hedge fund managers. It means eliminating tax breaks for oil companies and stopping the idiotic—for want of a better term—practice of encouraging and enticing, through the Tax Code, companies to actually invest overseas, so that if you shut down a plant in Steubenville or Toledo and move it to Wuhan or Xi'an, China, you actually can get tax breaks to do that.

I am a grandfather a couple of times and about to be a third time. I guess as we get older, we look at the world, not surprisingly, from a different perspective. I see, because of Social Security and Medicare, that hundreds of thousands, millions of Americans get to spend more time with their children and grandchildren. That is because of Social Security and Medicare. Forty-five years ago, before Medicare, 48 years ago, half of America's seniors did not have health insurance. Today, 99 percent have it. We know that means people live longer, healthier lives. It means not just that they get to see their grandchildren, which is the pleasure and the delight of almost all grandparents, it also means they get to impart their wisdom and knowledge and values to their grandchildren.

Margaret Mead once said wisdom and knowledge are passed from grandparent to grandchild, because there is this sort of natural tension—or there might be—between children and parents, but between grandchildren and grandparents it makes for a richer society. Because of these two Social Security programs, Medicare and Social Security, we are a richer, better country.

Today, 63 million Americans receive Social Security benefits. In my State it is 2 million. Let me give a couple of statistics, because this is really a moral question of what we do with our retirement system. For two-thirds of seniors, Social Security is more than half of their income in my State and in the State of the Senator from New Hampshire, who is sitting here. In the State of the Senator from Connecticut

it is not much different. No State is much different from this. Social Security provides more than half of the income for about two-thirds of seniors. For more than one-third of seniors, Social Security provides essentially 90 percent, or all, of their income. For one-third of seniors, without Social Security, they would have zero or close to zero income.

It lifts 15 million Americans out of poverty. In my home State of Ohio, if Social Security did not exist, almost half of seniors would live in poverty.

Looking forward, improving Social Security's adequacy is the best way to address the retirement crisis. That is why I am working with Senator HARKIN and Senator BEGICH and Senator HIRONO and Senator SCHATZ on the Strengthening Social Security Act.

My colleagues will talk about strengthening Social Security, but what do they mean by that? They usually mean that strengthening Social Security means we make cuts in benefits. Those cuts in benefits can be raising the retirement age, it can be something called the chained CPI, which is cutting the Social Security cost-of-living adjustment. It can mean some kinds of means testing, so people get less, if they are a little wealthier. It can mean a whole host of things, but each of them is a cut to Social Security.

So the debate here seems to be not: How do we make seniors' lives better—when a third of seniors on Social Security get almost all their income from Social Security. And they are not doing that great with Medicare either. With some of the copays and the deductibles and all that, some get some help that way. But the debate should not be all about cutting Social Security—which it really is, this whole strengthening. We have to strengthen Social Security, is the way they talk about it. We have to reform entitlements. We have to worry about the sustainability of Social Security and Medicare, and I do worry about them. But the fix is not to debate cutting these programs and giving these seniors less.

As the Presiding Officer knows, defined pension benefits are less than they used to be. Fewer and fewer people retiring now have defined pension benefits. Unless they have a government job or a good union job, fewer and fewer have retirement benefits. Fewer people are able to save money because we know in the last decade savings rates have gone down because incomes—while the wealthy have done better and better and better, profits have gone up and up and up, productivity in the workforce has gone up and up and up—wages have decoupled with that. They have not kept up. That means people are saving less.

So originally as to Social Security, you would have Social Security, you

would have a pension, and the third of the three-legged stool is you had savings. Well, now the savings and the pension—whether it is a 401(k) or a defined pension—are less than they used to be. So Social Security is more important.

So why are we even discussing the whole idea of cutting Social Security? That is why we need a fairer COLA to start with. The Harkin bill would formalize a Consumer Price Index for the Elderly that calculates the Consumer Price Index, the cost-of-living adjustment, not the way it does now—a 40-year-old in the workplace—it calculates it based on a 70-year-old who is retired. A 40-year-old in the workplace has a very different set of expenses for their standard of living than does a 70-year-old. Obviously, the 40-year-old spends less on health care, on the average, than the 70-year-old, on the average, spends on health care. So we should calculate the cost-of-living adjustment that way.

That is not what so many people in this body want to do. There is just something about a bunch of Members of Congress, who have good salaries, who have good taxpayer-financed health care, making decisions to cut Social Security and cut Medicare.

I will close with this because I know Senator SHAHEEN is scheduled to speak and I will not take much longer.

But I hear these self-appointed budget hawks, most of whom will not be relying—almost none of whom, colleagues here, will be relying—on Social Security to make ends meet in their retirement. I take a back seat to nobody in what we do about budget cuts because I have been involved with a lot of colleagues on both sides of the aisle on how we deal with budget deficits. But when you hear these self-appointed fiscal hawks, these so-called wise men—and they are mostly men—talking about how we need to reform entitlements, scratch a little deeper. Ask them what they mean by that. They will probably say: Well, we can't sustain this. Ask them: Well, what do you mean by that? Then they will probably say: Well, we need structural reform. Ask them: Well, what do you mean by that? Ask them the question—what do they really mean? What is their idea? Their idea, almost always, is either raise the retirement age or cut benefits in some ways, cut the cost-of-living adjustment, something like that.

I will close with this. As to that townhall I was attending in Youngstown, I was there 3 years ago at a townhall, and a woman stood up and said: I have two jobs, both \$9 or \$10 an hour jobs. I have worked all my life this hard. She said: Do you know what. I am 63 years old. I just have to find a way to stay alive until I am 65—just for another year and a half—so I can have health insurance.

Imagine. This is a woman living right on the edge. She will not have much

from Social Security. She has no savings. She just wanted to stay alive until she got health insurance.

That is why it matters so much what we do on social insurance, why it matters that we protect Medicare—really protect Medicare, not protect it by privatizing it. And it really matters why we protect Social Security and not “strengthen” the program by cutting the benefits. That is why our work matters. That is why it is so important we pass the Harkin-Begich-Hirono-Schatz-Brown bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be until 7 p.m. for debate only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENDA

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, almost 50 years ago Congress passed the Civil Rights Act. This landmark legislation prohibited discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, and gender in employment, housing, and public accommodations. Many of us in the Senate remember the passage of that legislation. And many of us, unfortunately, saw firsthand the painful examples of legally sanctioned discrimination that existed before the Civil Rights Act.

I grew up in a State where I went to segregated schools. I can remember the separate drinking fountains and going to the movie theater where if you were an African American you had to sit in the balcony. These practices were wrong, and they ended because of the Civil Rights Act.

Well, this week the Senate has the opportunity to extend our national quest for equal opportunity for all by passing the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. This legislation simply prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, and I give great credit to JEFF MERKLEY for sponsoring this legislation and for pushing for it.

I was proud as Governor of New Hampshire 16 years ago to sign legislation making New Hampshire only the 10th State in the country to include sexual orientation in its antidiscrimination laws. That State legislation went further than the bill before the Senate this week. It not only covered employment, but it covered housing and public accommodations as well. At the time, both the New Hampshire Sen-

ate and House were controlled by Republicans. Yet the bill passed both bodies with large bipartisan majorities because it was not seen then as a partisan issue.

Including sexual orientation in New Hampshire's antidiscrimination laws was just one more step forward in New Hampshire's long history of promoting civil rights. No one in America should be hired or fired because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

I realize, as we all do, that no law can erase prejudice. Prejudice will continue to exist after the Employment Non-Discrimination Act becomes law. But that is not the issue. The issue is whether it is acceptable as a matter of law in the United States to hire or fire someone because of sexual orientation or gender identity.

When we declared our independence from Great Britain back in 1776, our Founders stated:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal. . . .

Of course, I would add women to that. But equality under the law is part of our national creed. We have an opportunity this week to take another step forward in advancing equal opportunity for all. Let's pass the Employment Non-Discrimination Act with a very strong bipartisan majority. I hope we will do that. I hope we will do it this week.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR EVA GALAMBOS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I rise for a moment, the day after elections all over the country, to pay tribute to a great Georgian.

Yesterday, November 5, 2013, the city of Sandy Springs elected a new mayor by the name of Rusty Paul. But Rusty was elected to succeed Eva Galambos, the first and only mayor of Sandy Springs, GA—an outstanding citizen of our State and a real representative of what it is about to be a good citizen of Georgia.

For 30 years she chaired a committee called the Committee for Sandy Springs, from 1975 until 2005. That committee was a committee of community members in an unincorporated area who wanted to have their own city, their own government, and they wanted to privatize government.

They tried for 30 years to get the State legislature—for 20 of those years I was a part of that legislature—to approve a municipal charter for Sandy

Springs. Finally, in 2004, the legislature did. In 2005, it was ratified by the voters of Sandy Springs and the voters of the city of Atlanta, and Sandy Springs became a city.

Because Eva had chaired the committee to make it a city for 30 years, she was selected as its first mayor and served in that capacity for 8 outstanding years. A city that was a typical urban sprawl, suburban sprawl city, she turned into one of the prettiest places in Georgia. She beautified the streets, put in streetscapes, easements for beautification.

Today, we have a beautiful linear park on the most major road that goes through Sandy Springs, on Johnson Ferry Road and Abernathy—a linear park where people are able to enjoy a park and have a buffer from a highway, yet improved traffic flowing through that community.

That was just one of many things she did in innovative ways to make it a better community.

Eva is a great citizen. She has a wonderful husband, three great children, six great grandchildren, but her seventh grandchild is the city of Sandy Springs. She birthed it. She led it. She grew it. At the end of this year she will leave it as its mayor, but she will always be there as its leading citizen.

So I rise today on the floor of the Senate to pay tribute to Eva Galambos for doing the American dream—having a dream, 30 years working to achieve it, and at the end of those 30 years then leading it to become what she always hoped it could be: a great city, the city of Sandy Springs, GA.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for up to 8 minutes, followed by Senator BALDWIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote for ENDA, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. This bill is about basic fairness, and it is really about the Golden Rule—treating others as you would like to be treated. Every single American should have the right to earn a living and provide for his or her family without fearing discrimination in the workplace because of who they are

and whom they love. Americans like Marty Edwards, an assistant vice president of First National Bank of Granbury, Texas, whose story was recently featured in *The Advocate*. Marty was passed over for promotions at work despite a very strong 11-year history at the bank. When he asked for an explanation from his vice president and human resources department, he was told that the workers who had received the promotion were “a better fit for the image we are looking for.” Marty Edwards was hired by the bank right out of college. He formed his professional identity there. He was moving up the ladder until he came out as a gay man. When Edwards asked whether his sexual orientation was the main reason he had been denied promotion, the bank’s executive vice president demanded his resignation. Edwards refused, and then he was fired.

Sadly, Marty Edwards’ story is not unique. Between 15 and 43 percent of LGBT people have experienced discrimination in the workplace or harassment in the workplace as a result of their sexual orientation. Twenty-six percent of transgender people report having been fired from their jobs because of their gender identity, and 90 percent reported experiencing harassment, mistreatment, or discrimination.

Our fellow citizens need ENDA. I was here when ENDA was voted on so many years ago when it was a Ted Kennedy bill. We did not make it then, but I think we are going to make it now because Americans know that ENDA is the right thing to do. As a matter of fact, 80 percent of Americans assume there already is a law prohibiting discrimination against this community. But more than half of Americans still live in States where it is perfectly legal to fire a lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender American just because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. So that is why we need this bill. There are many States where there is no protection. This bill would make sure the protections are nationwide.

Seventy percent of the American public supports ENDA. According to the Washington Post, public support ranges from a high of 81 percent in Massachusetts to a low of 63 percent in Mississippi. So it is clear that the support cuts across party affiliation and generational gaps. Whether they are a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, whether they are a libertarian, whether they are young or old, Americans overwhelming support this bill. The American people are basically giving us a message: This is a no-brainer. We should not have to fight about it. We should just vote for it.

That is why I was so dismayed to read that House Speaker BOEHNER said he would not support ENDA. His reason was that it will increase litigation. Does the Speaker really think that LGBT Americans, who have families to

support and bills to pay, would rather pursue frivolous lawsuits than earn their pay in a workplace free of harassment and discrimination?

Here is what I think is really disingenuous about that. Republicans do not suggest that all the other groups covered by the Civil Rights Act are filing frivolous lawsuits. In other words, all the rest of Americans who are protected because of their religion, because of their color, because of their creed, Speaker BOEHNER says they are not filing frivolous lawsuits and he does not want to repeal the civil rights of those people. Good. Why does he think that the LGBT community is going to file frivolous lawsuits?

I have to say that evidence shows what he is saying is false. The Speaker ignores the fact that the Government Accountability Office issued a recent report showing that in the 22 States that banned sexual orientation discrimination in the workplace, “there were relatively few employment discrimination complaints based on sexual orientation and gender identity filed.” In other words, there is not a problem with frivolous lawsuits being filed by the LGBT community in the States that have protective laws. That is because LGBT Americans are woven into the fabric of our workplaces, our communities, and every other facet of our American life. This bill is about granting them the just and fair protections they deserve so that they can live their lives and contribute to our economy without fear of losing their jobs because of who they are or whom they love. It is the moral thing to do. It makes good business sense. A majority of Fortune 500 companies have sexual orientation and gender identity nondiscrimination policies in place. Recent polling shows that a majority of small businesses do too.

I have to say that in the States where we have these laws, people are happy with it. People are so happy with it that they think the whole country has already passed a law. So how could the Speaker get up and announce that he is opposed to it because there will be the filing of frivolous lawsuits? It is a made-up straw man, if I might say.

The State of California and many of our cities enforce these policies as well. The economy benefits.

Apple CEO Tim Cook wrote in the *Wall Street Journal*:

Those who have suffered discrimination have paid the greatest price for this lack of legal protection. But ultimately we all pay a price. If our coworkers cannot be themselves in the workplace, they certainly cannot be their best selves. When that happens, we undermine people’s potential and deny ourselves and our society the full benefits of those individuals’ talents.

I thank Tim Cook, the CEO of Apple, for those progressive thoughts.

Employers know they will be the most competitive when they hire and

retain the best people, and folks will apply for and strive to keep their jobs if they know a company only considers their qualifications for the job and the result of their hard work—nothing more, nothing less.

I believe my colleagues will do the right thing and pass this bill. I want to say to my colleague JEFF MERKLEY, who is not on the floor right now—he has really pushed hard for this vote. I thank Senator HARRY REID, our leader. There are many other bills that compete for attention. I think it was very important because what could be more important than protecting our people, protecting our sons and daughters, protecting all God's children? That is what ENDA does. So I think we are going to see a very good vote on this bill tomorrow. Really, it ought to pass by 80, 90, 100 votes because it is a very simple idea: Everyone should be treated fairly. Everyone should be treated equally. This Nation is at its best when we do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the Senator from Rhode Island Mr. WHITEHOUSE be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor again to talk about the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, known as ENDA. This is a bipartisan effort to advance uniquely American values: freedom, fairness, and opportunity. It is about freedom—the freedom to realize our founding beliefs that all Americans are created equal under the law. It is about fairness, about whether lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans deserve to be treated just like their families, their friends, their neighbors, and their fellow workers. It is about opportunity, about whether every American gets to dream the same dreams and chase the same ambitions and have the same shot at success.

On Monday this week 61 Senators, including 7 Republicans, voted to support opportunity and fairness. Today we agreed to a Republican amendment that would strengthen the bill. Bipartisan support for the Employment Non-Discrimination Act is growing as we head toward a vote on passage tomorrow. I would urge all of my colleagues to join us and vote for this important legislation.

I have seen firsthand the progress we have made in recognizing that fairness and opportunity are not partisan issues; they are core American values. When I served in the House of Representatives, I worked with Congressman Barney Frank on the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. We had many conversations with Members with varying political, personal, and religious

beliefs. At times it was a difficult debate. There were many disagreements. However, the tone of the debate here on the Senate floor has been remarkably dignified and cordial. This has been true throughout the Senate debate. In fact, I was pleasantly surprised as a member of the HELP Committee that the committee markup of this bill took only a little over 5 minutes. I had been prepared to be in our markup for hours. This dignified tone of today's debate in committee and here on the floor reflects the progress our Nation has made in recognition of fairness and equality.

My home State of Wisconsin was the first State in the Nation to add sexual orientation to its antidiscrimination statute. At the time, back in 1982, only 41 municipalities and 8 counties in the entire United States offered limited protections against discrimination based on sexual orientation. Wisconsin's efforts pass the Nation's first sexual orientation antidiscrimination law was supported by a broad spectrum of supporters and advocates. It was a bipartisan coalition including members of the clergy, various religious denominations, medical groups, professional groups. The measure was signed into law in Wisconsin by a Republican Governor, Lee Sherman Dreyfus, who based his decision to support the measure on the success of municipal ordinances providing similar protections against discrimination.

Since Wisconsin passed its statute back in 1982, 20 States and the District of Columbia, representing nearly 45 percent of the population of the United States of America, have passed similar antidiscrimination measures. Sixteen States and the District of Columbia also protect their citizens on the basis of gender identity.

However, 76 million American workers have to contend with a very ugly reality. It is the reality that in more than two dozen States it is legal to discriminate against LGBT employees. That is simply wrong. This legislation seeks to right that wrong. We do not just want to live in a country where our rights are respected under the law; we want to live in a country where we are respected for who we are, where we enjoy freedom and opportunity because that is who we are as Americans.

The change in law that we work for this week and today can add up to incredible progress in our lifetime. This generation can be the one in which we fulfill the promise of freedom and equality for all, in which America finally becomes a place where everyone's rights are respected at work and every family's love and commitment can be recognized and respected and rewarded under the law.

Finally, I would like to recognize my Senate colleagues, the ones with whom I have worked to advance this bill, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act.

Senator MERKLEY, Senator KIRK, Chairman HARKIN, and Senator COLLINS' tireless efforts have led us this close to the finish line with regard to this bill.

Without naming all of them, I also would like to thank my colleagues who have taken the time to join in our effort to bring cloture and bring this debate before the body, the ones who have taken the time to sit down with me and my colleagues and talk through this issue so that we might answer their questions and move it ahead. It means a great deal. This is an important place we have reached.

As we prepare for the final vote tomorrow, I wish every Senator would stand with us and vote for fairness and opportunity. While we might not meet that high mark, I do hope it is a very strong vote. Passing this bill with a strong majority will show America that the Senate believes in a future that is more equal, not less, for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. While I was awaiting my turn to speak on the floor, I had the opportunity to hear both Senator BOXER and Senator BALDWIN. I commend both of them for very excellent and eloquent remarks and thank Senator BALDWIN for her courage and conviction.

I also know that my dear colleague in the House, Representative DAVID CICILLINE, is watching this vote very carefully. We hope we will make him, Senator BALDWIN, and so many people around this country proud when we take up this vote tomorrow.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I am here today for what is now the 49th straight week in which the Senate has been in session to urge that we wake up to the effects of carbon pollution on the Earth's oceans and climate, that we sweep away the manufactured doubt that so often surrounds this issue and get serious about the threat we face from climate change.

When I come to the floor, I often have a specialized subject. I talk about the oceans and how they are affected by carbon pollution. I talk about the economics around carbon pollution. I talk about the faith community's interest in carbon pollution. Today I want to talk about the role of the media in all of this.

In America, we count on the press to report faithfully and accurately our changing world and to awaken the public to apparent mounting threats. Our Constitution gives the press special vital rights so that they can perform this special vital role. But what happens when the press fails in this role? What happens when the press stops

being independent, when it becomes the bedfellow of special interests? The Latin phrase "Quis custodiet ipsos custodes"—who will watch the watchmen themselves—then becomes the question. The press is supposed to scrutinize all of us. Who watches them when they fail at their independent role?

I wish to speak about a very specific example—the editorial page of one of our Nation's leading publications, the Wall Street Journal. The Wall Street Journal is one of America's great newspapers, and there is probably none better when it comes to news coverage and reporting. It is a paragon in journalism until one turns to the editorial page and then steps into a chasm of polluter sludge when the issue is harmful industrial pollutants. When that is the issue, harmful industrial pollutants, this editorial page will mislead its readers, will deny the scientific consensus, and it will ignore its excellent news pages' actual reporting, all to help the industry, all to help the campaign to manufacture doubt and delay action.

As I said before, there is a denier's playbook around these issues. We have seen the pattern repeat itself in the pages of the Wall Street Journal on acid rain, on the ozone layer, and now, most pronouncedly, on climate change. The pattern is a simple one: No. 1, deny the science; No. 2, question the motives; and No. 3, exaggerate the costs. Call it the polluting industry 1-2-3.

Let's start in the 1970s when scientists first warned that chlorofluorocarbons, or CFCs, which were commonly used as refrigerants and aerosol propellants, could break down the Earth's stratospheric ozone layer, which would increase human exposure to ultraviolet rays and cause cancer. As outlined in a report by Media Matters, this is when the Wall Street Journal's editorial page embarked upon what would become a persistent and familiar pattern.

For more than 25 years, the Wall Street Journal's editorial page doggedly printed editorials devaluing science and attacking any regulation of CFCs.

In January of 1976, an editorial proclaimed the connection between CFCs and ozone depletion "is only a theory and will remain only that until further efforts are made to test its validity in the atmosphere itself."

In May of 1979, an editorial said that scientists "still don't know to what extent, if any, mankind's activities have altered the ozone barrier or whether the possibly harmful effects of these activities aren't offset by natural processes. . . . Thus, it now appears, all the excitement over the threat to the ozone layer was founded on scanty scientific evidence."

In March 1984, we read on the editorial page that concerns about ozone depletion were based on "premature

scientific evidence." Rather, it was written, "new evidence shows that the ozone layer isn't vanishing after all; it may even be increasing."

In March 1989, an editorial called for more research on the "questionable theory that CFCs cause depletion of the ozone layer" and implored scientists to "continue to study the sky until we know enough to make a sound decision regarding the phasing out of our best refrigerants."

Again, deny the science.

Predictably, they also attacked the motives of reformers. A February 1992 editorial stated that "it is simply not clear to us that real science drives policy in this area."

Finally, playbook 3, they have warned that action to slow ozone depletion would be costly.

A March 1984 editorial claimed that banning CFCs would "cost the economy some \$1.52 billion in forgone profits and product-change expenses" as well as 8,700 jobs.

An August 1990 editorial warned that banning CFCs would lead to a "dramatic increase in air-conditioning and refrigeration costs." It added that "the likely substitute for the most popular banned refrigerant costs 30 times as much and will itself be banned by the year 2015. The economy will have to shoulder at least \$10 to \$15 billion a year in added refrigeration costs by the year 2000."

A February 1992 editorial warned that accelerating the phase-out of CFCs "almost surely will translate into big price increases on many consumer products."

Despite the protests of the Wall Street Journal's editorial page, we actually listened in America to the science, and we took action. We protected the ozone layer, we protected the public health, and the economy prospered.

What about all those costs that they claimed? Looking back, we can see that action to slow ozone depletion in fact saved money. According to the EPA's 1999 progress report on the Clean Air Act, "every dollar invested in ozone protection provides \$20 of societal health benefits in the United States"—\$1 spent, \$20 saved. The Journal's response? Silence. They just stopped talking about it.

Next we will go to acid rain. In the late 1970s scientists began reporting that acid rain was falling on most of our Northeastern United States. Guess what. Again, at the Wall Street Journal editorial page, out came the playbook.

First, they questioned the science behind the problem. A May 1980 editorial questioned the link between increased burning of coal and acid rain, concluding that existing "data are not conclusive and more studies are needed."

In September 1982 the editors told us that "scientific study, as opposed to

political rhetoric, points more and more toward the theory that nature, not industry, is the primary source of acid rain." Nature is the primary source of acid rain.

A September 1985 Journal editorial claimed that "the scientific case for acid rain is dying."

In June 1989 the editorial page argued that we needed to wait—it is always needing to wait—for science to understand, for example, to what extent acid rain is manmade before enacting regulations. During that same period the Wall Street Journal's editorial page also smeared the motive, declaring that the effort to address acid rain was driven by politics, not science.

Consistent with No. 2 in the playbook, in July 1987 the editorial page wrote: "As the acid-rain story continues to develop, it's becoming increasingly apparent that politics, not nature, is the primary force driving the theory's biggest boosters."

Wall Street Journal editors also consistently opposed plans to address acid rain because of cost concerns—No. 3 in the playbook.

A June 1982 editorial warned of the "immense cost of controlling sulfur emissions."

A January 1984 editorial claimed a regulatory program for acid rain would cost "upwards of \$100 billion."

These claims were made even as the evidence mounted against their position, even as President Reagan's own scientific panel said that inaction would risk "irreversible damage." Of course, the cost equation of the Wall Street Journal editorial page was always totally one-sided—always the cost to clean up the pollution; never the cost of the harm the pollution caused.

That is the industry playbook, faithfully spouted through the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal—No. 1, deny the science; No. 2, question the motives; and No. 3, exaggerate the costs.

But we made undeniable progress against acid rain despite the efforts of the editorial page. Guess what. The Journal's editorial page suddenly reversed its tune. A July 2001 editorial called the cap-and-trade program for sulfur dioxide "fabulously successful," noting that the program "saves about \$700 million annually compared with the cost of traditional regulation and has been reducing emissions by four million tons annually." On this occasion, when its effort had failed, the Journal changed its tune, but until then it was still the industry playbook—No. 1, deny the science; No. 2, question the motives; and No. 3, exaggerate the costs.

With carbon pollution running up to 400 parts per million for the first time in human history, the Journal is using the same old polluter playbook against climate change. The Journal has persistently published editorials against

taking action to prevent manmade climate change. As usual, they question the science.

In June 1993 the editors wrote that there is “growing evidence that global warming just isn’t happening.”

In September 1999 the page reported that “serious scientists” call global warming “one of the greatest hoaxes of all time.”

In June 2005 the page asserted that the link between fossil fuels and global warming had “become even more doubtful.” This is June 2005, and the Wall Street Journal editorial page is questioning whether there is a link between fossil fuels and global warming.

A December 2011 editorial declared that the global warming debate requires “more definitive evidence.”

As usual—back to the industry playbook—the motives of the scientists were smeared.

A December 2009 editorial claimed that leading climate scientists were suspect because they “have been on the receiving end of climate change-related funding, so all of them must believe in the reality (and catastrophic imminence) of global warming just as a priest must believe in the existence of God.”

As usual, we heard that tackling climate change, tackling carbon pollution, would cost us a lot of money. In August 2009, the editorial page warned “that a high CO₂ tax would reduce world GDP a staggering 12.9 percent in 2100—the equivalent of \$40 trillion a year.”

Just last month, October 2013, the editorial board of the Wall Street Journal warned that in the face of climate change, “interventions make the world poorer than it would otherwise be.”

That same October 2013 editorial actually completed the full polluter playbook trifecta by also decrying the “political actors” seeking to gain economic control and by questioning the science, saying “global surface temperatures have remained essentially flat.”

They covered them all in just the one editorial. If only the editorial page writers at the Wall Street Journal would turn the page to the actual news their own paper reports on climate change.

A March 2013 article reported:

New research suggests average global temperatures were higher in the past decade than over most of the previous 11,300 years, a finding that offers a long-term context for assessing modern-day climate change.

A piece from the Wall Street Journal news in August 2013 revealed:

Average global temperatures in 2012 were roughly in line with those of the past decade or so, but the year still ranked among the 10 warmest on record as melting Arctic ice and warming oceans continued to boost sea levels.

That takes me to a particular fact about what carbon pollution is doing,

and that is our oceans are taking the brunt of the harm from carbon pollution, and it is time to stop looking the other way. But the Wall Street Journal editorial page doesn’t often address the effects of carbon pollution on oceans, perhaps because the changes taking place in our oceans are not a matter where the complexity of computer modeling leaves room for phony doubt to be insinuated.

The oceans’ recent changes from our carbon pollution aren’t projections and they aren’t models, they are measurements—simple, unyielding measurements. We measure sea level rise with a ruler. It is not complicated. We measure ocean temperature with a thermometer. We measure ocean acidification on the pH scale. They do not talk about that much in the Wall Street Journal editorial pages. There is no room for phony doubt. So they look elsewhere.

We have the right to expect independent and honest media to teach the American public about the threats facing our oceans and our environment. What a difference good reporting can make. Exemplary and compelling storytelling can and does influence our national conversation and inspire change. Reporters fail when they give false equivalency to arguments on each side of the political spectrum, even though they are not really equivalent. Editors fail when they look at the science, look at the measurements, look at the real threats posed to our world and then fail to tell us the unvarnished truth.

The story of climate change needs to be told. Our oceans need a voice. It seems the big polluters already have one.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

SEQUESTRATION IMPACT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the impact of sequestration on our national security and the economy.

As a Nation, our military strength is directly supported by our economic strength, and sequestration has done substantial harm to both. This senseless policy has put our military in a very bad position and undermines our national security strategies.

In fiscal year 2013, the Defense Department’s budget was reduced by approximately \$43 billion due to sequestration, or a roughly 8 percent cut to each defense account. These cuts have undermined our military’s readiness and reduced necessary maintenance. They have also undermined long-term investments in modernizing our force.

Our military leadership has been clear about the impact of sequestration at numerous hearings before Congress. All of the services have raised concerns

about the Budget Control Act’s sequestration and the post-sequester budget caps. In particular, we have heard how these cuts undermine their ability to carry out the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance or DSG.

The DSG outlines the strategic priorities of the Department of Defense. The DSG reflects the input of a wide range of military stakeholders. The DSG describes the security challenges we are likely to face as well as the resources needed to meet key mission requirements.

The 2012 DSG sets as a central goal the transition of a U.S. defense enterprise from an emphasis on today’s wars to preparing for future challenges. The cuts due to the Budget Control Act undermine that goal. As a result, the services will have to reduce personnel levels, delay or scrap necessary equipment modernization and acquisition, and reduce training and readiness activities.

In recent testimony before the House of Representatives, Army GEN Ray Odierno noted the Army’s personnel will shrink by 18 percent in the next 7 years. This includes a 26 percent reduction in Active Army personnel, 12 percent reduction in Army National Guard, and a 9 percent reduction in the Army Reserve.

In discussing these reductions, General Odierno said:

In my view, these reductions will put at substantial risk our ability to conduct even one sustained major combat operation.

While I hope we will not have to engage in such an operation in the near future, this reduction in our capacity to do so is very troubling.

In addition, Navy ADM Jonathan Greenert expressed serious concern about cuts to operations and maintenance and investment accounts. These cuts threaten the Navy’s readiness. He explained that the Navy would likely have to cancel necessary maintenance, which reduces the useful life of ships and aircraft. In addition, the Navy’s shipbuilding program could be seriously affected. This means a submarine, a littoral combat ship, and an afloat forward-staging base could be on the chopping block.

Hawaii is home to the Pacific Command. Its responsibility encompasses half the globe. This enormous area of responsibility is home to some of the most dynamic and fastest growing economies in the world. The Asia-Pacific nations are huge markets with growing middle classes of consumers for American goods and services. However, it is also home to some of the most serious security threats we face. It is an area where U.S. economic, strategic, and security interests face many challenges, but also many opportunities.

As part of our Nation’s recognition that we need to engage more in this region, President Obama has committed

to a rebalance of our strategic focus to the Asia-Pacific. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Dempsey, described the Asia-Pacific rebalance by saying:

It's about "Three Mores"—more interest, more engagement, and from the military perspective more quality assets and quality interaction.

For the Asia-Pacific rebalance to provide the long-term benefits to our Nation, we need to be fully committed. This requires the transition, training, and support of U.S. military personnel and assets to the region. However, this important initiative is undermined by the budget cuts our military is facing. We cannot support regional peace and stability with insufficient resources and personnel. Yet this is the reality if we fail to address planned budget cuts.

These are just some examples of how our ability to effectively protect U.S. interests and security are being impacted by the Budget Control Act. We also know that reductions in defense spending impact the Nation's economy. For example, Department of Defense employees across the country, including thousands in Hawaii, have faced furloughs this year. This is a pay cut for many families at a time when they can least afford them.

Some will argue that all we need to do is to give the Department of Defense the authority to transfer funds between accounts. I strongly disagree. Congress can address these cuts to national security while also strengthening our overall economy. How can we do this? By simply eliminating sequester and funding the whole government at the level assumed by the Senate's budget resolution.

Sequestration, like the recent government shutdown, results in self-inflicted wounds to our economy. The shutdown was like a sudden economic heart attack. But sequestration is like death by a thousand cuts to our national defense, our science and research enterprise, and programs which our communities rely upon.

I have spoken a great deal about the impact of sequestration on our military. However, the substantial cuts sustained by our education, research and development, and infrastructure are equally as damaging. These are programs that support an educated and productive workforce, improve the flow of commerce and support those in our communities in the greatest need. Just as a hollowed-out force will struggle to meet mission requirements, a hollowed-out workforce will struggle to compete in the global economy. These two are tightly linked. That is why I urge my colleagues to support eliminating sequestration for both military and nondefense programs.

The Financial Times recently reported that U.S. public investment has dropped to 3.6 percent of GDP. This is well below the 5 percent we have aver-

aged since World War II. These cuts not only undermine our long-term national security strategy but also our long-term competitiveness and economic growth. Without a strong economy, we cannot sustain the investments we need and a strong national defense.

According to Macroeconomic Advisers, spending cuts enacted since 2010 have reduced GDP by 0.7 percentage points. This reduction in our economy has raised unemployment by 0.8 percent, or 1.2 million jobs. The Congressional Budget Office—CBO—recently reported we could give our economy a significant boost by eliminating sequestration. In fact, CBO found that if Congress had enacted legislation last summer to cancel the 2013 and 2014 sequester, the economy would have nearly 1 million more jobs by next year. Our economy would also grow nearly a full percentage point faster.

To put this in perspective, without sequestration, our economy would be nearly back on track to where it was before the great recession.

We all recognize a strong economy is the backbone of our strength as a Nation. In order to get back to full strength, we need to get more people back to work. The more people who are working, the more productive our economy is. This is not rocket science. The more productive our economy, the more opportunity there is for people to achieve the American Dream.

Getting people back to work also means less people have to rely on safety net programs and more tax revenues coming in without raising any tax rates. By reducing spending and increasing revenue this way, we are helping to stabilize our fiscal situation.

A robust economy ensures that our Nation has the capacity to meet our commitments and support our vital priorities. This means we don't have to choose between a strong national defense and investment in education, infrastructure, and innovation. We can, and must, do both.

The place to start is with ending sequestration and revising the Budget Control Act caps. This modest policy change will pay dividends for our economy and, in turn, will strengthen our national security.

I yield the floor.

NSA OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we are at a watershed moment in the history of intelligence oversight, like nothing I have seen since the Church Committee. Some of the recent revelations have led to important national conversations about the scope of our Nation's intelligence gathering powers here at home, and to renewed legislative efforts to recalibrate those authorities and the related oversight regimes. The USA FREEDOM Act that Congressman JIM

SENSENBRENNER and I introduced last week along with more than 100 members of Congress does just that.

It is important, however, to acknowledge that some of the leaks have led to needless risk to our national security and have threatened our relationships with some of our most important international partners.

And all of this leads back to a 29-year-old contractor named Edward Snowden.

Let me make clear once more that I do not condone the way any of these highly classified programs were disclosed. I am deeply concerned about the potential damage to our intelligence gathering capabilities, foreign relationships, and national security.

I am also deeply concerned that one person could wreak this much havoc in such a short period of time. Especially in the wake of the Private Manning leaks, I do not understand how the National Security Agency could have allowed this to happen.

This past weekend, Colbert King wrote in the Washington Post that this damage was, in a sense, self-inflicted. I ask unanimous consent that the King op-ed be printed in the RECORD. As Mr. King put it, "I want to know how Snowden got his hands on so much of the nation's most sensitive intelligence and was able to flee the country, all within three months."

I want to know too. We need to hold people accountable for allowing such a massive leak to occur and we need to change the way we do business to ensure that we prevent this type of breach in the future. In public and in private, I have continued to ask the leaders of the intelligence community to tell me who is being held accountable and what is being done to prevent this from happening again.

Without adequate answers to these questions, the American people are rightly concerned that their private information could be swept up into a massive database, and then compromised. The NSA has acknowledged that it is collecting U.S. phone records on an unprecedented scale, and that it is also collecting massive amounts of Internet content against targets abroad, which also includes some communications of law-abiding Americans. And yet the government asks us to trust that it will keep this information safe, and that we should have faith in its internal policies and procedures.

This plea comes from the same intelligence community that the FISA court found to have made substantial misrepresentations about the scope of its collection; and the same intelligence community that allowed Edward Snowden to steal such vast amounts of information.

And it comes from the same intelligence community whose inspector general just wrote to tell me that he is unable at this time to conduct a

communitywide review of government activities conducted under section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act and section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. I ask unanimous consent that the September 23, 2013, letter from a bipartisan group of Senate Judiciary Committee members to the inspector general of the intelligence community be printed in the RECORD, as well as his November 5, 2013, response.

The intelligence community faces a trust deficit, and I am particularly concerned that the NSA has strayed and overreached beyond its core missions. One important step toward rebuilding that trust would be for the NSA to spend less of its time collecting data on innocent Americans, and more on keeping our Nation's secrets safe and holding its own accountable.

The Senate Judiciary Committee will continue its work on these issues in the next few weeks. On November 13, the Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology, and the Law will hold a hearing on Senator FRANKEN's Surveillance Transparency Act, which I have cosponsored. And on November 20, I have invited back to the committee Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, NSA Director Keith Alexander, and Deputy Attorney General James Cole for another hearing to review the intelligence community's surveillance authorities.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 2, 2013]

LATEST NSA SPYING REVELATIONS DISTRACT
FROM THE REAL ISSUES
(By Colbert I. King)

What's this about governments spying on their closest allies?

We called it "the bubble." It was a 12-by-15-foot acoustic conference room made of clear plastic and aluminum. There were at least five inches of space between the walls of the bubble and the walls of the room in which it was located. The bubble's plastic walls, ceiling and floor allowed visual inspection for electronic listening devices, or "bugs."

As an extra security measure, a noise-generating machine was installed in the outer room to prevent interception of any discussions of classified information within the bubble. The outer room was secured by a combination lock, the code known only to my office.

The first U.S. "bubble" was installed after hidden microphones were found in American diplomatic missions in Moscow, Prague and elsewhere in the 1960s.

Our bubble, within a room on an upper floor of the U. S. Embassy in Bad Godesberg, West Germany, was a countermeasure against possible technical penetration by the Soviet KGB and the East German Stasi. But Eastern Bloc countries weren't the only concern.

Our bubble allowed classified discussions to occur beyond the hearing of our host and ally, the then Federal Republic of Germany, and our friends down the road in the French and British embassies.

That was nearly 50 years ago.

This year, in my current capacity, I was sitting in the office of an ambassador in Washington when a member of his staff alerted him to an important call. There was

a phone on the ambassador's desk. But he left the room to take the call.

It turns out that his prime minister was calling from overseas. The ambassador went to a secure location in the embassy where he could conduct a confidential conversation.

True, he was in the capital city of his nation's closest ally. But the matter to be discussed was for the ears of his countrymen only, U. S. friendship notwithstanding.

Today, as the United States has been doing for decades, close allies in Europe, the Middle East and elsewhere take similar precautions even when their missions are in friendly countries.

Gentlemen may know that it is bad form to read each other's mail or to eavesdrop. But in diplomacy and national security, the desire to know what another country is up to tends to overwhelm any sense of rectitude.

Consequently, the European outrage over snooping among friends may be slightly overdone. That is an entirely separate matter from the National Security Agency's (NSA) vacuum-cleanerlike collection of the communication records and metadata of millions of Americans, including private citizens and, apparently, foreign citizens both here and overseas. The scope of that intelligence-collection program, disputed by Gen. Keith Alexander, the director of the NSA, this week is the cause of uproar around the country and in Congress. There is still much to sort out and probably reform.

The monitoring of foreign leaders' phone calls, however, is closer to the larger deed of spying on allied governments.

Which takes us to an indelicate question: Why is a foreign leader, a repository of a nation's secrets, communicating by text messages and smartphone?

The most junior Foreign Service officer or government civil servant entrusted with sensitive information assumes that e-mails and cellphones are susceptible to eavesdropping. What makes a head of state behave as if he or she is immune from monitoring?

Which brings up another tactless question: Why haven't the security services of those foreign leaders developed countermeasures to prevent successful spying on personal communications?

The danger here isn't simply that the NSA may have overstepped its bounds with respect to U.S. allies. The intelligence services of the foes of Germany, France, Spain, Brazil and the like may have the capacity to listen in on high-level conversations.

The naïveté of outraged foreign leaders and their vulnerability to spying are nearly—but not totally—as surprising as the scale of NSA snooping.

The NSA revelations, meanwhile, should not draw attention away from the revelations' primary source: Edward Joseph Snowden.

How in the world is it possible that a high school dropout with a GED, a community college student who didn't graduate, a failed Army recruit and security guard can catapult himself into a CIA information technology job, an overseas posting and subsequently a \$200,000-a-year job with a company contracted to do NSA work in Hawaii, where he was able to gain access to the crown jewels of America's secrets?

Whistleblower, traitor, patriot: Debate the labels all you want. The government has charged him with espionage. Take it up with Attorney General Eric Holder.

I want to know how Snowden got his hands on so much of the nation's most sensitive intelligence and was able to flee the country, all within three months.

Damage? Done by the U.S. government to itself.

U.S. SENATE,

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,

Washington, DC, September 23, 2013.

Hon. I. CHARLES MCCULLOUGH III,

Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Washington, DC.

DEAR INSPECTOR GENERAL MCCULLOUGH: Recent disclosures about classified government surveillance activities have generated significant public discussion about the breadth of these programs, many of which are conducted pursuant to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), and the need for appropriate oversight and checks and balances.

In particular, concerns have arisen about activities conducted under Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act and Section 702 of FISA, which was enacted as part of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008. Recently declassified documents appear to reveal numerous violations of law and policy in the implementation of these authorities, including what the FISA Court characterized as three "substantial misrepresentation[s]" to the Court. These declassified documents also demonstrate that the implementation of these authorities involves several components of the Intelligence Community (IC), including the National Security Agency, Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Central Intelligence Agency, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, among others.

We urge you to conduct comprehensive reviews of these authorities and provide a full accounting of how these authorities are being implemented across the Intelligence Community. The IC Inspector General was created in 2010 for this very purpose. Comprehensive and independent reviews by your office of the implementation of Sections 215 and 702 will fulfill a critical oversight role. Providing a publicly available summary of the findings and conclusions of these reviews will help promote greater oversight, transparency, and public accountability.

In conducting such reviews, we encourage you to draw on the excellent work already done by the Inspectors General of several agencies, including the Department of Justice, in reviewing these authorities. But only your office can bring to bear an IC-wide perspective that is critical to effective oversight of these programs. The reviews previously conducted have been more narrowly focused—as might be expected—on a specific agency.

In particular, we urge you to review for calendar years 2010 through 2013:

- The use and implementation of Section 215 and Section 702 authorities, including the manner in which information—and in particular, information about U.S. persons—is collected, retained, analyzed and disseminated;

- applicable minimization procedures and other relevant procedures and guidelines, including whether they are consistent across agencies and the extent to which they protect the privacy rights of U.S. persons;

- any improper or illegal use of the authorities or information collected pursuant to them; and

- an examination of the effectiveness of the authorities as investigative and intelligence tools.

We have urged appropriate oversight of these activities long before the problems

with the implementation of these FISA authorities became public. We believe it is important for your office to begin this review without further delay.

Please proceed to administratively perform reviews of the implementation of Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act and Section 702 of FISA, and submit the reports no later than December 31, 2014. Thank you in advance for your efforts to ensure a full accounting of the implementation of these surveillance authorities across the Intelligence Community.

Sincerely,

Patrick Leahy, Charles Schumer, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Chuck Grassley, Ted Cruz, Michael S. Lee, Jeff Flake.

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Washington, DC, November 5, 2013.

Memorandum for: See distribution.

Subject: IC IG Review of Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act and Section 702 of FISA Authorities.

Thank you for your 23 September 2013 letter requesting that my office review the Intelligence Community's (IC) use of Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act authorities and Section 702 of FISA authorities.

At present, we are not resourced to conduct the requested review within the requested timeframe. As you stated in your letter, several IC inspectors general have oversight of the IC's use of foreign electronic surveillance authorities. While my office has the jurisdiction to conduct an IC-wide review of all IC elements using these authorities, such a review will implicate ongoing oversight efforts. Therefore, I have been conferring with several IC Inspectors General Forum members in order to consider how such a review might be accomplished given the potential impact to IG resources and ongoing projects. As my IG colleagues and I confer regarding the possibility of conducting a joint review of the requested topic, I will keep you and the committee staff informed.

Again, I thank you for your continued support of the IG community. If you have any questions regarding this subject, please contact me or my Legislative Counsel, Melissa Wright, at 571-204-8149.

Sincerely,

I. CHARLES MCCULLOUGH, III,
Inspector General of the Intelligence Community.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a topic not debated nearly enough here on the Senate floor—making the Federal Government more accountable and transparent.

Today, the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, under the leadership of Chairman CARPER and Ranking Member COBURN, passed important legislation that will expand Federal financial transparency and accountability in many important ways.

I sponsored this legislation—the Digital Accountability and Transparency, or DATA, Act—because it will significantly reform the way agencies report Federal spending, and for the first time

provide checkbook-type spending data from across the Federal Government.

The Federal Government spends more than \$3.7 trillion each year, with more than \$1 trillion being distributed as awards. However, the public cannot clearly track where this money goes. We currently have a Web site—USASpending.gov—that is supposed to show taxpayers and policymakers where the money goes, but it is not accurate.

Most States already have an online portal so that taxpayers can track where their dollars are spent, and it is long past time for the Federal Government to move into the 21st century and adopt a similar system.

At a recent hearing of the Budget Committee Task Force on Government Performance that I chair, it was reported that over \$900 billion of direct assistance data on USASpending.gov was misreported in 2011 alone.

No wonder the public has such little confidence in government—we can't even tell them where their tax money goes.

It seems to me that the data collected by the budget shops, the accountants, the procurement offices, and grant makers all needs to be combined, reconciled, and then presented in a relevant and transparent way.

These various systems should be able to work together based on financial standards so that policymakers and the public can track the full cycle of Federal spending clearly.

The DATA Act will help us move in that direction by making four specific improvements that I want to highlight today.

First, it creates transparency for all Federal funds. DATA will expand USASpending.gov to include spending data for all Federal funds by appropriation, Federal agency, program, function, and maintain the current reporting for Federal awards like contracts, grants, and loans. This is important because there is currently no place online to find and compare all government spending.

This expansion of USASpending.gov will allow policymakers and taxpayers to track Federal funds more clearly and to more easily link spending to budget priorities.

Second, the DATA Act sets government-wide financial data standards. Currently there are no consistent standards for reporting financial data to USASpending.gov, and it makes much of the data confusing and unreliable—especially if you want to compile and compare spending from multiple Federal agencies.

DATA tasks the Department of Treasury with establishing consistent financial data standards for the Federal agencies to support the USASpending.gov website.

Third, the DATA Act will actually reduce recipient reporting require-

ments. I have long been concerned about the compliance costs for the recipients of Federal funds. It appears that all the overlapping systems are frustrating and also create additional waste—especially for State and local governments.

For example, many universities file similar financial reports, multiple times, to multiple agencies on an annual, quarterly and monthly basis. If all this reporting redundancy were streamlined, we could direct more money to programs and less to administrative costs.

This legislation requires the Office of Management and Budget to review the existing Federal award recipient financial reporting to reduce compliance costs based on the new financial data standards.

Finally, the DATA Act will improve data quality. The inspectors general at each agency will be required to provide reports on the quality and accuracy of the financial data provided to USASpending.gov. Then GAO will then create a government-wide assessment on data quality and accuracy based on the inspectors generals' findings.

Being able to follow the money is critically important to running our government in a more efficient way and getting the best value for the taxpayer. The DATA Act will help us take steps in that direction, and that is why passing it is so important.

I want to close today by saying thanks again to my colleagues for passing the DATA Act out of committee. I am also pleased to be working with my friend, Republican ROB PORTMAN of Ohio, as my Senate cosponsor of the DATA Act. We will continue working to make sure this important bipartisan legislation becomes law this year.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN EDWARD KLEIN

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor U.S. Army CPT Edward "Flip" Klein, an Arkansas soldier who fought for his country on the battlefield and is fighting to recover from injuries he sustained in Afghanistan.

On October 22, 2012, while out on patrol near Kandahar, Captain Klein, a 2006 West Point graduate, was severely wounded, losing both of his legs, his right arm, and severely damaging his left hand. Captain Klein credits much of his recovery success to his wife Jessica who he calls his "rock." His determination is an inspiration to everyone who meets him. Albert Carey Caswell wrote this poem, "The Battle, After the Fight," in honor of Captain Klein and his family:

And on that morning . . .

When we awake . . .

As we so see what this war would take . . .

As all of our hearts so begin to break!
 Will we be ready,
 for this new battle that which before us now
 awaits?
 All in our strength,
 and faith!
 The . . .
 The Battle,
 After The Fight!
 From out of the darkness,
 into the light!
 Those brave hearts,
 who bring their light!
 Who evil must fight!
 After That Battle,
 But Begins The Fight!
 When,
 hearts of honor so chose to ignite!
 When,
 death stands so all in sight!
 All out on that edge,
 after The Battle But Begins The Fight!
 All in what . . .
 within ones chest ignites!
 While,
 so close to death!
 All in this most divine sight!
 When,
 heroic hearts of valor so reach to new
 heights!
 To Fight!
 After That Battle!
 But So Comes The Fight!
 Moving forth,
 throughout all of this darkness as coura-
 geously onward they stride!
 While against all odds,
 to a place where only the most magnificent
 of all hearts of honor reside!
 After The Battle!
 With but tears in their eyes!
 As their families so cry!
 Asking our Lord up above,
 for the strength to supply!
 After That Battle!
 As somehow!
 As someday!
 So very deep down inside,
 as onward they fight!
 How Brilliant! How Brilliant!
 How Brilliant they shine!
 So surely these are America's brightest of all
 lights!
 After The Battle!
 Now Into The Fight!
 Hooo . . . aaah!
 As Captain Klein,
 your most magnificent of all hearts would
 ignite!
 For you are a warrior whose heart burns
 bright!
 As man who is Army Strong!
 Who all for his Country Tis Thee,
 his fine heart beats loud and so long!
 After That Battle Flip,
 As So Began Your Most Courageous of All
 Fights!
 As one of the few,
 who to West Point so belongs!
 As you Flip,
 so earned that most honored of all rights!
 The kind of man,
 that MacArthur or Mahollen would so sing of
 both day and night!
 Both day and night!
 And General Petraeus,
 would give a big Hooo . . . aah so all on
 sight!
 Because After The Battle!
 But So Brings The Fight!
 The kind which so bring tears to The Angel's
 eyes on this night!
 As it was while out on patrol,
 when death to you so spoke!

With you Captain Klein lying there so close
 to death . . .
 As all in that moment,
 to yourself you so made a pledge!
 To live on,
 while your heart of valor would crest!
 As they so gave you last rites!
 As from you but so came a most magnificent
 sight!
 After That Battle,
 as your fine heart so chose to fight!
 As so came your light!
 As You Edward So Chose To Stand and To
 Fight!
 With All of Your Might!
 Which to this day,
 lives on brighter than bright!
 TO SO REACH US!
 TO SO TEACH US!
 TO SO SPEAK TO US!
 TO SO BESEECH US!
 All in hearts born,
 which now so warmly lives on which so
 greets us!
 After That Battle,
 but so Came Your Most Heroic of All Fights!
 Oh what a most beautiful,
 most sacred of all sights!
 From out of The Point,
 a fine hero whose heart would anoint!
 A world,
 with its faith and its courage . . .
 to so surely nourish to keep hope alive!
 After That Battle!
 As onward Captain you were so to stride!
 With your fine wife Jessica all by your side!
 As together you cried!
 You cried!
 As when you awoke and looked down . . .
 All in what you found . . .
 As your heart broke!
 As The Real Captain America's heart spoke!
 For you had miles to go!
 And so many hearts to touch so,
 all in this load!
 All out in the distance which so means the
 most!
 For you have mountains to so climb!
 And hilltops to so reach,
 so all in your time!
 And out of so many valleys to climb!
 As you take that beach!
 While watching you,
 all of our hearts so break with feelings so
 very deep!
 After That Battle Which To All Of Us Teach!
 All left in your most courageous of all
 wakes,
 that which so speaks!
 As on ward you continued your climb,
 no matter how steep!
 After That Battle!
 After That Fight!
 What This World Must So Know On This
 Very Night!
 Teaching us all about life,
 as there you would so courageously go!
 While watching your fine heart all in leaps
 and bounds grow!
 While,
 holding onto to your faith and not letting go!
 After That Battle So!
 All in your angelic glow!
 As somehow the courage you found so!
 For you live in a town without pity,
 and oh how it shows!
 No Flip,
 you're not half the man you used to be!
 For your sum,
 for your whole . . .
 has grown far much more greater see!
 And I could climb to the highest of all moun-
 taintops,
 to the very top!

And still I would have to look up to you to
 see!
 Because After That Battle,
 your heart would not so stop!
 Because minutes,
 are all that we so have!
 Moments,
 to make a difference to defeat all of that
 bad!
 Better to live for something,
 than realize your life meant nothing at all!
 Better to die for something,
 than in the end wishing your life you could
 recall!
 Better to give up your strong legs and arm
 while standing tall!
 Than look back in such regret realizing,
 all you ever did was crawl!
 Yes arms and legs we need,
 one and all!
 But we can get by!
 But without a heart,
 we will so surely die!
 For it's all what's found from deep down
 within,
 the reason why!
 And up in Heaven you need not arms nor
 even legs,
 and Captain Klein that's where you're going
 you can rely!
 I'd much rather limp here on earth,
 and run with our Lord up in Heaven for what
 I gave because of my worth!
 Where you lead Captain,
 I will follow!
 Because After That Battle!
 As So Began Your Most Courageous Fight!
 Bringing Such Warmth!
 Bringing Such Light!
 Breaking hearts,
 to your left and to your right!
 Bringing tears to all of your Brothers In
 Arms,
 who After The Battle So Saw Your Fight!
 With this sacred bond,
 and this blood which binds you both day and
 night!
 And After The Battle!
 Will we so choose to run?
 Or will we so choose to fight?
 Will all of our hearts so ignite?
 Will we so bring our light?
 Or will we in the darkness reside?
 Or will we move on,
 and to like the sunlight shine so very bright?
 All In That Battle,
 After That Fight!●

COMMENDING THE GEORGIA AIR NATIONAL GUARD

● Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 10th anniversary of the 165th Airlift Wing of the Georgia Air National Guard. Since 2003, the Georgia Air National Guard has played a vital role in fighting the war on terror, with over 80 percent of the wing's 900 airmen serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation New Dawn.

I could not be prouder that these brave men and women call Georgia their home. They protected our Nation during a critical time, and in doing so set the standard for service in the Georgia Air National Guard. As a unit, they have flown more than 11,363 hours and 7,441 combat sorties. They were the first C-130 unit to deploy and operate out of Iraq under the famous "Red

Tail" designation of the 332nd Air Expeditionary Wing, and they were also the only squadron in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility tasked at 100 percent. The wing crew supported the rescue mission of SEAL Team 10 and 3rd Battalion of the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment when they lost three members of their team, and their heroic actions became the subject of Marcus Luttrell's book, *Lone Survivor*.

It is only fitting we commend these courageous individuals of the 165th Airlift Wing of the Georgia Air National Guard for their outstanding service and sacrifice. Their determination to protect our fellow Americans and defend our freedom should be an example to us all.●

● Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I wish to honor in the RECORD the 165th Airlift Wing of the Georgia Air National Guard for 10 years of exemplary service on behalf of the United States.

During the wing's decorated career, it served in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation New Dawn with the majority of the unit's 900 airmen having been deployed in support of these major war operations.

Over the past decade, the unit has flown over 11,363 hours and 7,441 combat sorties, and in 2004, the wing was the first C-130 unit to deploy and operate out of Iraq and fly under the distinguished "Red Tail" designation 332nd Air Expeditionary Wing.

A unit of precision and valor, the wing crew supported the rescue mission of SEAL Team 10 and 3rd Battalion of the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment. During the mission, 16 U.S. servicemembers were tragically killed in action, including three from the wing after a MH-47D Chinook was shot down during a reaction force task in support of the U.S. Navy SEALs. Acting swiftly and heroically, the wing was the first C-130 aircraft to respond. The courageous response from the unit was later celebrated in Marcus Luttrell's book, *Lone Survivor*.

The 165th Airlift Wing of the Georgia Air National Guard has set a standard of military excellence, and its decade of service during the War on Terror has demonstrated remarkable strength and diligence.

It is with great pleasure that I recognize the altruism and bravery showed by the 165th Airlift Wing of the Georgia Air National Guard and thank the unit for its courageousness and dedication toward protecting the freedom of our country.●

lator, Mr. Faiss's passing is a great loss and his commitment to serving the Silver State will never be forgotten.

Representing Las Vegas, Mr. Faiss served 2 terms in the Senate from 1976 to 1984. During his time in the Legislature, he authored two important laws, including one allowing pharmacists to substitute affordable, generic brands in place of name brand drugs, and another to allow seniors to access State parks and campgrounds for free. Mr. Faiss was also a strong advocate for the Equal Rights Amendment in 1977 and has professed that voting in support of that piece of legislation was one of the proudest moments of his life.

On his 100th birthday, Mr. Faiss lent advice from his experience in the Senate, stressing the importance of compromise and a positive outlook, whether in your professional or personal life. It is clear that he practiced these sensibilities in the Senate and at home. His marriage of 79 years to his late wife, Theresa, is a testament to this philosophy. In 2012, he and Theresa were recognized as one of the longest married couples in the U.S.

The citizens of the Silver State were fortunate that such a dedicated and passionate individual called Nevada home. Mr. Faiss serves as an example for others who hold the role of public office. My thoughts and prayers go out to his three sons, six grandchildren, five-great grandchildren, and four great-great grandchildren. Today, I would ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the life of a devoted Nevadan and honoring his accomplishments.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 11:40 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Chiappardi, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) had signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 2094. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

H.R. 3302. An act to name Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Bay Pines, Florida, as the "C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3491. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Spirotetramat; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9399-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 5, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3492. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Defense (DoD) providing military compensation and retirement modernization recommendations to the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission and Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3493. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Global Strategic Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report on Utilization of Contributions to the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3494. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of References to Credit Ratings in Certain Regulations Governing the Federal Home Loan Banks" (RIN2590-AA40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 4, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3495. A communication from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2012 Annual Report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation (SIPC); to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3496. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 1, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3497. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Public Housing Capital Fund Program" (RIN2577-AC50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3498. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3499. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3500. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, (10) ten reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Energy, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 1, 2013; to

TRIBUTE TO WILBUR FAISS

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize a true Nevadan, humble public servant, and dedicated family man, Wilbur Faiss. Believed to have been the Nation's oldest-living legis-

the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3501. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Quality of Water, Colorado River Basin, Progress Report No. 24"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3502. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Qualification Tests for Safety-Related Actuators in Nuclear Power Plants" (Regulatory Guide 1.73, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 4, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3503. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Design of Structures, Components, Equipment, and Systems" (NUREG-0800) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 4, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3504. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Radiation Protection" (NUREG-0800) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 4, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3505. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances; Removal of Significant New Use Rules" (FRL No. 9902-16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 5, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3506. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment Rule" (FRL No. 9901-98-OECA) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 5, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3507. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Deadline for Action on the Section 126 Petition from Eliot, Maine" (FRL No. 9902-55-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 5, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3508. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio: Bellefontaine; Determination of Attainment for the 2008 Lead Standard" (FRL No. 9902-33-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 5, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3509. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition of ortho-Nitrotoluene; Community Right-to-Know Toxic Chemical Release Reporting" (FRL No. 9902-12-OEI) re-

ceived in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 5, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3510. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel (OSS-2013-1711); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3511. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel (OSS-2013-1685); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3512. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (RSAT-13-3485); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3513. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "United States Participation in the United Nations in 2012"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3514. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program for 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3515. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of a determination to waive certain restrictions on maintaining a Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Office in Washington and on the receipt and expenditure of PLO funds for a period of six months; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3516. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2013-0179-2013-0184); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Nanci E. Langley, of Hawaii, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission for a term expiring November 22, 2018.

*Tony Hammond, of Missouri, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission for a term expiring October 14, 2018.

*William Ward Nooter, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed sub-

ject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1344. A bill to promote research, monitoring, and observation of the Arctic and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-117).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 987. A bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media (Rept. No. 113-118).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1499. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 278 Main Street in Chadron, Nebraska, as the "Sergeant Cory Mracek Memorial Post Office".

S. 1512. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the "Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office".

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BOOZMAN:

S. 1655. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve waivers under the Medicaid Program under title XIX of the Social Security Act that are related to State provider taxes that exempt certain retirement communities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 1656. A bill to clarify that volunteers at a children's consignment event are not employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

S. 1657. A bill to reduce prescription drug misuse and abuse; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1658. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent certain small business tax provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1659. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 regarding proprietary institutions of higher education in order to protect students and taxpayers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. HAGAN (for herself, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1660. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 288. A resolution supporting enhanced maritime security in the Gulf of Guinea and encouraging increased cooperation between the United States and West and Central African countries to fight armed robbery at sea, piracy, and other maritime threats; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 562, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 623, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 699

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes.

S. 700

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 700, a bill to ensure that the education and training provided members of the Armed Forces and veterans better assists members and veterans in obtaining civilian certifications and licenses, and for other purposes.

S. 795

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana

(Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 795, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the publicly traded partnership ownership structure to energy power generation projects and transportation fuels, and for other purposes.

S. 842

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 842, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 842, *supra*.

S. 928

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of claims for compensation under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 932

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 932, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for advance appropriations for certain discretionary accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 1012

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1012, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve operations of recovery auditors under the Medicare integrity program, to increase transparency and accuracy in audits conducted by contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 1046

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1046, a bill to clarify certain provisions of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act of 1994.

S. 1053

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1053, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen and protect Medicare hospice programs.

S. 1069

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1069, a bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual ori-

entation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved.

S. 1089

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1089, a bill to provide for a prescription drug take-back program for members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1143

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1143, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 1155

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1155, a bill to provide for advance appropriations for certain information technology accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to include mental health professionals in training programs of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1187

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1187, a bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt.

S. 1296

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1296, a bill to amend the Wounded Warrior Act to establish a specific timeline for the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to achieve interoperable electronic health records, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1310

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1310, a bill to require Senate confirmation of Inspector General of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes.

S. 1332

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 1505

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1505, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to certain sporting good articles, and to exempt those articles from definition under that Act.

S. 1557

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1557, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

S. 1590

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1590, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges.

S. 1600

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1600, a bill to facilitate the reestablishment of domestic, critical mineral designation, assessment, production, manufacturing, recycling, analysis, forecasting, workforce, education, research, and international capabilities in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1602

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1602, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for the diagnosis, treatment, and research of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces, to provide certain services to those descendants, to establish an advisory board on exposure to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

S. 1610

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from West Vir-

ginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1610, a bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

S. 1622

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1622, a bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

S. 1624

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1624, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit for hiring veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1632

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1632, a bill to protect 10th Amendment rights by providing special standing for State government officials to challenge proposed regulations, and for other purposes.

S. 1644

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1644, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for preliminary hearings on alleged offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

S. 1647

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1647, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal distributions for medicine qualified only if for prescribed drug or insulin.

S. RES. 128

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 128, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that supporting seniors and individuals with disabilities is an important responsibility of the United States, and that a comprehensive approach to expanding and supporting a strong home care workforce and making long-term services and supports affordable and accessible in communities is necessary to uphold the right of seniors and individuals with disabilities in the United States to a dignified quality of life.

S. RES. 251

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of

S. Res. 251, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Preventive Services Task Force should reevaluate its recommendations against prostate-specific antigen-based screening for prostate cancer for men in all age groups in consultation with appropriate specialists.

S. RES. 284

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 284, a resolution calling on the Government of Iran to immediately release Saeed Abedini and all other individuals detained on account of their religious beliefs.

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 284, *supra*.

S. RES. 287

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 287, a resolution congratulating the Boston Red Sox on winning the 2013 World Series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2011

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2011 intended to be proposed to S. 815, a bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1659. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 regarding proprietary institutions of higher education in order to protect students and taxpayers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1659

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Our Students and Taxpayers Act of 2013" or "POST Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. 85/15 RULE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 102(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking "and" after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period and inserting "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(F) meets the requirements of paragraph (2).";

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) REVENUE SOURCES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to qualify as a proprietary institution of higher education under this subsection, an institution shall derive not less than 15 percent of the institution’s revenues from sources other than Federal funds, as calculated in accordance with subparagraphs (B) and (C).

“(B) FEDERAL FUNDS.—In this paragraph, the term ‘Federal funds’ means any Federal financial assistance provided, under this Act or any other Federal law, through a grant, contract, subsidy, loan, guarantee, insurance, or other means to a proprietary institution, including Federal financial assistance that is disbursed or delivered to an institution or on behalf of a student or to a student to be used to attend the institution, except that such term shall not include any monthly housing stipend provided under the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Program under chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code.

“(C) IMPLEMENTATION OF NON-FEDERAL REVENUE REQUIREMENT.—In making calculations under subparagraph (A), an institution of higher education shall—

“(i) use the cash basis of accounting;

“(ii) consider as revenue only those funds generated by the institution from—

“(I) tuition, fees, and other institutional charges for students enrolled in programs eligible for assistance under title IV;

“(II) activities conducted by the institution that are necessary for the education and training of the institution’s students, if such activities are—

“(aa) conducted on campus or at a facility under the control of the institution;

“(bb) performed under the supervision of a member of the institution’s faculty; and

“(cc) required to be performed by all students in a specific educational program at the institution; and

“(III) a contractual arrangement with a Federal agency for the purpose of providing job training to low-income individuals who are in need of such training;

“(iii) presume that any Federal funds that are disbursed or delivered to an institution on behalf of a student or directly to a student will be used to pay the student’s tuition, fees, or other institutional charges, regardless of whether the institution credits such funds to the student’s account or pays such funds directly to the student, except to the extent that the student’s tuition, fees, or other institutional charges are satisfied by—

“(I) grant funds provided by an outside source that—

“(aa) has no affiliation with the institution; and

“(bb) shares no employees with the institution; and

“(II) institutional scholarships described in clause (v);

“(iv) include no loans made by an institution of higher education as revenue to the school, except for payments made by students on such loans;

“(v) include a scholarship provided by the institution—

“(I) only if the scholarship is in the form of monetary aid based upon the academic achievements or financial need of students, disbursed to qualified student recipients during each fiscal year from an established restricted account; and

“(II) only to the extent that funds in that account represent designated funds, or income earned on such funds, from an outside source that—

“(aa) has no affiliation with the institution; and

“(bb) shares no employees with the institution; and

“(vi) exclude from revenues—

“(I) the amount of funds the institution received under part C of title IV, unless the institution used those funds to pay a student’s institutional charges;

“(II) the amount of funds the institution received under subpart 4 of part A of title IV;

“(III) the amount of funds provided by the institution as matching funds for any Federal program;

“(IV) the amount of Federal funds provided to the institution to pay institutional charges for a student that were refunded or returned; and

“(V) the amount charged for books, supplies, and equipment, unless the institution includes that amount as tuition, fees, or other institutional charges.

“(D) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than July 1, 2014, and by July 1 of each succeeding year, the Secretary shall submit to the authorizing committees a report that contains, for each proprietary institution of higher education that receives assistance under title IV and as provided in the audited financial statements submitted to the Secretary by each institution pursuant to the requirements of section 487(c)—

“(i) the amount and percentage of such institution’s revenues received from Federal funds; and

“(ii) the amount and percentage of such institution’s revenues received from other sources.”

(b) REPEAL OF EXISTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 487 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (24);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (25) through (29) as paragraphs (24) through (28), respectively;

(C) in paragraph (24)(A)(ii) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B)), by striking “subsection (e)” and inserting “subsection (d)”; and

(D) in paragraph (26) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B)), by striking “subsection (h)” and inserting “subsection (g)”; and

(2) by striking subsection (d);

(3) by redesignating subsections (e) through (j) as subsections (d) through (i), respectively;

(4) in subsection (f)(1) (as redesignated by paragraph (3)), by striking “subsection (e)(2)” and inserting “subsection (d)(2)”; and

(5) in subsection (g)(1) (as redesignated by paragraph (3)), by striking “subsection (a)(27)” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting “subsection (a)(26)”. (c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 152 (20 U.S.C. 1019a)—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking “subsections (a)(27) and (h) of section 487” and inserting “subsections (a)(26) and (g) of section 487”; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1)(B)(i)(I), by striking “section 487(e)” and inserting “section 487(d)”; and

(2) in section 153(c)(3) (20 U.S.C. 1019b(c)(3)), by striking “section 487(a)(25)” each place the term appears and inserting “section 487(a)(24)”; and

(3) in section 496(c)(3)(A) (20 U.S.C. 1099b(c)(3)(A)), by striking “section 487(f)” and inserting “section 487(e)”; and

(4) in section 498(k)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1099c(k)(1)), by striking “section 487(f)” and inserting “section 487(e)”. (d) (e)

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 288—SUPPORTING ENHANCED MARITIME SECURITY IN THE GULF OF GUINEA AND ENCOURAGING INCREASED COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND WEST AND CENTRAL AFRICAN COUNTRIES TO FIGHT ARMED ROBBERY AT SEA, PIRACY, AND OTHER MARITIME THREATS

Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 288

Whereas, although the number of armed robbery at sea and piracy attacks worldwide dropped substantially in recent years, such acts in the Gulf of Guinea are increasing, with more than 40 reported through October 2013 and many more going unreported;

Whereas the United States imported more than 315,000,000 barrels of oil through the region in 2012, and United States businesses have extensive fixed assets in the region that are important to United States energy security;

Whereas the nature of attacks in the Gulf of Guinea demonstrates an ongoing pattern of cargo thefts and robbery, often occurring in the territorial waters of West and Central African states;

Whereas there are countries in West and Central Africa that are susceptible to acts of armed robbery at sea and piracy that lack adequate law enforcement and naval capabilities to stop or deter such attacks;

Whereas acts of maritime crime raise the costs and risks of trade and commerce in Africa and beyond because the security of vessels, crews, and cargoes cannot be guaranteed;

Whereas shipping insurance premiums increase after such attacks, and in so doing, create disincentives for local, regional, and international investors and companies seeking to do business in the region;

Whereas imports provide indispensable goods and services for the people of West and Central Africa, generate port fees and customs duties for their governments, and are essential in spurring economic growth and development in the region;

Whereas the U.S. Strategy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa issued by President Barack Obama in June 2012 states, “It is in the interest of the United States to improve the region’s trade competitiveness, encourage the diversification of exports beyond natural resources, and ensure that the benefits from growth are broad-based.”;

Whereas a vibrant trade relationship between Africa and its partners, including the United States, can lead to expanded economic opportunities that can spur competition, raise productivity, and facilitate job creation in the economies of all participating countries;

Whereas the African Union, in collaboration with numerous official and nongovernmental stakeholders, developed the “2050 Africa’s Integrated Maritime Security” strategy (the 2050 AIM STRATEGY) which seeks “to address contending, emerging and future maritime challenges and opportunities in Africa... with a clear focus on enhanced wealth creation from a sustainable governance of Africa’s oceans and seas”;

Whereas the African Union's 2050 AIM STRATEGY seeks to combat "diverse illegal activities which include...arms and drug trafficking, human trafficking and smuggling, piracy, and armed robbery at sea", among other objectives;

Whereas the June 24–25, 2013, meeting of the Gulf of Guinea Maritime Security Heads of State Summit held in Cameroon marked the culmination of a United States Government-supported Economic Communities of Central African States (ECCAS) and Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)-led initiative and process that produced an approved ECOWAS-ECCAS Memorandum of Understanding for regional cooperation, and adopted a Gulf of Guinea Code of Conduct to address maritime crime and a Heads of State Political Declaration;

Whereas ECOWAS and ECCAS states are working to cooperate and build their joint capacities in order to increase maritime security in the Gulf of Guinea and are working to achieve this goal with such partners as the United Nations Offices for West and Central Africa, the Gulf of Guinea Commission, the International Maritime Organization, the Maritime Organization for West and Central Africa, and the African Union;

Whereas the United States Government in the Gulf of Guinea has focused on encouraging multi-layered regional and national ownership in developing sustainable capacity building efforts, including working with partners through the G8++ Friends of Gulf of Guinea Group, to coordinate United States Government maritime security activities in the region;

Whereas the United States Government has assisted the countries of West and Central Africa to enhance regional maritime security through programs such as the "African Partnership Station", operated by United States Naval Forces Africa "to build maritime safety and security by increasing maritime awareness, response capabilities and infrastructure", and the "African Maritime Law Enforcement Partnership", which "enables African partner nations to build maritime security capacity and improve management of their maritime environment through real world law enforcement operations, and through provision of diverse types of training and equipment assistance and participation in diverse regional maritime military exercises", as well as by employing analytical tools such as the Maritime Security Sector Reform Guide; and

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 2039, "expressing its deep concern about the threat that piracy and armed robbery at sea in the Gulf of Guinea pose to international navigation, security and the economic development of states in the region", was unanimously adopted on February 29, 2012: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns acts of armed robbery at sea, piracy, and other maritime crime in the Gulf of Guinea;

(2) endorses and supports the efforts made by United States Government agencies to assist affected West and Central African countries to build capacity to combat armed robbery at sea, piracy, and other maritime threats, and encourages the President to continue such assistance, as appropriate, within resource constraints; and

(3) commends the African Union, sub-regional entities such as the ECOWAS and ECCAS, and the various international agencies that have worked to develop policy and program frameworks for enhancing maritime security in West and Central Africa, and en-

courages these entities and their member states to continue to build upon these and other efforts to achieve that end.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2012. Mr. REID (for Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. MCCAIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 815, to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

SA 2013. Mr. REID (for Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MCCAIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 815, supra.

SA 2014. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 815, supra.

SA 2015. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2014 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 815, supra.

SA 2016. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 815, supra.

SA 2017. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2016 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 815, supra.

SA 2018. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2017 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 2016 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 815, supra.

SA 2019. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 815, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2020. Ms. COLLINS (for Mr. REID) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2013 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MCCAIN)) to the bill S. 815, supra.

SA 2021. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 815, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2022. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 815, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2023. Ms. HIRONO (for Mr. SANDERS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 287, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve assistance to homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2012. Mr. REID (for Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. MCCAIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 815, to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; as follows:

Strike sections 2 through 6 and insert the following:

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to address the history and persistent, widespread pattern of discrimination on the bases of sexual orientation and gender identity by private sector employers and local, State, and Federal Government employers;

(2) to provide an explicit, comprehensive Federal prohibition against employment discrimination on the bases of sexual orientation and gender identity, including meaningful and effective remedies for any such discrimination;

(3) to invoke congressional powers, including the powers to enforce the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, and to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to section 8 of article I of the Constitution, in order to pro-

hibit employment discrimination on the bases of sexual orientation and gender identity; and

(4) to reinforce the Nation's commitment to fairness and equal opportunity in the workplace consistent with the fundamental right of religious freedom.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In this Act:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term "Commission" means the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

(2) COVERED ENTITY.—The term "covered entity" means an employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee.

(3) DEMONSTRATES.—The term "demonstrates" means meets the burdens of production and persuasion.

(4) EMPLOYEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "employee" means—

(i) an employee as defined in section 701(f) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(f));

(ii) a State employee to which section 302(a)(1) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16b(a)(1)) applies;

(iii) a covered employee, as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301) or section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code; or

(iv) an employee or applicant to which section 717(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16(a)) applies.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The provisions of this Act that apply to an employee or individual shall not apply to a volunteer who receives no compensation.

(5) EMPLOYER.—The term "employer" means—

(A) a person engaged in an industry affecting commerce (as defined in section 701(h) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(h)) who has 15 or more employees (as defined in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B) of paragraph (4)) for each working day in each of 20 or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year, and any agent of such a person, but does not include a bona fide private membership club (other than a labor organization) that is exempt from taxation under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(B) an employing authority to which section 302(a)(1) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 applies;

(C) an employing office, as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 or section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code; or

(D) an entity to which section 717(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 applies.

(6) EMPLOYMENT AGENCY.—The term "employment agency" has the meaning given the term in section 701(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(c)).

(7) GENDER IDENTITY.—The term "gender identity" means the gender-related identity, appearance, or mannerisms or other gender-related characteristics of an individual, with or without regard to the individual's designated sex at birth.

(8) LABOR ORGANIZATION.—The term "labor organization" has the meaning given the term in section 701(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(d)).

(9) PERSON.—The term "person" has the meaning given the term in section 701(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(a)).

(10) SEXUAL ORIENTATION.—The term "sexual orientation" means homosexuality, heterosexuality, or bisexuality.

(11) STATE.—The term “State” has the meaning given the term in section 701(i) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(i)).

(b) APPLICATION OF DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, a reference in section 701 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—

(1) to an employee or an employer shall be considered to refer to an employee (as defined in subsection (a)(4)) or an employer (as defined in subsection (a)(5)), respectively, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection; and

(2) to an employer in subsection (f) of that section shall be considered to refer to an employer (as defined in subsection (a)(5)(A)).

SEC. 4. EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.

(a) EMPLOYER PRACTICES.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

(1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise discriminate against any individual with respect to the compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment of the individual, because of such individual’s actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity; or

(2) to limit, segregate, or classify the employees or applicants for employment of the employer in any way that would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment or otherwise adversely affect the status of the individual as an employee, because of such individual’s actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity.

(b) EMPLOYMENT AGENCY PRACTICES.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employment agency to fail or refuse to refer for employment, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual because of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of the individual or to classify or refer for employment any individual on the basis of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of the individual.

(c) LABOR ORGANIZATION PRACTICES.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a labor organization—

(1) to exclude or to expel from its membership, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual because of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of the individual;

(2) to limit, segregate, or classify its membership or applicants for membership, or to classify or fail or refuse to refer for employment any individual, in any way that would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment, or would limit such employment or otherwise adversely affect the status of the individual as an employee or as an applicant for employment because of such individual’s actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity; or

(3) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this section.

(d) TRAINING PROGRAMS.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining, including on-the-job training programs, to discriminate against any individual because of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of the individual in admission to, or employment in, any program established to provide apprenticeship or other training.

(e) ASSOCIATION.—An unlawful employment practice described in any of subsections (a) through (d) shall be considered to include an

action described in that subsection, taken against an individual based on the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of a person with whom the individual associates or has associated.

(f) NO PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT OR QUOTAS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed or interpreted to require or permit—

(1) any covered entity to grant preferential treatment to any individual or to any group because of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of such individual or group on account of an imbalance which may exist with respect to the total number or percentage of persons of any actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity employed by any employer, referred to or classified for employment by any employment agency or labor organization, admitted to membership or classified by any labor organization, or admitted to, or employed in, any apprenticeship or other training program, in comparison with the total number or percentage of persons of such actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in any community, State, section, or other area, or in the available work force in any community, State, section, or other area; or

(2) the adoption or implementation by a covered entity of a quota on the basis of actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity.

(g) NO DISPARATE IMPACT CLAIMS.—Only disparate treatment claims may be brought under this Act.

(h) STANDARDS OF PROOF.—Except as otherwise provided, an unlawful employment practice is established when the complaining party demonstrates that sexual orientation or gender identity was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.

SEC. 5. RETALIATION PROHIBITED.

It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a covered entity to discriminate against an individual because such individual—

(1) opposed any practice made an unlawful employment practice by this Act; or

(2) made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this Act.

SEC. 6. EXEMPTION FOR RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act shall not apply to a corporation, association, educational institution or institution of learning, or society that is exempt from the religious discrimination provisions of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) pursuant to section 702(a) or 703(e)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e-1(a), 2000e-2(e)(2)) (referred to in this section as a “religious employer”).

(b) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN GOVERNMENT ACTIONS.—A religious employer’s exemption under this section shall not result in any action by a Federal agency, or any State or local agency that receives Federal funding or financial assistance, to penalize or withhold licenses, permits, certifications, accreditation, contracts, grants, guarantees, tax-exempt status, or any benefits or exemptions from that employer, or to prohibit the employer’s participation in programs or activities sponsored by that Federal, State, or local agency. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to invalidate any other Federal, State, or local law (including a regulation) that otherwise applies to a religious employer exempt under this section.

SA 2013. Mr. REID (for Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr.

MCCAIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 815, to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; as follows:

In section 6, insert before “This Act” the following: “(a) IN GENERAL.—”.

In section 6, insert at the end the following:

(b) IN ADDITION.—In addition, an employer, regardless of whether the employer or an employee in the employment position at issue engages in secular activities as well as religious activities, shall not be subject to this Act if—

(1) the employer is in whole or in substantial part owned, controlled, or managed by a particular religion or by a particular religious corporation, association, or society;

(2) the employer is officially affiliated with a particular religion or with a particular religious corporation, association, or society; or

(3) the curriculum of such employer is directed toward the propagation of a particular religion.

SA 2014. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 815, to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

SA 2015. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2014 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 815, to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”.

SA 2016. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 815, to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 5 days after enactment.

SA 2017. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2016 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 815, to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “5 days” and insert “6 days”.

SA 2018. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2017 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 2016 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 815, to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “6 days” and insert “7 days”.

SA 2019. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 815, to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SECTION _____. PRENATAL NONDISCRIMINATION ACT.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Prenatal Nondiscrimination Act (PRENDA) of 2013”.

(b) **FINDINGS AND CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress makes the following findings:

(A) Women are a vital part of American society and culture and possess the same fundamental human rights and civil rights as men.

(B) United States law prohibits the dissimilar treatment of males and females who are similarly situated and prohibits sex discrimination in various contexts, including the provision of employment, education, housing, health insurance coverage, and athletics.

(C) Sex is an immutable characteristic ascertainable at the earliest stages of human development through existing medical technology and procedures commonly in use, including maternal-fetal bloodstream DNA sampling, amniocentesis, chorionic villus sampling or “CVS”, and obstetric ultrasound. In addition to medically assisted sex determination, a growing sex determination niche industry has developed and is marketing low-cost commercial products, widely advertised and available, that aid in the sex determination of an unborn child without the aid of medical professionals. Experts have demonstrated that the sex-selection industry is on the rise and predict that it will continue to be a growing trend in the United States. Sex determination is always a necessary step to the procurement of a sex-selection abortion.

(D) A “sex-selection abortion” is an abortion undertaken for purposes of eliminating an unborn child based on the sex or gender of the child. Sex-selection abortion is barbaric, and described by scholars and civil rights advocates as an act of sex-based or gender-based violence, predicated on sex discrimination. Sex-selection abortions are typically late-term abortions performed in the 2nd or 3rd trimester of pregnancy, after the unborn child has developed sufficiently to feel pain. Substantial medical evidence proves that an unborn child can experience pain at 20 weeks after conception, and perhaps substantially earlier. By definition, sex-selection abortions do not implicate the health of the mother of the unborn, but instead are elective procedures motivated by sex or gender bias.

(E) The targeted victims of sex-selection abortions performed in the United States and worldwide are overwhelmingly female. The selective abortion of females is female infanticide, the intentional killing of unborn females, due to the preference for male offspring or “son preference”. Son preference is reinforced by the low value associated, by some segments of the world community, with female offspring. Those segments tend to regard female offspring as financial burdens to a family over their lifetime due to their perceived inability to earn or provide financially for the family unit as can a male. In addition, due to social and legal convention, female offspring are less likely to carry on the family name. “Son preference” is one of the most evident manifestations of sex or gender discrimination in any society, undermining female equality, and fueling the elimination of females’ right to exist in instances of sex-selection abortion.

(F) Sex-selection abortions are not expressly prohibited by United States law or

the laws of 47 States. Sex-selection abortions are performed in the United States. In a March 2008 report published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Columbia University economists Douglas Almond and Lena Edlund examined the sex ratio of United States-born children and found “evidence of sex selection, most likely at the prenatal stage”. The data revealed obvious “son preference” in the form of unnatural sex-ratio imbalances within certain segments of the United States population, primarily those segments tracing their ethnic or cultural origins to countries where sex-selection abortion is prevalent. The evidence strongly suggests that some Americans are exercising sex-selection abortion practices within the United States consistent with discriminatory practices common to their country of origin, or the country to which they trace their ancestry. While sex-selection abortions are more common outside the United States, the evidence reveals that female feticide is also occurring in the United States.

(G) The American public supports a prohibition of sex-selection abortion. In a March 2006 Zogby International poll, 86 percent of Americans agreed that sex-selection abortion should be illegal, yet only 3 States proscribe sex-selection abortion.

(H) Despite the failure of the United States to proscribe sex-selection abortion, the United States Congress has expressed repeatedly, through Congressional resolution, strong condemnation of policies promoting sex-selection abortion in the “Communist Government of China”. Likewise, at the 2007 United Nation’s Annual Meeting of the Commission on the Status of Women, 51st Session, the United States delegation spearheaded a resolution calling on countries to condemn sex-selective abortion, a policy directly contradictory to the permissiveness of current United States law, which places no restriction on the practice of sex-selection abortion. The United Nations Commission on the Status of Women has urged governments of all nations “to take necessary measures to prevent . . . prenatal sex selection”.

(I) A 1990 report by Harvard University economist Amartya Sen, estimated that more than 100 million women were “demographically missing” from the world as early as 1990 due to sexist practices, including sex-selection abortion. Many experts believe sex-selection abortion is the primary cause. Current estimates of women missing from the world range in the hundreds of millions.

(J) Countries with longstanding experience with sex-selection abortion—such as the Republic of India, the United Kingdom, and the People’s Republic of China—have enacted restrictions on sex-selection, and have steadily continued to strengthen prohibitions and penalties. The United States, by contrast, has no law in place to restrict sex-selection abortion, establishing the United States as affording less protection from sex-based feticide than the Republic of India or the People’s Republic of China, whose recent practices of sex-selection abortion were vehemently and repeatedly condemned by United States congressional resolutions and by the United States Ambassador to the Commission on the Status of Women. Public statements from within the medical community reveal that citizens of other countries come to the United States for sex-selection procedures that would be criminal in their country of origin. Because the United States permits abortion on the basis of sex, the United States may effectively function as a “safe haven” for those who seek to have American

physicians do what would otherwise be criminal in their home countries—a sex-selection abortion, most likely late-term.

(K) The American medical community opposes sex-selection. The American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, commonly known as “ACOG”, stated in its 2007 Ethics Committee Opinion, Number 360, that sex-selection is inappropriate because it “ultimately supports sexist practices”. The American Society of Reproductive Medicine (commonly known as “ASRM”) 2004 Ethics Committee Opinion on sex-selection notes that central to the controversy of sex-selection is the potential for “inherent gender discrimination”, . . . the “risk of psychological harm to sex-selected offspring (i.e., by placing on them expectations that are too high)”, . . . and “reinforcement of gender bias in society as a whole”. Embryo sex-selection, ASRM notes, remains “vulnerable to the judgment that no matter what its basis, [the method] identifies gender as a reason to value one person over another, and it supports socially constructed stereotypes of what gender means”. In doing so, it not only “reinforces possibilities of unfair discrimination, but may trivialize human reproduction by making it depend on the selection of non-essential features of offspring”. The ASRM ethics opinion continues, “ongoing problems with the status of women in the United States make it necessary to take account of concerns for the impact of sex-selection on goals of gender equality”. The American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians and Gynecologists, an organization with hundreds of members—many of whom are former abortionists—makes the following declaration: “Sex selection abortions are more graphic examples of the damage that abortion inflicts on women. In addition to increasing premature labor in subsequent pregnancies, increasing suicide and major depression, and increasing the risk of breast cancer in teens who abort their first pregnancy and delay childbearing, sex selection abortions are often targeted at fetuses simply because the fetus is female. As physicians who care for both the mother and her unborn child, the American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians and Gynecologists vigorously opposes aborting fetuses because of their gender.”. The President’s Council on Bioethics published a Working Paper stating the council’s belief that society’s respect for reproductive freedom does not prohibit the regulation or prohibition of “sex control”, defined as the use of various medical technologies to choose the sex of one’s child. The publication expresses concern that “sex control might lead to . . . dehumanization and a new eugenics”.

(L) Sex-selection abortion results in an unnatural sex-ratio imbalance. An unnatural sex-ratio imbalance is undesirable, due to the inability of the numerically predominant sex to find mates. Experts worldwide document that a significant sex-ratio imbalance in which males numerically predominate can be a cause of increased violence and militancy within a society. Likewise, an unnatural sex-ratio imbalance gives rise to the commoditization of humans in the form of human trafficking, and a consequent increase in kidnapping and other violent crime.

(M) Sex-selection abortions have the effect of diminishing the representation of women in the American population, and therefore, the American electorate.

(N) Sex-selection abortion reinforces sex discrimination and has no place in a civilized society.

(O) The history of the United States includes examples of sex discrimination. The people of the United States ultimately responded in the strongest possible legal terms by enacting a constitutional amendment correcting elements of such discrimination. Women, once subjected to sex discrimination that denied them the right to vote, now have suffrage guaranteed by the 19th amendment. The elimination of discriminatory practices has been and is among the highest priorities and greatest achievements of American history.

(P) Implicitly approving the discriminatory practice of sex-selection abortion by choosing not to prohibit them will reinforce these inherently discriminatory practices, and evidence a failure to protect a segment of certain unborn Americans because those unborn are of a sex that is disfavored. Sex-selection abortions trivialize the value of the unborn on the basis of sex, reinforcing sex discrimination, and coarsening society to the humanity of all vulnerable and innocent human life, making it increasingly difficult to protect such life. Thus, Congress has a compelling interest in acting—indeed it must act—to prohibit sex-selection abortion.

(2) CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.—In accordance with the above findings, Congress enacts the following pursuant to Congress' power under—

(A) the Commerce Clause;

(B) section 5 of the 14th amendment, including the power to enforce the prohibition on Government action denying equal protection of the laws; and

(C) section 8 of article I to make all laws necessary and proper for the carrying into execution of powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

(c) DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE UNBORN ON THE BASIS OF SEX.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 250. Discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Whoever knowingly—

“(1) performs an abortion knowing that such abortion is sought based on the sex or gender of the child;

“(2) uses force or the threat of force to intentionally injure or intimidate any person for the purpose of coercing a sex-selection abortion;

“(3) solicits or accepts funds for the performance of a sex-selection abortion; or

“(4) transports a woman into the United States or across a State line for the purpose of obtaining a sex-selection abortion;

or attempts to do so, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

“(b) CIVIL REMEDIES.—

“(1) CIVIL ACTION BY WOMAN ON WHOM ABORTION IS PERFORMED.—A woman upon whom an abortion has been performed pursuant to a violation of subsection (a)(2) may in a civil action against any person who engaged in a violation of subsection (a) obtain appropriate relief.

“(2) CIVIL ACTION BY RELATIVES.—The father of an unborn child who is the subject of an abortion performed or attempted in violation of subsection (a), or a maternal grandparent of the unborn child if the pregnant woman is an unemancipated minor, may in a civil action against any person who engaged in the violation, obtain appropriate relief, unless the pregnancy resulted from the plaintiff's criminal conduct or the plaintiff consented to the abortion.

“(3) APPROPRIATE RELIEF.—Appropriate relief in a civil action under this subsection includes—

“(A) objectively verifiable money damages for all injuries, psychological and physical, including loss of companionship and support, occasioned by the violation of this section; and

“(B) punitive damages.

“(4) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A qualified plaintiff may in a civil action obtain injunctive relief to prevent an abortion provider from performing or attempting further abortions in violation of this section.

“(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph the term ‘qualified plaintiff’ means—

“(i) a woman upon whom an abortion is performed or attempted in violation of this section;

“(ii) any person who is the spouse or parent of a woman upon whom an abortion is performed in violation of this section; or

“(iii) the Attorney General.

“(5) ATTORNEYS FEES FOR PLAINTIFF.—The court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs to a prevailing plaintiff in a civil action under this subsection.

“(c) LOSS OF FEDERAL FUNDING.—A violation of subsection (a) shall be deemed for the purposes of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to be discrimination prohibited by section 601 of that Act.

“(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—A physician, physician's assistant, nurse, counselor, or other medical or mental health professional shall report known or suspected violations of any of this section to appropriate law enforcement authorities. Whoever violates this requirement shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

“(e) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—It shall be the duty of the United States district courts, United States courts of appeal, and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of any matter brought under this section.

“(f) EXCEPTION.—A woman upon whom a sex-selection abortion is performed may not be prosecuted or held civilly liable for any violation of this section, or for a conspiracy to violate this section.

“(g) PROTECTION OF PRIVACY IN COURT PROCEEDINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except to the extent the Constitution or other similarly compelling reason requires, in every civil or criminal action under this section, the court shall make such orders as are necessary to protect the anonymity of any woman upon whom an abortion has been performed or attempted if she does not give her written consent to such disclosure. Such orders may be made upon motion, but shall be made sua sponte if not otherwise sought by a party.

“(2) ORDERS TO PARTIES, WITNESSES, AND COUNSEL.—The court shall issue appropriate orders under paragraph (1) to the parties, witnesses, and counsel and shall direct the sealing of the record and exclusion of individuals from courtrooms or hearing rooms to the extent necessary to safeguard her identity from public disclosure. Each such order shall be accompanied by specific written findings explaining why the anonymity of the woman must be preserved from public disclosure, why the order is essential to that end, how the order is narrowly tailored to serve that interest, and why no reasonable less restrictive alternative exists.

“(3) PSEUDONYM REQUIRED.—In the absence of written consent of the woman upon whom

an abortion has been performed or attempted, any party, other than a public official, who brings an action under this section shall do so under a pseudonym.

“(4) LIMITATION.—This subsection shall not be construed to conceal the identity of the plaintiff or of witnesses from the defendant or from attorneys for the defendant.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—

“(1) The term ‘abortion’ means the act of using or prescribing any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance, device, or means with the intent to terminate the clinically diagnosable pregnancy of a woman, with knowledge that the termination by those means will with reasonable likelihood cause the death of the unborn child, unless the act is done with the intent to—

“(A) save the life or preserve the health of the unborn child;

“(B) remove a dead unborn child caused by spontaneous abortion; or

“(C) remove an ectopic pregnancy.

“(2) The term ‘sex-selection abortion’ is an abortion undertaken for purposes of eliminating an unborn child based on the sex or gender of the child.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 249 the following new item:

“250. Discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex.”

(d) SEVERABILITY.—If any portion of this section or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the portions or applications of this section which can be given effect without the invalid portion or application.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require that a healthcare provider has an affirmative duty to inquire as to the motivation for the abortion, absent the healthcare provider having knowledge or information that the abortion is being sought based on the sex or gender of the child.

SA 2020. Ms. COLLINS (for Mr. REID) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2013 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MCCAIN)) to the bill S. 815, to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

SA 2021. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 815, to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 14, insert the following:

SEC. 14A. DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF MILITARY SERVICE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CIVIL RIGHTS DEFINITIONS.—The terms “complaining party”, “demonstrates”, “employee”, “employer”, “employment agency”, “labor organization”, “person”, “respondent”, and “State” have the meanings given the terms in section 701 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e).

(2) MEMBER OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.—The term “member of the uniformed services” means an individual who—

(A) is a member of—

(i) the uniformed services (as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code); or

(ii) the National Guard in State status under title 32, United States Code; or

(B) was discharged or released from service in the uniformed services (as so defined) or the National Guard in such status under conditions other than dishonorable.

(3) MILITARY SERVICE.—The term “military service” means status as a member of the uniformed services.

(b) EMPLOYER PRACTICES.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

(1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to the individual's compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's military service; or

(2) to limit, segregate, or classify the employer's employees or applicants for employment in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect the individual's status as an employee, because of such individual's military service.

(c) EMPLOYMENT AGENCY PRACTICES.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employment agency to fail or refuse to refer for employment, or otherwise discriminate against, any individual because of the individual's military service, or to classify or refer for employment any individual on the basis of the individual's military service.

(d) LABOR ORGANIZATION PRACTICES.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a labor organization—

(1) to exclude or to expel from its membership, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual because of the individual's military service;

(2) to limit, segregate, or classify its membership or applicants for membership, or to classify or fail or refuse to refer for employment any individual, in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities, or would limit such employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect the individual's status as an employee or as an applicant for employment, because of such individual's military service; or

(3) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this section.

(e) TRAINING PROGRAMS.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining, including on-the-job training programs, to discriminate against any individual because of the individual's military service in admission to, or employment in, any program established to provide apprenticeship or other training.

(f) BUSINESSES OR ENTERPRISES WITH PERSONNEL QUALIFIED ON BASIS OF MILITARY SERVICE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, it shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to hire and employ employees, for an employment agency to classify, or refer for employment any individual, for a labor organization to classify its membership or to classify or refer for employment any individual, or for an employer, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee controlling

apprenticeship or other training or retraining programs to admit or employ any individual in any such program, on the basis of the individual's military service in those certain instances where military service is a bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the normal operation of that particular business or enterprise.

(g) NATIONAL SECURITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, it shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to fail or refuse to hire and employ any individual for any position, for an employer to discharge any individual from any position, or for an employment agency to fail or refuse to refer any individual for employment in any position, or for a labor organization to fail or refuse to refer any individual for employment in any position, if—

(1) the occupancy of such position, or access to the premises in or upon which any part of the duties of such position is performed or is to be performed, is subject to any requirement imposed in the interest of the national security of the United States under any security program in effect pursuant to or administered under any statute of the United States or any Executive order of the President; and

(2) such individual has not fulfilled or has ceased to fulfill that requirement.

(h) SENIORITY OR MERIT SYSTEM; QUANTITY OR QUALITY OF PRODUCTION; ABILITY TESTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, it shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to apply different standards of compensation, or different terms, conditions, or privileges of employment pursuant to a bona fide seniority or merit system, or a system which measures earnings by quantity or quality of production or to employees who work in different locations, provided that such differences are not the result of an intention to discriminate because of military service, nor shall it be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to give and to act upon the results of any professionally developed ability test provided that such test, its administration, or action upon the results is not designed, intended, or used to discriminate because of military service.

(i) PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT NOT TO BE GRANTED ON ACCOUNT OF EXISTING NUMBER OR PERCENTAGE IMBALANCE.—Nothing contained in this section shall be interpreted to require any employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee subject to this section to grant preferential treatment to any individual or to any group because of the military service of such individual or group on account of an imbalance which may exist with respect to the total number or percentage of persons with military service employed by any employer, referred or classified for employment by any employment agency or labor organization, admitted to membership or classified by any labor organization, or admitted to, or employed in, any apprenticeship or other training program, in comparison with the total number or percentage of persons with military service in any community, State, section, or other area, or in the available work force in any community, State, section, or other area.

(j) BURDEN OF PROOF IN DISPARATE IMPACT CASES.—

(1) DISPARATE IMPACT.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—An unlawful employment practice based on disparate impact is established under this section only if—

(i) a complaining party demonstrates that a respondent uses a particular employment

practice that causes a disparate impact on the basis of military service and the respondent fails to demonstrate that the challenged practice is job related for the position in question and consistent with business necessity; or

(ii) the complaining party makes the demonstration described in subparagraph (C) with respect to an alternative employment practice and the respondent refuses to adopt such alternative employment practice.

(B) DEMONSTRATION OF CAUSATION.—

(i) PARTICULAR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—With respect to demonstrating that a particular employment practice causes a disparate impact as described in subparagraph (A)(i), the complaining party shall demonstrate that each particular challenged employment practice causes a disparate impact, except that if the complaining party can demonstrate to the court that the elements of a respondent's decisionmaking process are not capable of separation for analysis, the decisionmaking process may be analyzed as one employment practice.

(ii) DEMONSTRATION OF NONCAUSATION.—If the respondent demonstrates that a specific employment practice does not cause the disparate impact, the respondent shall not be required to demonstrate that such practice is required by business necessity.

(C) ALTERNATIVE EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE.—The demonstration referred to by subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be in accordance with the law as it existed on June 4, 1989, with respect to the concept of “alternative employment practice”.

(2) BUSINESS NECESSITY NO DEFENSE TO INTENTIONAL DISCRIMINATION.—A demonstration that an employment practice is required by business necessity may not be used as a defense against a claim of intentional discrimination under this section.

(3) RULES CONCERNING CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a rule barring the employment of an individual who currently and knowingly uses or possesses a controlled substance, as defined in section 102(6) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(6)) and included in schedule I or II of the schedules specified in that section, other than the use or possession of a drug taken under the supervision of a licensed health care professional, or any other use or possession authorized by the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) or any other provision of Federal law, shall be considered an unlawful employment practice under this section only if such rule is adopted or applied with an intent to discriminate because of military service.

(k) PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATORY USE OF TEST SCORES.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a respondent, in connection with the selection or referral of applicants or candidates for employment or promotion, to adjust the scores of, use different cutoff scores for, or otherwise alter the results of, employment related tests on the basis of military service.

(l) IMPERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF MILITARY SERVICE IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, an unlawful employment practice is established when the complaining party demonstrates that military service was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.

(m) RESOLUTION OF CHALLENGES TO EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES IMPLEMENTING LITIGATED OR CONSENT JUDGMENTS OR ORDERS.—

(1) PRACTICES NOT CHALLENGEABLE.—

(A) PRACTICES TO IMPLEMENT A LITIGATED OR CONSENT JUDGMENT OR ORDER.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as provided in paragraph (2), an employment practice that implements and is within the scope of a litigated or consent judgment or order that resolves a claim of employment discrimination under the Constitution or Federal civil rights laws may not be challenged under the circumstances described in subparagraph (B).

(B) CIRCUMSTANCES.—A practice described in subparagraph (A) may not be challenged in a claim under the Constitution or Federal civil rights laws—

(i) by a person who, prior to the entry of the judgment or order described in subparagraph (A), had—

(I) actual notice of the proposed judgment or order sufficient to apprise such person that such judgment or order might adversely affect the interests and legal rights of such person and that an opportunity was available to present objections to such judgment or order by a future date certain; and

(II) a reasonable opportunity to present objections to such judgment or order; or

(ii) by a person whose interests were adequately represented by another person who had previously challenged the judgment or order on the same legal grounds and with a similar factual situation, unless there has been an intervening change in law or fact.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to—

(A) alter the standards for intervention under rule 24 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or apply to the rights of parties who have successfully intervened pursuant to such rule in the proceeding in which the parties intervened;

(B) apply to the rights of parties to the action in which a litigated or consent judgment or order was entered, or of members of a class represented or sought to be represented in such action, or of members of a group on whose behalf relief was sought in such action by the Federal Government;

(C) prevent challenges to a litigated or consent judgment or order on the ground that such judgment or order was obtained through collusion or fraud, or is transparently invalid or was entered by a court lacking subject matter jurisdiction; or

(D) authorize or permit the denial to any person of the due process of law required by the Constitution.

(3) COURT FOR ACTIONS THAT ARE CHALLENGEABLE.—Any action not precluded under this subsection that challenges an employment consent judgment or order described in paragraph (1) shall be brought in the court, and if possible before the judge, that entered such judgment or order. Nothing in this subsection shall preclude a transfer of such action pursuant to section 1404 of title 28, United States Code.

(n) DISCRIMINATION FOR MAKING CHARGES, TESTIFYING, ASSISTING, OR PARTICIPATING IN ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to discriminate against any of the employer's employees or applicants for employment, for an employment agency, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining, including on-the-job training programs, to discriminate against any individual, or for a labor organization to discriminate against any member thereof or applicant for membership, because the employee, applicant, individuals, or member involved has opposed any practice made an unlawful employment practice by this section,

or has made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this section.

(o) PRINTING OR PUBLICATION OF NOTICES OR ADVERTISEMENTS.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer, labor organization, employment agency, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining, including on-the-job training programs, to print or publish or cause to be printed or published any notice or advertisement relating to employment by such an employer or membership in or any classification or referral for employment by such a labor organization, or relating to any classification or referral for employment by such an employment agency, or relating to admission to, or employment in, any program established to provide apprenticeship or other training by such a joint labor-management committee, indicating any preference, limitation, specification, or discrimination, based on military service, except that such a notice or advertisement may indicate a preference, limitation, specification, or discrimination based on military service when military service is a bona fide occupational qualification for employment.

(p) EXEMPTIONS.—

(1) INAPPLICABILITY OF TITLE TO CERTAIN ALIENS.—This section shall not apply to an employer with respect to the employment of aliens outside any State.

(2) COMPLIANCE WITH STATUTE AS VIOLATION OF FOREIGN LAW.—It shall not be unlawful under this section for an employer (or a corporation controlled by an employer), labor organization, employment agency, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining (including on-the-job training programs) to take any action otherwise prohibited by such section, with respect to an employee in a workplace in a foreign country if compliance with such section would cause such employer (or such corporation), such organization, such agency, or such committee to violate the law of the foreign country in which such workplace is located.

(3) CONTROL OF CORPORATION INCORPORATED IN FOREIGN COUNTRY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an employer controls a corporation whose place of incorporation is a foreign country, any practice prohibited by this section engaged in by such corporation shall be presumed to be engaged in by such employer.

(B) FOREIGN PERSON NOT CONTROLLED BY EMPLOYER.—This section shall not apply with respect to the foreign operations of an employer that is a foreign person not controlled by an American employer.

(C) CONTROL.—For purposes of this subsection, the determination of whether an employer controls a corporation shall be based on—

- (i) the interrelation of operations;
- (ii) the common management;
- (iii) the centralized control of labor relations; and
- (iv) the common ownership or financial control,

of the employer and the corporation.

(4) CLAIMS OF NO MILITARY SERVICE.—Nothing in this section shall provide the basis for a claim by an individual without military service that the individual was subject to discrimination because of the individual's lack of military service.

(q) POSTING NOTICES.—Every employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee covered

under this section shall post notices to applicants, employees, and members describing the applicable provisions of this section, in the manner prescribed by section 711 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-10).

(r) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue regulations to carry out this section in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code.

(s) ENFORCEMENT.—The powers, remedies, and procedures set forth in sections 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, and 712 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-4, 2000e-5, 2000e-6, 2000e-7, 2000e-8, 2000e-9, and 2000e-11) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this section provides to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, to the Attorney General, or to any person alleging discrimination on the basis of military service in violation of any provision of this section, or regulations promulgated under subsection (r), concerning employment.

(t) APPLICATION.—Nothing in sections 2 through 14 shall be construed to apply to this section.

SA 2022. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 815, to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 8, add at the end the following:

(c) GUIDANCE ON GENDER TRANSITION.—Not later than the effective date of this Act, the Commission shall issue guidance with respect to this Act and gender transition, including defining the term “transition” (including other forms of the word).

(d) GUIDANCE ON SHARED FACILITIES.—Not later than the effective date of this Act, the Commission shall issue guidance with respect to this Act on shared facilities. When issuing such guidance, the Commission shall take into account any undue hardship on employers in meeting the nondiscrimination requirements of this Act.

SA 2023. Ms. HIRONO (for Mr. SANDERS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 287, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve assistance to homeless veterans, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 11, strike line 25 and insert the following: lessness pursuant to such partnerships.

“(f) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to enter into partnerships under this section as described in subsection (a) shall expire on December 31, 2016.”

On page 13, strike lines 3 through 18 and insert the following:

SEC. 10. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR PROGRAM OF REFERRAL AND COUNSELING SERVICES FOR VETERANS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS WHO ARE TRANSITIONING FROM CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS.

Section 2023 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b);

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “To the extent practicable, the program” and inserting “The program”;

(3) in subsection (d), by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2017”;

(4) in subsection (e)(2), by striking “provided under the demonstration program”; and

(5) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively.

On page 14, strike lines 2 through 14 and insert the following:

(a) TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION FOR SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL AND HOMELESS VETERANS.—Section 2031(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “December 31,

Beginning on page 14, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 15, line 7, and insert the following:

(f) TRAINING ENTITIES FOR PROVISION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES IN PERMANENT HOUSING.—Section 2044(e)(3) of such title is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2014”.

On page 15, strike lines 8 through 12.

On page 16, line 7, strike “March 31, 2018” and insert “August 31, 2017”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 6, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, “America COMPETES: Science and the U.S. Economy.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 6, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Health Insurance Exchanges: An Update from the Administration.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 6, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 6, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 6, 2013, at 10 a.m., in

room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Bureau of Prisons & Cost-Effective Strategies for Reducing Recidivism.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on November 6, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Judicial Nominations.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on November 6, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SR-418, of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Relations, and the District of Columbia of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on November 6, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “One Year Later: Examining the Ongoing Recovery from Hurricane Sandy.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on November 6, 2013, to conduct a hearing entitled “Transportation: A Challenge to Independence for Seniors.”

The Committee will meet in room 562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building beginning at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to ask unanimous consent that my intern, Chloe Becker, who is shadowing me today, be accorded full privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Lauren Sarkesian and Jennifer Lucas of my staff be granted floor privileges for the duration of today’s session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOMELESS VETERANS EXPANSION ACT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 197, S. 287.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 287) to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the definition of a homeless veteran for purposes of benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, with an amendment and an amendment to the title, as follows:

S. 287

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Helping Homeless Veterans Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF DEFINITION OF HOMELESS VETERAN FOR PURPOSES OF BENEFITS UNDER THE LAWS ADMINISTERED BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Section 2002(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “in section 103(a) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11302(a))” and inserting “in subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11302)”.

SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENTS TO GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.

(a) MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS FOR PROGRAMS THAT ASSIST HOMELESS VETERANS.—Subsection (a) of section 2011 of title 38, United States Code, is amended, in the matter before paragraph (1)—

(1) by striking “or modifying” and inserting “, modifying, or maintaining”; and

(2) by inserting “privately, safely, and securely,” before “the following”.

(b) REQUIREMENT THAT RECIPIENTS OF GRANTS MEET PHYSICAL PRIVACY, SAFETY, AND SECURITY NEEDS OF HOMELESS VETERANS.—Subsection (f) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) To meet the physical privacy, safety, and security needs of homeless veterans receiving services through the project.”.

SEC. 4. INCREASED PER DIEM PAYMENTS FOR TRANSITIONAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE THAT BECOMES PERMANENT HOUSING FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.

Section 2012(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (D) as subparagraphs (C) through (E), respectively;

(2) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated, by striking “in subparagraph (D)” and inserting “in subparagraph (E)”;

(3) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated, by striking “under subparagraph (B)” and inserting “under subparagraph (C)”;

(4) in subparagraph (E), as redesignated, by striking “in subparagraphs (B) and (C)” and inserting “in subparagraphs (C) and (D)”;

(5) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “The rate” and inserting “Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (B), the rate”; and

(B) by striking “under subparagraph (B)” and all that follows through the end and inserting the following: “under subparagraph (C).”

“(B)(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), in no case may the rate determined under this paragraph exceed the rate authorized for State homes for domiciliary care under subsection (a)(1)(A) of section 1741 of this title, as the Secretary may increase from time to time under subsection (c) of that section.

“(ii) In the case of services furnished to a homeless veteran who is placed in housing that will become permanent housing for the veteran upon termination of the furnishing of such services to such veteran, the maximum rate of per diem authorized under this section is 150 percent of the rate described in clause (i).”.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF PER DIEM PAYMENTS FOR FURNISHING CARE TO DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN HOMELESS VETERANS.

Subsection (a) of section 2012 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) Services for which a recipient of a grant under section 2011 of this title (or an entity described in paragraph (1)) may receive per diem payments under this subsection may include furnishing care for a dependent of a homeless veteran who is under the care of such homeless veteran while such homeless veteran receives services from the grant recipient (or entity).”.

SEC. 6. REQUIREMENT FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO ASSESS COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall assess and measure the capacity of programs for which entities receive grants under section 2011 of title 38, United States Code, or per diem payments under section 2012 or 2061 of such title.

(b) ASSESSMENT AT NATIONAL AND LOCAL LEVELS.—In assessing and measuring under subsection (a), the Secretary shall develop and use tools to examine the capacity of programs described in such subsection at both the national and local level in order to assess the following:

(1) Whether sufficient capacity exists to meet the needs of homeless veterans in each geographic area.

(2) Whether existing capacity meets the needs of the subpopulations of homeless veterans located in each geographic area.

(3) The amount of capacity that recipients of grants under sections 2011 and 2061 and per diem payments under section 2012 of such title have to provide services for which the recipients are eligible to receive per diem under section 2012(a)(2)(B)(ii) of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 4(5)(B).

(c) USE OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall use the information collected under this section as follows:

(1) To set specific goals to ensure that programs described in subsection (a) are effectively serving the needs of homeless veterans.

(2) To assess whether programs described in subsection (a) are meeting goals set under paragraph (1).

(3) To inform funding allocations for programs described in subsection (a).

(4) To improve the referral of homeless veterans to programs described in subsection (a).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the assessment required by subsection (b) is completed, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on such assessment and such recommendations for legislative and administrative action as the Secretary may have to improve the programs and per diem payments described in subsection (a).

SEC. 7. EXPANSION OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE DENTAL CARE TO HOMELESS VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2062(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b) ELIGIBLE VETERANS.—(1) Subsection (a) applies to a veteran who—

“(A) is enrolled for care under section 1705(a) of this title; and

“(B) for a period of 60 consecutive days, is receiving—

“(i) assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)); or

“(ii) care (directly or by contract) in any of the following settings:

“(I) A domiciliary under section 1710 of this title.

“(II) A therapeutic residence under section 2032 of this title.

“(III) Community residential care coordinated by the Secretary under section 1730 of this title.

“(IV) A setting for which the Secretary provides funds for a grant and per diem provider.

“(V) A setting—

“(aa) in which the veteran is receiving transitional housing assistance;

“(bb) for which funding is not provided for transitional housing assistance under the laws administered by the Secretary;

“(cc) for which the Secretary receives verification from the provider of care that the veteran is receiving care for a period of 60 consecutive days; and

“(dd) from which the Secretary determines that the veteran cannot reasonably access comparable dental services at no cost and in a reasonable period of time.

“(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), in determining whether a veteran has received assistance or care for a period of 60 consecutive days, the Secretary may disregard breaks in the continuity of assistance or care for which the veteran is not responsible.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. PARTNERSHIPS WITH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE ENTITIES TO PROVIDE LEGAL SERVICES TO HOMELESS VETERANS AND VETERANS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 20 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2022 the following new section:

“§2022A. Partnerships with public and private entities to provide legal services to homeless veterans and veterans at risk of homelessness

“(a) PARTNERSHIPS AUTHORIZED.—Subject to the availability of funds for that purpose, the Secretary may enter into partnerships with public or private entities to fund a portion of the general legal services specified in subsection (c) that are provided by such entities to homeless veterans and veterans at risk of homelessness.

“(b) LOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall ensure that, to the extent practicable, partnerships under this section are made with entities equitably distributed across the geographic regions of the United States, including rural communities, tribal lands of the United States, Native Americans, and tribal organizations (as defined in section 3765 of title 38, United States Code).

“(c) LEGAL SERVICES.—Legal services specified in this subsection include legal services provided by public or private entities that address the needs of homeless veterans and veterans at risk of homelessness as follows:

“(1) Legal services related to housing, including eviction defense and representation in landlord-tenant cases.

“(2) Legal services related to family law, including assistance in court proceedings for child support, divorce, and estate planning.

“(3) Legal services related to income support, including assistance in obtaining public benefits.

“(4) Legal services related to criminal defense, including defense in matters symptomatic of homelessness, such as outstanding warrants, fines, and driver's license revocation, to reduce recidivism and facilitate the overcoming of re-entry obstacles in employment or housing.

“(d) CONSULTATION.—In developing and carrying out partnerships under this section, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, consult with public and private entities—

“(1) for assistance in identifying and contacting organizations capable of providing the legal services described in subsection (c); and

“(2) to coordinate appropriate outreach relationships with such organizations.

“(e) REPORTS.—The Secretary may require entities that have entered into partnerships under this section to submit to the Secretary periodic reports on legal services provided to homeless veterans and veterans at risk of homelessness pursuant to such partnerships.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 20 of such title is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2022 the following new item:

“2022A. Partnerships with public and private entities to provide legal services to homeless veterans and veterans at risk of homelessness.”.

SEC. 9. REQUESTS FOR DATA TO EVALUATE AND IMPROVE SERVICES PROVIDED TO VETERANS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS.

Section 2022 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g);

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection (f):

“(f) REQUESTS FOR DATA TO EVALUATE AND IMPROVE SERVICES PROVIDED TO VETERANS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS.—(1) The Secretary shall from time to time request from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Prisons, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, and other appropriate Federal law enforcement agencies data in the possession of such agencies useful for the evaluation and improvement of the services provided to veterans at risk of homelessness under this section and section 2023 of this title.

“(2) Such agencies shall make reasonable efforts to comply with any such request by the Secretary.”.

SEC. 10. REPEAL OF SUNSET ON AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT PROGRAM OF REFERRAL AND COUNSELING SERVICES FOR VETERANS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS WHO ARE TRANSITIONING FROM CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS.

Section 2023 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b);

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “To the extent practical, the program” and inserting “The program”;

(3) by striking subsection (d);

(4) in subsection (e)(2), by striking “provided under the demonstration program”; and

(5) by redesignating subsections (c) and (e) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

SEC. 11. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR ANNUAL REPORTS ON ASSISTANCE TO HOMELESS VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2065 of title 38, United States Code, is hereby repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 20 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2065.

SEC. 12. EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITIES.

(a) **COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS.**—Section 2013 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraphs (4) through (6) and inserting the following:

“(4) \$250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2014.

“(5) \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each subsequent fiscal year.”.

(b) **HOMELESS VETERANS REINTEGRATION PROGRAMS.**—Section 2021(e)(1)(F) of such title is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(c) **TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION FOR SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL AND HOMELESS VETERANS.**—Section 2031(b) of such title is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(d) **CENTERS FOR THE PROVISION OF COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES TO HOMELESS VETERANS.**—Section 2033(d) of such title is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(e) **HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.**—Section 2041(c) of such title is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(f) **FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES IN PERMANENT HOUSING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (1) of section 2044(e) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph (F):

“(F) \$300,000,000 for fiscal year 2014.”.

(2) **TRAINING ENTITIES FOR PROVISION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.**—Paragraph (3) of such section is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2014”.

(g) **GRANT PROGRAM FOR HOMELESS VETERANS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.**—Section 2061(d)(1) of such title is amended by striking “for each of” through “shall be available” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2014, \$5,000,000 shall be available”.

(h) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS FOR NON-PROFIT COMMUNITY-BASED GROUPS.**—Section 2064(b) of such title is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2014”.

(i) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HOMELESS VETERANS.**—Section 2066(d) of such title is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

SEC. 13. EXTENSION OF REDUCED PENSION FOR CERTAIN VETERANS COVERED BY MEDICAID PLANS FOR SERVICES FURNISHED BY NURSING FACILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (d)(7) of section 5503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “November 30, 2016” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **SECTION HEADING.**—The section heading of such section is amended to read as follows: “**Reduced pension for certain hospitalized veterans and certain veterans receiving domiciliary, nursing home, or nursing facility care**”.

(2) **TABLE OF SECTIONS.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 5503 and inserting the following new item:

“5503. Reduced pension for certain hospitalized veterans and certain veterans receiving domiciliary, nursing home, or nursing facility care.”.

Ms. HIRONO. I ask unanimous consent the committee-reported substitute amendment be considered, the Sanders amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to, the committee-reported amendment, as amended, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third

time and passed, the committee-reported title amendment be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2023) was agreed to, as follows:

On page 11, strike line 25 and insert the following:

lessness pursuant to such partnerships.

“(f) **SUNSET.**—The authority of the Secretary to enter into partnerships under this section as described in subsection (a) shall expire on December 31, 2016.”.

On page 13, strike lines 3 through 18 and insert the following:

SEC. 10. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR PROGRAM OF REFERRAL AND COUNSELING SERVICES FOR VETERANS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS WHO ARE TRANSITIONING FROM CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS.

Section 2023 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b);

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “To the extent practicable, the program” and inserting “The program”;

(3) in subsection (d), by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2017”;

(4) in subsection (e)(2), by striking “provided under the demonstration program”; and

(5) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively.

On page 14, strike lines 2 through 14 and insert the following:

(a) **TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION FOR SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL AND HOMELESS VETERANS.**—Section 2031(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “December 31,

Beginning on page 14, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 15, line 7, and insert the following:

(f) **TRAINING ENTITIES FOR PROVISION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES IN PERMANENT HOUSING.**—Section 2044(e)(3) of such title is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2014”.

On page 15, strike lines 8 through 12.

On page 16, line 7, strike “March 31, 2018” and insert “August 31, 2017”.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 287), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 287

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Helping Homeless Veterans Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF DEFINITION OF HOMELESS VETERAN FOR PURPOSES OF BENEFITS UNDER THE LAWS ADMINISTERED BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Section 2002(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “in section 103(a) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11302(a))” and inserting “in subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11302)”.

SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENTS TO GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.

(a) **MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS FOR PROGRAMS THAT ASSIST HOMELESS VETERANS.**—Subsection (a) of section 2011 of title 38, United States Code, is amended, in the matter before paragraph (1)—

(1) by striking “or modifying” and inserting “, modifying, or maintaining”; and

(2) by inserting “privately, safely, and securely,” before “the following”.

(b) **REQUIREMENT THAT RECIPIENTS OF GRANTS MEET PHYSICAL PRIVACY, SAFETY, AND SECURITY NEEDS OF HOMELESS VETERANS.**—Subsection (f) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) To meet the physical privacy, safety, and security needs of homeless veterans receiving services through the project.”.

SEC. 4. INCREASED PER DIEM PAYMENTS FOR TRANSITIONAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE THAT BECOMES PERMANENT HOUSING FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.

Section 2012(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (D) as subparagraphs (C) through (E), respectively;

(2) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated, by striking “in subparagraph (D)” and inserting “in subparagraph (E)”;

(3) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated, by striking “under subparagraph (B)” and inserting “under subparagraph (C)”;

(4) in subparagraph (E), as redesignated, by striking “in subparagraphs (B) and (C)” and inserting “in subparagraphs (C) and (D)”;

and

(5) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “The rate” and inserting “Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (B), the rate”; and

(B) by striking “under subparagraph (B)”

and all that follows through the end and inserting the following: “under subparagraph (C).

“(B)(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), in no case may the rate determined under this paragraph exceed the rate authorized for State homes for domiciliary care under subsection (a)(1)(A) of section 1741 of this title, as the Secretary may increase from time to time under subsection (c) of that section.

“(ii) In the case of services furnished to a homeless veteran who is placed in housing that will become permanent housing for the veteran upon termination of the furnishing of such services to such veteran, the maximum rate of per diem authorized under this section is 150 percent of the rate described in clause (i).”.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF PER DIEM PAYMENTS FOR FURNISHING CARE TO DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN HOMELESS VETERANS.

Subsection (a) of section 2012 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) Services for which a recipient of a grant under section 2011 of this title (or an entity described in paragraph (1)) may receive per diem payments under this subsection may include furnishing care for a dependent of a homeless veteran who is under the care of such homeless veteran while such homeless veteran receives services from the grant recipient (or entity).”.

SEC. 6. REQUIREMENT FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO ASSESS COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall assess and measure the capacity of programs for which entities receive grants under section 2011 of title 38, United States Code, or per diem payments under section 2012 or 2061 of such title.

(b) ASSESSMENT AT NATIONAL AND LOCAL LEVELS.—In assessing and measuring under subsection (a), the Secretary shall develop and use tools to examine the capacity of programs described in such subsection at both the national and local level in order to assess the following:

(1) Whether sufficient capacity exists to meet the needs of homeless veterans in each geographic area.

(2) Whether existing capacity meets the needs of the subpopulations of homeless veterans located in each geographic area.

(3) The amount of capacity that recipients of grants under sections 2011 and 2061 and per diem payments under section 2012 of such title have to provide services for which the recipients are eligible to receive per diem under section 2012(a)(2)(B)(ii) of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 4(5)(B).

(c) USE OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall use the information collected under this section as follows:

(1) To set specific goals to ensure that programs described in subsection (a) are effectively serving the needs of homeless veterans.

(2) To assess whether programs described in subsection (a) are meeting goals set under paragraph (1).

(3) To inform funding allocations for programs described in subsection (a).

(4) To improve the referral of homeless veterans to programs described in subsection (a).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the assessment required by subsection (b) is completed, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on such assessment and such recommendations for legislative and administrative action as the Secretary may have to improve the programs and per diem payments described in subsection (a).

SEC. 7. EXPANSION OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE DENTAL CARE TO HOMELESS VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2062(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b) ELIGIBLE VETERANS.—(1) Subsection (a) applies to a veteran who—

“(A) is enrolled for care under section 1705(a) of this title; and

“(B) for a period of 60 consecutive days, is receiving—

“(i) assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)); or

“(ii) care (directly or by contract) in any of the following settings:

“(I) A domiciliary under section 1710 of this title.

“(II) A therapeutic residence under section 2032 of this title.

“(III) Community residential care coordinated by the Secretary under section 1730 of this title.

“(IV) A setting for which the Secretary provides funds for a grant and per diem provider.

“(V) A setting—

“(aa) in which the veteran is receiving transitional housing assistance;

“(bb) for which funding is not provided for transitional housing assistance under the laws administered by the Secretary;

“(cc) for which the Secretary receives verification from the provider of care that the veteran is receiving care for a period of 60 consecutive days; and

“(dd) from which the Secretary determines that the veteran cannot reasonably access comparable dental services at no cost and in a reasonable period of time.

“(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), in determining whether a veteran has received assistance or care for a period of 60 consecutive days, the Secretary may disregard breaks in the continuity of assistance or care for which the veteran is not responsible.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. PARTNERSHIPS WITH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE ENTITIES TO PROVIDE LEGAL SERVICES TO HOMELESS VETERANS AND VETERANS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 20 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2022 the following new section:

The title was amended so as to read:

“A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve assistance to homeless veterans, and for other purposes.”.

CONDEMNING THE NAIROBI TERRORIST ATTACK

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 234, S. Res. 268.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 268) condemning the September 2013 terrorist attack at the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, and reaffirming United States support for the people and Government of Kenya, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. HIRONO. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 268) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of October 11, 2013, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2013

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, November 7, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 815, the Employee Non-Discrimination Act, under the previous order; and that the first-degree filing deadline be 10:30 a.m. and the second-degree filing deadline be 11:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, there will be two rollcall votes at 11:45 a.m. tomorrow and a third rollcall vote at 1:45 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:18 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, November 7, 2013, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, November 7, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

NOVEMBER 12

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's semi-annual report to Congress.

SD-538

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Subcommittee on Employment and Workplace Safety

To hold hearings to examine payroll fraud.

SD-430

NOVEMBER 13

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Jeh Charles Johnson, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law

To hold hearings to examine "The Surveillance Transparency Act of 2013".

SD-226

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine a review of programs for veteran entrepreneurs.

SR-428A

2 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the role of manufacturing hubs in a 21st century innovation economy.

SR-253

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the current economic outlook.

SH-216

NOVEMBER 14

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Steven Croley, of Michigan, to be General Counsel, and Christopher Smith, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, both of the Department of Energy, and Esther Puakela Kia'aina, of Hawaii, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Insular Areas.

SD-366

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine threats to the homeland.

SD-342

NOVEMBER 20

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine continued oversight of United States government surveillance authorities.

SD-226

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining

To hold hearings to examine S. 182, to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city of Anchorage, Alaska, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversion interest to the City, S. 483, to designate the Berryessa Snow Mountain National Conservation Area in the State of California, S. 771, to provide to the Secretary of the Interior a mechanism to cancel contracts for the sale of materials CA-20139 and CA-22901, S. 776, to establish the Columbine-Hondo Wilderness in the State of New Mexico, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of National Forest System land in the State, S. 841, to designate certain Federal land in the San Juan National Forest in the State of Colorado as wilderness, S. 1305, to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado, S. 1341, to modify the Forest Service Recreation Residence Program as the program applies to units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain by implementing a simple, equitable, and predictable procedure for determining cabin user fees, S. 1414, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, S. 1415, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and S. 1479, to address the forest health, public safety, and wildlife habitat threat presented by the risk of wildfire, including catastrophic wildfire, on National Forest System land and public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to expedite forest management projects relating to hazardous fuels reduction, forest health, and economic development.

SD-366

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

SENATE—Thursday, November 7, 2013

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, our refuge and strength, give us reverence for Your greatness. Guide our Senators around the pitfalls of their work, enabling them to have hearts sustained by Your peace. May they surrender their will to You as they trust You to direct their path. Lord, give them the wisdom to receive Your approval with the understanding that You chastise those whom You love for their good. Empower them to find freedom in being as true to duty as the needle to the pole. Make their lives productive for the glory of Your Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

DRUG QUALITY AND SECURITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 236.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the bill (H.R. 3204) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for giving me an opportunity to speak first this morning due to a commitment I have away from the Capitol.

TRIBUTE TO BILLY GRAHAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to start out this morning by saying a few words about a man who has earned the respect and admiration of countless Americans for his energy, courage, and faithfulness to a calling that he first received about 75 years

ago on a late-night walk around the Temple Terrace Golf Course in Tampa. The son of a North Carolina dairy farmer, Billy Graham turns 95 today. And I just want to join all the others across the country and around the world in thanking this good and humble servant for his decades of ministry and tireless preaching of the Gospel that he loves.

In a career that spans generations, Billy Graham has walked the halls of power and counseled presidents and kings. But he has never forgotten his mission in life. And while he may not be able to preach at the giant rallies that made him a household name, he is still finding new ways to share his faith with a world in need of healing, hope, and purpose. Tonight, at the age of 95, Billy Graham will preach what's been called his final message to America.

Growing up, Billy Graham wanted to be a baseball player. Thankfully, God had different plans. And ever since that night in Tampa, he's put his extraordinary natural talents and generosity of spirit at the service of others.

Billy Graham's first crusade took place in the Civic Auditorium in Grand Rapids, MI, in September 1947. In the decades to come, more than 400 crusades would follow in more than 185 countries and territories on six continents. At one memorable crusade in South Korea, more than one million people showed up to hear the powerful preaching and the hopeful message of the Reverend Billy Graham.

Billy Graham may be the only preacher with a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame. But he never let that celebrity get to his head. I am sure he would say that his beloved Ruth helped keep him focused. And it is a credit to both of them that all five of the Graham children are carrying on the family legacy today.

As Billy Graham has receded from public life in recent years, we have missed the steady, reassuring presence that he lent to moments such as the Oklahoma City bombing and 9/11. But we have been consoled to know that he is still there on his mountain retreat in Montreat, NC. Billy Graham once said that "God has given us two hands, one to receive with and the other to give with." So today, I join countless others in sending our own message of thanks to a man who has been called "America's pastor," and to say how grateful we are for the life and witness of the Reverend Billy Graham.

OBAMACARE

Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, yesterday Secretary

Sebelius came back to Capitol Hill to testify about ObamaCare. We did not learn much from her testimony, but some of the Q-and-A was actually pretty revealing. She admitted that the number of folks who have enrolled in ObamaCare is "very low."

When pressed on the administration's promise that ObamaCare would drive down premiums, here is what she said about premium rates on the individual market: "I didn't say they are going down."

When asked if convicted felons could become ObamaCare navigators and acquire Americans' sensitive information, here is what she said: "It's possible."

These revelations are really concerning. Americans were counting on the President's claim that their families' premiums would go down, not up, under a new health regime. Americans who have lost their insurance and find themselves forced into the exchanges—the last thing they need is to worry about some felon stealing their identity.

To many Americans the administration still seems more interested in deflecting blame than taking responsibility for the real harm this law is causing. Yesterday's hearing did little to dispel that notion.

By now we have heard our friends on the left blame just about everyone and everything for the disaster they forced on our country—everyone and everything, of course, except themselves. They have tried to blame the same contractors they hired. They blame the Republicans. They blame the tea party. I am sure they have even tried to pin this on George W. Bush. Of course, the administration has repeatedly tried to blame insurance companies for lost plans too. But here is what the Washington Post Fact Checker had to say about that:

The administration's effort to pin the blame on insurance companies is a classic case of misdirection.

That is the Washington Post—"a classic case of misdirection." They got three Pinocchios for that whopper.

Unfortunately, that does not seem to have deterred our friends on the other side from indulging in the blame game. Within just the past week we have seen the White House lash out at the words of a cancer survivor and try to point a finger of blame at Texans. A few days ago—get this one—one of the President's political allies attacked the very kind of folks who are now losing their health coverage under ObamaCare. "Free riders," he called them. "Free riders." You know the folks he is talking about. These are not folks who

have done anything wrong. They are not free loaders or free riders or anything else; they are our neighbors, our constituents, and they are not looking for handouts from the government. In fact, these are folks who went out and spent their own hard-earned money—not taxpayer money—to purchase the kind of health protection that best suits their families. For this, the President's allies attacked them? Many just want the government to leave them alone. Many just want to be able to keep the plans they like instead of only the plans the President likes. They want to keep the plans they like, not the ones the President in effect picks for them.

Here is what a small business owner in North Carolina said after his premiums shot up 400 percent: "I just wish I could have my insurance back." That is what he said. "I just wish I could have my insurance back."

I just read this morning about a constituent who lost his insurance and is finding that policies on the exchange will be more than double his premium and increase his annual deductible. That is partly because as a 31-year-old single male he will now be required to buy a policy with features he doesn't need, such as pediatric dental care and maternity care. "It doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me," he said.

Another constituent from Caldwell County had this to say after learning of changes to her plan: "My husband and I work hard, pay a lot in taxes and ask for little from our government. Is it asking too much for the government to stay out of my health insurance?"

No, it is not asking too much. It is simply taking the President at his word for the promise he made over and over, the promise that so many Democrats here in Washington made to their constituents but that we now know is simply not true.

I understand the White House is in a tight spot. They did a poor job preparing the country for this law, they wasted time making promises that simply could not pan out, and they chose to ignore the warnings from my party and experts across the country that these kinds of things would, indeed, happen. This is the result, and people are getting hurt. Premiums are rising, taxes are going up for millions in the middle class, folks are losing access to hospitals and doctors they like.

At this point, more Americans have lost health coverage than have gained it. As I mentioned yesterday, more than 50 times as many Kentuckians have lost private health coverage as have signed up for private plans on the State exchange. That is 280,000 folks we are talking about in my State, 280,000 Kentuckians who have lost their insurance. In Louisiana we are talking about 80,000 folks; in Kentucky, 280,000; up in Minnesota, 140,000 people; and close to half a million people in Georgia have lost their insurance.

It is way past time for our Democratic friends to end the blame game. Instead, they need to start acknowledging the consequences of their law and actually do something about the mess they created. If they are ready to do so, Republicans are willing to help. Let's work together to undo the harm of ObamaCare and start over with real, bipartisan, cost-saving reforms, reforms that will actually allow Americans to keep the health plans they like. That is the kind of reform Americans really want. If Democrats are ready to work with us, we can give them just that.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks the Senate will resume consideration of S. 815, which is the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. At 11:45 there will be two rollcall votes, first on the Toomey amendment and then a cloture vote on the bill. If cloture is invoked, there will be a third rollcall vote on passage of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act.

TRIBUTE TO BILLY GRAHAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am happy to join with my friend in happy birthday wishes for Billy Graham. I have not had the good fortune to meet this man, but I have read his book. I read a biography of him. He is such a personality I thought that was something I should do, and I did.

I remember a lot of things about the book. The one thing I do remember is this: He is so scrupulous in making sure there is never any question about his integrity, his moral integrity. We have had a lot of problems with people preaching who do not turn out to be so good. But Billy Graham, among other things, would never meet a female in his office without the door being wide open so people could see everything that was going on in that room. That is just an indication of the kind of person he is.

I join with my friend in congratulating Billy Graham in his 95th year.

HEALTH CARE

The remarks of my friend, the Republican leader, kind of remind me of a joke that is not very funny, but it is a joke and I think it makes the point. Prison setting—these people run out of material for jokes. They are there together all the time and hear the same joke day after day. So they decided what they would do is they would list the best jokes from 1 to 50, and rather than tell the joke over and over, they would just yell a number and people would laugh.

That is what we have here. Why don't our Republican colleagues just number from 1 through 50 their criticisms of ObamaCare, and rather than coming

and giving these speeches, I think we would be much better off if they would just give us a number and we would all—because we have heard these speeches so many times—immediately laugh because basically they are jokes too.

It is too bad that the Republican leader and many of his Republican colleagues want to keep fighting an old fight. Four years ago we passed the health care reform bill. The President signed it, the Supreme Court upheld it, and it is the law of the land. Of course, we want to make it better, and certainly with what has happened with the rollout of the Web site, we need to do that. But I wish our Republican colleagues would stop trying to scare people out of participating in this program. If they would stop fighting last year's fights and move on and try to do the business of the American people, we would all be better off.

We can look back at the big changes we have made in legislation and we have made some big changes over the years in this body and some of those matters dealt with health care.

I was not here when Medicare passed, but I remember how important it was, because at the time it passed, I was the chairman of the board of trustees—an elected official in Nevada—with the biggest hospital district in Nevada. They had lots of beds and lots of patients. So I remember the impact of Medicare. We also know Medicare did not become popular overnight. There were a lot of criticisms about it.

Although not nearly as big as ObamaCare or Medicare, I was here when we passed—under the leadership of President Bush No. 2—the Medicare drug benefit bill. A number of us didn't like that. We thought it didn't go far enough and that it should have been done differently, but it passed in this body and became the law of the land. It was difficult to get that up and running, but we did not come to the floor and say: Get rid of this bill. We believed, as imperfect as it was, it was the beginning of building support and doing something about health care in America.

I wish my Republican colleagues would do something constructive regarding health care. We have not heard one positive remark about what they would do to change what we have already done. I think we would all be better off if that were, in fact, the case. This legislation is working, and it will work even better when we get the issues regarding the Web site worked out.

There are people in Nevada, there are people in New Jersey, there are people in Indiana, and there are people all over America today who are benefiting as a result of what happened 4 years ago in the Senate and the House of Representatives when the President signed the bill.

I am sure the Presiding Officer, and other people who are listening to this speech, can identify with someone who has or had a preexisting disability. Under the old law, if you were a woman, it was a preexisting disability. You could be charged differently because you were a woman. A child born with diabetes, an adult with diabetes, someone who had been in an automobile accident, someone who was—my friend Tony Coelho, who was one of the leaders when I served in the House with him, was an epileptic. He had a preexisting disability, and that is an understatement.

We could go on and on. If you are under age 18, it doesn't matter if you have a preexisting disability. At the first of the year, you can be an adult and have a preexisting disability and you can get insurance. In many States we extended the preexisting disability exemption to adults. It is already in effect in a number of States because under the law the States had the authority to do that, and the Federal Government will help them.

The Bush drug benefit was flawed. What did we do with it? We didn't try to get rid of it, we improved it. The so-called doughnut hole is being filled and millions of senior citizens, and Americans over the last 4 years, have received millions and millions of dollars in benefits because our drugs are cheaper.

I have talked on this floor before, and I will say it again—in my hometown of Searchlight, NV, there was a young man who was in college and on his parents' insurance. In Nevada you could stay on your parents' insurance until you were 23 years old. Within a matter of weeks of turning 23, he started getting very sick. He had testicular cancer. His parents had no money. One of my friends who is a neurologist did the surgery for free, but he had two other surgeries that were not free.

His parents had no money; one was a retired operating engineer and one worked part-time in a post office there in Searchlight. They struggled, and their son Jeff has been taken care of. Many people don't have the benefit of his parents who sacrificed a great deal for their boy. That is no longer a problem. Children can stay on their parents' insurance for 3 more years, and that would have allowed Jeff, and other men and women just like him, to get out of school.

ObamaCare is a wonderful piece of legislation for America. Let's make it better. Stop carping about this. Get over it. It is the law. It is the legacy of Barack Obama and always will be. Let's make it better and stop the mischievous, unfortunate speeches out here every day about how bad it is. Talk about the good things in this bill and help us work to make it better.

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT

This afternoon the Senate will vote to advance the Employment Non-Dis-

crimination Act. It is legislation that will protect all Americans from workplace discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity. The vote on cloture on the bill will take place before lunch and vote on final passage will take place before the caucus adjourns. We will start voting at 1:45 this afternoon.

I do hope and expect a bipartisan vote, a good one, to extend safeguards against workplace harassment and discrimination to every American. The time has come for Congress to pass a Federal law that ensures all citizens, regardless of where they live, can go to work unafraid of being who they are.

More than 80 percent of the American people think that is already the law. It is not already the law, but that is what they think, so let's just do what the American people think already exists.

I appreciate Chairman HARKIN. He is a devoted person for people who need help. If you ever wondered how C-SPAN has closed captioning, it is because TOM HARKIN led the fight here for many years in the Senate to provide closed captioning. He has a brother who is hearing impaired, and because of that, he was focused on providing closed captioning. We have all kinds of good things for the disabled thanks to TOM HARKIN. The disabilities act, which is so important for our country, is now the law. So I appreciate Chairman HARKIN's work on this legislation. It is a shame for Iowa and the country that he has decided not to run for reelection. What a good man.

JEFF MERKLEY, from Oregon, also worked on this legislation. He has devoted huge amounts of time to this legislation, and I admire and respect him so very much. I respect and appreciate the leadership of these two fine Senators.

I hope Speaker BOEHNER will reconsider his decision not to bring this up for a vote in the House of Representatives. This legislation would pass by a nice margin in the House if the Speaker would allow a vote on it.

I can't understand what is going on in the House of Representatives. Legislation the American people want is held up over there. The farm bill would save this country \$23 billion, and they will not bring it up. The American people want this. There are reforms in the legislation that Senator STABENOW and others have worked so hard to put in place for decades. They are in this bill. The House is holding this up.

Immigration reform. America wants immigration reform. They are going to get it, but it is just too bad that it is being fought every step of the way by my friend, the Speaker. Comprehensive immigration reform is something that is needed in this body; it is needed in the House. We have already passed it. It should be the law of the land. They seem to be so focused on debt reduction. Well, immigration reform saves \$1 trillion of debt.

Marketplace fairness would allow little strip mall operators and small businesses to have the same benefits others have. It is unfair that brick-and-mortar businesses that pay rent cannot be competitive with the businesses on the Internet that pay no sales tax. The House is holding that up, and now they are holding this up. That is just another piece of legislation that people around America support and the House is holding up. I hope the Speaker will reconsider his position.

D.C. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

I will also file cloture today on the nomination of a highly qualified jurist to serve on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. The D.C. Circuit is often called the second highest court in the land. No one has debated that in any other way. It is so important. It is no wonder why. Here is what former D.C. Circuit Chief Judge Patricia Wald said of the court's caseload: "The D.C. Circuit hears the most complex, time-consuming, labyrinthine disputes over regulations with the greatest impact on ordinary Americans' lives."

It is unfortunate that Republicans are filibustering another talented and dedicated public servant nominated to service on this crucial court.

Georgetown law professor Nina Pillard is the next victim of what the Republicans are doing. She graduated magna cum laude from Yale and attended Harvard Law School. For 5 years she litigated individual and class action racial discrimination cases as an attorney for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund.

She served as Deputy Assistant Attorney General and Assistant Solicitor General. Support for her confirmation is bipartisan. Two top Justice Department officials from the Bush era, Assistant Attorney General Viet Dinh and former FBI Director William Sessions, have supported her nomination.

Professor Pillard is also faculty co-director of the Supreme Court Institute at Georgetown, which helps attorneys to argue cases before the High Court. She brings a wealth of knowledge to the job. She has argued nine cases before the Supreme Court and has written briefs for another 25. Her arguments helped open the Virginia Military Institute to women in 1997 and beat back a constitutional challenge of the Family and Medical Leave Act.

She is qualified and dedicated. It is truly a shame that Republicans would filibuster this nomination for unrelated political reasons. The D.C. Circuit is currently operating with only 8 of its 11 seats. While Senate Republicans are blocking President Obama's nominees to this vital court, they were happy to confirm judges to the D.C. Circuit when President Reagan and both President Bushes were in office.

Republicans have already blocked two exceedingly qualified nominees to the D.C. Circuit, Caitlin Halligan and

Patricia Millett. I hope my Republican colleagues will not block another qualified nominee when we vote on cloture on this matter next week. This nominee deserves a fair confirmation process and a simple up-or-down vote.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 815, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 815) to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

Pending:

Reid amendment No. 2014 (to the language proposed to be stricken by the committee substitute), to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 2015 (to amendment No. 2014), of a perfecting nature.

Reid motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions with instructions to report back forthwith, Reid Amendment No. 2016, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 2017 (to (the instructions of the motion to recommit) Amendment No. 2016), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 2018 (to amendment No. 2017), of a perfecting nature.

Reid (for Toomey/Flake) amendment No. 2013, to strike the appropriate balance between protecting workers and protecting religious freedom.

Collins (for Reid) amendment No. 2020 (to amendment No. 2013), to change the enactment date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss the topic of religious freedom. This issue is an important component in the debate on the legislation that we are currently considering, but it's also an issue that defines, I believe, who we are as a Nation as well as the rights granted to us in the Constitution.

To paraphrase what Thomas Jefferson said in 1807, for Americans, he said, 'Among the most inestimable of our blessings' is the blessing 'of liberty to worship our Creator in the way we think most agreeable to His will; a liberty deemed in other countries incompatible with good government and yet proved by our experience to be its best support.'

From Jefferson's time to today, freedom of religion has been a core American principle, a principle our founding fathers put their lives on the line for and a principle that generations of Americans in uniform have defended so that we can all enjoy this cherished freedom. Unfortunately, this principle

of religious freedom is under attack across our country today. Though in many cases these attacks may be subtle, make no mistake, we are seeing the free exercise of religion and freedom of speech constrained and restricted.

We have seen it in the administration's rule regarding church-affiliated groups to facilitate insurance coverage that includes contraceptives and abortion-inducing drugs despite their deeply held religious beliefs.

I think about my alma mater, Wheaton College in Illinois, which is a school from which Billy Graham graduated years ago.

I appreciate the Senate's Majority Leader and Minority Leader's reference to his life as he celebrates his 95th birthday. Billy Graham had an important impact on my life and millions of people—not just Americans, but people around the world. I appreciate the recognition that has been given here by our leaders.

I also think about Indiana-based University of Notre Dame. Despite conscious objections and the clearly outlined standards of these colleges and universities—the College's Community Covenant at Wheaton and the values of the University of Notre Dame—they have been told by the government that they are not considered religious institutions and must comply with the Health and Human Services Mandate.

Let me describe a little bit the thread of faith that runs through every aspect of a school like Wheaton College and the values of faith expressed frequently in a number of ways by the University of Notre Dame. If you tune into the Notre Dame football programs on Saturday afternoons, as I do every week, or intend to do, you will see an ad by Father Jenkins, President of Notre Dame, that talks about the component and element of faith that is essential to the beliefs of what the University of Notre Dame is trying to address through its education process.

Whether it is professors or students, administrators or groundskeepers or others that thread of faith and values runs through the university and throughout my alma mater as well. There's such a thing as, it's been described by former president of Wheaton College, as umbrella universities—those [universities] that have a faith component perhaps in a theological school or a religious program. The thought is well, certainly, they can exercise their constitutional rights guaranteed by the First Amendment. But what about the doorkeeper or receptionist at the administration building or the coaches of the teams or the professors? Sure the professor of theology and the professor of religion, but what about the professor of science, professor of economics, or the professor of business, how does that apply? Or what about the groundskeepers or those who

serve the meals in the cafeterias to the students? Well, there are those types of institutions, and there is an argument that it is not systemic, it is not the thread that runs through every aspect of the program. And this applies to homeless shelters and faith-based institutions across America. Some are secular related. Some are a mix of secular-religious. And some are systematically faith-based where a thread of faith runs through every aspect of their program or the institution.

So what we're talking about here is a situation where institutions of education, like Wheaton College and the University of Notre Dame, or faith-based institutions reaching out through homeless shelters, food kitchens, any number of programs provided by faith-based institutions or individuals engaged in this that believe that the thread of faith is important to their success and that's why they're there.

These faith-based institutions have been told by the government that they're not considered religious institutions and must comply with the Health and Human Services Mandate. Last year administration officials said they worked out a compromise on this rule, but the fact is the mandate still exists. These institutions should not have to facilitate insurance coverage for products that are counter to their moral beliefs. In my opinion, to require faith-based institutions to betray the fundamental tenets of their beliefs and accept this violation of their First Amendment rights guaranteed by the Constitution is simply wrong.

I think about the health care professionals who have been required to participate—required by the government—to participate in medical procedures that violate their rights of conscience and their deeply held religious beliefs about the meaning of life and when life begins.

I think about the recent efforts in many States to force churches and religious professionals into performing rituals or ceremonies that run counter to their faith.

So what is at stake here is of extreme significance. Established in our nation's founding days and sustained for over 200 years, this principle is at the very core of our system of government, as Jefferson was trying to say.

We can't pick and choose when to adhere to the Constitution and when to cast it aside for cheap political prerogatives. We must consistently stand for these timeless constitutional granted privileges and rights.

The legislation before us raises very serious concerns regarding religious freedom. The so-called protections from religious liberty in this bill are vaguely defined and do not extend to all organizations that wish to adhere to their moral or religious beliefs in their hiring practices.

For example, the religious beliefs of faith-based childcare providers and small business owners would be disregarded under this legislation. Faith-based daycare providers could be forced to hire individuals with views contrary to the faith and incorporated values of these daycare providers. Do we really want to support policies that discriminate against an employer's religious beliefs and require employers to hire individuals who contradict their very most deeply held religious beliefs?

This bill also would allow employers to be held liable to workplace environment complaints opening the door to the silencing of employees who express their deeply held beliefs. This possibility runs counter to everything America stands for in the realm of free speech.

Now I know there have been some efforts, including amendments offered by my colleagues, Senator TOOMEY from Pennsylvania and Senator PORTMAN from Ohio, to clarify the existing religious protections in this bill. Some Members believe that these amendments go too far. I frankly believe they don't go far enough. However, they are at least a first step, and I will support these two measures not to make a bad bill better, but to highlight the importance of the freedom of religion principle involved in this legislation.

Let me quote from Jay Sekulow, Chief Counsel for the American Center for Law and Justice. He wrote this:

A steadfast commitment to one's religious scruples was once lauded as a virtue, but in the current public discourse, religious objectors are often chastised as seeking special treatment that would impose their values on others. The apparent unpopularity of the expression of religious values through actions or words brings to mind Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes' observation that: "We should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death and the Supreme Court's more recent reminder that the First Amendment protects expression, be it of the popular variety or not."

The Supreme Court's recent reminder and I quote again, "the First Amendment protects expression, be it of the popular variety or not." It is an important thing for us to remember from a very respected Supreme Court judge.

I oppose discrimination of any kind, and that includes discrimination against individuals or institutions for their faith and values, which often gets lost and has been lost in this discussion. So there's two types of discrimination here we're dealing with and one of those goes to the very fundamental right granted to every American through our Constitution, a cherished value of the freedom of expression and religion. And I believe this bill diminishes that freedom.

So I feel it's vital for this body to stand up for our country's long-standing right to the freedom of religion and speech. For these reasons, I am not

able to support this current legislation, and I hope my colleagues would stand with me in protecting our religious freedom and oppose this legislation.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion for the absence of a quorum.

Mr. COATS. I will, and I apologize for not recognizing my colleague, who is standing in the back row. My eyesight is not as good as it used to be.

Mr. FRANKEN. I can see my colleague from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act.

In many towns, cities, and States across our country, it is still perfectly legal to fire someone simply because they are gay. One can be a hard worker who shows up on time and gets exemplary performance reviews, but if a person's boss discovers that he or she is gay or transgender or suspects it, he can fire a person for being who they are or for whom they love, and there is nothing the person can do about it.

That is a terrible injustice for Americans who happen to be LGBT. It violates the principle that we are all equal under the law. We all deserve the chance to work hard and to prove ourselves, regardless of our race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, age, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

Many Americans do not realize it remains legal to discriminate against LGBT Americans in the workplace. In one recent poll, eight in ten Americans believe it is already illegal under Federal law to fire or refuse to hire someone because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Doesn't that tell us something about how obviously right ENDA is?

The debate we are having in the Senate today is about whether we should ensure LGBT Americans don't suffer discrimination in the workplace. I have long been a supporter of ENDA, and enacting it into law is something we should have done a long time ago. In fact, 17 years ago, it came within one vote of passing in the Senate.

Making ENDA law will be the next significant step in the fight for equality for LGBT Americans. After decades of struggle, we have achieved a number of huge victories in rapid succession: ending don't ask, don't tell; overturning the Federal ban on same-sex marriage recognition; the achievement of marriage equality in more and more of our States, including my home State of Minnesota.

While we are debating ENDA in the Senate today, equality in the workplace is, in fact, something we achieved in Minnesota over two decades ago. In

1993, the Minnesota State legislature amended our State's human rights act to protect Minnesota's workers from discrimination based on their sexual orientation or gender identity. At the time only a few States prohibited discrimination based on sexual orientation, and Minnesota was the first State to include protections for transgender workers.

We have had this law in effect now for over 20 years in Minnesota, and what has been the result? Well, for LGBT Minnesotans it has meant they do not have to live in fear of being fired or discriminated against in hiring just because of who they are or because of whom they love. That is a big deal.

But if you are not an LGBT Minnesotan, very little has changed. Some people, including House Speaker BOEHNER, are opposing ENDA because they claim it will cause frivolous lawsuits and be bad for business. The Minnesota experience shows these fears are unfounded. There has not been a flood of lawsuits because the rights of LGBT Minnesotans are wisely respected. And with 19 Fortune 500 companies, Minnesota has become an ever better place to work and do business. Minnesota is basically the same as it was before this law was passed, except that it is better because LGBT Minnesotans are free from discrimination at work.

Let me give you one example. Last year, a vice president from General Mills—the Minnesota-based company that is one of the world's largest food companies and which currently employs 35,000 people and makes Cheerios—spoke at a Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee hearing about General Mills' support for making sure that the same legal protections people have in Minnesota are extended to workers all across the United States.

The General Mills vice president spoke about how the company's policy of inclusion has contributed to its innovation and growth. He said:

Employees who are members of the LGBT community are incredible contributors to our enterprise. Absent their unique perspectives, talents, and gifts, we would be less competitive and successful. Simply said, talent matters. Now more than ever, American business needs to leverage the ingenuity of all sectors for our nation. Discriminatory barriers to top talent just don't make business sense.

And there are many other large employers headquartered in Minnesota—Target, Supervalu, U.S. Bancorp, Xcel Energy, Medtronic, 3M, Cargill, Best Buy, and many others—who have put in place companywide policies against discrimination on the basis of gender identity and sexual orientation wherever their other factories or businesses or stores may be.

Minnesota's small businesses have also reported on the positive effects of Minnesota's human rights law. For instance, Nancy Lyons is the owner of a

small 70-person Minneapolis business that develops software. Nancy says the protections and peace of mind her employees get from not living in fear positively impact every aspect of their lives, from their productivity at work to their family lives.

It is long past time that LGBT employees around the country be guaranteed the same rights they have had in Minnesota for 20 years. In Minnesota, our law has given LGBT Minnesotans peace of mind and freedom from discrimination at work and improved the overall climate in our State for those individuals, for families, and for businesses. I look forward to the Senate passing this bill, and I hope the House will take it up and pass it as well.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

OBAMACARE

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor today to urge my colleagues again to focus on an important issue in the overall ObamaCare debate; and that is how Washington fares under ObamaCare, and does Washington live by the same rules, the same laws it passes on the rest of America?

All across the country, as we see daily in news reports, Americans are struggling with real issues and real challenges created by ObamaCare. We need to fix those issues and those challenges. We need to get it right. But at the same time as that is going on in the real world, Washington—leaders here—basically get an exemption, a carveout, special treatment, a subsidy. That is particularly egregious and particularly unfair when ordinary Americans suffer under these very real challenges.

That is why I have introduced my No Washington Exemption from ObamaCare bill, and that is why I continue to work hard with many other Members—we have significant co-authors here and in the House—to get that passed.

With regard to Congress, the ObamaCare statute actually got it right. And with regard to Congress, all we are asking for is that we live by the statute, live by the law. That statutory language says clearly that every Member of Congress and all of our congressional official staff go to the exchanges for our health care and be treated just like other Americans going to the exchanges—many of them being forced off plans, employer plans they like, and having to go to the exchanges—no special treatment, no special exemption or carveout or subsidy.

The problem is that after the law passed—I guess it was a classic case of what NANCY PELOSI said: We need to pass the law in order to figure out what is in it—because after ObamaCare passed with that specific statutory language, a lot of folks on Capitol Hill

read it, figured out what was in it, and said: Oh, you know what. We can't have this. We can't live with this. And then they furiously started lobbying for a way out, for an end-run around: And sure enough, they got it. The Obama administration issued a special rule for Congress to take all of that financial sting out of the provision.

The rule basically said two things, both of which I think are outrageous and contrary to the statute itself. First of all, it said: I know the law says all official staff go to the exchanges. But we don't know who that is. We don't know who official staff are. So we are going to leave it up to each individual Member of Congress to designate who is official staff who must go to the exchanges for their health care.

Well, I think that is flat-out ridiculous. The law, the statute, clearly says all official congressional staff. To create this opportunity for exemption, where each individual Member designates staff as official or not, is silly. That designation, by the way, happened last week, and some Members have actually said: None of my staff is official. I have no official staff for purposes of this section, so none of my staff go to the exchanges. That is outrageous. Other Members said: Well, my personal office staff is official but committee staff, no; leadership staff, no. That is outrageous too.

The second thing this illegal rule did to get around the impact of this provision of ObamaCare is to say: Well, for Members and staff who do go to the exchanges, they get to take with them a huge taxpayer-funded subsidy—a big subsidy no other American at that income level gets. That is not in the ObamaCare statute either, and that is contrary to the ObamaCare statute. In fact, that specific language was considered for inclusion and was not put in—proof that was not the intent of that section of ObamaCare.

I believe that is outrageous as well and defeats the whole purpose of the section, which is to make sure Members of Congress and our staff walk in the same shoes as other Americans, 8 million-plus of whom are being forced off coverage they like and being forced on to that ObamaCare exchange.

That is why I have joined with others to push this No Washington Exemption from ObamaCare language.

As I mentioned, one key element is this election that this illegal rule creates, where every individual Member of Congress determines who on their staff goes to the exchange or does not. As I said, in some cases, Members say: I have no official staff. Nobody has to live by the law, nobody has to live by this mandate, which is particularly outrageous.

To add insult to injury, these individual decisions by every Member of Congress are not public. This is all secretive. This is hidden from the public.

Some Members have said what they are doing through the press, but the full information, each individual Member's election in this regard is not public.

So as soon as that loophole was created, I filed another bill, another piece of legislation, that simply says we are going to make all of these decisions public. Everybody has a right to know how each Member of the Senate, how each Member of the House is handling the situation. That is my Show Your Exemptions bill, which I filed about 10 days ago.

I think it should be a no-brainer. I think it should be beyond debate. Whatever you think about the underlying issue, whatever you think about ObamaCare, shouldn't this decision of each individual Member be made public? Shouldn't the public have a right to know? That is why I filed this bill, and that is why I am pushing for a vote on this bill.

Getting a vote on that proposal will be a key priority of mine, particularly when we consider the drug compounding bill in the near future and when we consider the Department of Defense authorization bill. It is going to be my key priority: to get a simple vote on that simple proposal. Again, I believe that should be a no-brainer, that this information—which does involve how taxpayer dollars are being treated, which does involve how congressional offices are handling the situation—that information one way or the other be made public. You do not need to editorialize about it. Everybody can make up their own mind about what they think about the underlying issue, about what they think about ObamaCare, but shouldn't that information be made public?

We need to vote on that proposal, and I urge us to move and agree quickly to have a vote, either in the context of the drug compounding bill or the Defense authorization bill over the next few weeks. Those are probably going to be the only opportunities for a vote this calendar year. I think it is certainly fair and reasonable to get that vote, have the American people be able to see that information, and that is the only opportunity I am likely to have in the Senate this calendar year.

Again, whatever my colleagues think about the underlying issue, certainly whatever we all think about ObamaCare, I would hope we can all agree—that election, that information, how each individual Member of the Senate, each individual Member of the House, handles the situation should be made public. It certainly involves public policy and taxpayer dollars and how we run Congress. It should be made public.

I urge my colleagues—Republicans and Democrats—to unite around that reasonable, commonsense proposal and get that information out to the public, as it should.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

Excuse me. I withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum, but I do yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

BUDGETARY WASTE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, after weeks of budgetary wrangling and a government shutdown that had the country on edge, last week marked the beginning of the bicameral budget conference. I commend my colleagues who are meeting on the issue and are trying to reconcile the goals of wildly different budget outlines. That is no easy task. I think we all know that. However, we all know that shoveling more IOUs into our \$17 trillion debt is simply unsustainable.

No matter on which side of the aisle we sit, I hope we can all agree that America's present fiscal trajectory is untenable and that our Nation's future depends on turning these economic issues around. There is no secret formula. At a minimum, Congress should abide by the budget control framework which has produced some of the most meaningful discretionary spending reductions in decades. Beyond that, we have to slow the rising costs of entitlement programs in order to achieve significant long-term deficit reduction.

Sadly, some seem fixated on spending beyond the BCA's cap for next year. Some of our colleagues have suggested that the spending discipline we achieved with the sequester should be replaced with revenue increases. Now, we all know that sequestration is a blunt instrument for reducing spending, but this desire to replace it by driving up taxes is based on an incorrect assessment. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem. In 2013 the government spent some \$3.5 trillion. We are on track to spend another \$3.7 trillion in 2014. Before anyone starts to look at tax hikes, we should realize that we are nowhere near cutting our budget to the bone. In fact, there is a lot of fat left in a lot of agencies. These budgets deserve to get the knife. But do not just take my word for it. The administration, our colleagues in the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Accountability Office, and numerous concerned-taxpayer organizations have also posed examples of wasteful spending that should be eliminated.

If the sequester's bluntness has taught us anything, it is that Congress ought to jump at the chance to make smart, surgical spending cuts. To that end, I intend to take 5 minutes each week for the coming weeks to highlight some of the wasteful spending programs that still, even in times of economic belt-tightening, lurk in our Federal budget.

Today I would like to highlight some of the programs in the U.S. Depart-

ment of Agriculture. With a budget request of \$146 billion in 2014, the USDA rounds out the top five most expensive Federal agencies. Many programs within the USDA provide valuable services, including meat inspection, crop data collection, and managing the agricultural safety net. But the USDA also has its own agency-level homeland security department, pays for Sunkist to advertise overseas, and underwrites an astonishing number of zero-down-payment suburban home mortgages. That is the USDA.

The most obvious place to realize significant savings in the USDA is with the Federal Crop Insurance Program. Here is a program in which the taxpayers cover the majority of the risk. It pays private insurance agents commissions to sell and administer individual policies. It funds the oversight of the program and, on top of all of that, subsidizes policyholders' premiums. That is a pretty good deal if you can get it.

In 2012 taxpayers spent more than \$7 billion to subsidize this program. In 2010—one of the better recent crop years—when the USDA took in a record \$2.5 billion more than it paid in claims, the Federal Crop Insurance Program still cost taxpayers \$3.7 billion. That is because taxpayers foot the bill for roughly two-thirds of each premium, leaving the policyholder only to cover the remaining third.

Congress could reap significant savings just by reducing the percentage the taxpayers have to spend to subsidize these premiums. In fact, according to CBO, simply rolling back the percentage of taxpayer subsidy in the program to pre-2000 levels would shave more than \$40 billion in spending from the pre-2013 farm bill baseline. To that end, I have introduced the Crop Insurance Subsidy Reduction Act, which would do just that.

There are a number of other places at USDA where Congress can find savings. Surely one of those is USDA's own Office of Homeland Security, created in the post-9/11 security glut. This department is supposedly responsible for providing oversight and coordination for USDA's preparation and response to matters of homeland security importance. A \$1 million program such as this may be easily lost in the President's \$4 trillion budget, but there is an entire agency in the Federal Government tasked with the same objective and funded with the tens of billions of taxpayer dollars.

Another place to find savings at USDA is in the Market Access Program, which has spent \$1.4 billion since 2006 and looks to collect another \$200 million in taxpayer funds in 2014. This program has spent billions of tax dollars on overseas advertising campaigns that benefit some of the most deep-pocketed corporations around, including McDonalds, Nabisco, Welch's Foods, and Sunkist.

When it comes to questionable budgetary items at USDA, the single-family housing direct and guaranteed loan program takes the cake. This obscure but growing home loan program writes and guarantees mortgages for low- and moderate-income families in rural and suburban areas. These loans are 100 percent financed and require no down payment. While home buyers in big cities are not eligible for these loans, residents of many fast-growing towns and suburbs—some within 30 miles of this very building—are receiving those kinds of subsidies. Do not be fooled into thinking these loans are for rustic farmhouses either. They are specifically designed to finance your standard home, and, inexplicably, the USDA discourages buyers from using them to purchase farms or ranches. This is the USDA discouraging us from using these subsidies to purchase farms and ranches but, rather, regular homes.

Since 2006 the USDA—remember, that is the Department of Agriculture—has spent nearly \$10 billion on single-family housing direct loans. While it did not show up in the budget, home loan guarantees by the USDA have also put taxpayers on the hook for another \$118 billion. The agency has requested another \$320 million to fund single-family housing direct loans in 2014 and plans to issue another \$24 billion in guarantees. To put the figures in perspective, the entire Department of Housing and Urban Development submitted a budget request of \$47 billion.

When we have such egregious examples of waste, why should we demand more of the taxpayers' money?

In the coming weeks I hope my colleagues on the budget conference committee, along with the President and Members of Congress and various fiscal organizations, will consider some of the proposals I am offering to eliminate this wasteful spending. A good start would be sowing the seeds of fiscal restraint at the Department of Agriculture.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a short colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate so much the comments of my colleague from Arizona on the challenges inherent in getting our budget under control. I particularly appreciated over the last few days the conversation we have had about the Employment Non-Discrimination Act.

I would like to say that the Senator from Arizona has brought particular value in expressing concerns about how we make sure businesses have the guidance they will need to implement this

act effectively, particularly as this act embraces an area—that is, transgender discrimination—that was not part of the act considered in the House of Representatives.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I appreciate the work the Senator from Oregon did with my office this week to try to arrive at language we could put into an amendment. We were not able to get that amendment.

When I voted for ENDA in the House in 2007, as the Senator mentioned, it did not contain the provisions with regard to gender identity. Those added provisions have concerned me in terms of potential costs of litigation or compliance. I still have those concerns. I hope that as we work through the process, as this bill moves on to the House, we can find ways to make sure employers can implement these provisions in a way that is reasonable and proper.

I also thank the Senator from Wisconsin for working with my office on these issues as well. I have a better appreciation for what needs to be done and what we can do with this legislation as it moves through the process.

I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude to the Senator from Arizona for his very thoughtful and careful approach to considering this legislation. I enjoyed working with the Senator during our days in the House of Representatives and remember well the vote the Senator cast back in 2007 after great study and reflection.

I think we find ourselves in the position we are in right now, with an expanded bill that has protections for both sexual orientation and gender identity, because of the leadership of the Senator from Oregon.

To the point of the concerns that have been raised in this colloquy, there has been a really exhaustive amount of research done on those States that have passed similar pieces of legislation at the State level and how they chose to move forward on employment protections on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. I have discussed with the Senator from Oregon on numerous occasions the approach most States have taken and the success these bills have had in helping to keep all of our employment decisions based on work ethic, character, and loyalty, and the subjects on which they should be focused.

I look forward to working on this measure in the future, and I thank both the Senators from Arizona and the Senator from Oregon for their focus on ENDA.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I look forward to that conversation as well. The State of Wisconsin was one of the first or maybe the first in the Nation to bring an end to workplace discrimination. Oregon has a fully inclusive bill

that has worked very well. We have worked out a great partnership with the businesses of Oregon in making sure there is satisfactory guidance for them. I look forward to bringing that experience into this conversation about the concerns of the Senator from Arizona. I echo the appreciation for the thoughtful dialog we have had over the past few days and look forward to future dialog as we continue to try to make this bill ending discrimination in the workplace work well for businesses across the Nation and certainly for the millions of LGBT Americans who will have the opportunity to break these chains of discrimination and more fully participate in our national economic life.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank both the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Wisconsin for working with me and look forward, as this process goes on, to making sure the provisions in the legislation work for employers as well as for employees. I appreciate the work and the assistance the Senator has given our office. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MERKLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WOMEN'S RIGHTS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank Senator BLUMENTHAL and Senator BOXER, who will be joining me in this conversation in a few minutes.

I think that now more than ever, after we have emerged from this very damaging and completely unnecessary government shutdown, the American people want us to focus on jobs and the economy. That is what every poll says, that is what all of our constituents say, and that is absolutely what is needed at a time when families continue to struggle to make ends meet.

Instead of working with us across the aisle on jobs and economic growth, it seems as if some Republicans are now focused on something else entirely—politics. In fact, in a short while, the senior Senator from South Carolina is going to be introducing a bill that is blatantly political, a bill that not only undermines a woman's access to her doctor but also restricts an array of reproductive health services.

Today we wish to make it abundantly clear; that is, that this extreme, unconstitutional abortion ban is an absolute nonstarter. It is going nowhere in the Senate and those Republicans know it.

I want to think that over the last 40 years, since the historic decision of *Roe v. Wade*, we have moved on from debating this issue. I wish to think that after four decades many of those who want to make women's health care decisions for them have come to grips

with the fact that *Roe v. Wade* is settled law. After all, the many signs of progress are all around us.

This year a record 20 women are serving in this body. One year ago yesterday women's power and voice at the ballot box was heard loudly and clearly. In fact, last year when Republican candidates running for office thought that rape was a political talking point, that idea and their candidacies were swiftly rejected, thanks in large part to the voices of women. Only this week we saw women in Virginia resoundingly reject the Republican candidate for Governor and his misguided and outdated agenda for women's health.

Sometimes it is tempting to think that times have indeed changed, that maybe politicians have realized that getting between a woman and her doctor is not their job, that it is possible that rightwing legislators have a newfound respect for women's health care.

The truth is that the drumbeat of politically driven extremist and unconstitutional laws continues to get louder. Apparently some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to make some noise about this so that their adoring audience of rightwing radio hosts, columnists, and activists is satisfied.

In fact, here is an example of how blatantly political this restrictive ban is. One of the actual participants in the press conference to introduce their bill today had this to say to Politico about the strategy behind doing this. She said: "It's a much better thing to be campaigning on rape and incest these days."

That is an insult to women everywhere, and it is most certainly not what the Senator from South Carolina has called "a debate worthy of a great democracy."

This is a debate we have had. A woman's access to her own doctor is settled law. We are not going to let attacks on *Roe v. Wade* such as this one change that.

I wish to remind all of those who are even considering supporting this bill that real women's lives and the most difficult health care decisions they could ever possibly make are at stake.

I wish for us to consider the story that Judy Nicastro from my home State shared so bravely with the *New York Times* last summer. In an op-ed she wrote only days after the House passed a bill that was virtually identical to the one that is being introduced today, Judy talked about being faced with every pregnant woman's worst nightmare. In describing the news that one of the twins she was carrying was facing a condition where only one lung chamber had formed and that it was only 20 percent complete, Judy captured the anguish that countless women in similar positions have faced. She wrote:

My world stopped. I loved being pregnant with twins and trying to figure out which

one was where in my uterus. Sometimes it felt like a party in there with eight limbs moving. The thought of losing one child was unbearable.

She went on to say:

The M.R.I., at Seattle Children's Hospital, confirmed our fears: the organs were pushed up into our boy's chest and not developing properly. We were in the 22nd week.

Under the bill that is being introduced, the decision Judy ultimately made through painful conversations with her family and consultation with her doctors would be illegal.

The decision to make sure, as she put it, "our son was not born only to suffer" would be taken from her and given to politicians.

I am here to provide a simple reality check. We are not going back. We are not going back on settled law. We are not going to take away a woman's ability to make her own decisions about her own health care and her own body. Women are not going back to a time when laws forced them into back alleys and made them subject to primitive and unsanitary care. Senators such as me, Senator BOXER, Senator BLUMENTHAL, and others who join me in opposing this effort are not going to go anywhere.

Advocates and doctors who treat women every day and know that their health care must be protected are not going to go anywhere. Women who continue to believe that their health care decisions are theirs alone are not going anywhere.

By the way, the Constitution is not going anywhere. Therefore, this bill is not going anywhere. This bill, as attacks on *Roe v. Wade* before it, will eventually be lost to history. But millions of American women will not forget. I welcome our colleagues on the floor to this debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I thank my colleague from the State of Washington for her eloquence and leadership on this issue, as I do my colleague from California. She has been steadfast and strong in support of a woman's right to make choices about reproductive rights. She is absolutely right; we are not going away.

This bill that will be introduced later today from our colleague from South Carolina—as much as we respect him—is a nonstarter because it is nonsensical and unconstitutional. This bill was passed by the House of Representatives earlier this year. We could not have been clearer then, and we should be very clear now, that it is inappropriate, unwise, and unfair. It remains so today and will be so for as long as we are here.

This bill essentially leaves any woman who needs an abortion for health reasons—and I stress, for health reasons—after 20 weeks of a pregnancy

with no options—none. It punishes doctors with up to 5 years in prison for providing a service that the doctor believes, in his or her professional judgment, in his or her medical opinion, is best for her and her family. Those decisions are what the Constitution protects, what *Roe v. Wade* guarantees, what the right of privacy preserves in the right to be left alone.

Quite simply, this bill is bad for women, and it criminalizes medical professionals who would try to do what is right. I have a long history in law enforcement, and this sort of ban, which would leave women in completely desperate circumstances with no options is shortsighted, misguided, and illegal. We should not be here talking about proposals that would degrade and disgrace the Constitution, but about job measures, economic growth bills, and measures to solve the immense challenges that confront us in dealing with budget issues. I thank the Senator from Washington State for the great work that she is doing on those issues.

We should be debating the issues that concern and confront the American people at this historic challenging time—not a measure that will be struck down by the courts because it is so plainly unconstitutional and so clearly bad policy—not only for women but for men, families, and for all of us.

We have seen bill after bill in recent times stalled by disagreements over health care. We have seen the Federal Government shut down over health care. Now we see another legislative attempt to win, essentially, political points at the expense of risking the health and welfare of women and children in this country. The attack on women's health care must stop.

We are here in the midst of a busy legislative session to restate the fact that this bill is going nowhere. My colleagues and I will not allow this bill to put women's lives at risk, and to put their health care in jeopardy with politically motivated attempts at destroying constitutionally protected rights. That is why we are elected to this body, to take a stand and speak out, to protect the people who are most vulnerable, and to make sure that women who are at risk can be allowed to make personal private decisions about their health and their bodies without obtrusive interference from the government.

These decisions should be made by women, their families, the medical profession, and whomever else they wish to consult, not by politicians.

I yield the floor for my colleague from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. It is very good to see the Presiding Officer in the chair.

Since the Senator has arrived, we have cast some landmark votes for

laws that are so critical and for candidates who are so critical. We are about to have a moment in history where we are going to expand opportunities for the LGBT community, expand protection for them so no longer will they face fear in the workplace.

If we have an overwhelming vote—which I hope we will have—it will send a message to Speaker BOEHNER that he should join with us. After all, what is the purpose that we should serve here? It is really making life better for people. It certainly is protecting our people.

This leads me to the reason I am here at the request of Senator MURRAY. It is because we need to speak out against the bill that will shortly be introduced. It is ironic, because as we are about to end discrimination on a whole group of worthy people, this bill attacks another group of people, the majority of this country, women.

We are here to say that the extreme and dangerous 20-week abortion ban is not going anywhere in the Senate—not on our watch. Anyone who knows this knows we mean what we say and say what we mean.

The American people continue in election after election to reject the war on women. They did it in race after race in the 2012 cycle, and they did it in these local and State-wide races only a couple of days ago.

The American people, regardless of party, want us to focus on issues that make a difference in their lives, such as creating jobs, reforming our immigration system, keeping college affordable for students, and rebuilding an infrastructure that is failing us. They don't want to take us back to the last century and open up battles that have long ago been fought in 1973.

I see my friend from Iowa, a real champion of *Roe v. Wade*, a decision that was made by the Court that was a very tough decision. They really did take a moderate view of balancing all of the interests.

We have a bill being introduced today that has been shopped around by the most extreme elements in our country that would essentially say *Roe v. Wade* doesn't make any difference, and it opens up a direct assault on women's health, a direct assault on *Roe v. Wade*, a direct assault on doctors.

It is a radical bill. It is an abortion ban. It offers no health exception, no help for women facing cancer, facing kidney failure, facing blood clots or other tragic complications during a pregnancy, no exception for rape or incest when folks are too scared to report that they were raped or they were a victim of incest. It throws trusted doctors into jail for 5 years simply for providing needed health care to their patients.

I wish to tell you who opposes this: the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. They said that

these restrictions are “dangerous to patients’ safety and health.”

I want to speak about Judy Shackelford. Four months into her pregnancy, she developed a pregnancy-induced blood clot in her arm. The only guarantee that she wouldn’t die and leave behind her 5-year-old son was for Judy to end that pregnancy. She and her husband made that very difficult decision.

No Senators were in the room when she made that decision with her husband. No Governor was in the room. No President was in the room. This was a personal decision she made with her husband, her god, and her doctor. That is how it ought to be. If a family decides they are going to save the life of their mom, that should be respected.

Christie Brooks of Virginia, when pregnant with her second child, after her 20-week ultrasound found out that her daughter would be born with a severe structural birth defect and the baby would suffocate at birth. She made the incredibly difficult decision to end that pregnancy. She wouldn’t be allowed to do that under this radical ban.

We need to decide who we stand up and fight for. Is it some ideological rightwing agenda or is it for the people, the families, the loving families that we represent?

What is best for them? That is it.

So we are going to stop this dangerous bill. We are going to stop this dangerous attack on women in its tracks. We are sending a clear message—and I thank Senator MURRAY for organizing us today—that we will protect women and their families across America.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise today to address an amendment I have pending on the ENDA bill which we will vote on soon. This is an amendment I have offered on my own behalf and that of Senators FLAKE and MCCAIN, who have joined me in this effort, and I thank them for that.

It occurs to me that sometimes in our work a tension can arise between important competing American values, and two vitally important American values are, I believe, somewhat in tension in some aspects of this bill. First, one great enduring and important value for all Americans is equality. This bill today clearly makes a strong stand for greater equality.

I believe, and I think most Americans share the view, that every indi-

vidual is entitled to dignity and respect and fairness, and that individuals ought to be judged based on their merits, on their character, and on their abilities. A person’s sexual orientation is irrelevant to their ability to be a good doctor or engineer or athlete or a Federal judge. That is why I have supported acknowledging that reality.

I supported 17 years ago, in the writing of the charter of the city government of Allentown, a provision that would ban discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in the hiring for that city. I supported an end to don’t ask, don’t tell, because I thought it was an inappropriate infringement on the freedom of gay and lesbian persons serving in the military. I believe there are more legal protections that are appropriate to prevent employment discrimination based on sexual orientation. So these are an important set of values.

Another obvious and vitally important American value is freedom, and particularly religious freedom. The First Amendment guarantee of the free exercise of religion means that religious groups, even in the course of secular services, can, for instance, choose to hire employees who agree with their religion, employees who will promote that religion. And of course, the First Amendment applies even when we don’t necessarily agree with the views of that religion or that faith.

What we have tried to do in this legislation and in other context is to strike an appropriate balance between the tension that arises between these sometimes competing values. The sponsors of this bill have made a very thoughtful, credible effort to strike that balance. In fact, the sponsor of this bill and I agree on what at least an important aspect of that important balance ought to look like, and specifically I believe the agreement is that religious institutions, including those engaging in some secular activities, should be exempt from the requirements of this bill if it violates the tenets of their faith.

The goal of my amendment is to simply make sure the bill actually achieves what the drafters intended. The Senator from Oregon, who is the chief sponsor of the bill, has stated correctly, in terms of its intent, that the bill “broadly exempts from its scope houses of worship as well as religiously affiliated organizations.” This exemption, which covers the same religious organizations already exempted from the religious discrimination provisions of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 should ensure that religious freedom concerns do not hinder the passage of this critical legislation.

Other groups that are advocates for this legislation have similarly observed that the provisions of title VII would ensure the exemption of faith-based institutions. There are examples where

circuit courts have ruled, in interpreting title VII of the Civil Rights Act, that affiliated organizations would in fact get this exemption. Examples include a gymnasium run by the Mormon Church, Christian elementary schools and universities, a Presbyterian-operated retirement home, a Seventh Day Adventist hospital, a Jewish community center, and there are others.

So I acknowledge it is absolutely true it is the case there are Federal courts that have respected the religious freedom of these institutions to be exempted from the religious hiring mandates of the Civil Rights Act and, presumably, that would apply in the case of ENDA because of the way the legislation is crafted.

The problem that concerns me is that there are other cases where other courts have come to a different conclusion, and they have not recognized religious institutions the same way. There is a lack of uniformity across our country, across the different districts that ultimately interpret the application of title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

In fact, over the years, different courts have interpreted the language quite differently, and so we have these two problems, in my view, if we leave the underlying legislation as it is. One is that Americans will live under not two but multiple different standards. The 12 circuits that apply the title VII exemptions have already adopted four different tests for determining whether an institution qualifies for the religious exemption.

The second problem is that employers and workers don’t necessarily have predictability even within a circuit that has its own test, which differs from another circuit. And the reason is the tests themselves are somewhat subjective and somewhat unpredictable. They have multiple factors. For example, the Third Circuit, which includes my State of Pennsylvania, has nine factors; and as the court explained, not all factors will be relevant in all cases, and the weight given each factor may vary from case to case. The result is that in a single case decisionmakers looking at the same set of facts can reach very different conclusions.

In the absence of my amendment, my concern is there will be no uniform, predictable national standard for determining when a religious entity, a religious organization, is exempt from the bill. There are a couple of examples that illustrate my point.

In a case called the EEOC v. Kamehameha Schools—that is a Hawaiian word. My pronunciation may not be correct. This is a 1993 decision—there were two schools created by a charitable trust to help orphans and poor children. The trust instructed “the teachers . . . shall forever be persons of the Protestant religion.” The schools shall provide a good education “and also instruction in morals.”

The schools hired only Protestant teachers. They held themselves out as Protestant schools. They required all the students to take religious classes. They offered Bible studies and worship services, and they had a cooperative relationship with one specific Protestant church.

The district court found the schools were religious and, therefore, they were covered and they qualified for the exemption. But the Ninth Circuit Court, considering the exact same set of facts, found the opposite and decided the schools were secular. The Ninth Circuit acknowledged the schools' original principle was providing religious instruction, but they essentially ruled that since some students were not Protestant and since the schools offered courses that were not religious in nature—the schools taught math and they taught social studies—for those reasons they would not qualify for the exemption and the schools were required to hire non-Protestant teachers.

Another example—and I only have two—is a Methodist orphanage founded by the Methodist Church. The board of trustees were Methodist and they had close ties to the Methodist Church. The district court eventually held that many of the orphanage's day-to-day activities of caring for children were simply not necessarily religious, and so the home was not exempt. But initially, the district court had actually found for the Methodist orphanage. It was the Fourth Circuit that reversed it, sent the case back with instructions they reconsider this.

The district court had an interesting comment in this. It stated its opinion by declaring that it remains somewhat confused as to the proper interpretation, but it would do its best. So if a Federal judge can't tell what the test is, how could workers? How could an employer? How could an institution based on faith?

My amendment really is a modest attempt to ensure the bill actually achieves what I believe its authors and sponsors and supporters intend. It would continue to guarantee equality to workers, but it would protect religious groups' rights to the free exercise of their religion. And it would ensure all Americans would live under the same rule, the same formulation, with predictability and certainty. It would clarify that ENDA's religious exemption applies to religious hospitals, schools, charities, and other organizations that are owned by, controlled by, or officially affiliated with a church or religious group covered by ENDA's current exemption.

What this does is simply ensures we get close to striking a good, sensible balance between the equality in the workforce that is the principle motivation for this bill and the religious freedom I feel very strongly about and I

think many of my colleagues do as well.

I want to commend everybody who has put in a lot of hard work on a careful and thoughtful effort here, and I hope my fellow Senators will join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes in opposition to the Toomey amendment and that the Senator from Wisconsin also have 2 minutes to speak in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, over the course of this debate, we have documented the tremendous business community support for this bill, including over 100 major companies. A key reason for that support is that ENDA is closely modeled on title VII of the civil rights law. Employers are familiar with the law, they understand how to comply with the law, and it provides certainty.

The many Fortune 500 companies that have employment nondiscrimination policies in place have modeled their policies on the nondiscrimination requirements of title VII. Unfortunately, by proposing an entirely new definition of businesses that would qualify for an exemption from the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, this amendment calls into question that very certainty. ENDA already exempts the same religious organizations that qualify for an exemption under title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

Under current law, the exemption includes not only houses of worship—churches, synagogues, and mosques—but also religious schools and religiously affiliated hospitals. The exemption in this bill passed the House of Representatives on a broad bipartisan basis, 402 to 25, in 2007.

In determining what organizations should qualify for religious exemption, most courts have also said that where the primary activity of the organization is commerce or profit, despite strongly held religious beliefs by the owners, the organization may not discriminate in hiring. That is what this amendment, I believe, seeks to change. This amendment would allow entities that are "officially affiliated" with a religious society to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. This is a new term that is undefined in the text of the amendment and could lead to thousands of for-profit businesses being allowed to discriminate.

Some examples that have been suggested could qualify for the exemption could be a private employer whose only "affiliation" with a religious society is receiving a regular newsletter from

that society or a private employer who sponsors a fundraiser for a religiously affiliated nonprofit or a private employer who provides goods and services to a religious organization. Again, this amendment would open the floodgates for all kinds of lawsuits. Courts would be inundated trying to figure out what does "officially affiliated" mean because there is no definition to that. The definitions we had before provide that kind of certainty to our business owners.

Our Nation's civil rights laws require those who participate in commercial activity must adhere to the broad principles of fairness and equal treatment. In potentially allowing secular commercial businesses to discriminate in hiring and other employment practices on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, this amendment threatens to gut the fundamental premise of ENDA that all workers should be treated equally and fairly.

So while I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, I wish to note that the sponsor of the amendment supported beginning debate of the bill. His amendment is one that goes directly to the substance of the bill that we are debating and not an unrelated issue. So I wish to compliment the author, Senator TOOMEY. This is the way we should operate in the Senate.

As many know, I have been advocating for rules changes since 1995. One thing I have always adhered to is that it is the right of the minority to be able to offer relevant germane amendments to a bill. The author of this amendment has adhered to that. This is certainly relevant. This is certainly germane. That is why I compliment him for providing us with a way the Senate should work. But the amendment, I believe, is ill-defined. It would open the floodgates for all kinds of new cases. It would disrupt businesses all over America. So for that reason I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the bill before us today, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, contains a very carefully negotiated bipartisan religious exemption provision. The amendment before us right now significantly expands that provision, and I rise to share why I believe it would be unwise to do so and urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Religious organizations are not touched by this legislation. They can use an individual's sexual orientation or gender identity in their employment decisions if they choose to. ENDA does apply, however, to businesses and entities that are not primarily religious in purpose and character.

Just as with other civil rights legislation and in laws protecting individuals from discrimination on the bases of race, sex, national origin, religion, age, and disability, a capable employee in a nonreligious business should not be fired—or not hired—because of his or her boss's religious beliefs.

The amendment offered by Senator TOOMEY would broaden this exemption to allow an employer to be exempt from ENDA if it is affiliated with a particular religious organization, even if it engages primarily in secular activities. Allowing this type of exemption could be interpreted so broadly that it could negate the bill and its important protections for American workers.

The provision of this bill that this amendment seeks to modify is the product of a long and significant bipartisan negotiation and compromise.

I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. BALDWIN. I am a former Member of the House of Representatives, and I worked very closely with faith groups and civil rights advocates over the months leading up to consideration of ENDA in 2007 to arrive at the religious exemption compromise in the bill we are considering today. In fact, this current language in the bill before us passed the House of Representatives on a broad bipartisan basis of 402 to 25 as a floor amendment during our consideration of ENDA in 2007. It is a bipartisan compromise supported by many religious organizations, including the Presbyterian Church, the United Methodist Church, and the United Synagogue for Conservative Judaism.

Over 40 religious organizations wrote to endorse this bill with a letter that reads:

Any claims that ENDA harms religious liberty are misplaced. ENDA broadly exempts from its scope houses of worship as well as religiously affiliated organizations. This exemption—which covers the same religious organizations already exempted from religious discrimination provisions of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—should ensure that religious freedom concerns don't hinder the passage of this critical legislation.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment and then join together on a historic day to vote in support of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, the motion to recommit S. 815, the pending amendments to the underlying bill, and amendment No. 2020 offered by the Sen-

ator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) for the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are withdrawn.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2013 offered by the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) for the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 230 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Pryor
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Chambliss	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johanns	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Wicker
Donnelly	McConnell	
Enzi	Moran	

NAYS—55

Baldwin	Heinrich	Murray
Baucus	Heitkamp	Nelson
Begich	Hirono	Reed
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rockefeller
Booker	King	Sanders
Boxer	Kirk	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Landrieu	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Levin	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden
Hagan	Murkowski	
Harkin	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—2

Casey Coburn

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for adoption of the amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Under the previous order, the committee-reported substitute amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 815, a bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jeff Merkley, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Udall, Mark Begich, Brian Schatz, Al Franken, Barbara Boxer, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Barbara Mikulski, Kirsten E. Gillibrand

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 815, a bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 64, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 231 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Ayotte	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Baucus	Heitkamp	Portman
Begich	Heller	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Booker	Kaine	Rockefeller
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Kirk	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Levin	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCain	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	McCaskill	Warner
Flake	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden
Hagan	Murkowski	
Harkin	Murphy	

NAYS—34

Alexander	Enzi	Paul
Barrasso	Fischer	Risch
Blunt	Graham	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Scott
Chambliss	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Vitter
Cornyn	Lee	Wicker
Crapo	McConnell	
Cruz	Moran	

NOT VOTING—2

Casey Coburn

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 64, the nays are 34. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, cloture having been invoked on S. 815, the time until 1:45 p.m. will be equally divided

between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the need to protect all Americans from workplace discrimination. The vote that the Presiding Officer from North Dakota just announced was a tremendous victory for civil rights in our country; it was a tremendous victory for all people, gay and straight. It will mean a more productive workplace. It will mean better work conditions. It will mean an expansion of human rights. And what is not to celebrate about that?

I worked on this bill as a cosponsor starting almost 15 years ago—more than 15 years ago—in the House of Representatives, and I am thrilled to have been able to vote for it today, as I know 60-plus of my colleagues were, and I am hopeful the House of Representatives decides to do the same.

Earlier this year people of different genders, ethnicities, and ages gathered outside of the Supreme Court wanting to be there when civil rights history was made when the Defense of Marriage Act was declared unconstitutional. Clergy, people in collars, parents with children, students, seniors—everyone in between—were there too. The steps of the Supreme Court that morning were filled with people who represented every walk of life in our great country; so, too, must our laws.

Today and every day far too many Americans still go to work fearing they can be fired for who they are and whom they love. This needs to stop now. That is why the Senate needs to pass—later today, I hope—the Employment Non-Discrimination Act and the House needs to bring up ENDA for a vote. ENDA would protect LGBT Americans from workplace discrimination. It is currently legal—this is what I think the public does not always hear and what I think Speaker BOEHNER needs to hear—it is currently legal in 29 States to discriminate based on sexual orientation. Think about that. Twenty-nine States—in this great country, with this Constitution, with this Bill of Rights—29 States allow gay Americans to be fired solely on the basis of their sexual orientation. In 2013 you can still be fired for whom you love in 29 States. It is legal to do that.

We have laws protecting Americans from workplace discrimination based on the color of their skin, as we should; based on their religion, as we should; based on whether they are a man or a woman, as we should; or whether they have a disability, as we should have those laws in place.

We should offer these same protections to LGBT Americans. We currently do not protect or workers, though, from being fired for whom they love. It is morally wrong. We are not living up to the basic moral standards. We teach our children the Golden Rule:

that we are to treat others as we would want to be treated. This country was not built on the ideal that only some people deserve equality and justice. We know that no one should be discriminated against simply because of who they are.

Many Fortune 500 companies and small businesses have already taken steps to protect their employees because they know it is right. In a meeting a few months ago, I listened to a Cincinnati-based engineer from Procter & Gamble discuss the importance of ENDA. She said, simply: People should be able to bring all of themselves to work, not needing to hide herself or her family in the workplace. She gets it. Unsurprisingly, so does her employer, Procter & Gamble, an American icon.

Passing ENDA makes good economic sense. In a competitive global economy, it is essential that businesses attract talented, hard-working employees. That is difficult to do when discrimination is allowed. If we want to create jobs and compete on a global level, then we need all workers from all walks of life to be contributing to the economy. Purposefully leaving out a portion of our workforce only puts us behind in that global competition.

We have already made progress in the fight for equality, but we need to continue to move forward. We repealed don't ask, don't tell. This June the Supreme Court held the Defense of Marriage Act—which five of my Senate colleagues voted against in 1996, a few of us in the House voted against—as unconstitutional. As a result, couples are able to legally marry in many States across the country, the newest of which is Illinois. We must continue this progress to create a most just, inclusive Nation. Dr. King once said, "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." Workers fought for the right to organize, woman for the right to vote, African Americans fought for equal justice, and now LGBT Americans of all backgrounds are fighting for equality. They are entitled to the support of their government, of all of us, in that fight.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH.) The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time, including the time during quorum calls, be equally divided between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. CORNYN. During the first few years after it became the law, the Affordable Care Act was known to most Americans as mainly a set of promises. Americans were repeatedly told that ObamaCare, once it began to take full effect—that coverage would expand, premiums would go down, and everyone who liked their existing health care coverage could keep it.

When the President and my friends across the aisle described it this way, ObamaCare sounded too good to be true. Unfortunately, the promises really have turned out to be too good to be true. After spending years listening to hollow assurances about what ObamaCare would or would not do, the past 5 years have taught us a lot, maybe only the tip of the iceberg, about the realities of what ObamaCare actually looks like.

We have learned that no fewer than 3.5 million Americans have already received cancellation notices from their insurance coverage because of the new law. We have learned that millions more will receive those same types of notices in the foreseeable future.

We have learned that the administration and, in fact, the Senate, knew that was going to happen in 2010 because we had a vote on the Congressional Review Act of the regulation which would have expanded the grandfather clause, and it was defeated in a party-line vote with all Republicans voting to expand the grandfathering provision and all our Democratic colleagues voting against.

What we learned, when they launched the ObamaCare Web site—which has been perhaps the most visible image of ObamaCare—was they did it before they could guarantee the information people would put in it would be secure. That includes both your tax information, your Social Security, and your mental health and physical health conditions. We learned yesterday from Secretary Sebelius that the navigators, who are the people who have been hired to help people navigate the Affordable Care Act and get signed up, were hired without performing any kind of background check. To the surprise of a lot of people, Secretary Sebelius answered a very direct question about that. I asked her in the Finance Committee: Is it possible a person could be a navigator and be a convicted felon? She said it is "possible." Because there is no criminal background check.

In other words, America's top health care officials believe it is possible that convicted felons could be collecting some of our most sensitive personal information—our Social Security numbers, tax information, and sensitive

medical data. Yet this administration continues to insist upon refusing a proper vetting system. It is bad enough the Web site is entirely dysfunctional—that will get fixed sooner or later—but the fact is this same Web site could, in the interim, become a magnet for fraud and identity theft.

Many of us who were skeptics about the President's extravagant promises of ObamaCare once implemented have been expressing our concerns for years. But as skeptical as I was about ObamaCare when it passed the Senate on Christmas Eve in 2009, it is even worse than many of us predicted—certainly worse than we imagined.

With millions of Americans getting cancellation notices from their insurance companies, we are finding out their premiums are about to go up and not down. It is important to remember exactly why this is happening. Thanks to the regulations our friends across the aisle continue to support, ObamaCare has allowed Washington bureaucrats to define what constitutes an acceptable health insurance policy in the individual and small group market. In other words, it has allowed Washington bureaucrats to force hard-working American families to pay for health care coverage they do not want and they do not need.

I have heard from my constituents in Texas who are absolutely furious and, in some cases, absolutely desperate about losing their coverage or being forced to pay higher premiums they simply can't afford in order to buy coverage they do not need.

The underlying conceit of ObamaCare is that individuals and their families can't be trusted to choose the right health insurance coverage for themselves so they must turn those decisions over to the bureaucracy in Washington to do it for them.

Some have heard us talk about a government takeover of the health care system. This is what a government takeover of a health care system looks like—when you lose the choices that should be available to you as an American citizen—to decide what kind of policy you need at a price you can afford—because of this monstrosity of a law. That is a government takeover.

The main objective of ObamaCare, we were told, was to provide coverage for all Americans. Yet the Congressional Budget Office has made it clear ObamaCare fails even in that objective. They estimate about 30 million people will still remain uncovered by the year 2023 when ObamaCare has been fully implemented. Thirty million people. OK, explain to me again, what was the purpose of this exercise? We were going to bring costs down and cover people without insurance, and everyone would be able to keep the insurance they had if they liked it. Yet none of that ends up being true. All of that ends up being false.

As I said yesterday, the cost of ObamaCare far outweighs the benefits. It would have been a lot smarter for us to figure out how to deal with the people who are uninsured and get them insured without raising costs or prejudicing the rights of people who had policies they already liked.

If Congress were to choose at some point to actually dismantle ObamaCare in its entirety, which I think we ought to do, we ought to start over and enact an alternative health care reform bill aimed at solving the problem not creating new ones. These reforms could include revising the Tax Code so that individuals could buy their own health insurance on the same tax terms as if it were employer provided.

We would allow people to actually buy in the health care market nationally and form pools to share risks. That would help bring down the costs. It would increase competition.

We also ought to expand the use of tax-free health savings accounts for people who decide they want to buy a high-deductible catastrophic health insurance policy because it is pretty cheap, and in the meantime they want to set money aside each month in a health savings account. Maybe they will need it for health care and maybe they won't, but they get to do that tax free. And if they don't use it, they can use that as part of their retirement. We ought to expand that.

We ought to make health care price and quality information a lot more transparent. One of the most successful health care programs I have seen pass the Congress—though we made some mistakes with it and we should have offset the cost—is the prescription drug plan, Medicare Part D. It has actually worked better than any of us thought it would because it is not a government takeover. It created competition between competing prescription drug companies that had to compete based on quality and price. The result has been the price has gone down roughly 30 percent under the projected costs when it was passed.

That is the kind of transparency and choice that is produced from quality information and that leaves the choices to people individually and not to the government.

And yes, we ought to crack down on frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits. We have seen in Texas that reducing the costs of frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits in turn helps to protect against defensive medicine, where doctors make clinical decisions based not on their best medical judgment but based on their aversion to litigation risk.

We ought to use high-risk pools to ensure people with preexisting conditions can get covered. This is one of the biggest misrepresentations I have heard about ObamaCare. Some of our colleagues have said: Well, the only

way you can get preexisting conditions covered is to take ObamaCare hook, line, and sinker. That is clearly not true. Virtually all of our States have high-risk programs for people with preexisting conditions. They may need to be better funded—and we ought to look to try to shore them up—but it would be better to fix the problems we know exist rather than creating more problems.

We ought to give the States more flexibility to deal with Medicaid. Medicaid is designed as a safety net program for people who can't afford to buy their own health insurance. I see the Senator from Maine on the floor, and she was very intimately involved in this when she was the insurance commissioner for her State. Medicaid, unfortunately, pays doctors about half of what private health insurance does to reimburse them for their costs, so many doctors have to restrict their practice and their ability to see new Medicaid patients.

In Texas, only about one-third of the doctors will see a new Medicaid patient because they simply can't afford to do so. So we need to have additional freedom to improve Medicaid and to shore it up while providing competition and consumer choice to bring down costs in Medicare.

Mr. President, such reforms would give us a health care system with much lower costs, much better coverage, and much greater access to quality care. Those are the sorts of reforms we should have embraced in 2009 and 2010 but did not. We missed our chance back then, but there is no good reason we have to accept ObamaCare or nothing. As a matter of fact, we should take this opportunity, as we see the promises of ObamaCare being broken and not living up to the expectations of its strongest proponents, to turn to these other sensible ways to lower costs, increase coverage, and improve access.

As the law's deficiencies become more and more evident, I hope my friends across the aisle will join with us, Republicans and Democrats alike, to replace ObamaCare with something better.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I will cast my vote in support of S. 815, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. This vote is consistent with my firm belief that workplace discrimination—whether based on religion, gender, race, national origin, or sexual orientation—should not be tolerated in America.

As my colleagues know, this legislation expands Federal employment discrimination protections, provided under the Civil Rights Act, to include sexual orientation. Under this bill, employers with more than 15 employees would be subject to new Federal regulations for hiring, firing, or promoting an individual on the basis of sexual orientation.

Many of my colleagues raised concerns about how the bill's language failed to provide adequate protections for religious businesses, schools, charities, and other institutions. In order to address these concerns, I worked with Senator PORTMAN of Ohio and Senator AYOTTE of New Hampshire to offer an amendment to further protect the constitutional rights and religious freedoms of religious organizations. Our amendment prevents retaliation on religious employers by Federal, State, and local governments based on the fact that these employers are exempt from the non-discrimination requirements of ENDA. I am pleased that this amendment was agreed to without opposition.

I have always believed that workplace discrimination—whether based on religion, gender, race, national origin, or sexual orientation—is inconsistent with the basic values that America holds dear. With the addition of the amendment I cosponsored with Senators PORTMAN and AYOTTE strengthening protections for religious institutions, I am pleased to support this legislation.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today the Senate is voting on the Employment Non-Discrimination Act—a bill that I am proud to cosponsor. Americans believe that hard-working people should be rewarded for their efforts and commended for their skills. Yet all throughout our Nation individuals are being held back at work or even fired—not because they are incompetent but because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

I firmly believe people should be judged based on their individual skills, competence, and unique talents and nothing else. Sexual orientation does not affect job performance, so it should not be a consideration, and the vast majority of Americans agree. In fact, an overwhelming 73 percent of Marylanders support the Employment Non-Discrimination Act.

The Employment Non-Discrimination Act would close a significant gap in our civil rights laws. It would ensure that people are judged on the quality of their work, not on sexual orientation or gender identity. Job discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, or religion has long been prohibited; however, it is still legal to hire and fire a person based on their sexual orientation. This is an outrageous practice for a country that prides itself on equal rights for all.

Today, when I look back at the civil rights movement of the 1960s, I am shocked by how modest the demands of the African American community actually were. If we can pass this piece of legislation, in the future we will look back and think what a modest, obvious step it was and wonder why it took so long. This bill does not bestow special rights; it simply offers gay, lesbian, bi-

sexual, and transgender Americans the same protection against unfair discrimination in the workplace as other groups—no more, no less.

Currently, 21 States and the District of Columbia have passed laws that prohibit job discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. In addition, hundreds of companies have implemented nondiscrimination policies that include sexual orientation.

Gay Americans are part of the American mosaic and are entitled to the same rights and freedoms as every other American citizen. Change in civil rights comes slowly, but we are long overdue in making sure they have protection against unfair discrimination in the workplace. My hope is that someday we will look back on this and wonder what took us so long. We all deserve to live in an environment where people are treated fairly and with the dignity they deserve, and today I urge my colleagues to vote for this important bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this Nation began not as merely a plot of land, or as a group of people united by language or ethnicity. It began with an idea: "That all men are created equal." Our story since Thomas Jefferson wrote those words has been a story of progress toward honoring what has been called "the immortal phrase."

Today, this Senate can move our Nation one important step forward in honoring the truth of those words by finally passing the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, or ENDA. We can help ensure that no American is deprived of the opportunity to work—the opportunity to succeed—as all of us want to succeed merely because of sexual orientation or gender identity, just as we have acted to protect that opportunity against discrimination based on age, race, color, religion, national origin or disability.

This legislation is carefully crafted to protect the sincere religious beliefs many Americans hold. It embodies a simple but powerful American ideal: On the job, what matters is your work, not your gender or skin color or faith or your sexual orientation any other extraneous matter.

There may have been times in the past when the Congress pushed Americans into new and perhaps uncomfortable territory in the march toward equality. But today, the law lags public opinion in this area. Public opinion polls show that roughly 7 in 10 Americans believe workplace discrimination against gays, lesbians and transgendered individuals should be against the law. In fact, they think it already is—according to one poll, 80 percent of Americans believe such discrimination is already a violation of Federal law. Support for ENDA is not confined to one region of the country—polls show that majorities in every State in the union support it. So, pas-

sage of ENDA is not some bold social experiment or engineering process. It is what the American people want and are ready for.

That is as true today as it was in 1996, the last time the Senate held a vote on this measure. Even then, a majority of Americans supported it, and just as it is today, it enjoyed the support of a diverse group of religious and business organizations. Then, as today, American businesses recognized that discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity is just bad business.

This is also not a partisan issue. This legislation is on the brink of passage here because members of both parties have shown principled leadership and dedication.

But the ultimate reason I have supported this legislation for decades now is not related to public opinion polls or endorsement letters from churches and corporations, though those are heartening and welcome. Simply, it is wrong to deny employment to anyone who can do the job, just because of their sexual orientation. "All men are created equal" means giving every American the opportunity to earn what their talents and dedication allow, to provide for themselves and their families. Denying anyone that right is at odds with the ideals on which this country was founded and on which it depends to this day.

I strongly support this legislation. I urge my Senate colleagues to support it, and upon Senate passage, I urge the leaders of the House of Representatives to recognize just how far behind the American people they have fallen on this issue, and bring the Employee Non-Discrimination Act to the House floor for a vote.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Senate has a historic opportunity today to take discrimination out of the workplace by casting a vote for the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. Today's vote has been 20 years in the making, and it is long overdue for Congress to extend these protections to all American workers. Years from now we will look back on this remedy as another substantial milestone on our Nation's everlasting quest to achieve a more perfect union—a quest to realize more completely the motto engraved in Vermont marble above the Supreme Court building that declares: "Equal Justice Under Law."

We now have protections for workers from discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion, national origin and disability, as we should. Yet there are no Federal protections from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity. In 29 States, it is still legal for an employer to fire employees based on their sexual orientation, and in 33 States employees can be fired based on their gender identity. Maintaining the status quo would keep

in place a system that supports a second class of workers in a majority of States. This runs counter to our founding values. It is time to remedy that.

As the son of Vermont printers, I learned at an early age the primary importance of the First Amendment. The First Amendment in our Bill of Rights is the foundation of our democracy and our way of life. It is one of the most defining principles of our national character. It helps preserve all of our other rights. By guaranteeing a free press and the free exercise of religion, it ensures an informed electorate and the freedom to worship God and to practice our religion as we choose—or to practice no religion at all.

Religious freedom does not end with the vital protections afforded by the First Amendment. The bill before us contains important protections for religious organizations by ensuring that they can continue to make significant faith-based employment decisions. The carefully crafted religious exemption in this legislation is consistent with the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution.

All Americans deserve civil rights protections under our Constitution, which, in addition to the First Amendment, also ensures due process and equal protection. In previous legislative debates like the one before us today, Congress has protected and bolstered these rights by passing legislation to fill gaps in our Federal laws. This includes passing legislation to protect the practice of religion without discrimination, to prevent pay discrimination based on sex, and to serve openly in the military. By passing the remedy before us today, we will take another significant step forward in taking discrimination out of our laws and ensuring the equal treatment of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans.

I thank Chairman HARKIN and Senators MERKLEY and COLLINS for their leadership on this significant, overdue, and bipartisan antidiscrimination remedy. I also am mindful and appreciative of the leading role that Senator Jim Jeffords of my State of Vermont took in advancing this remedy during his time in this body. And I thank Majority Leader REID for making this a priority for the Senate. I know that my late friend Senator Kennedy is smiling down on this chamber today as we advance his efforts to end employment discrimination. Today we can honor his legacy with this historic vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, we are about to make history in this Chamber by passing the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, more commonly known as ENDA. We will establish the principle that the right to work free from discrimination is a fundamental right of each and every American re-

gardless of age, race, gender, religion, disability, national origin, and now, finally, sexual orientation.

It has taken a long time to get to this day. More than 10 years ago I was proud to join a life-long champion of civil rights, the late Senator Ted Kennedy, as a cosponsor of ENDA. That was back in 2002. Over the years our country has rightly taken a stand against workplace discrimination in a wide variety of forms. It is past time we close this gap for our LGBT employees. The time to pass this bill has come.

I thank Senators MERKLEY and KIRK for taking up the cause and for moving this bill forward. Senator KIRK, along with Senators HATCH and MURKOWSKI, led Republican support for this bill during its consideration by the HELP Committee.

I also acknowledge the work of the chairman of the committee TOM HARKIN in bringing this bill to the floor.

Other Senators who helped to improve this bill include Senators PORTMAN, AYOTTE, HELLER, HATCH, and MCCAIN, in their effort to draft strong antiretaliation language. Their amendment, which was adopted unanimously, improves this bill by strengthening the protections for religious institutions that are legitimately exempted under ENDA.

I thank each of those Senators and others, such as Senator FLAKE, for their willingness to work with the sponsors and cosponsors of this legislation. Senator TOOMEY also has worked hard.

Mr. President, all Americans deserve a fair opportunity to pursue the American Dream. ENDA is simply about the fundamental right to work and to be judged according to one's abilities, qualifications, and job performance. Much of corporate America has already voluntarily embraced LGBT protections because they know that doing so helps them attract and retain the best and the brightest employees.

Nearly two dozen States have versions of ENDA. In fact, in my home State of Maine, it has been the law for nearly a decade. Simply put, ENDA is about fairness and workplace equality. Today, I am confident the Senate will affirm that principle and will say to everyone in this country the workplace is simply no place for discrimination.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today the Senate is sending a clear message that all Americans are entitled to earn a living free from discrimination and to be judged in the workplace based on qualifications, ability, and integrity.

The Employment Non-Discrimination Act is simple and clear. It states that private businesses, public employers, and labor unions cannot make employment decisions—hiring, firing, promotion, or compensation—because of a person's actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity. The bill is

modeled on title VII of the Civil Rights Act, a law that has been in place for almost 50 years. It is a law that is well understood by employers and is strongly supported by employers.

More than 50 years ago, with the Civil Rights Act, we took the first steps to eliminate discrimination at work. Since that time we have ensured that the employers may not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, national origin, religion, or age. In 1990 with passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act we ensured that Americans were not discriminated against on the basis of a disability. Today, for the first time, the Senate goes on record prohibiting discrimination at work on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.

Yesterday I entered into a colloquy with Senator LEAHY, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee with regard to Senate amendment No. 2012. I would like to further clarify my response to Senator LEAHY. As Senator LEAHY clearly set forth in his question to me, this amendment simply says that you cannot retaliate against an organization solely because it qualifies for the exemption under section 6(a) of ENDA. The amendment is not intended to undermine in any way current or future Federal, State, or local civil rights protections—States and localities can still enforce their own non-discrimination laws for violations within their jurisdiction, regardless of whether an entity is exempt under the national ENDA legislation.

We have had a very collaborative process on this bill, and I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of those who have made that possible first, to the sponsors of the bill, Senator MERKLEY, Senator KIRK, Senator BALDWIN, and Senator COLLINS, all of whom have put in many hours behind the scenes working to build support for this bill and make passage today a reality. Thank-yous also go to their staff: Jeremiah Baumann, Cade Clurman, Amber Shipley, John Kane, Katie Brown, and Betsy McDonnell.

On my HELP Committee staff I would like to thank Beth Stein, Lauren McFerran, Chris Williamson, and Pam Smith. I would also like to thank the HELP Committee minority staff who also worked to get this bill through a very collaborative process: Kyle Fortson, Kai Hirabayashi, and David Cleary. A special thank-you goes to Dan Goldberg, who recently left my HELP Committee staff but did a tremendous job on this bill up through the committee markup. I commend all of the staff for helping to make final passage of this bill a reality.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 minutes to speak to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague who preceded me who has summarized the bipartisan collaboration to bring this bill to this point that we will be voting on in just a few minutes. No one has done more than she to advance this conversation over many years. I thank the Senator from Maine for those incredible efforts on behalf of ending discrimination and advancing liberty and opportunity.

Today the Senate will vote to break the chains of discrimination that hold back millions of LGBT Americans from the full promise of liberty—liberty, that freedom to participate fully in our society, in the public square to the voting booth, to the school, to the workplace; liberty, that quality deeply rooted in our national journey and embedded in our Declaration of Independence “. . . that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness;” liberty, the declared mission of our Nation in the preamble to the Constitution: We, the people, in order to form a more perfect union and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish a Constitution of the United States of America.

But the march to liberty has been long, with numerous battles along the way: the fight to end slavery that President Lincoln figured so prominently in, the fight to end racial discrimination, the fight to end gender discrimination, the fight to end discrimination against our seniors, and the fight that continues today with this bill to end discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

Discrimination diminishes the potential of the individual and it diminishes the potential of our Nation. Senator Ted Kennedy said this succinctly when he helped introduce in 2009 a predecessor of the bill we will be voting on today. Senator Ted Kennedy said: “The promise of America will never be fulfilled as long as justice is denied to even one among us.” He spoke these words just 20 days before he passed away. It is appropriate to quote Ted Kennedy because he led the fight for this bill since its first introduction in 1994. I think he would be tremendously pleased with the bipartisan vote of affirmation against discrimination which we will soon be taking.

Along the course of the two decades many have helped on this bill, whose footsteps no longer echo in these Halls, and to all of those champions of liberty who have participated in this process I say thank you.

There are many champions of liberty still in this body who have been fighting toward this moment, and I wish to make sure I acknowledge them: Sen-

ator HARKIN, who championed many elements, including ending discrimination against those with disabilities and who steered this bill through his committee; Senator HARRY REID and the leadership team who worked together to enable this moment in the calendar to have this debate and to advocate this bill; Senator TAMMY BALDWIN, who brought in energy from the House and the powerful voice of her personal experience to bear on this debate; Senator COLLINS, who just spoke, who has done so much for so long to make this happen, and in the first 2 years of 2009 and 2010 was the lead cosponsor. She passed the baton to Senator KIRK, who has carried that baton forward in the most admirable way. Senators MURKOWSKI and HATCH joined to help this bill come out of committee and helped create the momentum; Senators PORTMAN, AYOTTE, HELLER, TOOMEY, and HATCH engaged to help make sure the religious exemption which we developed with the right hand is not taken away with the left hand, to reinforce the integrity of the title VII religious exemption; Senator FLAKE, who brought forward ideas on how to make sure the guidance would be there to help businesses understand how to implement this act.

There are a lot of coalition groups that have done a tremendous amount of work. Well done. Every conversation such as this takes advocates inside the Chamber and advocates outside the Chamber but a particular acknowledgment of the Human Rights Campaign.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. There are two staff members on my team who have labored on this whom I wish to personally acknowledge: Scott Rosenthal, who carried this organizational responsibility for a number of years, and my legislative director Jeremiah Baumann, who provided over these last few months this critical organizing stage.

I look forward to this vote for liberty, this vote for freedom, this vote for opportunity, and this vote for a fairer and just America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is yielded back.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Shall the bill (S. 815), as amended, pass?

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 232 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Ayotte	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Baucus	Heitkamp	Portman
Begich	Heller	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Booker	Kaine	Rockefeller
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Kirk	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Levin	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCain	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	McCaskill	Warner
Flake	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden
Hagan	Murkowski	
Harkin	Murphy	

NAYS—32

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Blunt	Fischer	Paul
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johanns	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—4

Barrasso	Coburn
Casey	Sessions

The bill (S. 815), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 815

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Employment Non-Discrimination Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to address the history and persistent, widespread pattern of discrimination on the bases of sexual orientation and gender identity by private sector employers and local, State, and Federal Government employers;

(2) to provide an explicit, comprehensive Federal prohibition against employment discrimination on the bases of sexual orientation and gender identity, including meaningful and effective remedies for any such discrimination;

(3) to invoke congressional powers, including the powers to enforce the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, and to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to section 8 of

article I of the Constitution, in order to prohibit employment discrimination on the bases of sexual orientation and gender identity; and

(4) to reinforce the Nation's commitment to fairness and equal opportunity in the workplace consistent with the fundamental right of religious freedom.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In this Act:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

(2) COVERED ENTITY.—The term “covered entity” means an employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee.

(3) DEMONSTRATES.—The term “demonstrates” means meets the burdens of production and persuasion.

(4) EMPLOYEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “employee” means—

(i) an employee as defined in section 701(f) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(f));

(ii) a State employee to which section 302(a)(1) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16b(a)(1)) applies;

(iii) a covered employee, as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301) or section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code; or

(iv) an employee or applicant to which section 717(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16(a)) applies.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The provisions of this Act that apply to an employee or individual shall not apply to a volunteer who receives no compensation.

(5) EMPLOYER.—The term “employer” means—

(A) a person engaged in an industry affecting commerce (as defined in section 701(h) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(h))) who has 15 or more employees (as defined in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B) of paragraph (4)) for each working day in each of 20 or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year, and any agent of such a person, but does not include a bona fide private membership club (other than a labor organization) that is exempt from taxation under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(B) an employing authority to which section 302(a)(1) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 applies;

(C) an employing office, as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 or section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code; or

(D) an entity to which section 717(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 applies.

(6) EMPLOYMENT AGENCY.—The term “employment agency” has the meaning given the term in section 701(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(c)).

(7) GENDER IDENTITY.—The term “gender identity” means the gender-related identity, appearance, or mannerisms or other gender-related characteristics of an individual, with or without regard to the individual's designated sex at birth.

(8) LABOR ORGANIZATION.—The term “labor organization” has the meaning given the term in section 701(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(d)).

(9) PERSON.—The term “person” has the meaning given the term in section 701(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(a)).

(10) SEXUAL ORIENTATION.—The term “sexual orientation” means homosexuality, heterosexuality, or bisexuality.

(11) STATE.—The term “State” has the meaning given the term in section 701(i) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(i)).

(b) APPLICATION OF DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, a reference in section 701 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—

(1) to an employee or an employer shall be considered to refer to an employee (as defined in subsection (a)(4)) or an employer (as defined in subsection (a)(5)), respectively, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection; and

(2) to an employer in subsection (f) of that section shall be considered to refer to an employer (as defined in subsection (a)(5)(A)).

SEC. 4. EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.

(a) EMPLOYER PRACTICES.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

(1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise discriminate against any individual with respect to the compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment of the individual, because of such individual's actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity; or

(2) to limit, segregate, or classify the employees or applicants for employment of the employer in any way that would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment or otherwise adversely affect the status of the individual as an employee, because of such individual's actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity.

(b) EMPLOYMENT AGENCY PRACTICES.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employment agency to fail or refuse to refer for employment, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual because of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of the individual or to classify or refer for employment any individual on the basis of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of the individual.

(c) LABOR ORGANIZATION PRACTICES.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a labor organization—

(1) to exclude or to expel from its membership, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual because of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of the individual;

(2) to limit, segregate, or classify its membership or applicants for membership, or to classify or fail or refuse to refer for employment any individual, in any way that would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment, or would limit such employment or otherwise adversely affect the status of the individual as an employee or as an applicant for employment because of such individual's actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity; or

(3) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this section.

(d) TRAINING PROGRAMS.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining, including on-the-job training programs, to discriminate against any individual because of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of the individual in admission to, or employment in, any program established to provide apprenticeship or other training.

(e) ASSOCIATION.—An unlawful employment practice described in any of subsections (a) through (d) shall be considered to include an action described in that subsection, taken against an individual based on the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of a person with whom the individual associates or has associated.

(f) NO PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT OR QUOTAS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed or interpreted to require or permit—

(1) any covered entity to grant preferential treatment to any individual or to any group because of the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of such individual or group on account of an imbalance which may exist with respect to the total number or percentage of persons of any actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity employed by any employer, referred or classified for employment by any employment agency or labor organization, admitted to membership or classified by any labor organization, or admitted to, or employed in, any apprenticeship or other training program, in comparison with the total number or percentage of persons of such actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in any community, State, section, or other area, or in the available work force in any community, State, section, or other area; or

(2) the adoption or implementation by a covered entity of a quota on the basis of actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity.

(g) NO DISPARATE IMPACT CLAIMS.—Only disparate treatment claims may be brought under this Act.

(h) STANDARDS OF PROOF.—Except as otherwise provided, an unlawful employment practice is established when the complaining party demonstrates that sexual orientation or gender identity was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.

SEC. 5. RETALIATION PROHIBITED.

It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a covered entity to discriminate against an individual because such individual—

(1) opposed any practice made an unlawful employment practice by this Act; or

(2) made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this Act.

SEC. 6. EXEMPTION FOR RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act shall not apply to a corporation, association, educational institution or institution of learning, or society that is exempt from the religious discrimination provisions of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) pursuant to section 702(a) or 703(e)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e-1(a), 2000e-2(e)(2)) (referred to in this section as a “religious employer”).

(b) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN GOVERNMENT ACTIONS.—A religious employer's exemption under this section shall not result in any action by a Federal agency, or any State or local agency that receives Federal funding or financial assistance, to penalize or withhold licenses, permits, certifications, accreditation, contracts, grants, guarantees, tax-exempt status, or any benefits or exemptions from that employer, or to prohibit the employer's participation in programs or activities sponsored by that Federal, State, or local agency. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to invalidate any other Federal, State, or local law (including a regulation) that otherwise applies to a religious employer exempt under this section.

SEC. 7. NONAPPLICATION TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES; VETERANS' PREFERENCES.

(a) ARMED FORCES.—

(1) EMPLOYMENT.—In this Act, the term “employment” does not apply to the relationship between the United States and members of the Armed Forces.

(2) ARMED FORCES.—In paragraph (1) the term “Armed Forces” means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

(b) VETERANS' PREFERENCES.—This title does not repeal or modify any Federal, State, territorial, or local law creating a special right or preference concerning employment for a veteran.

SEC. 8. CONSTRUCTION.

(a) DRESS OR GROOMING STANDARDS.—Nothing in this Act shall prohibit an employer from requiring an employee, during the employee's hours at work, to adhere to reasonable dress or grooming standards not prohibited by other provisions of Federal, State, or local law, provided that the employer permits any employee who has undergone gender transition prior to the time of employment, and any employee who has notified the employer that the employee has undergone or is undergoing gender transition after the time of employment, to adhere to the same dress or grooming standards as apply for the gender to which the employee has transitioned or is transitioning.

(b) ADDITIONAL FACILITIES NOT REQUIRED.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require the construction of new or additional facilities.

SEC. 9. COLLECTION OF STATISTICS PROHIBITED.

The Commission and the Secretary of Labor shall neither compel the collection of nor require the production of statistics on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity from covered entities pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 10. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) ENFORCEMENT POWERS.—With respect to the administration and enforcement of this Act in the case of a claim alleged by an individual for a violation of this Act—

(1) the Commission shall have the same powers as the Commission has to administer and enforce—

(A) title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.); or

(B) sections 302 and 304 of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16b and 2000e-16c), in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such title, or of section 302(a)(1) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16b(a)(1)), respectively;

(2) the Librarian of Congress shall have the same powers as the Librarian of Congress has to administer and enforce title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such title;

(3) the Board (as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301)) shall have the same powers as the Board has to administer and enforce the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of section 201(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(1));

(4) the Attorney General shall have the same powers as the Attorney General has to administer and enforce—

(A) title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.); or

(B) sections 302 and 304 of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16b and 2000e-16c);

in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such title, or of section 302(a)(1) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16b(a)(1)), respectively;

(5) the President, the Commission, and the Merit Systems Protection Board shall have the same powers as the President, the Commission, and the Board, respectively, have to administer and enforce chapter 5 of title 3, United States Code, in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of section 411 of such title; and

(6) a court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction and powers as the court has to enforce—

(A) title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such title;

(B) sections 302 and 304 of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16b and 2000e-16c) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of section 302(a)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16b(a)(1));

(C) the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of section 201(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(1)); and

(D) chapter 5 of title 3, United States Code, in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of section 411 of such title.

(b) PROCEDURES AND REMEDIES.—Except as provided in section 4(g), the procedures and remedies applicable to a claim alleged by an individual for a violation of this Act are—

(1) the procedures and remedies applicable for a violation of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such title;

(2) the procedures and remedies applicable for a violation of section 302(a)(1) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16b(a)(1)) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such section;

(3) the procedures and remedies applicable for a violation of section 201(a)(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(1)) in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such section; and

(4) the procedures and remedies applicable for a violation of section 411 of title 3, United States Code, in the case of a claim alleged by such individual for a violation of such section.

(c) OTHER APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—With respect to a claim alleged by a covered employee (as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301)) for a violation of this Act, title III of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.) shall apply in the same manner as such title applies with respect to a claim alleged by such a covered employee for a violation of section 201(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(1)).

(d) NO DOUBLE RECOVERY.—An individual who files claims alleging that a practice is an unlawful employment practice under this Act and an unlawful employment practice because of sex under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) shall not be permitted to recover damages for such practice under both of—

(1) this Act; and

(2) section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a) and title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

(e) MOTIVATING FACTOR DECISIONS.—On a claim in which an individual proved a violation under section 4(h) and a respondent demonstrates that the respondent would have taken the same action in the absence of the impermissible motivating factor, the court—

(1) may grant declaratory relief, injunctive relief (except as provided in paragraph (2)), and attorney's fees and costs demonstrated to be directly attributable only to the pursuit of a claim under section 4(h); and

(2) shall not award damages or issue an order requiring any admission, reinstatement, hiring, promotion, or payment.

SEC. 11. STATE AND FEDERAL IMMUNITY.

(a) ABROGATION OF STATE IMMUNITY.—A State shall not be immune under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution from a suit brought in a Federal court of competent jurisdiction for a violation of this Act.

(b) WAIVER OF STATE IMMUNITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) WAIVER.—A State's receipt or use of Federal financial assistance for any program or activity of a State shall constitute a waiver of sovereign immunity, under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution or otherwise, to a suit brought by an employee or applicant for employment of that program or activity under this Act for a remedy authorized under subsection (d).

(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term “program or activity” has the meaning given the term in section 606 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d-4a).

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—With respect to a particular program or activity, paragraph (1) applies to conduct occurring on or after the day, after the date of enactment of this Act, on which a State first receives or uses Federal financial assistance for that program or activity.

(c) REMEDIES AGAINST STATE OFFICIALS.—An official of a State may be sued in the official capacity of the official by any employee or applicant for employment who has complied with the applicable procedures of section 10, for equitable relief that is authorized under this Act. In such a suit the court may award to the prevailing party those costs authorized by section 722 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988).

(d) REMEDIES AGAINST THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, in an action or administrative proceeding against the United States or a State for a violation of this Act, remedies (including remedies at law and in equity, and interest) are available for the violation to the same extent as the remedies are available for a violation of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) by a private entity, except that—

(1) punitive damages are not available; and

(2) compensatory damages are available to the extent specified in section 1977A(b) of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a(b)).

SEC. 12. ATTORNEYS' FEES.

(a) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term “decisionmaker” means an entity described in section 10(a) (other than paragraph (4) of such section), acting in the discretion of the entity.

(b) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, in an action or administrative proceeding for a violation of this Act, a decisionmaker may allow the prevailing party, other than the Commission or the United States, a reasonable attorney's

fee (including expert fees) as part of the costs, to the same extent as is permitted under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.), sections 302 and 304 of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16b and 2000e-16c), the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.), or chapter 5 of title 3, United States Code, whichever applies to the prevailing party in that action or proceeding. The Commission and the United States shall be liable for the costs to the same extent as a private person.

SEC. 13. POSTING NOTICES.

A covered entity who is required to post a notice described in section 711 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-10) may be required to post an amended notice, including a description of the applicable provisions of this Act, in the manner prescribed by, and subject to the penalty provided under, section 711 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require a separate notice to be posted.

SEC. 14. REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d), the Commission shall have authority to issue regulations to carry out this Act.

(b) LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.—The Librarian of Congress shall have authority to issue regulations to carry out this Act with respect to employees and applicants for employment of the Library of Congress.

(c) BOARD.—The Board referred to in section 10(a)(3) shall have authority to issue regulations to carry out this Act, in accordance with section 304 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1384), with respect to covered employees, as defined in section 101 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1301).

(d) PRESIDENT.—The President shall have authority to issue regulations to carry out this Act with respect to covered employees, as defined in section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code, and applicants for employment as such employees.

SEC. 15. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.

This Act shall not invalidate or limit the rights, remedies, or procedures available to an individual claiming discrimination prohibited under any other Federal law or regulation or any law or regulation of a State or political subdivision of a State.

SEC. 16. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or the application of the provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of the provision to any other person or circumstances shall not be affected by the invalidity.

SEC. 17. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act and shall not apply to conduct occurring before the effective date.

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I was with my wife today, who was recovering from surgery, but had I been present I would have proudly cast my vote in favor of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA). As a co-sponsor of ENDA, I am grateful for today's bipartisan Senate vote, and I was pleased to vote for cloture earlier this week.

Despite the progress our Nation has made in ensuring equality for all, more than one in five lesbian, gay, bisexual

or transgender employees have experienced workplace discrimination. That is completely unacceptable and Congress is long overdue in extending workplace protections to the LGBT community. Workers should be judged on the quality of the job they do, not who they are. I applaud today's vote and hope that the House of Representatives will quickly follow the Senate and work in a bipartisan way to send this legislation to the President for signing.●

DRUG QUALITY AND SECURITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

VETERANS DAY

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, on Veterans Day we come together to honor the brave men and women who have given so much to defend our country and protect our freedoms. I think of so many veterans, including my dad, who served in the U.S. Navy. I want to take this opportunity to say thank you to our country's veterans, and the nearly 500,000 veterans in the State of Indiana, for your service to the Nation.

Veterans Day is also a chance to reaffirm our country's commitment to caring for veterans and their families. While it is important to say thank you to veterans, it is even more important to express our gratitude through action for all generations of veterans.

There are several ongoing efforts in my office that I would like to share with everyone. I have been a proud supporter of the Veterans History Project through the Library of Congress, and it has done an outstanding job in leading this effort. We have so much to learn from our veterans, and it is vital that we record their stories and experiences for future generations. I urge veterans of any conflict to contact our office if you would like to share your story. We stand ready to give Hoosiers information on this important project, and please contact us at any time if you would like to participate.

Additionally, there are Hoosier veterans of Vietnam and other wars who still have not received, or have lost over the years, their honors or their medals that they earned for heroism. Now is the time to resolve these cases.

I am so deeply honored this Veterans Day to be handing to four Hoosier veterans—Mr. Michael Hodgson, Mr. Canard Terhune, Mr. Jim Horn, and Mr. Julian Quarnstrom—the many medals and ribbons they were awarded for their service and bravery but still have not received.

I also believe it is important to honor veterans from all conflicts, which is why earlier this year I introduced a bill that would authorize the construction of a National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial at no cost to the gov-

ernment. The men and women who fought in the first gulf war, especially those who gave the ultimate sacrifice, deserve to have their service memorialized.

Now we have a new generation of veterans. They have returned home from Iraq and Afghanistan, and many of them are still coping with readjusting to civilian life. They have experienced health challenges, including traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder. These incredible challenges have resulted from their service and their dedication to our country. Our veterans have earned the best care we can provide, and this includes access to timely and quality medical care. It is both our challenge and our priority to ensure a smooth transition and to effectively treat any health conditions linked to their service efforts.

In particular, I am dedicated to addressing the problem of military and veteran suicide. If you are in need of or know of a servicemember or veteran who has challenges and who is in need, please know that seeking help is a sign of strength, not a sign of weakness, and from that strength there is always help that is available.

I am also committed to addressing the backlog in benefits claims, one of the significant challenges facing the Veterans' Administration. Wait times for benefits claims are at an unacceptably high level.

In the VA regional office in Indianapolis, Hoosiers play a critical role in processing claims to eliminate the backlog. I thank them for their public service, their hard work, and urge them to continue to do whatever they can to reduce that wait time so benefits may be received more promptly.

While I know the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, General Shinseki, is fully committed to solving this problem, more must be done. I stand ready to work together with my colleagues to provide the VA the tools it needs to accomplish this goal, reduce the wait times, and take even better care of our veterans.

In addition to ensuring care and benefits for our veterans, I believe economic opportunity is equally important. When I ask servicemembers what we can do for them, they always have the same answer: We just want to make sure there is a good job to come home to and a good job that can help take care of our families when we do.

A quality education and gainful employment give our veterans the chance to fulfill the American dream, and it helps fulfill our responsibility in supporting our veterans. That is where all of us come in. As one of Indiana's U.S. Senators, I am always looking for ways to improve the transition from military to civilian life. Let's make sure our trade schools and universities welcome our veterans with open arms.

To our business owners, thank you for all of the veterans you have hired,

and I urge you to hire even more. Veterans have many skills that can translate to a variety of positions, they have a strong commitment to quality and service, and you can always rely on our veterans.

Hoosiers in every community, please welcome back our brave men and women—whether it is in your neighborhood, whether it is at the local restaurant, whether it is at your child's school, or whether it is at church on Sunday.

On Veterans Day, and every day, let us honor America's veterans by cherishing the freedoms they have defended. Our country is grateful for all you have done for all of us. You have given us our safety, our freedom, and our liberty. Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

MANUFACTURING JOBS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about an important initiative that is not only important to my State of Arkansas but important to our entire Nation, and that is manufacturing. This country is an economic powerhouse, and we are certainly a manufacturing powerhouse. There is an important initiative that is being put together here in the Senate called the Manufacturing Jobs for America campaign. I think so far we have maybe 21 colleagues, maybe 22, or maybe even more who are in support of this effort. I encourage others to look at it.

We see a lot of manufactured crises here in Washington. It may be the farm bill or the government shutdown or the near debt default. Those are all just kind of manufactured by the Congress. But I am glad to see we have 21 or 22 or 23 colleagues here who are ready to turn off the "my way or the highway" politics and turn down the rhetoric and really focus on what our No. 1 priority should be, which is jobs and the economy, because if we didn't learn anything else from the shutdown and some of those high-wire act politics of the last few weeks, hopefully we learned that if we want to get anything done in Washington, we need to work together. That is the bottom line. That is what this package of bills and this initiative are intending to do. If we really want to create jobs and if we really want to make a difference for the U.S. economy, we have to reach across the aisle.

There are many bright spots in the Congress. Listen, we know we have been through the ringer. We know how difficult this recession was. It was the hardest economic downturn in my lifetime and most of our lifetimes, the hardest economic downturn we have ever seen since we have been alive, but we are coming out of it.

There are many bright spots in the economy. Yes, we get good economic news pretty much every day, and we also get some mixed economic news

pretty much every day. So it is not happening as fast as we would like it to, and it is not happening in every sector of the economy and in every section of the country as we would like it to, but it is happening.

One of those bright spots is manufacturing. Last year manufacturing contributed \$1.87 trillion to our economy—\$1.87 trillion in manufacturing. That is how much of a difference it made in our economy. There are 17.2 million U.S. jobs; that is, jobs in this country, and 1 in 6 private sector jobs is tied to manufacturing. It also provides a very strong return on the investment we make. So if we invest \$1 in manufacturing, it adds \$1.48 back into the economy.

America is a powerhouse when it comes to manufacturing, and we need to keep it that way. Everybody knows—look at all the studies—the United States is the world's largest manufacturing economy. In fact, if we just took manufacturing and put everything else on the side, the United States would still be the 10th largest economy in the world just based on our manufacturing. We are a powerhouse, but we can do more, we can do much more, and we should.

We need to fight hard to make sure that "Made in America" remains the gold standard. We want it to be the thing everybody wants to see in every market. "Made in America" means something. It also means something here because the investment is here, the workers are here, and the productivity is here. It is good for GDP, et cetera. We want to make sure manufacturing remains what it has always been. That is why today I offer my public support for this Manufacturing Jobs for America campaign, and it is why I have supported a lot of provisions in the past. Most of them have been bipartisan efforts where we have reached across the aisle to try to work with my Republican colleagues on all kinds of issues, including the America COMPETES Act and the America COMPETES reauthorization efforts. I am totally for them. I think they are good initiatives.

One of them we have talked about is the national strategic plan for advanced manufacturing. Advanced manufacturing is a little different from traditional manufacturing. We need to make sure that we are strategic and focused and that we know what we are talking about, as with angel investors. A lot of times people think investment just happens. A lot of times it does, but sometimes, if we can give that little nudge to angel investors, they can invest and make a huge difference in those companies and they can touch millions of people's lives. We have seen that in our State of Arkansas, and that resulted in some real success stories.

Then, if we can bring it back down to a really small scale, one of the initia-

tives I have supported over the years is the small business startup savings account. People can take a certain amount of money from a paycheck, put it in a savings account tax-free—kind of like an IRA or a fund like that—put it in that savings account and use it to start a business or somehow grow the business. They never get taxed on it. They can cash it in at some point and use it to start a business. That is good for savings, it is good for the economy, and it is good to get these small businesses started. Everybody knows as well as I do that when someone walks into a lender, a bank, and they have, say, \$10,000, \$20,000, or \$30,000 saved, that gives them a big advantage when they need a loan for the rest of the money. So that is a win-win across the board.

Again, I support working on this commonsense package of bills that really accomplishes four goals: First, strengthening our manufacturing sector; second, leveling the playing field for American companies; third, helping startups get access to capital; and fourth, enhancing innovation, competitiveness, and trade opportunities for businesses here at home. Various Senators in the Chamber have different ideas on how we accomplish them, but I think we can all agree on those goals. If we work together, we really can make a great difference for our Nation.

One of the reasons why coming out of this sluggish economy has been a little more slow than we would have liked is because we don't have as many manufacturing jobs as we used to. Although the number is on the rebound and it is growing, we all know we have lost a lot of manufacturing jobs in the last couple of decades. But we are back. It is because of energy. It is because of the trained workforce. It is because of our efficiencies, et cetera. We are back. We need to push this advantage and keep it growing. Our country has the workforce, we have the infrastructure, and we have the manufacturing base and the work ethic here; we just need to give our businesses that little extra boost to manufacture jobs for America.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPORTSMEN'S ACT

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of protecting our Nation's outdoor traditions, including opening access to our public lands, preserving some of the greatest places to

hunt and fish and recreate, and encouraging economic development and job creation in our great outdoors.

Last fall I called upon Congress to pass my bipartisan Sportsmen's Act. As the chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, I made it my goal to do something significant, something historic for this country's hunters and anglers. We came very close to passing my bill twice, but politics got in the way both times. A commonsense and widely supported measure failed to get across the finish line because some folks around here put self-interests before the interests of their constituents. I am optimistic that this time will be different and that we can work together to get this bill across the finish line.

Senator HAGAN is leading the charge on behalf of our sports men and women, and I know she is ready to work with all of our colleagues to find a path forward. My friend from North Carolina is the new chairman of the sportsmen's caucus. Hailing from a State with a rich hunting tradition, she knows the importance of protecting America's outdoor heritage. Representing a State that stretches from the Atlantic Ocean to the Appalachian Mountains, she knows it is critical to preserve our wide range of treasured lands.

Senator HAGAN's legislation combines more than 15 bills that will increase access for recreational hunting and fishing, that support land and species conservation, and that protect our hunting and fishing rights. Most importantly, they take ideas from both sides of the political aisle, ideas with support from all corners of the conservation and outdoors community.

When I was the chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, sports men and women would constantly tell me about the importance of access to our public lands. Right now there are 34 million acres of public land that sports men and women cannot access. That is why this bill requires that 1.5 percent of the annual funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund be set aside to increase public land access, ensuring sports men and women access to some of the best places to hunt and fish in the country.

Senator HAGAN's bill will reauthorize the North American Wetlands Conservation Act. This voluntary initiative provides matching grants to landowners who set aside critical habitat for migratory birds, such as ducks. Over the past 20 years volunteers across America have completed more than 2,000 conservation projects and protected more than 26 million acres of habitat under this successful initiative. The North American Wetlands Conservation Act is a smart investment in both our lands and our wildlife, and it needs to be reauthorized.

Senator HAGAN's bill and mine are not identical, but most of the provi-

sions are the same, and the bill is a product of the same spirit of cooperation that drove my bill.

Now, just as happened last year, some folks around Washington will ask why this legislation is important. After all, we need to be working together to create jobs and put this country on solid financial footing. But outdoor recreation is a job creator and an economic driver throughout this country, and Montana is no exception. In my State, one in three Montanans hunts big game and more than 50 percent fish. Nationwide, outdoor recreation contributed nearly \$650 billion in direct spending to the economy in 2012. Hunting and fishing is not just recreation; it is a critical part of our economy. In Montana, hunting and fishing brings in more than \$1 billion a year to our economy—nearly as much as our State's cattle industry.

Strengthening our economy, creating jobs, preserving our outdoor traditions and our treasured places—these all sound like no-doubt-about-it ideas, but last year the Sportsman's Act ran into trouble right here in this Senate. Opposition to my bill didn't come from concerns about measures in the bill itself; instead, it was blocked by Members of Congress taking out frustrations with how other votes went that day. My bill was simply caught in the crossfire. Sports men and women across the country who have been waiting for a bill such as this for a generation watched in disbelief as my bill fell victim to politics. They won't stand for it again.

This is a bill with widespread support that preserves our outdoor economy and secures our outdoor heritage for our kids and our grandkids. There is nothing controversial about it.

Thanks to the leadership of Senator HAGAN, my colleagues have another chance to get it right. When Senator HAGAN's sportsmen's bill comes to the floor, whether here or in committee, I urge my colleagues to support it. Approve it as a vote for bipartisanship. Approve it as a vote for common sense over political victory. Approve it as a vote for America's 90 million sports men and women. Approve it as a vote to create jobs.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

POST ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, yesterday Senator HARKIN of Iowa, the Chairman of the Senate HELP Com-

mittee, joined me in reintroducing a bill called Protecting Our Students and Taxpayers or the POST Act. I am pleased that supporting our efforts are the Education Trust, U.S. PIRG, the National Association of College Admissions Counseling, the Military Officers Association of America, and the Young Invincibles.

Since 1992, Congress has required for-profit schools to derive a portion of their revenue from non-Federal sources. Most people would be surprised to learn how these for-profit schools are really totally upside down. Many depend almost exclusively on Federal money. They are private schools, very profitable, and yet often most of their money comes from the Federal Government.

If you took this segment of our economy, for-profit schools, and made it a Federal agency, it would be the ninth largest Federal agency. That is how much money we put into for-profit schools. Who are these schools? Well, young people, particularly high school age or college age, they know them by name. They are the ones that come bombarding you on the Internet with solicitations to please come join our for-profit school. You cannot get on a CTA bus in Chicago, or on the subway in New York without being inundated with all of these schools trying to sign up young people.

There are three numbers which everyone should understand when they take a look at the for-profit school industry. These three numbers tell you what you need to know: 12 percent of high school graduates go to for-profit colleges—12.

For-profit colleges and universities receive 25 percent of all the Federal aid to higher education, 12 percent of the students—25 percent of the Federal aid to higher education: student loans, Pell Grants.

The third number is the most important. Forty-seven. So 47 percent of the student loan defaults in America are students from for-profit schools. They are a small segment of the population, 12 percent; 25 percent of the Federal aid to higher education and 47 percent of the defaults. They have cooked quite a deal with Congress and with our Federal Government.

Since 1992 we have said to these schools—the law has said: You have to derive a portion of your revenues not from the Federal Government. It is not a portion from the Federal Government, but a portion not from the Federal Government. This was meant to keep for-profit schools in a situation where they would not rely completely on Federal dollars to survive.

Originally, these schools had to come up with—listen to this—15 percent of their revenue from non-Federal sources—15 percent. In 1998, it was reduced to 10 percent. What it means is when the school signs up a student,

they only have to come up with 10 percent of the actual cost, in most circumstances, from sources outside of the Federal Government.

These schools are channeling Federal dollars by the millions through these students into their own coffers. Nine out of every \$10 that these schools take in can come from the U.S. Treasury and taxpayers. Much of the for-profit college industry takes in most of its money directly from the Federal Government.

In fiscal year 2012, we sent \$32 billion to for-profit schools. We spent more on for-profit schools than we did on the National Institutes of Health, NASA, the Coast Guard, Customs and Border Patrol, the EPA, or the FBI. We spend more on for-profits than we do keeping planes in the sky, protecting our borders, tracking down criminals, responding to disasters, researching cures for cancer, protecting the Nation's food supply, making sure our air and water are safe, or exploring the outer reaches of the universe.

In 2009 and 2010, for-profits took in 25 percent of the Department of Education Title IV funds, enrolling only 12 percent of the students. They have quite an arrangement going on here. The largest is University of Phoenix, the Apollo Group. You have heard about the University of Phoenix; you cannot escape them. They advertise all the time.

In 2011, the Apollo Group, which owns the University of Phoenix, counted 86 percent of its revenue from Federal sources, Title IV funds, more than \$5 billion to this one for-profit school. As long as they are educating students, why should we be concerned?

The Apollo Group's profit last year was more than \$400 million. In an era of spending cuts and austerity, what are Federal taxpayers doing sending so much money to a private sector company that is so profitable, particularly in a sector of the education economy that accounts for 47 percent of student loan defaults?

Last year a young woman who received a BA in Fine Arts from the International Academy of Design and Technology in Chicago contacted our office. She finished the undergraduate program, and she found that no graduate programs outside of that school would even consider her transcript. They did not recognize a degree from the so-called International Academy of Design and Technology, a for-profit school.

So 4 years later, with a worthless diploma, she was \$58,000 in debt and had no real future in her chosen field. Federal taxpayers gave the International Academy of Design and Technology, 89 percent of its revenue.

It is a flowthrough. The students apply. They then apply for Pell grants if their income is low enough, student loans. The money flows through the

student into the for-profit school. The student ends up with the debt and the for-profit school ends up with the money. In this case, the student ends up with a worthless diploma and \$58,000 in debt when it is all over.

Ashford University—I could go on for a while about Ashford in Iowa—is currently being investigated by the California attorney general for its recruitment practices. It receives 87 percent of its revenue from the Federal Government.

For such dependence on Federal taxpayers for their operation, one would think these schools must be generating a great return on investment. We have a deficit. Why should we be sending so much money to these for-profit schools? Some of these schools are good, make no mistake, but many are not, and the taxpayers pay either way. For-profit colleges spend less on student instruction than traditional schools, \$3,500, roughly, for students at the for-profit schools, over \$7,000 at public institutions, and \$15,000 per student at private not-for-profit schools. The students leave school with more debt if they go to for-profit schools. They average at least \$6,000 more debt than the typical student.

For-profit students, as I said, are more likely to default. Almost half of the student loan defaults come from students from these schools.

How are the CEOs at the top for-profit schools doing? They made an average in 2009, the last reported date, of \$7.3 million a year. Think about that, 80 or 90 percent of the money is coming from the Federal taxpayers, encumbering the students with debt, and CEOs of the company are walking away with an average of over \$7 million a year in income.

The bill I have introduced with Senator HARKIN would change this. I want to do more, but the first step is returning to the 85-15 ratio, saying that for-profit schools cannot take more than 85 percent of their revenues from the Federal Government and taxpayers. It would also hold these schools accountable for breaking the threshold after 1 year of noncompliance, rather than the lenient 3 consecutive years, which is currently the law.

That is only part of the story. The Federal subsidy of these schools, these money-making machines, goes even farther. The dirty little secret of the current Federal 90/10 rule is that it doesn't count GI bill benefits or the Department of Defense Voluntary Education Program. Hundreds of millions of dollars per year would flow to these schools from these programs and they are exempt from the 90 percent-10 percent requirement.

Does anybody dispute the Department of Defense is part of the Federal Government—of course it is. Whether it be planes, bombs, or servicemembers' education it's paid for by U.S.

taxpayers. Nobody questions that. When we limit how much of these schools' revenues can come from the Federal Government, why should we ignore the money coming through the Department of Defense? It is Federal money, Federal taxpayer money.

According to the 2009 HELP Committee report on for-profit schools, if all forms of Federal funds were counted, the top 15 publicly traded for-profit companies received, on average, 86 percent of all their revenue from Federal sources. The loophole makes servicemembers and veterans prime targets of for-profit schools. They are all over these servicemembers and veterans to sign them up because they bring in more federal dollars. It has led to well-documented horror stories about aggressive predatory recruiting practices.

I have been on this floor telling these stories many times. I do think they bear repeating. I have told the story of two former military recruiters at a for-profit college in Illinois. They contacted my office to tell me what happened. They were told their job was above all to put "butts in classes"—that they should dig deep into the personal lives of their recruits to find their "pain point."

If a prospective student was out of work, recruiters were encouraged to say things such as: "How do you think your wife is about being married to somebody unemployed?"

Entrance requirements at these schools are very low, maybe nonexistent. It didn't matter how long a student stayed as long as he came in, signed up, got the Federal loan that went to the school, and then he was stuck with the debt. There is no telling how many servicemembers have been lured by these practices and then ripped off.

One of these schools has the name the American Military University. A nephew of mine is serving in the U.S. Army. I sent him an email, and I said take a close look at this school. It is not part of the military. They sound like it, but they aren't. It is a for-profit school, and very profitable. There is no telling how many servicemembers have been lured into these schools.

There is James Long, who suffered a brain injury when an artillery shell hit his humvee in Iraq. He used military benefits to enroll in Ashford University, one of the more notorious, after he had been heavily recruited by that school. He told Bloomberg News he knows he is enrolled in Ashford, but he can't remember the courses. Remember, he suffered a head injury in Iraq.

Christopher Ford told the LA Times he used his GI bill benefits at a for-profit school to take an online engineering course, only to find out no company would accept his training and he had used his benefits in pursuing this degree. Of his for-profit education, he said:

It was heavily marketed, so I took it. It sounded pretty good, but it turned out to be pretty predatory.

Our bill, Senator HARKIN's bill and my own, would protect servicemembers and their families from being preyed on by ending this loophole and counting these military and veterans' benefits in the new 85-percent limit. This commonsense bill is a modest step forward trying to reclaim some dignity when it comes to Federal aid in education.

We have opened up this amazing loophole, and 25 percent of all the Federal money for higher education is going into these schools, many of which are just plain worthless. If the students were just wasting time, that would be bad enough, but they are wasting opportunities for education and they are digging debt holes they can never get out of.

I received an email this week from a family in Illinois, a mom. She was so proud that her son had graduated from school. It was not a for-profit school, but he graduated, and she was pretty proud of him. She told me he had a problem. He had incurred \$130,000 in student loan debt. She found out that he had signed up for a lot of debt that couldn't be consolidated, couldn't be refinanced, and she was begging me to do something to help her. There was one line in that email I will never forget. She said: Senator, we just can't afford to pay more than \$1,000 a month for his student loans.

She is speaking of \$1,000 a month on a student loan. That is not unusual.

Too many of these young people and their families get sucked into these student loans, many of these worthless for-profit schools. We have cases that have been reported of grandmothers who have had their Social Security checks garnished because they signed on to guarantee their granddaughter's student loans. God bless grandma for wanting to help her granddaughter, but then her granddaughter can't get a job, can't make a loan payment, and they go after the grandmother's Social Security check. That is outrageous. Surely this Congress can come to a bipartisan agreement on how to cure this.

I wish to thank Senator HARKIN for his partnership on this bill. There is more to come. This student loan crisis is a growing one, and it affects some of the hardest working families in America. They were sure they were doing the right things for their kids. Now they find themselves hopelessly in debt, many times with worthless for-profit school diplomas.

We can do better and we should do better to give these young people and their families a chance.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERANS DAY

Mrs. FISCHER. I rise today on behalf of all Nebraskans to say thank you to our Nation's veterans. Our Nation has long been blessed with men and women with integrity who step forward and answer the call to serve. Throughout times of war and times of peace, our country has maintained a military that has been the envy of the world. Each year Veterans Day is a time to thank and to honor the generations of patriots who have risked life and limb to protect our Nation and defend the cause of freedom. These heroes leave their homes—their comfortable lives with loved ones—for months and years at a time to fight wars in foreign lands. From the windy beaches of Normandy, to the snowy mountains of Korea, and the blistering deserts in the Middle East, our veterans have served fearlessly around the globe. Meanwhile, others, including members of the National Guard, have been stationed throughout the United States serving dutifully to protect the homeland.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have the unique privilege of interacting directly with our servicemembers. I have had the opportunity to meet soldiers, including many Nebraskans, working to protect the hard-fought gains in Afghanistan, and I have visited with troops stationed in Germany, Italy, and other allied nations. This past July I had the opportunity of a lifetime, celebrating Independence Day with our troops in Afghanistan. I expressed my gratitude for their work, and I assured them of my support in the Senate for that work.

While I am committed to ensuring our Active-Duty servicemembers have the training and the tools they need to fulfill their missions, I am equally committed to keeping the faith with our Nation's veterans. Each time I speak with one of Nebraska's many wonderful veterans, I am reminded of the honor and the valor that decorates all of our men and women who have served. Each one has a unique and a very memorable story to tell.

Recently, I was humbled to take part in the inspiring journey of more than 130 Nebraska Korean war veterans to Washington, DC, through the Honor Flight Program. It was a privilege to help welcome them at the Korean War Memorial on the National Mall. All of our veterans deserve our appreciation, but it was especially important for me to acknowledge the heroic efforts of those men and women who fought in what is referred to as America's forgotten war. We are forever grateful to

each and every American who has served, and we salute those who have paid the highest price.

Another way to honor our fallen and missing servicemembers is by showing our gratitude to those who are still with us today. As President Lincoln stated, it is our great charge "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan."

As a Senator, I am dedicated to promoting policies that assist America's veterans when they return home and to help ease the transition back into a normal life. Many need care for their physical injuries as well as their emotional scars.

Despite possessing valuable skills, veterans also have difficulty finding employment after their return. We need to encourage businesses and organizations to utilize the talents of our Nation's veterans and to help them find employment in our local communities. It is not only the values but also the training and the discipline of our military personnel that make America's fighting force second to none.

I am pleased to report to Nebraskans that this year's National Defense Authorization Act, the NDAA, furthers the goal of helping servicemembers better translate the skills they gain in the military to a civilian job. Specifically, it helps ensure that servicemembers understand how their military skills effectively transfer to meet license or certification requirements for civilian careers.

It also requires the DOD to make available as much information as possible on the content of military training to the civilian credentialing agencies. Employers need to appreciate the vast array of skills and knowledge our veterans acquire during their Active-Duty service. My staff and I also stand ready to assist these men and women in navigating Federal agencies to get the assistance they may need.

Many of our States' veterans have contacted my office with a range of important needs that are not being met, promises that have yet to be kept. These requests range from acquiring important service treatment records, to securing benefits for veterans' spouses, and navigating the bureaucratic maze that plagues the Department of Veterans Affairs. We have a great track record in securing the needed assistance.

This year's NDAA also urges the Secretary of Defense to expedite efforts to integrate electronic health records between DOD and the VA.

When it is fully implemented, this should greatly shorten the time it takes for these servicemembers to have their information transferred to the VA and start receiving the benefits they are due.

We can never fully repay our men and women in uniform for the contributions they have made to our country, for their noble acts of service, but

we can continue to do our best to honor their legacy. The peace we enjoy was hard earned. We owe our way of life to their service and their sacrifice. We will never forget and we are forever grateful.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

D.C. CIRCUIT NOMINATIONS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I come to the floor because there are three extremely talented, well-qualified women nominees who are ready to get to work on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. It is time they are confirmed.

I will be joined this afternoon by several of our colleagues: Senators HIRONO, CANTWELL, KAINE, and BLUMENTHAL, because we all know it is time for the Senate to stop the needless blocking of these women. Enough is enough.

I thank Chairman LEAHY for his persistence and the fact that we are not giving up on these three qualified women for the bench.

Our courts need judges in order for the third branch of our government to function. The Senate should not be shutting down another branch of government. Some of my colleagues in the Senate will not even allow an up-or-down vote on these nominees. I don't know if they have even met these nominees, but if they had met them, I don't know how they could come to this floor and not allow an up-or-down vote.

President George W. Bush's candidates to the D.C. Circuit were confirmed so the D.C. Circuit could keep running, and our current President's nominees should be considered in the same manner. You can't have justice with an empty courtroom. It is time to stop making excuses. It is time to put judges in their courtrooms, and it is time to get these women on the bench.

One of the very well-qualified nominees is Nina Pillard. Nina Pillard is a talented lawyer and professor. She is the kind of sensible, well-respected person whom we need to fill one of those empty seats in that courtroom. Actually, it is Professor Pillard because she has been a law professor at the Georgetown University Law Center for the last 15 years. She graduated magna cum laude from Yale College in 1983 and earned her J.D. from Harvard Law School in 1987, again graduating with honors.

In addition to her academic career, Ms. Pillard served in government. From 1998 to 2000, she was the Deputy Assistant Attorney General for the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel. Prior to that she served as an assistant to the Solicitor General, a position held by some of our country's most talented lawyers.

It should be no surprise Ms. Pillard is one of the most accomplished Supreme

Court advocates in the Nation. She has argued nine cases before our Nation's highest Court and has briefed 25 cases.

Outside the courtroom, she has spent her time teaching and mentoring young lawyers, serving as the faculty director for Georgetown Law School's Supreme Court Institute.

When the current Supreme Court Justice Alito was nominated by President Bush to fill an open seat on the Supreme Court, Ms. Pillard also donated her time to the committee to help review his writings and make a recommendation on his qualifications. Why? She was the chair of the American Bar Association's Reading Committee at Georgetown Law Center, which found Justice Alito "well qualified" to sit on the Supreme Court.

People across the aisle think Ms. Pillard is well qualified too. The head of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Policy under President Bush said that Ms. Pillard is "a patient and unbiased listener . . . a lawyer of great judgment and unquestioned integrity."

The deans of 25 law schools, including the University of New Hampshire, the University of Arizona, and the University of Maine, wrote that Ms. Pillard "has shown an appreciation of nuance and respect for opposing viewpoints, grounded in a profound commitment to fair process and fidelity to the law."

Twenty-five more former Federal prosecutors and law enforcement officials said Ms. Pillard "is unquestionably eminently qualified, and is a sensible and fair-minded lawyer." The nonpartisan American Bar Association's—this is no surprise—committee that reviews every Federal judicial nominee unanimously gave Ms. Pillard its highest possible rating.

Fairminded, unquestionably qualified, unquestioned integrity—these are the qualities the Senate should be looking for in a person we entrust to decide cases in our Federal courts. Next week the Senate should give Ms. Pillard an up-or-down vote.

My hope for progress next week is in contrast to the reality we saw just 1 week ago when the Senate voted to block another eminently qualified woman to an up-or-down vote. As I stated last week on the floor, Patty Millett would also be an excellent person to fill one of the vacancies on the D.C. court.

My colleagues have discussed the qualifications of Ms. Millett at length. She is a talented lawyer with extensive appellate experience—32 cases in front of the Supreme Court. I do not understand how anyone in good faith could vote to block an up-or-down vote of someone who has argued 32 cases in front of the U.S. Supreme Court, who has served as an Assistant Solicitor General, and who spent 15 years as an attorney on the appellate staff of the U.S. Department of Justice Civil Division under both Democratic and Republican administrations.

With all this experience, Ms. Millett is also one of the most experienced Supreme Court advocates in the Nation. Just as Ms. Pillard did, Ms. Millett also received the highest possible rating from the nonpartisan American Bar Association committee that reviews every Federal judicial nominee. She has done all of this, as we have all learned, while raising a family, with a spouse serving in the military overseas. She has been raising two children while her husband was serving our country overseas and while donating her time to help kids learn how to read and volunteering for the homeless.

How can anyone not allow a vote on this nominee? This is another woman of unquestioned ability. Instead of confirming Ms. Millett last week, sadly, she was filibustered—another woman filibustered, stopped in her tracks.

I see some of my colleagues have gotten to the floor, and so before I talk about Caitlin Halligan I will give them an opportunity to speak. But Caitlin Halligan is yet another woman stopped in her tracks. This has to end. We have been making so much progress for women in the judicial system and for women in the Senate. We are now 20 of 100 Senators. No one filibustered us. We got an up-or-down vote when we came before the American people, win or lose. That is how it should work for judges. They should get an up-or-down vote—and that is what these women deserve.

With that, I will yield the floor for Senator HIRONO from the State of Hawaii, who is also a member of the Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Minnesota. I rise to speak in support of the nomination of Cornelia "Nina" Pillard to be a circuit judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Less than 2 weeks ago, my colleagues on the other side of the table blocked another nominee to the D.C. Circuit—Patty Millett. Earlier this year, they also blocked Caitlin Halligan—yet another woman who had been nominated to the D.C. Circuit. Unfortunately, Ms. Halligan withdrew her nomination after 2 years of obstruction.

Only five women have served as judges on the D.C. Circuit in its entire 120-year history. The D.C. Circuit is one of the most important circuits in our Nation, and it is shameful that female perspectives are so underrepresented.

Now the Senate will consider the nomination of Nina Pillard, a truly outstanding nominee to the Federal bench. Ms. Pillard is currently a law professor at Georgetown University Law Center and is one of the leading appellate attorneys in this country. Professor Pillard has extensive litigation experience at all levels. She has

argued nine cases before the Supreme Court and has briefed dozens more, including the historic *United States v. Virginia* case that opened the Virginia Military Institute to women and the *Nevada Department of Human Resources v. Hibbs* case that sustained the Family and Medical Leave Act against constitutional challenge and ensured a primary caregiver could take leave in the case of a family illness regardless of gender and in this case the family caregiver was a male.

Professor Pillard has also had an impressive 15-year tenure teaching constitutional law at Georgetown. The fact that is my alma mater has nothing to do with my support of her.

In addition, she serves as codirector of the Georgetown Supreme Court Institute, where she prepares lawyers for oral argument before the U.S. Supreme Court on a pro bono basis, without regard to which side of the case they represent. In fact, under her leadership, the Supreme Court Institute prepared lawyers on one or both sides of every case heard by the Justices in the 2012 term.

Professor Pillard has also twice served as a top attorney at the U.S. Department of Justice, and in those roles she advised and defended U.S. Government agencies and officials on criminal law enforcement and national security matters—invaluable experience for a judge on the D.C. Circuit, where such issues are routinely considered.

I have been deeply impressed with her experience and record and have found her to be exceptionally qualified for this important position in the D.C. Circuit.

In addition to her extensive qualifications, Professor Pillard also has demonstrated a commitment to fair and impartial process throughout her career. As mentioned by my colleague, for example, when Professor Pillard chaired the ABA Reading Committee that reviewed Samuel Alito during his nomination process, her assessment of his legal record led the ABA to apply their highest rating of “well-qualified.” She deserves to be held to the same rigorous, fair standard.

However, following Patty Millett and Caitlin Halligan, Nina Pillard is the third woman in a row to be nominated to the D.C. Circuit only to face obstruction from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

The D.C. Circuit is one of the most important courts in our Nation, weighing key constitutional issues and other matters of Federal law and regulation. Three of the eleven seats on this court stand vacant. Given the complexity and far-ranging impact of the cases the court hears, it is critical we fill vacancies without delay.

Along with Patty Millett and Nina Pillard, President Obama has nominated Judge Robert Wilkins to fill these important vacancies. Unfortun-

nately, so far, we have seen nothing but more obstruction of these extremely well-qualified nominees. This is an opportunity to put exceptionally talented lawyers on a significant court that has vacancies needing to be filled.

I am disappointed our colleagues recently blocked a vote to confirm Patty Millett, not only a great lawyer but a military spouse who managed a successful career and the care of her children while her husband was deployed overseas. When we talk about supporting our troops, it means supporting their very well-qualified spouses, such as Patty Millett.

I was dismayed and saddened when obstruction caused Caitlin Halligan to give up on her nomination after 2 years.

It would be disgraceful to continue this obstruction of these qualified and impressive women. I urge Senators to reconsider and support these nominations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, we have also been joined by Senator Kaine of Virginia, who knows a little bit about one of these nominees and is also a strong advocate for more women in the legal profession. That is one of the cases we are making; that this is about the D.C. Circuit, this is about the repeated gridlock we are seeing in Washington that the people of this country have said they have had enough of, but it is also about the fact our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have now blocked not one, not two but three incredibly qualified women.

So we are starting small on a Thursday afternoon—and maybe there are not a lot of people in the gallery—but this is just the beginning. We are not going to let this go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I thank my colleagues, the Senators from Minnesota and Hawaii, for joining me on the floor. This is a matter I feel very strongly about, and I do wish to offer a few words to basically just raise the question of whether there is a double standard for appointment of women to this particular court, the D.C. Circuit.

Before I tackle that question, I will say one thing knowing that I am speaking to a law professor. I am concerned more broadly about what I consider sort of a pattern of nullification. If there is a law we don't like and we can't get it overturned, there seems to be efforts to defund it or even shut down government—or, in this case, what I would call the decapitation strategy: If you don't like the National Labor Relations Board, just don't appoint people to run the business or the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms or, in this case, the D.C. Circuit.

The D.C. Circuit has an allotted number of judicial positions. This isn't something the President chooses. Congress sets it on the advice of the judicial conference. The judicial conference has not suggested the number should be shrunk. There are 11 judges and 3 are currently vacant. The strategy of blocking appointments is sort of a nullification of law, which I think is troubling. But let me get to the question of what I consider to be a double standard that is blocking some wonderful candidates from going onto this court.

My legal practice for 17 years was in the civil rights area. In the civil rights area, there is a legal notion called the pretext. When something bad happens—you don't get an apartment, you don't get a job, you don't get your bank loan or your homeowners insurance policy—and if a reason is asserted for that, but the reason just falls apart, it is completely illogical, it is not borne by the facts, that is called a pretext. I worry in this instance there are a couple of pretexts going on because the instances that have been cited by my colleagues—the filibustering of Caitlin Halligan, the filibustering of Patty Millett, and now the filibustering of Nina Pillard—rely on two pretexts. Why are these candidates—Caitlin Halligan, who practiced before the U.S. Supreme Court, was the Solicitor General for the State of New York and did such a good job, why block her? Why block Patty Millett, who worked in the Solicitor General's Office under both administrations, supported by Solicitor Generals of both administrations? Why block Nina Pillard? Nina Pillard was the appellate attorney before the U.S. Supreme Court to argue for the need to admit women students to the Virginia Military Institute in my State, which they have done and it is working very well. One of Nina Pillard's supporters was the superintendent of VMI who was being sued. The promise of America will never be fulfilled as long as justice is denied to even one among us. Josiah Bunting has come forward and said Nina Pillard would be a great circuit justice.

So what is the reason being asserted to block these three women? The reason asserted is there is not enough of a workload on this court. I think it is clear the asserted lack of workload is a pretext. It is nonexistent. It is a phantom argument which gets brought up whenever we want to but then abandoned whenever we want to. My evidence for that is pretty clear.

There are two circuit courts—the Eighth and the Tenth Circuit—which have lower caseloads per judge than the D.C. Circuit, but we have been approving nominees for that circuit this year without raising any question about workload. So we will put folks on the Eighth and Tenth Circuits, even though they have a lower workload and no one complains and the other side

doesn't raise that. I asked Members: Why are you raising that here when you weren't raising it on other courts, and they said it is because the D.C. Circuit is the second highest court in the land. It is a more important court. The phrase used by someone to me: It has more juice. Members on the D.C. Circuit might be on the Supreme Court. So workload isn't the issue on the other courts. It is just an issue of this court apparently because the court is so important.

Let's now drill down on what has happened just this year. The Presiding Officer and I are freshmen. We came in on January 3, 2013. We came in with the pending nomination of Caitlin Halligan for the court—supremely qualified, bipartisan support in the legal profession for her. She was filibustered, and one of the principle asserted reasons was there is not enough workload on the court. So she couldn't even get an up-or-down vote.

Within 2 months we had another nominee—a superbly qualified nominee whom I introduced before the Judiciary Committee, Sri Srinivasan, and we approved him in the Senate 97 to 0. He is a male. No one raised one question or mentioned the workload on the D.C. Circuit Court. We had just turned down Caitlin Halligan—because you don't get an up-or-down vote because there is not enough workload—but within 2 months, a 97-to-0 vote we confirmed. I want to make clear, Judge Srinivasan is very qualified to be on this court. But the workload rationale just disappeared.

But it didn't go away because as soon as Patty Millett is nominated—as was indicated, not only a superb appellate attorney who has argued more cases before the Supreme Court than all but a handful of women in the history of this country, who has argued cases before the D.C. Circuit, where we hope she will sit, and other circuits as well. As soon as Patty Millett was nominated, the workload issue pops back up: The court doesn't have enough workload. Now Nina Pillard is being told she is going to be blocked also because the court doesn't have enough workload.

I assert that this workload issue is a complete pretext. It is not raised about other courts and it is not raised about other nominees. Even this year it hasn't been raised. But it has been raised with respect to three superbly qualified women: Caitlin Halligan, Patty Millett, and Nina Pillard. I have only been here 11 months. I don't know all the previous history. But as I watch, women candidates are being treated differently on this court. This second highest court in the land, this court which has juice from which people may go to the Supreme Court, the women candidates are being treated differently. They are being blocked by concerns about workload which are not being applied in an evenhanded way.

The last thing I will say is another bit of evidence which I think is fair to put on the table in this question of whether there is a double standard for women. During the Presidency of President Obama, there has also been the nomination of two women to be on the U.S. Supreme Court. These were debates we followed. These two women—Justices Sotomayor and Kagan, enormously qualified, with bipartisan support from bar associations and others. Justice Sotomayor, when her vote was finally held here, more than 75 percent of the Senators in the minority party voted against her confirmation on the Supreme Court. Elena Kagan, when she was up for nomination, 88 percent of the members of the minority party voted against her confirmation to be on the Supreme Court.

We could look at courts that aren't the two highest in the land and see there have been more appointments of women judges—and that is a good thing and I hope there are more still. But when you get to the D.C. Circuit and the Supreme Court, it seems there is a double standard. It seems this phantom workload issue gets raised when it suits one side and then immediately dropped a couple months later, only to be raised again to block women candidates. I think that is a very serious concern.

Congress set the law that there are 11 judges on this court. The President is trying to comply with the mandate of Congress in putting well-qualified women before this body. We should debate their qualifications. If folks have concerns about those, let's have that debate. But we shouldn't block them from being considered and assert reasons that don't stand the light of day. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Virginia for his well-thought-out argument and the evidence he put out here for the Presiding Officer, a former law professor who believes in evidence. I think it is important that we look at the facts.

I wish to back up some of the facts to why this workload argument doesn't make sense, even when it is put out clearly for the women nominees and it wasn't put out recently for the male nominees. But here are the facts:

When George W. Bush was President, the Senate confirmed his nominees to fill four empty seats on the D.C. Circuit. That was not long ago. Under President Obama, there have been four vacancies on the court. There were four under Bush and four under Obama. The difference? All of President Bush's nominees were confirmed by the Senate.

It is important to note that one of President Obama's nominees—as was pointed out by my colleague from Virginia—was confirmed by the Senate. I

guess that means one guy is confirmed and then these three seats are still open for which women have been put forward.

Some people apparently think there is a problem with the numbers, but let's look at the actual numbers. These same people have supported having more judges on another court that actually has fewer pending cases. The reason we use that standard—pending cases—is those are the active cases. They are not the pro forma orders which are issued quickly. These are the actual cases before the court for which they have to make difficult decisions.

The D.C. Circuit has 8 active judges, 6 partially retired senior judges, and 1,479 pending cases. The Tenth Circuit has 10 active judges, 10 senior judges, and 1,341 pending active cases. So the Tenth Circuit—to which my colleagues have confirmed multiple nominees—has more judges but fewer pending cases per judge.

Why does the Tenth Circuit have more judges with fewer cases per judge than the D.C. Circuit? I believe the answer is quite simple: Earlier this year, the Senate confirmed two judges to fill the empty seats on the Tenth Circuit, and the Senate should do the same with the D.C. Circuit by taking these three well-qualified nominees and confirming them.

I see the Senator from Washington has arrived and I know she has a few remarks about this as well. As I pointed out to the Presiding Officer, this is just the beginning. We are going to continue to fight for these three women judges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for her leadership on the floor this afternoon. It is great to join her and my other colleagues to talk about the importance of judicial nominees, and in particular today, because today we are talking about the nomination of more female representation on the courts which I think is incredibly important.

I served my first 2 years in the Senate on the Judiciary Committee, and I was struck to find that, I think at that time, I may have been the fourth woman in the whole history of our country to be on the Judiciary Committee. Now I am so proud that my colleague from Minnesota serves on that committee and does an excellent job and that we have other representation as well. But the point we have to ask ourselves is, do we have to get women elected to the Senate to get women on the Judiciary Committee to get women on the courts because our colleagues aren't going to help us do that?

I am rising to support moving these nominations. President Obama has nominated Cornelia Pillard and Patricia Millett. We want to see these vacancies filled. We don't want the same

dysfunction which led to a government shutdown to let us move toward the kind of the stopping of putting people on the court. Nominating highly qualified individuals is what the President's job is, and filling seats on the court is not packing the court. It is simply doing the job.

On October 31, 2013, many of my colleagues voted against a motion to end debate on Patricia Millett to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. She is a very highly qualified attorney who has argued before the Supreme Court 32 times and is recognized both by Democrats and Republicans for her legal acumen. Despite her qualifications, her nomination was being blocked. Had she been confirmed, she would only be the sixth woman to sit on the D.C. District Court of Appeals. So I am questioning the place we are now on this nomination.

Professor Nina Pillard is another filibustered nominee who has argued historic cases before the Supreme Court, including a case to open the Virginia Military Institute to women for the first time in history and a case defending the family medical leave law. American people want to know why are these qualified female judges being blocked. Just 32 percent of the U.S. Appeals Court judges are women. In my opinion, it is time to move forward with more highly qualified nominees to add diversity to the courts.

I have not heard any of my colleagues question the credentials of these nominees. In fact, Ms. Millett has been called "a brilliant mind, a gift for clear persuasive writing, and a genuine zeal for the rule of law." This is not a quote by a Democratic Senator or a liberal think tank. That quote is from former Special Prosecutor Kenneth Starr in a letter with six other Solicitors General, top lawyers who have served in the George H. Bush and George W. Bush and Clinton administrations, basically saying, "Equally important, she is unfailingly fair minded." That is from Mr. Starr.

So the D.C. Circuit Court currently has four judges chosen by Democratic Presidents and four by Republicans. There are three vacancies on the court. Republicans are arguing we shouldn't fill these vacancies, that we should just eliminate them. I think my colleague from Minnesota just spoke to this. This is a proposal that is even opposed by Chief Justice John Roberts, who argues that the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals is similar to many of the Federal courts and is operating in a state of crisis. He said, "Based on our current caseload methods, the D.C. Circuit Court should continue to have 11 judgeships."

So we need a court that is fully staffed. The primary responsibility of this court is the handling of cases involving Federal regulations on environ-

mental safety, health care reform, and insider trading. We should trust that our judicial branch can nominate and get judges on that court that basically will look at the law and not party affiliation and stop obstructing people whom I believe are qualified to be on the court.

I hope we can move forward. Ms. Millett is the second female nominee opposed by Republicans after the nomination of Georgetown professor Pillard was filibustered. However, she joins a long list of judicial nominees who happen to be female who have been opposed, not because of their qualifications but because they were nominated by this President. I will submit that list for the RECORD.

I hope this discussion today points out the need of more women on the courts. Maybe we also need more women elected to the Senate so we can make sure we get more women on the courts. But this is, today, about asking my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to not look past this court. Do not try to diminish it by narrowing its focus. Get more people who will support qualified women so we can have the diversity in America that we need represented on our courts, even at the D.C. district appeals level.

I thank my colleague from Minnesota for arranging for all of us to be here today to share our views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I think there are two interesting facts that Senator CANTWELL brought up that I didn't know. The first was the percentage of women in the Federal district courts—in the 30-percent range, 32-percent range. The second was Justice Roberts' belief that, in fact, we should have judges to fill these seats. It is interesting that Justice Roberts actually was on the D.C. Circuit. I remember looking at the numbers. When he was confirmed to serve on the D.C. Circuit, there were actually fewer pending cases per judge than there are now—even if these vacancies were filled. I keep bringing that up because it is the one and the only argument we keep hearing against these three women we talk about today. Caitlin Halligan was already filibustered, stopped in her tracks despite trying three or four times and never giving up—1 year, the next year, putting in her name, having to go through a nomination process. We just saw Patty Millett, eminently qualified, filibustered, stopped at the door. I have never seen so many tweets about a judicial nominee. They are not always that well known, but in her case she is a hero of military spouses across the country who cannot believe my colleagues across the aisle are denying her that right to serve on our courts.

Now we have a new nominee before us, Cornelia Pillard, someone, as we

noted, who has been unanimously suggested for this job by the nonpartisan American Bar Association. She is someone eminently qualified, with nine Supreme Court arguments, and someone who has so much respect from those she mentors, from her colleagues both Democratic and Republican.

I see the Senator from Connecticut is here, another member of the Judiciary Committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, an esteemed lawyer and prosecutor herself, for her service on the Judiciary Committee and dedication to the quality of our courts and for her bringing us together this afternoon to focus on a topic I think perhaps is not uppermost on the minds of most Americans, not something they worry about when they are bringing their kids to school or fixing dinner at night, but that shapes the quality of our society. It assures the rule of law, and it guarantees the courts of our country look like the people of our country.

We are here because there are too few women as judges on our Federal courts. They have been denied that opportunity, and for so long they were denied the opportunity even to practice law. We are here because this situation is unacceptable. The Senate cannot and should not continue to obstruct the appointment of qualified nominees—in this instance women. Nina Pillard, like Patty Millett, is eminently qualified—indeed, distinguished, a candidate who fits the ideal profile. If you were designing and writing in the abstract the resume of a circuit court judge for the United States of America, it would be Nina Pillard.

One of the tragic results of the obstruction that we see in the appointment of judges nominated by the President is that the Senate is blocking women appointees to this court. The Senate has only confirmed one woman to the D.C. Court in the last 19 years. During this same time period, five men have been confirmed to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. In the court's entire history, only five women have been confirmed. These facts speak for themselves.

Thanks to the leadership of President Obama and Chairman LEAHY, the Judiciary Committee has been approving qualified women to take the "men only" sign off the door at the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. But those women have been blocked by a minority of this body.

There ought to be common ground for Senators to have a good reason to block an appointment to the judiciary made by the President of the United States, which is his constitutional responsibility just as it is ours to advise and consent, and not simply, blindly block a woman appointee.

In 2005, the bipartisan gang of 14 came together and they agreed that a Senator should vote against a nominee only in “exceptional circumstances, extraordinary circumstances.” The history of that agreement is pretty well known here even though only a handful of Senators who joined in the agreement are still here. Its spirit and intent ought to guide us. Even if it is not binding in letter, its intent and purpose are as real now as they were then. It was to avoid the kind of nuclear approach—it is called, I suppose, the nuclear option for that reason—because it would be so organically threatening to the civility and collegiality of this body if it is invoked. The approach should be, as a Republican member of that gang of 14 said, that judges should be denied confirmation only in the event of “a character problem, an ethics problem, some allegation about the qualifications of a person, not an ideological bent.” If Senators agree that only exceptional circumstances justify blocking a nominee, then clearly the three female nominees that have been nominated by the President ought to be confirmed by the Senate. Our Country, and the legal profession specifically, has an unfortunate history when it comes to women.

As I mentioned earlier, for generations women were not even allowed to practice law. Only recently have they been afforded the opportunity to serve on the Federal bench—despite their serving with extraordinary distinction when they were in fact appointed. They are still woefully underrepresented.

When women are denied an equal chance to serve on our courts, we are left with judicial bodies that fail to reflect the American people, fail to reflect their values and backgrounds, their aspirations and dreams, and in fact their talent and insight. An exclusionary Federal judiciary makes a mockery of our Nation’s claim to equal justice under law.

The excuse for blocking appointees is that the D.C. Circuit Court does not need more judges. I find this claim unpersuasive, based on the workload of the court. We can debate, in fact, the numbers, but statistics in this instance fail to reflect the complexity and difficulty of the cases that come before this court. The same Senators who say the caseload fails to justify appointments now gladly voted to approve John Roberts to the ninth seat on the court when the court had just 111 pending appeals per judge. It now has 182 appeals per active judge.

The history here is that the Senate approved appointees nominated by George Bush to fill the 9th, 10th, and 11th seats on the D.C. Circuit, the three seats that are vacant today. But this issue should not be about partisan politics. It should not be about which President made the appointments. It ought to be about the principle; that is,

if the workload is insufficient, the number of seats on the court should be reduced by legislation. The Congress should not refuse to fill vacancies when they exist lawfully and in fact when there is strong evidence that the workload justifies filling those vacancies.

Nina Pillard is a civil rights icon. She is a public servant of extraordinary distinction. Ms. Pillard led the integration of women into the Virginia Military Institute. Her work led the Supreme Court to uphold Congress’ ability to pass the Family and Medical Leave Act. Her academic work continues to identify common ground between liberals and conservatives that can allow for the protection of important rights.

Some have said that she is a feminist. The fact is, Professor Pillard believes that a woman’s right to choose is protected by the U.S. Constitution. In other words, she believes in a judicial decision, written by Justice Blackmun—for whom I clerked—which has been upheld repeatedly by the U.S. Supreme Court over four decades. It is embedded in our constitutional law, as fundamental as the right to privacy is fundamental to our Constitution. I think the merits more than justify her confirmation. There is no question that she has the talent and temperament, the intellect and integrity, the experience and the sensitivity to serve as one of our great judges on this court of appeals.

I urge my colleagues to put aside the extraneous and irrelevant considerations that may lead them to oppose confirmation and, very simply, to give their approval to a woman who will be a mentor and a model to so many other women now in law school or beginning their careers or even beginning their judgeships, and who one day will aspire to this kind of position. They will see her example and ours in approving her as an inspiration to them in their careers.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, we have been trying to figure out all day how to fit five numbers on this poster. I have been bringing it down nearly every week since the anti-gun violence bill failed here in the Senate due to a Republican filibuster, and this is the first week this poster comes down to the floor of the Senate with five digits. There have been 10,287 Americans killed by guns since December 14, the day of the Sandy Hook shooting.

What I have been endeavoring to do since the failure of that bill on the floor of the Senate—despite the fact that 80 to 90 percent of Americans supported the bill—is to bring to the floor the voices of victims, because the statistics are numbing at this point. We have had 10,000 people in this country die at the hands of gun violence since December 14, and that apparently has not been enough to move this place, or the House of Representatives, to action.

My hope is that by coming down to this floor every week or so and telling the real stories—the human stories—about the individuals who have lost their lives and the absolutely catastrophic runoff of trauma that happens to a family and a neighborhood and a community when you lose a loved one due to gun violence, maybe that will move this place to do something.

I want to tell three stories this afternoon because it now is kind of routine—you just sort of wonder what day of the week is it going to be when you turn on CNN or look at your Twitter feed and you see “active shooting in progress,” “school lockdown,” or “people fleeing airport.” It just kind of happens every week now. It has become a kind of commonplace occurrence. It is almost like raindrops in the background of news coverage on a daily basis—this week’s shooting, next week’s shooting.

On October 21, a seventh grader named Jose Reyes, a student at Sparks Middle School, opened fire with a handgun he took from his parents. He killed a teacher, himself, and left two other students wounded at a middle school in Nevada.

The teacher he killed was named Mike Landsberry, and, boy, you don’t get much more American than Mike Landsberry. He was an Alabama native. He graduated from high school in Reno, which is right next door to Sparks, in 1986, and then served in the Marine Corps. He joined the Air National Guard after he got out of the Marine Corps. He rose to the rank of master sergeant and served as a cargo specialist in Kuwait and Afghanistan. He fought for this country. He put his life on the line to defend this Nation. When he came back, as happens with thousands of veterans, he decided to continue his public service and became an incredibly popular math teacher.

His brother said of Mike: He is “the kind of person that if someone needed help he would be there. He loved teaching. He loved the kids. He loved coaching them . . . He was just a good all-around individual.”

Mike is no longer with us because he is now one of the over 10,000 Americans who have died at the hands of a gun—this time in a school shooting on October 21.

Gerardo Hernandez, according to his wife, was always excited to go to work.

He was a joyful person who took pride in his duty for the American public. Gerardo was the TSA screener at the Los Angeles International Airport who was gunned down when Paul Ciancia, a troubled 23-year-old, walked into LAX with an assault weapon and a grievance and grudge against the government. He opened fire and killed Gerardo Hernandez, age 39. He was the youngest in a family of four boys who had all emigrated from El Salvador. He was 15 years old when they made the decision to come to the United States to seek a better, safer, more stable life. And now the youngest of four boys is one of 10,287.

Finally, the story of Maria Flores, who, frankly, didn't make headlines when she died over the summer along with her daughter Elizabeth Gomez. They died in Las Vegas when Manuel Mata, her boyfriend with a history of jealousy and domestic violence, shot and killed Maria. He shot and killed her teenaged daughter and wounded a 4-year-old before turning the gun on himself.

Family members said that Mata had financial troubles, drank often, displayed jealousy, and constantly accused his girlfriend of cheating. They said his girlfriend Maria Flores, who died that day, threatened to move out of the residence a couple of weeks earlier, but she was convinced by Mata to stay.

The daughter who was killed was scheduled to graduate 3 days after the murder took place.

I tell these three stories for this reason: First, in the wake of the TSA shooting, a lot of folks from the gun lobby made the argument that the way to fix this problem was to arm TSA agents, just as people made the argument that the way to guarantee another Sandy Hook tragedy from happening is to arm the teachers. Some people actually had the audacity to argue that an even better way was to arm the students too.

It speaks to this sort of new philosophy that has infested this place—the Senate and the House—that I kind of describe as gun control Darwinism, the idea that if everybody has a gun—the good guys and the bad guys—hopefully enough of the good guys will shoot the bad guys. You just throw a whole mess load of guns out there, let them figure it out, and in the end we will take care of the bad guys.

We have some new data that tells us how backwards that philosophy is. Common sense tells you that is not a good idea, but the data now tells you that is not a good idea.

The American Journal of Public Health did the most comprehensive study ever done in this country. They looked at rates of gun ownership and rates of homicide by gun death. They looked at decades of data across every State in the Nation, and then they had

the common sense to account for about every factor you could think of: gender, race, poverty, income, education, alcohol use, and crime rates. What they found is pretty stunning and straightforward. The American Journal of Public Health said that for every 1 percent increase in gun ownership in a particular State, locality, or geographic region, there is a firearms homicide rate increase of 1 percent, a 1-to-1 ratio. If gun ownership goes up by 1 percent, increases in gun homicide go up by 1 percent.

Police chiefs in city after city across the country will verify that. As they have taken guns off the street, as they have engaged in gun buyback programs, guess what. Miraculously gun deaths decrease. That is not to say the only thing that matters is the number of guns on the street. Clearly, this young man who walked into Sparks Middle School and the 23-year-old who walked into LAX had enormous issues that were going untreated. We are fooling ourselves if any of us are trying to perpetuate an argument that this is just about gun ownership. This is also about a very broken mental health system that we need to address. But a 1-percent increase in gun ownership leads to a 1-percent increase in gun violence.

The reason I tell Maria's story is because this is Domestic Violence Awareness Month—or maybe it was October. We have either completed it or we are in that month. Here is a stunning fact: In States that have comprehensive background checks, women are 38 percent less likely to die from domestic violence crimes. Women are 38 percent less likely to die from domestic violence crimes if they are lucky enough to live in a State that says: Before you buy a gun, you have to prove to us you are not a domestic abuser.

Since 1998, 250,000 domestic abusers have been stopped from buying guns because of background check laws. That is just the domestic abusers who were dumb enough to show up at a gun store and try to buy a firearm. That doesn't count, frankly, the millions of domestic abusers who never walked into the store to buy the gun in the first place because they knew they were going to be denied. Women in the United States are 11 times more likely to be murdered by a gun than women in any other high-income Nation. And we have a solution: background checks. Women are 40 percent less likely to die from domestic violence if they live in a State that does background checks.

I bring just three stories to the floor today in my effort to bring voices to the victims—the stories of Mike, a teacher in Nevada; Gerardo, an immigrant to this country who loved doing his public service as a TSA screener; and Maria Flores, one of thousands of women across this country killed by their spouses or partners in part be-

cause of the ease of access to a gun in this country.

So 10,287 people—that number is tough to fit on one board. That is just in 11 months. Frankly, it won't be that long—just a handful of years from now—before there is absolutely no way to fit this number on this board unless the Senate and the House of Representatives decide that 90 percent of Americans are right and we should make sure criminals can't access guns. We should ban illegal gun trafficking. We should expand the reach of our mental health system so we can finally say that Congress—the Senate and the House—is going to do something to give voice to these victims.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERANS DAY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, as we approach Veterans Day on Monday, I want to rise to recognize the selfless service and sacrifice of America's veterans. As we reflect upon the generations of men and women who have answered the call to serve and defend our freedoms, we especially remember those who have given what President Lincoln so eloquently called "the last full measure of devotion."

Just as we owe it to the memory of those who have given their lives for freedom, we also have the solemn obligation to ensure that every servicemember comes home and that we care for those who still bear the wounds of war. Some of these wounds are physically visible, while others are not so apparent.

We have made great strides in caring for our servicemembers, especially in regard to lifesaving procedures on the battlefield and rehabilitative care through the Department of Veterans Affairs, but there is still much we must do to combat the epidemic of mental health issues among veterans. Traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress disorder, and the alarmingly high rate of suicide among our servicemembers remain among the most pressing issues our veterans face.

We owe all of our veterans a tremendous debt of gratitude, and we must uphold the foremost duty of providing for their care. This responsibility includes aiding our veterans as they transition to civilian life by finding ways to put their skilled military training to work and through providing timely processing of medical claims. We must rise to the occasion to make sure our past mistakes are not repeated as our troops return from current and future conflicts.

In my home State of South Dakota, it is easy to see the integral role veterans have played in shaping who we are as South Dakotans—a legacy that dates back to before the founding of the State itself. South Dakotans have always punched above their weight when it comes to military service in all the various conflicts in which our country has been involved over the years. The values of service and honor are woven into the fabric of our communities. With each passing day these values are strengthened by the men and women currently serving at Ellsworth Air Force Base and in the South Dakota Air and Army National Guard and VA centers around my State. I doubt there are many South Dakotans who do not have a family member or friend who has worn our Nation's uniform.

I know firsthand the sacrifice made by our Nation's veterans because my own father Harold was a decorated World War II Navy pilot. Like all our veterans, my dad served with pride and dignity, protecting our democracy at home and abroad. One of my favorite memories since I have been in the Senate was the opportunity to accompany my father to the World War II Memorial and show him that great memorial that was erected in honor of his generation's veterans. I was humbled by the quiet reverence they had for their comrades lost in battle and reminded of the ultimate sacrifice made by so many of our countrymen.

We should be grateful for the generations of men and women who have given of themselves on behalf of our great Nation. There can be no mistake that America's veterans have served bravely and honorably, making America the country it is today.

As we celebrate a weekend filled with fanfare and celebrations, with people involved in their weekend activities, I would ask that we all take a moment to remember the service of those who did not make it back to their families and that we rededicate ourselves to caring for those who continue to bear the cost of our freedoms.

May God bless our veterans, and may we continue to honor those who have nobly answered the call to serve. On this Veterans Day, may we all keep the brave members of our military and their families in our thoughts and prayers as they continue to serve our great Nation.

VETERANS DAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, as Veterans Day 2013 approaches next Monday, I ask that in honoring the brave men and women who have served our Nation, we in Congress honor them in ways that are meaningful and help them return to civilian life after they have served. A mere thank-you is little comfort to a veteran who cannot find

meaningful employment, who is striving to provide for his or her family, or who is dealing with post-traumatic stress.

President Woodrow Wilson established this holiday—originally known as Armistice Day—on November 11, 1919, when he proclaimed that it would be used to honor the brave Americans who fought and died in World War I. The holiday was officially recognized by the U.S. Congress on June 4, 1946. After the end of World War II, Armistice Day was expanded to honor all veterans of our military services, and the holiday's name was changed to Veterans Day.

We should honor our veterans every day, but I believe that this annual holiday is especially important as it allows us to reflect on the true aspect of the sacrifices that our servicemembers have made. Their sacrifices are often made in stressful, frustrating, and dangerous conditions. Yet these brave men and women do not shy from committing themselves to serving our country. It is because of those who have served selflessly, with honor and dignity, that we can continue celebrating our history and our way of life.

While I am proud of all of our veterans, I am especially proud of the veterans in my State. Maryland has a long and proud military tradition. Maryland is known as the Old Line State. Some people think that comes from the Mason Dixon Line, but it actually dates back to 1776, less than 2 months after the Declaration of Independence, when George Washington's army was nearing annihilation in an indefensible position at Brooklyn Heights. They were faced with overwhelming odds, and the British Army—the most powerful military force in the world at the time—was closing in around them. But on this historic day 400 Marylanders who made up the Maryland Line stepped up against those overwhelming odds and ran into the breach in defense of our Nation. Today, there is a plaque over the mass graves of those citizen soldiers that reads simply this: "In honor of the Maryland 400, who on this battlefield on August 27, 1776, saved the American Army."

Every year I make it a priority on Veterans Day to take an opportunity to thank the millions of brave men and women who served our Nation in uniform and honor them for their courage, dedication, and sacrifice. In my first year as a Senator of Maryland I went to Garrison Forest Veterans Cemetery in Owings Mills for a Veterans Day observance, as well as attended a Veterans Day Salute and groundbreaking of a new facility for Baltimore Station, which provides innovative therapeutic residential treatment program supporting veterans who are transitioning through the cycle of poverty, addiction, and homelessness to self-sufficiency.

I have also spent Veterans Day at the Leonardtown Cemetery and Crownsville Veterans Cemetery Remembrance Ceremony, where I placed wreaths honoring those who have paid the ultimate price in serving our country. Two years ago, I had the privilege of joining Maryland Veterans Affairs Secretary Edward Chow, Jr., to observe Veterans Day at Cheltenham Veterans Cemetery. Through our efforts, we were able to announce that the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs has awarded the cemetery a grant of \$1.7 million to make improvements.

Just last year, I had the opportunity to thank the millions of brave men and women who have served in the U.S. Armed Forces and risk their lives for our Nation when I provided remarks at the Crownsville Veterans Day Ceremony. Additionally, I was invited by the Armed Forces Foundation to speak to students at Manor View Elementary School—located on Fort Meade—as part of their Operation Caring Classroom Program. During my visit, I talked to students about Veterans Day and the importance of honoring the service of men and women in the military, as well as the sacrifices of their families. We far too often forget to thank the families of our veterans for all they have sacrificed. We want our veterans and their families to know we are grateful for their service to our Nation and are here today to honor them as well.

This year I will have a chance to say thank you to veterans across Maryland as I participate in the Vietnam Veterans of America, Chapter 451 Veterans Day Celebration and Baltimore City's Veterans Day Celebration sponsored by the Baltimore City Veterans Commission. This Veterans Day, I am reminded that Maryland is home to over 470,000 veterans to whom we made solemn promises. I am committed to making sure they receive the services and benefits they earned and the support they were promised. The United States is the strongest Nation in the world, and I am proud to honor Maryland's veterans with my gratitude and respect.

For more than 237 years, Marylanders in every branch of service have been at the forefront of providing distinguished service for our national defense. Let me mention a few examples. Marylanders are justifiably proud of amazing soldiers like PFC Kevin Jaye, an Army hero born and raised in Smithsburg who saw his life change when he stepped on an improvised explosive device, IED, while serving in Afghanistan. Kevin lost his right leg below the knee, but despite the many surgeries and the long recovery process, he is determined to overcome these challenges. Since the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan began, more than 1,500 U.S. troops have become amputees and Kevin is one of them.

We are justifiably proud of naval heroes like Navy Hospital Corpsman Michael Couch, who received a Purple Heart earlier this year as a result of the injuries he sustained while serving in Afghanistan. Michael was traveling in a convoy when his vehicle rolled over an IED which detonated. He was knocked unconscious, and his eardrum was ruptured. After 3 weeks of rehabilitation he rejoined his unit. Michael is now stationed at the Naval Academy, where he is an optometry technician who prescreens the vision of midshipmen before they meet with an optometrist.

We are justifiably proud of marines from Maryland like HM3 Vanzorro Gross, Jr., who was awarded the Purple Heart in May by Naval Health Clinic Patuxent River. Corpsman Gross received the Purple Heart for wounds received in action during a raid while deployed in Afghanistan with the Marines. During the firefight, eight service personnel were injured and two were killed. Corpsman Gross was 30 days into a 6-month deployment at the time of the attack and was sent home with damage to the bones in his foot. He had a 3-inch hole in his foot from the shrapnel damage and has undergone four orthopedic surgeries so far to reconstruct it. Despite these injuries, when visited in Walter Reid National Military Medical Center by a commanding officer, Corpsman Gross' first question was, "When can I go back?"

We are justifiably proud of Air Force Airman Captain Barry F. Crawford, Jr., a member of the Maryland Air National Guard, who was recently awarded the Air Force Cross—second only to the Medal of Honor—and Purple Heart for his extraordinary heroism in military operations against an armed enemy of the United States as special tactics officer near Lagham Province, Afghanistan. Captain Crawford is credited for taking decisive action to save the lives of three wounded Afghan soldiers and evacuating two Afghan soldiers killed in action. Captain Crawford is only the fifth recipient, since 9/11, to receive the Air Force Cross.

We are justifiably proud of Security Forces airmen stationed at Warfield Air National Guard Base, who were awarded the Bronze Star Medal for meritorious achievement while assigned to the Air Force Office of Special Investigations Tactical Security Element at Bagram Airfield, Afghanistan. MSG John Duly and MSG Olen D. Smith III led a 15-man tactical security element that provided security wherever the Office of Special Investigations detachment needed to go. On a routine mission, an Army platoon came under attack from Taliban fighters, and Sergeants Duly and Smith moved their unit to provide support. For the next 48 hours their unit provided security and overwatch, re-

sponded to a vehicle rollover, initiated and received direct fire, coordinated with helicopter and fixed wing assets, and responded to a vehicle hit by an IED.

We are justifiably proud of the A-10 pilots from the 104th Fighter Squadron with the Maryland Air National Guard assigned to Bagram Airfield, Afghanistan, who recently flew as part of a harrowing mission to support ambushed coalition forces fighting during dangerous weather conditions. A dozen pilots protected more than 90 coalition servicemembers during a major battle in the mountains of eastern Afghanistan.

All across the services, our military members and veterans from Maryland are the best in the Department of Defense. But Congress simply has not done enough to provide enough support to our veterans. For example, unemployment is also an issue for the veterans community. Veterans, particularly young veterans from our most recent conflicts, are having trouble getting jobs. In this September's jobs report, the Bureau of Labor reported that while the unemployment rate for non-veterans was 7.2 percent and the unemployment rate for all veterans was at 6.5 percent, the unemployment rate for post-9/11 veterans was at an astonishing 10.1 percent. I find this troubling, as the experience that these veterans acquired during their recent military service should make them invaluable to prospective employers. We must do better in providing employment opportunities for our veterans.

Ultimately, Veterans Day is an opportunity for all of us to thank our veterans for their service and to renew our commitment to serving and honoring them each and every day of the year. A true marker of our Nation's worth is our willingness to serve those who have served us. As we continue to wind down our commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan after a decade of war, we need to gear up our commitment to our veterans. Our veterans deserve every possible tool we can provide to help ease their transition to civilian life. I am committed to making sure that our veterans receive the services and benefits they earned and the support they were promised and deserve. The United States is the strongest Nation in the world because of our veterans, and we owe them and their families our gratitude and our respect.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, Veterans Day 2013 gives us an opportunity to set aside our day-to-day worries and celebrate the men and women who have served in the United States Armed Forces. It is a national day of recognition and gratitude for those who have bravely served and fought to defend the freedoms that make the United States a beacon of liberty to the world.

I am heartened each year by the pride that Mississippians have for our

Armed Forces, and their appreciation for the sacrifices made by loved ones on behalf of our Nation. The ceremonies, parades and programs taking place this year will reflect the admiration we share for our veterans. It is gratifying to see the deep respect that the people of my State have for those who have served, from the first Mississippians who took up arms to defend this land to those currently deployed around the world.

Today, the new generation of all-volunteer veterans returning from more than a decade of sustained combat operations reminds us of our sacred obligations to all our veterans and their families. We must dedicate ourselves to meeting those commitments. Doing so will make us a stronger Nation.

I appreciate that on Veterans Day the world will witness an American people united in its appreciation of the men and women who have served and fought for our republic.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FISCAL YEAR 2014 APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator MIKULSKI, earlier this week. She has really been an extraordinary leader for many years in this Congress. She is truly an expert appropriator. We could have no better person trying to bring this body together—Democrats and Republicans—in my mind than Senator MIKULSKI. She is trying to get our appropriations bills through the process—which is so important for the country, not just for our agencies and our departments, as the Presiding Officer knows, as a Senator from Massachusetts with thousands in his State and millions of private contractors and nonprofit organizations, not the least of which is one my favorites, the Catholic Church, which delivers so many social services to the people of our State and Nation.

It is very hard for anyone to plan anything when the Federal budget is in such disarray. If there is anyone that can figure this out, it is Senator MIKULSKI. So as one of her subcommittee chairs, I want to be here to support her work. I am the chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee, and I add my voice to how important it is for us over these next few weeks to get a budget resolution done.

Senator MURRAY has passed a budget on this side. After the recklessness of a government shutdown, finally everyone

has come to their senses, and we are now in conference with the Budget Committee. We have to get that budget number down so that once we agree on what the top-line spending is, the budget for the country, we can then go about building the 12 bills that actually run the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Education, and the others.

The important reason for Congress to adopt a budget resolution would be for us to provide some stability—not just for the next year but the next 2 years, and not only for stability to our agencies but to our many private sector partners, so that we can give some idea of what the outlook for spending and investing is going to be by the Federal Government. It is very important for our overall economic strength. We cannot afford another government shutdown which puts our economic viability at risk and denies assistance to millions of Americans.

In my State, I was trying to figure out a way to describe the cost of the shutdown—reckless, and it should have been avoided, and it was not. So I asked, what are some of the things that cost about \$92 million in Louisiana? One of the things I found out is that the New Orleans Saints payroll is \$70 million a year. That would be like telling the Saints we are not paying you for one whole year. We would never do that in New Orleans. But when we think about not paying the salaries of the players and then the effect that would have on the whole operation, the whole organization, the city itself, the games, we can see the ripple effect; and that was just the impact to Louisiana. The impact to the Nation was extraordinary. We have to avoid it at all costs.

One of the missions of the Appropriations Committee is to make sure the Federal Government continues to operate on behalf of the people, the taxpayers we serve, and that we invest in their future, in their opportunities to strengthen families and grow businesses. They need a budget that they can count on just like we do. When the Federal Government is not functioning under normal order and getting our budgets, our appropriations bills, it really does wreak havoc in many communities throughout our country. We need to pass our 12 appropriations bills that set priorities and invest in our future.

If we are not able to get to an agreement on the budget and to set top lines for all of our appropriations bills, we will basically punt to a continuing resolution—CR—which I think Senator DURBIN said is like running your business for 2014 based on your checkbook receipts from 2013. Why would any smart businessperson do that? No one would run a family budget or business operation using last year's stubs from the checkbook. We want to pay for this

year coming up. We want to budget for the future.

Anytime we can't pass an appropriations bill and we punt to a continuing resolution, it is like putting the country on autopilot set for last year's weather, not what is coming ahead for next year. It really is a waste of money. It wastes taxpayer money.

So I am hoping that cool heads can prevail and we can get a budget number. It is going to take some additional revenues put on the table, as well as some smart cuts and reductions, balancing between the Murray priorities and the Ryan priorities. Then we can be given our numbers to build the Homeland Security budget. That is what I want to talk about now just briefly.

Everyone knows how important it is to keep the homeland security of this country intact. We have done a very fine job. It has been expensive. This budget has gone from zero to its current level of \$42 billion post-9/11, in the last 12 years, but it has been an investment worth making. We have a lot of threats against our country every day from border intrusions, to cyber security threats, to explosions, as the Presiding Officer knows so well, with the Boston Marathon, which frightened and terrorized an entire community and city. So there are lots of challenges. Throwing money at the problem isn't going to fix them all, but not having enough money to invest will ensure vulnerabilities which we cannot allow.

When a homemade explosive device wreaked havoc at the Boston Marathon, we saw how critical it was that law enforcement and first responders had proper training and equipment. That training and equipment is funded through the Homeland Security bill. We have given robust grants over the years. We want to continue to be able to do that. However, if we don't get to a budget, if we don't get to an agreement, grant funding would be reduced to the lowest level since it was formed 10 years ago. I don't think we want to go back to pre-9/11 investments. This is a new world. It is a dangerous world. The threats are evolving, as we saw play out in Boston. We need to be ready for the next attack, and we won't be if we can't get a budget agreement.

Our cyber networks are under constant attack. There are 6 million probes on U.S. networks alone. Among the attackers we know are 140 foreign spy organizations. One example: The Syrian Electronic Army defaced the Marine Corps Web site and hacked into numerous print media Web sites. A recent Annual Report to Congress from the U.S. Secretary of Defense documents that China is using its network exploitation capability to support intelligence collections—of course, that is understandable—but hacking into some of our manufacturing and private

sector databases to steal U.S. trade and manufacturing secrets. We know this. It has been put into the record before, but it is worth repeating.

Also this year, in the wake of serious chemical plant incidents in West, Texas and Ascension Parish in Louisiana, we are reminded that people live around chemical plants and industrial sites that are very dangerous. Lots is done to keep them safe, but if that perimeter was ever breached by people who had intentions other than to work there and produce legal products, it could be a disaster. That is ongoing. It is a big country. It is an open country. We have partnerships to build in the private sector, and in large measure that is part of what our budget does. Last week, a Transportation Security officer lost his life, and two others were shot in the line of duty at the Los Angeles airport.

So these attacks are real. This budget does what it can with limited resources. We try to be strategic. We try to be as efficient as we can to make sure that we keep our hundreds of airports, land ports, and water ports safe for people to move, for manufacturing and trade, and for our economy to advance. It is a big job. It takes a lot of money to do that, and it takes cooperation. I sure hope in the next couple of weeks we can find it.

We continue to face threats of weapons of mass destruction. Dirty bombs being detonated in one of our cities or ports is an ongoing worry. A radiological attack would incite not just harm but mass panic and shut down transportation systems. We just cannot afford not to have a Department of Homeland Security budget that is looking to the future. As these threats evolve, they are ever changing. People say: I just bought a cell phone. Do I have to buy another one? The technology is changing so fast, it is hard for people to keep up. I just got a laptop last year. I need to buy another one. The technology is changing. In the same sense, threats are evolving. We can't budget for what happened 2 years ago. We need to budget for the future, and if we can't get this budget worked out, if we can't get our appropriations numbers, we will either be in a continuing resolution—which is basically funding what happened in the past, which makes no sense and wastes taxpayer money—or we will be short-changing our constituents.

For 4 years in a row the Department of Homeland Security has had to tighten its belt. Everyone has. We have been willing to do that. We have operated at reduced funding. But the impact of the sequester—which is really a blunt instrument that cuts funding in a not very smart way. They are automatic cuts that were never intended, that were never designed to run the government. They were really designed to motivate us to do a better job of getting

to the budget. That seems not to be working. As a result, these automatic cuts that are blunt, that are harsh, and that really are not smart are happening to all of our agencies, defense and nondefense alike. It is time to get rid of that inefficient way of operating and go to a more strategic, forward-leaning planning budget process.

I just want to mention an agency that I am very supportive of, the Coast Guard, not only because we build many of the boats in Louisiana but because so many of our people—and Massachusetts as well—are literally saved every year by the Coast Guard. We have lots of water, lots of lakes, lots of important work going on with offshore oil and gas drilling, and we are intercepting drugs that come into the United States. The Coast Guard is on the front line. They are operating their surface and air assets at 25 percent below planned levels because of sequestration—not smart cuts. It has resulted in a 30-percent reduction of drug seizures—people are not happy to hear this; I am not happy to say it—and an 11-percent reduction in the interdiction of undocumented migrants.

Under a yearlong CR, Customs and Border Protection would not be able to hire any new officers for our air, land, and sea ports of entry. This is bad news for travel and trade. The Presiding Officer knows, as people come into America they ask: Why do we have to wait so long in line? We just came here to do business. We have to get to New York, Chicago, Boston, Louisiana, California, and to other places where people come to do international business.

We can't shift assets from the past to the front line with a sequester. We can only do it with a rational budget that will help cities such as New York, Los Angeles, Houston, Chicago, Dallas, New Orleans and Miami to grow. This is important to business. It is important to the Chamber of Commerce.

So I urge my colleagues, let us work very hard together in a bipartisan way to come to some agreement on our budget, so that we can have direction as appropriators to design bills—whether it is for the Department of Education, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Commerce—to fashion budgets that meet future needs, that are not funding tired past priorities but are funding investing in the real future and real-time needs, present and future, of our citizens and of the great country that we believe in and want to see get stronger.

Under a year-long CR, DHS would not be able to implement safeguards to prevent unauthorized release of classified information. Vulnerabilities in the existing system were highlighted in the Wikileaks releases and the more recent disclosures by Edward Snowden. There was no funding in fiscal year 2013 to stop this type of activity so DHS's

classified data will not be adequately protected without fiscal year 2014 funding.

Critical infrastructure protection efforts would be hindered. For example, without the \$34 million above the fiscal year 2013 sequester level, inspections of chemical plants to prevent weaponization by terrorists will be delayed. Funding to better coordinate Federal chemical programs in the wake of the West, Texas facility explosion will not be provided. Increases to prevent catastrophic impacts to critical infrastructure during manmade or natural disasters will be eliminated.

Because of these impacts, it is critical that we conference our fiscal year 2014 Senate bills with our House counterparts so that we can address the weaknesses that continuing to operate at sequestration levels would entail. A conference would also permit a necessary delay to flood insurance rate increases for properties that were formerly grandfathered into affordable rates since the House and Senate Homeland Security bills contain identical language on this issue. This is one small step in a larger effort I have been working on to fix flood insurance so that it is affordable, accessible and self-sustainable. Time and time again, Senators have heard from their constituents about the skyrocketing increases in flood insurance rates. Many homeowners throughout the United States will see their rates rise to unaffordable levels. For example, up to 2.9 million policies nationwide could see their previously grandfathered rates become absolutely unaffordable. One resident in my State of Louisiana could see rates increase from \$633 to over \$20,000 per year. That makes homeownership unachievable for many Americans and traps others in houses that they cannot sell.

We must get our work done. We need to agree on a budget for fiscal year 2014. Then we need to finalize our fiscal year 2014 bills so that our agencies have the appropriate funding for their critical missions—instead of lurching from one funding crisis to the next. This is a hard task but one I believe that is achievable. This is exactly what we were elected to do.

I thank Senator MIKULSKI for her leadership.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 346.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

NOMINATION OF CORNELIA T.L. PILLARD TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Cornelia T. L. Pillard, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, John D. Rockefeller IV, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jon Tester, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mark R. Warner, Patty Murray, Mazie Hirono, Angus S. King, Jr., Barbara Boxer, Jeanne Shaheen, Robert Menendez, Bill Nelson, Debbie Stabenow, Richard Blumenthal.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

DRUG QUALITY AND SECURITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Is the motion to proceed to H.R. 3204 now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed to H.R. 3204 is pending.

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 236, H.R. 3204, an Act

to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Udall, Mark Begich, Brian Schatz, Al Franken, Barbara Boxer, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Barbara Mikulski, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Jeff Merkley.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING IVEY LEE ARMSTRONG, SR.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a wonderful man, Ivey Lee Armstrong, Sr., who died last month. He was just 62. He worked for nearly 30 years cooking and preparing delicious food in the Senate Carryout. The entire Senate community will miss him dearly.

Many of our constituents may not appreciate that the Senate truly is a community. Our partisan or regional differences of opinion are made public on C-SPAN2, in the newspapers, and on the campaign trail. But here, where we work day in and day out, we are surrounded by thousands of hardworking and dedicated people who mostly toil in anonymity. They are the fabric of the community here. They are the ones who keep the Senate functioning. We have our own staff, and the committees have staff, and leadership has staff, and there are the floor and cloakroom staffs and the Parliamentarian and Senate legislative counsel and the Bill Clerk and the Senate reporters, and so on. But we also have Capitol Police, who protect all of us and the thousands of people who visit the Capitol campus daily. We have plumbers and electricians and carpenters and painters. We have people who man the elevators and the subways and help guide the public through the buildings and up into the Galleries. And we have people who work in the cafeterias, including the Senate Carryout in the basement of this building.

I eat lunch at the Senate Carryout frequently because it is convenient and because the food is excellent. It is really home cooking. And I always enjoyed catching up with "Mr. Ivey," as everyone knew him. But it wasn't just his culinary skills that we will miss. Mr.

Ivey was a fine gentleman. He was unfailingly cheerful and polite and he made everyone feel at home.

Meredith Shiner and Niels Lesniewski wrote a nice article about Mr. Ivey in Roll Call, noting that he was often the first person at work in the morning and the last one to leave when the Senate Carryout finally closed for the night. They also noted that he was an Army and Army National Guard veteran who earned the National Defense Service Medal, a Good Conduct Medal, and M16 Sharpshooter awards. I am proud to say he was a constituent and there will be a memorial service for him tomorrow at From the Heart Church of Ministries in Suitland.

Mr. Ivey wasn't just devoted to his country, to the Senate, and to his job, he was devoted to his family and to his faith. According to the Roll Call article, Mr. Ivey re-enlisted so that he could get the health care coverage needed for a sick daughter. It is a big family—8 siblings, 4 children, 10 grandchildren, and 4 great-grandchildren, among others. I want to send my deepest condolences to his family and friends and coworkers. The Senate community has lost one of its finest and kindest members. We will miss his cooking but, more important, we will miss his good cheer, his demeanor, and his friendship.

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, recently the people of Taiwan celebrated their National Day, marked by celebrations, parades, and fireworks befitting its importance as a national holiday. This occasion offers a timely opportunity to reflect on the state of our bilateral relationship with Taiwan, which has been a cooperative and warm relationship over many decades.

In this rapidly evolving 21st-century global economy and with Taiwan's economic significance having steadily grown, it is important for our two nations to further resolve our bilateral trade issues. While some progress has been made through our trade and investment framework agreement, the continued resolution of outstanding trade issues could help pave the way for even deeper ties, including the possibility of a bilateral investment agreement.

Concurrently, the U.S. Trade Representative recently wrapped up the 19th round of negotiations of the Trans-Pacific Partnership. I welcome Taiwan's interest in the TPP—an interest that we hope will serve as a catalyst for Taiwan to continue making progress toward meeting its existing trade commitments so that it may be in a position to meet the higher level requirements of the TPP.

Taiwan continues to be an important friend and ally of the United States,

and we look forward to strengthening those ties.

REMEMBERING SERGEANT LAWRENCE ROUKEY

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, Sergeant Lawrence A. Roukey, a native of Maine, was honored today for his exceptional service and sacrifice by the Defense Intelligence Agency, DIA, in a ceremony at DIA Headquarters. SGT Roukey was among four servicemembers honored and inducted into the DIA Patriots' Memorial located in the lobby at DIA Headquarters on Joint Base Bolling Anacostia in Washington, DC. The DIA Patriots' Memorial honors DIA employees who died in service to the United States in support of DIA's mission.

As a recipient of the Bronze Star Medal and the Purple Heart, Sergeant Roukey has previously been recognized for emulating the highest values of selflessness, dedication, and courage. Let me illustrate how DIA described Sergeant Roukey's heroism and outstanding contribution on behalf of our country and why the agency is honoring him today. A member of the U.S. Army Reserve, Sergeant Roukey volunteered to serve during Operation Iraqi Freedom as a member of the security detail for the Iraq Survey Group mobile collection team that was conducting a critical field inspection in an anticoalition forces area. Under dangerous conditions, Sergeant Roukey and his squad mate provided protective security for personnel charged with inspecting a suspected weapons of mass destruction facility in Baghdad on April 26, 2004. Both soldiers lost their lives when a massive explosion occurred at the facility being inspected.

Prior to rejoining the military as an Army Reservist in Maine, Sergeant Roukey served in the U.S. Army infantry in South Korea and Egypt. He was a respected teammate in the Reserves and at the Portland Post Office, where he worked as a civilian, and he enjoyed hiking and sharing stories about his family.

It is fitting for the DIA and for all of us to honor Sergeant Roukey so close to Veterans Day, as well as all of the men and women who have sacrificed so much in defense of America and American values, including our military intelligence professionals. Prior to today's ceremony, the memorial at DIA honored 21 individuals for their ultimate sacrifice. Now the memorial honors 25 individuals. Today we commemorate Sergeant Roukey and the other servicemembers honored with him, as well as all of those who have served under the flag of the United States of America.

REMEMBERING MASTER SERGEANT MICHAEL LANDSBERRY

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor one of Nevada's own veterans, MSgt Michael Landsberry, who died a hero's death in Sparks, NV, on October 21, 2013. After spotting a student with a gun at Sparks Middle School, Master Sergeant Landsberry moved directly into harm's way to protect his students and others from danger. He was fatally shot. This patriot leaves behind a legacy of self-sacrifice and service to his country and community.

Master Sergeant Landsberry was an Alabama native, a graduate of McQueen High School, a U.S. Marine Corps veteran, a University of Nevada Reno alumnus, and a decorated master sergeant Nevada Guard airman. In 2001, Master Sergeant Landsberry enlisted in the Nevada Air National Guard and subsequently began working for the Washoe County School District. He began his teaching career at Trainer Middle School, where he spent 4 years teaching history, math, and science. In 2006, he started teaching math at Sparks Middle School. Throughout his tenure as a teacher, Master Sergeant Landsberry served as a coach in his community for middle school basketball, cross country, track, and volleyball, as well as high school soccer. He was a passionate teacher, coach, and mentor who touched the lives of his students and those in the community each and every day.

In 2006, Master Sergeant Landsberry deployed to Camp Arifjan, Kuwait, where he performed duties as an airlift validator for the Central Command Deployment and Distribution Center. He deployed again in 2011 to Bagram Airfield in Afghanistan, executing air transportation functions for the 455th Expeditionary Aerial Port Squadron. Throughout his career, Master Sergeant Landsberry was extensively decorated, signifying his strong work ethic and commitment to service.

Today, I also want to recognize and express my gratitude to Master Sergeant Landsberry's family. The sacrifices of our servicemembers and their families are debts that can never fully be repaid. My thoughts and prayers continue to go out to his wife, Sharon, and his two daughters, Alisa and Andrea. This tragedy is one that all of us struggle to understand, but we will continue to remember Master Sergeant Landsberry as a great and honorable man and father. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the life of a courageous patriot whose act of heroism cost him his life but saved many more.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

GREATER NEW BRITAIN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

• Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Greater New Britain Chamber of Commerce.

Founded in 1913, the Greater New Britain Chamber of Commerce has been the business voice of New Britain, CT, for 100 years. Throughout its existence, the Chamber has tirelessly encouraged the growth and success of the manufacturing, medical, and, more recently, high-tech sectors of the local economy. It has provided area businesses with numerous opportunities to market themselves, increase their customer base, network with prospective business partners, cut costs, and share best practices. As New Britain's population growth soared during the first half of the 20th century, the Chamber also actively embraced diversity, helping to ensure that immigrant entrepreneurs had the necessary support and resources to open countless new businesses throughout the city.

New Britain, CT, has had a long and storied industrial history. By 1913, New Britain manufacturers were producing more than 300 kinds of products, and the community had become known as the "The Hardware City." For the past 100 years, the Greater New Britain Chamber of Commerce has helped to build upon that proud industrial legacy. As a result, in reflection of its century-long dedication to the businesses of New Britain and the region, I am proud to honor the 100-year anniversary of the Greater New Britain Chamber of Commerce, its commitment to serving its member companies, and the important role it has played advancing the welfare of the community at large.●

WORLD WAR II VETERANS VISIT

• Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Honor Flight South Alabama, a truly great branch of a great organization which is dedicated to bringing our World War II veterans to their memorial in Washington, DC.

Honor Flight South Alabama has brought over 1,000 veterans and their companions to the World War II Memorial created in their honor and located in Washington, DC. The World War II Memorial honors the 16 million veterans who served in the Armed Forces of the United States, the more than 400,000 who died, and all who supported the war effort from home.

They are truly a remarkable breed of patriots. They endured and survived the biggest war in the history of the world, and deserve such a great memorial in their honor. This Nation owes a debt of gratitude for the sacrifices of these Americans, who left their fami-

lies and lives behind to go "fight the good fight."

The veterans I have spoken to are so positive and enjoy the visit so much. It is remarkable. To be recognized this way has meant so much to them. I have taken great pleasure in having the chance to share in the fellowship of these veterans.

As in any great organization, there are many wonderful leaders who should be recognized. I wish to take a moment to appreciate a few of the directors of Honor Flight South Alabama.

Ms. Margaret Coley, the Director of Volunteer Activities and School Support Systems, had the responsibility of the in-flight mail call program and Welcome Home Ticker Tape parade at Mobile Airport.

COL Pat Downing, the Director of Guardian Training, was charged with the most responsible position on the team, that of presenting an in-depth safety training program to all guardians, thereby allaying any fear on the part of the families in releasing their loved ones for flight day.

Ms. Ann Eubanks, the director of the Medical Support Staff for Springhill Hospital, who was in charge of coordination of comprehensive medical support for our WWII veterans.

Ms. Tina McGrath, the director of Administration, who organized and documented all of the administrative and financial information for the Honor Flight Program.

COL John New, the director of Security, who organized all of the security arrangements between Mobile Regional and Washington Reagan airports and served as the liaison with the National Park Service for all memorials.

CDR Pete Riehm, the director of Operations, who designed, organized, and maintained order for every phase of Honor Flight South Alabama activities.

Finally, Dr. Barry L. Booth, the director of the Veteran-Guardian Program, who coordinated the assignment of all veterans and guardians and assisted in fund-raising activities.

Without these patriotic men and women stepping up to organize this wonderful program, many of the WWII veterans in the region would not have had the opportunity to visit their capital and see the memorial they so richly deserve. I am grateful to all of those who contributed to the Honor Flight programs throughout the country and to those veterans who fought to preserve the freedoms we enjoy today.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN BENJAMIN

• Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, one of the great natural treasures of my State, and of our Nation, is Carlsbad Caverns National Park. Underneath the Guadalupe Mountains, in southeastern New Mexico, lies one of the most spectacular

caverns in the world. Will Rogers famously called it “the Grand Canyon with a roof on it.”

Since 2004, the park has been well served by Superintendent John Benjamin. I rise today to congratulate John on his retirement after 45 years with the National Park Service.

John’s tenure with the Park Service has been a remarkable journey, and he has served with distinction every step of the way. He graduated from Syracuse University with a bachelor’s degree in resource management and a master’s degree in forestry. He then began his career at NPS in 1968 as a park naturalist at Dinosaur National Monument in Colorado and Utah.

For over four decades, John has been an exemplary public servant at America’s greatest wilderness and recreation areas, including Lake Mead, Glacier National Park, Glen Canyon, the Everglades National Park, and the Grand Canyon. He served as deputy superintendent at Boston National Historical Park and Boston African American National Historic Site, and as superintendent of Lake Meredith National Recreation Area, prior to his time at Carlsbad Caverns.

Throughout his career, John has reflected that he enjoyed every job he had and particularly his role as a mentor to others who would go on to serve the Park Service and the American people with the same dedication that he has demonstrated for so many years.

In his book, *The Quiet Crisis*, my dad wrote the following:

Each generation has its own rendezvous with the land, for despite our fee titles and claims of ownership, we are all brief tenants on this planet. By choice, or by default, we will carve out a land legacy for our heirs. We can misuse the land and diminish the usefulness of resources, or we can create a world in which physical affluence and affluence of the spirit go hand in hand.

Public servants like John Benjamin make sure that our “rendezvous with the land” is a noble one and that our national treasures will be safeguarded for generations to come. John can look back on a career of great accomplishment and service. He exemplifies a legacy of professionalism and commitment that will continue to inspire others. I wish him and his wife, Deborah, much happiness in all their future endeavors.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United

States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawals which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1661. A bill to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards of up to \$5,000,000 for information regarding the attacks on the United States diplomatic mission at Benghazi, Libya that began on September 11, 2012.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3517. A communication from the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration’s Annual Report of Payment Recapture Audits; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3518. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Extension of the Expiration Date for State Disability Examiner Authority to Make Fully Favorable Quick Disability Determinations and Compassionate Allowances” (RIN0960-AH59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 4, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3519. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Program Integrity: Exchange, Premium Stabilization Programs, and Market Standards; Amendments to the HHS Notice of Benefit and Payment Parameters for 2014” (RIN0938-AR82; RIN0938-AR74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 29, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3520. A communication from the Assistant Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Credit for Production from Advanced Nuclear Facilities” (Notice 2013-68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 4, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3521. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Announcement of the Results of the 2012-2013 Phase III Allocation Round of the Qualifying Advanced Coal Project Program” (Announcement 2013-43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 4, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3522. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and

Segment Rates” (Notice 2013-66) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 4, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3523. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “2014 Cost-of-Living Adjustments to the Internal Revenue Code Tax Tables and Other Items” (Rev. Proc. 2013-35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 4, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3524. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Q and A Tax Credits for Sections 25C and 25D” (Notice 2013-70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 4, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3525. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “FFI Agreement for Participating FFI and Reporting Model 2 FFI” (Notice 2013-69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 4, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3526. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 1, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3527. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to its audit and investigative activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3528. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-70; Small Entity Compliance Guide” (FAC 2005-70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3529. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the District of Columbia’s fiscal year 2014 Budget and Financial Plan; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3530. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report for the period of April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3531. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General’s Semiannual Report for the six-month period from April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3532. A communication from the Program Manager, Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology,

Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2014 Edition Electronic Health Record Certification Criteria: Revision to the Definition of 'Common Meaningful Use (MU) Data Set'" (RIN0991-AB91) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 4, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3533. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act of 2012 (FDASIA); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3534. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Family Education Loan Program, and William D. Ford Federal Loan Program" (RIN1840-AD12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 6, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3535. A communication from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 6, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3536. A communication from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate for the period from April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 7, 2013; ordered to lie on the table.

EC-3537. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Boscalid; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9401-5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 6, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3538. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "FD and C Green No. 3; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9402-7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 6, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3539. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prothioconazole; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9400-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 6, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3540. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Farm Loan Programs; Clarification and Improvement" (RIN0560-A114) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3541. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of the Commodity Futures

Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants; Clerical or Ministerial Employees" (RIN3038-AE00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 6, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3542. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 6, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3543. A communication from the Director, Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Financial Reporting Requirements for Non-Profit Organizations" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 6, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 822. A bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1661. A bill to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards of up to \$5,000,000 for information regarding the attacks on the United States diplomatic mission at Benghazi, Libya that began on September 11, 2012; read the first time.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 1662. A bill to provide for the introduction of pay-for-performance compensation mechanisms into contracts of the Department of Veterans Affairs with community-based outpatient clinics for the provision of health care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1663. A bill to end the unconstitutional delegation of legislative power which was exclusively vested in the Senate and House of Representatives by article I, section 1 of the Constitution of the United States, and to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to issue a report to Congress detailing the extent of the problem of unconstitu-

tional delegation to the end that such delegations can be phased out, thereby restoring the constitutional principle of separation of powers set forth in the first sections of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1664. A bill to end the practice of including more than one subject in a single bill by requiring that each bill enacted by Congress be limited to only one subject, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1665. A bill to preserve the constitutional authority of Congress and ensure accountability and transparency in legislation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 1666. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to improve the patient navigator program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1667. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to provide consumers with a free annual disclosure of information the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection maintains on them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 1668. A bill to require a Comptroller General of the United States report on the impact of certain mental and physical trauma on the discharge of members of the Armed Forces for misconduct; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. VITTER):

S. 1669. A bill to provide for proper reimbursement of the Department of Defense for assistance provided to nongovernmental entertainment-oriented media producers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. HATCH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. RISC, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BURR, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. LEE):

S. 1670. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 1671. A bill to delay the implementation of the individual health coverage mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1672. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 1673. A bill to help States develop and improve the qualifications and training of their early childhood educator workforce; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 1674. A bill to help establish, enhance, and increase access to early childhood parent education and family engagement programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 1675. A bill to reduce recidivism and increase public safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1676. A bill to exempt certain payments to States from sequestration; to the Committee on the Budget.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 289. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams and should be discouraged; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 84

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 84, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 603

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 603, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 695

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr.

HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 695, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay a monthly assistance allowance to disabled veterans training or competing for the Paralympic Team and the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide assistance to United States Paralympics, Inc., and for other purposes.

S. 700

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 700, a bill to ensure that the education and training provided members of the Armed Forces and veterans better assists members and veterans in obtaining civilian certifications and licenses, and for other purposes.

S. 709

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, leading to better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

S. 718

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 718, a bill to create jobs in the United States by increasing United States exports to Africa by at least 200 percent in real dollar value within 10 years, and for other purposes.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 825

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 825, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S.

942, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 971

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 971, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements.

S. 1143

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1143, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1181

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1181, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes.

S. 1320

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1320, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the armed forces.

S. 1332

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 1335

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1335, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1525

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1525, a bill to ensure that the personal and private information of Americans enrolling in Exchanges established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is secured with proper privacy and data security safeguards.

S. 1530

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1530, a bill to realign structures and reallocate resources in the Federal Government, in keeping with the core American belief that families are the best protection for children and the bedrock of any society, to bolster United States diplomacy and assistance targeted at ensuring that every child can grow up in a permanent, safe, nurturing, and loving family, and to strengthen intercountry adoption to the United States and around the world and ensure that it becomes a viable and fully developed option for providing families for children in need, and for other purposes.

S. 1589

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1589, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure the Department of Veterans Affairs has an up-to-date policy on reporting of cases of infectious diseases, to require an independent assessment of the Veterans Integrated Service Networks and medical centers of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1592

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1592, a bill to provide for a delay of the individual mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until the American Health Benefit Exchanges are functioning properly.

S. 1610

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1610, a bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

S. 1642

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1642, a bill to permit the continuation of certain health plans.

S. 1647

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1647, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal distributions for medicine qualified only if for prescribed drug or insulin.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 165

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 165, a resolution calling for the release from prison of former Prime Minister of Ukraine Yulia Tymoshenko in light of the recent European Court of Human Rights ruling.

S. RES. 251

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 251, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Preventive Services Task Force should reevaluate its recommendations against prostate-specific antigen-based screening for prostate cancer for men in all age groups in consultation with appropriate specialists.

S. RES. 284

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 284, a resolution calling on the Government of Iran to immediately release Saeed Abedini and all other individuals detained on account of their religious beliefs.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 1662. A bill to provide for the introduction of pay-for-performance compensation mechanisms into contracts of the Department of Veterans Affairs with community-based outpatient clinics for the provision of health care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1662

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans Health Care Improvement Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Veterans of the Armed Forces have made tremendous sacrifices in the defense of freedom and liberty.

(2) Congress recognizes these great sacrifices and reaffirms America's strong commitment to its veterans.

(3) As part of the on-going congressional effort to recognize the sacrifices made by America's veterans, Congress has dramatically increased funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans health care in the years since September 11, 2001.

(4) Part of the funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans health care is allocated toward community-based outpatient clinics (CBOCs).

(5) A number of CBOCs are administered by private contractors.

(6) CBOCs administered by private contractors operate on a capitated basis.

(7) Some current contracts for CBOCs may create an incentive for contractors to enroll as many veterans as possible, without ensuring timely access to high quality health care for such veterans.

(8) The top priorities for CBOCs should be to provide quality health care and patient satisfaction for America's veterans.

(9) The Department of Veterans Affairs currently tracks the quality of patient care through its Computerized Patient Record System. However, fees paid to contractors are not currently adjusted automatically to reflect the quality of care provided to patients.

(10) A pay-for-performance payment model offers a promising approach to health care delivery by aligning the payment of fees to contractors with the achievement of better health outcomes for patients.

(11) The Department of Veterans Affairs should begin to emphasize pay-for-performance in its contracts with CBOCs.

SEC. 3. PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE UNDER DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CONTRACTS WITH COMMUNITY-BASED OUTPATIENT HEALTH CARE CLINICS.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a plan to introduce pay-for-performance measures into contracts which compensate contractors of the Department of Veterans Affairs for the provision of health care services through community-based outpatient clinics (CBOCs).

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Measures to ensure that contracts of the Department for the provision of health care services through CBOCs begin to utilize pay-for-performance compensation mechanisms for compensating contractors for the provision of such services through such clinics, including mechanisms as follows:

(A) To provide incentives for clinics that provide high-quality health care.

(B) To provide incentives to better assure patient satisfaction.

(C) To impose penalties (including termination of contract) for clinics that provide substandard care.

(2) Mechanisms to collect and evaluate data on the outcomes of the services generally provided by CBOCs in order to provide for an assessment of the quality of health care provided by such clinics.

(3) Mechanisms to eliminate abuses in the provision of health care services by CBOCs

under contracts that continue to utilize capitated-basis compensation mechanisms for compensating contractors.

(4) Mechanisms to ensure that veterans are not denied care or face undue delays in receiving care.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall commence the implementation of the plan on the date that is 60 days after the date of the submittal of the plan. In implementing the plan, the Secretary may initially carry out one or more pilot programs to assess the feasibility and advisability of mechanisms under the plan.

(d) REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the recommendations of the Secretary as to the feasibility and advisability of utilizing pay-for-performance compensation mechanisms in the provision of health care services by the Department by means in addition to CBOCs.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1672. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Special Needs Trust Fairness Act with my friends, Senators GRASSLEY, ROCKEFELLER, and ENZI. Our common-sense bill will correct a fundamental flaw that prevents individuals with disabilities from creating their own trusts. This is a basic right that should have never been overlooked.

November is Long-Term Care Awareness Month, when hopefully many families will discuss and decide how to best plan for their retirement and their future health care needs. Unfortunately, current law assumes people with disabilities lack the requisite capacity to create such trusts for their long-term care needs, so these individuals must turn to others to create such a trust. This creates an unnecessary and sometimes costly burden on the individual and additional caseloads in our over-worked courts.

I also am pleased to have the support of the American Association of People with Disabilities and Easter Seals as well as the National Academy of Elder Law Attorneys, the Academy of Florida Elder Law Attorneys, the Academy of Special Needs Planners, and the Florida Joint Public Policy Task Force for the Elderly and Disabled.

I urge my colleagues to support me in this legislation so that we can finally correct this flaw.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES,
Washington, DC, October 31, 2013.

Hon. BILL NELSON,
U.S. Senate, Senate Hart Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
U.S. Senate, Senate Hart Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON AND SENATOR GRASSLEY: I am pleased to support the Special Needs Trust Fairness Act of 2013 (H.R. 2123 in the House) on behalf of the American Association of People with Disabilities (AAPD). I commend your bipartisan effort to empower people with disabilities by introducing this legislation. The Special Needs Trust Fairness Act will allow people with disabilities to set up a special needs trust for themselves.

AAPD is the nation's largest disability rights organization. We promote equal opportunity, economic power, independent living and political participation for people with disabilities. Our members, including people with disabilities and our family, friends, and supporters, represent a powerful force for change.

A special needs trust allows assets to be held in a trust and protects against the risk of complete impoverishment. As you know, due to a glitch in the current law, a capable, competent person with a disability is prohibited from creating her or his own special needs trust. We are in the position of having to ask a parent, grandparent, guardian, or the court to do so for us. This legislation not only eradicates this discrimination against people with disabilities, but also promotes self-sufficiency and independence.

Thank you for your leadership on this important issue. AAPD looks forward to working with you on passage of the Special Needs Trust Fairness Act of 2013. Please feel free to contact Colin Schwartz if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

HENRY CLAYPOOL,
Executive Vice President.

EASTER SEALS,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, October 31, 2013.

Hon. BILL NELSON,
Chairman, Special Committee on Aging, U.S.
Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NELSON: Easter Seals is pleased to support your efforts to introduce the Special Needs Trust Fairness Act of 2013 in the United States Senate. This legislation would empower individuals with disabilities to help plan and save for their future daily living expenses by allowing them to set up a special needs trust for themselves, which is prevented under current law.

Easter Seals is a national nonprofit organization that provides individualized services and supports to help people with disabilities or special needs and their families reach their potential. Through our network of 72 community-based affiliates, including the four that serve the state of Florida, Easter Seals assisted more than 1.4 million individuals and their families last year through community-based services, including medical rehabilitation, employment, child care, adult and senior services, caregiving, and camping and recreation.

Easter Seals understands how important access to quality services and long-term supports are for individuals with disabilities. One tool to help ensure individuals with disabilities have access to these essential serv-

ices and support beyond what is available through the government is through a special needs trust. Currently, a special needs trust can be created for a person with a disability by family members, a guardian or the court. Unfortunately, current law prevents people with disabilities from creating their own special needs trust for their asset, which can later be used to supplement living expenses and care when government benefits alone are insufficient. This legislation would remove this barrier, giving individuals with disabilities direct access to a current tool that can help them live independently and improve their health and well-being.

Thank you for your leadership on this important issue. Easter Seals looks forward to working with you following your introduction of the Special Needs Trust Fairness Act of 2013 to help ensure the legislation receives consideration and approval during the 113th Congress.

Sincerely,

KATY BEH NEAS,
Senior Vice President,
Government Relations.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF ELDER
LAW ATTORNEYS, INC.,
Vienna, VA, November 7, 2013.

Hon. BILL NELSON,
Senate Hart Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: We congratulate you for your leadership in protecting individuals with disabilities from unjust and discriminatory laws and we applaud your introduction of the Special Needs Trust Fairness Act of 2013. As you know, currently under the law, individuals with disabilities who have the requisite mental capacity are prevented from creating their own special needs trusts, which Congress has already authorized. They must have a parent, grandparent, guardian, or the court create their special needs trust even though they have the mental capacity to do it themselves.

As elder law attorneys, NAEALA members' clients experience this injustice on a regular basis. Not all individuals have a parent, grandparent or guardian who can create their special needs trusts for them, and many of these individuals are forced to petition a court and pay additional fees to have a special needs trust. The Special Needs Trust Fairness Act of 2013 will remove the current barriers that prevent an individual with disabilities from creating his or her own special needs trust.

NAELA is a professional association consisting of more than 4,300 attorneys who advocate for the rights of seniors and people with disabilities. Elder law attorneys are specialized and trained in a variety of areas in the law that address an individual's long-term care needs.

NAELA has made your legislation a top priority and stands ready to assist you in securing passage of the Fairness Act and eliminating this unjustified discrimination in the law.

Sincerely,

PETER G. WACHT, CAE,
Executive Director.
HOWARD S. KROOKS, CELA,
CAP,
President.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 289—EX-
PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE
SENATE THAT AMBUSH MAR-
KETING ADVERSELY AFFECTS
THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC
AND PARALYMPIC TEAMS AND
SHOULD BE DISCOURAGED

Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 289

Whereas the 2014 Olympic and Paralympic Games will occur on February 7 through February 23, 2014, and March 7 through March 16, 2014, respectively, in Sochi, Russia;

Whereas more than 5,500 athletes from 80 nations will compete in 7 Olympic sports and 1,350 Paralympic athletes will compete in 5 sports;

Whereas American athletes have spent countless days, months, and years training to earn a spot on the United States Olympic or Paralympic teams;

Whereas the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act (36 U.S.C. 220501 et seq.)—

(1) established the United States Olympic Committee as the coordinating body for all Olympic and Paralympic athletic activity in the United States;

(2) gave the United States Olympic Committee the exclusive right in the United States to use the words “Olympic”, “Olympiad”, “Paralympic”, and “Paralympiad”, the emblem of the United States Olympic Committee, and the symbols of the International Olympic Committee and the International Paralympic Committee; and

(3) empowered the United States Olympic Committee to authorize sponsors that contribute to the United States Olympic or Paralympic teams to use any trademark, symbol, insignia, or emblem of the International Olympic Committee, International Paralympic Committee, the Pan-American Sports Organization, or the United States Olympic Committee;

Whereas Team USA is significantly funded by 31 sponsors who assure that the United States has the best Olympic teams possible;

Whereas, in recent years, a number of entities in the United States have engaged in ambush marketing as a marketing strategy, affiliating themselves with the Olympic and Paralympic Games without becoming sponsors of Team USA;

Whereas ambush marketing harms the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams, undermines sponsorship activities, and gives ambush marketers an unfair and unethical advantage over entities that officially sponsor and provide funding for the elite athletes of the United States; and

Whereas efforts to prevent ambush marketing have enjoyed limited success as the strategies used by ambush marketers continue to multiply: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams and their ability to attract and retain the sponsorships necessary to be successful at the 2014 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Sochi, Russia; and

(2) entities in the United States should cease all ambush marketing efforts related

to the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a business meeting has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. This business meeting will be held on Thursday, November 14, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, prior to the already scheduled nominations hearing.

The purpose of the business meeting is to consider pending military land withdrawal bills.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by email to Abigail_Campbell@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224-7571 or Abigail Campbell at (202) 224-4905.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on November 14, 2013, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to consider the following legislation: S. 1352, A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; S. 1448, A bill to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes; and S. 434, A bill to authorize and implement the water rights compact among the Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation and the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224-2251.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, November 14, 2013, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct an oversight hearing entitled “Contract Support Costs and Sequestration: Fiscal Crisis in Indian Country.”

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224-2251.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 20, 2013, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct an oversight hearing to receive testimony on “Carceri: Bringing Certainty to Trust Land Acquisitions.”

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO
MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 7, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN
AFFAIRS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 7, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Housing Finance Reform: Essential Elements To Provide Affordable Options for Housing.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 7, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 7, 2013, at 11 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION,
PRODUCT SAFETY, AND INSURANCE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 7, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, “Demand Letters and Consumer Protection: Examining Deceptive Practices by Patent Assertion Entities.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT, FEDERAL RIGHTS, AND AGENCY ACTION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Oversight, Federal Rights, and Agency Action, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on November 7, 2013, at 1:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Justice Denied: Rules Delayed on Auto Safety and Mental Health."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Zachary Kachevas and Nicole DuBois, of my staff, be granted the privilege of the floor during the remainder of today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. TROOP WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 280.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 280) recognizing the 40th anniversary of the withdrawal of United States combat troops from the Vietnam War and expressing renewed support for United States veterans of that conflict.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 280) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of October 31, 2013, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1661

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told that there is a bill at the desk due for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the title of the bill for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1661) to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards of up to \$5,000,000 for information regarding the attacks on the United States diplomatic mission at Benghazi, Libya that began on September 11, 2012.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that from Thursday, November 7, through Tuesday, November 12, the majority leader be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2013, AND TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11:45 a.m. on Friday, November 8, 2013, for a pro forma session; that will be all we will do, with no business conducted; and that following the pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, November 12, 2013; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 4:30 with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; that at 4:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 346, the nomination of Cornelia Pillard to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia, with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided and controlled in the usual form prior to a cloture vote on the nomination; further, that if cloture is invoked on the Pillard nomination, upon disposition of the nomination, the Senate resume legislative session and the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 3204, the Pharmaceutical Drug Compounding bill; and finally, that if cloture is not invoked on the Pillard nomination, the Senate immediately resume legislative session and the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 3204, the pharmaceutical bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. There will be up to two rollcall votes on Tuesday, November 12, beginning at 5:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:45 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:15 p.m., adjourned until Friday, November 8, 2013, at 11:45 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

JOSEPH P. MOHOROVIĆ, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SEVEN YEARS FROM OCTOBER 27, 2012, VICE NANCY ANN NORD, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

JANICE MARION SCHNEIDER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, VICE WILMA A. LEWIS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ELLEN DUDLEY WILLIAMS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE ARUN MAJUMDAR, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

COLLEEN BRADLEY BELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO HUNGARY.

JOSEPH WILLIAM WESTPHAL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

JANET L. YELLEN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE BEN S. BERNANKE, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

MADELYN R. CREEDON, OF INDIANA, TO BE PRINCIPAL DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, VICE NEILE L. MILLER, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

SCOTT A. HABER
PAUL R. HLADON
MATTHEW G. KESLER
YVES P. LEBLANC

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203(A):

To be captain

KENNETH J. ANDERSON
JAMES B. ANDREWS
JAMES F. BLOW
ROBERT M. BRADY
BARON K. BROWN
LISA M. CAMPBELL
DANIEL W. CLARK
BRION J. FITZGERALD
JOHN M. HARTZELL
STEVEN J. HILL
PETER D. KILLMER
JAMES S. LIVINGOOD
KYLE E. MAKI
FRANK V. MCCONNELL
GERALD A. NAUERT
RAFAEL A. ORTIZ
CAROL A. POLLIO
KERSTIN B. RHINEHART
JAMES P. ROBINSON
FRANKLIN H. SCHAEFER

DOUGLAS B. SCHNEIDER
BENJAMIN L. SMITH
MATTHEW B. STUCK
ALAN R. TUBBS
FREDERICK WASCO
FOREST A. WILLIS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES
COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(E):

To be captain

WAYNE R. ARGUIN
PAUL D. ARNETT
JERRY R. BARNES
SCOTT A. BEAUREGARD
DAVID F. BERLINER
GEORGE L. BOONE
WILLIAM CARTER
ANTHONY J. CERAULO
MICHAEL A. CLYBURN
MICHAEL R. COCKLIN
LAURA D. COLLINS
SEAN M. CROSS
BRYAN E. DAILEY
JOSEPH E. DEER
PAUL E. DITTMAN
CHARLENE L. DOWNEY
BRYAN L. DURR
DAVID M. EHLERS
THOMAS M. EMERICK
BRIAN E. FIEDLER
GREGORY T. FULLER
GEOFFREY P. GAGNIER
EDWARD J. GAYNOR
MICHAEL W. GLANDER
ERIC S. GLEASON
MARK D. GORDON
SHANNAN D. GREENE
THOMAS A. GRIFFITTS
DUSTIN E. HAMACHER
BENJAMIN J. HAWKINS
JAMES A. HEALY
CHAD L. JACOBY
BRENDAN D. KELLY
THOMAS H. KING
AMY E. KOVAC
JOSEPH E. KRAMEK
MICHAEL C. LONG
JUAN LOPEZ
JOHN S. LUCE
KIRSTEN R. MARTIN
THOMAS W. MCDEVITT
MALCOLM R. MCLELLAN
DARRAN J. MCLEON
JASON A. MERRIWEATHER
JAMES B. MILLICAN
MICHAEL A. MULLEN
PATRICK J. MURPHY
KEVIN D. ODITT
STEVEN F. OSGOOD
KEITH A. OVERSTREET
DAVID L. PETTY
MICHAEL E. PLATT
DAVID W. RAMASSINI
WILFORD R. REAMS
FRANCISCO S. REGO
JOSHUA D. REYNOLDS
KEVIN W. RIDDLE
MICHAEL T. RORSTAD
ORIN E. RUSH
MATTHEW A. RYMER
ROSS L. SARGENT
HARRY M. SCHMIDT
JAMES W. SEEMAN
EDWARD B. SHEPPARD
WILLIAM G. SMITH
JOSEPH E. STAIER
GREGORY STANCLIK
BION B. STEWART
LAURA J. THOMPSON
JOSEPH G. UZMANN
ALDANTE VINCIGUERRA
MATTHEW R. WALKER
THOMAS F. WALSH
RICHARD J. WESTER
KEVIN E. WIRTH
MICHAEL B. ZAMPERINI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES
COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(E):

To be commander

STEVEN C. ACOSTA
MICHAEL N. ADAMS
JEREMY J. ANDERSON
BRADFORD E. APITZ

WALTER J. ARMSTRONG
WILLIAM L. ARMITT
MATTHEW J. BAER
GRETCHEN M. BAILEY
GREGORY R. BARBIAUX
PATRICK T. BARELLI
KEVIN M. BARRES
IAN A. BASTEK
JONATHAN J. BATES
PAUL R. BEAVIS
BRENT R. BERGAN
KRISTI L. BERTSTEIN
KEVIN C. BERRY
JASON M. BIGGER
KATIE R. BLANCHARD
AMY L. BLOYD
DIANNA L. BO
MATTHEW A. BRADEN
JOHN B. BRADY
MARC T. BRANDT
JASON A. BRENNELL
CHARLES J. BRIGHT
RANDALL E. BROWN
JONATHAN A. CARTER
ANTHONY B. CAUDLE
KIMBERLY B. CHESTEEN
MICHAEL A. CILENTI
HECTOR L. CINTRON, JR.
JEFFREY S. CLARK
CHRISTOPHER F. COUTU
THOMAS C. DARCY
CARMEN S. DEGEORGE
FRANCIS J. DEL ROSSO
KELLY K. DENNING
DAVID M. DUBAY
JOHN A. ELY
ANTHONY S. ERICKSON
BRIAN C. ERICKSON
SEAN C. FAHEY
JOSHUA W. FANT
JAMES T. FLANNERY
AURORA I. FLEMING
FRANK L. FLOOD
AMY E. FLORENTINO
KEVIN D. FLOYD
JAMES G. FORGY
PAUL E. FRANTZ
MATTHEW J. FUNDERBURK
GLENN J. GALMAN
BENJAMIN A. GATES
EDWARD P. GERAGHTY
BENJAMIN M. GOLIGHTLY
MARK A. GRABOSKI
TIMOTHY J. GRANT
JASON B. GUNNING
MATTHEW W. HAMMOND
KEITH T. HANLEY
SEAN P. HANNIGAN
JOANNE N. HANSON
KATRINA B. HARPER
CHARLES W. HAWKINS
EDWARD J. HERNAEZ
WESLEY H. HESTER
ANGELA R. HOLBROOK
TOBY L. HOLDRIDGE
BRIAN P. HOPKINS
TEDD B. HUTLEY
RANDY J. JENKINS
STARLING S. JINRIGHT
ANDREW S. JOCA
ERIC J. JONES
SCOTT B. JONES
ANDREA K. KATSENESE
MICHAEL A. KEANE
IBRAHIM M. KHALIL
MICHAEL E. KICKLIGHTER
JUSTIN A. KIMURA
CASSIE A. KITCHEN
DIRK L. KRAUSE
MICHAEL S. KRAUSE
BRIAN C. KRAUTLER
JON M. KREISCHER
THOMAS E. KUJAR
MARK I. KUPERMAN
TAYLOR Q. LAM
TIMOTHY R. LAVIER
LYNDA C. LECRONE
TIMOTHY J. LIST
JOHN H. LOVEJOY
LEANNE M. LUSK
EVELYN L. LYNN
ERICA N. MACK
JOSE D. MARTIS
BENJAMIN J. MAULE
ALAN B. MCCABE
LEON MCCLAIN JR
TIMOTHY M. MCLELLAN

PAUL S. MCCONNELL
AARON R. MEADOWS-HILLS
IVAN R. MENESES
ZEITA MERCHANT
JOSEPH E. MEUSE
JOSHUA P. MILLER
STEPHANIE A. MORRISON
DAVID B. MURRAY
BRYAN C. PAPE
ERIC D. PEACE
ROBERT M. PEKARI
JOSE A. PEREZ
DOUGLAS C. PETRUSA
KRISTIAN B. PICKRELL
ERIC C. POPIEL
SCOTT B. POWERS
CLINTON J. PRINDLE
ARTHUR L. RAY
TODD E. RAYBON
VICTOR F. RIVERA
BRIAN W. ROBINSON
MARTHA A. RODRIGUEZ
BRUST B. ROETHLER
JERREL W. RUSSELL
ROBERT G. SALEMBIER
MICHAEL R. SARNOWSKI
RICHARD M. SCOTT
FRED W. SEATON
WILLIAM E. SEWARD
MICHAEL R. SINCLAIR
KEVIN J. SMITH
BOWEN C. SPIEVACK
BLAKE D. STOCKWELL
JENNIFER A. STOCKWELL
VERONICA A. STREITMATTER
SHAD A. THOMAS
PATRICK M. THOMPSON
DEREK R. THORSRUD
JEFFREY M. VAJDA
DANIEL R. WARREN
DONIS W. WATERS
DOUGLAS G. WATSON
JAMES D. WEAVER
EDWARD A. WIELAND
ERIN E. WILLIAMS
TARIK L. WILLIAMS
AMY E. WIRTS
CHRISTOPHER G. WOLFE
MARC A. ZLOMEK

THE JUDICIARY

ROBIN S. ROSENBAUM, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT, VICE ROSEMARY BARKETT, RESIGNED.
JAMES D. PETERSON, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN, VICE JOHN C. SHABAZ, RETIRED.
NANCY J. ROSENSTENGEL, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE G. PATRICK MURPHY, RETIRING.
RONNIE L. WHITE, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, VICE JEAN C. HAMILTON, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

KEVIN W. TECHAU, OF IOWA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE STEPHANIE M. ROSE, RESIGNED.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive message transmitted by the President to the Senate on November 7, 2013, withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nominations:

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF LT. GEN. SUSAN J. HELMS, TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MARCH 19, 2013.

BEN S. BERNANKE, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, (REAPPOINTMENT), WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON APRIL 18, 2013.

THOMAS EDGAR WHEELER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2013, VICE JULIUS GENACHOWSKI, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MAY 9, 2013.

SENATE—Friday, November 8, 2013

The Senate met at 11:45 and 15 seconds a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable CHRISTOPHER MURPHY, a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

—————

**APPOINTMENT OF ACTING
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, November 8, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of Rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRISTOPHER MURPHY, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MURPHY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

—————

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY,
NOVEMBER 12, 2013, AT 2 P.M.**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, November 12, 2013.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:45 and 42 seconds a.m., adjourned until Tuesday, November 12, 2013, at 2 p.m.